

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : मैं शौर नहीं मचाता हूँ।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : मैंने दोपहर से पहले जो मसला उठाया था उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं केवल दो प्रश्न पूछना चाह रहा था। क्या यह बात गलत है कि इण्डिया एयर फोर्स का एक प्लेन कल कोई गिरा या गिराया गया? क्या यह बात गलत है कि मुरेन्द्र सिंह राठी, एयर फोर्स आफीसर उसमें मारा गया है?

रक्षा मन्त्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : जहाज जिम रूप में आपने कहा उस तरह से नहीं गिरा वह ऐसा है—An Indian aircraft on a supply drop mission in the NEFA area is reported to have met with an accident. The weather conditions were extremely difficult. The plane has crashed, The rumour that it was shot down is incorrect. Further details are awaited. A Court of Enquiry is being appointed.

—
**MOTION RE TREATY OF PEACE,
FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION
BETWEEN INDIA
AND THE U.S.S.R.—contd.**

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, today I was very much astonished to hear the Leader of the Opposition making unusually an illegal speech. Generally he is very logical. Today he said that this Treaty might encourage Pakistan to attack India. He just gave out his suspicion without giving any argument for it as to how he thinks so. We in this House cannot talk in the *bazaar* way; we must give plausible arguments for what we say.

Secondly I was listening to Dr. Mahavir and I think they are caught in their own blanket. The world has changed, the configuration of forces has changed but they are still caught in their own thinking from which they are finding it very difficult to get out. That is the problem with Jana Sangh and all others.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, when we consider the situation today, when we consider the question of this Treaty, we have to con-

sider the background against which it has happened. Dr. Bhai Mahavir said that it was because of Bangla Desh this had happened. I would humbly submit to this House that it is not merely Bangla Desh; there are various other factors.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : I did not say, merely because of Bangla Desh. Don't misquote me.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I am glad that he is understanding.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : I said that that was the immediate cause and that it had played a part.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Deputy Chairman, what I am saying is, the world configuration of forces is changing for a number of years now and we must see what has happened in this background. There is of course this Bangla Desh situation; and as many hon. Members have said the military junta is carrying out a policy of murder in Bangla Desh and driving out millions of people into India placing an unacceptable and intolerable burden on our economy and our political and social fabric. It transfers its own burden on India and it has threatened a general war against us if we took any step to help Bangla Desh and resolve the problem of the millions of refugees that have crossed over to India. That is the problem India is facing and what is Pakistan doing? Using the Anglo-U.S. detente Pakistan is hoping that in case of war China would make threatening noises and frighten India and then their friendship with the USA would be used to secure international intercession which is already sought to be made through U.N. observers so that the basic issue of the aggression on the people of Bangla Desh would be clouded but it would only compel India to go on accepting the massive burden of the refugees and remain a silent spectator of the genocide in Bangla Desh. The United States has been for a number of years—and has come out openly now—in favour of Islamabad and it has become clear now that Pakistan is depending not only on the help of China but in a much more meaningful way on the USA. Thus the Sino-US equation was being used by Pakistan to outflank India and to threaten India with war. India naturally had to take

[Shri Krishan Kant]

action to secure her flanks and let the hostile combines know that no war could be waged against India. This was the general background. Another aspect we have to remember is that a virtual reorganisation of the world is taking place and today new equations are arising. A new situation is developing as a result of the new equations. The entire world situation is in a melting pot today and the old combinations have withered away. We must get out of the cold war thinking and the cold war terminology. My friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, was talking of defence pacts and politics of blocs. The blocs have broken and the air of cold war is gone. Alignment has lost all meaning and those who are still talking of alignment are in a world that is dead and gone. What is happening in the world today is not alignment but political equations and political understanding. What do we find today? Soviet Union is talking with France; it is talking of European security conference. It is befriending France because it wants to break up the whole thing. Romania, Yugoslavia, are all trying to be friends with China and the policy of the United States of America of open hostility towards China is breaking down. Mr. Nixon wants to fly to Peking to befriend China. The old blocs are gone. Mr. Gurupadaswamy speaks about some of these old military blocs. I would request him to see the new equations. Let us think of having a new understanding . . .

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Man has gone to the moon.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Yes, that is true. India could not sit with folded hands and watch the political reorganisations in the world and be left in the lurch. Unless we understand this, we will not grasp the significance of the Indo-Soviet Treaty. It is not a question of alignment, but it is a question of providing a new equation in this world. I would come to the Treaty. These clauses do not mean alignment in the context of political understanding and the growth of nations as it is coming up today. Secondly, the Treaty with the Soviet Union is not a one-sided affair. It is also beneficial to the USSR. Today China and the USA are mixing. The USSR on the one hand is trying to face a united

Europe and on the other hand nuclear China. In this world situation, naturally with our ideological affinity for fifteen years with the Soviet Union, with the type of help that they have given, Russia and America find themselves naturally interested and their interests coincide at a particular point and that is why this Treaty. It is a geopolitical historical growth which must be understood. Unless we understand this, is no good harping on the situation in Bangla Desh. With the new equation political understanding is growing. Unless there is understanding for a longer period, we cannot solve the economic problem. The Sino-US detente is directed against the Soviet Union, in order to isolate Moscow. President Nixon is flying to Peking. It is not merely for Bangla Desh that Moscow is important. Moscow's only important political friend in Asia is India. Therefore, coincidence of political interests has brought about this Treaty. The Indo-Soviet friendship is positive in outlook and nature. It is not negative. It is not a bloc. It is not creating something against the other. It is directed against war threats and not against any particular country. There is nothing in it which precludes having normal relations with other countries of the world. We can, in fact, continue to probe the Chinese and express willingness to normalise our relations with them whenever they are ready. Even the Soviet Union wants to befriend China. I know, as the Government is very much aware of it, it will be dangerous to be passive in foreign affairs and depend on this approach. The Government is not going to depend on this approach. As the Prime Minister said yesterday, it is the economic strength which alone can strengthen a country, can protect a country. Weak countries cannot do it. We are keeping our options open in regard to China, in regard to the world powers, in regard to Latin America, in regard to Africa, Europe and South East Asia. We are a strong nation and we can formulate our friendship with all of them. We cannot take the attitude of leaving it to any other country. There are four important areas for diplomacy : (i) South East Asia, (ii) Japan, (iii) Latin America and (iv) Africa. In the new configuration that is growing India has to play its part. Mr. Gurupadaswamy, the concept of the two blocs has gone. Now, it is triangular, viz., the United States, the USSR and China. China is a world power. There are two other places, two centres of

power. One is the united Europe and the other is Japan which is growing into a mighty power. We are having a pentagon, India is a potential great power and when that comes about it will be a hexagon. The days of the two blocs are gone and are going away. Military alignments are going away.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want the pentagon to become a hexagon.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: The two old blocs have disappeared. There are three centres or focuses of power. Now our friends tell us that earlier we had friendship with Russia.

It is necessary to strengthen the friendship, it is essential because in this country we are being told, frequently told, that Russia is also giving to help to Pakistan. Pakistan has gone to Bangla Desh both Russia and America are equal, they are having the same attitude. This thing was being propagated in this country. It was necessary that we looked into the whole situation and know the real position about the Soviet Union's relations with India.

Mr Deputy Chairman, I would now like to come to two very important articles of this treaty about which so much has been said, about which Mr Gurupadaswamy and many others raised doubts. I want to draw attention to articles IX and X. Here as regards article IX, it is very much mentioned here.

"Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from providing any assistance to any third party that engages in armed conflict with the other Party. In the event of either Party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries."

The words 'armed conflict' have been put wisely, they have not put 'war', they have not put in any other thing. "Armed conflict" means skirmishes also. My friend, Dr. Mahavir, asked whether or not they will come in aid of Bangla Desh when India goes to war. Let him understand it—why

do we want to proclaim it openly? 'Armed conflict' has been very wisely put. It enjoins the Soviet Union not to assist Pakistan in any circumstances. That is very clear. In international political parlance, armed conflict comes lower than war. War is war. Skirmishes can mean armed conflict.

Another very interesting thing is that this treaty does not refer to the circumstances in which the armed conflicts can arise. It is free for interpretation, both the countries can interpret it in any way they like. If I interpret it like this, I hope the Defence Minister will, while replying, say whether my interpretation, as I see it, is right or not. Nor does it limit the operation of the clause to the cases of the High Contracting parties. It is not only when they become victims of aggression. This Article goes into that. It is not that. The treaty does not bar unilateral action on Bangla Desh as the hon. Minister of External Affairs said in the Lok Sabha. This is how I interpret it. This Article further mentions the action to be taken to remove a threat, not a counter-threat. It does not prohibit India from exercising, from taking initiative, concerning her security when faced with such an attack. Article XX does not strictly mean that they should initiate discussion. It is not necessary to initiate and complete the discussion before that as Dr. Bhai Mahavir said. No. Initiation of discussion and action can take place side by side.

In Article X, they say—

"Each High Contracting Party further declares that no obligation exists, nor shall any obligation be entered into, between itself and any other State or States, which might cause military damage to the other Party."

It is a very significant Article. Suppose the armies on the China-Russia border and the Indo-Tibetan border have to be increased they can be increased. Or if they want to reduce the number of armies, they can talk to the other High Contracting Party that we want to reduce. You can talk to them only when you reduce the army and not when you increase the army. So this article is very significant and interesting and useful. I congratulate the Government of India for putting these two Articles in a very interesting way.

[Shri Krishan Kant]

On the question of non-alignment, I would say that Jawaharlal Nehru in 1946 tried to define it when the two power blocs were there. Even at that time there was non-alignment and he said that an elephant can never be a pet, a big country with such a population can never be aligned with any other country ; it has to be great. That is the basic point of non-alignment. At no time can we give up non-alignment, it can never be possible. Whichever Government might come to power in India, the country will have to remain non-aligned. This is the basic thing. Whoever wants to misguide the country and say that India is getting aligned, that it has changed its policy only because of the new circumstances, is wrong ; the emphasis has to be different, the understanding has to be different. India has not entered into that treaty with the Soviet Union out of anything.

India is strong and continues to be strong. India will fight its own battles with the new consideration as its background. I must congratulate the Government of India for entering into this Treaty at a particular time. Mr. Gromyko rightly said that this Treaty is a landmark not only for the two countries but the growing friendship that is taking place amongst people of similar thinking on a very grand scale.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I am afraid I cannot rush to welcome this Treaty as many others seem to think. I have many questions to ask, I have many doubts in my own mind and at least reasonable people will have to admit my doubts are well-founded particularly in the background of the history of the last few years.

This Treaty is supposed to bring peace and security in this region to these countries. Does this Treaty bring in the Soviet Navy into the Indian Ocean ? Is this a step that brings us peace ? Are there not other countries in this region which are important ? Have we not thought of having treaties of this type with other Asian countries ? What about Japan ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : What about Taiwan ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Why not ? There are other Asian countries.

We do not look to them. We have many things to learn from them. I have said this in this House and I repeat it. I mentioned the strongest of the countries first to strengthen my argument. Why do we not think of Japan ?

Then the reason given is that it strengthens our policy of non-alignment. I am afraid this is the hollowest of the arguments. This makes us completely aligned to the Soviet Union. How can we call ourselves non-aligned ? In the course of the history of the last few years what have we seen the Soviet Union doing ? Czechoslovakia is the most recent case. What happened there ? And what happened to the countries nearby, countries like Poland and Finland ? What has been the Soviet's role there ? Is their role going to be the same here ? This is supposed to be a treaty of friendship. Is it a role of friendship ? There are types and types of friendships in this world. Is this going to be a treaty of friendship that they had with Czechoslovakia ? Shall we ask Mr. Dubcek about it ?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI)
in the Chair]

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Who has written this brief for you.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am reading from the notes that the External Affairs Ministry has given, followed by my questions. Mr. Arora thinks I have not studied English.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : You have.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : This is the cyclostyled copy that has been given to us. I have made my own notes. Why should Mr. Arjun Arora think so ? Why should Mr. Arjun Arora take it upon himself to disturb everybody who speaks on this side, I do not understand. Can that party not think of anything else ?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Mr. Arora thinks it is his birth right.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Perhaps he thinks that it is his monopoly of interrupting everybody on this side.

So, I want to ask Mr. Arora and friends of that thinking : Have they not

heard of the Brezhnev doctrine ? Has Russia given up the Brezhnev Doctrine ? It may be difficult for the friend who just tried to interrupt to understand it but the Brezhnev doctrine is a clear thing. This line of reasoning holds that Moscow has a moral right to intervene anywhere in the Socialist Commonwealth to prevent counter-revolution.

I want to know if Russia has given up this doctrine. And by signing this Treaty, have we gone into the Socialist bloc or the Communist bloc ?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : It is not joining a bloc. It is a friendship treaty between two friends.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Like Czechoslovakia ? Like Finland ? Like Poland ? These are my doubts to which I want clarification and I do not find it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Are the United States and China joining any bloc ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : The statement on the talks in Delhi says that they further strengthened the belief in non-alignment. Will this work in our favour ? Will not this Treaty bring the Soviet Navy into the Indian Ocean ? Does this protect peace ? Will this not ultimately reduce India to the status of a vessel as Czechoslovakia has been reduced ? These are my serious doubts

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We are grateful to the hon. Member for not saying that the Soviet Navy will be brought to the Moghul Gardens here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : Please do not interrupt him.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : There are some people here who have got the monopoly of interrupting others. They talk loudly against monopoly, but they will not give up their monopoly of interrupting others. When they have no logical answer, they go on disturbing.

Now, in this joint statement, there is no mention of the word "Bangla Desh".

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Mr. Vice-Chairman, why doesn't Mr. Dahyabhai Patel feel stimulated by these interruptions ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : You cannot cross-examine him now. Let him continue. Please go on, Mr. Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : As I was saying, in the statement there is no mention of the word "Bangla Desh" or even "West Bengal".

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : West Bengal ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Sorry, "East Bengal".

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Now, you should thank me. I helped you.

SHRI HAYATULLA ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh) : A typing mistake perhaps in the papers you are holding.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : No, I am getting old ; I have got glasses, don't you see ?

Now, has not this statement considerably toned down Government of India's stand on Bangla Desh ? The statement makes no reference either to the Awami League or to the unprecedented victory won by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman's party or to his struggle or to what the fate that is awaiting him is.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : वियटनाम का रेफरेंस है।

SHRI HAYATULLA ANSARI : But there is no reference to Taiwan. That is the thing Poor Taiwan !

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : पाकिस्तान का रेफरेंस है।

SHRI DAHYABHAI PATEL : You are not worried about East Bengal or about Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. What area do you come from ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : East U. P.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Can the solution of the issue of Bangla Desh or East Bengal be reconciled with this 'tatement ? Does this Treaty help us in any way in the desire of this country, in what was expressed in both Houses of Parliament as regards Bangla Desh ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Bhupesh Gupta, why don't you help him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am trying to help him.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am afraid I can never be helped.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I find you are generally vigorous in your speeches, but to-day you seem to be upset.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : He is not probably convinced of the brief that he is holding.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He has brought an American book to discover a Brezhnev doctrine. We do not know of any such Brezhnev doctrine.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : Please allow him to speak.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Most of the newspapers in this country at first welcomed the Treaty. But now most of them are having second thoughts. And doubts are being raised as to whether this Treaty is going to be helpful. In Yesterday's Indian Express there was a report that the well-known novelist, Dr. Han Sueyn, and her husband, Vincent Ruthnaswamy, were in Delhi and during their stay they met important leaders and officials of the External Affairs Ministry. I understand they met the Prime Minister more than once. And they have gone back to Peking with a brief from India. They are still in Peking. We would like to know the veracity of this report and also the significance of their visit. Would it help India in settling its disputes with China ? We would like to settle our disputes with China. But it should be an honourable settlement and not a surrender

which has been bothering us all this time. I hope the talks with China would not need clearance of the Soviet Union after this Treaty and would not amount to a violation of this Treaty. The Russians would, however, not like it, but we have to see our interests and we cannot allow the Russians to use us against the Chinese or any other country. I hope the Government of India is aware of this situation and of the Brezhnev doctrine—whether Mr. Bhupesh Gupta calls it an American book or not, it is a fact...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is a notorious book.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Whether it is notorious or not, the notorious Brezhnev doctrine is also well known. I want to know whether that doctrine comes into operation as a result of this Treaty.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The honourable Member should tell us where he is quoting from. From which book is he quoting ?

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, साइड बाइ साइड भाषण देने की परम्परा हो तो हम भी शुरू कर दे।

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Do we not remember the fate of Czechoslovakia, of Poland, of Hungary ? What is happening in the Sudan now ? Are these not warnings to us ? And if this Treaty is going to help us in doing something similar to the Warsaw Pact, where will all this talk of peace and better times for this country be ? Therefore, I have very grave doubts about all that has been said in support of this Treaty.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING/ प्रधान मन्त्री परमाणु उर्जा मन्त्री, गृह मन्त्री तथा सूचना और प्रसारण मन्त्री (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : If I heard the honourable Member right, he said something about my meeting Mr. Ruthnaswamy and Dr. Han Sueyn yesterday. So far as I am not even aware if they are in Delhi.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am only quoting from a report, not yesterday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : Mr. Arjun Arora. I give you fifteen minutes.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Thank you, Sir.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : दूसरों को डिस्टर्ब करने का टाइम इनके टाइम से एक्सक्लूड हो जाना चाहिए।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : जब आप चेयरमेन की गद्दी पर बैठेंगे तब एक्सक्लूड होगा, उससे पहले नहीं।

Sir, Mr. Gromyko has described this Treaty as a fruit of a dozen years of friendly relations. During these dozen years there were some people in this country who, in season and out of season, condemned and opposed friendly relations between India and Soviet Union. And they are the very people who after the initial shock have now recovered and are expressing grave doubts about the utility of this Treaty to the country. Shri Dahyabhai Patel said something very interesting. He said the first reaction of the press was in favour of the Treaty but now the press is having second thoughts. That reveals the nature of the monopoly press in this country. When the treaty came, the jute barons and the cement barons did not know about the Treaty. So, the journalists and editors gave a healthy reaction to the Treaty. Now the monopolists, the jute kings, the steel kings and the cement kings are compelling those editors or their understudies and pulling strings to write articles against this Treaty. That is the nature of the press in India.

Before I proceed further, I must congratulate the Ministry of External Affairs and all those concerned with this Treaty because this was a very well kept secret. There was not even a whisper. This is quite contrary to the practice of the Government of India where even before the thinking begins, information is leaked out to the press. This is a departure from the normal practice, but a healthy departure for which I congratulate all concerned.

There was, of course, a very, if I may say so, childish question from an old man about secret classes . . .

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT/संसदीय कार्य, तथा नौवहन और परिवहन मन्त्री (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) : May I seek some information as an exceptional case? The room upstairs cannot hold all the Members of Parliament. It is not possible to accommodate 300 or 400 people there. Therefore, we want your permission to have the meeting in the Central Hall . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : What meeting?

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : Meeting with Senator Kennedy. This is as a very special case.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : The hon. Members will take note of the announcement.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : He wants your permission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The Lok Sabha never recognises our jurisdiction in the Central Hall. This is *de facto* recognition.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : The Central Hall is within the control of the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Speaker. I am sure that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs must have got in touch with them. In any case, we take note of the announcement, Shri Arora will proceed.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : My speech will be deemed to have begun now.

The Minister for External Affairs has said somewhere that he was negotiating this Treaty for two years. This is something which I am unable to understand. Why should such a simple treaty—a treaty which is not a military alliance, nor a regional security arrangement—to declare friendship and determination to maintain peace and consult each other in case of aggression or threat of aggression, be negotiated for two years? That is something which, as a humble student, I am unable to understand.

[Shri Atjun Arora]

Now that there are no secret classes and there should be no secrecy about it, I want to know who was responsible for this long delay? Was the delay on our side or was it on their side and if it was on our side, it is the right of the Parliament to know where the file was held up. All the same, Sir, the Treaty is well-timed. It came on the 9th of August, a day which is important in the history of the country, not only because of what happened in 1942, but also because about two million people from all parts of the country came to Delhi to express their solidarity with Bangla Desh. . . (Interruptions). . . Sir, the Minister should either sit and listen or must go.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : He is listening. —

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : No, Madam, I mean the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. His movements disturb me.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I did not think that you could be disturbed so easily.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : So, Sir, after the Treaty, during the last four or five days, we have found some new advocates of non-alignment. It is very interesting that the very people who, for the last twenty years, opposed the policy of non-alignment tooth and nail are today attacking this Treaty as a violation of the policy of non-alignment.

Sir, they are fooling themselves if they think that public memory is so short that the public, the people of India, will forget that they were the people here who were opposing the policy of non-alignment. Sir, their opposition to non-alignment remains and their opposition to non-alignment was because India did not join the American bloc.

AN HON. MEMBER : That is right.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : That is what hurt them and that was why they were opposing the policy of non-alignment and day, Sir, when the Soviet Union, consistent with its past policy, agrees to certain

arrangements with a non-aligned country, again declaring its respect for non-alignment they have become champions of non-alignment. Sir, anybody and everybody who opposes our friendship with the Soviet Union and particularly this Treaty, beginning from Shri Rajnarain, Shri Dahyabhai Patel . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : He is 'Dayabhai Patel'.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Whatever be the pronounciation of the name, everyone including Shri Dayabhai Patel—he is not here now—talks of Bangla Desh. Sir, we must remember that this Parliament, on the 31st of March, passed a resolution, a unanimous resolution, about Bangla Desh and, within two days, Sir, there was one country in the world which reacted favourably to the resolution passed by us, by this Parliament, representing the Indian nation and that country was not the United States, it was not Taiwan, it was not Japan, it was not South Korea, it was not any of these countries, which Dr. Bhai Mahavir and Shri Patel admire. But it was the Soviet Union and, Sir, no less a person than the President of the Soviet Union wrote a strong letter to Yahya Khan, the military dictator of Pakistan, disapproving of all that he was doing. Sir, in this connection it is important to mention that the Soviet 4 P.M. Union has not supplied arms to Pakistan since 1970. This declaration was made by the Soviet Union and accepted by our Government. Sardar Swaran Singh, our very able External Affairs Minister, has repeatedly said that in this House. Sir, the Soviet Union has no outstanding obligations towards Pakistan as far as arms supply is concerned. Sir, there are other powers who have some arms for Yahya Khan in the pipeline. As far as Soviet Union is concerned, there are no outstanding obligations towards Pakistan. And even if there were any, this treaty will eliminate them.

Sir, as I said, this is not a treaty of a military alliance; Article 9 makes that very clear. It is not a regional security arrangement; it is only an attempt to win the friendship of an old friend which should be available to us in case of any eventuality.

Sir, the fact that the treaty is not a

military alliance, and the fact that India retains its basic policy of non-alignment should make it abundantly clear that we have not lost our initiative as far as other countries are concerned. And the Government has correctly said—Sardar Swaran Singh mentioned two countries; I don't know why, only two countries, China and Japan—that a similar treaty can be signed with other countries. Why should people come and say, "Are we free to sign treaties with other countries?" Sir, the question is: Are other countries prepared to sign similar treaties with India? Is the United States of America, which supplies rotten PL-480 wheat, prepared to give up its commitment to Pakistan and undertake not to supply lethal and non-lethal weapons to Pakistan and sign such a treaty? The fact is that much as Bhai Mahavir may desire, much as Mr. Patel may desire, the United States will not be prepared.

Sir, somebody—I think Dr. Bhai Mahavir—mentioned a press report in the "Indian Express" giving the British feelings and trying to raise the question of utility of this treaty. Sir, as far as I know, the British Government has not officially reacted to this treaty. So if some Indian journalist or some Anglo-Indian journalist sitting in London tries to sum up the British feelings, I expect him to be wrong. . .

(Interruption)

Sir, for every interruption I should get two minutes.

Sir, I was the other day at the Jan Sangh rally. I wanted to hear Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. When he used to be in this House, he was an entertaining speaker. Sir, the man was, so to say declaring war on Pakistan. That obviously is not our policy. And this treaty is not a declaration of war on Pakistan by the Soviet Union and India. That is clear. The treaty is a deterrent to war. Yahya Khan can no more threaten us because at least this treaty provides that if there is a threat of war there will be mutual consultation between these two countries as to the steps to be taken, and the Soviet Union is not a small power whom Yahya Khan can conveniently ignore. So, this treaty guarantees that Yahya Khan will not likely make threats of war against India. It is the duty of every patriotic Indian to support the Government as far as the Bangla Desh policy is con-

cerned, and not threaten war on Pakistan from every platform, as Mr. Atul Behari Vajpayee did the other day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): You must conclude within three minutes.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Yes, Sir.

People talk of the United States and some people object to the reference to Vietnam in the joint communique. As far as Vietnam is concerned, the Soviet policy is to support the 7-point peace plan of the Provisional Revolutionary Government. Madame Binh's 7-point peace plan is the plan which the Soviet Union supports, and this country also has supported that plan long before this treaty was signed. So, the Soviet Union and we hold the same view. If we have held the same view about the Vietnam problem, what is the harm in mentioning that we hold the same view.

This treaty, of course, opens the opportunity for us to convince the Soviet Union of the line that India is adopting towards the solution of the Bangla Desh problem. Of course, it is not very clear as to what steps we are taking for the solution of the Bangla Desh problem, but whatever steps the Government takes, this treaty opens for us the opportunity to convert the Soviet Union to the same view.

As far as the United States is concerned, it is isolated from the American people over Vietnam. It is also isolated from the American people over Bangla Desh. Sir, I hope this treaty will open the eyes of the American Administration towards the realities of Asia, particularly towards the realities of the Indo-Pak sub-continent and they will respond to the desires of their people and, if they do not respond to the desires of their people, why should we expect or, why should anybody in India expect that the isolated, cruel, war-mongering Nixon Administration will respond to the wishes of the Indian people? We understand that this rotten Nixon administration, isolated from the American people will continue to support the murderers of Pakistan and there can be no alliance between them and the peace-loving India. Thank you

SHRI N. G. GORAY: Sir, I want to say that the Central Hall is so full and we have such a little attendance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : I would request you not to raise the question of attendance in this House now because it is a very important debate and quite a number of Members are anxious to speak. I know the Central Hall will be full when Senator Kennedy addresses, but I think, in the interests of Rajya Sabha and in the interests of this debate, the debate should continue

Mr. Sardesai will speak now.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this Treaty has already received universal acclaim from our people in India. I think almost unprecedented and all sorts of greetings and compliments—as a landmark, as a great event and so on—have been given to it. If we believe—we ought to as democrats—that the voice of the people is the voice of truth, I must frankly say that the speeches of our friends, Sarvashri Gurupadaswamy and Dahyabhai Patel, were amusing. I was going to say it 'shocking' but I would much rather call them amusing for this reason that it reminded me of a famous story of George Bernard Shaw who was addressing a big meeting and the meeting gave him a tremendous ovation. But just one single person, present at that meeting, got up and tried to hoot down George Bernard Shaw. Shaw said, "My friend, even if I were to agree with you, we are in a hopeless minority". That is what I would like to say to them because it is difficult to take those arguments seriously. In which world do they live? One of them asked me which region I come from. I want to ask them which country they come from. Something which has put the fear of God in the heart of Yahya Khan, they are not happy about it. And yet they ask us which country we come from. Here are the open and declared enemies of our country. They are restrained by the treaty. A deterrent is there and there are some here who are sorry for it. To whom are they professing loyalty I want to ask them. What a loyalty. Such a perverted logic. Anyway, since they are looking at this Treaty with microscopes and magnifying glasses and they think that the Treaty is something like a Sherlock Holmes's story, may be, having all sorts of mysterious things in it they want to turn it upside down. I think some clear statement should be made on this. The content of the Treaty is the name which is given to it.

There is nothing to dig out, or to bury or to expose in it, and do all that. It is a Treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation. Nothing more, nothing less, but peace, friendship and co-operation are very great things. Peace means peace, co-operation means co-operation and friendship means friendship. These people must clearly understand it and in signing a Treaty of friendship you do not wish to discover things which stand at the back and then call it a Treaty of friendship.

Now, the first question which has been asked here is, what will it do for Bangla Desh? Again I am surprised. I think the taste of the pudding is in the eating. The Bangla Desh Government and the Awami League leaders have welcomed it. Do these people claim to be better patriots of Bangla Desh than the elected representatives of Bangla Desh? Who should judge it better—These people or the elected representatives? But they are better Bangla Desh patriots—again this is something which shocks me.

Secondly, as has been very correctly said, it is a deterrent. As a deterrent, what do the people of Bangla Desh gain and what do we gain? I think it is the protection of Bangla Desh which the people of Bangla Desh gain. With this, we can go ahead now in India by giving every kind of support and a far greater support—10 times greater support to the liberators, to the fighters of Bangla Desh than what we have given in the last three months. That is the crux of the matter.

What is happening in Bengla Desh? Material help is the most important thing. After this Treaty we can go ahead and if I have to say one thing to the Government of India today I would definitely say this, they were taking of all kinds of international complications; they were having various kinds of inhibitions saying they had to look this side, that they had to look that side. I would tell them, now that this Treaty is there, give them full aid, ten times more than in the past, and the Soviet Union and India can together to face the consequences. Surely, we do not want to declare war. Who says we want a war? But it definitely means this. Yahya Khan has said that in the process of liberation of Bangla Desh if certain areas are liberated he would attack India. In that case surely the clear meaning of this pact is that the

Soviet Union and India will stand together. It is not a question of our declaring war, the question here is we fully support Bangla Desh and the question here is our capacity, our freedom to help their struggle which is far greater now than it was before this pact. Even on the question of recognition various kinds of things were in the mind of the Foreign Minister when we pressed Government for recognition but this question of recognition has definitely become more practical, more realisable now. Formerly they were feeling what so and so will say, what the other country will say. But now this pact is a deterrent. I would say it is a big umbrella, cover, protection for all the help which we want to give to Bangla Desh. Therefore we can go ahead with it far more boldly in a far bigger way than before.

However there is another aspect, and a deeper aspect of this Treaty, to which no reference has been made but which has been run down by the Leader of the Opposition. That is about the life of this Treaty. It is for 20 years and I welcome it. Not that it will take that much time for the Bangla Desh question to be settled. But there are other things in this Treaty. This Treaty definitely provides for greater expansion of our economic co-operation, of our scientific co-operation, of technological co-operation, of cultural co-operation. Some sort of fears were raised by Dr Bhai Mahavir: does it not mean Soviet interference in our internal affairs? It means nothing of the kind. No one wants any interference from anywhere. We have got our full right and we will decide how to go forward on our path of democracy, socialism and all those things. But surely it means it is a tremendous help for the strengthening of our economy, a tremendous help for the strengthening of our public sector—it is perfectly clear—and thereby it surely means weakening of Indian monopolies, weakening of Indian reaction. It is not interference in India's affairs. It is just friendship and co-operation and it through this friendship and co-operation the monopolists are weakened, if the big financiers are weakened or if the public sector is strengthened or if our economy improves what is wrong with it? Is it interference? It is not interference. It just helps us: it is only assistance to carry this country forward to the aims and objectives which we have decided for ourselves

and which we have been wanting to pursue. Naturally one can understand why the big monopoly press is against it, why the reactionaries are against it.

Now a question has been raised about non-alignment and it was asked what happens to non-alignment. I think the Treaty is very correct in so far as India is not joining any military bloc. It has been said there that non-alignment continues and there is no question of non-alignment having been given up. But I do want to mention one thing here. Does this Treaty, or does it not, strengthen the anti-colonial, anti-imperialist content of non-alignment which is the living spirit of non-alignment? I want to put this question: is it an accident that this time the Americans and the perverted Chinese are helping Yahya Khan? It is not as if somebody tossed a coin to decide whether Nixon should help Yahya Khan and Kosygin should help India or whether Kosygin should help Yahya Khan and Nixon should help India.

No spinning of a coin decided who is helping this side and who is helping that side. It is not at all so. I want you to understand how did this happen. On the position of Goa who was on the right side and who was on the wrong side? The Soviet Union supported us and the Americans were on the wrong side. On the question of Kashmir from the beginning, regarding its accession to India, Americans questioned it, while the Soviet Union supported us. On the question of the West Asia crisis, who is standing on the right and who is standing on the wrong side, who is helping the Arabs and who is helping Israel? On the question of Vietnam who is on the right side and who is on the wrong side? Take the question of arms aid to India. Who is giving arms to India and who is giving arms to Pakistan? The fact that Mr. Nixon has helped Pakistan and the Soviet Union has come to our aid is not something new. It is in continuation of the happenings in the last twenty years. That is why we have every right to say that this Treaty is anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist. This is something which we welcome. There are those who ask: What happens to non-alignment? We should be clear. There is no doubt that this Treaty strengthens the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialists. A reference has been made and correctly made that the monopoly press said on the first day: 'Yes, Yes and No, No'. They asked;

[Shri S. G. Sardesai]

It is necessary? Notice some of the arguments. I do not want to refer to them, but read the Hindustan Times read the Statesman and read some of these papers. What a fantastic argument that have given? The argument is: "Is this necessary?" Why is it not necessary? They say that China and America being on the other side, in any case the Soviet Union is going to help you. So, they argue, why go in for a treaty, why have some sort of common obligations and common responsibilities? They say that you should have done nothing and the Soviet Union would have automatically come to your aid. I must say that as an Indian I feel ashamed of such an attitude. Friendship and co-operation are not a one-way traffic. Such a cynical argument they put forward. They say, you do not join anybody in common defence, in common security. If you are in danger you can be sure that they are going to help you. Why do you have this kind of Treaty? Is that an argument? As an honourable and self-respecting Indian I want to understand it. So, the whole argument about the Treaty not being necessary is simply selfish. You will not somebody's help. I do not want to use any caste name, but this is 'Bania politics' as it is called. There is a proverb in my mother-tongue which says: What is mine and what is yours is also mine. This is not friendship. This is not co-operation. This is not the correct attitude towards peace. We stand together, that is the spirit. Surely, the Treaty says whenever there is a threat of aggression or aggression, the Soviet Union will come to our aid. Is it not our moral duty if tomorrow there is any danger to them, that we go to their aid? What is wrong about it? They say 'domination'. Where is the question of domination? There is just no question of domination. This is an honourable Treaty. Anything short of it would have been dishonourable to India. It is not as if they should pull our chestnuts out of the fire, but we have a obligations to them. I do not think that is proper.

One word about the Breznev doctrine and Czechoslovakia . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): Other people will deal with that.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI: Just a minute. It was not a question of difference of opinion inside Czechoslovakia, about what path to follow for socialism. It was only when conclusive evidence was available to prove that the Nato Powers, West Germany and the Americans were fishing in troubled waters inside Czechoslovakia only when the question of the security of the socialist countries came, the Soviet Union intervened. They did not intervene to settle internal differences in Czechoslovakia all these years.

I join in the voice of the Indian people in greeting this Treaty, in welcoming it, and, of course, I congratulate the Government of India for the bold and correct thing they have done. Now, having done it, let us not try to water it down or wriggle out of it saying, this does not mean that, this does not mean this, it only means this, etc. As an Indian I would feel ashamed if it only means that somebody help us and we have no responsibility. I do not think it means that. It helps us also to shoulder responsibility. We are a big country, a strong country, a great country. We are prepared to discharge our responsibilities. That is the meaning and the only meaning. We should welcome it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): Before I call upon the next speaker, I would like to mention that there are seven Members who want to speak from this side of the House, and I would therefore request . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Those who are absent and have gone . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): . . . them to confine their remarks to ten minutes. Mr. Puri.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI (Haryana): Sir, this is unfair. Some of us are going to address the House for the first time in the session.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): Take some little time more.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI: It is my maiden speech in this session. Sir, in the short time at my disposal, I do not propose to waste any time in meeting the arguments

of the Swatantra and the Jana Sangh Benches because I feel that this has been adequately done by my friends, Mr. Arora and Mr. Sardesai. I cannot do better than address myself to two important questions that arise out of this treaty. Firstly, in signing this treaty, have we deviated from the path of non-alignment? My second question is: Is this treaty directed against anyone? I will first of all examine Articles VIII and IX with the specific object of finding answers to these two questions.

Sir, both Articles VIII and IX impose certain negative obligations on the High Contracting Parties and they also impose positive obligations and I propose to examine the negative and positive obligations separately. Amongst the negative obligations are that the High Contracting Parties shall not enter into military alliances against the other party, shall abstain from aggression against the other party, shall abstain from providing assistance to a third party that engages in armed conflict with the other party. If I may state these negative obligations negatively, can we accept anyone as friend who does not abstain from aggression against us? Can we accept anyone as friend who continues to provide assistance to a third party that engages in armed conflict against us, be it the United States or Iran or Turkey or any other country in the world? Can we really call that country as our friend which who continues to assist a third party, which third party engages or threatens to engage in an armed conflict against us? Sir, I would only say this that these negative obligations are the minimum requirements that we can expect of any friend. And also I would like to say . . .

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON (Kerala): Where have the Members gone, Sir?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: They are coming.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): I request the Members not to raise the question of attendance because this is an important debate.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: We know that it is an important debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): They will all be coming.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: Why don't you ring the quorum bell?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): Let us wait for some time and then consider what we can do.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI: I would say, Sir, that these are the very minimum requirements that we expect from one whom we accept as a friend. So far as the negative requirements or obligations of Articles VIII and IX are concerned, they are no more than the reaffirmation and the reiteration of the friendship between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

Now, Sir, I come to the positive obligations under articles VIII and IX. The first positive obligation of Article VIII is that the High Contracting Parties "shall prevent the use of its territory for the commission of any act which might inflict military damage on the other High Contracting Party." I do not treat this as a negative obligation because the Article does not provide that we shall not allow our territory to be as used, but it is a positive thing that we shall prevent the use of our territory for the commission of any act which might inflict military damage on the other party.

This is a rather far reaching and very interesting provision. Eventuality may arise in respect of the Indian territory of Kashmir occupied by Pakistan which is recognised as our territory by the High Contracting Parties having regard to the stand taken by the U.S.S.R. in the Security Council and elsewhere. Of course, this territory of occupied Kashmir is our territory. We incur an obligation in this treaty to prevent the use of this territory in a manner which may inflict military damage on the other party. That, again, Sir, is no more than a minimum act of friendship.

The other two positive obligations relate to what happens in the event of an attack. In the event of an attack, in the event of either party being subjected to an attack or threat thereof, the High Contracting Party shall immediately enter into "mutual consultation" to remove the threat. That, again, Sir, is no more than a mere act of friendship. What kind of friend would he be who refuses to enter into consultations

[Shri Dev Datt Puri]

when we are under attack or even threat of an attack ? Therefore, it is no more than an act of friendship.

Coming to Article IX the last sentence says :

"... the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries."

I confess I am not very happy about the words "their countries". I do not quite know what the words "their countries" mean. Whether the effective steps that are to be taken are to be taken to ensure that there is peace in the country concerned. In that case they would not have used words "their countries". It is my respectful submission that this expression is somewhat equivocal. It could be twisted to mean that "their countries" in this context means their respective countries, and if it means their respective countries, if we are attacked and if the other Contracting Party is to take effective steps to see that there is peace in their respective countries, it can be interpreted so as to mean non-involvement in the event of one of the parties being attacked. I hope the hon'ble Minister will throw some light on the words "their countries" occurring at the end of article IX.

Sir, having examined the negative and the positive obligations in regard to articles VIII and IX, the answer to the question that I pose to myself : Is it a deviation from the non-alignment ? is very clearly in the negative. After all, there is nothing more than, as I said, the reiteration and the reaffirmation of a friendship that we have enjoyed with the Soviet Union on a mutual basis, and to call it as a treaty of mutual protection, or as a military alliance or anything else is, I think, a travesty of the truth. There is no question of any deviation from non-alignment. As a matter of fact article IV specifically deals with this question. Article IV is in two parts. The first part deals with the position of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic. Non-alignment comes in the second paragraph of article IV. It is an acknowledgment, it is an acceptance that India follows and shall continue to follow after this Treaty the policy of non-alignment, and it also reaffirms that both

parties believe that this policy of non-alignment of India is conducive to the "maintenance of universal peace and international security and in the lessening of tensions in the world". Therefore, specifically as well as impliedly, positively and negatively, there is no question of our having deviated from the path of non-alignment when we signed this Treaty.

The second question that I pose to myself is this. Is this treaty directed against any one ? It is against those who cast an evil eye on India ? It is certainly directed against those people who have evil designs on this country because it reaffirms our lasting friendship with a strong country at a time when it is appropriately needed. I shall deal with the timing of this Treaty in a little while. It is not directed against those who do not cast an evil eye against this country. But it is certainly a deterrent against those people who may have evil designs against this country.

Sir, while examining the timing of this Treaty, I will not go into the background as to whether it took two years or as to who is responsible, but I beg to submit that a better timing could not have been found for signing a treaty like this and I would briefly mention two factors for why I say this. First, it is most timely because of what is happening in our backyard, in Bangla Desh where the tyranny of a minority—after all, what is Yahya Khan's title to his power, to the power that he exercises ? He seized it by force—is murdering the voice of democracy today. Sir, it is an amazing state of affairs that the leader of the majority party of a country is being dubbed as a secessionist. Who is waging war against Pakistan ? Is it Yahya Khan or is it the leader of the majority party ? I say this Treaty is extremely timely firstly for what is happening in our backyard. The world must know it in the context of what is happening in Bangla Desh, and I leave all the questions asked by the Jan Sangh to find their own answers. The very fact that the Treaty has been signed at this time is a notice to everyone concerned, most of all to our immediate neighbours who are doing all this in our backyard, that we have friends and these friends propose to stand by us even under the existing circumstances. That is the reason first why I say it is very timely. The second reason is that certain things have happened in the very recent past. The *detente* between the United States of America

and China is very much in the air. Sir, I cannot help referring to Mr. Dahyabhai Patel who asked : If we get closer to the USSR, will that mean interference in our affairs by the Soviet Union ? I would like to ask him to look round and see the *detente* that is evolving between the United States of America and China. Does it mean Chinese interference in affairs of the United States of America or U.S. interference in Chinese affairs ? He is talking of the diplomacy and the state of affairs 20 years back. Things are moving much faster today and things are moving in a very different manner. Of course, if he has a Russian phobia that anything connected with the Russians is not to be touched, than it is a different matter. So, Sir, these two factors have an important bearing on the timing of the Treaty—(1) what is happening in Bangla Desh and (2) the *detente* between the United States of America and China that we see on the horizon. I would ask our Government to extend this new thinking to certain other countries which are feeling very unhappy about this *detente* developing, for instance, Japan. Japan feels let down. I will not go into the details. (*Time bell rings*) I will take five minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : You have already taken 14 minutes. There are seven speakers on this side. You must conclude now. You can take two minutes more.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI : All right, very rapidly I would recount the background to the Indo-Soviet friendship. Of course, I will not go into the details and all the help that this country received before independence. But in 1955, when Bulganin and Krushchev visited this country and our Prime Minister visited the Soviet Union, immediately after these visits, the Soviet Union undertook certain corrections in their Encyclopaedia which had previously made some derogatory references in regard to Mahatma Gandhi. A new chapter was opened in 1955 in Indo-Soviet relations. On September 9, 1957, it condemned the bloodshed in Longju which was an act of equating us as an ally and friend. Sir, the Soviet Union has consistently supported us and our case on Kashmir in the Security Council and in the United Nations in general.

We on our part also refused to approve

the Baghdad Pact which went against Russia. Therefore, this Treaty is nothing new, not a bolt from the blue but an act of reaffirmation, reiteration, of friendship between Soviet Union and India. These who see a departure from non-alignment in this Treaty are imagining things and I think they are letting their imagination run riot.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : Mr. Niren Ghosh. Fifteen minutes for you. Everybody has taken fifteen minutes each.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : You are warning me from the very beginning . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : I have to control the debate because there are many Members who want to speak.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Sir, I welcome this Treaty. I may also remind the House and the country that it is a vindication of the stand that our policy and the democratic forces have taken for a pretty long time. We warned the Government of India time and again, the way they are handling foreign affairs, the way they are handling the concept of non-alignment at different times in different ways, the way they are leading for the dependence of the country on the imperialists in matters economic wholly and fully leading to the erosion of non-alignment, it means that we must conduct a consistent and resolved fight against imperialism and colonialism. So we said that this will land you in soup, this will land you in troubles. And this is exactly what happened. We said that it is necessary for a country like India, a developing country like India, to forge links with the socialist world *vis-a-vis* this country on the basis of equality and on the basis of the five principles. And that is the only course which can reduce our dependence on imperialism, which can make for the strengthening and consolidation of our independence and sovereignty and make our voice heard in the world. We were derided for that. Harsh words were used. Now things have come to such a pass that under prodding from that gangster Yahya Khan with the backing mainly of USA, this had to be done. When Mr. Chagla spoke, I wonder he did not refer even once to the USA. Everybody

[Shri Niren Ghosh]

knows just at this moment the US arms supply that is pouring into Pakistan is far, far, greater than that from China. . .

AN HON. MEMBER : What about China ?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : We did not approve of China supporting Yahya Khan against this country. It is clear and we have deplored it. And it is against the interests of our fight against colonialism and also self-determination, if I may say so. . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Why do not send a delegation to China from your party ?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : You accompany me, I will go.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I will.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Yes, I am ready.

Now it is a step in that direction which will help us in the strengthening and consolidation of our sovereignty, which will show that no country can commit aggression against us. While saying this I take this opportunity to point out certain things to you. It is good in the joint communique for the first time India supported the seven-point demand of PRG. You were not inclined to do so before. But I regret that you have not yet recognised the Government of PRG. When the Government is not opposed to the recognition of Bangla Desh—time and again we have been demanding the recognition of Bangla Desh—if it had recognised Bangla Desh, things would not have perhaps come to such a pass. Why this delay ? You are dividing the country on this question. And it is time that you should do so forth-with after the conclusion of this Treaty. Why do you not recognise the Government of PRG ? Why were two years taken by you to conclude this Treaty ? You were conducting negotiations. You were afraid of America as to what they will say. Now they have landed you in such a situation where finding no other way you came to decision. We warned you of this, we advised you and we pleaded with you. But you did not listen.

What about Korea ? Twenty or twenty one years ago when we supported the USA in the U. N. on this issue, it was a completely wrong step. Therefore, we took a positive step in bringing about a Korean armistice. After that India has played no role. Who can deny that South Korea is an occupied country, occupied by the US troops ? Our determination to fight against colonialism and imperialism and make our country strong, sovereign and independent is not compatible with the positive we have so far taken with regard to South Korea. It is time that we reverse that policy. It is time that we recognise GDR at Ambassadorial level. But we are afraid of West Germany because they are giving us economic aid. We are afraid of USA because 6 or 7 thousand crores of rupees have come to us from there. Even today 1,500 crores of foreign private capital are here. They are at the commanding heights of our economy in the strategic sector. They are entrenched there. For all things, for the running of wheels of our industry, we are depending on them. There is a most favoured clause on economic co-operation here in this Treaty which can take India away from subservience. It is a pity, it is a shame and it is humiliation for the entire people of India because we started our journey two years before China started on their journey after independence. We started with an industrial base which was perhaps superior to that of China. For 22 years, America was trying to contain China and for that they waged wars in Indo-China, Laos, Cambodia and Korea. They spent millions of money and suffered from half a million casualties. After all that, they have now been forced to reckon with realities. They have changed their policy because they realised that things in the world cannot be decided without normalising relations with China. But still we are not taking such positive steps in that direction. I remember what Shri Swaran Singh told me in reply to my question the other day. It is being widely quoted. It indicated some change in their attitude. The other day Chou-en-Lai was saying that they have tried again and again to settle the issue. They have put the blame on us. I do not want to go into the question of apportioning blame. That would be illogical. Does the Government of India know that no question in Asia can be settled without reckoning with China ? If these two biggest countries do not stand together, can there be peace in Asia and can other small

and great nations of Asia advance? I think not. It was India which withdrew the Ambassador. It is not China which did it first? It is time that India takes some positive steps. I will agree that any step should receive response from the other side. We cannot surrender our dignity and honour. It stands to reason. Whether socialist, imperialist or capitalist, whatever it is our country must have a square deal. Our relations must be put on an equal footing. We must not be on unequal footing in relation to any country, socialist or capitalist. That is why I plead that the time has come that you also take a step in that direction.

I say, Sir, that the time has come when we have to take steps for recognition. A question has been raised whether the Soviet Union has done so or not. I put the question to my friends: When China or the Soviet Union recognised the PRG, did they seek our approval? And, without our approval, did they stop recognising the PRG or helping them? It is time that we expressed our solidarity with the freedom fight being conducted in South Vietnam. We have not done so and so we were taken amiss. And, Sir, our sincerity on the question of Bangla Desh is being questioned. So you are facing this question now and there are other questions on which you have taken a different position. That opens our position to being questioned by other countries. Therefore, Sir, I think that the time has come now and irrespective of whatever other countries do or not do, because the entire Indian people are behind you, recognise Bangla Desh, give help to all the freedom fighters. Sir, I say these words to Shri Jagjivan Ram, because, Sir, irrespective of political affiliations, those who are genuine freedom fighters of Bangla Desh, whatever groups they might belong to, you must help all of them and it is for them to wage their struggle and it is for us to give moral and political support and other material help. No other country can fight the struggle of the Vietnamese people or the Korean people or other people. It is for them to fight and they will fight. I say, Sir, they will fight. I can tell you this much that I know that there are almost a lakh of people ready to sacrifice in their lives if they are given arms and go into the interior of Bangla Desh and carry out that struggle. So, Sir, after the Treaty, I think, the time has come for you to take a position. Do not delay. Do not delay any more, because

it has caused immense sorrow. That was why I pleaded with the Government so strongly that you should proceed with recognition and proceed with giving all possible national help to the freedom fighters irrespective of their political groupings. India should not make any distinction between this and that. It is in our interest that country becomes sovereign and independent and that country has a democratic government. Let the people of Bangla Desh fight out their struggle and set up their own democratic government according to their choice, according to whatever they like and I know, Sir, our people will play the key role.

Sir, their acknowledged leader is there. Mujibur Rehman is their acknowledged leader for whose life we are pleading. We are pleading to give recognition to the government set up by the Awami League. So, Sir, I think that question should not be delayed any longer in this connection and that is what I wish to point out.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI): You should conclude now.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Now, Sir, I say this that, after all, the foreign policy of a country follows its economic policy. Our economy is not in a state of good health. Everybody will know that. It is deteriorating and it is declining. Some amount of picking up is there after three or four years, with seven to eight thousand crores of foreign debt, fifteen hundred crores of rupees of foreign private investment and without any infra-structure so that we cannot stand on our own! Signs of crisis are there and if the economy is thrown into a crisis, if there is shambles, then our state of sovereignty and independence and the policy of non-alignment, of anti-colonialism or anti-imperialism, everything will go to the dust and it will put everything into shambles, however much you may try. That is why I say we should realise our position. For how long can we depend on the other countries for our arms and supplies? For how long can we depend on the other countries for our spare parts and components to run the meagre industries that we have now? Can we boast that we are a free and independent country? Let us remember that we are the second populous country in the world which will have immense power and

[Shri Niren Ghosh]

vitality if it is built up. President Nixon has said that one of the most powerful countries in the world is going to normalise its relations with the most populous country in the world. At least we are the second populous country.

We are the second power potential in the world. I do not say that we should harrass others or threaten others. But all I say is that we must be a great country and grand people. Where is that Policy? Strengthen your policy to such an extent that you establish normal relations with China or raise your voice against the American occupation of South Korea. I do say that if the Government does that, all Opposition parties can support them. Wherever we see even a meagre step or a faltering step in the right direction, we extend our support. But we are bound to oppose any wrong step. That is the duty that we have got to perform and that is the duty we owe to the people whom we seek to serve. Let us not look backwards. Let us look forward and march forward and be a big country, a great country, a really independent and sovereign country and help all the oppressed peoples of the world. That should be our rule. I would like the Government of India that the treaty should be taken in that manner so that we can advance along that direction. That's what I have got to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : Before Mr. Panda speaks, I would like to mention that there are about 14 speakers and we have to conclude the debate. The Minister will also speak. I would therefore suggest that Mr. Panda will speak for the minutes. That will help me to control the debate.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa) : At the outset, I must congratulate the Government of India for entering into this treaty with a great country like the U.S.S.R., which is the culmination of the collective wisdom of the Government of India and, above all, a master stroke of statesmanship by our Prime Minister. As Mr. Arora pointed out, not a whisper was there. The monopoly press or the reactionary press could not try to give different stories or create doubts and suspicions; in fact, they could not scoop it, they could

never know that such a big thing is coming up.

Sir, this treaty which not only works as a deterrent for the war-mongers at Washington and at Islamabad, but also gives a new dimension to our policy of non-alignment which we have been constitutently practising these 20 years. Sir, when Panditji enunciated this policy of non-alignment, between two warring groups, he created history. Now history is shaping wonderfully our Prime Minister to see that non-alignment blossoms and new dimensions are added to it.

First of all, Sir, this is a treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation. Definitely, India is a peace-loving country and we do not war. We never want to take an inch of territory of any other country. Rather the Government has been blamed many a time they had to hear harsh words—that they are not trying to get back our land or the areas occupied by other countries. We are a big country. I have no doubt about it. Whenever we discussed the Bangla Desh question, they asked the Government, "Who is your friend?" Sardar Swaran Singh was asked: "Who is your friend? Tell us of one in the whole world." I do not blame the Government, if my friends opposite are surprised.

I am sorry for those people because they cannot see ahead. What is happening in the world? The world, what it was ten years ago, will not remain the same ten years hence. Therefore, all the groupings, all the blocs that were created in the world in the different spheres are now undergoing a terrific change. No country, no Government, no nation can remain static in any particular thing. We grow. What things were in Africa twenty years ago are today not what they were. What things were in the European countries are today not what they were ten years ago. They were pointing out that India is isolated. India was never isolated. I knew, something was coming in a big way because this is a great country.

What is the grouping of the European countries or, the ECM? It is a grouping only to free themselves from the domination of the dollar. As I told earlier, this dollar domination is receding from every country in the world.

Yahya Khan was sending threats of attack and war. Now his position is reduced to that of any other puppet. Now, practically for all accounts he counts on America and American money is being flooded into his country. And the irony of the situation is that the followers of Abraham Lincoln are supporting the military junta of Pakistan to suppress the people who are fighting for their liberty. And a country whom they term as proletarian dictatorship—the Soviet Union—or the followers of Lenin are coming to support, to help as friends the biggest democracy in the world! That is the irony of the situation, that is the irony we are facing.

These are the challenges of time. Naturally, we should not get perturbed. Our friends on the opposite were saying “we are friendless, we are isolated.” Now we have a big friend who can stand by us not today alone but for twenty years the treaty is for 20 years—and the coming twenty years are going to be very eventful years for the world because many changes will take place. This is a treaty for twenty years. Unless you have security, unless you have peace stabilised in the entire country, you cannot grow. We must advance.

I am also point out one thing. We are committed to the path of socialism. It is but natural that people who believe in socialism should come closer. I do not want that type of people's capitalism as is talked of in America. If I want to be a socialist, I must be a socialist—of course according to our historical conditions and the cultural content of our nation we will have to advance.

Our friends opposite have made many points but I need not answer them because my time is limited and if I have to answer them this will become an academic discussion. But I shall certainly answer one particular point made by Mr Gurupadaswamy, the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, I believe he is a socialist but I had never heard such confused views from him before. He says it is a formal agreement. “Was this treaty necessary at all?” he asks. To this I would request him to read article 9.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY
I think I have to correct you. I have said it cannot be a formal treaty, it has to be

something more. I was only criticising the words of the official spokesman.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA
For that I would ask him to read that article a little seriously. And all his speech, if you sum it up, comes only to one sentence: consolidation of Soviet influence in India.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY
I raised the issue whether it means consolidation. I was posing a question for answer.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA
You have the answer in yourself. You may have posed it as a question.

So this treaty is certainly brought about because I think America and China are coming closer. We do not know whether America will be interfering in Chinese affairs or China will be interfering in American affairs. And I want to tell those friends who become suspicious that this treaty will not only affect their domination but will also serve as a deterrent and, from the day it was signed we did not hear any strong words from that great Yahya Khan of West Pakistan.

The Prime Minister has rightly said that Yahya Khan is against India but we cannot alienate ourselves from the people of West Pakistan. The people have nothing to do. They are also groaning under this brutal tyranny of Yahya Khan. History will not wait for Yahya Khan to see the impact of these treaties. People will rise and they will triumph.

Now, Sir, there is a cry for recognition of Bangla Desh. Many members have spoken on this issue.

SHRI GANESHI LAL CHAUDHARI
(Uttar Pradesh) Mr Panda, you should not speak on recognition.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA
Then they were asking what will happen to Bangla Desh? Bangla Desh is only a part of our problem. We are trying to help them. But you should see what will happen to Bharat Desh. If there is no India, how can you think of Bangla Desh? Those people who suspect, who advance the arguments that Bangla Desh finishes means India finishes. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : You will have to conclude in two minutes.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA : A little more sympathy from the Chair, Sir.

Now, Sir, I wanted to say, in the present context it is really America that is being isolated. I was sitting in the Central Hall, waiting for my turn to speak here. All the Members of Parliament had also assembled there to meet Senator Kennedy. Is it not a proof in itself that the Nixon Administration being isolated in its own country. The Pentagon and Nixon are being isolated in their own country. Some Members said that we could accept the 7-point programme of the P.R.G., but there is no mention of Bangla Desh. I would like to say, that is the only difference between the struggling people and a world power like America. We are also a big power. We definitely know that we are with the struggling people of Vietnam and the people of Vietnam will triumph as the people of Bangla Desh will also triumph. Our Prime Minister has clearly mentioned in reply the other day to a question from Mr. Gurupadaswamy about the "political solution of Bangla Desh." Can it be anything other than the liberation of Bangla Desh?" Let us wait. Before we conclude this debate, let me caution you that we should not hustle Government to come to a decision. They are in touch with the reality. We need not be so much hasty, so much dynamic as our hon. friend, Shri Niren Ghosh, wants us to be. We have our own way to move things and we move according to our needs, according to the needs of the nation, according to the words that can be accepted by our people. Therefore, Sir, this is not a Treaty for the time being because very big things have to come in the coming decade. This is a Treaty of 20 years friendship. As Mr. Sardesai said, I repeat, peace means peace, friendship means friendship and co-operation means co-operation, and this will help us in building up and stabilising peace not only in our sub-continent but also in South-Eastern Asia.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Sir, taking into consideration the climate of euphoria about this Treaty, I do not know whether the House will be in a mood to

understand the points that I am going to make in the proper manner. Sir, I do not want to play the Cassandra but listening to the speeches made here in support of the Treaty I was reminded of the days after 1956 when the whole country was reverberating with the slogan of *Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai*. Now it is most probably *Hindi Rusi Bhai Bhai*. Sir, the *Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai* slogan had possessed the mood of our people to such an extent that those of us who raised their small voice to warn the Government were decried as anti-Communists, anti-Socialists and anti-peace. With all the respect that I have for the late Pandit Nehru I must point out that when I raised my voice it was he who said, 'I know that the Socialist Party has a vested interest in keeping the enmity between China and India alive.'

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : Sir, they could have . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : Mr. Alva, you are speaking next. Please do not interrupt. You can answer his points in your speech.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I was surprised that while this Treaty was being discussed here in this House they forgot one thing that in our Constitution there is no clause which lays down that every Treaty will have to be ratified by the House. That is why we must have a discussion so that we know all about this Treaty and the clauses of this Treaty. But I am surprised and sorry to find that barring a few exceptions nobody came to the clauses of the Treaty itself. All of them were talking about the glorious friendship between Soviet Russia and India. I am not against friendship but I would like to study this document as well as the text of the Indo-Soviet statement after this Treaty was signed because both of these form part of the same theme. The statement flows out of the Treaty and therefore I would like to discuss the Treaty first and then turn my attention to the statement.

Sir, if you go into the various Articles of the Treaty you will find that there is hardly any Department of the Government left in which mutual consultations will not take place once the Treaty is signed. I will point out Article VII which says :

"The High Contracting Parties shall

promote further development of ties and contacts between them in the fields of science, art, literature, education, public health, press, radio, television, cinema, tourism and sports."

These are in one single Article where almost all the Departments have been mentioned barring those Departments which find expression in some of the other Articles. Then if you proceed to Article II it is about defence.

Here, Sir, I would like to point out the severe limitations that this Article puts on us. In this Article II it is stated that the High Contracting Parties desire to halt the arms race and to achieve general and complete disarmament, including both nuclear and conventional, under effective international control. Sir, the Treaty has to be closed studied; every word in the Treaty will have to be studied and its implications will have to be understood. It is said here that there is to be complete disarmament.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That has been our policy.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Then, it says : "both nuclear and conventional, under effective control." What is the position today ? Today we have put on ourselves a self-denying ordinance that we shall not produce any nuclear arms. On the other hand, Soviet Russia is producing nuclear arms day and night. For them to say that there should be a limitation on the arms race, for them to say that there should be complete disarmament has some sense. Has it got any sense so far as we are concerned ? It is just like saying that a *Brahmachari* should be provided with family planning appliances. We are not going to produce anything at all. Here the Prime Minister has said so many times that even if we have got the capacity, we are not going to produce nuclear arms.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That has been our established policy.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I know that my speech will disturb some hon. Members. Does it mean that Soviet Russia is going to disarm itself ? Does it mean that by this Treaty Soviet Russia has bound herself to

be a non-nuclear nation and that nuclear arms will not be produced ? Nothing of the kind. So far as India is concerned, it has unnecessarily accepted this condition, when there is no scope for it. This is so far as defence is concerned.

Let us now come to foreign affairs. Here also you will find :—

"...the High Contracting Parties will maintain regular contacts with each other on major international problems affecting the interests of both the States by means of meetings and exchanges of views between their leading statesmen, visits by official delegations and special envoys of the two Governments, and through diplomatic channels."

Why should this condition be there ? After all, in international affairs India does not count for much. Whenever we go there, we try to have contracts with other people for peace and security. This kind of condition is likely to be a sort of binding condition on us and it is likely to cramp our style.

Then, Sir, go to article IX. There, you have said :—

"Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from providing any assistance to any third party that engages in armed conflict with the other Party. In the event of either Party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries."

Just my friend there pointed out that the occupied territories of Kashmir cannot be used by Pakistan under this Treaty in such a manner that they will pose a threat to us. I would like to say that they are being just now used by Pakistan for that very purpose. Does it mean that after the signing of this Treaty Soviet Russia will stop Pakistan from using that particular piece of land or that area in such a manner that it will not oppose a threat to our security ? It is not going to happen like that. What has come to stay is going to stay. Therefore this clause in the Treaty also is not going to benefit our country to any great extent.

[Shri N. G. Goray]

Then, Sir, I come to article X. That, I suppose, is the coping-stone. It reads :

"Each High Contracting Party solemnly declares that it shall not enter into any obligation, secret or public with one or more States, which is incompatible with this Treaty. Each High Contracting Party further declares that no obligation exists, nor shall any obligation be entered into, between itself and any other State or States, which might cause military damage to the other Party."

I would like to know why this particular clause has been accepted. Does it mean that India cannot have friendly relations with China, which would enable her to move all its troops from India's border and concentrate on the Russian border ? Is that possible ? Does it mean that Russia cannot have friendly relations with China, because then China can bring all the troops from there and mass them on our frontier ? So, this Treaty in a way will freeze the existing international relations and bring India and Soviet Russia closer. These two countries coming closer means that India being a weak nation will have to accept it not the dictates, the pressures of Russia because it is a strong nation. When a weak nation and a strong nation come together, it is inevitable that the weak nation should be guided and controlled by the stronger one.

It is a universal law which nobody can deny. So, these are some of the points which I think must be gone into, and I would like the Defence Minister and some other Ministers, if they are here, to explain to me how this treaty is beneficial both to Russia and to India, on an equal footing. Is it really possible ? These are my doubts. Moreover this treaty is to remain in force for twenty years. Remember that. It is not a sort of temporary alliance or anything of that sort. It is going to be a permanent feature of our international or foreign policy. This is so far as the treaty is concerned.

Now, I come to the statement. So far as the statement is concerned.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : Three minutes more

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I will take five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) : But there are other people.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I will not take more time than you give.

Sir, I would like to draw your attention to this portion—

"In the course of the meetings and talks, both sides noted with satisfaction that their positions on various problems discussed were identical."

Our positions were identical and they do not mention any positions. They mention only two, one is Bangla Desh and the other is Vietnam. Try to compare these two paragraphs, and you will find a vast difference between the two attitudes taken. As regards Bangla Desh, what has been said is, they do not want to use that term 'Bangla Desh' even. They say, 'East Pakistan' and we subscribe to it. Had our Government insisted that U.S.S.R. may say 'East Pakistan' in brackets, but India will say 'Bangla Desh', or we say 'Bangla Desh' and U.S.S.R. says 'East Pakistan' ? It is not so. They most probably said, we cannot use 'Bangla Desh' and we have accepted that. And they then say—

"...in East Pakistan for the achievement of a political solution and for the creation of conditions of safety for the entire people of Pakistan."

So, let there be no doubt that so far as the statement goes, the position is that a solution will be found without breaking the whole of Pakistan because otherwise it cannot satisfy the entire people of Pakistan. Let us be very clear about it ; let there be no quibbling about. Mr. Panda asked me : has not the Prime Minister told you that this is the only solution ? With all respect, I beg to differ. But what happens when you come to Vietnam ? Here, the Indian Government is very grateful that they have been listened to. The words are remarkable. I do not think any Government will say that we are grateful to the representatives of the Soviet Union that they listened to our story. But then, in regard to Vietnam, what is stated ?

"They consider that it will be futile

to attempt to impose any settlement not acceptable to the peoples of the area. They welcomed the recent seven point proposal of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam as a concrete step forward which could form the basis of a peaceful political settlement."

AN HON MEMBER What about Mujibur Rahman?

SHRI N G GORAY Those conditions have been completely accepted, the very conditions that the PRG is putting forward for a settlement. This is what we have committed in Vietnam. But when it comes to Bangla Desh, no Mujibur Rahman, no six-point programme that was put forward by Mujibur Rahman, no mention of Mujibur Rahman even, and no question of Bangla Desh at all.

AN HON MEMBER That is the joint statement.

SHRI N G GORAY This is the joint statement. I want you to compare and contrast. I only say, I am not opposed to this treaty. But what I am saying is, my only hope is, that India should not become complacent because of this treaty. It is prone to be complacent. So many people talked about the big umbrella. And there was a very visible sign of relief. What does it mean? It means that in spite of the assurance by the Defence Minister and the Foreign Minister that we can withstand the onslaught from Pakistan and China, nobody took them seriously, others had not taken this seriously. When Russia came, everybody heaves a sigh of relief that now we can feel secure. That shows—though this is a welcome treaty—the sign of nervousness and less of confidence in ourselves. I wish India to develop its own internal resources so that it can utilise the treaty for its own progress and strength and for its real sovereignty.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A D. MANI) Mr Appan, Please confine yourself to ten minutes because the time is very short. Ten minutes, please.

SHRI G A APPAN (Tamil Nadu) Mr Vice-Chairman, first of all I congratulate

the two countries for concluding this treaty of friendship, cooperation and peace. Mr Vice-Chairman, some years ago there was hatred against communism. Even the Congress people thought that communism was dangerous. But I am happy to see that even Congress people have come in close cooperation and friendship with the Communists.

Previously Russia was considered to be one of the greatest Communist countries. It was believed to be practising drastic type of communism. Gradually it appeared to be transforming into socialism and now this socialism has emerged as the greatest Congress ideal of friendship, cooperation and every lasting peace not only in this country but in the whole world. Sir, this Treaty is a monumental experiment in friendship of the two countries to deal a heavy blow to colonialism, imperialism, dictatorship and those things.

Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, this Treaty works as a deterrent against war-mongers against this country. When the Bangla Desh issue began to crop up some time back people began to come from that country. Everybody then was shouting, "Recognise Bangla Desh". Sir, Bangla Desh is our neighbour and who else will help them except India? In the beginning it was India and India alone which raised its voice against the treachery and hooliganism of the Pakistani aggression and genocide. Our Government, our Prime Minister and our Cabinet have been extending all help to the refugees from the Bangla Desh from the very beginning. Do you mean to say that the mother does not know the difficulties of her children, her foster children also, putting it in the words of Mr Chavan, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, knows the meaning of all these hollow, unnecessary tall cries of "Bangla Desh, Bangla Desh".

Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, there was no difficulty in our country recognising Bangla Desh. We were the first to extend a hand of friendship and shelter for the Bangla Desh people. It was only after we extended the hand of friendship that people from other countries too began to come forward. Sir, when Pakistan mounted aggression on Bangla Desh, everybody was posing the question: Who is our friend? None came to our rescue then. None supported us in

[Shri G. A. Appan]

our pleadings Everybody thought that India had no friends

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Everybody thought that India was alienated. They thought we were trying to court trouble for nothing. Everybody was watching. Everybody was trying to put us on war path. But fortunately we escaped, thanks to the wisdom of the Cabinet of India, Indian Ministers and the Prime Minister. We have been trying to follow the policy of "go-slow"

Mr. Deputy Chairman, who is your friend? A friend in need is a friend indeed. When the whole world began to feel that India has no friend and that India's voice for the recognition of Bangla Desh was a lonely voice, Russia began to come to our help. And when Gromyko came here, it was a real surprise to see the next morning that we had signed a treaty. It was a great joy to me and I was really thunder-struck. Next came the clarion call of our Prime Minister to all the nations to extend their helping hand to save the life of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and to stop the genocide in Bangla Desh. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there is the saying. Tell your friends, I will tell who you are. And the wearer knows where the shoe pinches. You know Russia was a poor country. In Russia, Communism began to develop, socialism began to develop. Ours is a poor country. We are also trying to develop socialism here. So, another poor man has come to the rescue of this poor man. When we are in need, Russia has come to our help and Russia is also trying to help the Bangla Desh movement. So, India went to the support of Russia. And these two countries have now joined hands and we are now trying to fight against the monstrous attack of the Pakistani army against the noble and innocent people of Bangla Desh. They are now even trying to murder or assassinate or kill Sheikh Mujibur Rehman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Treaty is a reiteration and reaffirmation of friendship and acknowledgment and acceptance of our long-standing co-operation and goodwill to help the poor man, the common man, and for universal peace, tranquility and develop-

ment, economic and social. Some people say that this alienates India from non-alignment. How is it? We still have the unfailing, unshakable policy of non-alignment because we are not going to side with the strong people, the colonialists, the money-mad America or the power-mad, bloodmongering Pakistan or the cat-on-the-fence Britain. On account of the continuing support of the Americans, Pakistan is trying to harass the poor Bangla Desh people. They want to strike a heavy financial blow to us by putting our country into a huge financial commitment. We are spending so much of our hard-earned money to help the Bangla Desh people. Of course, we do not feel sorry for that. But instead of thanking the Government of India for all these efforts, some people begin to find fault with the Government of India by demanding "Recognise Bangla Desh, recognise Bangla Desh", as if the Government of India is not interested in this and a handful of people are more interested in this. Now, we are entering into an understanding with a company of very good people. If we only recognise the GDR or grant full recognition to GDR, many more countries like GDR and Russia, almost all the socialist countries, will come to strengthen our hands. It is time that we tried to assert ourselves and win the friendship of more people throughout the world and leave these one or two countries alone to see that they fall at the feet of good people and realise their vicious nature and realise their responsibilities. It is not that they should be doomed for ever. It is better that we should make them understand their vicious nature and bring them round to co-operate and to ask for our co-operation to strengthen peace, universal peace and tranquility in the whole world. With these words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA Sir, I would like to mention an episode which I mentioned on the last occasion, I think, when I made my maiden speech in this House and when the honourable Prime Minister was present. What I am mentioning is a fact and I hope you will believe me. I met the then Vice-President Nixon at Rashtrapathi Bhavan. When the then President Rajendra Prasad was nearby and his good and able wife was standing by, I asked him four questions that day. And the first question was this: You are going to Pakistan? He

said, yes. You are going to arm Pakistan ? He said, yes. You know what will happen to India ? He said, yes. You know which side India will go ? He said, yes. These were the answers he gave in 1955. They have today the perfect exemplification of those objectives of the great President of the United States of America in his present policies. Later on I met him when he came here as President. I had the honour of being invited with my wife for a banquet. He shook hands with everyone there and when he came to me, I said, "I met you there. . . ." And he took back his hand and held tight. And I must say these are the great acts of diplomacy. That was the state of affairs of India. The British tore India into two bits. Then came the Americans. Then came the Chinese. And we have the Russians on our soil. Let us not forget in the history of 25 years when India was torn into two bits, one under the Hindus set against the Muslims and the other under the Muslims set against the Hindus, General Claude Auchinleck in the British Foreign Office said, "We wanted to divide India into two countries, one for the Hindus and the other for the Muslims." I wish I could quote his exact words. I wanted to mention it last time but I forgot. These are the exact words, you can look up, "We wanted to divide India between two countries, one for the Hindus and the other for the Muslims, and we shall back up the Muslims." And they want us to forget what atrocious part they played. It is impossible to forget it. When the late Lal Bahadur Shastri went on a mission to Tashkent, they said, "A time bomb has now been blown and you are facing it." This is the position. And now my learned friend, my great friend, Mr. Goray, for whom I have respect and for whom I am a companion nearly for 35 years since Nasik, said—I think Pandit Nehru told me—you people are doing like that. I wanted to mention to him that but for the PSP and Jan Sangh party we would have had China united with us at least in terms of friendship. You know when the great Chou En-lai. . .

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I accept the compliment

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : He came to our door in 1960, he said, "We shall have Aksai Chin on our side and you will have

NEFA", but you sent him back. Do you think your enemy will come to your door a second time ? When the Prime Minister of Cuba went to Washington, what happened ? They turned him away. These great leaders never come to us a second time. . .

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Alva, Aksai Chin is not a piece of cake to be cut and given.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : I want to quote the words of Pandit Nehru. He said, "I want my dialogue with China to continue, I shall never give it up under any circumstances." Now we lost a great chance. Even General Ayub Khan said, "We shall have a common defence for the sub-continent of India to see Hindu and Muslim soldiers standing together." We lost another great chance. Whatever all that may be, now let us forget that. Now this is said to be the culmination of a great process, the process started by the great Pandit Mohanlal Nehru when he went to Moscow in 1927 with his son and daughter. I still remember—I do not know whether Mr. Goray remembers it or not—when Pandit Nehru came to Poona in 1928 to preside over the first Bombay Youth Conference how the Maharashtra youths were anxious to know all about Russia, all the young men wanted to know all about Russia and their ideas. And those ideas have fructified and I must pay a tribute to Mr. Gromyko for framing two phrases—I am saying it with my apologies to our Foreign Office and the Prime Minister—which are models of clarity and models of our friendship. And he says :

"The significance of this Treaty cannot be over-estimated. It crowns the principled and consistent policy of our two countries aimed at cooperation and friendship."

And the basis of this policy was laid down by the outstanding national leader and statesman Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. And he says—

"Both in friendship and jubilation we have been together. It was so in the past, it is so in the present, for friendship and cooperation."

When Kissinger after Kissinger goes to China by back door and talks to the Chinese

[Shri Joachim Alva]

do they expect us to keep our hands closed ? Do you know what Shri Bulganin said when Great Britain, France and Israel launched an attack on UAR in 1956 ? He said that there will be a nuclear warfare against these three powers if the war against UAR was not stopped. For India it is even a greater occasion than that. We had the fear of China and America and China were helping Pakistan. Then we started this process two years ago. It was an excellent process started by our officers and Ministers and that lady in magic, the Prime Minister of India, sent her Ambassador Shri Dhar to Moscow and then Shri Gromyko came here and signed this Treaty. It was the first time in our history when a Foreign Minister was received with so much ovation.

VII, VIII IX and X are the real paragraphs. Others are claws but these have teeth in them. We have to depend on some one in times of great distress. I would implore of this House whether we want a strong India or not so strong India ? Till the end of the century we shall have to be a self-reliant and strong race, depending on ourselves for arms. You know that Israel has the largest aircraft factory in Asia or Africa except perhaps in Japan which invented great fighters and tremendous aeroplanes in the last war with Americans. We can produce goods ourselves. We have demobilised after 1947 for a short time and sent away some of our officers till the Chinese banged their heads on us. Then we started preparing. This is going to be our process. It is no use saying that these are times of peace. In the next 30 years we shall have to be a very strong nation so as to take care of all these things that may happen. We are not sure of China because they talk very nicely. They are great diplomats. They were sucked by the Europeans to their bones until they became a Communist power and drove everybody out. We cannot find fault with any nation for taking any particular step. Russians also did the same thing. We do not know when India is going to be Communist. That is another position. But if things are going so fast, it is time that we put our house in order so that these things do not occur. Everything depends on ourselves. Many of us are lazy people. If we want to make our country strong we want to be strong in army, aviation and navy. We should not

neglect these things thinking that Soviet Russia will stand by us. There is nothing wrong in friends helping friends. Even Britain had to depend on a large number of friends in the Second War, such as Soviet Union, India, the whole of Europe and America. Otherwise, Britain would not have won and they may not be free today.

I was the first to point out in this House that when the Partition treaty took place, we did not have a look at the Iran Soviet Treaty. Our foreign office was non-existent then and Britishers were there. We did not look at the Iran Soviet Treaty where there was a clause on the ratio of defence. That clause said "If you have three, we will have five and if you disturb that ratio we will come and conquer you." In Indo-Pakistan Treaty we did not have such a clause which said "Your ratio of defence is 5 and our ratio of defence will be 7 or 8 and if you go beyond your ratio, we will take upon our head to take back your country."

What has happened in Bangla Desh is something to be taken care of. And, Sir, we cannot perhaps rush to conclusions and take things on ourselves until we have our own umbrella and nobody else's umbrella on us and we should have our own umbrella and only then, only when we become self-reliant and strong, we can build our great nation.

Sir, these are the points that I would like to urge upon the House. You have given me very short time. But here I would like to say that we do not want any unhappy things as it happened in Czechoslovakia or Hungary. But, Sir, about Hungary, I would like to say one thing. If Russia had not entered Hungary, whatever you might say, foreign powers would have reached some part of Europe and put their feet there. This is what I told Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and he said, "Perhaps this point is correct." I had also talked to Mr. Hugh Gartsell, the British Labour Party Leader and I mentioned to him this. But he did not agree with me. Now, we have two points of view in the sense that the Russians were to go and occupy Hungary and whatever may be said about it, but for that the situation would have become serious and might have caused a state of war and the very existence of Russia might have been threatened. Sir, these are the points that I would like to mention. I do

not want any unhappy things to take place here.

Sir this has been the greatest Treaty since we won independence. There are Clauses in the Treaty which are in our favour; there are Articles which affirm our friendship, friendship between India and the Soviet Union. Sir, they are a great nation. Remember, Sir, which nation was there to help us to find oil for us? Remember, Sir, which nation was there to help us find steel for us? Which is the nation on which we depend so much for our exports? You know we try to export more. Our largest exports go to the Soviet Union and then to England and then to Japan.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : When we talk about exports, we should not always talk in terms of money only. Their best exports are books and those exports are from the Soviet Union and we cannot ignore these things. We co-operate with the Soviet Union in a manner which is intellectual, which is intellectual co-operation. But we have got here in India rotten books from certain countries and some rotten films. Their books are clean and their literature is clean and there is nothing dirty about them. So, Sir, these are the things that we forget and we are asking our boys and girls to go and read those rotten books that are coming into India and the rotten and dirty films that are pouring in. This should not be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Please conclude now.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : Sir, it is a great Treaty and, as I said earlier, I would like our own nation to be very strong and self-reliant and not to depend upon anyone though in times of stress friends will help us. Thank you, Sir.

श्री गंडे मुराहरि : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा को हम नजर में रखते हैं तो लगता है कि शायद हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने यह सोचा कि दुनिया में कुछ दोस्त बनाए और उसी दोस्त बनाने के लक्ष्य को लेकर रूस

के साथ उसने यह समझौता किया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि कुछ इस तरह नजरिया रखना ठीक भी है कि दुनिया में हम कुछ दोस्तों को बना कर रखें क्योंकि आजकल की दुनिया ऐसी है कि जब तक अपना बल इतना नहीं हो जाता कि हम दूसरों का मुकाबला कर सकें तब तक हम लोगों को अगल बगल में दोस्त बनाने की इच्छा होती है। लेकिन मान्य श्री नाथ यह भी देखना है कि जब हम इस तरह की सन्धि करने हैं तो उसका फल क्या होता है, नतीजा क्या होता है। जैसा मान्य श्री नाथ ने अभी बताया, कई चीजें इस सन्धि में हैं जिनके बारे में सरकार को अच्छी तरह से सोचना चाहिए था और इस तरह का निर्णय करने से पहले यह भी सोच लेना चाहिए था कि इस तरह की सन्धि के चलते-चलते हमारे हाथ बंध जायेंगे। मेरे ख्याल में कई ऐसी चीजें हो सकती हैं जो हमारे हाथ को बाध दें खासकर बंगला देश के बारे में। मैं बंगला देश के बारे में इसलिए बोलना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि जो सन्धि आज हमारे सामने आई है बंगला देश की मान्यता के सवाल को और बंगला देश की आजादी के सवाल को लेकर हिन्दुस्तान में जो हलचल मची हुई थी उसको मद्देनजर रखते हुए सरकार ने भट्ट से इस तरह की सन्धि हमारे सामने ला दी। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सन्धि आज की नहीं है, इसकी बातचीत दो-तीन साल में चल रही थी, यह बनी हुई थी लेकिन इसके ऊपर हस्ताक्षर नहीं हुये थे। उस वक़्त हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार नहीं चाहती थी लेकिन अब जो हालत बंगला देश में हुई, जो पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति ने कहा और जो अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति की चीन जाने की बात हुई, उसको देखते हुए सरकार ने इस सन्धि को भट्ट से कर लिया।

श्री महेश्वर नाथ कौल : रूस को भी स्वादिल होगी।

श्री गंडे मुराहरि : रूस की शुरु से स्वा-
हिश थी। जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है, रूस

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

शुरू से चाहता था कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ इस तरह की सन्धि हो जाय। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार दो साल से रुकी हुई थी, आज उनको समझ में आया कि इसको कर लेना चाहिये लेकिन करते समय इन सब विषयों पर सोच लेते कि इसके चलने-चलते हमारे हाथ किसी तरह बंध तो नहीं जाएंगे।

अब अगर हम बंगला देश को लेगे तो हम देखेंगे कि बंगला देश के बारे में जो सरकार कहती आ रही थी कि कल या परसों या दो तीन दिन में उसके बारे में हम कुछ फैसला कर रहे हैं, सिर्फ समय की बात है कि किस वक्त हम फैसला करें, यह बात तो अब नहीं रह गई कि कुछ करना है या नहीं करना है। प्रधान मंत्री ने कई बार यह कहा कि असल में सवाल यह है कि कब करना है। जब अपाचूर्न मोमेंट आया उस वक्त हम उसको मान्यता प्रदान कर देंगे।

SHRI GANESHI LAL CHAUDHARY :
That will never come.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : अगर यह चीज हम अपने सामने रखते हैं तो फिर उस संधि के चलते क्या यह स्थिति रह गई है। क्या इस संधि के चलते हमारे हाथ बंध नहीं गये हैं। हमें इस चीज को देखना पड़ेगा और इस चीज को देख कर आप जवाब दीजिएगा।

साथ ही साथ संधि में वियतनाम का जिक्र है। वियतनाम के बारे में रूस वालों का जो भी कहना था वह हम लोगों ने मान लिया। लेकिन बंगला देश का जो आइडेंटिकल मामला था, मुजीबु-रहमान या अबामा लीग के जो छः सात प्वाइंट के प्रोग्राम थे जिनकी बेसिस पर वहाँ कोई मेटिलमेंट हो सकता था उसको भी हम उनसे मनवाते तो कोई काम बनता और हम समझ सकते थे कि इस संधि के चलते हमारा कुछ फायदा हुआ, इस सब-कॉन्टीनेंट में बंगला देश

का कोई हल होगा, लेकिन आज स्थिति ऐसी है कि जैसा कि पहले भी कहा गया कि जो परिस्थिति है उसको फ्रीज कर दो। इसको फ्रीज तो हमें नहीं करना चाहिये था। असल में हिन्दुस्तान को बंगला देश के बारे में कोई न कोई पोजिटिव स्टेप लेना था। उस सिचुएशन में जाकर अगर हम कोई ऐसी चीज करते हैं जो सारे मामले को फ्रीज कर दे तो उससे हमारा ही नुकसान होता है और किसी और का नुकसान नहीं होता। इस लिए मैं कहूंगा कि जहाँ पर एक साइड कोलाजिकल क्लाइमेट आफ पैदा करने वाले हैं इस संधि के चलते, जिसमें कि आप समझते हैं कि देश में इस तरह का साइकोलाजिकल वातावरण पैदा हो जायगा जहाँ मोरेल व्रोस्टिंग होगी उस समय मैं यह कहूंगा कि इसके जो डिस्एडवांटेज हैं उनको सरकार ने अपने ध्यान में नहीं रखा और इसके बारे में ठीक से नहीं सोचा क्योंकि संधि तो हो गयी 20 साल के लिए, हम बंध गये और 20 सालों के लिए जो भी क्लाइमेट इस संधि में है उनको अगर हम एक-एक को लेगे तो वे सब लागू होंगे और जहाँ उनके चलते हमारा नुकसान होगा वह तो होगा ही, इस लिए मैं चाहता था कि सरकार इसके बारे में ठीक से सोच कर कोई काम करे।

इसके बाद नान-एलाइनमेंट की बात कही गयी। यह कहा गया कि फैसला हमारा है और वह इस सन्धि से खत्म नहीं होता। मैं उस चीज को तभी मानूंगा जब दूसरे देशों के साथ भी आप इस तरह की सन्धि करें तब जा कर इस नान-एलाइनमेंट का कोई स्वरूप हमारे सामने आयेगा। आज तो हम रूस के साथ इस तरह की संधि किये हैं, लेकिन अगर हम दूसरे देशों के साथ भी इस तरह की संधि करें तभी हमारा नान-एलाइनमेंट कायम है यह मैं मान सकता हूँ। इसके साथ ही जो एलाइनमेंट हुआ है रूस के साथ उसके साथ-साथ हम को और आगे बढ़ना चाहिये और दूसरे देशों के साथ भी हम

को ऐसी सधि करनी चाहिये। जैसे पाकिस्तान को हम ले ले तो पश्तूनिस्तान के साथ, उस मामले में हमको कुछ करना चाहिये।

जो पश्तूनिस्तान का मामला है उसको लेकर अफगानिस्तान की सरकार और वहाँ की पार्लियामेंट में हलचल है और पश्तूनिस्तान की माँग का वह समर्थन करते हैं और वह हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में भी सद्भाव रखते हैं और मेरे ख्याल में अगर उनसे कोई सधि होती है तो अच्छा ही होता है। असल में जो बड़े-बड़े मुल्क हैं हम उन्हीं के बारे में सोचते हैं कि वहाँ से हमको कुछ मिल सकता है इस लिये हमारी नेचुरल टेडेसी होती है कि हम बड़े मुल्कों के साथ सधि कर ले। छोटे मुल्कों को हम भूल जाते हैं और मैं तो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को कहूँगा कि जो हमारे आस-पास के मुल्क हैं उनसे खास कर इस तरह की सधिया हमको करनी चाहिए और जितन भी देश हमारे बगल वाले हैं वह जितना ही हमसे बंध जाएगा उतनी ही ज्यादा हमारी सुरक्षा होगी और हमारी सुरक्षा के पक्ष में वे काम कर सकेंगे, चाहे उनके पास उतना बल हो या न हो, हो सकता है कि हमको ही उनकी आवश्यकता पड़ने पर बल देना पड़े, तो भी हमको यह काम करना चाहिये। और साथ-साथ आज आखिरी दिन है, हमारी पार्लियामेंट का, इस लिये इस डिस्कशन में मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि बंगला देश के बारे में जब तक आप कोई पाजिटिव डिसीजन नहीं लेते हैं उसको मान्यता देने के बारे में और उसकी सहायता जब तक आप नहीं करते हैं तब तक हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत बड़े पैमाने पर हलचल मचने वाली है। दो तीन महीनों के बाद ही यह होने वाला है, क्योंकि जो कुछ हमने कहा है पार्लियामेंट के जरिये और सरकार के जरिये कि हम उसको मान्यता देगे लेकिन उस वक़्त जब समय आयेगा, तो पार्लियामेंट तो आज खत्म हो रही है और इस लिये मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि अगर हम जल्दी से जल्दी यह काम नहीं करेंगे तो बहुत जल्दी ही आप सामने

सारे हिन्दुस्तान में एक गड़बड़ी होने की स्थिति पैदा हो जायेगी। इसलिए मैं सरकार को कहूँगा कि इसके बारे में वह सोचे और जो सधि हुई है उसका फायदा तभी होगा जब हम बंगला देश को मान्यता देगे और वह मान्यता देने के बाद अगर पाकिस्तान की ओर से या और किसी ओर से कोई धमकी आती है या हमारे पर अटंक होता है तब हमारी सहायता में कीई आता है या नहीं, रूस हमारी सहायता में आता है या नहीं, यह देखना है और तभी जब वह हमारी सहायता को आयेगा तभी लोगों को यह विश्वास होगा कि इस सधि के कुछ मायने हैं और इससे हमें कोई फायदा हुआ है। वरना हम सोवियत रूस के साथ बंध जाएं हर चीज में, और कई चीजें इस सधि में लगी हुई हैं, और उसके साथ ही हम बंगला देश के बारे में कुछ न कर पायें, तो इस परिस्थिति में लोग एक महीने तक तो चुप रहेंगे, वह सोचेंगे कि रूस के साथ हुई सधि से कोई फायदा होने वाला है, लेकिन एक या डेढ़ महीने के बाद लोगों की समझ में आ जाएगा कि इससे कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। हम बेकार ही उनके साथ बंध गये तो इससे लोगों का धैर्य समाप्त हो जाएगा और उनका गुस्सा सरकार के खिलाफ होगा। इस लिये मैं आज ही चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि बंगला देश के बारे में सरकार जल्द में जल्द कुछ करे और शेख मुजीबुर्हमान का जो ट्रायल शुरू हुआ है वह अगर चलता है और वह शेख को फासी देते हैं तो उससे हुई हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर की हलचल को आप रोक नहीं पायेंगे। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि आपने सधि तो अच्छी की है, उसमें पार्लियामेंट अब कुछ कर नहीं सकती, इसको कोई रैटीफिकेशन की पावर नहीं, अगर होती तो इसके बारे में दूसरे ही ढंग से बहस होती, लेकिन अब चूँकि सधि हो गयी है और उसके प्राविजनस के बारे में अगर अभी भी कुछ हो मके तो हम रूस के साथ उसके लिये बात चीत कर सकते हैं और रूस के साथ बात करके जहा नदीली की जरूरत हो उसको कर सकते हैं।

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

इसमें रिबीजन का क्लोज होगा और न हो तभी भी तब्दीली हो सकती है। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस बारे में मोचे और उचित कार्यवाही करे।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mani, only five minutes please.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy-Chairman, Sir, within the five minutes you have allotted to me, I would like to say that the debate has revealed that the treaty has received overwhelming support from many sections of the House. There are, of course, critics, of the treaty.

In view of the Indo-Pak sub-continent the treaty was a necessity in the interests of the Indian people. We had to conclude a treaty in order to give ourselves a sense of security in view of the threats hold out by the Pakistani military regime against the security of India and the threat of war over which President Yahya Khan spoke very violently the other day. I would like to say that we have been subjected to the taunt that we are alone in the world but, today we are not alone in the world.

We have a known friend who has entered into a treaty with us. It 6 P.M. has been said that we have not completely departed from non-alignment. I may not be able to agree with it academically. There has been a slight shift in the non-alignment policy. We have not entered into any military pact or alliance but there is no doubt that we have a friendly power on our side in regard to the matters concerning our security. Sir, Article 9 of the Treaty to which reference has been made by other speakers in this House, gives us the benefit of a military alliance without our being a party to the military alliance at all, but in the event of our country being subjected to attack we can always expect the Soviet Union to come to our help, not with men, but in other ways so that we have some safeguard against aggression on our leaders as a result of hostile action by Pakistan.

Sir, I would like to mention that the communique which was issued by the two Ministers after the conclusion of the Treaty

mentioned somewhere that we are more careful that our point of view on Bangla Desh was understood by them. I can quote from the Communique but the time allotted to me is short. I do not think that we should indulge in such a language at all. We need not be grateful to anybody for understanding our problem. It is their duty, as intelligent people, to understand this problem. We should not give any impression that we are occupying a somewhat subordinate position in regard to this matter and I hope that this point of view will be taken note of by the Minister of External Affairs.

Sir, I would like to say that there has been some feeling that the duration of the Treaty for a period of 20 years is perhaps too much in the present circumstances. 20 years means that we are committing ourselves to the observance of the Treaty for full four Lok Sabha terms. Perhaps it would have been desirable if we had restricted the Treaty to a duration of ten years. One could have understood this because within 20 years a revolution may take place in the Soviet Russia itself. A revolution has already taken place in the Soviet Union after Stalin. We should not have bound ourselves for such a long period of 20 years.

I would like to raise one more question and I hope the Minister would answer it. A question has been asked whether this Treaty prevents us from having negotiations with China. It has been urged that we must have a dialogue with China. Does it mean that this Treaty might come in the way of our having any dialogue with China, I personally share that view. I would like the Minister to say on this because we are not bound by the Soviet Union views on China or on any other matters excepting those which concern our security. I feel, therefore, that we must have freedom to negotiate with China, if necessary, and the situation permits.

The other point that I would like to make is, a number of observers are quite unhappy about the conditions prevailing in, what you are calling, the Communist countries of Enrope.

All of them are trying to assert their autonomy. We did not approve of intervention by Soviet Union in Hungary or Czechoslovakia. Anything may happen at any stage, but we must have freedom to

take appropriate action and devise our own policy if such a situation were to arise in Europe at any time. This is a matter of fundamental importance to our country and I hope that as a result of the wording of this Treaty, not only the security of this country would be safeguarded, but we would have the satisfaction of maintaining the same kind of independent action in regard to foreign affairs which is a part of our independent heritage.

Sir, I would like to say that whatever might be the shortcomings in the eyes of critics about this Treaty, this is the best for our people and we have concluded it at a time when it was an absolute necessity for our own safety. I think the Government deserves warm congratulations for concluding this Treaty which gives India protection against aggression from any other quarter.

I hope this will enable us to deal with a little more firmly with the problem of Bangla Desh because this is a matter on which I do not want to suggest to Government that a particular line of action should be taken but I feel, Sir, that it should give us a little more freedom to take initiative for a solution of the problem of Bangla Desh.

SHRIMATI PRATIBHA SINGH (Bihar) Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to congratulate the Government on the signing of the Treaty with Soviet Union on the 9th August, 1971. It is a document for the rededication to the cause of peace in Asia. This Treaty is designed to extend the horizon of peace in Asia and particularly in Indo-Soviet sphere. This document clearly demonstrates that India and Soviet Union stand on one platform wherever peace in Asia is concerned. It also shows that they stand united even when some big powers may wish to interfere—whether they are big in scientific and technical knowhow of war materials or they are big so far as manpower is concerned.

It is, Sir, wrong to say that this Treaty has been signed in a hurry owing to particular circumstances, i.e., due to fear of USA, China and Pakistan coming together. That is not so. It has been signed because Soviet Union and India have truly faith in peace. They have recognised the awakening of oppressed people in Asia. It is this awakening that has created the present

situation in Bangla Desh. Who is Mujibur Rehman? He is the symbol of revolution. He is the symbol of the aspirations of the people who have been oppressed for years and years economically, politically, linguistically and specially geographically and have been discriminated against. According to Arnold Freleigh an authority on International Law, a combination of two conditions, geographical separation and denial of political rights are sufficient to justify the demand for independence.

India and Soviet Union have signed this Treaty because they do not want India or even Bangla Desh to be a testing ground for the new weapons of human destruction as was done in Vietnam and Korea. The Treaty would make the adventurers think many times before launching unjust and irresponsible actions. And, yet, Sir, this document is not a war pact like the Warsaw Pact or like NATO and SEATO. This document is an agreement not about war but about the threat of war. The U N has been trying to define aggression for the last 15 years but has not been able to do so. And yet everybody knows what aggression is. We have made an advance, it is preventive end not a cure. We have said that not only on aggression but as soon as there appears to us any threat of aggression the two countries shall immediately enter into mutual consultation in order to remove such threat and to take effective measures to ensure peace and security. Sir, one should mark the words 'effective measures' which have great significance. Otherwise the framing of the sentence in Article IX could have been "to take such measures to ensure peace and security etc." What I mean to emphasize is that the word 'effective' has great importance and significance so far as the operative part of Article IX is concerned. As you know, Sir, Article IX clearly indicates that the two countries will not wait for the commitment of aggression but shall start taking action as soon as the threat of aggression appears.

Another important aspect in Article IX is that the Contracting Parties will abstain from providing any assistance, i.e., sale of arms etc. to the third party that engages in armed conflict with the other party. This should provide some sense of security to India at a moment when there is threat of aggression from a neighbouring country.

[Shrimati Pratibha Singh]

Similarly Article X is also important when it mentions that the contracting parties shall not entertain any obligation secret or public with one or more States which is incompatible with this treaty. It further adds that no obligation exists nor shall any obligation be entered into between itself and other State or States which might cause military damage to the other party. Here mark the words "no obligation exists etc." that is to say that even if there were any, after 9th August, 1971 no obligation exists. This too is a great achievement. Even if there were some previous treaties with some States who could cause military damage to either India or Soviet Union they shall be considered non-existent.

As for non-alignment, let nobody confuse this with indifference to happenings in the world. We have been in the past and are now quite interested in what happens around us. We have maintained freedom in our approach to every individual case on merit and sought justice for those who have been denied justice. This, I am sure, India will still continue to do and that is our non-alignment and it remains secure.

So, Sir, this treaty nowhere infringes the right of the Government to decide its national interests and to develop relations with other States. It at no place restricts us from the right to recognise Bangla Desh at the opportune moment. As each country decides the issues on the basis of certain principles based on considerations of National Independence, on grounds of economic considerations and many other relevant factors, it has the right to decide what arrangement to forge keeping in view its time honoured principles. Diplomatic relations need not mean camp-following. Diplomatic arrangements between countries need not create a sphere of influence. We do not entertain the concept of gaining power over the other countries in Asia. But we do wish that every country in Asia should have independence and freedom to develop as it wants without outside interference as that is the only way peace and stability in Asia can be maintained.

Some critics may question that when we talk of Bangla Desh we are interfering in the internal matter of Pakistan. That is clearly not so. The case of Bangla Desh is different. In Bangla Desh the democratic

rights were exercised in an unambiguous manner unanimously by the people. They are now being suppressed by the Military Junta. The genocide in Bangla Desh has surpassed all such acts in the past by either Hitler in Germany or other Hanibals in the world. Seven and a half million people have been uprooted besides those ruthlessly murdered. These 75 million people have now taken refuge in India. This has resulted in upsetting many of our plans besides threatening economic imbalance in our country. This has jeopardised the very security of our country. The Bangla Desh question has posed a threat of war in Asia owing to the wrong and fallacious appreciation of facts by the Nixon Government while a common American citizen recoils at the brutality done by the military dictatorship, the Nixon Government is guided by the consideration of the role that Islamabad has to play in their global strategy. They have blundered in Korea, they have blundered in Viet Nam and now they are going to make a greater blunder in Bangla Desh.

This treaty is, therefore, a contrast to the approach that is being followed in the present-day world by certain powers which has led basically to many crises in the world. Sir, it has been argued that the treaty concluded for duration of twenty years is far too long a period. I may humbly be permitted to say that twenty years in a nation's life is not much. In fact, no period is long enough to carry on friendship, to work for peace and to co-operate for the development of science, technology and research. It is a known fact that researches in many important lines and particularly in the space are being conducted only by two countries, namely, the USA and the Soviet Union. This treaty may enable both India and the Soviet Union to march together with faster and quicker strides in their researches. Hence, Sir, 20 years is not too long a time. Sir, lastly, as India gains by the friendship of the Soviet Union, so does the Soviet Union gain by the friendship of India. It gets the support of the vast millions of people residing in India to work for peace not only in Asia but in the world besides the development of trade, commerce and other things.

Sir, this treaty is a landmark in the course of a journey undertaken over a period of 20 to 30 years in the recent history of India. We fully support this.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM. Sir, I am grateful to the House and the hon Members for the overwhelming support that has been extended to this treaty. We started the debate at 2.00 P.M., nearly 17 Members have participated, and it was only four Members who have but not so categorically, opposed the treaty. They found themselves in a very difficult situation, whether to extend unqualified support to it or to indicate their reservations by expressing their doubts. I find it difficult myself to put my hon friend, Shri Gurupadaswamy in the category of two 'bhais'—I mean Dr. Bhai Mahavi and Shri Dahyabhai—the two 'bhais' in juxtaposition. I find it difficult myself to place Shri Gurupada Bhai in that company.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN. He is not in the company.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM. And he is not. But he found himself in difficulty, due to some psychological reasons, if not ideological, to extend wholehearted support to this treaty. And he expressed a few doubts. I am sure, if he later, again, cares to go through the various clauses of the treaty, he will find that his doubts are not sustainable. I am sure that again, he will read the treaty, the whole text of the treaty. Perhaps, the various doubts that he expressed were projections of his own apprehensions as to whether as a result of this treaty America will not feel more pushed and extend more assistance to Pakistan. It may be, but what is the position of the USA today? Today the Nixon Administration has succeeded in isolating itself from the people of America, they have succeeded in isolating themselves from their own legislature. And if President Nixon does not read the signs of the times in his own country and further extends his help and assistance to Pakistan, I think he will be harming his cause more than the cause of India. Sir, he asked whether it will not push China closer to Pakistan. You know the relation between Russia and China; the relation between India and China is also there. The relation between Pakistan and China is not a secret thing.

The question is whether this Treaty will encourage China to render more assistance to Pakistan, whether it will encourage Pakistan to commit some more acts of

madness or whether it will produce some salutary effect on Pakistan so that it desists from entering into acts of madness. I have no doubt this will work as a positive deterrent to any kind of madness on the part of Pakistan. And if Pakistan does not control itself, it will have to pay very dearly for that.

It is argued that this Treaty has been entered into in a state of nervousness on the part of India. The doubt has been removed on more than one occasion by our Prime Minister that this is not the case. As has already been explained, this idea of having such a treaty originated some two years ago. Mr Arjun Arora is not here. He asked why did it take two years. There was no continuous negotiation for two years. The idea originated two years back. Some talks were held. But as to when it should be announced was to be decided. Naturally it was to be done at the most appropriate time. And it was felt that in the mutual interest, not only in the interest of India but in the mutual interest, this was the most appropriate time to sign the Treaty and to announce it, and it has been done.

Then the question was raised by my friend, Shri Gurupadaswamy, and also Mr Dahyabhai Patel whether after this Treaty we will be free to take some decisions or actions as we like in relation to Bangla Desh. If you read the Treaty you will find that there is nothing in the Treaty which restricts or abridges the sovereignty of the two countries in any way. Therefore, India is free. Unless India herself desires to consult Russia she is free to take any action as a sovereign, independent nation in relation to Bangla Desh whether it is a matter of recognition or any matter which will advance the cause of Bangla Desh.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Shall I ask a question? It is mentioned in the communique about the entire people of Pakistan. Does it not restrict?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM. I was coming to that. Let it be remembered that any statement by either of the Foreign Ministers, or even the joint communique by the two Ministers does not over-ride the clauses of the Treaty. The statement can be over-ridden by the Treaty but the Treaty cannot be over-ridden by the statements either of India's Minister of External Affairs or the

[Shri Jagjivan Ram]

Foreign Minister of Russia or by the joint statement That should be clear

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN It is not conflicting also

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : I am saying that this should be accepted that the Treaty is not to be over-ridden by the statements. The statements are clarificatory and explanatory of the Treaty. Therefore, I say that this Treaty does not in any way infringe, restrict, abridge or detract from the sovereign rights of both the countries. And, therefore, we are free to take any action at the opportune time as our judgement may dictate in relation to Bangla Desh

It has been further said that this Treaty means that we are bidding good-bye to our policy of non-alignment. Non-alignment does not mean that the country is static. It does not mean that we are immobile.

Non-alignment is a dynamic policy with vigour and vitality. And that has been demonstrated. It does not mean that we must stand at a particular point and we do not move this side or that side, forward or backward. That will be no policy. The policy of non-alignment is not a policy of neutrality. I think it is Mr. Mani who said that we have moved a little.

SHRI A. D. MANI A slight shift in non-alignment.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : As I have said, the policy of non-alignment does not mean a static policy.

SHRI A. D. MANI It is not bad, but there is a shift.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : I am not saying bad or good. But it is the quality of the policy of non-alignment to be dynamic with vigour and vitality. Therefore, this does not detract us from our policy of non-alignment. The question was raised whether we have joined a bloc. If you will read the terms of the Treaty, you will find that it will be a very remote idea to impart any meaning like that. We have not joined any bloc. As a matter of fact, the blocs are crumbling. New alignments are taking place. And it

has been India's good fortune that we have been in a position to influence many nations to realise that ultimately it is the policy of non-alignment which will be contributory to everlasting peace in the world. Therefore, I wanted to remove this misapprehension. This Treaty does not mean abandonment of the policy of non-alignment which India has pursued so long and proposes to pursue in the future because India is convinced that there cannot be a more fruitful and purposeful policy than the policy of non-alignment which will be in keeping with the traditions of India. As was pointed out by Mr. Chagla, India has the proud privilege of being the one country in history which never tried with sword and fire to deprive any nation of its sovereignty and independence and freedom. And we want to pursue that policy. If our sovereignty is dear to us and valued, we feel that the sovereignty and freedom of other nations are equally dear to them. Even when India was fighting for her own independence, she always supported nations and peoples fighting for independence and freedom.

Regarding the period of 20 years, many points and doubts that have been raised have been effectively replied to by hon. Members in this House itself and to that extent my task has become very light. Twenty years is not a very long period. I look at it from another aspect. The friendship between India and Soviet Russia is likely to be so enduring that 20 years will not be a long period. India is a developing country and has to develop in many fields. And by this friendship with a developed country which has made spectacular progress both in science and technology, India has to profit much in this age of science and technology. This Treaty which covers, apart from security, many aspects of development, will help the country in all-round development and in making India a nation which can be self-reliant and can stand on her own legs.

That was pleaded by several Members. Dr. Bhai Mahavir and Shri Dahyabhai, as I have said, raised many doubts which are not sustainable. Many of them have been effectively replied by other Members, by Mr. Bipinpal, by Mr. Panda, and others. I do not want to take the time of the House in repeating those arguments. But I will come to this thing. It has been raised by my friend, Mr. Goray about some articles of the Treaty. About Article 2 where we talk

of disarmament, I will put it to Mr. Goray himself; Does it contain anything new? Have we not persistently and consistently pleaded in all international bodies what has been included in this Article? Have we not consistently stood for disarmament? Does it mean that if we signed the Treaty for disarmament, we and Russia will have to disarm ourselves and leave other nations of the world to go on arming themselves? Certainly it is quite clear and if he applies his analytical mind, Mr. Goray will find that it is disarmament under an effective international control. What does that mean? It envisages a situation where by agreement of the nations concerned an international agency will be established to see that no nation or big powers are running an arms race when they have agreed to disarm, and this body will supervise how far they are implementing that. Does it mean that because India and Soviet Union signed this thing which they have been professing for so long, India will be debarred, if India at any time decides, from the other uses of nuclear power? Does it mean that this Treaty will come in the way? It will not. It does not restrict our sovereign right. At present we have decided that we will develop nuclear power for peaceful purposes, for development work. But if at any time we think that it should be diverted to other uses also, I do not think this Treaty will come in the way; whether it is the nuclear thing or the conventional weapons, it is quite clear. Similarly, he raised doubts, I think, about Article 6. Well, here again what is exceptional in it? We have said that in important international matters we will consult each other. We exchange delegations, we will have discussions at higher levels. I do not think there is anything which restricts or abridges our sovereign right to take such actions to have any relation with any country in the world. I am quite clear about that. Therefore, I will again appeal to Mr. Goray to apply his analytical mind once more to the various Article not with prejudiced and predetermined views and he will find that the doubts and suspicions that he is entertaining are not sustainable by the wordings of the Treaty. I need not argue that this Treaty is not a Treaty for aggression. It is distinctly different from various Treaties that there are like the CENTO, the SEATO, the NATO, and others. And it has been argued very effectively by others. Then I

come to the real question—I am skipping over various points that were raised by Dr. Bhai Mahavir like what appeared in the London Times...

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Will you kindly tell me what the implication of this article 10 is?—

“Each High Contracting Party solemnly declares that it shall not enter into any obligation, secret or public, with one or more States, which is incompatible with this Treaty. Each High Contracting Party further declares that no obligation exists, nor shall any obligation be entered into, between itself and any other State or States, which might cause military damage to the other Party.”

Who interprets whether military damage is done or not?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : Each High Contracting Party further declares that no obligation exists, nor shall any obligation be entered into, between itself and any other State or States, which might cause military damage to the other Party. If either of the two Contracting Parties feels that some action by one Party has caused some military damage to the other Party, the Treaty itself provides for an instrument for resolving that.

SHRI A. D. MANI : He wants to know who will decide it.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : If you care to read the Treaty, it provides how in case of a difference between interpretations the matter will be settled. It will be settled by bilateral discussion as to whether any infringement of this Treaty has taken place or not. There is no arbitration clause and therefore we will not go to a third Party. If there is any difference between the two Parties, they will sit together and decide. This has been provided for in the Treaty itself. I will again appeal to him to go through all the clauses in which case he will find that all his doubts are removed.

Shri D. D. Puri mentioned about the Pak-occupied Kashmir and Shri Goray caught hold of that as a straw. It may be argued that if Pakistan uses that territory for any action against Russia, will it not be

[Shri Jagjivan Ram]

interpreted that India has permitted Pakistan to use that territory which is virtually India's territory against Russia ? But Russia will not be so devoid of commonsense as to blame India for that. It was a very interesting argument which was raised by Shri D. D. Puri and Shri Goray found that perhaps it was a very good stick. I do not think that Russia will be so devoid of commonsense as to think that India has 'permitted and not prevented' as the wording of the Treaty says. It is a far-fetched argument and far-fetched suspicion that has been imported into the text of the Treaty.

Then comes the most important point, what about the joint statement and Vietnam and Bangla Desh. As it is I do not find any mention of Bangla Desh in it. What has been mentioned is about East Pakistan. I am quite clear, whatever interpretation there might be, when we think of a political settlement, we think of a settlement which will receive the approval of the elected representatives of Bangla Desh.

AN HON MEMBER : Already elected representatives

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : I have no doubt about that. I am not thinking of any future election. I am speaking of already elected members of the National Assembly and provincial assemblies. Any settlement should meet with their approval. Here it has been said that it will be good for the entire of Pakistan. Certainly it will be to the good of the entire of Pakistan. Today people of Bangla Desh are suffering, no doubt.

But there is no doubt that the people of the whole of Pakistan are paying very heavily for that. I may not feel for the Administration of Pakistan. But certainly I do feel for the people of West Pakistan as such and, therefore, India has to think of the entire people of Pakistan. The Administration of Pakistan, the military junta of Pakistan, is to blame. Certainly I am not going to blame the entire people of Pakistan. Therefore, any solution by Pakistan will be to the benefit of the people of Pakistan. It may also be interpreted that if a political solution is not found for Bangla Desh, is it inconceivable that there will be repetition of several

Bangla Deshes in West Pakistan as well ? Why not read those things in the general statement ? I read it through and it is clear that if the political solution is not found for Bangla Desh—and political settlement does not mean anything except independence of Bangla Desh—the elected representatives, the already elected representatives of Bangla Desh, have made it clear in unmistakable terms that nothing is going to satisfy them. And, for India, which has received nearly seven to eight million citizens of Bangla Desh who have been forced out from there by the military rulers of Pakistan, the only condition under which it can send them to their hearths and homes will be when they will be assured that their life, property and honour will be safe in Bangla Desh.

And, Sir, that condition and assurance can be given only when they know that Bangla Desh is not going any more to be ruled by the military junta of Pakistan, but by the elected representatives of Bangla Desh. I am quite clear on that point and the Government of India is quite clear on that point and I find the germ of what I have said in the joint communique issued by the two Ministers. Let us also not create any unsustainable doubts and suspicions as to whether, in the name of cultural relations and economic or technological conditions, Russia will send a large number of people to overwhelm Indian culture and Indian economy. This is a far-fetched argument. It can be an argument if India, the leaders of India, whether of this party or that party, have not enough sense to safeguard their interests, culture and tradition. Why presume such things ? It does not go to the credit of the nation to presume such things and make allegations, to create such doubts and such suspicions.

India is a proud nation, is a developing country, and it has a tradition, a background of tradition and culture which is comparable to that of any country in the world. Why should India be afraid of being overwhelmed by other cultures ? Therefore, all these doubts should not be raised. Russia has an ideology. But why are you afraid of the value of our ideology ? Why are you afraid that you would be sucked away ? Because you are doubtful about your own background. If you are not, well, you can assimilate and you can adopt any ideology to suit your own genius and I think India

has that genius and I think India has that capacity

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI You have taken it like a Hindu, because Hinduism can assimilate anything

SHRI JAGIVAN RAM I am speaking like a good Indian. You see, I am speaking like a good Indian. India has that genius and India has shown that capacity to assimilate several cultures which came with a view to invading Indian cultures, but which were assimilated in the Indian culture. So, I am speaking like a good Indian, an Indian who is proud of his culture, who is proud of his composite culture, and therefore, we should not be apprehensive on these trivial matters. We want to make friends and that has been the tradition of India. We never subjugated any country and we never conquered the territory of any country.

But, then, certainly we are proud of conquering the hearts of the people of many nations. Why not revive that tradition of India that without conquering the territory of any country we will conquer the hearts of many nations and many countries? And that is possible only by the message which our great Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru gave to the world—the message of co-existence. The various philosophies and various values can co-exist to complement and supplement each other for making human life more happy. And, therefore, the spirit of this treaty does not prevent us in any way from entering into such treaties with other nations. It will be our endeavour to persuade other nations also, in mutual interest, to have such treaties. As I have said this treaty does not in any way affect our policy of non-alignment does not in any way preclude us from having such

relations with other countries as in our judgement we think will be to our national interest and to mutual benefit.

Russia has been helpful to us even without this treaty. But after this treaty we will have a political and legal base. Let us hope that our friendship will be enduring and, as has been proclaimed by both of us, the interests of peace will be everlasting in which the developing countries of the world may develop and aspire to have a standard of living which will be comparable to the developed countries of the world. In that spirit, I think, this treaty is one which should be welcomed by all thinking people, by all people who want peace in the world and orderly development to make human life happier and pleasanter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gorav, do you want to press your amendment?

SHRI N. G. GORAY : No, Sir. I would like to withdraw my amendment.

* Amendment No. 1 is, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, Secretary says that we have to adjourn *sine die*. We have worked very hard. And I hope that hon. Members will enjoy their hard earned recess. May I offer my sincere greetings to the hon. Members for the Independence Day tomorrow? I am adjourning the House *sine die*.

The House adjourned *sine die* at forty-nine minutes past six of the clock.

*For text of amendment, *vide* cols. 64–65 *supra*.