

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Reports: —

- (a) Sixth Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on the Fertilizer Corporation of India limited, New Delhi (Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals).
- (b) Seventh Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-second Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Ranchi (Ministry of Steel and Mines).

ENQUIRY RE. CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I gave a calling attention Notice before the Session about Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda's visit to Calcutta on the 10th of April when he met Mr. G. D. Birla and said many things about the Government policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, there is a question on that and it will come up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The question is separate. This has given rise to a serious controversy in West Bengal and in other parts of the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing it. You have given the notice. It will be dealt with. The notice will be dealt with in due course.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I sent it last month.

MOTION RE. SITUATION ARISING OUT OF ATTACKS BY THE ARMED FORCES OF PAKISTAN OF KUTCH BORDER

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion re. situation arising out of repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, on a point of order. I am grateful to you that you have admitted the motion on the first day. I must say that, but I think that it is fair that Shastriji, the Prime Minister, agrees to supplying us with the proposal that he had from the United Kingdom with regard to cease-fire or whatever it is.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The matter is being leaked out in the press. The point of order is this. We, as Members of Parliament, should not be driven to a position whereby we either keep guessing or get the news through the press.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not « point of order. This is a request. The motion will come up before you. During the discussion you can say this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point of order is that there is a report in the newspapers . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I do not entertain the point of order.

श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील "तालिब" (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, मैं आपसे यह अज्ञ करना चाहता हूँ कि कच्छ के बार्डर का जो सवाल है वह बहुत अहमियत का है और सीरियस नेचर का है। इसलिए मैं आप से दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि यहां पर जो कुछ भी कार्यवाही हो वह "इन कैमरा" में होनी चाहिये और मैं इस के बारे में दो बातें आपके सामने कहना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात यह है कि जब लोक-सभा में इस तरह के प्रस्ताव के बारे में बहस हुई थी तो उस

समय तक प्रेस कारोस्पोन्डेन्ट उस एरिया में नहीं गये थे, लेकिन अब वहां पर प्रेस कारोस्पोन्डेन्ट चले गये हैं और उन्होंने अपने डिस्पैचेज में तरह तरह की बातें भेजी हैं जिनकी वजह से तरह तरह की रयूमर्स फैल रही है। इसलिए कि हमारे देश को किसी तरह का कोई नुकसान न हो और इस तरह की बात बाहर न जाय जिससे हमें नुकसान होता है, इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि आज की प्रोसीडिंग्स को दो दिन के लिए रोक दिया जाय या फिर इस बात पर दो दिन के बाद डिस्कशन किया जाय ताकि उस इलाके के कमान्डर यानी सदर्न एरिया के कमान्डर अपोजीशन पार्टी के लीडरों को तथा कांग्रेस के लीडरों को वहां की हालत के बारे में बतला दे। अगर यह बात नहीं हो सकती है तो मैं कहूंगा कि आज की कार्यवाही "इन कैमरा" में की जानी चाहिये क्योंकि यह मामला सोरियस नेचर का है और इस बारे में तरह तरह की रयूमर्स फैल रही हैं।

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ कि सदन की बैठक "इन कैमरा" में हो और इसको कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमारा देश लोकतंत्रवादी देश है। जो बात मंसूफ़ को तय करना होता है, सरकार को कोई बात करनी होती है, तो उसके बारे में जनता को पूरी जानकारी होनी चाहिये। कोई भी देश बिना जनता को साथ लिये लड़ाई नहीं लड़ सकता है और न ही लड़ाई जीती जा सकती है, इसलिए "इन कैमरा" में बहस करने का सवाल ही नहीं उठता है।

जहां तक श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने सवाल उठाया है, मैं समझता हूँ कि हाउस की बैठक आज शुरू हो रही है, प्रधान मंत्री जी बोलने वाले हैं, हम उनके भाषण को सुने और हम आशा करते हैं कि अपने भाषण में वे जनता को

जितनी जानकारी देना चाहेंगे, देना जरूरी होगा, उतनी देंगे और उसके बाद सदन अपनी नीति तय करेगा।

(Shri P. L. Kureel Urf Talib rose)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have had your say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the discussion should take place openly. Perhaps it should be open to the press also. There is no need for hiding anything. If there is any secret matter or security matter, it is for the Prime Minister not to touch it. But we should be taken fully into confidence including the proposal that has been made by the British Government.

(Shri G. Murahari rose)

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point? There is a proposal that it should be in camera. There is another opinion that it should not be.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : My point is that it should be in public. Even during the War everything had been discussed in public.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY (SHRI LAL BAHADUR) : I do not think it is necessary to have a meeting in camera. We have had discussions in the Lok Sabha also more or less on the same lines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with your view. We will not have it in camera. Yes, the Prime Minister.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following Motion:—

"That the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border be taken into consideration."

[Shri Lai Bahadur.]

I know how anxious the hon. Members must be to know the facts of the situation and the policy of Government in regard to the grave developments which have taken place. First of all I would like to report to the House that during the last two or three days there has been no major engagement on the Kutch border and that the aggressive armed forces of Pakistan have not been able to make any further inroads on our territory. Secondly, during the clashes which took place heavy losses were inflicted on the intruders. The morale of our Armed Forces is very high. I know that this House and the people of India stand behind them united in the determination that the territorial integrity of India must be preserved fully and completely.

With your permission, Sir, I would like to state briefly the facts of the situation.

The Kutch-Sind border is a well-defined, well-known and well-established border which is clearly marked in the various editions of the Survey of India maps ever since 1871. A large part of the boundary is not demarcated on the ground. This is so however because there was no disputed boundary between the Province of Sind and the Kutch Durbar, and it was not customary to demarcate with pillars the boundary between Provinces and States of British India as they were not international boundaries.

On the 15th August, 1947 Pakistan was carved out of India as an independent State. Under the Independence Act the territories of Pakistan were enumerated and these included the Province of Sind. The boundary between Sind and Kutch thus became an international boundary. Pakistan is precluded from claiming any more territory than was included in the Province of Sind on

the 15th August, 1947. No part of the territory south of the Kutch-Sind border which is shown in the map as situated north of Kanjarkot, which is thus clearly Indian territory, could conceivably be a part of Pakistan. In fact this area was under the jurisdiction and authority of the Ruler of Kutch which had extended at all times both in law and in fact right up to the border between Sind and Kutch as shown in the Survey of India maps of 1871, 1886, 1898, 1943, and 1946 which was the last map before the date of independence.

The boundary between Kutch and Sind has also been described in detail in other official documents over the last three-quarters of a century prior to the partition of India. The official Gazetteer of Sind published in Karachi in 1907, the Gazetteer of India of the Bombay Presidency published in 1909, and the Imperial Gazetteer of India published by the British Secretary of State for India in 1908 are all categorical about the Rann of Kutch being outside the Province of Sind. In all the documents of the Political Department of the then British Government of India in 1937, 1939 and 1942 defining the political charges of the various officials the Rann of Kutch was invariably shown as falling within the Western India States Agency and never as falling within the Province of Sind. As the House is aware, the entire Western India States Agency became part of India as a result of accession. The position is so clear that in the light of this the attack on the Kutch border is a clear case of aggression by Pakistan. This aggression also fits into the pattern of Pakistan's aggressive behaviour during the last few months. Pakistan has been resorting frequently to firing and clashes at several points on the Indo-Pakistan border both in the east and in the west. She has shown an utter lack of responsibility and displayed amazing recklessness.

A few days ago Prime Minister Wilson sent a message to me, and I presume a similar message to President Ayub Khan, making certain proposals in the framework of which a cease-fire could be brought about. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom is still pursuing his efforts and therefore for obvious reasons I am unable to say much more about this matter at this stage. I can however assure the House that in the exchanges I have had with Mr. Wilson and in any further exchanges we shall not depart *from* the position that along with cease-fire there must be a restoration of the *status quo ante*.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Government and the Indian people have *no* ill-will against the people of Pakistan. We wish them well and we would be happy to see them progress on the road to prosperity. We are aware that their prosperity as well as the prosperity of the people of India, of the 600 million people who inhabit this sub-continent, depends upon the preservation of peace. It is for this reason that we have adhered fervently to the path of peace all these years. A war in the Indian sub-continent may well undo the massive efforts which have been made in both countries to secure an improvement in the living standards of the people. The march in this direction has only just begun and there is a long way yet to go. But President Ayub has talked of a total war between India and Pakistan. We on our part have been greatly restrained not because we are unprepared to meet President Ayub's challenge but because we feel that reason and sanity should prevail over aggression and bellicosity. President Ayub seems to suggest that whereas his country has the right to commit aggression on Indian territories at will and at a point of its own choice, India must not take effective counter-measures. This thesis is totally unacceptable to us. The pattern of Pakistan's activity is this. First raise a claim to neighbour's territory, suddenly mount an attack taking the neighbour by sur-

207 RS—6.

prise, launch an ingenious propaganda campaign to suggest that the action is only of a defensive character. I do want to urge upon President Ayub Khan to think a little more carefully of the consequences of the line of action that he has chosen to pursue. So far the Pakistani aggression on the Kutch border has been met only by local defensive action to protect our territory. From the Indian side there have been no counter-measures and the aggression has therefore been a totally one-sided affair. We have restrained ourselves but if the Government of Pakistan persists in its present aggressive posture, the Government of India will be left with no alternative except to think how best to defend the territorial integrity of the mother-land.

Mr. Chairman, let me once again make the position of the Government of India perfectly clear. We will have no objection to ordering a cease-fire on the basis of a simultaneous agreement for the restoration of the *status quo ante*. If the *status quo ante* has been restored, we will be willing to sit together with the representatives of Pakistan to demarcate the boundary in accordance with the well-settled and well-established dividing line between the erstwhile Province of Sind and the State of Kutch. At the same time, I must reiterate clearly and emphatically that the Government of India do not recognise that there is any territorial dispute about the Rann of Kutch. Let me also make it clear that the threat of total war held out by President Ayub Khan will not deter us from performing our rightful duties. No government in the world would be worth its name if it allows its own territories to be annexed by force by an aggressive neighbour. The Government of India know their responsibilities in the present situation and they are determined to discharge them most effectively.

The threat to our freedom is real, continuing and immediate. We have to meet this threat with all our re-

[Shri Lai Bahadur.]

sources and with all our might. We can afford to give up a few projects for economic development but we cannot allow our defence mechanism to be in any manner inadequate for safeguarding our frontiers. Among the people there must be a real sense of unity. We must give no quarter to the rumours that are sought to be circulated by anti-social elements. I am greatly strengthened by the knowledge that the morale of our people is high and that every Indian today is prepared to make any sacrifice for defending the territorial integrity of India. The Rann of Kutch has been and continues to be, India's territory. It has been in our possession according to Pakistan itself, though Mr. Bhutto characteristically chooses to call it "adverse possession". Pakistan seeks now to annex the territory by force. This we shall not allow; no government in the world could allow that. We have acted with the greatest restraint so far but the sands of time are running out. I shall say no more on this difficult situation. This is a testing time for our country and for our people. I would, say to our people: Be united, feel the pride of belonging to a great nation, carry out your task with true dedication, take no notice of the false Pakistani propaganda. Let us have faith in ourselves and in the great destiny of our country.

I would now close by asking the House to declare that we all stand together united in defending our motherland.

The question was proposed.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh):
Sir, I move:

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

'and having considered the same this House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of the police force as well as of men and officers of our arm-

ed forces while defending our frontier and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our motherland and with hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India'."

*(This amendment stood in the name of
Shri M. P. Bhargava also.)*

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh):
Sir, I move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House—

places on record its high appreciation of the undaunted courage and valour displayed by the men and officers of our armed forces and the police force in resisting the aggressor against heavy odds;

pays its homage to the worthy sons of our motherland who laid down their lives while defending the independence, integrity and honour of the motherland;

reiterates the sacred and firm resolve of the Indian people not to rest until the aggression is fully vacated from the Indian soil; and

supports the Government's policy of not agreeing to any peace talks or accepting any mediation unless the position prior to the attack (*status quo ante*) is restored.' "

*(This amendment stood in the names of
Shri V. M. Chordia and Shri G. K.
Kapoor also.)*

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move:

3. "That in the Motion the words 'on the Kutch border' be deleted."

*(This amendment stood in the name of
Shri G. K. Kapoor also.)*

Smu V. M. CHORDIA: Sir, I also move:

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

'and having considered the same this House is of opinion—

(a) that in order to drive the Pakistani forces out of the Indian territory and to teach them a lesson so that they may not commit any such aggression again, the army should be ordered to face the situation with full strength on a war footing;

(b) that the Nation should be mobilised to drive out the aggressor;

(c) that the fifth columnists who may be operating in the country should be traced out and arrested;

(d) that stern action should be taken against disruptive forces in the country which are taking undue advantage of the present crisis;

(e) that Indian publicity machinery in the foreign countries should be strengthened to counteract the false propaganda carried on by Pakistan;

(f) that the patriotic people in the border areas should be armed with weapons and should be given training to handle them.' "

The questions were proposed.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Sir, may I suggest to Mr. Mani a slight change in the wording of his amendment? Instead of the word 'martyrs' which gives a religious colour to this war, may I suggest that it be put—

"... while defending our frontier and pays its respectful homage to the brave men who have laid down their lives in

defending the honour and integrity of our motherland ..."

because the word 'martyrs' gives a religious colour to war (*Interruptions*) and we in India never believed in religious wars. Therefore, I would suggest

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): We hold them martyrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let there be no discussion, it is a suggestion made to Mr. Mani.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, Mr. Ruthnaswamy talked to me about accepting his amendment. I would have done so in the ordinary circumstances but I would like this House to adopt the Resolution which is more or less on the lines of the amendment adopted by the other House because that would signify the united determination of both the Houses of Parliament on this issue, and it is possible for us to argue that, those persons who have laid down their lives may also be soldiers, and certainly martyrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your amendment stands as it is. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL, (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman. Sir, at the outset I would like to pay my hum-tribute to the jawans whethet they be of the Territorial Army or the Gujarat Security Force that has been guarding this border under the most difficult situation. They have-been facing very heavy odds often, not receiving the adequate support that they should receive from the Government.

I welcome the Prime- Minister's statement that not an inch of Indian land would be surrendered. We are-, however, in circumstances—though not altogether, but to a small extent—similar to those with which we-were faced some 1\ years ago. when the massive Chinese aggression came and we were caught unprepared. But the question is whether we are fully

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

prepared today or whether we are still unprepared. The tactics adopted by Pakistan today are very similar to those followed by China. Has our Government, has our Defence Ministry, learnt the lessons that they should have from the Chinese aggression because a new element in the situation is growing, the growing cordiality between Communist China and President Ayub Khan who deals with the Communists firmly at home but reconciles in doing business with them abroad for mutual profit, entering into treaties to distribute India's border unilaterally. These are matters which lend a new complexion to the situation. The real issue has moved far beyond Kashmir which was or which has been an old point of dispute for so many years. And while speaking of Kashmir, it reminds us of the failure of a policy for the last sixteen years. If the whole of India could be integrated into one union, why could one single State be not integrated in the same manner? If there was a person in this country who would integrate the whole of India, why was he prevented from doing so in the case of Kutch, when he repeatedly asked, repeatedly drew the attention of the people and the country to this?

This is one of our greatest failures. We have also tried to placate Pakistan repeatedly, again and again. We have entered into Canal Waters Treaty. We have entered into treaties about lockers and many other matters. But we have not sat down to enter into a complete settlement of all outstanding issues. Why? Therein lies the failure of our Government and its policy. Whether you call it a policy of indecision or whatever you like, this has led us into this unfortunate situation. Why did the Government of India not say when concluding the Canal Waters Treaty, "Look here, friends. We want to be friends. We are willing to go so far and let us sit down and settle the whole issue". But there '

was one fly in the ointment. The fly in the ointment was that a particular friend of our Prime Minister would lose practically his employment. His only employment in the last few years has been going to the United Nations, going to America, going to Europe as this country's representative and abusing the West. This has not brought us any friends. This has made only things difficult for us. It is time for the Shastri Government, when he appeals for unity and support of the whole country, to see if this situation can be remedied even at this late hour. I am wondering whether a similarity between the circumstances does not exist in this House and in the other House. Repeatedly questions were asked before the Chinese aggression came and when the Chinese build-up and construction of roads in the northern borders was going on, but they were brushed aside. Why quarrel over a territory, we were told, where not a blade of grass grows? Are we going to be told that in the Rann of Kutch not a blade of grass grows or that it is difficult to defend it? Are we going to be faced with a similar situation as we are faced with on our northern border. Sir, it is going to take a lot for the Shastri Government to convince the country that that is not the situation.

I would like this House and this country to remember that this border situation is not something new. The Government know that a claim to this area was made in 1956 when Pakistan trespassed on a small grazing area in the Rann known as Chhad Bet and a minor operation was mounted. Thereafter an Army garrison was located there. Later on, however, I do not know under whose advice the Government of India handed over the region to the Bombay State on the ground that that State could very well look after it. The State Government's view of the matter was that the function of guarding the international border was that of the Government of India and that the State police were not meant

for maintaining law and order and for checking of smuggling etc. So the State police did not bother very much about our border.

Sir, this was a very anomalous situation that went on for some time. The limited role envisaged by the Government of India for our Central Reserve Police post in Chhad Bet did not, even implicitly, extend to the regular patrolling of the entire 30 miles even during the limited period of the dry season. However, following the steady increase in the incidence of aggressive acts by Pakistan along the international border in the other States, the Government of Gujarat thought it prudent to plan and organise against the possibility of similar acts of aggression by Pakistan on the Kutch-Sind border. In this context, I am told, after a proper survey and consultation in 1960 the Government of Gujarat sent proposals to the Government of India for construction of six strategic roads in this area. Sanction of one road has recently been given. The Government has been sleeping over this all these years. The letter was signed by the Chief Minister of Gujarat in 1960 and addressed to Mr. M. J. Desai, the then Foreign Secretary. This was followed by an official letter addressed to the General Officer Commanding, Maharashtra and Gujarat areas at Bombay, seeking support of the Army authorities for the construction of these strategic roads. The only outcome of this proposal was that in June 1962 the Ministry of Transport communicated approval to give priority to the construction of only one of the six roads, namely Khavda to Chhad Bet, with the proviso that the work should not be started until detailed plans and estimates had been approved by the Government of India. Despite the best efforts of the Chief Engineer the sanction of the concerned authorities of the Government for acceptance of tenders for construction of the first part of this road was not received until February 1965. This

is how the Government of India is functioning on this matter.

Sir, the formation of closer ties between Pakistan and China is well known. It appears that in March last the Chinese Prime Minister had » stop-over in Karachi when this plot was hatched according to certain newspapers. I would like to ask very humbly the Prime Minister whether he had any information about this from our High Commissioner or other sources, or whether the door of information from Karachi stands barred, bolted and made into a stone wall. Is it not the feeling of many people who have held the post of High Commissioner to Karachi that repeated requests for settlement of outstanding border issues and coming to a settlement with Karachi were always met with a rebuff under the regime of the then right hand of the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, Mr. Krishna Menon I mean, and it is, therefore, that we are in this situation today? Even when temporary posts were set up, when weather conditions permitted, at Karim Shahi in the first quarter of 1964, patrolling along the border in front of Karim Shahi began. In May 1964 occurred the incident in which three Pakistani civilians were taken into custody by one of our border patrols and were subsequently handed over to the Pakistani police after interrogation had revealed that there was no ground for retaining them into custody. It was in the course of this incident that there was an exchange of notes between the Pakistani Police Commandant and our Liaison Officer in which the former claimed and the latter denied that the spot marked on the map as "Kanjarkot", near which three Pakistani nationals had been arrested, was within the Pakistan side of the border. It is pertinent to mention at this stage that the incident which occurred, and all subsequent developments, were duly reported to the Government of India and action taken according to their

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

instructions. Were not the instructions of the Government of India very-clear not to fire the first shot always? Then how do you repel aggression, if you are serious about repelling it, I would like to know? It is since February that our posts, our guards, have been observing that the Pakistani rangers have been assuming firing positions at Kanjarkot, that heavy vehicles have been moving about. The track marks show that just as the Chinese had built roads on the frontiers and the Government ignored it, the Government of India seemed to be similarly ignoring the id tracks that were left on the sands, the sands that became consolidated because of the passing of these heavy vehicles and salt and sand also make roads as any engineer will tell you. So Pakistan was getting an advantage over our forces in the sense that they had connecting roads while we were separated from these areas by a large sheet of water that came in particularly during the monsoon months. If attention to this had been drawn by the Gujarat Gov-ent repeatedly, why was the Foreign Office sleeping about it? I am told that very recently an officer of the Gujarat Government was deputed to wake up Delhi. The man could not get a seat on the plane. He tried to ring up the high ups in the Indian Airlines and he said 'You cannot disturb me at night. Do what you like*';

SHRI A. D. MANI; Who said that?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: A high officer in the I.A.C. He got a seat up to Jaipur. He went to Jaipur and appealed to another Government to allow him to go. When he came here for the Conference, the meeting took place but the army officers were in no mood. They left very early before the Conference had taken all its decisions. It was the civilians that sat and took the decisions. The army officers are inclined to say: "This territory cannot be defended, why waste our breath

about it?" I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether this is true or not, whether this is the report that their officers had submitted to the Government of Gujarat or not and what is the Prime Minister doing about it?

I am just drawing the attention of the Government to the situation that exists as regards our defence. May I say that as everyone in this country wants to stand behind this Government, merely an appeal by the Prime Minister is not going to bring confidence into the people. What is really necessary is the changing of the character of the Government that is sitting in office to-day. Our views, or the ink of the report of Parliament on what is happening in every Ministry, or what is happening in every State is not dry before the Government is defending the acts of corruption, acts of lapses, every day, day in and day out. How can people have respect or faith in a Government that carries on like this? What is needed for the Prime Minister to do is to clean the Augean stable with a firm hand and remove corruption and change the character of the Government. It is the only thing that will get the wholehearted, unstinted co-operation of the people that will be necessary for a massive effort that will have to be made if we are to meet the combined enemies that now face us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a very long list before me and I would like the debate to finish to-day. So we sit through lunch and I would request the subsequent speakers to confine their remarks, if possible, to fifteen minutes.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: I would request that one more day may be allotted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid it will not be possible. Mr. Pathak.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: A spokesman may be given 20 minutes.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK; (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, this is no border incident. After 1947 this is the second major aggression committed by Pakistan. The report of the press representatives who visited the Kutch area recently and other information which came into the possession of the Members of Parliament makes the position clear— that the terrain is extremely difficult. The army has exercised the utmost caution and restraint. It was open to our jawani to enter, if necessary, the territory of Pakistan. That was legally permissible to them in order to defend our territory and posts. They have defended as far as it was possible and they have exercised the utmost care and caution. It was also possible to retaliate but at this stage they have exercised the utmost restraint. This was a surprise attack. Our posts were manned only by police officials and it was not till the 9th April attack that the matter was put in the hands of the army. We never expected that Pakistan would attack the Indian territory. We never expected that suddenly the police which was posted there would be attacked by the army personnel in overwhelming numbers. We now know that this is a conspiracy between China and Pakistan which has been put in action and on all the borders there is concentration of Pakistani forces which are poised for attack. This is a challenge to our nation. We must pay a tribute to our jawans who have shown heroism, who have fought under the most difficult circumstances. Today the border incidents are increasing. There has been about 59 incidents in Jammu and Kashmir border and therefore after President Ayub Khan has in a fiery speech given us a threat of an all-out war, we must accept the challenge. We have tried our best to be friendly with our neighbours. We tried our best to have all the disputes between us solved. The Conference proceedings would bear that out but Pakistan has always been recalcitrant. Pakistan has never offered the hand of friendship, never wanted to have the disputes decided and that is

the reason and not any slackness on the part of the Government of India that these disputes had not been solved.

So far as the Kutch region is concerned, as the Prime Minister has said, it is not a matter of dispute. The whole situation, the whole border between this Sind State and the Kutch State, the British Indian Sind and the Kutch State, is quite clear from the survey maps, gazetteers and other documents which you find during the British period.

Now it is amazing, Mr. Chairman, that the British press, with one or two exceptions like the 'Economist', are wilfully shutting their eyes to the documents which belonged to the British period, and they have become the victim of Pakistani propaganda. The Labour Government has always been more objective, and I would appeal to the British press to examine the documents which belonged to the British period and not to be a party to suppression of facts, where the documents of the British period would make the position clear.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have to refer to another friendly nation. Recently, before the American Society of International Law, Mr. Dean Rusk, the American Secretary of State, made a statement, and I am quoting it.

"We are talking about the appetite for aggression—an appetite which grows upon feeding and which is proclaimed to be insatiable. Surely, we have learned over the past three decades that the acceptance of aggression leads only to a catastrophe. Surely, we have learned that the aggressor must face the consequences of his action and be saved from the frightful miscalculation that brings all to ruin. It is the purpose of law to guide men away from such events, to establish rules of conduct which are rooted in the reality of experience."

[Shri G. S. Pathak.]

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of law cannot be different if the country which commits aggression is a friendly country. If during the three decades, of which Mr. Dean Rusk spoke, Pakistan's aggression had been condemned, at least when Mr. Zafrulla Khan admitted, contrary to the false denials made before, that Pakistan's army was on the territory of Kashmir, and at least later, when Judge Dixon had clearly said that the entry of Pakistan into Kashmir territory was contrary to international law if Pakistan's aggression had been condemned then, Pakistan would not have received an encouragement to continue to make aggression on the territory of India. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Americans want that our democracy should live.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Under Pakistani guns.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Please listen. But it is an irony that the aid that they have given, the arms that they have given her are being used against us and those arms may spill Indian blood, may take Indian lives. There is no American who wants that Indian democracy should be destroyed. Every American wants, I firmly believe, that we should live, but they have fallen into a contradiction . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope you are not falling.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: They love dictators.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: and it does appear that unless they take suitable action, unless they enforce the treaty under which they have given the arms, their policy may be self-defeating. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, they should realise that Pakistan today is acting as a tool of China, with whom Pakistan has entered into a conspiracy to destroy India. If aggression of this type is allowed to continue, there will be an end of all talk of disarmament, and the United Nations, which is already tottering, will be in shambles. There-

fore I am certain that the world community will realise now that those nations who commit unrestrained aggression in this manner must be stopped. Mr. Chairman, as the Prime Minister has said, this is a testing time for us. A nation, of 470 million people must rise—and has risen to meet the challenge; we must be self-sufficient and self-reliant and, Mr. Chairman, it is often said that it is more difficult to preserve freedom than to gain it. That time has come; it is going to be a long drawn out affair. Even if there is some sort of compromise, cease-fire, Pakistan has demonstrated by her past conduct that she will always act in the manner in which she has acted so far; that is to say, engage in a continuous aggression, hostility and hatred against us. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is heartening to find—we are proud of this—that at this moment, as two and a half years ago, we are sinking all our differences; there is unity, which you find throughout the country. And we have woken up to the realisation that it is not a question of raising panic if we want to have civil defence now. It is a question of realisation of the dangers and preparation for the dangers which might come. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, people are going to associate with the Government wholeheartedly at this juncture. The student community has made an appeal, and that is a very strong appeal. I am certain that the business community will also allow part of the industrial potential to be converted into war potential, and the Prime Minister's appeal will have universal response throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, democracy has never failed, so far in the history of the world against a totalitarian State, or against military dictators, and I am certain, Mr. Chairman, with all our efforts to achieve peace, that if the alternative to peace has to be followed, then we shall have success and we shall preserve our democracy and the integrity of our country.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 P.M.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : सभापति जी, बधाई है उन जवानों और अफसरों को जो कच्छ के मैदान में जान की बाजी लगा कर शत्रु के दांत खट्टे कर रहे हैं। अभिनन्दन है उस हवाबाज का जो अमेरिकी टैंकों का चित्र ले कर आया है। हम अनुगृहीत है सेना के उस अफसर के जो एक मशीनगन के बल पर सारी पाकिस्तानी टुकड़ी को परास्त कर के ऐसी परिस्थिति का निर्माण करने में सफल हुआ जिसमें पाकिस्तान के चार अफसर हमारी गिरफ्त में आ गए और जिन्हें दिल्ली की सैर करने का भी मौका मिला। वे अफसर जमीन में उल्टे मुंह कर के लेटे थे। वे मरे नहीं थे मरे होने का नाटक रच रहे थे, बाद में जब पास जा कर देखा तो वे जिंदा निकले। हमारी सेना और सेना के अफसर इस सदन के और देश के अभिनन्दन के अधिकारी हैं।

जहां सड़कें नहीं हैं, पीने के लिए पर्याप्त पानी नहीं है, संख्या बल में और शस्त्र बल में जहां हमारी सेना शत्रु से कम है वहां सेना जिस वीरता, जिस शूरता का प्रदर्शन कर रही है उसके लिए हम उसे बधाई देते हैं। अपनी सेना पर, अपने सेना के अफसरों पर हमारा पूरा भरोसा है। काश, यह बात इतने विश्वास के साथ मैं अपने राजनीतिज्ञ नेताओं के बारे में भी कह सकता।

सोच पूछते हैं, कच्छ में सड़क क्यों नहीं बनाई गई? छावनियां क्यों नहीं स्थापित की गई? १९५६-५७ में पाकिस्तान ने छाड़बेट में घुसपैठ कर के अपने अपवित्र इरादों की हमें सूचना दे दी थी। फिर सरकार ने उस सीमा की उपेक्षा क्यों की? हम असावधानी में क्यों पकड़े गए? क्या १९६२ में हमने जो पाठ पढ़ा था वह हमारी आंखें खोलने के लिए पर्याप्त नहीं था? क्या हर बार हमें बड़ी पाठ नये मिले

से पढ़ना होगा? क्या हमें यह समझना बाकी है कि दुर्बलता एक अभिशाप है, दुर्बलता आक्रमण के लिए एक आमंत्रण है? इस क्रूर संसार में यदि स्वाधीनता की, अखंडता की रक्षा करनी है, तो शक्ति के और शस्त्रों के बल पर हो होंगे, हवाई सिद्धान्तों के जरिए से नहीं। उत्तरी सीमा में हम हारे। हमने हिमालय की ऊंचाई को दोष दिया। आज क्या सागर की गहराई को दोष दिया जायेगा? तब बर्फ हमारे मार्ग में बाधक बन गई। क्या आज रेगिस्तान को, दलदल को हम दोष देंगे? तब किसी कोल पर कलंक का टीका लगा, आज किस पर कलंक लगेगा? तब श्री कृष्णा मेनन को इस्तीफा देना पड़ा, आज कौन इस्तीफा देगा?

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल : चह्वाण देगा।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : सभापति जी, पाकिस्तान, सरकार के कहने के अनुसार, कच्छ की सीमा पर जनवरी से आक्रमण कर रहा है। कच्छ में पाकिस्तानियों ने जनवरी में पहले प्रवेश किया लेकिन संसद को, देश को कब सूचना दी गई? क्या विदेशी आक्रमण के तथ्य को संसद से, देश से, छिपाना अपने उत्तरदायित्व की अवहेलना नहीं है? जब गुजरात की विधान सभा में और राज्य सभा में मैंने तथा मेरे अन्य मित्रों ने यह प्रश्न खड़ा किया कि क्या पाकिस्तानियों ने १३ हजार एकड़ भूमि पर कब्जा कर लिया है तब सरकार की ओर से कहा गया, हां कब्जा हो गया है। फिर भी पूरी बात सदन के सामने नहीं रखी गई। गृह मंत्री ने कहा—पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में कोई भूमि नहीं है, केवल पाकिस्तान ने स्टैंडिंग पोस्ट बनाये है। नन्दा जी का वक्तव्य गवाह है। उन्हें इसका जवाब देना होगा। तीन दिन पहले जो मानचित्र निम्नरित किया गया है उसमें २० मील के सारे इलाके पर पाकिस्तान का अधिकार दिखाया गया है और दो

[श्री ए० बा० वाजपेयी]

चौकियों की जगह तीन चौकियां दिखाई गई हैं। हमें विश्वास में क्यों नहीं लिया गया? आज एकता की अपीलें की जाती हैं। हम उन एकता की अपीलों का समर्थन करेंगे क्योंकि यह देश बड़ा है, कांग्रेस से यह देश बड़ा है, इस नेतृत्व से यह देश बड़ा है। मगर एकता हमें धोखे में रख कर कायम नहीं हो सकती। आज भी विरोधी दलों के साथ विचार विनिमय का कोई निश्चित स्थायी प्रबन्ध नहीं है। क्या प्रधान मंत्री एक ऐसी समिति का निर्माण नहीं कर सकते जिसमें कांग्रेस दल के सदस्य भी हों, विरोधी दल के सदस्य भी हों, जिसकी बैठकें रोज शाम को हों और जिसे प्रतिदिन सीमा पर चलने वाले घटनाचक्र से परिचित कराया जाय। क्या कठिनाई है इसमें? या वह समझते हैं कि विरोधी दल इसके अधिकारी नहीं हैं। यद्यपि ऐसा समझने का कोई कारण नहीं है। मैं उनसे कहूंगा कि अभी देर नहीं हुई है। आप सारी परिस्थिति को उसकी सम्पूर्ण गम्भीरता में, अयंकरता में, नग्नता में जनता के सामने, सदन के सामने, विरोधी दलों के सामने रखने में संकोच न करें।

सभापति जी, पाकिस्तान हमारे खिलाफ अमेरिकी शस्त्रों का प्रयोग कर रहा है। यह गम्भीर चिन्ता की बात है। जब पाकिस्तान-अमेरिका का सैनिक गठबन्धन हुआ हमने अमेरिका को चेतावनी दी थी कि पाकिस्तान हथियार मांग रहा है कम्युनिज्म से लड़ने के नाम पर मगर वे हथियार शान्तिप्रिय भारत के खिलाफ काम में लाये जायेंगे। अमेरिका ने हमारी चेतावनी पर कोई कान नहीं दिया मगर हमारी आशंकाएं सिद्ध हो गई हैं। अमेरिका के दिए हुए हथियार आज भारतीय जवानों की छातियों को छलनी कर रहे हैं। क्या दक्षिण-पूर्वी एशिया में लोकतंत्र की रक्षा करने का, साम्यवाद के प्रसार को रोकने का यही

तरीका है? और जब भारत सरकार ने शिकायत की कि अमेरिकी हथियार पाकिस्तान काम में ला रहा है तो प्रेसिडेंट जानसन ने दोनों देशों को यह चेतावनी देना ठीक नहीं समझा कि जो भी देश अमेरिकी हथियार इस लड़ाई में काम में लायेगा उसे सैनिक सहायता देना बन्द कर दी जाएगी। अमेरिका अगर चाहता, तो यह चेतावनी दे सकता था और यह चेतावनी अपना असर करती। वह हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को अमेरिका आने का आमंत्रण भौंडे तरीके से, अशिष्टतापूर्ण तरीके से रद्द कर सकता है और वह पाकिस्तान को चेतावनी भी नहीं दे सकता कि हमारे हथियारों का प्रयोग मत करो? चेतावनी देने के बाद फिर जांच होनी चाहिए थी कि कौन प्रयोग कर रहा है, किस मात्रा में प्रयोग कर रहा है। जिस तरह से हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का आमंत्रण रद्द किया गया है उससे भारत और अमेरिका के मित्रतापूर्ण सम्बन्धों को धक्का लगा है लेकिन जिस तरह से पाकिस्तान अमेरिकी हथियारों का हमारे खिलाफ प्रयोग कर रहा है और उस प्रयोग पर अमेरिका जिस तरह से तुरंत कार्यवाही करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है उससे भारत और अमेरिका के सम्बन्धों को इतनी क्षति पहुंच सकती है जिसे सम्मालना शायद मुश्किल होगा। अमेरिका के नेता यह तय कर लें कि दक्षिण-पूर्वी एशिया में साम्यवाद के प्रसार को रोकने के लिए चट्टान का काम कौन करेगा। हम उनके मित्र बनना चाहते हैं, हम पुंछलगे तो नहीं बन सकते, लेकिन ऐसा पुंछलगा जो पीठ में छुरा भौंक दे उससे ऐसा मित्र, सच्चा मित्र, अच्छा है जो कि आलोचना भी शालीनता की भाषा में करेगा और मित्र के व्यापक हितों को ध्यान में रख कर चलेगा।

महोदय, प्रेसिडेंट अयूब ने हमें धमकी दी है। आक्रमण करने के बाद वह पूरी लड़ाई की धमकी दे रहे हैं और नये आक्रमण की भाषा बोल रहे हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने

अपने वक्तव्य में उन्हें दृढ़ता से जवाब दिया है लेकिन हमें पाकिस्तान के इरादों को समझना चाहिए। वह हमारा ध्यान बंटाने के लिए किसी और भी सीमा पर संकट पैदा कर सकता है। हमें दोनों दृष्टियों से तैयार रहना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान यदि नए मोर्चों पर संकट खड़ा करे तो हम उसका सफलता के साथ सामना कर सके और कच्छ में पाकिस्तान ने जैसा खुला आक्रमण किया है उसका मय व्याज के साथ बदला चुकाने के लिये हमें भी कहीं अपनी इच्छा का स्थान बूढ़ता पड़ेगा। भारत और पाकिस्तान की सीमा एक है, उसे टुकड़ों में नहीं बांटा जा सकता। शांति और स्वतंत्रता की तरह से सीमा अविभाज्य होती है। वे हमें कमजोर देखकर अगर कच्छ में घुस आए, तो उस आक्रमण का बदला जहां हम ले सकते हैं, जहां वे हमारी दृष्टि में कमजोर है, वहां हार करके हम को देना चाहिये।

मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी की इस घोषणा का स्वागत करता हूँ कि अगर पाकिस्तान होश में नहीं आएगा, तो सेना को अपनी रण नीति निर्धारित करने की छूट होगी। लेकिन मैं एक बात जानना चाहता हूँ। वे कच्छ में घुस आये, तो क्या हमारी सेना के लिये संभव नहीं था, कि वह कच्छ में सखर की तरफ से उनकी पीठ पीछे जाकर हमला करती? क्या सेना ने इस तरह का कोई सुझाव मंत्रिमंडल के सामने रखा था? क्या मंत्रिमंडल ने सेना को सचमुच में छूट दी है या यह छूट केवल संसद को बताने के लिये है? क्या हमारी सेना अपनी रण नीति निर्धारित करने के लिये पूरी तरह मुक्त है?

सनापति जी, हम एक संकट की स्थिति में से गुजर रहे हैं। लेकिन यह संकट की स्थिति १९६२ से चल रही है।

स्वाधीनता बलिदान मांगती है। क्या कारण है, चीनी आक्रमण के पश्चात् देश में जो राष्ट्रीय चेतना जागी थी, यह सरकार, यह संसद उस चेतना को बनाए नहीं रख सकी? चीन और पाकिस्तान हमारे स्वाभाविक शत्रु हैं—हम उन्हें एक ही गज से नहीं नापना चाहते हैं। मगर वे हमें मजबूर कर रहे हैं इस बात के लिये, कि अगर दोनों मिलकर कहीं हम पर वार करें, तो उस वार को सफलतापूर्वक झेलने के लिये हम अपने को सन्नद्ध करें। इसके लिये कम से कम २० लाख सेना हमें चाहिये। चीनी आक्रमण के बाद पैदल सेना की संख्या घटाने का जो रक्षा मंत्रालय ने निर्णय किया है उसे कैबिनेट ने, मंत्रिमंडल ने, स्वीकृति दी है—उस निर्णय पर फिर से विचार करने की जरूरत है। कम से कम हमें २० लाख की सेना चाहिये, आधुनिक शस्त्रों से लैस सेना। शस्त्र चाहे जहां से मिलें प्राप्त करना चाहिये। इस परिस्थिति में जो देश हमारी मदद के लिये आ सकते हैं, वे फिर किसी भी विचारधारा को मानने वाले हों, उन से पूरी तरह से मदद लेने में सरकार को किसी तरह का संकोच नहीं होना चाहिये।

देश के भीतर पंचमांगियों पर भी कड़ी दृष्टि रखनी होगी। आज के समाचारपत्रों में खबरें छपी हैं कि सिलचर में, पंजाब में, कच्छ में पंचमांगी गिरफ्तार किये गये। यदि सरकार जागरूक है, तो अधिक कुछ कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं। जनता का कर्तव्य है कि देश में शांति बनाए रखे। कितनी भी उत्तेजना हो हम शत्रु के एजेंटों के हाथ में नहीं खेल सकते। पाकिस्तानी तत्व पीकिंग परस्तों के साथ मिल कर साम्प्रदायिक उपद्रव भड़का सकते हैं। हमें उत्तेजित नहीं होना है, न हमें असावधान होना है। देश की एकता की रक्षा करते हुए हमें अपनी स्वाधीनता का संरक्षण करना है।

[श्री ए० बी० वाष्पेयी]

प्रधान मंत्री जी से मैं कहूंगा : नेशनल डिफेंस काउन्सिल का आप विस्तार करिए । केवल अतुल्य बाबू को उसमें शामिल करना पर्याप्त नहीं है । वे जनता में लड़ने का और आने वाले संकट का मुकाबला करने का उत्साह पदा नहीं कर सकते । पूज्यपतियों के साथ उन के कैसे भी घनिष्ठ सम्बन्ध होंगे, मगर जनता के साथ उन के सम्बन्ध न के बराबर हैं । क्यों नहीं आचार्य रंगा को, श्री सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी को और श्री दीन-दयाल उपाध्याय को राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद् में शामिल किया जाता ? अगर राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद् का विस्तार करना है, तो सही दिशा में विस्तार होना चाहिये ।

महोदय, मैं एक बात कह कर खत्म कर दूंगा । अभी युद्ध शुरू भी नहीं हुआ है कि युद्ध विराम की बातें हो रही हैं । अभी हम लड़े कहां हैं । अभी हम ने बार कहां किया है ? अभी हमारे जवानों को अपना पुरुषार्थ दिखाने का मौका कहां मिला है ? युद्ध विराम कैसे हो सकता है ? और अगर ब्रिटेन के प्रधान मंत्री युद्ध विराम चाहते हैं, उन से कह दीजिए वे पाकिस्तान को सलाह दें कि तुम कच्छ की सीमा छोड़कर, कच्छ का प्रदेश छोड़ कर चले जाओ । अपने आप युद्ध विराम हो जायेगा । हम पाकिस्तान पर, पाकिस्तान के प्रदेश में जा कर गोली नहीं चलायेंगे । मगर हम अपनी भूमि में युद्ध विराम मान लें और उस पर यह कह कर लीपापोती करें कि पहले आप युद्ध विराम मान लीजिए फिर वे चले जायेंगे, तो मेरा कहना है : इस को जरा, उल्टा कर दीजिए—वह पहले चले जायें फिर युद्ध विराम की आवश्यकता ही नहीं रहेगी । आज की स्थिति में युद्ध विराम नहीं हो सकता । इस युद्ध विराम का सेना पर और देश के मनोबल पर कसा असर पड़ेगा, इसका विचार करना चाहिए । वैसे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो रवया अपनाया है उससे

मोटे तौर पर मैं सहमत हूं और मैंने अपना संशोधन भी इसी आशय का दिया है और मुझे विश्वास है, सरकार को मेरा संशोधन स्वीकार करने में आपत्ति नहीं होगी ।

सभापति जी, मैंने सरकार के कर्तव्यों की चर्चा की । संसद् के सदस्यों का भी कुछ कर्तव्य है, और मैं विरोधी दलों से कहना चाहता हूं : देश लड़ाई में है, आप उस लड़ाई को जीतना चाहते हैं, तो क्या लड़ाई को जीतने का तरीका यह है कि अगर एक चौकी गिर जाय, तो आप संसद् में काम रोककर प्रस्ताव पेश करें, अगर बोलने का मौका न मिले तो बहिर्गमन करें और प्रधान मंत्री के इस्तीफे की मांग करें ? मैं प्रधान मंत्री का कोई बहुत बड़ा प्रेमी नहीं हूं मैं विरोधी दल में बठा हूं । लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री के त्यागपत्र से अगर आज की समस्या हल होने वाली हो, तो शायद मांगने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी—प्रधान मंत्री स्वयं त्यागपत्र देने में संकोच नहीं करेंगे । मगर प्रधान मंत्री का त्यागपत्र कोई रामबाण नहीं है जो दिल्ली में दिया जाय और जिससे कच्छ की सीमा में घुसी हुई पाकिस्तान की सेना पीछे हट जाय । यह राजनतिक प्रचार का, सस्ती प्रसिद्धि का अवसर नहीं है । देश की अग्नि परीक्षा हो रही है, विरोधी दल भी कसौटी पर कसे जा रहे हैं । राष्ट्र के मनोबल को बनाए रखना होगा ।

चीन के हाथों से हमारी सेना का पीछे हटना समझ में आ सकता था, पाकिस्तान के हाथों पीछे हटना समझ में नहीं आ सकता । महोदय, हम लड़ाई के मैदान में कभी नहीं हारे, हम हर दम दिल्ली के दरबार में हारे हैं । हम युद्ध में कभी नहीं हारे, हम शांति में हारे हैं । हम संघर्ष में कभी नहीं हारे, हम संधि में हारे हैं । मुझे खुशी है, श्री यशवंत राय चव्हाण आ गए हैं । मैं अभी महाराष्ट्र का दौरा करने गया था और महाराष्ट्र की जनता पूछ रही थी : क्या कर रहे हैं हमारे रक्षा मंत्री चव्हाण ? हिमालय की रक्षा

के लिये आने वाला सहायि क्या कर रहा है ? जिसे छत्रपति शिवाजी का आधुनिक अवतार कहा गया वह क्या कर रहा है ? मैंने कहा, दिल्ली में अकेले चव्हाण जी क्या कर सकते हैं, दिल्ली में असली घोड़े की टाप नहीं सुनाई देती है, कागज के घोड़े दौड़ते हैं । लेकिन आशाएं हैं, आकांक्षाएं हैं । जो पराजय हुई है, जो अपमान हुआ है, उस के बदले का गुस्सा है । और श्री यशवंत राय चव्हाण ने कहा था कि चीन के हाथों से हुई पराजय का बदला लेने के लिये सेना उदल रही है । पाकिस्तान के हाथ पराजय का बदला लेने में कोई देर नहीं होनी चाहिये । सारा देश सरकार के साथ है । आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि नेतृत्व दृढ़ता के साथ खड़ा रहे । हम अभी लड़ाई नहीं हारे हैं, हम मोरचा हारे हैं । और लड़ाई हम तब तक नहीं छोड़ेंगे जब तक उस लड़ाई को विजय में नहीं बदल देंगे । सारा देश विजय के संकल्प से भरा हुआ है । नेतृत्व की आवश्यकता है । आप आगे चलिए, तो हम पीछे चलेंगे । किन्तु यदि आप डगमगाए तो हम कभी आप को माफ नहीं करेंगे । धन्यवाद ।

SHRI K. K. SHAH (Maharashtra): Mr. Chairman, it is a very grave situation but it is in such situations that the leadership is tested. I welcome the spirit in which Mr. Vajpayee has addressed the House but when the situations are grave, the calculations must be graver. The questions that demand answer are these: Have we a strategy to meet this challenge? Have we a strategy, when Pakistan is trying to exploit a supposed joint action of China and Pakistan somewhere else, to see and go on achieving its vicious object because the supposed joint action is likely to take place? The third question that must be asked is this: Is this not an opportunity to expose Pakistan? Are we not in a position to push Pakistan where Pakistan will have to call for

help either from America or from China? From my point of view, this is a unique opportunity for this country to expose Pakistan and to force Pakistan to make up its mind whether she wants to go to China or to America.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

If we can achieve these objects, then this is a welcome move by Pakistan. I therefore propose to set at rest some of the doubts that have been raised by my friend, Mr. Vajpayee. May I ask those doubting minds, has not President Ayub Khan tested our army on the Kashmir front? Has he not realised that if it is impossible for Pakistan to move an inch during all these fifteen years in spite of the fact that China has been sitting there for the last 21 years? Therefore let us not worry; let us not go to the extent of saying that we are not prepared. What Pakistan today is doing from my point of view—even though there are friends who have not been in agreement with me—should be seen in the light of what is happening after President Ayub Khan has returned from China. All these probing attacks have started, have multiplied after President Ayub Khan has returned. Why these probing attacks, not at one place, not at two places, but at umpteen places? Is it an attempt to spread out our army at a number of points so that when the joint action starts in Assam, our forces will take time to regroup? And if this aspect is being borne in mind by the Government of India, by the Defence Minister and by the Prime Minister, we should have no quarrel with them. What is necessary is that a perfect strategy must be hatched out long before and I have no doubt that the army and the Government of India are not only in control of the situation but are also in a position to give a proper answer to Pakistan. If it takes a little time in view of the Military calculations that confront us, we should not be impatient and I am very happy that Mr. Vajpayee's speech does not show im-

[Shri K. K. Shah.] patience. What is necessary—as I wish to point out,—is this. It is true that the Prime Minister—and I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister for this—has made it abundantly > clear that no negotiations can take place before Pakistan moves back to the position before the aggression took place but I wish to submit to the Prime Minister that the announcement of even readiness to talk before Pakistan has gone back creates an impression in the country that we are not able to fight against Pakistan. That psychology is bad. Therefore I would beg of him that having taken up this position the control must pass on to the army I can say with confidence that the psychology of the army is much better than what it was in 1962. All those bosses have disappeared; the dissatisfaction has disappeared. The army is waiting for an opportunity and I think that opportunity has been provided I think Mr. Vajpayee is correct. If one terrain is unfavourable there are a number of terrains on the border between India and Pakistan which are favourable. In fact, today's motion must result in a unanimous vote by this House permitting or giving a mandate to the army that if it is necessary, in order to give an answer to Pakistan, to go over the borders of Pakistan, to go into Pakistan, they will have perfect liberty to do so. Those days are gone when anxiety was displayed by us to show that we did not wish to go into the territory of Pakistan even by an inch. But if that determination of ours is sought to be exploited by Pakistan for the purpose of undesirable aggression we must not allow Pakistan to take advantage of this.

There -are rumours—and I think Mr. Vajpayee refers to these rumours —of some difference of opinion about the strategy between the High Command or in the Government. I wish that these friends realise the gravity of circulating such rumours. To the best of my knowledge—of course I

have no inside information but to the best of my knowledge—I can say with confidence that there is no difference of opinion between the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister or as a matter of fact between any Member of the Cabinet. They are all determined that the time has come when Pakistan must know what it means to invade even an inch of India's territory. What has happened in Kashmir should have been a lesson to Pakistan but Pakistan probably from my point of view—I wish to be forgiven for repeating—feels that India must be labouring under a feeling that a joint action by Pakistan and China might take place and therefore it will be easier for Pakistan to poach upon our territory which is thousands of miles away from Assam and Ladakh. I have *no* doubt that in Ladakh they are not going to try; I have also no doubt that China is not foolish enough to start a war again but if it ever happens it can only be in Assam and no-where else. If that is so, may I request the Defence Minister and the armed forces, are not there places near Assam where Pakistan is vulnerable? That way you will not spread out your forces far away from Assam. These are of course calculations which must be left to the army but it is time that the country is put on a war footing. The statement made by the Prime Minister is welcome; the stand taken by him is welcome but I would go a step further. We have missed opportunities of putting this country on a war footing. A country which " is just rising after 700 years of slavery deserves a harsher treatment. An occasion has arisen when the country must be placed on a war footing. About this idea of taking help from America, from the West, may I request Mr. Dahyabhai Patel to reexamine what the attitude of our friends in the West is? We are grateful them for the help that they have given but if we reexamine their attitude we will be more than satisfied that if anybody is more interested in

Pakistan it is the West and the

is continuing in spite of the fact that Pakistan is the close ally of China which is the arch enemy of America. Have you ever seen in the history of the world a country collaborating with an arch enemy of another country but still continuing to receive help from the latter? If they Pakistan and China, combine together, the entire help that is pouring from America to Pakistan will be utilised not only against India but against all the ramparts of democracy. Is not the West aware of this and in spite of being aware of this why are they still pouring in help? Does it not require examination at our hands? These are questions which must be answered and it is not right for Us to take things for granted. Therefore, it is my suggestion—I take the clue from the Prime Minister's statement—that the time has come when the economists of this country should sit down and find out in what way the country's manpower and the progress that the country has made can be utilised for the purpose of making this country self-sufficient. The idea of exploiting outside influences that are in our favour should be given up. The idea of what others will think about us should be given up. It is a war now, a war which Pakistan has imposed on us. Therefore, the manpower must be utilised. I have no doubt that the late great Prime Minister had laid the foundations for making this country self-sufficient. If this had been imposed on us in 1952 we would not have been able to spend more than Rs. 350 crores. When it is imposed on us in 1965, we are able to spend Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 1,500 crores, thanks to his wisdom. Now, the time has come when the country must think in terms of being self-sufficient without anybody's help. If anybody helps us, it is welcome. We will be grateful, but no calculation should be based on somebody coming to our rescue. For that purpose the third thing which is necessary is this and I welcome Mr. Vajpayee's suggestion. Attempts may be made to create a religious conflagration in this coun-

try so that the Army will be required to be utilised for the purpose of maintaining internal peace. Everybody in this country should now undertake the responsibility of looking after internal peace in every village, mohalla and town so far as civil defence is concerned. I hope it will be possible for the Prime Minister to again revitalise the Citizens Defence Committee so that in a month or two the country is placed on such a footing that the Army will also have the courage. The Army will think it possible to take drastic steps because the Army knows that the country inside is able to look after itself and the country can marshal its resources. From this point of view the House should be proud that in a very critical situation we have leadership which is able to take every aspect of the situation into consideration. I wish to assure the Defence Minister that neither this House nor this country is worried if a post is lost in a difficult terrain, from where after a month we may have to come back. But what this country does expect from the Army and from you, the Defence Minister, is that if they take away two miles or thirty miles from we should be able to take fifty miles from them immediately after we have started our operations. That is the strategy, I hope, which this Government will follow.

Thank you very much.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमन, आज की जो बहस सदन में हो रही है, उस को सुनते वक्त मुझे सन् १९४० में जो ब्रिटेन में एक बहस हुई थी, उस की याद आती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह भी मई का महीना था और हम आज ३ मई को ही यह बहस कर रहे हैं। उस वक्त भी सरकार की ओर से यह कहा गया था कि अगर सरकार के वार एफेंस के खिलाफ कुछ सदन में बहस हुई, तो एनिमी को बल मिलेगा, शत्रु को बल मिलेगा।

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

लेकिन बाद में उसी बहस में सरकार के पक्ष के लोगों ने सरकार के खिलाफ वोट दिया और सरकार को खत्म किया। उसको भी हमें याद रखना चाहिये। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आज जो श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी की सरकार है, उस को खत्म होना है, लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि ब्रिटेन में वहाँ की सरकार उस वक्त जो गलतियाँ कर रही थी, उस तरह की गलतियाँ यह सरकार न करे।

हमेशा यह कहना कि यह बहुत मुश्किल टेरन था, वहाँ पर पानी बह कर के आ जायगा, इसलिये हम कुछ नहीं कर पाते, या कहीं यह कहना कि वहाँ कुछ नहीं उगता है और वहाँ तो सिर्फ पत्थर हैं, इसलिये हम कुछ नहीं करना चाहते हैं, इस तरह का जो विमर्श है, इस से देश का नुकसान होता है। देश की जमीन चाहे एक इंच हो, चाहे वह बहुत सड़ी हुई जमीन हो, लेकिन वह देश की जमीन है और उस की रक्षा करनी चाहिये।

सन् १९६२ में जब चीनियों ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया था, तो उस वक्त भी हम लोगों ने एक बड़ा दृढ़ संकल्प किया था कि हम हिन्दुस्तान की एक एक इंच जमीन को बचायेंगे और उस को हम वापस लेंगे। लेकिन तीन साल के बाद फिर हमारे ऊपर हमला होता है और इस वक्त पाकिस्तान का हमला होता है, और फिर वही दर्दनाक बात होती है कि अचानक उन्होंने हमारे ऊपर हमला कर दिया और हम इस के लिये तैयारी करेंगे। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि यह सरकार हमेशा तैयार रहे। तीन साल में अगर तैयारी नहीं हुई है, तो सरकार को यह गलती माननी चाहिये कि हम कुछ कर नहीं पाये। तीन साल आप क्या करते रहे ?

पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी सीमा है, चीन के साथ हमारी सीमा है, और पाकिस्तान के साथ हमेशा हमारा लड़ाई झगड़ा चलता रहा है। यह नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान ने आप के साथ बहुत अच्छा सलूक किया है। जब से हिन्दुस्तान का राज शुरू हुआ, तब से पाकिस्तान के साथ झगड़ा शुरू हुआ और हमेशा झगड़ा रहा। फिर भी आज १७ साल के बाद यह कहना कि हम ऐसी तैयारी नहीं कर पाये कि हम कंजरकोट को बचायें या किसी चीज को बचायें, यह सरकार के खिलाफ जाता है। मैं चाहूँगा कि इस तरह का एक जो विमर्श हो गया है हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का, वह खत्म हो।

आज हम को बचाना है सारी सरहद को, चाहे वह कंजरकोट के इलाके में हो, चाहे वह ईस्ट बंगाल के इलाके में हो या चाहे वह काश्मीर में हो। मैं यह भी कहना चाहूँगा कि अगर पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान की किसी भी जमीन पर आक्रमण करता है, चाहे वह कच्छ में हो या कहीं भी हो, तो फिर हम को भी यह छूट मिलनी चाहिये कि जहाँ पाकिस्तान सब से ज्यादा कमजोर है, वहाँ पर जा कर के हम हमला करें। अगर एक हमला आवर को यह छूट होती है कि वह हमेशा हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण करे, हमारी जमीन ले ले, फिर जा कर के यह कहे कि तुम सीज फायर करो, तो मुझे समझ में नहीं आती है सीज फायर की बात। सीज फायर तो तब हो सकता है, जब हमारी जमीन को खाली कर के वे चले जायें और फिर उस के बाद सीज फायर का कोई मतलब ही नहीं रहता है। जब वह जमीन खाली हो जाती है, तो आटोमैटिकली सीज फायर वहाँ पर हो जायगा। लेकिन यह कहना कि पहला हमला कर देंगे, हमारी जमीन को ले लेंगे और फिर सीज फायर की बात करेंगे, इस का कोई मतलब नहीं होता है। मैं यह चाहूँगा कि अमेरिका और ब्रिटेन की सरकारें, जो हम को आज यह सलाह देती हैं कि

वहाँ पर सीज फायर हो, उन को यह बात सोचनी चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन के ऊपर जब आक्रमण होता है, तब हमेशा हम को यह राय दी जाती है कि सीज फायर करो। हम को १७ साल का जो तजुर्बा हुआ है, उस से हम को समझ लेना चाहिये कि हम में उन का कोई इंट्रेस्ट नहीं है, हम को बचाने की कोई इच्छा नहीं है। वे चाहते हैं पाकिस्तान को बचाना क्योंकि पाकिस्तान के साथ उन का गठबन्धन पहले से हो चुका है। सिएटो के नाते या किसी पैक्ट के नाते व उसी को बचाना चाहते हैं। आज हम को यह साबित हो चुका है कि अमेरिका हो या ब्रिटेन, जब भी कोई प्रश्न हिन्दुस्तान का उठता है, तो वे हमेशा ऐसी सलाह देते हैं जो हमारे विपक्ष में होती है यद्यपि उनके पक्ष में होती है।

हम एक ही कामनवैलथ में आज हैं, लेकिन हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है कि हम ऐसे कामनवैलथ में बैठें, जिस में पाकिस्तान भी एक मेम्बर हो और साथ ही साथ ऐसी चीजें होती रहें। आज विल्सन साहब ने कोई एक सलाह दी है सरकार को और हमें यह बताया नहीं गया है कि वह सलाह क्या है, लेकिन मैं यह चाहूंगा प्रधान मंत्री से कहना कि अगर यह सलाह ऐसी है कि जो हमारी जमीन पर आक्रमण हुआ है, उस को वापस रखते हुए, कोई सीज फायर होने की बात है, तो फिर इस को हर्गिज नहीं मानना चाहिये।

मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि कच्छ में एक एक इंच जमीन जब तक खाली नहीं करता है पाकिस्तान, तब तक कोई समझौते की बात न हो, सीज फायर की बात न हो। असल में हम लोगों को यह करना चाहिये कि जब उन्होंने हमला कर के ले लिया है, तो फिर पाकिस्तान के कोई दूसरे इलाके पर हम को हमला कर के उन को कमजोर करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये। आखिर, ईस्ट

बंगाल है। ईस्ट बंगाल की हालत देखिये। ईस्ट बंगाल में माइनारिटी के ऊपर जो आक्रमण हो रहा है उस को देखिये। ईस्ट पाकिस्तान के जो वाशिनदे हैं चाहे वह माइनारिटी कम्युनिटी के हों या मेजोरिटी कम्युनिटी के हों, सारे वहाँ के लोग पाकिस्तान की सरकार से नाखुश हैं। तो फिर क्या बात है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार कोई ऐसा कदम न उठाए कि वहाँ के लोगों को बचाया जाय। मैं तो चाहूंगा कि इसके बारे में भी सरकार को सोचना चाहिए। ईस्ट बंगाल में कोई मुश्किल बात नहीं है, चार दिन का मामला है, उसे ठीक किया जा सकता है। हमें सिर्फ यह नहीं सोचना चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान को यहाँ या वहाँ, काश्मीर में या कंजरकोट में, रोकने की बात है बल्कि जहाँ भी पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान का सीधा सम्बन्ध है वहाँ सोचना है। जब अयूब खां टोटल बार को बात करते हैं, तो हम लोगों को भी इसे समझ लेना चाहिए और इसी तरह से हम लोगों को भी प्रिपेरेशन करनी चाहिए ताकि अगर अयूब खां टोटल बार करते हैं, तो हम उस के लिए तैयार रहें। लेकिन आज की सरकार का जो दिमाग है उससे हमें लगता है कि भाषण तो बहुत दिए जाते हैं, अपील भी बहुत की जाती है, पर होता कुछ नहीं। सदन में आ कर यह कहा जाता है कि जो विरोधी पक्ष हैं उनको ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिए, ऐसे समय पर इस तरह का कोई विपक्ष नहीं करना चाहिए और सरकार को मदद करनी चाहिए। सरकार को मदद तब करेंगे जब सरकार खुद अपना संकल्प करे। यह कहना कि वक्त ऐसा है कि सरकार की गलतियों का भी हम समर्थन करें यह सब से खतरनाक चीज है और हम इस को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं अगर सरकार एक नीति नहीं बनाती है। मुझे कोई वास्ता नहीं है कि कौन प्रधान मंत्री है, ए बी सी जडी कोई भी प्रधान मंत्री हो, जब तक आप अपनी नीति को नहीं बदलेंगे, नीति को ठीक तरह नहीं बनावेंगे

[श्री गोडे मुगर्हि]

तब तक कोई एकता की बात या मदद की बात कोई माने नहीं रखती है। हर हिन्दुस्तानी चाहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान का राज्य बचे, हर हिन्दुस्तानी चाहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा की रक्षा हो और हम समझते हैं कि कोई ऐसा हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं होगा जोकि सरकार को मदद करने को तयार नहीं होगा लेकिन सरकार खुद अपने आप को ठीक करे, अपनी नीति बदले और संकल्प को दृढ़ बनाए। जब तक संकल्प नहीं होता तब तक मदद करने का मतलब यही होता है कि सरकार की जो गलती है उस को कायम रखना। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार पहले अपनी नीति को बदले। और पाकिस्तान और चीन का जो गठबंधन हुआ है उस का भी हमें सोच लेना चाहिए। अगर पाकिस्तान चीन के साथ गठबंधन कर के हमारे ऊपर ऐसा आक्रमण कर सकता है और हिन्दुस्तान को चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों का मुकाबिला करना है, तो फिर हमारी जो आज की सैनिक स्थिति है, जो रक्षा का कार्यक्रम है उसमें बहुत ज्यादा बड़े पैमाने पर बढ़ोतरी होनी चाहिए लेकिन हम क्या देखते हैं? हिन्दुस्तान में कोई ऐसी साइकालोजी नहीं है कि हमारे ऊपर हमला हुआ है। ऐसी साइकालोजी पैदा हुई हो हम यह नहीं देख रहे हैं खास कर के सरकार में, वैसे जनता की ओर से तो कई प्रदर्शन होते हैं मीटिंग्स होती हैं और वे जाहिर करते हैं अपनी इच्छा कि हम हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करेंगे लेकिन सरकार की ओर से मिलिटरी को ठीक करने का और हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसी प्रिपेयडनेस लाने का कि हम दोनों हमलों का सामना कर सकें कोई चीज नजर नहीं आती है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आप हिन्दुस्तान की डिफेंस प्रिपेयडनेस को ठीक करें। यह हो सकता है कि जो आज की सेना है उसमें बड़े पैमाने पर बढ़ोतरी करनी पड़े लेकिन उस को बढ़ाना पड़ेगा क्योंकि जब हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा की रक्षा नहीं कर

सकेंगे तब तक हिन्दुस्तान में कोई भी व्यवस्था हो, चाहे समाजवादी व्यवस्था कायम करना चाहें, चाहे कोई दूसरी व्यवस्था करना चाहें, वह कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। जब तक अपने स्वयं में अभिमान नहीं है, जब तक देश की रक्षा करने का अभिमान नहीं है, जब देश की सीमा की रक्षा भी नहीं कर पाते हैं, तो फिर क्या देश में उन्नति करना चाहते हैं यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। इसलिए मैं कहूंगा कि सरकार इन सब बातों को तय करे।

जो कुछ कच्छ के बारे में हुआ है उस के बारे में भी मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहूंगा। यह कहा जाता है, आज प्रधान मंत्री साहब ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि पाकिस्तान जब कोई आगे बढ़ा नहीं, लेकिन जहां तक आगे बढ़ चुका है वह बढ़ चुका है, तो मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि ट्रबैंटीफोर्थ परेलल के उत्तर में हमारी कितनी सेना है। जो ट्रबैंटीफोर्थ परेलल कही जाती है उस के उत्तर में हिन्दुस्तानी सेना कितनी है? और अगर नहीं है तो फिर क्या बजह है कि सरकार हमारे सामने आ कर यह कहे कि उन को तो वहां पर हम ने रोक दिया वह आगे नहीं बढ़ पा रहा है। आगे तो बढ़ चुका है, उसको जितना लेना था वह ले लिया। असल में हमारी सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि जो उन्होंने ले लिया है उसे वापस ले और जब तक वह कार्य नहीं होता है तब तक यह कहना कि हम ने उन को वहां तक रोक दिया कोई शोभा नहीं देता।

मैं सरकार से यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि जहां पर गलती होती है, जहां कोई कमजोरी है उसे मान लेना चाहिये और देश के सामने असलियत को रखना चाहिए। जब कहीं पर हमें शिकस्त होती है, तो मान लें कि यहाँ शिकस्त खाई है लेकिन तुरन्त उसका कोई न कोई प्रतिकार हो और कोई न कोई उत्तर हम दे सकें ऐसी काबलियत

सरकार में होनी चाहिए तब जा कर देश में दृढ़ता बनेगी और देश में कोई एक कांफिडेंस पदा हो सकता है ।

इसलिए मैं सरकार से यही अपील करूंगा कि आप अपनी नीति ठीक करें, एक संकल्प बनावें और उस के बाद हिन्दुस्तान के सारे राजनैतिक दलों से कोई अपील करें, तो सब लोग आप को मदद कर देने को तैयार होंगे और उन में कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ेगा । लेकिन जब ऐसा संकल्प नहीं होता है, तो फिर यही कहना होगा कि जो स्थिति ब्रिटेन में उस वक्त थी, १९४० में जबकि चम्बरलेन की सरकार वहां पर कायम थी और जिसके खिलाफ वहां के लोगों ने आवाज उठाई थी वसी स्थिति हिन्दुस्तान में भी पदा होने वाली है और होगी जब तक कि यह नीति नहीं बदलोग ।

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Madam, I was greatly distressed to hear the last speaker. On one side some Members of the opposition call upon the country to support the Government. On the other hand they take every opportunity that they can lay their hands upon to criticise the Government rightly or wrongly in a serious situation that faces the country and the Government

Madam, let us look at this problem from a very serious point of view. We are faced with a very serious situation indeed. That is why my friend, the leader of the Jan Sangh, who spoke—I congratulate him on the speech that he made. He made a very brilliant speech, a very statesmanlike speech in which he said everything that he wanted to say, but he called upon the country to be united behind the Government. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel on the other hand, when he got up to speak, made two criticisms, one of Mr. Krishna Menon and the other of the Government. In regard to Mr. Krishna Menon he said something that he did not really understand. He does not understand that Mr. Krishna Menon was the first individual sent

by the Government of India to the United Nations who told the truth about the Kashmir situation. Never had that truth been told before to the United Nations as was told by Mr. Krishna Menon. I do not hold any brief for Mr. Krishna Menon but I must give the devil its due, and it is necessary that we must put the record right in regard to that particular matter.

In regard to the attack that Mr. Dahyabhai Patel made on the Government, he said in that attack: Why has not the Government settled all these border disputes with Pakistan? Perhaps my learned friend remembers that there is a Punjabi saying which says that you cannot clap with one hand, and if only the Government of India's goodwill were concerned in the matter, there was ample goodwill on the part of the Government of India, as I know personally from the late Prime Minister to the present Prime Minister; but unfortunately there was not that goodwill on the part of Pakistan. Therefore, my reply to Mr. Patel is that you cannot clap with one hand only. It is not possible to do so.

In regard to Mr. K. K. Shah—I am sorry that he is not here now—when he said: "Put the country on a war footing", I entirely agree with him as I entirely agree with Mr. Vajpayee when he said that there must be constant consultations between the leaders of the Congress Party, the opposition party, and the leaders of the opposition. In regard to a very serious situation it is necessary that every body who means anything in this country should be mobilised for the purpose of consultations with the Government. And I do hope that the Prime Minister will concede both these demands, firstly that the country should be put on a war footing and secondly that there must be constant consultations with the leaders of all parties.

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

Now, Madam, there should be no illusion amongst us that this dispute with Pakistan is indeed a long affair, it is not a short affair.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Is it a dispute?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: It is a dispute. I do not agree with my learned friend that it is anything else but a dispute. There are many warmongers amongst us but I do hope that my learned friend is not one of those warmongers. It is a dispute between Pakistan and ourselves over the very serious issue of the border—an aggression has been committed against us. Just as there must be no illusion about the dispute with China, there must be no illusion amongst us about the dispute with Pakistan. An aggression has been committed against us.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: It is not a dispute, it is an aggression.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My learned friend is merely bandying about words. He says that it is not a dispute, that it is an aggression. The origin of the aggression is a dispute, a dispute which has arisen in regard to this border trouble. That is what Pakistan says. My learned friend must understand that the Pakistanis say that they have a claim to a certain, a particular area (*Interruptions*). It is wrong, I say it is wrong, it is entirely wrong. They say that they have a claim up to the 24th Parallel. I do not know if my learned friend has seen the map.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: We have.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: There is absolutely no question of 24th Parallel. Every map—as the Prime Minister stated—of that particular area from 1907 onwards lays down that Kutch which acceded to India later On, on the 1st of June, 1948, was entirely outside any claim that Pakistan now makes in regard to this area. (*Interruptions*). I cannot say that

My learned friend must understand that it is Pakistan which says that there is a dispute. Well, let us deal with that particular matter. We say, there is no dispute, we say that the maps are clear enough in regard to this matter.

Now, this matter of the aggression by Pakistan goes back to the time when on the 22nd of October, 1947, Pakistan attacked Kashmir. The aggression that is now committed by Pakistan against India occurred as early as 22nd October, 1947.

SHRI OM MEHTA (Jammu and Kashmir): The aggression is not vacated.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My learned friend says that the aggression is not vacated. Does not my friend know that? He knows perfectly well that aggression is still there, it is still there. What I am trying to connect up is this. The aggression that was committed in Kashmir on 22nd October, 1947 is now continuing in the shape of aggression against Kutch in the month of April, 1965.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: January.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: January, 1965. Now, it is a long-standing business indeed. You will recall, Madam, that at that time, when we accepted the cease-fire, a United Nations Mission came out to India. And Pakistan had been saying all along that there was not one single Pakistani Army officer or man inside Kashmir, that Pakistan had nothing to do with the aggression that had taken place. When the United Nations Mission came, they found out that this was entirely false. They said that the situation had changed radically by their discovery that Pakistani troops were actually fighting in Kashmir. When that happened, Pakistan had to admit that their troops were in Kashmir in spite of Sir Zafarullah Khan's statement at

the United Nations that no Pakistani soldiers had been fighting in Kashmir. The same situation has arisen now ■when Pakistan says that no American armour is now being utilised by-Pakistan today. Exactly the same thing happened at that particular time when they denied that the Pakistani Army was engaged in operations in Kashmir. They say now that no American armour is being utilised, in spite of the fact that 10 tanks have been destroyed by the Indian Army and photographs have been sent all over the world and particularly to the Americans showing that the arms that they have given to Pakistan are being employed against us in spite of the statement that they have made that under no circumstances would any arms supplied to Pakistan by America be utilised against us.

I say, Madam, that the time has come for us to make it quite clear to the United States of America that if they do not take any action now in regard to this matter, we will consider it to be a hostile action against us. It is very necessary that we say this; it is very necessary that we ask them now to stop all the aid that they are giving to Pakistan in the matter of armour which is being used now against us.

May I now take the opportunity to pay a very belated tribute to the brave men who fought at the time of the invasion of Kashmir by Pakistan in the year 1947, many of them who lost their lives, officers and men, brave men, who fought in order to protect our country? And may I say that this House will join me in paying this great tribute to those brave men?

There are three things that, I think, should be done. The first thing is that we must defend ourselves, as the Prime Minister has stated in his very brilliant and positive speech that he made this morning. Now, Madam, let me pay a tri-

bute to that one company which faced a whole brigade of Pakistani troops and faced it brilliantly at Biar Bet? May I take this opportunity of paying the tribute of this House and of this country to those brilliant and brave men who fought to the last minute in order to protect our country? There must be no more giving in to aggression. I think this is perfectly clear as far as the Prime Minister and the Government of India are concerned. There is no question now of Pakistan claiming any advantage over us. Pakistan says—and I again repeat the fact—that there is a dispute, dispute between India and Pakistan over this particular territory. We know that there is no dispute about this territory, but Pakistan says that there is a dispute. May I ask: Even when they say that there is a dispute, is it permissible to go to war and kill each other, brother against brother? I, who come from Pakistan and have recently been to Pakistan, can assure you, the average man thinks no differently today from what he thought in 1947, and it is a fratricidal war that Pakistan's leaders are indulging in against India. That is the first point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is almost over.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Madam, I am very sorry but if you permit me to take a couple of minutes more, I will try and wind up.

May I say this that it is not permissible for Pakistan to indulge in a war situation with us over the question of the boundary dispute? It is not permissible under international law. You will realise that Article 1 of the Second Hague Convention endorsed subsequently by the Paris Pact has said that hostilities between two parties must not commence without a previous and unequivocal warning, which may be a declaration of war or an ultimatum, as the case may be. The Nuremberg 2 P.M. war criminals were tried for this particular breach of this

[Diwan Chaman Lall.] particular convention. Now Pakistan has gone and attacked India in this particular area without declaring any-war, without even issuing an ultimatum to us. It is trying to capture Indian territory. I suggest that this is all wrong. It is against the spirit of international law on the point.

Secondly, Madam, apart from paying our due tribute to the soldiers and officers, we must not forget that the political control of the Army rests with the Cabinet, a Cabinet of peace-loving men headed by the Prime Minister. I wish that Pakistan would realise this particular fact that we are peace-loving men, that our leaders are peace-loving men who do not want to go to war. But if they are forced into a war they will go to war. But unfortunately the position is that Pakistan does not realise the significance of all that is happening in India. What is happening in India? That is why I support what Mr. K. K. Shah said. What is happening in India? There are all sorts of dissensions, rumours, this, that and the other. I think the time has come that the Government should take action to put in its own censure, put in its own particular controls for the purpose of a situation which is obviously a war situation.

Thirdly, Madam,—and then I wind up—it must be understood that there are people going about the country who advocate a change of policy on the part of the Government of India. Now it is all very wrong on the part of these people to go about preaching a change of basic policies. One of the basic policies that they are preaching against is non-alignment. They do not realise what non-alignment means. Non-alignment means not surrendering your judgment to anybody else. Joining a military pact would be handing over your liny, your freedom, your Inflepen-ice into the hands of somebody else. Hon. Members will perhaps

remember that we were precluded from asking even a question about foreign affairs in the Legislative Assembly; we could not even ask a question. Why? Because India's troops, India's manpower, India's treasure, followed the British men of war. Now surrendering our independent judgment would mean that we would be following somebody else's men of war right through whether it is S.E.A.T.O. or S.E.N.T.O. or the Warsaw Treaty. We would be following somebody else's men of war

Madam, non-alignment, peaceful co-existence, friendship are the basic things that India stands for, and I do not think that there should be any change in the policy that the Prime Minister has laid down so forcefully time and again in regard to India.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you will have to wind up now because every one should adhere to time. There is a long list of speakers.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I am finishing. May I just merely say this that I am one of those who are not war-mongers. I am still fully convinced of the fact that if peace can be secured that must be secured and not at any price but peace with honour. That is the main basic principle. If not, then every man in India, even an old man like me, would be prepared to join up and go and defend the integrity of India.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam Deputy Chairman, our border has been invaded. Indian territory has been visited with foreign invasion for the second time during the last three years. The situation is a serious one and one which is fraught with grave peril. But the relieving features of the situation are the magnificent performance of the jawans and the officers of the Indian army who in accordance with the true traditions of valour of the Army have put up a glorious fight in the Kutch area. The second reliev-

ing feature is the firm and categorical statement made by the Prime Minister this morning that unless the status *quo ante* was restored there would be no question of a cease-fire. I regard that statement as one of the most memorable statements made in the history of Indian Parliament.

I was much interested to listen to the speech of the previous speaker, my hon. friend, Diwan Chaman Lall. He spoke about the dispute and later corrected himself by saying that as far as he was concerned, there was no question of a dispute. It is necessary for us to avoid the word "dispute" in any discussion on the subject because the moment we say it is a dispute, foreign nations would say that since there is a dispute, this dispute should be impartially investigated, and we being one of the concerned parties are not the competent judges to decide whether our stand is correct.

Madam, I understand that the Government of Gujarat is trying to gather a good deal of historical material and has engaged the services of a scholar to prove that Kutch belongs to India. I do not think that these efforts are called for because Kutch has been a part of Indian territory and was accepted as such at the time of partition in 1947.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is only for education of people here. Gujarat is not in any doubt.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes. But this creates confusion. We are reaping the mistakes of the past. If we had not accepted the Colombo Proposals with alacrity in 1962 and allowed the Chinese to retain their posts in Ladakh this situation would not have arisen because Pakistan came to feel that by invading Indian territory and occupying it forcibly and then by talking of negotiations she could make India surrender a part of her territory. If we had only said at the time of the Colombo Proposals that we were prepared to carry on an

undeclared war with China and that we were not prepared to accept a cease-fire at that time, this situation would not have arisen. The object of Pakistan is to humiliate Indian national self-respect and make us feel that we are not in a position to fight for the independence and integrity of our country. There may be other motives also for Pakistan's incessant adventure in the Kutch area and it may be that Pakistan is acting in collusion with China. Anything may happen during the next fifteen days. There may be eruptions of fighting in other sectors of the border. There may be a pressure on our friendly Himalayan neighbours from the Chinese sources. We do not know what is going to happen. Whatever it may be, I think this House should make it clear that if it is a question of a total war, we are prepared to face it. We are prepared to die with honour than to live in disgrace. We cannot allow this piecemeal nibbling of Indian territory to go in the name of border dispute. Madam, I feel therefore that we must make it clear in this House—and I hope that whatever is said in this House will be taken note of by President Ayub Khan—that we do not want to have a war with the people of Pakistan. We have nothing against the people of Pakistan. Nature has made both Pakistan and India a part of a single geographical entity. It was the unfortunate partition that led to the creation of these two States. The people of Pakistan have been our brothers. Probably a good deal of the same blood runs in our veins. We regard them as the people of a neighbouring country with whom we have to live in peace. The rulers of Pakistan are not the people of Pakistan. And ^Tdo not think that President Ayub Khan represents the wishes and sentiments of the people over whom he rules.

Unfortunately, Madam, the present situation has also other serious features. World order has collapsed. There is a United Nations in existence.

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

Nobody wants to go to the United Nations for its assistance because its assistance may become more dangerous than the present situation. The United Nations is so much discredited that we cannot have any faith in its decisions on account of the partisan decisions that have been taken in Congo and other areas. Further, we have to think about our Afro-Asian friends. Where are our Afro-Asian friends? Where is Mrs. Bandaranaike? Where is President Soekarno? Where is President Nasser? Have they condemned Pakistan aggression in the Kutch area? We have been thinking in terms of financial imperials :n of Wall Street. But the Asian imperialism of power-drunk politicians can be as bad as imperialism of any other type. It is a disgrace to Asia that one Asian nation without any provocation should have invaded the territory of another nation as Pakistan has done. It is a failure of Afro-Asian opinion that the action of Pakistan has not been so far condemned by the Head of any Asian country. We now know where we stand. We all like to go to Bandung Conferences. We want to go to the Algiers Conference. We want to attend Conferences at Cairo; but all these people who speak about in a very cordial way with us, are not going to stand by us in regard to the settlement of our problems with Pakistan or with China. We have to rely on ourselves. We have to build up our strength. We do not want a total war with Pakistan, if that can be avoided but if President Ayub wants a total war, we are prepared to face it. The moment he says that a total war is going to be declared, let us make it clear that the decision is going to be taken by the military commanders and not by the politicians. Then it will not be for President Ayub to say that the whole Indo-Pakistan sub-continent has been enveloped in a conflagration. Pakistan is a much smaller territory than India. Its Army is numerically smaller than the Indian Army. There are I

450 millions here. We do not want to swamp out Pakistan but if President Ayub thinks in terms of a total war, let us tell him that Pakistan has got a soft under-belly and if the military commanders want that soft under-belly to be attacked in the interests of defence, then it will have to be done. We hope that that situation will not arise.

A reference has been made by the Prime Minister to the efforts of Premier Wilson to offer his good offices for mediation in this dispute. It is for Premier Wilson to offer his good offices for mediation in this dispute but we should make it clear that we neither welcome nor condemn such efforts at mediation. It is necessary that we should not give any impression to people abroad that we are anxious to settle the problem somehow. We know that a peaceful settlement of the problem is necessary but if Premier Wilson wants to mediate, let it be understood that he mediates on his responsibility and not at our request, and that we cannot accept any terms except the complete restoration of the *status quo ante*. The Prime Minister said this morning and I was listening to him very carefully when he said that along with the cease-fire there should be a restoration of the *status quo ante*. Now I would rather like to put the matter in the reverse gear. There should be first a restoration of the *status quo ante* and then only there should be a cease-fire.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: There will be automatically cease-fire.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, there will be an automatic cease-fire because we do not want the folly and blunder of the Colombo Proposals to be repeated. The *status quo ante* should be restored first, then the cease-fire will follow because we will have nothing to fight about.

I would like to say here that we have got to think in terms of a two-front war for a good number of years to come, maybe for a decade to come.

We have got to put our economy in order. My hon. friend, Mr. K. K. Shah, spoke about creating a war economy. I would like to make some suggestions to the Government that as long as this emergency lasts, no contentious legislation which has aroused passions and controversies, should be brought before either House of Parliament. The second suggestion that I would make—and this is necessary for putting ourselves on a war footing—is to see that there is industrial truce in the country. The leaders of the Labour Unions must meet the leaders of the Government and the leaders of the employers and agree to an industrial truce. It may be necessary also for the suspension of the Factories' Act so that we may work for 12 to 14 hours to produce the goods necessary for the Army. The third suggestion I would make is that the frontier districts throughout the Indo-Pakistan frontier should be made more or less subject to semi-military control. We do not know when another Kutch is going to erupt and we must not repeat the mistakes that have been committed in the past when we allowed the frontier areas to be treated as the responsibility of the Government of Gujarat.

I would also like to say that the time has come for us to have a reconsideration of those foreign policies which have led us to the present situation. My hon. friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, said that there are certain fundamental features about which there cannot be any controversy—for example, non-alignment. If non-alignment means that our territory is going to be taken away, that we would be robbed of our self-respect, that we should be made more or less a person who is impotent and who cannot fight in any part of the -world, then I would not like to have that kind of non-alignment. I would also like to say that this nonviolence and Ahimsa have debilitated our self-respect and deprived us of our honour. We should be willing to fight for the honour and integrity

of our motherland. There should be a rethinking about these policies. It is not for me to make any constructive suggestions at this stage but when the time comes for the rethinking of our policy, the Members of the Opposition would co-operate with the Government in coming to its conclusions on the subject.

I would like to conclude by saying that though on many matters the Opposition and the Government are divided, on this issue of the independence and integrity of India and its honour, all the Members of the Opposition are with the Prime Minister.

I support the appeal made by my hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, that the National Defence Council should be reconstituted—this should not be made a parody of a National Defence Council as the present one is—and that the Leaders of the Opposition Parties should co-operate with Mr. Shastri in constituting the National Defence Council and we will not be content until all the aggression, either of China or Pakistan, is vacated and we shall fight unitedly behind the Prime Minister provided the call is given for the evacuation of these areas and it is not an attempt to have some kind of a settlement in the name of peace.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Madam, we are in a sombre hour of Indian history. The present period, in a small degree, is similar to that which obtained in 1962. In this short period of three years India had to face two critical situations, in 1962 the Chinese aggression and now the Pakistani aggression. There are two or three important things to remember on this occasion. Firstly, the Pakistani aggression has been deliberate, pre-planned and unprovoked. Perhaps it has been a part of the Sino-Pakistani strategy, maybe hatched at Bandung. This may be a new spirit of Bandung cultivated, learnt, now practised by Pakistan against India on the deliberate encouragement by China.

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.] Secondly another fact to remember is that the entire land frontier of India has been opened. To-day the entire Northern frontier is manaced, threatened and exposed to Chinese attack at any time. In the East and West, on the Indo-Pakistan border, the territory is exposed to Pakistani attacks. Virtually the entire land mass of India is exposed to two enemies.

Thirdly the aggressor has chosen, in both the times, her own ground for the attack. The time is chosen, the place is chosen.

There is another thing which has got to be remembered by this hon. House. That is, the Pakistan of today is somewhat different, from the Pakistan of yesterday. When Pakistan attacked Jammu and Kashmir after Partition, the situation was not so bad. Her politics was different; her style was different; her power and position was different. But today her position has very much changed. At that time, when she attacked Jammu and Kashmir, she was not a member of SEATO or CENTO, and she had no American arms of this magnitude with her. She was not ruled by a military junta. She was not friendly with China, nor cordial with Russia. But things have changed today. Now she has befriended China. She has China's goodwill. I think he is a part of a new growing *entente* a new axis consisting of herself, Indonesia and China, and Mr. Ayub Khan, the President of Pakistan, seems to me to be a sort of running dog of Peking imperialism. He is acting as a sort of tout, a big tout, in this part of the world to project the territorial and imperial ambitions of Peking. Besides, she maintains her membership of the SEATO and CENTO and as a price of this she has received so far nearly three thousand million dollar worth of military aid from America whereas India, in spite of Chinese aggression, in spite of our big effort, has so far received only 165 million

aoiiar worm of military aid. Because of this change in the position of Pakistan and realignment of various forces in this part of the world, Pakistan feels today, more than ever, that, her campaign of bluff and hostility and blackmail against India can be carried on more fruitfully and effectively. Therefore she has enlarged her frontiers of conflict against India, and at no time in her history, in the seventeen years of her existence, at no point, at no place in the world, has Pakistan been cordial to India so far; from Sheikh Abdullah to the Rann of Kutch, or from the arena of sport to the arena of politics Pakistan has not been in any way friendly to India. Moreover she has always proved to be a sort of renegade of trust and peace. Today Pakistan wants to have a showdown with India and she has adopted the same strategy as the Chinese. As you will remember, and as the Prime Minister just now told us, the Chinese adopted this strategy firstly, namely "make a claim over our territory, then mount an attack on it, then call it a disputed land and then make a sort of an effort to get India to a round table conference for negotiations." I think Pakistan today is adopting the same strategy, the same kind of approach, and what she has done in Kanjarkot is that she attacked our territory and occupied it. Now she says that she is ready for compromise, for negotiation, holding the invaded territory in her hands. And this is a strategy to which India should not fall a prey. Madam, may I remind the Prime Minister and the Government that we should look into the whole question, the question of defence as a whole? There seems to-be, as I said, a growing *entente* between China and Pakistan, and there has been continuous nibbling and attack. In such a situation, to isolate Kanjarkot from the rest of the problem is not correct to my mind. May I therefore suggest that the entire problem should be looked into from a different angle, and I feel that is the time, this is the moment when we require not only the decision of

this House but also a great effort in the matter of mobilisation of our resources, both in the army as well as in other spheres, to meet this danger.

Madam, I began my speech by saying that it is a very sombre hour in our history. Of course friendly countries like America and the United Kingdom have been making an effort to bring about a compromise, to bring both the countries for negotiations. And may I say that we are not against any negotiation? We are not against any effort at mediation, but there should not be any mediation, there should not be any negotiation at our cost; there should not be any disadvantage to us as a result of this compromise, negotiation or mediation. My hon. friend Diwarv Chaman Lall, was saying that we should have peace, peace with honour. But may I also warn this House that we should not go into a folly over our desire for peace. In our anxiety to have peace we should not be caught in any sort of trap. The issue today is not of peace or war. The issue is not even Americanism or anti-Americanism. The issue today, to my mind, is essentially and fundamentally the issue of our nationalism and our sovereignty, whether our nationalism would be defended, protected, whether our sovereignty would be safeguarded, or whether we are going to negotiate our sovereignty, and our nationalism. To put it the other way, the choice before us is between national honour and national dishonour, and if this is the choice, I think we should choose the former. I think we have got enough self-respect, enough self-confidence in this country; we have not sunk so low and our will has not been paralysed. May I therefore say that what is required today is unflinching, dogged, valiant and continuous effort and a will to defend and safeguard our land from any attack from any quarter? May I therefore suggest that we should not harp very much upon negotiation, compromise and peace, though they are impor-

tant? Secondly, may I say that whenever we want a settlement, the settlement should be on a basis which is, honourable to this country? In the case of the Chinese aggression in the past, what has happened? There is stalemate; there has been the withdrawal of the Chinese army and the posts remain, and their aggression has been consolidated. Now I do not want the same thing to be repeated in Kanjarkot or elsewhere; I do not want a repetition. We want that Pakistani aggression in Kanjarkot should be vacated, and if Pakistan ; not vacate the aggression in time, I think Government has got to make an effort and take all possible steps to see that that aggression is vacated quickly, in time. Madam, I am sorry to find that some hon. Members of the Opposition are for having, some sort of an inquest on the conduct of the Government. May I tell them that this Government is not like the Vichy Government and that the situation in India to day is not the same as the situation that obtained in France in 1940? May I say that all people, including all Members of this House, would be ready and would be anxious to render any service that is required and to dedicate themselves to the task of liberating that part of the territory of India which is with Pakistan? I will, therefore, say that this is an hour which requires absolute unity and dedication and effort and more than all that, the spirit of sacrifice which is not wanting. We plead with the Prime Minister that he need not be hesitant in his effort. There is no want of support for him in this task. May I appeal to him to be firm and to see that all steps are taken to vacate this aggression from this area?

Lastly, may I say that—and I find that the Defence Minister is here—it is high time that our defence efforts are increased? I am of opinion that a big army of some 200 million, people at least, must be created. Otherwise you will not be able to defend the

Lohri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.]

territories either in the north or east or west. Enough money should be provided for this. There has been enough support for the Prime Minister and I do not know why there should not be more effort in this direction. I would not like to be told and I would not like this House to be told that we are careful and waiting for counter-attack. I say when there is an attack, we want a counterattack. We want to see that there is a counter-attack. If Pakistan behaves rough with us, we should be rough too with them. If there is a blow then there has got to be a counter-blow. I do not like the kind of talk that we should be very cautious, that we should be very careful and so on. These are words. I think, not of bold men. Therefore, may I again in the end say that what is required is a sense of urgency, a sense of dedication not only on the part of the House but also on the part of the Government?

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Kerala): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to take part in the discussion on the motion moved by the hon. the Prime Minister on the situation arising out of the attacks by the Armed Forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border. I am fully conscious of the grim and grave situation we are facing because of this unprovoked and naked armed aggression by Pakistan against our sacred frontiers.

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

The Prime Minister in his very convincing and moving speech has laid before us the facts of the situation and has clearly explained the aggressive intentions of the rulers of Pakistan. I am glad that while maintaining our deep faith in the principles of peace, the Prime Minister has declared in most unmistakable terms that the Government is prepared to meet the present aggression by Pakistan -with all our resources and with all

our might. Let me assure the Prime Minister that this is the feeling and this is the aspiration of all Indians and also I can assure him that all Indians, Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs and all others, irrespective of caste, creed and colour, stand solidly behind him and are with him when he makes such a declaration about defending the territorial integrity of the mother-country. Indians, let me tell him, would like to die with honour than live with disgrace. I would only wish that President Ayub realises the consequences of disturbing the peace in the sub-continent and would also understand that we Indians love nothing more than our freedom and our honour.

I feel, Sir, that this is not the time to deliver fiery speeches or for criticising the Government on its acts of omissions and commissions. This is not the time to ask for military secrets and military movements. This is the time for determination and for dedication. It is a time really to unite and to act. Let me assure the hon. Prime Minister that at this critical hour of India's history I pledge the support of my Party to this Government in all its actions and measures taken to meet the Pakistani aggression on our sacred frontiers. Every Muslim, man, woman and child, deeply loves his or her country, the motherland and they are all prepared to offer all sacrifices needed for the protection of national honour and the territorial integrity of our mother country.

Before I conclude I have to pay my humble tribute to those sons of India who have shown such heroism and have shed their blood on the sacred frontiers of the motherland in defence of the honour territorial integrity of this country. While concluding I express my hope that the Government will take all the Opposition leaders who are prepared to meet this challenge and to make all the sacrifices needed for the protection of the in-

tegrity of the country, into confidence. The National Defence Council must be expanded, as has been suggested by previous speakers, by taking in the leaders of the Opposition, including Shri Mohammad Ismail Sait, the President of the Indian Muslim League.

One thing more I would like to add before I conclude. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the necessity of seeing that internal peace and harmony are also maintained while we are engaged in the sacred task of meeting this external aggression.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset I would like to pay my tribute and homage to the jawans and the members of the Gujarat Police force and of the Central Police Force who have laid down their lives for defending the territorial integrity of our land.

After the determined and convincing and decisive speech of the Prime Minister made this morning, I do not think we have got much to say with regard to the final choice before the country. But certain aspects of this latest aggression on our territory call for some comments.

Since its very inception, Pakistan has been having an eye on us, and we have not passed a single day on which there had not been some incident here or there. This should have been taken note of. And in this latest aggression, let it be very clearly understood that there is conspiratorial collusion between China and Pakistan to divert us from our path and to come in the way of our growth. At the same time as a country with such a large population, they want to humiliate us before the world. That is clear enough.

They have said that we are in adverse possession of the Rann of

Kutch. But the Rann of Kutch is as much a part of our land as Gujarat or Maharashtra or Punjab is and it is undisputed territory of our country. Whether it is a swamp or a desert, it is our territory and any aggression or intrusion into it shall not be tolerated. It is said sometimes that the terrain is unfavourable to us. Maybe the terrain is unfavourable to us but any unfavourable terrain in the modern world, with the modern inventions, technology, can be made favourable. It is no use now crying over spilt milk but our eyes have been opened and even if our economic growth were to be lessened a little, the integrity and the sovereignty of our land must be maintained at any cost.

I read in the papers this morning that Pakistan has thrown a challenge. The question before this country is whether we accept that challenge. In his introductory remarks the Prime Minister has very unequivocally stated that the challenge will be accepted at whatever cost and we endorse every word that the Prime Minister said this morning. We stand for peace. We stand for co-existence. We also stand for non-alignment. As somebody said, there is no question of changing that policy but let us understand that in this world of stark realities peace is not obtainable without strength and sanction.

When I talk of strength I mean the military strength and when I talk of the sanction I mean the sanction of the morale of the people. Whatever be the cost we have to build up our armed strength and the morale of the country has also to be kept up. One thing that has emerged from the development is that we have got very few bosom friends in the world. Any small incident happening here or there, there is a big hue and cry but here is naked aggression. Where are those friends? What are our friends doing? They give us sane advice but what is the worth of this,

[Shri Khandubhai K. Desai.] sane advise? Is it to allow the aggressor to pocket the fruits of aggression? It shall not be done and it cannot be done. We want to keep our self-respect, we want to keep our sovereignty. We want to maintain the integrity of the land. There cannot be any mortgaging of this country, come what may.

Now, we are members of what is called the Commonwealth. Prime Minister Wilson is trying to use his good offices to bring about peace, to bring about a cease-fire but is this enough for him? Should he equate Pakistan with India? Should he not condemn the aggression which Pakistan has committed? Should not the British Government or the British Press have taken into consideration that it was under Britain's auspices that the country was divided?

The Rann of Kutch has never been part of Sind. It has always been a part of the old princely state of Kutch and times without number, historically, by resolutions of the then Government, it was decided that the Rann of Kutch formed an integral part of the princely State of Kutch. The old princely State of h has acceded to India; the whole of the . State, including the R3nn of Kutch, is integrated with our country. There is one other aspect 'to which I would like to draw your attention. When Pakistan joined the CENTO and the SEATO, our late Prime Minister warned America that *iny* arming of Pakistan against China was going to be misused and misapplied in the future. Repeated assurances were given to us that no arms given by America will be utilised against India but what do we find when American arms have been used against us? What has been done is that a protest has been sent. Now, that shows what? I will not say that their sympathy lies with Pakistan but they are not genuine friends of our country. What it means, I will

not say at this stage but we have to stand on our own legs. We must, if necessary, begin building up our strength; even though our military strength has been increased, it requires to be further increased if not today at least for the future.

As I said earlier, we want peace, we want co-existence and non-alignment. There is no question about that but, as I said, peace in this world of stark realities is not obtainable without strength and sanction. That is the clear view which we must have before us. How can America or the other members of the CENTO or the SEATO tolerate Pakistan befriending China? The CENTO and the SEATO were organised or designed to fight China. One of the members of the SEATO or the CENTQ makes common cause with the enemy against which the SEATO and the CENTO were created. Have they got any explanation for it? There is no democracy in Pakistan, as we all know I do not mean to suggest even for a moment that the people of Pakistan are hostile but the ruling clique in Pakistan is jealous of us; it wants to humiliate us.

And last but not the least, Indonesia, whom our late Prime Minister had aided to become independent at great risk, at great unpopularity amongst the powers that be, has also turned against us.

Now, this is the grim story of Pakistan's aggression against us. That aggression has to be vacated sooner than later and all the forces at our command should be utilised to get this aggression vacated. Do we not see before our very eyes that it is not only aggression on a part of Kutch but it is a sort of mobilisation that is taking place as far as Pakistan is concerned in our neighbouring territory on the Punjab frontier, on the Kashmir frontier, on the Assam frontier, on the Cooch-Bihar frontier? Shall we again be taken in unpre-

pared? It must be very clear to us I that the design of Pakistan and "China is not friendly but it is hostile. and a hostile neighbour—in fact there are two neighbours—should be taken as hostile and not as friendly. If we surrender, if we are taken in by this talk of cease-fire which does not come about on our terms of vacating the aggression, we will, as some people said, get into the trap.

Therefore I would say to our Prime Minister and the Government that the whole country is behind you ■solidly in unity and strength to carry out any action that the statement this morning has called upon us to do. We would not budge; as some speaker has pointed out, it is better to lose one's life and be obliterated instead of becoming a victim of humiliation, dishonour and destruction. With these words I support wholeheartedly the statement, the contemplated action contained it and the spirit of the statement which the Prime Minister has made in the House.

شرعی مودالغائی (پنجاب) :

وائس چورمین صاحب - اس میں
ہو رہے تھے کہ جب سے ہم نے ملک
کے دو تارے کئے پاکستان نے ہمیشہ
ایسا رویہ اختیار کیا جسے - صالحانہ
نہیں کہا جاسکتا - شروع سے جب
کشمیر کے ایک حصہ پر پاکستان کے
کچھ لٹائوں نے قبضہ کر لیا تھا اور
اس وقت ہمارے فوجیں جب ایک
دوسرے کے سامنے آہٹیں تھیں اور وہ
بڑھتی چلی جا رہی تھیں تو میں
ایسے موقع پر جب کہ ہمارے فوجیں
کام یاب ہو سکتی تھیں ہم نے سب
لائر مانا اور وہ حصہ جو پاکستان

کے قبضہ میں تھا اس کو ہم واپس
نے لے پائے - اس کے بعد یہ در یہ
چاہہ وہ ناگاہک ہو چاہے کوئی اور
ہاؤز ہو - پاکستان کی سرگرمیاں ہمارے
پار پار ملک کے دونوں ہاؤزوں کے
سامنے آتی رہیں کہ وہ ناگاہکوں کو
کس طرح سے اٹھاتے ہیں - آج
ہمارے سرگرم کہتی ہیں کہ یہ ایک
ایسا موقع آیا ہے جب ہمیں کو
ایک ہونا چاہئے کہ ہمیں کچھ کا
ملاقات پاکستان والوں نے چھپی لیا ہے -
پاکستان والوں نے آزاد کشمیر کے نام سے
ہم سے ملکہ چھپنا پاکستان والے ناگاؤں
کو ہمارے خلاف اٹھاتے رہے - پاکستان
والوں نے چاہنا ہے سرگرمیاں کر کے
اس کے ساتھ ایک ایگزیکٹو ملکہ کہا اور
اس کو کچھ حصہ دیا اس کشمیر کا
جو ہمارا حصہ تھا - اس وقت کہا
کوئی اندیشہ نہیں تھا یا ملک کو
ایک ہونے کی ضرورت نہیں تھی -
سرگرم اہلی کم ذریعوں کو چھپانے کے لئے
جب بھی ایسا موقع آتا ہے سارے
ملک پر ایک چاند گرنا چاہتی اور
چاند کوٹنا چاہتی ہے - یہ کہہ کر کہ
اس وقت ملک کو ایک ہونا چاہئے -
میں ہونچکا ہوں کہ جب ملک کو
ایک نہیں ہونا چاہئے - کب یہ
سہرت بھدا نہیں ہونی چاہئے -

میں نے دیوان صاحب کی تقریر
کو اور گورنمنٹ - وائی جی کی تقریر
کو بڑے دھیان سے سنا - وہ کہتے

[اشری عید اربعہ]

ہیں کہ پاکستان والوں نے امریکہ کے
ہوئے ہوئے اسلحہ استعمال کئے -
کیروین سوانس جی کہتے ہیں کہ
امریکہ والوں نے ہمارے آٹھ ہائی
نہیں دیا چھٹا کہ پاکستان کو دیا گیا
آٹھ - کچھ زیادہ دیا توڑا سا -
میں پوچھتا چاہتا ہوں کہ دیوان
صاحب بڑے زور میں آئے لیکن کہا
کہا کہ امریکہ کے تئیں ہمارا ہرناؤ کہا
ہونا چاہئے - اور پاکستان کے متعلق
جس نے ایگریمنٹ کر کے آج ہمارا
پھر ایک ٹکڑا چھٹا اس کے تئیں
ہمارا کہا روئے ہونا چاہئے - وہاں آکر
بالکل وہی مثال ہمیں کرتے ہیں
دیوان صاحب کہ حضور میری تلخواری
بوجھ دو روزہ ... اس نے کہا روزہ
کہا ... روزہ حضور کی نوکری کروں
گا - آج آپ کہتے ہیں کہ نان
اٹلیٹ کی ہماری پالیسی ہے - پھر
جانب دارانہ ہماری پالیسی ہے پھر
آپ توقع کہوں کرتے ہیں کہ امریکہ
آپ کو اسلحہ دے -؟ پھر آپ توقع
کہوں کرتے ہیں کہ امریکہ آپ کی
صافقت دے - اگر آپ پھر جانب دار
ہیں تو آپ کو اس بات کے لئے
تیار ہونا چاہئے کہ آپ اپنے اندر
شکری پیدا کریں - آپ اپنی آنکھیں
کھولیں - مگر سرکار نے ابھی تک
اپنی آنکھیں نہیں کھولیں - میں
سرکار سے پوچھتا چاہتا ہوں کہ ۲۱

مارچ کو اسی سن ۶۵ میں تھوڑے تھوڑے
اُسی آپ ختم کرتے ہیں اور ان کو
جواب دیتے ہیں کہ جاؤ تمہارے لئے
ہمارے پاس کرنی چکے نہیں ہے اور
۲۵ اپریل کو پھر ان کو بلاتے ہیں -
کہا دنیا کی کوئی سرکار ایسی ہو
سکتی ہے -؟ اگر میں نکسی کہوں
تو کہیں کے اس وقت نکسی نہیں
کہتا چاہئے - ہم کو یہ کہنا چاہئے
کہ حضور ہم آپ کے پوچھتے ہیں -
ہم آگے کہتے ہو سکتے ہیں - ہم تو
پوچھتے ہی رہیں گے - لیکن میں
پوچھتا ہوں کہ کیا کوئی سرکار ایسی
نکسی ہو سکتی ہے جو اتنا ہی نہ
بہانہ کہ پاکستان کی نعمت کیا ہے
وہ کس طرح ہمارے باؤر ہر کو ہو
کرنا چاہتا ہے - اور وہ کس طرح
چھین کے ساتھ مل کر اس وقت
ہمیں ہلکے سے مل کرنا چاہتا ہے -
اگر ہماری آنکھیں کھلی تھیں اور ہم
یہ جانتے تھے کہ ۲۵ دن کے بعد پھر
ہمیں اپنی تھوڑے تھوڑے اُسی کو واپس
بلانا ہے تو پھر میں پوچھتا ہوں کہ ان
کو کہوں جواب دیا گیا - کہا آپ کو
دس دن یا پندرہ دن پہلے بھی یہ
پتہ نہیں تھا کہ دیہے میں کہا
بہتا آئے والی ہے - اگر آپ سلسلہ
میں دیہے کے لئے اور ہمارے ہوائی
سلسلہ جو ہمارے ساتھی ہیں وہ
سلسلہ میں دیہے کے لئے تو ان کو
چاہئے تھا کہ وہ اپنی ذرا بات کو قائم

رکھتے جب ان سے ایک بھول ہوئی اور جب ان کے سرور رساں دستوں نے ان کو نہیں بلایا کہ پاکستان کچھ نہیں کھا کرتے جا رہا ہے اور جب ان کے ہوائی چھانڑوں نے بھی ان کی راہ نمائی نہیں کی - بہادر سپاہیوں کی بہادری تو دھ کی ہی - اور ان کی جتنی ہم تعریف کریں وہ کم ہے - اور ان کی شہادت کی ہم جتنی چہچا کریں وہ کم ہے لیکن ان کو شہید کروانے سے پہلے کیا ہم نے یہ دیکھا کہ ہم کو وہاں کتنی فوج بھجائی ہے - اگر پاکستان کی طرف سے فوج بڑھ رہی ہے یا اس کی طاقت آگے چلی آ رہی ہے تو کیا ہم نے اپنے سپاہیوں سے یہ کہا کہ ہم تمہاری مدد میں آ رہے ہیں جو شہادت ہوئی وہ تھیک ہے - خدا ان کو بہت عزت دے - وہ بہادر تھے اور انہوں نے بہادری دکھائی لیکن ہم نے ان کی بہادری کی کتنی قدر کی اور کتنی طاقت ہم نے وقت پر بھجی ہے -

میں سمجھتا تھا کہ لال بہادر شاستری جی اس وقت ریٹائر ہو گئے اور اپنی سرکار کو ریٹائر کرانے گئے اور یہاں ایک نیشنل گورنمنٹ بلانٹس گئے تاکہ ملک میں اعتماد پیدا ہو تاکہ ملک میں نیک جہتی آئے تاکہ ملک یہ سمجھ پائے کہ اس وقت اس کو کیا ضرورت ہے - شاستری جی نے جوش میں آ کر لوگ سمجھا میں یہ کہہ دیا

کہ مٹھی بھر ممبروں کے ہونٹوں پر کیا ہماری سرکار اپنا کام کاج چھوڑ دے گی - میں سمجھتا ہوں یہ ان کی فطرت کے خلاف تھا کہ انہوں نے ایسا کہا کیوں کہ انہیں جاننا چاہئے کہ ان میں وہ بھی ہیں جو ان سے کہیں سینئر ہیں - آچاریہ جے - بی کرپلائی ان میں تھے ڈاکٹر رام منوہر لوبھیا ان میں تھے اور دوسرے بڑے بڑے نہتہ نانو پٹی جی وغیرہ بھی ان میں تھے وہ بھی دیس کے اگلے ہی ہتھشی ہیں جتنے لال بہادر شاستری جی ہیں - کانگریس والوں کو یہ گمان ہو گیا ہے کہ حب الوطنی وطن کی محبت اور وطن کے ساتھ پیار صرف کانگریس والوں کے لئے وقف ہو گیا ہے اور کسی کے لئے وقف نہیں ہے - اگر آپ یہ دھمکی دینے کی کوشش کریں گے کہ مٹھی بھر لوگ کریٹیسائنز کرتے ہیں تو ان کی کیا قیمت ہے - میں کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ اسپرٹ اچھی نہیں ہے - مٹھی بھر لوگ اپنی جان پر کھیل سکتے ہیں - اور اس ملک کو یہ بتا سکتے ہیں کہ اس وقت جو یہ حکومت ہے اسکو بدلنا چاہئے اور ایک پارٹی گورنمنٹ اس وقت ملک میں نہیں رہتی چاہئے - اس لئے کہ آج ہمارے جو ساتھی ہیں جیسے اے - سی ملی صاحب نے کہا کہ کہاں ہیں ناصر کہاں ہیں اور ملک جو ہمارے ساتھی ہیں - آج وہ کیوں نہیں پکارتے ہیں کہوں نہیں آج وہ اپنے والٹور ہمیں دیتے ہیں کہ ہمارا پاکستان کے ساتھ مقابلہ جو ہے وہ

[شری عبدالغنی]

دنیا کے تمام متحبان وطن کا ہے - کہوں
کا ہے - کہوں کہ صرف ایک P.M.

مملدوستان کا سوال یہیں
ہے - کل کو آپ کو پھر امریکہ
سے مدد لینی ہے آپ کو کل اس سے
ہی غلہ خریدنا ہے - آپ مستحضر ہیں
کہ غلہ اس سے خریدیں - تو آپ
سوچیں کہ کہوں امریکہ کی یہ
پالیسی ہوئی کہ وہ ہمارے مقابلہ
میں ان لوگوں کو جو کہ چائنا کے ساتھ
جا رہے ہیں مدد کر رہا ہے - مگر آپ
کی سمجھ اس طرف نہیں جاتی -
آپ بھی سوچئے پھر مستحضر ہیں کہ
صرف کانگریس ہے جس کو کہ گدی پر
رہنا کا اندیشہ ہے - تو میں سمجھتا
ہوں کہ آپ دیس کے ساتھ اٹھائے کر رہے
ہیں - ابراہم سہت کہہ سکتے ہیں
کہ سب دیس آپ کے پیچھے ہے -
تھیک ہے دیس پیچھے ہے لیکن دیس
میں کتنی جان آپ نے چھوڑی ہے -
دیس میں کتنا مارا آپ نے چھوڑا
ہے - سہاہوں کا مارا بلند ہے یہ
میں مانتا ہوں - آپ کا بھی مارا
بلند ہے یہ بھی میں مانتا ہوں لیکن
آپ کو یہ سمجھنا چاہئے کہ آج آپ
دیس کو ایسی نوبت پر ایسی حالت
پر ایسی حد تک لے آئے ہیں کہ دیس
کے اندر یہ ہچچان ایک دم پیدا نہیں
ہوتا پاکستان کے خلاف جس نے کہ
لمبریشن کیا ہے جو کہ ظلم پر ظلم کر
رہا ہے اس کے خلاف کیوں آواز نہیں

آتی - اس کا ایک کارن ہے اور کارن یہ
ہے کہ زپ نے کشمیر کے معاملہ میں
جو کیا وہ سامنے ہے - ہمارے بھائی
دیوان چمن لال فرماتے ہیں کہ کوشنا
میلن نے جا کر صاف صاف کہا - کہا
خاک صاف کہا - آپ نے خود کشمیر
کو ایک الگ سمجھا - اس کو
مملدوستان کا ایک ٹکڑا نہیں سمجھتے
رہے آپ انہیں میں - اپنی روایات
میں اپنے ہر بل میں کشمیر
کو باقی مملدوستان سے الگ سمجھا
حالانکہ یہ ایک حقیقت تھی
کہ کشمیر ہمارا تھا - اگر کشمیر
ہمارا تھا تو پ نے ایسی دورنگی
پالیسی کہوں اختیار کی - مگر
آپ نے دورنگی پالیسی اختیار کی -
تو پاکستان نے یہ سمجھا دنیا والے
یہ سمجھے کہ آپ کی پالیسی فاصلہ
کو پالیسی نہیں ہے آپ صرف یہ
کہہ کر ایک دھشت ملک میں پیدا
کرتے ہیں - کہ اندھیر چھا گیا ہے -
کہا اندھیر چھا گیا ہے - کہا اندھیر ہے -
اگر مقابلہ کرنا ہے تو مقابلہ کرنا
ہے اور اس میں کوئی لہوزیشن والے
جو یہاں بیٹھے یا باہر موجود ہیں
ان میں سے کوئی پیچھے نہیں رہے
گا - لیکن آپ نے لہوزیشن کو کتنا
اعتماد میں لینے کی کوشش کی -
آپ یہ بھی بتانے کو تیار نہیں
ہیں کہ انگلینڈ کیا چاہتا ہے -
انگلینڈ کے پرائم منسٹر کیا چاہتے
ہیں - کیونکہ آپ کہتے ہیں یہ

دیس کے ہت میں نہیں ہے - اگر
 دیس کے ہت میں نہیں ہے تو یہ
 بات صاف ہے کہ سیز فائر کیا ہے
 سوائے اس کے جو ساک ہم نے چائنا
 کے بارے میں سیز فائر مانا -
 اور تمام وہ علاقہ جو ہمارا ہے جو
 ہمارا تھا جس پر ہمارا انگریز ہے
 اس کو ہم واپس نہیں لے پائے -
 کیا سیز فائر کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ
 کہ پاکستان نے ظالمانہ طور پر چائنا
 کچھ کا علاقہ چھینا ہے یا آگے اور
 کسی طرح وہ جو بڑھے اس سے
 ہم پیچھے ہٹ جائیں - چائنا
 کا ہم نے کہا کہا کہ اس نے ہمارے
 علاقہ پر قبضہ کر لیا ہے - اگر قبضہ
 کر لیا ہے تو اس علاقہ کو واپس
 لے لیا ہمارا کام ہے ہمارا دھرم ہے ہمارا
 ایمان ہے - ہمیں ملک کی ایک
 ایک انچ زمین کو چاہے وہ پاکستان
 کے قبضہ میں ہو چاہے چائنا کے
 قبضہ میں ہو واپس لے لیا ہے - یا
 چاہے پاکستان ناکا کے نام سے یا
 کسی اور نام سے آگے بڑھنے کی کوشش
 کرے تو اسے پیچھے ہٹانا ہے - ہمیں
 اپنے ملک کی ایک ایک انچ زمین
 کو واپس لینا ہے - اگر ہم ایسا
 کریں تو میں مانتا ہوں کہ وہ ایک
 اسدہرت ہے اور آپ کو مہن دینے کی
 ضرورت ہے اور اس کے لئے ملک کو
 سوچنا چاہئے ورنہ ہم کہیں گے کہ
 لال بہادر شاستری نے اپنی شان کو

قائم نہیں رکھا - دیکھو کا ایک
 ایکسیڈنٹ ہوا ایک حادثہ ہوا
 جس سے ان کا سہنہا تعلق نہیں
 تھا لیکن اس وقت انہوں نے ریزون
 کیا - تو کیا وہ محسوس نہیں کرتے
 کہ ان کے عہد حکومت میں ایک
 طرف پاکستان نے یہ حملہ کر کے
 ان کو تکلیف پہنچائی - دیس کو
 اس سے تکلیف پہنچی ہے - کیا
 انہوں نے یہ محسوس نہیں کیا کہ
 کہیں ان کا وزیراعلیٰ اسٹاف جو ہے
 اس میں کسی ہے کہیں ان کے فارن
 منسٹر جو ہیں ان کی سمجھ بوجھ
 میں کمی ہے - کیا انہوں نے یہ
 محسوس نہیں کیا کہ ٹیریٹوریل
 آرمی جس نے توڑی اس کی سمجھ
 میں کوئی فرق ہے - اگر ان کی
 حکومت میں اتنی ترقی ہے تو
 ان کو اپنے آپ پر غور کرنا چاہئے -
 اپنے دیس سے جو ان کو پریم ہے
 اس کی بنا پر انہیں غور کرنا چاہئے
 کہ کیا ایک نیشنل گورنمنٹ کی
 ضرورت ہے یا صرف ایک پارٹی گورنمنٹ
 کی ضرورت ہے - میں مانتا ہوں کہ
 آپ کی اکثریت ہے - وائس چیرمین
 صاحب - اس میں مجھے کوئی
 اعتراض نہیں ہے کہ کانگریس کی
 پارٹی کی اکثریت ہے - آج ان کی
 زیادہ گنتی ہے لیکن زیادہ گنتی سے
 دنیا میں کوئی چھٹا نہیں کرتا -
 زیادہ گنتی سے کوئی دنیا میں فتح
 حاصل نہیں کرتا - وہ تو قوت سے

[شری جی.الغنی]

ایمان سے اسہرت سے جس میں کہ آدمی اپنی قربانی کر کے اپنی جان کو ہتھیلی پر رکھ کر آگے بڑھتے ہیں اس میں ہوتی ہے۔ اگر اس طرح کریں گے۔ اس طرح ملک کو بڑھائیں گے۔ ملک کو اعتماد میں لیں گے اپوزیشن پارٹیوں کو اپنی ساتھ میں ملائیں گے تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہم نہ صرف پاکستان اور چین کا سامنا کریں گے بلکہ اگر ہمیں ضرورت پڑے گی تو ہم ہر شخص کا ہر ملک کا ہم سے مقابلہ کر سکیں گے۔ جو بھی بھارت کی طرف بری آنکھ سے دیکھے گا اس کی آنکھ نکالنے میں ہم کوئی کسر نہیں چھوڑیں گے لیکن اگر اس کے معنی یہی ہیں کہ آپ صرف ایمرجنسی کا نام لے کر ایک تماشہ کریں تو کچھ نہیں ہوگا۔ آپ نے پہلے بھی ایک تماشہ کیا تھا وہ تماشہ مٹری آنکھوں کے سامنے ہے جب کہ آپ نے سارے دیس والوں سے کہا کہ سونے کی بالیاں دو۔ سونے کے زیورات دو سونے کی گھڑیاں دو۔ سونا دو یہ دو وہ دو۔ وہ مجھے بھولا نہیں ہے لیکن اس کا نتیجہ کیا ہے۔ کہاں تک ہم آگے بڑھے ہیں۔ اگر آپ اس طرح سے کرتے رہے تو مجھے قہر ہے کہ چاہے ابراہیم سیتھ ہوں یا کوئی اور میں جو کہ کہتے ہیں کہ بھارت۔ ہم آپ کے پیچھے ہیں۔

بالکل ایک تماشہ بن کر رہ جائے گا۔ آپ کا کھا تماشہ بنے گا اس سے تو ملک کا نقصان ہوگا۔ اس لئے حکومت سوچے کہ آپ سے سینڈی لوگ بھی جو یہاں بیٹھے ہیں ان کو اعتماد میں لے۔ آپ کے برابر کے جو لوگ یہاں بیٹھے ہیں ان کو اعتماد میں لے۔ آپ سے قربانی کرنے والے لوگ یہاں بیٹھے ہیں ان کو اپنے ساتھ ملاویں۔ آپ سے زیادہ دلیر لوگ یہاں بیٹھے ہیں ان کو آپ موقع دیں کہ دیس کو آگے لے جاویں۔

وائس چیرمین صاحب۔ اس موقع پر صرف ایک عرض کر کے بیٹھ جاؤں گا۔ یہ اپنی آنکھیں بند کرنا ہوگا اگر آپ یہ سوچیں کہ پاکستان والوں نے جو یہ شرارت کی ہے اسکے بعد اور کوئی شرارت نہیں کریں گے اس کے بعد کوئی ظالمانہ کارروائی نہیں کریں گے۔ ایسا جو خیال کرنا ہے وہ اسی طرح ہے جیسے کہ کبوتر آنکھ میچ لہتا ہے۔ یہ خیال کرنا کہ چھن والے ہمیں اور زیادہ اکانامی تباہ کرنے کے لئے اور ہم میں دہشت پیدا کرنے کے لئے آگے نہیں بڑھیں گے تو وہ عقل مند کی بات نہیں ہے بلکہ کہوتر کی طرح آنکھ میچنے والی بات ہے۔ تو جب یہ حالت ہے تب ملک کو اسی

طرح تیار کریں جس طرح کہ
سہاہی کو تیار کرتے ہیں۔ اگر آپ
اس کو اس طرح تیار نہیں کرتے تو
میں آپ کو یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ
جو مورخ ہے وہ آپ کو کبھی معاف
نہیں کریگا اور وہ کہے گا کہ ایسے
موقعہ پر جب کہ تھاگ دیکھا لے کی
ضرورت تھی سارے ملک کو اپنے ساتھ
ملا لے کی ضرورت تھی تب آپ نے
ایسا نہیں کیا۔ آپ نے ملک کے
ساتھ بے انصافی کی اور جب ہم ایک
ہو کر مقابلہ کر سکتے تھے تب جان
بوجھ کر آپ نے اس موقعہ کو کھو
دیا۔

†[श्री अब्दुल रानी (पंजाब) : वार्डस
चेयरमैन साहब, इस में दो राय नहीं कि जब
से हमने मुल्क के दो टुकड़े किये पाकिस्तान
ने हमेशा ऐसा रवैया अख्तियार किया जिसे
मसालहाना नहीं कहा जा सकता । शुरू
से जब काश्मीर के एक हिस्से पर पाकिस्तान
के कुछ कबालियों ने कब्जा कर लिया था
और उस वक्त हमारी फौजें जब एक दूसरे
के सामने हुई थीं और वह बढ़ती चली जा
रही थीं तो ऐन ऐसे मौके पर जबकि हमारी
फौजें कामयाब हो सकती थीं हमने सीज फा-
यर माना और वह हिस्सा जो पाकिस्तान के
कब्जे में था उस को हम वापिस न ले पाए ।
इस के बाद पै-दर-पै चाहे वह नागालैण्ड हो
चाहे कोई और बार्डर हो, पाकिस्तान की सर-
पमियां बार बार पार्लियामेंट के दोनों हाऊसों
के सामने आती रहीं कि वह नागा लोगों को
किस तरह से उकसाते हैं । आज हमारी
सरकार यह कहती है कि यह एक ऐसा बड़ा
मौका आया है जब देश को एक होना चाहिए
क्योंकि कच्छ का इलाका पाकिस्तान वालों
ने छीन लिया है । पाकिस्तान वालों ने
आजाद काश्मीर के नाम से हमसे इलाका

†[] Hindi transliteration.

छीना, पाकिस्तान वाले नागाओं को हमारे
खिलाफ उकसाते रहे, पाकिस्तान वालों ने
चायना से सरगोशियां करके उस के साथ एक
एग््रीमेंट किया और उस को कुछ हिस्सा
दिया उस काश्मीर का जो हमारा हिस्सा
था । उस वक्त क्या कोई अंधेर नहीं था
या मुल्क को एक होने की जरूरत नहीं थी ।
सरकार अपनी कमजोरियों को छिपाने के
लिये जब भी ऐसा मौका आता है सारे मुल्क
पर एक जादू करना चाहती है और
जादू करना चाहती है, यह कहकर
कि इस वक्त मुल्क को एक होना चाहिए ।
मैं पूछता हूं कि कब मुल्क को एक नहीं होना
चाहिए । कब यह स्प्रिट पैदा नहीं होनी
चाहिए ? मैं ने दीवान साहब की तकरीर
को और गुरुपाद स्वामी जी की तकरीर को
बड़े ध्यान से सुना । वह कहते हैं कि पाकि-
स्तान वालों ने अमरीका के दिए हुए असला
इस्तेमाल किए । गुरुपाद स्वामी जी कहते हैं
कि अमरीका वालों ने हमें आधा भी नहीं दिया
जितना कि पाकिस्तान को दिया या आधे से
कुछ ज्यादा दिया, दिया थोड़ा सा । मैं पूछना
चाहता हूं कि दीवान साहब बड़े जोर में आए
लेकिन कहा क्या कि अमरीका के तइयें हमारा
बरताव क्या होना चाहिए, और पाकिस्तान
के मुत्तल्लक जिस ने एग््रेसन करके फिर
हमारा एक टुकड़ा छीना उसके तइयें हमारा
क्या रवैया होना चाहिए । वहां आ कर
बिल्कुल वही मिसाल पेश करते हैं दीवान
साहब कि हजूर मेरी तनख्वाह बढ़ा दो वरना...
उस ने कहा वरना क्या ? ... वरना हजर
की नौकरी करूंगा । आज आप कहते हैं कि
नान-अलाइनमेंट की हमारी पालिसी है ।
गैरजानब दाराना हमारी पालिसी है फिर
आप तबकों क्यों करते हैं कि अमरीका आप
को असला दे ? फिर आप तबको क्यों करते
हैं कि अमरीका आप की साइड रहे । अगर
आप गैर-जानब दार हैं तो आप को इस बात
के लिए तैयार होना चाहिए कि आप अपने
अन्दर शक्ति पैदा करें । आप अपनी आंखें
खोलें । मगर सरकार ने अभी तक अपनी

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

आखें नहीं खोलीं। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ३१ मार्च को इसी सन् ६५ में टेरिटोरियल आर्मी आप खत्म करते हैं और उनको जवाब देते हैं कि जाग्रों तुम्हारे लिए हमारे पास कोई जगह नहीं है और २५ अप्रैल को फिर उन को बुलाते हैं। क्या दुनिया की कोई सरकार ऐसी हो सकती है? अगर मैं निकम्मी कहूँ तो कहेंगे इस वक्त निकम्मी नहीं कहना चाहिए। हम को यह कहना चाहिए कि हज़ूर हम आप के पीछे हैं। हम आगे कैसे हो सकते हैं। हम तो पीछे ही रहेंगे। लेकिन मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या कोई सरकार ऐसी निकम्मी हो सकती है जो इतना भी न भापे कि पाकिस्तान की नीयत क्या है। वह किस तरह हमारे बार्डर पर गड़बड़ करना चाहता है। और वह किस तरह चीन के साथ मिल कर इस वक्त हमें ब्लैक-मेल करना चाहता है। अगर हमारी आखें खुली थीं और हम यह जानते थे कि २५ दिन के बाद फिर हमें अपनी टेरिटोरियल आर्मी को वापिस बुलाना है तो फिर मैं पूछता हूँ कि उन को क्यों जवाब दिया गया। क्या आपको दस दिन या पन्द्रह दिन पहले भी यह पता नहीं था कि देश में क्या विपत्ता आने वाली है। अगर आप सीनसियर हैं देश के लिए और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर जो हमारे साथी हैं वह सीनसियर हैं देश के लिए तो उन को चाहिए था कि वह अपनी रवायत को कायम रखते जब उनसे एक भूल हुई और जब उनके सुरास-रसान दस्तों ने उनको नहीं बताया कि पाकिस्तान कच्छ में क्या करने जा रहा है और जब उनके हवाई जहाजों ने भी उनकी रह-नुमाई नहीं की। बहादुर सिपाहियों की बहादुरी तो रहेगी ही। और उन की जितनी हम तारीफ़ करें वह कम है और उन की शहादत की हम जितनी चर्चा करें वह कम है लेकिन उन को शहीद करवाने से पहले क्या हमने यह देखा कि हम को वहां कितनी फौज भेजनी है। अगर पाकिस्तान की तरफ से फौज बढ़ रही है या उसकी ताकत आगे चली आ

रही है तो क्या हमने अपने सिपाहियों से यह कहा कि हम तुम्हारी मदद में आ रहे हैं जो शहादत हुई, वह ठीक है। खुदा उन को बहुत इज्जत दे, वे बहादुर थे और उन्होंने बहादुरी दिखाई लेकिन हमने उनकी बहादुरी की कितनी कदर की और कितनी ताकत हमने वक्त पर भेजी।

मैं समझता था कि लालबहादुर शास्त्री जी इस वक्त रिज़ाइन करेंगे और अपनी सरकार को रिज़ाइन कराएंगे और यहाँ एक नेशनल गवर्नमेंट बनाएंगे ताकि मुल्क में एतमाद पैदा हो, ताकि मुल्क में एकजुती आए ताकि मुल्क यह समझ पाए कि इस वक्त उस को क्या जरूरत है। शास्त्री जी ने जोश में आ कर लोक सभा में यह कह दिया कि मुट्ठी भर मेम्बरों के बोलने पर क्या हमारी सरकार अपना काम-काज छोड़ देगी। मैं समझता हूँ यह उनकी फितरत के खिलाफ था कि उन्होंने ऐसा कहा क्यों कि उन्हें जानना चाहिए कि उन में वे भी हैं जो उन से कहीं सीनियर हैं। आचार्य जे० बी० कृपलानी उन में थे, डाक्टर राम मनोहर लोहिया उन में थे और दूसरे बड़े बड़े नेता नाथपेयी जी वगैरा भी उन में थे, वे भी देश के उतने ही हितैषी हैं जितने लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी हैं। कांग्रेस वालों को यह गुमान हो गया है कि दुबलवतनी वतन की मुहब्बत और वतन के साथ प्यार सिर्फ कांग्रेस वालों के लिए वक्फ हो गया है और किसी के लिए वक्फ नहीं है। अगर आप यह धमकी देने की कोशिश करेंगे कि मुट्ठी भर लोग क्रिटिसाइज़ करते हैं तो उनकी क्या कीमत है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह स्पष्ट अच्छी नहीं है। मुट्ठी भर लोग अपनी जान पर खेल सकते हैं और इस मुल्क को यह बता सकते हैं कि इस वक्त यह जो हुकूमत है उस को बदलना चाहिए और एक पार्टी गवर्नमेंट इस वस्तु मुल्क में नहीं रहनी चाहिए। इसलिए कि आज हमारे जो साथी हैं जैसे ए० डी० मणि साहब ने कहा कि कहाँ है नासिर, कहाँ हैं और मुल्क जो हमारे

साथी हैं ? आज वे क्यों नहीं पुकारते हैं, क्यों नहीं आज वे अपने बालेंटियर हमें देते हैं कि हमारा पाकिस्तान के साथ मुकाबला जो है वह दुनिया के तमाम मायबाने बतन का है। क्योंकि सिर्फ एक हिन्दुस्तान का सवाल नहीं है। कल को आप को फिर अमरीका से मदद लेनी है आप को कल उससे ही गल्ला खरीदना है। आप मजबूर हैं कि गल्ला उससे खरीदें। तो आप सोचें कि क्यों अमरीका की यह पालिसी हुई कि वह हमारे मुकाबले में उन लोगों को जो कि चायना के साथ जा रहे हैं मदद कर रहा है। मगर आप की समझ इस तरफ नहीं जाती। आप यही सोचने पर मजबूर हैं कि सिर्फ कांग्रेस है जिसको कि गद्दी पर रहने का अधिकार है। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आप देश के साथ अन्याय कर रहे हैं। इब्राहीम सेट कह सकते हैं कि सब देश आप के पीछे हैं। ठीक है देश पीछे हैं, लेकिन देश में कितनी जान आप ने छोड़ी है। देश में कितना मारल आप ने छोड़ा है। सिपाहियों का मारल बुलन्द है यह मैं मानता हूँ। आप का भी मारल बुलन्द है यह भी मैं मानता हूँ लेकिन आप को यह समझना चाहिए कि आज आप देश को ऐसी नोबत पर ऐसी हालत पर ऐसी हद तक ले आए हैं कि देश के अन्दर यह हिजान एक दम पैदा नहीं होता। पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ जिसने कि एग्रेसन किया है जो कि जुल्म पर जुल्म कर रहा है उस के खिलाफ क्यों आवाज नहीं उठी। इसका एक कारण है और कारण यह है कि आप ने कश्मीर के मामले में जो किया वह सामने है। हमारे भाई दीवान चमन लाल फरमाते हैं कि कृष्णमेनन ने जा कर साफ साफ कहा। क्या खाक साफ कहा। आप ने खुद कश्मीर को एक अलग समझा। उस को हिन्दुस्तान का एक टुकड़ा नहीं समझते रहे अपने आईन में, अपनी रवायत में, अपने हर बिल में कश्मीर को बाकी हिन्दुस्तान से अलग समझा हालांकि यह एक हकीकत थी कि कश्मीर हमारा था अगर कश्मीर हमारा था तो

आप ने ऐसी दो रंगी पालिसी क्यों अख्तियार की ? मगर आप ने दो रंगी पालिसी अख्तियार की। तो पाकिस्तान ने यह समझा, दुनिया वाले यह समझे कि आप की पालिसी फसला-कुन पालिसी नहीं है। आप सिर्फ यह कह कर एक दहशत मुल्क में पैदा करते हैं कि अंधेर छा गया है। क्या अंधेर छा गया है, क्या अंधेर है ? अगर मुकाबला करना है तो मुकाबला करना है और इस में कोई अपोज़िशन वाले जो यहां बैठे या बाहर मौजूद हैं, उन में से कोई पीछे नहीं रहेगा। लेकिन आप ने अपोज़िशन को कितना एतमाद में लेने की कोशिश की ? आप यह भी बताने को तैयार नहीं हैं कि इंग्लैंड क्या चाहता है। इंग्लैंड के प्राइम मिनिस्टर क्या चाहते हैं। क्योंकि आप कहते हैं यह देश के हित में नहीं है। अगर देश के हित में नहीं है तो यह बात साफ है कि सीज फायर क्या है सिवाए इसके जैसा कि हमने चायना के बारे में सीज फायर माना और तमाम वह इलाका जो हमारा है जो हमारा था जिस पर हमारा अधिकार है उस को हम वापिस नहीं ले पाए। क्या सीज फायर के मायने यही हैं कि पाकिस्तान ने जालिमाना तौर पर जितना कच्छ का इलाका छीना है या आगे और किसी तरह वह जो बड़े इससे हम पीछे हट जाएं। चायना का हम ने क्या किया कि उसने हमारे इलाके पर कब्जा कर लिया है। अगर कब्जा कर लिया है तो उस इलाके को वापस लेना हमारा काम है हमारा धर्म है, हमारा ईमान है। हमें मुल्क की एक एक इंच जमीन की चाहे वह पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में हो, चाहे चायना के कब्जे में हो, वापिस लेना है। या चाहे पाकिस्तान नागा के नाम से या किसी और नाम से आगे बढ़ने की कोशिश करे तो उसे पीछे हटाना है। हमें अपने मुल्क की एक एक इंच जमीन को वापिस लेना है। अगर हम ऐसा करें तो मैं मानता हूँ कि वह एक स्प्रिट है और आप को मदद देने की जरूरत है और इसके लिए मुल्क को सोचना चाहिए वरना हम कहेंगे कि लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने अपनी

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

उस शान को कायम नहीं रखा। रेलवे का एक एक्सिडेंट हुआ एक हादसा हुआ जिससे उन का सीधा ताल्लुक नहीं था लेकिन उस वक़्त उन्होंने रिजाइन किया तो क्या वह महसूस नहीं करते कि उन के अहदे हकूमत में एक तरफ पाकिस्तान ने यह हमला कर के उन को तकलीफ पहुँचाई। देश को इस से तकलीफ पहुँची है। क्या उन्होंने यह महसूस नहीं किया कि कहीं उन का विज़िलेंस स्टाफ जो है उस में कमी है, कहीं उन के फारन मिनिस्टर जो हैं उन की समझबूझ में कमी है, ? क्या उन्होंने यह महसूस नहीं किया कि टेरिटोरियल आर्मी जिस ने तोड़ी उसकी समझ में कोई फर्क है? अगर उनकी हकूमत में इतनी दृष्टि है तो उन को अपने आप पर गौर करना चाहिये। अपने देश से जो उन को प्रेम है, उस की बिना पर उन्हें गौर करना चाहिए कि क्या एक नेशनल गवर्नमेंट की ज़रूरत है, या सिर्फ़ एक पार्टी गवर्नमेंट की ज़रूरत है। मैं मानता हूँ कि आप की अक्सरियत है। वाइस चेयरमैन साहब इस में मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है कि कांग्रेस की पार्टी की अक्सरियत है। आज उन की ज्यादा गिनती है लेकिन ज्यादा गिनती से दुनिया में कोई जीता नहीं करता। ज्यादा गिनती से कोई दुनिया में फतह हासिल नहीं करता। वह तो कूअरत से, ईमान से, लिप्रट से जिस में कि आदमी अपनी कुर्बानी कर के, अपनी जान को हथेली पर रख कर आगे बढ़ते हैं उस में होती है। अगर इस तरह करेंगे, इस तरह मुल्क को बढ़ायेंगे, मुल्क को एतमाद में लेंगे, अपोज़िशन पार्टियों को अपने साथ में मिलाएंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम न सिर्फ़ पाकिस्तान और चीन का सामना करेंगे

बल्कि अगर हमें ज़रूरत पड़ेगी तो हम हर शख्स का हर मुल्क का हिम्मत से मुकाबला कर सकेंगे। जो भी भारत की तरफ बुरी आंख से देखेगा उस की आंख निकालने में हम कोई कसर नहीं छोड़ेंगे, लेकिन अगर इस के मायने यही हैं कि आप सिर्फ़ एमरजेंसी का नाम ले कर एक तमाशा करें तो कुछ नहीं होगा। आप ने पहले भी एक तमाशा किया था वह तमाशा मेरी आंखों के सामने है जब कि आपने सारे देश वालों से कहा कि सोने की बालियां दो, सोने के जवरात दो, सोने की घड़ियां दो, सोना दो, यह दो, वह दो। वह मुझे भूला नहीं है। लेकिन उसका नतीजा आज क्या है? कहां तक हम आगे बढ़े हैं। अगर आप इसी तरह से करते रहे तो मुझे डर है कि चाहे इब्राहीम सेट हों या कोई और हों जो कि कहते हैं कि साहब हम आप के पीछे हैं बिल्कुल एक तमाशा बन कर रह जाएगा। आप का क्या तमाशा बनेगा इस से तो मुल्क का नुकसान होगा। इसलिए हकूमत सोचे कि आप से सीनियर लोग भी जो यहां बैठे हैं उन को एतमाद में ले। आप के बराबर के जो लोग यहां बैठे हैं उन को एतमाद में लें। आप से ज्यादा कुर्बानी करने वाले लोग यहां बैठे हैं उन को अपने साथ मिलावें। आप से ज्यादा दलेर लोग यहां बैठे हैं उन को आप मौका दें कि देश को आगे ले जावें।

वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, इस मौके पर, सिर्फ़ एक अर्ज कर के बैठ जाऊंगा। यह अपनी आंखें बन्द करना होगा अगर आप यह सोचें कि पाकिस्तान वालों ने जो यह शरारत की है उसके बाद और कोई शरारत नहीं करेंगे, इस के बाद कोई जालिमाना कार्रवाई नहीं करेंगे। ऐसा जो ख्याल करना है वह इसी तरह है जैसे कि कबूतर आंख मीच लेता है, यह ख्याल करना कि चीन वाले हमें और ज्यादा एकानामी तबाह करने के लिए और हम में दहशत पैदा करने के लिए आगे नहीं

بہتے تو وہ ابل مندی کی بات نہیں ہے بلکہ کبوتر کی طرح آواز مچانے والی بات ہے۔ تو یہ حال ہے تب ملک کو اسی طرح تیار کریں جس طرح کہ سپاہی کو تیار کرتے ہیں۔ اگر آپ اس کو اس طرح تیار نہیں کرتے تو میں آپ کو یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو مورخ ہے وہ آپ کو کبھی صاف نہیں کرے گا اور وہ کہے گا کہ اسے مائیک پر جب کہ تیار دیکھنے کی ضرورت تھی سارے ملک کو اپنے ساتھ ملانے کی ضرورت تھی تب آپ نے اسے نہیں کیا۔ آپ نے ملک کے ساتھ بددلی کی اور جب ہم ایک ہو کر مقابلہ کر سکتے تھے تب جان بوجھ کر آپ نے اس مائیک کو بند کر دیا۔]

شی جی - ایم - سر: (جموں

اور کشمیر): وائس چیمبر مین صاحب آج صبح جناب وزیر اعظم صاحب نے جو پرستار یہاں پر پیش کیا اور جس اعلان کا مضبوطی کے ساتھ انہوں نے ذکر کیا اس کے لئے میں ان کو دل کی گہرائیوں سے مبارکباد عرض کرتا ہوں۔ اس کے ساتھ ہی میں شاعری جی سے یہ اپیل بھی کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جس اعلان کا ذکر انہوں نے یہاں پر کیا ہے۔ جو اعلان یہاں پر انہوں نے فرمایا ہے اس پر وہ مضبوطی سے قائم رہیں اور یہاں کے ۲۷ کروڑ انسان ہندو مسلمان اور سکھوں کے پچھلے ایک مضبوط چٹان کی طرح تھے وہیں گئے۔ آج یہ ایگریمنٹ جو پاکستان کی طرف سے ہوا ہے یہ آج کا ہی نہیں بلکہ ۱۹۴۷ سے ہے جب کہ پاکستان

نے کشمیر پر حملہ کیا اور اپنی فوجیں بھیجیں۔ اس وقت سے یہ ایگریمنٹ جو وہ شروع ہوا اور آج بھی ہمارے ہندوستان کا بہت سا حصہ پاکستان کے قبضہ میں چلا آ رہا ہے۔

جناب والا۔ میں ابھی ابھی تمام بارڈر سٹرکٹس کا دورہ کر کے آ رہا ہوں۔ پاکستان کے پریذیڈنٹ ایوب خان کے چھن کے دورے کے بعد جو حالت بارڈر پر ہو رہی ہے وہ میں نے اپنی آنکھوں سے دیکھی۔ اس لئے چار پانچ مہینوں سے متواتر پاکستان کی طرف سے بارڈر پر فائرنگ ہوتی رہی ہے۔ کچھ کسانوں کو اور مزدوروں کو کچلا گیا ہے۔ ان کا سب کچھ چھین کر اور مویشیوں کو اٹھا کر لے جایا گیا۔ میں نے کشمیر کے بارڈر پر یہ تمام چیزیں اپنی آنکھوں سے دیکھیں۔ پچھلے چند دنوں سے جب کہ پریذیڈنٹ ایوب چین گیا اور واپس آیا تب سے بارڈر پر فائرنگ تیز کر دی گئی ہے۔ زبردستی بلکرس اور ٹرنکچرز کوٹنے کا کام کیا گیا اور زیادہ سے زیادہ فوج کو بارڈر پر تعینات کیا گیا۔ تو جناب والا۔ اس سے ہمیں اندازہ کرنا ہے اور اس بات کو دیکھنا ہے کہ ایک ایسا واقعہ آ گیا ہے جب ہمیں یہ فیصلہ کرنا ہے کہ ہمارا دشمن کون ہے دوست کون ہے۔ ہم متواتر پچھلے سولہ سالوں سے

[شری جی - ایم - میو]

گلندھی جی کے اس ملک میں ہلڈت جواہر لال کے اس ملک میں تمام دنیا کو شانتی اور امن کا پیغام دیتے آ رہے ہیں۔ ہمارے مستحب نوتا جواہر لال نہرو نے یہ کہا تھا وہ لہو ایڈٹ لٹ دیو، یعنی ہمیں زندہ رہنا اور دوسروں کو بھی زندہ رکھنا ہے۔ لیکن آج ہلڈت سال گذرنے کے بعد ہم اس نتیجہ پر پہنچے ہیں کہ اب بھی یہ فیصلہ کرنا رہ گیا کہ ہمارا دوسرا کون ہے ہمارا دشمن کون ہے؟

جناب والا - ہمارے کچھ ہائر پر پچھلے دنوں پاکستان نے جو حملہ کیا ایگریشن کیا یہ بالکل دنیا کے سامنے عیاں ہے۔ امریکہ اور برطانیہ اس کو جانتے ہیں۔ وہ ملک جنہوں نے پاکستان کو آرمس ایڈٹ امریکنیشن دئے جنہوں نے ٹیلکس اور ہوائی جہاز دئے مشین گنز دیے۔ آج ان کے بھی ہوائی جہاز وہی ٹیلک ہمارے جوانوں کی چھائی کو چھائی کرتے دکھائی دیتے ہیں۔ جب اس کا ثبوت دیا گیا تو مجھے الموس کے ساتھ کہنا پوتا ہے کہ جو ملک ہمارے ساتھ دوستی کا دعوہ کرتے تھے وہ آج چپ بھٹے ہیں۔ امریکہ کی طرف سے اس نہتہ ایگریشن کو کہوں نہیں کڈم کیا گیا۔ دوسرے ممالک نے اس کو کہوں نہیں کڈم

کیا۔ اور آرمس ایڈٹ ایگریشن جو کمیونسٹ چائلز کے خلاف استعمال ہونے لگے وہ آج ہمارے جوانوں کی چھائی کو چھائی بنا رہے ہیں۔ آج ہمارے جوانوں کے اوپر وہ گولیاں وہ ٹیلک استعمال کئے جا رہے ہیں تو میں آج اس ملک کے رہنے والوں سے کہوں گا کہ آج ہم اپنے پیاروں کے اوپر کھڑے ہیں۔ ہماری فوجیں جن کے اوپر ہمیں پورا بھروسہ ہے۔ جنہوں نے اپنی جوانی مردی کا بہادری کا ثبوت دیا ہے اور تکلیف اور مشکلات میں رہ کر گولیاں کھائی ہیں۔ آج ہمیں اس پر پورا بھروسہ ہونا چاہئے۔ آج اگر پاکستان امریکہ کے ٹیلک اور دوسرے سازوسامان استعمال کر رہا ہے۔ تو ہمارے فوجوں پر بھی کوئی دستبرد نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔

جناب والا - میں یہ چاہوں گا کہ جہاں ہم آج اس معزز ایوان میں اپنے ملک کی حالت پر بحث کرنے کے لئے یہاں اکٹھے ہوئے ہیں تو آج اس ایوان میں ہم اپنے ان بہادر جوانوں کو جنہوں نے قوم کی رکشا کے لئے ہندوستان کی سالمیت کے لئے ہندوستان کی انگریزیت کے لئے ہندوستان کی سولہریوں کے لئے ہندوستان کی عزت اور عظمت کو اونچا رکھنے کے لئے اس ترنگے کو اونچا رکھنے کے لئے جس کے نیچے ہم

انے ملک کو غلامی سے نجات دلائی -
 آج جن دوستوں نے، جوانوں نے اس
 کے لئے اپنی جانیں قربان کیں یہ
 ملک کی خاطر شہید ہوئے انہی ہم
 ان کو شردھالجاتی پڑھی کریں -
 مبارکباد دیں - پاکستان کوئی
 بہت بڑا ملک نہیں - ہم نے تو
 سب کے آگے دوستی کا ہاتھ بڑھایا ہے -
 ہم نے پڑوسی ممالک کے ساتھ
 چاہے وہ کمیونسٹ چاہے وہ
 چاہے کوئی اور ہو دوستی
 کا ہاتھ بڑھایا اور ہماری یہ کوشش
 رہی کہ ہم امن اور شانتی کا وہ پیغام
 جو ہمارے محبوب جواہر لال جی
 نے دیا اس کو ساری دنیا کے سامنے
 پہنچائیں - ہم پاکستان کے ساتھ لونا
 نہیں چاہتے ہیں ہم نہیں چاہتے
 پاکستان کے لوگوں سے ہمارا جھگڑا ہو -
 ہمارا جھگڑا تو پاکستان کے ان لہجروں کے
 ساتھ ہے جو ملگروں کا کٹھنڈرپ قائم
 کرتے ہیں - جو چاہتے ہیں ایشیا
 میں حالت خراب ہو - بد قسمتی
 سے ایسے ملکوں کے ساتھ ہمارا واسطہ
 پڑا کہ ایک طرف چین ہے جو کسی
 بھی اصول کی پروا نہیں کرتا جو
 انٹرنیشنل لا کی پروا نہیں کرتا -
 جو کسی مذہب کو نہیں مانتا اور
 ایک طرف پاکستان ہے جو اس ملک
 کے ساتھ گٹھ جوڑ کرتا ہے جو کہ
 مذہب کے خلاف ہے - آج اس کا
 پاکستان کے ساتھ گٹھ جوڑ یہ صاف
 ظاہر کرتا ہے کہ ہمیں دو غیر اصول

والے ممالک سے واسطہ پڑا ہے - ن
 پرنسپل ممالک سے واسطہ پڑا ہے -
 اس لئے یہ جو میڈیج آف کلویٹس
 آپ سمجھ لیتے ہیں جو کہ پاکستان
 اور چین کے بیچ ہیں - یہ
 ہمارے لئے آئی آپر ہونا چاہئے -
 پلڈت جی جب زندہ تھے تب ایک
 دفعہ لہات علی خاں کی طرف
 سے دھمکی دی گئی تھی کہ ہم
 ہندوستان کے ساتھ جنگ کریں گے تو
 پلڈت جی نے جواب دیا تھا - It will

be fought on the soil of Pakistan and
 not on the soil of India"

آج ہمارا وہ حصہ جو برسوں سے
 ہمارے ملک کے ساتھ چلا آ رہا ہے
 جسے برطانیہ اچھی طرح سے جانتا
 ہے جسے انگلینڈ والے اچھی طرح
 سے جانتے ہیں اور ہمارے پڑی
 پارٹیشن کے نقشہ میں دیکھ لیتے
 اس سے ثابت ہو جاتا ہے کہ ہماری
 تقریریں ہیں لیکن آج ہمارے سیکریٹ
 سوائل پر ایک ہاک اور صاف زمین
 کے اندر جنگ چل رہی ہے - تو ہم
 چپ نہیں رہ سکتے

میں اس معزز ایوان کو اور اس
 ایوان کے ذریعہ اور آپ کے ذریعہ
 جناب شاستری جی کی حکومت کو
 یقین دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان
 کے مسلمان عموماً اور جموں اور کشمیر
 کے مسلمان خصوصاً ایک ایک انچ
 زمین کے لئے مرنے کو تیار ہیں -
 آپ کے حوالہ دیتے رہیں گے -

[شری جی - ایم - میہر]
 ہم لڑنے کے لئے تیار ہیں - اس لئے
 کہ پاکستان ایک بے اصول ملک ہے
 اس لئے کہ پاکستان نے ہمارے مدر
 لہندہ پر ہمارے مادر وطن پر حملہ
 کیا ہے اور اب ضرورت اس بات کی
 ہے کہ چھوٹے موٹے تفرقات کو ختم
 کریں - قیفرینسیز کو سلک کریں -
 چاہے لیلنگویج ہو چاہے پارٹی پالٹیکس
 کا جھگڑا ہو سب کو ختم کر دیں -
 فنی صاحب کی تقریر میں سن رہا
 تھا - انہوں نے کہا کہ شاستری جی
 نے استعفی دے دیا تھا جب کوئی
 ایک ریل ایکسیڈنٹ ہوا تھا -
 جناب - یہ معاملہ استعفی دینے
 سے حل نہیں ہوتا چوں اور پاکستان
 کا معاملہ شاستری جی کے استعفی
 دینے سے حل نہیں ہوتا - شاستری
 جی نے ایک شاندار قدم اٹھایا ہے -
 ایک مضبوط پالہسی کا اعلان کیا ہے
 جو اس بات کی ترجمانی کرتا ہے کہ
 ہمارے نیتا مضبوط ہیں - انہوں نے
 صحیح قدم اٹھایا ہے - بجائے اس
 کے کہ اپوزیشن پارٹیاں یہ کہیں کہ
 ہمیں دعوت دی جائے ہم شامل ہوں - آج
 اپوزیشن کا کام ہے کہ شاستری جی کے ہاتھ
 کو، حکومت کے ہاتھ کو اور اپنی فوج
 کے ہاتھ کو مضبوط کریں - لاکھوں
 آدمی ایک ایک فلیڈ میں فیکٹری
 میں کام کر کے ہر دیکھنے کو بڑھائیں
 تب ہمارے اوپر جو حملہ ہو رہا ہے
 جو حملہ ہے اس کا ہم مقابلہ کر سکتے

ہیں - حالانکہ یہ سچ ہے کہ ہم
 نے جو پالہسی بنائی ہے وہ نان
 واٹمس کی پالہسی ہے -

آخر میں ایک شعر سنا کر ختم
 کرنا چاہتا ہوں -

میں تجھ کو بتاتا ہوں تقدیر امم کہا ہے
 شمشیر و سنان اول غاوس و رباب آخر

اتنا کہہ کر میں اس تحریر کو
 سہورٹ کرتا ہوں جو شاستری جی نے
 اعلان فرمائی - میں اپیل کرنا
 تمام ملک کے رہنے والوں سے کہ آپ
 ایک ہو جائیں - یہ جو چین اور
 پاکستان کا ہمارے اوپر حملہ ہو رہا
 ہے دونوں اصول والے ملک ہمارے
 ساتھ لڑنے کے لئے تیار بیٹھے ہیں -
 ہمیں اس کا مقابلہ کرنے کے لئے ایک
 ہو جانا چاہئے -

†[श्री जी एम० मीर (जम्मू और
 काश्मीर): वाइस चयरमैन साहब, आज
 सुबह जना वजीरे आजम साहब ने जो
 प्रस्ताव यहां पर पेश किया और जिस
 एलान का मजबूती के साथ उन्होंने जिकर
 किया उस के लिए मैं उन को दिल की
 गहराइयों से मुबारकवाद अर्ज करता हूं।
 इस के साथ ही मैं शास्त्री जी से यह अपील
 भी करना चाहता हूं कि जिस एलान
 का जिकर उन्होंने यहां पर किया है जो
 एलान यहां पर उन्होंने फरमाया है उस
 पर वह मजबूती से कायम रहें और यहां
 के 47 करोड़ इन्सान हिन्दु, मुसलमान
 और सिख उन के पीछे एक मजबूत चटान
 की तरह डटे रहेंगे। आज यह एप्रेशन

†[Hindi translation.

जो पाकिस्तान की तरफ से हुआ है यह आज का ही नहीं बल्कि १९४७ ई० से है जब कि पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर पर हमला किया और अपनी फौजें भेजीं। उस वक्त से यह एग्रेसन जो है वह शुरू हुआ और आज भी हमारे मुल्क का, हमारे हिन्दुस्तान का बहुत सा हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में चला आ रहा है।

जनाब वाला, मैं अभी अभी तमाम बार्डर डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स का दौरा करके आ रहा हूँ। पाकिस्तान के प्रेसिडेंट अयूब खाँ के चीन के दौरे के बाद जो हालत बार्डर पर हो रही है वह मैंने अपनी आँखों से देखी। इसलिए चार या पाँच महीनों से मुतवातर पाकिस्तान की तरफ से बार्डर पर फायरिंग होती रही है। कुछ किसानों को और मजदूरों को कुचला गया है। उन का सब कुछ छीन कर और भवेशियों को उठा कर ले जाया गया। मैंने काश्मीर के बार्डर पर यह तमाम चीजें अपनी आँखों से देखीं। पिछले चन्द दिनों से जब कि प्रेसिडेंट अयूब चीन गया और वापिस आया तब से बार्डर पर फायरिंग तेज कर दी गई। बड़े जबरदस्त बंकरस और ड्रेचिज खोदने का काम किया गया और जयादा से ज्यादा फौज को बार्डर पर तैनात किया गया। तो जनाब वाला, इस से हमें अन्दाजा करना है और इस बात को देखना है कि एक ऐसा वक्त आ गया है जब हमें यह फैसला करना है कि हमारा दुश्मन कौन है दोस्त कौन है। हम मुतवातर पिछले १६ सालों से गांधी जी के उस मुल्क में, पंडित जवाहरलाल के उस मुल्क में तमाम दुनिया को शान्ती और अमन का पैगाम देते आ रहे हैं। हमारे महबूब नेता जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने यह कहा था। "लिव एण्ड लेट लिव" यानी हमें जिन्दा रहना है और दूसरों को भी जिन्दा रखना है। लेकिन आज पंद्रह साल गुजरने

के बाद हम इस नतीजे पर पहुँचे हैं कि अब भी यह फैसला करना रह गया कि हमारा दोस्त कौन है हमारा दुश्मन कौन है?

जनाब वाला, हमारे कच्छ बार्डर पर पिछले दिनों पाकिस्तान ने जो हमला किया, एग्रेसन किया यह बिल्कुल दुनिया के सामने अयाँ है। अमरीका और बरतानिया इस को जानते हैं। वे मुल्क जिन्होंने पाकिस्तान को आर्मस एण्ड एम्प्लूशन दिए, जिन्होंने टैंक्स और हवाई जहाज दिए, मशीन गनों दीं। आज उन के वही हवाई जहाज वही टैंक हमारे जवानों की छाती को छलनी करते दिखाई देते हैं। जब इस का सबूत दिया गया तो मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जो मुल्क हमारी दोस्ती का दावा करते थे आज चुप बैठे हैं। अमरीका की तरफ से इस नेकेड एग्रेसन को क्यों नहीं कंडम किया गया। दूसरे मुमालिक ने इस को क्यों नहीं कंडम किया। और वह आर्मस एण्ड एम्प्लूशन जो कम्प्यूनिस्ट चायना के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल होने थे वे आज हमारे जवानों की छाती को छलनी बना रहे हैं। आज हमारे जवानों के ऊपर वह गोलियाँ, वह टैंक्स इस्तेमाल किये जा रहे हैं तो आज इस मुल्क के रहने वालों से कहूँगा कि आइये हम अपने पैरों के ऊपर खड़े हों हमारी फौजें जिन के ऊपर हमें पूरा भरोसा है। जिन्होंने अपनी जवांमर्दी का, बहादुरी का सबूत दिया है और तकलीफ और मुश्किलात में रह कर गोलियाँ खाई हैं। आज हमें उन पर पूरा भरोसा होना चाहिये। आज अगर पाकिस्तान अमरीका के टैंक और दूसरे साजों सामान इस्तेमाल कर रहा है तो हमारी फौजों पर भी कोई रेस्ट्रिक्शन नहीं होना चाहिये।

जनाब वाला, मैं यह चाहूँगा कि जहाँ हम आज इस मोज्जिज एवान में अपने मुल्क की हालत पर बहस करने के लिए

[श्री जी० एम० मीर]

यहां इकट्ठे हुए हैं तो आज इस एवान में हम अपने उन बहादुर जवानों को जिन्होंने कौम की रक्षा के लिए, जिन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की सलामती के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान की इंडिप्रिटी के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान की सोलिडेरिटी के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत और भजमत को ऊंचा रखने के लिए, इस तिरंगे को ऊंचा रखने के लिए, जिस के नीचे हम ने मुल्क को गुलामी से नजात दिलाई, आज जिन दोस्तों ने, जवानों ने उस के लिए अपनी जानें कुरवान की यह मुल्क को खातिर शहीद हुए, आइये ! हम उन को श्रद्धांजलि पेश करें। मुबारकबाद दें। पाकिस्तान कोई बहुत बड़ा मुल्क नहीं, हम ने तो सब के आगे दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया है। हमने पड़ोसी मुमालक के साथ, पड़ोसी मुल्क के साथ चाहे वह कम्युनिस्ट चायना हो, चाहे कोई और हो दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया। और हमारी यह कोशिश रही कि हम अमन और शान्ति का वह पैगाम जो हमारे महबूब जवाहर लाल ने दिया उस को सारी दुनिया के सामने पहुंचाएं। हम पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ना नहीं चाहते हैं पाकिस्तान के लोगों से हमारा झगड़ा हो। हमारा झगड़ा तो पाकिस्तान के उन लीडरों के साथ है जो मिल्ट्री डिक्टेटरशिप कायम करते हैं। जो चाहते हैं ऐशिया में हालत खराब हो। बदकिस्मती से ऐसे मुल्कों के साथ हमारा वास्ता पड़ा कि एक तरफ चीन है जो किसी भी अमूल की परवाह नहीं करता जो इंटर-नेशनल ली की परवाह नहीं करता। जो किसी मजहब को नहीं मानता और एक तरफ पाकिस्तान है जो इस मुल्क के साथ गठ-जोड़ करता है जो कि मजहब के खिलाफ है। आज उसका पाकिस्तान के साथ गठ-जोड़ यह साफ जाहिर करता है कि हमें दो गैर-अमूल वाले मुमालक से वास्ता पड़ा है। अन-प्रिंसिपलड मुमालक से वास्ता पड़ा है। इसलिए

यह जो मेरिज आफ कनविनिएन्स आप समझ लीजिए जो कि पाकिस्तान और चीन के बीच में है, यह हमारे लिए आई ओपनर होना चाहिए। पंडित जी जब जिन्दा थे तब एक दफा लियाकत अली खां की तरफ से धमकी दी गई थी कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जंग लड़ेंगे तो पंडित जी ने जवाब दिया था :

“It will be fought on the soil of Pakistan and not on the soil of India,,

आज हमारा वह हिस्सा जो बरसों से हमारे मुल्क के साथ चला आ रहा है जिसे बरतानिया अच्छी तरह से जानता है, जिसे इंग्लैंड वाले अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं और हमारे प्रीपार्टिशन के नक्शे में देख लीजिए उस से साबित हो जाता है कि हमारी टेरिटरी है लेकिन आज हमारे सेक्ड सोयल पर एक पाक और साफ जमीन के अन्दर जंग चल रही है। तो हम चुप नहीं रह सकते।

मैं इस मौजिज एवान को और उस एवान के जरिए और आप के जरिए जनाब शास्त्री जी की हुकूमत को यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमान अमूमन और जम्मू और काश्मीर के मुसलमान खसूसन एक एक इंच जमीन के लिए मरने को तैयार हैं। आप के जवान पीछे रहेंगे। हम लड़ने के लिये तैयार हैं। इसलिए कि पाकिस्तान एक बे असूल मुल्क है इसलिए कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारे मदरलैंड पर, हमारे मादरे-वतन पर हमला किया है और अब जरूरत इस बात की है कि छोटे मोटे तफहकात को खत्म करें, डिफ्रेंसिज को सिक करें। चाहे लेंग्वेज हो, चाहे प्रोविनशियलिज्म हो, चाहे पार्टी पोलिटिक्स का झगड़ा हो सब को खत्म कर दें। रानी साहब की तकरीर मैं सुन रहा था। उन्होंने कहा कि शास्त्री जी ने इस्तीफा दे दिया था जब कोई एक रेल एक्सिडेंट हुआ था। जनाब, यह मामला इस्तीफा देने से हल नहीं होता। चीन और पाकिस्तान का मामला शास्त्री जी के इस्तीफा देने से हल नहीं होता शास्त्री जी ने एक शानदार कदम

उठाया है। एक मजबूत पालिसी का एलान किया है जो इस बात की तरजमानी करता है कि हमारे नेता मजबूत हैं उन्होंने सही कदम उठाया है। बजाए इसके कि अपोजिशन पार्टियां यह कहें कि हमें दावत दी जाए हम शामिल हों। आज अपोजिशन का काम है कि शास्त्री जी के हाथ को, हुकूमत के हाथ को और फौज के हाथ को मजबूत करें। लाखों आदमी एक एक फील्ड में, फैक्टरी में काम कर के प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाएं, तब हमारे ऊपर जो हमला हो रहा है जो हमला है उस का हम मुकाबला कर सकते हैं। हालांकि यह सच है कि हम ने जो पालिसी बनाई है वह नान-वायलेंस की पालिसी है।

आखिर में मैं एक थोर सुना कर खत्म कर रहा हूँ।

मैं तुझ को बताता हूँ तकदीरे उमम क्या है।

शमीशीरो सिनां अब्बल, ताऊसी रुबाब आखिर।

इतना कहकर मैं इस तहरीक को सपोर्ट करता हूँ जो शास्त्री जी ने एलान फरमाई। मैं अपील करूंगा तमाम मुल्क के रहने वालों से कि आप एक हो जाएं। यह जो चीन और पाकिस्तान का हमारे ऊपर हमला हो रहा है दोनों गैर-असूल वाले मुल्क हमारे साथ लड़ने के लिए तैयार बैठे हैं। हमें इस का मुकाबला करने के लिए एक हो जाना चाहिए।]

श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील "तालिब" :

जनाब वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, यह बात माननी पड़ेगी कि भारत और पाकिस्तान की तकसीम और कुदरती तौर पर हुई और इस तकसीम को न तो हिन्दुस्तान के लोग चाहते थे और न ही पाकिस्तान के लोग चाहते थे। हिन्दुस्तान के लोग तो इस तकसीम को बिल्कुल ही नहीं चाहते थे और न मुसलमानों की अक्सरियत चाहती थी कि पाकिस्तान बने। मुसलमानों में कुछ खुद-गर्ज लोग थे जो

पाकिस्तान चाहते थे और इन्हीं लोगों ने एक नामुमकिन चीज को यानी तकसीम को मुमकिन कर दिया। लेकिन मैं आप से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इसके पीछे किस का हाथ था? इसके पीछे बाहर के सियासतदानों का हाथ था, बाहर के मुल्क के लोगों का हाथ था जिनकी पालिसी की वजह से हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान दो अलग अलग मुल्क बने। यह एक बुनियादी चीज है जिसको कभी भी नहीं भूला जा सकता है और न भूली जानी चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के जो दो अलग अलग मुल्क बने वह बाहर के सियासतदानों की वजह से हुआ। यह बात अच्छी तरह से सब को महसूस कर लेनी चाहिये कि जब तक दोनों मुल्क फिर से एक नहीं हो जाते तब तक दोनों मुल्क तरक्की नहीं कर सकते हैं और दोनों मुल्कों के बीच जो इस समय प्राबलम्स हैं वे हमेशा बने ही रहेंगे। अगर डिफेन्स के मामले में दोनों मुल्क एक हो जायें तो बहुत सी समस्याएं जो मौजूद हैं वह अपने आप खत्म हो जायेंगी। इस समय दोनों मुल्क डिफेन्स में ही लगे हुए हैं जिनकी वजह से वे अपने अपने मुल्क की तरक्की की ओर तबज्जो नहीं दे सकते हैं और किसी तरह का कोई कदम नहीं उठा सकते हैं। आज दोनों मुल्क इसी हालत में हैं कि वे अपनी अपनी जनता की तरक्की की ओर तबज्जो नहीं दे सकते हैं। आज पाकिस्तान की अक्सरियत जनता इस तकसीम से नाला रही है और हिन्दुस्तान की आम जनता भी नाला रही है। पाकिस्तान के जो सिपाही लड़ रहे हैं क्या आप यह समझते हैं कि वे वाकई हिन्दुस्तान पर कब्जा करना चाहते हैं? वे तो मर्सीनरी सोलजर्स हैं और रुपया लेकर लड़ना जानते हैं। पाकिस्तान के कुछ लीडरान हैं, कुछ रिलीजियस लोग हैं जो उन्हें भड़काते हैं कि तुम हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ जंग करो और इसी वजह से ये लोग लड़ रहे हैं। लेकिन पाकिस्तान की जो आम जनता है, जो अक्सरियत में लोग हैं वह जंग करना नहीं चाहते हैं क्योंकि उन लोगों की

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील तालिब]

माली और अखलाकी हालत ठीक नहीं है। वहां की जनता अपने लीडरों से खुश नहीं है और इसी वजह से वह लड़ाई करना नहीं चाहती है। लेकिन मैं आप से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि हमारी सरकार की जो यह अपीजमेन्ट की पालिसी है वह ठीक नहीं है और मैं इसको अच्छा नहीं समझता हूं। यह जो शगड़ा है और उसके लिए जो जंग की बात कही जा रही है उसके पीछे एक बड़े जंग की पेश कदमी मालूम पड़ती है। पाकिस्तान अपने कुछ दोस्तों से मिलकर हमारे खिलाफ एक बड़ी जंग करना चाहता है और इसलिए हमें एक कदम उठाना है और इस सरकार को उसके लिए आगे बढ़ना है। अगर हम इस तरह का कोई कदम उठाते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान की जनता सरकार की पूरी पूरी मदद करेगी और जो चीज हम चाहते हैं वही चीज वहां की जनता भी चाहती है कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जज्ब हो जायेंगे। जब इस तरह की हालत पैदा हो जायेगी तो वहां के लोग खुशामद करेंगे कि हम जज्ब होना चाहते हैं। वहां की जनता तो हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जज्ब होना चाहती है लेकिन हुकूमत में कुछ लोग ऐसे हैं, चन्द फौज के लोग हैं जो हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करना चाहते हैं, जो हिन्दुस्तान को जंग का मैदान बनाना चाहते हैं क्योंकि उनके पास अब वहां की जनता को समझाने के लिए कोई बात बाकी नहीं रह गई है। वहां की आम जनता नहीं चाहती है कि पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जंग करे क्योंकि वह अपनी ही परेशानियों में फंसी हुई है। इसलिए सरकार को जो भी कदम उठाना है वह पुरजोर कदम होना चाहिये और इस बारे में किसी बात की परवाह नहीं की जानी चाहिये। आप को यह बात याद रखनी चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान जो जंग करना

चाहता है उसके पीछे किस का हाथ है। इस जंग के पीछे बहुत सी बातें हैं जिसके लिए यह जंग होने जा रही है। उसके पीछे कौन कौन सी बात हो सकती है?

हमें ताज्जुब तो इस बात का होता है कि जब चीन ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया था तो अमरीका ने १६॥ करोड़ डालर की इमदाद दी थी और पाकिस्तान की सेना को उसने करीब ३ अरब डालर की मदद दी जबकि उसके ऊपर कोई हमला होने वाला नहीं था। आज हालत यह है कि जो हथियार अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को दिये उन का ही इस्तेमाल उसने हमारे खिलाफ किया। जब इसके बारे में अमरीका की तबज्जो दिलाई गई तो कहा जाता है कि हम इस बारे में इन्क्वायरी कर रहे हैं कि हकीकत क्या है? इंग्लैंड और दूसरे मुमालिकों ने भी हमें समझाने की कोशिश की लेकिन मैं आप से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं हमें अपने ही पांव पर खड़े होने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये चाहे कोई मुल्क हमारा साथ देता है या नहीं देता है। यहां की जनता आपके साथ हर तरह से मदद करने को तैयार है और अपना खून बहाने के लिए तैयार खड़ी है। यहां के जो मुसलमान अवाम हैं वे भी आपके साथ लड़ने के लिए तैयार हैं और सब लोग चाहते हैं कि सरकार कोई मजबूत कदम उठाये और मजबूती के साथ पाकिस्तान से बातचीत करे। सरकार को सब लोगों को कान्फीडेंस में लेना चाहिये ताकि वह सरकार का हर कदम में साथ दे सकें।

मैं एक बात और अर्ज करना चाहता हूं और वह यह है कि आज हमारे नौजवान सिपाही बड़ी बहादुरी से लड़ रहे हैं लेकिन जो जंग हो रही है उसमें हमारी सरकार सच्ची से कदम क्यों नहीं उठा रही है, यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है। पाकिस्तान अमरीका के दिये हुए मशीनगन, आर्टोमेटिक वैपन्स और दूसरे हथियार इस्तेमाल कर रहा है तो हमारे नौजवान सिपाहियों को

इस तरह के हथियार क्यों नहीं दिये जाते जो कि अपनी जान न्योछावर करने के लिए तैयार हैं ।

अभी पिछले दिन लोक-सभा में इस चीज के बारे में बहस हो चुकी है और उस समय तक हमारे कारोस्पोंडेन्ट लड़ाई की एरिया में नहीं गये थे, लेकिन अब ये लोग वहां पहुंच गये हैं और वहां से तरह तरह की खबरें हमारे सामने आ रही हैं । मैं आप के सामने कुछ खबरें रखना चाहता हूं और आप से अज्ञ करना चाहता हूं कि आप बतलायें कि ये बातें सही हैं या नहीं ? इन अखबार के नुमायन्दों ने वहां से जो कुछ लिखा है उसकी तरफ सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये । मैं ये बातें अपनी तरफ से नहीं कह रहा हूं, मेरे पास कल का अखबार है, जिसका नाम स्टेट्समैन है, जिसमें यह खबर दी हुई है और जिसको मैं आपकी इजाजत से पढ़ देना चाहता हूं । मैं हाउस का ज्यादा बक्त नहीं लेना चाहता हूं क्योंकि मैं चाहता हूं कि इस बारे में ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोग बोलें और बतायें कि हमें क्या करना चाहिये । मैं अखबार की खबर आपकी इजाजत से पढ़ना चाहता हूं :

"On some of the more far-reaching features of the limited fighting in Kutch, the officers and men in the area are rather reticent. They apparently realise that these problems emanate from higher policy direction which it was their job to accept without reservation or question.

"But this does not mean that the gallant members of the armed forces do not have views on these matters. Nor is this any reason why the country should not face these issues boldly and squarely, especially when the-Pakistani aggression is still in progress, and there is no "guarantee that what is happening in Kutch would not be repeated elsewhere.

207 RS—9.

"It is no secret that in view of the terrain chosen by Pakistan, the simple and straightforward method of annihilating the invaders at Kanjarkot and Biarbet is to allow the Indian army to outflank the aggressors, go into the Pakistan territory and occupy the elevations the Pakistanis were using as the base for their attack. The permission is being withheld.

"Furthermore, after the Pakistanis moved into Biarbet in force with tanks and heavy armour, the need to bomb them (within Indian territory) has become both clear and pressing. But this, too, is not permitted.

"Politically, there may or may not have been strong reasons to follow the course of action that has been adopted; but militarily it makes no sense.

"Par more incomprehensible than even what is quaintly called the

"non-use of the air force" has been our unwillingness to meet Pakistani tanks with tanks.

"To this reporter the starkest fact of the Kutch situation has been that while Pakistan deployed as many as 90 US-supplied tanks, we do not have a single tank in the entire battle zone.

"The total absence of tanks from the Kutch landscape was obvious to us reporters as it must have been to the US. Brigadier-General Tibbets whom we ran into on a dry, dusty dirt-track in the forward areas where our jeeps were bumping, rather than moving, along".

इस तरह की तमाम बातें हैं जिनके बारे में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि वे कहां तक दुस्त हैं ? मैं यह मानता हूं कि फौज के अन्दर पोलिटिक्स नहीं आनी चाहिये, जो बातें अखबार में लिखी हैं वे कहां तक सही हैं और उसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है और

[श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील 'तालीब']
आइन्दा इस बारे में क्या किया जायेगा, ये सब बातें मैं जानना चाहता हूँ ।

मैं तो यह चाहता था कि यहां पर डिसकशन होने से पहले सदस्य कमान्ड के आरमी कमान्डर जनरल सेन यहां पर आयें और पार्लियामेंट की सब पार्टियों के लोगों को वहां की सही हालत बतलायें । हम लोग वहां की सही हालत को इस समय नहीं जानते हैं और वहां के बारे में तरह तरह की अफवाहें उड़ रही हैं । इसलिए मैं सरकार से चाहता हूँ कि वहां के बारे में हमें सही हालत बतलाए जायं । हम चाहते हैं कि डिसकशन से पहले अपोजीशन पार्टी के लीडरों को कम से कम वहां की सही हालत तो बतलाई जाए । इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान अमरीका के दिये हुए हथियार जो इस्तेमाल कर रहा है, उसके बारे में उसका क्या रवैया रहेगा ? क्या वह हमारी गैरजानिबदारी पालिसी के साथ है या नहीं ? इस तरह की तमाम बातें हैं जिनके बारे में गौर करना बहुत जरूरी है क्योंकि हमारे नौजवान अपनी जाने दे रहे हैं, अपना खून बहा रहे हैं और हम सब लोगों का फर्ज हो जाता है कि उनके साथ जहां तक हो सके हम इन्साफ करें और उन्हें जिन हथियारों, टैंकों और स्यर कवर की जरूरत हो वह हम दें । इस तरह की जो बातें लिखी गई हैं वे नहीं होनी चाहिये और हमारी आर्मी का वही हाल न हो जैसा ईजिप्ट की आर्मी का पैलेस्टाइन की लड़ाई में डिफेक्टिव आर्म्स और एम्पुनोशन दिये जाने से हुआ । हमारी आर्मी में इस तरह के ख्याल पैदा नहीं होने चाहियें कि उन्हें लड़ने के लिए मुनासिब हथियार नहीं दिये गये । अभी तक हमारी आर्मी में बगावत का जज़्बा पैदा नहीं हुआ है । हमारी आर्मी जहां भी लड़ी है अपनी जान की बाजी लगाकर लड़ी है और हमेशा वफादार रही है इसलिए

हमारा फर्ज हो जाता है कि हम उनके साथ इन्साफ करें ।

मैं आप का शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे चन्द मिनट बोलने के लिए दिये ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Shantilal Kothari. Ten minutes please.

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I join my friends here who have paid a tribute to our jawans who are lighting the Pakistan aggression on our fronts. When the Nation's breast is angered by the cruel events decreed as a result of the conspiracy by the totalitarian governments of China and Pakistan against India's territorial integrity, our hearts and heads know no differences. They only know unity—emotional, intellectual, Political and traditional. The Prime Minister has rightly expressed our sentiments and has stated in no uncertain terms the nation's firm determination to repel the aggression. Not only that, he has, as a great humanitarian, expressed India's concern for the welfare of people of Pakistan as well as the people of China who, otherwise, stand alienated from their own governments.

I only want to draw the attention, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to some of the the salient issues implicit in the present struggle in Asia and Africa. We are all aware that the Pindi-Peking axis is a fact in Afro-Asian politics. Their fear that the two major concepts, democratic, socialist and constitutional polity, and peaceful co-existence have become a going concern in the world politics and in the Asian-African politics because of India's success in these fields. To disengage the minds of their own people from their legitimate economic aspirations, the governments of China and Pakistan created disturbance in

Asia. They knew if these concepts became successful, their totalitarian aggressive adventures would not pay them any dividends. They, therefore, aimed at weakening India in its base. I may draw the attention of the august House, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to the fact that India itself being the arsenal of democracy, arsenal of freedom and human values of Asia and Africa and the world, because the target of attack by this unholy axis—Pindi-Peking.

If one goes through press propaganda in these countries, one finds that they expected a collapse in India after the unfortunate demise of the great leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. They failed to see the collapse coming in; instead, smooth transfer of active political leadership took place without affecting the Constitution, without affecting this political stability and without affecting the Nehru basis of our foreign policy. That was to their disappointment and dismay. And this disappointment was so great on their part that somehow they wanted to disturb the Asian-African countries by trying to disturb and dislocate India. Sir, may I draw the attention of the Asian-African statesmen to one fact, if we only look at the pages of history of Africa and Asia of the 18th and 19th centuries, we learn that fragmented Asia and Africa, divided, disunited Africa and Asia fell prey to even the small powers of Europe and it took us no less than 300 to 400 years to come back to our own, to be politically free. I am sure the statesmen of Asia and Africa will see in this Pindi-Peking axis the danger to themselves. It is not only an attack on the borders of India—India can meet it. The world and particularly members of Afro-Asian fraternity know the Indian traditions prior to 1947 when the Indian people were not masters of their own house. They went out with material help and noble sentiments in the crisis of Spanish Civil War, in the Abyssinian crisis and also the crisis of Manchuria against

the tyrants. After India became free and master of its own house, does the world not remember that Indonesia's cry of Merdeka was the cry of every Indian also? Did not India play in concert with the Afro-Asian fraternity, a role which was decisive and effective? Is it not true, therefore, that today the Afro-Asian friends should realise that China and Pakistan, should be declared outlaws by the fraternity and brought to reason before it is too late? If further disintegration is allowed in this polity, non-Asian powers will further exploit our situation and may stage a come back. Therefore, a free India with free region of Afro-Asian fraternity alone can ensure dynamic peace and economic progress in this developing new world.

I might also refer briefly to geopolitics. If you look at the history of the world politics, although 'there have been irreversible trends taking place, one thing stands out unaffected. Whenever India has lost its freedom, as in 18th and 19th centuries; the whole of Asia has lost its freedom as well. Whenever India has gained its freedom as in 1947, the whole of Asia has gained its freedom.

Sir, after 1947 and to this day you have seen that the movement of freedom in fact has not only gained ground but has become concrete reality. Whenever the nerve-centre—Suez to Singapore—has fallen apart from India, it has brought in foreign domination in the entire region. And, therefore, it is in the interest of African and Asian nations' statesmen to understand this basic truth before it is too late, before China and Pakistan go ahead with their adventurist designs which unfortunately is clear from their actions of aggression on India.

Before I close, I might remind the Western Powers that whatever the game they might play, if they want to shift the scene of conflict to non-European region, meaning Asia, they may not gain anything. They must

[Shri Shantilal Kothari] know that, as far as India is concerned, no sort of imperialist, neo-colonialist domination can take place till even one India is alive. We had determination. We know in the lines of Kautilya that it is power that brings about peace between two rulers. No piece of iron that is not made red hot can combine.

(Time bell rings.)

Before I close, Mr. "Vice-Chairman, I again want to remind in all seriousness and earnestness the powers that be in Asia and Africa that their freedom is in danger, if China-inspired Pindi-Peking Axis is allowed its way and if it is not contained right now. It is in this context that they will have to form an Afro-Asian concert, a concert with a constructive purpose, divorced from the spirit of the nineteenth century concepts of self-centredness but based on the concept of socialist democracy^ and non-alignment to which a reference has been made by Mr. A. D. Mani. I might submit that non-alignment is antithesis to neutrality, the difference being that former does not approach the problem with inhibitions or commitments except the commitment to freedom as Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said long ago. Non-alignment is receptive and responsive to responsibilities while neutrality escapes all responsibilities, moral, political or otherwise. If freedom is endangered, ed anywhere in Asia or Africa, India will not sit idle. She will go there and actively participate in rescuing it from any aggression.

Thank you.

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, we are faced with a grave situation. Pakistan's intrusion into the Rann of Kutch is not a border dispute; it is an aggression. Rann of Kutch, as has already been pointed out by the Prime Minister, belongs to India, and Pakistan's intrusion into that area is wholly unwarranted and unjustified.

Aggression will have to be got vacated. Force will have to be met with force to the extent necessary. The Pakistani aggression, I fear, seems to be instigated by Communist China and the possibility of simultaneous attack b'y both cannot be ruled out.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair].

After its collusion with China, Pakistan requires to be treated more seriously than we have done so far. Though China is our greatest enemy, Pakistan, as an ally of China, is also a source of great danger to national security. Even the United States, whose grand strategy is to contain China, will be well-advised to revise its attitude towards Pakistan. Pakistan can no more be trusted to defend the world of democracy against Communist dictatorship of China. In the interests of its own strategy, the United States must strongly protest against the use of its arms against India and must withhold military aid to Pakistan. National security demands much greater attention than had so far been paid by our Government. Every time when India is faced with an aggression, we are told that we are not prepared to meet the aggression and after a few months due preparation will be made for the defence of that part of the country. I do not think that way national security can ever be secured. The Government continues to surfer from complacency escapism and vacillation in the matter of defence. National security cannot thus be secured. National security is to be treated as the first obligation of the Government. It must receive our first consideration and all possible efforts should be made to build up our defences. I am of opinion that the grand strategy will have to be planned for the defence of the country. Without that it will not be possible for Us to ensure protection from foreign aggression. Our efforts in matters regarding defence are to a large extent piece-meal. We are

fighting with a danger. We do some patch-work. Then again we begin to suffer from complacency. We have borders to defend and it is our duty to plan, to guard our defences, taking into consideration that our country may be subjected to aggression at any point which we left undefended. We have reason to feel obliged to Great Britain for extending its good offices but at the same time it is our duty to tell Great Britain that restoration of the *status quo ante* must precede the cease-fire. Pakistan will have to be taught a lesson if it refuses to be reasonable, if it continues to challenge the integrity of our country and threatens us with a total war. The nation no doubt stands united against foreign aggression. There are no two opinions in India in so far as the defence of the realm is concerned but if the Government really wishes to ensure united effort, what is needed most is to resolve internal dissensions in the party in power. What is undermining the efficiency of the Government most is not the Opposition Parties but the internal dissensions from which the party in power suffers. If the Government really wish greater co-operation from the Opposition parties than the Opposition parties are able to extend in matters regarding foreign aggression, the Government itself will have to devise ways and means of securing greater co-operation. Belonging to the Opposition Party, I do not wish to say, I do not wish to beg the Government in what way the cooperation of ours is to be secured. Either the Government should refuse and refrain from talks regarding cooperation of all parties in this matter or the Government should devise ways and means to secure greater cooperation from the Opposition parties. Verbal talks of co-operation can only result in verbal co-operation. What is needed is also the reformation in administration. The administration also requires to be infused with a sense of urgency, a spirit of devoted service, with due efficiency. We have proclaimed an emergency. There are the Defence of India Rules and they

are being used sometimes in the interest of national security, on many occasions in the interests of the Government but there does not seem to be that sense of urgency in the Government. The Government is proceeding as hesitatingly, as vacillatingly, as it was doing before the national emergency was proclaimed. I feel that this vacillation and complacency will have to be discarded. I wish to point out that the nation will not excuse the Government if it continues to suffer from complacency, and escapism in the name of peace, non-violence and non-alignment. No nation can enjoy peace if it is not prepared to defend its own country, and non-alignment does not impose on us any sort of obligation to neglect our own defences. Non-alignment only requires us not to get ourselves involved in the conflicts of big powers. But there can be no non-alignment against aggression, and non-alignment entitles us to accept support from all sides for the defence of our own land.

In the end I wish to pay my homage and tributes to the jawans who have laid down their lives or who are fighting valiantly in defending our country.

With these words I resume my seat.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, on the 28th of April, the Prime Minister, in the Lok Sabha, called upon the people to work with a true dedication and united heart to combat the Pakistani aggression against our country. The nation, to a man, stands behind the Prime Minister and Government.

May I say that, as one who is in business, the business community pledges itself to the cause of the nation at a critical hour? All those who are connected with productive effort, whether in the farms, factor-

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.] ies or market places, are willing to put in their best effort with vigour and determination. I do hope that Government will also help them not only to keep production going, but to increase the same. Also the many pipelines of supply, both for the civil population and the army, have to be kept smoothly flowing. Government policies must help and not hinder this flow, for the morale of the people and of our jawans must be kept up with adequate supplies.

Our thoughts go back to the beginning of the Kashmir conflict in the year 1948. They are a painful reminder of Pakistan's civil designs, which have been kept up by her keeping the nearly 2500 miles of common border alive through sporadic attacks here and there. We always endeavoured to make Pakistan see reason, but without any avail. Take even the Rann of Kutch.

The Rann of Kutch always belonged to Kutch. Prior to Britishers establishing their paramountcy in India, the then rulers of Sind made several attacks on the Rann and on Kutch, but on every occasion they were repulsed with heavy casualties. The biggest attack on the Rann and on Kutch was made by the Muslim ruler, Janab Karimshah, three centuries back. He came up to Zara and there he was defeated and sent back. Thereafter peace prevailed between the two countries. Sind gave up its ambition to occupy the Rann and rule Kutch. During the British regime Sind formed part of the former Bombay Presidency and there was no dispute either regarding boundary or any other matter between the British and the Maharao of Kutch. Even after the separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency and the establishment of a separate province of Sind, the propriety of the ownership of Rann was never questioned. Rann always belonged to Maharao of Kutch. He recovered grazing charges from shepherds. At

the time of partition and merger of Kutch with the Union of India, the ownership of Rann was not in question. It formed part of India along with Kutch. Kutch was made a Part 'C' State and its administration was conducted by a Chief Commissioner. Again, grazing contracts were awarded by the Chief Commissioner by public auction, and Pakistan never raised any objection. A little later Pakistan raised a boundary question but was not serious about it. But all of a sudden, in 1956, Pakistan occupied Chhad Bet, but within a few days she was driven out by the Indian Army, and once again it remained an integral part of India.

Generally speaking, the protection of the borders here has been neglected. The administration of Kutch, when the first road map of Kutch was formulated, had suggested the construction of roads from Bhuj to Khavada, and from Rapar to Bella—it was in 1948. But both the suggestions were not accepted. In the First, Second and Third Plans also these roads were recommended for construction, but it would appear that they were not considered important and therefore no action was taken. Linking Lakhapat, by rail, with Bhuj was also recommended during these Plan periods, but this suggestion also appears to have not found any favour. The Prime Minister will bear me out on this question because, at that time, he was the Railway Minister, and I know it that he, when he visited Kutch, recommended this special railway link. When Chhad Bet was occupied by Pakistan, Kutch had ceased to be a Part 'C' State and had merged in the then State of bigger Bombay. Immediately after the Pakistani attack on Chhad Bet, the present Defence Minister, as the then Chief Minister of Bombay, accompanied by Shri B. A. Khimji, the then Member of Lok Sabha representing Kutch, visited the Rann of Kutch in the middle of May and personally witnessed the difficulties under which the Reserve Police Force had to live there. There is no

drinking water available. It is brought from about 25 miles away in water tanks and rationed. There is also no road from Bhuj to Khavada, and Khavada has to be reached by jeeps on bad tracks. From Khavada to Chhad Bet one has to go through, salt and marshy lands. It was at this stage that a decision was taken to construct an all-weather road from Bhuj to Khavada and the work was taken in hand. Even though nine years have elapsed, the work is not completed. Supply of drinking water through pipelines was altogether abandoned. And it is in this terrain that our jawans have to fight.

Another important point to which I would like to draw attention is the small port Jakhau, which is in Kutch and which is now being used by Pakistan for smuggling purposes. I want to bring to the kind notice of the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Defence Minister that proper precautions should be taken to see that no navy makes use of this port for coming to India at any time in future. We have two small launches which are plying, but I suggest that more precautions should be taken so that Pakistan does not take any advantage of our situation. The Indian Navy should therefore take care of this point. Today there is evidence of Sino-Pak collusion. On the Kashmir front there is greater inimical activity. On the East Pakistan border Chinese military experts are seen with Pakistani troops. So it is not unlikely -that this new Pindi-Peking alignment mounts joint attacks to transgress Indian boundaries at different points. All this should only strengthen our resolve to face the situation boldly and calmly,

All our policies must be directed to make the economy viable for both development and defence. Indeed we are at a stage when the two objectives could be dovetailed into one another. Our cause is just; and let the 4 P.M. certainty of our conviction in what we are doing be followed up by purposeful and uni-

ted action by the Government with the fullest cooperation of all sections of the community.

Madam, during the course of the speeches here, some hon. Members have raised two or three points on which I would like to touch very briefly. First, it was made out that there is no link between the Government, the Police and the Army. This, I think, is rather far from the truth because if that was the case, how is it that Sardar Post which was on the point of being lost to us has not been lost? It was on the point of being lost to the police. Had not our army reached that spot within ten minutes, perhaps it would have gone. But they reached in time and till today Sardar Post is with us. That is why I say there is coordination and to state that there is no coordination between these three the Government, the Police and the Army, is not a fact.

It has also been asked by some hon. Members: Why are not tanks sent there? In the excitement of the moment, they seem to lose sight of the type of soil in that area, and whether tanks can pass on that kind of soil and can also come back when the water comes on. All these factors have to be taken into consideration by those who are in charge of the operations I sometimes feel that just as an Indian crow can express an opinion on everything under the sky, sometimes we politicians also try to express opinion on every subject, irrespective of the fact whether we know about it or not. Thirdly I would also bring to your notice that some Members have asked why we have not sent a brigade, as if sending a brigade is all that is needed. We must know whether there is need for a brigade and whether we will be able to pull back the brigade at any time when necessary, if such circumstances are there, also whether at the initial stages a brigade is necessary whether in the initial stages the technique of the army should not be to see that as much casualty is inflicted as possible, that as much ammunition as possible is

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.] destroyed and after that a brigade is sent. All these factors require attention and decision at the very highest level. Therefore, I feel that we as Members of this House are not competent to express any opinion on this problem.

Finally, Madam, I must say that I am really surprised at the attitude of our friends and especially I do not understand the United States of America. I am one of those who believe in the friendship of all and if I am branded as being pro-West, I have no objection to it and I will be happy. But on this occasion, Madam, I have not understood them. What have we done to have this kind of treatment? What has our Prime Minister said? What he said was only this, on Vietnam: Please do not bomb Vietnam. But that has been our consistent policy all along, right from the very beginning whether it be Vietnam or any other country. And for saying that, if they are going to take offence, well, howsoever big the power may be I am afraid, our self-respect demands that we should not be brow-beaten by that. We want friendship and we want the friendship of the United States of America much more than that of anybody else, because they are our real friends. They have been helping us with everything, with arms, with ammunitions, with food and also with money, but they cannot trample on our self-respect. With these words, I support the motion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have professedly heard a real friend of America. But since we are not such real friends I do not know how many guns of the Americans would be required to be sent by the United States of America to Pakistan to get our soldiers killed on the borders of India. I wonder if the hon. JVTember will be convinced that friendship is misplaced in this situation.

[MR CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, I express our solidarity with the fighting men on the Kutch border and I take it, they can

count upon the united support of the entire nation in the trials they are facing today. I naturally pay my respect to the soldiers who laid down their lives—I call them martyrs—in the cause of the sacred cause of the defence of the country. Here again I would like to say a few words in passing and congratulate the Flying Officer who at great risk to himself, took very effective photographs of the American tanks which certainly would be of great use for us for exposing the American game. I think of this Flying Officer there would be given due recognition by the appropriate authorities and of the wonderful service that this Flying Officer has done to the nation and to the cause of peace. Mr. Chairman, Sir, so long as the Pakistani attack continues, backed by American weapons, it has got to be met and repulsed with all our might. There cannot be two opinions about it. But at the same time I think Shastriji, our Prime Minister, is right when he combines that approach with the other approach, namely, efforts for negotiation naturally with dignity and without in any way bartering away the honour of the country, because even in war, we do not abandon the paths of peace. That is the demarcating line between a nation which is peaceful and a nation which is warlike, and aggressive. Here Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite your attention to and discuss the political aspects of the matter. I think we are facing a situation in which we have to fight a battle, fight the military battle in the Rann of Kutch and on the frontier. And at the same time, a battle has got to be fought and won—in order to make certain of success, certain of victory—in the chambers of foreign nations and the bar of world public opinion. We are in a much better situation today to wage that battle and I hope this opportunity will not be missed, because some people in the Government and in the ruling party, suffer from certain infantile illusions about Americans. Mr. Chairman, Pakistan's j bellicosity and aggression today, as the i Prime Minister rightly referred to, is

unthinkable without the U.S. arms which have flowed into that country ever since the Arms Pact was signed about ten years ago. It appears that about Rs. 500 crores worth of military hardware has come to Pakistan from the United States of America. I should like the Government to share the information, if it has the information, with regard to the quantum of arms, at least the value of those arms, that Pakistan has received from the U.S.A. If we have that information, we certainly should make it known to world public opinion, so that the world I may know how Pakistan is being backed over the past years clearly against India, by the United States of America. This should be made a point in our diplomatic offensive today.

President Ayub Khan has linked up his Kutch adventure with his claim for Kashmir, and we are not surprised. Clearly he wants to pressurise India on the question of Kashmir and wants to take advantage of the situation created on this part of the India-Pakistan border. Here we ought to take note of the fact that the United States and Britain are openly with Pakistan. One has only to refer to the records of the Security Council which bear testimony to this fact. Therefore, we cannot isolate what is happening on the Kutch border or the possible roles and intentions of the United States and Britain from the rest of the chain of developments ever since the Kashmir question went to the Security Council. Here again, Mr. Chairman, I should invite your attention to what is appearing in the U.K. Press and today's "Indian Express" carries a sum-up of the U.K. Press. It says:

"The common thread running through the coverage of British newspapers is a jeering display of what India says on the subject and a wholesome respect for the Pakistani stand and President Ayub's ability to back it up with military might".

The "Sunday Times" has readily supported Pakistan and has accused Shri iihastriji's Government of trying to create incidents in order to distract the people's attention from economic bankruptcy and intra-Congress jockeying for power. Mr. Chinai will be well-advised to know what his friends are saying. As far as "The Economist" is concerned, it equates India and Pakistan both as untruthful. "The Sunday Telegraph" speaks in the same strain and therefore one should be careful about it and yet we find that when the United States has taken up this attitude, Mr. S. K. Patil, a very powerful member of this Government, speaking at a reception given by the Congress in Bombay on May 1, asking Pakistan to heed to the advice of Britain and America and interestingly enough talks of the U.S. promise to India in case Pakistan misuses the United States military aid. Mr. Patil is still in doubt whether Pakistan is misusing the military aid received from the United States. It seems that this vigilant eyes have not seen the photographs of the Patton tanks published in the newspapers but that is our great Mr. S. K. Patil. I think these facts have to be borne in mind. How can you develop diplomatic initiative when Shrimati Indira Gandhi says something in the right direction and Mr. S. K. Patil exactly the opposite thing, in another direction and in between them there is Mr. Chinai to plead his friendship of the United States? One could not perhaps choose a worse moment than this to plead such friendship. He should hold his patience a little longer. Behind the latest Pakistani move and the virtual combination of the same in the ruling circles of the United States and Britain, there is another sinister design which has to be taken note of. One of their objectives seems to be to push India in the direction of the Western camp and get India some how or other entangled with the manipulations of the United States and Britain. This is done in a very sub-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] tie way and then the logic follows. We have the great example of what happened in the Security Council and the various Commissions that came over the Kashmir issue and got us involved, We have taken quite a lot of time to disentangle ourselves and I would ask Mr. Shastri, intelligent as he is, not to permit himself to be drawn into the cobwebs of British and American engineered diplomacy. Therefore, I have my own doubts about the British proposal and Mr. Shastri will be well-advised to be careful in this respect. The Prime Minister should tell us the exact proposals. Why did not the British Government criticise Pakistan for committing an open act of aggression? Has the British Government any doubt about what Pakistan has done? In 1962-63 we found Americans offering us everything in order to contain the Chinese attack. I don't understand their attitude here. Here it seems they are becoming unnecessarily laconic and trying to avoid things which go against the interests of our country. We should be a little careful and I would like to know what steps Government is taking to expose U.S. military aid to Pakistan. Here is the time and here is where diplomacy is needed and must be very active to compel the U.S. by world public opinion to stop all kinds of military aid to Pakistan, recoilless guns, tanks and other weapons with which they are violating our territory, killing our soldiers and pressurising and threatening us. These things have got to be taken into account in all seriousness and have to be exposed before the world, in the other parts of the world which are favourable to us and we must launch such an offensive there. Therefore, I was a little upset when Shri Shastri did not have a word to say about the U.S. promises in his speech. Maybe due to oversight he missed it but when the Prime Minister misses even by oversight the tanks and other weapons photographs of which have been published in the newspapers, we feel a little sorry, up-

set and somewhat apprehensive. I only hope that the wrong type of pressure is not being brought to bear upon him and I am sure that he would not yield to the pressure in this respect but nonetheless some people may try to put pressures and so on and we should give him all courage and sustenance in order to withstand such pressures as are coming today.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection, it is very important to understand that we cannot expose Pakistan on a political plane without dealing with the United States. Everybody now knows why Pakistan was receiving arms from the United States. When in the past years we raised this issue, we were told that assurances had been given by Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Foster Dulles but we asked the Government not to attach importance to such assurances because they were not part of the agreement under which Pakistan was getting the arms. On the contrary they made us sign an agreement saying that the arms we received from the United States should not be used against any country except China. We are precluded from using the arms that we received from the United States even in self-defence when Pakistan is free to use the arms lavishly given in aggression against our country. This is a paradox in international relations and I should like to know whether there is any similar example in world relations when such kinds of agreements operate simultaneously, this sort of one-way traffic, we are to be killed, they are to be the killers. That was the role assigned to the American weapons. May I ask Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri another things? Why should he treat that particular agreement that we cannot use American arms against anybody excepting China as sacrosanct? The arms are in our possession, they are our property no matter from which source they have come and we are to use them in defence against anybody. I think the time has come to assert Indian sovereignty in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to come to the other problem. Suggestions have been made for political settlement. Hon. Members have made good suggestions. As far as the unity of the country is concerned, yes, in such matters there should be unity of the country and we should all work for it and there is no doubt about it but here again I should like to know one or two things. Here I find that Paul Tibbets who dropped the nuclear bomb in Hiroshima is here in the American Military Mission and he has been allowed by this Government to go to the Indian side of the Kutch border to find out whether we are using American arms. First of all, it is surprising that such a Mission should be in India today. We do not like such a military mission being here at all and if it were there, why should such a man who killed the people of Hiroshima by dropping the fatal nuclear bomb be allowed to come here? Even to find out whether we are using American arms or not such things should not be allowed.

I agree that unity has to be built up, patriotism has to be roused and national sentiments have to be encouraged but we must guard against chauvinism and communalism being roused in the country because in a situation like this it is possible that some people may be interested in rousing communalism and chauvinism. I am sure that Mr. Ayub Khan's threat in Pakistan of a so-called total war is meant to rouse war hysteria and chauvinism in Pakistan. I come from a part of India, Mr. Chairman, where we have certain problems and we have left behind many people belonging to the minority community in East Pakistan. We have got minorities in this country also. We know what it means when communalism and chauvinism take up a prominent place. Therefore, solemnly as we are pledged today to stand up against the Pakistani aggression with all our might, we shall have to wage also a very powerful moral and political

fight on the home front so that communalism and chauvinism do not get any quarter. Patriotism should not be confused with chauvinism. When this thing develops reactionaries come on top. There has not been an instance in history up to now when chauvinism and this kind of communalism have been roused while the reactionaries have not come on top. It was interesting that Mr. Dahyabhai Patel was suggesting the recomposition of the Government. Naturally everybody is up to his game. He wants the Government to be composed of such people who will be very friendly, even more friendly than Mr. Chinnai, to the United States of America, Mr. Lai Bahadur Shastri is accused of indecision but I hope he will never take such a decision in order to oblige our friend, the Leader of the First Opposition Group here.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I have never made a secret of it. I do not want fellow-travellers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has not got any fellow-travellers. Neither Mr. Shastri wants pullers and traducers of independence and their policies. I do not know who are the fellow-travellers. Is Mr. Sanjiva Reddy a fellow-traveller? I do not know. Therefore I say this in all seriousness because it looks as if some people are trying to take advantage of this in order to push their favourite politics. National unity demands that this Government remains firm on the basic policies which are good for the nation, which have been proved to be good for the nation; as for example, non-alignment, non-involvement in military blocs.

Finally one word more and I sit down. An appeal to unity has been made but I hope the democratic rights and liberties of the people will not be attacked in the name of defence. Unity has to be built on democratic foundations; all the more so when we need the mobilisation of all democratic secular forces against some possible communal threats or tendencies in

[ohri Bhupesh Gupta.] our country. There are other things like holding the price line, etc. The people's demands should not be frowned upon. The people should not be asked in the name of unity to toe blindly in mute silence whatever line the Government takes in the economic and political sphere. For example, in the name of national unity, when we give such a call, the Ministers like Mr. Nanda, Mr. S. K. Patil and Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha, should not rush to Calcutta as they did on the 10th April to give assurances to Mr. G. D. Birla and others and held private consultations with them which created confusion even amongst their own supporters so much so many Congressmen in Calcutta expressed their doubts and apprehensions about what happened. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we want to fight but fight as a democratic and peace-loving nation. That is what we should show to the world. We meet Pakistan on the military front because they have left us with no other choice. So long as they continue their attacks, they have to be met but our arsenal of peace efforts is inexhaustible and they should always be in operation whenever any chance comes up. Therefore I support the Prime Minister's suggestion for a cease fire agreement simultaneous with the restoration of the status quo ante. That is a wise suggestion. These are the two points on which our position should be stated.

That is all that I wanted to say Mr. Chairman. Once again I would say that this question has to be met with courage, resolution and also with wisdom and foresight. Let us not lose sight of the fact that the real enemy is in the Pentagon, the United States of America abetting Pakistan; otherwise that country would never have dared to attack us.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, there has been naked aggression on the part of Pakistan on our territory and there is nothing to add to what the hon. Prime

Minister said this morning, that every inch of our territory will have to be recovered and unless the *status quo ante* is restored there will be no peace talks. The country trusts in the integrity of the Prime Minister and in his determination to defend the Honour and integrity of this nation. Therefore I do not think that there is anything else, anything better, that one can say on this particular situation save to support what the hon. Prime Minister said in this connection.

But I wonder why it is that whenever an attack is launched on our territory we express a sense of shock and surprise. In 1962 we had an attack by China—then also we expressed a sense of shock and surprise—in spite of the fact that we ourselves had accepted the suzerainty of China over Tibet with which we had entered into various agreements about the Himalayan borders. We accepted that Tibet was under the suzerainty of China. If Tibet was not sovereign then all the agreements we had entered into with Tibet about the Himalayan borders fall to the ground. Therefore when an occasion arose—I do not want to criticise the Government present or past—for you to recognise the Government of the Dalai Lama, why was it not done? If China can now enter into an agreement secretly or overtly with Sheikh Abdullah or with Pakistan over some areas of Kashmir, why not we pay them in the same coin and do the right thing by recognising Dalai Lama's sovereign rights over Tibet and recognising his Government as the only duly constituted lawful Government of Tibet with which we had entered into agreements about our Himalayan borders?

Similarly when we talk about this Kutch-Sind border and the Pakistani aggression why have we ourselves committed in writing, even though by implication, that there is a dispute over this territory? Why did W8 do so? If the border had to be demarcated why did we not do so?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We did not accept that there was a dispute.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: We did; Sardar Swaran Singh had . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It was Mr. Sheikh of Pakistan who raised the question and it was recorded but Mr. Swaran Singh did not accept it.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: The point is, all the time it is we who have to give something or other and it is always Pakistan that has to take. For instance in Kashmir, why did we accept the aggression of Pakistan?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: We did not accept it.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: One-third of Kashmir is still in the possession of Pakistan. The whole world knows that. All the time it is our giving that is discussed; never any giving by Pakistan. It is Pakistan that has committed aggression and the whole world knows about it but still when people talk to us it is always our giving something to Pakistan. For instance, we have lost Rs. 500 crores worth of property in Pakistan. Have we ever raised, this question in the councils of the world? Have we ever talked about the partition debt owed by Pakistan to us of Rs. 300 crores or more? Does anybody say anything about this debt? Then again when the canal waters dispute was raised we had to part with Rs. 80 crores in the bargain and decide the issue of canal waters distribution in their favour. Once again when the question of Berubari came it was we who had to surrender that part of the

territory. It is we who have given whenever there has been an attack. Forty-nine attacks have been launched during the last fortnight by Pakistan on our territory on the Jammu-Kashmir border and bunkers are being dug up even now in East Pakistan all along the border. And what is the Pakistan President threatening us with that there will be a total war? The total war is already there. It is only we who are restrained. We have no doubt about what Pakistan President means by his threats. Pakistan wants to destroy our image as China wanted to do two years earlier. And now they are in collusion with each other, and both of them either singly or jointly want to attack us; or maybe not to attack us but just to bully us so that our economic and political stability might be destroyed. We can see through their game and this attack on the Kutch border is in line with their whole strategy. It is all a part of a grand strategy. They want to isolate us from our friends at the right moment. Don't you see that when China attacked us in 1962 the United States and the U.S.S.R. were engaged in Cuba? Similarly now the United States is occupied in South Vietnam and Britain is occupied in Malaysia-Indonesia confrontation. Therefore Pakistan has chosen the right time and the right spot. How much did we know; we did not know that they would attack us from here. That enemy will be a poor enemy who attacks us at a place where we expect him to attack us. He will not attack us on the ground of our choosing. He will attack us on the ground of his choosing. You choose your ground, if you want to, and do not talk about it that you are going to do this, or that and the rest. Leave it to the Army, the Defence Minister and the Chief of Staff and you can leave it to the Army to attack where they choose. It is not for us to suggest to them where they should do so and when. It is for them to decide and for them to choose. It is a military decision. It is not a political decision. You have to take in

[Dr. Gopal Singh.]

this Parliament and in the Government a political decision. Plan out the strategy, plan out the objective, and then leave it to the Army. Do not be frightened if one point is lost. It is said, unless Kanjarkot is liberated we are going to shed the last drop of our blood. We are not going to do that. I can assure you that we will be very foolish if we shed the last drop of blood over Kanjarkot. They want us to meet them actually elsewhere, not in Kanjarkot. They want to hog you down in a marsh where you cannot fight at this time of the rainy season. But they are planning their attacks elsewhere. Please remember this. Therefore, for heaven's sake do not advise the Government, the Army and the Defence Minister to do this, that and the rest, immediately, for the sake of the honour of this country. The honour of this country, of course, has been violated not now, but seventeen years ago. We still have the aggressor, that is Pakistan, on our soil in Kashmir. Therefore, not merely on the military front, but some offensive has to be launched on the diplomatic front also. Therefore, I would submit to you that if we really want to win the war, then we need to get some more friends in favour of us. It may be that the United States is fighting the battle in South Vietnam in a way which might not appear to us to be very sensible, but let us leave the matter to them. Similarly, if the British are intervening in Malaysia—there is confrontation between Malaysia and Indonesia—let us leave that to them. Let us, therefore, make some sensible overall appraisal of the whole situation rather than go about shouting about other peoples' business whose result, ultimately, may turn out to be in our favour.

We must also not forget that China is the real enemy, that China is behind Pakistan, and that China will not attack us so long as it knows that the United States will be here to help them even without our too much

pleading. Fortunately, China knows about it. Therefore, we should not frighten our people with the thought that China and Pakistan will join hands together and if they attack us what shall we do? China will think twice before she attacks us. If Pakistan attacks us, it will be an engagement between India and Pakistan because Pakistan knows that in such a situation the United States and Great Britain would not be able to intervene. On the one hand, we are both in the Commonwealth and on the other hand they are aligned to America, etc. So, there will be some kind of peace talk after the tussle, struggle, etc. China cannot afford to intervene. No doubt China can boast that they will come, but then they will not come. They have not come so far in North Vietnam. They know their strength too. You should, therefore, while appraising your weaknesses, also know your strength, where your strength lies. Your strength lies in some of the friends who are fighting! the battle against China. That is number one. Number two, if you really want to have a showdown with Pakistan, go ahead. We do not want to be assured. It is you who are to be assured in your own minds about where to attack and when and who are going to be your friends in the long run and who are going to be your enemies. After making this appraisal and after making all this assessment, politically, diplomatically and militarily, go ahead with this and let God bless you and the whole country will be behind you.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated): Sir, it is not possible for me to assume that I am addressing a meeting of the Members of the various Parties in the House I cannot but be conscious that when we are speaking here, we are speaking in a forum which is a sounding board from where echoes go far beyond this Chamber. What we say and do here has a great repercussion on public opinion in the country and on opinion in various other countries about

India. On an occasion like that I feel that we should be conscious that we represent, a great country with great traditions of the past and a great future to look forward to and on all important -and critical occasions restraint, which should guide and control what we say ought to be regarded a determining and vital factor.

I do not feel in a mood to repeat any hard words that have been said about Pakistan. I do not think that the wrong action which they have taken need have any but a passing verbal, vocal reaction. Our reaction to what Pakistan has done ought to be in the nature of increasing unity within India and of strong and firm action on the field and it is in these two directions that all that we say and do here ought to lead. I do not also want to utilise this occasion, would not wish that we should utilise this occasion for criticising the Government in regard to what has happened. Many things have been said lightly. They have been referred to and stressed too but I think that is not exactly what should happen. Those who constitute the Government are as staunch in their patriotism as any one of us. They are as sincere and capable of sacrifice as shown by their lives as any one of us. I feel that they are as determined to see that the honour and dignity and the territorial sovereignty and integrity of the country is maintained as any one of us. Equally, I believe that they are sincere and earnest that the duties which times have imposed on them, responsibilities which times have cast on them, are properly, and bravely discharged. Therefore, I do not think that today is an occasion when we should feel in a mood to be hyper-critical because, as I said, this is a forum which is a sounding board from where echoes go not only to the Ganga and the Godavari, but they go beyond. They go to the Indus, the Yangtze, the Volga the Danube, the Mississippi—one does not know where—and I think if we wish to act in the interests of the country On occasions like this our ap-

proach to problems and our expression of opinion must all be controlled and guided. By this I do not mean that that such attempt has not been made by friends who have criticised. I think a conscious attempt has been made, but I still feel that we have to go a long way before democracy in India can function correctly during wartime. After all in our country democracy is being experimented by us in peace and in war. We need not think that America and the United Kingdom or Russia and any other country is a model for us and that we must necessarily copy some country or the other, whether in the East or the West. We shall have to shape our action according to the requirements of our country. We talk of non-alignment and I find that those who talk of non-alignment wish¹ to pull India away from non-alignment, in this direction or that direction. There are pulls by various groups and sections of people to see that we do not adopt non-alignment in the correct and proper manner, but I will not go into this controversy. What I feel is that on an occasion like this we should discard our differences with regard to certain matters, giving the heartiest support to the Government to tide over the present situation. It was very good that we had amendments from the Opposition groups supporting the Government, but that support must get reflected also in the speeches delivered, because we cannot forget that the atmosphere generated by the reporting of speeches in the House is an important factor. The wording of an amendment is not so important but it is the impact on public opinion which we create. Therefore, I would with great respect suggest that in dealing with Kutch affairs and Pakistan entanglement this may not be the last occasion for it, we should keep this matter in mind.

At the same time I would like to make a few constructive suggestions, to Government. One does not feel happy, I do not want to go into any details for which this forum is unsuitable, but it does not make one feel

[Shri Jairamdas Daulatram.]

happy that we should find ourselves attacked by surprise. This is the second time this thing has happened. I think something is lacking somewhere. I will not refer to any particular matter but something is lacking somewhere which prevents this country from knowing well in time the moves, intentions and activities of our neighbours. This is a fundamental requirement of a country which wishes to maintain its freedom and prevent any assault and aggression inside it.

The second suggestion that I would make is this. I do not know whether the report in the press is correct that the security of the border areas will be either financed or taken over by the Central Government in the Fourth Plan. The news may be correct, the news may not be correct, but I strongly feel that all our border areas must at once be taken charge of by the Centre, by a force controlled by the Centre and in some way integrated with our defence organisation. I have had occasion to go through this Rann of Kutch. I have gone through 30 miles of it from one end to the other. I have passed a night in the Chhad island or a neighbouring island, and I have had experience of the dangerous condition of this border—an arid waste, salty, hard, with mirage to deceive you; a plant appears like a tree, and also many other misleading things. It is a very dangerous border area. I think that we ought to take the earliest possible steps to see not only with regard to this Rann of Kutch but with regard to the whole of Rajasthan and all our border areas, that they are all taken charge of by the Centre. Unfortunately all our border areas are very difficult areas. Either they are high hills; 23,000 feet high in the north, or on the east 7,000 feet high, or arid waste and moving dunes in Rajasthan. I think we may face more difficulties if the Centre does not immediately take charge of the border areas.

The other suggestion that I want to make is that I think it is a very incomplete *mantram* or slogan which we

have adopted. We have said "Satya-meva Jayate" I do not think that that is a complete statement. The complete statement can only be "Satyam Bala-meva Jayate". It is only when truth is supported by strength that truth can win, and no one gave us a greater demonstration of it than Gandhiji. Gandhiji stood for truth but he put tremendous strength and pressure of the spirit of sacrifice behind it. It is impossible for this country to believe in non-violence of a passive type. When we say that we should not have violence, then we must have the strength to use the non-violent weapon. When the Japanese were about to defeat the British in 1944, it was Gandhiji who said: "I shall resist the Japanese with the same spirit with which I am resisting the British". Today we have not got that personnel. We have not got that material to develop that non-violent strength. Let us admit it frankly, and there is no way out so far as I can see for present-day India except to depend upon the strength of the normal type, and I entirely support those who have said that peace cannot be supported by India if India is weak. Russia will not count for peace if Russia had not its strength. America will not be talked to about peace if America had not its strength. I am not saying anything about the kind of strength, nuclear or of this or that form, but unless India of the present times has the physical strength to maintain its integrity and prevent any neighbouring country from thinking of invading India, India is lost because India has not got the non-violent weapon. I therefore suggest that Government as a government should seriously consider that we should enable India to stand entirely on its own feet without looking to this or that country unless it is for the time being wholly unready. It is an inherent principle of our independence that we should be independent also in our capacity to defend ourselves.

May I in the end again make an appeal to our friends of the opposi-

tion? They may not agree with me, possibly they will disagree, but I do appeal to them that occasions like this necessitate their trying to demonstrate that just as statesmanship is expected from the ruling party, statesmanship also is expected from the opposition. I have no doubt that if the opposition groups were one single opposition as in England or America, that opposition in my opinion would function a little differently. I will not go into these controversies but I believe that in the interests of creating a certain atmosphere in the country the proceedings of Parliament, the speeches in Parliament, the way in which we express ourselves, our emphasis, our vehemence, all these are factors which create or prevent conditions which enable India to face a difficult situation.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of every Indian to support the Government and I am perfectly certain that there is no Indian worth the name who is not behind the Government in its desire to protect our integrity and independence. I believe in democracy, Sir, but I believe also in its limitations. I believe that a discussion of this type, as my friend, Mr. Jairamdas Daulatram, pointed out, has very important repercussions all the world over. For this very reason I am in favour of carrying on such a discussion in a secret session, not open to the press, not open to the world. There is nothing undemocratic about it. If this had been adopted, we would have had the right of freedom of speech and at the same time the necessary secrecy from the other parts of the world. Unfortunately this has not been done. So it imposes a restraint on the Government, it imposes a restraint on us who have to speak and take part in this discussion.

Sir, when the leader of the opposition, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, spoke this morning, I was taken very much by surprise. It has been said that

207 RS—10.

this attack from Pakistan came as a surprise, and he said that this was really premeditated by good five years, that the State of Gujarat as far back as 1960 recommended the construction of six roads and that the Central Government could not come to a decision even about one road till February 1965. Well, it does not speak much for the vigilance of the Government however patriotic we be and however willing we be to support the Government. That is the very reason why I support the idea that the defence of the frontiers should be taken up by the Centre. It is not the business of the States only. It is the business of all the States concerned because all the States united stand for India. I regret to say that we have put strong faith in mere words. Whenever anything is done against our country, we send protests and we say that we are sending strong protests. But the strength does not go beyond words. It has almost become a joke in the international world about our protests. An independent country worth the name should be strong enough to support its integrity and independence either by the policy of non-violence or, if necessary, by the force of violence. We have done nothing of that sort all these years. Our protests are consigned to the waste paper baskets. Therefore, I feel that the time has come when the Government must make up its mind to be very determined and firm. Mr. Chinai said that it is not our business to tell the Government what they should do. I agree with him. We are not competent to say whether tanks should be sent, whether one brigade should be sent or half a brigade should be sent, but it is our business as Indians to say that something should be done. What that something is, is the responsibility of the Government. But it is no use being content merely with words. In this wretched world mere words have no significance. We are literally living on the top of a volcano and we do not know when the clouds of the third world war will

LProf. A. R. Wadia.]

overtake us. In such a world based on force, we cannot be negligent and be content merely with words.

Now, there is not the slightest doubt in the mind of any country in the world that Pakistan has been aggressive. Well, if Pakistan has been aggressive, it is our duty to repel that aggression, not merely by sending notes of protest, not merely by being on the defensive, but even if necessary, by carrying on the offensive. That is why our Army exists. We have been taxed so heavily and we pay the taxes willingly because we need a strong defence force. We were taxed heavily when China attacked us, it may be that we have to be very careful even about Pakistan. But if money has been spent, if we have taken arms from Russia, from America and from Britain and if we have taken loans to start our own defence industries, we must make use of these arms, and I feel certain that nobody will blame us as being aggressive. After all, we are defending only our frontiers. It is no use saying that we shall not enter into negotiations till such and such a plot is vacated. Have we done anything to see that it is vacated? That is our strength, and unless we are able to do it, it is no use trying to feed the world with mere words. Peace is all right, but peace has its limits. We are a peaceful nation, we all admit it, we are proud of it. But we are also a proud nation and our pride should be supported by the show of arms if necessary. War may be a bad choice but if it has to be chosen, it has to be chosen in the right spirit.

I entirely agree, I associate myself with the words of commendation that have fallen from the lips of so many hon. Members in praise of our soldiers who have fought so boldly and so courageously and who have laid down their lives for the sake of their country. But let them feel that we are behind them. I remember a very sad episode which took place |

long ago when I was travelling in the tram with a high officer of the Indian Army. And he was saying "we were on the brink of marching to Lahore but we were stopped". And we are reaping the rewards of it by having a cancer within our own body politic. If we had marched not to Lahore but at least to our own frontiers, all the evils that have been connected with the Kashmir problem would not have arisen. But we failed at that moment and I am afraid we are failing again at other moments. Let us be strong. Let us not fight shy of the word 'war'. If war has to come, let it come. That is the strength of the people, the spirit of the people, the wealth of the people behind it, and that counts. Without that spirit, Pakistan will continue to treat us with such scant courtesy without any appreciation of our efforts.

That is why I feel that we could have talked even more strongly if this discussion had been held *in camera* but even with these limitations, let not the world be deceived—we mean business, we mean to preserve the integrity of our country, whatever be the cost in men and in money.

Mk. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Mehta. I could allow you only five minutes— you yourself fixed it—because at five I have to call the Prime Minister.

SHRI M. M. MEHTA (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, I come from a part where the present battle is being fought. I call it a battle though it is an undeclared war. But we know that the very conception of Pakistan is based on hatred, communal fanaticism and jealousy of India. It was the great leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, who led India to the height in the world, but today when he is not there, they think that there is an opportunity to keep down our prestige.

In the Rann of Kutch and the surrounding areas, you will find that

the attack was just like the Chinese attack. China attacked India at a place where there was a sparse population and the Indian forces had to go far distant to save the border. Exactly the case is here. The Rann separates the main inhabited land of Kutch from the Pakistani border. All the police force was just on the southern side of it; the northern side has remained absolutely without there being any police post even. And that was why in 1956 Chhad Bet was taken. In these days we were in Part 'C State; the Centre was there. And immediately steps were taken and Chhad Bet was vacated by Pakistan. But I know it definitely—our Defence Minister will correct me if I am wrong. A survey party in 1958-59 went there and found that Sakkur, a few miles from Ram Ki Bazar, was occupied by Pakistan; they had already irrigated the land; revenue was paid to Pakistan. But our leaders at that time were busy in adjusting the borders of Maharashtra and Gujarat. It remained there. Some contradictory reports were submitted to the police, and in 1960 the administration of Chhad Bet was handed over to the State only to see that the smugglers did not come. And I am very sorry to say that there is no question of roads there. We appealed from the Kutch side for roads being built there. Every now and then we are drawing attention that roads should be there. Today also we say the same thing. If Chhad Bet was evacuated within a few days, it was only because Kutch was the Part C State. It was merged with the Central Government administration; then it was taken out. I think that decision was wrong. If today we reverse that decision and if Kutch is again brought under the Centre, this problem or controversy as to who is responsible, whether the Centre or the State, will not arise. No time will be lost in preaching or appealing or asking for sanction from here and there. It is a border which will remain alive for years to come. We should be alert and should not wait for negotiations to be begun. Not

only in Kutch, but all over India the same tactics are being applied. When homage was paid to the martyrs over there in Bhuj then, such a huge crowd was there present, even our jawans and people from the military were so much impressed by that. Today I say, there is not a single person who has gone away from any village where the gun-fires are heard day and night, but the people are there. The morale of the 5 P.M. people is so high. Every

young man there asks for arms and he will fight. That is a history there. Kutch has always been attacked from the Sind side and the people have fought very gallantly. The same history the people want to see repeated today. They say, "Give us arms. We shall fight." Every son of Kutch will fight in every street and in every house. They are so much prepared. But I am very sorry to say in this House that the enthusiasm of the people nobody takes care of. Even the people are not taken into confidence. People in the districts of Kutch swear in thousands forgetting all their differences, "We have no complaint today. We have nothing to say against the Government. We all stand for unity." Unlike the friends opposite who profess that only if the ruling party concedes to something they will give co-operation. Nothing of the sort. They say this is time that we should forget our differences and get united and become one. But unfortunately they are not taken into confidence. They went to the Government and said that they would do all the civilian work. If the pipeline has to be taken to Khavda or Chhad Bet they would take it. I say this, because if the people there are taken into confidence, so much civil defence work can be done. Not only that. There is another thing that I want to put. They, do not mind whether the Army goes there or not. The Army will go in time. I know yesterday some newspaper people had been there. They have mentioned what the Jawans told them. It is immaterial whether the Rann of Kutch gets

[Shri M. M. Mehta.] filled with water and Kutch becomes an island but they will be there and defend the land. But they want clear instructions. They say that they do not know what they have to do today when the tidal water comes. The tidal waters come on the 15th May and Kutch becomes an island surrounded by water when for connecting it with the rest of India there will be the metre gauge railway. I have come to know—I do not know. I am not a military man but this is what they say—that at Sardar Post when there was heavy concentration of Pakistanis nobody cared for it. We know that there was concentration with tanks and all these things. At that time only S.R. Police and C. R. Police was protecting it. They fought gallantly over there. Today again we have come to know that in Nagarparkar, just opposite to Bela there is heavy concentration of Pakistanis. If they attack from the sides of Bela and Wahgad, Kutch will be cut off in no time. After the 15th May it will be isolated from the rest of India. This is a very vital, strategic point. And today in Wahgad there is not a single military man, not a single military activity. I am not an expert. As I told you these things cannot be out of mind of the Government. But as I feel it I have put it before you.

Sir, there is another thing that I want to state. Everybody there feels that it is the American bullet that has killed the people there. They feel that the Americans are supporting them. Today we take America as our friend. Sir, Gujaratis as a class are very practical men. They say, "Why sit on the fence? Let us negotiate with China, but finish once for all with Ayub. Let China go to Vietnam and let America taste their arms over there. But let us solve the problem once and for all. Let us teach a lesson to Ayub. This will solve the problems with Pakistan once for all so that Pakistan will never raise its ugly head. We shall

see China afterwards". That is what they feel. Since the attainment of our independence we have been seeing these problems. Every now and then these problems come up and they will continue coming up unless we solve them sternly and with a firm hand; it will go on harassing us. I have no time; otherwise I would have elaborated it.

Sir, on the Kutch border there is pro-Pakistani activity. I should not say all these things over here. But I have seen it with my own eyes. And I have seen jawans being actually told of so many bad things for unnerving them. There is population on both sides with relatives living on either side. It requires very serious attention and if proper attention is not given and action taken, I do not know what misfortune it will bring to us. All that I know is that we have courage

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid your time is up. Prime Minister.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard the speeches of the hon. Members with care and attention. I was somewhat surprised to hear two or three speeches which were rather critical. I would not like to cormem on them but would leave it tr. those hon. Members to consider if it was proper or advisable to launch these criticisms at this critical juncture of our country when we all have to stand united, stand together to fight the present menace. However, I am grateful to all the other sections of this House, the Members who have spoken and the general support they have given to the Government. This has given added strength to our resolution and I am sure it would give much happiness to the Army because they will also know that they have the whole Parliament and the whole country behind them.

Sir, there has been some criticism made of our faulty preparations. I do not want to deny completely what has

been said. It is true that we have often concentrated more on the economic development of our country. We have rightly or wrongly felt that there was not much cause for aggression on our frontiers, on our borders. But we have often been deceived and it is important that we should take much greater care of our borders and frontiers. There is no doubt about it that we will have to make roads, provide better communication facilities and also do various other things. We have not taken any final decision, but I have no doubt that the Centre will have to take the major responsibility of the borders and of the arrangements on our frontiers.

There are two or three things about which there have been some whispers going round, going about. It has been said that there is some difference of opinion amongst the Ministers in regard to the various steps we have taken or we are taking in so far as this issue of the Kutch-Sind border is concerned. I might make it absolutely clear that there is no truth in this at all. There is complete unanimity and the Government and the Members of the Cabinet wholly and entirely share the views which I have expressed here this morning and have expressed in the other House the other day. It is also said that we are taking a complacent view and we are really not serious about this matter, that is, we may not do the needful and might just keep quiet over what has happened and leave things as they are. There would be, if I might say *so*, nothing more wrong than, as I have said, what is being suggested. We are quite earnest and may I say that the jobs we have taken up would be fulfilled with the fullest might at our command and with the fullest sense of responsibility? There has been some talk about the Army also. I do not want to go into that at all. Merely talking to some jawans if anyone comes to certain conclusions, it would not at all be desirable. The decisions are taken at the top level of the Army. It is just possible

some of the people down below may agree or may not agree with it. It is always the case everywhere, but in the present situation specially, I would like to appeal to all who are concerned that impressions should not be formed merely by talks with certain jawans or some of the officers down below. The decision on policy is entirely that of the Government. There is no doubt about it, that in so far as policy matters are concerned, it is entirely the responsibility of the Government, of the civil authority and then in so far as strategy is concerned,—employment of men, use of weapons or armour,—that is entirely the responsibility of the Army and the Government can never conceive of coming in the way of these operations or of these various matters to which I just now made a reference. So I would very much like that this kind of talk and these gossips come to an end. It creates some kind of sense of frustration among the people. I would beg of all of us and I would also request those who are outside the House that great restraint has to be exercised in regard to these matters.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta on the one hand says that this conflict should not escalate. I have also said it but then if the U.K. Prime Minister tries to mediate or makes certain proposals and we see such proposals with some suspicion, then, in that case, there can be no talk or possibly there can be no further discussions but I might say that I do not want to proceed purely on an assumption that a particular country has any evil intentions and I do feel—I might share in some of the views he has expressed about the U.K.—whatever their approach, in so far as this particular matter is concerned, I am prepared to accept the bona fides of the U.K. Government. It is true that we would not like this thing to be delayed any further. I mean, we have more or less given our views to the U.K. Prime Min-

[Stoi Lai Bahadur.]

ister. Why should it take a long time for the Pakistan Government to furnish its own views? Therefore we were rather keen and particular that the U.K. Prime Minister should try to obtain the views of Pakistan in this regard and try to get it as early as possible.

I would not like to take much time of the House but I might say that if once we are fighting the aggressor, it is exceedingly important that we remain peaceful and united inside the country. Any talk of hatred or bitterness against any community would be most suicidal. I know that there has been a very great response. I have been receiving letters and telegrams from the minority communities that they are prepared to offer their services and they are prepared to sacrifice themselves for the security and freedom of the country. In these circumstances, I would appeal that there should be complete unity and accord in our country between the different communities and we should all stand as one to fight the present difficult situation and come out of it successfully.

I might also say that if possible—I do not know but I would like to suggest that—there should be no demonstrations against Embassies. It does not pay us in any way. There is hardly any point in leading a big procession to a particular Embassy and demonstrate there for some time and come back. It is, if I might say so, sheer waste of energy and I would therefore like to appeal to all . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You speak strongly against them.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I would like to appeal to all those who may be thinking of it, to stop it completely. There are a number of amendments but I would like to say that the amendment of Mr. Vajpayee is more or less the same as the amendment of Mr. Mani and Mr. Bhargava.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Then it should be accepted.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: But he has added a para to it.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: That is very important.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Although I endorse what he has said, but I do not think it advisable that we should have a different Motion than what was passed in the Lok Sabha. It is true that we are determined to vacate aggression and we do not want to accept any kind of talks or negotiations which would in any way lead to the partition of even an inch of our territory or separation of our territory. Therefore I say it is quite obvious that what Mr. Vajpayee has said in his amendment has been brought out in my speech and that is the definite policy and conviction of the Government. Therefore I would suggest to the House that the amendment as moved by Shri Bhargava and Mr. A. D. Mani may be accepted and we may pass that Motion unanimously. I have only to say that we are passing through very difficult times and our responsibilities are indeed very great. I have no doubt that we are determined to fight the aggression and I am quite sure to tell the House that we will definitely come victorious out of it. Thank you very much.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: May I seek a clarification? The hon. Prime Minister in his speech this morning stated that along with cease-fire, simultaneously there should be restoration of the *status quo ante*. Obviously the two things cannot happen together. First there will be cease-fire and then the restoration of *status quo* will follow. Does it mean that we are in favour of cease-fire even though the Pakistani forces will be on Indian soil and, if so, will not that amount to acceptance of defeat? How can there be any cease-fire unless the

Pakistani forces quit our territory? May I request the hon. Prime Minister to make the position clear?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR; Well, Sir, of course cease-fire has to take place first in the sense that there will be disengagement of the armies, and then, simultaneously or side by side with the acceptance of the cease-fire, the principle of *status quo ante* has also to be agreed to; these two things are not to be agreed to separately; they have to be agreed to simultaneously, at the same time. But the physical vacation does take time. Our army will also take a few days' time and their army also will take a few days to go back to their place. Therefore there should be no doubt at all in the mind of Shri Vajpayee, that by accepting the cease-fire we do not really mean that the armies of the two countries will go back to their places, to their respective frontiers.

SHRI G. MURAHARI; It is Pakistan that has come into our territory.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE; *la* ihat case why should we not insist that Pakistani forces should quit Indian territory? And there will be automatically cease-fire.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR; It comes to that.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE; It does not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; I have another point to get clarified. Even now the Prime Minister has not said something as to what he proposes to do in the new context with regard to the use of U.S. arms by Pakistan against this country, whether he has taken any initiative, diplomatic or otherwise, to take up this matter with the Americans. It seems to me that the Americans do not accept the exposure by the Government of India, by the Indian authorities, that U.S. arms are being so used. I should like to know from the Prime Minister whether any kind of contact has been

established diplomatically with the U.S. authorities with the clear suggestion that their arms are being so used and that their arms should not be sent to Pakistan any more and that if they continue to be sent, this Government would consider it a hostile act against India.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR; Weil, Sir, we have already taken up this matter with the Government of the United States. We have written to them; we have sent them the pictures and we have made it quite clear how we feel about this matter, and there is no doubt that the assurances given by the Government of the United States me not being fulfilled in this matter, that Pakistan is undoubtedly going against the terms of the agreement under which such arms were given by the U.S.A., and, as I said, we have brought it to the notice of the Government of the United States.

SHRI P. A^T. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh; 1 have one question for clarification.

MR. CHAIRMAN; It is rather late, Mr.' Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU; Just one question. Our respected Prime Minister made a distinction between the responsibility of civil authorities and that of military authorities in defence matters. He said that the responsibility, so far as the strategy and use of weapons is concerned, was entirely that of the military authorities. I want him to make it clear that when he says "use of weapons" he does not mean that the military authorities have a right in any country, whether in ours or in any other country, to use any weapon in any manner they like. If his speech goes in the form in which it is, it is likely to create some misunderstanding.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pra-de:h); tl is not a High Court judgment.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU; It is; it is much more than that; it is a statement on

[Shri P. N. Saprū.] behalf of the country by the highest dignitary.

Sum LAL BAHADUR: I mean, in so far as whether they should employ tanks, or whether they should employ bombers or lighters, it is entirely for the operational command to take a decision about it. If Mr. Saprū has in mind the use of some kind of nuclear weapons, well, I can quite understand it. The use of nuclear weapons or atom bombs will certainly not fall under the decision taken by the operational command. Of course in that matter it is a very serious decision to take, and ultimately in that case the decision finally would be that of the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the amendments to vote and I take up first of all amendment No. 2. In view of the remarks made by the Prime Minister I would first ask Mr. Vajpayee if he would press his amendment to vote.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to divide the House although I am not satisfied with the clarification given by the hon. Prime Minister. There is no need for any cease-fire unless the Pakistani forces withdrew from Indian territory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vajpayee, now I am putting you a definite question. Are you pressing your amendment or withdrawing your amendment?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: In order to maintain unity and unanimity I do not intend to press my amendment. I beg leave to withdraw my amendment No. 2.

Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then amendments Nos. 3 and 4 are *ⁿ t^he names

of Mr. Chordia and Mr. Kapoor. Would you like to press amendments Nos. 3. and 4, Mr. Kapoor?

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ और उसके पूछे बगैर मैं नहीं रह सकता ।

श्री अध्यक्ष : इतना जमाना गुज़र गया आप ने पूछ लिया होता ।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : मैं सिर्फ एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kapoor, I am very sorry. I am in the stage of putting the amendments to vote. I want to know whether you press your amendments to a vote, or you intend to withdraw them.

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : एक ही जवाब है ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please Kapoor, I will not allow it, a understand why I don't allow n. * have had occasions when everybody put questions. Now I am putting the proposition to vote.

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : देश की अखंडता के लिये मैं अपने संशोधन प्रेस नहीं करता हूँ ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 were, by leave withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put amendment No. 1 in the names of Mr. Mani and Mr. Bhargava. The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, this House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of the police force as well as of men and office^ of our armed forces while defending our frontier and pays its respect-

ful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our motherland, and, with hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India?"

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the motion, as amended, to vote. The question is:

"That the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of the Police force

as well as of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontier and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our motherland, and, with hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-six minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 4th May, 1965.