

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION—continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the international situation. Shri S. N. Mishra may continue his speech.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, I was stressing yesterday when you were not in the Chair, that for any realistic discussion or appraisal of our foreign policy in the new context, it is necessary to begin with the recognition that there has been a disturbance of the balance both in the international affairs as also in the domestic sphere as a result of the recent developments so the most seminal question to my mind with which the House has to grapple is whether we are going to succeed in creating a higher equilibrium or whether we are going to settle down at a lower level. And in fact, this is not the question posed only to this country, this is also a question posed to the major countries of the world, I repeat, whether the Indian equilibrium both in the international affairs and in the domestic sphere is going to be at a higher level. If there is going to be any difficulty about this, looking at it from a wider angle, I must say that this is ultimately going to lead to a great disequilibrium in the world, not only in Asia. That is a very important point to consider from my point of view.

Now, so far as we in this country are concerned, unless we grapple with this, we will be accused of ignoring the harsh realities which are bound to assert themselves sooner than later. While I am on this subject of 'the disturbance of the equilibrium in the domestic sphere, I would like to explain it as I was trying to do yesterday. With regard to this matter, we have to reckon with the fact the military factor—or if you so like, the defence factor—is going to claim much of our energy and resources in the days to come and,

as a consequence the developmental programmes are going to be affected adversely. As I said, this is bound to have repercussions all along the line, which cannot be ignored. Maybe, with better skill and management and with a greater sense of sacrifice and statesmanship, we may be able to turn it to our better advantage.

Similarly, in the field of international affairs, the old order of our international relationship has been disturbed. And the major development in this connection has been that our relations with some of the friendly countries of the world are under strain. And there is yet another dynamic factor of no mean significance; that is the precipitation of a large amount of goodwill so far as the Soviet Union is concerned. This factor has a certain amount of dynamism which will work itself out in many ways and in many ramifications.

Now, another point to which I had also made a reference yesterday is that this disturbance of the equilibrium had taken place even in the year 1962 when we had a major confrontation with the Chinese. But subsequent to that, the order which had emerged was indeed of a higher character because after the Chinese aggression, we found that our defence was more secure, that it was better strengthened and that it had acquired a measure of self-reliance. Not only that. A very important factor that had come into play was that the natural balance which had been disturbed as a result of the military alliances was redressed to some extent after the Chinese aggression. And then, it is also of no mean satisfaction that our developmental programmes after the Chinese aggression had gone on uninterrupted without any impairment and our programme of basic industries, in particular, which leads to greater self-reliance had also gone on, broadly, uninterrupted.

In that international sphere, too, , there was a larger constellation of friends belonging both to the West and the East who had come to our assistance and that testified to the essential soundness of our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. And the recent crisis has established that this equilibrium which had emerged after the Chinese aggression had served us indeed remarkably well. And in fact, it is only because of that equilibrium which had emerged after the Chinese aggression that we were successful in meeting the Pak. soldier who had American equipment and Chinese strategy behind him.

When I mention this factor of American equipment, I do not want to suggest even in the remotest way possible that this was done with American consent or with the tacit American approval. But to our regret, Mr. Chairman—this is a grievance shared by all, not only my grievance against the Government— the Government does not seem to speak very frankly against one thing. I have not come across a single statement from the Government with the necessary amount of frankness so far as this question is concerned. We have not told them that we have not found a single public statement made by any American official of standing condemning the Pak. action in this regard. What is worse, instead we find abstruse references being made to the use of American equipment by both the sides. You will remember that the Defence Secretary of the United States, Mr. McNamara, only some time back, suggested in a way that the use of arms by Pakistan did not matter so much since the Indian Army was larger and had quantitatively much larger equipment. These things make us very sad indeed. And this, in spite of the fact that President Eisenhower had assured our Prime Minister in February, 1954 in no uncertain terms that they were not going to be used against any country in aggression. I would like j

968 RS—4.

to quote him because nowhere, again, have I found the Government spokesman quoting this very relevant and important sentence of President Eisenhower in this context. President Eisenhower had said in his letter:

"And I am confirming publicly that if our aid to any country, including Pakistan, is misused and directed against another in aggression, I will undertake immediately, in accordance with my constitutional authority, appropriate action both within and without the UN to thwart such aggression."

But we do not find this assurance reflected anywhere, either in the United Nations or outside. Newspaper reports emanating from Washington or any part of the United States suggest that there is no doubt a change in the American attitude. Nobody would welcome the change more than I would do personally. Some politicians of stature visiting the United States also say that there is a definite change in the American attitude. But people of humbler type who have got lesser sight are not able to identify any change on the part of the American authorities.

We do need American friendship, Mr. Chairman, and we need it badly —there is no doubt about this. This friendship has yielded very good results not only for us but for the world peace as well in the past. But why should this come in the way of speaking out our mind on this question very frankly? Frankness, if anything, should reinforce friendship; it should not weaken friendship. But that is not how the Government proposes to deal with this matter. So far as the United States is concerned, I do not think there is going to be no improvement in the matter.

No wonder, Mr. Chairman, that people in this country—and this is not only my personal impression, this is the universal impression—where-ever we go, have found a new faith in our old policies which have not

[Shri S. N. Mishra.] only passed the test of the times, not only come out unscathed from the present crisis, but have come out much stronger, more vibrant and vigorous after the present crisis. If this crisis, to my mind, has affirmed anything—and let me emphasise it as far as I can—it is the essential soundness of our foreign and planning policies. In other words, this crisis has tested and affirmed our policies of non-alignment and secularism and, I would say, socialism too. But here it is difficult for me to give all the implications of socialism in terms of defence and our policy of basic industrialisation. And what is more important, Mr. Chairman—and this must be declared by every thinking person in this country who has to raise his voice at this particular juncture—that this crisis has tested Jawaharlal Nehru. Jawaharlal Nehru, to my mind, is more alive today than he was during his life time in spite of all this subtle and persistent attempts at denigration by a certain section of the people in this country. And the successor Government—I must warmly congratulate them—has shown the necessary faith, grit and determination to act up to the policies of Jawaharlal Nehru. I have no doubt that had our friends on the Opposite given unstinted support and co-operation to these policies, both the international policy and the planning policy, India would have been much stronger and more vigorous and vibrant than what it is at the present moment.

Yet I must confess, Mr. Chairman, with deep regret—and here the melancholy story begins—that about these very policies which have been tested and emphatically affirmed by the present crisis, confusion is created periodically, not by any outsider, but by the members of the Government themselves. I feel concerned, Mr. Chairman, at the increasing tendency on the part of the members of the Government to give expression to what are called with impunity,

personal views as if these personal views can be expressed with perfect freedom by any member of the Government, as if one can take one's robes off at any time as one likes. And particularly this External Affairs Ministry seems to be everybody's cup of tea so that everybody can express one's opinion on this. Let me give some examples.

Some Ministers speak, Mr. Chairman, on the Commonwealth on which the Prime Minister chooses to be reticent for very perfect and obvious reasons, and with which these Ministers have got absolutely nothing to do. Others speak on Tibet although Tibet is something far removed from the departments with which they are concerned. A Governor speaks—I do not have that issue of the London Times with me nor do I have the time to go into the statement on Kashmir. Had a Muslim Governor spoken in the same strain on Kashmir, he would have been dubbed right away as a Pakistani. This is how we are allowing people to run amuck. Another Minister speaks on the shift in the atomic policy although atomic energy is the concern of the Prime Minister. And finally, another Minister speaks on rethinking and reappraisal and the need for injection of more realism into the foreign policy.

Here I must congratulate the Minister of External Affairs for having made it clear beyond any shadow of doubt that there could be no such nonsense about rethinking and reappraisal of our foreign policy and that whatever adjustments have to be made, they will be made within the basic framework of the foreign policy. And I ask you, Mr. Chairman, when were these adjustments not made in the past? Is it by implication meant that the adjustments were not made in the past? These adjustments were certainly made by the man whose star shone undimmed for well over 50 years a fact probably, the like of which you have not found anywhere in the world's bls-

tory. Was he successful because he was inflexible? He was flexible and he made adjustments according to the needs of the time.

Here, perhaps when I am on this aspect of the operation of the foreign policy, it would be appropriate to make a reference to a question which was put this very morning about the N. R. Pillai Committee. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was not at all satisfied by the answer which was given by the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs. Why should there be this original sin in the composition of this Committee? The question is not one of making a change at this late stage. The original sin in the composition of the Committee was that it did not contain any non-official element. There should have been non-officials of standing who have had distinguished public service, who have had distinguished diplomatic service. But that was not done. And these gentlemen are asked to sit in judgment on the administration of which they are a part. Here you also, Mr. Chairman, would feel a little puzzled as to what this Morarji Desai Committee has to do in this regard. Is the Indian Foreign Service going to be a part of the Committee's business or is it going to be taken away from the purview of the Committee? I really do not understand it. (Time bell rings,)

I would crave your indulgence for two minutes. A word about the Algiers Conference, the burning topic of the day. I completely agree with many of the things which have been said by the Government spokesman. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that China's asking for the postponement of the Conference was an acceptance of a major defeat on her part. It did indicate a definite decline in the influence of China in Africa and Asia. But my feeling is that had we emphasised this aspect and not taken a very rigid stand, had we taken a flexible stand on the issue of postponement, the impression would not have gone round that we also got defeated in the process.

Therefore, I should have thought that the whole issue should have been left to the other countries. (Time bell rings.) Only one word if you can permit me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sure it will not be one word.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: It is* only a word about another burning question of the day, namely, Rhodesia, and in two minutes I will finish it

Sir, before I finish I would like to say a word about this Rhodesia question. Here both the speeches of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister have been in the right key and perspective. But I do not think that all our responsibility should end with that. We should have thought that we could have taken steps to hold a Commonwealth Conference at least if not an Afro-Asian Conference. I do not agree at all with the Foreign Minister that such a Conference would serve no purpose. If the Commonwealth is not a forum for grappling with these questions, I do not know what the Commonwealth is meant for. Therefore, I thought that some steps could have been taken in this direction. This initiative would very well have been appreciated by the people of Africa.

Now, this Rhodesia question, to my mind is a very crucial one in the sense that if Rhodesia succeeds in consolidating itself, then in the crucial part of Africa—including South Africa and Rhodesia—there would be white dominance. We just can not appreciate, while we appreciate many of the steps taken by the Wilson Government, the Gandhian attitude shown by it which was denied to us and which was denied to the colonial peoples during the last 200 years. Thank you very much.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Chairman, I was closely listening to the speech of the Foreign Minister. He has given us in detail the background of the con-

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.]

flict between India and Pakistan but I expected that he would spend more time in giving us the lessons of the confrontation. I found that he was silent on certain important questions. My friend Shri Patel has once again come out with his opposition to the policy of non-alignment. I felt that after the recent developments at least now he will stop his opposition to the policy of non-alignment. If anything has been confirmed during this conflict, it was the correctness of the policy of non-alignment but some of our friends yet seem to doubt the correctness of this policy. Supposing we did not follow this policy, what was the alternative? Supposing India was following a policy of aligning with the Western Powers and if we were confronted with a situation as we had with Pakistan, what would have been the fate of our country? Definitely we could not expect any help from those Western countries and Kashmir would have been militarily occupied by Pakistan. That would have been the result. So even now speaking against this policy of non-alignment, I cannot understand. Then he has been trying to find out allies for us and who are the two allies he has pointed out? One was Taiwan and the other was Israel. These are the two countries with which he wanted us to align and in his speech he also said that more than Pakistan, China should be considered as our enemy. I need not remind you about the strength of Taiwan to fight the Chinese. They were driven out of China by the present Chinese Government and in what way we are going to get strengthened by the support of Taiwan, I need not explain. So also about Israel but even he did not have the courage to tell us that we should align with the Western Bloc. Even though some of his friends outside this House are trying to persuade India to align with the Western Powers, fortunately, perhaps it might be because of the blood in him, he did not advocate that policy but recently I found not

only the Members of the Swatantra Party but very important members of the Congress—Cabinet Ministers, completely forgetting the experience of the last few months, advocating the cause of the Americans. Now they want to white-wash what all the Americans have done during the last few months. I do not think that I should go into all the details but it is known to everybody that when we were confronted with Pakistan, our Army had to fight against Sabre jets and Patton tanks supplied by the Americans. My previous speaker reminded you of the promise made by Eisenhower but we have our experience not only in this conflict but when we were confronted with the Pakistan army in the Rami of Kutch. There also it was the Patton tank that was used and then the explanations given by the Americans were: "Even though the Pakistanis flirted with the Chinese, after all they are our allies and so we cannot give them up." That was the explanation given. We did not take note of that at that time but when we were confronted with the Pakistan army recently, our Army, our soldiers had to fight against these. Even today there is no guarantee on the part of the Americans that they will not supply them with further arms. Not only that, but through Turkey, Iran and other countries they are even now helping Pakistan and more than all that, from 1947 onwards what has been the attitude of America towards the Kashmir issue? I do not know why the Foreign Minister failed to tell us the background in which Ayub Khan accepted the cease-fire. It was reported in all the papers that just before accepting the cease-fire, Johnson and Ayub Khan had a phone talk where a guarantee was given to Ayub Khan that the U.S.A. would give all material and moral support for the political solution of the Kashmir question in their favour. This was reported in all the Indian papers and it was after getting this guarantee that Ayub Khan informed Mr. Bhutto, who was at that time in the U.S.A. to accept the cease-fire.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Ayub Khan also had a licking from the hands of the Indian Army.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That is another aspect of the matter but my point is, from 1947 to this date, the attitude of America with regard to this question of Kashmir has been a consistent one and unfortunately it was against the interests of our country. So these advocates of America like our Minister, Shri S. K. Patil, before persuading the Prime Minister to visit the U.S.A. should at least get a categorical statement from the American Government that they would accept Kashmir as an integral part of India. Also they should see that no armaments are supplied to Pakistan as they have been doing in the past. When we are sure that these things are not going to happen, I cannot understand why so much of pressure is put on the Prime Minister to visit the U.S.A. in the present context. Those people who are advocating this are forgetting what we had experienced while we were confronted with the Pakistan army. Some people quoted and I do not want to quote all those things once again. But everyone knows that they have taken a very unfriendly attitude on this issue. It is not only the Government there, but the press also. Now this attitude, this American lobby which is working here to white-wash what they have done, well, that should not be encouraged, and I think that after this experience the Government will take a firm and honourable attitude towards America.

Then coming to the other question of our relationship with the British Commonwealth, yesterday one of our friends here was saying that the Commonwealth was already dead. Of course, I also agree, and from the way in which the British Prime Minister has been behaving, it has become clear that the Commonwealth has ceased to exist as a live organisation. But when something is dead, you are not to leave it there as such; you

have to bury it and not allow it to putrefy the atmosphere. So all the arguments which have been put forward by my friend, Mr. Gujral, I accept, but I want the Government to take the next step of burying the Commonwealth, and that can be done by our quitting the Commonwealth immediately. I thought that some enlightenment I will get from the speech of the Foreign Minister in this regard. Perhaps he may be reserving it for his reply. Also it is not enough, as far as the British are concerned, that we get out of the Commonwealth. That must be done but certain other steps are also to be taken. Even in today's papers, in the 'Statesman', there was a news item to the effect that three Britons were to be deported from Shillong. I need not read the whole thing. The three British planters, who were behaving in an anti-national way, were arrested, and they are now going to be deported. So here the question is: In that border State of Assam should you permit an enemy base to function against our interests? So the thing you have to do at least in this context is that you should take steps to nationalise all these plantations and send the Britishers away. During 1962 our job was to find out conveyance for these people to rush back to Britain, and after the trouble was over, again they came back. Now what are they doing there? Instead of supporting our cause, or even instead of remaining neutral, they are functioning as an enemy base within our own country. So I strongly request the Government that this opportunity should be utilised to nationalise all these tea plantations.

Then another experience gained during this period was that even the ordinary man has realised the vital importance of oil in the defence of the country, and yet you continue to allow this oil industry to be owned by imperialists like the U.S.A. and U.K. This will definitely go against even our defence efforts and requirements. So apart from coming out of

[Shri M. N. Govitidan Nair.] the Commonwealth we have to take these immediate steps of nationalising the oil industry and nationalising these tea plantations.

Now everybody appreciated the stand taken by the Prime Minister immediately afterHow many minutes more do I have, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can have four minutes more. You will then exhaust the time. You have already spoken for sixteen minutes. So you can have four minutes more, because your party has twenty minutes.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Now within these four minutes I will just point out one or two things.

Now in this conflict, as has been pointed out here, on the one side, Pakistan supported by imperialists was attacking us, and on the other side China was giving us an ultimatum to attack us. Now this also is a common factor as far as Afro-Asian countries are concerned, Now the adventurist and disruptive line of the Chinese communists serving as handmaid for imperialist intrigues in all the Afro-Asian countries. So when we say that you should get out of the Commonwealth and you should not rely on America, it does not mean that we are left without friends. During this period, on the one side we found that the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries were prepared to help us. Secondly I feel the identity of interests of all these Afro-Asian nations which, if we properly cultivate, will prove to be extremely useful in building up a common line, because all these nations—including us—are faced with this one problem of consolidating and strengthening their independence. Now in this they are faced with two opponents—I might say—one and the most important is the imperialist intrigues and, **two**, the wrong tactics and policy **pursued** by China—these are weakening the independence of these

countries. So if we follow the correct policy, we will be able to build up a wide range of friendship.

Then here there was some talk about the atom bomb. Some people were advocating that, even curtailing the Plan in other regards, we should set in preparations and go in for manufacturing an atom bomb. I think this is a very wrong thing not only on principle but also even from the defence point of view. Yesterday the Foreign Minister was telling us that Pakistan is even now infiltrating into Rajasthan territory, where we have a big and a very long border to protect. Even in conventional armaments we cannot claim that we are well prepared. So any money that can be spared should be used for building up a pile of conventional armaments, and this idea of having an atom bomb as a prestige possession should not take us in the wrong direction. Secondly, even on principle it is wrong to manufacture an atom bomb—I need not go into that.

Then I have to raise another point and that is about Tibet. Now there is a feeling in the country, as has been just expressed by my hon. friend, that we had taken a wrong stand with regard to Tibet in the past and that should be rectified now. I think that is also a wrong line. As long as we have accepted that Tibet is a part of China, an integral part of China, I think it is wrong to raise the question of Tibet, as it was raised by my hon. friend Shri Dahyabhai Pate. Just as we say that no other country has any right to speak about the internal affairs of Kashmir, so also we have to stick to the principle that we will not interfere in the internal affairs of another country.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: But Tibet is not a State of China.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You see, if I have more time with me, I can argue that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I am not in a position to oblige you.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I know our Chairman is very strict •with regard to time and so I cannot go into that matter now. I would only say that we should not be swayed by certain passions and thus put ourselves in the wrong before the world. So with regard to both matters, namely, the question of making the atom bomb and the question of Tibet, the stand that we have been taking should be maintained, the policy that we have been pursuing should be pursued and there should be no change. Thank you.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI (Madras): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are discussing the subject of foreign affairs, this time under rather a peculiar and exciting situation. We have had very recently the glorious experience of thwarting the attempted aggression and now we are meeting full of pleasure and pride, legitimate pride, about our fighting forces. But we should not be misled into the belief that the victories on the battle front are the direct outcome of our foreign policy and its implementation. The foreign policy of our country is far more permanent, far more flexible than our tactics and our strategy that we from time to time take on the battle front. We are all thankful and proud to possess a fighting force which has shown its mettle and when I go through the catalogue of victories that our fighting forces have won I for one am constrained to think that if only the ruling party had given such a catalogue of triumphs all these 18 years, then most of the ills of this country even on the foreign front would have been absent. We had given our fighting forces, we have been told, not sophisticated instruments and weapons. We gave our fighting forces weapons that have been considered to be even obsolete. Yet against odds and against sophisticated American Patton tanks, our fighting forces on all our fronts have established victory and triumphed. We have also given to the ruling party •U these 18 years, not obsolete

machines, but whatever and all that they wanted. Yet whether it is on the foreign front, whether it is on the home front, whether it is on the food front or on the industrial front, they have not presented such a catalogue as our fighting forces have presented to us. Therefore it is that we should not think that the victories that have been registered on the battle front should be taken into consideration when we are considering the foreign policy of this country. As a matter of fact, the foreign policy of this country, or for that matter, of any country, is not strictly a one-way traffic. We cannot go on formulating certain foreign policies without taking into consideration the foreign policies and the situations that are being created in the world around. That is why when some of us begin to talk about a re-thinking on the policy of non-alignment and other policies, the members of the ruling party should not rush and dash against us saying that we are trying to sell goods and ideas of some other country. As a matter of fact, the D.M.K. is not interested in any camps whatsoever. This non-alignment recalls to my mind a story of my student days. An applicant for a job wrote in his application form that he was a non-matriculate. The entry "non-matriculate", of course, proved beyond doubt that he was not a matriculate. But the person who was to give the job put the applicant the question, "Well, you are not a matriculate. Then what are you? Have you passed the First Form, the Second Form or Third Form or what?" I am interested not in the particular question as to whether you are non-aligned or not, but I am perfectly legitimate in asking that the Government should place before us when they say that they are non-aligned, what exactly they are. This non-alignment or non-involvement is a negative thing. There is no use rushing forward to say that it is purposeful and specific and positive. The very connotation of the word "non" means that we are not aligned with anybody. By

[Shri C. N. Annadurai.]

that I do not mean that we should get ourselves aligned to SEATO or CENTO or NATO. As a matter of fact, I do not want any such military junta to exist at all. They are, as a matter of fact, trying to almost stab the United Nations Organisation itself in the back, by having these circles within circles. Therefore, when I say that I want the Government to inform us what they exactly mean by non-alignment, that does not mean that I am asking the Government to go and join some military junta. They should have before them an objective and that objective they have announced and that is an objective which is appreciated by all and which nobody would repudiate, and that objective is peace with honour and concord, leading to comradeship. When we want peace, we are equally determined not to enter into any military alliances or pacts or military junta, and the next best thing and the only alternative is to make ourselves stronger and stronger, to get everything that we want from the home soil, to stand on our own legs, not looking to this side or that side or going to this country or that country very often. Somebody said—I fail to recollect his name—that a nation with a begging bowl in its hand cannot have an independent foreign policy. It is very easy and very enthusiastic to say that we will never accept any aid with any strings attached. But even accepting aid without strings speaks ill of this country. We have got vast potentialities. We have got vast possibilities and the present conflict has shown us that if the call comes from the proper quarters, and at the proper moment and with the proper tone, then the masses are ready to stand up and produce what they are expected to produce. Therefore, our foreign policy, if it is to be really independent, can be based only upon a strong homefront. What do I mean by a strong home front? Not the home-guards nor the defence councils and other so-called clubs or '

meetings, but the strengthening of the democratic forces, the democratic machinery, and above all, the democratic spirit. It is for the ruling part, for the Members of the Treasury Benches, even now to think whether they are strengthening the democratic machinery even during this period of emergency. Can the Members of the Treasury Benches say with enthusiasm that they are taking along with them all the opposition parties in every one of their efforts?

Nearer home, the Prime Minister of our country who has hit the headlines and rightly entered into everybody's heart here and legitimately so, is having triumphal tours. He is entitled to them. Or rather I would say that the people are entitled to ask their Prime Minister to come and receive their ovations and honours. But has he thought at any time how fine, how ennobling, it would be if instead of these triumphal tours being merely government functions or party functions, they had been arranged on an all-party basis? Then the strength of that democratic spirit, that energy that we have seen surging in the country, would have been unparalleled. Well, I am talking, people may say, of small things. But then the tiny small spring it is that makes the clock tick. Therefore, even though the matter may appear very small when compared to the controversy over the atom bomb or the Afro-Asian Conference, nevertheless we have to take into consideration the small matters also, because, as I said, without the small springs we cannot make the clock tick. Therefore, I would like that on the home front the democratic spirit should be built up constantly, consistently, taking into consideration the vast energy that has come gushing forth from the masses now.

As far as the present situation is concerned whether we look to this country or that country for help, let

us not forget that even after eighteen years we are not in a position to stand on our own legs. We have every wish to stand on our own legs. We are very strong in our sentiments, stronger still in our statements but fact belies even our statements. Even today we have to depend upon America for aid not for sophisticated items of machinery but for a morsel of food. For eighteen long years the ruling Party has been sitting tight over the destinies of this country. What did the people derive out of that? They asked for taxes, more and more and they have been given as and when the taxes were raised. They asked for loans, they asked for grants and everything was given. They asked for votes in three consecutive General Elections and the people were generous enough to vote them to power but even after eighteen years the Food Minister and the Prime Minister meet in a Party conclave and decide that unless we receive P.L.-480 foodgrains from America, there is the grim prospect of famine gripping the country. When I compare the failure of the Government on the food front with the victory registered by our fighting forces on all sectors, oh! what a comparison it makes. We think that had only the ruling Party given the priorities as they ought to have been given, this food problem itself would not be facing us today. Well, for that, I do not mean, as my friend, Mr. Govindan Nair, would say, "No P.L.-480 at all" because famine and starvation death are something more gruesome than even P.L.-480. Therefore it is that our Prime Minister has been asked by well-wishers and friends, especially by the Food Minister and the Railway Minister, to take a quick sojourn to America and the Prime Minister seems to be saying all along that he is prepared to talk with anybody on anything except about Kashmir. In today's paper I find that the Prime Minister has stated in the other House that he is prepared to talk even about Kashmir with the President of the United States if Mr. Johnson wants that talk to take place. It is in that

context that we should find out what is at the back of the American Government, what possibly can be at the back of the American Government, what possibly can be the policy of the American Government with regard to the Indo-Pakistan conflict. There is no denying the fact that Pakistan is aligned with America. When the United States of America issued an invitation for various nations to join the SEATO, the NATO and the CENTO, India refused and refused correctly, to join any *one* of the Pacts but Pakistan, though it withstood the temptation for some time, took upon itself the option

of joining the SEATO and other military Pacts adumbrated by the United States of America. We cannot then except America not to be partial to Pakistan. Therefore, we should find

out how best to convert the American mind in spite of its alliance with Pakistan and in spite of its alliance with Pakistan there seems to be a change in the trend. Member after Member has been telling us here that there is a change in the trend of American policy. I fail to find any such trend. Of course, it is a big question and it is, to a great extent, due to the Foreign Minister of our country, Mr. Swaran Singh, that the American Press and the American public and American leaders have now given up talking about plebiscite but still they think and talk about some sort of a political solution for the Kashmir problem. Therefore, when the Prime Minister of this country meets the President of the United States of America, and when the President of the United States of America takes up the Kashmir question, the Prime Minister of this country should remember the blood spilt on the various fronts, the victories registered on the various fronts, the various assurances given in this and in the other House and outside by the Prime Minister and his Government that they are not going to part with Kashmir. Another thing. Somehow though it has now become necessary or expedient to take aid from America I think, reading through the history of American diplomacy and American international commitments

[Shri C. N. Annandurai.] somehow the American Government and American leaders have a peculiar knack of choosing the wrong people all over and they are adepts in the art of bidding on the wrong horses on high stakes and one of the horses has been given the salubrious stable in what is called Taiwan. Another is Syngman Rhee and there are other puppet leaders created every week in South Vietnam. Therefore it is that somehow in the people's mind and in my mind, in spite of the fact that I have got my differences with the Communists, Right and Left, American money seems to be tainted. The less of it the more we gain; the more of it the more we lose. Therefore it is that we should come back to the home front, strengthen our democratic forces and democratic spirit and stand on our own legs.

Thank you.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the success or otherwise of our foreign policy is judged when we are face to face with an acute crisis in which our interests are at stake. It is now clear to anybody that the policy which we have followed during the last eighteen years and which has been a gift by our late Prime Minister, not to our country but to the whole world, has been completely vindicated, has been justified. Even though some people might say that the Resolution of the Security Council does not go far enough in the sense that it has not declared Pakistan as the aggressor, and the procedure that has been followed in the Security Council, the latest Resolution even though it does not satisfy us completely goes a long way in satisfying us to a great extent. Therefore I would say that the policy which we have followed has been proved to be the right policy. The policy of non-alignment is the right policy particularly for those countries which have got independence after the second war. I remember that during the first phase of non-alignment, the policy which Pandit Nehru gave us

was ridiculed from various sources but it has now been found that it is the right policy. Even here I find that the Leaders of the two opposite parties have spoken but they have not openly said that non-alignment is wrong. If the speeches of both the Swatantra Party leader, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel and of the Communist Party leader were analysed properly, were probed properly, both of them want us to join one or other of the two blocks. That itself in my view is the success of the policy which we have followed. It is a matter of satisfaction to us that in the crisis which has overtaken us about two or three months back the implementation of our policy has been actively followed up diplomatically and I think for the time being we have come out of the struggle with colours. There is no doubt about that.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): With flying colours.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI: Yes; with flying colours. Now, Mr. Chairman, during the crisis we have been able to judge—goodwill has always been available in words; it was available in profusion during the last eighteen years—who are our genuine friends and—I won't say there are any enemies—who are our opponents for the time being who take up an attitude which sees nothing on one side or the other. We know that now because in the international field there are no permanent friends and there are no permanent opponents. I deliberately do not use the word 'enemies' because there are no enemies in the world. We are friends of all in the sense we would like to be friendly with everyone.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): What about China?

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI: Yes; some day China also will be our friend. In the initial stage, well, there is the struggle and that struggle we have to go through. I personally feel that the policy which we have followed for the last eighteen years is the right policy and it must be con-

tinued to be followed without any hesitation, whatever the Swatantra Party may feel or whatever the Communist Party may say. I have no doubt in my mind about that.

One thing that hurt us in the course of this crisis considerably was the attitude of the United Kingdom. The Labour Party of the U.K. eighteen years back in the circumstances of those days granted us, as the world say, independence. But they did not grant independence out of volition. The circumstances in those days were such that they could not help doing anything else. Anyway, it had left some goodwill in this country. This goodwill has been cultivated both by our good friends and by us. When the crisis came, it is very unfortunate that the U.K. had taken a positively hostile attitude. It could have remained silent. One could have understood it. But of all the nations in the world, Britain, which knows us very well, which knows our country, which knows our people and which was also mainly responsible for the partition, comes forward and says that we are the aggressors. When protests were made and when it was pointed out to them Prime Minister Wilson came out with a statement that they did not know the facts. It is most surprising for the Prime Minister of a country, which has got a full-fledged High Commission here, which has got correspondents here, to say that they did not know the facts. If they did not know the facts on the subject they should not have said anything and should have deferred it. I must say that it was done deliberately. In the circumstances, how can one heal the injury which the British Government has done. In that context, some cry has been raised by some Parties that we must get out of the Commonwealth. I do not subscribe to that view at all. The Commonwealth is not the British Commonwealth. The Commonwealth consists of various countries, which have got willy nilly some association with the British Empire which does not exist now. They came together and if I am right 80 to 83 per cent of

the people represented in the Commonwealth are non-British. At the same time, in order that this illusion may not persist in the Commonwealth may I suggest for the consideration of the Government that the annual or biennial meetings of the Commonwealth should not always be held in London? It must be held in the different countries which are members of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has got its advantages and its disadvantages. It is a forum. It is a replica, to an extent, of the multiracial world, for exchanging notes and views. As a matter of fact, it served the purpose of international relations by having private diplomatic activities in such a big gathering. That is the point which we should not forget. What is now required is the real test of that policy. It has been found to be to our advantage. In the implementation thereof, for the future certain transformation and reorientation in its implementation would have to be thought of by the Foreign Minister.

We have also found in this crisis that our ambassadorial institutions, all over the world, when the crisis came, to an extent, had not been able to deliver the goods adequately either in respect of publicity or in contacting the various parties and sections in those countries. In order to make up for what we have not been able to do at our ambassadorial level, the Government has decided to send *ad hoc* delegations of Members of Parliament to various countries. I would like to ask the Foreign Minister a straight question, namely, whether such *ad hoc* delegations sent out in a short space of time are a substitute for diplomatic activities in various countries. It is a reflection though in this crisis we have been able to come out successfully. The fact that certain *ad hoc* delegations have had to be sent out, I think, is a commentary on the real working of our diplomatic missions in the various countries of the world. This, I believe, will be taken into consideration while formulating the implementation of our policy in the future. Our diplomatic missions in

[Shri Khandubhai K. Desai.] various countries require to be strengthened.

What we have to consider as an independent nation is to see what our position is in what is called South-East Asia. China is there on our northern frontier. It is active. It wants to grab ideologically, if not territorially, all the countries round about it. Therefore, our policy should be so adjusted, keeping in view non-alignment and co-existence, as to how to forestall any evil eye, in future, on us or on our neighbours.

That is all I have to say with regard to the present policy of our Government. Thank you.

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, one feels proudly privileged to participate in the debate on foreign affairs particularly at a time when we, as a great nation, irrespective of political differences normal to democracy are paying our tributes to our jawans on the front, to the farmer on the farm, to the worker in the factory, to the administrator at job and to the people's chosen representatives in this House and the State Legislatures. It has been one of the remarkable historical experiences for us to witness the meaning of our own policy, the significance of our perspectives, the health of India's leadership and the soundness of India's policies during this crisis.

Often, it has been said that in a moment of crisis lesser nations lose their anchors of values. It has happened in history. But fortunately we have seen that despite the spectacular success in repelling the aggressor Pakistan, our country had not blurred its vision; it in fact attested India's maturity. It has geographical responsibilities in relation to Asia, in relation to the people who have just emerged as free societies and as free nations. Therefore, it is time to remind ourselves as to what exactly is happening in and around us, that in winning the battle on the front however unscrupulous the enemy be, we have got to keep in mind the ques-

tion of winning a lasting peace, a dynamic peace. Asia needs a responsible lead in its attempt to create an Asian consensus based on regional relevance and love for international peace for meeting the problems of socio-economic character. We understand as our fellow Asian compatriots, the significance of diplomacy of regional relevance. Have we not tested the success and the fruitful result of such an approach? In 1949, the second Asian Conference met and collectively and correctly met the challenge posed by the Dutch, which sought to disturb the entire freedom movement in Indonesia. Every Asian's slogan was "merdeka", the breath of Indonesian Freedom. Was not this cry also of every sane Asian, every Indian and every political institution in this region of Asia, a demonstration of practical Statesmanship and diplomacy of the leaders? That lesson is sometimes lost sight of unfortunately by our own friends in Asia'. But nonetheless we must assure them, India has got to assure them, as is assured by this experiment in the recent crisis, that although the enemy has done his worst India has done only its best, that it will not deviate from its principles founded on the history of the past—which have opened up new channels in history towards creation of a healthy wantless and democratic fraternity of Asian people. It wants to assure, as it can and it has, that the smaller the country in Asia, the bigger will be its impact on Asian opinion. That is what the late Prime Minister Nehru said in his opening remarks addressed to the Asian Relations Conference when India was yet to be free. It was prior to August 1947 that as a Member of the Interim Government he said to the enthusiastic participants of the Asian countries that the Conference was taking place in India and also it was natural that it should have its meeting in an undisturbed area which was India at that time. But he did not forget to remind the participants that the policy of any country in the Asian region would have to be a regional

Asian policy and that it could no longer be a parochial national one. He said that the future policy of this country or any other country headed by any statesman would have three pillars of diplomacy: first, decolonisation; second, de-glamourisation of war; third, settlement of disputes, whatsoever they may be, to be arrived at through an international organisation or a regional one. Regarding non-alignment, my colleagues opposite had asked it to be spelt out. Prime Minister Nehru at one stage did so in reply to Maulana Hasrat Mohani on December 4, 1947. He said: "Non-alignment has nothing to do with neutrality or passivity. Let us mark the emphasis on neutrality or passivity. The choice to join any side in case of war will be, in line with our enlightened interest and there the matter ends." He never bruised this aspect further except giving the conceptual framework •which any responsible statesman could adopt, the basic foundational basis for almost all Asian countries.

Coming down, Madam Deputy Chairman, to the recent crisis, may I draw attention to another factor regarding partition? One should not at any time forget that international political settlements, if they do not conform to at least the minimum expectations on which they were based, are liable to be unsettled in the course of history. I do not thereby mean nor would I suggest at this stage that we don't honour them. We hope, if Pakistan behaves, if China behaves, as a responsible member of the Asian community, it would be the greatest day for Asia itself. Prosperous Pakistan, progressive Pakistan, democratic Pakistan will, no doubt link itself with the healthier society of India and other Asian nations. Our response will be based on that which tends to conform to the minimum expectations, namely "behave as good neighbour-citizen." The people of Pakistan must be given economic and political freedom, otherwise they would have no choice but to reconsider their own future. If Pakistan continues to give pinpricks to India as at present, the

future generation of this country might take second thought on Partition. History is full of instances of doing and undoing of annexations, of partitions, based on policy of this kind of divide et impera. Phillip Talbot, of the State Department, said: "Partition was a monument of the British colonial policy, of divide *et impera*." Prof. Strauss Hupe, another leading American authority on international politics, said that Partition was nothing but a complete disregard to economic factors and geographical features of a nation. None the less this dismemberment was accepted in full faith and is being accepted by us in full faith. Let Pakistan behave as a respectable member of the Afro-Asian comity. We have many problems, besides Kashmir, pending for solution in the interest of India, Pakistan, Asia and the world. Let us evolve healthy Afro-Asian citizenry.

We all hope that the situation created by Pakistan in the present case with Chinese support, would become the thing of the past.

My honourable friend has suggested that we be friends either of this country or that, with the United Kingdom or the United States or Soviet Russia. Such decision may be taken as hasty by the posterity. My learned friend has suggested that all kinds of things are happening in the United Kingdom, in their Press— quite rightly so. Happily, the courage of the British High Commissioner in this country, Mr. Freeman, was displayed in his saying that it was a misunderstanding in the U.K. Can we not, therefore, as Shri Shyam Nandan Mishra has suggested examine our own political apparatus? Is it alert? Is it virile? Does it anticipate things? Anticipation does not mean precipitation. But none the less, it is necessary for us to plan our perspectives of the political trends, of what is happening around us. It is true that in some countries misunderstanding has crept in. Without blaming others, let us see ours^olve<, what reforms, what renovations and what changes are required; even drastic changes are called for in

[Shri Shanti Lai Kothari.] our apparatus. Statesmanship which has received response from the people so spontaneously should make us bold enough take right decisions in right lime in diplomatic fields.

It has also been said that the foreign policy of this country has alienated some of the countries of Asia. I am inclined to suggest that it is not wholly untrue. If it is not wholly true, it is also not wholly untrue. It is true that the atmosphere generated in 1946, the atmosphere generated by Jawaharlal Nehru after he returned from his South Asian tour before India was free, could not be understood in the right perspective, nor were institutions created to meet the challenges which he already had outlined for us at that time. The first Head of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind, Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose in his first broadcast prophetically said: "With India unfree, no Asian country can be free and with any Asian country unfree, India cannot remain free." This geo-political nerve-line was further elaborated, after India became free, by the first Prime Minister of this great Asian Republic, Jawaharlal Nehru.

Lastly, I would only request the Asian statesmen from Japan to the Suez and still onwards, as soon as possible, to come together in an informal meeting, in a sort of Asian Con-sembly. It is high time they did it. It is no use sitting in the arm-chair and saying that China will do that or do this. It is a fact of geo-politics that the interplay of power in the worst form—displayed by China and others, must be contained, it must be done in this region. But we have to speak with our own voice—Asia's authentic voice—against the unscrupulous political systems against which we are fighting. The world would be looking at it with hope. We have to create an Asian pressure group or Free Asian pressure nucleus. It has not been done, but it has got to be done. It is no use being bogged down to petty things. Other statesmen are very keen to

come together to share with us in this assignment. It is no use merely crying about the meaning of a free world concept. India has a responsibility to respond to it in the same manner as the hon. Members of the Opposition have no doubt done in the present crises for which we have all admiration for the patriotic understanding—they have shown their constructive responsibility by responding to the call of the nation, and have identified themselves as one nation, as the common man in the street has done. There is need for a sort of Brains trust as far as India is concerned. Now the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister are not the same person as Jawaharlal Nehru used to be; now we have the External Affairs Minister, who is not the Prime Minister. At this stage, it is the right time to have a Brains trust composed of talent, irrespective of their political affiliation, irrespective of everything else. Those talents would be fearlessly and objectively tendering advice, from time to time on the guide-lines accepted by the nation, towards creation of a society democratic and socialist.

Thank you.

श्री जगतनारायण (पंजाब) : मैडम डिप्टी चैयरमैन महोदया, पिछले बजट सेशन के मौके पर जब विदेश नीति पर बहस हो रही थी तो मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी को और विदेश मंत्री जी को संबोधित करते हुए कहा था कि हमारे देश की इमेज बाहर के मुल्कों में दौरा करने से नहीं बनेगी बल्कि अपने देश की सरहदों की हिफाजत करने से बनेगी। मैं सरकार को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ कि उसने थोड़े से ही असें में यह फैसला कर लिया कि हमारी सेनाओं को लाहौर की तरफ मार्च कर देना चाहिये, जब कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारे मुल्क पर हमला कर दिया था। यह एक ऐसा फैसला था और इस फैसले की वजह से हमारे नौजवानों ने अपनी जान की आहुति देकर इस देश की इमेज को बनाया। मगर मैं बड़े अदब के

साथ अपने विदेश मंत्री जी की खिदमत में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्हें किसी कम्प्लेसेन्सी में नहीं रहना चाहिये। वे जिस समय अपनी तकरीर कर रहे थे और हमारे कुछ मेम्बरों ने भी जिस तरह से तकरीरों की कि दुनिया के मुमालिक इस झगड़े में हमारे साथ हैं; तो मैं अदब के साथ उनकी खिदमत में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उन्हें इस तरह की कम्प्लेसेन्सी नहीं रहना चाहिये। यह मैं इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक देश की इमेज बनाने का ताल्लुक है वह बाहरी मुमालिकों की मदद से नहीं बनाई जा सकती है वह तो सिर्फ अपनी ही ताकत को बढ़ाने से बनाई जा सकती है। मैं इस बात पर ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ मगर विदेश मंत्री जी ने कल अपनी तकरीर में दो तीन जगह जो कुछ कहा और जो बात सिनोप्सिस में आई है उसका मैं यहां पर जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ। विदेश मंत्री जी ने अपनी तकरीर में दो तीन जगहों पर कहा कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारे मुल्क पर मेसिव एग्रेसन किया तो मैं आपकी बसाकत से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में करीब 113 मुल्कों के मेम्बर हैं तो किसी ने यह भी कहा कि पाकिस्तान ने हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर इनवेजन किया है मेसिव इनवेजन की बात छोड़ दीजिये, फिर हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी ने अपनी स्पीच में कहा :

"During the conflict, FaKistan committed several other acts of a highly reprehensible character. The manner in which they treated our High Commission staff and the High Commissioner himself was something which was unheard of in diplomatic history anywhere in the world."

जी सलूक हमारी एम्बेसी के साथ किया गया जिसको कि वे खुद मानते हैं कि दुनिया की तारीख में दुनिया की हिस्ट्री में इस तरह की बात पहले देखने को नहीं मिली तो मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि 113 मुमालिक

में से किसी एक ने भी इसके खिलाफ आवाज उठाई कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारी इम्बेसी के साथ इस तरह का खराब सलूक किया? सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में मि० भुट्टो ने बठ कर हमारे नेताओं और देश को गाली दी तो क्या किसी देश ने जो वहां पर मौजूद थे, जिनके नुमाइन्दे वहां पर बैठे हुए थे, उन्होंने एक शब्द भी इसके खिलाफ में कुछ कहा? किसी भी मुल्क के नुमाइन्दे ने मि० भुट्टो की गालियों के बारे में कहा और न ही उसकी निन्दा की। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें बाहर के मुल्कों के बारे में किसी गलतफहमी में नहीं रहना चाहिये।

आज संसार में चार पांच बड़ी ताकतों वाले देश हैं। इसमें रूस एक बड़ी ताकत वाला देश है, चीन ताकत वाला देश है अमरीका ताकत वाला देश है और इसके साथ साथ अरब लीग भी है जिसके साथ 13 मुल्कों के लोग हैं और यह अफ्रीकन कन्ट्रीज की ताकत है। चीन के साथ हमारी लड़ाई जारी है और प्रधान मंत्री जी तथा विदेश मंत्री जी बराबर अपनी तकरीरों में कहते रहते हैं कि चीन और पाकिस्तान के मुल्क हमारे देश के ऊपर दुबारा हमला करने वाले हैं और इसके लिए सब कुछ कर रहे हैं। तो चीन से कोई सुलह की बात नहीं हो सकती है। जहां तक रूस का ताल्लुक है उन्होंने और उनके नेताओं ने हमारी मदद की। एक जमाना था जब श्री ब्युश्चेव ने श्रीनगर की चोटी में बख्शी साहब और श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू से कहा था कि अगर कभी तुमको तकलीफ पहुंचे तो हिमालय की चोटी पर खड़े होकर हमें आवाज दे देना और हम आपकी मदद के लिए पहुंच जायेंगे। अभी हाल में श्रीनगर के ऊपर दो मासिव इनवेजन हो चुके हैं जैसा कि विदेश मंत्री जी ने अपनी तकरीर में कहा लेकिन रूस को और से कोई सहायता नहीं पहुंची। यह बात ठीक है कि सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में रूस ने हमारी मदद की लेकिन हालात बदलते रहते हैं आज एक बजारत है

[श्री जगत नारायण]

तो कल दूसरी आ जाती है और जिस ढंग से श्री खुशेव हमारी देश की मदद करना चाहते थे उस ढंग से श्री कोसीगिन नहीं करना चाहते हैं। अगर वे कहने पर भी हमारी मदद नहीं कर सके तो कल क्या होगा इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता है। इसलिए जो हालत चल रही है उसके बारे में मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे एलाइनमेंट और नान-एलाइनमेंट से कोई सरोकार नहीं है मुझे तो अपने देश से प्यार है। आप अपनी फारेन पालिसी का कोई नाम रख लीजिये मगर मैं एक बात चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि मेरा देश मजबूत रहे और उस पर किसी तरह की आंख न आने पावे। मुझे इस बात से कोई वास्ता नहीं है कि आप किस मुल्क के साथ वास्ता रखते हैं या नहीं रखते हैं आपकी पालिसी एलाइनमेंट की रहती है या नान-एलाइनमेंट की रहती है मैं तो सिर्फ अपने देश को मजबूत करना चाहता हूँ।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी अर्ज करता चाहता हूँ कि आपने अपनी तकरीर में यह भी कहा था कि अरब मुल्क वालों ने और नासिर ने हमारी मदद की। आपने अपनी तकरीर में कहा था कि अफ्रीका में हाल में जो मीटिंग अरब मुल्कों की हुई थी उसमें कोई रिजोल्यूशन पास नहीं किया गया। मगर मैं आपकी खिदमत में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐन जिस समय सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल की मीटिंग हो रही थी, जिसमें अरब मुमालिकों के 11 नुमाइन्दे थे और इनमें से 9 ने वहाँ पर तकरीर की और 7 ने हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ तकरीरें कीं। तो आप इस बात से अन्दाजा कर लीजिये कि अरब लीग से कहां तक आपको सहायता मिल रही है। आपने यहां पर अरब लीग का एक अलहिदा सिफारस-नामा स्वीकार किया है और उन्हें मंजूर किया है। आज क्या हो रहा है? आज हम यहां देख रहे हैं कि कुवैत और अरब लीग के मुल्क पाकिस्तान को हार्ड करेन्सी में बदलने के लिए

रुपया दे रहे हैं ताकि वह दूसरे मुल्कों से असलहा खरीद सके। ये मुल्क अरब लीग के मेम्बर हैं और आपने यहां पर अरब लीग को रिकगनाइज किया है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपने अरब लीग के नुमाइन्दे से पूछा कि आपके मेम्बर पाकिस्तान को क्यों मदद दे रहे हैं? मैं बड़े अदब से विदेश मन्त्री जी और प्रधान मन्त्री जी की खिदमत में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आप किसी तरह की कम्प्लेसेन्सी में न रहिये, अगर आप इस तरह से रहेंगे तो मुसीबत में फंसेंगे। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अरब मुमालिक के जो मुल्क हैं उन्होंने हमारे मुल्क की किसी तरह से भी मदद नहीं की और किसी ने भी पाकिस्तान के इन्वेजन के खिलाफ आवाज नहीं उठाई। जब इस तरह का इन लोगों का रवैया है, तो हम किस तरह से कहते हैं कि हमारी विदेश नीति कामयाब रही है। मैं भी चाहता हूँ कि हमारी विदेश नीति कामयाब हो ताकि हमारा देश मजबूत बने और देश के ऊपर कोई भी आंख उठा कर न देख सके। मगर मैं बड़े अदब के साथ यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश को कम्प्लेसेन्सी में बिल्कुल भी नहीं रहना चाहिये।

एक बात मैं और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि कुछ ऐसे देश हैं जिनके मारफत हमको कुछ असलहा मिल सकते हैं, कुछ चीजें मिल सकती हैं, मगर हम उन मुल्कों की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। इजराइल एक ऐसा देश है मगर हमारे देश ने इजराइल को अभी तक रिकगनाइज नहीं किया है। ईरान और तुर्की ने इसको रिकगनाइज कर लिया है और ये ही देश पाकिस्तान को तेल और दूसरे असलहा सप्लाई कर रहे हैं। मगर हम डरते हैं उसको रिकगनाइज करने में। ईरान और तुर्की, जिन्होंने इजराइल की सरकार को स्वीकार किया है, वे पाकिस्तान को असलहा सप्लाई कर रहे हैं, मगर हम इजराइल को रिकगनाइज करने में डरते हैं। तो यह जो हमारी पालिसी है, यह गलत है। इसी तरह

जो फारमोसा है, ताइवान है, उसको भी आप रिकगनाइज नहीं करते हैं। अमूमन दुनिया में लड़ाई के वक्त यह तरीका होता है कि दुश्मन का दुश्मन दोस्त होता है, मगर हमारी पालिसी बड़ी अजीब है। हम दुश्मन के दुश्मन को भी दुश्मन समझते हैं और उसको अपना दोस्त बनाने की कोशिश नहीं करते हैं। मैं आपके सामने कुछ फीगर्स रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं बड़ा हैरान हुआ जब मैंने यह देखा कि ताइवान के 92 सिफारतखाने दुनिया में हैं और उसके मुकाबिले में हमारे 70, 80 के दमियान सिफारतखाने हैं। हमारा इतना बड़ा देश है और इसराइल पंजाब से भी आघा है। इसी तरह वह ताइवान भी पंजाब से आघा है। मैं वहां हो आया हूँ और मैंने वहां बहुत कुछ देखा है। मैंने वहां पर सुना कि दुनिया में उनके 80 या 83 सिफारतखाने हैं। उन्होंने हर देश में अपना एम्बेसेडर रखा हुआ है और हमारी यह पोजीशन है कि हमने चार पांच देशों के लिये अपना एक एम्बेसेडर रखा है। तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आपको अपने देश का इमेज बनाना है और अगर आप चाहते हैं कि आप दूसरे देशों में अपना इमेज बतायें, तो उसके लिये आप दूसरे देशों को अपना दोस्त बनाइये, मगर यह भी याद रखिये कि अपनी यह नीति होनी चाहिये कि दुश्मन का जो दुश्मन है उसको अपना दोस्त बनाने की कोशिश की जाय और सिर्फ इस लिये नहीं डरना चाहिये कि फलां आदमी या फलां देश नाराज हो जायगा। याद है आपको कि जब मिस्र पर नहर स्वैज के मामले में हमला हुआ था, तो हमारे स्वर्गीय प्रधान मन्त्री ने सबसे ऊंची आवाज में यह कहा था कि यह इनवेजन किया है बरतानिया ने। मगर आज क्या हालत है। आज दुनिया में एक भी मुल्क हमारे लिये यह कहने को तैयार नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान ने हम पर हमला किया है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप नासिर के साथ ताल्लुकात नहीं बनाइये या दूसरे अरब देशों के साथ ताल्लुकात नहीं बनाइये। मगर मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आप सिर्फ उनको

968 RS—5.

खुश करने के लिये यह मत कीजिये कि उन देशों को अपने साथ न मिलाइये जो आज आप की मदद कर सकते हैं।

दूसरी बात जो मैं आपकी खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ, वह यह है कि इसराइल ने राजस्थान के रेगिस्तान में फूड पैदा करने के लिये सर्विसेज देने के लिये कहा। मगर मेरी यह इत्तिला है—मुझे मालूम नहीं है कि यह ठुस्त है या गलत है—कि एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री ने उनकी सर्विसेज को लेने से इन्कार कर दिया। मैं खुद इसराइल नहीं गया हूँ, लेकिन मैंने यह पढ़ा है कि इसराइल ने अपने डिजर्ट को इतना अच्छा प्रोडक्टिव बना दिया है कि आज वह खुदकफील हो गया है और खुराक के लिये वह किसी के आगे हाथ नहीं फैलाता है। इसलिये आप को इसके सम्बन्ध में अपनी पालिसी को बदलना चाहिये कि जो मुल्क आपकी ऐसी मदद कर सकते हैं जिससे हमारा फूड प्रोडक्शन बढ़े और हमें फूड के लिये किसी के आगे हाथ न फैलाना पड़े, तो आपको उन देशों से मदद लेनी चाहिये।

इसके साथ ही मैंने यह सुना है कि एक नया एशियन डेवलपमेन्ट बैंक बन रहा है। अगर ऐसा है, तो हिन्दुस्तान एशिया का सबसे बड़ा देश है, इसलिये उसका हैड आफिस यहाँ होना चाहिये। मेरी इत्तिला यह है कि कोशिश यह हो रही है कि थाईलैण्ड में, बैंकाक में, उसका हैड आफिस बनाया जाय। अगर उस बैंक का यहाँ हैड आफिस बनेगा तो इस देश को बहुत फायदा पहुँच सकता है और आप दूसरे देशों को भी फायदा पहुँचा सकते हैं। इसके लिये भी आपको पूरी कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

एक मिनट में मैं एक दो बातें कह कर बैठ जाऊंगा। मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आपने लोकसभा में यह तस्लीम किया है कि बाहर के देशों में अपनी पब्लिसिटी नहीं है और हमारी पब्लिसिटी बेहतर तरीके से होनी चाहिये। मेरे पास एक किताब है जिसे

[श्री जगत नारायण]

एक ऐसे शख्स ने लिखा है जिसने 14, 15 मुमालिक का दौरा किया है। यह किताब छपी है सस्ता साहित्य मण्डल में जो कि एक नेशनल इंदारा है। उनका नाम है श्री यशपाल जैन वे कोई 15 मुमालिक में गये थे और उन 15 मुमालिक का नक्शा खींचा है। एक देश का जो उन्होंने नक्शा खींचा है, उसमें उन्होंने यह लिखा है कि वहां रहने वाले हिन्दुस्तानियों की हालत अच्छी नहीं है, वहां से हिन्दुस्तानियों को जाना पड़ेगा या उनकी जायदादें जब्त हो जायेंगी या उनकी हालत बहुत बुरी हो जायगी। इसलिये आप को यह देखना चाहिये कि जहां आप डिप्लोमेसी में दूसरे देशों के साथ ऊंची पदवी पर बैठ सकें वहां हमारी विदेश नीति यह भी होनी चाहिये कि जो हमारे भारतवासी दूसरे मुमालिक में हैं और बड़ी अच्छी पोजीशन में हैं, अच्छा खाते पीते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान को रुपया भेजते हैं, उनको कोई तकलीफ नहीं हो। खुद मेरे जिले से आज हजारों आदमी इंग्लैण्ड गये हुए हैं। तो यह आपका देखना निहायत जरूरी है कि हमारी ऐसी विदेश नीति हो कि जो हमारे भाई दूसरे मुमालिक में कारोबार कर रहे हैं, वे वहां अच्छी तरह से अपना कारोबार कर सकें और उनको कोई तकलीफ नहीं हो और बर्ग की तरह से उनको वहां से भ्रामना न पड़े।

इन अलफाज के साथ मैं आप से फिर अज कहेगा कि आप काम्पलेसली में न रहिये और हिन्दुस्तान की बेहतरी के लिये पालिसी बना-इये ताकि हिन्दुस्तान मजबूत बन सके।

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh):
Madam, I support the motion which has been moved by the hon. Foreign Minister and the amendment thereto moved by my friend, Shri Sadiq Ali. The subject is a vast one and it is not possible for me to cover all the aspects. The recent conflict with Pakistan has attracted the attention of most of the Members and I would like to make a few observations in that connection. It will not be possible, within the limited time at

my disposal, to have a fuller discussion on every point. Therefore, I have decided just to enumerate those points with as short comments as possible on each.

First of all this war with Pakistan was not of our seeking. It was thrust on us. The Prime Minister of Britain may express opinions against us and say that we were the aggressors but all through this conflict, whatever action we have taken, has been to defend our territory. First of all there was infiltration of raiders into Kashmir. They came stealthily, in plain clothes but fully armed. The time when they came was selected on purpose, and 9th August was the date on which a demonstration and meeting had been announced to protest against the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah and those in Pakistan thought that by sending these infiltrators they would cause unrest and incite a rebellion among the Muslims of Kashmir but the whole population of Kashmir including the Muslims belied all their calculations and frustrated all their machinations and they stood like a wall against the infiltrators. Then in order that this infiltration may not continue, we crossed over the cease-fire line and occupied Kargil, and later Hajipir and Tithwal so that this infiltration may become, if not impossible, at least as difficult as possible. Then there was a massive attack on our territory at Chhamb and Jaurian, after crossing not only the cease-fire line but also the national frontier. We are accused of aggression because we crossed over into West Punjab in Kasur, Sialkot and Lahore sectors but this we did in order to dis*ract the pressure that was on our front at Chhamb; and then there are military tactics. We did not like that the initiative of choosing the area of operation should always remain with Pakistan. Naturally every pa'ty in a war wants to select such area as is favourable to it. Now we crossed over to Pakistani area not by way of aggression but in order to defend our own territory. It was throughout, at every moment, made-

clear that we had no designs on any territory of Pakistan. We had reached near Lahore, but we refused to occupy it. So this assertion that we were the aggressors has absolutely no foundation whatsoever. We are proud of the part played by the officers and men of our Army and of the Air Force and I pay my humble tribute to them and I also pay my homage to all those who have laid down their lives in the defence of the country. Concern has been shown by some among us that the number of officers we have lost has been more than the number of officers that Pakistan has lost although the losses in the number of men on the side of Pakistan has been much heavier than the loss on our side. I think that our officers are living with their men as a family. Our officer is not prepared to expose his men to a greater danger than he is himself prepared to face and that is, in my opinion, one of the reasons for our victory. When an officer goes ahead of his men, you know the spirit which is created in the men who follow him. Then I remember one incident. While this conflict was going on, I was informed by <a Lady Member of this House who had received a letter from her son who was undergoing training for higher officer service, asking her to use her influence, to persuade the military authorities that he may be sent to the front to join his Jawans instead of undergoing a training which would have entitled him to a higher post. That is the spirit with which our officers were working and our victory is also because everyone of us realised that we were fighting for a right cause. We had no designs on Pakistan territory. But we were fighting to defend the integrity of our country.

Now, Madam, there are one or two results which have emanated from this conflict. Number one, during all the period of seventeen or eighteen years we have always tried to have peace with Pakistan. On every occasion we have been generous to them. We have avoided fighting although provoked on a number of occasions. But

this was taken by Pakistan, interpreted by them as our weakness, and now this conflict has shown that though we are keen for peace we are not afraid of war if it is thrust on us. This has been brought home to them and they must realise it. Then, number two, day in and day out they were indulging in communal propaganda and raising cries of *jehad*, simply to disturb the conditions here, in order to incite the Muslims to go against their own country. But this has failed. They have seen that the Muslims of this country are not only loyal but are also ready to shed their blood for the safety of their country. Even in this propaganda of theirs they have always claimed to be solicitous of the Muslims of this country. But what has been their real object? Are they solicitous? The brutal treatment to which the minorities in Pakistan have been subjected on a number of occasions, and that too either at the instance or with the connivance of some very high authorities in Pakistan, had its reaction here. They have simply endangered the safety of Muslims here. So they are not friends of the Muslims of India. If they had been friends, the only course to them was to treat their minorities well, and do nothing the reaction whereof might go against the Muslims here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have got two minutes more. There are about thirty speakers and everyone has kept to the time limit.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN: I may irt this connection, while on this point, also deal with the reaction of some of my countrymen to what happened in Pakistan. I do not think it can be justified in any way. From another point of view also, if such persons as resort to such reaction from such incidents in Pakistan, if they only realise what they are doing, they will always desist from having those reactions. Now this conflict was also a conflict of ideologies, and the conflict was between the two-nation theory and secularism. Now if really there:

could be any reaction as this, that because the Muslims in Pakistan behave in a particular way the Muslims in this country are to be made to suffer for their actions, it only goes to support the two-nation theory of Pakistan. Once we realise that our reaction goes to support the theory of Pakistan, I think we should be careful about that and give it up. The only difference has been this that, while the authorities in Pakistan have been encouraging such activities there, our Government, has always tried to curb such activities with a very strong hand. Wherever these things have occurred, I know our Prime Minister has acted promptly and put them down.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will pass on to the next speaker now. You have taken more than fifteen minutes, Mr. Hasan. I think you should cooperate with the rest of the Members who want to speak.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN: Only one minute more. Now three questions are contained in the Security Council Resolution. One of them is the question of withdrawal—I won't deal with number one and number three. On the question of withdrawal to positions as obtained on the 5th of August our Prime Minister has of course not committed himself on this question. As far as our withdrawal from Tital, Haji Pir and Kargil is concerned, this question should be approached from another aspect also. In law all this property belongs to us. There can be no dispute about it because of the accession. Everybody realises that Kashmir is a part of India because of that accession. At least in law we are lawfully entitled to it, and more so after the conflict. This part was under the occupation of Pakistan but now—we did not commit any aggression. It was in self-defence that we went over to that place—but now, since we are in possession of that place, there is no justification in law to oust us from a place which we are now lawfully and peacefully occupy-

ing, and which belongs to us. I hope this point of view will not be lost sight of.

Thank you.

MISS MARY NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, many of my friends who spoke yesterday expressed their rightful anger on U.N.O. in general and U.K. and America in particular for not naming Pakistan an aggressor. I fail to understand this anger, Madam, because Pakistan is a pet creation of Britain and she fought with the arms of America. How can we expect them to blame her in public? We know their policy in war. To them all is fair in love and war but we on the other hand, could not even twist a sentence in the midst of our war propaganda, and had to create a 'Jootis-tan' in order to express our disgust of the persistent lies told by the Pakistan radio. However, from their silence we have to learn a lesson, Madam, to which my friend, Mrs. Paranjpye referred yesterday—silence is golden. It is certainly true. Much more can be expressed sometimes through silence than shouting aloud. Words may hurt people and turn them into our enemies, but silence will never make us lose our friends. Moreover, a non-aligned nation cannot demand everything, not even justice sometimes. It is perhaps to make us feel that being non-aligned does not pay that they refrained from naming a glaring aggressor. It is up to us to prove that our policy is good in spite of all our difficulties.

Well, Madam, the recent aggression by Pakistan brought out what is best in our magnificent fighting forces and showed to the world the glorious fulfilment of our secular ideal both on the battlefield and on the home front. At the same time, Madam, our eyes were also opened to the fact that self-interest was the guiding factor for the nations of the world in the determination of their attitude to the various problems.

The attitude of Britain in the recent conflict did not just hurt us, but

wounded us deeply. She played the rôle of an advocate to Pakistan in pleading for self-determination in Kashmir. Did no one ask her why she did not apply that principle all these years to the Pakistan occupied Kashmir, or to Pakhtoonistan or to Aden and now to Rhodesia? Why does she not plead with Pakistan to give at least minimum human rights to her minorities? — At this very moment Christians from East Pakistan are being driven out. Will Britain kindly go to their help?

However, Madam whatever our hurt or resentment towards Britain may be, we should not because of that leave the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth is not just Britain. It consists of 22 members. India should remain in the Commonwealth and make Britain realise where she is unjust, India should try to play a dominant role in the Commonwealth and see that Commonwealth conferences are held in all the member countries.

We are extremely thankful to our friends, the USSR and others, who came to our help in the hour of our distress. Let us hope and trust that this friendship will grow as years pass. But, Madam, let us not consider those who did not help us as our enemies. They just did not choose to be our friends because we clashed with their self-interests. Let us smile at them and leave them to realise that they were mistaken in not befriending us.

America, Madam, the biggest democratic country, was unable to understand why India, also a democratic country, should remain non-aligned, instead of joining them. Want of trust in our non-aligned policy must have made them turn to Pakistan where they could store their arms under the plea of aid. Even while they were supplying arms, our beloved leader, the late Prime Minister, Nehruji, realised and foresaw the results. On February 22nd, 1954 he said—I am quoting—

"This step is a wrong step and a step which adds to the tensions

and fears of the world. It adds to the feeling of insecurity in Asia. It is therefore a wrong step from the point of view of peace and removal of tensions.."

How very true he was. Just as my hon. friend mentioned a little while ago, he is more alive today than he was during his lifetime. So from tension it has become a reality. That fear made us prepare ourselves. Our late leader had prepared the country for this conflict. America perhaps at that time did not dream that Pakistan would flirt with China and act over her head, just as we did not dream that China would stab us in the back. And today once again Britain is trying to increase the fears and tension by meddling with the Indian Ocean.

Well, Madam, we have to be patient and make it clear to them all and to the whole world that we, will never change our policy. We are firmly wedded to Panch Sheel and non-alignment policy. No country is our enemy. In fact in my opinion not even Pakistan. Only individuals like Mr. Bhutto and President Ayub may be our enemies, but no country. A non-aligned country needs the friendship of the whole world. Our policy is a policy of peace and peaceful co-existence. We want to be friends with one and all and to struggle hard to succeed in our democratic planning in the face of all our difficulties.

Truth, Madam, is not confined to one country or one people. It has too many aspects for anyone to presume that he knows all or that he is right. Each country, if it is true to itself, has to find its own path through trials and errors, through suffering and experience. Only then can they grow. Hence it is our duty and we must strive hard to make the new world believe in the integrity of the policy of India. We are thankful to them for their kind help in supplying food and other things, but we cannot barter our policy for their help. We have to try and make them believe that ours is a sincere policy based

[Miss Mary Naidu.] essentially on goodwill and fellowship with other countries and no ill-will for any country. America and Britain sooner or later, are bound to realise that helping true democratic governments to become strong and self-reliant is better than trusting dictators like Pakistan, with arms which they can at any time misuse.

Peace is our aim. Self-protection is our duty. If we ever fight it is only in self-defence and not because we crave even for one inch of any one's land. If our forces are in Lahore and Sialkot it is only to make Pakistan leave our land in Kashmir and other parts, in exchange for theirs. We want no war. We want to be friends of all and what is more, we are longing for the day when America and Russia will become close friends and spread peace and security to the whole world.

Our Government and our External Affairs Ministry, are doing their level best and though there may be some room for improvement and correction we know that they will rise to the occasion, as was suggested by the Members who had spoken before me and they will do their best. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy. Your party has got just twelve minutes.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY {Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, India believes in the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence. India also believes that the United Nations should be strengthened and all the countries of the world should come under the purview and discipline of the United Nations. But unfortunately, the United Nations Organisation has not given a good record of its existence. The world knows that Pakistan committed unprovoked aggression against India. The world knows that the peaceful intentions of India were mistaken for weakness and it was thought that by committing

aggression against India, India would be forced to negotiate its sovereignty over one of its parts, namely Kashmir, with Pakistan. Even though the U.N. Observers' Group under Gen. T.Timmo made the categorical statement to the Security Council that Pakistan had committed aggression, the Security Council did not name Pakistan the aggressor. In fact the Security Council treated both the aggressor, and the aggrieved, on the same footing and thereby the faith of humanity in the Security Council and in the United Nations has been undermined. It is true that America entered into military pacts in order to contain the Communist expansionism in Southeast Asia. But unfortunately things are happening just the other way round. It is, India which stood up against Communist aggression in 1962 and it is India which is the bulwark of democracy, which is fighting for the preservation of democracy, for the preservation of a secular State. It is India that is fighting for the forces of progress and against that country, Pakistan in collusion with China, committed aggression. In spite of the fact that India has come out successful in the fight for a just cause, for the preservation of democracy and for the preservation of secularism, it is unfortunate that America does not think that Pakistan has misused the sophisticated weapons that America had supplied. We must tell the United States of America point blank that these military pacts have aggravated the situation and that these military pacts have not helped to contain Communist China but that, on the other hand, they have helped to throttle democracy in Asia. We must tell America that they should cease the supply of military weapons needed by Pakistan.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the role of the United Kingdom in this sordid affair is a very reprehensible one. We never expected the Labour Government in Britain would take sides in this dispute. It is true that since the beginning, from 1947 when India

and Pakistan were formed, Great Britain has been adopting a very partisan attitude but we expected the Labour Government to adopt an impartial attitude and to come to the rescue of a country fighting for democracy, fighting against theocracy and military dictatorship like the one prevailing in Pakistan. We must reconsider our position in the Commonwealth in view of the fact that Great Britain has always adopted a partisan attitude and has utilised membership of the Commonwealth for the glory of herself, for the preservation of her own interests and for the furtherance of her own interests. This membership has not served any useful purpose so far as India is concerned. We know how Great Britain behaved in Rhodesia. She has tolerated the unilateral declaration of the white minority there suppressing the rightful and just interests of the four million Africans. At the same time, when the lawfully elected Government was functioning in Aden and clamoured for independence, Britain dismissed that lawfully elected Government there. Great Britain has always adopted a very partisan and a narrow attitude in these respects. Therefore, it is time that we quit the Commonwealth in order to expose Great Britain to the world, in order to expose the claim of Great Britain that she fights for the justice of mankind.

Madam, we know that in this dispute some of the countries supported us openly, supported this just cause, for example, Malaysia, the U.S.S.R. Yugoslavia and some of the Socialist countries of Europe. They have come out openly saying that the Kashmir question cannot be re-opened, that Kashmir is an integral part of India. This has been recognised on all hands and, therefore, at any negotiating table the Government of India should state categorically and clearly that we are not prepared to discuss the question of Kashmir which is an integral part of India. India complained to the United Nations Security Council

in 1948 that Pakistan had committed aggression, had occupied one-third of the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan should be asked to vacate that aggression. In this conflict, some of the right-thinking nations have appreciated the stand taken by India and we must be ever grateful to those countries. Our relations with the U.S.S.R. should be strengthened further. It has consistently helped India and has consistently taken a very right attitude in regard to Kashmir. Our relations with such countries should be strengthened further. Madam, what we are fighting in Kashmir is not for a piece of territory but for a just cause, for secular ideas and for democracy. We are fighting against Pakistan, the theocracy and military dictatorship in Pakistan. In India we have a multi-lingual, multi-religious community living in amity and friendship and at the moment of peril, at the moment of crisis, they stood together and rose as one man to fight the aggressor. These multi-lingual, multiracial and multi-religious societies are found in many countries of the world. In Singapore and in Malaysia they are making a very good experiment of it and in most of the countries it is inevitable that such multi-lingual, multi-racial and multi-religious societies should exist. Therefore, to think of self-determination for a minority or the basis of religion or on the basis of language or on the basis of race is not tenable. Madam, we have seen that since 1947 there has been no elected Government in Pakistan. A military dictatorship is at the helm of affairs. Human rights are denied to the people of Pakistan and human rights are denied to the people of Pakthoonistan. Whatever steps Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan takes in order to liberate Pakthoonistan from the clutches of the military dictatorship should be supported by the Government of India and, if necessary, the Government of India should recognise any Government that may be formed by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. In the same way, if the people of East Pakistan were to declare that they are

(Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy)

going to secede from Pakistan, that they are going to form a provisional Government, the Government of India should assist such peoples' movement, such revolutionary movement.

Madam, one word with regard to Tibet. We have committed a mistake in the past. China has changed its attitude towards India. China, which was one of the co-sponsors of the Panchsheel, which signed that solemn agreement with us, has betrayed us and today in collusion with Pakistan, is trying to subvert democracy in India. China which was fighting for the freedom of the oppressed people, for the freedom of the colonial people is in fact helping the racial minorities in other countries. China is continuing to have trade relations with South Africa. When such is the attitude displayed by China, when China has taken a posture in the different context and when China is trying to subvert Indian democracy and secularism in India, we should be prepared to help the Tibetan people to fight for their just rights, for their liberation and we should be prepared to recognise the Dalai Lama's Government if the Dalai Lama wants to organise an emigre Government in India. We should assist such movements in Tibet. We should also be the co-sponsors of the Resolution that is to be inscribed in the Agenda of the United Nations General Assembly. We should take steps to see that China is exposed and Tibet is restored to its proper glory.

We have found to our peril, Madam Deputy Chairman, that we cannot rely on others for our military supplies. We do believe in disarmament, we do believe in total disarmament and if all the countries which have produced nuclear bombs are prepared to destroy them, we do not want to have any atom bomb manufactured here but unfortunately even the partial Test Ban Treaty has not been accepted by some of the countries, particularly China and France.

It is therefore necessary, while believing that total disarmament is necessary and nuclear weapons should be destroyed totally, that we must be in a position to produce atom bomb so that it will give prestige and status and so that at a time of crisis we can stand on our own legs and defend India's integrity and sovereignty against the aggression that may be committed by China and Pakistan.

Thank you.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman, it is very unfortunate that Pakistan should have chosen to deal with India or debate India with guns instead of taking recourse to either reasoning or arguments or morals. I do not want to deal with all that has been said of this recent war. They are well known but I would like to concentrate on one aspect, that is, what has been the consequence of this recent war with Pakistan. Madam, certainly this recent war with Pakistan has resulted in one thing more than any other and that is, that Pakistan will never be able to defeat India. Pakistan will never be able to set her feet on the soil of India. It is also true that not only India has declared Pakistan as the aggressor but in a way indirectly it could be interpreted—in fact directly also—that Pakistan has been declared as the aggressor by the supreme world body, the Security Council. I would only refer here in this context to what U Thant has said in his Report to the Security Council. He says:

"The current troubles began according to the report of General Nimmo, Chief U. N Military Observer in Kashmir to a considerable extent in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the cease-fire line from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side."

This is the observation made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. What else is it if it is not

declaration of Pakistan as the aggressor?

With regard to the results of the war, I would like to refer in this connection to an observation made in the foreign Press by one of the famous columnists, Mr. John Creek. He is an Englishman, an honest Englishman and what had he to say about this war? He said:

"India is receiving virtually no encouragement in a struggle which will decide the fate of the free institutions in Asia."

He has accused in very clear terms the attitude that Britain has taken towards this conflict with Pakistan. He further goes on to say:

"We cannot afford to treat a secular State with a democratically elected Government and a free Press on a par with a theocratic State led by a military dictator."

Can there be a greater condemnation ! of the attitude of Britain towards India in this recent Indo-Pakistan conflict? He further says:

"Pakistan has to assert the communal idea; India has to resist it."

And he goes on:

"If India loses, the dissipated tendencies in the country will soon get out of control and the light of freedom will be extinguished in Asia"

These are the words which were uttered by a very famous journalist of Great Britain and these should certainly have their effect on the attitude of Great Britain and the world as a whole. Therefore, Madam, it has been proved that Pakistan is a theocratic State, Pakistan has no principles, Pakistan is a dictatorship and Pakistan can do anything for her own convenience without caring for morals or decency or international behaviour.

On the top of this another thing has been made clear and I would like to quote another Englishman, Mr. Patterson. He observed:

"In this actual warfare the Indian Army routed the Pakistan forces with superior tactics, superior command in the field and superior use of weapons although the troops on both sides fought fiercely and valiantly."

This is the version of another great English journalist. Therefore in spite of the fact that Pakistan was in possession of sabre jets, highly sophisticated sabre jets and Patton tanks and a huge amount of other equipment, we have shown that we were able to give them almost a defeat. The very fact that the Indian Army is flying the tri-colour flag there right on the outskirts of Lahore today goes to show that Pakistan has been taught a lesson which it very much deserved at the hands of the valiant jawans of India. Madam, I join with the rest of my friends in the House, I join with all the 450 million country-men, in paying my humble tribute to the jawans for their valiant deeds in the field.

Then, Madam, there was another great, treacherous and perfidious enemy of India that poked her nose into this conflict. I am referring to China. China's tactics are well known. In the year 1962 when there was likely to be a big conflagration in the Caribbean Sea between two great super-powers, Russia and America, that was the time chosen by this perfidious enemy, China, to make an attack and aggression on India. China thought that the entire world's attention would be drawn away towards the Caribbean Sea and India would be left alone and that she could march in and subjugate her. She had no morals, no decency whatsoever and her only aim was to subjugate India at any cost. That was the tactics which China adopted and no doubt she is now waiting for such opportunities, for such international situations, so that she

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

could pounce upon weaker countries and devour them completely. That is her attitude. Let everyone in the Asian continent and in the world abroad know this is the tactics of China. And what did she do in the present conflict when India and Pakistan were fighting? She was only adding fuel to the fire. She wanted somehow that Pakistan should not agree to the cease-fire and withdrawal proposals of the Security Council and on 16th September she came forward with an ultimatum to India ordering India to dismantle certain military fortifications and structures said to have been built in Tibetan country. Everybody was wondering what this was about. How could we have built military fortifications and structures in their country? Still she had the audacity; this perfidious China had the audacity to say that we had built certain structures and she gave an ultimatum to us. This was only with a view to see that Pakistan did not accept the cease-fire proposals of the Security Council so that India could be attacked both by Pakistan and China together in combination. So once again 1962 was repeated but fortunately for Pakistan—I say for Pakistan—she agreed finally though Bhutto's boastings—I wonder if I cannot say—showed that Bhutto was out-Bhuttoing -----

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Out-booting.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Just as we say out-Heroding Herod, he was out-boasting the boast. Mr. Bhutto was probably out-boasting. That is what he was doing. He said he would fight for a thousand years and he has now come forward, after the utter defeat which they have suffered.....

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Out-Bhuttoing Bhutto.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Thank you. He was out-beating Bhutto. This

is the story. This is the result of all this. China has been taught her lesson. Now, what is the position of China in the world today? Today in the entire Africa she is despised and Asia is disowning her. I would like to know who is going to recognise China. In the entire Africa she is already despised. Asia is disowning her. I think in this conflict she has been isolated. I am very happy that this result has come about.

(Time bell rings.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Four minutes more.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Only four minutes? Thank you very much.

Now, having said that much I would like to say a word about some of these problems that have loomed up on account of the India-Pakistan conflict. One is that we should manufacture the atom bomb. Does anybody here realise what an atom bomb means? It means that it must be based on our foreign policy. It must be based on the cost it is going to involve. What is the economic aspect of the atom bomb? After all these atom bombs may not serve any purpose at all. All these things have to be considered. According to me, our foreign policy does not admit of manufacturing the atom bomb. This country was almost the first to denounce nuclear weapons and the manufacture of atom bombs, non-proliferation, non-manufacture and even outlawing the bomb. That is what we have done all these years. Are you going to wipe out the entire history which India has created in the world by trying to have recourse to the manufacture of atom bombs? It would be a standing monument of disgrace if we ever had to take to the manufacture of the atom bomb. After all it is only a weapon of destruction. It is not a weapon of defence or offence. It is only a power of destruction. I would like to invite the attention of the House to this

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE (West Bengal): You may have an atom bomb, but you may never use it.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Now, all the Conventional Fire Power that had been used in the Second World War was equal to only one-third of the ten megaton atom bomb that is produced now. There are hundred megaton bombs also. What is our fate? One megaton is equal to one million ton of TNT. Please note that also, what an enormous destructive power has been concentrated in these bombs. Are you going to have recourse to these atom bombs?

Another result of the India-Pakistan conflict is that the two superpowers, Russia and America, have been coming together, as they have done never before. There is the unanimous resolution of the Security Council. We can rightly take pride in the fact that we have been responsible for this. Our foreign policy has been responsible for bringing these two great powers together. This is the greatest achievement that we have made on behalf of India.

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Congratulations on self-praise.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: It is not self-praise. It is there for you to see, my dear friend. It is there. The whole world sees it today. How can you not see it? You are a Professor in addition.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): He stands in need of changing his specs.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I would like to say a word about the Commonwealth.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. You are out-beating your time.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: With regard to the Commonwealth I want to say that we shall not quit the

Commonwealth, because the Commonwealth is not the property of Great Britain. If you only look at it from the point of view of your prestige, what about our trade? I am looking it from that point of view. We have got crores of rupees worth of foreign trade with Great Britain. We have got so much of trade with them. We cannot lose all these things? Why do you allow it to happen? (*Interruptions*). I am prepared to accept the explanation given by Mr. Freeman, the British High Commissioner, here. He said that Mr. Wilson made the statement without a proper appreciation of events here. I am prepared to accept it and advise my Minister not to quit the Commonwealth.

PROF. M. B. LAL: I wish to know whether India's withdrawal from the Commonwealth would necessarily mean termination of trade relations also with Britain.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, I will not follow the Minister of External Affairs through all his wandering from China to Peru, which he achieved during his speech. China is a good starting point, no doubt, for a debate in the Indian Parliament, because that is our greatest danger, but why should we go as far as Peru, Latin America, taking Aden, Rhodesia and other countries on the way, mainly with a view to condemning the foreign policies of the countries involved in these territories? My friend, Mr. Gujral, I wonder if he is here and I should like to deal with his strictures against England and the British Prime Minister. I have great respect for Mr. Gujral's conscientious comprehensiveness which allows him to deal with all topics incisively and with information, but I do not think he has been fair to Mr. Harold Wilson. He must remember that Mr. Harold Wilson is a socialist and socialist governments have not been famous for their success in foreign policy, in all countries, including our own. In all countries with socialist governments . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL: Is there a socialist government in India?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: They call themselves 'socialists'. They are so much taken up with domestic policies and have so little contact with the outside world that the socialist governments have always failed in foreign policy. And here you have a Prime Minister, who has to depend on a majority of one or two, harried by critics at home for his domestic policies, and we expect him to be *au courant* with all that has taken place in the Indian sub-continent. Even in the days when India was a dependency of England, debates about India were very sparsely attended in the House of Commons. Half a dozen people constituted the audience when the Secretary of State for India used to address on the so-called Indian Budget. So, we cannot take tragically the omission of Mr. Harold Wilson to take sides in the matter of Pakistani aggression as a settled policy of the Government. With regard to England as well as America you must go by the deeds of these Governments and not by the speeches which are occasionally made, speeches which are not meant for export but which are meant for domestic consumption.

I would rather concentrate my speech on the foreign policy of India and not on the international situation. Pakistan is the most recent problem with which we have to contend. I congratulate the Government on the firm attitude it has taken in regard to the Pakistani aggression and congratulate not only the Government but also our troops which have resisted this aggression. But may I ask why action against infiltrators was so late in coming on behalf of the Government? Let us look at the dates. In the second week of July President Ayub Khan addressed a meeting in Murree bidding godspeed to the infiltrators who were starting on their adventure, on their journey to Kashmir.

On the 5th of August the infiltration began. On the 1st of September the

regular Pakistan Army began to invade India, and it was only on the 6th September that the Indian Army took the offensive. Why was this lag between the infiltration and the action taken by the Government in regard to the disposal of these infiltrators? From the end of July till practically the 1st of September no action was taken although the infiltrators were infiltrating into India by dribs and drabs. It was either 'because of the failure of the intelligence organised by the External Affairs Ministry or the External Affairs Ministry did not take note of the intelligence reports of their Intelligence Officers. In any country which is bounded by such possible potential enemies as Pakistan and China and others, the Intelligence Officers must be on the spot the whole time. We should have a large Intelligence Service frequenting the borders, inspecting the borders and reporting even the slightest incident that happens on the border, and on these intelligence reports our External Affairs Ministry in combination with the Defence Ministry should take action.

I will not say much about the Kashmir issue except to say that Pakistan, whatever right it had once or approaching the conference table in regard to it, has lost it twice, once in 1947 when it organised the first invasion of Kashmir, and now in 1965 when it organised the second invasion. So twice it tried the weapon of war and twice it has failed, and therefore it has lost for some time to come at least all hope of bringing about a settlement of the Kashmir issue at the negotiation table. For the present of course Kashmir is an integral part of India about which there is no dispute at all. But as regards the future, as regards specially the question of peace, that is, permanent peace between the two countries, is there any method for considering this question at the negotiation table either in

, an international conference or at a conference of Asian and African powers? In fact both the United States

and Russia are for once united on this question, namely, of inviting India to approach the conference table and try to settle the dispute with Pakistan on the Kashmir question by peaceful negotiations. Otherwise what is the point of the Russian invitation to Tashkent of both President Ayub and Prime Minister Shastri? It was not to discuss the weather at Tashkent. I suppose it is more interesting than our weather; but it was not for that purpose that Russia had issued this invitation, and the Prime Minister himself today has announced that he would have no objection to talking about Kashmir with President Johnson. But Pakistan is not our enemy, is not our real enemy. China is the most anxious problem by which we are confronted. It is threatening Sikkim and Bhutan. There are two hundred thousand Chinese troops massed on the Sikkim border, and it is not only to Sikkim and Bhutan that they are offering a threat. But by their occupation of Tibet and by their friendship with Nepal they are threatening the borders of UP. *via* Nepal. Here again I must register another failure of the External Affairs Ministry, failure to retain Nepal in our entire friendship, to make India the sole friend of Nepal. We have failed there. We have allowed Nepal to enter into peaceful, friendly relations with China, allowed China to build a road for her in the north having built a road ourselves in the south. That road also should have been built by India and not by China. Not merely for straightforward war we must be prepared on the part of China; next to guerilla war the Chinese have specialised in what has been called war by seepage, namely, war by means of infiltration, getting into a country till one fine morning they find that the whole country is in the possession of the Chinese. There is also war by proxy in which the Chinese specialise. We have found it in Vietnam and we have found it recently in Pakistan. Let us remember in this connection what Mao Tse-tung had said in one of his classic writings called

Protracted War". "It is extremely important", he said, "to keep the enemy in the dark as regards when and where our forces will attack. This creates a basis (for misconception and misunderstanding on the part of the enemy." Let us also remember Lenin's famous saying that the road to London and New York lies *via* Shanghai and Calcutta.

Another important point that I want to make about our foreign policy is that there is no initiative in its makers. We always wait for the other man to make a move. In the diplomatic chessboard we are always waiting for the opposite number to make a move and then we make a move. No chess game can be won on these negative methods, waiting for the other man to make a move. We lost a great opportunity in creating a South East Asian alliance. We have given the lead to Japan. Japan has recently invited the South East Asian powers to come to an economic conference. That invitation should have been issued by India and not by Japan, and this economic alliance might have led to a military alliance. Placed as we are, unless we spend all the money that we can afford to raise from a poverty-stricken people on defence, we cannot depend on ourselves for defending ourselves. Talk has been going on of a nuclear shield. Certainly the U.S.A. will offer this nuclear shield, and it has offered it already if China were to attempt a nuclear war on India.

Then I have noticed certain wrong trends recently in the foreign policy, that is, encouraging rebellions in other countries. I was astonished the other day to hear from the Deputy Minister of External Affairs that India would encourage the rebels in Pakhtoonistan against Pakistan. Is that a game that we can afford to play, with all kinds of doubtful people, people not already fully integrated into India? What would prevent Pakistan from playing with the Nagas and the tribes on the

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

border in order to organise a rebellion among them against us? It is a dangerous game to play. It is playing with fire. By all means we can express our sympathies with any movement towards autonomy or independence, but we cannot go on encouraging rebellion positively. And then, what is the meaning of our protest against bases of the United Kingdom and the United States being in the Indian Ocean? We seem to be as childish as President Soekarno when he converted the name of the Indian Ocean into Indonesian Ocean. The Indian Ocean does not belong to us. We have no rights, except in our territorial waters there. And after all, let us remember—and here I would contradict Shri Gujral—it is not against India, it is not against any democratic country that these bases have been thought of; everyone knows that these bases are against China. It is against China that the Seventh Fleet is plying in the Indian Ocean, and it is against China that these ocean bases are required. After all, what can we do except entering these childish protests? Unless we are able to prevent these bases from being formed; there is no point at all in making these feeble protests. It is like a little lamb pleading for peace when two tigers are locked in mortal battle. The tigers might be tempted to put a stop to the battle and try to dispose of the silly, little lamb. I too believe, as the Minister says and his supporters say, in a truly independent policy. But non-alignment is not necessary for forming a truly independent policy. One hon. Member—I think the Maha-rani of Patiala—said the other day that non-alignment was an article of faith. May I remind her of a definition of an article of faith? An article of faith has been defined as 'a hope in the substance of things to come and an evidence of the things that are not seen'. Non-alignment is against all sense of reality. And the very term 'non-alignment', as I have pointed out so often, I

is a negative word. Why don't you choose an active or positive word like 'pacifism' or something else? You cannot rouse the sympathies of people on a negative policy." And may I remind the House and the Minister that the opposite of non-alignment is not alignment? Because we give up non-alignment, it does not mean that we must go on aligning ourselves with the Western or the Eastern powers; the opposite of non-alignment is a policy of selective alliance. We choose allies here and there according to our necessities or according to our situation to any given time. It is not necessary that we should be the permanent allies of the United Kingdom and America; for the time being; just now, it may be necessary. And we must also choose our alliance according to the political creeds that we profess. These alliances must not be a threat to our political creeds.

Therefore, looking at our foreign policy, I would plead with the Minister of External Affairs and the Government as a whole, to convert it into a policy of realism and rationalism. Let them go on chanting the mantra of non-alignment. There is a story told of a certain tribe in Africa which, when it wanted to do anything which was forbidden by its religion, veiled the face of the idol which it ordinarily worshipped and veiling the face, it went on doing the things which were prohibited by its religion. Similarly, the Government may veil the face of non-alignment and do the things which are really necessary for the promotion of the interests of India, for the defence of the integrity of our country.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):
Madam, I was amazed when I read Mr. Wilson's statement on the 6th of October in which he more or less insinuated that India was wrong. I have very great regard for the British Labour Party. I happen to know Mr. Arthur Bottomley very well and I know Mr. Wilson just slightly. This

very Mr. Wilson had, two or three years back, when the question of Indo-Pakistan relations was raised by the Pakistan Government in the Security Council, criticised the then Prime Minister, Sir Alec Douglas Home, for taking a partisan view. He wanted that Britain should have taken a neutral point of view. I should have thought that after coming back into power—even though he has only a majority of two—he would stick to the principles for which the British Labour Party and British radicalism stand. I have a deep affection for it; I am steeped into the thought of British radicalism. I have great affection for the British Labour Party. And I am sorry that a misunderstanding of such a nature should have arisen between our country and Britain at a time when a leftist party is in power. It may be that the British Prime Minister was not well informed. It may be that we were perhaps not quite explicit in the statements that we had to make. I have read the statement of Shri Chavan, I think it is an explicit statement. I have read the statement of our Prime Minister, Shri Lai Bahadur. I can find nothing wrong with it and I am fairly certain in my mind that our embassy in Britain is up to the mark. I have no doubt that the British Ambassador here, Mr. Freeman, who was an editor of 'The New Statesman', a paper which I have been reading for the last 51 years, must have kept himself informed of the conditions as they were in this country. Therefore, it is painful for me to find that the movement for the secession of this country from the Commonwealth is growing strong, is gaining strength.

Now, the Commonwealth is not Britain's exclusive preserve; the Commonwealth in its present form is the work of Jawaharlal Nehru. It was he who made the Commonwealth what it is today. Before India became independent, the Commonwealth was a white men's community. Today, as members of the Commonwealth, we

have no obligation other than that we must consult each other. Therefore, I think that there is no substance in the demand that we should withdraw from the Commonwealth.

Let me now go on to say a few words about the Indo-Pakistan issue and the issue of Kashmir.

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

I confess that I am one of those who attach very great importance to Indo-Pakistan amity. Nature intended, as I once said in this House, this continent to be one. Man has divided it. Now I am free to admit that we **cannot** rewrite history. We cannot undo the evil effects of the partition to which we agreed in 1947. But we can minimise those effects, and I think we as sensible men, as men who have the welfare of our country at heart, should work as a sort of detente between India and Pakistan. As a matter of fact, I should like the relations between those countries to be like those between Canada and the United States of America. Therefore, I do not glory in the fact that we have won victory over Pakistan. No doubt tribute is due to our Generals and our jawans, to our Defence Minister and to our Prime Minister for organising the defences of this country in a proper manner. But I do not like this military way of thinking. I do not like a military approach to questions. I do not like this talk of war, war, war.

Sir, we *were* among those who used to denounce the cold war in the old days. Well, we are having in our country something more than a cold War. We are nearly having a hot war. I would not like, therefore, the question of Indo-Pakistan relationship to be viewed from a new perspective.

I know that Pakistan is a most difficult country to deal with. It is difficult not because it is theocratic. You may say that in a way Britain is

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

theocratic. It is not difficult in the sense that it is theocratic. It is difficult in the sense that it has only one creed, and that is hatred for this country. Well, I know no method which can conquer hatred except perhaps love. And that was the basis left to us by Gandhiji, and that is the basis left to us by our great leader, Mr. Nehru. Let us fight for the right by all means. But let us do it with charity in our heart and with magnanimity in our soul. Therefore, I would like a frank discussion between Mr. Lai Bahadur Shastri and General Ayub at Tashkent. A tribute is due from us to the Soviet Union for the consistent support that it has given us in our stand over a secular Kashmir. But I hope that these talks will be conducted in a new spirit, and that we shall, during the course of our discussions, also remember the people of Kashmir to whom we gave certain pledges which are embodied in article 370 of our Constitution. Interpreted in the language of the Constitutional law article 370 gives special status which means a semi-government, and it may be that that may provide a sort of solution so far as the Kashmir problem is concerned. I do not think that Pakistan will agree to that solution, but I want to know the reaction of the people who matter in Kashmir to a solution of this character.

May I, Mr. Vice-Chairman, also say one or two words about China? China is one of the ostracised countries of the world. Possibly that ostracism has determined her attitude towards world problems. She is no doubt an aggressive country, but we cannot deny the existence of China as a factor in world politics. Therefore, I am not one of those who think that there must be no talk between us and China. I do not know whether the time is opportune for a talk with China. I do not know whether an Ambassador to China can do miracles, but I do want some way to be discovered whereby we can get negotiations started with

the Chinese Government. It may be that in this matter we can get the support of some countries who are not definitely alike either to Russia or to the West. I am thinking, for example, of the U.A.R.

Now I want this question of China to be viewed from a broad angle because we have to maintain the solidarity of the Asian people who have gained independence, and it is important that the great countries like China and India should be friends. I would, therefore, say that in this matter I rather find myself in agreement with a name which is perhaps hateful to most of you. I find myself in agreement in this matter with Mr. Namboodiripad.

PROF. M. B. LAL: I anticipated this. Very glad to know that.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I do not say that I agree with Mr. Namboodiri in all respects...

PROF. M. B. LAL: I think he has imbibed the spirit of both Gandhi and Nehru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I do not think that I agree with Mr. Namboodiri's Marxist-Socialism. But on this question of Pakistan and on this question of Kashmir he has been talking good sense.

PROF. M. B. LAL: What about his views regarding China and Szechuan?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: On the question of China he has been talking good sense because all that he has been saying is that a day must come when we must talk to China. And I think that is the spirit in which we should approach the problem.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD

SINHA (Bihar): Are we delaying it? Are we coming in the way?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I have deliberately chosen to speak frankly because my conscience oppresses me to say things frankly. May I also say that

we have heard a great deal about alignment and non-alignment and all that? I am not worried about words. I think that non-alignment has paid dividends and it would be an evil day for this country, it will be a misfortune for this country, it will be the saddest day in our history, if we were to manufacture the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb. We have denounced the manufacture of these bombs. We have been consistent in that and I believe with Phillip Toynbee in unilateral disarmament if it comes to that. It may be that my views are of a queer nature but I would ask you to believe me that they are based on deep conviction and I would like the people of this country to set an example of peaceful living and not talk in the language of chauvinistic imperialism. I am afraid that we are developing in this country certain tendencies which are not in harmony with the spirit which animated the policy of our late Prime Minister and I hope . . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Do not bring in his name.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Chandra Shekhar is a turncoat. He was sitting on
(*Interruption*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: He is riot at liberty to talk anything . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): No three persons at a time.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I stick to W views. I am prepared and if I am speaking against the country, Mr. Nanda has enough means under the D.I.R. to take action against me. I am not afraid of that.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: You will not be arrested.. (*Interruptions*)

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: But I want this country to retain its balanced attitude and I am happy that the Minister for External Affairs has

given us a balanced speech. Thank you very much for the courtesy with which you have listened to me.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): Madam, I feel it a privilege to be speaking immediately after Mr. Sapru, at least for this that he has exhibited rare courage on the floor of this House. That is why I say that it is a privilege that I am immediately following him. There were taunts and shouts thrown at him. I am willing to take all those taunts and shouts that Mr. Chandra Shekhar can give from that corner.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Why are you so considerate to Mr. Chandra Shekhar?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Because you interrupted him so often that it was fast becoming unparliamentary. You are good at shouting. I am not good at shouting....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please address me. Mr. Chandra Shekhar is not in the Chair.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Yes, I do not want him to take up my time. Again and again, in the course of this debate a quotation has been given which purports to be from somebody high up in British politics and this quotation has been given from the right, the left and the centre of the floor of this House and the quotation purports to explain the basis of the British foreign policy. "Britain has neither permanent friends, nor permanent enemies. It has only permanent interests." Madam, what else can come as the delineation of the foreign policy of a nation, long known as a nation of shopkeepers? It has no permanent friends, no permanent enemies. It has only permanent interest. Strangely this quotation comes from people here who immediately after having quoted this, attack England for doing something or for not doing something which they want. This is very strange because once you grant

[Shri G. Ramachandran.] that it is only national interests that are at stake and nothing else in the world, then England is doing what she ought to be doing. Every country is doing what it ought to be doing! But I think in the country of Gandhi and Nehru—and in my mind there is no contradiction between Gandhi and Nehru—in this country we must take a larger view of foreign policy. Even in England, I do not think, the best minds of England would accept this dictum. Somebody has said it, it suits us and so we go on quoting it. I do not think the best minds of England would accept that because even England is working at least on the basis of one permanent friendship and that is, with the U.S.A. Through two world wars they have maintained that friendship and to-day also between the U.S.A. and England there is a close link. I say that we should take a more human view of our foreign policy. If every nation says: 'Nothing but my interest' this world would be a world of perpetual war and conflict. If every nation says 'I am not bothered about anybody else's interests and my interest alone first, middle and last' then this world is in a very sad plight and luckily this is not wholly true today because very often one nation takes a keen interest in the affairs of another nation, and goes to its help. So the world is not having this as the absolute dictum as some make it out to be. We have a foreign policy. More than any other policy of the Government of India, this policy has stood the test of time. If I may say so, Pandit Nehru never insisted that it should be called "non-alignment". Once it was called neutralism, then this and that and then finally we have ended up with the word 'non-alignment'. Whether this word itself explains fully that policy I am not sure. Some pundit will have to invent a proper word but this policy of non-alignment is as old as the independence of India and perhaps even older because this policy of non-alignment comes directly from Gandhiji who said that we must live at peace with

all the world and holding out our hands of friendship to the whole world. That was a philosophic concept but Pandit Nehru, as the head of the Government, translated it into action and we have called it non-alignment. I do not think we should quarrel over the word. If my friend Shri Ruthnaswamy who is an English scholar and a scholar in many other ways, can invent some other name for this, we will have no quarrel with that word. The essence of that policy however is that India keeps its soul free to look at every problem in the world with dispassionate eyes and come to a judgment entirely its own not based absolutely on its self-interest only but on its interest plus the good of mankind. This freedom to look upon the world with souls free is nonalignment. There is no other word: at the moment. People are attacking it from different sides. Mr. Patel attacked non-alignment and what did he attack it for? He said: "Do not align yourself with Russia and the Russian group but please align yourself with the U.S.A." He then wants alignment and non-alignment at the same time, but his own liking. And then my friend, Mr. Govindan Nair, from the other end said, "Don't align yourself with the United States and England. They are absolutely undependable. You rely on Moscow and the Communist countries." So people attacking this from different sides also end up with saying, "Align yourself, to somebody or other and also not to anybody or others!" But the policy of non-alignment says, "No; we will choose our friends carefully, keep our friends carefully and as we go on with our programmes we shall keep friendship with all nations and look at every problem with an unclouded vision, with the real good of India at heart and also the good of the world at heart". With a passionate conviction Shri P. N. Saprú, younger in spirit than I and younger in spirit than many younger people here, said that it would be one of the saddest days in this country when you give up this

policy of non-alignment and get shuttle-cocked between this power and that power who will play with our destiny. The dignity of India, the greatness of India, the strength of India depends on keeping this non-aligned policy inviolate against every attack. Luckily the Government does not sorely need my support. It has a big party and behind the party are millions of people who accept it. So they are safe. But even if they are safe, we ourselves, in our own mind, must realise truly and sincerely what a splendid policy it is, the policy of non-alignment.

Having said this, how does non-alignment today impinge on the problems we are facing? Supposing we are non-aligned and we want friendship with the whole world and then, in practice if we do something contrary, then it is not the man who attacks the policy that is really pulling it down, but we who are clinging to the policy in theory and breaking it in practice; we will be breaking it ourselves. So we have to see whether we ourselves are truthful in our policy of non-alignment, which is friendship with every nation to the extent that our friendship will be accepted by anybody. Now if you look at it that way, there are certain problems that come up at once, and even about these problems my friend, Dr. Sapru, has spoken with remarkable courage.

Now take for instance what is happening in South Viet-Nam. Nobody could have made India's position clearer than the Prime Minister of India. He has declared in unequivocal language that this war in Viet-Nam is a crime against mankind and must stop. And there are people in India who are criticising the Prime Minister saying, "What necessity is there for this man to go and give away his own mind like that which has created antagonism elsewhere?" Now such critics are betraying the policy of non-alignment. But the Prime Minister is standing firm by non-alignment when he says that non-alignment does not mean that we

shall not speak the truth as we know the truth. So about Viet-Nam the position of India is absolutely clear. Then about Rhodesia. No one could have made a more thorough-going statement about it than Shri Swaran Singh, who holds today the Ministry of External Affairs. There was no reservation about what he said. He said that India, to the utmost its ability, would prevent the racist white minority from dominating Rhodesia, and in every step that the other nations of the world take, India would take its full share. So there also we have a clean slate and a clean conscience.

Then we come nearer home, Madam, and here is where passions are roused. Rhodesia and South Viet-Nam are far away places and we can choose to say all that we want to with full gusto. But let us now come to Kashmir, come to Pakistan and to this vast country of China with whom we have several thousands of miles of common boundary. If ultimately this non-alignment and this foreign policy of India which, I think, had its roots in the mind of Gandhi and its branches in the soul of Nehru. If

policy is to succeed—and it ought to succeed—then the result must be that Pakistan and India should become friendly, today, tomorrow, or the day after. We should be able to have a situation in Kashmir which does not continually become a terrific strain and burden on India. It should ultimately also lead to peaceful coexistence with China. Again Dr. Sapru showed remarkable courage when he referred to China. Hardly some years ago everyone in India was on the side of China, and if somebody had said something against China, then these very people who are now shouting against China would have been up in anger. The wheel has turned. (Interruptions) I repeat the wheel has turned. I am not going to allow you to shout me down. I am saying,

the wheel has turned. There was a time when the foreign policy of India was based on strong Indo-China friendship.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is free to express his own opinion.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: I am saying, Madam, that the wheel has turned. I am not bothered about what the interruptor is saying. I am saying that the wheel has turned. Till the Chinese attack came, the friendship between India and China was one of the rocks upon which our foreign policy was based (*Interruptions*) and it seemed then very sensible. If anyone says today that India will be in eternal enmity with China it need not be, and ought not to be, true. You don't like it when Bhutto says that Pakistan will be in eternal enmity with India, for a thousand years as he put it. So now China cannot be the eternal enemy of India, and India cannot be the eternal enemy of China. It would ruin both China and India if they are to be quarrelling with each other perpetually. I am not saying thereby, Madam, that we must go now and hug the Chinese to our bosom, and I know there are serious difficulties now. But our foreign policy, while it deals with the issues of today, must look beyond the issues of today into the tomorrow and the day after. It must attend to the integrity of our nation and the good of the world. As I look into the future, I cannot imagine India and China locked in an eternal conflict. Take Russia and China, Madam. They were the best friends but they are quarrelling today and China and Pakistan have become friends. So anything can happen between nations. If anyone imagines that by developing great anger and hate against Pakistan or China, we are serving the cause of the nation, and the world I do not grant that. Now there has been an attack on India by Pakistan. Now somebody used the word 'perfidy' repeatedly. I think it was my friend behind me, Mr. Reddy, who specialises in that word. Now perfidy and all that are granted. But if we look forward to the future, it must be a future in which our foreign policy, our non-alignment, must bring us a rich harvest of friendship with the whole world if possible, or at least as much of the world as possible.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh): I want to know what is your suggestion.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: I will come to that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to come to that perhaps outside this House. Your time is limited.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: That is friendly advice by one woman how a man should deal with another woman.

Now, Madam, I am for firmness against aggression. The word 'surrender' is not for India. We will not surrender to anybody. We shall all be firm like a rock in resisting aggression. But even while we are doing so, our minds must travel beyond today to the tomorrow that must come for mankind as a whole. We must be ready for peace at the first sign that peace can come. Take for instance our Prime Minister now going to Tashkent. Some people are saying, "Don't go to Tashkent". Other people are saying, "Go to Tashkent having given in regard to this side and that". Let the Prime Minister of India go as a free man to Tashkent. The honour of India is hundred per cent safe in his hands; the man has proved it in these few months. Small in size but big in will, big in courage and large in heart, he has shown himself to be a man whom we can trust. It is not for us to trammel him. He will not betray the honour of this country. Let him talk at Tashkent with Ayub Khan on any subject in the world. When the Prime Minister was in Cairo, the U.A.R. leader suggested a meeting between our Prime Minister and Ch'ou En-lai. He did not rule it out altogether. I am glad he did not rule it out. While we are firm and while we are strong in resisting aggression, our minds must be willing to go out not 100 miles but one thousand miles to meet the other side if there is a chance of peace I know that the policy of the Government of India is one of firmness on the one hand and restraint on the other, and I have not the slightest doubt that if we pursue that policy

properly, we shall with the friendship of the world.

SARDAR RAGHBIR SINGH PANJHAZARI (Punjab): Our Prime Minister did not meet the Prime Minister of China at the airport at Cairo.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No no. He has not said that. You have not heard him correctly.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Madam, let me conclude. To this partial policy of non-alignment, that is, the foreign policy of India, I as a Member not belonging to any party, give my fullest support.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anwar, you have just fifteen minutes.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have listened with rapt attention to the speech of the hon. Minister of External Affairs and to the contributions that several leading lights have made in the course of this debate on the international situation. Throughout the deliberation in this House our conflict with Pakistan and our conflict with China had been the burden of our song. But let me say this, Madam, that even as from out of evil cometh good, so from this conflict India has emerged stronger. Only a month ago, when I had an opportunity to go on my own nearly 16,000 miles through many interesting capitals of the world, I found much to my own amazement, a tremendous reassessment of the position that India occupies in the World today. Well, we know that we have been paying tributes to our Army and our Air Force. I must join the chorus of tributes for the glory that our Armed Forces have brought for our country. But, Madam, much more than this glory that the Armed Forces have brought for our country, our tribute must go not so much to the Armed Forces, not so much to the leadership in this country at the moment, but to the 475 millions of the people of India who have in the most spontaneous and instantaneous

inspiration, without any prompting without any propaganda, have risen to the call of duty and rallied round the flag of India. Madam, when I was having discussions with many intellectuals not only at Moscow and London but even in Frankfurt and Rome, in Paris and Zurich, in Copenhagen and Amsterdam, in Beirut and Aden, I found that they were flabbergasted that India should have presented this spectacle of national solidarity. And why? Because as students of history they had known that India all through the centuries has been the invaders' paradise. Right from the time of the Aryans it has been so and I as a Dravidian feel that we have always been dividing ourselves in the hour of crisis and making it possible for every invader to find his way into this country. Madam, for the first time in our history, a Country of this tremendous dimensions, which is as good as a sub-continent in the world, with a population of 475 millions and with such a plural society, a multi-religious multi-racial, multi-regional, multilingual and multi-coloured society, has shown this national solidarity. Not only that, it is not a closed society, but it is an open society, breathing the air of liberty and practising the virtues of democracy, and this nation has demonstrated before the world that when the crisis comes, they all stand together as one man, as one nation. This, Madam Deputy Chairman, is the most glorious tribute that we have paid to the memory of Gandhi and Nehru who had inculcated into the mind of India, into the mind of Modern India, this ideal of secularism. Madam, I know that when different communities fought with one another before, but I feel proud today as a Muslim of India, that we have demonstrated this national solidarity, much to the bewilderment of doubting Toms and confirmed critics here, there, and everywhere in the world. Even when I was in Mecca and Medina, in that *sanctum sanctorum* I was flabbergasted to hear from my good friends that they had little knowledge about the facts that as many as 60

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]

million Muslims are living in this country, India. I make bold to say that I am proud that I am not only a Muslim, but I am a Muslim of India.

Madam, that really brings to us this greatest victory of secularism. That is the key to our victory and that is the "open sesame" to the glorious of our future. I shudder to think, Madam but just at this moment when we have such wonderful display of unity in our country, we also hear certain rumblings, rumblings which give me sometimes agony, of currents and under-currents and cross-currents of power politics. We now find certain misgivings being expressed from certain quarters about the policies that we are now pursuing.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

So, I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to take a warning from our history. While India has now regained her soul through the teachings of Gandhi and Nehru, let us not relapse into what has been the misfortune in our history, when every crisis has always discovered and found us disunited. That was how we had lost ourselves to the invaders throughout history. I now think that it is but proper that we should warn Ourselves. Let there not be any divisions in the rank and file of our party, nor shall there be any controversy between parties over the pursuit of this policy that has brought glories to this country. There are groups and parties. First let me give to them my unstinted tribute on the wonderful way in which all of them had rallied round the honour of India, regardless of group politics, regardless of communities. Every party in this country has got together as one. But even as we are now thinking over the aftermath of this victory, already I feel sometimes a little overwhelmed by a sense of misgiving; that some political groups and parties have started indulging in group criticisms not in a fact-finding but in a fault-finding spirit. This danger we have to guard our-

selves against, for the sake of the future of our country.

Mr. Chairman, what is the real reason why we have not been able to carry the world opinion, the opinion in most countries of the world with us? Well, I must say one thing. I feel that even if I should be in the minority of one, I must now express my view with courage, candour and conviction and say that the very size of this country, the very number of the people in this country, these 475 millions living under one flag, that appears to be more a liability, for that seems to be an eyesore when we deal with many countries of the world which happen to be unfortunately small in size and population, I mean, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to see that while dealing with different countries we approach them with the utmost humility, never conscious that we happen to be a very big country. So many friends asked me in the distant countries that I visited recently, "Why have you got this problem with Pakistan? We have lived through two world wars and nearly every family has suffered from the ravages of war. But now we have come to think in terms of living together even with countries with which we are not in agreement on matters of ideology. Why then should you not, as good neighbours, live together, India and Pakistan?"

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the world has still to know the real situation. Many references have been made in the course of the deliberations in this House to that classic statement of Lord Palmston. It is true—and that is an axiomatic statement applicable to almost every country in the world—that each country in international dealings has no permanent friends, no permanent enemies but only permanent interests. Very true and possibly because of this criterion nearly every country now regardless of what efforts we put in in the diplomatic field or publicity comes to have a certain standpoint in our

conflict with Pakistan and with China but, Mr. Chairman, let me say this that because of the wonderful virtues that we have got in the pursuit of our policy of non-alignment we have now emerged as a country to be reckoned with. And, particularly in the wake of the conflict we have demonstrated our valour and our victory both in the battle front and in the home front by preserving our national solidarity and we have emerged as a force to be reckoned with in the world. I should think that we must stick together and see that no matter which country comes to our rescue, to our support, we actively work for friendship with every country in the world no matter to which bloc it belongs. This conflict has proved to be an eye-opener to us. We have got to galvanise the energies and the resources of the four hundred and seventy-five million people and preserve this unity under one flag. If only we can carry through this unity for some years to come, I am sure we can achieve respect in every country of the world. If there are different countries which come forward to help us, from the East and the West, they are most welcome but if they continue to criticise us and adopt a fault-finding attitude, let us not, because of that, suffer from any inferiority complex and run away with criticising this or that country. As it always happens as between two individuals, it is but natural that when there should be conflict between two nations, the world sits in judgment and every country, big or small, naturally tries to sit in judgment and offers its opinion. I feel that we have got to pursue this policy most vigorously because we have come to realise that this unity is the result of secularism. Somebody asked me, Mr. Chairman, "What is it? You are a vegetarian society and how have you been able to enact a wonderful demonstration of valour?" I gave my reply and I said, "Don't you know that in the animal kingdom the biggest beast is a vegetarian, the elephant? That elephant has got good sense but when attacked it can retaliate with utmost vigour". Thank you to the Congress

Party, to which I have the honour to belong—this Party which has been a fighter for freedom, the winner of liberty and the unifier of the nation—we have preserved the traditions of democracy and the greatest factor is that this Congress has been responsible for promoting secularism in this country of different communities. Therefore, unless the communal frenzy is raised when, I am afraid, this elephant may turn out to be a rogue elephant, this country shall have the right to retaliate and if there should be any aggression committed on our borders, no matter from whichever quarter it may come, every community in India is duty bound to honour this country and preserve its culture. That duty we have done and let us now preserve it through unity for the posterity.

SHRI A. K. A. ABDUL SAMAD (Madras): Mr. Chairman, my Party, the Indian Union Muslim League, has always been generally supporting the foreign policy of the Government of India. Only we wanted that the Government should be firm in carrying out the policy and be forewarned about any aggression on our country. The Chinese aggression of 1962 which took us unawares taught us a lesson and now, in the present Pakistani aggression, that lesson stood us in good stead and we regained more than we lost in the year 1962. In this case of the Pakistani aggression, the Government's proper, prompt and firm action galvanised the people into solid unity for the defence of the honour and integrity of the country. All the parties and all sections of the people rose as one man and backed the measures taken by the Government for repelling the Pakistani aggression. This upsurge of the people was not due to any propaganda or magic but to their own innate spontaneity and patriotism. This shows that there is real and enduring integration of the people in the country. It demonstrated itself in 1962 and once again, but in a more amazing manner, in the present crisis. This solidarity of the people was highlighted by the dazzling performance of our

(Shri A. K. Abdul Samad.) jawans in the battle field, their magnificent achievements wrought by their toil and blood, brought home to the world the Conviction that India cannot be trifled with. Some critics abroad who scoffed at us at the beginning, had soon to revise their ideas of things. Though their self-interest made certain powers, not to come out in an open manner, at least with their moral support for us, it was clear that they had revised their erstwhile assessment of our capacities and now have real respect for our country. This, for one thing, seen in the attitude adopted towards us by the various countries which took part in the preliminaries of the abortive Algiers Conference, though, for unavoidable reasons, our head of the Government or the Foreign Minister could not attend the same conference. More than anything else this respect and deference to us was unmistakably and clearly seen by the decision arrived at by the Secretary-General and the Security Council of the United Nations. Though the Security Council would not name the aggression, its decisions are undoubtedly in our favour. This was in no small measure due to the presence of our Foreign Minister in the United Nations at the time and to his clear-sightedness and unoffending tenacity. Even the most unbecoming and unseemly language and behaviour of our opponent could not move our Foreign Minister away from the gentlemanliness and decorum that are his characteristics and the symbol of our culture. In the midst of the atmosphere surcharged with self-interest of the statesmen of certain countries, India was not without its real friends. That country, Malaysia, though little but endowed with a great heart, stood by us firm as a rock and spoke words in our defence which could not be bettered even by our own representatives. Malaysia openly and clearly supported us during the 1962 Chinese aggression and its Prime Minister, Tun-ku Abdul Rahman Putra, even collected funds for our national defence. Though beset with a cruel confrontation from her own neighbour, she has

shown an exemplary courage of conviction and forthright boldness in defending our just cause in the Security Council. That beautiful country is really entitled to our gratitude and lasting friendship. There are also other countries deserving of our consideration and gratitude such as Yugoslavia, the United Arab Republic and Singapore, which were not sparing in support to us in our hour of trial. In proper time and particularly as a result of our more purposeful and meaningful propaganda and a re-orientation of our diplomatic front the circle of our active friends will hereafter be surely enlarged. About a week ago, Mrs. Chester Bowleg is reported to have blamed India's poor publicity for confusion in American thought about the Kashmir question. She said:

"Indians in the U.S.A. did not think public relation is their job.**

At the same time there was a party of about 40 Canadian tourists in India, who are reported to have observed that there was a fund of goodwill for India in Canada and that there was need for closer contacts between the two countries. On the same day Mr. S. K. Patil who arrived from his foreign tour said that there were second thoughts in America about plebiscite in Kashmir after his talks with American authorities. He also declared that our representation in Latin American countries should be strengthened. Mr. Patil's visit abroad has it seems really done good to the cause, that we stand for. Mr. Dinesh Singh, who visited Ceylon recently has made a good job there. The Ceylon papers are profuse with their praises for him and his brilliant advocacy of India's cause. When there is a need for sending special envoys it is such men as Mr. Patil, Mr. Dinesh Singh and similar others who ought to be thought of rather than a disjointed group of 'temporary salesmen' and sightseers. The most important in this connection is to strengthen and galvanise our permanent embassies by, amongst other things, providing adequate hands, facilities and encouragement.

In this Connection I have to say that the answer to Pakistan's slogan of religious war must have been left more in the hands of the Muslims of India. The tallest of the Muslim architecture in the world, Qutab Minar, and the most beautiful and the daintiest piece of Muslim architecture, the Taj Mahal, are in India. There are many more remarkable monuments of Islam in this country than in most of the Muslim countries. The maso-leums of the makers and savants of Urdu and Bengali, which are the national languages of Pakistan are in India. There are six crores of Muslims in India, which number is larger than that of all the Arab countries comprised in the Arab League and all the Muslims here are as one man behind the Government of India in repelling the Pakistani aggression. The voice of these Muslims ought to have been allowed to be heard by the world. But instead of doing so that voice has been stifled so far. Now in this period of aggression, Muslims are solidly one with the rest of their brethren in upholding and strengthening the honour and integrity of the country. But even so many Muslims, most of them innocent, and several Muslim League workers in such places as Madras, Kerala, Bombay, Andhra and Mysore, who were actively co-operating in the defence efforts and carrying on effective propaganda against Pakistani aggression, have been arrested and detained. Even in spite of the Home Minister's reported writing to the States about this matter, no tangible action seems to be taken in this direction. I only want to submit that this is not the way to reply to the Pakistani slogan and propaganda. The Government must pay immediate consideration to this aspect of the situation.

At this juncture I have to refer to a point which deserves much more attention but to which very scant attention is being paid by our authorities. I mean, the plight of the Burma refugees in India and the case of the Indians who are still in Burma and also their assets and properties which are in Burma. Thousands of people were

forced out of Burma, barely with their clothes on their bodies, and millions worth of their assets are retained in that country. When the Indians left that country, the Indian Embassy could not even take charge of their jewellery and other valuable personal belongings. All these are really the property of our country which will come handy just at this juncture. The Government must really pay more consideration and take active steps to repatriate the assets and belongings of our country.

Thank you.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we had a debate on the Security Council Resolution on which occasion we dealt with many of the problems which have been discussed today. At this stage before I express my opinion on certain matters I must pay my homage to the great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who is the architect of our foreign policy. It is the basic policy and the fundamentals which he had laid down which the present Government is following and following with credit and to the great advantage of the country. Sir, in the battle field the leadership of our Generals the sacrifice of our jawans and all concerned has earned respect and exacted praise not only from our countrymen but throughout the world. The image that was spoilt in 1962 has been made up in 1965. But now after that victory, the cease-fire that we have, I am sorry to say, is an uneasy cease-fire. It is necessary that thought should be given to this fact and it is the duty of the Security Council to see that the cease-fire really means cease-fire. In the second round that we had in the United Nations—and here I must pay credit to our External Affairs Minister—when I read the speeches in the Assembly and in the Security Council I feel that we have done a good job and all the credit goes to Sardar Swaran Singh. So I offer my congratulations to him and to the Government Of India.

rlbhri Akbar Ah Khan.]

Now, Sir, without going into all that had already been mentioned I would just say two or three things. There has been a great emphasis given by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel regarding Taiwan and Israel. I would only say that possibly my friend does not remember that in connection with the Chinese aggression and the claims that they had made Taiwan fully endorsed the demands of China regarding the territory. So far as the real China is concerned, it is the China which is Communist China, and so far as Taiwan is concerned everybody knows that it is supported by the United States. Is it right, is it proper, is it diplomatic, that we should have our relations with Taiwan and also we should have our relations with Communist China? If you look at it from any point of view, I think that will not be a right thing and I am glad that our present Ministry is backing up the same principle of supporting the admission of Communist China, no matter how it affects us. It is a question of principle; we have been sticking to it and we should stick to it in future as well.

So far as Israel is concerned, in the twentieth century two States have been established on communal lines, on the basis of religion. One is Israel and the other is Pakistan. Having that in mind we have to see, in the interests of the world and humanity and especially having in view the newly independent countries that are coming up in Asia and Africa, whether it is the right thing or right policy that we should support Israel. It has been established to contain Arab nationalism. Even if some people in some Arab Countries do not agree with us, the bulk of the Arab countries, as will be evident from the proceedings of the United Nations General Assembly, have, in a way, supported us. They have not supported our adversary and our opponent. So, from that point of view also, would you like to have alignment or connections more with Israel or with the Arab countries? Unfortunately, the position is that if we have friendship with one, there is diffi-

culty with the other. So, from the point of view of the real facts and also from the point of view that it will pay us better, I think the policy of the Government to support and to have more cordial relations with the Arab countries, is really in the interests of the country.

So far as the motion to support the foreign policy is concerned, I am glad to say that in the Lok Sabha there were about a dozen amendments from the Swatantra Party, the Praja Socialist Party, the Communist Party, the Socialist Party and so on I think after hearing the convincing statements of the External Affairs Minister and the Prime Minister the Opposition Parties in this House have come to the conclusion that there is no necessity to table any amendments. Although they may express their opinions differently, they are in full support of the foreign policy of the Government of India. Only Mr. Chordia, on behalf of the Jan Sangh, has given an amendment and Mr. Sadiq has given another amendment supporting the motion. Of course, I think if Mr. Vajpayee, a senior leader, had been here, he would also have probably followed the other senior leaders in the Opposition group, but as Mr. Chordia had the responsibility he has tabled an amendment. Still I think he is not very keen because he is absent now.

PROF. M. B. LAL: He will be present at the time of voting.

SHRI AKBAR ALT KHAN: I hope so. Prof. Sahib. Let us see. Now, the whole thing which has to be looked into, in determining our foreign policy, is this. The principle of non-alignment, the principle of peaceful co-existence, the principle that we should be friendly with everybody, I think those principles laid down by our late Prime Minister have paid dividends in the recent conflict that we had with Pakistan. I think the world has come to realise it, even those who were not in agreement with our non-alignment policy. I do not bother about the wording, as has been suggested by Prof. Ruthnagwamy and I

think my esteemed friend, Mr. Ramachandran, has replied to it. The basis of non-alignment is that the decision will be with us. We will decide. It is not only in the best interests of the country. It is a positive content of non-alignment. Whatever the problem, we will not talk in the language of Russia or communist countries or the United States or Great Britain. We will consider the problem in the best interests of our country and in the best interests of world peace and we will decide it.

I shall conclude. I was just reading the speech of Mr. Chester Bowles, which was given at the Laski Institute in Ahmedabad. I have read it in the newspaper and we have been supplied with a copy of it. One thing he has said very emphatically. So far as food is concerned, there are no strings and the agreement and the promises of the United States regarding sending of food will be fully implemented. I on my behalf and on behalf of this House express our gratitude and when a responsible person from a responsible country speaks in that tone we have to accept it and I am sure that it will be implemented. At the same time, he has said in that speech. Let me speak the truth plainly and without any reservation. May I with your permission, also speak a few words in a very frank manner, in the way in which Mr. Chester Bowles has done? As there is not much time, I would put it in the form of a query. Mr. Eisenhower did promise that in case the arms were used except against communists, he would take appropriate action within his country and outside. May I ask Mr. Chester Bowles what action has been taken regarding this promise that was given to us by Mr. Eisenhower? Mr. Chester Bowles has also said that they are deeply interested in world peace as well as in democratic principles. May I also ask him: Has he studied—and I am sure, belonging to a mature nation and being a very mature Ambassador he must have studied it—how Pakistan has come into existence? How many of the people who rule Pakistan have taken part in the freedom

struggle? How many of them joined the freedom movement? I am sure he must have studied that those people in Pakistan who had taken part in the freedom struggle are not only not in power but they are in great difficulties. I do not want to go into the details, but I am sure the people of the United States, which is the greatest democracy, who have always stood for certain principles, will look into the matter deeply. Now, the ball is either in Washington or in Moscow. So, I would submit, while discussing this matter, let it not be from the narrow angle, from the narrow point of view. Rhodesia and Kashmir, these are the two big problems of racial discrimination and communal discrimination. In the interests of Pakistan itself, I think it will do a great service at this juncture if it gets out of communalism. Now, whatever it is, that State of Pakistan has been formed. We wish them good, but let them have a democratic and human approach, an approach which would appeal to the whole world and which would be a matter of satisfaction to the one crore non-Muslims who are there indistinguishable to communal approach. That is the greatest service that the United States or the USSR can render to Pakistan and to the world at large. I thank you, Sir.

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब" (उत्तर प्रदेश) : जनाबवाला, मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आपने कुछ वक्त मेरे लिये निकाला। इससे पहले कि मैं कुछ कहूँ, मैं हुकूमत को, अपने प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री को और उन के साथियों को मुबारकबाद दूँगा कि उन्होंने निहायत दिलेरी से, निहायत दानिशमन्दी से उन हालात का मुकाबला किया जो कि पाकिस्तान ने पैदा किये थे। पहली बार अप्रीजमेंट की पालिसी को छोड़ कर उन्होंने एक दिलेरी का कदम उठाया। एक मजबूत कदम उठाया, जिससे हिन्दुस्तान का मस्तक दुनिया के सामने ऊँचा हुआ और हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया के सामने सुखरू हुआ, इसके लिये मैं हुकूमत को

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब"]

खासतौर पर मुबारकवाद देता हूँ। इसके अलावा उन्होंने पहली बार अपोजीशन को कांफिडेंस में लिया और यह जो तरीका उन्होंने अपनाया जिसको कजह से हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर एक नई स्पिरिट पैदा हुई, एक यूनियटी कायम हुई, इस के लिये भी मैं उन को मुबारकवाद दूंगा। मुझे उम्मीद है कि आइन्दा भी वे ऐसा ही करेंगे और जो टेम्पो हम ने पैदा किया है, एसेलफसफोशिएंसी के लिये जो हमने मोरल अपने देश में बनाया है, वह आइन्दा भी कायम रहेगा और आइन्दा भी इसी यूनियटी के साथ हम पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण का मुकाबिला करते रहेंगे।

अब सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि पाकिस्तान कब तक हमारे साथ छेड़छाड़ करता रहेगा और कब तक हम पाकिस्तान की वजह से हजारों और करोड़ों रुपया बरबाद करते रहेंगे। इस का कोई हल निकलना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान जिस वक्त बना, तो किसने उसको बनाया यह आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। मुसलमानों की अक्सरियत भी पाकिस्तान नहीं बनाना चाहता था। चन्द मजहबी जनून में मुस्तला लोगों का यह कारनामा था। यहां हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की राय भी नहीं ली गई और कोई प्लेबिसाइट भी नहीं हुआ। किसी कंट्री का बंटवारा होता है तो वहां की जनता की सलाह से होना चाहिए। यह अंग्रेजों की एक सियासी चाल थी। अंग्रेज जानता था कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान यूनाइटेड रहेगा तो यह एक बहुत बड़ा ताकतवर मुल्क होगा। इसलिये उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान का बंटवारा किया कुछ मसलों का सहारा लेकर के। यहां हिन्दू मुस्लिम यूनियटी नहीं है, दो नेशंस हैं इस मुल्क में, ऐसी बातों का सहारा लेकर के उन्होंने मुल्क का बंटवारा किया जो कि एक आर्टिफिशियल बंटवारा था। हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के दरमियान कोई कुदरती हदबन्दी नहीं है, कोई नैचुरल बैरियर नहीं है। हमारी सहजीब, हमारा तमद्दुन, हमारी बातचीत,

हमारी हर चीज एक है, हमारी एक नेशन है, मगर उन्होंने इसको किएट किया। मैं जानता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर मजहबी फसादात होते थे कुछ जनूनी लोग हर देश में मौजूद हैं। क्या दूसरे मुल्कों में मुख्तलिफ मजहब के लोग नहीं रहते हैं। तो फिर हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में हो क्या खास बात थी कि हम सब यहाँ अमन व आमान से नहीं रह सकते थे। यह तो सिर्फ अंग्रेजों की एक सियासी चाल थी और उन्होंने हमें जान बूझ कर लड़ाया क्योंकि वे हमें आजादी देना नहीं चाहते थे और आजादी देते वक्त वे जानते थे कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान को हमने इसी हालत में छोड़ दिया तो यह बहुत बड़ी ताकत हो जायेगा और इसीलिये उन्होंने मुल्क का बंटवारा किया।

अब हमें भी कुछ सोचना चाहिये। जो लोग कभी छुरी से या लाठियों से लड़ लिया करते थे, आज उनको अंग्रेजों ने पैटन टैंकों से, बमों से, गोलियों से लड़ा दिया। यह उनकी एक सियासी चाल थी और यह आज आप लोगों की समझ में आजानी चाहिये। पहले हम थोड़ी देर लड़ कर अपने मजहबी जनून को खत्म कर लिया करते थे, अपने जोश को खत्म कर लिया करते थे। वैसे जहां इतनी ताबाद में मुख्तलिफ खयालात के लोग रहेंगे वहां वे थोड़ा बहुत लड़ेंगे ही। मगर कहां छुरी और लाठी की लड़ाई, कहां दो चार आदमियों के मरने की बात, और कहां पैटन टैंकों की लड़ाई और बमों की लड़ाई और आज तो एटम बम की भी बात चल रही है। इन बातों पर हमें गौर करना है और हमें अंग्रेजों से कहना है, दुनिया से कहना है कि यह आर्टिफिशियल बंटवारा है, यह कायम नहीं रहेगा, इसको खत्म करने की जरूरत है और जब तक यह तंक्सीम खत्म नहीं होती है तब तक दोनों मुल्कों के मसायल कायम रहेंगे।

इतना हमारा रुपया आज बरबाद होता है। जिस वक्त इस देश के अन्दर मुस्लिम लीग थी और कांग्रेस थी, दोनों चाहती थी कि जम्हूरी निजाम कायम हो, दोनों सिविल

लिबर्टीज के लिये तैयार थीं, दोनों कहती थीं कि जम्हूरियत कायम हो। आज पाकिस्तान में क्या है? जम्हूरियत का वहां खून हो रहा है। आज हमारे यहां जम्हूरियत कायम है, वहां जम्हूरियत का खून हो रहा है। वहां लोग मजहबी जुनून में मुब्तिला हो रहे हैं। यहां सेक्युलरिज्म है, वहां मजहबी जुनून बढ़ रहा है। आज यहां शक्सी आजादी है, वहां शक्सी आजादी का खात्मा हो रहा है। क्या यह हमारे देश के लिए खतरा है? यह सारी दुनिया के लिये खतरा है और इसी में दुनिया की बेहतरी है कि पाकिस्तान के एग्जेशन को खत्म किया जाय। मैं बता देना चाहता हूं कि आज जिन लोगों ने पाकिस्तान बनाया था, वही उसको खत्म कर रहे हैं, वह उसे अपने जुनूनीपन से खत्म कर रहे हैं, अपनी सिपासी पालिसी से खत्म कर रहे हैं। हम यह बता देना चाहते हैं कि हमेशा की छेड़छाड़ हम वर्दाश्वत नहीं करेंगे। हिन्दुस्तान ने बता दिया है कि हम हर तरह की कुर्बानी दे कर भी पाकिस्तान का मुकाबला करेंगे, पाकिस्तान का बेहूशत का मुकाबला करेंगे, पाकिस्तान के लोगों का मुकाबला करेंगे। अगर दुनिया पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान को एक नहीं कर सकती, तो हम खुद हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान को एक कर के रहेंगे, हम इस प्लान से काम करेंगे। आज क्या जोर्डन का एटीट्यूड है, क्या मिश्र का एटीट्यूड है, क्या यू० एन० ओ० का एटीट्यूड है, यू० एन० का भी वहां हथ होने वाला है जो लोग आफ नेशनस का हुप्रा। आज सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल का भी वहां हाल होगा जो कि लीग आफ नेशनस का हुप्रा था। थोड़ी देर के लिए संचिए। जब कोई मसला यू० एन० ओ० के सामने, सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल के सामने आये, झगड़े का, लड़ाई का, तो पहला बेसिक चीज जो मालूम को जानो चाहिये, जिस पर फैसला गैर-जानिब-जानिबदारी से करना चाहिए। वह यह है कि एग्जेशन कौन है, कसूर किसका है। अगर सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल इतना नहीं बता सकती तो कैसे वह दुनिया में अमनोअमान कायम रखेगी, कैसे मुल्कों में शान्ति बनाए रखेगी। आज

दुनिया के बहुत से लोग जानते हैं कि पाकिस्तान एग्जेशन है, पाकिस्तान ने ज्यादाता की है और पाकिस्तान ज्यादाता करता जा रहा है, मगर आज सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल खामोश है। क्यों खामोश है? आज मुट्रो जैसे आदमी ऐसे वहशियाना अलफाज इस्तेमाल करते हैं जो मुअज्जिज कौम इस्तेमाल नहीं कर सकता है और सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में एक भी देश नहीं जो उसके खिलाफ आवाज उठा सके। एक देश ने भी प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर नहीं किया, एक देश ने भी यह नहीं कहा कि इस देश को सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल से बाहर निकाला जाय। यह एक ही मुल्क की बेइज्जती का सवाल नहीं थी, यह तो उन सारे मुल्कों की बेइज्जती का सवाल था जो सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में थे, लेकिन किसी मुल्क ने आवाज नहीं उठाई। अगर इसी तरीके से सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल चाहे कि हम देशों के साथ इंसफ करेंगे और दुनिया के अन्दर अमनोअमान कायम रखेंगे तो यह नहीं हो सकता। इसका हलक बड़ा होगा जो लीग आफ नेशनस का हुप्रा। मैं आज ब्रिटेन से और यू० एन० ओ० से कहता हूं कि ठंडे दिल से सोचें और न्याय करें और फैसला करें। मैं जानता हूं कि पाकिस्तान में यू० एन० ओ० के बेसेज हैं, और यह जानते हुए कि पाकिस्तान उन की मुट्ठी में ही है, हिन्दुस्तान को भी वे मुट्ठा में लेना चाहते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान को भी चाहते हैं कि उनके जेरे असर रहे। हिन्दुस्तान कभी ऐसा नहीं होने देगा। हम आजाद मुल्क हैं, हम आजाद रहेंगे, हम अपने मुल्क के लिए, अपने मुल्क की आजादी के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं और इस आजादी की रक्षा करेंगे, इस चीज को लेकर हमें आगे बढ़ना चाहिए।

अब मैं अपनी पब्लिसिटी के लिए ख़ास तौर से बहूंगा। सब से पहले हमने एक साल पहले इस बात को उठाया था, कई बार कहा कि पब्लिसिटी बाहर के देशों में नहीं है। जैसा कि अभी अनवर साहब ने कहा और दूसरे लोगों ने कहा, दूसरे देशों के लोग यहां तक नहीं

[श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील "तालिब"]

जानते कि हिन्दुस्तान में 6 करोड़ मुसलमान रहते हैं। कितने अफमोस की बात है कि बाहर के देश यह चीज नहीं जानते कि हिन्दुस्तान में मुसलमान रहते हैं और काफी तादाद में रहते हैं और कई मुसलमान मुल्कों से ज्यादा तादाद में यहां पर रहते हैं। इसी तरह से हमारी पब्लिसिटी डिफेक्टिव है, पब्लिसिटी की ठोक कोजिए, पब्लिसिटी दीजिए। छोटे-छोटे पैम्फलेट निकालिए और लोगों को बताइए कि हकीकत क्या है। अगर वे हकीकत समझ जाएंगे तो सब आपका साथ देंगे। हम नोमसिटी के साथ नहीं चाहते, पूरे दिल के साथ दें, जैसे कि प्रोक्लाविषा ने दिया, रक्षा ने दिया और दूसरे लोग देने के लिए तैयार हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि जो हमारा साथ दें, पूरे दिल से साथ दें और सही माने में साथ दें। अगर हमारी पब्लिसिटी सही होगी, तो जरूर लोग समझेंगे, दूसरे देशों के लोग भी समझेंगे।

दूसरा बात आप नान-आफीशियल एम्बेडेडर नेजिए जिनका जवता से सम्पर्क हो सके, जवता में जा सकें, वहां की भावना को समझ सकें। आफोशियल से काम नहीं चलेगा, बड़े बड़े अफसरों को भेजने से काम नहीं चलेगा। ज्यादा से ज्यादा तादाद में उन लोगों को भेजिए जो दूसरे पत्रों में जा कर अपनी परछाई में लोगों को अपना दोस्त बना सकते हैं। ऐसी मशीनरी बनाई जा सकती है जो इस बात का पता लगाए कि कौन से लोग हैं जिनको डिप्लोमैटिक मिशन भी भेजा जा सकता है और उन से फायदा उठाया जा सकता है। सभी इन किस्म की कोई मशीनरी नहीं है।

तिब्बत का सवाल है। हमने पहले गलती की। गलतियां हो जाती हैं, देशों से गलतियां होती हैं, बिनास गलतियां होती हैं, बड़ी बड़ी गलतियां होती हैं, जैसे देश का तत्काल तक बड़ी भारी गलती थी। हमने तिब्बत की

आजादी का सवाल नहीं उठाया, अब उठाने की जरूरत है। अब उठाइये उसकी आजादी का सवाल और दुनिया को ओपेनियन उस के हक में बनाइये। एक बफर स्टेट बीच में बनती है। डा० अम्बेडकर ने 1956 में ही कहा था—उसकी डिबेट में जाकर देखिये— कि तिब्बत को आजाद नहीं रखा गया तो हिन्दुस्तान के लिए बहुत बड़ा खतरा है। आपको तो बताने वाले हमारे यहां बहुत से आदम मौजूद हैं। दो साल पहले कहा गया था कि पाकिस्तान फौजी दस्ते बाईंग पर तैयार हो रहे हैं। यह कहा गया था कि इन्फिट्रेशन हो रहा है, कई सवाल पालिया-भेंट में पूछे गये, मगर सरकार ने बहुत देर कर दी। बहुत देर के बाद गवर्नमेंट होश में आई। इस तरह से तिब्बत की आजादी के सवाल की हमने नहीं उठाया था। अब उठाना चाहिए। अगर हम तिब्बत की आजादी के सवाल को उठावेंगे तो आपको यह जानकारी खुश होगी कि बहुत से देश, बाहर के देश आपको सप टे करेंगे, आपको सहाय देगे। इस तरह से एक बफर स्टेट की आप कायम कर सकते हैं।

बहुत सी बातें मुझे कहनी थी। इतना जरूर कहूंगा कि उहा मेहरबानी आपने की कि मुझे वक्त दिया, तापका सक्रिया बढ़ा करता हूं। इसके साथ ही यह जरूर कहूंगा कि जो टेम्पा बन गया है उसको खराब मत कीजिए। हमारे फौजी नौजवानों की बहादुरी से जो मोराल बना है—उनका बहादुरी का मेदाद देता हूं, उन्हें किस तरह से अपना जान का बाजा लगाई दुनिया का बहुत कम ऐसा कौम होगा जो ऐसे शिपाह, ऐसे नौजवान होंगे कि जिन्होंने पैटल टीकों का मिट्टी के टैंक समझ कर उठाया, कितना गुरबाबी का—उस टेम्पा को, उस मोराल को हम कायम रखें। हम गाफिल नहीं क्योंकि सीधे रास्ते पर पाकिस्तान कभी नहीं आएगा जब तक पाकिस्तान खत्म नहीं होगा, पाकिस्तान के लोग इस जूनन में मुश्किल रहेंगे। इसलिए हमको चाहिए कि हम अपने इस मोराल को

कायम रखें ताकि हमारे नौजवान हर वक्त
आजादी के लिए कुशानी करने के लिये
तैयार रहें और इन्हीं के साथ जो फूड सफ़ी-
शिरा, ओ मोर फूड के लिए मूनिटी और
संगठन कायम हुआ है, उसे हमें कायम रखना
चाहिए ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Wadia.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): The Prime Minister would be speaking now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He will speak afterwards.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am perfectly certain that four Prime Minister and his Government must be feeling with pride and satisfaction that the whole country is behind them in this struggle against Pakistan. I admire the courage of the hon. External Affairs Minister when he said that our publicity has been poor. I would go a step further and say that our advocacy has also been poor. I have often felt that if a persuasive speaker like Mr. Chagla had gone to the United Nations ten or fifteen years earlier, our case would have been much better appreciated in that international forum. But unfortunately, we had one of our representatives who had a better capacity to make enemies rather than win friends.

Now, we are perfectly at one so far as Pakistan is concerned; there is no dispute about it. But a few points have arisen in the course of the discussion, namely, our relationship with the United Kingdom, the United States of America or the Soviet Union. We blame the United Kingdom or the United States of America for not siding with us in this dispute between Pakistan and ourselves. I am afraid, we ourselves have contributed to their neutrality or hostility, whatever you like to call it. After all, after independence we went in for the policy of non-alignment. That policy has

been praised again and again by several speakers on the floor of this House. It has been claimed that this policy has given us very rich dividends—perhaps so—rich dividends in the sense that we have been able to get help from both sides according to our needs. But I am not prepared to say that our policy of non-alignment was absolutely altruistic. It was fundamentally based in our own self-interest and in spite of all the eloquence of Mr. Ramachandran, the foreign policy of every country, at any time, anywhere, is always actuated and must be actuated by the interests of that country. We cannot afford to be altruistic at the expense of our country.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: I did not say that. You are misrepresenting me. I only said—"Not only our interests but also the good of mankind."

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Good of mankind can be reconciled with our interest. Now, so far as Pakistan is concerned, it chose a different path. It chose to be definitely in alliance with the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Now, how can we blame the United Kingdom or the United States for taking their side of Pakistan, because Pakistan is their ally? We are only a non-aligned people, neither friend nor foe. It may be very uncomfortable for us. We may not like it. But facts are facts. Therefore, we need not be very angry about this. But we have learnt one bitter lesson that so far as our conflict with Pakistan is concerned, we shall have to go our lonely way, we cannot expect assistance from the United Kingdom or from the United States of America so far as this particular point is concerned. But it does not follow from this that therefore we should leave the Commonwealth. I am perfectly certain that this consequence does not follow because fundamentally neither the United Kingdom nor the United States is unfriendly to us. They pour millions and millions of pounds and

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

dollars for our cultural benefit, *or the benefit of our agriculture, for the benefit of our universities. Therefore, it means that they are interested in our country but not to the same extent as perhaps they are interested in Pakistan. It is their military ally.

Now, I have to point out that our real enemy is China. Pakistan is comparatively a small episode. Pakistan is comparatively a weaker country and a smaller country, and we are in a position to grapple with it and we have grappled with it very successfully, thanks to the bravery of our jawans, thank; to our military leadership, thanks to our patriotism, thanks even to our Chief Ministers who are, for the time being, not acting as heads of sovereign States—they are not quarrelling with each other, but are sacrificing their interests for the time being in the interests of the country at large. That is the position. But China is a very difficult problem. China has her atom bomb; China has "her millions of conscripted men (Interruptions). and I am a'raid we are not in a position to fight China. Therefore, it is in our interest to keep on good terms with the United Kingdom and ^e United States. We have still to cling to the Commdnwealth and the Commonwealth has still several advantages. I wa's wondering, when I was listening yesterday to Mr. Gujral, whether he was speaking as a member of the Congress Party or whether he was speaking as a crypto-Communist or whether he was speaking as a full-fiedged Communist.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You are speaking like a British Tory.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: All the time he was so bitter against the Commonwealth. He even took for granted that the Commonwealth had ceased to exist But it is very much alive as he will discover some day. Now, the Commonwealth has changed its character. It is not purely British or white. The

majority of the members of the Commonwealth are coloured people like ourselves. We have a say in framing the policies of the Commonwealth, and if we leave the Commonwealth, we shall leave a free field to the White people to do what they like. It is to our advantage to continue in the Commonwealth and shape the policies or influence the policies of the British Government and of the other British Commonwealth countries. It is from that standpoint that I believe in continuing our membership of the Commonwealth.

Apart from that, our material interests are involved in our continuing as members of the Commonwealth. Unfortunately we are short of food. We have to import food. I think in the beginning there was some talk that we would rather starve than get food from America, but that mood has passed because reality always has a commanding influence on human affairs. People cannot afford to starve. I remembe- Lenin saying in a very ruthless manner that if millions of Russians are killed, it does not matter so long as the remaining Russians live as Communists. And more recently Mao Tse-Tung also said something similar that the Chinese population is so big that even if half the population dies, the other half will live in more comfort. But I did not expect this sentiment to be repeated on the floor o' this House by a gentle Hindu lady that the starvation of Indians would be a solution of the population problem.

Sir, there are better ways of solving that problem. Educate the people and I am perfectly certain that if the people are educated, they naturally become more restrained in the production of children because they know what methods to use. They know what their economic interests are. They know what their economic liabilities are. In other countries, in Europe and in America you find that the higher the progress of education the lesser the birth-rate. That is the

lesson that we have to learn- In all high professions of lawyers, doctors, teachers, industrialists, the rate of population growth is very much less, and that is a very sensible thing to do. That is the lesson which we need to learn.

Mr. Chairman, may I add one thing more, and that is, we have to be very realistic in our attitude and in our policies? I wonder if any of the countries except India can afford to export sugar in order to get a little foreign exchange at a loss of crores of rupees. I wonder if any other country in the world would export bananas to get a little foreign exchange when they know that banana is practically the only luxury of the common people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you sure that you are speaking on the International "situation"?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Two minutes more. So far as atom bomb is concerned, I have not the slightest desire to say whether we should go in for the atom bomb or we should not. Perhaps the time has not come for that. But I would advise my friends to keep silent on this topic. It is all very well to talk of peace but circumstances may arise when we have to wage war. We may talk well about the undesirability of having an atom bomb, but the time may come when we may be forced to have an atom bomb and then we shall have to swallow all the high words spoken on the floor of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Wadia, I think you should also keep silent on that.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I would rather not say anything about the atom bomb. My last conclusion is, Mr. Chairman, let us be realistic. Let us not be swayed by sentiments and by slogans that sound big and pomp-ours but may lead us to disaster.

968 RS—7.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY (SHRI LAL BAHADUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have always considered it most unfortunate that Pakistan should have decided to make aggression on India. They had done so, not as a regular attack, but in the year 1947-48 they had sent raiders in Kashmir . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL: In 1948 there was a full attack.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: ... and there was a good deal of fight. It was, as Mukat Behari Lalji says, an attack. But, I said, it was resisted and ultimately there was peace and a cease-fire line drawn up. I must say that we did not expect that Pakistan would think in terms of making another attack and a bigger attack than the earlier one on Jammu and Kashmir, and not only on Jammu and Kashmir but on other areas also of our country.

This attack was not only confined to infiltrations or sending infiltrators. Soon after, when it was found that the infiltrators did not succeed in their effort, a regular attack was made in Chham in Jammu. There were other attacks also made a day or two later in Rajasthan in the Barmer area and in Gujarat in the Port of Dwarka. It was thus to be seen that Pakistan had every intention of not only annexing Kashmir but they had also in their mind to occupy as much area as they could in other parts of India specially in Rajasthan.

Sir, it is unfortunate that Pakistan should have decided to take these steps in spite of the fact that we from our side had always tried to have as good relations as possible with Pakistan. I need not remind the House that only six months or seven months before we had made an agreement *on* the Rann of Kutch before the attack and invasion by Pakistan. We felt that even in that difficult and most unfortunate situation if it was possible to settle the matter peacefully we should do so and we did it although I

[Shri Lai Bahadur.]

know that the feelings in the country ran high. Soon after that agreement, about a month later this serious and severe attack was made on our territory. This attempt, I would not go into details, was thwarted. And when we found that Pakistan was determined to attack other parts of India and also was trying to cut the Akhnoor lifeline with a view to annexing Kashmir or to occupying very large parts of Kashmir, isolate it completely, we felt that there was a danger to the integrity and sovereignty of our country. It was in these circumstances that we decided, and there was no alternative for us except, to move forward towards the Lahore sector and the Sialkot sector.

The fighting has been of a very serious nature in these areas. But in spite of the fact that sometimes different versions are given in foreign newspapers about the achievements of our Armed Forces, there is no doubt about it that our Armed Forces did splendidly well. It does not give me any special satisfaction to say that but there is no doubt that a large part of Pakistani territory is under the occupation of our Armed Forces. It is regrettable that this situation should have arisen. However this went on for some time and when a proposal came to us that there should be a cease-fire, we agreed to it immediately. The House knows that the first day when I met the Secretary-General and he put up this proposal I replied to him the very next morning that we were willing to accept a simple cease-fire. Pakistan took a pretty long time in answering to that call but anyhow ultimately it also agreed almost the last day or, if I might say so, the last moment. In fact the time of the declaration of the cease-fire had to be postponed, I think for about twenty-four hours because of the delay which took place in Pakistan giving its reply to the proposals of the Secretary-General. The cease-fire has come but it is an uneasy cease-fire and I have only to say that Pakistan is indulging in violations almost every

day. It may be said that we have also retaliated at some places. We have done so but only in those places where Pakistan has tried to usurp some posts or occupied some posts after 23rd September, that is, after the date of the declaration of the cease-fire. It is indeed a very unfortunate and very difficult situation. What are we to do? We have been telling and informing the Secretary-General about the violations being committed by Pakistan. We have also told them how they have tried to come and occupy some of the posts in the Rajasthan area. It has been trying to do it in other areas also but the most important area is that of Rajasthan and I had made it quite clear that in case there is an aggression or there is an attempt on the part of Pakistan to introduce into our territories after 23rd September, we have no alternative but to resist it and try to overthrow it or send it back. We have done it in three or four places but still Pakistan is occupying some posts in Rajasthan. Of course it makes all kinds of claims about it. Really the area it occupies is exceedingly small. If in that large desert, it sits at five or six places miles away, it does not mean that it is occupying the whole territory and it cannot do it because in the desert it can only sit at places where you have water and the water is in restricted places and in exceedingly small areas. So of course it might claim all that but ultimately it is confined to a few small places but our position and attitude has been made clear in that regard that we cannot accept it. This continuing violation is not a good indication at all and I do not know what Pakistan really means by doing it. If it is trying to give an impression to its people and to its countrymen that it is still fighting, it leads to, or if I can say so, duping or trying to dupe the people of the country. It is misleading them completely because there is no fighting as such going on at the present moment. Pakistan has been doing it all these years. In the last 10 or 12 years there have been firings, there have been infiltrations. They have indulged in sabotage in our diff-

erent borders, whether it was Kashmir or Bengal border or the Tripura border and through these means they have tried to create a hatred against India which has been a most unfortunate feature of the whole situation. Pakistan was formed in the hope that the communal problem would be solved once for all. In spite of our resistance, in spite of the feeling which especially Gandhiji had at that moment that there should be no partition of India, this was agreed to and as I said, in the belief that at least the communal frenzy which had prevailed then in the country and the attitude of the Muslim League, would change and it was felt that the formation of Pakistan would help in relieving the situation or at least in reducing the tension. We hoped that Pakistan will try to live peacefully and India will also be her friendly neighbour. But, as I said, from the very beginning, there has been a hate campaign going on in Pakistan and all these attacks and firings on the borders and other places created a different impression altogether in the minds of the people of Pakistan. They must have given an impression to them that it is India which is compelling them to resort to firings to defend their borders but the truth is otherwise and I can say with confidence that except for instances here and there, by and large India has kept peace. India has not tried to create disturbances on the borders or create troubles there. If the ceasefire has to be properly stabilised, it is essential that Pakistan should give up indulging in these violations. It would be advisable for the Secretary-General and for the U.N. Observers to advise Pakistan that if withdrawals have to take place and if any further effort is to be made, it is essential that the cease-fire should be fully stabilised. I do hope that Pakistan will give full consideration to it.

About withdrawals we have agreed that we are prepared to discuss withdrawal of Armed Forces and armed personnel. There may be difficulties in the way of withdrawals. I know

that it is not going to be an easy process. It would be a difficult process. There may be complications in that regard and yet I am prepared to say that India will be prepared fully to co-operate in the matter of withdrawals and be as helpful as possible. On the political question of Kashmir we had made it clear, and I am glad that the Security Council also fully appreciated it that the question of cease-fire and withdrawals are most important, that they have to be tackled first. In regard to the political issue of Jammu and Kashmir India had made her position absolutely clear. We have always said it, that Jammu and Kashmir belonged to India, that they are part and parcel of India and it would not be possible for us to negotiate, insofar as the question of Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, with Pakistan. So on that issue our position is quite clear. Yet, an approach was made by the Soviet Union—I might say that we had it also recently; a couple of days before a fresh approach was made by the Soviet Union whether I would be willing to meet President Ayub in Tashkent—this suggestion was made some time back also and perhaps, as the House is aware, I have informed the House earlier that we had agreed to using the good offices of Prime Minister Kosygin in this regard. As I said, a couple of days before, I got a message from the Soviet Union, and to that of course I have replied. I have said that I have no objection to meeting President Ayub. I shall certainly meet and talk to him. But what I have stressed is that the points to be discussed are not only of Jammu and Kashmir as perhaps the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has said. If it is suggested that better relationship between India and Pakistan could come only if the question of Jammu and Kashmir is settled first, well, I would only say that that proposal, from our point of view, is fantastic, I mean, it is something which can never be acceptable to us. However, if it relate to our relations in totality, I am always prepared to consider it.

[Shri Lai Bahadur.]

As I said, what is important; is that India and Pakistan should live as good neighbours, and for that we have many other problems to consider. But Pakistan has to forget once for all that there can be no territorial claims on India. Pakistan, as it is formed and constituted, and India, as it is formed and constituted, have to remain intact. This is a position which has to be clearly understood by Pakistan, and by us also. We have no claims on and we do not desire to have even an inch of territory of Pakistan. We have never conceived of it. Similarly Pakistan has to understand the fact that these two countries, as they are constituted, have to remain intact, and there can be no claim from either side on the territory of either country. So, if Pakistan will realise this fact and understand it fully, then we can certainly discuss any other matter. There are many matters, say, border matters, where there are differences; there are demarcations to be made. Then there is the question of the better utilisation of the river -waters. There is the question of refugees. There is the question of evictees. There are many other matters on which we could meet and discuss and I think it will be good that these matters are discussed and we come to some agreement. So in this wider context of things I am certainly prepared to meet President Ayub for a talk with him. I do not know as to what would be the time for it. However, in principle we have agreed and we have intimated to the Soviet Union that I would be willing to go to Tashkent and have a talk with President Ayub.

Something was said about our policy of non-alignment. We are truly non-aligned and we think that this policy has paid dividends. We are friends both of the Eastern countries as well as of the Western countries, and it is desirable because our non-alignment policy leads us to that. It would be wrong for us to be inimical or opposed to any country even if they don't

agree with us. But non-alignment means that the sphere of friendship is extended and if possible—I do not say that India is in a position to do it today, but as and when it becomes possible, we would be happy if we can be helpful in any way in strengthening the relationship between the East and the West. It is good that we have received friendship, help and assistance from different parts of the world. The Soviet Union has been of great help and assistance to us. It has consistently supported us on the question of Kashmir, and we are indeed grateful for it. The United States of America, they do not see eye to eye with us on the question of Kashmir, but I must say that there is, perhaps now, a slightly better appreciation on the part of the United States of America insofar as our stand on Kashmir is concerned. I shall not give examples, but recently, their writings and talks have indicated that they are clear that the question of plebiscite now does not arise insofar as Kashmir is concerned, and it is definitely a great advance. We have tried and we will try to be as friendly as possible with the United States of America. It is quite clear that there are differences amongst us, and whatever the differences, well, they can take their own stand, but we cannot also deviate from our position. So this has to be made clear. But non-alignment is really useful especially for those countries which are still developing, and I must pay my sincere compliments to Panditji who laid down this policy. Sometimes these policies are formulated in the light of the conditions and environments prevailing within and without. It was at a time when India had become free and independent and Jawaharlalji knew that other countries in Asia would also soon become free, and of course later on came the turn of the African continent. And it was in that context that he formulated this policy of non-alignment with which some of his colleagues in countries like Yugoslavia and UAR agreed and they wholeheartedly supported and endorsed it. So as I said, for us in developing countries it is essential

that we should not be tagged on either to one bloc or to the other block. We must have some freedom. We must have our independence in thinking and in our course of action. Thus for example, in India, we may not be a capitalist country. Similarly we may not be a communist country. Yet we will try to build up our own social order and we may be a socialist society of our own genius. So it is important that in this world if there is some kind of regimentation, human civilization will not grow. There will be stunted growth. Therefore, it is important that human beings and countries should be left free to carve out their course of action and their way of life. That is why I feel that for all the developing countries at least, and especially I am referring to the countries of Asia and Africa, if they will adopt a policy of non-alignment, they will on the one hand be trying to reduce tension as it exists in the world today,—and it would certainly help to reduce tension—and on the other, every country will have the freedom to function as it thinks best.

It is unfortunate that in spite of China being a communist country, it seems to be totally and wholly opposed to the Soviet Union at the present moment. I do not know what the differences are. There might be minute differences or major differences between the two countries. I am talking about ideologies, although apparently it does not seem to me that there are major differences, insofar as the principle and philosophy of communism is concerned, between the two countries. But the ambition of China seems to be very high. China is not prepared either to accept non-alignment or to accept peaceful co-existence. China talks of anti-colonialism, but in different ways China is trying to establish her sphere of influence on various countries. What is happening in Tibet? Of course, the suzerainty of Tibet was agreed to by us. But the autonomy of Tibet, of course, is a matter which is in danger. Anyhow, I do not want to go into that. I do not want to go into the question of colo-

onialism. I am specially referring to the policy of peaceful co-existence and the effort on the part of China to try to expand not through peaceful ways but by the use of force. So it is that I said that in the present day world even the USA and the USSR to some extent have come closer with a view to keeping peace in the world. They differ widely on ideological matters, on administrative matters, on various matters, on practically many matters on all matters, if I may say so. And yet, these two countries, they do not want that there should be another war in this world, and therefore, they have come to at least some kind of an understanding, not a formal understanding, in their approach, in order to avert war, in order to avert a major conflagration, they have come somewhat nearer.

It is only one country, if I may say so, Pakistan unfortunately, that has joined hands with China for selfish interests. It is just antipathy and antagonism against India which has led Pakistan to join hands with China. China also although it knows what Pakistan's philosophy is, yet it has joined hands with Pakistan, perhaps only because both are opposed to India. They are hostile to India. But as I said, China is one country which in the present-day world is the cause of great irritation. One does not know. I mean, the way they behave, it may lead to some kind of a conflagration as well. So it is China which is adopting a philosophy almost single-handed which is not generally acceptable in the world at the present moment. We, do not know, Sir, what is going to happen in our country. Symptoms are not very good. Even on the Sikkim frontier and on the Ladakh border, incidents are taking place. These incidents had stopped for some time, but they have started recently. I do not say that they are serious incidents, but yet why should they happen? It does cause us worry and anxiety. Therefore, We do not know what the attitude of China is, I mean what they propose to do. It is clear that they are hostile to us, they are very much

[Shri Lai Bahadur.] against us and it seems that they are not in a mood to settle matters at all. We had made offers. While those offers have now become very old and practically they are rejected, yet it seems clear that there is no indication on the part of China to reduce its hostility. In fact, it is on the increase.

Therefore, we are faced with a very difficult situation. On the one hand on one border there is Pakistan, and on the other there is China, and I would not say that this is a situation which we can meet very easily. After p 11, China especially and Pakistan too, are powerful countries. Both of them have specialised, I mean, they have built up their war machine, terrible war machines. They have concentrated in building up their defence strength whereas we did not do it at all. In fact for the last ten or 12 years, we practically concentrated all our attention on something else. So in the face of that war machine, we have to be prepared and we have to meet that challenge. I have no doubt that our Armed Forces, they are confident. I am especially talking of the Chinese frontier. It has been possible for us to make some preparations on these borders also. They may be much stronger than us. Yet it is courage, it is the determination of our people, of our Armed Forces, which counts. Sometimes armies in large numbers, they do not matter so much as small armies with courage and with the determination to advance further and to be prepared to make any sacrifice, and I have no doubt that in case there is trouble on the Chinese frontier, our Armed Forces will try to meet that challenge and will go ahead and march forward with the utmost courage. I am sorry, Sir. I had thought that I shall finish soon. Have I your permission to take a little more time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: It is said, Sir, that we have no friends. It may be true in the sense perhaps in which that term is used by the hon Mem-

bers in the Opposition but I can say that there are a large number of countries in the world which have all their sympathies for us, for India and for the cause we stand for. It is a different matter that when there is a conflict countries may not come forward to express their opinion one way or the other categorically. Generally, when there is a conflict, and especially these days, all the countries start saying that the conflict should not be intensified further, the conflict should not increase further and if they speak on behalf of one country, they think that they might not be so useful and so effective. However, that is a different matter. Perhaps, the kind of friendship that some hon. Members suggest comes up with military alliances. I think that some hon. Members feel that way. Just as we have got the SEATO, the CENTO, the NATO and other alliances, they perhaps think that when countries enter into military alliances then they become real friends. Unfortunately, Sir, we do not propose to have that kind of friendship and we do not want to enter into any kind of military alliances with any country, with any power bloc. I might also add, Sir, that during this conflict, it has also been seen that even those who had entered into military alliances did not come forward to help one of their friends or one of the members of the alliances. So, it is not always essential that these alliances pay or that they are exceedingly useful. It is clear that it is useful to be non-aligned, it is good and, in spite of the fact that we have not joined any power bloc, we got the support and sympathy of a large number of African, Asian and European countries. As I said in the beginning, the Soviet Union has been exceedingly helpful to us and its stand has been consistent. The same is the case with Yugoslavia, Malaysia, Cyprus. I need not name the many countries but there are many others which have openly supported our cause. Their attitude has been just and fair and it is a good thing to know what Malaysia has done. At least, on

the basis of religion, Malaysia said that purely because she happens to be a Muslim country, she could not lend her support to Pakistan. She said that this was a purely political issue and, therefore, Malaysia went all out in support of India.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: What is the attitude of the United Arab Republic?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: The United Arab Republic has been very friendly to us and it remains friendly with India. I do not know if I should say it but in the Casablanca Conference, it was the United Arab Republic which gave a special lead and a big support to India and for the cause we stood for. So, we are grateful, Sir, to Yugoslavia, to Malaysia, to Cyprus to Laos, to Singapore and to so many other countries. What we want is that we do not want their blind support but if we are right, we hope that they will continue to lend their support to us. There was some talk that I would be going to the United States. I have made it quite clear that I do propose to go to the United States of America. As to when, I shall decide about it soon but it would be wrong to suggest that I go there with a special purpose, that is, for getting economic aid or for getting cereals or food-grains. It would not be so at all. Of course, I do not deny that these matters might come up and we might have a general discussion in regard to both these matters and there may be many other matters for discussion among national and international matters. Certainly, we will have a discussion about them but it would be entirely left to the United States of America to act as they thought best. From my side, there will be no insistence or no demand as such. However, I shall put my point of view and we will have an exchange of views. I think it would be good both for India and America and perhaps, to some extent, for the world also.

I would not take more of your time, Mr. Chairman, but I would only say

that this is a situation which might—although I would not like it—not be shortlived. Therefore, we have to take a longrange view of things and it is essential that we try to build up our economy whether it is industry or agriculture or exports. These are all exceedingly important for us and for this we do require resources. I have often said that I would not like the country to be further burdened with taxes but I cannot be quite sure of it. It is, therefore, that the Government of India has introduced some scheme whether it is the scheme of savings or the scheme of Defence Loans or the Gold Bond Scheme. These are exceedingly important for us and, both from the internal point of view, rupee resources, and from the point of view of foreign exchange, these schemes can be of immense help. I hope hon. Members know what those schemes are. I would beg of them to lend their support to them. This has got to be converted into a campaign and each and every house has to be approached, whether it is for Defence Loans or for savings or for the Gold Bonds and if we can get them in adequate quantities, as I said, this would lessen the burden on the country as a whole. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that when I was in Madras the other day I was struck by the response especially of the women. They had collected in thousands in one meeting. I think there were about ten or fifteen thousand or perhaps more and the way they came forward, took out their ornaments and gave them to me there and then was indeed a moving sight. I got about ninetyseven thousand grams in Madras City alone. It is not that the people are not prepared to come forward and make sacrifices. The people are willing to make sacrifices. It is for us to approach them, it is for us to contact them, it is for the Government, for the political organisations, for the different non-official organisations to go to them and try to collect as much as they can. I would only say that I want the help and co-operation of each and every political party. Indeed, it is a national

[Shri Lai Bahadur.] emergency and I would like all the political parties to function on that national basis and national scale. We would be most happy to get the cooperation of each and every Member of each and every political party. I have only to say, Sir, that we have to pledge that we will build up our Defence strength and we will build up our economy so that we can march forward with dignity and with our heads high. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of External Affairs will reply to the debate tomorrow.

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

The House then adjourned at minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 24th November, 1965