

[Mr. Speaker]

the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 101 to 105, 148 and 149 relating to the Department of Communications."

The motion was adopted.

16.52 hrs.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. Five hours have been allotted for this. Those who want to move their cut motions may do so within 15 minutes.

DEMAND NO. 22—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,48,07,000/- be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

DEMAND NO. 23—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,69,36,000/- be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 24—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,21,16,000/- be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 119—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,25,00,000/- be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to speak in support of my cut motion No. 7 on the order paper which refers to the failure to take adequate steps for the defence of India's security and vital national interests which are involved in the defence of Malaysia, South Vietnam and Laos against Chinese Communist backed aggression.

I would like to start by inviting hon. Members to undertake what the French call a tour d'horizon, that is, a view of the horizon. Let us look around our frontiers and see in what condition and in what neighbourhood we find ourselves. On our West, we find that our relations with our neighbour Pakistan, have deteriorated—a most unfortunate condition. When we turn to the north, we find the Himalayan heights occupied by the Chinese Communist invaders who have not withdrawn from our territory and who do not look like withdrawing

unless we do something about it. When we turn to the North-east, we look at Burma which has been treating our citizens, people of Indian origin, very harshly. It looks as if they are being sucked increasingly into the Chinese Communist orbit. When we turn to the South-east, we find our friends, and neighbours, in the Commonwealth, Malaysia being subjected to aggression from Indonesia. I think, till a few days ago, it could have been said that the only two countries in the region which were really warm and friendly towards us were Afghanistan and Malaysia. Thanks, however, to recent developments in Ceylon, where the forces of liberalism have routed the forces of Marxism, I think, we can count on genuine friendship and expect genuine friendship from the south. Even so, the picture is a dismal one.

It is the result of many years of our failure to understand the nature of the Chinese Communist regime, the betrayal of Tibet and the unfortunate adventure into Panch Sheel. Even today, while all our eyes are glued to the Himalayas, while our defence discussions are concerned with the mobilisation of Chinese Communist divisions across our own borders, while we look at the Himalayan verandah, the bandit is advancing creeping on us from our backyard. And that backyard is South-East Asia. For the Communist Chinese bandit there are no separate fronts and no separate wars. They are all sectors of the same front, the all-Asia front on which he wishes to advance.

Now, let us see what the facts about South Viet Nam and Laos are. The facts are that in 1954, a Geneva Agreement or Accord was made by which all concerned agreed to respect the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of all countries involved, and to refrain from any interference in their internal affairs. A second Geneva Agreement was made in 1960 with similar terms about Laos.

From the word 'go' in 1954, the Communist regime in North Viet Nam, which is a well-known satellite of Communist China, started violating the Agreement of 1954. Their instrument in Viet Nam was the Viet Cong and later in Laos it became the Pathet Lao. In these two countries they have been waging a new kind of war. They have been indulging in a new brand of aggression.

This North Viet Nameese Communist Government has set out during the past few years cold-bloodedly to conquer the sovereign peoples in the neighbouring States on its borders. This kind of aggression is as real and as pernicious as that of an invading army across the border. What does it consist of?

There are four elements in this war that they are waging and in this aggression that they are committing. The first is that the hard core of the Viet Cong forces in South Viet Nam have been trained in the North and ordered to infiltrate into the South. The second is that the key leadership of the Viet Cong forces in South Viet Nam consists of professional officers and men of the North Viet Nam Army. The third element is that the operations are directed from Hanoi. And the fourth element is that weapons have now been found with them, new type of weapons, which show that the origin of these weapons are Communist China, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

The Government and the people of South Viet Nam have been exercising their inherent right of self-defence, and in doing so, they have called upon the United States to give them assistance, exactly as we did in October-November, 1962.

In June, 1962, the International Control Commission, of which we have been the Chairman, in its Legal Committee came to certain conclusions; they found that the charges that were

[Shri M. R. Masani]

made had been proved, and the charges that had been made by the Government of South Viet Nam had been documented. I am quoting from the report of the legal committee of the International Commission to which we are a party:

"There was sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt that North Viet Nam had sent men and arms into South Viet Nam to subvert and overthrow the legal Government of the country."

The legal sub-committee of the ICC found Hanoi guilty of violations of four clauses or provisions of the Geneva Accord of 1954.

Since then, other evidence has come to light. It is now estimated that since 1959, 20,000 North Viet Namese officers and men have entered South Viet Nam to pursue the war against that country. In guerilla warfare, one gureilla counts for ten soldiers. In Malaysia and in other countries where guerilla warfare has been indulged in, the ratio is ten to one. That means that you need ten soldiers to hold down a guerilla and destroy him. Therefore, on that ratio, North Viet Nam is waging a war in South Viet Nam to the extent of sending in an army of 200,000 men. Even a blind man would not refuse to see that when 200,000 men cross into one country from another, that is war, and that is what is going on in South Viet Nam today; it is war.

On 16th February, 1965, a North Viet Namese vessel was sunk off the coast of South Viet Nam, because it was suspected of carrying arms. The members of the ICC were invited, and they visited the ship. And what did they find? They found a cargo of 100 tons of weapons and ammunition of Chinese Communist, Czechoslovakia, East German and Soviet manufacture. It is no wonder that Marshal Chen Yi said recently that "China and North Viet Nam go together like teeth and

lips." It is very easy to see which are the teeth and which are the lips.

17 hrs.

All these years, the Governments of South Vietnam and of the United States made the mistake of allowing this war to be waged on only one side of the frontier, of allowing North Vietnam to continue to be what was described as "a privileged sanctuary." The aggressors crossed into South Vietnam, but nobody pursued them back into North Vietnam. It was a fantastically one-sided fight. There is no wonder that as a result, the aggressors got bolder and the threat intensified during the last few years.

It was a very mistaken policy. Some of us have argued against it for many years now. When you give the communist aggressors a privileged sanctuary you are practically making it impossible to defeat aggression. I am very glad—and every lover of freedom in Asia is glad—that President Lyndon Johnson has discarded that policy and launched into a policy of what may be called "planned escalation" a policy of calculated risk, a risk that is completely justified by the facts of the situation. The result is that the initiative is no longer in Chinese Communist and North Vietnamese hands. The initiative, for the first time in South East Asia, is in the hands of the defenders of freedom. The communists now have only one choice: either they abide by the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1960 or they will have to take the consequences.

I say that every Indian who loves his country, if not for the sake of justice, for the sake of our own national interest, must welcome this development in US policy which holds out hope for the future of South and South East-Asia.

It is comparable to the way in which President Kennedy called Mr. Khrushchev's bluff in Cuba. Now at last the bluff of the Paper Dragon is being

called. As somebody said the other day, Communist China has administered its 1,347th 'serious warning' to the United States. But nothing has happened except the 'serious warnings'. At last the measure has been taken of this big paper dragon, this big bully, which has been intimidating all of us in Asia.

Let us imagine what would happen if South Vietnam and Laos were to fall. The first thing would be that Thailand would be encircled and would not be able to stand up very long. When Thailand fell, Burma would succumb, and we would have the Red armies on the gates of India on our Eastern frontier. Malaysia would then have a common frontier with the Communist enemy. And Malaysia, with a pincer movement of the Communists from the north, and Soekarno from the South east, would be destroyed. Then you will have the Chinese Communist and their satellites all the way from Karachi down to Singapore. India would be encircled.

There is one thing about Malaysia which we must remember. One-tenth of the people of Malaysia are of Indian origin. Imagine what would happen if the Chinese Communists and their allies were to occupy Malaysia. This ten per cent could be brainwashed. They could be trained in guerilla warfare, and just as Soekarno is today landing his infiltrators by boat into Malaysia, so the so-called Indians from Malaysia, brainwashed into traitors, would be landed on the coast of Madras to start what the communists would like to see in our country. These are the perils to which we would be exposed if, God forbid, South Vietnam and Laos were to be allowed to fall.

Now, in this situation, what is our country's policy, and what should it be? That is the question to which I would like to address myself. Is our policy today in regard to South Vietnam and Laos in line with the fact that the defence of South Vietnam, Laos and Malaysia is part and parcel

of the defence of this country? Is it one of encouraging those who are holding the frontiers of India? Let me say clearly that the frontiers of India today lie on the river Mekong. The Mekong river and its valley are the eastern frontiers of India today. Every country has two kinds of frontiers, its own territorial borders and those frontiers, which if they are not defended, will lead to the destruction of its own liberty. Tibet was our frontier. We gave it away.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambal-pugha): Did you go and fight?

Shri M. R. Masani: What is going to be our eastern frontier now? Are we going to encourage those who are standing up in defence of those frontiers against the common enemy? What is our stand? Our stand, I would explain in three parts.

The first is another Geneva Conference and the withdrawal of foreign armies from the region. There have been two Geneva Conferences. It has been proved that those agreements have been shamelessly violated by the Communists and yet we want a third Geneva Conference. Are not two betrayals enough? Does not the old proverb once bit twice shy apply at least twice bit thrice shy? Are we being prudent men and are we giving prudent advice when we ask the twice betrayed to invite a third betrayal?

With whom are we asking the Americans and the Vietnamese to negotiate? With those who treacherously destroyed Tibet, those who were guilty of a breach of promise given to us, those who treacherously invaded our own country. Not content with this treatment, we invite others to be as foolish as we have been in the past.

Therefore, President Lyndon Johnson is hundred per cent right when he says that there can be no negotiation with these people until they first stop violating the solemn agreements into which they entered in 1954 and 1960. There can be no other answer to this,

[Shri M. R. Masani]

and I do not think it is honourable for us to advise somebody who is doing the right thing to capitulate because, to negotiate with the Communists today is to sell out Vietnam and Laos. And when we talk of withdrawal of foreign armies. I have already shown what would happen if these foreign armies were to withdraw.

Take another aspect of our policy, our role in the International Control Commission, that boneless wonder, always like Nelson applying the telescope to the blind eye, not able to see anything that happens under its nose until it is brutally forced to do so. There, we have been sitting on the fence between the Canadians and the Poles.

Recently we were bundled unceremoniously out of North Vietnam, and we in our supine manner, walked out with our tail between our legs. There was only one thing honourable to do, to say we will not withdraw from North Vietnam to resign the Chairmanship of the International Control Commission. We did neither.

On 13th February, 1965, the International Control Commission sent a special message to the co-chairman, Britain and Russia. It was an interim report, promising a full investigation, but meantime relaying the Communiques of allegations of both sides, North and South. That was all right. But both sides were blamed equally. The aggressor was held as responsible as the victim—very much what the Colombo Powers did to us when we were fighting Chinese Communist aggression in 1962. Why did we refuse to join the Canadian Member who did the sensible, honourable thing? The Canadian Member, in his note, reminded the co-chairmen of the Commission's report of June, 1962 to which I have referred earlier in my speech, where the Legal Committee of the International Control Commission had found North Vietnam guilty of aggression. What was wrong in referring to the past report? Why were

we turning our blind eye to what was going on? Why were we trying to equate the aggressor and the victim? By joining the pole against the Canadian, we, in fact, gave aid and comfort to the enemies of our own country, to those who will destroy us when they have the chance.

Instead of encouraging those who are fighting and laying down their lives for the defence of India, we needle them, we harass them, we weaken them. We join in the international Communist chorus, trying to stop the United States from helping South Vietnam.

And then our role in Malaysia is most unfortunate. Malaysia is today being attacked by Indonesia. Here we say: why don't you two people talk and make friends?—exactly what the Colombo Powers told us when China was attacking us, and we got so angry about it.

There was a day in October, 1962, when this country was attacked by Chinese Communist troops. The Prime Minister of Malaysia happened to be in Delhi on that day. He did not advise India and China to talk and make friends. He did not want to go back to his Capital to consult his Cabinet. He was an honourable man, and a good friend.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): A courageous man.

Shri M. R. Masani: On that very day he came out in public and said: "China is attacking India. I am with India". He is under attack now. He has appealed for our help. Not a sound goes out from us to the effect, "We are with you, and against Indonesia; we are with you in defending the country." The least that we can do is to send a token battalion or two of our troops to show that we are prepared to stand side by side with little Malaysia against a big bully. We send troops to Gaza, we send troops to Congo, we send troops to every remote corner of the world,

but we cannot send a thousand or two of our men to Malaysia as a symbol to show that India is with Malaysia in its fight. We have been guilty of base ingratitude in so far as Tenku Abdul Rahman and Malaysia are concerned. What an image we are giving to the world of an ungrateful friend! No wonder others are not able to see the beauties of our policy.

Mr. George Ball, United States Under Secretary of State said some things the other day not about India, but about others who also play that role. It is not without its virtue. Let me read a couple of sentences. He said:

"To play a useful and effective role on the world stage, it is not enough for a nation simply to offer advice on all aspects of world affairs; it should be prepared to back that advice with resources. If unwilling to do so, it does not contribute to the interests of the 'free world' by seeking to impose its views on the nations that are carrying the common burden."

At least let us not err against this very discreet reproof.

The question arises: why are we following this policy which is unfair on the one side and is against our own national interests on the other? What comes in the way of our joining in guarding our own frontiers on the Mekong river?

Most people would say: non-alignment. I do not agree. This is not the occasion to discuss non-alignment. I will assume for the moment that the policy of our country is non-alignment and remains so long as this Government is in power. I do not think that non-alignment has anything to do with it. The origins of non-alignment were, many years past, when our former Prime Minister said that he would not take sides between two blocks of Powers fighting each other. He never said that we would not take sides with ourselves against our enemies. And, Sir, when in 1962

an occasion arose, Mr. Nehru was big enough and patriotic enough to put the country's interests first and to realise that non-alignment has no place when your own security and your own survival were at stake and he said that so far as Communist China was concerned, there could be no non-alignment. Yet we practise non-alignment in Malaysia, in South Viet-Nam and in Laos against Communist China.

It is a strange psychosis. There are several separate issues on which it worries one as to why our Government takes wrong policies. I will take only the last of these for lack of time, and that is the ballyhoo about the aircraft carrier. I have no information about what kind of appeal our Prime Minister made to President Kennedy. That he made an appeal is absolutely definite, but none of us knows its terms nor do we know what President Kennedy did except what we know already. I think the Government owes it to the country to give full information about the nature of the appeal and the nature of the response.

Too often things are hidden from the public which they have a right to know. Hon. Members may remember Mrs. Bandaranaike's letter which proved that an assurance that was denied three times by the Ministry of External Affairs was in fact given by our Prime Minister to Mr. Chou En-Lai through Mrs. Bandaranaike, and the present Prime Minister was good enough to admit it in a letter to me which was published last year. Let us have a little fresh air and light on these matters.

But I am not discussing what happened. I am discussing the reaction which was a fantastic reaction. The suggestion was made that if Mr. Nehru had asked for an aircraft carrier, he would have done something dishonourable, something to be ashamed of! I think the whole House would have honoured Mr. Nehru if he had asked for help when help was required. And yet our Finance

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Minister said in the Rajya Sabha on 22nd March, 1965.

"It is a slur on the character of India for anybody to say this."

It would be a slur on the character of the man-in-charge if he did not get help for the country when its security required. Would the gentlemen who were so annoyed about this suggestion, right or wrong, have held the Prime Minister back, in 1962, if the plains of Assam had fallen under the heels of the conqueror and if Bihar and Bengal were in danger? Would they have said: "No, no; do not ask for an aircraft carrier?" What is the difference between an aircraft or a plane that flies on to your land, as it did, and the plane that flies in from the sea? It was a fantastic, psychopathic reaction which amazes us and disgusts us because it shows that there is something wrong about the minds of the Government and some at least of its supporters. Therefore, it is not non-alignment that comes in the way. It is the distortion of non-alignment under International Communist pressure. It is appeasement of aggression.

I come to the end of what I wanted to say. We live today in an entirely different situation from that which we faced when this country became independent. For this new situation we need new policies, not a parrot-like repetition of old slogans which have no relevance in this new climate.

We must put first things first. We have inescapable responsibilities in South and South-east Asia. We have been defaulting on them, as Mr. George Ball very gently tried to remind us the other day. It is time that we took up those responsibilities. What are they?

It is the responsibility of this country, as the biggest and leading Democracy in this part of the world, to take the lead in building up a system of collective Security. With its neighbours, and having got that, we have

to invite the Western Democracies to underwrite that security. That is the role that our Government should have played but has not. It should be our major effort to rally the countries of the region, to ask Japan to come in. It is only if Japan at one end and India at the other hold the front, that the smaller countries in between will be able to stand up against the common menace.

We have sat on the fence long enough. For Heaven's sake, let us come off that fence. What is necessary is not to sit on the fence, but to mend our broken fences. If we do not do so, we shall be in great peril.

श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी (मंदसौर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सवाल जो हमारे सामने नान-एलाइनमेंट का है, इस पर विचार करने से पूर्व आसमान में न उड़ते हुए हम अगर जमीन पर चलने लगेंगे तो हमें अच्छी तरह से पता चल जायगा कि इस नान-एलाइनमेंट का मतलब क्या है। हम शत्रुविहीन हैं या मित्रविहीन? आज कोई हमारा मित्र ही ऐसा नहीं दिखाई देता है। सब तरफ हम को शत्रु ही शत्रु नजर आते हैं। जिनको हम मित्र बनाना चाहते हैं और जो हमारा मित्र बनना चाहते हैं उनकी तरफ हम मित्रता का हाथ लम्बा नहीं करते हैं और जो शत्रु हैं वे हमारी तरफ बढ़ते चले आ रहे हैं। जब पहले नान-एलाइनमेंट का सवाल पैदा हुआ था तो दुनिया में दो ही ऐसे स्थल थे जिन की तरफ लोगों की आंखें गड़ी हुई थीं, एक मास्को और दूसरा वाशिंगटन। उस वक्त तो कुछ मतलब नान-एलाइनमेंट रख सकता था लेकिन आज वहां से स्थल हट कर दिल्ली और पेरिस आ गये हैं। इनकी तरफ दृष्टि डालते हुए हमें यह देखना है कि क्या नान-एलाइनमेंट का मतलब यह होता है कि हम अपने खुद के वास्ते नान-एलाइन हो जायें? क्या हम अपने वास्ते यह बात कह दें कि हम

किसी की मित्रता नहीं चाहते ? क्या हम यह कह दें कि हम मित्र-विहीन होना ही चाहते हैं, हम को शत्रु ही शत्रु चाहियें ? अगर यही हमारी नीति रही तो हमें पूछने वाला कोई नहीं मिलेगा ।

वीयतनाम का जो सवाल अभी भी मसानी ने छोड़ा था उसकी तरफ अगर हम निगाह डालें तो हम को वास्तविक बात का पता चल जाएगा कि हम बड़ी भयंकर भूल कर रहे हैं । हम अपनी तो निबेड़ सकते नहीं और दूसरों के जाल में हम फँसते जा रहे हैं । हमें एक सिद्धान्त मंजूर करना है और वह यह है कि 'तू पहले अपनी निबेड़ और बाद में दूसरों की बात के बीच में पड़' । हमें यह देखना होगा कि किस हद तक अगर आज चीन वीयतनाम को हड़प जाता है, तो उसका असर हमारी स्थिति पर पड़ेगा । सब जानते हैं कि वीयतनाम का पुराना नाम इंडोचाइना था । वह भारतवर्ष का भी एक अंग था और चीन का भी एक अंग था । आज वहाँ अगर सारे चीनी ही चीनी आ जायें तो हमारी क्या स्थिति होगी, यह हमें सोचना है । चीन अगर वहाँ आ जाता है तो कोई दूसरी ताकत ऐसी नहीं जो उस को आगे बढ़ने से रोक सके । न मलेशिया कम्युनिस्ट साम्राज्य को आने से रोक सकता है, न थाईलैंड में रकावट पंदा करने वाला कोई है और बर्मा तो पहले से ही खिसकता हुआ उस की ओर चला जा रहा है, उस के पंजे में चला जा रहा है । हम चारों तरफ से घिर जायेंगे । इस वास्ते हमें खयाल करना होगा कि कैसे इस स्थिति से बचा जाय ? यहाँ बैठे हुए हम टोका टाकी करें यह अच्छा मालूम नहीं पड़ता है, हमें शोभा नहीं देता है ।

अज अमरीकी एम्बेसी के ऊपर 250 पाउंड का बम गिराया गया है और हम उस के बारे में कुछ कह नहीं पाते हैं । यह हमारा जो दम्भ है हमें कहां ले जाये, इसका विचार हमको करना होगा ।

इन दो चीजों पर आपका ध्यान दिलाने के बाद मैं आगे बढ़ता हूँ । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो एक बड़ी भारी त्रुटि हमारे देश में देखने में आई है वह यह है कि यू० एन० को हम जितना प्रोत्साहन देते हैं, रुपया पैसे से देते हैं, उतना हम ध्यान इस बात की तरफ नहीं देते हैं कि हमारे जो यहां से आदमी जाते हैं वे वास्तविक रूप से हमारे देश का प्रतिनिधित्व कर सकते हैं या नहीं कर सकते हैं ? क्या सिर्फ उन्हीं लोगों को वहाँ जाना चाहिए जो कोट पतलून डाट लें, जिन से हमारा काम नहीं हो सकता, जो अंग्रेजों के साथ खाना खा सकें, नाच गान कर सकें । इतने से हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता । क्या हमारे पास ऐसे आदमी भी नहीं हैं जो एक भुट्टो जैसे मामूली आदमी का, जो वहाँ जाता है, सामना करके बोलने के लिये तैयार हों । हमको वहाँ भ्रमना पड़ता है । जब देखो हमारी ऐसी स्थिति हो जाती है । यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती । हम देखते हैं कि हमारे प्रश्न सही होते हैं, हमारी बातें सही होती हैं, लोग हमें मानने के लिये तैयार हैं लेकिन हम लोगों को मनवाने के वास्ते तैयार नहीं हैं, हम लोगों को बतलाने तक को तैयार नहीं हैं । अमरीका के लोग, यू० के० के लोग, दुनिया के आदमी हमारी बात नहीं महसूस करते हैं, हमारी बात वे नहीं जानते, और हमारे खिलाफ जो कुछ भी कहा जाता है उसको मानने के लिये तैयार हो जाते हैं । अखबारों में जब बड़ी बातें आती हैं तो हमें यह देखना पड़ता है कि हमारी बातें सही होते हुए भी झूठी मालूम पड़ती हैं ।

मैं अभी अभी एक तार पढ़ कर आ रहा हूँ कि अयूब खां ने एक बयान दिया है, अयूब खां कहता है कि हमेशा से इंडिया ऐंग्रेसिव रहा, हमेशा से इंडिया ने पाकिस्तान के ऊपर हमला किया, और वह सच्चा है, उसकी बात सच्ची है, सिर्फ इंडिया ही बदमाश

[श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

है। वह ऐसी बातें कहने की ताकत रखता है जो झूठ है। झूठ बोलने में वह गीयबल्स को मात करता है, लेकिन उसके खिलाफ कोई प्रोपेगेंडा करने के लिये हम तैयार नहीं हैं। हम उस दम्भी से भी बचने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। उस आदमी का दम्भ भी चले, उसका असत्यवाद चले और हम सत्यवाद को, जो बातें हम जानते हैं उन को भी जनता के सामने नहीं रख सकते, दुनिया के सामने नहीं रख सकते। जब ऐसी स्थिति है तो हमें क्या अधिकार है कि हम इतना बड़ा राज्य चलायें।

आज दुनिया की दृष्टि हमारे ऊपर गड़ी हुई है। डिमोक्रेसी का या प्रजातन्त्र का अगर कोई कोना है, जिसकी तरफ लोग देखते हैं, तो वह दिल्ली है। दिल्ली ही ऐसा स्थान है जिसकी तरफ सभी प्रजातन्त्र राज्य देख रहे हैं। आज इजराइल भी यह देख रहा है कि सच्चा प्रजातन्त्र कहां है, आज मलयेशिया देख रहा है कि सच्चा प्रजातन्त्र कहां है। अगर आप ऐसी ही बात करेंगे और प्रजातन्त्र को पीछे ठकेलेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया में आज जो नाम कमाना चाहते हैं आप उसे बरबाद करेंगे और अपने मुंह पर कालिख पोत देंगे।

मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो पिछली कामनवेल्थ प्राइम मिनिस्टर्स कांफरेंस हुई उस कांफरेंस में जो बात रेजोल्यूशन में आई पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में क्यों आपने खड़े होकर उसका मुकाबला नहीं किया। क्यों आपने ऐसी बात कहने दी, क्यों यह तारीफ की बात कहलाई गई कि दोनों देशों ने मिल कर बात करने की बात कही है। ऐसी बात वहां क्यों आई। आप मुंह तोड़ जवाब इसका क्यों नहीं दे सके। आपको कहना चाहिये था कि या तो सारी बातें खोल कर कहो

वर्ना मत उठाओ। यह हमारी कमजोरी कब तक चलती रहेगी। हम क्यों पाकिस्तान को बढ़ावा देते चले जा रहे हैं कि दुनिया में हम बुरे मालूम पड़ें। कई बातों में ऐसी चीजें होती हैं कि वास्तविक रूप से सारी बातें हम देख नहीं सकते।

जब हम सीलोन की तरफ निगाह दौड़ाते हैं तो सीलोन वाले कहते हैं 9 लाख 75 हजार आदमी जो इंडियन ओरिजन के हैं वह स्टेटलेस हैं। क्या आप इस मामले को हल नहीं करा सकते क्या इसके बारे में आप इंटरनेशनल कोर्ट, हेग में नहीं जा सकते। कोई आदमी स्टेटलेस नहीं हो सकता जो दो, चार, पांच पुस्त से या 100 सालों से सीलोन में रहता है। कहा जाता है कि वह बिल्कुल स्टेटलेस हो गये और हमारे ऊपर थोपे जाते हैं, क्योंकि हमारी बात का वजन नहीं पड़ता। हमारा वजन इस वास्ते नहीं पड़ता कि हम ताकतवर नहीं हैं। जो हमारे देश के वतनी हैं उनको लात मारने के लिये सब तैयार हो जाते हैं। जिसका बाप ताकतवर होता है उस के बेटे को मारने के लिये कोई नहीं जाता, लेकिन जिसका बाप कमजोर होता है उसे मारने के लिये सब जाते हैं। आज हमारी यह दुर्दशा इसलिए हो रही है कि हमारा बाप कमजोर है।

अगर हम इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ते हैं तो हमको शर्म से अपना सिर झुकाना पड़ता है। यह रिपोर्ट मंजूर करती है कि 14,500 वर्ग मील हमारी भूमि चीन ने दबा रक्खी है। हमने इस का वादा किया था इस सदन में, सबों ने मिल कर कसम खाई थी कि अपनी एक एक इंच भूमि हम वापस छुड़ायेंगे, लेकिन कौनसा काम आपने किया उस 14,500 वर्ग मील भूमि में से एक इंच भूमि भी वापस लेने के लिये। इसके वास्ते आपने क्या कोशिश की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह हमारे लिये बड़े शर्म की बात है कि हम चुपचाप हाथ पर

हाथ रख कर बैठे हुए हैं और बगलें झांक रहे हैं।

श्री कपूर सिंह (लुधियाना) : यह बात हमारे विचाराधीन ही नहीं है।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माथुर (जालोर) : क्या 800 करोड़ रुपया हम जंगल में फेंक रहे हैं ?

श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी : हम खर्च कर रहे हैं यह सही है लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि यह बनिये वाली बात आप छोड़ दें। रुपया खर्च करने से कुछ नहीं होता है। आदमी के पास बाज़ की ताकत चाहिये। खाली रुपया खर्च करने से क्या होगा। इज्जत रुपयों से नीलाम नहीं होती है। इज्जत बचाने के लिये ताकत से काम लेना पड़ता है और खून बहाना होता है। रुपया बांटने से क्या हो सकता है। आप देख रहे हैं कि तिब्बत में क्या हो रहा है। हमारे यहां 45 हजार तिबेटन्स बसे हुए हैं। आये दिन हमारे यहां खबरें आ रही हैं कि तिब्बत के अन्दर तिबेटन्स का सत्यानाश किया जा रहा है, उनको जिन्दा नहीं छोड़ा जा रहा है। जिन को ह्यूमन फंडामेंटल राइट्स कहा जाता है, जिन को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स ने मंजूर किया है, उनका सत्यानाश हो रहा है। आज उन लोगों को कोई राइट्स नहीं हैं। जो गह 45 हजार आदमी यहां पर आ गये हैं उनके बसने के लिये तिब्बत के अन्दर आज जगह नहीं है। हम नेकेड जैनीसाइड देख रहे हैं, लेकिन कुछ कर नहीं सकते।

हम इनकी दूर क्यों जाते हैं। क्या देश का बटवारा करते वक्त हम समझौता पाकिस्तान के साथ नहीं हुआ था कि जो माइनारिटीज जहां हैं वह उसी प्रकार से वहां रहेंगी। लेकिन आज उन का जेनोसाइड हो रहा है, उन्हें मार डाला जा रहा है। आज वह लाखों की तादाद में वहां से भाग कर यहां चले आ रहे हैं। लेकिन इसके वास्ते आज आप आवाज नहीं उठा सकते। हमारी यह कमजोर नीति कब तक रहेगी। मुझे यह कहते हुए बड़ा दुःख होता है कि हमारे

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह जी स्वर्ण के न बने रहें वह लौहसिंह बन जायें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा, ताकि हम उनका मुकाबला कर सकें। वह नमं बनते जा रहे हैं और इसका नतीजा हमें भुगतना पड़ रहा है।

चीन को आप देखिये। चीन क्या कहता है कि पाकिस्तान वाले बड़े अच्छे आदमी हैं, बड़ी सीधी तरह से रहते हैं और हम बड़े अच्छे आदमी हैं। अगर लड़ाई करता है तो सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान करता है। भारतवर्ष लड़ाई करता है। इस तरह से चीन हमारा मजाक उड़ाता है, यह बड़े दुःख की बात है। क्या हमने कभी इसका कारण भी सोचा है। मैं जब इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ता हूँ तो इसमें सफाहा 41 पर जो लिखा है पाकिस्तान के बारे में उसे पढ़ कर मेरे मन में बड़ा दर्द आता। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज जो आपके ऊपर चारों तरफ से हमला हो रहा है वह किस बात का सूचक है। क्या यह झगड़े सिफ यों ही हो रहे हैं। तीन सालों में 347 दफे हमले हो गये, लेकिन क्या कभी आपने सोचा कि यह 347 हमले किस प्रकार से हो रहे हैं। उधर चाडवेट का झगड़ा पहले से चल रहा है, वहां वे घुस रहे हैं। वहां कितनी ही तादाद में पाकिस्तानी घुस जाते हैं लेकिन जब गुजरात असेम्बली में सवाल पूछा जाता है तो कहते हैं कि हमारी कोई जमीन नहीं गई मगर जब यहां पूछा जाता है तब आप मंजूर करते हैं कि हमारी चौदह हजार एकड़ जमीन उन्होंने दबा ली है। बड़े शर्म की बात है कि जिसको आप छोटा राज्य कहते हैं वह भी जब चाहे तब हमारी जमीन दबा लेता है। 34 हजार स्ववायर मील पहले दबा ली थी, अब यह दबा लिया। अब दहाग्राम का झगड़ा हो रहा है, बेरुवाड़ी को पहले से ही दबाये हुए है। कोई जगह नहीं है जहां उसने हमारे ऊपर हमला नहीं किया।

अब शेख अब्दुला की बात देखिये। आज सुबह हम बात कर रहे थे कि वह इस तरह से चला गया और हम उस पर कड़ी कार्रवाई करेंगे। क्या आप के पास कोई समझदार आदमी

[श्री: उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

नहीं है कि जहाँ शब्द अम्बुल्ला हो वहाँ से पकड़ कर लाया जा सके। क्या आपके पास कानून बतलाने वाला आदमी कोई नहीं है, क्या आप की समझ में यह इंटरनेशनल कानून नहीं आ रहा है, कि जहाँ वह हो वहाँ से लाकर उसको सजा दी जा सके। वह इंडियन सिटिजेन है और अफेन्स कमिट कर रहा है और आप इसका कोई उपचार नहीं कर सकते। आप हाथ पर हाथ रख कर बैठे हुए हैं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि आप क्या कर रहे हैं। क्या आपकी बुद्धि का बिल्कुल दिवाला निकल गया है, क्या हमने अपनी आंखें मूंद रखी हैं, कि यह छोटा सा काम भी नहीं कर सकते हैं।

मैं आपको एक बात और बता देना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे इन प्रश्नों पर बड़ा दुःख होता है। मेरा तो कहना है, जैसा अभी मिस्टर मसानी ने कहा, कि मीकांग हमारा फ्रांटियर है। जहाँ हमको मीका मिले वहाँ हमको अपना फ्रांटियर मानना होगा।

मैं आपको कहूँ कि इजराइल का सवाल है। हमारी सरकार इजराइल की तरफ निगाह नहीं डालती। आज इजराइल से बोन मित्रता कर रहा है। जिनमें पक्की दुश्मनी थी आज वे मित्र बन रहे हैं। आज इजराइल में जोरडन नदी पर एक ऐसा बांध बनाया जा रहा है कि इजराइल में उसका पानी न जाकर जोरडन में जाएगा। उसका नतीजा क्या होगा। मरता क्या न करता, उसका नतीजा एक भयंकर लड़ाई होगी, चाहे वह पूर्व वालों की हो या पश्चिम वालों की हो। द्युनिसिया के प्रसीडेंट बोरग्वीना वहाँ जाते हैं और वह जोरडन वालों को समझाने की कोशिश करते हैं कि आपस की लड़ाई मोल मत लो और इस प्रोबलम का आपस में हल कर लो। लेकिन हम चुप बैठे हैं। हमारी ताकत कुछ कहने की नहीं है। हम समझते हैं कि अरब देशों की यह स्थिति है उनमें आपस में एक दूसरे से मेल नहीं बैठता। और वह विचित्र प्रकार की

डिमाक्रेसी जो कम्युनिस्ट वर्ल्ड ने पैदा की है वह हमको मंजूर नहीं है, फिर भी हम अपनी आवाज उठाने को तैयार नहीं हैं।

अन्त में मैं एक बात और कह देना चाहता हूँ कि आप अगर कल्चरल डेलीगेशन बाहर भेजें तो नाचने वालियों को न भेजें। अगर बाहर भेजना है तो ऐसे ऊंचे आदमियों को भेजिए जो हमारी ऊंची संस्कृति का परिचय बाहर के लोगों को दे सकें। पिछले दिनों हमारे शंकराचार्य जी महाराज बाहर गए थे तो श्री शोम्बे ने उनका बड़ा आदर किया जैसे कि पोप का यहाँ हुआ था। आपके पास अच्छे अच्छे आदमी हैं उनको आप बाहर भेजें, नाचने गाने वालों को बाहर भेज कर हमको बदनाम न कराइए।

और जो हमारे एम्बेसेडर हैं उनका अनुभव हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर को हुआ। हम नहीं चाहते कि भविष्य में हमको यह चीज महसूस हो। हमारे एम्बेसेडर हमारे देश के सच्चे प्रतिनिधि होने चाहिए, वे हमारे देश के संस्कारों के सच्चे प्रतिनिधि हों, उनको हमारे देश पर गर्व हो। ऐसे आदमियों को जब आप बाहर एम्बेसेडर के रूप में भेजेंगे तभी हमारे विरुद्ध जो प्रचार हो रहा है वह रुक सकेगा। नहीं तो इस प्रचार से हम मर जाएंगे, और सारी दुनिया हम को झूठा मानेगी।

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members may now move the cut motions to Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs, subject to their being otherwise admissible.

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

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to take adequate steps for the defence of India's security and national vital interests which are involved in the defence of Malaysia, South Viet Nam and Laos against Chinese

Communist backed aggression. (7)].

Dr. M. S. Aney: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Reaction of the Indo-Ceylon settlement agreement concluded recently on the people of Indian origin in Ceylon* (8)]

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I beg to move:

(i) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Need to further improve our relations and influence among Afro-Asian Nations* (13)].

(ii) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Need to make India's policy of refusing to arm itself with nuclear weapons better known to Asian neighbours* (14)].

(iii) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Failure to seek contacts with other non-nuclear Nations and to establish a common policy or line of action* (15)]

(iv) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Failure to obtain compensation of lost assets for Mozambique Indian repatriates* (16)].

(v) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Need to improve external publicity* (17)]

(vi) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Need to take immediate steps for demarcation of the land frontier of India.* (18).]

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I beg to move:

(i) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Need to improve working of our Missions abroad* (23)].

(ii) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Dereliction of duty regarding issuance of passport to Sheikh Abdullah* (24)].

(iii) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Failure to react properly in the matter of continued United States misadventure in Vietnam* (25)].

(iv) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Failure to consolidate India's friendship among non-aligned Powers and in the Afro-Asian world* (26)].

(v) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Lack of initiative and of a sense of perspective in our foreign policy* (27)].

(vi) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Failure to give full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic or even to extend to it minimum diplomatic courtesies* (28)].

(vii) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[*Need to settle the problems of Indians in Ceylon* (29)].

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

(viii) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to extend rehabilitation facilities to displaced or compulsorily repatriated persons from Ceylon, Burma, Malaya and other Commonwealth countries. (30)].

(ix) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to explore possibilities to ban all sorts of testing of Atom weapons. (31)].

(x) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to extend and strengthen cultural ties with newly independent African countries. (32)]

(xi) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to establish separate diplomatic relations with every newly independent African country. (33)].

(xii) "That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to intensify our foreign propaganda to counter all those coming from not-so-friendly countries. (34)]

Mr. Speaker: These cut motions are now before the House.

17.32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Haarish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member from Rajkot, who initiated the discussion, did well in taking the live issues with which we are very much concerned. He did not go into the basic tenets of our foreign policy, and very wisely so. These mantrams of our basic tenets have been remitted by this House and they are accepted, by and large, by most of the Members here. He was quite right to say that there is no use repeating them parrot-like, that we want peace.

friendship with all, disarmament, non-alignment and so on. While we are within the framework of these basic tenets, it has also got to be judged to what extent they serve the national interests of a country. No foreign policy of our country will stand accepted by the people and Parliament unless and until we could give an assessment of it and we could spell it out in terms of national interest. I would not like to go into these basic tenets and say that they are sound to the core. We have to judge them by the way they are implemented. So, the questions posed by my hon. friend are of very great concern to all of us.

He took up the question of Viet Nam and posed the question what our policy regarding South Viet Nam is. Well, I think the present Prime Minister of this country has made it absolutely clear quite a long time back. They say that we have not taken a decision and our mind is not quite clear. Our mind is perfectly clear on this subject. We have never condemned and asked America to clear from there. We have never said that. We understand the expansionism, the growing influence of China, and the expansion and aggression by China in its subtle form is a thing of which we take full note. Certainly, we do not want war; we do not want war to spread; we do not want the destruction of the country which is inherent if the hot war continues there. Therefore, we want that there should be a political settlement. But when we talk of the political settlement, it must be clearly understood what the political settlement means. The basic question in Vietnam is the stability of the South Vietnam Government. We have been quite clear in our mind. We want the stability of the South Vietnam Government. We would never support any encroachment; we would never support any sabotaging; we would never support any expansionism and the growing influence of China. Therefore, to say that our policy is not clear on the subject is not a correct assessment of

the situation. He may in his eloquence intend to give a colour to it. That is another matter. We quite appreciate it. Apart from our own national interest, apart from anything else, it is quite clear and just that what had been decided and agreed upon at Geneva must be adhered to. When we talk of negotiations, we talk of negotiations in that context. He asked: With whom to negotiate? I would like my friend Mr. Masani to tell me why is it that Mr. Gordon-Walker has gone to that area? He has gone to that area simply to bring about certain settlement, to try to help, to try to talk to all the people who are concerned and that is a wise step that has been taken there. That is a step which has been appreciated and that is almost toeing the line which our Prime Minister had taken earlier. He also asked: What about Malaysia? I think, on Malaysia; when our Finance Minister, much earlier, had gone to that country, he made a clear categorical statement regarding our support to Malaysia. This has been made clear on the floor of this House also. Where is the doubt? Possibly, his acid test had been: Why have we not sent forces and military? He said that we sent military to Ghana and we sent military to Congo. A man of his intelligence should have given the whole story. It is not that we send our military to any country. It was sent to the U.N.O., it was sent there under the auspicious of the United Nations. Let us make a difference. Let us understand the very very important basic difference. It was not to Egypt or to Congo. But we sent our army to the U.N.O. which was operating there and let him understand that. In spite of the fact that they have been saying that there has been a slant in our policy towards the left, even then the USSR was not very happy about it and still we never hesitated to send our forces to Congo to see that there are chances for Congo to stand united. Therefore, to accuse this Government for

not sending a military detachment to Malaysia is more than unfair.

Having disposed of this, I would rather like to deal with other important aspects with which this country is concerned. It has been often said, both from that side as well as by certain Members from this side, that there is indecision by this Government. I would like to know it. I have carefully scanned all those speeches which have been made by the hon. Members from this side or from that side and, except a general and a vague denunciation, I have not found one single positive suggestion made in any of the speeches. Where is the indecision? As I just pointed out on these two vital issues, our mind is quite clear. When there is an opportunity and when there is a need for certain further action, I am sure this Government will never hesitate to take that action. But we want to strengthen the forces of peace. There is the least doubt about it. We do understand, of course, what China is.

If there has been a stalemate in our performance in the international field, I think that it is a matter of concern not only for the Members on our side of the House, but for every patriotic citizen and for every Member of this House, and we would very much like to receive constructive criticism from them and to welcome any suggestions that they may have to make in order to make our policy more robust and to make ourselves felt.

But let us take into consideration two or three important facts. The world scene was dominated in the past by three great stalwarts, not only because they were the Prime Ministers of their particular countries but because they had a personality of their own; there was President Kennedy, then there was Premier Khrushchev, and then there was Prime Minister Nehru. They had injected in the international field something which was really glamorous; there was a flash and flare in whatever they said and in whatever they did, and they had made a great contribution in the

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

international field, each one of them in his own way. Now, all these three people from the international field have disappeared, and there is a slump in the international field today, if there is a slump anywhere.

Whether we have been able to perform well and watch and guard our national interests or not is the crucial point which we must consider. The first thing with which we are concerned is Pakistan and Kashmir. Pakistan comes very much because when we are talking of Pakistan, we must remember that the dispute with Pakistan centres very much round Kashmir. Is it not to the credit of this Government that during the last six months, very positive steps have been taken for a better integration and better understanding of Kashmir here? Only the day before, the Kashmir Assembly had passed a resolution or Bill which is of very great significance. Articles 356 and 357 of our Constitution have been applied to that State, which have a deep meaning. We must understand this. We have projected the Congress there. It is only during the last six months that certain important positive steps have been taken. Now, please mark that another important thing has happened. Pakistan on much lesser provocations used to run to the UN with representations and raise a bogey there. But what has happened now? In spite of our having taken all these important steps, Pakistan which used to go there for even much lesser things, has not been able to find a friend in the UN to go now and again raise this debate on Kashmir. Why has Pakistan not been able to do so?

Shri Shinkre: There is Sheikh Abdullah now.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I shall deal with Sheikh Abdullah also a little later. Pakistan has not been able to raise it now because there is nobody to support her. UK is not prepared to support her.

You will remember that the representative of the UK Government was one of the staunchest supporters of Pakistan and he had led a scurrilous attack on this Government and had asked for a plebiscite. But I certainly give a little credit to the Labour Government. Let us also remember that there was another friend, namely Ireland who had played that part. We had taken care, good care, before the next UN debate that Ireland was also weaned away from supporting Pakistan. We had taken these positive steps.

Sheikh Abdullah is very much in our minds. I think that we are attaching too much importance to Sheikh Abdullah. When Sheikh Abdullah was released, I had written a letter to the late Prime Minister telling him that I did not mind the release of Sheikh Abdullah, but I certainly did mind giving him a status and a stature which did not belong to him, and I did mind his asking him to be his guest; I had also said that I did not mind Sheikh Abdullah being given a passport to go to various countries. This country is too high, too strong, to be shaken by a person like Abdullah. We need not be frightened of Abdullah. As a matter of fact, Abdullah has exposed himself, has exhausted himself, and there is nothing we need worry about it. Abdullah will come here, if he cares to. Otherwise, we are not anxious about his coming here at all.

But what intrigued me a little, about which I would like the hon. Minister to take this House into confidence, is that only the other day the Commonwealth Secretary of UK, Mr. Bottomley, made a statement on the floor of the House of Commons—he is reported as saying this—that Abdullah is one person who enjoys the confidence of the Government of India. That has intrigued me most. I would like the hon. Minister to throw light on this. How have our Government briefed our High Commission

there? Have they briefed them properly or not? Has our High Commission made it absolutely clear to the British Government that Abdullah has nothing to do with the India Government, that he does not have our confidence? If so, they have got to lodge a protest. They have got to ask the UK Government to correct their statement, to correct their mental attitude in this matter.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Nothing doing with his utterances.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I have nothing to do with his utterances. I do not care for his utterances. Those utterances will go to the wind. They will go to the dust. Nobody will attach any importance to them.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: The Government also should say so.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: They will be of no value in this country. If anything, let us take note of the fact that Abdullah was a much greater power when he was behind prison walls. As soon as he came out, the whole of Jammu and Kashmir had expected something out of him. As a matter of fact, by his own utterances, he was completely disowned by Jammu. Before he wanted to go from this country he said he would first finish Faruq. He said he would not go out before doing that. But Abdullah has lost so much even in Kashmir that Faruq could not be finished by him. He had to shake hands with his enemy before he had to go. His existence depended only on friendship with Faruq. But even that Faruq, with whom he had shaken hands, has made a statement in Kashmir saying that Abdullah is a traitor, Abdullah is a Pakistani. He has lost ground, and he will be losing more ground; if God willing, he accepts the invitation from China, I am sure; when he goes back to Kashmir, he will be lynched by the people of Kashmir. This Government need not do anything about it, because the people know their mind, the people

know their affinity with this country.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, let us understand its background. Pakistan is the creation of British diplomacy for their own sphere of influence, a thorn in our body-politic.

Shri Kapur Singh: Did we have nothing to do with it?

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): We did not want it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: What we want will come about, not because we are doing anything, but because Pakistan is going the wrong way. It will liquidate itself. Very soon, sooner than our friends expect.

Shri Hem Barua: What a prophecy?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Pakistan was going belligerent. Pakistan has pacts. It was found very handy by the USA for projecting its foreign and military policy. So it entered into pacts with Pakistan. Pakistan is now flirting with China, making friends with China and Indonesia. I do not know; I simply wonder whether the USA has taken this attitude of Pakistan seriously or there is something much deeper below it. Why has the USA not taken Pakistan's flirtation with China seriously? The United States had stopped its aid, even economic aid, to various other countries, but why has USA not pulled the strings so far as Pakistan is concerned? Economic as well as military aid continues to flow to Pakistan all the time, but that is the affair of USA, and I will not go further into it. But I would certainly like to warn our Government to take Pakistan seriously. . . . to expect trouble from them. We are more than a match for Pakistan, and it will be the Doomsday for Pakistan when it attacks India, I have not the least doubt about it, but we must be prepared for it.

I pass on to China. So far as China is concerned, I think it is time we

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

said these Colombo proposals are dead in letter and dead in spirit.

Shri Nath Pai: Say it twice. Repeat it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, when he attended the last Commonwealth conference said so. When I put a question to the Defence Minister here asking whether the massing of troops by China, whether the making of preparations by belligerent China, was not against the Colombo proposals in letter and spirit, and whether he did not think that the Colombo proposals were dead for all purposes, the Defence Minister said "yes". I want the Government to say so now. What is the use of our thinking about and talking about peace with China. I said on the floor of the House that this withdrawal of the Chinese forces and this cease-fire was far more dangerous. Let us not forget that China wants to hurt our cause much more by its withdrawal than it had done by mounting a regular aggression on this country. If we do not take note of it, we will certainly suffer very much for it.

What is the Chinese strategy in Vietnam? It is not coming out openly and fighting. This very China was calling the USA a paper tiger. What has happened? Why is it not facing the paper tiger? China was telling Russia that she should not have withdrawn from Cuba, that she should not have cared for USA as it was only a paper tiger. Now, China is not facing that paper tiger in Vietnam. What I say is that they will do the same thing that they are doing in Vietnam, which they have done to a great extent in Burma, and therefore, I congratulate this Government on taking a bold step in that particular direction, trying to take every step to see that there are no saboteurs here who are permitted freedom.

For anybody to say that this Government does not take decision, is not

alert, is not right. How does this fit in with its performance, with its decisions. We knew very well that this decision regarding the Left Communists being clapped in jail was going to be disastrous for us in the elections in Kerala, and the Home Minister made that statement, and he was aware of it. It takes a little time for people to grasp and understand the implications of the situation. Of course, if the Congress was anxious to form a Government, they could have joined hands with the Kerala Congress and formed a Government, but it is not hankering after that. They did take proper action, and they took that action in the best interests of this country.

Our Prime Minister will be going abroad, and I am very happy that he has selected USSR to be the first country to visit. I would not like to bracket China and USSR together, even though it may be very much to the dislike of my hon. friend who initiated the debate. Even when China attacked us and passions were running very high against all the Communist countries, I said that must be discreet in our observations against USSR. The USSR has given ample proof of it by very wisely moving in the matter step by step and giving substantial assistance and help. There is a great psychological impact of that assistance and that help. Therefore, let not bracket them together.

I would then, in conclusion, Mr. Deputy-Speaker urge on the hon. Foreign Minister not to be rigid in what said yesterday. It is time that he reorganised the EA Ministry. Previously, it was entirely different. Prime Minister Nehru was the external affairs; everything initiated from him. He sent notes down; he was external affairs; he was everything. Now, notes come up from below and that is becoming routine work; that also results in certain delays in regard to quick reactions which are of

very great importance. There is also need today to send the right type of people to the right places in our foreign embassies. I raised this question yesterday. You have categorised our missions as A, B, C, D and E according to comforts. That is not correct. We must send our senior and proper people where our national interests demands.

There was another question about those people who are in the foreign service, those people who are taken from outside the services, from the political life of the country. I think there has been some misunderstanding about it. I had taken statistics from all the countries. In our country it is less than thirty per cent people working as heads of missions who are taken from public life. In the United States, it is more than forty per cent. I do not say that it need be here forty per cent or 35 per cent or that it should be retained at thirty per cent but it is necessary that we select the right people who will be able to understand and inject the aspirations and ideology of this country who will be able to represent this country in a proper manner abroad. That is very necessary and I do hope the hon. Minister will take due note of it and give proper consideration to this matter. Thank you very much, Sir.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखा-बाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्री जी ने कुछ दिनों पहले फरमाया था कि वह श्री मधु लिमये की कृपा से विदेश मंत्री नहीं बने हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : डाक्टर साहब आप का टाईम दस मिनट है ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हाउस कब तक चलेगा ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अच्छा होता कि विदेश मंत्री जी ने श्री पटनायक और श्री लिमये की राय मानी होती, क्यों कि तब उन से और उन की सरकार से वियत-

नाम के सम्बन्ध में गलतियां न हुई होतीं आज से सत्रह वर्ष पहले इसी शहर में भी उन की सरकार का आसू गैस का शिकार हो चुका है । यह सही है कि अमरीका ने जो गैस इस्तेमाल की है, वह आसू गैस से ज्यादा तेज है, लेकिन जो सरकार बिना हिचक अपनी ही जनता के ऊपर आसू गैस का इस्तेमाल करती है, उसे प्रति शब्दों में एक विदेशी सरकार की निंदा करते हुए गोभा नहीं देता ।

इस सम्बन्ध में विश्व मत का जिक्र बहुत किया गया । गार्डन वाकर साहब का नाम लिया गया । हो सकता है कि और भी कुछ नाम लिये जायें, लेकिन यह बात याद रखनी चाहिये कि दुनिया में और कोई देश नहीं है, जिस की जमीन चीन ने छीनी हो । एक पुराने जमाने में हिटलर—जर्मनी का पहला पता चैकोसलोवैरको को लगा था और तब याकी दुनिया को लगा । उसी तरह से पीकिंग चीन का पहला पता हिन्दुस्तान को लगा है और बाद में शायद दुनिया को पता लगेगा कि आज के युग का यह पीकिंग—चीन क्या है और कौन है । जिस तरह से तब के जमाने में दुनिया ने चाहा था कि चैकोस्लोवैरको को वे त्याग करके उसके खिलाफ कारवाई करके हिटलर जर्मनी को सन्तुष्ट किया जाये, उसी तरह से आज की भी तथाकथित प्रगतिशील दुनिया हिन्दुस्तान को त्याग करके, उसको नुकसान पहुंचा करके पीकिंग चीन को सन्तुष्ट करना चाहती है । इसलिए हमें अपनी बिल्कुल साफ नीति बना लेनी चाहिए कि दक्षिण एशिया में कम से कम हम ऐसा कोई काम नहीं करेंगे जिससे चीन की ताकत बढ़े और चीन के मुकाबले में अमरीका की ताकत घटे ।

18 hrs.

मैं कभी किसी हालत में उत्तरी वियत-नाम को मदद देने वाला कोई काम नहीं न करूंगा, कोई बात न करूंगा । लेकिन आप पूछ सकते हैं कि दक्षिण वियतनाम का

[डा० राम मोहंर लोहिया]

समर्थन क्यों नहीं करता हूँ ? उस का कारण है कि दक्षिण वियतनाम का जनता अगर मैं देखता हूँ कि पूरी तरह से इस लड़ाई में हिस्सा ले रही है और कुछ दूसरे और भी कारण हुए रहते तो शायद करता । लेकिन आज का हालत में मैं सलाह दूंगा कि आप का चुप रहना ही श्रेयस्कर है और अन्तराष्ट्रीय नीति में ऐसे अवसर आया करते हैं, ऐसा वक्त आया करता है जबकि किसी देश का बोलना विश्व हित के लिए, और राष्ट्र हित के लिए दोनों दृष्टियों से खतरनाक हुआ करता है । दक्षिण एशिया में या तो आप चुप रहो, चीन के खिलाफ नहीं बोल सकते तो न बोलो लेकिन जब बोलो तब चीन के खिलाफ बोलो । यह आप की नीति हो जानी चाहिये ।

लोकसभा में मैं अमरीका के सम्बन्ध में कई बार टीकायें सुनता हूँ । कुछ वे ठीक भी हैं । मुझे भी अमरीका का विदेश विभाग और वहाँ की कई संस्थाओं का ढंग और रवैया पसन्द नहीं है । वे नादान हैं । लेकिन एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि रंगभेद और जातिभेद पर जितना बड़ा हमला आज अमरीका ने बोल रखा है उतना दुनिया में और किसी देश ने नहीं बोल रखा है और उसकी हमें हमेशा हर हालत में तारीफ़ करनी चाहिये । मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज इस उस गोरी औरत जियाला लुईडो को मैं नमस्कार करूँ । क्या मैं नमस्कार करूँ कि मेरे नमस्कार के साथ श्री स्वर्ण सिंह और श्री लाल बहादूर शास्त्री का भी नमस्कार है ? उसने अपनी जान गंवाई है गोली खाकर रंगभेद और जातिभेद को खत्म करने के लिए । मैं चाहता हूँ कि अमरीका में यह प्रयास सफल हो । मैं जानता हूँ कि अमरीका में अतिवादी लोग हैं जो इस मामले को ठीक नहीं होने देना चाहते । मुझे इस बात का शक है कि चूँकि यह मामला बहुत खतरनाक है इसलिए क्या

अमरीका इसको हल कर पायेगा ? लेकिन मेरी पूरी सहानुभूति अमरीका के साथ है और अगर कहीं वह हल कर लिया गया तो यह हमारे लिए बहुत बड़ा सबक होगा । याद रखो कि अमरीका के गांव गांव और शहर शहर में काले और गोरे साथ साथ रहते हैं । रूसके लिए यह आसान है क्योंकि रूस में तो काले गोरे साथ नहीं रहते हैं कि वह उपदेश दे दें । अमरीका एक ऐसा इलाका है जिसे अपने उपदेशों को कार्यान्वित करना पड़ता है । अगर कहीं अमरीका पास हो गया सफल हो गया तो हमको शायद शर्म लगेगी । हमारे गावों में भी चमरहट्ट और ठाकुरों की अलग अलग बस्तियां बसी हुई हैं । उनको खत्म करके एक साथ जनता को रहने के लिए मजबूर किया जाये ।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ अपनी नीतियों की बुनियाद को बदलो । अभी तक जो आप की नीति रही है, उसके बारे में मैं इन शब्दों का इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहता हूँ कि जिनका मुझे इस्तेमाल करना पड़ रहा है । इसको मैं पसन्द नहीं करता हूँ । हम सब लोग हिन्दुस्तानी हैं । हमें हिन्दुस्तानी नीति चाहिये । लेकिन आज की दुनिया के लिए रूसी और अमरीकी बटखरा मुख्य होगया है और उन्हीं से तौला जाता है । अभी तक आपकी नीति रही है, बाहरी स्तर पर तो रूसी और अन्दरूनी स्तर पर अमरीकी । अमरीका की विलासिता, अमरीका का जीवन स्तर, अमरीका का ऊंचा खर्चा, अमरीका का आर्थिक संगठन, यह सब आपने अपनाया है । अन्दरूनी स्तर पर अमरीकी और बाहरी स्तर पर रूसी । उसका कारण रहा है कि आप हिन्दुस्तान में क्रांति करने हुए हिचकते हैं । मैं आप को सलाह देना चाहता हूँ कि आप अन्दरूनी स्तर पर रूसी बनें और बाहरी स्तर पर अमरीकी बनें अगर आपको दुनिया के बटखरों का ही इस्तेमाल करना

है तो । असल में तो हमें हिन्दुस्तानी बनना चाहिये । कहीं मेरी बात को तोड़ न डालिये । मैं खाली अपनी बात को समझाने के लिए कह रहा हूँ कि दुनिया के स्तर पर अगर रूसी और अमरीकी बटखरों का ही इस्तेमाल करना है तो अन्दरूनी स्तर पर रूसी बनिये और बाहरी स्तर पर अमरीकी । अपनी आर्थिक बुनियाद समाजवाद के आधार पर डालिये, फिजुल-खर्ची को खत्म कीजिये, जो आपस में गैर-बराबरी है उसको खत्म कीजिये, जो पैसा बचे उससे खेती और कारखाने सुधारिये और जब ताकत बन जाएगी उसके बाद विदेशी नीति में भी कुछ हुनर और कुछ चमत्कार आप दिखा सकेंगे । इस वास्ते अन्दरूनी मामलों में रूसी और बाहरी मामलों में अमरीकी । आर्थिक मामलों में रूसी राजकीय मामलों में अमरीकी । मोटे तौर से अगर आपने इस बुनियाद को अख्ति-यार किया तो विदेश नीति भी आपकी सफल हो सकेगी ।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी हाल ही में जो दक्षिण में एक पड़ोसी देश में चुनाव हुआ है, उसके बाद श्री डडले सेनानायक ने जो बयान दिया और उस बयान की तरफ आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिये । विदेश मंत्री जी, हो सकता है कि कुछ छोटी कसौटियां मीलोन के अन्दर इस्तेमाल की जायें तो कुछ तथाकथित प्रगतिशील लोग कहें कि डडले साहब कहां से जीत गये । लेकिन याद करो डडले साहब ने आते ही मीलोन को हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जोड़ा है और चीन के खिलाफ । इस लिए विदेशी मामलों में कोई भी फैसला करते वक्त समझना चाहिये कि यह दुनिया पेंच वाली है, इस में कई कसौटियां हैं, सिर्फ एक कसौटी के इस्तेमाल से काम नहीं चला करता है । अगर एक ही कसौटी इस्तेमाल कर लेंगे तो फिर दुनिया के गलत रास्तों पर चले जाने की आशंका है । मैं दोहराये

देता हूँ । एक पुराने जमाने में बहुत से प्रगतिशील लोग हिटलर जर्मनी को सन्तुष्ट करने के लिए गलत रास्ते पर चले गये थे, उसी तरह से आज भी पीकिंग चीन को सन्तुष्ट करने के लिए बहुत से लोग गलत रास्ते पर जा सकते हैं । लेकिन आप चोट खाये हुए हैं और अपनी जमीन खोये हुए हैं और आपको तो कम से कम मेहरबानी करके दुनिया को बताना है कि पीकिंग चीन का स्वरूप क्या है । इसलिए कभी भी एक काम मत करो, एक बात मत बोलो जिससे चीन का फायदा होता हो । एक मत करो, एक बात मत बोलो जिससे दक्षिण एशिया में अमरीका का पलड़ा घटना हो । इतना ही मैं कहना चाहता था ।

18.06 hrs.

ARREST OF MEMBER

SHRI DASARATHA DEB

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to inform the House that the Speaker has received the following telegram, dated the 31st March, 1965, from the Administrator, Tripura:—

“I have the honour to inform you that I have found it my duty in exercise of the powers under Rule 30 of the Defence of India Rules, 1962, read with sub-rule (11) of Rule 2 of the aforesaid Rules and all other powers enabling me in that behalf to direct that Shri Dasaratha Deb, Member, Lok Sabha, be detained until further orders, with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the defence of India and civil defence, the public safety, the maintenance of public order, India's relations with foreign powers, the maintenance of peaceful conditions in Tripura and the maintenance of supplies and