

(V) The Lokpal and Lokayuktas Bill, 1968.

(I) "I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd July, 1968, has adopted the following motion extending the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Bill, 1968:—

"That this House do extend the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to make provision for the appointment and functions of certain authorities for the investigation of administrative action taken by or on behalf of the Government or certain public authorities in certain cases and for matters connected therewith, upto the first day of the next session'."

(II) "I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 22nd July, 1968, has adopted the following motion extending the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1967 :—

"That this House do extend the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to provide for the inclusion in, and the exclusion from, the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, of certain castes and tribes, for the readjustment of representation, and re-delimitation of parliamentary and assembly constituencies in so far as such readjustment and redelimitation are necessitated by such inclusion or exclusion and for matters connected therewith, upto the first day of the second week of the Budget Session ('969)."

(III) "I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 22nd July, 1968, has adopted the following motion extending the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Government (Liability in Tort) Bill, 1967:—

"That this House do extend the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to define and amend the law with respect to the liability of the Government in tort and to provide for

certain matters connected therewith upto the last day of the next session."

(IV)

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 22nd July, 1968, has adopted the following motion extending the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Contract Labour (Regulations and Abolition) Bill, 1967 :—

"That this House do extend the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to regulate the employment of contract labour in certain establishments and to provide for its abolition in certain circumstances and for matters connected therewith, upto the first day of the next session'."

(V) 'I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on Monday, the 22nd July, 1968, adopted the following motion in regard to the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Bill, 1968 :—

"That this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do appoint a member of Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee on the Bill to make provision for the appointment and functions of certain authorities for the investigation of administrative action taken by or on behalf of the Government or certain public authorities in certain cases and for matters connected therewith, in the vacancy caused by the death of Shri Harish Chandra Mathur and do communicate to this House the name of the member so appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

I am to request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said motion, and also the name of the member of Rajya Sabha appointed to the Joint Committee may be communicated to this House."

#### **MOTION RE THE SITUATION ARISING OUT OF THE DECISION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE U.S.S.R. TO SUPPLY ARMS TO PAKISTAN**

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I move :— "That the situation arising out of the decision of the Government of the U. S. S. R. to supply arms to Pakistan and the Government of India's stand in relation thereto, be taken into consideration."

[Shir M. N. Kaul]

Madam, as in individual relations, so also in international relations it is good to recall the past, the good old past of the Indo-Russian relations, particularly when relations with the Soviet Union are under strain as they certainly are as a result of the decision of the U.S.S.R. to supply arms to Pakistan. What is this past? We cannot forget the consistent support that the Soviet Union gave throughout the period from 1948 onwards till the cold war subsided. The echo of the words 'Kashmir is an integral part of India' still rings in our ears. On numberless occasions they exercised their veto against the joint efforts of Britain and the United States to damage our position in regard to Kashmir. Again, the Soviet Union gave us economic aid in spheres which were of vital importance to the development of our economy at a time when similar help was not available from the United States or Britain and last but not the least they gave us military aid and equipment which stood us in good stead in the war with Pakistan in 1965. It is good, as I said, to recall these facts in order that our current relations with Russia might be viewed in their true perspective and we take a balanced and not an excited view of the current developments. At the same time it is good to remember that relations between nations are governed by mutual self-interest and there was certainly an element of self-interest in the attitude that the Soviet Union adopted at that time in relation to Kashmir and generally in regard to Indian affairs. The cold war was at its height and it was the policy of the United States of America to encircle Russia at all points, particularly when Mr. Dulles was at the height of his power, and Pakistan was certainly an important link in that chain of encirclement round Russia. And the Russians have never forgotten it. Whenever I have visited Russia—and I have visited Russia three times—I have heard that whenever a Pakistani delegation visits Russia they are confronted with the remark 'what about the U-2?'. Now the U-2 is something which is engrained in the mind of the Russians. It was from Rawalpindi that the U-2 planes flew over Soviet Russia for military reconnaissance spotting out the location of strategic installations. Certainly in that period there could not be any contacts, there could not be any relations between Pakistan and Russia. Pakistan was a definite ally of the United States and was taking a line which was completely hostile to the Soviet Union. The cold war attained its climax at the time of Cuba and after that it slowly be-

gan to subside and contacts between the United States and Russia began to develop. This was reinforced by the deterioration of relations between Russia and China. Concurrently, Pakistan, taking the hint from its major ally, the United States, and others, also tried to cultivate relations with Russia. Initially there were formal visits, exchanges of delegations, trade delegations and other contacts, but in reality it was to find out what the Russian reaction was to the changing situation in world politics. Pakistan in their own interests tried to probe Russian feelings in regard to them. In the first instance, they found the Russian feelings rather cool, because the past takes some time to die out. Then came the war in 1965. At that time the matter came up before the Security Council, and, for the first time, it was clear to us that the Soviet Union was taking a stand which was somewhat different from its earlier stand. For the first time in the history of the U.N. Resolutions on Kashmir, an agreed resolution on a major issue was passed by all the three powers, the USA, the UK and Russia. I am not going into the details of it. The substance of that was that Russia, in effect, sided with the United Kingdom and the United States on the question of our withdrawal from Haji Pir Pass, Tithwal and other strategic areas in Kashmir which we had occupied in our own territory and which we wanted to retain in order to safeguard our position and in order to prevent any infiltration from Pakistan. In his talks with U Thant, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Shastri, took a firm line on this matter, but it has to be remembered that so far as Russia was concerned it did not support us in our stand. It agreed with the other powers, namely, the United States and the UK, that we should withdraw to the line or position where we stood on August 5, 1965, i.e., when the infiltration started.

Much is said as to what happened at Tashkent. It is said that pressure was applied. There was no open or direct pressure. Surely our relations with Russia are not of such a character—till the present time at any rate—that they would directly say to us: "If you do not do this or do not do that, we will take such reciprocal action." At the same time we cannot forget the fact that in the background and in the mind of the Indian Prime Minister the thought was there that, if he took a strong line on the question of our withdrawal from Haji Pir Pass and other areas, he would not have the support of Russia in the matter. That was quite plain. These

pressures are not something which are directly applied. The pressures, so to say in international politics flow from the attitudes that are taken by various powers who are interested in this matter.

So, it is clear from 1964 or at any rate from 1965 that a change was discernible in the Russian attitude. I well remember when the then Prime Minister, Mr. Shas-tri, returned after his first visit from Russia. I had a brief talk with him, from which I could sense—at any rate that was the impression I had in my mind—that he felt that the Russian approach was undergoing a change. So the Russian attitude on Kashmir and other allied matters was undergoing a change. Perhaps this will be apparent from the notes that the Head of our Government and certainly our External Affairs Ministry recorded at that time that this gradual and perceptible change in the Russian attitude was noticeable. No longer was the phrase "Kashmir is an integral part of India" heard so often. Now, the current phrase is that "India and Pakistan should settle their affairs between themselves without any outside interference." So, the change was certainly noticeable. There are many instances which could be cited as evidence of this slow and gradual change. Our Government was aware of it. Certainly our Embassy must have been aware of it, although it might not have been openly and directly expressed for diplomatic reasons. Parliament, in any case, was conscious of it. Then members put questions to the Government. The matter came to a head when the Russians supplied helicopters to Pakistan. At that time direct questions were asked in Parliament from the then Minister of External Affairs and I regret so say that at that time—I read the debate again—the line taken was that the transaction was not between Government and Government, but it was with a body corresponding to our State Trading Corporation and Russia classified helicopters as civilian supplies. Surely the Government was conscious of the slow, changing attitude of Russia. They should have taken Parliament more into confidence and they should have given out their view that, although the helicopters were classified as 'Civil supplies', we were certainly apprehensive that they will be used for military purposes. I think that the Government's approach at that time and in this period should have been one of apprising Parliament and the country, that is to say slowly and gradually, indicating to Parliament and the country that the Russian position was undergoing a slow change. If

that had been done, at the present time the country would not have been so shocked by the sudden announcement of military supplies to Pakistan.

So, my submission is that the shift was noticeable, that Parliament should have been taken into confidence to the extent it was diplomatic to do so. On the contrary, the Government played down the element of shift. I am one of those who believe that good relations with Russia should be maintained, but those relations will be maintained provided we do not base our approach on sentiment, but on a realistic consideration of the situations as they develop from time to time. If we feel that a change is discernible, we should say so discreetly so that the country knows what is happening.

Now, it is a settled fact of history that Russia has decided to supply arms to Pakistan. The Deputy Prime Minister, speaking in the other place yesterday, said that the fact of shift in policy was more important than the quantum of military supplies. In a sense it is true that the shift in policy is important and we are certainly concerned about it, but that has now passed into history. Nothing that our Government can do will, I feel, make Russia reverse this policy. So the shift in policy has become now a settled fact. If that be so, the quantum of aid is an important matter and we have to bear that in mind. I do not think that we are entitled to ask from Russia as to what supplies they have given to Pakistan. They may in their conversation say: "If we give you this information, Pakistan may request us to give them similar information about India." And thus we will be involved in these diplomatic conversations. "We should not rely too much upon information that may or may not be derived from Russia. We should rely upon our own sources, and information with regard to military equipment of any country is now readily available in the world. The Institute of Strategic Studies, a very competent Institute in London, in America and elsewhere make it their business to collect every scrap of information from every part of the world and from time to time it is published. A great deal of information is also from time to time available from such summaries of evidence as are released by the Senate Investigations Committees. I am reminded of an order that President Kennedy passed in his regime which has been reproduced in a book on Kennedy. Kennedy passed an order appointing a

[Shri. M. N. Kaul] Committee, and the Committee was charged with the duty that it should report to the President on the state of the American defences and the entire information should be gleaned from published record whether in America or abroad. The Committee did not have access to any official information and no official witness was called. The Committee investigated the matter, a very competent Committee, and produced a solid volume for the President's review. When the President referred it to the Pentagon, the Pentagon said after investigating it: "This is perfectly true. Every bit of it is true. We should therefore immediately mark it as 'Top Secret' because this information in such a condensed, clear and presentable form will not be available although it has been gleaned from published records." I remember an incident in the other House when on a particular day the Defence Minister of the day strongly said that he would not place the document on the Table, that it was not in the public interest. The Member had a copy of the foreign journal where the entire information was reproduced. When the matter was taken up in the House, he confronted the Defence Minister, "You may not give me the information, but here it is published in a foreign journal". So, if we are vigilant, we should have the information and mould our policies accordingly.

We talk of the Tashkent spirit. The Tashkent spirit survived from the date the Tashkent Declaration was signed, that is on 10th January, to February 25th when each side was back to the August 5 position.

AN HON. MEMBER : It died along with Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : After that date so far as Pakistan was concerned the Tashkent spirit was dead. In the history books of Russia, Tashkent will be a great landmark in the history of Russia. For the first time the great powers, America and Great Britain, acquiesced as it were because without their acquiescence Pakistan would not have agreed ; President Ayub Khan may have got an O.K. as is apparent from statements made by the President of the United States, "Let Russia try her hand". Now Tashkent marks the definite entry of Russia, a big power, a super power in the affairs of India and Pakistan. From that point of view it is important. Now that Russia has given military supplies to Pakistan, we have to watch because it is a well known doctrine that Russia has applied that, in order to spread her influence,

she must give military supplies in addition to civil supplies. So far as is known today Russia is taking a leaf out of the imperialist book of Britain and the United States. But I do not want to speculate further. I think it is the right of every country to give military supplies. We cannot object to that. Our objection at the present moment was that in the condition of high tension Russia should not have given these supplies; but they propose to give these supplies to Pakistan and we cannot spoil our relations with Russia on that ground. Certainly we had our relations with the United States when they were equipping Pakistan and giving Pakistan excessive free military aid for a period of years. I still remember during that very period President Eisenhower, the only President of the United States who has come to India, addressed Members of Parliament in the Central Hall; our relations were maintained in spite of the fact that there were strong statements when Pakistan threatened us and we felt that American military aid was wrong. So, in any case in the final analysis it can be said that our relations with Russia have as it were come nearer to those with the United States. We should watch the coming developments. Who knows that Russia as a socialist country may play a different role in these developing events. She is bound to play a role; we cannot help it. She will make suggestions to us, pass on recommendations, and all kinds of developments may be there.

I was greatly struck by a sentence which the Prime Minister used in the other House yesterday when she said that much of the future is hidden from view or obscured. At that time I recalled an observation of Churchill in one of his memoirs where he has said : "The veils of the future are lifted one by one and we mortals have to act from day to day". Our problem is that without prejudice, without any animosity towards Russia, we should coolly consider the facts; we should not bother as to what is the truth, what is behind the minds of the Russians, but we should factually survey from time to time what are the facts and in a cool and balanced manner draw inferences and keep the Parliament informed not of the entire dossier of correspondence that passes but certainly of the salient features and the main thinking of the Government on this issue.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Your time is over.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I will make only one brief observation in regard to the President's visit because so much has been.

said about it in the other place. It is true that the Government had information in their possession before the President left that the Soviet Union had decided to supply arms to Pakistan. I consider that that was no ground for cancelling the President's visit. I think the President's visit has been an extremely useful visit because at the time there was excitement in India and when the Prime Minister made a statement at Gauhati, the President was present in the U.S.S.R. and there was an opportunity for the President concurrently to convey our view to the Soviet Union, and the communique says there were frank discussions. There was some inkling of what the President said in his public speeches. He told them clearly that public opinion in India was greatly disturbed over this decision of the Government of the U.S.S.R. to supply arms to Pakistan. He told them that you cannot take the friendship of India for granted; he warned in a public speech at Tashkent that if the aid to Pakistan assumes a massive form, that will considerably weaken the relations between India and Soviet Russia. I think rarely an occasion will ever arise for a President to counter such a situation and express such sentiments in a very frank manner. I think it was all to the good that he was in Russia at that time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are four amendments.

SHRI J. P. YADAV (Bihar) : Madam, I move:

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House regrets—

(i) that the Government of India's stand in relations to the situation is not realistic and does not take into account the full implications of the Russian decision;

(ii) that the Government withheld this important information from the public in India even though they had knowledge of this some time ago; and

(iii) the omission in the Joint Communique issued at the conclusion of the recent visit of the President of India to the U.S.S.R. of any reference to the U.S.S.R. Government's decision to supply arms to Pakistan.'

5—10 R. S./68

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Madam, I move :

(2) "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same this House regrets the reported decision of the Soviet Union to supply military arms and equipment to Pakistan as constituting a grave danger to the security of India and to the peace of the sub-continent.'

श्री सुंदरसिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : महोदया, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि :

(३) "प्रस्ताव के अंत में निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जाये, अर्थात् :—

'और उस पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह सभा इस बात पर खेद प्रकट करती है कि रूस की सरकार द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार सप्लाई किये जाने के बारे में प्रधान मंत्री के वक्तव्य में इसके कारण उत्पन्न स्थिति का सामना करने के लिए सरकार द्वारा कोई ठोस कदम उठाये जाने के सम्बन्ध में कोई संकेत नहीं है' "

[(3) 'That at the of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House expresses its regret that the Prime Minister's statement regarding the supply of arms by the U.S. S.R. Government to Pakistan does not indicate any positive steps by the Government to meet the situation arising therefrom.'"]

SHRI B. N. MANDAL (Bihar) : Madam, I move :

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion :

(i) that the Government of India misinterpreted the Tashkent Agreement during and after the Indo-Pakistan conflict of 1965; and

(ii) that the foreign policy of the Government is based on the lack of self-confidence.

The questions were proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Chiir-man has directed that each Member will take ten minutes. Mr. Dharia.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) Madam, while our country has been passing through various stresses and strains, it is indeed distressing and it is a matter of deep concern for us that Russia has decided to give military aid—it is not aid but it is an arms deal, it is a sale—to Pakistan. Along with the sale deed there is a piece of advice from our friendly country, Soviet Russia, that the dispute of the Ganges waters should also be amicably settled with Pakistan. Madam Deputy Chairman, while we discuss in this House the international policies and the international politics I feel that no feeling of passion should overtake us. We shall have to take into consideration the fluid situation as it stands in the whole world today. The recent decision of Russia creates that feeling of distress because of our friendly ties with Russia. Since independence Russia had taken a forthright attitude so far as the Kashmir issue is concerned. At the time when almost the whole world was not with us on that issue it was Russia who came for help. Till 1964 consistent efforts for mutual friendship, assistance and cooperation by this great country had created an immense impact on this country. It is in the background of these feelings, even though we see a marked shift in the policy of Russia today, we have not forgotten the assistance and the cooperation that was given and that is being given to us by Russia and it is in this background, when we see this decision, that we ask : Is not Russia aware that since independence it was on three occasions that Pakistan committed aggression? Is not Russia aware that the arms that were obtained by Pakistan from America, inspite of the assurances given by Pakistan to 'Werica that they will not be used against India, were used against India ? Is not Russia aware that at Tashkent we came to an understanding and India tried her level best to maintain a golden spirit for creating an atmosphere of goodwill and mutual relationship to go according to the Tashkent Declaration but it was not observed by Pakistan. Then take the Kutch Award. I am one of those persons who had agitated against my own Government when the Kutch Award was being implemented; but the Government stood firm and said "No; we are committed to it and we should accordingly do it." In that background is it not possible for Russia to take into consideration the approach of Pakistan at the

one end and the approach of India at the other end and when this approach of ours instead of getting recognised is being ignored, it becomes a cause for more distress and concern and therefore, in this light, Madam, I feel that we shall have to talk not of our policies, because we have always rightly stressed them. I would like to say especially that even today we find the blocs; blocs which speak against this bloc and that bloc and those blocs are now getting evaporated, because of several reasons and they are ultimately trying to come to our own policies that were adopted by us long back; so it is not the policies that we must look at but the interests of various countries; we must now realise that in the whole world there are no common friends, there are no common enemies for any country; there is that harmony established. Our policy shall have to be decided from our own interest and from that point of view. Why do we blame Russia? It is a sovereign country. It has that sovereign right to support, to help or to give out whatever it has. We do feel having regard to our relationship with Russia, that they should have taken into consideration the approach of Pakistan and the constructive approach of India. Unfortunately they have not done that. But that does not mean we should go on antagonizing every country. We should neither antagonize Russia nor America nor any other country. As was rightly stressed by the Hon'ble Prime Minister yesterday in the Lower House, I also feel all our endeavours should be for better relationship with all countries in the world. Because of this decision of Russia there are suggestions that India should try to have a new sort of coalition, a new sort of relationship with China and also with Pakistan. From one quarter the suggestion is to have plain talks with China; from the other quarter the suggestion is to have talks with Pakistan. As far as my information goes, this House will agree, that India has never closed the ways for any mutual discussion and talks. India never did. It is Pakistan who has never agreed to have that pact to have no aggressions. Is it not China who committed that aggression against us ? Is it not China who has committed that aggression ? In spite of our desire, China was not ready to have any talks with us whatsoever. Under these circumstances, if any talks are to take place, let us not forget the dignity and honour of this country, it is by maintaining the dignity and honour of this country that we can have talks& discussions and not otherwise. It is only in this back-

ground that we shall have to proceed further on this question. Madam, my submission would be that while deciding external policy we must not forget our internal strength. After all, external policy is a reflection of our internal strength. What is our internal strength to-day? We have been developing but we shall have to develop much faster. We shall have to create those tremendous potentialities in this country so that we need not go begging to another country for our own living here, for our own existence here. It is the self-dependence that is more material. If we stand to create that sort of atmosphere in this country, I have no doubt whatever that a time will come when China and Pakistan will have to open their doors for the talks, because our doors always remained open. We have always kept them open. It is they who have closed their doors. It is they who have been playing all possible nasty tactics against this country and in spite of it there are some suggestions that we should now proceed with further talks. Now it is for them to realise it. But from any point of view, Madam, I would like to stress today that this stand taken by the Government of India so far as this 'arms deal' is concerned, I am here to support the stand taken by the Government. We cannot antagonize any country at this stage. We are passing through a very critical phase and while we are passing through a very critical phase at one end, we shall have to develop all our resources at one end, we shall have to develop all our military strategy, all our military forces and military strength and at the other end we should see that we enjoy more and more peace by this developments. And from that point of view also for securing help from all these countries also we should see that our relationship is not strained. I was really surprised when I listened to the speeches of the Honourable Members from the Opposition particularly who go to the length of attacking Russia today and when American aid was given to Pakistan there was furore in this country. I have read the speeches of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and I have brought that book also for reference. Unfortunately my time is limited. I can say even at that time no such remark which will offend America was then passed by our late Prime Minister. I have gone through the speeches. I have no time to read them, but I can say at that time it had been stated by the then Honourable Prime Minister that America would realise our interests and in order to maintain good relationship they will take proper

care. It is in those words that a hint had come. On this occasion also similar care shall have to be taken. And it is in this context, Madam, I feel that the statement which was laid on the floor of the House is a very valuable piece of document. And Mr. Kaul said that we have not taken into consideration the shift in the policy of Russia. Is the policy of Russia is not very clear, Mr. Kaul, from the statement? I should like the House to bear in mind that international relationships as a whole are in a particularly fluid state at the present time. The old landmarks and the rigid divisions between the rival blocs appear to be in the process of disintegration although they have by no means disappeared. And, Madam, when this change is taking place in the whole world, when this new shape is going to come, what should be the shape of this country, it is more material for me and I feel that India should rely on itself in creating that future history. I appeal to all my friends here, let us all stand united on this issue. Ultimately, the important issue is to strengthen our own country and take care that this country develops its own strength. It is only reply that we can give to the present international situation.

With these words, I feel that the whole House would stand by the decision taken by the Government.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Madam, this country faces a peculiar situation. We have been deluding the people of this country by talks of the great friendship of the people of the Soviet Union of which I have no doubt. I have no doubt that the people of the Soviet Union are very friendly to us. But I have great doubts about the intentions of their rulers. Our Government has done nothing to warn the people of this, in spite of being told repeatedly. It has been a folly of our Government to keep this dispute with Pakistan hanging all the time. The folly or the first mistake was of withdrawing our victorious forces when they needed only two days. Who are paying for that all these years? This is one more of what we have to pay for that original folly or sin, whatever you like to call it. (Interruptions) It was not necessary to run to the United Nations at that time when the United Nations was still in its infancy, was in its making. And what has been the fate of the people who have gone to the United Nations like us on the Kashmir issue, like Korea, like Vietnam. Besides, the issue

rShri Dahyabhai V. Patel.] of Kashmir was an internal issue. It was not necessary to invite an outsider there. It was like running to call a policeman when a thief is coming to your house, instead of getting up and driving him out. All this time, this issue is being used by powers for their own purposes and we have acquiesced in, or have not stood up to, the challenge as we should have. The only solution in such a situation would have been to develop our own strength and not necessarily rely on any outsider or any of the power blocs. Whatever one may say of the United States, the United States did give us aid, material aid, whenever we were in need which has helped us to develop. We protested against their giving arms aid to Pakistan and we warned the United States that this was likely to be used against India. In spite of President Eisenhower's assurance which he gave in good, honest spirit, those arms were used against us. And I would now like to hear what our friends who were violently condemning the use of US arms all these years have to say when the boot is now on the other foot. The Soviets, we consider our friends. At the instance of the Soviet Union or perhaps on our own, we had the slogan 'Hindi-Cheeni Bhai-Bhai' and we saw what it resulted in. We went all out for the Soviet friendship. Unfortunately, we forget the lessons of history. How did the Soviet Union take power in Europe after the last war? Before that it may be another chapter. But after the last war how many countries in Europe have they occupied one by one? Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary. How did they take them? The usual Soviet method—subversion, deceit, infiltration and naked violence whenever necessary. Are we in for this trouble? I have been warning our Government practically since the day I came that we are in for this trouble if we do not awake. The only reply, the only answer, should have been to build up our own strength. We have failed to do so. We have wasted money on public sector projects and industries; if you like, call them by a big name, grandiose projects which yield nothing. So much of the country's money is going everyday as losses which the people of the country have to pay out of their hard-earned money as tax to make good those losses. Instead, if these losses were not there, that money could have been utilised to strengthen the country, its resources, its defences, our own people. It is wrong to rely on others. I would only like my friends who are so anxious to interrupt me when I said...

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala)  
You are fumbling for words.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am not fumbling for words and I will not need them from Moscow in any case. I know what words I want, I am straightforward and clear in what I am saying. I am telling, you forget the lessons of history. What has the Soviet Union done in all these countries? Do you expect that they would change their colour? Do you think that they are going to give up their strategy? Their strategy is always their power. They are thinking only of how to build up their strength.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) :  
The hon. Member is learning history.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I do not need to learn it from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON :  
From whom are you learning? You are speaking of socialist countries which are independent.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I know how they are free. I hope my friend is reading the daily papers. And what is happening in Czechoslovakia? It is a clear example to show how free these countries are and how they exist. Do you want India to go like that? I am sorry, our Government has allowed the economy of this country to be ruined by misleading the people about rupee payment agreement which also has been a fraud on the people. I have referred to that more than once. Is it not a fact, is not the Government aware that goods taken from this country have been exported to other countries by these countries which are supposed to favour us by rupee payment to earn hard currency themselves or much-needed equipment? That is what we are doing to help the Soviet Union, and what have they done? This is what we are going to get.

Now, there is a talk of dove-tailing the economy. It is part of the same thing. If we are going to dove-tail, then we are going to be the tail of the Soviet Union. We have become a suburb of the Soviet Union. If anyone has been observing from January to date, how many Soviet Delegations have come to this country under one pretext or the other? Have we received so many delegations from any other country? And what do they do? It is well known what the Soviet policy



is, how well it is directed. And what is happening in this country is indicative of what they propose to do. We have in this country today an unprecedented wave of unrest, strikes, stop-work, no production. Is that going to build up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Gherao.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Yes, gherao. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta rightly reminds me. It never helps. Is it going to build up our economy? (Interruptions) Those friends who speak so much and who are so sensitive when I criticise the Soviet Union. . .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : What have lock-out and strikes to do with the Soviet arms supply to Pakistan ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Gherao is a Soviet weapon imported by the Russian Communists into India or a Chinese weapon taken by the Chinese. Communists into India. It is a foreign weapon.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं इसका खंडन करता हूँ। यह घिराव भारतीय भूमि में पैदा हुआ है, न रूस से आया है, न चीन से आया है।

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am sorry I do not agree with Mr. Raj-narain that simply because he is using a Hindi word it becomes Indian. It is certainly not Indian. What the people were told. . .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Let him consult his notes. He has lost the chain.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : In the years when Mr. Krishna Menon was the great adviser we have had a running down, a ruination of our defences. Government must take lessons from those things. (Interruptions) I do not interrupt any of these friends. Why are they sensitive about it ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have two minutes more.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : They have sold themselves so much to the Soviet Union that they cannot understand this simple thing. In the world the Soviet strategy has always been in the interest of their country. They have never

thought of any other country. Why does our Government not learn that one simple thing? Let us do what is in the best interest of our country. If we are to condemn the United States for arming Pakistan, equally condemnatory is the stand of the Soviet Union which is now supplying arms to Pakistan. I would say that our Government must take its share of the blame for not informing us, for not taking the country into confidence.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Your time is up.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I will just take a few minutes. Our Prime Minister visits Russia so often. Particularly when she became a Minister, during the first six months she had been going there practically every month. When she was a member of the Shastri Cabinet, was she not aware of the happenings there? I understand that she was of it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All his facts are like this.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I understand that she was informed. Why did she not give this information to the country? Why was this important information withheld from this country after she became the Prime Minister ? She was a member in the Shastri Cabinet. She went to the U.S.S.R, as a Cabinet Minister\*, and if that information was conveyed to her, she should have conveyed that information to the Cabinet and to the country. Now she does not go there so often. Now Prime Minister Kosygin obliges by coming here so often. I do not have time to recount the number of delegations that he has sent. I think it is a long list of 70 or 80 delegations which have come from there one after the other till today. Have we received delegations of this type from any other country? That shows where our policy is going wrong, where we are mistaken and where we have to change our foreign policy. It is not too late yet. But if we do not change we have to go under as all the satellite countries in Europe have gone.

SHRI B.K.P. SINHA (Bihar) : Madam Deputy Chairman, Russia has extended arms aid to Pakistan. This in itself, in my opinion, is not a very serious matter for this small arms aid does not change the military balance in the sub-continent. And, Madam, Russia is as much sovereign as we are. Hence they have every right to

[Shri B. K. P. Shiha] extend aid and area of freindship. But what is important in my opinion is the change in the attitude of Soviet Russia. Mr. Kaul has explained at grant detail how this change came and when it became visible. The shift in the Soviet attitude had started after the death of Prime Minister Nehru. It was accelerated after the exit of Mr. Khrushchev from the Russian political scene. It became evident in 1965 in the Security Council and in Taskhkent. It is surprising that in spite of (hese the Government of India did not realise in time that there had been a change in the Soviet attitude and if they realised, that realisation at least was not allowed to percolate to the people. Mr. Kaul has talked of the Kashmir-issue. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel has talked of the plans to dovetail our economy and our plans with Soviet Russia. When this change had come, it was surprising that our responsible Ministers talked of dovetailing our plans and economy with the plans of a super-power. Even in normal situations when a weak economy is dovetailed with a powerful economy the weak economy becomes an appendage of that powerful economy. Therefore, theie is no justification for a project of this kind even in normal situations. But in view of the change that has come about in the Russian attitude the development is shocking and surprising and I am glad that after the adverse and strong reactions of the county there has been a healthy retreat from that position.

Madam Deputy Chairman, Russia has been our greatest supporter. But we have also been the greatest supporters of Soviet Russia. During the last twenty years we have operated as a knight palatin of the U.S.S.R. We have been "the most vociferous purveyors of their policies and interests and, therefore, this shift c ires as a rude shock to us. But this is not the time when we should be guided by elemental emotions. The first reaction of a crude man would be to take cudgels and strike at the bridge that unites us with Russia. But that would be a very crude reaction in my opinion. International affairs are not conducted so crudely. During the last twenty years, unfortunately, we have broken bridges that connected us with other great countries, America, China, the Unيتد Kingdom, France, etc. There remained one bridge only, the bridge that connected India with Soviet Russia. Now would it be proper, because of this elemental upsurge, to destory that bridge also? That bridge is not yet broken though it has developed serious cracks. I feel,

Madam, that self-interest demands that we make an earnest endeavour to patch up the cracks rather than in a moment of disgust and desperation try to break that bridge also.

Madam, the world has changed, Pandit Nehru evolved his foreign policy more than twenty yeas back when the world was moulded in a different pattern. Since then there has been a detente between the two super powers, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. They shout at each other but in substance, in practice, they always come together to maintain a balance in this world. China, which twenty years back was a very weak power, has now assumed a proportion of a great power and I am sure that in another ten years whatever we might think of it China is going to join the ranks of the super powers I and is going to be the third super power. New spheres of influence, areas of influence are coming into existence. The areas of influence are different from the areas of influence which we saw in the 19th century. In this changing world I feel that the policies that we evolved twenty years back need a revision. They should be revised. What that revision should be is difficult to say off-hand. That revision can come only after a mature consideration. But one thing is obvious. We have been putting our eggs only in one basket. It is imprudent for a man to do so. It is foolhardy for a nation to do so. And now when this shift has become apparent it should be our endeavour to rebuild the bridges that have broken down during the last twenty years. I would strongly urge that it is time that even the 'bridge' on the river Hwang-Ho, is rebuilt and we establish a rapport and start a dialogue with China.

Madam, in this world it is puerile to rely solely on ourselves. Ev,n the two super powers cannot rely only on l p.m. themselves. They are in constant search of allies. They are in constant search of friends. There is a constant endeavour on their part to expand the are a ol agreement and to get as much support as possible from other nations. Therefore, while primarily we have to rely on our own strength, that strength could be adequate only if it is associated with proper diplomacy. Madam, 20 years ago we relied mainly on our diplomacy and neglected our defence. And now the wheel has gone a full circle. To-day we talk of strength only to the neglect of dtplomacy. That, i,, my opinion, is a

disquieting situation. Therefore, it should be the earnest endeavour of the Government of India to build the bridges that have broken down during the last 20 years. I am happy the Prime Minister and the ex-Foreign Minister are here . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : The future Foreign Minister is also here.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Madam, I feel that since 1962 the political direction of our foreign affairs has not been what it should be in the changed situation of the world. Madam, after 1962 Prime Minister Nehru was in failing health. He could not devote his time, his attention, to the conduct of foreign affairs. If he were in good health, I am sure, he would have been capable of introducing certain changes in the foreign policy required by the new world. But after Prime Minister Nehru, an unusual development was discernible in the office of the Prime Minister. After Prime Minister Nehru, an expanded Secretariat of the Prime Minister was established. Prime Minister Nehru also had a personal secretariat, but that secretariat was not distinguishable, not bigger than the secretariats of the other Ministers. As Prime Minister he had the right to oversee the Ministries and Departments, but he exercised that right through the Cabinet Secretariat and through the apparatus of the Ministries concerned. But after Pandit Nehru a very big personal secretariat of the Prime Minister was established. And today it has assumed gargantuan proportions. And the result has been that the conduct of foreign policy, the formulation of foreign policy, the development of foreign policy, has really passed out of the hands of the External Affairs Ministry and now, if it is not the sole concern of the Prime Minister's Secretariat, at least the responsibility is shared by the Prime Minister's Secretariat. In my opinion, Madam Deputy Chairman, this is an extremely unhappy situation, because there is divorce between responsibility and power. The responsibility to conduct foreign policy is that of the External Affairs Ministry, but the power vests in the personal secretariat of the Prime Minister for the conduct of the foreign policy. Maybe, Madam, since to-day the Prime Minister herself is the Foreign Minister, this duality is not discernible, but the duality is there. And then, those who conduct the affairs in the External Affairs Ministry are men of wide experience and men of very senior status. All the information relating to the External

Affairs Ministry goes to them. In the Prime Minister's Secretariat, there are people who are of far inferior status to those who conduct the affairs of the External Affairs Ministry, and the knowledge of foreign affairs that is available to the External Affairs Ministry is not available to them and cannot be available to them. In such a situation of divorce between responsibility and power, administrative inefficiency is bound to creep in and it has crept in. It is not a matter of a priori reasoning, Madam Deputy Chairman. Even experience leads us to the same conclusion. I again remind Sardar Swaran Singh, who was Foreign Minister in 1965 or 1966, that when they went to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, the Foreign Secretary was not there, nor were there any important officials of the External Affairs Ministry. But then the reference out of which the Kutch Award arose was signed there. How could it be signed there? Because, even at that stage, if the conduct and control of foreign policy had not passed entirely under the control of the Prime Minister's Secretariat, at least the responsibility was shared by the Prime Minister's Secretariat. And, therefore, even a prudent man like Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri was misled and had to sign a reference of an extremely restrictive character. Madam, that is why I say that the time has come when the Prime Minister, the Cabinet and the Administrative Reforms Commission should apply their minds to this aspect of the question. I feel strongly that as long as this duality continues it will be difficult to evolve a foreign policy of an appropriate kind, more appropriate to the new world. I do not say that the Prime Minister has no right to oversee, supervise or keep an eye on, other Ministries. The Prime Minister has every right to do so. But that right should be exercised mainly through the Cabinet Secretariat and the particular apparatus of the Ministry concerned which the Prime Minister is overseeing for the time being. If that control, if that right of overseeing is exercised through a body that does not have adequate knowledge, that is manned by people of inferior status as compared to those who man the Ministries, then administrative inefficiency is bound to continue.

Thank you, Madam. I support the attitude of the Government of India that it is not the moment when in an upsurge of emotion

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The hon. Member has spoken as if he had been speaking on a cut motion on External Affairs.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Not at all. However, I support the attitude of the Government that we should not in a moment of exasperation embitter our relations further with Soviet Russia. We should try to make them as happy as they were before. But at the same time we should make an earnest endeavour to improve our relations with other powers including China.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The next speaker is Mr. Bhandari. The House now stands adjourned till 2 P.M.]

Th? Hau.e thsn adjourned for lunch at eight minutes past one of th? clock.]

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

**श्री सुन्दरसिंह भंडारी :** उसमानि महोदय, रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने के समाचार से सारे देश में एक चिन्ता का बातावरण बन गया है। इस सदन में ओर देश में की जा रही चिन्ता का अगर हम ठीक अनुमान लगायें, उस पर विचार करें और उस चिन्ता के निवारण की दृष्टि से कुछ सोचें, तो वास्तव में उसका कुछ लाभ होगा।

सरकार की तरफ से यह कहा गया है कि लगभग 3 सप्ताह पूर्व सरकार को इस बात का संकेत मिला था कि पाकिस्तान को रूस की तरफ से हथियार प्राप्त होने वाले हैं। जो कल वक्तव्य यहाँ पर दिया गया, उसमें इस बात का उल्लेख है कि हमने रूस को यह समझाने का प्रयत्न किया था कि इस तरह के हथियार देने से पाकिस्तान की शक्ति बढ़ेगी। पाकिस्तान अपनी सैनिक शक्ति और जगहों से भी हथियार प्राप्त करके बढ़ा रहा है क्योंकि वह सब जगह से शस्त्र इकट्ठा करने की कोशिश कर रहा है और उसे बहुत से शस्त्र प्राप्त भी हुए हैं। इस तरह से रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने से कोई लाभ नहीं होगा।

हमने उनको यह भी समझाने का प्रयत्न किया कि पाकिस्तान एक आक्रामक रवैया अपना कर फिर भारत पर आक्रमण करेगा और ऐसे अवसर पर उसको हथियार देने का मतलब उसकी आक्रामक मनोवृत्ति में वृद्धि करनी होगी। हमने उनको यह भी बताया कि पाकिस्तान को किसी बाहरी आक्रमण का भय नहीं है, इसके विपरीत पाकिस्तान ने भारत पर हमला किया। उसको कहीं से भी हमने का डर नहीं है और जिस बचाव के लिए वह हथियार इकट्ठा कर रहा है उसका मूल उद्देश्य भारत पर हमला करना ही है। हमने रूस के सामने यह भी स्पष्ट किया कि अगर हथियारों की दौड़ बढ़ाई गई तो इस महाद्वीप में उससे तनाव बढ़ेगा और तनाव बढ़ाना किसी भी दृष्टि से उपयोगी नहीं है। परन्तु यह सत्य है कि हमारे इन सब बातों के सामने के बावजूद भी एक एक पहलू जो हमने रूस के सामने इन प्रश्नों के संबंध में रखे, उसको रूस ने कद नहीं की। रूस ने हमारी इन सब बातों को मानने से इन्कार किया और इन सब बातों को समझाने के बावजूद रूस ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार देना संजूर किया। लेकिन इसके साथ एक तर्क जोड़ा है कि हम जो हथियार पाकिस्तान को दे रहे हैं वे सुरक्षा के लिए दे रहे हैं। उसने यह भी कहा है कि हम इस बात की व्यवस्था करेंगे कि इन हथियारों का प्रयोग भारत के विरुद्ध नहीं किया जायेगा।

अब यह सारी चीजें सरकार ने मानी हैं। इसमें यह कहा गया है :

"Before I refer to the exchanges which have taken place between the Soviet Union and ourselves on this subject."

मैं चाहूंगा कि यह जो एक्सचेंज रूस और भारत के बीच में हुए हैं, उसके बारे में सदन को जानकारी मिलनी चाहिये कि ये एक्सचेंज हथियार देने के मामले में भारत और रूस के बीच में कब से प्रारंभ हुए थे? भारत ने किस किस प्रकार से भारत पर आने वाले संकट का परिचय, हथियार देने का विचार का विरोध रूस को कराया और रूस ने इन सब का

क्या जवाब दिया? मैं यह पहली मांग आपके द्वारा सरकार से करना चाहूंगा कि ये सारे पत्र व्यवहार प्रकाशित होने चाहिये ताकि यह पता लगे कि कितने दिनों से बातें चल रही थीं तथा भारत ने इसके संबंध में कौनसा प्रतिवाद किया। रूस ने इस संबंध में क्या जवाब दिया और कौनसा तर्क उपस्थित किया ताकि हम वास्तविकता में पहुंच सकें कि रूस ने जो रबैया हथियार देने के संबंध में अपनाया है वह क्या था?

आज भी इस बात की दलील दी जा रही है कि इस चीज से भारत और रूस की मैत्री में कोई विरुद्ध परिणाम नहीं होगा और जो कुछ भी हथियार रूस की तरफ से पाकिस्तान को दिये जा रहे हैं, वह भारत और रूस की मैत्री को दृढ़ करने के लिए दिये जा रहे हैं। तो इस तरह की जो दलील रूस द्वारा दी गई है, उसके संबंध में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि ऐसा कौनसा अनोखा तर्क, ऐसा कौनसा अनोखा दृष्टिकोण उन्होंने अपने पत्र व्यवहार में प्रकट किया है जिस के आधार पर उन्होंने पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने का फैसला किया है।

पाकिस्तान के लोग पिछले अनेक समयों से सैनिक शक्ति मांगने के लिए रूस जाते रहे हैं और उनका इस संबंध में एक ही तर्क रहा है कि रूस द्वारा भारत को जो सैनिक मदद दी जा रही है उसने सैनिक संतुलन को बिगाड़ दिया है तथा पाकिस्तान के लिए खतरा उत्पन्न कर दिया है। हिन्दुस्तान की बढ़ती हुई सैनिक ताकत पाकिस्तान के लिए खतरा बनी हुई है। जब जब इस तरह के डेलीगेशन पाकिस्तान के रूस गये तो हमारे राजदूत जो वहां पर हैं, रूस के अधिकारियों से इस संबंध में मिलते रहे और उनसे स्पष्टीकरण मांगते रहे।

मैं समझता हूं कि पिछले 17 मई 1967 को जब पीरजादा जो उस समय के पाकिस्तान के विदेश मंत्री थे, हथियार प्राप्त करने के संबंध में रूस गये थे, तो उस समय हमारे

राजदूत सोवियत डिप्टी फारेन मिनिस्टर से मिलने गये थे। सोवियत डिप्टी फारेन मिनिस्टर ने उन्हें यह आश्वासन दिया था :

"There was no question of arms to Pakistan."

जब ईरान को हथियार देने की बात आई तो उस समय भी हमारे मन में यह शंका पैदा हुई कि रूस द्वारा ईरान को जो हथियार दिये जा रहे हैं कहीं वे पाकिस्तान न पहुंच जायें। उस समय भी श्री ग्रोमिको ने हमारे राजदूत को यह आश्वासन दिया था कि इस बात की सावधानी बरतने का प्रयत्न किया गया है कि ये हथियार किसी भी प्रकार से पाकिस्तान को न पहुंचने पायें।

1967 में जब पाकिस्तान को रूस द्वारा हैलीकोप्टर देने का सवाल आया और दोनों के बीच में इस संबंध में एक समझौता हुआ तो उस समय भी शंका व्यक्त की गई थी कि जो हैलीकोप्टर का समझौता पाकिस्तान के साथ हुआ है यह हमारे अहित में जायेगा। यहां पर उसके संबंध में भारत सरकार के नुमाइन्दे ने स्पष्टीकरण करने का प्रयत्न किया कि यह एक व्यापारिक समझौता है और हम इसमें क्या कर सकते हैं।

1968 में जब श्री कोसीगिन यहां आये थे तो उस समय भी उन्होंने यह कहा था :

"Soviet had no intention to supply arms to Pakistan."

यानि ये सब चीजें होती रहीं और इसलिए यह और भी जरूरी है कि जो पत्र व्यवहार भारत सरकार और सोवियत सरकार के बीच में चला वह किस भाषा में चल रहा था? सोवियत सरकार ने इस बात का सरकारी तौर पर क्या जवाब दिया क्योंकि जो पब्लिक स्टेटमेंट हुआ है वह उस जवाब के अनुकूल है या नहीं, इस बात को जानने का हमें पूरा अधिकार है। इसलिए मैं मांग करता हूं कि केन्द्रीय सरकार सारे पत्र व्यवहार को मेज पर रखे ताकि वह सदस्यों को देखने के लिए उपलब्ध हो सके कि इस संबंध में सारी चीजें क्या हुईं।

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

श्री दिनेश सिंह पिछले दिनों मास्को गये हुए थे। जिन दिनों वे मास्को गये हुए थे उन्हीं दिनों पाकिस्तान के मिलिटरी मिशन का वहाँ पर स्वागत किया जा रहा था। फिर यह जानना नितांत आवश्यक है कि जब पाकिस्तान का मिलिटरी मिशन वहाँ पर था तो श्री दिनेश सिंह ने रूस के नेताओं से इस चीज का उल्लेख किया या नहीं? अगर इस चीज का उल्लेख हुआ तो उसके संबंध में सरकार को क्या कहना है? यह कहना कि तीन सप्ताह पहले इस बात के इन्डी-केशन मिले थे कि पाकिस्तान को रूस हथियार देने जा रहा है उसके पीछे क्या वजन है। इसका मतलब तो साफ है कि रूस और पाकिस्तान के बीच में इन सारी चीजों के बारे में पहले से डेवलपमेंट होते रहे थे और यह सरकार उन सारे डेवलपमेंटों से अनभिज्ञ रही। सरकार ने जनता को अंधरे में रखा जो उसने रूस और पाकिस्तान के बीच में हो रहे डेवलपमेंटों को नहीं रखा। मेरी दृष्टि में सरकार ने यह उचित नहीं किया। अपने लोगों से छिपाना और ऐसी चीजों को छिपाना जिस का परिणाम देश के हितों पर निश्चित रूप से होता है, यह सरकार का उचित रवैया नहीं कहा जा सकता है और यह सरकार ने गलत काम किया है।

हथियारों के बारे में कई बार तर्क दिया जाता है कि यह समाजवादी देश के हथियार हैं, इनसे तुम्हें चिंता नहीं करनी चाहिये। अब मुझे नहीं मालूम है कि समाजवादी और गैरसमाजवादी देशों के हथियारों के आघात करने की शक्ति में क्या अन्तर है। पता नहीं—श्री भूपेश गुप्त शायद फिर उबल पड़ें—नक्सलवाड़ी में समाजवादी हथियारों से क्या किसी की हत्या नहीं हुई या किसी दूसरे के मनों पर उसके हिसाब से पड़ने वाले परिणामों से, बम विस्फोट वहाँ संतोषजनक थे, वह निर्माण करने वाला सिद्ध हुआ या मारक सिद्ध हुआ, यह अन्तर करना मेरी समझ के बहार है। लेकिन आज समझाने की, यहां के लोगों को तमल्ली देने की कोशिश की

जाती है, कि अगर ये हथियार दिये भी जा रहे हैं तो ये केवल समाजवादी मार्का हथियार हैं, इनसे चिंता नहीं करनी चाहिये, इनके बारे में किसी प्रकार के खतरे की बात सोचनी नहीं चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि इस प्रकार की आत्मवंचना और अपने देशवासियों की आत्मवंचना इससे बढ़ कर और किसी प्रकार की नहीं हो सकती। यह हथियारों का प्रयोग रोकने का आश्वासन हम ऊपर से देख रहे हैं। हम दूध के जले हैं, हम को छाछ भी फूँक कर पीना चाहिये। जब अमेरिका ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये थे, तब तो उनके ऊपर नियंत्रण के लिये अमेरिका के भी मिलिटरी कमांडर मौजूद थे पाकिस्तान में, तब भी पाकिस्तान ने उन हथियारों का खुल कर और वेशर्मी के साथ प्रयोग भारत के विरोध में किया था और अमेरिका देखता रहा, वह उस पर किसी प्रकार से कोई नियंत्रण नहीं लगा सका था। इस कारण से यह कहना कि ये हथियार सुरक्षात्मक हैं, इसका कोई भरोसा नहीं है।

भारत रूस मैत्री की दुहाई दी जाती है और यह कहा गया है कि इसमें ठेस नहीं लगेगी। मैं समझता हूं कि शब्दों को एक तरफ अगर हम रखें और व्यवहार का ज़रा विचार करें सदन को याद होगा कि रूस के कुछ नक्शे छपे थे और 1956 से ही उन नक्शों के सम्बन्ध में विरोध किया जाता रहा। सरकार ने उसके सम्बन्ध में विरोध पत्र भी भेजा था और रूस की तरफ से यह स्पष्टीकरण दिया गया था कि यह हो गया होगा, अगली बार जो नक्शे छपेंगे उनमें सुधार कर लिया जायगा। 1967 का जो लेटस्ट नक्शा, वर्ल्ड ऐटलस रूस का छपा हुआ है, वह मेरे पास है और उसमें से मैं कुछ कोट करना चाहता हूं। उसके प्रिफेस में एक लाइन है :

"Much attention is paid to political sub-divisions inside individual States, boundaries, place, names, Centres. . . The author's right to do their best to keep up with the rapidly changing, realities. . ."

"rapidly changing realities"

य शब्द इसमें महत्व के हैं यह इसके प्रिफेस में है। और इस में ही 134, 135 पेज पर "इंडिया, पाकिस्तान, सीलोन एंड नेपाल" का जो नक्शा प्रकाशित हुआ है उसमें काश्मीर का अक्सार्ड-चिन देखिये, यह चीन बताया गया है और तेजपुर से ऊपर का नेफा का सारा क्षेत्र चीन के रंग में बताया गया है। यह रूस का अधिकृत नक्शा है 1967 का छपा हुआ। मैं चाहूंगा कि यह सरकार के ध्यान में आया कि नहीं आया और अगर नहीं आया है तो इस सरकार के दरवाजे में से हाथी बड़ी आसानी से गुजर कर निकल सकता है। यह रूस का अधिकृत नक्शा है और अगर सरकार इस नक्शे के सम्बन्ध में निश्चित पग उठाने के लिये और यह नक्शा जब तक बदल कर दुरुस्त प्रकाशित नहीं होता इसके भारत प्रवेश पर पाबन्दी लगाने का फैसला करती है तब तो मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार अपने हितों की चिन्ता कर रही है। रूस का यह कहना कि मैत्री हमारी अटूट है और मैत्री के अटूट होने के दावे के साथ इस प्रकार का नक्शा प्रकाशित करना, यह वास्तव में एक अच्छी चीज नहीं है। हम शब्दों पर न जायें। हम व्यवहार से देखें। यह परिवर्तन हो रहा है। हम शब्दों के आडंबर में न रहें। कल मोरारजी भाई ने यह कहा :

"If the shift worked against Indian interests . . ."

अब मैं मोरारजी भाई और सरकार के डिप्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह शिफ्ट का इंडिकेशन है या नहीं। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने भी यह कहा है :

"There has been a shift to the extent it has sought to be friendly with other countries."

They have tried to be friendly with China, but is it not at our cost?

आ रहा है यह परिवर्तन केवल इस बात का नहीं है कि उसने पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती कायम करना शुरू किया है और इस लिये पाकिस्तान को

हथियार देना शुरू किया है। यह हथियार देना, यह पालिसी का शिफ्ट, यह केवल एक के पक्ष में दोस्ती का नहीं है, भारत के हितों के विपरीत दूसरे के समर्थन का है और इस बात को हमें निश्चित रूप से ध्यान में रखना चाहिये।

एक और भी मुझे शंका है। रूस यात्रा के सम्बन्ध में हमारे राष्ट्रपति महोदय की एक विज्ञप्ति प्रकाशित की गई है। हम और हमारी पार्टी के लोग बराबर जो इंडो-पाक रिलेशंस में ताशकंद ऐग्रीमेंट के सम्बन्ध में चर्चाएं करते हैं तो यह सरकार इस बात का गर्व अनुभव करती है कि चाहे एकतरफा आधार पर क्यों न हों, हम अपनी इस ताशकंद घोषणा का पालन करेंगे और हर प्रकार इन्होंने युनिलेट्रल डिमिजशन ले कर के, युनिलेट्रल इम्प्लीमेंटेशन का गर्व अनुभव किया है। वहां पर "म्युचुअल एफर्ट्स" की बात कही गई है। मैं कहूंगा कि जिन लोगों ने राष्ट्रपति महोदय को एडवाइज किया, जो भी राष्ट्रपति महोदय के एडवाइजर्स थे, उन्होंने एक प्रकार से देश के प्रति अन्याय किया है और सरकार ने आज तक जो स्टैंड लिया है उसको उन्होंने अंडरमाइन किया है। इस बात की पूरी जाँच होनी चाहिये कि वहां पर उस विज्ञप्ति में "म्युचुअल एफर्ट्स" शब्द का प्रयोग कैसे हुआ? जब कि यहां सरकार हमेशा ताशकंद ऐग्रीमेंट के इम्प्लीमेंटेशन में युनिलेट्रल स्टेप्स की दुहाई देती रही है। अगर इस प्रकार की बात आई है तो यह कहना कि हम उसमें डिसेंटिंग नोट नहीं जोड़ सकते थे और बातों के लिये, मैं समझता हूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने इन विज्ञप्तियों के प्रति ओर विज्ञप्तियों की भाषाओं के प्रति न्याय नहीं किया। आखिर, देश के ऊपर कोई चीज इन सामूहिक विज्ञप्तियों से थोपी नहीं जा सकती और इसी कारण से यह आवश्यक है कि इस बदली हुई परिस्थिति में हम विचार करें।

रूस के भी अपने स्वयं के हित हैं और रूस अपने हितों के आधार पर पाकिस्तान से सम्बन्ध स्थापित कर रहा है। हिन्दुस्तान को

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

समझना चाहिये कि केवल हम यहां पर अपने इसके सम्बन्ध में रिक्वेस्ट्स शो करें, इतने मात्र से हमारा काम नहीं चलेगा। हमें रूस को बताना होगा कि रूस का यह गलत कदम है और भारत रूस मंत्री पर प्रभाव डालने वाला यह कदम है। यह बताता है कि हमें स्वयं निर्णय लेने की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये। भारत ने अपने हितों की रक्षा करने के लिये क्या किया है। रूस की इस सारी नीति को देख कर हम अपने इंटेस्ट की रक्षा करें और अपने इंटेस्ट की रक्षा करने का प्रयत्न करें।

आज कुछ लोगों का कहना है कि वीटो का प्रयोग रूस इतने वर्षों तक हमारे लिये करता रहा और हमने उसका लाभ नहीं उठाया। हो सकता है कि उसमें भी वह परेशान हो कि ऐसे देश की मदद करके क्या करना है। काश्मीर पर वह वीटो का प्रयोग करता रहा और हमने काश्मीर की स्थिति में कोई परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता अनुभव नहीं की। आज अगर दुनिया हमारे स्वयं के इरादों पर अविश्वास करे तो उसका हमें मूल्यांकन करना चाहिये। आज हमारे मुल्क में अणु शक्ति के सम्बन्ध में एक अजीब कदम उठाया जा रहा है। नान-प्रालिफिकेशन ट्रीटी का विरोध करने मात्र से कहीं हम जिनेवा में फिर उनके चक्कर में न फँस जायें। इसके पहले अगर इस देश भर के मारल को अपकीर्ण करना है तो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को रूस के इस कदम के जवाब में अपनी स्वयं की शक्ति का निर्माण करने के लिये एक पॉजिटिव संकेत के रूप में अपनी अणु शक्ति में परिवर्तन कर अणु बम बनाने की नीति को घोषित करना चाहिये। इससे मैं समझता हूँ कि सारे देश के वातावरण को बदलने में सहायता मिलेगी और इस संकट का सामना करने की परिस्थिति का इस देश में स्वयं निर्माण हो जायगा।

मुझे खेद है कि मैंने कुछ अधिक समय ले लिया।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) Before you call any other Member would like to draw the attention

of the Chair and that of the House to the fact that this House is not treated properly by the Government. The Prime Minister is not here. The Minister in charge of External Affairs is not here. i.e. Minister of State is not here. Not even a Cabinet Minister is here.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : The Deputy Minister is here.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : Only the Deputy Minister is here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will take note of that. Mr. A. G. Kulkarni, you may begin now.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : Madam Deputy Charman I have listened with attention to the speech of Mr. Bhandari. It seems that he has looked at it from the angle of crisis and panic, but I do not want to look at it from that angle. I would look at it from the common man's practical interests. In this connection, Madam, I think history seems to be repeating itself. In 1954, when the United States started arming Pakistan, there was consternation in India, because an arms race with Pakistan was both unwelcome and undesirable though it did become unavoidable. With the memory of partition still fresh in people's minds, there was a genuine feeling that the U.S. was helping an enemy.

An almost similar situation is threatening to develop since the disclosure of the Soviet decision to supply "some arms" to Pakistan. The anti-Soviet sentiment is underpinned by cynicism and despair that we have no real friends in the world, that all the big powers are equally undependable and that Pakistan's multi-dimensional flirtation is more paying than our constancy.

But the reaction to the Soviet decision at the political level has several other motivations as well. It is one thing to acknowledge that there is not much prospect of improvement in our relations with Pakistan, and quite another to advocate the burning of all bridges with that country. But that precisely is what the Government is being asked to do by a certain political parties. These parties, which opposed the Tashkent Agreement and the subsequent withdrawal of troops, and wanted the Kutch Award to be rejected, do not distinguish between defence of our legitimate interests, military as well as political, and indiscriminate hostility to Pakistan. If the communists



tried to exploit the anti-US sentiment in 1954 and in 1965, the anti communists will have their day now. But it will be a tragedy if we let 1954 repeat itself. True, Jawaharlal Nehru had himself given the lead to the national campaign then against US arms aid to Pakistan. But that was against the background of an international situation in which the late John Foster Dulles was ringing the Soviet Union with bases and dividing the world into allies and enemies of the U.S. The US was then using Pakistan as an instrument of its policies. That Pakistan itself has had to retrace its steps since then justifies our opposition to American arms aid.

The argument that Soviet arms aid is intended to wean Pakistan away from China and the US does not cut much ice. Pakistan's friendship with Peking in essentially tactical and as long as Indo-Pakistani relations are in their present state of conflict and tension, Pakistan cannot be "weaned away" from Peking. It may be presumed that the Soviet Union appreciates this as much as the U. S. Washington was initially shocked when Pakistan took the side of China against India, and for a time in 1965 our criticism of Pakistan's flirtation with China while remaining in Western military pacts fell on receptive ears in the U. S. But ultimately Pakistan was able to convince Washington that its freind-ship with China was a tactical manoeuvre to pressurize India and that Sino-Pak relations were devoid of political or ideological content. To emphasise this President Ayub Khan got rid of Mr. Bhutto.

In other words, just as Japan, West Germany and the U. K. were having commercial relations with China unmindful of Washington's opposition, so was Pakistan successful in developing political and military relations with China whom it regarded primarily as an enemy of India. The U. S. could do nothing about it ; nor can the Soviet Union retrieve the situation now.

It is equally unrealistic to presume that the U. S. and the Soviet Union are competing for Pakistan's favours. It seems more a case of trying to get some leverage in a country of over one hundred million people, which after President Ayub Khan may again be in the throes of vast changes.

In this context, it is a lesser evil for us that Pakistan gets U.S. or Soviet rather

than Chinese arms. The global policies of both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have a restraining influence on any disturbance of the status quo. The U.S. withheld supplies to Pakistan during the 1965 conflict, and the Soviet Union stood by while the U.A.R. was humbled by Israel in June 1967. Similarly, the two powers will tend to discourage, if not actually prevent, even a limited war in the Indian sub-continent.

It will be foolish to imagine that all the Soviet military equipment being given to Pakistan is defensive, in fact as absurd as Defence Minister Swaran Singh's argument that the helicopters supplied earlier were not for military purposes. There is a famous observation of Mr. Krishna Menon that a gun does not fire in a single direction, nor does a missile for that matter.

In short, it will be futile to be little, militarily or politically, the implications of the Soviet decision. At the same time, it will be disastrous to launch an anti-Soviet campaign on the principle involved in the Soviet action and also what it means in tangible terms. The Soviet has to be our largest supplier of defence equipment because the U. S. still does not give "non-allies" sophisticated planes, tanks or missiles, and we do not have the foreign exchange to shop elsewhere. Our two-year quest for a submarine for the navy is a case in point. Further, thanks to the arms deals with the Soviet Union,, a trend towards uniformity and standardisation of defence material, especially in the Air Force, is emerging. So, instead of complaining about having put all our eggs in the Soviet basket, we should make the best of the links we have established with the Soviet Union and try to maintain a qualitative edge over Pakistan.

Any response to the Soviet arms sales to Pakistan based on assumptions which were relevant in the context of the cold war would today be totally inappropriate. Even if we took the absurd extreme step of breaking off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, the U.S. is not going to reward us by showering arms on us. So, what is necessary is to avoid isolating ourselves from our friends while waiting for an opportunity to settle with Pakistan and China without detriment to our national interest, and prestige. If the Soviet decision induces among some of us a realisation of the need for improving relations with Pakistan and China, it will be a blessing in disguise.

**श्री राजनारायण :** माननीया, श्री भूपेन्द्र नाथ जी मंडल का संशोधन चूंकि बाद में मिला हाउस में, इसलिए हमने अपना एक संशोधन मूव किया है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am permitting you to move that amendment to the amendment.

**श्री राजनारायण :** माननीया, मैं इस सदन में अपने सम्मानित सदस्यों को बहुत ध्यान से सुन रहा था। तीन प्रकार की आवाज मुझे सुनाई दी। कुछ तो रूस की आवाज उठाते हैं, कुछ अमरीका की आवाज उठाते हैं और कुछ चीन की आवाज उठाते हैं। मैं यह देख रहा हूँ कि भारत की आवाज अभी तक इस सदन में उठी नहीं है। इसलिए मैं भारत की आवाज को उठाना चाहता हूँ और उस आवाज को उठाने के पूर्व मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने 12 जुलाई को श्रीमती प्रधान मंत्री जी को जो पत्र भेजा था सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों की जानकारी के लिए उस पत्र को आपकी आज्ञा से पढ़ देना चाहूंगा। मुझे खुशी है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उसका उत्तर भी दिया और उन्होंने कहा कि आपका वक्तव्य जो आपने प्रेस को भेजा था और पत्र मुझे मिले और मैंने उनको देखा। इसलिये अपना जो प्रेस वक्तव्य है उसे सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों की जानकारी के लिये और उनका दिमाग बनाने के लिये आपको सुनाना चाहता हूँ। वह सोचें कि सदन में यकायक आकर कहने की बात नहीं है बल्कि बहुत सोच समझ कर जो हमारा दिमाग है उस दिमाग को हमने थोड़े में रखा है। और माननीया, मैं यह सिद्ध करने का प्रयत्न करूंगा कि यह दिमाग हमारा आज का नहीं है बल्कि यह हमारा दिमाग 1946, 1947 और 1948 ई० से बना हुआ है और वही दिमाग आज चल रहा है। जो भारत की विदेश-नीति है वह भारत की विदेश-नीति बुनियाद से ही गलत है। मैं अपने माननीय मित्र धारिया जी को सुन रहा था, मैं बड़ा आश्चर्य-चकित हुआ कि वह आज क्या बोल रहे हैं,

मैं बराबर इस प्रयत्न में हूँ कि वह हमारे नजदीक आयें, मैं बराबर प्रयत्न करता हूँ कि हमारे श्री भूपेश गुप्ता हमारे नजदीक आयें, हमारे श्री ए० पी० चटर्जी हमारे नजदीक आयें, हमारे श्री भंडारी जी हमारे नजदीक आयें . . .

**श्री ग्रोम मेहता (जम्मू और काश्मीर) :** दूर कौन है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** . . . इसलिये चाहता हूँ कि हमारा जो 12 तारीख का बयान था वह ध्यान से सुना जाय। वह यह है :

“हम बराबर भारत सरकार की नपुंसक विदेश नीति पर जनता का ध्यान आकर्षित किये हैं। भारत सरकार ने कभी भी स्वतंत्र सृजनात्मक नीति नहीं अपनायी है। . . .”

**उपसभापति :** क्या पढ़ते हो आप ?

**श्री राजनारायण :** जो हमने इन्दिरा जी को अपना पत्र भेजा है उसे।

“ . . . यही कारण है, भारत रूस, अमेरिका और ब्रिटेन की कभी कभी अलग अलग और कभी सम्मिलित कूटनीति के जाल में फंसा रहता है।

मैं सभी भारतीयों को एक सत्य बराबर स्मरण करने की सलाह आज भी देना चाहूंगा कि मुल्क का भारत और पाकिस्तान में बट-वारा त्रीराष्ट्र, मित्रराष्ट्र (अमेरिका, रूस ब्रिटेन) की उस विदेश नीति का फल है जो हिन्दुस्तान को कमजोर राष्ट्र के रूप में आजाद देखना चाहते थे। कभी अमेरिका पाकिस्तान को हथियारी मदद देगा, कभी रूस देगा, यह उनके लिये अनिवार्य है उसी प्रकार जैसे कि उन मुद्दों पर आज भारत की सरकारी नीति में भारत के लिये रोना, हल्ला मचाना अनिवार्य है। भारत यदि इस स्थिति से छुटकारा चाहता है, जैसा कि अब उसे अवश्य ही करना चाहिए तो भारत को यह अंतिम निर्णय ले लेना चाहिए कि चाहे हम पूर्णतः मिट जायें, नष्ट हो जायें, मगर अमेरिका, रूस, ब्रिटेन या तीनों के सम्मिलित

दबाव के सामने अपने राष्ट्र हित के प्रश्नों पर नहीं झुकेंगे। कच्छ और ताशकंद जैसे समझौते के चक्कर में नहीं पड़ेंगे। जो लोग कच्छ और ताशकंद जैसे समझौते के पक्षपाती थे उनको समझ लेना चाहिए था कि उन समझौते के गर्भ से ही रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियारी सहायता प्राप्त होगी। जब पाकिस्तान हथियारी लड़ाई में भारत के सैनिकों, बहादुर सैनिकों के सामने नहीं टिक पाया, तब ताशकंद समझौते का मसविदा आया। ताशकंद समझौते का मसविदा सभी की राय से आया।

मैं निश्चित मत का हूँ कि यदि सन् 1965 के सितम्बर युद्ध में पाकिस्तान का पलड़ा भारी रहता तो रूस, अमेरिका समझौते के लिये हरगिज जोर न देते। हमें यह भी समझ लेना चाहिए कि भारत के संदर्भ में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय पूंजीवाद और साम्यवाद समान रूप से आज भी असंगत है और पूंजीवादी अमेरिका या साम्यवादी रूस दोनों अपने स्वार्थ के नज़रिये से हिन्दुस्तान को देखते हैं।

इस समय मैं विशेष न कह कर केवल देश को सचेत करना चाहता हूँ कि वह अन्न और धियार दोनों में अपनी सृजनात्मक सक्रिय, स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति को ले कर चले और दुनिया की यदि सभी ताकतें एक हो कर भारत को नष्ट करने का प्रयत्न करें तो भी उनका मुकाबला करें तथा इस नीति की शुरुआत करें, ताशकंद और कच्छ समझौते को तत्काल रद्द कर के।

हमने प्रधान मंत्री के पास 12 तारीख को यह पत्र भेजा था और मैं चाहता हूँ कि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य अब इतना सुनने के बाद समझें कि हम चाहते क्या हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि भारत की जनता भारत के राजनीतिक नेता, भारत के राजनैतिक दल, भारत की सरकार आज मुक्त कंठ से इस सत्य को स्वीकार करे कि अमेरिका और रूस जहां तक भारत का ताल्लुक है भारत को सम्पूर्ण सशक्त राष्ट्र के रूप में नहीं देखना चाहते

और उनकी यह नीति आज से नहीं है बल्कि यह इनकी नीति बीस साल पहले से है। मैं अपने इस कथन के समर्थन में पंडित जवाहर-लाल जी और आज की प्रधान मंत्री, आज की सरकार, दोनों की स्थिति को स्पष्ट करना चाहूंगा।

**उपसभापति :** आपके लिये सिर्फ 10 मिनट हैं, कैसे आप यह सब पढ़ेंगे ?

**श्री राजनारायण :** 25 फरवरी, 1954 को जब कि अमेरिकी हथियार पाकिस्तान को मिल रहे थे उस समय भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने क्या कहा था इसको जरा इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य समझ लें और क्या उन्हीं शब्दों की पुनरावृत्ति, उन्हीं शब्दों को उन्हीं भावों को आज भी श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू की सरकार नहीं दुहरा रही है, दुहरा रही है या नहीं दुहरा रही है इसको भी आप मद्देनजर रखें। यह है :

In 1953 Mr. Nehru said that he believed with regard to the proposed U. S.-Pak pact the United States had gone pretty far and that the matter was of most intense concern to India. India, he said, was watching these developments with the greatest care. The Indian Press took over the issue and the whole country was emotionally charged in its opposition to the U. S. move to aid Pakistan militarily."

श्री जवाहर लाल जी ने "मोस्ट इंटेंस कंसर्न" कहा और इस समय श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी केवल "कंसर्न" शब्द का प्रयोग करती हैं। देखा जाय उनका बयान, उसमें केवल "कंसर्न" है। श्री भगत ने जो बयान कल पढ़ा

"As I have earlier said we view this development with concern."

ग्रेटेस्ट कंसर्न कहा और इन्होंने केवल "कंसर्न" ही इस समय कहा। अब यह खुद समझें कि क्या कह रहे हैं।

अब, इसी के बाद जब मिलिटरी पैकट हो रहा था, हथियार देने की बात चल रही थी कुछ हथियार आ रहे थे, तब इसको नेहरू

[श्री राजनारायण]

जी ने "ग्रेट कंसर्न" से देखा और जब हथियार आ गये तब पंडित जी पार्लियामेंट में 13 मार्च, 1959 का बोले हैं तो जरा पंडित जी की वाणी सुन लीजिये। वही वाणी हुबहु आज भी भारत सरकार रूसी एंड के बारे में बोल रही है :-

"In view of this interpretation on the part of Pakistan and the doubts that had arisen because of this agreement a request was made to the United States authorities for clarification. We have been assured by U. S. authorities that their latest bilateral agreement with Pakistan has no effect other than the extension of the Eisenhower doctrine to cover Pakistan and that the Eisenhower doctrine restricts the use of United States armed forces to cases of armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism. We have been specifically assured that this agreement cannot be used against India."

आगे चल कर के 1959 ई० में जो वाक्य पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने इस्तेमाल किया हुबहु उसी वाक्य को आज इन्दिरा जी इस्तेमाल कर रही हैं रूस के हथियार के बारे में कि हमें विश्वास दिला दिया गया है कि रूसी हथियार का प्रयोग भारत के खिलाफ नहीं होगा, भारत के प्रति जो सद्भावना है वह ज्यों की त्यों है, भारत को घबड़ाना नहीं चाहिये। तो बच्चा लेमनचूस चूसो, लेमनचूस चूसो, चाकलेट चूसो।

अब देखा जाय। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, जो अपने को राजनीतिक कहते हैं उनसे, कि आखिर नेता कौन हैं। आज तीन प्रकार के संकट भारत में आ गये हैं। एक संकट है तो विचार का, समझ का संकट है, दूसरा संकट है तो ईमान का संकट है और तीसरा संकट है तो कर्म का संकट है। तीनों संकट आज भारत में हैं। न तो इनके पास विचार है, न समझ है, न इनका ईमान ठीक रहा है, न इनके अन्दर कर्मठता रह गई है। इस लिये मैं आज भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर ईमानदारी के साथ रूसी हथियार की जो मदद पाकिस्तान को हो रही है उसका विरोध

करने की तनिक भी हमारे में इच्छा है तो काहे को ताशकंद समझौता मानते हैं, काहे को कच्छ समझौता मानते हैं। अपने दिमाग को साफ करें और ईमानदारी के साथ कहें कि हम ताशकंद समझौते को मानने से इंकार करते हैं, उसको हम ठुकराते हैं क्योंकि हम ताशकंद गये थे रूसी प्रधान मंत्री के निमंत्रण पर और वहां जाकर हमने समझौता किया था कि हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच में सद्भावना हो और बार्डर के सभी इश्यू समाप्त होने चाहिये, जिससे कोई समस्या नहीं रह जायेगी। बावजूद इसके अब पाकिस्तान को हथियारों से मदद हो रही है तो माननीया, मैं फिर भी कहना चाहता हूँ, अकसर लोग पता नहीं क्या समझते हैं, हमारे पास फारेन पालिसी रिटन बाई० डा० राममनोहर लोहिया यह एक किताब है। मैं उसकी भी ओण नियन को यहाँ पढ़ूंगा। एक और बात मैं यह भी याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ अपने मित्र डा० आभाई पटेल को कि बुद्धि में ताला लगा कर चलने से काम नहीं चलेगा। हमें याद आता है जब कि हम लोग शपथ लेते थे 1946-47 में और जब हमारे मित्र धारिया भी हमारे साथ रहे हों, डा० लोहिया ने एक लेख लिखा था कि साम्यवाद यूरोप की प्रभुसत्ता को एशिया पर कायम रखने का आखिरी कूटनीतिक हथियार है। उस लेख को आचार्य नरेन्द्रदेव ने कहा एक हफ्ते तक छापने नहीं दिया जाय, जयप्रकाश-नारायण जी देख लें, अशोक जी देख लें। एक हफ्ते के बाद डा० लोहिया ने कहा हमारा यह लेख जायेगा और वह लेख गया। डा० लोहिया ने कहा, इधर उधर की बात करने से कोई मतलब नहीं है, इन्टेन्शन में जाने की कोई बात नहीं है। इन्टेन्शन में जा कर हम करेंगे क्या। आप कहते हो रूस का इन्टेन्शन बहुत अच्छा है, आप कहते हो अमरीका का इन्टेन्शन बड़ा अच्छा है। तो उसको कितने अच्छे तरीके से, सफाई के साथ, डा० लोहिया ने बताया उसको मैं एक पैरा पढ़ कर बताऊंगा। माननीय सदस्य जान लें। (Interruption.) अंग्रेजी में है। हमारा समय नष्ट नहीं करो।

अगर दिमाग नहीं बनाना चाहते हो तो बोलने से कोई फायदा नहीं है। जो नीति चल रही है उस नीति का नतीजा देख रहे हैं, भूषण जो देख रहे हैं, हम देख रहे हैं, अगर उस नीति में कोई अमेन्डमेन्ट या संशोधन करना नहीं है तो हमारे बोलने से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। जब जनता में समझ आयेगी और देश का प्रबुद्ध समाज जागेगा तो अपने आप चेत जायेंगे। तो डा० लोहिया ने अपनी थियरी में समान असंगत का नाम लिया। कुछ लोगों ने उसमें इक्वीडिस्टेन्स को इक्वीडिस्टेन्स का नाम दे दिया जो हमारा कहना नहीं था। फिर भी मैं कहता हूँ आओ भारतीयों, अपने राष्ट्र को देखो। क्या हिन्दुस्तान की स्वाधीनता हिन्दुस्तान को पाकिस्तान और भारत दो मुल्कों में बांटना, जो यह तिराष्ट्र मित्र राष्ट्र थे अमरीका, ब्रिटेन और रूस, क्या इन तीन मित्र राष्ट्रों के गर्भ से मुल्क का बंटवारा नहीं हुआ। हमारे मित्र भूषण गुप्त को मालूम है, एक मर्तवा वे यहां कह चुके थे और मैं फिर उसको कहना चाहता हूँ, वह सोचें और समझें, अगर एक बार गलती हो गई है तो उसकी पुनरावृत्ति करना कोई नीति नहीं है। क्या उन्होंने मुल्क के बंटवारे की ताईद नहीं की। मुल्क के बंटवारे के पूर्व क्या उन्होंने मुल्क का सारा वातावरण नहीं देखा। जब मुल्क टुकड़ों में बांटा गया तो क्या आप समझते हो जब मुल्क दो टुकड़ों में हो जायेगा तो वह एक टुकड़े को कमजोर होने देंगे ? हाँ नहीं। जिस दिमाग ने हिन्दुस्तान को भारत और पाकिस्तान में बांटा वह दिमाग पाकिस्तान को कभी कमजोर नहीं होने देगा, वह दिमाग पाकिस्तान को उस स्तर पर रखेगा जिस स्तर पर जाकर पाकिस्तान भारत का मुकाबला बराबर करता रहेगा। विश्व की साम्राज्यवादी और साम्यवादी शक्तियां नहीं चाहती कि भारत एक सबल राष्ट्र होकर आए क्योंकि वह दोनों जानते हैं कि भारत का अतीत बहुत ही गौरवशाली रहा है। (Time bell rings) भारत के पास प्रभुताई है, भारत की क्षमता है, भारत के पास वह शक्तियां विद्यमान हैं कि अगर वह सारी

शक्तियां सम्पुट हो जायें, दिमाग ठीक हो जाय, तो रूस और अमरीका हमारा बाल बांका नहीं कर सकते और आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ : अगर भारत आज डंके की चोट पर कह दे कि आओ, रूसी भाई, हम तुमसे झगड़ा नहीं चाहते, हम तुमसे मित्रता चाहते हैं, आओ अमरीकी भाई, हम तुमसे झगड़ा नहीं चाहते, हम तुमसे मित्रता चाहते हैं, हम विश्व नागरिकता के सिद्धांत को मानते हैं, विश्व बन्धुत्व के सिद्धांत को मानते हैं मगर हमको मत छोड़ो, हमको दबाने की कोशिश न करो क्योंकि चाहे दुनिया की सारी ताकत आकर भारत को दबाने के लिये खड़ी हो जायें तो भारत की जनता भी यह कह कर उठ खड़ी हो जायेगी कि हम इनकार करते हैं तुमसे दबने से। मरने की तमन्ना ले कर चलने वाला मुल्क जिन्दा होता है और कायर और नपुंसक नीति को चलने वाला मुल्क मृतक समान होता है। इसलिये मैं आज इस प्रस्ताव पर बोलते हुए आपके जरिये माननीया, सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से अपील करूंगा : मरने की ओर मिटने की तमन्ना करने वाले छोटे से मुल्क इजराईल या पश्चिमी जर्मनी, पूर्वी जर्मनी मिट गये, फिर बन गये, खड़े हो गये। अब बीस साल से हम घिसघिस घिसघिस करके जो लड़िया गाड़ी चला रहे हैं उसका पहिया टूट गया है, अब जो चाल थी वह भी धीमी हो गई है। इसलिये मैं ताशकंद समझौते को, कच्छ समझौते को, एक स्वर से रिजेक्ट (रद्द) करने की मांग करता हूँ। माननीया, देखिये :

"Now what is this Warsaw Alliance ? I have no intention to go into the Russian motives but I would like to state the Russian case just in order to understand how their mind works. Russians seem to think that they must provide for themselves some kind of a shield against West European aggression and they have therefore extended their frontiers right up to the Oder and Spree and similar rivers in Europe, let us say beyond Poland and such like East European countries. Whatever might be their motives, their action is of a piece with Britain and France, for if Russian armies can exist in Hungary and

### [श्री राजनारायण]

Poland and Rumania only if they continue suppressing the sentiments of millions of these peoples, the consequences are obvious. I have often been told

I am adding "by Mr. Gupta"—

that the conflict in Hungary is between progress and reaction. We should reject such an explanation and boldly declare that even if reaction were to triumph, national freedom and sovereignty is an essential condition for all else, until a world parliament is elected on the basis of adult franchise."

SHRI G. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : Now, add Czechoslovakia.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now your time is over Mr. Rajnarain.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीयां, हमको तीन चार मिनट दे दें तो अपनी बात कह दूँ।

उपसभापति : अच्छा, आप तीन चार मिनट लें।

श्री राजनारायण : अब इसी के साथ साथ मैं भारत की विदेश नीति की ओर अपने आदरणीय सदन के सदस्यों का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूँगा। भारत आजाद कब हुआ ? 1947 में। इसी संदर्भ में मैं डा० लोहिया की किताब से एक पीस यहाँ सुनाना चाहता हूँ। अगर डा० लोहिया की इस किताब को श्री स्वर्ण सिंह न खरीद सकें तो मैं दे दूँगा।

"What these old influences have been is perfectly clear from the face of India's foreign policy from 1948 to 1957, or rather, from 1947. You might remember that although free India had nothing to do with the war against Germany and Japan, the State of legal war between India on the one hand and Germany and Japan on the other lasted until 1950 or 1951."

इसका कोई उत्तर स्वर्ण सिंह के पास है, या श्रीमती इंदिरा नेहरू गांधी के पास है !

For four years free India was at war with Germany and Japan. Why ?

"Again because of the intellectual enslavement to Great Britain, because Great Britain was at war with Germany and Japan, in a legal way, not actually, therefore India also continued to be at war. India took reparations."

हमने मुआवजा लिया। यह भारत की विदेश नीति है। काहे आपने जापान से, जर्मनी से मुआवजा लिया, इसीलिये न कि चूंकि ब्रिटेन लड़ रहा था, चूंकि रशिया लड़ रहा था, चूंकि अमरीका लड़ रहा था और ये मित्र-राष्ट्र थे और हम ब्रिटेन से संबंधित थे, हम गुलाम थे। यह सब क्या चीजें हैं ? इसलिये मैं बहुत ही सफाई के साथ चाहता हूँ कि भारत की सरकार अपनी नपुंसक, दकियानूसी, राष्ट्रहित विरोधी, जनहितविरोधी नीति को तिलांजली दे। डा० लोहिया के शब्दों में विश्व की पार्लियामेंट एडल्ट फ्रेन्चाइज पर बने, भारत उस पार्लियामेंट में जाय, दूसरे देशों के लोग जायें, तब जाकर दुनिया की एक सरकार को विश्व की मानवता अच्छी तरह से ग्रहण कर सकती है। इसलिये मैं एक तरफ रूस की मदद को कन्डेम करता हूँ, उसकी निन्दा करता हूँ और दूसरी तरफ भारत की नपुंसक विदेश नीति से घृणा करता हूँ, और उसका जबर्दस्त शब्दों में ठुकराने की जनता से मांग करता हूँ। आज मैं सरकार से दावे के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर चुनाव में श्री इन मसलों को लेकर कांग्रेस जनता के सामने आए और इनको पूंजीपतियों का पैसा न मिले तो मैं कहता हूँ जनता इनकी जमानत जप्त कर दे। हमारे स्वर्ण सिंह ने हरियाणा में देखा, एक कैपिटलिस्ट ने 16 लाख रु० दिया। उसको मैसूर में एक सीमेन्ट फैक्टरी दे दी गई, दूसरी जगह फैक्टरी दी जा रही है। हमारे माननीय सदस्य चन्द्रशेखर और भार्गव रोज चिल्लाते हैं। अपनी शकलों को देखो, अपने चेहरों को पढ़ो। आप कहां खड़े हैं, किस बालू के ढेर में खड़े हैं ?

इतना कहने के बाद मैं भारत की विदेश नीति का विरोध करता हूँ, ताशकंद समझौते का विरोध करता हूँ, रूस ने जिस ढंग से पाकिस्तान को मदद की है उसकी निन्दा करता हूँ। मैं भारत सरकार की दकियानूसी, राष्ट्र-विरोधी नीति के प्रति घृणा प्रकट करता हूँ जिसने जनता और पार्लियामेंट को तिलांजली

दी है और उसको ठोकर मार कर उसकी अवहेलना की है। मैं चाहता हूँ यह सरकार एक स्वतंत्र नीति अख्तियार करे, तभी देश में पूर्ण प्रभुत्व-सम्पन्न राष्ट्र का निर्माण होगा।

SHRI ABID ALI (Maharashtra) Madam, you have been kind to me as you have been kind to the colleagues who have spoken.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I want Members earnestly to co-operate in keeping their speeches within ten minutes.

SHRI ABID ALI : Our friend, Shri Rajnarain, was trying to remind the friends here that there have been some pro-Russians and some pro-Americans. I acknowledge that the hon. Member is an Indian but he should remember that he and his party are very much helping the Chinese Communists and Russian Communists, both, and co-operating with them in forming the Governments in some of the States. I hope that from now onwards at least he will implement the wish that he was expressing this afternoon.

Madam, with regard to this particular question, there is no occasion to be panicky or to exaggerate the situation. Pakistan has been promised some arms. I think that now we are sufficiently equipped to meet the situation to the extent at least that Pakistan will be strengthened through this help from Russia. But, Madam, the seriousness is in the trend. We do not like this way of Russian help and particularly the mention about reverse. That shows shift in policy. Some friend was telling here that Jawaharlal<sup>^</sup> did not mention this when Americans helped Pakistan. But did Jawaharlal<sup>^</sup> not say that this help from the U. S. A. to Pakistan is a challenge to our manhood ? Let us all remember that particular sentence of Jawaharlalji. At that time there were some people who were demonstrating in front of the U.S. Embassy. Now some other set of people are protesting. Those who were then protesting are now silent, and those who were then silent are now very much vocal. It is very interesting. Those who were so much vocal then now sit like a wet rat in front of a cat. That is the situation. Their loyalty is so much to foreign countries. I would request our Government particularly to remember that this silence is not because Government has been issuing this sort of statements. This silence is because of extraterritorial loyalty, and this will

change whenever occasion may change. That must always be remembered. Our people are angry because they rightly feel that giving this sort of help to the enemy of ours—we are not their enemy but they are their enemy; they are always eager to talk in terms of aggression; they are actively thinking about aggression, therefore people naturally do not like it. But when they will be assured that we are fully equipped to meet the situation, certainly I am sure they will feel that as we are strong, we shall become more and more strong and face the situation.

Some people say that the Russians have been very kind to us on the occasion of some veto and all that. But is it not a fact that it was India alone from amongst the non-Communist countries which first gave support to Russians in the matter of Hungary ? We supported them. That was a crucial situation and India came to their rescue at that time.

AN HON. MEMBER : It was a wrong step.

SHRI ABID ALI : May be. Most of us did not like it and what we are today in is because of that, but I am only mentioning a historical fact. The same thing was the case when the Tibet question arose. A statesman like Rajen Babu was not in its favour, but we supported them. But now "Hindi-Chini bhai bhai" "Hindi-Russi bhai bhai", all this has now been completely exposed. Anyway let us at least now have a little rethinking. I do not say that our non-alignment policy was wrong. It was a right policy. It should continue. But my submission, my request is (a) it should be a genuinely, completely non-aligned policy, genuine and complete; (b) our foreign Embassies, Ambassadors, Consulates, etc., all should be sufficiently alert. What have they been doing ? I find how the Embassies of Pakistan are working in various parts of the world. With missionary spirit they are working. When I mention this here, our Foreign Minister comes forward to say, "No, no; everything is all right". Nothing is all right. They do not behave as Indians, those who have been roaming about in foreign countries would confirm this. They are proud. They are un-Indian. They do not think about India. They think of something else, of their own interest. Some of them have failed to convey to us the correct situation prevailing in the countries where they have been posted. Kindly, if you do not want to punish them, at least disqualify them to be in Foreign Service

[Shri Abid Ali] Utilise them here if you want, I do not mind, but at least they have become unfit to represent us in foreign countries. (Interruption.) I must say that there are good people amongst them, there are competent people serving in our foreign Embassies. All are not bad, all cannot be bad anywhere. But this assumption that, anybody who has been posted in a foreign country has been of the required standard, this mentality is very dangerous so far as the country's interests are concerned. That is why I am submitting that it should change. We have been depending on bogus friends, and we have been depending upon the officers who are incompetent and we have been deceived by our own colleagues. One of them was mentioned this morning, Mr. Krishna Menon. It was because of his advice that while going to Colombo, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in Coimbatore, perphas, said, "I have asked my army to drive away the Chinese". That was the assessment that was reported to him. When Krishna Menon met Chau-en-lie no Indian interpreter was present. What he talked to him has appeared in a Chinese document. No interpreter was present. That was a very dangerous situation. My only request is, let us have a little rethinking, as I have submitted earlier, so that we may chalk out our line of action according to the requirements of the situation. I do not say, break off with Russia. No. We do not want to fight, and so long as we do not want to be fighting we should be talking. Let us go on talking and try to explain to them the correct sentiments and the consequences and the feelings of Indians with regard to this particular item and the change of mentality that has resulted from this deal of theirs.

Therefore, Madam, particularly again I may request the Government, so far as these friends here are concerned, to be very careful about them. See what 3 P. M. President Nasser has done. Nasser is very much friendly with Russia ; but so far as the communists in his country are concerned, that party has been banned and he is not allowing any communist there to function....

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What about Pakistan? Even in Pakistan .....

SHRI ABID ALI : Yes, yes, very much so even in Pakistan. Here we think that if we take action against the communists, the Russians will be angry; formerly we were thinking that the Chinese would disapprove in case we punish Communists

here. That attitude is not correct from the requirements of the national interests And if Government still goes on thinking that way it would be wrong. Let Russia be angry. But I know they will not be angry because they have not been angry in the matter of so many other countries having taken action against the communists in their own countries. Here you remember when our great friend Mr. Mathur said referring to an hon. Member here that we should consider matters purely from Indian point of view, he was interrupted.

A direct question was put Tell me, are you an Indian or a communist

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : What about you ? Are you an Indian ?

SHRI ABID ALI : That the honourable Member should know himself. Those who are in glass-houses should not throw stones.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : You have been speaking about our loyalty to the nation.

SHRI ABID ALI : Don't be excited-

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : Who are you ?

SHRI ABID ALI : Madam Deputy Chairman, about whom have I been speaking ?

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : .... loyalty of the communists who are here as Parliamentary members. You have no business to say all that. You must withdraw.

SHRI ABID ALI : He is not prepared to disclose the identity (Interruptions.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now. Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy. I am calling you.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : Madam Deputy Chairman, there are no two opinions in the country that the Soviet decision to supply arms to Pakistan has added to our perils. The response to this grave situation as expected should have been national unity. But the Government missed a splendid opportunity. When this question was raised in the meeting of the leaders of the Opposition with the Prime Minister, Mr. Nath Pai had suggested to the Government a



resolution that had the backing of the democratic opposition parties in the country. What was that resolution? I will read for the benefit of this House. I quote: "This House regrets the decision of the Soviet Union to supply military arms and equipment to Pakistan as it is constituting a grave threat to the security of the country and to the peace of this sub-continent". A more comprehensive, a more constructive, a more dignified and a more restrained response, at least I cannot think of.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra PRADESH): But there was no resolution when the United States helped Pakistan?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, at that time we all know, the Prime Minister criticised, condemned the action of the United States of America in supplying arms to Pakistan. At that time Pakistan was and now it continues to be, a member of the SEATO and CENTO. We did criticise at that time. We never passed a resolution. But the voice of the Prime Minister (Nehru) at that time reflected the voice of the people of this country. The Government says that it is concerned, that it is surprised at the action of the Soviet Union in supplying arms to Pakistan, that it is going to create tensions in this sub-continent. But still they are afraid to strike it. They are afraid to pass a resolution which voices the feelings of this country, disapproving of the action of the Soviet Union in supplying arms to Pakistan. Even now I appeal to the Government, I am glad that the Prime Minister is here, that they should accept the amendment moved by my friend Shri Banka Behary Das. Madam Deputy Chairman, we should have a dispassionate, cool assessment of the Soviet action. It has released forces of reaction, it has released forces of aggression in Pakistan to create further trouble in this sub-continent. Madam Deputy Chairman, this announcement of Soviet military aid to Pakistan came after 40 hours of a speech that was made by Mr. Arshad Hussain, the Pakistan foreign Minister, to say that they are not going to tolerate the present cease-fire line and that they are prepared to use force to have Kashmir included in Pakistan; and this announcement came after 48 hours of the speech made by Arshad Hussain, Foreign Minister of Pakistan. This was not an accidental announcement. After cool and deliberate thinking the Soviet Union has decided to supply arms

to Pakistan. This change in the attitude of the U.S.S.R., concerns Pakistan and India. In relation to India it did not come off suddenly. In 1964 we had an indication of this change in the attitude of Soviet representative when he made a "Narowa Kunjarowa" Speech in the Security Council. The Soviet attitude today has been "Ramaya Swasti, Raw-anaya Swasti", that good and evil be treated alike. The aggressor and the victim of aggression and the ally and the adversary are treated equally. Non-aligned India and Pakistan, a Member of the CENTO and SEATO military Pacts aimed against the Soviet Union are treated alike. This is a very strange phenomenon that is now taking place. Madam Deputy Chairman, our Government is far more concerned about the likely offence that this expression of disapproval may cause to the U.S.S.R., than the harm that is going to cause to us by this supply of military equipment to Pakistan by the U.S.S.R.

The Minister of External Affairs on the 4th of April, 1968 had this to say. With your permission, I will quote:

"In this matter we have tried to convince the United States Government that they have been changing their policy. They first said that they will give only non-lethal weapons which had no relation to military hardware. Then they started giving lethal weapons. Now, the recent report about 100 Patton tanks being given to Pakistan or the reported decision of supply of another variety, B-47 tanks, that is definitely going to damage or upset the military balance between India and Pakistan. This is a very serious situation that has developed and it neutralises all that we are trying to build up and it affects our close relations with Pakistan. It will be our effort to bring home to the Government of the United States that this particular factor is going against the spirit of Tashkent and is coming in the way of having friendly and good-neighbourly relations with Pakistan."

This is what the Minister of State had to say when America tried to supply some spears, tanks and other military equipment to Pakistan. And they have not got the guts to say that the country which was responsible for this Tashkent Agreement, the architect of the Tashkent Agreement,

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

n utter violation and in disregard of the Tashkent Agreement decided to supply military equipment and arms to Pakistan.

Madam Deputy Chairman, we should take a very serious view of this thing. My party has always believed...

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh) : What is your party ?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : The P. S. P. has always believed in friendship with the U.S.S.R., and we continue to believe that we should have friendship with the U.S.S.R. It is a socialist country—no doubt about it. But the attitude that is now being adopted by the U.S.S.R., a socialist country, resembles that of any imperialist country that is now going about. So, there does not seem to be much difference in the methods that are adopted by the U.S.S.R., or America.

Lastly, when the announcement came, the President knew about it. I understand that he was advised by some of the officers of the External Affairs Ministry and by some Ministers that he should postpone his visit to the U.S.S.R. But in spite of the advice given, he went to the U.S.S.R. After the conclusion of his visit and after having had talks with the leaders of the U.S.S.R., a communique was issued. This is what it says—I am quoting from the communique—with regard to the relations with Pakistan :

"In the course of the talks, there was an exchange of views on the question of Indo-Pakistani relations. The Indian side informed about the steps taken by them with a view to normalising relations between the two countries on the basis of the Tashkent Declaration and informed about their efforts to restore normal exchanges and contacts in various fields. The Soviet side appreciated the mutual efforts made by both sides for the normalisation of Indo-Pakistani relations. The hope was expressed that India and Pakistan will continue their efforts to settle step by step controversial questions and to establish good-neighbourly relations between them."

I take objection to this. We do not very much like the Tashkent Agreement. A pledged word was given to us that areas like the Haji Pir Pass and other strategic areas which were captured by the valour of our military men and with the co-operation of the people there,

the Kashmiris, they were handed over to Pakistan under this Tashkent Agreement. We were not happy about it. In spite of all that, we expected that the Tashkent Agreement would be followed in spirit and in letter. I am glad that our Government has followed it, and tried to implement the Tashkent Agreement. Unfortunately, Pakistan never thought of implementing the Tashkent Agreement. Even the Ministerial conferences were not allowed to be convened and at every stage they are bringing hurdles in the implementation of the Tashkent Agreement. When such is the case, to say that the Soviet side appreciated the mutual efforts made by both sides for the normalisation of Indo-Pakistani relations is a travesty of truth; it is a travesty of truth for the Soviet Union to say that both sides tried their best to implement the Tashkent Agreement. It was unilaterally implemented by India and not by Pakistan. Pakistan at every stage has violated the spirit of the Tashkent Agreement and it does not care to implement it. It is a slander against this country and also against the Government of India. When our President puts his signature to a communique which was issued after his talks with the Soviet leaders, I would have appreciated if in the communique he had also expressed grave concern about the decision of the U.S.S.R. to supply military equipment and arms to Pakistan. He should not have approved of this communique.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I still believe that we should continue to have friendly relations with the U.S.S.R. But that does not prevent us, and it does not come in the way of our friendship because the U.S.S.R. is our friend and ally for the last 20 years. It was for our mutual benefit and with reciprocity that we have close, friendly relation with the U.S.S.R. Our friendship with it has given respectability to the U.S.S.R. When that is the case we should not hesitate to tell our friend and ally, the U.S.S.R., that what it is doing now, is not in the interest of this sub-continent, that it is not in the interest of peace in this sub-continent and it is not going to solve the dispute, that we have with Pakistan over Kashmir. And I am really sorry to find that the U.S.S.R., which was always standing by us and which stood by us whenever this question came up in the Security Council, which declared that Kashmir was an integral part of India, should now equate India and Pakistan and

should not take aside which is reasonably in our favour. This unfortunate shift has taken place. We should not be panicky 'over-it. But we should do everything in our power to see, that we develop our own industries and that there is selfreliance in this. This supply of arms and equipment to Pakistan by the U.S.S.R, is the unkindest cut of all.

SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO (Jammu and Kashmir) : Madam Deputy Chairman, the situation that has arisen . out of the Soviet Union's arms aid to Pakistan should be looked into in the perspective of its military implications. For the last so many years it wanted to "see that both India and Pakistan should have a friendly and cordial atmosphere. That is also our basic foreign policy.

I feel that the military implication has two aspects. As far as India is concerned, we are c jmiHent to deal with any outside power, particularly Pakistan. But the fact remains that this aid to Pakistan will evidently boost up its morale on the one hand and will, on the other hand, add to its military build-up. This will eventually result that the desire of Pakistan. for extending her hand of friendship to India will be weakened.

The worst-affected wll be Soviet Russia who cherished a desire to come closer to all countries. Their cherished desire, particularly in the light of the Tashkent Declaration that we will develop an atmosphere of friendship with Pakistan, will gel a jolt. Looking, at that one can safely call this act of Russia unwise and unfortunate. If really this was the desire of the Russian Government, then such an act, instead of developing cordial relations, will result otherwise. Therefore, I feel that we should emphatically convey i t to the Government of Russia that this act of theirs is an unwise and imprudent act.

But we should not feel concerned and go to the extent of forgetting our past relationship since we became independent. We should not forget the aid, collaboration, advice and other things that we have been having from Soviet Russia and for this apparently unwise act of theirs we should not wash off the past. As far as our basic policy is concerned we should adopt the attitude of s;-lf-reliance and educate the people also to rely upon our own resources. Our policy should always be that of self-reliance.

As far as our relationship with other countries is concerned our basic foreign policy should be guided by our desire to be friends with all, if possible, and particularly our earnest desire should be that of friendship and co-existence with the countries situated on the borders of India, namely, Burma, Indonesia, Pakistan and China. We should always think that generally our policy is of friendship and good neighbourly relations with our neighbours. Though sometimes we may have conflicts and hostility with our neighbours, that should not become permanent. That should always be transitory and momentary. It, therefore, appears o me that the attitude the Government of India has adopted is very mature, dignified and prudent. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Madam Deputy Chairman, the decision by the Soviet Union to sell arms to Pakistan has caused a certain amount of anxiety and concern in this country. This is quite understandable in view of the past record of the present Ayub regime which has not even cared to give a fair trial to the Tashkent Agreement. But som times I feel concerned about the manner in which some people are expressing their concern about the Soviet armd business.

Madam, if you go through the debates in the other House and this House you will find that in the name of showing concern the Indo-Soviet friendship is under fire, some doing it openly like Mr. Dahyabhai Patel—he is a big gunn»r some doing it surreptitiously trying to ambush, as it were, the Indo-Soviet friendship. Non-alignment is under fire. The Tashkent Agreement is under fire. Mr. Abid Ali wanted to have the Communist Party of India banned because he thinks this would protect India and it would be a good answer to the Soviet Union.

As far as Mr. B. K. P. Sinha is concerned —he spoke in the morning—he wants a rearrangement of the Secretariat personnel in the South Block. Now at concern being shown in this manner the whole world will laugh. I think we are up against every reactionary element inspired by imperialists. They are not in front but they are behind. Undoubtedly it is always the globil strategy of the diplomatic wing of the United States of America to undermine friendship among socialist countries.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Who is reactionary I would like to know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You are reactionary. If you have not understood this much what have you understood ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I do not understand the Russian language. I understand only the Indian language.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am sorry you have not understood that you are reactionary, a loveable man in a bad, reactionary and unpleasant company. The real aspect of the matter is that they have got a chance after a long time to mount an attack against the Soviet Union, against non-alignment, against the Tashkent Agreement and against progressive forces in order to defeat it. That is their line. I would like to know from the Government whether they are prepared to give concessions to this line. It is for them to decide. But certainly no man in his senses, who stands for peace and peaceful co-existence, good neighbourly relations and so on, would ever give any quarter to this calculated move of reaction. When France was giving planes to Pakistan our Tan Sangh "ends did not & to the French Embassy in demonstration nor did they raid the French Consulates in Calcutta or Bombay. But the moment the decision to give arms not even given, not even the agreed is known, marches the army to the Soviet establishment, in Delhi and Calcutta, else- SanSh/riends « Calcutta and Wel T °fed It SrAet imperialism. This is not say more than that. concern n Tri they are sh™irlS their n°onl knT many right-minded P-ople would like to dissociate with that kind concern bang shown in that manner because this has nothing to do with the real problem.

Here, Madam, suppose the arms had been given to Ceylon, Burma or other countries you would not have been worried. We are worried because of our present state of relationship with Pakistan and for that I hold Pakistan primarily and mainly responsible. There is no doubt about that. If they had given us their trust and the Agreement a trial, if they had agreed to sign a no-war pact and taken to the line of friendly relations, discussion and negotiations, perhaps this kind of concern would not have been shown even by well-meaning people. It is a tragedy of our political life in the

sub-continent that we are at loggerheads; we have not yet come together. But we are convinced that in the course of history we will teach us that it is necessary for us to live in peace and amity.

Now the Indo-Soviet atmosphere is full of misgivings and apprehensions. If the campaign is intended to undermine the Indo-Soviet friendship, discredit the policy of non-alignment, defeat the progressive forces all of which are aimed at paving the way of reaction in this country, this will not last long. Let us be very clear about it. That is why I think this concern has to be exposed, the concern of those people who in the name of concern for the country, are showing concern for inviting reactionary advent in our political and social life. Not for a moment must we forget that undermining of the Indo-Soviet friendship has been the policy of reaction and it is in full operation now.

Madam Deputy Chairman, nobody has contended here or in the other House that the Soviet arms supply on a commercial basis is going to change the military balance in the sub-continent. Sometimes our friends here and there talk as if they are the High Command, the Chiefs of General Staff. They know everything about our military position. Now, everybody knows that they are as ignorant about military affairs as I am except that perhaps they know how to wield weapons better than I do. Even the Prime Minister in her statement has not said that the proposed sale endangers the security of our country. She has, however, said—I am reading her statement—"Inevitably this accretion of strength had the effect of encouraging Pakistan in its intransigent and aggressive attitude towards India". I wish I could say that the statement is altogether wrong. But there is some substance in this statement and I hope the Soviet Union has taken this into account and will take steps to prevent this kind of intransigence gaining the upper hand as a result of the arms sale. Now I say this because the Soviet policy is one of bringing these two countries together on a peaceful plane and helping us to settle our problems through peaceful negotiations. To that the Tashkent Agreement bears adequate testimony.

Now I should like to say one or two other things. First of all, I think the Prime Minister was well advised to say that the Government did not doubt the bona fides or the good faith or the

intentions of the Soviet Union. I presume that they still think the Soviet Union are our friends. They may not think so. They have never thought Soviet Union as our friends. There is nothing new in it. They will kill us ; they will kill the Soviet Union. If they cannot do it, they will put Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan to kill somebody, or some other people in some other place. Now the Jana Sangh has become very fond of Czechoslovakia. Mr. Sondhi gets up with the action programme of the Czechoslovakia Communist Party as if he is the champion of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. This is the subterfuge of reaction. It always happens. Now, therefore, let us see why they are doing it. Let us try to understand the position of the Soviet Union. You need not agree with it. But understand the position of the Soviet Union. Let us discuss as to why the Soviet Union, a friend of ours, has decided to give arms to Pakistan knowing fully well that a great friend like India will feel a little agitated over it, all the more so because there is the Swatantra Party and the Jana Sangh, and the underground Swatantra Party and Jan Sangh sitting in the Congress benches. But do not doubt Soviet friendship. I would ask Mrs. Gandhi to note that the Soviet Union is friendly to your Government despite the fact that such a wonderful character as Mr. Abid Ali is in your benches. Is that not a sign of friendship ? It is a sign of friendship that despite that they are friendly to you. Now it is not a secret that Pakistan has been asking for arms from the Soviet Union for some time past. Now the Soviet Union has decided in principle to sell arms to Pakistan. The Prime Minister may not think it is a token supply, but nobody has said it is going to be a massive supply. We do not know either the quantity or the quality of these arms. But the fact remains that they are selling arms and these arms will fall into undesirable hands. Now I would like to know one or two things. I would like to ask the hon. Members : Would any one of you like Premier Kosygin to ask Ayub Khan to give up his demand for supply of Soviet arms by telling him that the Soviet Union would stop supplying arms to India ? I do not think anybody would suggest that line to Premier Kosygin in order to brush aside the pressure or demand from Pakistan for the supply or sale of Russian arms when the Soviet Union is trying to improve its relations with Pakistan. Therefore, let us bear that fact in mind. Now I mention this thing because this has not been mentioned by other people.

Now, it has been said that there has been a shift in the Soviet policy. Mr. Morarji Desai said that there has been shift in the Soviet policy. The statement does not say that there has been a shift. I do not know where the shift has taken place in the Cabinet. That is a different matter...

SHRI C. D. PANDE : It is a mild word for somersault.

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now three people have shifted. The shift is upwards. The shift has occurred neither to the left nor to the right but vertically.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated) : You said that Mr. Morarji Desai said that there has been a shift in the Soviet policy. Was it said only by Mr. Morarji Desai ? Did not the Prime Minister herself say that ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am sure they are in perpetual consultation. Otherwise why do you conceive them as Leader and Deputy Leader ? There is perpetual consultation between the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister. Now I should like to argue with Mr. Morarji Desai. Shift from what ? Towards which ? Against what ? First of all, if it is meant to be a shift in the Soviet policy towards Pakistan, then you must know that the Pakistan policy towards the Soviet Union has also shifted. Where is SEATO in that context ? Not that Pakistan has left it. Where is the Baghdad Pact and CENTO ? Where the Americans wanted Pakistan to be a very active partner in their aims against the Soviet Union ? Where are the U-2 bases ? Where are the bellicose statements from Karachi as used to happen in the late 'fifties or even in the early 'sixties ? It is because of Pakistan's internal contradictions and other international contradictions in the world politics today, a faint reference has been made to it by the Prime Minister while seeking also the friendship of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union had always stood for friendship, but what came in the way at that time was the SEATO and CENTO which Jawaharlal Nehru denounced at that time. But now Arshad Hussain gets up in the Assembly in Rawalpindi and says that the SEATO and CENTO are dead. It is not that. They have got out of it. These are contradictory situations to-day. Now they got military aid from the U.S. under the U. S. Military

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] Pact. Article i of the Military Pact says that such assistance as may be made available by the Government of the United States pursuant to the agreement will be furnished under these provisions subject to all terms and conditions and the provisions of the Mutual Defence Act, 1949 and the Mutual Security Act, 1951. This is how it was conceived. What has happened to that ? The contradictions between Pakistan and America are growing despite the fact that Pakistan is still a member of SEATO and CENTO and the U.S. Pact is a dead letter. Madam Deputy Chairman, we did not quarrel when Pakistan was buying arms from the United Kingdom or from the United States of America before 1954. We criticised it—read Mr. Nehru's speeches—because it was given under the Military Pact. It was a free gift and as you know, up to now, two billion dollars worth of military hardware has been given to Pakistan according to the Mw York Times and other papers, which comes, in terms of the devalued rupee, to Rs. 1,500 crores. Well, we were opposed to that. We were not opposed to Pakistan buying arms even at that time despite our problems with that country. But we never passed a resolution on that. One must bear that in mind. Now, has the Soviet policy shifted from one of friendship into the opposite direction as far as India is concerned ? My answer is an emphatic "No". Let the Prime Minister, if she can, say "Yes". Well, has not economic co-operation between the two countries grown over this period ? Is it not a fact that the mission of Mr. Dinesh Singh, the Minister of Commerce, has been a considerable success ? Is it a sign of friendship or is it a sign of breach in friendship ? Is it not a fact that the Soviet Union is still giving you plenty of military weapons ? Even to-day the Statesman has said in its editorial page.

"Incidentally, never before India received so many key weapons as during the last few weeks after the Soviet decision to supply arms to Pakistan became public knowledge.

Madam Deputy Chairman, are these signs of breach in friendship ? Well, let this thing be denied. Can they deny that supplies are to be maintained and that the Soviet Union has given an assurance that all commitments to India will be carried out ? This is what Mr. Kosygin told Indian Pressmen on July 10 :

"I can assure you that all questions are decided from the point of view

of friendship between India and the Soviet Union. There can be no other solution. It is of utmost importance for our two Governments to ensure that nothing is allowed to cast the slightest shadow on the friendship between the two countries."

I want to know how a responsible Government can brush aside this statement\* of the Soviet Premier who says that the Indo-Soviet relations, whatever their relations be with Pakistan, are guided by the main consideration of Soviet friendship with India. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, let us not think friendship is a Platonic affair in international politics. There are people who believe in Platonic love. Even in human relations one is not satisfied with Platonic love. There may be some. {Interruption} I do not know what the Soviet Union has given but from the newspapers and other things we have collected something which is by no means exhaustive but only illustrative.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I thought they had consulted you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Thank you very much. They do not consult us; there are better people to consult; they do not consult me because I am not a military man. There are MIGs, at least 3 squadions supplied and already in operation with the IAF; MIG complex for manufacture, 3 factories at Nasik, Koraput and Hyderabad; MI-4

helicopters extensively in use in all border areas; ANT heavy transport plane used for carrying military supplies and paratroops; Anti-aircraft guns used in defence of Amritsar during the 1965 war. It is also reported that some SAMS (surface-to-air missiles) have been supplied; then submarines, 4 ordered and 1 arrived, these are far heavier and more modern than the 'Ghazi' type in Pakistan's possession. Then there are transport vehicles (heavy 'jeep' type) which can be seen in use in large numbers in our border areas; also there is indirect contribution to independent defence potential in oil, steel. HEC can forge heavy field guns, etc. Now are these signs of friendship

I or are these signs of breaking away from friendship? There is no shift at all in the policy of the Soviet Union in this period. You can accuse this Government for

I anything. I accuse this Government every time. In fact I shall not have my desire fulfilled till I see these people out of power but we cannot accuse them of breaking the friendship as far as they are concerned.

There may be something bad but in this period friendship between India and the Soviet Union has not lessened.

Now the question has come about non-alignment. It is being suggested by some people that Pakistan's foreign policy has made a great diplomatic victory while India's policy of non-alignment is in complete mess. Not that Indian policy of non-alignment is consistently and correctly implemented, far from it. I do not know why they do not think over it. What has happened to Pakistan ? Is Pakistan the same type of partner of the SEATO and CENTO as it was in mid-fifties ? Is Pakistan working to the same extent as it was under the US-Pak Military Pact as in the late fifties ? Are Pakistan's relations with the Soviet Union and other non-aligned countries the same when it was completely under the thumb of the United States of America some 10 years ago ? Nobody will say this thing. If you admit that historic fact, it shows the vindication of the policy of non-alignment, not its condemnation. It is the policy of the Soviet Union and other non-aligned countries not only to strengthen the non-aligned countries but also to help other countries which are in imperialist alliances to break away from those alliances and become non-aligned. Madam, I do not see why Shrimati Indira Gandhi should be apologetic about it. She fumbles. I know not why she should do that. If the grip of the U.S. imperialism is loosening in Pakistan and Pakistan's relations with the Soviet Union are improving, it is a vindication of the policy of non-alignment and not its condemnation.

Madam Deputy Chairman, one point more I have to make. The President's tour has been taken exception to. A learned man gets up and says "Look here, this communique does not refer to this horrid proposal to sell arms." Now first of all one should have a little sense of proportion. Well, you do not go into political controversies of that nature when you sign a joint communique. It is not expected. Those things the Soviet Union will discuss in its Parliament and we will discuss in our Parliament. In joint communiques we bring broad agreements and other things. It is written in a spirit of understanding and friendship, it is written with a view to consolidating the gains and bringing countries closer together.' Here I should like to point out something for the heroes who have been marching in order to attack the President. Well, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru visited Washington in December

1956. He had a talk with Eisenhower. After that talk a joint communique was issued, and that was the 20th of December, 1956. At the time your shiploads of U.S. arms were coming to Karachi and other Pakistani ports under the U.S. Pakistan Pact of 1954- why did you not then object to it ? I was in Parliament. I did not see any man getting up and asking Jawaharlal Nehru "Why is it that you did not include that thing in the joint communique?" {Interruption} Nobody got up, I remember nobody got up to say that. Today Nehru's daughter is attacked. I think she should be attacked for various other things but not for that joint communique. That is all I can say. Well, at that time it was much more serious. We read every day in the newspapers about Pakistani ships coming to the Karachi port, heavy armaments given free by the United States of America to Pakistan. Either they were afraid of Jawaharlal Nehru or they believed in double talk with ulterior motives. At least we have the courage to laise such things. Therefore on no account should there be any defensive position as far as Indo-Soviet friendship is concerned.

Finally there is no comparison between the U.S.-Pak Military Pact and the arms aid amounting to 2 billion dollars and this kind of thing. The decision to sell arms was taken for aggressive purposes, 'or strengthening the various alliances, for not only provoking Pakistan against India, China and the Soviet Union but also for bolstering the reactionary regime within Pakistan itself. That was a part of the global strategy. It was an aggressive policy followed by the U.S. Well, our friends are talking about arms and other things. I must tell those friends to remember that the Soviet Union wants to bring this country together in friendship and amity. It is in Soviet interest, it is in our interest and it is in the interest of Pakistan. The Soviet Union does not follow any neo-colonial policy. She does not have any aggressive designs. If the Soviet influence grows in Pakistan, normally you should calculate that the influence of America will decline, the influence of China will, in so far as it is anti-Indian, decline and that is certainly to our national interest. Certainly if American and Chinese influence there continues to grow, it does not serve our national interest even from a narrow angle, if we judge the situation that way. So I think they do not take all these factors into account. They do not see beyond their nose. That is the problem with them.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

I think a disservice has been done by our friends here by mounting this anti-Soviet campaign. It will not create a better image of this country in the outside world, the world that loves us, the world that seeks our friendship, the world in which Nasser and others live, the world that is non-aligned, the world that stands for peace, the world that wants to see understanding not only between India and Pakistan but between India and all her neighbours. We have not done a good service to our cause if at all we sincerely mean it.

I need not go into any other aspect of the matter because I know this exhibition of irritation and anger has behind it certain political motivation as far as the particular party is concerned. The Government of India can always discuss this matter with the Soviet Government and seek satisfaction and I am sure this will produce results provided the approach is one of friendship and amity. So far as this Government is concerned, it is standing on the plane of friendship and is seeking the solution of the problems in its own way and I think they can count on the support of all well-meaning people in this country. This is how we view this matter. This is how we would like the situation to be faced. I think there is no reason to think that the friendship between India and the Soviet Union will be weakened unless we hammer it in order to weaken it. If we stand sincerely and loyally by our friends, I believe the Soviet people will be never failing in reciprocating it. The Soviet influence in Pakistan, the Soviet friendship with Pakistan produced whatever little development took place in that direction. It produced the Tashkent Agreement and we do hope that the Soviet influence will be still more beneficial so that we are able to bring Pakistan and India more close together so that that influence helps in the promotion of feelings of amity and right approach in Pakistan itself. Past experience gives us such assurance but nobody can help one unless he helps himself.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) I would like to seek a clarification from Shri Gupta. While I am one of those who would thank the Russians for all the help given to India from time to time, I would like to know from Mr. Gupta whether he does not see as a shift in the Soviet policy what has been described in the joint communique, equating India and Pakistan together?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am grateful to Mr. Bhargava—though he is not always grateful to me—for putting this question and I shall answer the question. They have said 'India and Pakistan'. It is not equation. The two countries have been named. A joint communique's function is not to say that India has carried out the Tashkent Agreement 90 degrees and Pakistan is 90 degrees. You do not write like that in a joint communique. In fact in the U.N. when you write your name, you come in the alphabetical order. Now it is for you to think how you understand and it is for others to think when the Soviet Union certainly speaks in that language. How many times your Government speaks in this language when you sign joint communiqués with the Americans, British and West Germans? Do you not equate, by your own token, those countries with the Soviet Union? The Soviet Union never complains when you mention the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. in the same paragraph and they do not complain. Understand it in a wise statesmanlike manner.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL Do we take it that Mr. Gupta is the spokesman of the Soviet Union in this House? It appears like that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:  
Shri Ghinai.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. GHINAI (Maharashtra) : Madam, it is certainly not my purpose to question either the right of the Soviet Union to give military aid or sell arms to any country it chooses, nor is it my intention to suggest that the Soviet Union has become unfriendly to us only because it is clear now that it will supply arms to Pakistan. My main anxiety is to call the attention of both Government and the public, not to speak of hon. Members of this House, to certain aspects of our foreign policy and the need to build our economy in a manner as to withstand the gyrations in world politics and the alignment and realignments in power blocs. Twenty-two years ago, on September 7, 1946, just after the Interim National Government was formed, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru made his first official announcement on foreign policy over All India Radio. It is well to remember that those were the enchanting post-war days when few could perceive the shadows of what later developed into the cold war or the system of blocs, military, political or otherwise. Then, Russia was remote from India's consciousness, and Mao



was still a rebel in the hills. And yet Jawaharlal<sup>^</sup> announced over the All India Radio—let me quote :

"We propose as far as possible to keep away from the power blocs or groups aligned against one another which have led in the past to world wars and which will again lead to disaster on an even vaster scale".

In subsequent years, Pandit Nehru enunciated neutralism which later became dynamic neutralism and eventually non-alignment. For some years, indeed we did play the part of a 'folding bridge' or an 'intermittent middleman'. May be, this philosophy of letting the right hand know what the left hand is doing, that is being openly friendly with both the sides, attracted to India technical, financial and industrial aid from both the power blocs.

Nevertheless, during the past decade, it was becoming increasingly clear, and I believe that Pandit Nehru was not unaware of it, that whatever our philosophy and however high it might be, both India and Pakistan, by virtue of their geographical positions, formed part of the chessboard of international politics. The leverage of the great powers in the two countries was increasing in strength and purposiveness. And let us face the fact that the manoeuvrability of our policy was to that extent reduced in effectiveness.

If, apparently, America and China and Russia are all wanting to wean at the same time, Pakistan, I submit it is not so much because of Pakistan's superior foreign policy, but merely because of the fact that the geography of Pakistan is not a little responsible for the great interest evinced in Pakistan. My immediate purpose is to suggest that we can ill-afford to have illusions of any kind. In 1962 one illusion was greatly shattered by China, out of which, alas, Pandit Nehru could not recover. Are we to allow ourselves to have another illusion shattered, or allow ourselves to get into a panic because the Soviet Union has declared its intention to supply arms to Pakistan? We know the result of the U.S. arms aid to Pakistan. China too has apparently aided Pakistan. Now the Soviet Union will be adding to Pakistan's arsenal. If past experience is any guide, Pakistan's arms will continue to be mainly used against us. However, the Soviets, like the Americans, may not accept this thesis. We will be told that these arms will not be used against India.

From our side we must make the usual kind of protestations. That I submit is not enough. It is time that we revised the fundamental assumption of our foreign policy. As I indicated earlier, the assumption must be that India will be put to their own use by the great powers. Of course, it is our duty and our right not to be made use of. We can do so only if we accept without reservation and without fear the salutary philosophy of the British statesman who said : "We have no permanent friends; we have no permanent enemies; we have only permanent national interests".

It is in the realms of foreign and economic policy where some really hard thinking is called for. We should no longer be prepared to take anything for granted. Of course, the concept of non-alignment is sound; so also of world peace. We have to keep working towards these ends. But I have a fear in my mind that in case we are not constantly on our guard we might be caught in the big power game. We might even be used as pawns to subserve the interests of this or that country. This we must avoid at all costs. And how can we do so ?

Our national interest is to be friendly with all, while at the same time making ourselves strong in the economic field, a field which alone can develop the sinews of defence strength. We must endeavour, without becoming a closed society, to attain self-sufficiency not only in the basic matter of economic development, but also in respect of defence. We should get out of the inclination to try to look elsewhere for support. According to me, it will be a great tragedy if at any moment we look to Russia against China or America, or to look to America against Russia or China. We have to look not to others, but depend upon ourselves. It should be our endeavour to unfetter ourselves of external encumbrances. The earlier we do so, the better.

Already there is some friendly feeling between America and Russia. It is all for the good. During the past couple of months there seems to be some loud thinking going on in the U.S.A., loud thinking in quarters that matter, to take a less antagonistic attitude towards China. If the cold war vis-a-vis China is reduced, certainly world tensions will be reduced. This will have an odd effect in that neither Russia nor the U.S.A. might be interested in aiding either India or Pakistan, possibly

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai] India will be the first country, as between the two in this sub-continent, to receive less and less economic assistance.

Therefore I strongly urge a re-formulation in our economic policy along with a re-thinking in our foreign policy. The Planning Commission's document on the Approach to Fourth Plan is singularly silent on defence. I would strongly urge that defence must be the core of our approach, and when I suggest this I do not of course mean that we should become hysterical, but I do certainly mean that we should release forces in our economy and in our national life which will create not only more goods and services, but also a new sense of national integrity and solidarity.

Thank you, Madam.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN (Madras) : Madam Deputy Chairman, in this matter I am more concerned about the problems relating to our foreign and economic policies which this issue brings to the forefront, much more than the limited scope of this issue by itself. Today by any standards ours is a big country, with its huge population, with its very big size, with its unlimited resources and with a tradition and history second to that of none in this world. Nevertheless we are now perturbed and we are discussing emotionally now about some country—the Soviet Union—having sold arms to some other country—Pakistan. Today we really must seriously examine what lessons discussion, which we are carrying on here, has for us. I am not able, as my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was able, to see how unqualifiedly vindicate the undoubted support which the Soviet Union has given to us and the good that such a help confers on us. Nor am I able to tell the Government, as he did, that our Prime Minister must not fumble, must not be defensive, and all that. Our Government cannot but be defensive today. I saw the contents in the Prime Minister's statement of yesterday to the effect that our foreign policy stands vindicated, that our sovereignty and independence have been upheld. Is that really true? Could we be getting perturbed at all by a sale of arms to be made, the quantum of which is yet to be known, we being a big country, if really our policy all these years, down the years, had been one of peace and non-alignment really and seriously and strictly, had been one of building up our own strength? That is why I am concerned, I am worried that occasions like this do not make

us think seriously, what a fundamental change in thinking is called for on our part with reference to the policies we have been pursuing. Today, instead of being able to take an independent position as to what is best in the interests of our own country, we are pushed willy-nilly by this power or that. Have we become a country like, say, Switzerland, or even small Monaco? Instead of we being able to take with absolute composure and even indifference, and with a sense of confidence in our own strength in the matter of whoever sells arms to whosoever else ..

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) IN THE CHAIR]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now that you are in the Chair you can ask for more clarifications.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : Unfortunately that is not so because the U.S.A. of all countries is able to dictate to us today. We undoubtedly have our differences with China and I wish that we continued to discuss with China with a view to settling these differences purely from our own interests and decided by our own wishes and feelings alone in the matter. Have we done so? No. On the other hand, in addition to whatever differences we undoubtedly have with China, the American lobby or the American interests are certainly pressurizing us to take a stand for the containment of China, which is undoubtedly American foreign policy. Similarly with reference to the USSR now. They obviously have their own bones to pick with China today, starting from the ideological front. And today naturally they would like to have India also on their side. I am not able to see through the actions of the Government of India that they are absolutely uninfluenced by pressure either from the Soviet Union or from the United States of America. To the United States we are obliged to tell, 'we are with you; we want to see that China is contained'. And I am constrained to state here that during the tour of our Prime Minister to the South East Asian countries like Australia, New Zealand and others, the burden of the song was, we will be able to contain China, we will be a force to be relied on.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What is the harm

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : We are telling the whole world that with borrowed arms we shall fight both Pakistan and China. That is the position to

which we are reduced today. In our foreign policy are there any things other than these two issues, which confront us more seriously and urgently and is not rethinking needed on these issues, the dispute with Pakistan and the dispute with China ? Should we go on as we have been doing all along till now, relying in the United Nations on the veto power of the U.S.S.R, to come to our rescue? You also want to see that the Americans are satisfied that you will be able to play your part in containing China in the Asian continent. It cannot but be so; I do not attribute this to any particular individual in the Cabinet or to any particular person. It is because of the policy that we have been following down the years. Now this Fourth Plan we cannot implement because we have not....

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Apart from what the Americans say, what is your opinion about containing China within their territory and not allowing them to come beyond the Himalayas towards India ? What is your own view ?

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : I am second to none in fighting for the interests of my own country; there is no question about that. The whole question is this. In the statement of the Prime Minister it is said that things are fluid, things are changing. I want to ask my friend Mr. Misra this question; is he going to take a static and final position with reference to China ? Will he be averse to a dialogue with China? I can tell you that you and I and people like us will take a patriotic stand and will not let down the interests of the country at any time. We will not do anything which will damage the interests of the country. Always subject to that, can we not think as a great country, independently of what the U.S.S.R, thinks and its quarrels with China, independently of what the U.S.A. might think and its attitude towards China, what our attitude should be towards China? Have we not got an attitude towards that country? Is there anything like permanency and finality in life ? Even with our enemies do we not speak in our lifetime? We do speak. Instead of having that sort of approach if motives are attributed and if it is said that a greater percentage of patriotism is in Mr. Misra's blood and much less is in mine, well, there is hardly anything to be said about it. So my point is..

SHRI A. P. JAIN : You have not answered his question. What do you like India to do vis-a-vis China ?

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : I am now on this limited issue which we are discussing. However I can only say that I am prepared to sit with anybody and discuss what we should do. It has to be on a different forum and on a different occasion. Now I only wish to say that . .

SHRI A. P. JAIN : With reference to these two issues which you....

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : Will you kindly listen to me ? After all, which is the foreign policy issue which has given us trouble ? These are the two issues. One is with reference to Pakistan and again narrowed down, what is this Pakistan issue ? It is with reference to Kashmir and again and again we say we must try to find a solution for this issue with reference to the people of Kashmir, with reference to the real representatives of the people of Kashmir. Similarly with reference to China also our position is more or less solidified and the tension is continuing. We as a country, with all our experience which is second to none compared to other countries of the world, must find out ways and means of changing that position otherwise somebody else is bound to make use of that. Today we are worried about somebody selling arms to somebody else and my whole point is, this position to which we are now reduced is not unconnected with our economic position. Once we begin doing this we have to go in for borrowed arms and for borrowing arms we have to increase our defence budget which is already a thousand crores or so. If I may quote Mr. R. Venkataraman, Member of the Planning Commission, only a few days back in a Seminar at Bombay he was saying that at the rate at which we are going at the end of the Fourth Plan period we will have to pay Rs. 700 crores annually towards our debt charges. That is our economic position. When our economy is in a sort of a collapsing condition naturally we are pushed from pillar to post and other countries are able to pressurise us.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Venkataraman, it is time.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : I would just conclude. Therefore I would say with all humility and in all seriousness that we must rethink about our economic policies also. This is a sentence which is uttered by many friends here but I would like to make my position very clear. It is generally very easy for anybody to say

[Shri M. R. Venkataraman] that the Government must rethink about its policies. I want to spell it out more precisely. So long as our economy moves in the direction of building up big monopoly capital and business in the country, our economy is bound to be weak and we will be at the mercy of foreign countries. So long as our economy does not take drastic measures by way of agrarian reforms to control the big, not the small, not the medium but the big vested landed interest our country will always have to be toddling along as we are doing today. Unless our capitalist class is able to do for our country what the British capitalists did for their country and what the American capitalists did for theirs, if they go on think-in only in terms of collaborating with foreign capital and if the foreign capital is not controlled here fully and completely, we will never be able to advance and we will always be at the mercy of other countries. It is in these directions that rethinking is needed. Mr. Chinnai also said more or less the same thing; my sentence read in the abstract will be like his sentence also. That is why I want my distinct and different stand...

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: What a unity?

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : Only in words; not in content. I am clear on that. There is nothing in Common there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is time to wind up now.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : Therefore I would say that this issue is not a thing which need worry the Government to any great extent today. A more serious and more fundamental question as to the basis on which we should continue is really the thing that should worry the Government.

I would also say this. So long I have only talked about our Government about which I have a right to be heard in this place and I have exercised that right. About the Soviet Union many friends have said that nobody can prevent somebody selling something to somebody else. But somehow I have been brought up with certain ideas of socialism, scientific socialism and it galls me to see that a socialist country gives arms unqualifiedly to other countries. What for ? I can well understand if it is for fighting imperialism. Socialist countries must give armed help to other countries if it is for their liberation fight or

if it is for fighting imperialism. But for any other purpose, for getting friendship why should it sell arms? It can help with trade or to work for amity. That is why I say unless such arms are given by socialist countries to another country for fighting imperialism or for its liberation fight I am not at all for such help being commended or appreciated in any way at all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The Home Minister/

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Is he intervening?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : I am intervening in the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : They had the Finance Minister in the other House and we have the Home Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Any objection?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No objection.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Then, please take your seat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I say we are being looked after.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Is it to show the solidarity of the Cabinet ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Order, order. Please, let us not waste time.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as the debate has been initiated mainly because of certain new developments and as the supply of arms by Russia to Pakistan has become a matter mainly of tension and traction, it is very necessary that every thinking Indian besides those who participate in parliamentary life and administration—should apply his mind to the problem. There is nothing wrong in it and it is a very welcome debate that is going on. It is very essential. While discussing such an important question, let me examine the fundamental aspects of the problem. It is not merely a question as to whether a few arms have been given by one country to another. Certainly it is a major factor that has sparked off this discussion. Therefore, I would like to think aloud on these matters. One criticism which I am hearing and

which I am leading is that this is a result of the failure of the foreign policy that we have pursued for the last twenty years or so. The other line of criticism is that there is a fundamental shift in the policy of Soviet Russia. A third criticism is that we have lost some sort of manoeuvrability in our foreign policy. We come across such criticisms. Personally I do not agree with this approach. If I have understood the policy of non-alignment of this country rightly, what does it mean? It has been very aptly described by the Prime Minister yesterday and she has given the four pillars of it. But I would like to describe it in my own way. The central theme of non-alignment is independence in formulating our own policy, consider all the international issues on their merits, examine them from the point of view of the national interest and arrive at conclusions on our own. This is one aspect of it. The second aspect which flows from this is not to become a party to any military blocks or pacts as such. If this is the basic approach of our non-alignment policy, I think, as it has been applied in the last twenty years, a major plank of our non-alignment policy is friendship with all countries—America on the one hand and the Commonwealth countries on the other, the Asian and African countries and the socialist world also. As a result of this policy

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : You said friendship with all countries. Do you mean to say, from the language you used, friendship with China and Pakistan?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : We began with friendship with China. I am trying to take a survey.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Friendship with China cannot be ruled out.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am taking a survey of the trends in the last twenty years. As a result of this policy, one major plank of our foreign policy developed and that is we have friendship with other countries, friendship with Soviet Russia also. I must say that this is the most important plank of the foreign policy of India in the last twenty years. In a flush of emotion and in a flush of anger, let us not try to liquidate the achievements of the last twenty years. The friendship of Soviet Russia has had certainly some special significance in the last twenty years. I will come to the particular aspect of the arms supplies, etc. later, but this has its own historical importance to us. It has given us certainly some strength in our internal

economy and also strength internationally. Particularly from the point of view of our national interests, if we look at the world in which we live, purely academic and spiritual considerations are ultimately not very useful. This is how I look at it. Particularly in this matter we have to go by the political realities. Soviet Russia, China and India the three big land masses are the realities of political life of this part of the world. Friendship of the world is very important for us. But the friendship in this context, of Soviet Russia is very important to India and I have no doubt that the friendship of India is also important to Soviet Russia. It is even more necessary today and it will have to be more, not because somebody likes or dislikes India, but because of the inherent strength and geo-political situation of India, it is certainly of some importance. This is the basic thing which we have to remember.

Then, Sir, as the Prime Minister has explained from time to time—I think she has rightly laid emphasis on one aspect of it—the world is not static. It is naturally changing. The world of the 50's is not the world of the 60's.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras) : But we are static.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Fortunately you are wrong. When we are part of a dynamic world, how can we be static?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The Swatantra Party in 1960's is the same as in 1930's.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Possibly they are going backwards.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : For once you are wrong. In 1930 there was no Swatantra Party.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : Let us wait and see who is going backward and who is going forward.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The world is changing. The same postures of the fifties are no longer there. The cold war theories are no longer there. Countries are trying to win friendship from this bloc and that bloc. Liberating forces are working on the eastern side. There is also the concept of social justice asserting itself on the other side. Things are moving. Even so

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Mr. Home Minister, do not these premises lead to the conclusion that there must be a reassessment of our foreign policy?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Why do you not wait till I come to my conclusions? I am coming to it. Now, for example, as T said, "Soviet Russia is changing. It has to change. It cannot be taken for granted that those who were enemies are permanent enemies. Its present change in its approach towards Pakistan is proof of the changing world. They had a feeling that they were rather encircled by countries which were parties to military pacts. It is their effort to win over these countries. I can understand it. Probably in their national interest they are trying to do that. So, the world is • changing. Naturally, therefore, is it expected of us that we do not change? Some people say that we have lost our manoeuvrability and they expect us to react on certain things very prominently and take up very strong anti-Soviet postures'. This will be another wrong move which will make us lose our manoeuvrability further. Let us understand why the Soviet Union is doing it. It is not because T have to give a justification for Soviet Russia. The Soviet Union does not need any justification from me and I have no business to give any justification for the Soviet Union. We are trying to understand what it is doing. If we say that Soviet Russia is, trying to give aid to Pakistan and Strengthen Pa'kistan as against India, if that is the only explanation, I would certainly agree with some of the hon. Members who have taken up an anti-Soviet posture. They are doing it for their own reasons. "Therefore, we" have to adjust ourselves , to this fchanging situation. I think for us the basis of the Indo-Soviet friendship is still there. I have no doubt about it. I am convinced that Soviet Russia needs India's friendship. Not only India needs Soviet friendship, but Russia equally needs the friendship of India. Therefore, India should not take any wrong steps and take, an anti-Soviet posture throwing away the achievements of the last two decades. It would be an absolutely wrong thing to do.

Having said this, I certainly know that the supply of arms to Pakistan has created a situation, which also, in our own enlightened self-interest, we cannot forget. The supply of arms by Soviet Russia to Pakistan is creating a certain psychosis in Pakistan. That is what really speaking bothers us more. That is certainly creating concern in your mind, anxiety in my mind. We are expressing it as we are concerned about our national interest, because this supply of arms will certainly harden the attitude of intransigence of Pakistan and, as is said, the cold war atmosphere will

further be strengthened. That is the unfortunate position. Therefore, we have to take that into account. Also there is quite a possibility that supply of arms by Soviet Russia possibly might create a feeling in some other small countries to rush to supply more arms to Pakistan. It is quite possible. This certainly creates an anxiety in our mind, and we have to assess accordingly our problems and be watchful about it. What are we supposed to do ? Naturally we are expressing our concern in this matter and I suppose that this will be taken note of in Soviet Russia. This is my hope and trust. But at the same time ultimately when we are thinking of our security and our defence potential, what is ultimately the strength of a nation ? The strength of a nation certainly is the strength of its own industrial potential. What we can produce for the security of our own country is really speaking ultimately the right answer for it. When we need certain things, we go to different countries. If necessary, 'we will have to go there. But if anybody thinks that the availability of going to the different arms markets is the only strength by which a country can defend itself, one is completely misled in this matter. It is the greatest misconception about the defence potential. Ultimately the economy of the country, the industrial potential of the country, the morale of the people of 'the country, these are in the last analysis the real answer for the security of the nation and defence of the country. I have no doubt that if at all there is one important lesson that we have learnt—and I think we have learnt it from 1962 onwards—it is the emphasis that we have laid on the defence production in our country, and self-sufficiency of course. I know it is more easily said than done. I know we have taken the right steps in the right direction. Whether our approach is right or whether it is in the right direction the future will indicate. Let us go in that direction, let us be confident of our approach. I personally think that the policy we have pursued is sound— may be one can find fault here and there; I have no doubt that the assessment of the world situation will have to be made from day to day, from month to month—I do not say that whatever assessment we have made twenty years ago stands right in every respect today—but the basic steps and the basic postures we have taken stand justified. This is my position.

In 1954 America not merely sold arms to Pakistan but gave them freely, and really speaking by that action they completely changed the balance between the arm strength of Pakistan and India. What did

we do about it ? Did we throw away the friendship of the U.S.A.? I know some people wanted us to do that but we did not do that. I think that was a wise step to take. Therefore, one must react from the national point of view, in the national interest. We should do that and we are doing that. But if anybody wants to overreact and develop some sort of anti-Soviet complex, personally I think it will be a wrong thing to do. This is my view, and I think the only thing that we should emphasize in this country is, be watchful, beware of your own national interest, make the proper assessment of the changing world situation, ultimately develop your own strength and depend upon your own strength. This is the only thing that I can say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Thillai Villalan.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : What is the name you have called?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The gentleman can understand it.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : We should also understand. If you sitting in the Chair cannot properly pronounce a South Indian name, what are we to do ?

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Madras) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, this question of Russian arms deal with Pakistan is a problem of great importance. My submission would be that this should be considered without any emotion and reason should rule throughout the discussion. My request is this : 'Let there be light but not heat'; because this is a problem involving three countries, namely, one is Russia, another country is of our own, and another country is Pakistan. We must approach the problem from three angles: from the angle of Russia We have to look at the problem, at the same time from the angle of our own country, and then from the angle of Pakistan. This problem involves problems of one who is a friend, another who is a foe, and of ourselves.

From the statement presented before this House by the hon. Prime Minister we can find out what is the real problem and what is the real situation that has arisen now. The hon. Prime Minister stated :

"I have already publicly expressed my own and the Government's concern at the Soviet intention to supply arms to Pakistan."

Then in another paragraph she has stated :

"About three weeks ago, we received an indication from the Soviet Government of their intention to supply some military equipment to Pakistan."

In the first paragraph she said "intention". Then she said "indication" and "some military equipment to Pakistan". In another paragraph she had said :

"We do not know whether the Soviet Union has yet formalised an agreement with Pakistan for the supply of arms, nor do we have indications of the quantum or character of these arms or the terms and conditions of their delivery."

This is the situation and position. Being an advocate, I want to consider this situation as an advocate. So far as an act is concerned there are four stages. Before the commission of an act we have to pass four stages: first intention; then preparation; then attempt; then orily commission. We are now in the first stage. We are only in the stage of intention. The intention can be changed. It can be changed into another intention. That is why even at the outset I requested that this should be considered without any emotion and reason should rule throughout the discussion. So far as the intention is concerned, the Russians have shown the intention, that is what the statement says. Further the intention is also not definite because the Prime Minister says there is an indication only. Indication may be true or not, indication may be different and may be changed even. So as per the statement we are only in the first stage.

My next submission would be that Russia is a sovereign power. Russia has got every right to take any decision regarding their own commercial on their own political matters. They can have every right to take judgments of their own. We cannot dictate to Russia to do this thing or to do that thing. Russia in 1964 was prepared to supply arms to us. Russia was prepared to befriend us in all dealings. In the interests of their country Russia is always entitled to come to any decision in matters relating to their country. There are so many countries in the world. One country is giving ARMS or ALMS to each other; but we are not concerned with those dealings. But so far as Russia is concerned, we consider, that it represents a power bloc in the world. We look at Russia as our own friend and at the same time we were misled that it is not the friend

[Shri Thillai Villalan]

of any other country. That is not the position; that is not the real situation. We must now realise the real situation. Even in Tashkent agreement we cannot say that Russia is only the friend of India and not the friend of Pakistan. Russia acted as a mediator. A mediator can be friend of both the countries. It cannot be a friend of one country and foe of another country. Then mediation cannot be possible. Agreement cannot be possible and successful. The middleman must be a friend of both the countries. So even at Tashkent Russia acted as a mediator. So my humble submission would be so far as Russia's decision or intention is concerned, we cannot question it. But my accusation is only regarding our own foreign policy and our own diplomacy. I accuse this Government on the ground of failure in diplomacy. Our Government is not lacking in diplomacy, but my submission would be that their talents of diplomacy have been dried up due to the usage in over-doses in toppling the Governments controlled by non-Congress parties and bringing President's Rule and bringing mid-term elections in internal affairs. Their diplomacy has dried up.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : It was very difficult for us to follow his name that you pronounced. It is even more difficult to follow how this toppling Government has anything to do with the problem...

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : So only on the ground of lacking in diplomacy I am accusing this Government. If there is real diplomacy in our Government, our present Government can make Russia not to have any shift in its present policy in dealings with India. My submission would be that we cannot accuse Russia but we can accuse ourselves because of our failure in diplomacy, in the field of foreign affairs. We must take a lesson from this situation that we must prepare ourselves to deal in all our matters without the intervention or without the help of foreign powers. We cannot command dignity from the other countries of the world if we go all over the world with a begging bowl for arms or alms. We must prepare our country because we attained independence two decades before. Even after twenty years we are going around the world with a begging bowl. That should be stopped. We should prepare our country to deal with all things without the help of the other countries and that is the lesson to be learnt from the situation that has arisen from

the Russian deal. We can come to the conclusion from our present situation, we must rethink and rearrange our own House in order. Further non-alignment is the main point to be considered now. Non-alignment does not mean losing friend\* and gaining foes everywhere. During these twenty years by our foreign policy we cannot enumerate we got this friend or that friend. We are losing friends and at the same time we are gaining foes. So there is some flaw in our policy. That should be found out and rectified. Unless and until that flaw is rectified we cannot pursue the same policy. Our own foreign policy requires reorientation.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : What is that reorientation?

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : From our experience we can find out. If a policy is said to be successful, we must gain friends and not enemies. We are getting enemies even on the border. No country is getting enemies on the border. After 20 years, Pakistan is still our enemy, is it a successful policy we are adopting, and advocating? We are advocating a policy by which we are getting enemies. Pakistan committed act of aggression thrice. China entered into our own land. Still can we say that our foreign policy is successful? There is a flaw in that policy and that should be found out and that should be rectified. We must find out a way out. Without that we cannot pursue the same policy. With these words I conclude.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I share the deep distress which has been felt by this House, the other House and in fact the whole country at the recent decision of the USSR to sell arms to Pakistan. Now, Sir, in my opinion, it is not so much the shift in Russian policy which makes us regret the decision. It is the shift in the Indo-Russian relations. If you look at the evolution of Russian foreign policy you might say that the aid to Pakistan was a logical corollary of that policy. In the beginning the USSR wanted to have relations only with communist countries. The second stage was when the USSR wanted to have relations not only with communist countries but friendly countries, non-aligned countries like India and the UAR. The third phase which has been started only recently is to have spheres of influence even in countries which are pro-American, which were anti-Russian and which are even allied to the United States by military alliances. Now, Sir, what does "sphere of influence" mean?



All of us who have studied European history know that sphere of influence in bygone days meant that a country carved out, a particular part of a country, as its sphere of influence. For instance take Africa. You had the British sphere of influence, you had the French sphere of influence. You had the German sphere of influence. But today the sphere of influence has a different meaning and different connotation. The sphere of influence today means that in the same country more than one power has a sphere of influence. Therefore the USSR decided not to leave certain countries wholly to American influence. That is why it entered into pacts, trade pacts, and sold arms to Iran and Turkey which were wholly within the American influence. This was a very important shift in the Russian policy.

Now, it may be said that following that logical evolution she wants to enter Pakistan and limit the American or Chinese influence. But what I deplore, what I regret—and I am sure the whole House does it—is the shift in Indo-Russian relations. Now, Sir, our friendship with Russia has been a very special thing, a very precious thing, to my mind. Whatever we may feel, let us not forget that Russia has been a great friend of ours. She has stood by us in our hour of need. Let us think of Kashmir. Kashmir would not have been ours but for the Russian veto in the Security Council. She was the one country which stood b> us and vetoed any attempt at foreign interference in Kashmir. That is a fact we should never forget.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : May I ask Mr. Chagla one question? I am asking only one question. Does he mean that if the USSR had not supported our claim to Kashmir, it would have been surrendered or taken away from us by now?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I never said that. What I said was, internationally our position would have been very difficult. If the Security Council had passed a Resolution calling upon us to do certain things and if we had resisted, even though we would be right, it would have been difficult. I agree that under no circumstances and under no force will we ever surrender Kashmir or any part of it, and we should not. But all that I am pointing out is—I am sure my friend understands what I am saying.. .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : The United Nations also called upon Israel to surrender a part of Arab territory. What about it ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I am not going into it. I am dealing with Indo-Russian relations. May I repeat? At this time, time of stress, time of anger, time of indignation, we should not forget, we ought not to forget, that Russia has been, as my friend, the Home Minister said, our friend. If you look back at our past, at our own foreign policy, our friendship with Russia has been a very special thing, a very important thing, a very significant thing, and it has paid us dividends. It is a mutual thing. I quite agree that friendship has got to be mutual. It is a two-way traffic, it is not a one-way traffic. If we have benefited by Russian friendship, I am sure Russia also has benefited by our friendship. But, Sir, where I seriously quarrel over the shift is this that it goes entirely contrary to the Tashkent Agreement. What does Russia intend by asking the two countries to enter into the Tashkent Agreement ? The basis of that Agreement was that India and Pakistan will have friendly relations, will restore normal relations and will live like good neighbours. That was the basis of the Tashkent Agreement. That is what is known as the Tashkent spirit, an agreement to which we have tried our best to adhere, which Pakistan has done its best not to. But anyway, the USSR's main objective in getting us to sign the Tashkent Agreement was better relations with Pakistan. I want Russia should ask herself this question : Is this deal with Pakistan going to help the Tashkent spirit? Is it going to help the relations between India and Pakistan? Is it going to make it possible for the normalisation of our relations? Let me examine this. Has Russia asked Pakistan why she wants these arms, who is her enemy? Has Pakistan got any enemy except India? And surely, it would be obvious even to a child that if Pakistan wants arms, it can only be intended against India.

Then, I read in some paper—of course, I do not know State secrets but I read in some newspaper—that Russia has got an assurance from Pakistan that these arms will not be used against India. What is the value of this assurance? What is the worth of this assurance ? Did not America get the same assurance from Pakistan? And what happened? We know to our cost that the Patton tanks were used against us. It was the bravery and courage of our jawans which resisted that. But still Pakistan committed a breach of that assurance and used the arms against us. Therefore, I would implore the Government of India, implore the Prime Minister, not to place any value on any assurance that

[Shri M. G. Ghagla]

Pakistan might give to Russia that these arms will not be used against India. If that is the argument that Russia advances in support of this arms deal, we should make it clear that we do not trust Pakistan and we have reason not to trust it. The same thing happened in 1965. I am afraid the same thing will happen again.

Therefore, what makes us angry, hurt, indignant, is the fact that Russia which is a good friend of ours, a friendship which we have valued, and which wants better relations with India and Pakistan should do something which will aggravate the situation, which will increase the bellicosity of Pakistan, which will make a conflict between India and Pakistan more possible. That should not have been the action of a friend of ours.

Now, Sir, I will not take a long time. What should be our reaction, that is important. This has happened. How should a country like ours respond to the action of Russia? First of all, we must remember that, as the Prime Minister said in her statement, a free country has a right to sell arms to anybody. It is an unfortunate fact of international life that we have to admit. There is America selling arms, European countries giving arms to Pakistan. We have protested to the various countries. But the sale goes on. We are helpless. But we must strongly protest to the USSR with regard to this action. I do not believe in soft words. I think diplomacy should be conducted from strength. And we should not mince words. After all, even to a friend we are entitled to say, "You have gone wrong, you have hurt me, you have gone against my interest." And it should be pointed out clearly, emphatically, unequivocally that the Russian action is against our national interest and that, as I said, it is likely to make a conflict between India and Pakistan more possible. But having done that, I would appeal to the House to remember that we should not do anything to spoil this friendship between India and Russia. That is the main thing. After all, take individual life. There are two intimate friends. One friend hurts the feeling of the other, hurts it badly. Does the friendship break up? You get angry. You tell the friend, "Look, I am surprised that you, my friend, should behave towards me like this." But you do not break up the friendship. And if you are with me, Sir, on what I am submitting, the Indo-Russian friendship has a special significance, a special value, in our international life. I think it will be a tragedy if because of

this unfortunate, regrettable, wrong action on the part of the USSR we should try and break up our friendship. 5 p.M. Now, Sir, the hon. Home Minister said that Russia is not against India. I agree. But where I do not agree with him is that he has not realised the result of this action. The result of this action is that it goes against India, it goes against our national interest. But even so, having made it perfectly clear to the U.S.S.R., what we feel about the whole thing, at the same time the country should not do anything, this House should not do anything, which would come in the way of the friendship which we have had with that country for so many years, a friendship which has been of great importance to us in our international relations.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) Before I call the next speaker I want to tell the House that there is a list of a large number of speakers who want to take part in the debate. I would, therefore, appeal to the hon'ble Members to be brief in their remarks and not repeat what has been said already.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : May I say one thing? You are sticking to the list of those persons who have given notice of the calling attention motion. Now this debate has been a full-fledged independent debate. Therefore, all those whose names do not appear in the list should also be given time.

**श्री जगत नारायण (हरियाणा) :** वाइसचेयर—मैं महोदय, मैंने कल लोक सभा में और आज अपने हाउस में इस मसले पर काफी तकरीरें सुनी हैं, बड़ी प्रभावशाली तकरीरे सुनी हैं। मैं बड़े अदब के साथ प्रधान मंत्री की तबज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि अभी अभी श्री चव्हाण, होम मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि हम तो अपनी पालिसी पर कायम हैं, हम सब देशों को प्यार करते हैं और मैं आपकी तबज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब देश आजाद हुआ था, तो हमारी जो विदेश नीति थी वह यह थी। यह ठीक है कि तमाम मुल्कों से हमारा प्यार था लेकिन हमारा सबसे ज्यादा प्यार चीन और रूस के साथ था। दो ही नारे बुलन्द हुये, एक नारा यह बुलन्द हुआ—चीनी हिन्दी भाई भाई—और दूसरा नारा यह बुलन्द हुआ—रूसी हिन्दी भाई भाई, न कोई अमरीकी हिन्दी भाई भाई, न कोई फ्रांसीसी हिन्दी भाई भाई, न कोई बर्तानवी हिन्दी

भाई भाई का नारा लगा, ये दो नारे ही लगे । तो हमारी विदेश नीति इसी पर घूमती रही और देश की बदकिस्मती यह हुई कि सबसे पहले चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान की पीठ पर छुरा भाँका और उसका नतीजा यह भुगतना पड़ा कि अपने महान प्रधान मंत्री की जिन्दगी से हमें महरूम होना पड़ा । उसके बाद दूसरा मरहला आया जबकि पाकिस्तान ने हमारे देश पर हमला किया, तो उस वक्त क्या हुआ । उस वक्त ताशकन्द का मुआहिदा हुआ और वह मुआहिदा जिस ढंग पर हुआ वह आप सबको मालूम है ।

**श्री महेश्वर नाथ कोल :** बताइये जरा ।

**श्री जगत नारायण :** मुझे याद है, ताशकन्द जाने से पहले श्री शास्त्री जी ने एक मीटिंग बुलाई थी और उसमें उन्होंने यह कहा था जबकि उनको यह कहा गया कि आप ताशकन्द जा रहे हैं, मगर ज़रा सोच समझ कर आप दस्तखत करना तो उस वक्त शास्त्री जी ने कहा था कि क्या किया जाय, रूस ही हमारा दोस्त है, हमारा साथी दोस्त है, जिसको कि हम नाराज नहीं कर सकते, उसके कहने पर हमें ठीक तौर पर काम करना पड़ेगा, और वहाँ पर ताशकन्द का मुआहिदा हुआ और उस मुआहिदे पर दस्तखत करने के कुछ घंटों के बाद ही उनका देहांत हो गया, हिन्दुस्तान को उनकी खिदमत से भी महरूम होना पड़ा । यह इतना बड़ा शाक था । आज बेशक आप यह कहें कि कोई बात नहीं है कि रूस आज पाकिस्तान को आमन सप्लाई कर रहा है, यह मामूली बात है, मगर यह मामूली बात नहीं और जैसा कि श्री चागला ने कहा कि यह तो हिन्दुस्तान और रूस के सम्बन्ध की बात है और उस सम्बन्ध में एक दरार आ रही है । यह एक बड़ा शाक है और इतना बड़ा शाक है कि परमात्मा करे हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की उम्र बहुत लंबी हो, उनको परमात्मा बहुत उम्र दे, मगर यह इतना बड़ा शाक है कि हिन्दुस्तान के लिये इसको बर्दाश्त करना मुश्किल होगा । तो मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि आपको सोचना होगा कि हमने चीनी हिन्दी भाई भाई का नारा लगाया तो हमारा क्या ह्म हुआ और आज अगर रूस हमसे अलहदा हो जाय तो क्या ह्म होगा । मैं उन लोगों

में से नहीं हूँ, जो यह समझते हैं या कहते हैं कि हमें रूस से बिगाड़ पैदा करना चाहिये, मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ, जो रूस के साथ दोस्ती कायम रखना चाहते हैं । लेकिन इसके साथ साथ यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि दोस्ती तो मजबूत देश की मजबूत देश के साथ हो सकती है, इसलिये जब तक आप अपने देश को मजबूत नहीं बनायेंगे तब तक यह नहीं होगी । आप बार बार यह एलान करते हैं कि देश को मजबूत बनाना है । देश ने अपनी मजबूती का सबूत पाकिस्तान की जंग में दिया था, एक एक आदमी ने उस वक्त अपनी खिदमत को देश को सुपुर्द की थी, लेकिन आज देश को मजबूत बनाना हमारे नेताओं के हाथ में है, डिफेंस मिनिस्टर के हाथ में है, होम मिनिस्टर के हाथ में है, प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ में है यह रोज रोज हमको उपदेश देना कि देश को मजबूत बनाना चाहिये, इससे कुछ नहीं होना है । देश को मजबूत तो आपको बनाना है । मगर एक बात आप भूलिये नहीं कि यह दरार जो आई है, वह कोई छोटी सी दरार नहीं है । यहाँ बहुत कुछ कहा गया, मेरे पास वक्त नहीं है, स्टेट्समैन में खबर छपी है कि जब हमारे राष्ट्रपति वहाँ पर गये तो सिर्फ एक दिन यह नारा लगा कि रूसी हिन्दी भाई भाई और उनके सारे दूर में कोई नारा नहीं लगा रूस में कि रूसी हिन्दी भाई भाई । इतना प्यार था, इतनी मुहब्बत थी, हमारा आपस में सब कुछ था मगर वहाँ एक दिन जबकि वह लेनिन-ग्राड जा रहे थे तब यह नारा लगा । इससे आप अंदाजा लगाइये कि कितनी बड़ी दरार आई है हमारे और रूस के सम्बन्धों में । इसको मिनिमाइज न कीजिये ।

आप कहते हैं कि हमारी विदेशी पालिसी फेल नहीं हुई । अगर यह फेल नहीं हुई तो और क्या वस्तु है । आप और रूस इतने नजदीक थे, आप और रूस रोज नारा लगाते थे—रूसी हिन्दी भाई भाई—और आज क्या हुआ । आज आपके और उनके दमियान एक खलीज पैदा हुई है और अगर उस खलीज को पुर नहीं कर सकते हैं और अपने रूस के साथ ताल्लुकात अच्छे नहीं बनते हैं तो फिर यकीनन आपकी विदेश नीति फेल हुई है । और मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ जैसा कि हमारे चव्वाण साहब ने कहा कि हालात के साथ हम बदलने की

[श्री जगत नारायण]

कोशिश कर रहे हैं, मगर मुझे तो ऐसा दिखाई देता है कि जहां से हम चले थे वहां हम हैं, जब हमने आजादी हासिल की थी और जो विदेश नीति हमारे पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने बनाई थी, आज हम उसी पर कायम हैं। हमने आज कुछ सीखने की कोशिश नहीं की है कि आज हमें तमाम देशों के साथ अपने ताल्लुकात बनाने हैं।

वाइसचेयरमैन साहब, मैं आपकी बसातत से प्रधान मंत्री की सेवा में कहना चाहता हूं कि वह अपनी पालिसी को बदले, विदेश नीति को हालात के मुताबिक बनाने की कोशिश करें, इस वहम में मत रहें कि कोई बात नहीं, अगर रूस ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे दिया तो क्या हो जायगा। हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी कहा, उनका बयान छपा, मत फिर कीजिये, हमारे पास सब कुछ हथियार है, हम बड़े मजबूत हैं, हमारा फ्रांटियर बड़ा मजबूत है। यह ठीक है कि हमारा फ्रांटियर बहुत मजबूत है। मैं अभी कश्मीर गया था वहां देखकर के आया हूं कि वहां बर्फानी पहाड़ों पर हमारे जवान हिन्दुस्तान का डिफेंस करने के लिये बैठे हुए हैं। लेकिन मैं उनकी खिदमत में कहना चाहता हूं कि जिस दिन यह पता चला कि पाकिस्तान को रूस हथियार सप्लाई करने लगा है, तो पाकिस्तान से हिन्दुस्तान में जो लोग बैठे हैं, उनको चिट्ठियां आई कि आप तैयार रहें, अब हम आने वाले हैं। मैं यह उनकी वाकफियत में लाना चाहता हूं मुमकिन है कि डिफेंस मिनिस्टर को वाकफियत हो, मुमकिन है वह उनको भी गई हों, वे चिट्ठियां वहां पर आईं और उनका जिक्र श्रीनगर में हुआ और वहां पर हुआ जहां कि हमारे काश्मीर के मिनिस्टर बैठे थे, वहां इसका जिक्र सुना कि चिट्ठियां आई हैं उन लोगों को कि अब रूस ने हमारी मदद शुरू कर दी है, वह हथियार देगा, हम मजबूती से हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करेंगे। तो यह मामूली बात नहीं है। इसको आप ऐसे ही न फेंक दें कि यह मामूली बात है। आप कोशिश कीजिये, जो कुछ भी आपकी आर्मरी में हो, डिप्लोमेसी में हो, उसको इस्तेमाल में लाइये और रूस के साथ अपने ताल्लुकात बेहतर बनाने की कोशिश कीजिये, रूस को डिप्लोमेसी से, प्यार से, मुहब्बत से, अपने अखलाक से, जो कुछ

भी है उससे, अपना दोस्त बना कर के उसको इस बात से रोकिये, कोशिश करिये कि वह पाकिस्तान को हथियार सप्लाई न करे और अगर कुछ हथियार सप्लाई ही करे तो छोटे सप्लाई करे। इससे पाकिस्तान का मारल बहुत बुस्ट हुआ है कि रूस उसके पुश्त पर है। वाइसचेयरमैन साहब, मैं बड़े अदब के साथ यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारी प्रधान मंत्री इस सिलसिले में भूब करने की कोशिश करे।

दूसरी बात यह कि प्रेसिडेंट साहब वहां गये, हमारे राष्ट्रपति वहां गये, मैं इसके बरखिलाफ नहीं, मैं नहीं कहता कि उनको वहां नहीं जाना चाहिये था, हालांकि उनके जाने के दो दिन पहले वहां पर पाकिस्तान का जो डिफेंस मिनिस्टर था या फील्ड-मार्शल था वह वहां पहुंचा हुआ था, जो कमांडर-इन-चीफ है, वह वहां दो दिन पहले वहां पहुंचा था। पता था हमारी गवर्मेंट को। चलो, प्रोग्राम बना था और प्रेसिडेंट साहब गये वहां पर, लेकिन मुझे इस बात का ऐतराज है कि उन्होंने जोइन्ट स्टेटमेंट क्यों इश्यू किया। नहीं करना चाहिये था उनको और अगर करना था...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is time to wind-up.

श्री जगत नारायण : और अगर उन्होंने स्टेटमेंट इश्यू करना था, तो उसमें पाकिस्तान का जिक्र बिलकुल नहीं होना चाहिये था। पाकिस्तान को एक लेवल पर रख कर हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने, मैं समझता हूं, हमारे लिये ही नहीं हिन्दुस्तान के लिये मुश्किल पैदा कर दी है। उनके स्टेटमेंट के नीचे दस्तखत हैं, जिसमें उन्होंने पाकिस्तान को हिन्दुस्तान के साथ पेरिटी दी है। आज हम रूस को कैसे कह सकते हैं, रूस को कैसे कन्डेम कर सकते हैं जबकि हमारे राष्ट्रपति के दस्तखत हैं उस बयान पर। तो इसलिये मैं यह समझता हूं कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने सख्त गलती की कि जो उन्होंने कामन बयान दे दिया। अगर बयान देना था तो उनको काश्मीर के मामले में बिलकुल बयान नहीं देना था।

इन अल्फाज के साथ वाइसचेयरमैन साहब, मैं बड़े अदब से प्रधान मंत्री से और अपने डिफेंस मिनिस्टर से कहूंगा कि आप मत समझिये आपकी विदेश नीति कामयाब हुई है। अगर रूस जैस

देश आपके खिलाफ हो गया है, पाकिस्तान से समझौता करने लगा है, तो आपको यकीन रखना चाहिये कि आपकी विदेश नीति फेल हुई है। इसलिये आपको अपनी विदेश नीति को बदलना होगा और अपनी हालत ठीक करने में ही हिन्दु-स्तान का भला है और हमारा भला है।

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the supply of arms to Pakistan by Russia amounts to a total failure in Indian diplomacy, and at the same time, it means that Pakistan has been successful in her perfidy. The Government has been all the while complacent in this respect. Sometime back, questions were raised in this House about the supply of helicopters to Pakistan by Russia. At that time we were told in this House that these helicopters were of a civilian type and, therefore, we need not worry about it. That very incident should have opened the eyes of the Government. The Government should have noticed the change in the policy of the U.S.S.R., and should have been alert and should have made every effort to dissuade Russia from supplying arms to Pakistan.

This is a most unfriendly act that Russia has committed against India. It may not have dealt, as pointed by some friends in this House, a fatal blow to Indo-Soviet friendship. But there is no doubt, Sir, that this arms deal has dealt a serious blow to Indo-Soviet friendship. It increases the threat to the security of this country and it is a matter of grave concern for us. A number of theories are being advanced for the shift in the policy of Russia. I do not want to go into all those reasons. I am concerned only with the security and defence of our country. We know, Sir, that Pakistan is armed to the hilt. She has acquired her military hardware from the U.S.A., Iran, West Germany, and Italy, and now the U.S.S.R., also has joined in the supply of arms to her. It is also reported from Bonn that Pakistan is trying to get the most modern 47-ton Leopold tanks from West Germany. All this development indicates that Pakistan is itching to have another bout with India.

What are we to do now in these circumstances? One thing that we should do is we should depend on our own strength. For that purpose, as pointed by the hon. Home Minister, Mr. Chavan, we have to increase our industrial potential. We must depend on our own strength. We should not depend on anyone else. The lesson of

the Egypt-Israel war clearly shows that if any nation depends on other nations for her defence, she will have to face the kind of calamity that befell Egypt.

Now, it is said that Russia being a sovereign country is entirely at liberty to formulate her own policy. Nobody can question that. But as pointed by some friends, there is a shift in the foreign policy of Russia. Mr. Chagla has also pointed out that nowadays Russia wants to develop friendly relations with Pakistan. Now what would be the effect of this change so far as the defence of this country is concerned? Today just for the purpose of securing the friendship of Pakistan, Soviet Russia is supplying all kinds of arms to Pakistan. Against which country is Pakistan going to use these weapons? There is not the slightest doubt that Pakistan will ultimately utilise all these arms and ammunition against India only. Russia knows this fact. Russia is not ignorant of this fact. But even then, Russia is supplying arms to Pakistan. Why? It is said that Russia wants to win over Pakistan from China as well as from the U.S.A. I doubt whether Russia will be successful at all in her attempt to win over Pakistan from these two countries. Apart from that, Sir, the important question that arises is this; to-day to secure the support of Pakistan, Russia is trying to supply arms. To what extent will this policy of appeasement go? Tomorrow if Pakistan says "No, we will not be satisfied; you should also change your stand on the Kashmir issue." what will happen? If Russia wants to gain the friendship of Pakistan and wants to win over Pakistan from the U.S. and China, is she going to change her policy regarding the Kashmir issue also? I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what the position of Russia is in this respect. If Russia is going to change her policy in regard to Kashmir and in regard to other issues in which the vital interests of this country are involved, what are we going to do? Firstly, the question of defence is there. As I have already pointed out, we have to strengthen our defence and we have to rely on our own strength. Secondly, we have to build friendly relations with other countries. As pointed out earlier, the result of our foreign policy is that in the whole world to-day India has no friend at all who can come to the rescue of this country in case this country is attacked by Pakistan or China. We are friendless to-day.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : How do you know ?

SHRI B. D. KHOBAGADE : It has been said, that we should start a dialogue with Pakistan and China. In to-day's circumstances, my submission is that there can be no dialogue with China. It is not possible. China has been trying to dominate South Asia and South-East Asia and she considers India to be the biggest obstacle in the way of achieving her ambition. In such a situation, how can there be friendly and cordial relations between India and China ? However sincerely we might try to resolve our disputes and differences and have cordial relations with China, how can our efforts succeed When China has such an ambition to dominate the whole region ? Can we have friendly relations with Pakistan in today's circumstances ? I have grave doubts because for the last two years, Pakistan has been trying to amass arms and ammunition, getting them from whatever source possible in the world—U.S.A., West Germany, Iran and Italy and now Soviet Union. The recent bellicose and belligerent speeches of Pakistani leaders clearly indicate that Pakistan does not want to resolve all the disputes across the table, but they want to resolve them by means of force. If this is their intension, can there be any dialogue between Pakistan and India ? And if there is any dialogue, can that be fruitful?

Now so far as friendly relations are concerned, we have to create friendly relations with our neighbours. For that purpose, we have to develop most cordial relations with Japan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand, so that in case there is any attack from China, these countries can always come to our rescue because ultimately these countries also will suffer, because of China's ambition to dominate others.

It has been pointed out in this House that there is a change in international situation. I do agree with that proposition. There are no monolithic blocs in this world to-day as we used to have in the 'fifties and in the early sixties'. There was on the one hand the Western bloc and there was, on the other, the Communist bloc. These blocs are tottering to-day. I agree with what Mr. Bhagat has said in the statement yesterday. But what has Government done ? These blocs began to totter about two years back. China fell out with Russia and France fell out with the Western bloc. Have we tried to develop good relations with France? We cannot have good relations with China, that I can understand, because China

today is our enemy and she has occupied our territory. But what about France? Can we not develop good relations with France ? If America supplies arms to Pakistan and if the Soviet Union also supplies arms to Pakistan, we can get some help and assistance from France. France today has fallen out with the Western bloc. So we have to develop good relations and friendly relations with all those Asiatic countries and particularly with France on whom we can depend to some extent for military help and assistance. I think in view of the changing international situation it is necessary that we should reorientate our foreign policy. Thank you.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN (Gujarat) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is no doubt that that a formidable friend of ours and a source of strength, namely, Russia has in its wisdom, and in its own right thought it fit to sell arms to Pakistan. It has no doubt agitated our minds in both the Houses and also outside. But I cannot understand one thing. The Government of India through that valuable document presented yesterday have expressed their concern by saying that the intransigent attitude, and the bellicose attitude of Pakistan will be stiffened and it will be a problem to this country. We are all sharing this concern. The only question is whether we should do it by showing anti-Russian feelings or pro-American feelings. The Leader of the Opposition, started with a rhythm of follies, follies, follies. He was criticising the Government that they have failed. He said if China has become our enemy, it is the failure of the Indian Government. But what have we done? Of what are we guilty? If somebody does something wrong, what can we do ? If somebody becomes a goonda, we have to deal with him. But how can we be blamed for that? My predecessor argues that if India is attacked, then we have no friends to come to our rescue. The UAR was attacked. How many sovereign countries went with their Armies? That pattern of war blocs we are trying to avoid. We have been taking the attitude of non-alignment in this way that we stand for the establishment of good relations between all neighbourly States including Pakistan, because historically it is a sovereign State by itself. We have argued for China also because the justice is there and our moral voice will be there. Therefore it is not the policy of the Government which should be criticised because the Government has already expressed its

concern in this matter. I am wondering why no compliment is paid to the Government. After all in this situation we have to give some sober leadership to our people. Why agitate their minds and make them panicky, why ask them to indulge in demonstrations, why say that India is sinking and all that? Pakistan is already enjoying this. Why add to their joy further? After all we have conveyed our concern and anxiety to the Soviet Union and we have learnt a lesson that we have to stand on our own legs and for that the answer is not demonstrations. I have heard the speech of Shri Rajnarain. It is all annihilation. He says "He is not our friend, he is not our friend." I tell him "You are no friend of anybody." After all Russia and America have their own policies. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—I do not agree with him—says that it may be that they want to help Pakistan and then ask him to come closer and closer to India to settle its disputes. Looking to the previous attitude of Pakistan even the bona fide intentions of the Russian Government may not succeed. America also said "We are helping Pakistan because otherwise it will go to China." So Pakistan may play the same game as it played with America. But the responsibility is ours. We have to stick to our policy, we should not condemn our Government in this moment of grief, saying that the Government has failed. We must strengthen this Government and tell our people that the time has come for all of us to be united. Otherwise it will not help matters. We may have to face the situation all alone with Pakistan or China if we have to stand for our principles. Therefore I compliment the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Home Minister because they have in so many words conveyed our feelings to the Soviet Union and they have not taken any anti-Soviet attitude. If we take any anti-Soviet attitude, we will be going into the trap of the Swatantra and Jan, Sangh people. We are not like a small fly that would walk into such a trap or as we call it the spider's web. If go into their trap, they will say "You have no brain, no judgment of your own." But we have our brain and our judgment, and we can see things for ourselves. Practically there is a consensus of opinion, the PSP, the Communists and other progressive groups understand the importance of international politics of Russia; they do understand the machinations of the imperialist countries. Therefore we should firmly tell our people that we shall yield to none but we shall convey our concern and our anxiety to the Soviet Union. We should tell our people that

they should muster sufficient strength, to meet any challenge, be it from Pakistan or China. Thank you.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) s Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the outset I take this opportunity to express a deep sense of appreciation for the massive aid that India received in the past decades in order to meet the imperialist machinations and also to free the national economy from the preponderance of the imperialists. In this context it is not only necessary to maintain the bond of friendship with the Soviet Union un-interrupted but it is also necessary to strengthen it further in the common interests of the people of the Soviet Union and the people of India and also in the interests of international peace because in the past we have endeavoured together to fight the imperialists and we feel that this bond of friendship, will also help us in the matter of our common struggle against imperialism and capitalism and make this world a better place for the mankind to live. While, we are expressing these sentiments, I think we can ill-afford to remain oblivious and it will be only at the peril of our security if we do not take into account certain grim facts that our country is facing to-day. Particularly these facts are to be borne in mind by the people of India, those who believe in socialism, those who are patriotic, those who are peace-loving, in the context of the decision of the Soviet Union's arms deal with Pakistan. The facts are these: You know the fact that right from its inception Pakistan was being armed to the teeth by the Pentagon. It is also known that Pakistan secured huge quantities of US arms in the past and those were freely used against India. Pakistan committed aggression on our country not only once but on many occasions. Even to-day Pakistan maintains a bellicose and belligerent attitude and she is maintaining a posture which threatens the security of India. You also know that Pakistan used freely, the US arms despite the assurances given by the USA in the past. These bellicose and belligerent attitudes are being maintained by Pakistan even after the Tashkent Agreement. Though the Tashkent Agreement was unilaterally implemented by India I am sorry to mention that it was implemented more in the breach than in acceptance by Pakistan herself. That being the case, Pakistan has not only secured arms directly from the USA in the past but Pakistan has also secured arms indirectly from a third party against us. Pakistan has also by this time replenished her armoury by Chinese help. Now she

[Shri Chitta Basu] is shopping round the world for more arms and the Soviet Union has also agreed to supply arms to Pakistan. In this background we are to know the position of India. India's military strength is definitely defence-oriented. We have no aggressive designs against Pakistan. Not only that, we simply want to defend our country and for normalisation of relations between India and Pakistan, we have gone even to the extent of unilaterally implementing the Tashkent Agreement. We have gone to the extent of requesting Pakistan to sign a 'No-war' Pact with India. In spite of that, Pakistan has secured huge arms and has been armed to the teeth. I am surprised that the Soviet Union has decided to give arms to Pakistan. What is the reason behind it? If I am permitted to quote Marshal Ayub Khan, he said only yesterday :

"India wants us to remain defenceless. It has four-fifths of its army facing us."» The contention of Pakistan is that Pakistan cannot be denied the right of self-defence. She wants arms, against whom? She wants an assurance of self-defence—against which country? Does Pakistan feel that she is to face an aggression from America? Certainly not. Does Pakistan feel that there is a possibility of the Chinese, attacking her? Definitely not. Therefore Pakistan is candidly clear that she apprehends aggression from India and for that they want more arms for defence but the Government of India have said more than once—and I also agree—that India has no aggressive designs. Then, does the Soviet Union believe that India has also aggressive designs against Pakistan? Does not the Soviet Union believe in our bona fides and therefore in the interest of Pakistan's defence against India whether she has agreed to supply arms to Pakistan? If that is the position, then Indian diplomacy has failed and failed in a colossal way. We cannot convince the Soviet Union of our bona fides. We cannot convince the Soviet Union that we have really no intentions against Pakistan or any neighbouring country. Therefore the Government of India's diplomacy cannot but be censured on this score. Again, the Soviet policy has undergone certain shifts vis-à-vis the position of Kashmir. The question is: Kashmir is definitely going to be affected by this shift of policy of the Soviet Union vis-à-vis India and Pakistan. At this stage I want to bring in the question which has been raised by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He said in the course of his speech that the decision of Russia to supply arms to Pakistan

has been in the interest of the professed policy of the Soviet Union for peace, coexistence, and for lessening of tensions between States. I disagree with him. Of course I agree that peaceful co-existence, peace and lessening of tensions between States are the bedrock of the Soviet foreign policy but the decision of the Soviet Union to supply arms to Pakistan, which is led by a military junta, which is still allied to CENTO and SEATO and which in no case is going to break away from America is not in keeping with the spirit of coexistence and in the interest of peace in this sub-continent.

Again in this context I want to refer to the speech made by Marshal Ayub Khan only yesterday. He said :

"The relationship is based on bilateral relations. Pakistan cannot take sides with one Big Power against another Big Power".

That means, if there is an occasion where the Soviet Union is to take a very strong attitude against America, Pakistan is not going to side with the Soviet Union and Pakistan is not going to side with the progressive forces of the world because Pakistan is still aligned with the imperialist forces and the reactionary forces. Therefore this position has to be taken into account. The decision of the Soviet Union to give arms to Pakistan is not only going to create tensions between India and Pakistan but it is threatening the democratic movement in Pakistan. It will also increase the tensions in this sub-continent. What is the answer to it then? The answer is that these very things have highlighted the imperativeness of our country attaining self-reliance both in economy and defence because a self-reliant economy can only be built up by self-reliant defence.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Madras) . After having heard the brilliant speeches of many Members here the impression created in this House is that we should not get panicky over the situation. Being a great country, I do not think that we have got any ground to get panicky or alarmed over the situation. I would only respectfully state that in the context of the present relationship with this country one would rather believe that we must stand on our own legs and not depend on anybody else. We are aware that one who trusts more must suffer more. India is one of those countries that have suffered more, having trusted many other friends. I shall not narrate how we have suffered by trusting



others. We know the background of how we behaved with others and how others have behaved with us.

About one thing which I am sure is that the Prime Minister and every other leader here has said that there is a shift in the policy of Russia. The shift has not come all of a sudden. It is one of a progressive nature. There has been a shift ever since the exit of Mr. Khrushchev. As long as he was there, he was very friendly and he stated that Kashmir was an integral part of India. And after his exit there was slight tilting of their policy, and I should think that it was to the extent to which they had seen that India also had tilted its policy. Sir, we have been saying that this is a socialist country. But what have we done? We say we are a socialist country but in actual practice what we are doing is, we invite others to invest their money here and also enter into collaboration agreements with them. Also we undertake not to nationalise a thing. And when we are seeing that a thing is not nationalised, it is not a socialist country altogether; it is a country tilting towards a capitalist country. So they also have got a grievance against us that we are not maintaining an absolutely non-aligned policy. It might be politically non-aligned but internally and economically we may align with somebody else. Therefore, there was also tilting on our side as much as there was tilting on the other side. But one thing I should insist on in this connection. Certainly Russia has been very friendly with us, has come to our rescue in many previous incidents in which we were involved and even in the United Nations has exercised its vetoing power in our favour. She has happened to be a country which was very friendly with us. Since it is a sovereign country, it can do whatever it likes. It can sell arms. It can sell any heavy machinery. It can sell arms and ammunition to any country. We have no grouse; it can do it. But one thing. Just as human beings are now controlled by a social code, so also, as though bound by an international code, this country must see, we both being friends, that it should not lend support to a country which has been inimical towards us all through, in spite of all our efforts to make friends with Pakistan. We offered our hand saying that we would have a mutual no-war pact. But they said, "No", and they will never yield to it. In the face of all this I should say that our country must express its regret that Russia should enter into this commercial deal with Pakistan. We are very unhappy about it. Since it is a sovereign country we have no control over

the deal, but we have the control in the shape of the code of friendship between us and Russia, and since there happens to be this code of friendship, they must have some feelings towards us. They must have the feeling that they are offering these arms and ammunition to a country which is not friendly with India. Now certainly psychologically they are exalted, that this exaltation has come to them from Russia. They are very joyful now saying that they can get arms and ammunition not only from every other country but also from this country. And they are running a race in the accumulation of weapons and arms and ammunition for use against us. Even their Defence Budget has increased to the tune of Rs. 1200 crores. Considering their dimension in comparison with ours they need not have so much for defence. I should say in this connection that Russia should really have thought of the repercussions before entering into this deal with Pakistan. Because it has not done so, we shall not feel sorry about it. We shall stand on our own legs and see that we do not get panicky and see that we are in a position to face all the consequences that might flow from this. Though there may be differences of opinion with regard to this or that, we have seen before that when the time comes India remains united, and this is an opportunity given to us to see that all of us join together and face all the consequences if any arises adverse to us. I am sure that Russia will see to it that Pakistan mounts no aggression against India. And in case it does, it will be disappointed. Just as the U.S.A. had been disappointed she is bound to get disappointed with Pakistan one day or the other. The way President Ayub Khan is now gathering strength going from country to country and making purchases of military hardware while at the same time also vilifying India, we can be sure that one day or the other there may be some other eruption between these countries, and many of the countries that happen to support them now may have cause to regret their support to Pakistan. Sir, we are having so many people at our back. We may be divided now over this issue, but when the time comes we are all united. That indicates that we are not a country which can be dealt with as they please. The final aspect which I wish to place before this House is this. Many of our friends here have had different things to say about Russia and Pakistan and China and all the rest of it. We have seen how we made friends with China and how we shouted Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai. It was going on for a year or two. Thereafter we left that country. And now Russia has

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy] come in. Of course we are having friendship with them\*. But they are also tilting the balance now and they may also feel one day or the other that what they have now done is wrong, and you will see ultimately, Sir, that the people who now think that they can get over this situation and cow down India by some means or the other will certainly be belied in their expectations because we will never be lagging behind in our strength and in our unity.. The last word which I wish to say is that I only wish that many of our friends, who have got some sort of susceptibilities that we might one day or the other be invaded by any other country, will be believed in their apprehensions, and I am sure that the two countries will live in unity and friendship. But in case they want to use all the arms and ammunitions which they have now gathered against India, we shall stand united to face it and we can depend upon our own strength and upon the strength of our jawans. I wish God speed for India's victory on all fronts.'

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN (Non-ministered) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to join the other Members of the House in expressing my concern at the decision of the Government of the Soviet Union to supply arms to Pakistan. I don't think it is necessary for me to repeat the arguments that have been already advanced to the effect that this decision does not mark a shift in the policy of friendship which the Soviet Government has for India. I think, there is enough evidence to show that the Soviet Government continues to entertain sentiments of friendship for this country and that it is one of the planks of Soviet foreign policy, just as it is, as the Home Minister assured us again this afternoon, a plank of India's foreign policy. Having assumed this I would not like to waste the time of the House attempting to refute the argument of some of the Members—mainly from this side—and to prove that the attitude of the Soviet Government is one of continued friendship for India. I would like to crave your indulgence to point out to something else, and that is the Soviet argument which I wish to analyse. The Soviet argument is that every attempt should be made to detach Pakistan primarily from the military blocks and especially from the influence of the U.S.A., and to some extent of China, especially at a time when Pakistan has herself started moving away from these countries and towards the Soviet Union. Secondly, if the Soviet Government increases its influence

in Pakistan, it would be definitely to the advantage of India; It would have a restraining influence and therefore it would help to ensure. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have a submission to make.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Not at this stage, not in the midst of another Member's speech. Please let him continue with his speech. Yes, Mr. Nurul Hasan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In this Soviet map Kashmir has been shown as a part of India including the area now under the occupation of Pakistan.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN : (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Order, order. Mr. Nurul Hasan.

PROF. SAIYAD NURUL HASAN : Sir, this is the view which has been expressed by the Soviet Union about its 'new' policy towards Pakistan. I only hope that the view proves to be correct, and I am sure that we in this country would be very happy if Soviet influence in Pakistan leads to a detente between this country and Pakistan. But, Sir, unfortunately facts do not point to that direction. We cannot forget the circumstances in which Pakistan was created. The hope of the 'people of the world aroused as a result of the national freedom movement in India had certainly alarmed the imperialists. And hence the imperialists started encouraging secessionist trends in India. It was largely as a result of this imperialist encouragement that India was partitioned and from the very beginning it appears that the imperialists pinned their hopes on Pakistan, hoping to support Pakistan to adopt an attitude of hostility towards India thereby creating counterpressures in India hoping thereby that India would remain dependent upon the imperialist powers. We know, as the President of Pakistan in his Mein Kampf "Friends, Not Masters", has himself stated, that in 1954 just before the U.S.—Pak pact was signed there was every possibility of an agreement between India and Pakistan over the issue of Kashmir. It was at that stage that the military pact was signed and Pakistan which had formerly been in the enourage of British imperialism came under the influence of the United States and started receiving massive arms assistance given free of cost. These arms, as every one could see in this country and as many people outside also could see would be used only against India. This

pact increased the tension between India and Pakistan and whatever little chance there was of any settlement receded into the background. The President of Pakistan has said that the reason why the Indian offer of a 'no-War pact' was rejected by Pakistan was the refusal of India to agree to the right of self-determination in Kashmir and he ridicules the argument given by Jawaharlal Nehru that elections had taken place in Kashmir. And he says: what is the value of elections when there is no civil liberty? 'One would venture to ask: since President Ayub Khan has taken over power what civil liberties exist in Pakistan and what was the nature of elections which took place in Pakistan even before General Ayub Khan had come into power? A country which has rejected the democratic way of life, a country which has totally rejected the secular way of life, cannot turn round and say that it is unable to agree to a no-war pact with India only on the ground that self-determination is being denied by India to the people of Kashmir. Furthermore, Sir, a careful examination of this very valuable book shows that the President of Pakistan is not merely concerned with ensuring the right of self-determination to the people of Kashmir but he is interested because Kashmir is considered to be necessary for the economic development and defence of Pakistan. He ridicules the suggestions allegedly made by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah regarding a confederation of India, Pakistan and Kashmir and says that Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was talking under pressure. Throughout the two chapters that he had devoted to foreign policy there is this single theme of opposition and hostility to India and I would seek your permission to read two quotations :

"With one of them, India, the prospects of establishing normal relations do not appear to be in sight. We must therefore accept the situation of implacable Indian hostility and learn to live with it."

Similarly he also says :

"Should a conflict take place between India and Pakistan other powers will inevitably get drawn into it."

So what I am trying to submit is that the unfortunate policy which the leaders of Pakistan have adopted towards this country has created a situation in which if yet another source of arms supply is found by the leaders of Pakistan it would not lead

to a further detachment of Pakistan from the imperialist camp because it would increase the hostility of the leaders of Pakistan against this country thus providing a further opportunity to the imperialists to increase their stranglehold over the economy and defence of Pakistan. And therefore I am afraid that in spite of all the calculations which the Soviet leadership may have made it has erred and grievously erred in its decision to supply arms to Pakistan. We must therefore be prepared, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to face this situation, not in a spirit of hostility to the Soviet Union but try to make them understand and strengthen our relations with them. At the same time there is no denying the fact that we have got into a bit of a jam internationally. Let us increase our manoeuvrability and our flexibility, flexibility not in the direction of anti-Sovietism but in a genuine attempt to solve our conflicts with other powers in the best manner that we can on the basis of strength and self-reliance of the Indian people developing our industries, our technology and above all our morale.

Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have a submission to make. A reference was made to the latest Soviet Atlas which is about one month in weight— it is here—to create an impression that the Soviet Atlas is showing Jammu and Kashmir as part of .

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : On a point of order, on what is he drawing the inference? And what is the clarification that he is seeking?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You agree that Jammu and Kashmir is shown here in India ?

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : My submission was that Aksai Chin has not been shown as Indian territory, that NEFA has not been shown as Indian territory.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, you are intelligent enough, more intelligent than many of us. We are discussing Kashmir policy, whether the Soviet Union has changed its policy with regard to Kashmir. We are not discussing China or the Soviet policy with regard to China. In that context

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar) : Maps can be changed tomorrow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Just one minute. Mr. Vice-Chairman, in that connection the Atlas was referred to and paraded and the impression even I get was...

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Wrong impression.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I can correct myself by a personal explanation... as if Jammu and Kashmir is not shown in India but I find that it is shown in India in the Soviet Atlas, including that portion of Jammu and Kashmir which is under Pakistani occupation. So no change in their Kashmir policy

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI :  
What about Ahsai Chin?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Aksai had never been shown in their old map. Don't go into all that.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : That is what we have been objecting to.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The point here is . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you have said what you wanted to say.

The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 24th July, 1968.