

इसके मानी यह हैं कि कितनी भी आप तरक्की करें फिर भी २८ मिलियन टन गल्ला आपको बाहर से मंगाना पड़ेगा इसका कारण क्या है ? इसका कारण जमीन का बटवारा है। जो आदमी खेती करता है उसकी जमीन नहीं है। जमीन को हड़प कर रखने वाले बड़े बड़े लोग हैं जो अपने खेत में कमी एक मिनट भी काम न करते हैं। वे शहर में रहते हैं, खेत को देखने चले आते हैं। इसी लिये जमीन का पर एकड़ उत्पादन कम है। बड़ी जमीन का मालिक चार मन फी एकड़ पैदा करता है। अगर उनी जमीन को एक गरीब किसान को दे दिया जाये तो दस मन फी एकड़ पैदा करके देता है। इस तरह से वे अपना भी नुकसान करते हैं और साथ साथ देश का भी नुकसान होता है। ऐसी जमीन बहुत पड़ी हैं जिसकी वजह से बाहर से गल्ला मंगाना पड़ता है। इस लिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जमीन का उचित बटवारा होना चाहिये और उसकी टिनेन्सी का ठीक प्रबन्ध होना चाहिये। जमीन किसी के पास है और पटवारी के कागज में किनी और के नाम में दर्ज है। इस कारण मुकदमें बाजी बढ़ती है और असल खेती करने वाले मालिक नहीं बन पाते।

इसी कारण वह अपनी पैदावार को नहीं बढ़ा पाते।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य आज ही खत्म करेंगे या कल जारी रखेंगे।

श्री विश्राम प्रसाद : मैं कल खत्म करूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तो आज कल जारी रखें।

18 hrs.

***ANTI-INDIAN PUBLICITY BY CHINESE EMBASSY IN NEW DELHI**

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset, may I request you to so kindly arrange that, in this particular Half-an-hour discussion, both the Ministers, that is the Minister for External Affairs as well as the Minister for Home Affairs are represented here, because, I will read out . . .

Mr. Speaker: They are both here.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am sorry, I did not see; I am very sorry. He came in just now, I think.

Mr. Speaker: Even the Defence Minister is here.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is very good.

Since five years ago, since 1955 to be exact, when China lulled the Government and the Indian nation into complacency, may I say, rather affectionate complacency, by the chant of the mantram of *Panch Sheel* and the lullaby, *Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai*, the same pattern has been repeated in this country. And that is, the Government remains silent or somnolent until a Member of the Opposition,—by that, I will not include the Members of the Opposition on my right, extreme right, I mean—brings to its notice the grave aggressive crimes committed by China against India. At first, military forcible occupation of our territory by China, subsequently or simultaneously the insults and humiliation heaped upon the devoted heads of our Embassy staff in Peking and Mission in Tibet, and now, Sir, this war of nerves let loose in our own country, on our own soil, by the Chinese Embassy. I wonder, if ever an iota of the activity which the Chinese Embassy is indulging in Delhi

and in India including Kalimpong, which is a nest of espionage, from my personal knowledge . . .

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): The Prime Minister also has admitted that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: China has got a commanding position there in Kalimpong and they work behind closed and barred doors.

If our Embassy in Peking were to indulge in an iota of the activities that they are indulging in here, I am sure that the Chinese Government would have taken drastic action, very very drastic action, and our embassy may not have been allowed to function even. Here, we have not only allowed them to function, we have not even imposed restrictions on the Chinese Embassy in Delhi as they have imposed in Peking.

Coming to this particular matter under discussion, you yourself were provoked, and rightly so. You are very wise and calmed. Even you were provoked when questions were answered by the Minister of State.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know whether these comments are well deserved by me.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I have spoken from my heart.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): Looking for allies.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We have plenty of allies even though the Communists are not with us.

An Hon. Member: Don't drag us.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We do not want them in this matter. We have got the whole nation with us minus the communists.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; he has a limited time.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Here, when the Minister of State tried to pass the buck to the Home Minister,—he was, unfortunately absent, perhaps,

on that occasion, that day—you yourself said, "It cannot be passed on in this manner." When my hon. friend Shri Hem Barua asked why this delay in this matter, she said,

"The Home Ministry issues the orders. It is not the External Affairs Ministry. I think the hon. Member need not be angry with the External Affairs Ministry."

We are not angry with her. We were never angry with her. There is no need to be angry with any Minister. We are not angry with any Minister personally, least with Shrimati Lakshmi Menon. But, the point is of national interest. We are angry with the Government as a whole, not with any particular Minister. We are very affectionate towards each other. We do not want to cultivate anger against any Minister.

Here, in the written answer to the main question, the Minister was good enough to say,

"There are established conventions about the rights of foreign missions to carry on propaganda in the receiving State."

So far so good. I suppose it is reciprocal though the reciprocity principle has not been accepted by the Government of India, which is very very unfortunate. I do not know what they will do. Every time they say 'We do not retaliate'. There is no reciprocity in our relations with any foreign country. Even if they give us a kick, we shall smile and let them kick us again. That is the principle that is being followed in this country.

Then, the hon. Minister continued to say:

"The Government of India by and large take a liberal view. . ."

This word 'liberal' is vague and liberal indeed. It is not defined. Where do you draw the limit? Where do you draw the line?

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

The answer further reads:

"...take a liberal view of such applications even when these are critical of them."

But, ultimately, of course, the hon. Minister has admitted that:

"However, in this case, the 'Brief Account of the Contents of the Chinese and Indian Officials' Report as published in the Chinese Embassy's bulletin . . . flagrantly violates . . ."

That is, she has admitted that in this particular case, the Chinese Embassy has flagrantly violated—mark the words 'flagrantly violated', not merely violated, but flagrantly violated; this word was more or less wrenched from heart, or may be from her head.

The answer further reads:

"...flagrantly violates the law of the land, and more particularly the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1961."

I have got a copy here with me of that Act. Hon. Members are well aware of the contents of this Act, and, therefore, I need not take the time of the House by reading out from the Act. Then, the answer says:

"It is not permissible . . ."

—mark these words again—

"...for foreign missions to act against the laws of the receiving State and abuse its hospitality."

After this, any sensible person, who has got a sense of national self-respect would have expected that very very drastic action, which was the term used by my hon. friend Shri Thirumala Rao, would be taken against the Chinese Embassy for this flagrant violation of our law.

Moreover, this is not the first offence. My hon. friend Shri Hem Barua showed the latest copy of China

Today, dated 20th May. The one referred to in the question was with regard to the issue of 5th May. So, the second issue has again violated the law of the land. Why? Because China has sized up India; China has sized up India's strength. I am sorry to say this. It breaks my heart to say this. They know that a protest will be lodged, more protests will be lodged, stronger protests will be lodged, and the strongest protest will be lodged, but the protest is ignored because China knows that the protest will not be backed by action. No protest is of any use in international relations unless the receiving State, this is, the State receiving the protest is conscious that the protest, if ignored, will be backed by action, and very stern and drastic action at that. So, of that China is sure. Up till now, she has seen what India has done so far with regard to their occupying Longju and other things; I would not go into these things because time is against me.

Therefore, I would appeal to the House to consider this matter very seriously as to whither we are going. I would remind the House, and I would invite your attention and that of the hon. Minister to what President Nasser did in Cairo a few years ago. There was no question of any propaganda against his own country. The Chinese Mission there circulated once a small pamphlet or a small magazine containing some anti-Indian matter and distributed it in Cairo. And President Nasser warned the Chinese Mission that any propaganda against a friendly country, India being friendly with Egypt or the UAR, would be regarded as a hostile act, and action would be taken, and that they would be doing it on peril of the Mission being closed. That was the warning he issued. Here he words used are that a protest has been lodged. I wish the hon. Minister had said that a warning had been issued. I am sure no warning has been issued; only a protest has been lodged. Umpteen protests have been lodged everywhere, either with

Pakistan or with China, so that our protests have no value for the receiving nation at all; neither—China nor Pakistan—cares a hoot; they care two hoots for our protests, because, as I said, they know very well that action will not be forthcoming, and we are not going to take any action.

I want to know, after the hon. Minister's assurance to Shri Thirumala Rao, when she said 'Yes, we shall take drastic action—that was how she assured Shri Thirumala Rao; it closed on that note of firmness by the hon. Minister of State; when Shri Thirumala Rao asked whether drastic action would be taken, she said 'Yes'—I want to know if any action has been taken, what action is being contemplated after the issue of the second number dated May 20th, containing anti-Indian propaganda?

I shall say one word about the press where this was printed. The hon. Minister was hesitant, almost shy; at first, she was hesitant to mention the name of the press, I do not know why; and she fumbled and said 'The Modern Age Press'. It might be a *bona fide* mistake. There is no *Modern Age Press*. It is the *New Age Press*. Here the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1961, says "Whoever makes". This includes 'prints'; "Whoever by words either spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representation or otherwise"; "Whoever makes, publishes or circulates"—I suppose this includes printing also.

If no action is taken against this Press now—I have not got anything against the *New Age Press* as such; I have got friends in that Press also—in future Government will have so many headaches arising out of that, because any press will violate the law of the land with impunity, as immunity against legal action has been sor: of conferred on the *New Age Press*.

One last word. The policy of Government seems to be to give the Em-

bassy a very long rope. Whether they will hang us with that rope, time alone will tell. I hope not. I hope that rope will be used to hang the Embassy with. But this is not the way in which international relations are conducted in any part of the world. I do not know if we are going to set up a new law, a new convention, a new tradition, 'Whatever the other side will do, we will do what we think is right'. What is right in international relations? If they go on kicking you, you go on licking the feet that kick. Is that a pattern of international relations? I have not come across any such single instance in the whole history of the world; I do not know much of history, but from what little I know of, I do not know whether such relations, such sort of convention or such sort of action is adopted by a Government humiliated, insulted, rebuffed and kicked at every turn in this manner.

The only expression which I can think of at this moment is that one, a very picturesque one, used by Winston Churchill on a comparable occasion. He said:

"The way the Government acts and behaves reminds me of an animal about which my uncle told me . . ."—
his uncle, not my uncle told him in his boyhood in a story—
" . . . and that animal was a bone-less; wonder".

A bone-less wonder! I think that is the only description I can think of when I contemplate the supreme, masterly inactivity of the Government in regard to the Chinese Embassy.

Mr. Speaker: His time is up.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I will just read from the answers.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister will have to be given time. There are also three other Members who have to ask questions.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Usually, the Member opening is given 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: There are three other Members also who want to ask questions.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I will take only half a minute. I will read one relevant, important sentence from what the Minister of State said that day. This is as regards action against the *New Age Press*. She said the matter was under consideration. She did not rule out action. First she said, 'No action was taken'. Then she changed it and said 'It is under consideration'. I want to know whether the consideration stage is over or whether it is still under active consideration; perhaps till the Prime Minister comes back, it will lie in cold storage. That is all right. I have no objection to that. Let him finally decide.

Then you remarked, very rightly:

"Hon. Members....."

this was your very useful and very important suggestion—

"Hon. Members feel very intensely on this subject. Government should consider whether really....

the use of the word 'really' was very significant because I think you also had in your mind some suspicion that the Government is not taking some real action—

"some action can be taken or not. That is for the Government".

Of course, that is quite right. I would therefore request the Minister of State as well as the Cabinet Minister of Home Affairs to throw more light on this matter, particularly as to what the policy of Government is going to be in the future. Are they just going to forfeit or confiscate the copies and then let sleeping dogs lie? That is

what I want to know and what the House will want to know.

Mr. Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma. I will call those who have given advance notice and will allow them to put one question each.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): May I know if our Indian Embassy in Peking publishes any journal comparable to *China Today*? If it does, how often is it brought out; and whether any exception has been taken to its contents ever by the Chinese Embassy?

Then, second, may I know.....

Mr. Speaker: I told him to put only one question.

Shri D. C. Sharma: This question leads to the other question. May I know....

Mr. Speaker: It may lead to many.

Shri D. C. Sharma: As there has been such a big time-lag, because of that, I want to know about co-ordination of work between the Home Ministry and the Ministry of External Affairs, whether they cannot sit together and decide upon a general course of action. If that does not happen, where is the joint responsibility of the Cabinet?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is clearly understood that we cannot go the China way. But may I know whether, in keeping with our own dignity, it is not possible for us to resort to pre-censorship of this paper because of the repeated offence committed, and deal very severely with the press?

Shri Hem Barua: Since the hon. Home Minister and the Defence Minister two senior members of the Government are present, I want to put a very specific question. Not that China has....

Mr. Speaker: Otherwise he would not have put a straight question?

Shri Hem Barua: Just now thought of it. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Let him put the straight question, anyhow.

Shri Hem Barua: Not that China has bolstered up her pet theory of actuality by actual military occupation, but, of late, she has stepped up a veritable war of nerves through radio broadcasts from Peking and, at the same time from Lhasa..

Mr. Speaker: Is that question direct?

Shri Hem Barua: I will come to that. It will be one sentence; just one sentence.

Mr. Speaker: That also depends on how long that sentence is.

Shri Hem Barua: I shall try to be very brief, Sir.

Not that China has bolstered up her pet theory of actuality by actual military occupation but she has stepped up a veritable war of nerves through radio broadcasts from Peking and Lhasa, not to speak of the vitriolic campaign of calumny and slander organised on the very soil of our country, in view of that, may I know from Government whether Government, by now, have considered the necessity of severing diplomatic relations with Peking?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to the House and to you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to clarify the position with regard to our policy towards China about which criticism has been made on many occasions and today also by the hon. Member who seems to have been dissatisfied with the answer given by me to Question No. 900.

Before I take up the matter. I would like to point out that the first

point he raised, that is, Government takes notice of these things only when the Members of the Opposition party bring it to the notice of Government, is not correct.

Shri Hem Barua: Facts prove it.

Mr. Speaker: Now, he has to hear.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I will give the facts.

Take, for instance, the publication dated the 5th May. I would like the hon. Members to remember when they brought it to the notice of Government. Long before the hon. Member even knew of it, the Home Ministry had issued instructions that this copy should be forfeited to Government.

Shri Hem Barua: What was the date?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I will tell you. The copies were distributed on the 7th. We lodged a protest on the 9th, to the Chinese Embassy here.

On the 11th, the notification was issued.

Shri Hem Barua: Her statement is wrong.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I am making the statement. How dare the hon. Member rise up and interrupt before I finish it?

Shri Hem Barua: It is much ahead of that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. She might give that date also.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Then, the hon. Member referred to the vitriolic campaign, etc., in the subsequent issues, and yesterday, I think, the hon. Member also brought to the House the issue dated 19th May. The Government have scrutinised every page of it very carefully; it is contravening the international convention regarding the publication of letters, that is, these letters, before they were

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon]

received by the Government of India, were published in their paper. It is improper, no doubt. But there was nothing in it which one might take objection to, because our Government have stated that even when the official documents may be critical about our policies we do not object to their publication because they are official documents. The objection that we took to the brief account given in the issue dated 5th May was because a summary was given which was tendentious, which really doubted our territorial integrity, and therefore, it was not an official document but a propagandist material published by the Embassy, and therefore, those copies were confiscated. Regarding the other, there was no need to confiscate it, because we have already stated that our policy is that where it is an official document we do not take objection to it even though they are critical of us. (Interruption).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: rose—

Shri Hem Barua: rose—

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir I am not yielding. I must be allowed to proceed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members might resume their seats, and be patient.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Before I really come to the main portion of the debate, I would like to answer the questions already raised by hon. Members; first, whether we publish anything similar to *China Today* in Peking. Yes; we do bring out a fortnightly publication called *India Today*. The question was also asked whether the Chinese Government have taken any objection to our publication. Yes, Sir. They did on two occasions. The Peking Government took exception or objected to the publication, once when the AICC resolution about the northern borders was published and a second time, when the Prime Minister's speech at Belgrade was published

because the Chinese were giving a distorted version of the speech.

Then I come to the second question whether any precensorship is possible. In India, as hon. Members know, we do not have any system of precensorship at all. Whether precensorship should be considered or not is a matter which is really a suggestion for action and which will have to be considered. Now that the hon. Home Minister is here, I am sure he will decide whether such a thing is possible. Even if it is possible, it should be considered whether it is advisable. There are many things possible, but they may not always be advisable as far as our diplomacy is concerned.

I now come to the third question, and that is about closing down the Mission. Not only today, but even on other days, there were hon. Members who were so carried away by their enthusiasm and earnestness that they wanted the Mission in China to be closed.

Shri Hem Barua: I said severing of diplomatic relations.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It is all the same. You do not close down your Mission unless you sever your diplomatic relations. The hon. Member is a professor. He knows a lot of history and he ought to know better. (Interruption).

Shri Hem Barua: I understand it. But it is a wider question.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Why should a reference be made to 'professor'? There are professors and professors who do not know!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Students of history know that it is not always advisable to take such an extreme step. And recent history has shown how countries which, in a moment of anger closed down their Missions—though there was really no

opportunity for further negotiations—had to meet not in their home countries but in other capitals of Europe in order to meet and have discussions. We do not want to create a position like that, and it is not a sign of statesmanship to create a situation in which you are cut off from all negotiations. Our diplomacy is characterised not by right positions and unanswerable demands. Therefore, that suggestion also is not acceptable to us and we do not give any consideration regarding that.

We want to negotiate and our Prime Minister has told us many times that these are not things which can be done in a huff. Because you lose your temper, so you go and close down your Mission—almost like Alice in Wonderland. You do not like a person and so you cut off your head? That is not how diplomacy is carried on. Hon. Members who are well-versed in international law know that modern diplomacy is one of compromise and concession. Things may be done, which we may regard as humiliating. But what is the alternative? We have to think in terms of the modern age. We are living in the latter part of the 20th century when the very future of man is at stake. And, here are hon. Members who seem to be completely oblivious of the changes that are taking place in the world and are suggesting things which will not be acceptable even in the 18th century. I am surprised that the hon. Member should quote what Churchill's uncle told him about that wonderful animal.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Churchill himself said it in the British Parliament.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The hon. Member said that Churchill's uncle told that story to Churchill. Whatever it is, it is a matter of great shame that any Member of the House should think that our Government is a boneless wonder. If it is a boneless wonder, every Member of this House is a boneless wonder, because in a democracy . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I challenge that. Government may be a boneless wonder, but not the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He should have the patience to hear. Perhaps the Minister wants to say that people only get the Government that they deserve. (*Interruptions*).

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: In a democracy, the Government reflects the will, desires and aspirations of the people. Only a few days ago, we had the debate on the demands for grants for the External Affairs Ministry. I did not hear any Member violently opposing any single demand. Although there were a number of cut motions, they were all withdrawn *en masse*, and the demands were voted without any opposition, which meant that they supported the foreign policy and the diplomacy of the country. But today Members say, "Why don't you take drastic action?", without saying what that drastic action is. What the adjective 'drastic' means, they do not seem to know. The result is that they are creating an atmosphere, which would make our diplomacy more and more difficult.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order, Sir.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I am not yielding.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: She must yield on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Would he fight it out or allow me . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: She says she does not yield.

Mr. Speaker: He should appeal to me.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am sorry. She attributes to the Members of the opposition what she has herself said. This is very wrong. Here is the record which will bear me out. She herself promised a Member on the benches opposite that the Government would take drastic action in this matter. Why does she attribute it to us? She tries to accuse us . . .

Mr. Speaker: When he uses the adjectives, he becomes oblivious to all those implications. When those adjectives come from the other side, he should not be so sensitive.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I pray you, Sir; did I use any adjective just now?

An Hon. Member: 'Boneless' is the adjective.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I did not use it just now.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There is no point of order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is for you to decide; it is not for the Minister to decide. She has no power to decide points of order.

Mr. Speaker: Really it is for me to decide, but because I did not give a decision, therefore it was interpreted that there was no point of order.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: All that the hon. Member wants to do is to create confusion.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: ****

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would not allow these adjectives. He should not go on giving a running commentary on this.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I was telling the House that when the House as a whole had the opportunity to condemn the Government or criticise the foreign policy of the Government or our policy towards China, it did not say anything so drastic, but approved the policy of the Government.

Shri Hem Barua: It is a very lame excuse, Sir.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Today if hon. Members want a different policy to be followed, it is up to them to

suggest it, to bring pressure on the Government. After all, what is a democratic government if it is not the reflection of the will of the people? And if the elected representatives of the House, by and large, by a large majority, without opposition, support the policy of the Government, there is no excuse now to come forward and say it is a boneless wonder. I take very strong exception to the use of those words. If we do not take any strong action, nor the kind of action which is not defined but which the hon. Members want us to take against the press and the publishers etc., it is because we respect the fundamental rights, we respect the freedom of the press, we feel all members, of opposition parties and others... (*Interruptions*). Will hon. Members please allow me to proceed?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member says that the hon. Minister herself had suggested in her reply that some action was contemplated and was being considered. He wants to know whether that action has been considered and, if so, any decision has been arrived at.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: If I am constantly interrupted, what can I do? I cannot collect my thoughts if several hon. Members get up simultaneously and say something which is contrary to what I am going to say.

I have myself forgotten what I was going to say. I think I was trying to tell hon. Members that if we do not take any strong action, any drastic action, immediate action and all the rest of it, it is not because the Government is weak or inefficient. Every Government has the power to take the utmost action it likes against the people of the country and nobody could come in the way...

Shri Hem Barua: People of the country?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: By people of the country I mean all sections of

the people, press, organisations etc. It means everything else.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Now she is clearer.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I am much clearer than the hon. Member who asks the question.

Mr. Speaker: There should be some order here. We should listen to what she is saying.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It is not because Government does not have the power, or does not have the will, but because it has to conform to certain norms, certain principles which it has laid down for itself and for others. Now, it is easy for a dictator to close down a press, to close down a Mission, confiscate properties, suppress meetings and that sort of thing. Can we do that here? We have seen the debates that take place here on the Bill to extend the life of the Preventive Detention Act. No such debate takes place in any other countries which the hon. Member referred to.

So, what I was trying to say is, all that we do is determined by our respect for freedom, our respect for fundamental rights and, therefore, let it not be imagined by those who are opposed today to our policy towards China, that the Government is weak, or weak-kneed, or it is inefficient or it is waiting for the opposition to teach what it should do. It is a wrong thing.

Then the hon. Member referred to the need for co-operation between the Home Ministry and the External Affairs Ministry. Such co-operation already exists. In fact, the Home Ministry issues orders for confiscation or any other thing, for which the External Affairs Ministry has the prime responsibility, on our advice. We

read the papers and point out the things which are contravening the law of the land and action is taken by them.

For the rest, I would like to point out that nothing has been said, nothing has been raised in this House in this debate which would need any new answer or any new action. All I would like to say is, if the matter is serious, if there is anything which threatens our national integrity, or which would endanger our freedom, certainly Government will take proper action, serious action and drastic action. In the meantime, I would like to warn hon. Members that it is not to our advantage to go on constantly criticising the diplomacy or the defence of our country.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why not?

Shri Lakshmi Menon: Because these are things which should be muted and such discussions should be infrequent.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Then close down the Parliament.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Especially when we have to deal with countries which have aggressive tendencies, it is necessary that we should show the utmost restraint because the liberty of our people, the freedom of our country, the safety of our country has priority over everything else.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Wind up the Parliament.

18.35 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, May 24, 1962/Jyaistha 3, 1884 (Saka).