

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock. THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA), in the Chair.

RE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FOR LUNCH

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): May I bring to you—notice what appears to me to be a piece of irregularity this fore noon. I do not know how this House adjourned six minutes before one of the clock. We are all pressed for time and we have lost six minutes. I would like to know why we lost six minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): That is the discretion of the Chair. He had adjourned the House. Now before . . .

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Even before time?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Yes, Yes.

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

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Before I call upon the hon. Members to speak, I want to request the House that all hon. Members should co-operate with the Chair and not make their speeches beyond ten minutes. We are hard pressed for time and there is a long list. So, every hon. Member should restrict his remarks to ten minutes.

Mr. S. N. Mishra.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Mishra has already spoken for six minutes.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : If that satisfies him, it is all right.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am placed in a very difficult predicament because of the fact that on such an important subject I will have to co-press myself within ten minutes which would hardly give me time to analyse the factors that have been at work not only in relation to the Indo-Russian relationship but also with regard to the forces that have been working in the larger sphere of world politics.

Sir, the main theme of the debate that has taken place so far has been indeed of a universal character and it is unmistakably clear that the House is unanimous on the point that the deal has been against our interests and probably it has also been against the larger interests of world peace and security. About that there is absolutely no equivocation in this House from any quarter. So, it can also be said that the Government's response to the situation has been broadly endorsed by the House. But the matter, so far as I am concerned, ends there and I would not try to carry the eulogy so far as the Government's approach to the subject is concerned, any farther than that.

I have not felt very happy about the turn the discussion has taken because I find that it has gone, particularly in respect of analysis, on a somewhat wrong track, and for that the responsibility is not only that of the Members of the House but it also rests squarely on the Government which has not been able to give a right guidance or lead in this matter. The matter does not end by saying that this is the sovereign right of any country to do it; the matter requires a much further detailed approach. But the Government has not thought it fit to do all that. And therefore, we have found that the discussion in the House has been more or less of a rambling character. Really what did we find? It sometimes looked like a traumatic experience that the House was undergoing along with the Government. And the first victim of this trauma, it seems, was the Government itself. It seems that it was almost a reaction of gaping wonderment, so far as the Government was concerned. There was an element of surprise and amazement in the whole thing. Well, the whole matter was I—must assert with all the emphasis at my command—obvious to the layman in the country that there was going to be a shift in the Soviet policy during the course of the last three years or so. There have been writers on this subject who have gone on record to say that there was going to be a shift in the Soviet stand with regard to this.

While I am saying that I do not want to judge here whether the shift in the Soviet stand had been wrong or right, I am not going into the rights or wrongs of the matter just now at this stage. But the point that I want to make is that after Tashkent or even earlier it was clear to everybody that there was going to be a different kind of approach so far as the Soviet Union was concerned with regard to the Indo-Pak relations.

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

At times, Mr. Vice-Chairman, this discussion looked like a protest conference. And protest against what? And protest leading to what? I really do not believe in protests of this kind, a protest which ends in the bravery of words, and nothing more. We do not want to convert the House into a kind of protest conference and if protest is to be conveyed it will be conveyed properly and it will have to be conveyed by the country in hard dealings, in a cooler atmosphere and in a realistic manner. That would be the way to do it.

Again, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it appeared to me sometimes that the discussion was becoming something like an anti-Soviet conference in which some persons thought that this was the time, this was a very good stick to beat the Soviet Union with, as also the whole policy of non-alignment and so on.

But when I speak of non-alignment, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to say that no one has brought non-alignment into disrepute so much as the non-creativity of the External Affairs Ministry so far as the thinking with regard to non-alignment is concerned. Non-alignment as anything else, requires creative evolution. Non-alignment is all right. Whenever any question is asked about anything, the only reply that the Government wants to make is that our policy is of non-alignment, and those who think differently, they are against non-alignment. This is the kind of pseudo-radicalism which this Ministry of External Affairs has tried to foster, and in fact, the political leaders also will it. I am against this pseudo radicalism which is also found in the economy of the country but the pseudo-radicalism.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Oriss) : You are ...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Please hear me. Please give me some time out of your own quota. I am trying.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Order, please.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : This kind of pseudo-radicalism is there because of the kind of non-creative thinking, lack of creative thinking lack of creative evolution of the policy of non-alignment. S. N. Mishra at the age of five and S. N. Mishra at the age of 30 are different. S. N. Mishra at the age of 50 is a different S. N. Mishra. But non-alignment to many means a kind of Peter Pan who does not grow. While a Tito can have a bold initiative and approach and

can have the courage to enlarge the concept of non-alignment and also the membership on Non-aligned Conference, there is absolutely no courage or creativity in the thinking of the External Affairs Ministry or the political leadership which presides over that Ministry to bring in to whiff of fresh air into the whole concept of non-alignment. The House is in favour of non-alignment; the country is in favour of non-alignment. And one of the most potent and binding forces for the country is non-alignment. But this non-alignment is dying because of the bureaucratic blood-stream that is flowing through it. It is the blood-stream of the nation that should flow through it.

And if the blood stream of the nation should flow through it, it can flow only through the political leadership.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was saying that the discussion has been derailed. I do not agree with many friends who have spoken even from my side of the House when they say that we should administer a warning to the Soviet Union. I say that warnings are not administered like that. Warnings are administered in a friendly way after examining all the pros and cons of the matter. We cannot administer a warning to any country nor can we allow any other country to administer a warning to us. Now President Tito is talking about Czechoslovakia. I do not want to enter on the thorny ground of Czechoslovakia and the kind of thing that is happening there just now. Read the speeches of President Tito and the Statements of the League of Communists of Czechoslovakia. They do not want any interference in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. What I am saying is that this suggestion of administering a warning sounds very hollow. I feel that this is not the right approach to make.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : I am afraid I will not be able to oblige you. You can take another two minutes.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : It can end even just now...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : It will not be able to give more than two minutes...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : It will not be able to finish...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : What can be done?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, he is the Deputy Leader of the biggest Party in this House. He must be given some more time.

SHRI S.N. MISHRA : Some friends from my side will set apart some time for me, I think. It is after a long time that I am speaking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Let any hon'ble Member volunteer his time and I will give it to you. I can be fair to you but I cannot be unfair to others. Let any hon'ble Member stand up and give his time to Mr. Mishra.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN (Maharashtra) : I give my time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I am afraid your name is not here.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Yajee is giving his time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Are you speaking?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar) : I am speaking. (

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : But you told me that you would give me your time.

कहो, कोई कहो ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : I am afraid you will have to finish in two minutes.

SHRI S. N. MISRA : I just cannot complete my speech in two minutes.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : सर मैंने दे दिया, दान कर दिया ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You get another ten minutes.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, some important spokesmen of the Government stated yesterday and even day before yesterday in the other House that we have to ask the Kremlin to take note of it. I say that there could be no more erroneous approach than this. What is the Kremlin to take note of? It is we who are to take note of them. The Kremlin or some other powers have absolutely no concern to take note of this. And if they want to take note of it, let them do so. But this is not the right kind of approach.

I have found a peculiar, amusing spectacle that has taken place during the debate in both the Houses. Sir, the Ministry of External Affairs seems to be the mistress of everybody and a consortium of Ministers seems to be dealing with the External Affairs Ministry. Sometime we find one Minister taking part in the debate in the other House and another Minister taking part in this House. Therefore, to that extent we have got only a part-time Foreign Minister.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Do you advocate more Ministers for the Ministry of External Affairs?

SHRI S. N. MISRA : If they want to provide employment to some I do not grudge but I want a full-time Minister. That does not mean that I am trying to cast any reflection on the leadership which has been provided by the Prime Minister in this respect. I have found her as supple as silk on some occasions and as hard as a nail on other issues. But she does not have enough time to go into many of these matters. Let this Ministry become the Draupadi with a number of husbands; I have nothing to say.

But I was saying, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the main approach of the Government is essentially sound. But it is incomplete with regard to its analysis of the short-term and long-term forces at work in world politics. It is incomplete in respect of the framework which would ensure the security and defence of this country. The Government's approach is incomplete also in learning lessons of history, in learning from the approach which has been made by the Soviet Union in this regard. It is also incomplete with regard to the blueprint for action or the programme which should be placed before the country.

Now every one has been talking of self-reliance. And that has become one of the repetitive chants with the Government. The leadership in many ways wants the country to be fed on the chant of self-reliance. Self-reliance is the real backbone of non-alignment. That is true. But why do you not spell it out in concrete terms? That means, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we must have a free foreign exchange of the order of Rs. 200 crores per year if you want to be really self-reliant in defence. What do we find? Our exports are not showing the rate of growth which they ought to have shown. There is controversy between the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Commerce with regard to this. They say that the rate of growth should be 4 or 5 per cent. But what do we find? Pakistan registered a rate of growth of 8.3 per cent, in its export last year against the target of 9.3 or

[Shri S. N. Mishra] so. Now you want to match up with Pakistan. So why cannot we also do that? It would sound so hollow. We don't do that. I am afraid we are going to discredit this very important word "self-reliance" unless we gear up our machinery and ask the Planning Commission to prepare a programme of two years according to which Rs. 200 crores of free foreign exchange might be available for the country per annum for having military hardware from wherever we can. If that is possible then alone the word "self-reliance" would have any meaning. But nobody is looking into this problem in the Commerce Ministry with the seriousness which it deserves.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must say that for this we will have to recast the nature of the Fourth Plan. The responsibility is not only of the Government but also is of the entire House. The question is whether the House wants to measure up to this situation which has arisen. If that is so, it will have to show the evidence of its determination and indomitable courage through a different character of the Fourth Plan. But for that no party wants to prepare the country. Therefore, I would say that this talk of self-reliance sounds somewhat hollow unless we have got a definite programme before ourselves.

I was telling you about lack of creativity in the Ministry of External Affairs. I was also on the point of saying that although this is a very adequately staffed Ministry you would be surprised to learn that not more than 50 per cent. of the treaties into which we have entered have been registered with the United Nations. This is the state of affairs we are faced with. The country is facing a new situation...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA): The situation is that you must finish in one minute.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I have got at least three minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : You have already taken 21 minutes. I can allow you one minute more. Please be co-operative.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Otherwise I would not be able to cover all the points...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA): You are encroaching on the time of the other hon. Members.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Two minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Please wind up as early as possible.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, my point is this that the Soviet Union thinks that it is in their national interest to have this kind of relationship do we think that that country should do *sadavarat* for us and should be a charity house for us? It would be perfectly within the competence of the Soviet Union to enter into any kind of alliance it likes. Let us learn a lesson from that. We cannot nurse a grievance. No country owes to us to ensure a position of strength in international affairs. We alone should and can earn it. So I have no grievance so far as the Soviet Union is concerned on that point. But I have a grievance that the Soviet Union's protestations about world peace, about socialist advance, about democracy and about non-alignment and so on would sound very hollow after this deal has been struck between the two countries.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Nominated) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, whatever our feelings may be about Russian aid to Pakistan, one thing is inevitably clear. A few weeks or a few months on, there will be a clash of arms, the drums will roll by and our jawans and airmen will have to keep their boots on and be ready from now on for another clash.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Are you a prophet?

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : It is rather a very hard reality. Whatever might be the position, Pakistan will have one more trial of strength with India and it is time that we became a self-reliant nation. Whatever steps we may take, we must act from now on to become a self-reliant nation. I want our country to be armed with three weapons. First, we should be armed with the weapon of self-reliance in food, by 1970, we must be completely self-reliant in food. Secondly we should be armed with self-reliance in defence, so that we shall not have to go begging for arms from any power including the Soviet Union. Thirdly, we should develop self-reliance in science and technology. Science and technology will have to be developed and we should not allow the scientists to go abroad because they get better prospects, leaving the country in a little mess. Unless we have this three-powered umbrella, we shall be victims of nuclear blackmail, we shall perpetually be victims of the P.L. 480 food, and we shall be all the time begging for arms at the

doorsteps of other powers. We are a great nation. We are a great power. We exercise tolerance and non-violence in a manner that no country in the world had done. We have got different communities living here in peace. We have enormous natural resources. We must have faith in ourselves. We must have faith in our strength. Now many people are finding fault with this policy of non-alignment. What other policy can we have in this country? Nehru hugged that policy till the end of his life. It did not fall down from a rainbow. It did not fall out from the lap of gods. That policy had been hammered out for our 2,00 years as a result of the finest essence of Hinduism and Buddhism, the spirit of tolerance and nonviolence. We cannot change it to-day, nor can we change it tomorrow. Perhaps we can change it in the next century. We have made friends. We have popularised the spirit of non-violence. What can be done if the present Prime Minister has a load of troubles heaped on her head, which accumulated during the last 20 years? There is no statesman in the world, whether male or female, who has inherited such a mountain of labour on one's head. I have been around the world and I have seen various Prime Ministers. I was in the House of Commons when then Prime Minister MacMillan did not turn up for three or four days though he was in Downing Street. But our Prime Ministers have been constantly attending Parliament. We work very hard at our jobs. To-day with faith and courage alone can we face the situation. But that does not mean that we should look the gift horse in the mouth. We are grateful to the Soviet Union for various kinds of help that she has given us. The Soviet Foreign Minister under Stalin Molotov's declaration demanding Indian Independence right when the United Nations was born at San Francisco are still ringing in our ears with Congress leadership under Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru, with Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose fighting in South-East Asia, and with the Labour Party's accession to power, freedom was ushered into us. Remember it was Molotov who first raised his voice in the San Francisco conference and that was one of the factors in our freedom. Now I will ask you: Who are the guilty men who have brought us to this pass? I must praise Mr. Kaul for his very balanced speech. In fact, I listened to the speeches in the other House also, and I find that the debate in this House has been infinitely better. But Mr. Kaul did not refer to one important fact. All the trouble, all the mess, the way the peace of this sub-continent has been subverted, has been due to the massive arms aid which Pakistan has got from the

U. S. We are slurring over that. Our economy was disturbed. Mahatma Gandhi said that the Hindus and the Muslims lived together, ate together and smoked from the same hukka, but the British came and divided us and we had rivers of blood. I would ask you: who and where are the guilty men? Are they in the White House or in the Pentagon in Washington or in Rawalpindi or in Peking or Moscow? History will answer that question. Our conscience will answer that question. We were torn into two bits by the British and America stepped in with massive military aid to Pakistan under the triumvirate of Nixon, Dulles and Eisenhower. I would recall a very interesting incident with Mr. Nixon. I saw him standing by our then President Rajen Babu at Rashtrapati Bhawan when he came here. His wife, Patricia was standing unassuming and very genial. I had only two or three questions to ask him. I asked him, 'I believe you are going to arm Pakistan?' "Yes," he said. "Sir, I believe you are going to arm Pakistan?" "Yes", he said. "Sir, do you know what would happen to us?" "Yes" he replied. Then finally I asked him "Do you know which side we will go?" "Yes", he said. He replied so aggressively, puffed up with the power of the Americans wanting to rule the ends of the world. That policy to-day has been blown up sky high. America, Britain and the Soviet Union have come together. Mr. Nixon told me "Whenever you are in Washington, you come and see me." The next day he passed me by in the lobby, but I did not have the heart to talk to him except-exchange bare courtesies because he was going to arm Pakistan and he had complained that Nehru did not give him a red-carpet treatment. Super gentlemen—Eisenhower, Dulles and Nixon. These three then went on to arm Pakistan. John Foster Dulles was one of the cleverest men I have met anywhere in the world. Now I would ask you. Who are the guilty men who put the rope around our neck and from which we have not been able to get out? It is not easy for a Government to get out of such a situation. How is it that Russia has changed the pattern of its policy? I saw it in Turkey. I remember meeting Mr. Menderes, Ex-Prime Minister of Turkey. I was the last man to see him off at the Palam airport after Prime Minister Nehru. Menderes was executed. He was one of the ablest men. But he also fell a victim to his own policy. They were sworn enemies of Russia at that time. When I asked Mr. Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister, about this, he said one word

[Shri Joachim Alava] which I have not forgotten—"Time is on our side". They have settled their differences and they are now good neighbours. What happened to Iran? I was sitting beside the Deputy Prime Minister of Iran Mr. Hovvoda in the third Committee of the U. N. last year. He said : Iran was the first country to recognise the Soviet Union but we had a number of troubles with her thereafter". But the Shah of Iran later went to Yalta and his visit was preceded by a Soviet Exhibition in Iran. They have become friends. In Pakistan, America, used the U-2 bases in Peshawar in her aim to strike at the belly of the Soviet Union. Russia was always surrounded by hostile powers. There was an iron curtain around Russia. Thank God, Russia was not wiped off the face of the earth. They did not want India also to be a great power. Now we have also made some blunders. Why is it that Russia has changed her pattern of policy towards us ? Were they moved by the slaughter of half a million people in Indonesia amongst whom were a large number of communists and to whom they had supplied large quantity of arms ? Have they been moved by the aggressive Chinese policy ? Or have they felt, right ly or wrongly, that our Prime Minister is badgered or pressurised by the advance of American capitalists into India or by the strength of the Right, who are openly declaring that they can get things done as they want? Or is there any change in the atmosphere there? Russia's policy is an all-embracing policy. Now we ourselves have committed some blunders. The day Maharaja Hari Singh fled from Kashmir, he put a halter around our neck. He should have died on the hills of Kashmir like the brave and noble Shervani of Baramula.

He refused to decide whether to join Pakistan or India. Thus a Prince of India betrayed the cause of his motherland. Then, Sir, when President Ayub Khan made the offer for the common defence of the sub-continent of India and Pakistan, we did not accept it. In fact any price was worth giving for Indian soldiers and the soldiers of Pakistan to fight for the common cause of the two countries on the Indo-Gangetic plain or on the top of the Himalayas. We missed that golden chance. History does not give many chances like that. Then premier Chou-En-lai came to India in April 1960 and made the offer that China should have Aksai Chin leading into Tibet and we should have the rest of the territory for ourselves. Thereby a written treaty would have been drawn up which could not have been easily mutilated unlike

the MacMohan line which was dependent on a British scroll. Both the Right and the Left ditched President Ayub Khan and Premier Chou En-lai proposals respectively. Otherwise left to himself Nehru would have have consented. Jawaharlal Nehru had stated that he would not keep the door shut for any dialogue with China. Now we are compelled to revise our policy regarding China and we must tear open the iron curtain separating us. I know where is a great rejoicing in the minds and hearts of Rightists and Monopolists at this juncture. But they forget that there are 500 million people who have to be fed and clothed, educated, and housed. They only think of their own comforts and increase their wealth. But the socialist order is the biggest order today and we do not want to remain friendless. We have to be self-reliant because we have got to pull on. Anyway, we shall not forget those guilty men who tried the noose round our necks. We shall not forget the guilty men in the Pentagon and the White House, in Whitehall under Tory Governments allied with the reactionary British rulers in India for formulating policies setting one community against the other. If we had fought on for just 12 months more instead of yielding to the partition of India, we would have triumphed against the blackmail of the Muslim League, their terrorism and their violence by which they snatched a portion of our land for Pakistan. I was present when Jawahar-la Nehru took the oath along with other on September 2, 1946. However, we shall get out of this morass; we shall not be vanquished ; we shall stand shoulder to shoulder. Of course what Russia has done for us we cannot forget so easily; they have helped us in the past. We were the first and the only non-Communist power very prominently on their side and they stood by us through thick and thin. They also had their own troubles because millions of people perished under Hitler's invasion and the army of Hitler was at the gates of Moscow. However, we must be strong ourselves. Let us not have any doubts in our own capacities. But the social order in India can change only at the cost of India and of peace.

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, I am referring to an obvious but an obvious which deserves to be repeated that the whole country today is greatly concerned about the supply of arms by Soviet Russia to Pakistan. Now why are we feeling so much concerned? France supplied Mirages to Pakistan and West Germany also supplied aeroplanes to Pakistan. We felt concerned but there was not the same type of uproar in the country

as there is today. The reason is obvious that. Soviet Russia has been a good friend of India both politically and economically. In the Security Council many occasions Soviet Russia exercised veto in the matter of (Kashmir. I am afraid I cannot fully share the observations of Mr. Chagla when he said that we would have lost Kashmir but for the veto of Soviet Russia. None the less I cannot forget that Soviet Russia did us good, rendered us great help in the Security Council and strengthened our position with regard to Kashmir. In the economic matters too Russia has rendered us good assistance. Today we have got the basic structure of key and basic industries and in all these matters Russia has been very helpful to us. In the exploration of oil too Russia has greatly helped us. We have built up friendship with Russia. There is no doubt that that friendship has received a shock but does it mean that we should end that friendship? I may very respectfully submit that this is a valuable friendship and we should maintain it so long as it is possible. Certainly there are certain changes but we have to take note of them and we have to prepare ourselves to meet the challenge of those changes.

Sir, Shri Bhupesh Gupta laboured hard to establish that there has been no shift in the policy of Soviet Russia. He is a Communist, I was surprised that he would not admit that there was a change. Shri Gupta is a communist and, I trust, believes, in dialectic materialism. Why should he be afraid of change? There has been a change...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If I had thought it, I would have said it. I think there is no change. Hence I said that. Whether it is courage or fear, it is for you to judge.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : I am going to show that there has been a shift and a definite shift in the policy of Soviet Russia and that the shift is a part of the shift in the global international politics. I would like to repeat some of the observations that have been made in this House in order to build up my future arguments. International politics of the sixties is not the same as the international politics of the fifties. In the fifties there were two blocs, Russia and the USA. The USA had built a chain of military basis round about Soviet Russia and had created CENTO and SEA-TO with the idea of extending the sphere of influence of the USA to Asian countries. On the other hand Soviet Russia had planted rockets and nuclear heads in Cuba. So the whole of the world was divided into two blocs and all over the world there was

confrontation. Now this confrontation received a great shock from the Cuban crisis. When President Kennedy took the decision, to search the Russian ships before they entered the American waters, for offensive weapons, Khrushchev stopped sending the weapons there. That was I think a very wise and valuable strategy that he adopted and that saved the world which was on the brink of a World War. I was in America in those days and I know what was the amount of tension built up in America. That was not only a lesson for Khrushchev but that was also a lesson for America. Americans realised that if this tension continued in the face of the great build-up of the nuclear weapons, if this tension continued all over the world in different areas, it might lead to a world disaster. Sir, I remember to have read in one of the American magazines that there was a flock of swallows floating in the air and this was mistaken as the enemy aircraft on the American radar. But fortunately the mistake was discovered soon. Otherwise counter-action was going to be taken.

The world had reached a stage when it might have been completely destroyed and I think it was wise of Soviet Russia as also of America to have changed their strategy. Now what was the change in the strategy? The U.S.S.R., withdrew from the Caribbean. We have not heard for sometime of the planting of either rockets or nuclear war heads. The CENTO and the SEATO that had been created in Asia have melted, though they have not completely disappeared. They have lost their contents and they are just on paper to-day. These are great changes. With these changes came another change that America and Russia have now their own spheres of influence. Instead of America and the Soviet Union being locked up all over the world, America has its own sphere of influence and that is round about America. Similarly in Central Asia the Soviet Union has built its own sphere of influence. Now the three countries—Pakistan, Iran and Turkey—were members of the CENTO. Naturally when the tension disappeared, when the CENTO had lost its contents, there was bound to be a change, a change which is due to the changes of conditions and not because of any ill will towards us. There is a change in the attitude, in the policy of Soviet Russia. I can very well understand it. If I were a citizen of Soviet Russia, I would have welcomed the building up of good relations, as the Prime Minister often repeated, building bridges between Soviet Russia and Turkey, between Russia and Iran, between Russia and Pakistan.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) :
Dismantling the bridge with us.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : It is not dismantling. Building a bridge with another country does not mean dismantling the bridge with you. This will be only shortsightedness, this will be only injuring yourself. It is a confirmed strategy and a definite strategy which the Soviet Union has adopted. They have supplied arms worth about 200 million dollars to Iran. Now Iran is not on good terms with the U.A.R. Soviet Russia has been supplying arms to the U.A.R. as well. It is practically the same position as with us. They supplied arms to Turkey. Now I am afraid when we are told that the arms supplied to Pakistan will not be used against India. We were given a similar assurance by President Eisenhower that the American arms aid would not be used against India, but the assurance failed us. I am afraid the history will repeat itself. We have also to see what for these arms have been supplied. Then it will depend also on the nature and quantum of arms supplied. We do not yet know what the arms are, what is the quantity but any arms supplied to Pakistan obviously hurt our interests. Pakistan is on very friendly terms with China. Pakistan is also on friendly terms with Iran. Pakistan is not going to fight Afghanistan and therefore the only country left on the borders of Pakistan against whom the arms can be used is India. Again I say, it will depend upon the nature and quantity of arms that Soviet Russia has supplied to Pakistan. We have been told by the Government that this is not going to alter militarily the balance of power here in this part of the world, that it is not going to so much militarily affect us but none the less the thing is there. We have to be cautious. What should we do now? My own proposal would be that we must convey our concern to U.S.S.R. in clear terms. It is not a question of giving a warning. We are a friendly country. We do not want to break relations with U.S.S.R. None the less, we want to tell them what is the effect of supplying of the arms on India and how we are feeling. We must at the same time keep full vigilance. I am not sure whether the arms will not be supplied in the future. We must be prepared for it and we must keep ourselves fully informed of what is being done. We must have sufficient intelligence. We must gather fullest information about the quantity and quality of the arms supplied by Soviet Russia to Pakistan. There has been much talk about self-reliance. Self-reliance is the only policy but we must at the same time realise that you cannot become

self-reliant in a day. There will be an interregnum between the time you start efforts at self sufficiency and the time you become self-reliant. Self-reliance is the only thing. Nobody is going to defend us. We are going to defend ourselves but in the interval we must not shut out valuable sources of supply of arms. We will be only sabotaging our defence preparations against China and Pakistan if we stop all or any sources of supply of arms. We must receive arms from wherever they are available but at the same time our efforts to become self-sufficient must continue.

The subject under discussion is wide and I have not enough time to do justice to its importance. However, I must end as the time of the House is rationed and I would not like to encroach upon others' time.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will take only just one minute to refer to two of the previous speakers. About the first speaker, Shri Mishra, I think the whole of the speech was a strong attack on the External Affairs Ministry and on its ineptitude. I wish the Prime Minister had been here to hear that attack. I am not joining in the attack because I am not used to such attacking but I should say this to the Prime Minister that it is high time that there is a full-time Cabinet Minister in charge of External Affairs, that she has her hands so full that she will find it very difficult to personally handle such an important Ministry as External Affairs. I now come to the speech of my friend Mr. Alva. He referred to Ayub Khan's offer of common defence but he forgets that Pandit Nehru made again and again the offer of a 'No War' Pact to Ayub Khan and he did not accept it. I wish he had balanced what he said about Ayub Khan with what Pandit Nehru had offered to Ayub Khan.

In order not to stray from the main issue I have jotted down one or two things which I shall present to the House.

There is no escape for any one of us on the floor of this House, to whichever party one might belong, from facing up to two major developments. The first is the shift in the policy of the U. S. S. R. and the second the agreement to supply arms to Pakistan. Spokesmen of different political parties have hammered away to reinforce their well-known attitudes for or against the U. S. S. R. by making use of these two developments. This was only to be expected. Anti-Russian parties call this a betrayal and want us to break away from our-

friendly alliance with Moscow. Communists and pro-Communists have tried to explain away these two developments insisting that Delhi-Moscow friendship stands unbroken. I wish to look upon this issue as one wanting India to take every step towards disarmament and world peace, without which problems like the one we now have will become perennial and constant. Even so, I wish all parties and the general public in India to observe certain imperative proprieties.

The outburst of consternation verging on hysteria which we see in our country is unworthy of the India of Gandhi and Nehru. We are not marionettes in the hands of the U.S.S.R. or the USA or any other power on the face of the earth. As my friend Shri Venkataraman from the extreme Left said, let us not forget we are a great nation and a great people with our own distinct contribution for the making of a free prosperous and peaceful world. I deeply regret that we have made an unseemly exhibition of ourselves before the bar of international opinion. When America armed Pakistan free of cost we did not lose our heads. Our protest was properly canalised and dignified even though Leftist Parties did their share of shouting and raving. Let not the world think that India is terrified. The first reaction of the Prime Minister was at the highest level when she stated that it is not for India to tell Russia what to do or what not to do. India does not choose friends or give up friends at the orders of anybody. It is childish to give the impression to Moscow or to the world that we have a right because of our friendship with Russia that she should not be friendly to Pakistan or give Pakistan what Moscow chooses to give. We can only take up with Moscow relevant issues in a dignified and friendly manner and this is what our Prime Minister has done. It is a pity however that many others of different parties have given the impression of a terrified and terribly angry India to the world. I consider this a disgrace to the good name of our great country.

No one has denied a certain shift in the Russian attitude to India and Pakistan. I go one step further and say that the U.S.S.R. has every right to make a shift in response to new conditions. We were very close to China but our attitude underwent a revolutionary shift when China committed aggression. The change in the attitude of Russia to Pakistan comes not only out of the Tashkent agreement but even more as a response to a total and unimaginable shift of Pakistan's own policy. Pakistan has 5—11 R.S./68

almost repudiated its military pacts and closed down an American Base within its territory in spite of the earlier free gift of two billion dollars worth of military hardware and continued support later on in many other ways. This shows the courage of Pakistan to readjust itself to a new situation in the world. Pakistan has come our way, the way of non-alignment. Let us congratulate Pakistan that it has come our way. Pakistan has gone all out to befriend Russia, and that it has succeeded in spite of its close relationship with China is undoubtedly a tribute to its consummate diplomacy. You cannot prevent Pakistan making friends with Russia and Russia responding. The big shift in Moscow is in response to the bigger shift in Pakistan. No one can prevent such developments, and for India to cry out against such developments is, to say the least, unwholesome. We have no control over the actions of other people just as we do not want any other people to control us. We can only take care of our own policies and programmes of action within the country and without. Let us do this wisely, firmly and imaginatively.

What then must we do? Number one, we must build up our internal strength. This does not mean only producing arms and training the army but complete and total national integration. This is the primary condition. Number two, let us hold on firmly to the hand of friendship Prime Minister Kosygin has held out even after the decision to give arms to Pakistan saying quite openly before the whole world that nothing he will do will be such as to harm India. We must take him at his word. Number three, let our non-alignment become more truthful in that we shall keep on the friendliest relation also with the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Burma and other countries. Our lofty principle of non-alignment must stand every test and particularly this present test. Number four, let India go all out for disarmament and world peace, which I am not satisfied India is doing. We are labouring under some inferiority complex which was never in the picture during the great days of Pandit Nehru. We are strong because we are morally strong and not because we have destructive weapons. Number five, in our pursuit of world peace let us aim first at peace between India and Pakistan, our closest neighbour and until recently our own country, and do every thing in our power to accomplish this even if Pakistan does not come half way. The moment India and Pakistan come together we shall both cease to be marionettes in

[Shri G. Ramachandran]

the hands of big powers. We have in India such leaders even today as Dr. Radhakrishna[^] Rajaji, Vinobhaji and Jayaprakash Narayanji, not to speak of others, who can make a contribution in building Indo-Pakistani friendship. We must now think of actively helping them to do this. The key to the present situation of fear and anxiety, which can unnerve both the peoples, lies in this that we must establish goodwill and peace between India and Pakistan. Till this is done there will be recurring situations like the present one each one worse than the previous one, pushing both India and Pakistan to deeper dependence and degradation. Anyone who imagines that in the present day world superiority in arms will solve this or any other problem is living in fools' paradise. The arms race is one in which both sides can run with fatal consequences. I, therefore, plead, Mr. Vice-Chairman, finally that even while dealing with any immediate situation that confronts us today we must also look beyond the situation and discover the causes from which this situation has arisen and find solutions for those causes. If the present disillusionment in the minds of many of our people will teach us to do this, then we shall have lost nothing.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA): I have seen through the list and I find that so far 26 Members have spoken; not one among them was an hon. lady Member. So I hope the House will agree with me if I depart from the list and call an hon. Lady Member.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: (West Bengal) So an hon. lady Member will soon be speaking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA): Mrs. Rajagopalan.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN) (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the outset let me thank you for giving me time to speak on this Motion.

I have been listening to this debate since yesterday and I find that the debate has been of a high order. That there was no display of emotion even from the opposition reveals the grave concern of all sections of this hon. House on this matter.

I would like to point out, Mr. Vice Chairman, that this whole issue should be viewed from this international angle of a thinking world. Some have attacked the

Government's foreign policy, and some have drifted away from the main issue to attack a particular wing in the Ministry of External Affairs. Some have suggested to give up our non-alignment policy and some have suggested to re-shape our foreign policy. But I should like to point out to them that it is very difficult to build up friendship, goodwill and co-operation but it is very easy to break them up. So our main concern now is to strongly express our grave concern to the U.S.S.R.'s of its intention to supply arms to Pakistan, and there should be oneness in this matter not only to strengthen the hands of our Government but also to impress the world as a whole. Instead of that if for debate's sake we say that we should re-think, or reshape our foreign policy, or that our non-alignment policy should be abandoned, I think we have to consider also the dire consequences it would have if we do so under the present circumstances. No country in the world, which economically or in defence is not strong enough, and dependent on other countries, can think in this line. So we have first to strive to be self-sufficient and self-reliant before talking like this.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to point out that some have blamed the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs. Personally I congratulate the Prime Minister for handling the situation ably under such delicate circumstances. I think that the foreign policy pursued by our Government is the best in the present circumstance, and as for this particular matter I am sure that hon. Members who have gone through the statement made by the Prime Minister have been able to find out for themselves that all-out efforts had been made and arguments had been placed by the Ministry of External Affairs to dissuade Soviet Russia from giving these arms to Pakistan. But if they ignore this and go ahead, they must have some reason; whether good or bad we do not know. At this juncture I would also like to point out that during 1962 and afterwards the Western Bloc did not fulfil their commitment to India to more than 5 per cent of their commitment, whereas Soviet Russia have not only fulfilled their commitment but have also given more. Soviet Russia as well as the whole world knows from past experience the intentions of Pakistan and their aggressive attitude. So we have to have faith in the U.S.S.R.'s assurance to the President of India that it will try to maintain peace in this Sub-continent, but be prepared for any eventualities. I would also like to add, Mr. Vice-Chairman

we have to have continued faith in our non-alignment, non-violence, tolerance, truth and peace, the gospel of Mahatma Gandhi which brought glory to our country.

It is unfortunate that at this juncture the 'New York Times' should have come out with a news item—that and here I quote "India had agreed to supply details of its arms purchases from the Soviet Union to the United States" but the Indian Embassy has officially denied it. It is still more unfortunate that Pakistan should open fire on 20th July in Gulmarg area but whatever may be the incidents, we should remember that world powers will help India to get self-sufficient or strong only to a point but not to that point from whereon we would not need their assistance. We should bear this in mind; this is the theory of maintenance of balance of power practised all over the world. So I would like to say that instead of getting agitated about this Soviet arms aid to Pakistan, we should all take a pledge on the Independence Day that we will make our country self-sufficient and self-reliant thereby strengthening the hands of the Government as well as the people of the country.

Thank you.

SHRIS. S. MARISWAMY (Madras) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, let me say at the outset that I am not here to criticise Soviet Russia for its own decisions. It is a sovereign State, an independent country, which has got its own right to make any decision it likes. It can arm Pakistan today; tomorrow Timbuctoo or any other country. That is not our lookout and it is not right on our part to voice any criticism on the foreign policy of Soviet Russia. Why I have risen to speak today is to point out certain defects that we have in our diplomacy, in our foreign policy. The news that Russia has decided to arm Pakistan has been supplied to us by our Foreign Ministry only about three weeks before but the news was in the air all over the world some two to three months before. All the Governments in the world had come to know that there was going to be a shift in the Russian policy not only towards India but also towards Turkey, Iran, Iraq, America and so many other countries. Every other Government has taken action in regard to the shift except our own Government. I can understand our Foreign Ministry sleeping in Delhi. As many Members have pointed out, our Prime Minister is already loaded with many portfolios and she has also her own party problems. I can understand she cannot devote as much time to foreign policy as she is expected to do but I cannot

understand what our Embassy and our great Ambassador there in Moscow were doing. Iran, Iraq and other countries when they saw that a change was coming, made adequate arrangements to go to Moscow and cultivate Russia. Nasser, Tito, Afghan Ministers and others got perturbed over this change in policy; they also went to Soviet Russia and tried to persuade Russia. Our Prime Minister should have gone there or she should have sent some other Minister but not our President, poor Dr. Zakir Husain.

AN HON. MEMBER : Why poor?
(Interruptions).

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : Our President cannot go and negotiate such things with so much freedom as a Minister can do. He has got his own restrictions. As President, he cannot depart from the line chalked out and speak independently whereas a Minister can deviate. He can keep in touch with the Prime Minister; he can even dash back to Delhi, have consultations and once again go back. All these the President cannot do; he has his own restrictions. So that is where we failed.

To illustrate my point I will give one example. Yesterday I believe a Mission has come from the American State Department to have talks with our Government. I believe the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Shri Bhagat, is engaged in discussions with that Mission. But my information is that that Mission had planned to come to India four months before, as soon as they had the news that Russia was going to change its policy towards India. They said: 'this is not the time for us to go to India; let us wait for a few more months and when the atmosphere in India develops in our favour as against Russia, then we can go to India'. That is why they have come now thinking that the atmosphere is very favourable to them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the game which America.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : When do not attack Russia you should also not attack America. What is the use of attacking America?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You may say whatever you like.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : Yesterday, Mr. Vice-Chairman, when I heard Mr. Bhupesh Gupta speaking in a loud voice I was wondering whether he was speaking for the benefit of this House or whether he was speaking with a view to reaching the Kremlin because he was speaking so loud when we can easily hear him here.

[Shri S. S. Mariswamy]

So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the position now is this. What are we going to do in the changed situation in the world? Are we going to still hug to our so called non-alignment policy which had become an obsession with this Government, a dogma of this Government? What benefits we have derived from this non-alignment policy, let me be told about it. Previously we had Russia on our side and now Russia is no longer with us. Similarly we had America on our side and now whether America is on this side or on the other side, God only knows. So also the U. K. was for some time on our side but now it is not totally on our side. We are losing our friends very fast whereas Pakistan is gaining friends very fast, in fact much faster than we lose our friends. What is the charm that this great Ayub Khan has which we lack? What is it that Pakistan has got, what is the big asset that Pakistan has which we have not got? Our country is a great country; we have tradition and we have fought for our independence. We have sacrificed many precious lives in the course of our struggle for freedom but what has Pakistan done? I can understand some Congressmen who had contributed something to our national freedom coming and occupying the Chair and dictating to the nation but who are those people? What sacrifices have they made, people like Ayub Khan? I do not say anything against him. All that I ask is, what is the charm that he has acquired that we do not have? Is it not high time for us to sit down and think about it? We are bungling all through. Even on this issue I am told that when the news reached New Delhi somebody in the External Affairs Ministry—I was even told the name of the person but I do not want to mention it here; after all, he is an officer and I cannot charge him when he is not in a position to answer who advised the Prime Minister and others and as a result they took a complacent view and it seems? he said it is not a very big affair and that we can keep quiet about it. He is some I.C.S. officer and by such people the country has been let down. If some serious attempts had been made earlier, perhaps things would not be so dismal as they look now.

I am also told that three weeks before when the Foreign Affairs Committee met a suggestion was made that our defence Minister should visit Moscow and it appears that the Minister expressed his inability and said that he would not go. And what was the reason for his inability to go? It seems he said that our policy has

always been vacillating and he asked with what face he could go there.

Now I would like to be enlightened by the Prime Minister.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Who laid the foundation-stone of all this confusion.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : I would like to ask our Prime Minister : suppose tomorrow by some means or other Pakistan takes up the Kashmir question in the Security Council, what will be our position there? Can you still depend upon the Russian veto? Can you still depend upon the Russian support? How many members we have on our side amongst the permanent members and non-permanent members? Has any account been made to assess these things? Has any assessment taken place? This is an important question that I would like to ask. I don't want to traverse the ground already covered by other speakers. This is an important question that I expect our Prime Minister to reply. Another important matter that has not been pointed out by other speakers is, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I take the liberty of reading the small portion for the benefit of the House. In the joint communique issued it is stated:

"Mutual effort be made by both the sides for the normalisation of Indo-Pakistan relations

Hope was expressed that India and Pakistan would continue their efforts to settle step by step controversial questions and to establish good neighbourly relations. It is said that our Government had given to the Russian Government the steps that we had taken with regard to the Tashkent agreement. What are the steps that we had taken to bring about a mutual understanding between the two countries? It is said in the communique that the Russian Government had apprised us of the Pakistani steps and then they said that both of you have taken equally the same steps. I would like to know how Russia could take up the cause of Pakistan and speak to us on par. Who has given that right? If there had been a Pakistani representative and if he had taken the trouble of apprising the Russian Government, only it could be a party in issuing that statement. Pakistan was not represented. It means what? That Russia had taken up the cause of Pakistan and dealt with her and signed the joint communique. Where Russia plus Pakistan stand on one side India stands alone on the other. That is the point I would like the Honourable Prime Minister to explain.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir, listening to some of the speeches yesterday and today I was reminded of one of my neighbours who is an old fashioned husband. Every morning when his wife goes for Ganga snan and every evening when his wife goes to a temple, the old fashioned husband gives her only one advice:

‘इधर-उधर ताकेउना’

Don't you touch other men. Some of the speakers in this debate seem to make out that they are the old fashioned husbands and the Soviet Union should be their equally old fashioned wife. I am afraid that is a very wrong and a very incorrect approach. Friendly international relations are not special and exclusive relationships. Friendship does not exclude friendship with others and just because the Soviet Union has adopted a friendly attitude towards Pakistan, it is wrong of Mr. Mariswamy to argue that the Soviet Union has ceased to be our friend. A trend in the speeches has been that hostility to Pakistan is the acid test of friendship for India. That is a wrong approach. Friendship among nations can be with more than one country. We cannot ignore the realities of the international scene and cannot altogether forget the thaw in the cold-war involving new postures by the Soviet Union and other big powers. We also cannot forget that there is some fluid relationship within the power blocs, and as Mr. Ramachandran correctly pointed out, we cannot forget Pakistan's assertion, howsoever feeble, of her independence from the American dominated military blocs. Then, Sir, we cannot also forget the Chinese presence in Asia and the Soviet Union is at liberty and we should be able to understand the Soviet Union's manoeuvres to meet the Chinese threat about which those people who are speaking against the Soviet Union today have been in the habit of speaking a great deal. There was in some speeches, I think it was in Mr. Jagat Narain's speech, suggestion that we should take the initiative in improving our relations with China. That is not bad in principle. Establishment of good neighbourly relations with China should not be ruled out. But it should not be conceived as a counter-blast for improvement in Soviet-Pak relations. We also have to remember and ask the question: Are the Chinese willing to improve relations with India. Of course, all sensible Indians have always been willing to improve our relations with the Chinese. The disclosure of the Soviet intention to sell arms to Pakistan reveals that it has been for some political parties a cause for over-acting and ra-

6-11 R.S./68

ther for indulging in demonstrations of important rage. I personally feel that the suggestion that the President of India should have cancelled his visit to the USSR was preposterous. Similarly preposterous was the suggestion that the communique at the end of the visit of our President to the Soviet Union should have been anything else than what it was. Such occasions we know are not utilised to air grievances. The correct reaction and the correct attitude was that of the Prime Minister who at Calcutta airport and at the Gauhati press conference said: "Every country is free to give aid to any other. It is none of our business to interfere". Of course, in this case the Soviet Union is not giving arms aid to Pakistan. It is only permitting arms sale to Pakistan. Arms aid to Pakistan was given by the United States right from 1953 to 1965 directly and after 1965 it has been given by the United States indirectly through West Germany, Iran and other countries. The Soviet Union is giving them no aid. It is only permitting arms sale.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : More business like.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The anti-Soviet outburst, which we have witnessed, in some quarters—of course from narrow quarters—is based on narrow nationalism which seeks to argue that hostility to Pakistan means friendship with India. Then there are the usual anti-communists who think that anything that any communist country does anywhere at any time is always wrong and they have seized this opportunity. Then, of course, we cannot forget that in this country there are pro-American influences and in some political parties there are pro-capitalist lobbies. They have seized this opportunity to agitate against the Soviet Union. It is a friendly act on the part of the Soviet Union.

श्री तारकेश्वर पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश): एक आपसे जानकारी चाहता हूँ क्या आप भारत सरकार की वकालत कर रहे हैं या सोवियट सरकार की ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : मैं अपनी रायका इजहार कर रहा हूँ और पांडे जी क्या करते हैं यह बताने का इस समय समय नहीं है । फिर कभी बताऊंगा ।

It was a friendly act on the part of the Soviet Union to give us prior information of their intention to sell arms to Pakistan. We know that the normal Soviet practice is not to advertise arms sale. The Soviet

[Shri Arjun Arora]

Union. we know, has not given any military aid to Pakistan. It has been giving military aid and permitting arms sale to India. It is only thinking of selling some military hardware to Pakistan. The impression sought to be artificially and maliciously created by some people is that Pakistan is full of Soviet tanks and heavy armour and Mr. Alva seems to be afraid of these. That is not correct. Only talks are going on and the chances are that sophisticated weapons may not be given. This is a major problem of India's international relations which should be discussed on merits alone and calmly, as Mr. Kaul said yesterday and is saying now. Let us not import narrow political considerations and try to make political capital out of it. If we take a long-range view, we will agree that we have a large and continuing stake in Soviet goodwill. Any intemperate response like that of some of the political parties and some of the individuals in the Congress Party is not in our interest. It is interesting that the plea for a reappraisal of our foreign policy has come only from those who never understood it or at least never supported it. Their constant attack on our policy of non-alignment implies that we should seek Western co-operation on bended knees and we should expect the friendship of any other power, except the Soviet Union, on its own terms. The fact, however, is that the Soviet Union has been, is and shall remain our friend.

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर (मध्य प्रदेश) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे साथ यह अन्याय क्यों हुआ कि सबके लिये दस मिनट का समय दिया है और श्रीमान् ने स्लिप भेजी है कि पांच मिनट बोलें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARAVA): I have told you what is the party time left. You can take five or seven minutes.

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : मैं सदन का समय उन बातों को दोहराने में नहीं लूंगा जो कि सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत हो चुकी हैं। मूल प्रश्न दो हैं। मेरा नम्र निवेदन है सबसे प्रथम प्रश्न यह है कि क्या रशिया की पालिसी के अंदर कोई शिफ्ट हुआ है, और दूसरा प्रश्न यह है कि यदि शिफ्ट हुआ है तो किस समय हुआ है। मैं कल और आज दोनों दिन माननीय सदस्यों के भाषण सुनता रहा और

यह ठीक से समझ नहीं पाया कि वास्तव में यह शिफ्ट किस समय से समझा जा रहा है, यद्यपि शिफ्ट हुआ है या नहीं इसके बारे में भी कुछ कन्फ्यूजन है। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों का यही कहना है कि शिफ्ट हुआ ही नहीं। अगर शिफ्ट है भी तो किस दिशा में है यह पता नहीं लगता। हमारे एक माननीय साम्यवादी सदस्य ने कहा दायें तरफ है या बायें है या ऊपर है पता नहीं लगता। शायद यह नीचे की तरफ है। यह शिफ्ट किस तरफ है इसका अंदाजा नहीं हो रहा। वास्तव में सदन की लगभग यह राय है, और माननीय प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने भी जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है उससे भी यह पता लगता है, कि शिफ्टिंग हुई है। तो ऐसा प्रायः सबको स्वीकार है। परन्तु जब प्रश्न यह आता है कि उसका परिणाम क्या होगा तब फिर बड़ा भारी कन्फ्यूजन सा नज़र आता है। कुछ माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि उसका कुछ परिणाम ही नहीं है। मैं यह नहीं समझ सकता कि यह इसका निर्णय अभी कैसे कर लिया गया जब स्टेटमेंट जो जारी किया गया, उसमें लिखित रूप में बताया गया है कि किस प्रकार के कितने शस्त्र दिये जायेंगे और किस आधार पर दिये जायेंगे इसका कोई अभी तक पता नहीं है। पैराग्राफ 11 में यह लिखा गया है कि :

"We have to face this development as it presents itself. 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."

जब यह स्थिति है तो उसका प्रभाव कितना पड़ने वाला है या नहीं पड़ने वाला है, इसके बारे में यह पहले से निर्णय कैसे कर लिया गया है कि उसका कुछ प्रभाव नहीं होगा। एक तरफ तो यह कहना कि प्रभाव नहीं है और दूसरी तरफ यह कहना शिफ्ट से हमें कन्सर्न है, यह दोनों बातें कान्ट्राडिक्टरी प्रतीत होती हैं। वास्तव में बात यह है, और एक मोटी सी बात है, कि कोई भी हमारे

अपने दुश्मन राष्ट्र को शस्त्र देगा, और शस्त्र उसके पास पहुंचेंगे, तो हमारे लिये वह हानिकारक है, यह तो एक सर्वमान्य सिद्धांत है। इसमें कोई और प्रकार का सिद्धान्त प्रतिपादित करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। यह भी बात ठीक है चाहे रूस किसी को हथियार दे वह हमारा कोई कन्सर्न नहीं है, जैसा कि माननीय सदस्य अर्जुन अरोड़ा महोदय ने कहा कि उसको ताकीद करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हम तो जानते हैं वह एक माडर्न लेडी है जो किसी के साथ जा सकती है, उसमें किसी अफसोस वाली बात नहीं है। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि हमारे ऊपर उसका कोई प्रभाव हुआ है या नहीं, यह देखने के हम अधिकारी हैं या नहीं। आज जब हम इस बात को सोचते हैं तो यह बात निश्चित है इसके कारण हमारे ऊपर एक भयंकर प्रभाव पड़ने वाला है लेकिन इसके कारण कोई घबराहट में हम भी नहीं हैं और इसके कारण पैनिक भी पैदा नहीं है क्योंकि यह तो हमें गर्व है कि जब कभी संकट आता है हमारे देशभक्त उठकर खड़े हो जाते हैं और उठकर मुकाबला करने के लिये तैयार हो जाते हैं। तो इसमें पैनिक वाला प्रश्न नहीं है। प्रश्न यह है कि सारी भूमिका के अंदर देखना चाहिये कि क्या हमारी सरकार की जो नीति है और उसका जो कर्तव्य है उसका उसने जागरूकता से पालन किया है या नहीं। जिस प्रकार से यह परिवर्तन हुआ है उस परिवर्तन के प्रति प्रतिक्रिया हमारे शासनकर्ताओं की क्या है और अब तक उसकी कोई प्रतिक्रिया प्रकट क्यों नहीं हुई, यह सबसे बड़ा सवाल है। जैसा मैंने प्रारम्भ में कहा, यह जो दूसरा भाग है इसमें पता नहीं लगता कि यह किस समय शिफ्ट हुआ। इसके बारे में कोई location of particular point of time अभी तक करने का प्रयास नहीं हुआ है। मेरा तो निवेदन यह है कि वास्तव में हमारा ऐक्शन बिलेटेड हो गया है। हम कितनी देर के बाद जाग रहे हैं उसके बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे पास प्रमाण है कि जब

श्री अयूब सन् 1965 में रूस गये थे तो उस समय उन्होंने कोसीगिन महोदय से पहली बार मुलाकत की थी। यह मुलाकत बाहर जाकर, मास्को से 25 मील दूर जाकर एक गांव में हुई थी। उस समय उन्होंने कहा था कि हम पाकिस्तान को पिछले 20 सालों से समझ नहीं पाये थे लेकिन एक दिन में अब समझ गये हैं। यह बात श्री अयूब ने अपनी पुस्तक "फ्रेंड्स एण्ड नाट मास्टर्स" के 170 वें पृष्ठ पर लिखा है जिसको देखने से यह बात बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो जाती है।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वास्तव में जो शिफ्ट हुआ है वह उसी दिन से हुआ है और यह शिफ्ट आज नहीं है। आज ही उन्होंने पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने की बात मानी है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। इस चीज की छाया हमको ताशकन्द समझौते में देखने को मिली। रूस ने उस समय गलत रूप से पाकिस्तान का समर्थन किया था और हमको मजबूरन अपने स्थान से पीछे हटाया गया था। हमें उस क्षेत्र से उसने पीछे हटाने के लिए मजबूर किया जिस क्षेत्र को पाकिस्तान अपने अधिपत्य में नहीं मानता था बल्कि वह कहता था कि यह क्षेत्र इन्फिल्ट्रेटों ने अपने अधिपत्य में कर लिया है। हमें रूस ने इस स्थान से पीछे हटने के लिए मजबूर किया और जो समझौता हुआ उसके कारण हमको पीछे हटना पड़ा। हम उस समय भी रूस को नहीं समझ पाये कि रूस की जो प्रतिक्रिया हो रही है उसमें बदलाया आ गया है या नहीं। उसकी प्रतिक्रिया हमारे प्रति बदल रही है या नहीं बदल रही है, उस समय भी हम नहीं समझ पाये।

उसके बाद दुबारा जब हैलीकॉप्टरों का प्रश्न आया तब सरकार की ओर से यह एक्सप्लेन किया गया कि यह तो दोनों देशों के बीच में ट्रेड का समझौता है और इसको हम कैसे रोक सकते हैं। इस तरह से इस चीज को भी व्यापार के नाम पर छोड़ दिया गया। इस समझौते को सरकार रोकती या न रोकती परन्तु उसको उस समय से सजग हो जाने की

[श्री ना० कृ० शंजवलकर]

आवश्यकता थी। सरकार उस समय भी सजग नहीं हुई। आज इस सदन द्वारा केवल कंसर्न प्रकट करके और इस रूस ने जो कार्य-वाही की है उस पर चिन्ता प्रकट करके हम खामोश बैठ जायें मैं समझता हूँ इतने से ही हमारा कार्य पूरा नहीं होगा। मेरा वास्तव में सदन से निवेदन यह है कि शासन द्वारा इस संबंध में जो लापरवाही बरती गई है, उसके बारे में उसकी ताड़ना की जानी चाहिये। इसी चीज के लिए मैं सदन का ध्यान आर्पित करना चाहता हूँ।

हमारे अन्य भाईयों ने जनसंघ के बारे में यह प्रतिक्रिया की कि वह रूस और भारत की मित्रता को डिमान्सटेशन द्वारा खत्म करना चाहता है। मैं उन लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वे अपने दिल में हाथ रखकर पृष्ठों कि वास्तव में मित्रता को कौन खत्म कर रहा है। क्या जनसंघ ने प्रारम्भ में कोई सेक्शन किया। शस्त्र देने वाले ने ही पहले सेक्शन आरम्भ किया। जितनी मित्रता की चिन्ता हमको है उतनी ही उनको भी होनी चाहिये। क्या उन्होंने इस बात पर भी विचार किया कि अगर पाकिस्तान को शस्त्र दिये जायेंगे तो उसकी प्रतिक्रिया भारत के ऊपर क्या होगी? रूस ने कभी भी इस बात पर विचार नहीं किया। हम ही बराबर इस बात पर विचार करें और बराबर एक लकीर को पीटते चले जायें, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित नहीं होगा। अगर दोषी कोई हो सकता है तो वह रूसी शासन ही हो सकता है और कोई दूसरा नहीं हो सकता है। वास्तव में फ्रेंडशिप को सम्भालने की जिम्मेदारी म्यूचुअल हुआ करती है। दोनों राष्ट्र मिलकर कोई विचार न करें तो किस प्रकार यह मित्रता आगे चल सकेगी, यह बड़ा प्रश्न है।

वास्तव में इस मित्रता के पीछे हम पहले भी बलिदान कर चुके हैं। पहले हम चीन के साथ मित्रता करके बलिदान कर चुके हैं।

हमको यह भी पता है कि रूस के साथ मित्रता करके कच्छ के कुछ हिस्से का बलिदान किया। हमने काश्मीर के भी कुछ हिस्से का बलिदान किया। क्या हम इस तरह की मित्रता से इस प्रकार से बलिदान करते चले जायेंगे? इस चीज को भी हमको विचारना होगा। मित्रता ही हमारा लक्ष्य नहीं है। मित्रता एक उद्देश्य नहीं हो सकता है यह एक मार्ग हो सकता है। हमारा जो मूल उद्देश्य है वह भारत को ऊपर उठाने का है और उसकी अखंडता को अक्षुण्ण रखने का है? जो अपना लक्ष्य है उसकी पूर्ति का यह एक उद्देश्य मात्र हो सकता है, यह कोई लक्ष्य नहीं है। इसलिए मेरी सदन से प्रार्थना है कि शासन ने इस संबंध में जो ढिलाई बरती है, उसके बारे में उसकी ताड़ना करना आवश्यक है।

श्री बालकृष्ण गुप्त (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने जिस गलत विदेश नीति का विष वृक्ष हिन्दुस्तान में लगाया उसके कड़वे फल आज हम लोगों को खाने को मिल रहे हैं। स्वर्गीय डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया पिछले 20 वर्षों से बराबर इस गलत नीति की आलोचना करते आये थे। हमारी सरकार ने कभी रूस की तरफ झुकाव रखा और कभी चीन की तरफ झुकाव रखा। उसी नीति की वजह से चीन लद्दाख लेह और नेफा तक हमला करते चला आया और आज हमें चीनी हिन्दी भाई, भाई रूसी हिन्दी भाई भाई के फल मिल रहे हैं। जिस समय इमरेनागी की स्टालिन-वादियों ने हत्या की थी उस समय जवाहर लाल नेहरू के मुँह से एक शब्द भी नहीं निकला था। आज उनकी बेटी गद्दी पर विराजमान है और वह भी वही पालिसी चला रही है। आज हमारे देश के ऊपर प्रहार पर प्रहार होते चले जा रहे हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के मामले में और पाकिस्तान के मामले में रूस दखल देने के लिए तैयार है। इस समय जेकोस्लो-वकिया और रूस के बीच में जो द्वन्द चल रहा क्या उस में हम कोई सलाह देने की हिम्मत कर सकते हैं? जैकोस्लोवाकिया को हिम्मत

है, रूमानिया को हिम्मत है लेकिन हमारी तस्थता की बात तो बहुत होती है मगर हम कहीं भी बोलने लायक नहीं है।

आज हिन्दुस्तान की हालत क्या है। आज हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोगों के दिल हिल गये हैं। पिछले दिनों हमें पैटन टैंकों का मुकाबला करना पड़ा और अब हमें स्टेलिन टैंकों का मुकाबला करना पड़ेगा। यह हिन्दुस्तान कहाँ जा रहा है और कहाँ उसको सरकार ले जा रही है। मैं रूस पर इल्जाम नहीं लगाता हूँ बल्कि भारत सरकार के ऊपर इल्जाम लगाता हूँ कि वह 20 वर्षों से देश की जनता को धोका देती चली आ रही है और हमेशा धोखा देती रहेगी। जब तक आप इस सरकार को उखाड़ नहीं फेंकेंगे, उसकी विदेश नीति नहीं बदलेंगे तब तक इस देश की सीमाएं सुरक्षित रहने वाली नहीं है।

यह बात हमेशा से होती चली आ रही है कि हमारे सामने कभी रूस और चीन को भला कहा जाता है और पश्चिमी देशों को बुरा कहा जाता है। न कोई देश भला है और न कोई देश बुरा है। हमें विश्व यारी नहीं करनी है हमें तो भारत भक्ति करनी है। भारत को जहाँ से भी हथियार मिले उसको पाकिस्तान की तरह ही लेने चाहिये। जब पाकिस्तान को अमेरिका वालों ने हथियार दिये तब जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कम्युनिस्टों की मदद से जगह जगह मीटिंग्स और प्रदर्शन करवाये। उस समय न लाठियां चली और न ही लोगों को जेल भेजा गया था। आज उनकी बेटी की सरकार हमारे भारत भक्तों को और जवानों को जेल भेजती है क्योंकि वे रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने के खिलाफ आवाज उठाते हैं। यह सोचने और समझने को चीज है। यह मामूली चीज नहीं है। मैं यहाँ पर न रूस की वकालत कर रहा हूँ, न अमेरिका की वकालत कर रहा हूँ, मैं तो सिर्फ भारत की वकालत करना चाहता हूँ,

आज हमारी सीमाएं असुरक्षित हो गई हैं। जवाहर लाल नेहरू विश्व शान्ति के प्रतीक

बनना चाहते थे और उनके नाम में शान्ति वन स्थापित होता है। यह क्या हो रहा है, क्या नहीं हो रहा है, भारत के प्रतिनिधियों अपने दिल पर हाथ रखकर तो तुम लोग देखो कि तुम कहाँ जा रहे हो। आज तुम्हारे देश की स्वतंत्रता कैसे खतरे में पड़ गई है। पाकिस्तान जो एक चौथाई है, हम इजरायल की तरह उसको थपड़ नहीं मारेंगे। रूस ने अरबगण राज्य को हथियार दिये थे और वे हथियार इजरायल के कब्जे में चले गये हैं। तो उसी तरह से हम को भी दूसरे देशों को टटोलना पड़ेगा। हमें मिराज लेने होंगे। हमें हथियार अमेरिका से लेने होंगे, ब्रिटेन से लेने होंगे। अगर हम नहीं लेंगे तो हम पाकिस्तान को पराजित नहीं कर सकेंगे।

अब हमें अपनी विदेशी नीति की तरफ देखना चाहिये। जब अमेरिका वारसा में चीन के राजदूत के साथ, बैठकर बातचीत कर सकता है तो हम इन पांच वर्षों से चुप्पी क्यों साधे बैठे हैं। आज हम क्यों नहीं नये रास्ते ढूँढते और नये रास्ते निकालते? यह सब क्या हो रहा है। जब मैं सदन में देखता हूँ तो पाता हूँ कि यहाँ पर रूसी भक्ति हो रही है। यहाँ पर तो भारत भक्ति का इजहार होना चाहिये। रूस हम को क्या देगा क्या नहीं देगा! कौन किस को क्या देता है। हम इन 20 वर्षों से रूस के पिछलगू बन गये हैं और उसके गुणगान संयुक्त राष्ट्र और जगह जगह करते रहते हैं जिसकी वजह से उनके सारे एशिया और अफ्रिका को उसका झूटा भक्त बना दिया है। इससे रूस को ही फायदा हुआ और हमको क्या फायदा हुआ। आज हिन्दुस्तानी अफ्रिका से निकाले जा रहे हैं, लंका से निकाले जा रहे हैं। हमारी विदेश नीति का यह हाल है कि हम अपने नागरिकों तक की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते हैं। ब्रिटेन के अन्दर हमारे नागरिकों का अपमान होता है और फिर भी हम कामन-वेल्थ में बैठे हुए हैं। यह किस तरह की नपुंसक नीति है और किस तरह की यह नपुंसक सरकार है। जरा इस बात की सोचो और समझो।

[श्री बालकृष्ण गुप्त]

अगर भारत को बचाना है तो कोई वीरता-पूर्ण सरकार को कायम करो जो कि अपने पैरों पर खड़ी हो सके। 20 वर्षों से यह सरकार कहती चली आ रही है कि हम जल्द ही आत्मनिर्भर सब चीजों में हो जायेंगे। वह न हथियारों के बारे में आत्मनिर्भर हुई और न अन्न के बारे में ही आत्मनिर्भर हुई वह अब भी अन्न के बारे में भीख मांगती फिरती है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप अपने दिलों को टटोलिय और जरा सोच समझकर भारत की जनता की तरफ देखिये।

आज हमारी सीमाएं अरक्षित हैं। आज नागा चीन जाते हैं, पाकिस्तान जाने हैं। चीन कितनी दूर है नागालैंड से और कितनी दूर है पाकिस्तान से और हमारी पुलिस, हमारी सी० आई० डी० और हमारी सेना उनको रोक नहीं सकती। इस तरह के मामले हैं और बार बार एक महीने की अवधि बढ़ा दी जाती है कि दूस चलेगा क्योंकि इनको नागाओं से भी डर हो गया है। यह किस तरह की सरकार है। ३०० करोड़ रु० से बढ़ कर 900 करोड़ रु० का हमारा डिफेंस बजट हो गया है फिर भी सारे भारत के दिल कांप रहे ह। यह जो सरकार बनी हुई है यह हमारे देश की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती है। आप लोग सोचिये, समझिये और जरा अपने दिल को टटोल कर न रूस भक्ति कीजिये, न अमेरिका भक्ति कीजिये, सिर्फ भारत भक्ति कीजिये, विश्व यारी मत कीजिये। वह जमाना बीत चुका, अब भारत की ही सोचिये और भारत के लिये ही काम कीजिये।

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे तो इस सम्बन्ध में यही निवेदन करना है कि हम दूसरे देशों की तरफ जब तक देखते रहेंगे तब तक हमारी ठीक तरह से व्यवस्था नहीं हो सकेगी। आज के जमाने में हम को निश्चय ही दूसरे देशों का सहारा लेना पड़ता है, लेकिन मेरा ऐसा निवेदन है कि हम को स्वयं अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने के लिये जितनी भी कोशिश

हो सके वह करनी चाहिये। मिलिट्री आर्म्स के सम्बन्ध में जहां तक हो सके और जितना हो सके, उनको हमें अपने देश में ही तैयार करना चाहिये और इसके लिये अगर हमें टैक्सेशन कुछ ज्यादा भी करना पड़े तो वह भी हमें करना चाहिये। मैं तो यहां तक कह सकता हूँ कि अगर आवश्यकता हो तो हर व्यक्ति की जो प्रापटी है उसमें भी अगर कुछ शेयर गवर्नमेंट कर ले तो उसमें भी कुछ बुराई नहीं है। देश की रक्षा के लिये जो आवश्यक हो वह हमें जरूर करना चाहिये।

हम हमेशा लड़ाई के बारे में सोचते हैं हमारे सेंट्रल हाल के द्वार पर यह लिखा हुआ है :—

अयं निजः परो वेत्ति
गणना लघुचेतसाम्
उदारचरितानां तु
वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्।

हमको इस प्रिंसिपल को भी हमेशा ध्यान में रखना चाहिये। इसकी तहत मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान हमारे देश का ही एक हिस्सा है और निश्चय ही उसको इस वक्त परमात्मा ने सद्बुद्धि नहीं दी है। उसकी जो मौजूदा लीडरशिप है और पिछली लीडरशिप जो रही है उसके भले ही हिन्दुस्तान के बल पर महज आपस में घृणा फैला कर स्वतंत्रता हासिल की है, लेकिन उसकी बुनियाद जिस बिना पर पड़ी है वह बिना जब तक मौजूदा जनरेशन वहां है उस वक्त तक कायम रहेगी और उनमें कुछ सुधार होने की संभावना मालूम नहीं पड़ती। लेकिन मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि जब हम पाकिस्तान से जरा भी किसी प्रकार की दुश्मनी नहीं रखना चाहते हैं, न रखते हैं और न भविष्य में ऐसा खयाल करत हैं तो पाकिस्तान की मौजूदा जनरेशन जो साम्प्रदायिकता और घृणा फैलाने में विश्वास रखती है उसमें निश्चय ही एक न एक दिन सुधार आयेगा। राजनीति में और देश के इतिहास में कभी भी आप देखें तो हमेशा आपको ऐसा मिलेगा कि जो सदैव दुश्मन रहे हैं वे कभी कभी एक हो जाते हैं और जो सदैव मित्र रहे हैं वे कभी कभी दुश्मन बन जाते हैं।

इसलिये मैं ऐसा विश्वास करता हूँ कि एक दिन निश्चय ही वह आयेगा जिस दिन परमात्मा उसको सद्बुद्धि देगा और निश्चय ही जैसा हम सोचते हैं उसी प्रकार वह सोचेगा और विचार करेगा और हमारे साथ मिल कर काम करने की कोशिश करेगा। लेकिन जब तक उसकी बुद्धि इस प्रकार की नहीं होती तब तक हम को महज इस सहारे पर कि भविष्य में ऐसा हो जायगा निश्चिन्त हो कर बैठे नहीं रहना चाहिये। हमें निश्चय ही अपनी शक्ति बढ़ाने के लिये जितनी भी कोशिश हो सके वह करनी चाहिये।

जितने स्वतंत्र देश हैं वे अपना व्यवहार और अपना व्यापार जिस तरह से चाहें उस तरह से करते हैं। रूस ने निश्चय ही मित्रता का व्यवहार कुछ असें से किया है और अब भी हमें विश्वास करना चाहिये कि वह उसी तरह से व्यवहार करेगा। पाकिस्तान को जहां तक हथियार सप्लाई करने का प्रश्न है वह हम महज इसी दृष्टि से देखें कि रूस पाकिस्तान की शक्ति बढ़ाने के लिये उसको हथियार दे रहा है। ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता हूँ, ताश्कन्द समझौता जिस प्रकार से किया गया है उससे मैं यही समझता हूँ कि बहुत संभव है कि चीन के चंगुल से बचाने के विचार से कुछ हमदर्दी उसके साथ दिखाने के लिये उसने यह व्यवहार किया हो। इस विचार से उसने यह न भी किया हो तो भी हमारे अधिकार में कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं है जिससे हम उसको ऐसा करने से रोक सकें। हम प्रोटेस्ट करना चाहें तो हम निश्चय ही प्रोटेस्ट करें और सख्त शब्दों के साथ प्रोटेस्ट करें, लेकिन हम किसी प्रकार से रूस वालों को भला बुरा कहें या उनकी निंदा करें या उनके इस आचरण को हम ऐसा समझें कि उन्होंने हमारे साथ कोई दुश्मनी का व्यवहार किया है, तो मैं इसको कदापि मुनासिब नहीं समझता हूँ।

सदेव सेक्युलैरिज्म के आधार पर हमारा शासन चला है। हमने महज थ्युरी में कोई बात नहीं कही है। हमने जो कुछ किया है वह प्रैक्टिकल तरीके पर किया है और हमने

संसार को यह बता दिया है कि हम सेक्युलर गवर्नमेंट में विश्वास करते हैं और उसी का परिणाम यह है कि आज हम देख रहे हैं कि हमारे भारत के शासन का संचालन जिन के हाथ में है वह राष्ट्रपति एक मुस्लिम व्यक्ति हैं। इतना ही नहीं, हमारे सर्वोच्च न्यायालय के जो न्यायाधीश हैं वे भी एक मुस्लिम हैं। ऐसी हालत में हमारे ऊपर किसी प्रकार की शंका करने का अधिकार दूसरे देशों को नहीं हो सकता। यह सब होने पर भी मैं नहीं समझता कि पाकिस्तान किस प्रकार ऐसा सोचता है कि हिन्दुस्तान हमारा एनीमी नम्बर वन है। इसका वही कारण है जैसा कि मैंने अर्ज किया कि पाकिस्तान की बुनियाद घृणा पर बनी हुई है और उसी बुनियाद पर उसने स्वराज्य हासिल किया है। अंग्रेज और अमेरिका वाले सदैव किसी न किसी प्रकार से पाकिस्तान की सहायता करते हैं और उसी प्रकार से अगर हम रूस को भी देखें तो हमको कोई आश्चर्य नहीं करना चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा तो केवल यही निवेदन है कि हम ऐसा प्रयत्न करें जिस से हमारी शक्ति दिन पर दिन बढ़ती जाय और हम हथियारों में दुनिया के किसी भी हिस्से से, दुनिया के किसी भी देश से पीछे न रह सकें। क्योंकि हमारे यहां एक कहावत है कि भय बिन प्रीत नहीं होती है यानी जब तक हम डर नहीं पैदा कर देंगे तब तक कोई भी देश हमारा साथ देने के लिये तैयार नहीं होगा। इसलिये हमें वे सारे तरीके अख्तियार करने चाहिये जिन से हम अपनी सैनिक शक्ति को उत्तरोत्तर बढ़ा सकें और उसके लिये हमारे देश पर कितना भी बोझ पड़े उसकी हमें परवाह नहीं करनी चाहिये। आप यह निश्चय जानिये कि हम अपनी शक्ति से ही देश की रक्षा कर सकते हैं। हमको स्वतंत्रता मिले केवल बीस साल हुये हैं और बीस साल का समय एक राष्ट्र के लिये कुछ भी नहीं है। वैसे पिछले दिनों में भी हमने अपने हथियारों से अमेरिका के हथियारों का मुकाबिला किया है। अब रूस जो हथियार पाकिस्तान को सप्लाई करेगा उनके बारे में कहा यह जाता है कि वे डिफेंसिव हथियार होंगे। हम यह नहीं समझते हैं कि वे केवल

[श्री राम सहाय]

डिफेंस तक महद्द रह सकेंगे। वे निश्चय ही हमारे मुकाबिले में किसी न किसी प्रकार से इस्तेमाल किये जायेंगे। अगर वे डिफेंसिव ही हैं तब तो हमें कुछ कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि हमारा कभी कोई इरादा पाकिस्तान पर हमला करने का नहीं रहा है और न आगे रहेगा। लेकिन उन हथियारों को केवल डिफेंसिव हथियार कहना मुनासिब नहीं है क्योंकि पाकिस्तान सिवाय हिन्दुस्तान के और किसी दूसरे देश से कोई खतरा समझता ही नहीं है और वह यह समझता है कि उसको जो कुछ खतरा है वह सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान से ही है। इसलिये डिफेंसिव हथियारों के नाम पर कोई हथियार उसको सप्लाई करना किसी प्रकार से उपयुक्त नहीं कहा जा सकता। और मैं समझता हूँ जिस प्रकार की सारी बातें रूस ने की हैं और जिस प्रकार का रूस से हमारा साथ रहा है उससे उनको विश्वास होना चाहिए कि हमारा कभी इरादा पाकिस्तान पर हमला करने का नहीं रहा है। जब हमारा हमला करने का इरादा नहीं है तो इस प्रकार के हथियारों की सप्लाई पाकिस्तान को करना किसी तरह मुनासिब नहीं है। पाकिस्तान हथियारों के पीछे पड़ा है, रूस से ही नहीं, जहां से हो इस प्रकार के हथियार लेने के लिए प्रयत्नशील है, लेकिन हमें उससे घबराने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। पिछले दिनों में हमारे देश ने दिखा दिया है कि हम सब मिल कर किसी मुसीबत के मौके पर एक साथ इकट्ठा होकर कार्य कर सकते हैं और निश्चय ही भविष्य में हम ऐसा कर सकेंगे इसमें सन्देह नहीं।

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset I want to make it clear that I am not one of those who support the theory that we have no right to criticise a sovereign country even if it has gone against our interest. This means that we have no right to criticise China if they support Pakistan with arms nor can we criticise the Britishers even if they throw out our Indians from Kenya.

Sir, almost all the Members who have participated in this debate on the Soviet decision to supply arms to Pakistan have expressed concern and anxiety over the matter in varying degrees. While nobody

wants to take a stand that may seriously impair the friendly relations between India and the Soviet Union, there has been an attempt in some quarters to indirectly justify the action of the Soviet Union or to belittle the grave threat to the security and peace of this sub-continent. My amendment to the main motion is an innocuous one and is meant to express regret for the action of the Soviet Union who was one of the main architects of the Tashkent Declaration and which always advised us about brotherly relations with Pakistan. If military aid by the U. S. A. to Pakistan under military pacts or through third parties like Germany, Iran and Italy, was an unfriendly act, was an act to extend and keep alive the cold war in this sub-continent, the proposed military aid to Pakistan by the Soviet Union can never be a friendly act, nor can it ever bring about conditions of amity and peace amongst us. It will be an encouragement to the bellicose posture of the Pakistan rulers who have lived and flourished on a campaign of hatred and conflict against India. Driving this home truth to the Russian friends is an act of friendly warning, not an act of hostility.

The Soviet Union or any other sovereign country may be competent to order its own foreign policy, but we have a right and obligation to the Indian nation to tell the naked truth when the interest of India is being jeopardised. It will be foolish to argue that only American or British military hardware can create tension and aggravate and accentuate the cold war, whereas the Soviet weapons can serve the cause of peace. It will be equally foolish to argue that while Ayub Khan violated the assurance given to America not to use their weapons against India, he will honour the assurance given to Kosygin.

There has been also an attempt to show that there has been no shift in the Soviet policy towards India. Though the Deputy Prime Minister has admitted categorically about this shift, the Prime Minister has tried to play with words and has prevaricated even to admit this. Is it the personal opinion of Shri Morarji Desai? Does it show that the Union Cabinet is not in one mind when it reacts to this action of the Soviet Union? Howsoever one may vainly try to argue that there has been no shift in the policy of the U. S. S. R. vis-a-vis India, the Indian nation will not be duped by such argument. Is it not a fact that the Soviet Union which always expressed the opinion that Kashmir was an

integral part of India had stopped speaking like that? Is it not for the last few years equating India and Pakistan and advising us to come to a settlement about all issues including Kashmir by having mutual negotiations. This was definitely a shift and a shift in favour of Pakistan. A further shift came in favour of Pakistan when it announced its intention to help that country with military weapons. This action of the Soviet Union has definitely harmed the cordial relation that existed between us since the last World War.

Though the Government of India has always proclaimed a policy of non-alignment, it has moved like a pendulum between one big power and the other and exhibited its weakness every moment. It has always acted under pressure and it is natural for one not to admit of this naked truth because it is unpalatable. When it refused to have diplomatic relations either with East Germany or with Israel, it acted in a manner which smacks of pressure. The big countries which conditioned this mental make-up of India have recognised those countries because their existence has become a reality now.

Continued dependence on big powers either for food or for planning or for extricating ourselves from recession have diluted our non-aligned foreign policy. Even at this late hour, if the actions of big powers, whether of America or of the Soviet Union, compels us to follow a policy of enlightened self-interest, we would have benefitted much from the jolt and shock that we have received at their hands. These big powers are actuated by their self-interest and self-aggrandisement and it will be wrong to expect that there will be no conflicts between interests of smaller nations and big powers. The present conflict between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, the bitter and prolonged struggle and cold war between China and the Soviet Union, and the conspiracy of the capitalist America and the Communist Russia together to force non-nuclear nations to sign the non proliferation treaty have clearly shown that none of the big powers are motivated by high ideals or ideological considerations but by sheer self-interest and by motives of extension of spheres of influence. If creation of cold war and aggravation of conflict serve their interest, they will gladly go in for such a policy without caring for the interest of small powers or developing nations. America and the Soviet Union both in varying degrees are criminally guilty of such actions.

Russian bombers do not throw bombs of peace, nor the American lethal weapons emit shells of democracy. The Patton tanks of America and ground-to-air missiles of the Soviet Union will both act in unison in the hands of Ayub Khan against the friendly spirit of India and will create an imbalance in this sub-continent. How the self-interest of China, the Soviet Union and America, who are deadly enemies of each other, can meet in the soul of Pakistan and create a threat to India is not beyond the comprehension of an Indian whose loyalty to India is supreme and undiluted.

We are not enemies of any country and should continue to follow that policy however much provocation may come to sabotage that. But under that garb of friendship we will be acting under pressure if we do not give a friendly warning to any nation whose free action harms the cause of India. This does not mean that out of panic, again the Indian nation will lean towards the other big powers and if such tendencies will arise we should fight it tooth and nail.

Sometimes the American lobby in India gets an opportunity to amuse themselves when Russians are in difficulty. Sometimes the Russians lobby in India behaves in the same manner. But our interest lies not in the amusement of these lobbies, but in developing India economically and militarily so that that will ensure the independence and sovereignty of the country and insulate our non-aligned policy against international pressures.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there was a time when we were exulting in the beautiful, blissful idea of non-alignment but it lasted till the Americans betrayed us and gave massive support to Pakistan. That was the beginning of our shift towards Russia. Then came the Chinese war which made us helpless because that was a serious blow to our prestige and military strength. That naturally drove us into the Russian arms. Then came the Pakistan war. Of course we admit that then Russia helped us a great deal. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, we are really grateful to Russia so much so that when the Pakistan war came and when the Chinese fought against us, we felt that you were nearer us than Mr. Niren Ghosh. That is the impression not only of this House but the whole country. The Chinese incursion into India, their coming into the arena made us nearer to Russia. But what we felt about the American's

[Shri C. D. Pande]

then, we are feeling the same way today about the Russians. Not that we are in any way hostile to the Americans but we have no faith in them. They have given us a jolt. I say it is unfair. However, I will not say the same thing about the Russians because they are going cautiously. But our grievance is on a moral standing. Everybody knows that they used their veto power in favour of Kashmir being with India, not only once but twice. But is it enough? They did this for ten or twelve years. But today, at the end of twelve years, they say that Kashmir is not a closed question. Khrushchev assured us that way. Now today they ask us to settle the dispute. What they never conceded to be a dispute has now become a dispute. For the kindness of their veto then we are still grateful. But today our opinion has changed. We were obliged to them for something. Now that obligation is no more there. If that is not the quarrel with Pakistan what is our quarrel with Pakistan? Kashmir is the bone of contention. Pakistan is fighting with us over the issue of Kashmir and the same Kashmir has been made a disputed issue by Russia. Now Russia has given massive support to Pakistan and they say, no, it should be taken in a light manner. We cannot take it lightly. Now we are blaming Russia. But how can we have any grievance against Russia now because it is we who are to blame for all this? We had taken a posture that India would never react adversely whatever the pinpricks. What happened during the last eighteen months? They have conducted six or seven experiments on us. First of all, they gave us the Novo-4 P.M. treaty Agreement. The Information and Broadcasting Minister says that the Novotny Agreement is a great boon to India and we are getting everything free from Russia and our propaganda will be done by Russia. Then the question of 16 helicopters being supplied to Pakistan came up. We raised this question here but the Defence Minister said that they were only for transport purposes. Then came the scheme of educational endowment. Previously our Education Minister was saying that any agreement or any scheme of education from the U.S.A. was not worth touching. And there was a huge uproar in this House that the Americans were interfering with our educational system. But something of a similar nature came from Russia and the Education Minister was very happy and he did not object to it. I do not mean

Dr. Sen personally but as a Minister it happened. Then the Planning Minister says that our planning should be dovetailed to Russian planning. I tell you as an Indian I feel insulted and humiliated. We being a big nation having a democratic system, we want to dovetail our plans to Russian plans. I say it is a bankruptcy of mind and loss of self-respect. It is really surprising that these people can sustain such ideas. Therefore the whole blame is on us and the Russians took us for granted. The Defence Minister also says that every nation has a right to do any thing. When people came from Burma, he said independent nations can do anything. When people came from Kenya, he said it is an independent country. When Russia gave 16 helicopters, he said every nation has got a right to do anything. Mr Banka Behary Das rightly says that every nation is a sovereign country and can do anything; they have even a right to wage war against other nations. But after all there is something as moral obligation to our friends and to humanity. When Pakistan was a member of the SEATO and CENTO, Shri Bhu-pesh Gupta accused Pakistan as a stooge of imperialist powers but today he has no word of condemnation for Pakistan because Russia has come to her help. As Mr. Kaul said, the U-2 incident was a sore point for Soviet Russia. But they have forgiven and forgotten it. The whole thing is painful when we realise the background in which Russia took this step. Pakistan was in the American camp and Peshawar was the American base from where U-2 used to fly for spying over Russia. But everything has been forgiven and forgotten by Russia. In such circumstances they have given massive help to Pakistan. People say it is only some military hardware; they say like that to belittle as if it is nothing. Do you think a nation like Pakistan which has got sufficient arms will ask for small '303 rifles? It must be something substantial. Either it must be missiles or anti-missiles or it must be big tanks which can make appreciable difference in the defence potential of Pakistan. If that is not so, I think Pakistanis are poor beggars. But my view is that they are wiser than us. We assume that we are magnanimous and we have moral standing. But they have outwitted us in diplomacy. They have made friends with those of whom we were very proud. What I want to say is that any jolt from Russia is a matter which we should consider very seriously and very calmly and we should not be panicky.

At the same time we should behave like a big nation and in a dignified way. We have also to be self-reliant because we cannot go to the other countries for assistance. We cannot go to Britain for arms because we have burnt our boats with Great Britain. Therefore we have to adopt the policy of self-reliance in the manufacture of arms. If China can do it, if other countries can do it, we can also do it, and we have to do it in a big way necessary for our requirements. In the end I would like to say that when we have survived American betrayal, we can surely survive Russian betrayal.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULAT-RAM (Nominated) : Madam Deputy Chairman, both in this House and in the other House and much more in the country we have heard the voice of surprise and the voice of indignation at the step taken by the Soviet Union in regard to the supply of arms to Pakistan. Somehow I do not share that surprise or that indignation. I think there is no justification for surprise because, as I have understood the Soviet Union's policy, it has been from the start not only with regard to India but with regard to other countries, dictated by the national interests of the Soviet Union. In a changing world situations change and, therefore, foreign policies also, in their detailed adjustments, do change. Therefore from the time of the Security Council right down to this latest decision of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union has been guided, in regard to its attitude towards India, by the vital national interests of the Soviet Union, and from that point of view I appreciate the decision of the Soviet Union to allow no other consideration to influence them except their national interests, even though the decision may be to the dislike of the nation with whom they have been co-operating. It is true that the Soviet Union knew that Pakistan has invaded India twice. It is true that the Soviet Union knew that Pakistan has interfered very vitally, almost militarily, with the eastern hills, Nagaland and Mizo areas. The Soviet Union also knew that Pakistan has declared very clearly that there can be no lasting peace with India so long as the Kashmir problem remains unsolved, which is evidently an indirect hint that they may have to go to war for the third time. I am certain that the Soviet Ambassador in Pakistan and their intelligence system in Pakistan have made the Soviet Union aware about the temper of the people in Pakistan, the tem-

per of the press in Pakistan and also whatever war preparations may have been carried on there, and yet Soviet Union has decided to take this step. I think it is a lesson to all of us that we must place national interests first and, however weak it may appear to some, I interpret the present decision of the Government of India as one of frankness and restraint and in the context of the present situation a wise decision and in the interests of the nation. But we have only seen one straw in the wind. I do not know the further developments of this change in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. I am sure it will affect the question of Kashmir—largely or to a small extent, one does not know. So also many other developments are likely to take place. I do not believe that there is anything like "friendship" in international politics. The word "friendship" has not the dictionary meaning in international politics. It is a polite form of addressing each other. It is a cordial expression which prepares the mind of the opposite party to receive whatever you want to hand over with regard to proposals and ideas, and it is in a way a useful word. But I think it is coming to be a dangerous word. We must not mislead ourselves and mislead and miseducate the nation by talking of any nation as our friend, because experience has shown that China and Russia were friends, very thick friends, and it was Russia which trained China to build up its strength which we are seeing to-day. So also the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia were friends. The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia were friends. I believe that in a changing world, it is much better to use the word "co-operation" between two nations and popularise that expression because that is the real thing. "Friendship" is not a correct expression to be used. Friendship means that one should even sacrifice one's interests for the sake of the friend. That thing does not happen in this hard world. Let us thus avoid surprises and disappointments we must accustom ourselves and the people to the expression "co-operation". We are "co-operating" with various nations, including the Soviet Union with which nation we must co-operate. I believe that the policy of the Government to build bridges, but bridges for traffic both ways, is a sound policy which we should pursue. But these bridges have to be constructed efficiently, and they have to be controlled and managed efficiently. To the extent that we are able to build and control them efficiently, to that extent we will gain.

[Shri Jairadas Daulatram]

I will take only two or three minutes for my last point. The situation as it has arisen, and as I fear it will develop, is a challenge to us. It has thrown up certain problems of self-introspection, it has thrown up certain problems which relate to our internal strength. I do not think this is the forum, open to the ears of the world, where we can discuss this matter properly. But a section of the leadership of the country is here; the leaders of various parties are here. I think there is a challenge to the leadership of all the parties to deal with the situation that is coming before the country. In the military sphere—increasing the Defence budget, importing more weapons, and maximising our internal production—and in the economic sphere, we must have peace, a reasonable measure of peace; unless all this happens we will not be in a position to develop the strength of our country. And in the political sphere, we have achieved a unique distinction, not only in the history of our country but possibly in the history of the world, in human history, that at the State level, at the subordinate legislature level, as many as 14 parties have had to join to manage the affairs of the State. And they also remained in stable instability and ultimately gave way. There is also in various other directions a tremendous amount of divisiveness in our country. This is a challenge which the experience of the last 20 years has thrown up before us. It is the duty of the leadership of all national parties represented in this House to look at the problem from a larger point of view, to forget their parties for the time being and bring the nation before their eyes. There was a great nation in the world's history and it reached a certain stage of difficulties. Somebody there bemoaned: "All are there for the party, none for the State." Let us not reach, as we seem to be reaching, the stage where all may not be even for their party but will be for themselves. This, I think, is a warning to us, and I, as a humble worker with a little experience of political life, make an appeal in this House to the leadership of the country that it is time that we had self-introspection and looked into our internal problems. It is only the internal strength of our country which gives us real stature, which makes other people and nations anxious not to hurt us. And to the extent we develop our internal strength, to that extent shall we be able to survive in the world and be able to lead a dignified life.

SHRI T. CHENG ALVAROYAN (Madras) : Madam Deputy Chairman, it is no' without embarrassment that I rise to support this motion for consideration. Is there a man with soul so dead who has not said that this proposal to supply arms to-Pakistan will seriously disturb the balance of peace in this region? We yield to none, Madam Deputy Chairman, on this side of the House in our awareness of the portents and pointers of this proposal. But we are not, therefore, going to indulge in violent vocabulary and behave rather scho-lastically in the face of this great development. We are a poor country, but nevertheless a big nation, a great nation, great in our heritage, great in the devotion to our freedom, great in the dedication to the cause of peace, and for that reason, Madam Deputy Chairman, we shall not at all become nervous over this development. Have we not survived the shivering shocks similar to this in the times past? Alone, all alone, On the burning deck, we stood the two invasions. Beneath your Chair, Madam Deputy Chairman, are buried many invaders; perhaps there is still room left for some more. In this context, I beg of this House, as I would beg of this country to understand, in appreciating this development in the Indio-Soviet relationship, some broad and basic facts. Let us not miss some of the fundamental foundations that are rather indissoluble, indestructible and inviolable in the bonds of good relationship between India and the Soviet Union. We have to understand that the Soviet Union has given us in several spheres and sectors many an accord and satisfaction. We have also to realise that the relationship between India and the Soviet Union, which has taken deep, lasting and undying roots, is going to be for the common dimension, for a direction and for a destiny for the world cause. We must equally realise that the relationship between India and the Soviet Union is not tied of nylon strings; it is forged by stainless steel. But nevertheless, one Wonders: Is that the Soviet Union which has given us the veto everytime and turn when Pakistan most impertinently raised the question of Kashmir before the Security Council? Is that the Soviet Union which has given us that Tashkent auspices for peace ? Is that the Soviet Union which has given us enormous economic and other aid? Is that the same Soviet Union that has now chosen to supply arms to Pakistan? Blessed are the peace-makers. But when the peace-maker chooses to decide to supply arms to one of the contestants, I am afraid, Madam Deputy Chairman, with all good will, respect and friendship to

the Soviet Union, I am bound to tell them that peace will go to pieces everywhere. I therefore submit that in the appreciation of this great question of the development of the relationship between India and the Soviet Union on this question, we have to realise one other important fact, namely, why the Soviet Union has now decided to supply arms to Pakistan. I hope the

great leaders of the Soviet Union must have asked the question either to themselves or to Pakistan. Why should they supply arms? We know from the lessons of history that one nation requires arms from another nation either for offence or for defence. No nation requires arms simply to be kept in a museum. Pakistan has many exhibits, for such a museum but the question before the Soviet Union, I hope, is why does Pakistan want the supply of these arms. Is it for defence? Against whom? Britain? Its creator will not destroy it. America? Its mentor will not molest it. China? Its new lover will not crush it. But against whom this invasion is possible? Our great leader, the Prime Minister, has time and again, declared that we have absolutely no designs of any kind of aggression against Pakistan though we have told most unequivocally both by talk and by deed that we will crush any aggression against India. But against whom, therefore, any defence is thought of? Will it be for offence? The question therefore is, can Pakistan think of war against any other nation in this world? Will it be against Britain? Ingratitude can not go farther. Will it be against America? Madness cannot go worse. Will it be against China? Stupidity cannot be a greater. But against whom Pakistan may use these arms? It has shown in the times past, the fist against India. It has turned the tanks against India. It has turned the guns against India and therefore we tell most politely, most gently and most respectfully the Soviet Union: 'Look here, you are supplying arms to Pakistan—for what purpose?' International commentators have given three explanations for this move—that Russia wants to ward off America, that Russia wants to contain China and Russia wants to discipline Pakistan. The Soviet Union may succeed in the first, the Soviet Union may accomplish the second but with regard to the third, I am afraid the Soviet Union will meet the first of its failure in its long and historic career. For one thing, Pakistan has become venal in its military alliance and therefore we warn most respectfully the Soviet Union that this question of the supply of arms will

be rather very disquieting for the very cause of peace that we want to establish.

One word more and I have done. We want to say once again that this will not disturb the long historic association which is sanctified in its origin, which is memorial in its magnificence with regard to the Indo-Soviet good relations. What is the alternative that Members on the side opposite suggest? Shall we go and wait at the white gates of Washington? It is degrading. Shall we go and stand on the doorsteps of Downing Street? It is demoralising. Shall we appease Pakistan? It is debasing. But what shall we do? As our great, illustrious Prime Minister gave the gallant lead to our people and to our nation, we shall do one thing that is only within ourselves. We shall go to the fields; it will give the answer. We will go to the factories. It will give the argument. We will go to the people. They will give the reply that it is far better that we die on our feet than live on our knees.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar) : Madam, I am glad you have allowed me at the fag end. But the entire House is anxious to listen to the Prime Minister. I entirely agree with the statement which the Prime Minister has made on this issue. Having said so, I would draw the attention of the House that atomic weapons and other things which have annihilated time and distance, I mean the march of time, have brought about a metamorphic change in international relationships. What were certainties yesterday are uncertainties to-day and God alone knows what will be happening tomorrow.

So far as Russia is concerned, when Mr. Khrushchev was thrown out, Mr. Kosygin came to power. He made two declarations that he will try to cultivate friendship with China and Pakistan. He has very badly failed in his policy towards China. I am not happy over it but that is a fact. The armies of China and Russia are pitted against each other in their common border and some time even a skirmish takes place though they are two communist countries. Marx said 'In communism, there will be no contradictions'. The contradiction is proved by the show of arms and clashes. So there was a failure. Then he turned towards Pakistan and tried to cultivate friendship with it. The SEATO and CENTO countries were being left out by Soviet Russia and they had very good relations with us. Now they tried to come near Pakistan and it started much before

[Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha]

the Indo-Pak conflict. The Pak invasion took place in 1965. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is no more but God overhead knows, I would tell the House that Shastriji told me : 'It is not only America, it is not only England, it is Soviet Russia also which is bothering me about this conflict when we are trying to face up to the challenge of Pakistan.' The scene for the Tashkent Conference is very meaningful because America gave the green signal to Russia. Just now a great thing has happened between the UAR and other countries and Israel. Russia and U.S.A. —these two countries have not agreed. Even though the U.N. and the Security Council have passed many resolutions that the aggression should be vacated, it is not being vacated because the two have not agreed. Maybe to our fortune or misfortune, I do not know, Tashkent was made the scene. The great Lal Bahadur Shastri went there flanked by Sardarji and Chavanji and we agreed to vacate the aggression. It was a noble act on the part of Shastriji, I must say, because we did not go to even an inch of Pakistani territory to grab it. We went there to save the position when from the Chamb-Jaurian sector they wanted to isolate Kashmir. We had to go to other parts of Pakistan to show them our strength and see that Kashmir was saved from coming under their clutches. So we vacated it. People say that it is a point of weakness. It is not so but anyway, that is another matter but it was Russia, in co-operation with America, which wanted us vacate the entire territory which we had occupied. The Russians have not succeeded now with a small country like Israel to do what they wanted. America does not want that it should be vacated. Mr. Kosygin wants that it should be vacated but they are not agreed on that but here they were agreed. Having done this great help to Pakistan and to us also, perhaps they thought, our leaders thought that if we vacated the aggression, Pakistan will be friendly with us. When the Indus Waters Treaty was being signed, I had been to the great lamented leader Pandit Nehru and I said : 'Panditji, it will mean such a great amount of money and so many things; why are you entering into this Treaty? Do you think that Pakistan will respond to this gesture?' Panditji told me, "My dear boy, Gandhiji gave them crores of rupees and he was killed; I know that. Then about Kashmir. They took half of Kashmir and I stopped the fighting, though I was criticised by the entire country. Again, I am going to do this. One thing after another these three

things are being done with open eyes, because we feel that Pakistan one day will come to senses, because we know our relationship is there. Only a few years ago we parted. Many marriages take place every year. So let us do it." So out of generosity he did it. Lal Bahadur Shastriji also did it out of generosity. But that was not the motive of Mr. Kosygin. He wanted that occupied part should be vacated so that some good could come to Pakistan, and some to us also, in the sense that good relations should grow between the two countries. And now this has come.

My friend, Mr. Kaul, said that Government should keep us informed about all this. Everybody knew about these things. In diplomacy, I would like to tell Mr. Kaul—though he is a very experienced man and knows things much more than I can ever know—that it is none of the business of Government, it is no part of diplomacy, nor of defence, to come to the House and say, "Look here, such and such friendly country is making changes in its attitude towards us." That will simply be a foolish and ludicrous thing to do, and this is not the sort of thing for Government to accept. But our Government knew everything, and knowing this they tried to prevent it as far as it could. Otherwise, this help would have come from Russia much earlier, I tell you. Even then what we are doing? The statement the Prime Minister has made will make Russia think twice before they are able to give considerable or substantial help to Pakistan. This is the only way. We know that Russia stands for its own interests; we stand for our own; there is nothing emotional about it.

{Interruptions}

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is hardly any time; please wind up.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : So I entirely support the statement of the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Madam Deputy Chairman, this Motion was to consider the decision of the Soviet Union to supply arms to Pakistan and the Government of India's stand on this matter. As you know, and the House knows, Government always welcomes an opportunity to state its point of view and to listen to the views of the hon. Members. The discussion has ranged over a very wide field, not only the whole question of Indo-Soviet relationship, the entire field of

foreign policy, the running of the various Ministries of the Government of India, even domestic policy, and even the use of diplomacy in the toppling of various State Governments. It is indeed a very wide field and I do not think the House will expect me to wander so far myself.

There is the usual quota of amendments, some obviously written in haste. I am sure the hon. Member, Mr. Mandal, will excuse me for drawing attention to his amendment. He says that the Government misinterpreted the Tashkent— he says Agreement, actually it was a Declaration "during" the Indo-Pak conflict. What can I say in reply to this, because for my hon. friend, history evidently moves backwards.

I need hardly refer to the hon. Member, Shri Yadav's amendment. It is entirely wrong to suggest that the Government has withheld any information from this House or from the country. Both he and the hon. Member opposite, Shri Bhandari, have really sought, through their amendments, to bring into this House the much debated proposition about a Resolution by the other House. I think there has been a misleading impression, perhaps deliberately created, that there was some dispute about the word "regret". I have tried to clarify this on another occasion but I should like to say so again. There was no dispute about the wording of any Resolution. The dispute was about the desirability of Parliament passing such a Resolution. I gave my reasons for it which were, firstly, that we have never done it before. This does not, obviously, mean that the House can never do something new but that in the present context, it would certainly create misunderstanding if we were to pass a Resolution on the Soviet selling of arms when we did not do so even on the occasion of the getting of a vast amount of arms and when Pakistan has been buying arms from many other countries.

The hon. Member, Shri Dahyabhai Patel, has his own sources of information. I would really be interested to know what they are. He made one comment, hon. Members will remember, on the number of times that I have visited the Soviet Union. Perhaps the House knows that now in America there is something called New Mathematics in which two and two do not always make four. Perhaps that is the kind of reasoning which guided the hon. Member. But anyway, I thought that since he had taken a special interest in this matter I should also do a little research, and I tried to look back to count how

many times I had been to which country. And I was interested—this was not deliberate, I can assure the House—to find that by a strange coincidence, the number of visits to the U.S.S.R., and the United States of America are exactly equal.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You have not counted his visit to Taiwan.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : He also alleged that Chairman Kosygin had whispered about his intention to supply arms to Pakistan when I had gone to Moscow. I am not quite sure of the exact date of that particular visit but it was very soon after Mr. Kosygin took over as Prime Minister. I can assure the hon. Member that he was then far too pre-occupied with domestic affairs and the new situation in the Soviet Union to discuss the supply of arms to Pakistan, or any other such matter with somebody whom he did not know at all.

Some hon. Members have alleged that either the Government was unaware of what was happening or wanted to keep the country in the dark. This, as I have said earlier, is quite incorrect and I shall deal with the matter later on.

There is one other item which Dahya-bhaiji mentioned which I should like to mention now. It was about our rupee credits. I am told that today our foreign trade with the free market economies has an imbalance of about Rs. 500 crores per year. We have an adverse balance of trade with them. We buy more from them than they buy from us, and naturally this is to our disadvantage.

Now let us look at the picture of our trade with the socialist countries of Europe, the countries with which we have rupee accounts. There the trade is balanced; exports and imports are matched. Now I should like to ask how this is disadvantageous to us. I would like to suggest that, instead of criticising this trade, it might be useful for hon. Members who have friends and business associates in the free currency areas, to persuade them to buy more from us. We are happy that our trade is getting more diversified and that new markets for newer goods are being found and that our trade is growing. Exports this year as compared to last year have increased, and the credits we have received from the U.S.S.R., and other East European countries are of a direct export promotional character.

I think it was a Member from our side of the House, Shri B.K.P. Sinha, who referred to the size and function of the

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi] Prime Minister's Secretariat. May I, Madam, inform the House of the factual Position? The number of officials in the Prime Minister's Secretariat, both gazetted and non-gazetted, have been actually reduced in the last three years. My friend also made a rather strange remark about policy formulation. May I say, Madam, that it is entirely incorrect, and if my friend will forgive me, I think also irresponsible to suggest that the foreign policy of this country could be determined by any set of officials whether they are in the Foreign Ministry, the Prime Minister's Secretariat or in any other Secretariat.

Now, many Members have expressed their concern with regard to the Joint Communique. As hon. Members know, these communiques are formal documents giving indication of the trends of the discussion and any agreements which may have been reached. This communique has so many very positive features; it has given positive support to our stand with regard to Indo-Pakistani relations. For example, the communique supports the approach which we have been making of a step by step settlement between the two countries. Perhaps other points could have been brought in but if they do not find specific mention it does not mean that they were not discussed, nor does it in any way alter our own stand on these issues.

Another matter which is connected both with the communique and with the letter which I have received from Chairman Kosygin, was the question of mention of the Farakka Barrage. Now there was no specific suggestion that this matter should be settled in the same way as the Indus waters dispute. The suggestion in the letter was that we should find some mutually acceptable solution of this matter. The letter referred to many other questions, not only between India and Pakistan but to other areas, problems and matters of interest to us throughout the world. Alongwith, then there was mention of Indo-Pakistan relationship and it was stated that the Soviet Government wished that our relations should be normalised and should improve, which is what we also say. But I should like to make our position quite clear that there can be no question of any mediation or arbitration or third party intervention. Neither do we think that there is any comparison between the question of the Ganga waters and the question of the Indus waters. The Ganga is almost entirely an Indian river and I believe the

other day the Minister spoke on this matter in the other House.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Do you deny that there is Pressurisation from the U.S.S.R.?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I shall come to that.

The Farakka project is vital to our needs and especially to the very survival of the Calcutta Port. But we have always been willing to talk to Pakistan and to hear about its legitimate interest. Therefore we had agreed to an exchange of technical data and information but there should be no delay in carrying on the work or completion of the barrage.

The hon. Member just now asked about pressures. Now if by pressure he means that they have said that we must do this or that or else something will happen, there has been no such pressure. It is true that some people have been talking about these matters, and not only the Russians. But, as I said, it is a question for us to see how far we are prepared to listen and we have made our attitude very clear. My hon. friend from this side just now said something about telling them our views gently; I want to assure him that we have told this not gently but very firmly and in the strongest of terms.

The natural questions asked in this debate have been, why have the Russians entered into this deal; when did we know about it; could we have prevented it; why did we not prevent it and so on. Such an occasion is always used for blaming the Government for the failure of its policy. Now I do not think it would be proper for me to enter into any speculative analysis about the reasons why the Soviet Union decided to take this step. Many viewpoints have been put forward and there may be truth in some of them. Hon. Member Shri Jairamdasji rightly said that each country must look to its own interests and act in what it considers to be its interest. It is our misfortune that hon. Members sometimes take it for granted that we are the one country where we are not at all concerned with our national self-interests. Well, I must most emphatically say that there is no truth whatever in this. We may not agree with the Soviet assessment of the situation or their assessment of their interests in this matter. Perhaps they will find out that they were wrong. But I do not think it is right to question their motives. The possibility of this arms deal was in the air

for some considerable time; hon. Members know that there were speculations in the Press and that is why we had taken the matter up with them on several occasions previously even though there was no indication from them or other definite information.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI

{Rajasthan} : Since when ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Well, since the speculation was there.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : It would be good if you could give the year.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I do not think I can at this moment put my finger on the exact date but it was there for some considerable time; hon. Member himself will remember when it started coming out in the newspapers and so on. And here I would like to say one more thing. One or more Members have asked if we have the Intelligence; did we know anything about this matter apart from what was public knowledge. Hon. Members will surely understand that it is not possible always to give such information, even if we learn of something we would certainly not like other people to give out such information about us and therefore it is not proper that we should do so ourselves. But as soon as we had some definite indication, which was as I mentioned in my statement about three weeks back, we took the matter with the Soviet Government and I was the first person to give Government's reaction when I was asked about it by the Press. The Soviet Government have assured us that this would not in any way affect their relations with us, their friendship with us, nor would it injure our interests. Now obviously we have our own views about this and that is what I have expressed to them. We have our misgivings, we have our apprehensions, and as I have said, I have given public expression to them in the House and also to the Soviet Government. The whole nation is naturally most concerned. With all our understanding of Soviet policy we cannot but view this decision with concern and some disturbance. We are apprehensive because of the past record of our neighbour. The Soviet Union has assured us that it will not allow these arms to be used against us but, as hon. Members have pointed out, we have received such assurances before from other quarters. We did not believe it then and it is we who have proved to be right and not the others. So we find it difficult to believe that this new acquisition of

arms will not strengthen the bellicose attitude of Pakistan. Already there are some signs. First there were bellicose speeches immediately. But afterwards there was also a declaration that there would be "no trouble whatsoever between the two countries". If there is sincerity in this change of attitude that there will be no trouble, well, we would certainly welcome it. As I think it was the hon. Member Shri Jairamdas Daulatram who mentioned that many countries had been changing. I myself have been speaking about this change for some time. Naturally I could not put it in more specific terms. But I think that if people had read between the lines they could have got some indication of my thinking. Why should we look either at friendship or enmity in such total and absolute terms? I think that, as Jairamdasji has said, this is a rather unrealistic way of facing the world. It does not mean that we do not believe in friendship and I don't know whether the changing of the word from friendship to cooperation would make any difference because that would also be interpreted in many different ways. We accept friendship and we do not wish to do anything against friendship but this should not mean that we are complacent or that we close our eyes to what is happening. I am afraid, this is what always seems to happen here. If we think a country is against us then we are not willing to give even a little leeway nor are we allowed to make bridges with that country. If we think that a country is friendly then we expect that country to give up everything even its own interest, for the sake of our friendship. As I said just now, I think this is not a realistic attitude. We must accept friendship as it is; it may be more; it may be less. I for one cannot understand the argument that trusting a country or believing in its friendship has done us harm. Had we declared previously that the Soviet Union was giving or selling arms to Pakistan, would that have helped the situation? Would they have been more friendly towards us? How would it have changed the situation? Another hon. member similarly spoke of China having betrayed us. Now, they did betray us; they did attack us when we thought they were our friends. Suppose we had not been friends, would they have put off the attack? This is an argument which I must say does not make much sense to me. We must, at all times, be prepared for all consequences. But it doesn't mean that we should shut our doors or do anything that would make it more difficult for other countries to come closer or to change their attitude towards

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

us. As I have said before, vast changes are taking place in the world. In a way, of course, the world is always changing and so this is a statement of a Platitude; but it is true that 20 years ago or even 10 years ago there was rather a set situation; there were hostile blocs and we rightly decided that it would not be in our interest to belong to any one bloc because then we would naturally attract the hostility of the other bloc, and this did bear fruit when China attacked us, because we had then only China against us and not a bloc against us. It helped us on many other occasions. Then the blocs themselves found that the policy of alignment, the policy of rigidly clinging together by some people against other people did not pay. These blocs began loosening. These special friendships began to loosen and countries whether big or small, belonging to different blocs started to look for friends in the opposite blocs. So although the blocs are still there, they have not disappeared, we find that bridges, or whatever you would like to call them, have been built up across the barriers from one bloc to another in many directions. We find the countries of Eastern Europe trying to establish their own identity and their own personality and trying to loosen their rigid ties with their own bloc on the one hand without breaking these friendships and at the same time trying to increase trade, cooperation and friendship with the countries which have been entirely opposed to them in ideology or in policy. Every country has been doing this. The Western countries have also been doing this. Members of the NATO and of the SEATO have been doing it. To think that India has remained in some static position is not a true picture at all. India has also been making such an attempt. Somebody talked of the United States having betrayed us. We have not used that phrase and howsoever strongly we may have reacted when the United States gave a free gift of a vast amount of arms to its military ally, Pakistan. We did not break our friendship with the United States. On the contrary we strengthened the friendship and we have far closer relations with the United States on the cultural level, on the economic level, on the scientific level and other levels than we had at that time. Similarly we are also building bridges with other nations with whom we had no enmity perhaps, but with whom also up till now we had no close relations. Of course, it is true, and the House knows that because of the aggression on our borders we did get, and we have now a certain amount of rigidity,

a lack of manoeuvrability with regard to our two neighbours, China and Pakistan. But I have always stated on the floor of this House and outside that as far as I am concerned we would like to keep the doors open and, keeping our national interests in view we would like to see an atmosphere created or a path found whereby this rigidity could be softened. We could have a more flexible dealing even with these nations. As I said we don't believe, I don't believe, in total enmity with anybody or perhaps total friendship either, because it just doesn't happen in this world. Things are not jet black or pure white. Most things are in a range between the extremes. Judged in this perspective, to say that we have been hiding things from the nation, is not at all true. This matter did not come as a total surprise to us but from what we knew, it was not possible to accept it as a fact or to put it before the country as such. The people who talk either pretend in order to make political capital out of it for such views attacking the Government or perhaps they truly entertain out of naivete. Now, there was the question of the quantity and the nature of supplies. I have merely touched upon it before. I personally do not think that it will make much of a difference in the military sense. It is not possible to be 100 per cent or even 80 per cent definite about a thing like this. One can only make a judgment or an assessment. But our concern was because it might increase the cold war atmosphere. We have already had a great deal of propaganda, abuse and provocation from across the border and I don't think it helps our relationship nor does it help in the

lessening of tension for this to be 5 P.M. increased at the present moment.

I would like to ask the hon. Member, Shri Kaul, whether he expects us to say publicly what our sources are, what our methods are. Democracy makes diplomacy all the more difficult because there is far more publicity about these things than is good for diplomacy, or for the carrying on of talks or even for finding out things. The conduct of foreign affairs is complex at any time and, of course, in a democracy facts are seldom hidden from the public gaze. The Government has to be not only discreet, but has of necessity to be restrained; it has to take not only the short-term view but also the long-term view. Intentions cannot always be declared, even though broad policies are clear.

Non-alignment has had its usual share of abuse, though I might say that, for the first time, we have found some hon.

Members of the Swatantra Party in this House and in the other place also having a good word for it.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras) : No, no.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Perhaps not all of you, but some. I forget the name, but I was sitting here when it was said that there should be honest non-alignment. No amount of prejudice against non-alignment or criticism of it has diminished its value to the world. This is obvious because today all those countries, which were so strongly aligned are trying to be unaligned. Hon. Members who have spoken against non-alignment, have at the same time, praised Pakistan's flexibility and the diplomatic success which it has achieved by trying to break with its old alignment and by trying to be non-aligned. Actually when I said that recent events were a vindication of our policy, what I meant was that these old ideas of blocs are disappearing. We had always opposed the blocs. We had always said that these blocs would not work. We find today that all people are extending their friendship, building new bridges and there is a kind of liberalisation and breaking down of divisions all over the world.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : It is readjustment for their own benefit, Madam.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : One hon. Member said something about neutralism. This is one word which we have never used and we have very vigorously protested whenever it was used with regard to our policy. It is also wrong to call our policy one of rigidity. The words 'national interests' and 'self-interest' were frequently used and each group, each individual, as was to be expected, has interpreted these words in his own way. As soon as we talk to others, people think that we are in some way bartering away our national interest or that we are being pressurised. In a way any country's foreign policy, to some extent, is pressurised in the sense that each country wants to influence the other country, but it depends on each country not to be so pressurised or not to be influenced in any way. I certainly think that we shall never be found giving up our basic principles. We want to be inflexible in our resolve, but we want to be flexible and resourceful in our means. Today not only are there vast changes all over the world, but the pace of change is over fast and we must, all of us, keep pace with this changing world. The only way to keep

our own balance—I am glad to say that most hon. Members have said this—is to build up our own strength. At the same time, we must be careful not to say anything or do anything merely because we are in a huff or on the rebound. If we feel something has to be done, if it is the right thing to do, we should do it, but not merely because the Soviet Union is doing something today or America is doing something or some other country is doing something. That would be a position of weakness.

I am very glad that most Members have stressed the importance of not doing anything which would in any way impair Indo-Soviet relations. This entire development should be seen not only in the perspective of the Indo-Soviet close relationship politically, economically and culturally, but also in the national interest and should be judged in the totality of what image of India will be projected in the other countries of the world. Do we want an image which is of somebody whining and complaining because somebody else is doing something or do we want to give a picture of a country which is fully aware of the difficult situation created and of a people fully prepared to face such a situation with maturity?

The importance of self-reliance has been stressed—I am glad—and I would like to add my own strong views about it. This has been our own slogan and we have been diversifying our industry and our economy in other respects also. In regard to sources of supply, while we want to be self-reliant, we do realise that no country can be fully self sufficient. Our biggest single source of basic supply should be our own country. Our inter-dependence with other countries should be based on a strong and firm foundation of independence.

Now, some hon. Member, I think, it was Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who said something about fumbling I can very clearly tell him that this word was used by some newspaper. Such words come to the minds of those who think in clichés and who find it impossible to fit the changing world into patterns and labels which they have previously prepared for their articles. I have clearly stated time and again and I would like to repeat that this Government derives its strength from its firm belief and its unbounded faith in the wisdom and self-confidence of the Indian people. That is our real strength and I hope the Opposition Parties will not project their own lack of selfconfidence into this House or this country.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

One question which is very important and which I seem to have left out is with regard to Kashmir. The Soviets have not mentioned Kashmir at all to us. Somebody just now said that we have been told to come to a settlement about Kashmir and so on. This is far from the truth. But here again we are firm and we must remain firm in our stand. Previously we were anxious and we were seeking assurances. I think that we must give up this attitude. We know what we want and we should stand firm by it and I do not think that anybody can push us around.

I have also previously said that defence and security will remain our paramount concern and that we can ensure this with the full backing of a strong and united people. Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, I should like once more, before I end, to go back to the question of non-alignment. As I said, the essence of non-alignment is independent judgment, judging each issue on its merits. Nothing could be less rigid than that. It is a flexible approach, one which cuts across the rigidities of alignments. The price of independent thinking is that we annoy somebody or other, but the price of alignment is the curtailing of true independence. Madam, with your permission and the indulgence of the House I should like to read what I have said in the other House about how we implement this non-alignment or what is our approach to international affairs. I quote :

"I believe that where there is friends-ship we must enlarge it; where there is indifference we must remove it; and where there is hostility we should try to blunt it."

What are permanent and set are certain values and above all our national interests about which there can be no compromise. Let me in the end pick up the common thread which ran through all the speeches and which I think made this debate worthwhile. This was the idea of national solidarity, the idea of self-reliance and internal strength. If we can capture this spirit and work towards this and if we have a united view on this, then I think that the Soviet Government may well have done us a favour in forging this kind of determination amongst us to stand united, to stand on our own feet, and to be firm in our resolve about our national interests

Thank you.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार) : प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो रिमार्क मेरे अमेन्डमेंट के संबंध में किया है, मैं समझता हूँ उसके संबंध में मुझे कुछ कहने के लिए समय दिया जाना चाहिये। हमारा जो अमेन्डमेंट है उसके संबंध में हमें एक्सप्लेन करने के लिए टाइम दिया जाना चाहिये। अपने संशोधन पर बोलने का अब तक हमको टाइम नहीं दिया गया है, तो किस तरह से प्रधान मंत्री मेरी बात समझ सकती हैं ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is no time now. Mr. Kaul.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदया, आप कृपा करके मुझे यह बतला दीजिये कि आप किस नियम के अनुसार श्री मंडल को उनके अमेन्डमेंट पर बोलने का अधिकार नहीं दे रही हैं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Amendments were moved and the discussion started.

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा कहना यह है कि श्री मंडल के अमेन्डमेंट को समझने की कोशिश नहीं की गई है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Anyway this is not the time to raise issues.

श्री राजनारायण : जिस समय लन्च के पहले मिश्रा जी को बोलने के लिए बुलाया गया था और वे नहीं बोले, तो उस समय सदन की बैठक लन्च के लिए पांच मिनट पहले स्थगित कर दी गई थी। उस समय श्री मंडल को बोलने का समय दिया जाना चाहिये था।

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please take your seat.

श्री राजनारायण : अगर आप पांच मिनट का समय उनको दे दीजियेगा, तो क्या बिगड़ जायेगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You should have raised that issue when there were five minutes in the afternoon. Mr. Kaul.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : Madam, this has been one of the most constructive and realistic debates that

we have ever had in this House, and I think after this debate is over the Government emerges stronger than before. When the Prime Minister made various speeches in the country and later made a statement in Parliament, they were the views and reactions of Government. After this debate is over and after the voting is taken, I think the position will be that this Government have behind it the support and backing of this Parliament and the country. That illustrates what are the advantages that flow from...

श्री राजनारायण : महोदया, मेरा एक प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर है और वह यह है कि रिप्लाय उसी को देने का हक है जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर की बात से असहमत हो। जब कौल साहब ने प्राइम मिनिस्टर की बात को मान ली है, तो उन्हें बोलने का हक नहीं है। उनका समय काट कर मन्डल साहब को बोलने की इजाजत दी जाय।

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Madam Deputy Chairman, I have heard the debate all these days and listened to almost all the speeches, and by and large there is a consensus of opinion that the stand taken by the Government was the correct stand, that there has been a shift in Soviet policy and that we should watch future developments and take every step cautiously and carefully. A large number of Members supported . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He cannot say consensus. Then there is a way, voting. In the name of unanimity he cannot impose things on others.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : The second proposition that emerges is that whatever be the implications of the Soviet decision—and the implications have certainly dangerous potentialities—the Government should not lose its balance. The future is unknown to us. We do not yet know the exact position as to what is the quantum of armaments that will be supplied. Various statements have appeared. I will refer to a paper— radar, ground-to-air missiles, armoured vehicles, replacing tanks suitable for desert warfare anti-aircraft guns, helicopters—these are the things for which Pakistan has made an application to the Soviet Union.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We do not know. Which paper?

SHRI M. N. KAUL : You may refer to parliamentary debates.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Which paper ?

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I was referring to parliamentary debates.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You said newspaper.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I said paper.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not newspaper. He said paper.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Paper is the widest possible expression. It includes parliamentary proceedings.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is the source of your information ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let Mr' Kaul continue.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I have given my source of information. If you refer to the proceedings of Parliament, of the other House, you will find the statement in the speech of a member. That is the position on the one hand. On the other hand there is the statement of President Ayub who says that the aid merely fills in the gaps that it is marginal aid. There may be some factual basis in it because for a long time we have been reading reports in the newspapers that the tanks and other military equipment supplied by China to Pakistan cannot be used because spare parts are not available, and Pakistan has been very frantic about obtaining these spare parts. So it may be marginal. But from our point of view it is crucial aid which may activate all these elements of military equipment.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You seem to know everything that the Soviet Union is giving.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I say we do not know the quantum, therefore we should wait and see. As developments take place, we should shape our policy accordingly. One important point is that the Soviet Union is adopting different policies in different regions. Take Israel and Egypt. They are exclusively supplying arms to the Arab countries, not to Israel. Of course, Israel has not asked for arms from the Soviet Union. Take Turkey, and Iran. In these spheres the United States is supplying arms and now the Soviet Union is also cultivating relations.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : (West Bengal) : On a point of order. The Prime Minister has just now said that she cannot give the quantum of help in military hardware that has been received by Pakistan from the Soviet Union nor could she tell this House what will be the quantum of military hardware to be received by Pakistan. Mr. Kaul is saying all this. From what is he saying all this ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Well, he is reading something which has no basis. He is giving a list of arms supplied by the Soviet Union while only an intention has been expressed.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I hope Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will hear me ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You diarise the things. Here he is not correct. He is trying to be profound. While the Prims Minister, said that only the intention has been expressed, he produced a list here.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I said there was an application from Pakistan. Pakistan had applied for arms ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I know, I want to expose.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Kaul, have you finished ?

SHRI M. N. KAUL : No, Madam.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Madam ...

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What do you want to speak on?

(Interruptions)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. I want to know whether Mr. Sinha is on a point of order. Mr. Sinha, are you on a point of order ?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : No, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What do you want to say when the Mover is on his speech?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Madam, I am speaking in that connection. It is almost a point of order. He is the Mover of a certain Motion. He has every right to reply to the debate. It is unfair on the part of the House, when he is replying

to create a situation in which the Mover of the Motion does not get an opportunity to reply to the debate. If this sort of treatment becomes a common practice in this House, the dignity of the House shall suffer.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Kaul, please be brief.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : So ...

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : On a point of order. Mr. Kaul is replying to the debate. While replying, he must reply only to the points raised in the debate and not raise any new points as he is doing just now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, that is correct.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I am not raising any new points. I was merely saying that the stand that I took and the stand that has been taken in the Government's statement has, by and large, the support of a large number of Members of the House. And the basic point of statement is that in spite of the shift or deviation in the Soviet policy, that no action should be taken by the Government which will impair our relations with the Soviet Union.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : There is no such thing, there is no such statement. There is no such reference in the statement which we are considering. Why does he say that it is a deviation. Where is it in the statement ? Point out. No, No, Madam. You cannot. I should like to know whether in that statement which we have discussed there is any expression 'deviation'. Point out.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Shift means ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : 'Shift' means? What does it mean? I know enough English to understand it. 'Deviation'—does it occur?

SHRI M. N. KAUL : 'Shift' means...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It cannot be allowed. It will be misunderstood. It is not fair to anyone of us. You criticise the statement. But you cannot incorporate a word in the statement when it does not occur. You can criticise. Others have criticised. I can understand them. But do not smuggle new words.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : As Mr. Chagla, who was Minister of External Affairs

at a crucial time, said yesterday, the attitude now taken by the Soviet Government is contrary to the Tashkent Agreement . . . interruptions) Formerly, arms were supplied only to us. Now they are supplied to us and to Pakistan. There is obviously a shift in Soviet policy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

1. "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 relation 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 Communiqué issued at the conclusion of the recent visit of the President of India to the USSR of any reference to the USSR Government's decision to supply arms to Pakistan."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

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.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

3. "That at the end 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 USSR Government to Pakistan does not indicate any positive steps by the Government to meet the situation arising therefrom.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I shall put Mr. Rajnarain's amendment to vote.

श्री राजनारायण : महोदया, श्री भूपेन्द्र मंडल के अमेंडमेंट में मेरा अमेंडमेंट है। इसका प्राप्ति प्रोसीजर यह है कि आप कृपा कर के मंडल जी से यह पूछिये कि उनको हमारा अमेंडमेंट स्वीकार है या नहीं। अगर उन्होंने हमारा अमेंडमेंट स्वीकार कर लिया, तो उसके लिये करेक्ट प्रोसीजर यह है . . .

उपसभापति : मैं समझ गई।

श्री राजनारायण : मैंने श्री भूपेन्द्र मंडल के अमेंडमेंट में अमेंडमेंट दिया है और अगर मेरा अमेंडमेंट उनके अमेंडमेंट में स्वीकार हो गया, तो उनका अमेंडमेंट माना जायगा और . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I know it, I have understood what you want. But the procedure is that the amendment to the amendment must be put first. Therefore, I shall put Mr. Rajnarain's amendment to vote. It is an amendment to Mr. Mandal's amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Shall I, with your permission, give an amendment to Mr. Rajnarain's amendment?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Is it because Mr. Rajnarain's amendment was received first and Mr. Mandal's amendment was received later?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

The question is :

"That the following be added at the end of amendment No. 4 moved by Shri B. N. Mandal :

'iii and therefore it is necessary for Government to abrogate the Tashkent Agreement.' "

The amendment was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now we come to Mr. Mandal's amendment No 4. Mr. Mandal, do you press it?

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : इसको मैं प्रेस करना चाहता हूं और इसपर कुछ कहने के लिये मुझे पांच मिनट का टाइम दिया जाय . . .

उपसभापति : पांच मिनट नहीं, दो मिनट बोल लीजिये।

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : जो तरमीम मैंने दी है...

BHUPESH GUPTA : He has been subjected to pressure for the fourth time.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : जो तरमीम मैंने दी है वह तरमीम हिन्दी में थी और उसका ट्रांसलेशन अंग्रेजी में गलत तरीके से हुआ है...

उपसभापति : हिन्दी में दिया है।

श्री राजनारायण : हिन्दी में दिया है !

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : एक बात मुझे यह कहनी थी। दूसरी बात यह है कि मेरी जो तरमीम है उसके दो खंड हैं। पहले खंड में हमने यह कहा है कि हमारा पाकिस्तान से जो युद्ध 1965 में हुआ था...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If it is moved and then spoken upon, others have a right to oppose it, surely. You have allowed it. I have no objection to it. But certainly it is not parliamentary practice.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You cannot speak when the Mover of the amendment is speaking. You please take your seat.

Mr. Mandal, you said, one minute. I cannot give you more time at this stage

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : बस दो मिनट। पाकिस्तान के साथ भारत का जो युद्ध हुआ उसके सिलसिले में सुरक्षा परिषद में रूस का जो कण्डक्ट हुआ और उसके बाद जो ताश्कन्द समझौता हुआ उस सिलसिले में जो रूस का कण्डक्ट हुआ उसको जिस तरीके से समझना चाहिए था, हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने नहीं समझा। जो शिफ्ट आ रही थी रूस के दिमाग में वह हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने समझी ही नहीं थी, जो उस समझौते में काम किया गया उससे सीधा यही मालूम पड़ता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार अपने को गुलाम समझती है और रूस की सरकार को मालिक। ऐसा क्यों? रूस का आज जो कण्डक्ट पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने का हुआ, उसका जस्टीफिकेशन यह दिया जाता है कि अपने देश के हित में जो वह काम करता है वह ठीक है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You are repeating yourself. That will do, Mr. Mandal.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : इसी तरह से ताश्कन्द समझौते में हिन्दुस्तान के हकमें यह जरूरी था कि जो जमीन पाकिस्तान की हिन्दुस्तान के दखल में आ गई थी, वह उसके पास रहती। उसको हिन्दुस्तान के दखल से निकालने की

GIPN—S3—11 R. S./68—2-1-69.—570

रूस की बात को भारत सरकार को अपने हित में ठुकराना चाहिए था। यह गुलामी का काम हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने किया है।

दूसरी बात...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do now.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार अब तक डिफेंस के मामले में...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I cannot allow you.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल :... क्यों नहीं मजबूत बन सकी? इसका कारण यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार में आत्मविश्वास नहीं है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : यह आत्मविश्वास की कमी क्यों है? इसलिए है क्योंकि इसका चरित्र वर्ण और वर्ग के मामले में कमजोर है। यहां शासक और शासित वर्ग में स्वार्थ की एकात्मता नहीं है। हमारा पड़ोसी चीन...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mandal, no more, please.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल :... थोड़े से समय में मजबूत हो गया है। वहां की सरकार... नेतृत्व और जनता में एकात्मता है।

{Interruptions}

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. Now I will put it to the vote. The question is :—

4. " 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 motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till eleven A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-three minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 25th July, 1968