

what are you doing? The demands are that they want the profit-sharing bonus for the year 1964-65, they want the reinstatement of the discharged, dismissed and suspended workers for their taking part in lawful trade union activities. So, it is not only a question of talking with the recognised unions. In this context, may I know from the Minister whether he is in a position to discuss the matter with the representatives of all the unions, recognised and unrecognised, so that normalcy may be restored immediately and the plant may be put into production without any further delay and bring peace and tranquillity in that steel town of Durgapur?

SHRI T. N. SINGH : I also share the Member's anxiety regarding the running of the plant. It is a continuous plant and any disturbance in its running is a regrettable thing. I wish all concerned realise their responsibilities in this matter, to whichever union they may belong because if there is no continuous running of this plant, it causes a lot of damage and harm. So I agree with him there.

As regards the various claims, etc., I am a firm believer that the autonomy of the public sector should always be recognised and it should be allowed to function in its own way. I am sure the General Manager and the Chairman of the H.S.L. are both looking into the matter.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh) : It looks as if anybody with a gun can shoot anybody in this country. During the last three days there have been three firings in Bengal—in Durgapur, in Midnapore, where people wanted rice and they were shot at, and again in Cossipore. I do not understand why with such easiness the Government is resorting to firing. The issue here is this. Recognition is the right of a union to represent the workers. It does not prevent the union from writing. When the mass of workers had gone to the General Manager, the Manager would not have lost anything if he had addressed them and told them : 'I will consider the grievance, I will write a reply, I will consider it.' I do not understand his standing on his prestige on the basis of the Industrial Disputes Act of Bengal according to which even if a union captures all the elective posts, it still remains unrecognised, and the other union continues

to be recognised. I want to know why the Central public sector undertakings should not be taken over under the Central sphere in regard to labour relations. Another thing is, why the General Manager could not see the workers. If he had done it, all these could have been easily avoided.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : I have already stated that there can be no objection to meeting any individual worker for individual grievances but when it comes to a legal affair, namely, that they should be recognised as a union, then that can be considered only by the Bengal Government, otherwise, the management would be violating the law. Secondly, that is not the proper way—to *ghera dalo*, etc. There are other ways. We can discuss as between man and man many things without all these things. My instructions are there. As a matter of fact we had shown the example. I myself discussed with the same individuals and the Manager was also present.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER : We got to the discussion of the international situation.

MOTION RE THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—contd.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : I have listened patiently to the speech of the hon. Minister for External Affairs and also to what preceded it. I do not know how the statement regarding the reported massing of Pakistani forces across the cease-fire line happened to come just before we began the debate on the international situation. Was it timed deliberately for this purpose? We have heard the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs speaking in the other House and saying that the Government is using tricks. Was this one of the tricks employed by the Government to divert the attention from the failings of the Government, from the utter failure of the Government's policies, from the utter bankruptcy of the Government's foreign policy, to the attack, to the possible attack that we are faced with, the possible aggression that we are faced with from Pakistan? We are told that a great threat to our country is there. There is a fabulous arms build-up by Pakistan.

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

Fabulous arms aid has been given to Pakistan. What have we been doing about it? Even during the last late Prime Minister Nehru's time, this House and the other House had been drawing his attention to the way in which the Chinese were building roads on our borders. The Government ignored it until the Chinese aggression came and now that very act of aggression is used as a justification for the policies of the Government which have been utterly miscalculated, misguided and a failure. Since Mr. Krishna Menon became the guiding figure of the foreign policy of this country, we have gone astray, we have gone on the wrong path and in everything we did we had miscalculated and we had gone wrong. Mr. Menon is no more guiding the affairs of the Ministry but I do see his hand and the consequences of his action which we have to pay for so dearly.

The hon. Minister referred to our good relations with Afghanistan, Nepal, Burma and Indonesia. Yes, it is good that we have good relations with these neighbours. I am glad about it but what about our relations with a country, which is equally big in this continent and what are we doing to improve them. What are we doing to improve our relations with our neighbour who was part of us until recently? Here also the foreign policy of our Government has failed. When there was time to take firm action in Kashmir we hesitated. We had eighteen years of indecision. Now we do not know where we stand. If a decision had been taken firmly when it should have been taken, we would not have been in this situation today. Today, this country is not in the situation to be able to face two great enemies, China and Pakistan, together. Let us admit that we are not strong for that due to anybody's fault. It may be because of the Government's fault or whatever it is but to-day we are not in that condition. Then what does a wise man do? He makes up with the person with whom it is easy to make up. Pakistan was part of us. Many people in this country have relations in Pakistan. Many people in Pakistan have relations with us. What are we doing to make up with Pakistan? When Ayub Khan became the President of Pakistan, he offered common defence. His hand of friendship was spurned. That is

why we are having all this trouble. We are paying today for it. We paid for the war with Pakistan and we are paying for it because of the folly and utter failure of the foreign policy of this Government. And what a long tirade we heard about the doings of the Government.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : What to do to-day? Rajaji's solution?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Yes, I will tell you. The Government of India have failed to look at friends wherever they are. In Asian countries we have friends but we refuse to look at them. We have a friend in Taiwan, of course, but it is too small for these big people. But what did the Government of India do to run after the Arab countries, whose friendship was put to test when the Pakistani aggression came? Our Prime Minister and representatives of this Government went to the meeting of the Arab countries. With what result? We did not even receive a decent welcome. There was a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of Asian countries in South Korea, in Seoul, where we were invited more than once. They urged us to go to that meeting. What did our Government do? We did not show the courtesy of even sending a reply. Madam, anybody who looks at the map of India and knows current history knows that the countries right from Korea to Vietnam are suffering from the same threat of Chinese communist aggression. They would be the best friends to make. Yet our Government ignores them. Instead of making friends with them, instead of helping them to unite against the common aggressor, if the aggression comes, we do not even look at them. And there is the utter failure of our Government. The Foreign Minister of Thailand used to be in this country as his country's representative for many years. He knows many people here. He knows the affairs of the Asian continent. I would commend the speech that he made in Korea, and the other speeches that he has been making to our Minister for External Affairs and his aids to study and to see. This is the approach that our Government should take. We referred to the situation in Cambodia and in Laos but our Minister for External Affairs did not have a word to say about Thailand which is neighbouring those countries and is likely to be affected by the developments there. Why?

SHRI A. D. MANI : There is no trouble in Thailand.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : That is the place where we should like to have friends.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Oh, I see; that is what you want.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, just to correct it, if you don't mind. I did make a reference both to Thailand and to the Philippines and say that we are in friendly relations with them.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Yes, you have got relations . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Friendly relations.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You have got friendly relations with them but you have failed to have friendly relations, establish the relations, that you promised you would, with South Korea. You have written to South Korea that we are going to send an Ambassador. You intimated the name more than once. Nobody has yet been sent when that country is so anxious to make friends with you. They have sent here a gentleman, who has had the rank of Ambassador, and a gentleman who has represented his country in the United Nations. I do not know whether our Government cares to look at him, cares to listen to him and cares to understand that country's point of view.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : Do you know that 17,000 American troops are in South Korea ?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : How many Chinese there are in North Korea ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You would like to have Russian troops in India, I suppose.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : No, no. What I want my hon. friend to tell me is whether he is aware of the fact that there are 17,000 American troops in South Korea.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : What does it matter if they are there at the bidding of the United Nations and if they are there to prevent what is happening in

Vietnam now ? If they were not there and if they relied upon us as Vietnam did, they would suffer the same fate. My dear friend, why do you forget ? Do you like this country to suffer the fate of Vietnam ? Don't you know the communist tactics of deceit, subversion and take-over ? These have always been the communist tactics wherever they have gone. Have they not done so in Vietnam ? Did they not try to do so in South Korea ? And who saved the Koreans ? Would they not try to do that in India if they got an opportunity ? Fortunately they did not have any.

AN HON. MEMBER : So you seem to like the Americans because they . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I do like the Americans because the Americans do believe in democracy, and we have nothing in common with the communist countries. At least I hope the people of this country know it even if this Government does not know it. Without knowing this this Government forfeits its right to sit there. They do not follow the feelings of the people. I was surprised to read the statement that the Prime Minister made about two Germanys. I want to know . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) : I do not wish to interrupt the flow of eloquence of my esteemed friend but . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : My time is limited. If you are going to give me more time, Madam Deputy Chairman, then I may yield.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I would just like him to read with an open mind the objective reports of the correspondents of the British and American papers on the doings of his great and beloved United States. I have got with me a copy of the 'Manchester Guardian'.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You can read it out in your own time, when you speak, but I cannot allow my limited time to be utilised for that purpose. Therefore, Madam, I do not understand the purpose of this interruption except it be to take the limited time that we have. Madam, we have very limited time for this debate. We listened to the long speech by the Minister and we do not get enough time to reply, and this is not a fair way of doing it.

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

I was sorry to read the remarks of the Prime Minister about the German State. I do not know whether the present Prime Minister has changed, or whether the present Government has changed, the views that the late Prime Minister Nehru expressed in this House and in the other House also about two States of Germany. I know my friend, Mr. Mani, has been pleading for recognising two Germanys.

SHRI A. D. MANI : I have always been and I do.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : But this Government has not accepted that position and I was surprised to see the Prime Minister's statement on this matter. I would like to remind the House not only of what the Prime Minister said in October, 1962, but also I would like to remind the House of what the Minister of State for External Affairs, Mrs. Lakshmi Menon, said when she went to Germany on an official visit. The Minister of State went to West Berlin in July, 1963, and there she stated and supported the stand of the West German and West Berlin people on the so-called German and Berlin problem. This Mrs. Menon, I remember, spoke in Berlin in July, 1963, that the wall of Berlin put up by the East German regime was against the wishes of the people of Berlin and was only meant to curb the movements of the people of Berlin. And this statement by Mrs. Menon was well defended by the Prime Minister in both the Houses, the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. What the German people have done for India, I think, this Government seems to forget. Barring the United States I suppose we have received the largest aid from there. Besides that our cultural ties with Germany are very close. In fact, it is the German scholars who reminded us of our great cultural heritage. Even in the old days, before the British regime, they came; they studied the Sanskrit literature and pointed out to the world the wealth of literature and learning that was in this country. Now under these circumstances, Madam, I do not understand why such a statement was made.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : What is the statement ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : The Prime Minister stated in the Lok Sabha

on Thursday that "our conflict with China is not a conflict with communists." Now I am surprised to read this statement. Our conflict is with the communist regime in China. There is no doubt about it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Only with China; not with the U.S.S.R. or other communist countries.

3 P.M.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : At present you may say that there are two Chinas, one the Republic of free China which is a permanent member of the Security Council and which is recognised by the majority of the members of the United Nations, and then there is the Communist regime China which we have recognised, and we are now paying for that recognition. Actually our conflict is with Communist China and not with Free China. It is the Communist ideology of Peking's rulers which is threatening our frontiers.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Free China is in the United Nations.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : The people on the mainland of China who are kept under this Communist rule of Peking, do they understand the real position ? Free and democratic China on the contrary has declared publicly its assurance and this assurance was repeated by the Ministers of that Government when they were here a few months back for the ECAFE meeting. Then there is Communist China which has not only threatened our borders but has committed aggression against us and has occupied our territory and is occupying it even today, and of course, pursuing its measures like encouraging the subversive elements in this country and so on.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : He need not go on with this kind of a running commentary.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : They encourage also the provocative postures of Pakistan. I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether she would be more firm and clear in her thinking towards Communist China. Unfortunately, I do not see it and on the contrary I see the same kind of thinking that they experienced

some time back when the Minister tried to prevent my going abroad. I think the same confusion seems to prevail in the External Affairs Ministry.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Which Minister ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : The Minister of External Affairs. I thought I said it very clearly.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : How did he prevent you from going abroad ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : He tried his best and I had to appeal to the Prime Minister, late Lal Bahadur Shastri.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : And you went.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I would like to remind this House that when the Minister from Taiwan came here, seeing our difficulties he offered to present us with 100 tonnes of Taiwan rice of the quick-growing and high-yielding variety which we lack very much here. Had we taken that advice, perhaps we would not have had to go in for so much of this PL 480 aid that we are now taking ? When the Rockefeller Foundation offered to station their Rice Research Station here, this country spurned that offer saying that we had so much rice in this country that we did not want it here. And now we are taking seeds from that very station which has now been stationed in the Philippines. Why do we do things in such folly ? Why don't we do things at the right time ? If we do not do things at the right time, then naturally we are faced with such a situation.

I would consider it a very great failing on the part of the Government that they did not send a representative to the Asian Pacific Conference of Foreign Ministers, that was held a few weeks ago in Seoul.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : Just as another party has a home outside, you also now have one, it seems.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : We should have a common defence policy.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The Communists have lost all hope in South-East Asia and they have been liquidated completely.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : We have the same wrong policy in our dealings with Israel. Israel is a free democratic country of Asia. It has become a modern State by hard work and they have converted a desert into blooming fertile fields, while those who are so jealous of them are lagging behind.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : There I agree with you.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Thank you.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : Whose land ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : What is our Government doing ? We refuse to learn from them. When tourists from Israel want to come here they have difficulties. When they want to buy things from here then also they have difficulties. I do not know what type of a foreign policy we have. I do not know what we have gained by not recognising Israel. This act of recognising Israel, I am told, is likely to offend the Arab League. Now, I do not know what this Arab League is. I cannot understand it, whether it is a real Arab League or only a sort of hand-maid which President Nasser has planted. Then we have some representative here, some Mr. Maqsood.

SHRI A. D. MANI : He has the rank of an Ambassador.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : And what does he do ? He abuses us and insults us.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : He says that this country went to the help of Egypt during the Suez Canal crisis out of motives of self-interest. Was a greater lie, a more blatant lie ever said ? I am surprised that the External Affairs Minister had not asked him to pack up and go home.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I will not ask him to do that because he is a very distinguished Arab leader and his statements have been very helpful. And I would also request the hon. Member to show some restraint when he criticises the representative of another country.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I do not want to say anything against anyone. But when anyone offends the self-respect of this country and tries to get away with a lie, it is the duty of the Foreign Minister to correct him straightway. Did Prime Minister Nehru support Egypt in the Suez crisis out of any motive of self-interest? Do we not know that the country suffered a lot of loss because of the increase in freights? Ships had to come round the Cape and we had to pay higher freight. Our shipments were delayed and yet the Foreign Minister says that he is a distinguished Minister and I should not say anything. I am prepared to say anything against anyone who speaks against the interests of my country, and I would request the hon. Minister also to do so. That he has not done so is a failure. Therefore, I would say that the policy of this Foreign Ministry is a total failure and the policy of this Foreign Minister has been a total failure. They are suffering from confused thinking. They do not have a clear mind. They do not know who are their friends and who are their enemies. As I told the Prime Minister the other day, in this country we are running after the wrong persons. You are running after the Arab League. You say they are your friends. Anyway, we learned that during the time the Pakistani aggression came. Still you don't know who are your friends and who are not. You are running after the wrong countries and, therefore, I say this foreign policy is not a proper policy and the present Foreign Minister has been a total failure and this policy needs to be revised completely.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR : Madam Deputy Chairman, before I offer a few remarks and make some observations on my amendment, I would like to devote a little attention to what my hon. friend, Shri Dahyabhai Patel, just now said. What he said rather under some excitement he may not very much appreciate when he reads his own speech in cold cyclo-styled pages. I could gather from what he said that he paid some nice encomiums to the present Government and the present Foreign Minister and he said that they had failed, that they were bankrupt and that they were misguided, that they had miscalculated and that they had no clear mind. If I am to be frank, I feel that I

can apply some of these adjectives to my hon. friend with greater truthfulness. Of the many speeches which I had the privilege of hearing from him in this House, there was none—to use his own word, not mine—which was more bankrupt than this one in constructive approach. It failed in its objective. It was absolutely misguided in its content and so far as its effect is concerned, he completely miscalculated and the reason for all that is today—and I listened most carefully to his speech—my hon. friend was not clear in his mind about what he was saying. I will pick out only a few points. It took away my breath when he gave his appreciation of what Pakistan's mind has been like during all these eighteen years, by the gesture that President Ayub offered for a common defence. My hon. friend failed to see what were the implications. Against whom is this defence to be? We were against having any alignment, against any military alliance and even today we refuse to adopt a common defence against anyone. We fight our own battles; we want to be non-aligned. Of course, my friend disagrees entirely with that point of view; that is another matter.

Secondly, about Taiwan, I have a little softer observation. I myself have felt that after so many years of Taiwan's existence as a separate Government we might perhaps mellow our attitude which was there 15 years back especially in view of the Chinese intransigent attitude.

Then he says we are running after the Arab countries. Ultimately we have to analyse what are the feelings, what is the motivation of a State's action in respect of any particular issue. Now he has branded our alliance with the Arab countries as something very misguided. One or two of them possibly expressed themselves in favour of Pakistan. But that is not the only issue between us. Wherever there has been a cause to be fought for the underdeveloped countries we have always been sailing together with the Arab countries. This is not the one issue alone that should determine our attitude.

Of course, I must congratulate my hon. friend for making an honest confession today of something that underlies perhaps

much of his thinking. He frankly said, 'I like Americans'. Well, we neither like nor dislike; we are friendly with them.

Then, he found quarrel with us for saying that in our fight with China we are fighting against Chinese imperialism, not against Communism. Our late Prime Minister has made it quite clear that our fight is not against Communism as such; otherwise we would have to fight every Communist country with whom we are friendly, Soviet Russia, and the countries of Eastern Europe. Our fight is not against Communism as such; our fight is against the Communists here when they are misguided, not against what they think but against how they behave.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : What about the Communists in your party ?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR : But Communism as such, we are not at daggers drawn; let it be quite clear.

Then, he made some observations about the Arab League and all that. I was almost saying that it is not too good a behaviour for us to go on castigating against the representative of a very respectable organisation because some time or other he has said things which are unpalatable to us. If they are absolutely something which touches our self-respect, let my hon. friend be quite sure that including the Foreign Minister, everyone of us will be there to protest against any bad behaviour but because we feel that somebody has behaved badly under a mistaken notion let us not behave ourselves badly.

Now, having dealt with all these points, Madam, . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Can I interrupt him for a minute ?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR : My hon. friend's party has a sufficient number of speakers and . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I just want a clarification. Since he has a clearer mind about everything, as was said by him, can I have an explanation from him on this particular point referred to by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, my leader ? He said that at one time this distinguished representative

of the Arab League had said that India got into the Suez Canal dispute only because of self-interest.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Only on account of self-interest ? I have not seen any such statement.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : What is the explanation of my friend, Mr. Karmarkar, as to whether it amounts to an insult to a country if a distinguished representative of a distinguished organisation alleges that or not ?

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : That statement is contradicted.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR : I am very glad that my friend gave me an opportunity of clarifying this. Madam, you will kindly extend my time by two minutes more which he has taken.

Firstly, I wish he checks up the fact as to what his leader actually said because he is not quite sure of what he said. Secondly, after he checks it up I wish he checks up from the source to find out whether what he has said is really correct. And thirdly, if somebody says to me or to my country's leaders that we have done something which along with other things, besides serving the world interests, has helped our own self-interests, I will not be offended. I must work for my self-interest. Any foreign policy that goes against the interests of my country, I would be against it. National interests first and everything else afterwards. And happily for us in this case what has happened ? Does my hon. friend want to put world interest first and the country's interests afterwards ? No; national interests first and if somebody tells me, 'It is all right; you say you have acted in the public interest but primarily you have acted in your own self-interest' I would say, 'My dear friend, yes; that is quite all right. I have got two objects to serve, one world peace and the other is my own national interest.' And happily it happens today that our national interests are exactly concurrent with world peace. There is no question of any abuse. So, I wish my hon. friend takes it realistically as he takes the politics in his own State. Let us be realistic. Let us understand what they have said.

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar]

Supposing tomorrow my friend were to say to me, 'Mr. Karmarkar, you have served a little of your own self-interest in making your speech', very well, if I have served the public interest by the correctness of the views that I express and if I serve a little of my self-interest also by a good speech, what is the harm? There is nothing to be ashamed of one's self-interest or a nation's self-interest. Is my hon. friend prepared to say that all that he says is absolutely in the public interest and nothing is in his own interests? Madam, relevantly he has invited my attention to the very point that I was trying to make that in framing our foreign policy it is only by that test that we should see whether we have succeeded or failed in our foreign policy. In a move here or a move there there may be an error in a thousand correct things but that is another matter. What has been our objective? Apart from the fact that we have supported anti-colonialism which means freedom for everybody, democracy, that is, rights for the common man . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : And Communism.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR : . . . and socialism. If my hon. friend were here he would have supported Communism also but I do not include that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : That is exactly why I am not there.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR : But then above all, the policy of non-alignment comes to our mind. That is the only policy that is consistent with world peace. We have to test our foreign policy by that one test. Many of the countries, thanks to our support, thanks to destiny, thanks to their own efforts, are free today and many of the countries are trying to achieve democracy and there is much more development of socialism in the world today. The cause which should hold our attention today is the cause of world peace. I will not delve into history but even my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai, will find that some objective observers of international politics have said, have put it on record, that it is perhaps owing to our late Prime Minister's efforts that twice or thrice a world conflict has been avoided.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Quite right.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR : And it has also been said that India has played a greater decisive role in world affairs than is justified by her strength as a country. We are a poor country but today whether my friends on the other side like it or not, we are—and I say it in a spirit of humility—one of the most decisive countries in the world so far as world events are concerned. What India has said, what India says, is something of significance in every capital of the world. Let us not denigrate ourselves; let us not in the course of excitement try to think less of ourselves as a country than what we really are. This is not to make us feel proud. Why is it that it has assumed that stature in world politics today? It is because of our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlalji's policies, Lal Bahadurji's policies and the same policies now being followed by our present distinguished Prime Minister. There is no question about that. Even today it requires some boldness to be able to say, 'Stop bombing in Vietnam'. If we wanted to flatter someone, we could just as well have said, let there be peace.

सर्वेपि भवन्तु सुखिनः

सर्वे सन्तु विरोमयाः ॥

We have taken some risk of being misunderstood in that matter but we have not hesitated to say that just as we said in the old days : no going forward beyond the 36th Parallel. Therefore, my hon. friend, Shri Dahyabhai Patel and those who think like him should think of this in that perspective as to whether by and large our foreign policy has been directed towards the promotion of peace in the world or not. I will not wax eloquent nor take long. Even taking the opinion of third parties unassociated with our efforts, India has been maintaining this attitude and has actively participated in the efforts for the promotion of peace. It is a small matter but why is it that India has to be the Chairman of all the three International Commissions in the most crucial region in the whole world, namely, South East Asia? Why was it? It is because both the contending parties thought that if there was any one significant country which could be trusted with objectivity and impartiality it is India and India alone

That is the significance of our chairmanship of these international commissions in South-East Asia. I wish my friend appreciated that point of view, because in his anxiety to condemn the Government and the Treasury Benches, I wish he did not forget that any observations coming from an Opposition leader has some weight and I would not like his name to be associated with remarks which are either loose or something which could be misunderstood outside the country also. I appreciate his sincerity, though I am not able to appreciate the wisdom of his remarks. Now, that is where it is.

Now, I come to my next point. Now, the question is whether our foreign policy serves us or not. Our policy has been a policy of promotion of peace. What has been our objective? Why did Jawaharlalji always promote the cause of world peace? For the good of the world and for the good of my own country also we want peace. Unless there is peace in the world, there would not be peace in India. Unless there is peace in India for a number of years, we cannot achieve the country-wide development, which we would like to promote, for the elimination of poverty from this country. I do hope my friend concedes that these efforts for peace have led us on to economic development. Today, India is one of the privileged countries, if I may say so, while standing on its own, without sacrificing its self-respect, without having any strings attached, it is able to invite economic aid from all countries, from the United States, from the USSR, from Canada and all other independent countries. In fact, it appears that everybody is in a race to help India. Why? It is because they look upon India as a peaceful, gentle country, which should be helped to make economic progress, so that it might continue to be the mainstay for maintaining the peace of the world. We can blame the United States saying, well, there is some object behind that. It is because India is a stem against communism they are helping us. President Truman, when he initiated the Point Four Programme, said that it was not altruistic. It was selfish, meant to help America. All right. In helping us if it helps America also, why should we worry about it? The USSR may be feeling that India is the one country which has refused to go under any-

one and, therefore, it is good for them to help us and in so doing it has helped them also. Now, if it helps them and if it helps us without sacrificing our independence, why should we grudge? If my friend, Dahyabhai Patel, helps in the economic development of the country and if it helps him also, why should I grudge the help? God bless everybody. So far as the actual effect of this policy of non-alignment and promotion of peace is concerned, we did see that during the short period of fifteen years we have been able to achieve industrial progress whereby we can tell ourselves today that we can be Swadeshi in respect of everything, right from a pin to a motor car and so on. I can altogether dispense with anything produced in any other country and this is only possible because we have received aid for our steel plants, we have received aid for our heavy industries, we have received aid for our consumer goods industries and everything else. Without that aid we could not have achieved this progress.

Now, a lacuna has been found, and that is in the field of agriculture. Even there last year's drought has made us forget the fact that in spite of the growth of population in this country during the last fifteen years or eighteen years, our imports have been relatively low. I remember very well what we used to import; during the years 1948 and 1949 our average import of foodgrains from outside was about 3 to 4 million tonnes. In the meantime, our population has increased by 25 per cent. within the last ten years. In spite of this our imports of foodstuffs from outside have not been commensurate with the growth of population. We have definitely made progress in agriculture. Let us not forget that fact because of our difficulty. And this progress would not have been possible, unless aid had come to us from all quarters.

I would not like to take more time of the House. It has been often said and it has been said during the recent Indo-Pakistan conflict that we are trying to be friends with everybody, but where are our friends. It reminds me of a story where a child asks its mother. You invite everybody to lunch and dinner but why is it that nobody invites us? If it was a child that had asked the question, I could have understood

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

it. Here we have serious-minded people. Where are your friends? We have refused to enter into military alliance with anybody. We have refused to get down from a standard, just as Pakistan did. They flirted with America and they got arms. They are flirting with China and they are now getting tanks. If flirting with a third party in private life is not something very honourable, it is also not an honourable thing in public life. (*Interruption*). Dr. Sapru has just interjected that in private life it may be excused. My friend's actual experience is something different. My own experience has been different and I do not forget the fact that he belongs to a little more of an older and colourful generation than I have been. They could afford it and they could taste it. We could neither afford it nor taste it, but this is neither here nor there. Apart from the fact that we have refused to enter into military alliances—now Pakistan finds friends, one or two, across the table—we also did find friends. Our recent experience is this. During the course of the visit of the parliamentary delegation abroad—six of them went outside—we found a uniform spirit of friendship everywhere. We did find a very good friend in Malaysia. At the time of the Chinese aggression, Tunku Abdul Rahman, when he was here, declared from the Red Fort, that his country was with India. Not only that. He started a fund known as the Tunku Abdul Rahman Save Democracy Fund. He collected an amount of Rs. 12½ lakhs. It was a good gesture. Even though it is a Muslim State, it is a secular State. He is a Muslim. The majority of them are Muslims. Still that did not prevent them from saying to Pakistan what they did in the Security Council. A friend like that is very precious. Let us try and build ourselves up with 46 crores of people, with all our present resources. Let us build up. They have seen what we could do by attacking us in surprise. They will find the same experience, or worse experience, and things like that. An American editor from the 'Newsweek', which was consistently unsympathetic to us, came here and after his visit, said in so many words that Pakistan has been so much damaged that in the near future they will not find it very easy again to attack India. Let them. We must be prepared. Our Defence Minister

declared the other day that we are prepared. Now, that should be the outlook, that should be the way in which we should think about it.

Finally, I have a little gentle suggestion to make. I should like to say that our Foreign Ministry—day by day I have been watching it for the last eighteen years—have been showing a distinct improvement. It has been my recent experience, a pleasant experience, in South-East Asia, going along with five other esteemed colleagues in a delegation, to have found some of our Ambassadors top competent. Our Ambassador in Thailand, our Ambassador in Cambodia, our Ambassador in Malaysia—I should not like to give them less than hundred marks for their sincerity and their capacity. Things have improved and things are improving. There is no doubt about it. I should also like to compliment our Foreign Minister on the bold lead that he is giving to his Ministry. It is rather a difficult Ministry. If everything goes on all right, no thanks. If anything fails, then, of course, there is condemnation. But there are other things that require improvement. Now, it was a dismal experience for me—I do not wish that this remark of mine should land anybody, because sometimes the wrong person gets landed rather than the right person. It was a dismal experience of mine. Almost within a month of the Pakistan conflict the Information Ministry had brought out a very nice brochure on the deeds of heroism of our Jawans. We got it in Cambodia, but we could not either for love or for money get a single copy of it in Singapore or Malaysia. I should say that it was due to ineptitude and incompetence on the part of someone. There is no doubt about it. I do not want any disciplinary action to be taken, because I know that the fault will be laid on some wrong quarter.

The first suggestion I should like to make is this. Our publicity and these things should be looked into better and you should see that our pamphlets of this year reach this year at least. Now, the second suggestion I should like to make is this. I wish that our distinguished Minister of External Affairs and his Ministry thought of sending, a little more frequently, non-officials abroad. I do not mean only Members of Parliament. I wish there was

some organisation like the British Council, whereby some distinguished lecturers from here went round American universities, went round German universities and other countries. I wish a positive effort made to see to it that the people of this country and the people outside were brought together intimately both on an intellectual and popular level. I should like to make a special plea in respect of South East Asia. If I might say so without disrespect to the sovereignty of the respective countries, as many times as I have gone there, I have felt that I have gone to another part of India. When I went to Thailand and saw the Thai people, when I went to Cambodia or when I went to Laos, I did not feel that I had gone outside India at all. I feel they are our people. If this House will bear with me and if my esteemed friend, the Foreign Minister, will bear with me in these two minutes which I am now taking, the least has been done to keep up cultural contacts. I am not exaggerating; I am not castigating; I am not commenting; I am not criticising. Apart from the parliamentary delegation that went to South East Asia, apart from the visit of a Minister, the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, in the recent past, apart from the ancient visits of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, we appear to have taken South East Asia just for granted. It is all westward; all our cultural delegations westward; all our Ministers' visits westward; every distinguished delegation westward. We take these countries for granted. Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Singapore—we take them for granted. This I am saying not of my own accord, but they say that this is the first significant delegation that has ever come from India. They ask: Why not send a nice cultural troupe? I am mentioning one of the things for which our people were thirsting, for instance, a delegation of playback singers like Lata Mangeshkar and others. No cultural delegation has gone there worth the name. Why not, for instance, invite Princess Bhopa Devi from Cambodia, the distinguished daughter of the Cambodian Head of State and take her round and arrange her cultural performances?

I do not want to be hard, and this is my last sentence. All I want to plead is this. I shall take this question up with the Foreign Minister. After having mentioned

it so publicly, perhaps unnecessarily, it is good for me to take it up privately also. I wish repeated attempts are made to have cultural exchanges, to have intellectual exchanges, between South East Asia and India.

I beg to be pardoned for the five minutes more that I have taken on account of your indulgence and I conclude.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : उपसभापति जी, सारे संसार में समय-समय पर देश की स्थितियों में परिवर्तन होता है और इस कारण यह स्वाभाविक है कि हमारे देश के उन देशों के साथ होनेवाले सम्बन्धों को भी हम बार-बार रिव्यू करें। विदेश नीति का निर्धारण करते समय यह बात हमको साफ तौर पर समझ लेनी चाहिये कि हम किन्हीं विशेष प्रकार के सिद्धान्तों से बंधे न रहें। आखिर देश की नीतियां अपने ही देश के हित के लिये होती हैं। कोई भी मनोवैज्ञानिक बोझा या कोई बंधा-बंधाया दृष्टिकोण अगर हमारे दिमाग पर रहा, देश के हित के लिये कमजोर पग हम उठाएं और हमारे सिद्धान्तों में कहीं संघर्ष आता है—अगर इन दोनों बातों की दुविधा रहेगी तो मैं समझता हूं कि जिस मतलब के लिये हम विदेश नीति का निर्धारण करना चाहते हैं वह विदेश नीति देश के हितों की ठीक प्रकार से रक्षा नहीं कर सकेगी।

दुनिया में शांति रहे, परस्पर के देशों में सहअस्तित्व हो और कोई भी देश जान-बूझ कर किसी के साथ लगाव की नीति न अपनाए—यह दुनिया में एक स्थायी शांति और देशों के सवालों को हल करने के लिये अच्छे सिद्धान्त हैं और हमें यह कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि इन्हीं सिद्धान्तों को अधिक-से-अधिक हम लागू कर इन पर रहने की कोशिश करें। लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ जो दुनिया आज है वह इन सिद्धान्तों पर नहीं चलती यहां पर गुट बने हुए हैं। गुटों के आधार पर सोचा जाता है। हम केवल एक गुट से अलग रहें या दूसरे गुट के साथ मिल जायें, इसी विवाद में हम न रहें। जब आज हमारे ऊपर संकट है, युद्ध है, हम गुटों की राजनीति के शिकार बनें तो

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

हमें इस बात की कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि हम केवल दूसरे गुटों की रचना ही न करें, स्वयं भारत भी विश्व की सारी समस्याओं का केन्द्र है, इस आधार पर हम इसका विचार करें और अपनी इस नीति को इस केन्द्र को भी मजबूत बनाने की दृष्टि से हम बनाएं। बदली हुई परिस्थिति में हमें अपनी नीतियों को भी बदलना चाहिये। हमने अगर यह न किया तो हम केवल सिद्धान्तों के चक्कर में फंसे रह जायेंगे क्योंकि आज हमारे ऊपर पाकिस्तान का संकट है।

मैं बधाई देता हूं रक्षा मंत्री जी को इस बात के लिये कि उन्होंने इस बढ़ते हुए संकट को सार्वजनिक रूप से स्वीकार करने का साहस प्रगट किया। पाकिस्तान के अन्दर होने वाली तैयारियां बहुत मर्तबा छिपाई गई हैं। हमारे देश के लोगों को इस इम्प्रेसन में रखा गया है कि कोई खतरा नहीं है। आज उन्होंने साहसपूर्वक इस बढ़ते हुए खतरे की तरफ देश का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है, हम इस खतरे को छोटा न समझें। सवाल खड़ा होता है इस बढ़ते हुए खतरे का सामना करने के लिये हमने अपनी तैयारियों को बढ़ाया है अथवा नहीं। पिछले दिनों में चीन और पाकिस्तान के बीच अणु शस्त्रों की दृष्टि से, अणु आयुधों की सज्जा-सामान में मदद देने की दृष्टि से भी एक समझौता हुआ है। यहां बहुत दिनों से अणु शस्त्रों के सम्बन्ध में नीति बताई जा रही है। अणु आयुधों का एक खतरा है सारी दुनिया को। इसको रोकने का हम प्रयास करें, रोकने में हम पार्टी बनें, हम अगुआ बनें और सारी दुनिया को हम अणु शस्त्र के खतरे से बचा सकें, यह प्रयत्न सराहनीय है। इसमें जितना आगे बढ़ सकें उतना हमें बढ़ना चाहिये, लेकिन मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूं कि जो तात्कालिक संकट हमारे ऊपर है, चीन और पाकिस्तान में अणु शस्त्र के सम्बन्ध में हुए नये समझौते का कोई नया कागनीसेंस वह इस प्रश्न पर लेने के लिये

तैयार है या इसके बावजूद भी वह अपनी उसी नीति को उसी नुक्ते-नज़र से देखती है और आज भी अपने हठ को बनाए रखना चाहती है। आज अगर पाकिस्तान ने सैनिक शक्ति बढ़ाई है, चीन की ताकत से पूर्वी पाकिस्तान आज, अगर चीन का एक शस्त्रागार बन कर खड़ा है, पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान को अमरीका से सहायता और परीक्ष रूप से मदद मिली है, पिछले अगस्त-सितम्बर के महीने में हमारी सेनाओं ने उसकी आक्रमण करनेवाली ताकत को जो चोट पहुंचाई थी अगर उसने उसकी क्षतिपूर्ति कर ली है, अगर उसने अपनी सेना की संख्या बढ़ाई है तो इस दृष्टि से हम लोग यहां क्या कदम उठा रहे हैं? अगर नहीं तो केवल इस घोषणा करने से कि वहां पर सैनिक सामग्री बढ़ी है उससे कुछ होगा नहीं, इससे कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। वहां केवल सैनिक सामग्री ही बढ़ी नहीं। आज हमारी सीमाओं पर प्रत्यक्ष रूप से घुसपैठ की कार्यवाहियां बढ़ी हैं। जम्मू के क्षेत्र में, मेंढर, रजौरी और कालाकोट के क्षेत्रों में समाचार है कि 7,000 से अधिक लोग, पाकिस्तान के घुसपैठिए, आए हैं। 20 हजार के लगभग लोगों को पाक-अधिकृत काश्मीर में ही ट्रेनिंग दी जा रही है और ये वही लोग हैं जो अगस्त-सितम्बर के दिनों में आक्रमण के समय पाकिस्तान के अन्दर चले गये थे। आज इन सारे संकटों का हमें जायजा लेना होगा और हमें अपनी सैनिक ताकत, सेना की संख्या, आधुनिकतम शस्त्र बनाने की हमारी तैयारी, अणुबम के बारे में हमारी नीति—इन सब के बारे में हमें फैसले लेने होंगे।

हमें इस बात को याद रखना चाहिये कि भारत जब-जब अपने इन दुश्मन पड़ोसियों से हारा है तो यहां के मारल के कम होने के कारण नहीं हारा बल्कि हमारी इन्फिरियारिटी इन आर्म्स का बहुत बड़ा कारण रही है और अगर हम अपने इन पड़ोस के देशों की इन तैयारियों को सही रूप में देखना चाहते हैं तो यह इन्फिरियारिटी कम हो इस दृष्टि से भी हमें व्यावहारिक पग उठाने पड़ेंगे।

आज या कल हम ताशकन्द घोषणा की चर्चा करते चले जाये तो इससे समस्याये हल नहीं होंगी। हम कितना भी चाहें कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हम दोस्ती के साथ रहे लेकिन आखिर ताली एक हाथ से नहीं बजती। ताशकन्द घोषणा के आधार पर हमने एकतरफा कदम उठाये हैं। हमने व्यापार प्रारम्भ करने के लिये अपना हाथ बढ़ाया, हमने उसके जन्म किये गये सामान को रिलीज करने की बात कही। मैं पूछता हूँ कि हमने इनको पकड़ा क्यों था, हमने व्यापार पर पाबन्दी क्यों लगाई थी, हम किस कारणों से इसके लिये मजबूर हुए। पाकिस्तान ने हम पर हमला किया था, पाकिस्तान ने हमारे जहाज रोके थे। हम चाहते तो हम पाकिस्तान के जहाजों को उसी समय जाने दे सकते थे लेकिन हमने क्यों रोक लिया, क्या केवल इसलिये रोक कि उनमें कोई सैनिक सामग्री जा रही थी, क्या वही जहाज हमने रोके, हमने ऐसे जहाज भी रोके जिनमें सैनिक सामग्री नहीं थी। आखिर, ये ढंग है आक्रमण करने वाले देश को सही रास्ते पर लाने के लिये, उस पर प्रेशर कायम रखने के लिये। अभी तक उसकी मनोवृत्ति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं दिखाई देता लेकिन प्रेशर कायम रखने की इन सारी चीजों में हम ढिलाई वरतते जा रहे हैं और अब हम दोतरफा बातचीत के सहारे, व्यापार का मार्ग खोलने के लिये, आपस के ट्रेड रिलेणंस को कायम रखने के लिये यह कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि वाइलेट्टल टाक्स हों। हम अपने हाथ में से तीर को निकल जाने दे और फिर यह अपेक्षा करे कि पाकिस्तान जिसमें कहीं भी परिवर्तित मनोवृत्ति की गुंजाइश नहीं दिखाई देती वहां गुडविल और गुड-कामेंस पैदा हो। हम शायद इस प्रकार के कुछ प्रेशर्स में से ही नार्मलैसी की तरफ जाने के लिये आगे बढ़ सकते थे लेकिन हम उन प्रेशर्स को छोड़ते चले जाये और फिर नार्मलैसी की अपेक्षा करें। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें इस कदम को रोबने के लिये कोई न कोई निर्णय करना चाहिये।

M69RS/66-5

हमें याद रखना चाहिये कि जब पाकिस्तान से हमारी लड़ाई चल रही थी तब युनाइटेड नेशंस की तरफ से हमें एकतरफा लड़ाई बन्द करने की बातें तक कही गईं। बहुत बड़ी चीज थी। एकतरफा गुडविल जेस्चर्स प्रकट करने के लिये सिद्धांत रूप से हम किसी भी कदम का सहारा लेने के लिये तैयार हो सकते हैं तो क्या हम एकतरफा लड़ाई बन्द कर देते जब कि युनाइटेड नेशंस हमें कह रहा था कि ऐसा करो। लेकिन हमने उस समय फैसला किया कि यह वाइलेट्टल एक्शन ही हो सकता है, युनिलेट्टल लड़ाई बन्द होना कोई माने नहीं रखता। हमने युनाइटेड नेशंस की नाराजगी की भी परवाह न करते हुए लड़ाई को तब तक बन्द करने का फैसला नहीं किया जब तक कि पाकिस्तान भी उसके लिये रजामन्द नहीं हो गया। आखिर, युनिलेट्टल स्टेप्स लेने की कुछ मर्यादायें हैं और हम ऐसी कई चीजें करते चले जायें जो कि मूल समस्या के उलझने के और कारण बनें।

पाकिस्तान तो ताशकन्द में काश्मीर पर चर्चा करना चाहता था लेकिन हमने जाने तक से इन्कार कर दिया, हमने कहा कि अगर काश्मीर पर ही चर्चा करना है तो हमारे वहां जाने का कोई मतलब नहीं, हम उस पर कोई चर्चा करना नहीं चाहते, काश्मीर का सवाल तय हो चुका है, उसकी सावरेनटी किसी प्रकार का डिस्प्यूट नहीं बन सकती। आज पाकिस्तान फिर कहता है कि काश्मीर पर चर्चा हमें नहीं करना तो और किसी चीज की चर्चा करने की हमें जरूरत नहीं। लेकिन हम उसके लिये भी तैयार हैं और हम यह आड़ लेना चाहते हैं कि हम कोई विषय निर्धारित नहीं करना चाहते, हम कोई सूची बना कर बात करने के लिये जाने को तैयार नहीं। तो हम इन्डाइरेक्टली इस बात को कहने के लिये तैयार हैं कि अगर पाकिस्तान काश्मीर पर भी चर्चा करना चाहता है तो हम उसको रूल आउट नहीं कर रहे हैं, हम उस पर चर्चा करेंगे। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि ताशकन्द की भाषा के आधार पर जो कदम

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

हमने उठाया था हम उससे भी एक कदम पीछे यहां पर जा रहे हैं। हम ताशकन्द साफ तौर पर इस बात को कह कर गये थे कि किसी प्रकार की आफिशियल टाक्स में काश्मीर पर कोई चर्चा नहीं होगी। आज जब हम बातचीत करने के लिये जाना चाहते हैं तो काश्मीर जो आफिशियल एजेंडा से निकल गया है उसमें कदापि शामिल नहीं होगा, हम काश्मीर पर कभी किसी कीमत पर चर्चा नहीं करेंगे, बिल्कुल स्पष्ट शब्दों में हम इस बात की घोषणा करें और अगर पाकिस्तान काश्मीर के अलावा और किसी विषय पर बातचीत नहीं करना चाहता तो इस प्रकार की बातचीत के मामले में जो हम उतावलापन दिखा रहे हैं, जो हमारी नींद हराम हो रही है उस बातचीत को किये बिना हमें साफ तौर पर इसे कहना चाहिये और इस उत्सुकता और इस उदारता को निश्चित रूप से हमें कम करना चाहिये। मैं यह मांग करूँ कि भारत सरकार अपने विदेश मंत्री के द्वारा यहां पर इस बात की स्पष्ट नीति निर्धारित करे कि जब तक पाकिस्तान के द्वारा काश्मीर के प्रश्न के अतिरिक्त जो देशों के बीच में अन्य प्रश्न बने हुये हैं उन पर बातचीत की स्वीकृति नहीं होती तब तक हम तैयार नहीं होंगे।

मैं जानता हूँ कि बहुत-से सवाल दोनों देशों के बीच में हैं, पुराने समय से चले आ रहे बहुत-से कर्जा की वसूली का भी सवाल है, आये हुए शरणार्थी बन्धुओं की छोड़ी हुई जायदाद का सवाल है, पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में हमारे हिन्दू बन्धुओं के ऊपर आज भी अत्याचार हो रहा है, पाक सरकार उनके प्रति डिफरेंशियल ट्रीटमेंट कर रही है, उन पर प्रतिदिन अत्याचार होते हैं। तो उन प्रश्नों को भी लेने का सवाल है। केनाल वाटर डिस्पूट है, जिसके लिये हमने पहले यह कहा कि चाहे घाटा हो गया हो लेकिन हमें पाकिस्तान की दोस्ती मिल जायगी। अभी पिछले दिनों पानी की कमी के कारण जो थोड़ा पानी कम दिया गया उससे पाकिस्तान

की नाराजगी हमें मिली और आगे आनेवाली सारे नहरी समझौतों में यह प्रश्न भी तय होना बाकी है। तो अनेक प्रश्न हैं जिन पर चर्चा होनी चाहिये लेकिन यह बात साफ है कि काश्मीर का सवाल नहीं है जिस पर चर्चा होनी है, जिस पर कभी भी चर्चा की जानी है और ऐसा नहीं है कि सरकार का कोई भी प्रतिनिधि पाकिस्तान में जा कर या पाकिस्तान के तुमाइंदे को हिन्दुस्तान में बुला कर काश्मीर के सवाल पर चर्चा करे, यह निश्चित बात है। अगर हम ऐसे नहीं करते तो दुनिया के और देशों में—जिनको हमारे काश्मीर पर स्वयं के सिद्धान्त को समझने में तकलीफ महसूस होती है कि हम क्या करना चाहते हैं, कभी क्या कहते हैं, कभी उस पर बातचीत करने पर तैयार हो जाते हैं, उनके अलावा जो देश वास्तव में काश्मीर के इस सवाल पर हमारी हिमायत करना चाहते हैं उनके भी दिमाग में हम गलतफहमी पैदा करते हैं। तो हमें इन सारे सिद्धान्त को स्पष्ट करना चाहिये।

आज इन चीजों को किये बिना, अपने स्वयं के सिद्धान्त को क्लीयर किये बिना, हम दुनिया में दोस्त अपने ढूढना चाहें, यह चाहें कि दुनिया भिन्न-भिन्न रूप से हमारे मामले में हमारी मदद करने के लिये आये, लेकिन हम शायद स्वयं अपनी बदली हुई भाषाओं से, समय-समय पर बदल रहे उलट रहे सिद्धान्त से, उनके दिमाग में कंप्यूजन पैदा करते हैं। तो इसको हमें स्पष्ट करना चाहिये। अमेरिका ने भी पिछले दिनों में पाकिस्तान को मदद दी है, युद्ध के बाद भी अभी उसको पुरजे देने के मामले में उसकी क्षतिपूर्ति करने का प्रयत्न किया है। आखिर अमेरिका ने पहले भी हथियार दिये थे, वावजूद उन आश्वासनों के कि पाकिस्तान उन हथियारों का उपयोग हमारे खिलाफ नहीं करेगा, साम्यवाद के खिलाफ जो वह लड़ाई लड़ रहा है उसके अंदर उसका उपयोग होगा। पाकिस्तान ने उन हथियारों का उपयोग हमारे खिलाफ किया है और अमेरिका उसमें कुछ नहीं कर सका। आज भी उसके कोई भी

इन्टेन्शंस रहे हो, पाकिस्तान की नीयत में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं है। किसी भी प्रकार से अमरीकी शस्त्र पाकिस्तान को मिलना, पाकिस्तान की क्षतिपूर्ति करने में अमेरिका का सहयोग मिलना, ये हमें साफ तौर से समझना चाहिये, एक भारत विरोधी कार्य होगा। अमेरिका को हमें इस बात का स्पष्ट संकेत देना चाहिये कि अमेरिका और भारत के सम्बन्धों पर प्रभाव डाले बिना वह चीज नहीं रहेगी।

रूस से भी कुछ निवेदन हमें करने की आवश्यकता है। ताशकंद के अन्दर मीटिंग बुलाकर काश्मीर के मसले पर संघर्ष के दिनों में उसने जो व्यवहार अपनाया था उस पर उसने परदा डालने की कोशिशें कीं। उसने इस सारी समस्या को जिस तरह सुलझाने का प्रयत्न किया, उसमें हमें कोई आपत्ति की बात नहीं। पिछले दिनों पाकिस्तान का एक सैनिक मिशन रूस गया था। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस बात को कहा है कि अभी तक रूस ने पाकिस्तान को शस्त्र देने के मामले में कोई वचन नहीं दिया है, अभी तक उसने शस्त्र दिये नहीं। मैं चाहता हूं, हमें इस बात का भी उसमें एक आश्वासन लेना चाहिये कि रूस भविष्य में भी पाकिस्तान का जब तक हमारे ऊपर यह आक्रामक रवैया बना है, जब तक चीन के साथ सांठगांठ से उसके आक्रमण का खनरा, आक्रमण का डर, भारत के ऊपर है तब तक रूस की कोई भी सैनिक सहायता पाकिस्तान को प्राप्त नहीं होगी और इस प्रकार का आश्वासन हम उससे ले। भविष्य में भी कोई ऐसा कदम अगर रूस के द्वारा उठे तो वह हमारे प्रति रूस का अमैत्रीपूर्ण व्यवहार होगा, यह हमें रूस को निश्चित रूप से समझाना चाहिये।

मैं समझता हूं अगर हम और भी जो है दक्षिण-पूर्व एशिया में अनेक मित्र देश हैं, उनके साथ संबंध बढ़ाएं तो अच्छा हो। उन देशों में अनेकों भारतीय भी हैं, भारतीय रहे हैं, उनके भी प्रश्नों का विचार हमें करना चाहिये। ब्रह्म देश में अनेकों भारतीय थे

लेकिन जहां पर व्यापार का और उद्योग का सम्पूर्ण राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लिये जाने के कारण ये सब लोग वहां पर निस्सहाय हो गये। बहुत बड़ी संख्या में उन्हें भारत लौट कर आना पड़ा है। उनकी सब चीजे वहां छूट गई, भारतीय दूतावास में वे बहुत-सी चीजें छोड़ आए। हमें अपने विदेश मंत्रालय के द्वारा इस बात की कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि हमारे भारतीय जो सामान छोड़कर आए, जो कि वहां भारतीय दूतावास में छूटी पड़ी है, वे किसी न किसी प्रकार से भारत लाई जा सकें। भारत में आने के बाद भी उनके ऊपर कई कस्टम के, बाकी के, वायदे कानून तोड़ने के मुकदमें चल रहे हैं। हमें विदेश मंत्रालय के जरिये इस बात का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि वे लोग जो वहां में पीड़ित होकर, उजड़ कर, यहां आए हैं, उनके बारे में हम कुछ माननीय दृष्टिकोण अपनाएं और उनकी तकलीफों को हल करने की कोशिश करें। लंका में भी अभी डेढ़ लाख भारतीय ऐसे हैं कि जिनका प्रश्न खटाई में पड़ा है, अभी तक उनके सवालों को हम तय नहीं कर पाए। इस सवाल को भी हमें जल्द से जल्द लेना चाहिये।

वियतनाम के प्रश्न पर यहां लड़ाई को बन्द कराने की जो हम कोशिश कर रहे हैं, वह सही दृष्टिकोण है, हम उसको अपनाएं। लेकिन हमें अनुभव होना चाहिये कि एक तरफा अप्रोच कभी किसी भी प्रकार की सफलता नहीं लाएगा। हम अगर इस बात के लिये प्रयत्नशील हैं, और होना चाहिये, कि वहां मानव-संहार रुके, तो हमें इस बात की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये कि वहां के भविष्य का निर्धारण करने के लिये वही के लोगों को अपने भाग्य का फैसला करने के लिये पूर्ण अवसर मिलेगा और उस व्यवस्था के लिये कान्फ्रेंस टेबुल पर बैठने की हम दूसरी तरफ से भी तैयारी प्रकट करवाएं। दोनों तरफ के प्रयत्नों के सामूहिक निष्कर्ष में ही, मेरा निवेदन है, हम समस्या को हल कर पायेंगे।

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

मुझे अंत में सभापति महोदया, केवल मारिशस के लोगों के संबंध में निवेदन करना है। वहां स्वतंत्रता देने के बारे में पिछले दिनों में बातें हुई हैं लेकिन आज भी अंग्रेजी हुकूमत के द्वारा जो कोशिशें वहां चल रही हैं, वहां पर बेनवेल आयोग बिठाया गया, वह अल्पसंख्यकों को संरक्षण देने के नाम पर चुनाव क्षेत्र का परिसीमन कर रहा है और जिस तरीके से परिसीमन कर रहा है उसमें यह डर है कि मारिशस के छोटे-छोटे टुकड़े हो जायें और एक अल्पमत, डीलमिटेशन के इस तरीके से, एक बहुमत के रूप में वहां पर कुछ राजनैतिक विचारों को प्रभावीरूप से रखने में कामयाब हो जायेगा। हमें अपनी तरफ से कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि वह बेनवेल कमीशन कोल्ड स्टोरेज में रख दिया जाय, उसके ऊपर वहां की सरकार काम न करे और वहां के लोगों को जो एक स्वाभाविक स्वतंत्रता का अधिकार अपनी राजनीति के, अपने भविष्य के, निर्धारण करने के लिये उचित अवसर के साथ मिलना चाहिये वह मिले और हमें अपने विदेश मंत्रालय के द्वारा अपने गुड आफिसेज का प्रयोग करके वहां एक उचित परिस्थिति निर्माण करने के लिये कोशिश करनी चाहिये धन्यवाद।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Madam Deputy Chairman, I am going to do something which a Member of Parliament should not do while speaking on a subject like foreign affairs. I am going to think aloud and I am just going to give expression to some views which I have formed on the question of our foreign affairs. May I first congratulate the External Affairs Minister on the excellent speech he delivered? He has been to some of the friendly countries and I am glad that the Prime Minister's visit to the U.A.R., Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union was a success.

May I first say that when we talk of non-alignment we do not mean that we are a third bloc? Mr. Nehru was strongly opposed to the idea of a third bloc. I remember when Mr. Aneurin Bevan sug-

gested a third bloc he strongly differed from that view. His conception of non-alignment was that India's foreign policy will be of an independent character, that in pursuing its foreign policy India will be guided by her enlightened self-interest and the interest of the world at large.

May I first refer the question of Vietnam which is a most difficult question? It is threatening escalation of the war in Vietnam. Dr. Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam holds the highest place as Gandhiji held in India. I am not going into the controversy that there has been an attack or infiltration from the North on the South. But American bombing has exceeded all limits. Even a sober paper like the Manchester Guardian—I am very fond of that paper—said so.

4 P.M.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं सप्रू जी से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि नेहरू जी ने तीसरे ब्लाक को अपोज किया था या थर्ड फॉर्स को अपोज किया था?

श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू : थर्ड फॉर्म और थर्ड ब्लाक एक ही है।

I have mislaid that copy. 'The Manchester Guardian' in a recent issue has reminded the U.S.A. that she is carrying on for all practical purposes, a colonial war in Vietnam. I think the Americans get annoyed with the words 'imperialist aggression' but I am not using the words 'imperialist aggression'. I do not think that they mean to be aggressive but they are giving an impression to the world, the image of a new colonial power. That is something which President Johnson should remember. It is not we, Indians alone who condemn what is being done in Vietnam. It is the American Liberals who condemn it. The British Socialists and the British Liberals condemn it, and may I say one thing? There is one great difficulty in having a Geneva type of conference and it must be faced by us boldly. In a debate in the House of Commons, Mr. Michael Stewart, the Foreign Secretary, stated that one of the conditions on which Viet Cong is prepared to come to a conference is that it and it alone should be regarded as the representative of South Vietnam.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That is not fair.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I think, therefore, that Sardar Swaran Singh should undertake a journey to Hanoi and meet Dr. Ho Chi Minh and thrash out the question with him. He should put forward before him a suggestion which would make it possible for a conference either of the Geneva-type or some other type so that this war may not get escalated. If the war gets escalated, the whole of Asia will get involved . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : The whole world.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : . . . or for that matter the whole world and it will be a terrible disaster. Everything must be done to avert that disaster.

May I now come to the question of Pakistan ? We had a great statement from Mr. Chavan. I do not like chauvinistic and jingoistic statements. I have no soft corner for Pakistan but I think we should face some realities and there should be some elasticity about our policy in regard to Pakistan. I think it is necessary in the interests of the Asian sub-continent that there should be peace between India and Pakistan and I think that is the attitude of the Russian people also.

I would come to the vexed question of China. We all assume that we are a very righteous people and the assumption on which our Chinese policy is based is that all the right is with us and all the wrong is with the Chinese people. Again I have a copy of the "Guardian" . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : Burn it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : It should die with me. The article is headed 'Is China expansionist ?' and the "Guardian" reviews two books in this article, one by Mr. Francis Watson and the other by Dr. Alastair Land. Dr. Alastair Land is friendly to China and he says that China is not expansionist.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : The author is a friendly person to China. Is an elaborate comment by a certain person friendly to China relevant here ?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I am suggesting that perhaps it would be a good thing for our Foreign Minister to have a dialogue with China. I am suggesting that it would be a good thing for our Foreign Minister to send a high-powered Ambassador to find out what the Chinese intentions are and . . .

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : Is there any doubt ?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Our policy should not be based upon prejudices, should not be based upon the fact that we have rejected or accepted the Colombo Proposals but should be based on a proper appreciation of what the Chinese position is. I am not advocating a policy of surrender but I am advocating a policy of realism and a policy of realism requires that we should go deep into the motives which are influencing Chinese policy and the motives which are actuating Chinese policy.

Then I come to the question of Germany. I take some interest in this question. Mr. Nehru used to avoid talking about Germany in this House. Well, I find that there is reference to it in the joint Indo-Russian communique. I am not going into the question whether East Germany is or is not what they call, a 'satellite' country. That is not a material question from my point of view. The point is that East Germany is a separate entity. It has a trade representative . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar) : Not an Ambassador.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : . . . in Delhi. I do not see why we should not have a trade representative in East Germany. I do not see why we should not even give to East Germany diplomatic recognition. It may be that diplomatic recognition of Germany will facilitate a solution of the German problem, and in my opinion perhaps it is necessary for us to make a move in that direction in order to facilitate such a solution. Of course we are not a European power and it is for European powers to solve it. But perhaps the best way of solving the German problem is to neutralise Germany. For that, of course, you will have to get the agreement of Germany. We should not

[Shri P. N. Saprul]

be disturbed by the idea that Chancellor Erhard of Germany is postponing his visit. Well, we would like him to come as a visitor. We will give him all the respect that is due to his position. But we will stick to certain principles that we value.

Then I would like to say a word about our relations with the Arab world. I should certainly think that we should have very good relations with the Arab world. Personally speaking, Mr. Clovis Maksud, who was attacked by my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, is a very good friend of mine. But we do not allow our foreign policy to be dictated to by any group of countries. We do not allow it to be dictated to by the West. We do not allow it to be dictated to by the East. We have got our own way of looking at things. And I have never been able to understand why we should look upon Israel as an outcaste. I think the time has come when we should recognise the fact that Israel exists. I had a visit by the Israeli Consul the other day. He came and said, "You recognise Israel but you do not allow the Consul to stay in Delhi." Now that perhaps is in accordance with diplomatic practice. But why should we not have a Consul in Israel? Why should we not develop trade relations with Israel? Why should we refuse aid in the shape of fertilisers from Israel? We should not do all that just to please the Arab world. Our friendship with the Arab world stands on solid ground. We have got many cultural ties. We have got many ties of centuries with them. We want to be friends with them but we want to be friends with other countries also.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, I should like to refer to a question of vital importance to the existence of the Commonwealth. Mr. Nehru was one of the architects of the new Commonwealth. I will not be able to elaborate on this point for want of time, but I would tell you that the Commonwealth, after 1947, is different from the Commonwealth as we knew it in the days of the Statute of Westminster. Now, we have to be firm on one point, that there shall be no racial discrimination in this Commonwealth. The Rhodesia issue is of transcendental importance, and while I have great admiration for Mr. Wilson, I must say that in the

matter of Rhodesia he has blundered very badly. He should never have given, in order to be able to win a victory in the elections, a promise that force will not be used against Southern Rhodesia. And he had been criticised by some organ of the British press for having given that assurance. It is quite clear that sanctions have failed and that the time has come when Britain and the Commonwealth must act strongly against Southern Rhodesia, against the White Government of Southern Rhodesia. The principle of majority rule must be accepted for Southern Rhodesia.

Then one last word. I would like to say a word about the judgment of the International Court of Justice with regard to South-West Africa. Now these Mandates were not intended to enable countries to be annexed by the Mandated powers. And what this judgment has done is to enable South-West Africa to be annexed by South Africa, and with all respect to the Chairman, it is sad that he did not realise that the right thing for him to do was not to cast his vote for South Africa. I think the question of changing the pattern of international law should be considered very carefully by Indian and Asian jurists. International law was built up in the days of colonial domination in the West, and it requires many great changes. The Constitution of the International Court of Justice may perhaps also have to be changed, and thought should be given by our jurists, by our thinkers and by our statesmen, to the question of the changes that are necessary in international law.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I think I have abused your goodness far too much, and I would like to say that, by and large, I find myself in agreement with the policy of the Government.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal)

Madam Deputy Chairman, it has been said by our late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that the foreign policy of a country follows its internal economic policy in order to realise its aims. Now the path India has taken is the path of capitalist development, not making a complete rupture or break with the imperialist powers. It was also said by Pandit Nehru that unless foreign capitalists are com-

pletely done away with and our trade relations are put on the basis of equality and not on terms of unequal trade, sovereignty and independence can be put into jeopardy.

Now taking to the path of capitalist development, we not only have protected foreign capital but we have also taken huge amounts of loans from foreign capitalists. Some amount of trade relations with, or aid taken from the socialist world does not alter the basic fact that in trade relations, overwhelmingly we are tied to the imperialist economy, and, by and by, the country's economy reaches its logical end. It is bound to inevitably lead to abject dependence on the Western powers, and this is what has come to stay.

Now history has known no third way of development, that of independent development, that of making a complete break with the imperialists, and fighting imperialism on a world-scale with the newly liberated countries. But we have not taken to that path. So we find ourselves in this position now-a-days of abject dependence upon the Western powers except for a possible interlude for some years, say, from 1954 to 1959, or something like that. After that our foreign policy has taken a sharp pro-imperialist reactionary turn. Since my time is limited I would only refer to the big milestones on this road. First is our behaviour in Congo. Is it not a fact that when the United Nations' troops were called to Congo, India supplied troops in order to protect Patrice Lumumba, and yet in the presence of the Indian troops, Patrice Lumumba, the leader of the Congolese liberation movement, was murdered? We were there and Indian troops unwittingly it may be said, will say deliberately, whether deliberately or not, we helped the United States of America in its imperialism in this aggression against the national liberation movement in Congo.

Then take the case of Belgrade. In Belgrade the people were fighting against colonialism and against imperialistic domination direct or indirect. And the entire press in Asia, Africa and Latin America commented upon this. And for the first time there was suspicion about the political role of India, what role India is going to play in the liberation movements of other

countries. Did we give them full moral support in their struggle against colonialism and neocolonialism and direct or indirect aggression? There was suspicion about our policy in these countries.

Then there is the question of Malaysia. It is strange that a puppet regime has become our closest friend. Nobody in the world would believe that Malaysia is an independent government; that it is a really sovereign independent government.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : But it has been our friend.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : It is of a formal character. Its independence and sovereignty are of a formal character. You know in Latin America also there are a number of countries that are completely dependent on the mercy of the Government of the U.S.A. Similarly there in Malaysia they are dependent on and are at the mercy of the British Government and on the 50,000 British troops stationed there in order to protect them. We say we have found good relations and friendly relations with Malaysia. And lastly I come to the role that this Government has played in Vietnam. But I shall take it up later.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : What about the . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I am not yielding to any interruptions. I have only a few minutes and if I am given more time then I shall answer every point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please do not interrupt.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : This time the United States is encircling the whole of Asia, beginning from Korea and now the last outposts are set up on the Indian Ocean also. A string of bases are to be there. So it is from here that the threat is starting for the independence of India. It is here that for the last ten years the U.S.A. Government has committed the worst aggressions against Korea, against Vietnam, in its interventions in Cambodia and in the Democratic Republic of Congo and everywhere. So this is the worst enemy of mankind and it is strange to say they are our friends. We find common language with the enemies of mankind and the enemies of the Indian people.

AN. HON. MEMBER : Say something about China.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : With the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America we don't find any common language. Take a cross-section of the Indian press, i.e., the Link, the Hindu and the Indian Express. They have all commented during the last two or three years that our position is ill-understood everywhere. The people of those countries do not support us. They view us with suspicion. They have cooled off towards us and their warm relations have now become cool relations. So we should take note of the fact that we are not being understood in the outside world. Your people here may understand you because you are free to talk anything you want while we do not have that freedom and with the Defence of India rules and all that, we cannot put the whole fact before the people. But I say this is a position that India should take note of because India is a big country. If India throws its whole moral weight on behalf of the national liberation movements in the world, on behalf of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, then that will enhance the prestige of India tremendously and also strengthen that movement. There is a feeling that we are opposed to this movement and so we are getting isolated.

It is a basic matter in foreign policy that one should have good relations with one's neighbours. The hon. Minister of External Affairs spoke of our relationship with a number of countries. But the biggest of them all are Pakistan and China and with them our relations are those of hostility, and that is telling on our economy and that is also leading us in such a way that we are gradually, by and by, going into the grip of the Western powers, particularly and primarily of the United States of America.

AN HON. MEMBER : What do you want to do with China ?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I want that there should be peaceful negotiation. No conditions can be imposed. If China wants to impose conditions then we cannot accept them. But I cannot speak for China. It is their own affair. I can speak for the people and for those sections of our people

that I do represent. It is in the interest of our country; and this total dependence on imperialistic powers can never succeed. We must find some way of settling our differences and as Dr. Sapru said, there should be some dialogue with China and there should be negotiations. Unless we start that sort of a thing, the whole world thinks that we are refusing to negotiate.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : No, no.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : The hon. Minister said that we must bring the question of Vietnam to the negotiating table. I say this issue also should be brought to the negotiating table and if you put forward reasonable proposals and China refuses them, then we can tell the whole world that this is our position and then we will be understood.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : The Colombo proposals are there.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : That is a dead thing. That also has some sort of condition. Even so, you can take it as a sort of basis for talks. I do not know if we can make a beginning that way.

As regards Pakistan, we must settle this issue with that country. For nineteen long years these disputes have been troubling us. I do not know if we have any formula regarding these issues. But I say, if there is a will there is a way and it is for the Government to have the will and then a way will come. We do not have any formula. It is for the Government to come out with a formula. We say that the Tashkent spirit should be absolutely adhered to and all questions between the two countries including the question of Kashmir, should be settled and in that way we should go ahead. Otherwise whether we like it or not, we are selling the independence and the sovereignty of India bit by bit, to the U.S.A. Government and to the Western Powers for a mess of pottage.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : Question.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : That is the path we are taking now and instead of solving these questions we have come to this position now. It is time we make a right-about-turn and turn away from this path.

Can you say that India is supporting the national freedom movements in the world when our steel is being exported to South Vietnam in order to help the U.S.A. Government who are the aggressors there?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : It is a fact that the steel plant is built with socialist help and this Government is utilising his steel and allowing it to be sent there to help the aggressors and oppressors. Is it not a shameful thing? On the one hand they say these things and on the other these war and strategic materials are being sent to South Vietnam under the orders of U.S. AID. This is going on. Why can't you put your full moral strength on behalf of the Vietnamese people who, as the External Affairs Minister said, have been fighting for the last twenty years against aggression?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : At least for a thousand years, against the Chinese.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I took that figure of twenty years from the hon. Minister. Then you talk of starting negotiations. With three lakhs of American troops present there, can there be any talk of peace? Why don't you condemn this aggression by the United States? Why can't you demand that all foreign troops should be withdrawn from Vietnam and only then can peace talks start?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : And, then what about infiltration?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : If in our country who had foreign troops stationed, would you listen to such talks? When we make this appeal now, who will listen to us? Nobody will listen to us. The small countries of Asia are looking up to us for support and we are denying them this support and we are making proposals that are acceptable only to the Government of the United States and South Vietnam, the Philippines and other such stooges of the imperialist powers. Is it strange that no progressive, democratic country in Asia, Africa or Latin America has responded to our appeal? So this is the position that we have come to. You continue to suppose that you can fight for peace without

condemning aggression. How is that possible? Peace cannot be fought for and won in that way. We must fight for peace. We must brand the aggressor and we must show the way to peace in that way. As regards our atomic policy, I want to say it is a peculiar policy. Have we really the economic power to manufacture atomic weapons? I do not think so and it is no use bluffing the people.

AN HON. MEMBER : Why don't you advise China?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I don't advise China. You may advise China. It is not my business to advise China but it is my business to advise the Government as a citizen of this country and I will do it.

Now, have we really the power to do so? We believe in going in for a nuclear shield, a shield not of U.S.A. alone but along with U.K. so that we can appear to be neutral and non-aligned. This sort of going in for a nuclear shield would only lead to the complete withering away of our political independence. If we really have the power why have we not called for the total destruction of the stockpiles of atomic weapons? We have not. The Government of the United States and the U.K. are not prepared to destroy these atomic stockpiles. It is they who are from the very beginning resisting this; it is they who released the first atom bomb on Hiroshima and it is with them that you are going in for a sort of nuclear shield. I think it is a peculiar policy; it is deceiving the people. If your independence is threatened by any power—even if it be Chinese—we should build our own atomic weapons if possible but we should in order to ensure peace fight for the total destruction of the atomic weapons and eliminate the possibility of nuclear war altogether and we should point our accusing finger at the United States imperialism which is blocking the way deliberately and blackmailing the nations of the world. Now we really require a microscope to find out the content of our non-alignment, peace, anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. It has been emasculated and whittled away in such a big way that now one would require a microscope to find out the content of our policy though with the naked eyes

[Shri Niren Ghosh]

one can see the sharp turns towards imperialism that we have taken in our foreign policy *pari passu* with the internal economic policy that we are following.

Madam, with these words I conclude.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I just inform the House that the House will sit till 5-30 P.M.? Mr. Sri Rama Reddy.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, the former U.S. Ambassador to India, Prof. John Galbraith, had said that Pakistan would not have sought a military solution in Kashmir but for the flow of American arms to Pakistan. This view, it is reported, has been rejected by the U.S. Administration. On the other hand, it is a very sad state of affairs that America ignored all the warnings and protests of India and strongly believed that Pakistan would use all her 1½ billion dollar worth of military assistance to contain Communism. President Eisenhower, Madam, had assured India, while adopting the policy of military assistance to Pakistan, that his Presidential authority would be invoked to prevent any use of military assistance against India. The conflict of last September abundantly demonstrated how true India's apprehensions were. Demonstration, if it was needed, was made that guns do not point only in one direction. The furor raised by Pakistan about the imminence of India's nuclear explosion is intended not only to discredit India in the eyes of the world but also speed up the already indicated resumption of American military supplies to Pakistan, and also to cover up Pakistan's clandestine nuclear collusion with China. It is time that the U.S.A. took note of these most undesirable trends in the professions and practices of Pakistan. The U.S.A. believes that the Indo-Pakistan conflict is a projection of the old Hindu-Muslim conflict. Mr. McNamara's statement before the Congressional Committee proves this. It is a misleading statement and I am sure the U.S.A. would have corrected this impression of theirs.

The most astonishing feature of the military developments in Pakistan has come to light. They are intriguing as well. Now, America professes to arm Pakistan to contain Communism in Asia, thereby meaning only Chinese Communism, for

the Russian Communism is prepared to co-exist with systems different from their own. That is, they are prepared to co-exist even with America. Therefore, there is no conflict as such between Russia and America. Communism, if at all it is to be contained in Asia, is only of the Chinese brand but China, on the other hand, is also equipping the same Pakistan with military armaments. What is this? America is helping Pakistan with armaments and China is also helping Pakistan with armaments. I do not know if America is giving aid only to contain Chinese Communism. If that is so, what is proposed to be contained by Pakistan with the help that China is rendering to her? This is an enigma which is not very clear to us. This is a riddle which should be solved either by America or by China but so far as India is concerned the meaning of this riddle is that Pakistan is attempting to cut the throat of India with both American as well as Chinese arms.

Madam, with regard to the other aspects of Pakistan's intentions, India has been following the Tashkent Declaration both in letter and spirit. India has released cargo worth Rs. 7.5 crores seized during the last conflict but Pakistan has not reciprocated this gesture of India by releasing Indian cargo seized by Pakistan. On the other hand, news is on hand that Pakistan has re-labelled some of the Indian cargo and is using them for her own purposes. I do not know if it is true but that is what has been reported anyway. This is the most reprehensible character in international behaviour.

As regards Tashkent Declaration, Madam, India has proposed talks of officials to pave the way for a Ministerial meeting. The talks are proposed to be held without any pre-conditions or commitments but Pakistan has been insisting on a number of conditions like recognition of the Kashmir dispute and meaningful talks on Kashmir. It may be, Madam, that Pakistan has the right to raise the question of Kashmir dispute in a meeting of that kind but it is the right of India as well to reject outright such a claim of Pakistan because under the Tashkent Declaration if they have a right to raise the Kashmir dispute we have the right to reject it outright.

Madam, there is also another peculiar behaviour of Pakistan and that is with regard to Mizos and Nagas. President Ayub Khan has admitted only in his yesterday's statement in Lahore the presence of Indian Mizos in East Pakistan. He is reported to have said :

"Sometimes the Mizos were driven across Pakistan's borders by the Indians themselves. They have become a liability on us. What should we do with them? Should we shoot them? We have no heart to shoot them."

As if he is the only person who is going to save the Mizos and Nagas and as if we are trying to shoot down Mizos and Nagas and he is their defender and saviour. This is what Mr. Ayub Khan has said. What does it show? If anything it shows that he is intent upon training and equipping the Mizos in order to create trouble for us. Now, Madam, only this morning the Defence Minister made a statement about the preparations Pakistan is making on the borders of India in spite of the fact that there is a Tashkent Declaration, the articles of which we have agreed to work out by which peace was supposed to be established between us. Are they true to their conscience? Are they true to the world? blished between us. Are they true to their conscience? Are they true to the world? Are they true to the people? Are they

A massive arms build-up is taking place all along the border. Pakistan has successfully managed to circumvent the US embargo on the supply of arms and has acquired not only spares from Turkey, Iran, Portugal and South Africa, but also F-86's. It has been made clear this morning that as many as fifty F-86's were procured in a clandestine way. Is this the way of international behaviour, is this the way to show goodwill to this country? Pakistan has raised three more divisions. This morning only they were making it clear. It has strengthened its border defences along the entire border, including the cease-fire line in Kashmir. China has supplied MIG fighters and light tanks—it has come out today—and as many as 125 MIG fighters are reported to have been supplied by China to Pakistan. For what purpose? Against whom? Not only are there 125 MIG fighters. Many more are probably going to be supplied as well. Two

hundred more tanks are to be supplied. According to my information 270 tanks, as per reports in foreign press, have already been supplied by China. What is all this? What are they for? In addition, they have also promised to equip two divisions of the Pakistan Army completely with Chinese arms. They are also building Ordnance Factories in East Pakistan. Is it a preparation for another clash with India? I would like to ask this. If it is done for defence purposes, it is too costly a step, which Mr. Ayub Khan is taking. He could implement the Tashkent Declaration and establish peace without having to spend any money. Of course, the Minister was also saying to this morning. Instead of spending all this on defence, etc., if he spent the same amount of money elsewhere, Pakistan could show better economic progress and the happiness of the people could be secured. Instead of that they are taking to these methods. Continued co-operation with China in so sinister a field as arms supply should be a matter of grave concern to India, as indeed it should be to the USA. Mr. Ayub Khan is successful in having the best of both the worlds. Probably this is what he is thinking. He cannot have it for all time. I am sure he will be exposed. This is what is not understandable in international politics.

Now, the Sino-Pakistan collusion has come into the open. There is collusion in the military field, as well as in the economic field. This is a most undesirable trend not only from the point of view of Indian freedom and democracy, but also from the point of view of the free world.

Now, I would like to say a few words with regard to China. Mr. Mao believes that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. This is his philosophy and it is well known. It is in conformity with this ideal that New China undertook expeditions like attack on Taiwan in 1949, attack on Korea in 1950, attack on Tibet in 1950 and attack on the Indian border in 1962. Tibet was a poor, innocent country. They have squeezed out all these poor, innocent people, who have not done any harm to anybody in this world, ever since Tibet came into existence. Finally in 1962, the attack on India came, in Nathula Pass and in Ladakh. My learned friend, Dr. Sapru, was saying: You please go—directing his finger to the

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy]

External Affairs Minister—to China and find out what their view is. Their view is very well known. They have attacked an innocent country, which had assiduously worked for the friendship of China, right from the day we became independent and they became independent. The result was they stabbed us in the back, in Nathula pass and they stabbed us in Ladakh. China is bent on harming us.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Madam, on a point of personal explanation. What I said was and what I say is, have a dialogue.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : What is the dialogue for—to get stabbed again? We have cultivated friendship with China, but the result is they have stabbed us. No more proof is required. If proof is required, it has been given in Nathula and in Ladakh in 1962. No more proof is necessary.

There is genuine Sino-American conflict over the kinds of Government that Asian countries should have and we should not have anything to do with them. What this basic orientation in international politics should be is seen in the Vietnam war. We are not concerned with all their philosophies.

China's attitude to nuclear bomb is well known. Mr. Mao called it a paper tiger. The man who called it a paper tiger is going to produce it. Mr. Mao believes that if a nuclear war broke out, the entire world opposed to China would be wiped out, while half of China would survive to nurse communism of China's brand. This is the sort of people China is having and still my friend suggested that we should go and talk to them. China sets great store by her nuclear capability. She has made and tested nuclear bombs, much against the opinion and desire of the civilised world. The entry of Peking into the nuclear club is an event of great tragedy in world's history. I do not know how this tragedy could be averted. Still I have got great faith in human goodness and I hope that this tragedy will be averted.

Recently China and Pakistan entered into an agreement, whereby China had agreed to set up a nuclear power station in East Pakistan. China has finally rejected the U.N. offer for participation in the world

disarmament conference. It is hoped that good sense will prevail on the Peking leaders and they will ultimately participate in the world disarmament conference, which would bring about safety for the world.

The fact, therefore, is that China is stationing MIG fighters and tanks in East Pakistan. China is building an atomic power plant in East Pakistan. China is building Ordnance Factories in East Pakistan. China is training hostile Mizos and Nagas in guerilla warfare. The meaning of all this is one and only one that Pakistan has handed over East Pakistan to China to prepare to hurt India at the appropriate time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up. You have finished your time.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : Yes, Madam. In conclusion, I would like to say this. There is one and only one way to conduct international affairs. It is true that except Pakistan and China all others are our friends, whether in Asia or in Western Europe or in the communist bloc. Everybody is our friend. Everybody has approved our non-alignment policy. Everybody has approved our policy of peaceful co-existence. Therefore, having had this security of friendship of such a vast portion of this world, we have absolutely no fear. We believe in our non-alignment for the purpose of establishing peace in the world. We shall certainly go in the way the great, illustrious son of this country, the first Premier, Jawaharlal Nehru, had gone, in the way Lal Bahadur Shastri had fought for it and in the way presently Shrimati Indira Gandhi is going . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : In the way you let down Tibet.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : With these words I thank you very much. By doing so we shall be adding to the glory of this country.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, मैंने सग्वारी पक्ष और विरोधी पक्ष के सम्मानित सदस्यों के भाषण सुने। कुछ आश्चर्य में पड़ा हूँ। मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ कि आज जो मूल समस्या है वह दृष्टि से ओझल की जा रही

है। अगर एक वाक्य में मुझे कहना पड़े तो मैं यह कहूंगा कि इस सरकार को न तो अतीत का भान है और न वर्तमान के दुख का ज्ञान है और न भविष्य का कोई सपना है। अगर इन तीनों वाक्यों का अच्छी तरह से अर्थ किया जाय तो उसमें सरकारी पक्ष और विरोधी पक्ष दोनों से मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि अपने दिमाग और दिल को हम टटोलें कि हम कहां जा रहे हैं। जहां तक अतीत के भान का प्रश्न है, इसके बारे में थोड़ा समय लगेगा। मेरे पास कांग्रेस का इतिहास है और 14, 15 जून 1947 को दिल्ली में जो आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी का इजलास हुआ था, जिसके मुताबिक हिन्दुस्तान का बंटवारा हुआ, भारत पाकिस्तान का निर्माण हुआ, उसका प्रस्ताव है। पूरा प्रस्ताव पढ़ने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, इसके कुछ खास खास अंश आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों की सेवा में प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूं।

“कांग्रेस ने स्थिरता से हिन्दुस्तान की एकता का समर्थन किया है। 60 साल पहले, इसके जन्मदिन से लेकर, कांग्रेस ने एक आजाद संयुक्त हिन्दुस्तान का सपना देखा है और इसको हासिल करने के लिए, लाखों नर-नारियों ने कष्ट झेले हैं। समुद्र पहाड़ और अन्य भौगोलिक स्थिति ने खुद आज का हिन्दुस्तान निर्माण किया है। कोई इन्सानो ताकत इस के आधार को बदल नहीं सकती और न ही इसके भाग्य के आड़े आ सकती है। आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी का पूरा विश्वास है कि प्रस्तुत जोश ठंडा हो जाने पर, हिन्दुस्तान की समस्याओं पर समुचित दृष्टिकोणों से विचार किया जायेगा और उस वक्त दो राष्ट्रों की धारणा निर्मूल सिद्ध होकर त्याग दी जायेगी।”

हमने हिन्दुस्तान का जो चित्र देखा है, वह सदा हमारे हृदय और ध्यान में रहेगा।

इसके आगे इसमें यह कहा गया है “3 जून, 1947 की तजवीजों के अनुसार सम्भवतः

हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ भाग इसमें अलहदा हो जायें। बड़े खेद के साथ, मौजूदा हालात में आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी इस सम्भावना को मान रही है।” मैंने अतीत का भान कराने के लिये इस प्रस्ताव के कुछ अंश आपके द्वारा सम्मानित सदस्यों की सेवा में पेश कर दिये हैं। क्या इसका कुछ भान है कि यह अतीत है? मैं आज सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी से जानना चाहता हूं क्योंकि मैं उनकी व्यक्तिगत इज्जत करता हूं और पूछना हूं कि क्या उन्हें इसका भान है? अगर इस सरकार को इसका भान है तो इस सरकार ने उसकी तरफ कोई कदम उठाया है?

वियतनाम के बारे में बड़ा ही गम्भीर रुदन क्रंदन हुआ और ठीक भी है। मगर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में आज क्या हो रहा है, उसके बारे में एक बात भी माननीय मंत्री जी ने नहीं कही? मैं चाहता हूं कि अगर उनको अतीत का भान होता, वर्तमान के दुखों का ज्ञान होता और दिमाग में कोई सपना होता कि हम क्या राष्ट्र बनाना चाहते हैं, कैसी दुनिया बनाना चाहते हैं, तो उधर उनको जाना चाहिये था और ये जरूर गये होते। मगर वे राष्ट्र के हित की चिंता से दूर हैं और उनको पता नहीं है कि इस मुल्क में क्या हो रहा है। किसी तरह से चले जा रहे हैं, चले जा रहे हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि आज एक शब्द भी हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी के मुंह से खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां के बारे में नहीं निकले। हा, उन्होंने थोड़ासा प्रसंगवश चेयर की तरफ इशारा कर दिया कि आप काबुल गये थे, वहां के हालात के बारे में बतलाया और आपके साथ मित्रता का भाव दिखलाया। यह क्या है? खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां की स्थिति क्या है, वे क्या चाहते हैं, इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं बतलाया गया। मैं चाहता हूं कि खान अब्दुल समद खां के बारे में जो इस समय बीमार है, जो चाहते हैं कि बिलोचिस्तान पाकिस्तान से अलग हो, जिन्हें बिलोचिस्तान का ‘गांधी’ कहा जाता है, उस बिलोचिस्तान के बारे में हमारे मंत्री जी ने आज कुछ नहीं

[श्री राजनारायण]

कहा। उन्होंने अब्दुल गफ्फार खां की भावनाओं के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा। आज पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में आपको मालूम है, वहां आन्दोलन तेजी पर है और न मामूल कितने हजारों लोग जेल में हैं। उनकी मांग है कि हमारी विदेशी मुद्रा अलग हो, हमारा रेल यातायात अलग हो, बैंक अलग हो, मिलिशिया अलग हो और रिजर्व बैंक भी अलग हो, मगर उन्होंने इसके बारे में एक शब्द भी नहीं कहा। आज भारत सरकार के मुंह से निकल रही हैं अनावश्यक ढंग की बातें और इधर उधर की चकलसबाजी हो रही है तो मैं असल में सोच रहा था कि हमारी सरकार की यह विदेश नीति नहीं है, यह तो 'विदेह' नीति है, जिसका कोई देह नहीं होता है। हम इस विदेश नीति को सही माने में कोई शब्द देना चाहते हैं तो उसको 'विदेह' नीति कहना चाहिये। इसका न कोई देह है, न इसका कोई मुह है, न इसका पैर है, न इसका हाथ है और न कुछ और है। इसकी सिर्फ एक चीज है और वह "गुलामी" है, बारी, बारी से। यह कभी अमेरिका की गुलामी करेगी तो डिबैल्यूएशन हो गया। जब डिबैल्यूएशन हो गया और रूस नाराज हो गया, तो उसके लिए वियतनाम का ऋंन कर दिया और इस तरह से यह दोनों तरफ चलेगी। बारी बारी करके दोनों मुल्कों की दुम पकड़े रखना, इस तरह की आज हमारे भारत सरकार की विदेश नीति बनी हुई है। इस नीति के बारे में यह कहना कि यह बिना लगाव की नीति है, मैं समझता हूं कि अपनी बुद्धि के साथ धोखा करना है। यह बिना लगाव की नीति नहीं है। हम इसको कैसे कह सकते हैं कि बिना लगाव की नीति है? बिना लगाव की नीति तो वह होगी जिसमें अपनत्वपन होगा, मगर इस सरकार की नीति में अपना अपनत्वपन क्या है? इसके लिए एक नहीं, अनेक उदाहरण देखे जा सकते हैं।

पश्चिमी जर्मनी को हमारी सरकार ने मान्यता दी है, मगर पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता प्राप्त नहीं है। कुछ समय पहले इसके सम्बन्ध में यह कहा गया था कि हम उनसे व्यापार बढ़ा रहे हैं, मगर जिस स्तर पर इस सरकार ने पश्चिमी जर्मनी की सरकार को मान्यता दी है, उस स्तर पर पूर्वी जर्मनी की सरकार को मान्यता नहीं दी है। पश्चिमी जर्मनी ने एक घोषणा में कहा था कि अगर कोई देश पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता देगा तो उसके साथ हमारे संबंध विच्छेद हो जायेंगे। तो इस सरकार की चोटी कांप गई और उसकी हिम्मत नहीं हुई कि वह पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता दे सके।

इजरायल सरकार से भी हमारी सरकार ने संबंध विच्छेद कर रखा है और इसके लिए तर्क क्या है। सरकार कहती है कि इजरायल ने मिश्र की जमानत दवाई है, उस पर हमला किया है, इसलिये हमने उससे संबंध विच्छेद कर रखा है। अगर इजरायल ने हमला किया तो उसको आन कोसिये, उसकी गिन्दा कीजिये कि वह हमलावर क्यों है और उसको हमलावर नहीं होना चाहिये। यहां तक तो ठीक है। मगर जो सरकार मिश्र पर हमला करने के लिये इजरायल से संबंध विच्छेद करती है उसके बारे में यह कहना चाहता हूं कि चीन केवल हमला नहीं करता, हमारी मातृ भूमि के अंग को भी दबा लेता है और यह सरकार संयुक्तराष्ट्र संघ में उसकी सदस्यता के लिए अगुवानी करती है। इसकी क्या नीति है? यह कोई नीति है, कोई दृष्टि है, कोई दिशा है? इस सरकार की न तो कोई विदेश नीति है, न कोई दृष्टि है, न कोई दिशा है और यह सरकार त्रिशंकु की तरह आसमान में टंकी रहती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस सरकार की कोई दिशा नहीं है और यह इसको साफ-साफ कहना चाहिये।

ताशकंद के बारे में बड़ा ढोल पीटा गया और जब उसको देखता हूं तो उसके बारे में यह कहना चाहता हूं कि उसे "ताशकंद" नहीं बल्कि "नाशकंद" कह दिया जाना

चाहिये। ताशकंद नहीं नाशकंद, जो कि शुरू से ही नाश कर रही है और इस घोषणा में कोई नई चीज नहीं थी। जिस दिन ताशकंद समझौता हुआ उस दिन से ही चाहे अयूब साहब हो, चाहे भुट्टो साहब हो, उन्होंने कहना शुरू कर दिया कि जब तक काश्मीर का मसला हल नहीं होता, तब तक इस समझौते का कोई महत्व नहीं है और हमारे तथा भारत के बीच कोई समस्या का समाधान नहीं है। मैं जानता हूँ, अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ कि भारत और पाक का जो बंटवारा हुआ वह अप्राकृतिक है, गैर-कुदरती है, अनैचुरल है। और जैसा कि ऑल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी ने अपने प्रस्ताव में लिखा है, ऑल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी ने 14 जून के प्रस्ताव में जैसा कुछ कहा है कि हमने एक संयुक्त आजाद हिन्दुस्तान का सपना देखा है और वह चित्र बारबार हमारे हृदय और ध्यान में रहेगा। मैं माननीय मंत्री सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उनके हृदय और ध्यान में वह चित्र है? अगर वह चित्र है तो उसको हासिल करने के लिए सरकार ने क्या उपाय किये हैं? क्या सरकार ने ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा की है जिसके जरिये यह चीज हासिल हो सकती है? मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार बिल्कुल उल्टी दिशा में चल रही है और आपके द्वारा मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप देखेंगी कि 16 अगस्त को पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में अवामी लीग एक दिवस मनाने जा रही है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आन्दोलन शुरू करने के लिये यह सरकार मदद करे, मगर यह नालायक और निकम्मी सरकार कुछ नहीं करेगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष की जनता 16 अगस्त को अपने देश में कोई ऐसा दिन मनाये जिससे उनकी मांग के बारे में कुछ मदद और इमदाद हो सके और कहे कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के लोगों की मांग सही है और उन्हें हर तरह की मदद हमें देनी चाहिये। मगर मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि कांग्रेस सरकार की चाल

शुतुर-मुर्ग की तरह है : जिस तरह से शुतुर-मुर्ग बालू में सर गाढ़कर नाचता है, उसी तरह से कांग्रेस सरकार बालू में सर गाढ़कर चल रही है। उसको पता ही नहीं चल रहा है कि आखिर देश में क्या चल रहा है और कहां क्या बात हो रही है। तो इस सरकार

को अच्छे तरीके से, ठीक तरीके से 5 P. M. आगे बढ़ना चाहिये और कहना चाहिये

कि जब तक भारत और पाक का एकीकरण नहीं होगा तब तक समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा। मैंने जब यहां पर प्रधान मंत्री माननीया श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जी विराजमान थी उनसे कहा था कि आप विदेश गई थीं, अमरीका, रूस और सब जगह घूमी, भारत पाक के एकीकरण की चर्चा आपने कहीं की। हमने तो नहीं की, लोग सोचते हैं कि पुरानी बातों पर जाने से कोई फायदा नहीं है, यह उनका उत्तर था। आज भी मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ डंके की चोट पर कि जब तक भारत पाक का एकीकरण नहीं होता और एकीकरण होने के पूर्व कंफेड्रेशन नहीं होता तब तक समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा। एक नहीं, अनेक समझौते होते रहेंगे, माननीय स्वर्ण सिंह जी या इनके सरीखे मंत्रियों के जरिये, मगर समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा। सन् 1947 की एक संधि के जरिये इस मुल्क का बंटवारा किया गया था और 15 अगस्त, 1947 को इस मुल्क का बंटवारा हुआ था। मैं माननीय सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब लार्ड माउंट बैटन यहां आये मार्च, 1947 में तो उससे ब्रिटिश कैबिनेट ने यह कहा था कि जून 1948 तक हिन्दुस्तान का मसला सुलझा लें, मगर उसने अगस्त 1947 तक मामला सरका दिया। जून 1948 तक जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। पहली मुलाकात महात्मा गांधी से हुई थी। महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था कि मुल्क का बंटवारा कबूल नहीं, चाहे जो कुछ हो। मगर जिस नीति ने जिस चित्त की दुर्बलता ने, जिस शासन लिप्सा ने मुल्क के बंटवारे को दबूल

[श्री राज नागयण]

किया क्या आज वही शासन लिप्सा इस मुल्क की नीति पर छाई नहीं हुई है? वही शासन लिप्सा मुल्क की विदेशी और घरेलू नीति पर छा कर के आज 48 करोड़ का जनजीवन नष्टभ्रष्ट कर रही है। विदेशी नीति वहीं आसमान से नहीं टपकी है। विदेशी नीति घरेलू नीति से बनती है। जब घर की नीति भ्रष्ट होगी, घर की नीति डांवाडोल होगी, जब घर के लोगों का पेट नहीं भरेगा जब घर के लोगों को अन्न और कपड़ा नहीं मिलेगा, जब घर के लोगों को मकान नहीं मिलेगा, तो विदेशी नीति अपनी आजादी को गिरवी रखने वाली नीति होगी। आज भारत सरकार की विदेशी नीति अपनी आजादी को गिरवी रखने वाली नीति है। माननीया, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में प्रति वर्ष औसत 24 लाख टन गल्ला बाहर से आया, द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में प्रति वर्ष औसत 31 लाख टन गल्ला बाहर से आया और तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में प्रति वर्ष औसत 50 लाख टन गल्ला बाहर से आया। लगातार, निरंतर निर्भरता बाहरी मुल्कों के खाद्यान्न पर यह सरकार बढ़ती चली गई। तो इस सरकार की नीति आजाद कैसे होगी? यह घुटने टेकेगी, यह झुकेंगी और अपनी आजादी को गिरवी रखेगी और आज हमारी आजादी को गिरवी रखा है। यह हम को समझाने चले है कि हमारी कोई नीति है। मन् 1947-48 में देश की सुरक्षा पर कितना खर्च होता था? 148 करोड़। 1947-48 में 148 करोड़ रुपया सुरक्षा पर खर्च हुआ और 1965-66 में कितना हुआ? कुल अगर जोड़ा जाय तो वह चला गया 1,200 करोड़ के करीब। इतना जबरदस्त खर्चा बढ़ता चला जा रहा है हमारी सुरक्षा नीति पर तब भी हमारे राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा नहीं है। मैं बहुत ही दुख के साथ सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों की सेवा में

निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ चाहे वे ट्रेजरी बेचेज के हों, चाहे वे विरोधी पक्ष के हों, कि आज जिस के दिल में जनता से मुहब्बत है, राष्ट्र से मुहब्बत है, वह इस सरकार को एक मिनट, एक पल, के लिये बर्दाश्त नहीं करेगा। आज हम में ताकत नहीं है वरना क्या हम इसको बर्दाश्त करते? हमारी सारी आशाओं पर तुषारापात हो गया है, सारी उम्मीदों पर पानी फिर गया है। हमने इस लिये अंग्रेजी राज्य को नहीं तोड़ा था कि यह सरकार हमारी आजादी को गिरवी रखेगी या सरकार अमरीका की दुम में बन्ध बर के हमारे मुल्क की आजादी को बेच देगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि 17 वर्षों में 13 हजार वर्ग मील जमीन हमारे मुल्क की कम हो गई। कहां वह जमीन चली गई? माननीय सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी के पेट में चली गई या भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी या श्री लालबहादुर शास्त्री जी के या वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जी के पेट में चली गई या कहा गई? 13 हजार वर्ग मील जमीन कम है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र की किताबों में यह कमी सात गुनी बढ़ गई है। भारत सरकार अपने "इंडिया सर्वे" के हिसाब से देखें तो 84 लाख एकड़ जमीन हमारी गई है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र के हिसाब से 5 करोड़ 90 लाख एकड़ जमीन हमारी कम हुई है। सरकार ने कहा कि उससे नवशे में 2 हजार वर्ग मील का अन्तर आया है। इसका मतलब क्या हुआ? 1961 में देखा जाय, हमारे में गोआ जुटा, दमन जुटा, दीव जुटा, पांडेचेरी जुटा। करीब 5 हजार वर्ग मील जमीन उसकी होंती है। तो यह भी और बढ़ेगा न? इस प्रकार इतनी और कम हुई। 800 और 500 को आप जोड़ दीजिए तो 13 हजार वर्ग मील जमीन आज हमारे मुल्क की कम हो गई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सदन पूछे इस सरकार से कि यह हमारी जमीन कहां गई और क्या इसकी विदेश नीति से हमारी जमीन हासिल होगी?

चीन के साथ आज सरकार की क्या नीति है? मैं इधर के कुछ माननीय मित्रों से भी कहना चाहूंगा. . .

श्री सी० डी० पांडे : वे तो आप के दोस्त हैं आज कल।

श्री राजनारायण : हां दोस्त हैं और रहेंगे और कांग्रेस सरकार को पलटने के लिये रहेंगे, यह मैं डंके की चोट पर कहता हूं। मगर मैं जरा तर्क में जाना चाहता हूं। वियतनाम के लिये कहा जा रहा है कि वहां से अमरीकी सेना हट जाय तब उससे बात-चीत हो। और फिर चीन से क्यों कहा जा रहा है कि चीन से फौरन बात हो, सीधी बात हो? माननीय सपू साहब कह रहे हैं कि एक आदमी को भेजो। काहे? फिर चीन से क्यों न कहा जाय कि जब तक तुम हमारी मातृभूमि की एक एक इंच जमीन से न हट जाओ तब तक तुम से बात नहीं होगी? चीन से ऐसा क्यों न कहा जाय? हमें वही तर्क यहां भी देना चाहिये और हमारा डबल स्टैंडर्ड नहीं होना चाहिये कि मीठा-मीठा गप और कड़ुआ-कड़ुआ थू। उस तर्क को दोनों पर लगाइये, चीन पर भी लगाइये, अमरिका पर भी लगाइये, रूस पर भी लगाइये, अमरिका को भी हटाइये, चीन को भी हटाइये और रूस को भी हटाइये। तब अपनी नीति कोई होगी, तब अपनी बिनलगाव की कोई नीति होगी वरना अपनी नीति बिनलगाव की नहीं है। यह नीति कभी रूस के दुम में बंधेगी, कभी अमरीका के दुम में बंधेगी और कभी चीन ताकतवर हो गया तो चीन के भी दुम में बंधेगी। इसलिये जरा उधर भी चर्चा हो कर देखा जाना चाहिये।

उपसभापति : और चार मिनट बाकी हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : अरे वस, अभी तो हमारा सम्पूर्ण भाषण ही बाकी है।

देखिये, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि माननीय सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी इसे पढ़ें होंगे, मगर मैं विदेशी नीति पर बोलते समय इस तथ्य को इस सदन की सेवा में अवश्य रखना चाहता हूं। जंगलरी,

वाक्जाल और शब्दों की रचना में इस तथ्य को छिपाया नहीं जा सकता। ताशकंद में अपने एक बड़े राष्ट्र के एक गरीब परिवार के प्रधान मंत्री जब गये तो उनकी मृत्यु कैसे हुई, जब विदेश नीति पर हम चर्चा करते हैं प्रथम बार तो हम इसको भूल नहीं सकते। हमारे पाम बहा के डाक्टरों की रिपोर्ट है जो बहुत लम्बी है। चूंकि आप कहती हैं कि समय कम है, इसलिये हम पूरा नहीं पढ़ेंगे, मगर एक चीज की सफाई चाहेंगे कि जो लेडी डाक्टर डा० चुग के बुलाने के बाद सर्वप्रथम आई। लालबहादुर शास्त्री जी को देखने के लिये, उसने उस रिपोर्ट पर हस्ताक्षर क्यों नहीं है? इसका जवाब माननीय मंत्री जी को देना है। मैं आपको इसे पढ़े देता हूं :

"Within the next five minutes, Prime Minister L. B. Shastri lost consciousness, the pulse disappeared, breathing stopped and the heart beats could not be heard. Death occurred at 1-32 in the morning of 11th January, 1966. Doctor R. N. Chugh had already begun revival treatment by the methods of indirect massage of the heart and artificial respiration through the mouth by means of the air tube. The Soviet doctor, E. G. Yermenko, who had come there immediately on a call from Dr. R. N. Chugh also took part in the treatment by revival procedures."

6 डाक्टरों के इस पर हस्ताक्षर है, मगर उस लेडी डाक्टर के इस पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं है। हमारी जो गपट है उसने मुताबिक उसने इनकार किया हस्ताक्षर बनाने से तब कोसीगिन साहब को फोन किया गया और कोसीगिन ने दूसरे डाक्टरों को बुलाया और इस तरह बाल-बट्टा बनाया। आज तक क्यों नहीं इस सरकार की हिम्मत हुई कि एक इन्क्वायरी बिठाए जो माननीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री की मृत्यु के कारणों की जांच करे कि मृत्यु कैसे हुई, क्यों हुई। यहां भावुकता का चित्र पेश किया जाता है, भावना का दृश्य पैदा करके सत्य पर पर्दा डाला जाता है। सत्य पर पर्दा डालकर वस्तु

[श्री राजनारायण]

स्त्रियों को छियाया जा रहा है।

मैं ज्यादा नहीं

चाहता हूँ। रोडेशिया

क्या किया? पार्सि

ने किया है अपने

रोडेशिया के बारे

रोडेशिया के बारे

होना चाहिए। वि

मंत्री और माननीय स्वर्ण सिंह जी ने बहुत

बयान दिए हैं, पर रोडेशिया के बारे में एक

बार जवान खुली? आज उन्हें विदेश

नीति के ऊपर बोलना था, इसलिये रोडेशिया

के बारे में भी कह दिया। रोडेशिया में

दो लाख गोरों की स

पांच प्रतिशत—10

उनकी आत्मा को, जनतंत्र को कुचल कर

शासन कर रही है। ऐसे निकम्मे शासन से

बढ़कर साम्राज्यवाद क्या होगा, इस से

बढ़ कर तानाशाही क्या होगी। उसके बारे

में एक शब्द कह दिया। और हमारे मित्र

लोग भी बैठे हैं। रोडेशिया के बारे में

कोई बोल नहीं रहा है, भारत और पाकिस्तान

को एक करने के बारे में कोई बोल नहीं रहा

है, कोई अब्दुल गफ्फार खां के बारे में कह नहीं

रहा है। वह डंके की चोट पर कहता है कि

हमारा पख्तूनिस्तान अलग रहेगा। उसको

कोई मदद देने के लिए तैयार नहीं। यह

सरकार वियतनाम में मदद करेगी। क्या है,

श्रीमान, इनके पास, मैं आपके द्वारा पूछना

चाहता हूँ कि ये वियतनाम में मदद करेंगे?

क्या है जिससे ये दूसरे मुल्कों में मदद करेंगे?

केवल जोकरी करेंगे, दलाली करेंगे, अ

अमरीका के पीछे, कभी रूस के पीछे। इस

प्रकार की विदेश नीति स्वर्ण सिंह जी की

सरकार ने चलाई है। वह ऐसी विदेश

नीति इसलिए चला रही है

लोग अशक्त हैं, जनता अचेत है, जनता में

आर्थिक शक्ति नहीं है, जनता अभी 'पीड़ित'

बन नहीं पाई है। अभी विभिन्न जाति-पाति

नें, छोटे-बड़े लोगों में बंटी हुई है, हिन्दू-मुसलमानों में बंटी हुई है।

एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा। अमरीका में तीन मिनट, रूस में 8 मिनट, चीन में 40 मिनट और भारत में 60 मिनट—जो सामान तैयार होता है उसका यह अनुपात है। जब तक यह फर्क रहेगा राष्ट्र-राष्ट्र की उत्पादन शक्ति में, तो क्या यह सरकार गुलाम नहीं बनेगी? अपने देश की उत्पादन शक्ति को बढ़ाने की क्या योजना इस सरकार ने बनाई? अपने देश की मनुष्य-शक्ति को खपाने की क्या योजना इस सरकार ने बनाई? इस सरकार ने कोई योजना नहीं बनाई है। अगर कोई योजना है तो वह जन-हित विरोधी है।

इसके साथ-साथ हिन्दू-मुसलमानों का एक सवाल मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों के सम्मुख रख कर अपने भाषण को समाप्त कर दूंगा। आखिर भारत और पाकिस्तान का बंटवारा क्यों हुआ? हिन्दू और मुसलमानों के बीच नफरत की वजह से। उस नफरत को बढ़ाया अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद ने। उसने इतिहास को उलटा लिखाया। क्या इस सरकार ने कोई भी नए ढंग से, सही तरीके से इतिहास लिखाने की बात की है। उलटा इतिहास काश्मीर में पढ़ाया जा रहा है, अपने देश भारत में पढ़ाया जा रहा है। मैं आपके द्वारा माननीय स्वर्ण सिंह जी को बताना चाहूंगा कि इतिहास साक्षी है कि हिन्दू और मुसलमानों में जितनी नफरत नहीं थी उससे ज्यादा मुहब्बत थी। उस मुहब्बत की दरिया को, उस मुहब्बत की धारा को कांग्रेस की सरकार ने रोक रखा है। उसको यह प्रवाहित नहीं होने देना चाहती क्योंकि यह सरकार समझती है कि आज पाकिस्तान के एक-सवा करोड़ हिन्दू और दस-बारह करोड़ मुसलमान भारतवर्ष में आते हैं तो पांच-छः करोड़ मुसलमान और वहां के 10-12 करोड़ मुसलमान मिलकर अभी जो मुसलमान एक बटा आठ है वे

एक बटा चार हों जाएंगे। तो फिर मुसलमान को ये डरवा नहीं पायेंगे कि अगर तुम हमें वोट नहीं दोगे तो तुमको हम पाकिस्तान भेज देंगे।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : गलत धारणा है।

श्री राजनारायण : गलत धारणा है, तो इसे सही करवाओ। चलो हमारे आल-इंडिया भारत-पाक सम्मेलन में। एक तो यह कहना है।

दूसरी बात यह कहनी है कि सरकार को इतिहास फिर से लिखाना चाहिए। सरकार हिन्दु और मुसलमानों में नफरत बढ़ाने वाली, जो भी ताकत और शक्ति है उसको राज-द्रोही करार दे। आज वह ताकत जो हिन्दू और मुसलमानों में नफरत बढ़ाती है वह निश्चित रूप से राष्ट्र द्रोही ताकत है। सरकार को कहना चाहिये कि यह राष्ट्र-द्रोही है। उसके लिए क्या करना होगा? इतिहास में रहीम को पढ़ाओ, कबीर को पढ़ाओ, मलिक मुहम्मद जायसी को पढ़ाओ। 'सारे जहाँ से अच्छा हिन्दोस्तां हमारा, हम बुलबुले हैं इसके वह गुलिस्तां हमारा' किसने लिखा? इकबाल ने! किसी हिन्दु ने नहीं लिखा। तो भारत और पाकिस्तान के एकीकरण के बाद नए हिन्दुस्तान का निर्माण करो, पुराने एक संयुक्त हिन्दुस्तान की नयी प्रतिष्ठापना करो। तब कोई विदेश नीति सही होगी और तब जाकर वह विदेश नीति दुनिया के राजनीतिक श्यामपट पर अपना प्रभाव रखेगी, सही चित्र बनाएगी। जब तक भारत-पाक का एकीकरण नहीं होगा तब तक सही माने में भारत का सच्चा चित्र दुनिया के राजनीतिक रंगमंच पर आने वाला नहीं है। आपकी बेकरारी को देखते हुए, माननीया, मैं अपने भाषण को समाप्त करता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस लंगड़ी और राष्ट्रहित-विरोधी विदेश नीति को लेकर इस सदन के समय का अपव्यय न करे।

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, it has been said by an hon'ble Member of the Opposite side that a microscope is needed in order to see where the policy of non-alignment is. Madam, my submission is that after the very clear exposition that the Minister of External Affairs has given us of the foreign policy of the country, I do not think that a microscope is needed at all. We have from the very beginning, from the time of Jawaharlal Nehru, depended on the policy of peaceful co-existence and non-alignment. There have been various strains and stresses in the world. We have been deeply distressed this morning to hear about the military preparations of Pakistan and these military preparations are alleged to be helped by China. This, Sir, is one of the most distressing things that has come to our notice. But we must not think, I am afraid, that we will not make our preparations, that we will not be prepared to meet the aggression. We will not allow our non-alignment policy to be misunderstood for any weakness. We cannot falter from our path. We must follow the path of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. We have come to an agreement with Pakistan which is known as the Tashkent Agreement. We have agreed in that Agreement that we will do everything to have peaceful co-existence and peaceful relations.

My friend has just spoken of East Pakistan and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. We are second to none in our allegiance to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Personally I have been brought up at his feet in politics and I am a devoted admirer of his. But according to the Tashkent Declaration—I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Member to clause 3 which says : —

“That the relations between India and Pakistan shall be based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other.”

If Pakhtonistan had been formed and then Pakistan had been trying to conquer it, then it would be a valid thing for them to complain that we were not helping an independent country. But we cannot help any party in a country to separate from that country. That is definitely an internal affair. That is the basis on which we

[Shrimati Shyam Kumari Khan]

object to Pakistan interfering in Kashmir. We claim that Kashmir is our territory, that Kashmir is part of India, and when Pakistan prefers her claim to it we say that this is a wrong claim and they have no business to be there in Kashmir.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

Then, Mr. Vice-Chairman, another matter has been raised by the hon'ble Member Opposite that our path, quoting him, 'is that of capitalist development'. My friend, Mr. Niren Ghosh, says that it is the internal policy of a country that leads to the external policy. The internal policy of this country, I must say with all the force at my command, is definitely not that of "capitalist development". It is "mixed economy" which we are following to the best of our ability. We believe in non-alignment. We believe in taking help from the West and from the East. Whereas we go to America for food, we have also gone to Russia for aid. And, therefore, it is very unjust to say that we are taking help only from capitalist countries.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : Russia is also helping us.

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN : Exactly. So far as our policy with Pakistan and China is concerned, my friend said that we are not talking to them properly and we are not dealing with them properly. We have talked with Pakistan and the Tashkent Agreement has been the result. We have had to fight a very bitter war with Pakistan. We were not very happy about the war because as my friend opposite also said, we were part of one nation not very long ago. But Pakistan considered our non-alignment, our peaceful policy, to be that of weakness and I must, with all the strength at my command, refute this. The policy of peaceful co-existence is not a policy of weakness. It is a dynamic policy, it is a policy which is a positive policy and no country, at least not India, will submit to such a threat. Then he says : 'We have not talked with China'. Is it our fault that we have not talked with China ? On many an occasion our leaders have said that our policy is of peace and peaceful settlement of disputes and that we would be prepared to negotiate with China on

the basis of the Colombo Proposals with a view to the settlement of our border disputes. So the ball is in the other court. I am afraid that it is China that does not want to talk to us. It is China that is not prepared to talk to us on the basis of the Colombo Proposals and many a time, again and again, it has been said that if China is prepared to talk to us, we will certainly meet her round the table.

Another thing that has been said is about our objective. We are undoubtedly a nation of Asia and our objective in Asia must be peace. We would like to have peace with everyone around us. It is unfortunate, and we are not very happy about the position, that our relations with Pakistan and China are not good. We are not proud of it, we are not happy about it but we do not know how they can be made better if this armed infiltration, if the arming on our borders, if the marching of troops on our borders, are to continue. Anyhow that must take care of itself but I come to the very much discussed question of Vietnam.

Vietnam too is a part of Asia. Vietnam too is being at the moment bombed rather badly. My friend, Mr. Niren Ghosh, quoted Nehru and so will I. This is from a speech that he delivered in the Lok Sabha on May 14, 1962. He said :

"The whole of Laos and Vietnam depends, it is recognised now more than before, on the policy of what is called—I do not like the word—'neutrality'. Every person, even members of rival blocs agree that Laos and Vietnam must be neutral and must not attach themselves to this or that military bloc. The whole policy depends upon what is laid down in Geneva six or seven years ago—the Geneva Agreements. It is in so far as these agreements have not been acted upon that trouble has arisen."

What does our present Prime Minister say? She has also said :

"I offer these proposals as no more than an idea."

She has offered the same Geneva Agreement. She says :

"India is committed to a peaceful solution and not any particular solution."

We would—support any alternative proposal that offers hope of success. But of one thing I am certain, there must be an early, an immediate turning away from war in Vietnam.”

My friend has also said that we are not saying that Vietnam has to be cleared of foreign troops. I want to reply in the words of the present. Prime Minister;

“It is necessary to secure the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Vietnam and to insulate that unhappy country from every foreign interference so that the people of Vietnam determine their own future free of external pressures.”

This is what the policy of the Indian Government is and I support it fully.

I may remind America however that the whole world is very distressed at the war that is going on in Vietnam. We are not at all happy at the bombings that are going on there and in the words of a British paper—I wish to quote :

“It is a war that the very highest motives of the Americans do not excuse.”

The question has been asked of us : “You say that your policy is that of non-alignment. You say that these are your enemies but who are your friends ?” My submission is that the rest of the nations of the world are our friends. We have got friendly relations and our Foreign Minister had told us in the morning how our friendly relations are going on developing. We are developing them in Asia, we are developing them in Europe and we are developing them in America. There is no nation that is really antagonistic to us. Whereas our Prime Minister went to America, she also went to the UAR and she also went to the Soviet Union and other countries and, therefore, we do not put ourselves in any Bloc. The very fact that we are asking help from all sides, the very fact that we even have a Trade Commissioner of Israel in Bombay, the very fact that we are more or less following this policy of non-alignment is a thing that is not acceptable to those people who want us to join one Bloc and that I am afraid India will not do. Our policies are

definitely not passive. Our policies, as I said, are positive. They are based on friendship with the various nations and they are dynamic. We cannot copy any other nation. We cannot be dictated to by any other nation and we must develop in our own way and we are trying to do as best as we can. We know that the world is full of stresses and strains and we know that the world and some countries are going to the length of trials of even atom bomb though they talk of disarmament. You know and it is well known in the country and elsewhere that India has played a very significant part in the Disarmament Conference. We have been a co-sponsor of several resolutions. We have gone to Committees, we have participated in Commissions and we have shown in every way that whereas we are prepared to use atomic energy for development and for peaceful purposes, we are not for a nuclear war and for the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. We have definite faith that aggression of any type should be resisted and we will strain every nerve to establish our principle of co-existence, peace and non-alignment, for, in that way alone peace can be established in this world.

With these words, I support the foreign policy of the Government.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Not atom bomb.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the House has listened to an extensive survey of the international situation given by my friend, the Minister for External Affairs. It has been said that a nation which is improvident, which is heavily dependent on finance from other nations is not likely to have a strong and vigorous foreign policy and this has been true of the developments that have taken place in India and outside during the last one year. I am glad, therefore, that in the context of our worsening internal economic situation, we have tried to take the initiative in regard to certain matters in the broad field of international affairs. I would like in this connection to endorse all the friendly references made by the Minister for External Affairs to our neighbouring countries. We all want to strengthen our relationship with Cambodia, Laos, Ceylon and other areas which he mentioned this morning.

[Shri A. D. Mani]

I would like to concentrate on five points which are contained in the amendments which I have tabled to the main motion. The first is about the Tashkent Declaration. I have always felt that when we discussed the matter in Tashkent in January last, we did not insist on the scaling down of the Forces on both sides of the border as a condition precedent to the lessening of tension. What has happened is that though Pakistan has tried to pay lip-service to the Tashkent Declaration, in effect, it has been trying to undermine its very foundations, and to build up on the borders, to which a reference was made by the Minister of State for Defence Production, which shows that the Tashkent Declaration has completely failed as far as Pakistan is concerned. The question can be asked : Should we repudiate the Tashkent Declaration ? A repudiation of the Tashkent Declaration is a form of denial of the existence of such an Agreement and it would undermine India's position as far as the Soviet Union is concerned. I am not in favour of a repudiation but I think it is necessary for us to inform the Soviet Union that if the build-up continues on our frontiers and if we feel that for safeguarding the frontiers we may have to take a military initiative of the kind that we took by marching our troops very near Lahore, in September last, we would be forced to do it and this should not be regarded as a violation of the Tashkent Declaration.

And I also feel that the Minister for External Affairs should send a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations pointing out that Pakistan has been defying

the spirit of the terms of the Tashkent Declaration by speeding up the build-up of its armed forces on our frontiers. Sir, I have always regarded that if the developments in Asia continued to proceed like this, in the next ten years Pakistan will have to be regarded as a major threat to world peace and placed in the same category as China. And we have to strengthen, therefore, our public relations machinery in the United Nations to draw their attention to the failure of the Tashkent Declaration, and this is contained in one of my amendments. I would like to continue tomorrow.

HON MEMBERS : Yes, yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Please continue; there is half a minute still.

— SHRI A. D. MANI : Sir, in this connection I would like to say that we have had no information about the collaboration that is taking place, that is reported to be taking place between Pakistan and China in regard to the setting up of an atomic reactor station in East Bengal. We have been trying to get information from the Government, but I believe Government does not have authoritative information on this subject.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Now is time, Mr. Mani. You may continue tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 9th August, 1966.