

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE: I do not want to say anything about what motion should come and all that. I only want to bring to your notice that we were debating a motion moved by Shri Vajpayee which suggested that the debate on the business of the House be adjourned, and that motion has not yet been disposed of. Until the motion moved by Shri Vajpayee for adjournment of the business of the House under rule 109 is disposed of, the Rules of Business would not allow any other business to be taken up.

MR. SPEAKER: I accept it.....
(Interruptions).

Now, here are these motions. The motion in the name of Shri Hem Barua came earlier. I will read that motion. It says:

"That the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, be taken into consideration."

SHRI NATH PAI: The one disapproving of the stand.....

MR. SPEAKER: There are a number of them. If that motion is there, then the other one comes as an amendment. Shall we take up this motion?

16.10 HRS.

MOTION RE. U. N. SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION RELATING TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Yes. That is all right.

Sir, I beg to move:

"That the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, be taken into consideration."

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Dwivedy.

SHRI P. G. SEN (Purnea): Some time may be given for members to move amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one hour, up to 5 p.m.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Before the discussion starts, may I make a submission? Shri Vajpayee has been saying that the discussion must be conducted in a very dignified manner. On behalf of the Congress Party, may I make an appeal to Shri Vajpayee to see that it is his responsibility as Leader of his Party to restrain his members so that the debate could be conducted in a dignified way? (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I expect this co-operation from all Leaders. I may say honestly that but for their co-operation, even this much of discipline would not have been there in the House. I am very grateful to them for the help they have been giving. When something happens, they have been going round to their members and restraining them and trying to help that way.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You must add that you do not see the Prime Minister or even the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs running to some corner of the back benches of the Congress Party to restrain the disgraceful behaviour that you occasionally see from that side. (Interruptions).

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: I have to say that it was very cruel of the lady Prime Minister to say that I did not restrain the Opposition members. I am here for that purpose, and I have always restrained them.

MR. SPEAKER: I have seen that.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: But she did not hear what I said. Will you bring it to her notice?

I shall repeat for her. I was saying that it was very cruel of the lady Prime Minister to say that I am not restraining the Opposition parties. I have restrained the Opposition. I am here for that purpose. I have not said one word to the Congress members.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I apologise. I did not intend cruelty.

MR. SPEAKER: She apologises.

SHRI NATH PAI: That is the only good thing she has done today.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: I want to make it very clear at the outset that I have no quarrel with Shri Vajpayee if he had moved his Resolution. He would have expressed the same feelings which I am going to voice on this matter.

When I listened to the Prime Minister's statement on this question, I was really surprised and shocked. She says and admits that the Resolution before the Security Council, which she has asked our representative to abstain from voting on, is a total resolution which cannot be voted in parts, and as a result they could not but abstain. The crux of the resolution was condemnation of the aggression. That was what this House and this country wanted. The only plea that the Prime Minister took yesterday was that 'since the matter is before the Security Council, let me not commit myself, let me not use strong words so that we can play a part when the resolution is discussed; otherwise, it may create difficulties in our way'. That was the only explanation she gave to the House. She wanted time so that when the resolution is already before the Security Council, they could see if it was possible to manouvre and take other countries with them so far as their attitude to this resolution is concerned. But by telling us now that 'we have supported this part', 'we have supported that part', she has evaded the crux of the matter, the very crux of the resolution which is condemnation of aggression which all the seven powers agreed to do. By refraining from voting, and accepting that position, Government have committed a breach of faith with the Parliament of India and the people of India. Why are you afraid? The Hon. Prime Minister asked the Opposition to agree with her stand on the question of the safety of the

leaders of Czechoslovakia, on the question of the sovereignty and integrity of Czechoslovakia. She wanted this assurance and said: let us unite on this problem. But what was done in the Security Council. The Security Council Resolution said nothing except this, it said that we condemned the use of force. We wanted to assure Czechoslovakia of her integrity and sovereignty. That was the resolution. It has now become clear that this Government is not really deciding the policies of this country and nobody can deny that there is outside influence working on them. The Russians wanted time. The Prime Minister says that our representative in the United Nations asked the other Powers to give him some time, to wait till we make up our mind. Actually the Russians wanted time so that the Czechoslovak nation would be completely annihilated and crushed and there would be no Czechoslovakia by the time the resolution was accepted by the Security Council. Therefore, they are playing the game of the Soviet Union's aggressors. It was never expected of this great nation to bring degradation to India by not supporting such a motion. Why did they not move a substitute motion or sponsor a resolution? When this matter came before the Security Council, why did they not advise their representative to do so? If they wanted to deeply deplore the events why did they not sponsor a resolution on their own? That shows that we are guided by some other country, which has dictated how to do things, how to behave in the international forum. This is a disgrace to the whole country. Let it be clearly known that whatever the Government of India has done, the people of India do not support it; the people of India are against this Government and they demand that the Government should resign on this issue. Let us go to the people and let the people of India give their opinion, whether the honour of India has been maintained by the present Government. It has been repeatedly said in this House that it is not merely a question of

aggression by Soviet Russia against Czechoslovakia; it is a question of a country deciding its own destiny, a question of having a free choice to shape its policy and its future. The Bratislava Declaration also accepted this. These principles were subscribed to by them. By refraining from such a resolution did they encourage these principles? Whether they are Americans or the Russians, so far as the big powers are concerned, so far as the strangulation of the small powers and small nations is concerned, they are one, they pursue the same policy and they use their strong arm to see that small nations do not at all prosper or do not go their own way. That is why this is done; it has nothing to do with international communism; it has everything to do with Soviet Imperialism. Soviet Imperialism was threatened. It was going to be disintegrated. If the Czechs could stand on their legs in this matter, I am sure not only in Czechoslovakia but in Poland and Hungary and even in Soviet Russia itself, there would have been a revolution and change, as a result of which there would not have been this hegemony in Soviet Russia as it exists today. It is clear, though they may say that there is no difference and that Kosygin has not resigned, there is no doubt about the fact that there is serious difference and split in the Kremlin itself. And one does not know the technocrats, the various writers and others, the new generation that is coming up in Soviet Russia which are against any suppression; they want freedom; they want really to change the entire set-up that exists today. I do not know, if this had been allowed to continue in Czechoslovakia, there would have been a revolution in Russia itself and as a result, the present regime would have been ousted completely.

Therefore, you will note why some Communists do not want a resolution of this nature. It is because of the threat, a threat to their very existence in Soviet Russia. Now, are you going to be a party to that? Is it part of our policy of co-existence?

Is it part of our policy of non-interference? I want to ask, what is the policy. The Prime Minister, in her statement, has not justified the reasons why they refrained from voting. Therefore, I indict this Government. I say again and again, if you really want to pursue the policy that has been adopted by this House, if you really want to pursue the policy which you yourself yesterday only told the House, reiterated so strongly, if that is what you want to follow, you are betraying the people; you are betraying this country; this a breach of faith; it is treason; it is a disgrace.

Therefore, I ask, and want to repeat, we adjourn to discuss this very important matter. I would like the House to adjourn entirely without transacting any business, because this Government is not resigning; if it has any shame, if it has any consideration for the nation as a whole, it would have resigned and it would apologise to the nation for committing this blunder. I am sure that if this Government here had not instructed, and had asked our representative that "you act according to the policy that we have so far", I have no doubt in my mind, whoever he may be, he would have certainly voted in favour of the resolution. This Government is working as an agent of Russia; it has no right to exist, and it is a disgrace, and they should quit office.

SHRI RANGA: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, disapproves of the action taken by the Government of India and its representative in the U.N. in flagrant violation of the assurances given by the Prime Minister to the Lok Sabha."(1).

SHRI NATH PAI: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, disapproves of the stand taken by Government of India on the question of aggression by U.S.S.R. on Czechoslovakia in the Security Council."(2).

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH (Khagaria): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, disapproves of the stand taken by the Government of India in U.N. on Czechoslovakia."(3).

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, condemns the failure on the part of India to vote in favour of the resolution in the United Nations condemning the action of USSR and her Warsaw Pact allies in invading Czechoslovakia and suppressing the freedom of that peace-loving, independent, socialist country."(4)

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR (Gurgaon): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968

in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, regrets that the Prime Minister did not take into confidence the Opposition who got about 60 per cent votes in last General Elections."(5)

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, approves the statement made by the Prime Minister on 23rd August, 1968 on Czechoslovakia and the stand taken by India's representative in U.N."(6)

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाये, अर्थात् :—

"यह सभा, चैकोस्लोवाकिया के विषय में संयुक्त राष्ट्र सुरक्षा परिषद् के संकल्प के बारे में 23 अगस्त, 1968 को दिये गये वक्तव्य पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, चैकोस्लोवाकिया पर हुए आक्रमण के सम्बन्ध में सात राष्ट्रों द्वारा संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में प्रस्तुत प्रस्ताव पर भारत के प्रतिनिधि की तटस्थता पर असन्तोष प्रकट करती है क्योंकि भारत सरकार की यह दुर्बल नीति स्वातन्त्र्य प्रेमी राष्ट्रों और मानवीय अधिकारों को बहुत महंगी बैठेगी।" (7)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPA-
YEE: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, disapproves of the stand taken by

India's representative on the resolution condemning the action of USSR and her Warsaw Pact allies in invading Czechoslovakia." (8)

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 23rd August, 1968 in regard to U.N. Security Council resolution relating to Czechoslovakia, is of opinion that the stand of Government of India is regrettable and betrayal of the ideals and stand of India regarding aggression against civilised and poor countries." (9)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Sondhi.

SHRI R. K. SINHA (Faizabad): Sir, I may be given a chance.

MR. SPEAKER: No list has come. After the list comes, I will call you. I have no objection. I want somebody to speak from each group.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Sir, there is a supreme silence which is the truth of life, and living based on experiment in truth. That silence, I respect, and I trust, as I learn more in life. I shall adhere to that type of silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: But there is another silence, the silence which does not speak out, where it is a choice between good and evil. It fills me with a great sense of pride—and I would request you to listen to me—because the Indian people and the Czechoslovak people have by a certain coincidence of history, the same motto for their countries. In our case, it is *Satyameva Jayate* and in Prague, it is *Pravda Vytirzi*. Shri Morarji Desai has been to Prague, and he will bear me out.

MR. SPEAKER: What does that mean?

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: The words mean truth and victory, respectively. This is the slogan, the motto for which the people of Czechoslovakia, these people from Prague, from Bratislava have produced not one but thousands of martyrs. If you go to the Huss monument in the city of Prague, in that historic city, there are crosses marked on the floor. The visitor comes and asks "What are those crosses"? There are a number of crosses, and on each of these crosses was erected a scaffold where a Czech or a Slovak patriot died, was hanged there for the cause of his country.

Czechoslovakia has produced Jan Zizka, one of the great warriors of freedom of religious thought. Czechoslovakia has produced Comenius. Sir, you and I have had education and you remember the primer that we used to learn in our elementary classes, with the alphabet and a picture next to it. That primer was first made by Comenius who thought of how to teach children and evolved the method to learn the language. Czechoslovakia has produced, as I said earlier, a Jan Hus and there is a revolutionary tradition there and in Slovakia a national tradition which we in this country can understand. Sir, what we would have expected from the Government of India today was essentially a dynamic emphasis on Czechoslovakian freedom, we would have expected a behaviour in the Security Council in keeping with a certain sentiment, a certain atmosphere, a certain way of functioning which we had when we first became a member of the Security Council and of the United Nations. Go through the records of the debates of the United Nations in the early periods and you will find that India at that time fired the imaginations of the young people and the old people of war-torn Europe and war-weary America. At that time, at the Security Council, although we did not have much experience, our delegation used to participate in a manner which excited the envy of others. We would sponsor

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

resolutions and we would take initiative to bring a matter before the world body. This voice can be heard again if you go to the library and look at the records of the Security Council. We are today a member of the Security Council. The Charter declares that the members of the Security Council will ensure that war which has twice in our life time brought scourge to mankind would be banished for ever. That demands from us action for upholding the Charter.

Sir, permit me to say that I have served as a member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations as its Secretary before I resigned from foreign service. I knew something about the procedures. There are debates in the Security Council but there are certain methods which are used, there are certain precedents which are followed. If a country like India which speaks with a voice of authority wants a certain voting procedure, if we lobby for it, if we go to the various delegations and create a sense of participation, I am sure, you will bear me out, India still is a symbol before mankind and India's voice would be heard. But if we say one thing and we practise another, if we pretend to take up this issue but privately tell the Soviets that we are beholden to them for our steel plants and we do not want to imperil our trade with them, we are going to ditto what others say but we do not have our heart in the resolutions that are brought to the United Nations, then our voice will not be heard. What happens in the United Nations is to be understood in terms of the conventions, precedents and what happens in the lobbies of the United Nations. Permit me to say, Sir, that this is a strange spectacle that we find here about differentiation between the words 'deplore' and 'condemn'. Sir, I can produce resolutions which the Government of India have moved or co-sponsored in which the word 'condemn' is there.

I would also say, are we to think that the standard of intellectual efficiency has fallen so low that we are asked by the Prime Minister's advisers in the Ministry of External Affairs to believe that abstention will merely be understood in the terms in which the Prime Minister has been asked to explain that abstention means only that. Abstention is a political act. Abstention is something which is understood in the United Nations as the definition of a certain political point of view. Therefore, if India has to present a point of view we have enough legal resources, we have enough ability to advocate our views and we have enough precedents to go by by which we could have seen to it that we would not be found in the company of a country like Pakistan, a country with which I want peace but about which anyone with a little sense of history will be compelled to declare that Pakistan has never participated in any freedom movement and Pakistan has very little knowledge about democracy. Pakistan has hardly shown any concern for human rights. Pakistan is today suppressing the brave Pathans in Paktoonistan and Baluchistan. Why should we be found in the company of Pakistan? Perhaps, it would have been better not to be there.

But, permit me, while I am all for this procedure, all for correct effort, all for consensus, all for understanding what is known as a certain outlook of diplomacy, as a matter of fact, our plea is that the Soviet Union, which conducts at least a modicum of diplomacy towards every non-Socialist country should learn to conduct itself with diplomacy with the Socialist countries also. We are sitting here for a certain emergence of international law and principles of international discussion, principles of international courtesy so that we see that the dangerous world in which we live, where nuclear weapons cast their shadow, where there is arms race, in the next century the world becomes safe from internecine conflict in the human race.

But, what is our outlook? Where is our principle? Permit me to say, I stayed in Czechoslovakia for some time. I learnt their language. I stayed in the north with Czech students; I was able to visit the Slovaks and go to their homes. The honour, the respect and the fellow-feeling which the Czechs and Slovaks have for India, for Gandhiji and Gurdev Tagore, that is something which moves us. Charles University has a faculty for teaching Sanskrit, Tamil, Malayalam, Bengali and many other languages of our country. Charles University was the first to adopt the system of teaching Hindi in the whole of Europe when it has not even been taken up in many other countries with whom we claim to have Commonwealth relations.

The Czechs and the Slovaks, they have a certain tradition and something in my heart tells me, Sir, that if your advisers or those who fixed your programme had decided, instead of visiting the Soviet Union you were to visit Prague, to which we are connected by Air India, perhaps this tragedy could have been averted. Perhaps that is making a tall claim, but I feel so.

MR. SPEAKER: I went to Prague also.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: The context in which I am suggesting this is this. There was a time, till the late fifties when certain reverberations of the Indian revolution could be heard, when the children of the revolution were still having a little remnant of that fire. I was too young but I have been brought up on the mythology of *Inquilab Zindabad* and *Bande Mataram*.

In connection with Czechoslovakia there is one personal experience which I hope you would permit me to narrate here. Shri Morarji Desai visited Czechoslovakia at a time when President Novotny was reigning with his Stalinist terror. At that time Siroky was the Stalinist Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia. The meeting between Shri Morarji Desai and

Siroky took place in the office of the Prime Minister, who had a separate Secretariat, where the Soviet tanks are now moving. I can visualize it. I can see the Prime Minister's office and Hradcany Castle, the President's Home. On that day there was an interview of which I had some intimate knowledge, which I am prepared to share with you on account of the historical situation. Mr. Siroky the Stalinist tried to lecture to the present Deputy Prime Minister, who was then the Finance Minister, and the conversation was taking a turn which was not in consonance with our national interest. Shri Morarji Desai got up and told the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia "we would not tolerate your advising us; we would not receive advice from any other country". Mr. Siroky's face became red. I felt proud at that time; I felt somebody has spoken for India.

Where is that spirit today? What has happened in Czechoslovakia? What was the difficulty there? What has happened in Czechoslovakia is that a new generation has come up. And a new generation will come up in India also, whether you like it or not. And a new generation will always think differently from the older generation. According to our culture, our *parampara*, older people become advisers; they become sages, and the youth are encouraged to take their places. There is a Sanskrit quotation—I do not remember the exact words—the meaning of which is after the son has become 16 years of age, treat him as a brother. That is our *parampara*.

But what happened in Czechoslovakia? Permit me to quote Alexander Dubcek. I do not know of his fate. We are told all sorts of things. I do not want to speculate. If ever human prayer and human aspiration has any value, let us today pray that Alexander Dubcek is safe and sound. This is what he said at a television interview which explains for the benefit of my hon. friends and my elders, who might feel that they have reason to be displeased with me. But I ask them and beg them to bear

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

with me when I quote Alexander Dubcek from what was perhaps his last television interview. If you lend me your ears, he says:—

"After many years an atmosphere has been created in this country in which everyone can publicly, without fear, outspokenly and with dignity express his opinion and thus see for himself that the cause of this country and the cause of socialism in his cause. By this open and honest policy of honestly and consistently removing these sediments of past years our party is working hard to gradually win back the shattered confidence of the people."

It is this note which Dubcek strikes again and again and again—Win back the confidence of the people.

In Prague, there is a beautiful castle, Hradcany, where history lives again. The Thirty Years War can be witnessed again. There are many monuments scattered over Czechoslovakia which bear witness to the whole sentiment, feeling, emotion of this European people during their magnificent albeit tragic national history. There is also a cathedral, a piece of Gothic architecture of great excellence. Beside it on a plain called Letna, under Stalin's orders a statue of Stalin was put up. Visualise the size of it. The size of the shoe was the size of two men. A mighty ugly monument it was. The man who made it was so disgusted that after making it he committed suicide. But it remained there.

Then came the new course spread by events, connected with the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Union's Communist Party, connected with those events which brought Khrushchev and Bulganin to India. After that first thaw in the cold war then came the Twenty-second Congress of the CPSU which now is our reference point in history, that statue of Stalin was pulled down. The view was restored of that noble Gothic architecture and that Hradcany Castle. For the Czechs their President's House,

their Rashtrapati Bhawan is the symbol of the ancient State of Bohemia. It takes them thousands of years back. The Charles University is one of the oldest universities of Central Europe.

The point I want to make is that there is historical context of the present situation in Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia is still not a lost cause. This castle functions as a sub-unit in the city. It has the capacity to hold on, if not physically bombarded and crushed, for months together. It has its own sources of electric generation; it has its own sources of food supply; it has its own subterranean channels. The radio station also continues to function because of certain possibilities that the freedom-loving Czech people have created. The Czechoslovak Foreign Office, from which Jan Masaryk, the son of the liberator President of Czechoslovakia was defenestrated is still functioning. They are sending out regular transmissions to their foreign embassies. The Czechoslovak State is not dying unless we want to close our eyes. Shri Morarji-bhai Desai of all people should be able to convince himself because he went to Prague at a time when he felt the people there gasping for freedom.

I go now to the Security Council. In the Security Council here is an opportunity for India to express that sense of participating in moulding the conscience of mankind at this time and to protest against, on behalf of the civilised community, the deplorable lapse in manners and civilisation which the Soviet Union has shown us today. The Soviet Union cannot even claim to justify its actions with the mantle of Lenin or any other leader who at least in that situation was a creative genius. The Soviet Union seems to be in the clutches of a bureaucratic, monstrous, monolithic, soulless machinery. I do not even know if the Soviet Union speaks in its own interest.

Today, at the United Nations, what we require is this. I do not suggest that we speak there in the manner in

which we speak here. That is the forum where we have to express our point of view in order that the principles of international law, the principles of the United Nations Charter, may be applied. The Charter is what you make of it. It is a document which was brought out and written at the time and in the context of the Second World War. India is one of the founder members of the United Nations. India today is a member of the Security Council. If India which has a record of work at the United Nations cannot convey the facts, if India must hesitate, if India with all the knowledge at its command can still feel diffident and if India abstains, what will happen to other countries where the understanding of the international law is not yet fully developed. What will happen to other countries who do not share with us Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, Lokmanaya Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Subramanaya Bharati and many others? The point then is this: What do we hesitate to declare? I do not know. Sir, you may forgive me because I do speak loudly but, I do not think, I speak nonsense.

SHRI NATH PAI: Never, you have very good sense.

SHRI M. L. SONDH: Today, I was feeling sad and depressed. Then, fortunately, the *Tribune* from Ambala, edited by Mr. Madhavan Nair came to my hands and I felt that there is somebody who has expressed our anguish. The article is called, 'Rape on Czechoslovakia'. I commend it to the House.

SHRI NATH PAI: To the Government.

SHRI M. L. SONDH: There are many aspects in it. I need not trouble you now.

What I would suggest is that if we are to look at the situation which has developed in Czechoslovakia, let us have certain guide-lines. The first is that this Government, this Parliament and the people of India must never lose hope in Czechoslovakia; Czechoslovakia shall be free again.

This should be an article of faith in us.

Secondly, let our stand at the United Nations be principled. Let our stand be unequivocal. Let our stand be expressed clearly. Today, we want to condemn the Soviet Union. But that does not mean that we give up hope that the Soviet Union will one day return to the path of sanity.

Thirdly, let us take the initiative at the United Nations. Even now, if we do not find the resolution satisfactory, let us bring forward our own resolution. We have the right to do so. We are a member of the Security Council.

Finally, I would say that in our appreciation of the work of the Security Council, let us not despair.

Sir, if you will permit me, I will just make one more constructive contribution. We must look at the developing picture of the world that from a bipolar situation, the world is becoming multi-polar. In this process, not one such crisis, several such crises shall arise. Neither America nor any great power which is unable to extricate itself from its previous commitments can dare to speak openly. But for India, there is a real possibility that we express our point of view openly and help the international opinion to crystallise itself along constructive solutions to the problems, appropriate to the new international environment.

I feel that if we look at what has happened in Czechoslovakia, we must be concerned today with the fate of Rumania and the fate of Yugoslavia. Let us send a word to the people of Rumania and Yugoslavia that we shall be with them. Let us declare it unequivocally that we will help them and that we will prevent the development of further crisis. Let us not take a back-seat. Let us not abstain ourselves from this vital issue, an issue on which not only the exercise of our intellectual faculties is called for but also an assertion of our freedom.

[Shri M. L. Sondhi.]

Sir, before I sit down, I would like to say this. I will not say it loudly. I will say in a very subdued voice. This Government has, in my opinion, completely betrayed its own faith and the faith of the people of India. For that, they must atone and they must atone very quickly lest this blot on Indian history, on Mother India's name, should become an indelible spot.

SHRI NATH PAI: Just one minute. I will not be here. Events are taking place. I am going out, but my heart will be here.

I only want to make one request. The Czech National Assembly has asked for the support of all freedom-loving people. I do not know what attitude the Government is going to take. You, as Speaker, can certainly send a message of solidarity of Parliament of India to the Parliament of Czechoslovakia. I would like you to consider this. For this you do not require anybody's consultation. You, as the guardian of the hon. House, can send this message. I would request you to consider this.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH (Parbhani): It is with a deep sense of anguish and a heavy heart that I rise to participate in this debate. It is most unfortunate that a very senior member, of the stature of Hon. Member, Shri Vajpavee, should have persuaded himself to move for consideration a statement which, in response to persistent demand from Opposition, was only a statement of fact as to why and in what circumstances the Indian representative in the Security Council voted in the way he did.

This has been dramatically put by my very senior, esteemed and learned colleague, Shri Nath Pai: he compared our agreeing to a certain part of a Resolution and not agreeing to a certain other part of a Resolution to a very interesting incident: according to him, a young man says to a young lady, "I admire your face,

I admire your hands, I admire your physique, but I do not like you". I wish this consideration to be placed before him: for him, there is no difference between soul or heart and body. A man may agree to admire her face, to admire her hands, to admire her physique, yet he may not like her, and 'her' includes something more, i.e., heart. The word 'condemn' used in this Resolution constitutes the soul of the Resolution. If we agree to the soul of the Resolution being expressed in terms of the word 'condemn', then what he said becomes true that I admire you, I admire this and I admire that and yet, I do not like you. Then only his simile is totally applicable.

The Security Council is a political organisation where political powers throughout the world assemble under the pretext of having the sole charge of maintenance of peace throughout the world. The history of the world organisation is a proof of it. Nowhere has the Security Council proved to be very effective where the Security Council has operated in the atmosphere of cold war. If what has been said on the floor of the Security Council is an indication, if what has been said in the Parliament of the world and the world gathering is any indication, then the world today is in the grip of the severest coldwar that could be imagined. In these circumstances, it is the bounden duty of the House to consider the background in which Resolutions in the Security Council are moved. It is common knowledge that whenever the Security Council as the world forum has acted towards public gallery, has acted for the purpose of publication, has acted with political motivations, without any intention of protecting the interests or the sovereignty of member-nations, the Security Council has always fallen in the esteem of the people all over the world. If there was any occasion where the Security Council failed to move in respect of protection of the sovereignty of a State which is aggressed upon, it was precisely this occasion. If our representative had

voted for this Resolution, he would have fallen not only as a party to the cold war but he would also have been guilty of this: our country would have been blamed for intentionally being a party to a propaganda machinery which wants to condemn communism as such irrespective of their act. The Communist Party of China has come with the severest condemnation of Soviet action and no man in his senses can consider this except in the background of the hostilities that exist between the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. Had we agreed to be a party to the use of the word 'condemn' in the operative part of the Security Council resolution, we would have stood exactly where the imperialist countries led by the USA, UK and others would have liked us to stand. The use of the word 'condemn' and our suggestion that it should be replaced by the word 'deplore' can only be properly appreciated in the background of our foreign policy, the foreign policy for which this country has always stood. This country has never persuaded itself to align itself with any power bloc whatsoever. The world is changing very fast. Power blocs are crumbling. Even the Communist movement is crumbling. The naked aggression by Soviet armed forces and other Warsaw Pact countries has also proved for the first time that in the history of Communism, there is not only a split between the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and China, but between the Communist Party of the Russia and the Rumanian, Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Communist parties.

If we had agreed to the use of a strong word as suggested and supported the use of the word 'condemn', we would have been accused of being adventurist, of caring only for words and not for action. We would have been in the same position in which the most weakling of persons finds himself when being attacked by a very strong man. It is common knowledge that whenever a strong man assaults a weak man, the latter

raises a hue and cry with the hope that somebody will come to his rescue. I think this august House would never approve of this Government being party to a resolution which is meant to be moved for raising merely a hue and cry and pay lip service to the sovereignty and integrity of a country which has been aggressed upon. I think our representative in acting as he did, acted in a way most befitting to the dignity of this House and this country. Abstention was the only course open to us in those circumstances.

My hon. friend, Shri Sondhi, wants us to read a political meaning in the voting. I am sure he knows what political meaning involves. If we had opposed the resolution, then certainly our *mala fides* would have been on record. We would not only have been charged with *mala fides*; we would have been dubbed unfaithful to the cause of sovereignty, to the cause of independence and the cause of non-interference in the affairs of one country by another outside power.

As I said, our representative did not vote against this resolution. I am not saying that that is an excuse for abstention. In this context, mere abstention from vote can be only a very strong protest against the irregular processes and irregular rules of procedure for the first time adopted by the Security Council, where for the first time the Chairman says 'either take it or leave it'. If the Security Council were to dwindle down to a position where the Chairman could say 'take it or leave it; I will not permit a vote clause by clause'. I say our representative's attitude 'I do not have any option but to abstain from vote' is correct.

Those who think that our abstention was at the behest of certain external powers are very sadly mistaken. Let them point out any single leader in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union who would appreciate India's Prime Minister for the first time in the world on record condemning the Soviet action, the shameless act of

[Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh]

naked aggression by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But mere use of strong words in an international organisation's resolution, will not add to the prestige of a country on whom, as a member of the UN, is cast certain responsibilities. I think our country acted in the best possible manner by abstaining from vote on the resolution and thereby protecting this country's prestige from the parlour of the cold-war atmosphere within which the imperialist powers of the world want this country to grip.

My hon. friend, Shri Sondhi, said that we should have voted for the resolution as it was worded. Does he want this country to be subjugated to the interests of the USA or the USSR or for that matter any other country? We act independently. What more independence can one show than by our action in abstaining, where the use of a particular phraseology does not appear correct in our view? Prof. Sondhi very emotionally referred to the romantic history of Czechoslovakia and expressed his admiration for the Czech and Slovak people and for the leaders of that country. I think the same Czechoslovak people whom he respects very highly, even Mr. Dubcek would not have any regard or respect for the ideology of Mr. Sondhi and his party. So, it is certainly a fact that it is not out of any love or respect for the ideology of Mr. Dubcek or the socialist countries that they speak here like this. But they want to use this occasion merely as a stick to beat this Government. This Government is not so weak to be beaten by any stick available to Professor Sondhi. I had appealed in the past that Prof. Sondhi should be sent to Czechoslovakia. That was not an emotional suggestion made at the spur of the moment. As a Member of this House, I honestly and sincerely believe that when Mr. Sondhi was in Czechoslovakia as some Deputy Secretary or Secretary of the Indian Embassy, Czechoslovakia seemed to have enjoyed peace and there was no

outside interference. Immediately he left that country, there seems to have come on unfortunate train of incidents leading to naked aggression by the Communist party of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact armies are in Czechoslovakia. Let Mr. Sondhi's organising capacity, oratory and respect for ideology be laid at the doors of Czechoslovakia people, so that they could protect themselves from this act of naked aggression. The Security Council should have concerned itself with the operative provisions of the United Nations Charter. When this country requested it to withdraw the armed forces from the territory of Kashmir which legally and technically formed part and parcel of this country, the UN Security Council Members including those which Mr. Sondhi admires, the United States and the United Kingdom, wanted to use their own armed forces, the armed forces of the Member countries to force the withdrawal of the Indian armed forces from the territories which legally constitute part of India. But when Czechoslovakia is being aggressed upon, when the Russian army and tanks are in the heart of Prague, the Security Council concerns itself whether the word used should be deplored or condemned. If there is any indication in this, the indication is that the Security Council has refused to act and our abstention is the only course to be followed. We want the Security Council to act. We are not willing to leave the conditions in Czechoslovakia at the Security Council to the international mercies of the United States of America or the United Kingdom or France. We wish to convey our love and friendship to the Czech people and to the Slovak people as emphatically as we can. We shall go to any length to see that Czechoslovakia is protected by the four elements which the Madam Leader has suggested in her reply when this House considered a motion sometime back. What are these four elements? Soviet Army should be withdrawn. There should be no interference in the internal affairs of the country. The sove-

reignty and the territorial integrity of the country should be respected. All these four basic requirements should be fulfilled in respect of Czechoslovakia. The Press of every country will commend this Government and this Parliament for striving to achieve these things. We shall not leave this matter till these objectives are achieved.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जेकोस्लोवाकिया पर रूस और वारसा संधि के चार सदस्य राष्ट्रों द्वारा हुए नग्न आक्रमण के विरोध में संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के अन्दर सुरक्षा परिषद में जो प्रस्ताव आया उस पर भारतीय प्रतिनिधि के तटस्थ हो जाने से इस देश के प्रत्येक स्वाभिमानी नागरिक का मस्तक जहाँ लज्जा से झुक गया है वहाँ उस से भी अधिक लज्जा की बात आज प्रधान मंत्री के उस वक्तव्य को सुनने के बाद हुई जो सरकार के अनिश्चित मन का परिचायक एक वक्तव्य उन्होंने अभी यहाँ पर दिया है। प्रधान मंत्री यह कह रही थीं कि हमारे प्रतिनिधि के द्वारा जब हमारे पास यह समाचार आया कि इस प्रकार का एक प्रस्ताव आया है उस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन हम को करना चाहिए या नहीं करना चाहिए? उस के बाद हम ने मंत्री-परिषद् की बैठक बुलायी या मैंने अपने साथियों से परामर्श किया। उस के बाद इतना समय शेष नहीं रह गया था कि हम उन को अपना पूरा मन बता पाते क्योंकि वहाँ पर मतदान प्रारम्भ हो चुका था, अगर भारत सरकार की इसी प्रकार की अनिश्चित नीति थी तब तो फिर इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा कहना होगा कि यह सरकार इन अनिश्चित नीतियों के आधार पर इस देश का शासन सूत्र संचालने के योग्य नहीं है। इसी प्रकार की एक अनिश्चित नीति का परिचय हम को तब मिला था जब 1965 में पाकिस्तान का आक्रमण

हुआ था काश्मीर पर। उस समय पाकिस्तान के एयरफोर्स के मुकाबले हम भी अपनी वायु-शक्ति का प्रयोग करें, इस सम्बन्ध में निर्णय करने के लिये हमारी मंत्री-परिषद् की बैठक हुई। नहीं कहा जा सकता—इस में कहां तक सत्यांश है—लेकिन अगर यह समाचार सत्य है तो मैं आपके द्वारा यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस अनिश्चित नीति का दुष्परिणाम पहले दिन छम्ब में पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण के समय भारत को देखना पड़ा, उस से भी कहीं अधिक अनिश्चित नीति का दुष्परिणाम आज हम को देखना पड़ा है जब दुनिया के राष्ट्रों के सामने भारत का मस्तिष्क इस प्रकार की अनिश्चित नीति के कारण नीचा हुआ है। भारत सरकार को पहले से ही अपना मन इस सम्बन्ध में निर्धारित करना चाहिये था अगर इस प्रकार की परिस्थिति संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में आयेगी तो उस समय भारत सरकार की नीति क्या रहेगी? हमारे प्रतिनिधि के टेलीफोन सन्देश आने के बाद भारत सरकार मंत्री-परिषद् की बैठक बुलाये और प्रधान मंत्री अपने सदस्यों को बुलाकर तब कोई निश्चित नीति निर्धारित करें, यह किसी सुदृढ़ सरकार के चलाने का ढंग नहीं हुआ करता।

17 HRS.

इसी प्रकार के अनिश्चित मन का दुष्परिणाम इस से पहले भी दो दफा हम देख चुके हैं। जब तिब्बत को सत्ता का अपहरण हो रहा था, हम अपने मुंह पर पट्टी बांधे बैठे रहे। दूसरे जब हंगरी में मानवीय अधिकारों का अपहरण हुआ, उस समय भी हम अपने मुंह पर पट्टी बांधे रहे। उसी का दुष्परिणाम हमारी आन्तरिक स्थिति और विदेश नीति पर भी हुआ। अब तक भी हम अपनी उस भूल का पूरी तरह से प्रायश्चित्त नहीं कर सके हैं। हमारा अपना

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

अनुमान यह था कि चेकोस्लोवेकिया पर हुए इस नग्न आक्रमण के बाद भारत सरकार बड़ी दृढ़ता के साथ अपन मन्तव्य न केवल देशवासियों के सामने, बल्कि दुनिया के सामने रखेगी। जो दो भूलें तिब्बत और हंगरी के सम्बन्ध में पहले हो चुकी हैं, यह सरकार उन भूलों का प्रायश्चित्त इस बार करेगी। लेकिन आज भी इतनी चोट खाने के बाद यह सरकार दृढ़ निर्णय लेना नहीं सीख सकी है। अभी भी अपनी अनिश्चित नीति के आधार पर इस प्रकार के संक्रमणकाल के समय में डांवाडोल परिस्थितियों में चल रही है। कभी सोचती है उधर जाओ, कभी गोचती है उधर जाओ। पर इस का परिणाम इतिहास बतायेगा—कैसे अगली पीढ़ियों को भुगतना पड़ेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके द्वारा इस बात को कहना चाहता हूँ—चेकोस्लोवेकिया पर हुए इस आक्रमण का दुष्परिणाम न केवल चेकोस्लोवेकिया को भुगतना पड़ेगा बल्कि इससे विश्व शान्ति भी खतरे में पड़ गई है। इसका सब से बड़ा दुष्परिणाम यह होने जा रहा है—मुझे यह दिखाई देता है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का अस्तित्व कहीं खतरे में न पड़ जाये? दो सदस्य राष्ट्र जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र के सदस्य हैं, उन में एक राष्ट्र पर कई राष्ट्र मिल कर हमला करें और हम अपने को इस तरह से निरीह, और शक्तिहीन समझ कर देखते रहें—यह संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के लिये अच्छा नहीं है।

कल कछ मित्र चर्चा कर रहे थे कि चेकोस्लोवेकिया पर हुए आक्रमण के बाद प्रस्ताव करना चाहिये कि दुनिया के राष्ट्रों की बैठक बुलाई जाय। मेरा इस सम्बन्ध में कहना है कि अगर सांप

निकल गया तो फिर लकीर को पीटना कोई बुद्धिमत्ता नहीं मानी जा सकती। हम को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में आज स्पष्ट भाषा में कहना चाहिये कि जब संयुक्त राष्ट्र चार्टर में यह व्यवस्था है कि किसी भी छोटे देश पर कोई एक या अधिक देश मिलकर उस की स्वतन्त्रता पर आक्रमण करेंगे तो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ अपनी सामूहिक शक्ति का उपयोग करेगा और उस देश की स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा करेगा। हमें संयुक्त राष्ट्र को कहना चाहिये कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र के चार्टर में कलैक्टिव पावर इस्तेमाल करने की जो धारा है—आज समय आ गया है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र—जब कि चेकोस्लोवेकिया की स्वतन्त्रता का अपहरण हो रहा है—उस शक्ति का इस्तेमाल करे। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य यह है कि इतने दृढ़ शब्द कहना या इतना दृढ़ निर्णय लेना तो दूर—तीन दिन के इस नग्न आक्रमण के बाद अभी तक हमारी सरकार मामूली निन्दा के शब्द भी गले से नहीं निकालना चाहती है। भेड़िया खरगोश को लिये जा रहा है, छोटासा खरगोश चिल्ला रहा है उसे देख कर दुनिया का गला कण्ठ से भर रहा है। लेकिन एक आदमी खड़ा हुआ कह रहा है कि हम इस को बुरा नहीं कह सकते। रूस जैसा राष्ट्र एक छोटे से देश की स्वतन्त्रता का अपहरण करे और हम निन्दा शब्द का भी प्रयोग न करें यह भारत की परम्परा के सर्वथा विपरीत है। यह सही है कि विदेश नीति का सम्बन्ध दूसरे देशों से है, लेकिन यह भी सही है कि जिस विदेश नीति का सम्बन्ध विदेशों से है वह नीति देश में बैठ कर ही निर्धारित होती है। अगर हमारी विदेश नीति विदेशों में निर्धारित होने लगेगी जैसी कि स्थिति आज आ गई है, भारत सरकार का रवैया लगने लगा है कि इस देश

को रूस को गिरवी रखने जा रहे हैं। अगर देश को इस तरह से रूस के पास गिरवी रखा गया तो इस का दुष्परिणाम हमारे लिये क्या होगा? कल हम देख चुके हैं कि पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे कर रूस ने अपनी इसी नीति का परिचय दिया। काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में रूस का मन डावांडोल हो गया है। उस से भी रूस की स्थिति का कुछ परिचय मिलता है इस के बाद भी अगर यह सरकार बराबर इसी तरह झुकती चली गई, अपनी दृढ़ता का परिचय नहीं दिया तो इससे देश के लिये, देश की स्वतन्त्रता के लिये, भारत के प्रजातन्त्र के लिये खतरा उत्पन्न हो जायगा।

अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा कहना यह है कि जैसा कल कुछ मित्रों ने कहा था, हम इस देश में उस सरकार को मान्यता नहीं देंगे जो आक्रमण के बाद चेकोस्लोवैकिया के अन्दर बनेगी। जो वहाँ की जनता का सही प्रतिनिधित्व करती है उसी सरकार को हम मान्यता देंगे। मैं इस के साथ ही साथ एक दूसरी आवाज भी उठाना चाहता हूँ—इस नम्र आक्रमण के बाद अगर फिर भी इस प्रकार की स्थिति रहती है तो भारत सरकार इन चार बारसा सन्धि पैक्ट के राष्ट्रों के साथ और रूस के साथ भी अपने राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों पर फिर से विचार करे कि क्या इस प्रकार के आक्रमण के बाद और इस प्रकार का जघन्य दुर्व्यवहार होने के बाद भी भारत सरकार को इन देशों के साथ उसी प्रकार के मैत्री सम्बन्धों का रखना हितकर है? हमें अपने राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों के बारे में फिर से विश्लेषण करना चाहिये।

तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस भारतीय प्रतिनिधि ने वहाँ पर तटस्थ रह कर 52 करोड़ भारतीय जनता का अपमान किया है, इस प्रकार के प्रनितिधि को तुरन्त वापस बुलाया जाय। उस ने स्वयं यह निर्णय लिया

तो उस का अपराध है, लेकिन अगर सरकार ने निर्णय लिया है तो इस स्थान पर बैठने का इन को अधिकार नहीं है। इन्होंने भारत के स्वाभिमान के प्रतिकूल कार्य किया है, इस लिये इन को यहाँ से हट जाना चाहिये।

17.05 HRS.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI K. R. GANESH (Andaman and Nicobar Islands): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the motion that we are discussing today refers to the disapproval of the stand taken by the Indian Permanent Representative in the Security Council. Sir, the Prime Minister has pointed out that on all aspects of the Resolution which affects policies, principles, fundamental rights and sovereignty of the people the Indian representative has endorsed and approved the relevant parts of the Resolution. We disagreed with only that part of the Resolution in which the word "condemnation" was used. I do not know why this amount of noise as we saw today was raised in this House when the House only yesterday discussed a motion and almost pressed this Government to agree to the word "condemnation" which was not approved by this House.

Sir, the parts of the Resolution which we approved conforms to the basic principles of international behaviour. We have approved that the Soviet troops and the troops of other Warsaw Pact countries should be withdrawn. We have approved that there should be no interference in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia or any other country. We have approved that the sovereignty in terms of the United Nations Charter of Czechoslovakia should be maintained. It is only with the word "condemnation" on which we debated nearly for four hours yesterday, that we have disagreed.

I wish to bring to the notice of the House that in the past also, except I think in the case of Suez Canal when the late great Prime

[Shri K. R. Ganesh]

Minister of this country reacted very violently, and on the issue of South Africa, on every other international question that this House faced the Government of this country has reacted in the same way in which it has done now. Our friends here now have become the great defenders of democracy in Czechoslovakia. Of course, it does not lie in their mouths to speak about the strangulation of democracy in Czechoslovakia. I say it does not lie in their mouths because these people—I do not mean the entire opposition, but at least half of the opposition—have not spoken in the same language, with the same emotion, with the same feelings when lakhs of Vietnamese people are being maimed, are being destroyed by splinter bombs and a naked aggression has been committed on the people of Vietnam. Shri Masani quoted very approvingly the hon. Prime Minister of Australia. Now this one Prime Minister has no moral right to speak about the strangulation of democracy in Czechoslovakia because Australian troops are killing and maiming the poor Vietnamese people. Let us not forget it. But they forget it and come here as defenders of democracy.

Therefore, I was trying to say that the government of this country on every international issue, whether it was Vietnam, whether it was British and French aggression on UAR or Israeli aggression on UAR, whether it was Rhodesia, Guatemala or Bolivia, this country has reacted in a manner and in a language in which we have reacted now also.....(*Interruptions*) The defence of democracy which we experience in this House is not to allow the other people to speak. Therefore, the statement of the Prime Minister on the Czechoslovakia episode has been consistent with the kind of language, with the kind of sobriety with which we have always reacted to international events.

If the leading members of the Security Council, the Western Powers,

wanted a real solution of this problem they could have had a one-line resolution for the withdrawal of the Soviet and Warsaw pact countries' troops forthwith from Czech soil. But their game is not the saving of democracy in Czechoslovakia. Their game was to use the forum of the United Nations, the forum of the Security Council once again to bring back the cold war atmosphere. That is why they drafted the resolution in a language with which all countries could not agree.

We on all sides of this House have emphatically deplored the events that have taken place in Czechoslovakia, leading to the march of Soviet and allied troops there.

We have expressed solidarity with the Czechoslovak people in their hour of this most hard trial which they are facing. It is also a fact that inside Czechoslovakia two forces were trying to struggle in the situation in which the Czechoslovaks find themselves. It is a fact that the Czechoslovak Communist Party and the Czechoslovak people wanted to liberalise the socialist regime which they have set up and free it from the rigidity and the subversion of the socialist legality. It is also a fact, and it must be admitted here, that there were forces which wanted to utilise this process of liberalisation for bringing about a situation in Czechoslovakia in which the socialist system, which they had built up, would be ended.

Our friends who are the agents—that is quite distinct; you can see the language they speak; I am not here to learn from the agents of the Israelis and the Americans; the agents of Israel have been seen in this House itself—when the brotherly people, the African people were being aggressed by a small but a very highly industrialised and a highly military power, the Israelis, our friends kept mum and now they come to us and want us to defend their resolution.

Whatever the situation may be in Czechoslovakia and whatever may be the provocation, the march of the

Soviet and Warsaw Pact troops into Czechoslovakia is indefensible. I join this House, because I did not get an opportunity to speak yesterday, in saying that it is in the interest of the Soviet Union, because of this act the Soviet Union has damaged the great reputation that it has built up during the last 50 or 60 years and by this action the Soviet Union has disrupted the unity of the progressive and democratic forces, it is necessary and absolutely essential in the interest of democratic, socialist and progressive forces that the Soviet Union withdraw immediately from the Czech soil and allow the Czech people themselves to settle it.

Our defenders of democracy have today given us in this very House an example of how democracy is strangled in conditions of hysteria which was seen today. Our friends speak about the defence of democracy in Czechoslovakia but they would like the Prime Minister of this country to speak the language that they want her to speak. They will not even allow the Prime Minister to speak.

While defending the rights of the Czechoslovak people, while defending the sovereignty of the Czechoslovak people to have the kind of social system and socialism that they desire and not what the Soviets desire, we must see that there is a deep game behind this hysteria that has been created for the last three days. Externally they want us to dissociate, completely break from all the friendship that we have built and internally they have got a deep game and the conspiracy of this deep game was seen in this House during these three days.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Sir, I had warned this House in the past about what was likely to happen to our country if we did not take the lessons of history and if we did not learn from our past mistakes and if we continued to carry on in the manner and in the direction in which we were led as

early as 1955-56. Although I will be addressing you, Sir, I will really be speaking to the 200 and odd Members of the Congress Party who do not form the Council of Ministers. I would like to point out clearly why these very people, whom I have said in the past I do not consider as any different from us, when it is time to exercise their own intelligence, to exercise their own discretion, to exercise their own conscience, to assert their own conscience, will forget everything and will manufacture arguments, which may temporarily help in a debate such as this, but which, in the ultimate analysis, is going to not only cast a great slur on our country but is also going to take us down the drain faster and faster.

There was a time when some Members on these (Communist) benches and the parties that they represent were used by this Government in trying to argue against reason and caution preached to them by a certain section of their own party. Unfortunately, the clock has gone full circle. It is no longer they who are using them but it is these people who have started using the Council of Ministers with the result that, in the process, that must necessarily evolve in such a situation, we have sold ourselves and our country to the Soviets and the position is becoming, indeed, so bad that even they, the Communists, are ashamed to claim the responsibility for it.

Whom have we been supporting? For what reasons? What has happened in Czechoslovakia today should be a reminder to every one of them that it could happen to India. It will happen to India. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): It will never happen. It is only in your eyes. The Indians will never allow it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am addressing these very people.....

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL: Address the Chair please.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am addressing these very people through you, Sir. I am trying to arouse their conscience. Unfortunately, they do not even have the heart to listen to something which pricks their conscience just slightly. They think by getting up and interjecting in this fashion, they will sand-paper their conscience sufficiently that they may get six hours' sleep tonight.

What is the situation today? We heard the previous Member just now bemoaning everything. But he could not bemoan the very act which has brought about this debate—the rape, the murder and the slaughter of a people to which the country of Mahatma Gandhi, just would not react. They just cannot react! It was this Congress Party that was responsible, to a very large extent, for bringing freedom to this country.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not this Congress Party.

SHRI PILOO MODY: It was the Congress Party that was very largely responsible for bringing freedom to this country. It pains me to say that it is still the Congress Party which has brought us to this absolute and abject slavery. These are good and decent people. But they have been misled; they have been abused; they have been made to believe that no matter what happens, they must support the Treasury Benches. This has become their religion.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is our Government.

SHRI PILOO MODY: It is your Government. It also, unfortunately, happens to be our Government.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा (खम्मम) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य
चेकोस्लोवाकिया के बारे में बोल रहे
हैं या कांग्रेस के बारे में ?

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am very happy to see that the good lady makes an exhibition of her loyalties.

I am also happy that she is doing it in Hindi, but I would suggest that she thinks a little more on what I am trying to say.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा : माननीय सदस्य
हिन्दी में बोलने को शर्म की बात क्यों
समझते हैं ?

SHRI PILOO MODY: In the past the Government of India has voted on many an occasion when the word 'condemn' was used, for example, on Israel. But today they have become experts of the dictionary meaning of the word. This is the only excuse that they can possibly put forward to this House. That because of that one word 'condemn', out of over 500 words, they had to vote against the whole Resolution by abstaining. This is a shameful thing. It is just like the little gimmick, the trick, which is used by the small countries in South America; when they do not wish to vote for a particular Resolution, they find some cock and bull excuse such as this.

I believe a film has been stolen out of Czechoslovakia which shows the complete picture of what has taken place in the past two or three days there—those atrocities; it has been stolen out of Czechoslovakia and it will be shown on every T.V. Station and in every theatre. What I would like to do is to get a copy of this film and show it to these people and see if they can sit through it.

Lastly, I would like to say this. I think, what the Soviet Union has done in Czechoslovakia is really a nail in the coffin of communism throughout the world. This bogey of the inevitability of communism has been exploded for all time to come.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Gonda): Since yesterday I had been trying to say a few words, but without success. I, therefore, do not wish to make a speech. I have only a query, a question, to ask of the Prime Minister and that question arises out of the statement she made today. I consider this question

as of great importance to the country as well as to the Congress.

She read the whole Resolution that was moved in the Security Council. I am glad to find that the Government of India supported all the paragraphs, and one paragraph said that violation of the Charter has been committed. My amendment which merely said that we should state that the Charter has been violated, was not acceptable here, but I am glad that, though I could not carry my Parliament with me, it has been carried in a higher Parliament, in the Security Council. I am very happy that the Government has given its support to them. So, I think, my stand has been vindicated.

She read out, para after para to explain what we have supported. She read out every para and said that we have supported this, we have supported that and so on, and thereby it came out that all the sentiments that the Prime Minister expressed in her speech and all the sentiments that were expressed by the various members, viz., that the integrity of the small State should not be violated, that its sovereignty should be respected, that there should not be armed intervention in the internal affairs of the country, that the people have the right of self-determination, that people should be able to decide their destiny according to their own genius, etc., have come out.....

AN HON. MEMBER: That foreign troops should be withdrawn.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: Yes; that foreign troops should be withdrawn—all that has come, and the Government of India has supported it. I am very happy.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Where have they said it?

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: We only objected to one word, 'condemnation'. We did not want that word 'condemn'. We wanted that word to be changed into "deplore". I will now read out the

dictionary meanings of these two words. 'To condemn' means to pronounce adverse judgment, to censure, to blame, to convict; 'to deplore' means to weep, to lament, to regret deeply. I do not know what exactly we want to express. However, these are the dictionary meanings of the two expressions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Regret deeply.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: May be, we may want to regret deeply. But then I would also like to know: what were we asked to condemn? That is also very important. The paragraph says:

"Condemn the armed intervention of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and the other members of the Warsaw Pact in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic".

Did we not wish even to condemn the armed intervention? Was it a general condemnation? It was condemnation of a specific act of intervention which in some form or other we have already said that we do not like. However, we did not support the resolution because of this word.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is she supporting or opposing the Resolution?

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: I am supporting my own conscience. I do not want any excitement (*Interruptions*). This is a very serious matter. Let us discuss it with all the seriousness it deserves.

We decided to abstain. I am not condemning the Government. I am only asking a question, because this question will be asked of us wherever we go. We decided to abstain. Now, what does it mean? It means that we put all the other sentiments which we had expressed in our statement and in the resolution on one side and we put the word 'condemn' on the other side of the scale and the word condemn outweighed all other consideration.

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

We preferred to abstain. Now in the UN, there are ways of expressing one's opinion. Before voting we could make our position clear. We might have done that, after the voting, also. We could have made our position quite clear. With a reservation we could have voted and that we were voting because of these reasons and subject to those reservations. We could have done any of these things. But we did not do even that.

That means what? I only want to make this query of the Prime Minister. Does it mean that the need, the necessity and the interest of the Czechs, the need to prevent the stiffening of a small nation, the right of a small nation to freedom—all this was of no importance to us, and the matter which was of supreme importance to us was that we should not hurt the susceptibilities of Soviet Russia? I want to ask only this question.

We have said that the Charter has been violated. We have said it. After saying this, when we chose to abstain, I want to ask the Prime Minister: how are we going to face the country? Everywhere we go, the people will ask us: did you think that it was more important not to raise your voice when a small State was crucified and it was more important that we should not hurt the susceptibilities of a great power? That is all I have to say.

SHRI RABI RAY: Excellent.

एक माननीय सदस्य: असर पड़ गया है...

श्रीमती सुचेता कृपलानी: सच्चाई का असर जरूर पड़ेगा। पढ़ना चाहिए।

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY (Cuddalore): I rise to support the Motion and also to record my sympathies with my brethren who are fighting in Czechoslovakia for freedom.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: A friend has brought in my name in between.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no. She has admitted it.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: She may admit or not. But may I tell this House that I never knew what amendment she had moved? I only heard it from Shri Asoka Mehta. When I asked Shri Asoka Mehta, 'What has become of the Congress?', he said, that he is supporting Suchetaji's amendment—as if I knew what that amendment was. Then I knew that there was an amendment by her.

We do not take instructions from each other. In this hen-pecked country, where everybody is under the thumb of his wife, you must admire me that I am not under her thumb.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: She has admitted your influence now, on this occasion. She has admitted the influence exercised by you.....(Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER: They should not stoop so low to impute motives.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY: I do not want to hurt the sentiments of my hon. friends who are in the Congress. Our country has got a great tradition and culture. It has its Dharma and its faith in dharma. Do they not find a word in the dictionary. When there is armed intervention, when a free country is invaded by another powerful country? The Prime Minister is reluctant to call it aggression. She is reluctant to use the word condemnation. I should like to point out that there has been a failure of diplomacy on the part of the Government of India. The foreign policy has failed. We have not taken a definite stand on this. Even Pakistan has not opened its mouth. Why should we unnecessarily volunteer to support Russia at this time even after Russia has agreed to give arms aid

to Pakistan. Is it because of the fear that we shall be losing the arms that we are getting from Russia. I am really sorry. The strength of a country does not lie with its arms. The strength of a nation does not lie with the armaments and the ammunitions or the hydrogen or atom bombs. The strength of a country lies with its dharma, with the righteous policy which it follows. I am surprised that the tradition which India had been following so far had been broken by the Prime Minister and by my Congress friends. I should also like to point out that might is not always right. We should not bend ourselves before the insolent might. We must raise the prestige of our country. Our prestige will rise only when we condemn aggression. When we see a rose, we must call it a rose, when we see a crow, we must call it a crow. When we see a rose, we should not hesitate to call it a rose. That is why I am appealing to the Hon. Prime Minister. I have got great regard for her, her father and family. But I cannot accept the logic which the Hon. Prime Minister has been following in this matter. Here is a nation, a country into which tanks had been moved and massacres had taken place. Even East Germany, for whose recognition we have been fighting, has joined in this. Are we ashamed to say that this is armed intervention by Russia? Are we not entitled to condemn this action. I have to point out to the Treasury Benches and my good Congress friends and the Prime Minister that we have forgotten everything which the country stood for in the past. What Manusmriti says had been forgotten. We have to stand by dharma. You have forgotten that. Why have they forgotten dharma?(Interruptions.) It is they who had forgotten dharma, not we. Ravana was the mightiest king. Rama had only four persons to help him. That man, because he followed the path of dharma, won the battle. Sir, there is another comparison. Lord Krishna and Kamsa. Kamsa was the mightiest man. Krishna was only a

small man. But because Krishna followed Dharma and the righteous way, because he followed the straight-forward way, he won.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor): His party does not believe in God but he believes at least!

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY: You see only the appearance. You do not see the heart of the DMK. That is your principle. I can challenge you. (Interruption). Now, Sir, I know the Congress people have forgotten Dharma, but we cannot forget it. They want to sail with Russia which I do not agree. In a totalitarian country such things may exist, but I want our country to remain a democratic country, and to follow its history and its culture. Am I doing wrong in expressing it, Sir? I am still saying that Dharma has always stood the test of time. A nation must be guided not by missiles, not by atom and hydrogen bombs, not by power. The Prime Minister should be guided, the Deputy Prime Minister should be guided and the people in authority should be guided only by the right path, by the Dharma which has been our symbol.

I will finish my speech with a simple appeal to the Prime Minister. (Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not disturb him, please.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Let me not be interrupted. I am making my simple submission to the Prime Minister, because I have got still a regard for her. I believe that good may flow from what I suggest. I still believe that the Prime Minister will stand by the right path, and that she will condemn aggression and say that there has been an aggression in this case. That is what I am saying. Let the Prime Minister end her honeymoon with Russian politics. Let her face the realities. When Pakistan has not supported Russia's stand, who are we, and why should

[Shri V. Krishnamoorthi]

we support it? By this savage principle, which has been followed by the Prime Minister, by the Ministry of External Affairs, our country has gone a hundred feet below. Nehru, after Independence, elevated the prestige of this country to the skies, but the Prime Minister after him and lastly the madam Prime Minister have brought the prestige of this country to the lowest level possible.

I shall not take much time. I shall conclude by quoting a few verses from *Gitanjali* of Rabindranath Tagore. This is what I recommend to the Members on the other side; this is what I recommend to the Prime Minister and to the Deputy Prime Minister before they take any decision:

"This is my prayer to Thee, My Lord,

Strike, strike, strike at the root
Of my penury in my heart.

Give me the strength never to dis-
own the poor,

Never to bend my knees before
insolent might"

as the Prime Minister is bending
before Russia.

"Give me strength to raise my
mind high

Above the daily trifles."

That is what I am telling the Prime Minister. Unless she makes up her mind, unless she comes to a definite conclusion, and says where there is aggression we will condemn it, where there is honesty we will appreciate, where there is injustice we will not hesitate to condemn it, there is no use. Only then, the prestige of this country will get elevated, and that is why I am supporting this motion.

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA (Kaliabor): Sir, Soviet Russia has rightly caused the greatest indignation in the world. This is an unhappy development particularly because in the decade or more the Soviet Union was undergoing a process of liberalisation. It has spilled

over the frontiers of the Soviet Union. This is a fact which we very much welcomed and we considered it as a part of the process in which the tensions that were evident in the world could be reduced. India as a peace-loving country tried to do everything possible to help Soviet Union to come out of the type of Stalinist authoritarianism in which it was involved. This process of liberalisation is a fact because today in the Soviet Union, unless one looks at it with a jaundiced eye, things have happened that could not have happened twenty years ago in the time of Stalin. Of course, it has not happened in the way that we want, with the speed we want it to take place but it has happened and this is a definite gain to peace in the world.

The irony of the whole thing is that Soviet Union has committed an act which has been condemned and which has been disapproved by the various countries of the world. We have taken a friendly view and we have not gone to express our views in the words that would antagonise them. But this is an act which has attracted the antipathy of the whole world.

In this situation there is a country which has believed in Stalinism, which has not participated in the liberalisation process, which indulges in all types of strange atrocities—I mean China—which has come out in the Peking Radio in open condemnation of this act of the Soviet Union which from their point of view they would have almost welcomed.

We want that their freedom should be preserved. The content of freedom to the Czechs does not include merely national freedom but also freedom of the workers and the intelligentsia. To them socialism means also to act according to their own way. They wanted to express it in terms such as 'democratic socialism' which we in this country understand better. So, naturally, the silent resistance of the Czechs get our greatest admiration.

But when we come to the Security Council, in the last twenty years the two power blocs have kept their proteges to fight a bitter battle where we have kept our head cool. We have kept our head cool and never allowed ourselves to be swayed by the political emotions of the dual powers who dominated over others. We have never allowed ourselves to be influenced by the Americans or Russians. We have never used strong words as the Russians used or the Americans used in the Dulles period. We have not participated in wordy duels. We have not participated in the terminological wars of the Western World and the Soviet Union in the past.

Here is a situation where we have to work for peace. Wherever there is aggression we have to see that it is vacated. Aggression is a continuing factor. It has taken place in South America. When a regime in South America is not suitable to USA, the Americans use force to change it. It is a fact known to all. It has happened in so many countries in South America. Pressurisation takes place. Then we have said that Americans are interested in spending money in foreign countries. It is also a form of intervention. So, aggression in international politics has to be viewed in the proper perspective.

Soviet Union has done something that is wrong, something violent against national freedom, which needs to be corrected. The best way needs to be discovered to correct it. We have to pressurise Soviet Union by using all the levers. The friendship that we have built up with the Soviet Union, the mutual exchange of visits that we have with them, the assistance that we have given and received, the support they have given us on the question of Kashmir, because of all these we have developed a liaison with the Soviet Union which the other powers would envy.

It is essential that we as a nation behave not in the manner of chauvinists but in the manner of a country

that has learnt to live with this power in the context of the world power blocs and balance of power. To cite the instance of Pakistan is completely out of place. Pakistan does not have a world view. We have inherited a world view from history, from the past, and we have a policy. Whether other people appreciate it or not, we have it.

So far as peace is concerned, the Security Council has not intervened in a serious way in any crisis except in Korea. Therefore, it is doubtful whether in the present case also it can effectively intervene. The powers in the Security Council want to conceal everything in words. We do not want to confine ourselves to words. We do not want our efforts in the Security Council to end in a wordy duel, as it has happened during the last twenty years. It may very well start a new cold war which may be entirely against the interests of world peace. That is why in the Security Council we did not take any active steps. We would certainly say what is necessary. We would not mince words. We would tell the Soviet Union where they have gone wrong, as we have told them. We are the first country to do that. In this Parliament the government has reacted against the action of the Soviet Union in a very dignified manner. We have never hesitated to express our views clearly in Vietnam in the interest of human welfare, in the interest of world peace, in the interest of the coloured people oppressed by people living thousands of miles away.....
(Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER: Coloured people.

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA: Anybody who is not white is a coloured man. I say that whenever we were faced with a similar situation we have taken the same stand as we have taken now. We have always stood for freedom, whether it is Czechoslovakia or Vietnam, and without the assistance of the opposition parties this Government has always tried to vacate aggression wherever it has

[Shri Bedabrata Barua]

taken place. In the present situation all that we could do is to help in the reduction of tension. For that strong words may not be the best weapon.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we have discussed the whole question yesterday and, I am afraid, that today the same ground is being covered once again. The simple question before this House is whether the Government of India's particular position taken at the United Nations is in accordance with what the Government itself said yesterday it would do. That is the simple proposition. That is the first proposition.

Having taken up that position there are some people who say, even though it might be in consonance with the position taken by the Prime Minister yesterday, we disapprove of that position. The same position that was taken up and argued about here yesterday is being re-argued. That is what we are now concerned with. With regard to the position taken by the Government of India, whether I like it or not is a different matter, I am not talking about now. We are now rediscussing the whole gamut of this thing and I am very glad that we get an opportunity to rediscuss the whole question once again. I have no quarrel over that.

17.57 HRS.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

When we are discussing this whole question, I am rather amused at some people—I am not talking of all the people—in the Opposition shouting so much, working themselves up emotionally so much about the question of human rights and about so many other questions. We are all for the assertion of human rights, but I wish that they were also worked up so much emotionally when the question of suppression of Negro rights in the U.S. and at other places was there in order to condemn the Government for not raising at the United Nations

the question of suppression of Negro rights in the United States.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I wish you had done it; you did not do. You may do it hereafter; that is a different matter. But the fact remains that so far they did not raise this question and did not condemn the Government of India for not raising the question of suppression of human rights as far as the Negro population of the United States was concerned.

I wish also that they were equally vehement when the question of suppression of the human rights of the Vietnamese people was there. When bombings are going on over North Vietnamese people, when napalm bombs are being used against the Vietnamese people, I wish they were equally vehement about it and condemned the Government for not raising it in the United Nations and condemning those people who are perpetrating these atrocities.

I wish also that when General Mobutu was there and when the elected Premier of Congo, Lumumba, was whisked away and murdered, these people had raised their voice of protest in this House and condemned the Government of India for not taking up that question.

SHRI K. N. TIWARY: The question is of a nation.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I am talking of a nation. When Congo was burning, when a young nation was burning and its Prime Minister was whisked away and murdered in cold blood, when a young rising nation, may be they are a Tribal people who are coming into nationhood, was burning some of these people did not raise those questions. Therefore I am able to say, as I said yesterday, in this whole thing it is not only the question of human rights and all those things by which they profess. As far as that problem is concerned, I have made the position of my party clear; therefore, I am not

going into that whole question again. When this question is raised again and again, I am able to see also some other thing here. What is that thing? There is a particular thing now being sought for the very specific purpose of changing our foreign relations and our foreign policy. Let us be very clear about it. Somebody had made it absolutely clear also, that we must change our foreign policy. In what direction? Well, it is clear, as far as those people are concerned, that our foreign policy must change in the direction of our being a satellite of the United States. This is where it comes. Of course, I have not been a very great admirer of the entire policy of the Congress Government. I have had made many sharp criticisms. But, certainly, many of these people want the foreign policy to go in another direction. They think that this opportunity should not be missed and that this is an opportunity in which probably, even inside the Congress Party or even inside the Cabinet, some people will be available to them so that these pressure tactics can work and the entire foreign policy can be changed. That is the game. I am able to see the game.

18 HRS.

Having discussed it yesterday, we have it today again. Somebody said, for example, that it is a matter of shame that when the question of Hungary was raised, we kept silent and all that. I want to make my position clear on that. I have already made my position clear with regard to what is happening in Czechoslovakia. As far as Hungary is concerned, I would like to make my position very clear. With regard to the Communist movement, not only here but everywhere, what is the position? The worldwide struggle is going on between the forces of imperialism and the forces of freedom and the Communism everywhere. We do not stand for the export of revolution. We do not think that revolution can ever be exported. The

revolution can occur only on the soil when the people are prepared for it. But, at the same time, I say, a counter-revolution is sought to be exported. When a counter-revolution is exported and foreign imperialist forces are behind that counter-revolution in this country, then we also feel that it is not only the duty but it is also the responsibility of the socialist forces headed by certain States to intervene directly and smash that counter-revolution wherever it might come.

I want to make that position clear. Because, once again, the question of Hungary and all that was raised, I wanted to make the position clear. What is happening today? Here is the Government of India which has taken a particular position—I may not like it. But as far as the position they took in the United Nations is concerned, it is in consonance with the position they took in this House yesterday. As a matter of fact, in this House, the Prime Minister refused to accept all those amendments which wanted to have an outright condemnation. Therefore, I want to point out that, as far as the position—I may like it or not; that is an entirely different matter—taken in the United Nations is concerned, that is in perfect consonance with the position taken by the Government in this House. There is no difference on that score. You may not like it. You may like to revise the whole foreign policy. That is an entirely different matter. If you want the revision of the whole foreign policy and all that, let us have a straightforward debate. Why try to smuggle it through some other things? You have a straightforward debate. Let us have the debate lasting for a whole day. I am prepared to have it.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Yesterday, the Prime Minister, definitely, said that we did not want to pass a resolution here but that we will make our feelings felt there and we will support Czechoslovakia in the United Nations.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I also heard her. I have gone through the

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

script also. That is an entirely different matter. Let us have a debate on the entire foreign policy of the Government of India. Let us re-open the whole question, not only with regard to relations with China, not only with regard to the relations with Soviet Union, not only with regard to the relations with the United States, but all aspects.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: You bring it forward and we will support you.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Let us have a debate on the entire foreign policy than to have this kind of smuggled thing. So, I do not agree with any of these amendments because it is an attempt to smuggle something through a back-door.

MR. SPEAKER: I have requested the Prime Minister to reply round about 6-30 p.m. So, there are another 25 minutes. I will call a Congress member after the Communist Party has placed its view. Mr. Yogendra Sharma.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Basti): I want to speak.....

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately they have not given any name; otherwise I would have called him first... (Interruptions). If there is a demand from both the sides, then I will call him. Mr. Yogendra Sharma.

SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV (Baramati): How many hours are allotted for this?

MR. SPEAKER: I said that the Prime Minister would reply at about 6-30 p.m. You do not hear and ask me again. Mr. Yogendra Sharma.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा (बेगूसराय) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, चेकोस्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता और समाजवाद की रक्षा के विषय पर हम अपनी पार्टी के विचार कल सदन के सामने रख चुके हैं, हम

उस को दोहराना नहीं चाहते हैं। अभी सदन के सामने जो नया विचारणीय विषय आया है—जहाँ तक मैं समझता हूँ वह यह है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सुरक्षा परिषद् में भारतीय प्रतिनिधि ने जो पोजीशन ली और उस को जो हिदायत की गई क्या वह इस सदन के विचार के अनुरूप है, अनुकूल है या विपरीत है। दूसरा विचारणीय विषय यह है—शायद अभी उस पर हम लोग विचार नहीं कर सके हैं—हमारे एक भूतपूर्व माननीय मंत्री श्री अशोक मेहता जी आज ट्रेजरी बेंचेज पर न बैठ कर दूसरी बैंचों पर बैठे हैं—यह दूसरा नया विषय है। इन्हीं दो विषयों पर हम अपने विचार आपके सामने रखना चाहेंगे।

जहाँ तक पहला विषय है कि भारतीय प्रतिनिधि ने सुरक्षा परिषद् में जो स्टैंड लिया, उस को जो हिदायत दी गई—वह इस सदन के विचार के विपरीत है या अनुकूल है—अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल जब हम लोग इस विषय पर विचार कर रहे थे तो चेकोस्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा की चिन्ता सबों ने की थी—इस पर कोई दो रायें नहीं थीं। यद्यपि मैंने निवेदन किया था कि चिन्ता व्यक्त करने के पीछे उद्देश्य समान नहीं हैं, उद्देश्य अलग अलग हैं और हम ने यह भी निवेदन किया था कि चेकोस्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता और समाजवाद की रक्षा कैसे की जाय यह एक समान उद्देश्य बहुतां के बीच में होते हुए भी कैसे की जाय, क्या तरीका है, इस पर समानता नहीं है। कल के विवाद से यह बात स्पष्ट थी—ऐसी स्थिति में सदन में जो मतदान हुआ, उस के बाद उन माननीय सदस्यों के लिये यह उचित नहीं है—वे आलोचना कर सकते हैं, विरोध कर सकते हैं कि

कल का जो स्टैंड प्रधान मंत्री जी ने लिया था, वह गलत है। वह यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि कल प्रधान मंत्री ने जो स्टैंड लिया था और सिक्को-रिटी कौंसिल के स्थायी प्रतिनिधि को जो आदेश दिया उस में मतभेद है। जहाँ तक इस का सवाल है कि इस सदन के विचार के विपरीत सुरक्षा परिषद में भारतीय प्रतिनिधि को आदेश दिया गया, इस से मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ।

दूसरी बात जो मैं बहुत ही विनम्रता के साथ रखना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि चेकोस्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा का प्रश्न कैसे हल हो इस पर हमें बहुत गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये। यदि गाली गलोज से यह प्रश्न हल होने को होता तो वह हल कर लिया गया होता और शायद हम को उस पर विचार करने की जरूरत न पड़ती। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि हम ने इस प्रश्न को अन्तरराष्ट्रीय शीत युद्ध का विषय बनाया, इस विषय को यदि हम ने कम्युनिस्ट विरोध का विषय बनाया तो चेकोस्लोवाकिया की आजादी के लिये लड़ने वाली जनता को मदद होने के बदले नुकसान होगा।

श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी (मुरादाबाद) : क्या इटली और फ्रांस की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टियों ने यही कहा है ?

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : हमारी पार्टी ने जो कुछ कहा है वह मैं पहले कह चुका हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : उन्होंने धिक्कार किया है या नहीं ?

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : जिन लोगों ने अपने राजनीतिक स्वार्थ में सम्राज्यवाद का हित किया है और कम्युनिस्ट विरोध अपना धर्म बना लिया है, यदि वे चेको-स्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता की

बात आज करते हैं तो मुझे कहना पड़ेगा कि मुझ को एक संस्कृत की कहावत याद आती है :

“ बृद्धा वेष्या तपस्विनी ”

ऐसे लोगों की कोई बात चेकोस्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय स्वाधीनता के लिये लड़ने वालों के पक्ष में नहीं हो सकती। मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ, और जोर के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे आदमी जो आज इस सवाल पर कैबिनेट में इस्तीफा देते हैं, उन की चेकोस्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता के प्रति ईमानदारी का झंडा बुलन्द होता यदि वे डिवैल्यूएशन के सवाल पर हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी को अमरीकी साम्राज्यवाद के हाथ न बेच देते। जिन्होंने अमरीकी साम्राज्यवाद के हाथ इस देश की आजादी को बेचने की हिमाकत की है यदि वे चेकोस्लोवाकिया की आजादी की माला जपते हैं तो उस पर किस को विश्वास होगा ?

इस लिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि इस प्रश्न को अन्तरराष्ट्रीय शीत युद्ध का विषय न बनाया जाये, इस को कम्युनिस्ट विरोध का विषय न बनाया जाये। कैसे चेकोस्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता और समाजवाद की रक्षा होगी और क्या करने से हमारे देश का राष्ट्रीय हित सिद्ध होगा, इसी दृष्टिकोण से विचार करना चाहिये। इसी दृष्टिकोण में मैं ने अपनी पार्टी का स्टैंड कल रखा था।

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Kartik Oraon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We want Shri Sheonarain.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very happy that the Opposition is anxious to hear Shri Sheonarain. But when a Jana Sangh member is called, it will be the Congress Members who will decide who among the Jana Sangh

[Mr. Speaker]

will speak; then they should not get offended. Will they kindly allow me to conduct the business? I am going according to the list given to me. Shri Oraon tells me that yesterday also his name was there, but could not get a chance. I would also very much like to hear Shri Sheonarain. But I have to go according to the party lists.

SHRI KARTIK ORAON (Lohardaga): There is no doubt that today, we are very much concerned about what is happening in Czechoslovakia. But the fact remains that we are not bothered so much about Czechoslovakia; we are bothered about the word 'condemn' or 'deplore'. My approach to this is this. Every now and then we get up to condemn Russia, China, this and that. We have made this so cheap that it has almost become something like a telegram. Today telegram has lost its force. Even letters work faster than telegrams. What I mean is that we must reserve this word 'condemn' for special occasions, for graver occasions. My point is that if we start doing this without meaning that, if we condemn every day the very sanctity of the word 'condemn' will be lost. My point is this. I shall refer to Mr. Nath Pai's statement. He said something, A boy liked all parts of a young lady but did not like the whole. I cannot understand how this thing happened? It is an impossible proposition. If he likes all the parts, he must like the whole. It is only a question of his sleep. Yesterday, he said that if the Treasury Benches would have accepted the amendment of Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani on the actions of U.S.S.R. as the violation of the United Nations Charter, it would have been a good promise. Now that this motion has been accepted in the Security Council by Indian representative, nothing like this should have happened. Now that we are thinking about human rights and humanity, this is just the law of nature that very powerful, aggressive and more

forceful section of the community always has onslaughts on the others. We find in our country weaker sections. They had complaints. We have discussed in this House about a Harijan boy having been burnt. No one came forward with motions condemning those actions. Human rights and humanity are relative terms. We have always to keep this in mind in the context of the interest of our country. I am not a pandit in international law. There could be four kinds of situations: (a) the movement of the armed forces by an unfriendly country against an unfriendly country, (b) the movement of the armed forces by an unfriendly country against a friendly country; (c) the movement of the armed forces by a friendly country against an unfriendly country; (d) movement of the armed forces against a friendly country by a friendly country. Our position falls in the fourth category, i.e. (d) which is a difficult one. My point is that in commending, we must be very quick, but in commenting, we must be very slow. Otherwise, we shall confuse commending with commenting. We must not be in a hurry to comment when our national interest is concerned. It is not only the case of those four categories. On the top of that, China is knocking at the door. Pakistan is putting claims and counter claims on Kashmir. Mizoland, Nagaland and Garos and others are indulging in anti-national activities and are raising their ugly heads. We have to keep all these things in mind in this context. On top of all these, it is not only a question of condemning or criticising. It is a question of profit and loss with respect to the country's interest. We are almost in the grip of foreign collaborators to the tune of Rs. 7561.57 crores, involving 21 countries. How can we be involved with 21 countries unless we want to maintain good relations and friendship with them? We do not try to see all these. It is not that we do not feel, but we cannot afford to be indiscreet. We are almost tied with ropes from 21 corners and if we want to jump, we do that to our

own injury. We must be very careful in doing anything of this nature. Politics is very difficult even between person and person. It is very difficult to know as to who means what? It is not a question of this country and that country, but countries outside India, between one country and another country. We do not want to be indiscreet. Tomorrow they may come to terms. What do we gain? We become bad boys for those people. Supposing they become friendly, what do we gain. Then, should India have the unique distinction of being the first country, to condemn this and that? Supposing something wrong happens, who will be responsible? It is not the opposition but the ruling party that will have to face the music. Therefore, in doing what the Government have done, the interest of the country had to be considered supreme. It is also a fact that the actions of the Russians in doing what they did are in fact not only contrary to the relationship of socialist States and the principle of co-existence, but they are also against the principle of international law. But we cannot help it.

The point here is, we have to see that no matter what happens in the world, our approach should be subordinate to our national interests: our needs, our aspirations and our welfare. Then, of course, we are not falling behind any other country. It is the duty of every free and peace-loving country to respect and demand the rights of others. We have done it. But what do the opposition members want? Do they want us to be hanged?

Again, I would like to ask: between the words "deplore" and "condemn", what is the difference? When we deplore, we caution; when we condemn we want to twist the arms of another and when we want to twist the arms of another we must be equally prepared to be twisted. It works that way. Therefore, in anything that has been done, the Government of India has always taken a stand that the interest of the country is never, at any cost, jeopardised.

Therefore, the Indian representative, the proud Indian representative, in the United Nations, at the Security Council, has done the right thing. He has a duty towards his country; he owed a duty towards his country, a duty of care, and that, he has very gracefully maintained.

श्री अब्दुल गनी वार (गुडगांव):
इससे पहले कि मैं अपने भाई वाजपेयी जी की तजवीज के बारे में कुछ कहूँ मैं आपके द्वारा कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुल्क अब एक ऐसे मोड़ पर आ गया है जब मुल्क को फैसला करना होगा कि आया वह गांधी जी की वफादारी करता है या बाहर की जो किताबें लिखी हुई आती हैं, उस पर चलता है। उस पार्टी का मैं भी अदना सा सेवक, सिपाही और रजाकार रहा हूँ। लेकिन आप देखें के अभी दो दिन पहले मेरी बहन प्रधान मंत्री इंदिरा गांधी ने फरमाया था कि अपोजीशन चालाकी से चाहता है कि हम में किसी तरह की फूट पड़े। यह उन्होंने तब कहा था जब मोरारजी देसाई का सवाल यहाँ पर आया था और उस पर बहस हुई थी। मैं अपनी बहन को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि वह आज और कल की बहस को देखें और वोटिंग को देखें। उन्हें पता चलेगा कि अब मामला बहुत आगे निकल गया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई मुल्क दुनिया में ऐसा नहीं है जिस का इतिहास उतना अजीम्भुशान रहा हो जितना भारत का रहा है। कोई भी मुल्क इस में भारत का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकता है। भारत ने अजीम रवायात कायम की हैं भगवान राम से ले कर महात्मा गांधी तक। उसने हमेशा सच्चाई के लिए, हमेशा मजलूमों के लिए, हमेशा निर्बलों के लिए झंडा उठाया है।

आज बहस किस बात पर है। सिर्फ इस बात पर है कि भारत ने क्यों

(श्री अब्दुल गनी दार)

सिक्थोरिटी काउंसिल में यह रख रखतयार किया है। मैं अपनी बहन को दिलो जान से चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह देखें कि हमने क्या इकरार किया था। उनको मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज से बहुत पहले एक पुराने किले में सरोजनी नायडू साहिबा की प्रधानगी में महात्मा गांधी ने एशिया-टिक कंट्रीज़ की एक कान्फ़ेंस बुलाई थी। उस में यह तय हुआ था कि हर निबल की मदद की जाए। उसी का नतीजा है कि हिन्दुस्तान की उस आवाज़ से न सिर्फ़ इंडोनेशिया आजाद हुआ बल्कि मलेशिया भी आजाद हुआ और उन मुल्कों के साथ साथ दर्जनों और मुल्क भी आजादी के रास्ते पर आ गए और वे आजाद हो गए। मेरी बहन कहती है कि चाहे बूढ़े हों या नए हों, वे कुछ भी कहें लेकिन मैं सरगरम आबोहवा में रही हूँ जिस में हिन्दुस्तान की सारी आजादी की जंग लड़ी गई है। मैं उन से इस में सहमत हूँ। नेहरू फैमिली दुनिया में काबिले फ़ख़ है और हमें उस पर गर्व है। लेकिन जहां सिद्धान्तों का सवाल आता है, जहां यह सवाल आता है कि आया हम उन तमाम पुरानी बातों पर जो इन्हीं के पिता, इन्हीं के दादा और इन्हीं के गुरु और मेरे भी गुरु महात्मा गांधी ने कही थी, चल रहे हैं, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम नहीं चल रहे हैं। मैं मानता हूँ कि बाकी सब बातों पर उन्होंने हमारी नुमाइंदगी की है। इन्होंने हिदायत दी थी अपने रिप्रिजेंटेटिव को सिक्थोरिटी काउंसिल में कि इन इन पैरों से हम सहमत हूँ। लेकिन एक पैरा जिस में कंडमनेशन का लफ़्ज़ आता है उससे हम मुत्तफ़िक नहीं है। अगर ऐसी बात थी तो आप एमेंडमेंट दे सकते थे और

अपना रेजोल्यूशन ला सकते थे और भारत की आवाज़ नरम से नरम अलफ़ाज़ में वहां रख सकते थे ताकि दुनिया पर यह जाहिर हो जाता कि भारत की पालिसी जोकि महंज़मा गांधी के वक़्त से बनी हुई थी, उसी पर आज भी भारत चलता है।

मैं क्यों कह रहा था कि अब मुल्क एक मोड़ पर आ गया है? मैं इस वास्ते कह रहा हूँ कि अगले इलैकशन में तरह तरह की पार्टियां नहीं होंगी। इनकी पार्टी के दो हिस्से होंगे। एक के साथ एक हिस्सा जाएगा और दूसरी के साथ दूसरा जाएगा। आपने देखा होगा कि कल राम मूर्ति जी ने चैकोस्लोवाकिया के बारे में क्या कहा और आज यह बहाना किया कि कोई घड़ा है जिस ने अमरीका को कंडेम नहीं किया वियतनाम के मामले पर तथा और किसी मामले पर। राम मूर्ति जी की पोजिशन बदल गई हो, ऐसी बात नहीं है। राम मूर्ति जी हों या दायें के लोग है, डागें हों, उन सब को जाना है उनके साथ जो कांग्रेस में लैफ़्ट को रिप्रिजेंट करते हैं। मेरे जैसे जो इंडिपेंडेंट हैं और चाहे मेरे गुरु दादा कृपालानी हों उन्हें भी जाना है उनके साथ जो गांधी जी के ही आदर्शों पर चलने की कसम खाये हुए हैं। यह अगली इलैकशन में लाज़िमी तौर पर होगा।

मेरा एतराज़ एक और बात पर है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने फरमाया कि उन्होंने कैबिनेट से मुश्बरा किया था। प्रधान मंत्री को यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि वह मेरे सिर्फ़ इन बुजुर्गों की प्रधान मंत्री नहीं है, वह सिर्फ़ 49 परसेंट बोट देने वालों की ही प्रधान मंत्री नहीं है बल्कि वह सारे देश की प्रधान मंत्री हैं और ऐसे संकट के मीके पर उनका फ़ज़ था कि वह अपोजीशन के लीडरों को बुलातीं, जो चाहे, छोटे छोटे ग्रुप्स के

लीडर थे, और उन के साथ मिल कर इसको तय करती। उनको छोटी छोटी बातें तय करनी होती हैं, नेशनल इंटीग्रेशन का मसला तय करना होता है या कोई और मसला आ जाता है, उसको तय करना होता है तब तो उनको बुला लेती हैं लेकिन यह जब इतना बड़ा मसला आया तो भी इनको चाहिये था कि इन सब लीडरों को बुलातीं। उन्होंने कैबिनेट में इस पर विचार किया यह तो ठीक है और उनको ऐसा करने का हक भी हासिल था और उनको यह भी हक हासिल है कि वह मुल्क पर हल करें। लेकिन क्या यह उनका धर्म था या नहीं था कि वह उन बुजुर्गों को भी बुलातीं जिन्होंने उनके बुजुर्गों के साथ मिल कर जेलें काटी हैं, जिन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री के बुजुर्गों के साथ मारें खाई हैं बेंतें खाई हैं, मजायें भुगती हैं और अपने खानदानों को बरबाद किया है? उनका भी दिमाग है। उनको वह कॉन्फिडेंस में लेनी और कहती कि हम इस तरह से संयुक्त राष्ट्र में चलना चाहते हैं।

एक वक्ता आया था जब चीन ने हम पर हमला किया था। तब नेहरूजी जीवित थे। उस वक्ता रूस वालों ने कहा था कि दोस्त से खून करीब है और चीन का साथ दिया था। आज श्री राम मूर्ति फिर डांगे साहब के साथ हैं और उनको होना भी चाहिये, मुझे कोई दुख नहीं है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क की एक मजबूत स्थान लेना है, एक अहम रोल प्ले करना है। यह इसलिए कि यही श्री कोसिगन थे जिन्होंने यह कहा था कि चाहे तुम्हारे हज़ारों अफसर और बहादुर सिपाही शहीद हो गए हैं, हाजीपीर से भी आगे तुम निकल गए हो, तुम पीछे आओ, और ताशकंद में शास्त्री जी को बुलाया था।

वहां हमारे उस बहादुर निडर सिपाही पर, जिसे हम श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री के नाम से याद करते हैं, दबाव डाला या उन्हें प्यार से कहा, इस में मैं नहीं पड़ता, लेकिन उस ने वहां पर अपनी जिन्दगी खो दी और ताशकंद मुआहिदा किया। हमारा दावा है कि घर हमारा है; पाकिस्तान का नहीं है; पाकिस्तान वालों ने उस पर ज़बर्दस्ती कब्ज़ा जमा रखा है। उस ताशकंद मुआहिदे का नतीजा यह हुआ कि जब हम ने अपना घर वापिस ले लिया, तो हम से कहा गया कि घर तो तुम्हारा ही है, लेकिन वहां से जाओ।

मैं यह नहीं कहता कि फ़लां अमरीका का नुमायंदा है और फ़लां रशा का नुमायंदा है, लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुल्क की इज्जत तो सब के लिए बराबर है। आज इस मुल्क के 52 करोड़ इन्सान इस लिए इन्दिरा जी की पुष्ट पर हैं कि वह प्रधान मंत्री हैं और सब उन को प्रधान मंत्री मानते हैं, चाहे उन्होंने उन्हें बाट दिया हो या न दिया हो। आये दिन हम चाइना और पाकिस्तान से खतरे की बात सुनते हैं और करते हैं। इस हालत में जब रशा ने पाकिस्तान को अपने हथियार देने का फ़ैसला किया, तो क्या उस के दिमाग में यह था कि इस से हिन्दुस्तान की आज़ादी या इकानॉमिक तरक्की महफूज़ होती है? मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसा नहीं था। बल्कि वह तो हिन्दुस्तान को आँखें दिखाना चाहता था और बताना चाहता था कि मैं कुछ करने वाला हूँ। और उस ने क्या किया? एक छोटे से मुल्क पर, जो दिल्ली के बराबर है, जिस की आबादी दिल्ली के बराबर है, वह बहुत दनदना कर, ईस्ट जर्मनी, पोलैंड और अपने यहां से फ़ौज ले कर चढ़ दौड़ा।

(श्री अब्दुल गनी दार)

पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने एक बार कहा था कि अपोजीशन वाले एक चीटी को मारने के लिए हथौड़ा उठा रहे हैं। यही रूस ने किया है।

ये मेरे बुजुर्ग हैं। मैंने अपनी सारी जिन्दगी इन लोगों के चरणों में गुजारी है। जैसे फ्रांस ने अपने आप को, अपनी खुददारी और अपनी इज्जत को बचाने के लिए डीगाल को बुलाया, अगर ये लोग उसी तरह आचार्य कृपालानी को नहीं बुला सकते, जो गांधी जी की बात को पूरा करायें और देश की आवाज को गांधी जी की आवाज में मिला कर यू० एन० ओ० में उठायें, तो श्री जगजीवन राम हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : श्री मोरारजी देसाई हैं।

श्री अब्दुल गनी दार : श्री संजीव रेड्डी हैं। कौन जानता है कि किस के नाम की लाटरी निकले। जब श्री एस० आर० दास ने अपना फ्रंसला दिया, तो श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने कामरेड रामकिशन को पंजाब का मुख्य मंत्री बनाया। वह मेरे घर आये। उन्होंने कहा कि मेरी लाटरी तो 7, जन्तर मन्तर रोड में निकली है, लेकिन इस का क्रेडिट आपोजीशन को है, जिस ने एस० आर० दास कमीशन के सामने एब्यूज आफ़ पावर के चार्ज को साबित कर दिया। मैं नहीं जानता हूँ कि लाटरी आप के नाम की निकलेगी या किसी और नाम की। लेकिन अब वक्त आ गया है कि मुल्क को गांधी जी के रास्ते पर जाना होगा, अपोजीशन हो या कांग्रेस, उन को गांधी जी की आवाज को सुनना होगा।

फ़ादर आफ़ दि नेशन ने उस वक्त लड़ाई की, जिम वक्त हिन्दुस्तान के पास कुछ नहीं था, जब अंग्रेज़ का झंडा सारी दुनिया में लहरा रहा था। तब भी उन्होंने जुल्म के खिलाफ़ आवाज उठाने से दरेश नहीं किया। मैं इन्दिरा बहन से हाथ जोड़ कर कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपनी पोजीशन के बारे में फिर से सोचें। वह यह न समझें कि उन की

पार्टी में से सिर्फ़ श्रीमती मुचेता कृपालानी और श्री अशोक मेहता ने ही अपनी आत्मा की आवाज को उठाया है। इस पार्टी में वे लोग हैं, जिन्होंने अपनी आत्मा की आवाज उठाने के लिए अंग्रेज़ की मुसीबतें झेलीं। क्या उन की आत्मा कभी बेदार नहीं होंगी? यकीनन होगी।

मैं यह भी ईमानदारी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे बियतनाम का सवाल हो और चाहे कांगो का, इस मुल्क में सब लोगों को, श्री मसानी और श्री वाजपेयी और उन के ग्रुप्स को, सब पार्टियों को, एक ही आवाज उठानी पड़ेगी कि हिन्दुस्तान का बल, फ़ौज, पैसा और एक एक बाशिन्दा उस देश के लिए है, जिस पर कोई जालिम मुल्क, चाहे वह रशा हो या अमरीका या बरतानिया हो या और कोई मुल्क हो, चढ़ दौड़ेगा। हिन्दुस्तान का बच्चा बच्चा उस देश के लिए कट मरेगा। आज ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि सरकार अपोजीशन के लीडरों को कॉन्फ़िडेंस में ले।

रशा के बारे में यह उम्मीद हो गई थी कि अब उस की पालिसी बदल गई है, अब वह चाहता है कि दुनिया अमन और इत्मीनान में रहे, अब वह "जीओ और जीने दो" के उसूल में यकीन रखता है। लेकिन मैं ईमानदारी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे श्री राममूर्ति ने एक दिन में अपनी पोजीशन बदल ली, वैसे ही रशा ने एक मिनट में अपनी पोजीशन बदल ली। (ब्यबधान) मैं इन की हर एक गाली सुनने के लिए तैयार हूँ। अगर ये मुझे जूते मारें, तो मैं खाने के लिए तैयार हूँ। मैंने देश के लिए इनका हुक्म माना है, इन के वरडिक्ट को माना है। मैंने देश के लिए अपने भाई, बीवी और भतीजी की और अपनी जवानी की कुर्बानी दी है। मैं अब भी इन के चरणों में हूँ। आज ये श्री वाजपेयी, श्री मसानी या श्री रंगा को न लें, लेकिन ये लोग सोचें कि श्रीमती मुचेता कृपालानी या श्री अशोक मेहता के दिमाग में यह बात क्यों आई कि वे इतनी अच्छी, इतनी नेक और इतनी बहादुर इन्दिरा की बात के साथ न चल सके— इस लिए कि उन के सामने महात्मा गांधी थे। महात्मा गांधी जिदाबाद।

اُشور و ہندوستانی دار (گورگور) :

اس کے پہلے کہ میں اپنے بھائی شری راجیشی جن کی تعویذ کے بارے میں کچھ کہوں میں آپ کے دواوا کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ملک اب ایک ایسے میوزیو آگیا ہے جب ملک کو فیصلہ کرنا ہوگا کہ آیا وہ گاندھی جی کی وفاداری کرتا ہے یا باہر کی جو کتابیں لکھی ہوئی آتی ہوں۔ اس پر چلنا ہے۔ اس پارٹی کا میں بھی اندازہ سا سوک۔ سپاہی اور رضاکار رہا ہوں۔ لیکن آپ دیکھیں کہ ابھی دو دن پہلے میری بہن پردھان ملتوی اندیرا گاندھی نے فرمایا تھا کہ اپوزیشن چالاک سے چاہتا ہے کہ ہم میں کسی طرح کی پیوست پڑے۔ یہ انہوں نے تب کہا تھا جب شری مرزجی دھسائی جی کا سوال یہاں آیا تھا اور اس پر بحث ہوئی تھی۔ میں اہلی بہن کو یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ آج اور کل کی بحث کو دیکھیں اور روتلگ کو دیکھیں۔ انہیں پتہ چلے گا کہ اب معاملہ بہت آگے نکل گیا ہے۔ میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کوئی ملک دنیا میں ایسا نہیں ہے جس کا اتھاس اتنا عظیم الشان رہا ہو جتنا بھارت کا رہا ہے۔ کوئی بھی ملک اس میں بھارت کا مقابلہ نہیں کر سکتا ہے۔ بھارت نے عظیم روایات قائم کی ہیں بھوکوان رام سے لے کر مہاتما گاندھی تک۔ اس نے ہمیشہ سچائی کے لئے۔ ہمیشہ مطالبوں کے لئے۔ ہمیشہ نربون کے لئے جہنڈا اٹھایا ہے۔

- آج بحث کس بات پر ہے۔ صرف اس بات پر ہے کہ بھارت نے کبھی سیکورٹی کونسل میں یہ رخ اختیار کیا ہے۔ میں اپنی بہن کو دل و جان سے چاہتا ہوں۔ لیکن میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ دیکھیں کہ ہم نے کیا اقلو کیا تھا۔ ان کو میں یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج سے بہت پہلے ایک پرانے قلعہ میں سرورجنی ناتھو صاحب کی پردھانگی میں مہاتما گاندھی نے ایشیاتک کانگریز کی ایک کانفرنس بلائی تھی۔ اس میں یہ طے ہوا تھا کہ ہر نریل کی مدد کی جائے۔ اسی کا نتیجہ ہے کہ ہندوستان کی اس آواز سے نہ صرف ہندویشیا آزاد ہوا بلکہ ملیشیا بھی آزاد ہوا اور ان ملکوں کے ساتھ ساتھ درجنوں اور ملک بھی آزادی کے راستے پر آگئے اور وہ آزاد ہو گئے۔ میری بہن کہتی ہیں کہ چاہے بوجھ ہوں یا نئے ہوں۔ وہ کچھ بھی کہیں لیکن میں سرگرم آب و ہوا میں رہی ہوں۔ جس میں ہندوستان کی ساری آزادی کی جنگ لڑی گئی ہے۔ میں ان سے اس میں سہمت ہوں۔ نہرو فیملی دنیا میں قابل فخر ہے اور ہمیں اس پر گرو ہے۔ لیکن جہاں سدھاتوں کا سوال آتا ہے۔ جہاں یہ سوال آتا ہے کہ آیا ہم ان تمام پرانی باتوں پر جو انہوں نے پتا۔ انہوں کے دادا اور انہوں کے گرو اور مددے ہیں۔ گرو مہاتما گاندھی نے کہی تھیں۔ چڑھے ہیں تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہم

نہیں چل رہے ہوں - میں مانتا ہوں کہ باقی سب باتوں پر انہوں نے ہماری نمائندگی کی ہے - انہوں نے ہدایت دی تھی اپنے ریویژنٹھتو کو سیکورٹی کونسل میں کہ ان ان پہروں سے ہم سہمت ہیں - لیکن ایک پہرا جس میں فائیلمیشن کا لفظ آتا ہے اس سے ہم متفق نہیں ہیں - اگر ایسی بات تھی تو آپ اہانتہومات دے سکتے تھے اور اپنا آپریشن لاکھتے تھے اور وزارت کی رپورٹ سے نوم الفاظ میں وہاں رکھ سکتے ہو تاکہ نیا پر یہ ظاہر ہو جاتا ہے کہ یہ رپورٹ ہی بالیسی چو کہ مہاتما گاندھی کے وقت سے بنی ہوئی تھی اس لیے آج بھی بھارت چلتا ہے -

میں کیوں کہہ رہا تھا کہ اب ملک ایک روز پر آ گیا ہے - میں اس واسطے کہہ رہا ہوں کہ اگلے الیکشن میں طرح طرح کی پارٹیاں نہیں ہونگی - ان کی پارٹی کے دو حصے ہونگے - ایک کے ساتھ ایک حصہ جائے گا اور دوسروں کے ساتھ دوسرا جائے گا - آپ نے دیکھا وہاں کہ کل رام موورتی جی نے چیکیوساوا دیکھا کے بارے میں کیا کہا اور آج یہ بہانہ کیا کہ کوئی دھوا ہے جس نے امریکہ کو گڈتہ نہیں کہا و سخنام کے معاملے پر تنہا اور کسی معاملے پر - رام موورتی جی کی پوروشن بدل گئی ہو ایسی بات نہیں ہے - رام موورتی جی ہوں یا دائیں کے لوگ ہوں قنکے ہوں - ان سب کو جانا

ہے ان نے ساتھ جو کانگریس میں لفٹ کو ڈیز واک کرتے ہیں - سہرے جیسے جو اہانتہات نہیں اور چاہے سہرے کو روکا گیا ہو انہوں نے بھی جانا ہے ان کے ساتھ جو گاندھی جی کے ہی اہانتوں پر چلنے کی قسم کھاتے ہوئے ہوں - یہ اگلی الیکشن میں لڑی منظور ہوگا -

ہوا بعض ایک دو بات پر - پردھان مادی جی نے فرمایا کہ نہیں بے ٹیہماٹ سے مشورہ کیا تھا - پریشان ملتوی کو یہ نہیں بولنا چاہئے کہ وہ سہرے صرف ان بزرگوں کی پردھان مکتوں نہیں ہوں - وہ صرف ۳۹ پرستانہ روت دنے والوں کی ہی پردھان مکتوں نہیں ہیں بلکہ وہ سارے دیہے کی پردھان ملتوی ہوں اور ایسے سلکت کے موتمہ پر ان کا فوری تھا کہ وہ ایوویشن کے لہذروں کو ہاتھوں - وہ چاہے چہتے چہتے گرویس کے اہتو ہوں - اور ان کے ساتھ مل کر لیں کو طے کوتھیں - ان کو چہوٹی چہوٹی باتیں طے کرنی ہوتی ہیں نہشل انتھکریشن کا مسئلہ طے کرنا ہرتا ہے یا کوئی اور مسئلہ آ جاتا ہے - اسو طے کرنا ہوتا ہے تب تو ان کو بلا لیتی ہیں لیکن یہ جو ایو مسئلہ آیا تو بھی ان کو چہتے تھا کہ ان سب لہذروں کو ہاتھوں - انہوں نے اہانتہ مہور لیں پر چہرے کیا یہ تو ہدک ہے اور ان د

ایسا کرنے کا حق بھی حاصل تھا اور
 ان کو یہ بھی حق حاصل ہے کہ وہ
 ملک پر رول کریں۔ لیکن کہا یہ
 ان کا دھرم تھا یا نہیں تھا کہ وہ ان
 بزرگوں کو بینی بلائیں جنہوں نے ان کے
 بزرگوں کے ساتھ مل کر جیلوں کاٹی
 ہیں۔ جنہوں نے پردھان ملتاری کے
 بزرگوں کے ساتھ مارے کھائی ہیں۔
 بولمیتوں کھائی ہیں۔ سزائیں بھیگتی
 ہیں اور اپنے خاندانوں کو برباد کیا ہے۔
 ان کا بھی دماغ ہے۔ ان کو وہ کانفیڈنس
 میں لیتیں اور کہیں کہ ہم اس
 طرح سے سلطنت راشتہ میں چلنا
 چاہتے ہیں۔

وہاں ہمارے اور بہادر نڈر سہاوی
 پر۔ جسے ہم ال بہادر شاستری کے
 نام سے یاد کرتے ہیں۔ دباو ڈالا یا
 انہیں پھارے کہا۔ اس میں میں نہیں
 ہوتا۔ لیکن اس نے وہاں پر اپنی زندگی
 کھوئی اور تاشقند معاہدہ کیا۔
 ہمارا دعوے ہے کہ کھر ہمارا ہے۔
 پاکستان کا نہیں ہے۔ پاکستان والوں
 نے اس پر زبردستی قبضہ جسا رکھا
 ہے اس تاشقند معاہدے کا نتیجہ
 یہ ہوا کہ جب ہم نے اپنا کھر واپس لے
 لیا۔ تو ہم سے کہا گیا کہ کھر تو
 ہمارا ہی ہے۔ لیکن وہاں
 جاؤ۔

ایک وقت آیا تھا جب چین نے
 ہم پر جو حملہ کیا تھا۔ تب نہرو جی
 جھوٹ تھے۔ اس وقت روس والوں نے
 کہا تھا کہ دوست سے خون قریب ہے
 اور چین کا ساتھ دینا تھا۔ آج شری
 رام سرورتی پھر شری ڈانگے صاحب کے
 ساتھ ہیں اور ان کو ہونا بھی چاہئے۔
 مجھے کئی دکھ نہیں ہے۔ لیکن
 میں کہتا چھتہ ہوں کہ ہمارے ملک
 کو ایک مضبوط ستھان لینا ہے ایک
 اہم رول لینے کرنا ہے۔ یہ اسلئے نہ
 یہی شری کورسنگ تھے جنہوں نے یہ
 کہا تھا کہ چھتہ تھارے ہزاروں افسر
 اور بہادر سہاوی شہد ہو گئے ہیں۔
 حادی پھر سے ہی اگے تم نکل گئے
 ہو۔ تم پھوچے آؤ۔ اور تاشقند میں
 شاستری جی کو بلایا تھا۔

میں یہ نہیں کہتا کہ فلاں امریکہ
 کا نمائندہ ہے۔ اور فلاں رشا
 کا نمائندہ ہے۔ لیکن میں یہ کہتا
 چاہتا ہوں کہ منگ کی عزت تو
 سب کے لئے برابر ہے۔ آج اس ملک
 کے دن کوڑنسان اس لئے اندیرا جی
 کی پشت پر ہیں کہ وہ پردھان ملتاری
 ہیں اور سب ان کو پردھان ملتاری
 مانتے ہیں۔ چاہے انہوں نے انہیں
 ورت دیا ہو یا نہ دیا ہو۔ آئے دن
 ہم چائنا اور پاکستان سے خطرے کی
 بات سنتے ہیں لڑتے ہیں۔ اس
 حالت میں جب رہا نے پاکستان
 کو اپنے ہتھیار دینے کا فیصلہ کیا
 تو کہا اس کے دماغ میں یہ تھا کہ
 اس سے ہندوستان کی آزادی یا
 آزادی ترقی معترضہ ہوگی۔
 میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ایسا نہیں

تھا۔ بلکہ وہ تو ہندوستان کو انہیں دکھاتا چاہتا تھا اور بتانا چاہتا تھا کہ میں کچھ کرنے والا ہوں۔ اور اس نے کہا کیا۔ ایک چھوٹے سے ملک پر جو دلی کے برابر ہے۔ جس کی آبادی دلی کے برابر ہے۔ وہ بہت دندنہ کر۔ ایسٹ جرمنی۔ پولینڈ اور اچھے یہاں سے فرج لہکر چڑھہ دوڑا۔ پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو نے ایک بار کہا تھا کہ ایوزیشن والے ایک چھلتی کو مارنے کے لئے ہتھیار اٹھا رہے ہیں۔ یہی روس نے کیا ہے۔

یہ سہرے بزرگ ہیں۔ میں نے اپنی ساری زندگی ان لوگوں کے چہروں میں گزاری ہے۔ جیسے فرانس نے اپنے آپ کو۔ اپنی خوردہ داری اور اپنی عزت کو بچانے کے لئے ڈیکال کو بلایا۔ اگر یہ لوگ اس طرح آچاریہ کرپٹنی کو نہیں بلا سکتے۔ جو گاندھی جی کی بات کو پورا کرائیں اور دیکھی کی آواز کو گاندھی جی کی آواز بنا کر یو۔ این۔ او میں اٹھیں تو شہی جگجگھوں رام ہیں۔

ک م ناٹھ سدھیہ : شہی مرداؤ جی دیسائی ہیں۔

شہی عبدالغنی ناز : شہی سلجھو دیتی ہیں۔ کون جانتا ہے کہ کس کے نام کی لٹری نکلے۔ جب شہی ایس۔ آر۔ داس نے اپنا فیصلہ دیا تو شہی لال بہادر شاستری نے امریت رام کشن کو پنجاب کا مکھہ ملٹری

بلایا۔ وہ سہرے گھر آئے۔ الہور نے کہا کہ سہری لٹری تو جلدتر ۸ ملٹر روٹہ میں نکلی ہے۔ لیکن اس کا کوپڈت ایوزیشن کو ہے۔ جس نے ایس۔ آر۔ داس کدھن کے سامنے ایوز ف پارا کے چارج کو ثابت کر دیا۔ میں نہیں جانتا ہوں کہ لٹری آپ کے نام کی نکلے گی یا کسی اور کے نام کی۔ لیکن اب وقت آ گیا ہے کہ ملک کو گاندھی جی کے راستے پر جانا ہو گا۔ ایوزیشن ہو یا کانگریس۔ ان کو گاندھی جی ہی آواز کو سلنا ہو گا۔

فادر آف دی نیشن نے اس وقت لڑائی کی۔ جس وقت ہندوستان کے پاس کچھ نہیں تھا۔ جب انگریز کا چھڈا ساری دنیا میں لہرا رہا تھا۔ تب ہی انہوں نے ظلم کے خلاف آواز اٹھانے سے دریغ نہیں کیا۔ میں اندرا بہن سے ہاتھ جوڑ کر کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ اپنی یوزیشن کے بارے میں پھر سے سوچیں۔ وہ یہ نہ سمجھیں کہ ان کی پارٹی میں سے صرف شہیتی سوچھتا کرپلانی اور شہی اشوک مہتہ نے ہی اپنی آتما کی آواز کو اٹھایا ہے۔ اس پارٹی میں وہ لوگ ہیں۔ جنہوں نے اپنی آتما کی آواز اٹھانے کے لئے انگریز کی مصہبتیں چھوڑیں۔ کیا ان کی آتما کبھی بیدار نہیں ہو گی۔ یقیناً ہو گی۔

میں یہ بھی ایمانداری سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ چاہے وقت نام کا سوال

ہو اور چاہے کانگو کا اس ملک میں
 سب لوگوں کو، شری مسائی اور شری
 واجپئی اور ان کے سرپرستوں کو - سب
 وزارتوں کو - ایک ہی آواز اٹھانی
 پڑے گی کہ ہندوستان ۲ بل - فوج -
 پوسہ اور ایک ایک باشندہ اس دیس
 کے لئے ہے - جس پر کوئی ظالم
 ملک چاہے وہ رشیا ہو یا امریکہ
 یا برصانیہ ہو یا اور کوئی ملک ہو -
 چڑھ دوڑے گا - ہندوستان کا بچہ بچہ
 اس دیس کے اچھے کٹ مرے گا - آج
 ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ سرکار
 اپوزیشن کے زہتوں کو کانفیڈنس
 میں لے -

رشیا کے ہارے میں یہ امید کی
 گئی تھی کہ اب اس کی پالیسی
 بدل گئی ہے - اب وہ چاہتا ہے کہ
 دنیا امن اور اطمینان سے رہے - اب
 وہ دو جہوں اور جہلے دو کے اصول
 میں یقین رکھتا ہے - لیکن میں
 ایمانداری سے کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ
 جسے شری رام مورتی نے ایک دن
 میں اپنی پوزیشن بدل لی - ویسے
 ہی رشیا نے ایک مدت میں اپنی
 پوزیشن بدل لی - (Interruptions.)

میں ان کی ہو ایک گالی سنے کے لئے
 تیار ہوں - اگر یہ مجھے جوتے ماریں
 تو میں کہانے کے لئے تیار ہوں - میں
 نے دیس کے لئے ان کا حکم مانا ہے -
 ان کے وردکت کو مانا ہے - میں نے
 دیس کے لئے اپنے بھائی، بیوی اور

بھتیجی کی اور اپنی جوانی کی
 قربانی دی ہے - میں اب بھی ان
 کے چرنوں میں ہوں - آج یہ شری
 واجپئی - شری مسائی یا شری رنکا
 کو نہ لوں - لیکن یہ لوگ دیکھیں
 کہ شریعی ہو چکا کرہانی یا شری
 لشونہ مہتہ کے دماغ میں یہ بات
 کہوں آئی کہ وہ اتنی اچھی - اتنی
 نیک اور اتنی بہادر اندھیرا کی بات کے
 ساتھ نہ چل سکے - اس لئے کہ ان
 کے سامنے مہاتما گاندھی تھے - مہاتما
 گاندھی زندہ باد -

MR. SPEAKER: We will have to finish it as quickly as possible because there is a half-an-hour discussion also. I do not want to postpone it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPA-
 YEE: Let the Prime Minister reply tomorrow:

MR. SPEAKER: Only one more speaker is there. The Swatantra Party has got another five minutes. They have divided the 20 minutes into two. Shri Madhu Limaye has to speak from the SSP. After that on popular demand I will call Shri Sheo Narain. After the tension we must have Shri Sheo Narain. Shri Madhu Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, स्टालिन साहब ने क्वाब में भी नहीं सोचा होगा कि बिना एक तीर छोड़े हुए, बिना एक गोली चलाए हुए, यह पचास करांड का देश उन के अधीन हो जायेगा। लेकिन ब्रेज्नेव साहब बड़े खुशनसीब हैं। जब उन के चंगुल से कम्युनिस्ट देश एक के बाद एक निकलते चले रहे थे, तो

[श्री मधु लिमये]

उन को यह महात्मा गांधी का देश ऐसा मिला—इन लोगों की वजह से, जो उन के इशारे पर ताचने के लिए, उन के इशारे पर चलने के लिए तैयार है।

आज सबरे मैं ने जब यह कहा कि क्या सुरक्षा परिषद् में रूस के आक्रमण की निन्दा करने वाले प्रस्ताव पर तटस्थ रह कर आप ब्रैजनेव के दास और दासी बन जायेंगे—प्रश्न पूछा, तो कुछ लोगों को गुस्सा आया। मेरे शब्दों से इन को चिढ़ है, लेकिन इन को अपने काम से चिढ़ नहीं है, अपने काम पर खेद नहीं है। क्यों ये लोग आक्रमण को आक्रमण कहने से घबरा रहे हैं, और हिचक रहे हैं? उसकी आलोचना करने से, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है, इनको हिचक क्यों है? आखिकार 1956 में अध्यक्ष महोदय, इंग्लैंड, फ्रांस और इजरायल के द्वारा जब ईजीप्ट के ऊपर हमला हुआ तो भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने, नवम्बर 1956 की बात है, इस सदन में कहा था, उन के शब्दों में मैं रख रहा हूँ :

“The starting of military operations against Egypt by the United Kingdom and France and, more particularly, the bombing of parts of Cairo city came as a profound shock not only to people in India but people everywhere.”

और आगे चल कर इस काम का वर्णन उन्होंने किया :

“Flagrant case of aggression by two strong powers against a weaker one.....”

तो क्या यह वर्णन जेकोस्लोवाकिया के लिए लागू नहीं है? पिछले वर्ष जून महीने में जब इसरायल ने ईजीप्ट के

ऊपर हमला किया तो उस समय वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था :

“We have made our mark by taking a firm stand where justice is concerned. Non-alignment has never meant that we should be neutral.”

लेकिन जब रूस का मामला आया, जेकोस्लोवाकिया की स्वाधीनता की हत्या जब रूस ने की तो पुराने शब्द भी वह भूल गई? उन के अपने जो शब्द हैं उनका भी उनको विस्मरण हो गया? अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो निरपेक्षता की नीति है क्या उस में यूगोस्लाविया भी हमारा साथी नहीं है? यूगोस्लाविया न अमेरिका के साथ है न रूस के साथ है। यूगोस्लाविया एक तटस्थ राष्ट्र है, कम्यूनिस्ट देश होते हुए भी। लेकिन आप जानते हैं यूगोस्लाविया के नेताओं ने क्या कहा है? आज मैंने यह पढ़ा। उन्होंने कहा है :

“We condemn the occupation”

आगे चल कर उन्होंने इस का वर्णन किया है :

“A most brutal form of violation of sovereignty and territorial integrity.”

अध्यक्ष महोदय, रूमानिया की बात ले लीजिए। यह पूंजीवादी देश नहीं है। यूगोस्लाविया की तरह तटस्थ नहीं है। वारसा-संधि संगठन का रूमानिया सदस्य है। लेकिन रूमानिया के नेताओं में जो हिम्मत है, कल मैं जानबूझ कर बिट्ठल-भाई पटेल मैदान में जो सभा हुई उसके बाद उनके द्वतावास में गया था,

आप सभी लोगों की ओर से राजदूत को कहने के लिए कि आप ने जो हिम्मत दिखायी है उस पर हमें फ़ख़ है और आज जो इस सदन में इस सरकार की आवाज है वह 50 करोड़ जनता की आवाज नहीं है। रूमानिया की सरकार ने क्या किया? न केवल इस आक्रमण का विरोध किया, वह जानते थे, उन को पुराना इतिहास याद था। शुरू में हिटलर द्वारा आस्ट्रिया का खात्मा हुआ, बाद में चेकोस्लोवाकिया की नौबत आई, उस के बाद पोलैंड और इस तरह नार्वे, बेल्जियम, हालैंड और समूचे यूरोप पर अपनी साम्राज्य-शाही हुकूमत प्रस्थापित करने का जब प्रयत्न किया तो इंग्लैंड वाले कह रहे थे चेकोस्लोवाकिया बहुत दूर है। लेकिन रूमानिया के लोगों ने सोचा कि आज चेकोस्लोवाकिया पर हमला हो रहा है, हो सकता है कि कल हमारे ऊपर भी हमला हो जाय और इसलिए 'उन्होंने' नेशनल असेम्बली की बैठक बुलायी, रूस के आक्रमण का धिक्कार किया और आत्म-रक्षा के लिए उन्होंने अपनी मिलिशिया को मोबिलाइज़ किया है, उनको कहा कि वे तैयार रहे।

चीन को ले लीजिए। चीन के साथ मैं कहूँगा कि न सिर्फ़ हमारा मतभेद है, बल्कि मैं कहूँगा कि दुश्मनी है क्योंकि उन्होंने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया है। लेकिन आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे खुशी है कि चीन ने रूस के इस आक्रमण के बारे में बहुत सख्त शब्दों में निन्दा की है, शेमलेस ऐक्ट कहा है, साथ ही साथ उन्होंने यह भी कहा है :

“It reminds one of the occupation of Sudatenland by Hitler.”

इस से ज्यादा ताकत के साथ किसी भी देश की सरकार ने कुछ नहीं कहा। और यह कम्यूनिस्ट देश है। तो मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार की तटस्थता से..... (व्यवधान)हां, हमारे मतलब के लिए है तो जरूर करूँगा।.....(व्यवधान)..... हां, वासुदेवन नायर जी, शैतान को भी कोट करूँगा और आप से तो शैतान ही अच्छा निकला, आप हमारे देशवासी होते हुए आप से शैतान अच्छा निकला।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सुरक्षा परिषद में वोट न देने से हमारे राष्ट्रीय चरित्र पर धब्बा नहीं लगा है? महात्मा गांधी के नाम पर कलंक नहीं लगा है? कुछ मामलों में ब्रेज़नेव का कर्म स्टालिन के कर्मों से भी खराब है। स्टालिन ने फिनलैंड पर हमला किया था। फिनलैंड पूंजीवादी देश था और उस समय लड़ाई चल रही थी। सुरक्षा के लिये कम से कम थोड़ा बहुत खतरा था। लेकिन फिर भी समूचे फिनलैंड पर स्टालिन ने कब्ज़ा नहीं किया। लेकिन आज ब्रेज़नेव साहब किन के ऊपर हमला कर रहे हैं? किसी साम्राज्यवादी देश पर? कल ठीक ही कहा दिल्ली के विश्व-विद्यालय के लड़कों ने कि सोवियत रूस को अगर लड़ाई की इतनी इच्छा है तो साउथ वियतनाम की जनता को बचाने के लिए अपने टैंक वहां क्यों नहीं भेजता? मैं आज पूछना चाहता हूँ, मैं ने मास्को में भी रूस वालों से पूछा था कि....(व्यवधान).... आप जरा सुनिए। सुनने की आदत रखिए। सोफिया हो कर आये हो न शशिभूषण जी, चेकोस्लोवाकिया के लोगों से वहां मिलें होंगे?

[श्री मधु लिमये]

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मास्को में मैं ने उन से पूछा था कि क्या आप साउथ वियतनाम की जनता की रक्षा के लिए अपने टैंक वहां भेजने के लिए तैयार हैं तो वह लोग हंस, साउथ वियतनाम में भेजने के लिए मैं कह रहा हूँ, तो उन्होंने कहा, कि नहीं, उस से लड़ाई छिड़ जायगी। इसलिए हम नहीं जायेंगे, बहुत दूर देश है। लेकिन आज अपनी सेना का और पाशवी बल का इस्तेमाल रूस एक कम्यूनिस्ट देश के खिलाफ कर रहा है और सो भी ऐसे कम्यूनिस्ट देश के खिलाफ जो वारसा करार संगठन का सदस्य है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ वारसा करार काहे के लिए बनाया गया था? वारसा करार के बारे में रूसी नेता कहते थे आक्रमणकारी नाटो ताकतों के खिलाफ, साम्राज्यशाही के खिलाफ हमारा वारसा करार है। लेकिन आज खेद की बात है कि वारसा करार के नाम पर अपने ही एक कम्यूनिस्ट भाई को खत्म करने के लिए आज सेना का इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है। मेरी राय में ऐसा क्रूर कर्म, अपने ही साथी को दबाने के लिए सेना का इस्तेमाल करना, ऐसा क्रूर काम दुनिया के इतिहास में शायद ही कभी हुआ हो। आखिरकार चेकोस्लोवाकिया का क्या पाप था? क्या उन की नीति थी? उन्होंने यह कहा था कि 20 साल के पहले उत्पादन के साधनों पर जो सामाजिक मिल्कियत प्रस्थापित हो गई है उसको हम खत्म नहीं करेंगे। क्या वह पूंजीपतियों के हाथ में दे रहे थे कल-कारखानों को? नहीं, अध्यक्ष महोदय। उन्होंने कहा था कि कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी का नेतृत्व भी रहेगा लेकिन एक अच्छी बात उन्होंने कही

कि कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी का नेतृत्व डंडे के बल पर, कानून के जारिए हम प्रस्थापित नहीं करेंगे, जनता का समर्थन, स्वेच्छा से जनता जो समर्थन देगी वह समर्थन प्राप्त कर के हम अपने नेतृत्व को बनाए रखेंगे। यह बहुत अच्छी बात उन्होंने कही। दुनिया के किसी कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी ने यह बात नहीं कही।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, तीसरी बात उन्होंने कही—अगर रूस की सुरक्षा का सवाल है, यूरोप की शान्ति का सवाल है तो चेकोस्लोवाकिया के लोग कहते थे—जिस दिन नाटो खत्म हो जायगा, वारसा करार भी खत्म हो, वारसा करार से वह अलग नहीं हो रहे थे, उसकी पुनर्रचना की मांग कर रहे थे। जैसे डिगल साहब ने नाटो की पुनर्रचना की मांग की थी। लेकिन क्या अमरीका ने अपनी सेनायें फ्रांस के अन्दर नहीं भेजी? रूस को भी चाहिये था कि उन की मांगों पर विचार करते और इस तरह से टैंकों और हवाई दल का इस्तेमाल कर के उनका गला घोटने की कोशिश नहीं करते—लेकिन, अध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसा उन्होंने नहीं किया।

अब सुरक्षा परिषद् में इन्होंने जो पाप किया है उसका पापक्षालन ये लोग कर सकते हैं। मोरारजी भाई यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं, आपकी मारफत मैं उन से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जैनरल असेम्बली की बैठक बुलाई जा सकती है। अगर कोई बड़ा राष्ट्र व्हीटो का इस्तेमाल करता है तो क्या आज हिन्दुस्तान उस पापक्षालन के लिये पहल करेगा कि जैनरल असेम्बली की बैठक बुलाई जाय और उस बैठक में इस आक्रमण

की निन्दा की जाय और इस आक्रमण को खत्म करने के लिये सुझाव दिये जाय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज दिनेश सिंह साहब मुझे नहीं दिखई दे रहे हैं। सुना है काबुल गये हैं। लेकिन अगर इस बात का पता चल जाता है कि वह मास्को गये हैं तो वह बहुत पृणित कर्म होगा...

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : मास्को नहीं गये हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : तब ठीक है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जो प्रह्लाद सुक्रात और महात्मा गांधी की परम्पराओं में विश्वास करते हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे देश में न केवल गांधी जी के शरीर की हत्या हुई है, बल्कि इन लोगों ने गांधी जी के विचारों की भी हत्या की है। यद्यपि गांधी जी के शरीर की ही नहीं उन के विचारों की भी हत्या यहां पर हुई, लेकिन फिर भी मुझे हर्ष है कि अमरीका में शहीद मार्टिन लूथर किंग के रूप में महात्मा गांधी का नया अवतरण हुआ और आज मैं खुशी से फूला नहीं समाता हूँ चेकोस्लो-वेकिया के हज़ारों नवयुवकों के रूप में महात्मा गांधी का वहां अवतरण हुआ है जो रूसी टैंकों के सामने, तोपों के सामने अगने को न्योछावर कर रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, दो बार कल और परसों रूसी दूतावास के सामने प्रदर्शन करते हुए हम लोग गिरफ्तार हो गये। आज मुझे गुस्सा है—हिन्दुस्तान के नीजवानों से, दुनिया के दूसरे देशों में

प्रदर्शन होने हैं, क्या हम लोगों में गुस्सा नहीं है, क्या हमारी नस-नस में, खून के कतरे-कतरे में वह राष्ट्रीयता की ज्वलन्त भावना नहीं है? अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूँ—महात्मा जी ने कहा था अगर अहिंसा वाली हिम्मत आप में नहीं है तो हिंसा अच्छी है, लेकिन कायरतावाली नीति को मत अपनाओ। मैं आज आपकी मारफत हिन्दुस्तान के नवयुवकों से अपील करना चाहता हूँ—अच्छा होगा कि आप प्रह्लाद सुक्रात और महात्मा गांधी के रास्ते पर चलो, लेकिन यदि वह आपको मन्जूर नहीं है तो खुदी राम बोस और सरदार भगत सिंह का रास्ता भी तो आपके लिए खुला है। लेकिन किसी भी कीमत पर आक्रमणकारी के सामने आप घुटने नहीं टेकें आक्रमणकारी के सामने नहीं झुकें।

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI
DHRANGADHRA (Surendranagar):
I do not think that I have to make it clear that we on this side of the House wholly deprecate the stand taken by this country in the United Nations Security Council.

Having heard the Prime Minister yesterday and the Prime Minister having heard the sentiments on both sides of the House, there was no doubt left in anyone's mind that either India would herself raise the issue in the Security Council, or that if the issue was raised, she would be the first to vote for civilisation and against manifest tyranny. The fact that our representative has failed to do so, acting on the instructions of the Government here, is clearly a betrayal of the sentiments of this House and of this country and, I would go further to say, of the Prime Minister's own party and of that party's great traditions.

[Shri Sriraj Meghrajji Dhrangadhra]

As I understand it, it was proposed by our representative that the resolution should be put to the vote clause by clause so that we could vote in favour of most of the clauses recited earlier today by the Prime Minister. It seems there was one clause which contained the word 'condemnation' and it seems this word was too strong for us to use—when the independence, when the freedom of a country was being snuffed out and when people were throwing themselves in front of invading and merciless tanks. The word was too strong for us to use when even the small communist countries of the world were not hesitating to use it, and I am gratified to say that some Communist Members of this hon. House did not hesitate to use it either. And finally when we ourselves did not hesitate to use it in condemning the aggression by Israel which, as it turned out, was not an aggression at all. I may remind the House that the word is not unknown in the pronouncements of the Security Council itself, as witness its condemnation of South Africa.

In events of such a ghastly nature, the indignation of the world is a vital factor which affects the destinies of millions. Even before this country had won its independence, we were the first and the most forthright to condemn in unmistakable terms every incident of armed assault and aggression by one people upon another. Now that we are independent and ourselves a force in the world—and I believe a moral force—I do not see how we can justify our departure from our national and traditional stand.

The Prime Minister has said that there may be many in this House who were too young to have taken part in the freedom struggle and some of the elders who did not take part in it. Be that as it may, but taking her cue, may I remind all Members of this House, and especially those on the Congress benches,

of the ideals and motivations of that struggle and how it was won? I appeal to their memories and to their moral conscience. I know that they have their party discipline as we have ours. But there are times when one has to rise above mere party affiliations and to think in terms of being members of the human family. This is one such time when aggression and tyranny are again let loose and are rampant in the world and the threat of war hangs over Europe and the rest of mankind. In this fateful time, I move the whole House, on both sides, to speak with a united voice and join the world in condemning this outrage against mankind and against the very fundamentals of civilisation.

MR. SPEAKER:—Now, Mr. Sheo Narain will wind up the debate before the Prime Minister speaks.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : अध्यक्ष महोदय,

नं पैसां शिकन हैं, न गद्दार हैं हम,

बतन परबरी के खतावार हैं हम ।

हम इस देश के वफादार सिपाही हैं, रहे हैं और रहेंगे । मैं विरोधी दलों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज जो परिस्थिति है वह बड़ी गम्भीर परिस्थिति है । मेरे पास एक नोट है—अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपकी इजाजत से मैं उसकी दो लाइनें पढ़ना चाहता हूँ—

“Proclamation of the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, August 21, 1968. Czechoslovakia was occupied by the armed forces of five States of the Warsaw Pact, trampling over the will of its Government, National Assembly, the leadership of the communist party of Czechoslovakia and the people of Czechoslovakia. For the first time in the history of international workers movement aggression has been committed by

the armed forces of one socialist country against a country ruled by the communist party."

19-00 HRS.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को दबाया है। वह पार्टी जिसका सोशलिस्ट समाज और समाजवादी व्यवस्था का एक बहुत बड़ा नारा है। हमारे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के भाई ग्राइ में कहते हैं—वी विल लिबरेट यू, हम हरिजनों का उत्थान कर देंगे, उन्हीं का हमें आज यह नकशा दिखाई दे रहा है, कमिंग इविन्ड्स कास्ट दैर शैडोज़ विफोर। इसलिए मैं सरकार से और इन्दिरा जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि सन 42 के मूवमेन्ट में आपने देखा और हमने देखा, आजादी से हमको भी उतना ही प्रेम है जितना कि किसी को भी हो सकता है। आज संसार में हमको अपनी मर्यादा की रक्षा करनी है। कर बहियां बल आपनी, छांड पराई भास। इस प्रकार से हमको और आपको सोचना है। हमारे एक्स एजूकेशन मिनिस्टर ने कहा था कि वर्ल्ड में हमारा कोई दोस्त नहीं है। इसलिए मैं आपको सावधान करना चाहता हूँ कि आप एलर्ट रहिए। घर की फूट बुरी होती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप देश को एक सूत्र में बाँधें। जब चीन ने अटक किया था तब नेहरू जी के नेतृत्व में हमने यहां पर यूनानिमस रेजोल्यूशन पास किया था। नेहरू जी की और गांधी जी की जो हमें पंचशील की देन है हम उसकी रक्षा करें। हम दादा के अनुगृहीत हैं, उन्होंने हमको आज समझाया। वे 33 वर्ष तक हमारे जनरल सेक्रेटरी रहे, कांग्रेस के प्रेसीडेंट रहे, आज भी उनके प्रति हमारी उतनी ही श्रद्धा है, उसमें कोई कमी नहीं आई है। कम्युनिस्ट जो आ गये हैं वे समझते हैं कि दादा कुछ नहीं हैं लेकिन हम उनका उतना ही सम्मान करते हैं।

अन्त में मैं सरकार से यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप जो कुछ भी यहां पर कहें उसपर अमल करें। यही बात मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश के सम्मान पर ठेस नहीं लगनी चाहिए। इस देश में हमको यूनाइटेड होकर रहना है। धन्यवाद।

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister.

SHRI RAGHUVIR SINGH SHASTRI rose—

MR. SPEAKER: I have called the Prime Minister. If I call you now, everybody will rise. Please do not begin the trouble. If it is a lone request, I can understand; but if one begins, then everybody will begin. Excuse me.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the last three days, in one form or another, in this House and the other House and indeed all over the country and in large parts of the world, people have followed the tragic events in Czechoslovakia with profound concern, anxiety and anguish. The House has followed the reports which have come through the world press and radio and during the last 24 hours there have been reports of violence, of bloodshed, of loss of precious lives, and there have also been rumours about the Czech leaders. All these reports have naturally heightened our concern.

I believe several Members here asked about Mr. Dubcek. There is no authoritative news. Even the Czech Charge d'affaires who has been in contact with his country at least till this morning—after that I have not been in touch and have no fresh news. But we have been very closely in touch with our embassies abroad and ambassadors of other

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

countries in Delhi and, in particular, we have tried to establish contact with our ambassador in Czechoslovakia as well as with the *Charge d'affaires* of Czechoslovakia in Delhi. There is not much in the messages which we have received and which the hon. Members have not already heard about through radio or the press.

There was some misunderstanding about the rules which govern the conduct of business in the Security Council. May I ask your leave to explain the position briefly, and quote the relevant rules. In this case, as I have explained, we have supported practically the entire resolution, all but one sub-part of one single paragraph; part of one single paragraph out of nine paragraphs in all. We wanted to record our vote on the resolution accordingly.

The rules of the Security Council, however, lay down—may I quote from the relevant rules—it is rule 32:

“Part of a motion or of a draft resolution shall be voted on separately at the request of any representative, unless the original mover objects.”

Our representative, therefore, approached the movers of the resolution and tried to persuade him to agree to voting by parts. Unfortunately, they did not agree.

It was in these circumstances that our representative had no alternative but to clarify our support to all parts of the Resolution with the exception of that one single word and thereafter he abstained on the Resolution taking it as a whole. An extract from the PTI despatch says:

“In a speech early this morning Mr. Parthasarathy quoted that in the light of the statements of the Prime Minister of India it will be clear to the Security Council that India firmly supports respect for sovereignty, independence

and territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia. It would be equally clear that we are against any interference in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. The immediate need is for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Czechoslovakia. I should like—this is what Parthasarathi said—to place on record our deep sympathy with the heroic people of Czechoslovakia in their present ordeal.”

The word which has been coming up for much comment and the word to which we also took exception was the word ‘condemn’. Now, Sir, to condemn or not to condemn is not the question (*Interruption*). What is more important and indeed vital, for Czechoslovakia is the withdrawal of all forces forthwith, the restoration of the legitimate government to power and the restoration of sovereignty to the people of Czechoslovakia. We are in favour of all these objectives and we do not think that these objectives can be furthered by beginning with condemnation.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Why did you not vote for it and then explain your stand on ‘condemnation’?

MR. SPEAKER: She is explaining the Government's point of view and not the hon. Member's point of view.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I submit, Sir, that the main objective which we have to pursue as a mature and responsible people and as a member of the Security Council is to do everything possible to stop the process of serious setback to the forces of peace in Europe and generally in the world, to try and reverse the trends which have struck such a sharp blow to the earlier welcome process of peaceful co-existence and detente between the power blocs. This is what can serve the long-term and lasting interests of Europe and the world. That will also ensure the sovereignty and independence of Czechoslovakia. This is the only way

in which an atmosphere can be created which is necessary for the full observance of the U.N. Charter (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I would appeal to both sides of the House not to use words so loosely. I was very unhappy to find from the records that really very unfortunate words were used here in the morning.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: As I was saying, this is the only way in which an atmosphere can be created which is so necessary to ensure the full observance of the United Nations Charter and the observance of the charter rights of all free nations.

We have to face clearly what the reality is and what are the objectives. The reality is that even those countries which voted for that one part of the resolution in respect of which we suggested a minor modification, even those countries are not, as far as we can see, prepared to take any concrete step to help the Czechoslovak people, beyond what we are doing, namely, calling for the withdrawal of troops, for safeguarding the charter rights of the Czechoslovaks and so on.

I have already outlined the points this morning and also in my statement yesterday. Whatever their reasons or motives may be, we do not wish to question them. But we are averse, on our part, to do anything which might look like an empty gesture and which might invite comment that it is an exercise in propaganda and, above all, which might add to the tension which has arisen and also might possibly add to the difficulties of the Czech people.

Sir, much has been said here about the government not daring to say something or to use a word; not daring to use a word which is strong enough. Some members even called us stooges of one side or another. These are not new words. We have heard such remarks on occasion from

one side of the House saying that we are the stooges of American imperialism; then we hear them from another side and we learn that we are, on the contrary, stooges of the Communists of one kind or another. This is, perhaps, the fate of all those who try to plod a middle path.

From the beginning, our policy has been to try to lessen tension, not merely as a good ideal—we do believe it is an ideal—but from the point of view of national interest. It is not in our interest that tension should develop and increase; it is not in our interest that violence should break; it is not in our interest that there should be war. As many leaders have said, as Acharyaji has pointed out, the high ideals that Mahatmaji has put before us, the ideal that freedom was indivisible, that we should fight for freedom, for justice, not only for ourselves but for all oppressed and threatened people, this we have been trying to do.

We talk of courage. Now, when the whole House is shouting, perhaps the easier path would have been for me to say that I accept this word. It is not easier to say, in the face of large numbers of people shouting, that I shall stand by a particular statement. But why do we stand by that particular statement? Why, in the face of similar excitement have we maintained our stand?

SHRI RANGA: What is your stand?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Our stand has been made so clear, Shri Ranga. It has been made very clear also, at the present moment, in the United Nations. It has been made clear to the representative of Czechoslovakia in New Delhi. It has been made clear through our Ambassador in Czechoslovakia to the people there. There is no doubt about our stand amongst all those people who are vitally concerned. I am sorry that in this House people should try to create confusion about it. What is our objective? Are we

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

out to use this for propaganda purposes, saying this is wrong?

SHRI RANGA: No question of propaganda; it is a matter of conscience.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Well, I am glad it is a matter of conscience. When this matter first came up, I said and I repeat that it is this government and this side which has been friendly with the government and the people of Czechoslovakia. It was not the parties who were now raising their voice, who had contacts with these parties.....(*interruptions*). I am not saying that they should not now express their sympathy. I welcome it; I think, it is a good thing that they are doing it now. But it is well to remember that they had taken a particular attitude about these countries; they had at some time resented our contacts with them, our economic contacts and so on, and not so very long ago.

SHRI RANGA: All of us?

SHRI PILOO MODY: That was because of the rupee payment.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It is well to remember that in a previous debate in this House these countries were criticized; it was said that they are not our friends, that we should not have such close contacts with them. I do not want to say anything except that it is well to remember what was said in recent debates at this moment when we seem to be measuring friendship.

So I would like to submit to this House that we have very strongly and firmly put what is the real crux of the matter. From the beginning we have supported Czechoslovakia. We did not wait for anybody else to pin point the issues. We were the first and we stick by those principles with regard to Czechoslovakia, with regard to any other nation where they may be threatened. I think that there should be no doubt about that at all.

It would perhaps be presumptuous on my part to say that India has

been able to change world trends or lessen tension all over the world. But I think it would also be unfair if we were to disregard totally the role which India has played in the lessening of tensions between the two power blocs and in creating a better atmosphere. This is something in which we are vitally interested and which we must continue to pursue. If I said that we must tread carefully or must choose our words carefully, it is not because we are afraid of anybody, it is not because we do not want to offend anybody or want to please somebody but it is because we feel this is a moment when we should not look only to the present. Of course, if in so doing we had not stressed the positive aspects, hon. Members would have been justified in saying that we were hesitating, but we have not hesitated in emphasizing and reiterating again and again the positive aspects of the matter. But we do feel that conditions should be created—I do not know if it is possible; it may not help at all but at least in our judgment it was felt that we should take a part which would help to lessen tension in this unhappy part of the world.

I spoke earlier about the safety of Mr. Dubcek and his colleagues and, I am sure, the House will join me in expressing our great concern. We learn from the latest news that the President has already gone to Moscow. It seems from his statement that he has gone of his own will and he has stated.....(*Interruption*).

AN HON. MEMBER: He was dragged.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Mr. Svoboda has asked his people to have faith in him and has told them that he will return tonight to report to them. He has also assured them that they will accept no Prime Minister except Prime Minister Cernik.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: What about Speaker Smrkovsky? He is in the Soviet Embassy. Why do you not appeal to the Soviets to release the

Speaker? What if our Speaker is captured and taken to the Soviet Union?.....(Interruption).

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: We will rely on Shri Sondhi to rescue him.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure, even if Government fails, he will come to my rescue.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I should also like to express my deep admiration and full sympathy for the Czechoslovak people in their time of trouble, and admiration for the peaceful and passive character of their demonstrations and the calm and dignity which they are displaying.

SHRI PILOO MODY: What about a word of sympathy for Shri Sondhi who ruined his voice on this debate?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Shri Sondhi will very soon recover this. He is a very energetic young-man and it will take him no time to recover his voice. I hope it will be raised for other just causes.

May I add a word? Let us not use this opportunity for condemnation amongst ourselves but use it for expressing Czechoslovakia's point of view and for the principles which I have enunciated earlier. Let us create an atmosphere and let us work towards a world in which violence and force cannot triumph.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ। क्या भारत जनरल प्रसैम्बली में इस सवाल को उठाएगा? सोवियत रूस ने वीटो का प्रयोग करके सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में इस प्रस्ताव को निष्प्रभावी कर दिया है।

अब एक ही रास्ता है कि हम जनरल प्रसैम्बली में यह सवाल उठायें। क्या प्रधान मंत्री ने इसके बारे में विचार किया है?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : जब समय आएगा, हम जरूर विचार करेंगे।

श्री मधु लिनये : हमारे मुद्दों का जवाब ही नहीं आया है। मैंने पूछा था कि आप उठायेंगे या नहीं?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think the speech made by the Prime Minister has made any difference at all to what she said yesterday. I am really surprised that she takes the plea that when the resolution was discussed and adopted in the Security Council, we wanted only not to support a portion of it but the rules stood in our way. I would like to know whether our representatives do not know these rules at all. How is it that we were completely ignorant of the procedure in the United Nations or was it done deliberately? I want to know that. This is really an explanation which will convince nobody.

Sir, in this debate, many things have come up. The Members have raised the question of cold war, of propaganda, of this and that. The Prime Minister said yesterday that she did not like to use the word 'condemnation' because she stated that that would enable us to play our role in the United Nations. She said that this is being discussed in the Security Council and so let us not express ourselves in strong words which may prejudice the very cause for which we are all fighting.

She also said yesterday that we would support the charter of rights of Czechoslovakia in the United Nations. She emphasized that other countries have not yet expressed their opinion on it. What happened in the United Nations? A positive resolution came to the effect that it was a violation of the United Nations Charter. Why did we not support it? This is a double standard. Why we have refrained from supporting this condemnation, I want to ask. Have we not in the United Nations itself supported resolutions, in

[Mr. Surendranath Dwivedy]

the past, about aggression and about condemnation? What happened in the case of Israel? What happened in the case of the Suez Canal crisis? What happened in the case of resolution on racial discrimination? Have not resolutions been adopted condemning all these actions? We have supported them all along. Why do we hesitate in this case?

The Prime Minister, in the course of her long speech, has nowhere indicated what concrete steps Government of India is going to take. She says we always act to see that tensions ease in the world. But she has not indicated what concrete steps Government of India is going to take to ease tensions in the world. I could understand if she had any such proposals in her mind. She is not even prepared to say that we are ourselves going to raise this question in the General Assembly. That also she is not prepared to commit at present. The people will judge you not from your words but from your deeds. What will be the result of this? The result is very clear, as clearly as day-light. There is no condemnation of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries and they have already occupied that country. They have whisked away the President of that country to Moscow. They want to set up a puppet Government there. There have been reports that Mr. Dubcek and the Defence Minister will not be in the Government that will be set up. Probably, in a day or two, it will be announced that a puppet Government has been established there and then the withdrawal of the troops will take place. As soon as a puppet Government is established, the withdrawal of troops for which the Prime Minister is urging so much will, certainly, begin. Are you paving the way for that? Are you waiting for the withdrawal of troops and to enable them to set up a puppet Government? That seems to be the only result of the action that we have taken. If really we are against any such thing, we must prove it by

action. I want to put one question. The Leipzig fair is held in East Germany. You must have heard in the Radio that countries like Sweden and Norway have withdrawn from that fair just to register their protest against East Germany sending army to Czechoslovakia. Is the Government going to do that? Let us register our protest in some way. Merely saying that we are not dictated by anybody, that we are not afraid of anybody, does not convince anybody.....(Interruptions).

Now people are united on this question. There is no doubt about it. Let her not say this side of the House or that side of the House. People are united on this. You yourself felt it. So far as this question is concerned, nobody wants war, nobody wants suppression of human rights. What we wanted was that this country must raise its moral voice against any suppression of human rights anywhere. This is an occasion when the whole country, the whole population of this country and the sovereign Parliament should have unitedly voiced this feeling of our nation, and this certainly would have the moral effect on the countries which, by ignoring all sections of population, want to suppress the small nation because they have the armed strength with them. Therefore, we have failed in our duty. It is a disgrace that we did not support such a Resolution. We did not take the initiative. It was offered to us; yet, we did not do that. This is a disgrace and, therefore, I think that there is still time. Let us not stand on prestige saying that we have done something and now we cannot retrace. We have committed a mistake. Let us retrace our steps. You may not want to pass any Resolution because the opposition is bringing it, but even your own member's Resolution was not voted yesterday. I would make an appeal once again. If you really want to keep the prestige and honour of this country, please, for God's sake, once and for all declare from the housetop that this is an aggression, we condemn it,

we cannot support it, and we stand in the United Nations with all countries which condemned the aggression.

SHRI RANGA: I do not want to make any speech.....

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. Then everybody will start.....

SHRI RANGA: We must make our position very clear, so far as Opposition is concerned. Yesterday there was no positive Resolution from that side except that it should be taken into consideration. Our amendments were voted down. But today they have pursued a different line.....(Interruptions). I am glad to learn that they are not moving any positive motion. I do not want to use any harsh language and, therefore, I abstain from it. They do not want to move their Resolution today. The statement made by the Prime Minister, however much she tried to be conciliatory and accommodating, has not satisfied us. Therefore, we have no other go but to walk out.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सरकार ने जो रवैया सुरक्षा परिषद में अपनाया है, उसके खिलाफ हम सदन से बहिर्गमन कर रहे हैं।

(The members of Opposition then left the House.)

MR. SPEAKER: Since all of them have withdrawn, I presume nobody is pressing his amendment.

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN: I seek leave of the House to withdraw my amendment No. 6.

Substitute motion No. 6 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put all the other amendments together to vote.

Substitute motions Nos. 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 were put and negatived.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
PROCLAMATION re: PUNJAB AND REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PUNJAB

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers:

- (1) Proclamation dated the 23rd August, 1968, issued by the President under article 356 of the Constitution, assuming to himself all functions of the Government of the State of Punjab.
- (2) Order dated the 23rd August, 1968, made by the President, in pursuance of sub-clause (i) of clause (c) of the above Proclamation.
- (3) Report of the Governor of Punjab dated the 21st August, 1968, to the President.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1844/68.]

19-31 HRS.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

TALCHER INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

MR. SPEAKER: This half-an-hour discussion has already been postponed once. I do not want to postpone it further. We shall take it up now. It will be disposed of in a few minutes.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara): I want to raise a discussion on this matter, Talcher Industrial Complex, because it seems from the reply of the Minister that they are delaying the entire process. I feel there is a conspiracy at some level in the Ministry, either at the political level or otherwise, by which they do not want such a good scheme to be taken up. Otherwise, I do not see any reason why this delay should be there.

19-31½ HRS.

[SHRI R. D. BHANDARE in the Chair]

As is known to everyone, this scheme was started in 1964 at the instance of the Government of India.