

powers are adopting. But I think, his recognition, the formal recognition by India of that Republic, would perhaps help the situation and help the process of solution of the German problem. When West Germany is recognized, why should not the other Germany be recognized since they exist as a matter of reality? I think that would help.

Then, Sir, about the Algerian question. I think the Prime Minister is thinking too much of De Gaulle as a Gaul. I call him De Gaulle, he calls him a Gaul. Anyway I will use that expression. We cannot count on his goodness. You have seen what has happened in the elections. Now, about the elections the "New Statesman" wrote that the French had voted into power for the first time since 1871 an anti-parliamentary assembly. As far as the Communist Party was concerned, the Communist required 3,88,000 votes on an average to be elected as against 19,000 by the De Gaullists. By getting over 20 per cent, of the total votes the Communist got less than 3 per cent, of the seats. That shows which way things are moving. I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to what has happened. I would ask him not to rely much on it. He has taken a courageous stand. That should be pursued. I think the provisional Algerian Government should be recognised. It is not unknown in international law that provisional governments are recognised. Why should you not recognize? That will morally strengthen their position, morally isolate those people who are opposed to the settlement of the question of Algerian independence in a proper way. De Gaulle is not interested in it but is interested in exacting a complete surrender from the Algerian people which, of course, after all their heroic struggle and sacrifice, would never come. Therefore, I would not count much on De Gaulle.

Sir, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether the question of the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry

has been taken up with the De Gaulle administration. We were told that last month the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry would take place. The matter is being delayed. That agreement was signed in 1954. That matter is being delayed, and I would like to know what is the attitude of De Gaulle on this matter and why there is this delay.

Then I should like to make certain suggestions for the Prime Minister to consider. As far as the United States military aid to Pakistan is concerned, we are of the view that we must strongly express our opinion, and this must be expressed not only at the political level but also at the diplomatic level. We think that we are within our right to declare that the Union of India considers the continuance of arms supply to Pakistan as an unfriendly act towards India. It is necessary to do so in order to isolate people who carry on such kind of activities like supply of arms. It strengthens our position in the comity of nations. It will also have a good impact on the United States itself, and it will also assure the people of Pakistan who stand for friendship and peace with India. Therefore, I think I that it is necessary.' Sir, it is very ' good that-Mr. Chagla focussed attention on the United States arms aid to Pakistan, and he has done a good job of it. But I did not quite appreciate as to why he should have pressed so much for economic aid. The more we talk about economic aid from the United States, the more we weaken our case against the military aid that is coming for Pakistan. I think, Sir, we are not weak as to be so helpless that every time we speak to them, we should stretch out our hands to them for some dollars. Is that necessary? I cannot quite appreciate that. It compromises our position in so far as our stand against the U.S. arms aid to Pakistan goes. Therefore, it is also necessary to say that. Mr. Chagla said that Pakistan stands in the way of good relationship between India and the United States. I say that it is the United States which stands in the way