

MR. CHAIRMAN; And now, the last amendment.

The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, the House approves of the policy.' "

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration and having considered the same, the House approves of the policy."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, may I draw your attention to this cartoon from the "Daily Mail" which has been reproduced in a Bengali paper which shows the Prime Minister talking peace but showing his guns at Pakistan? And it asks, "Mr. Nehru, can you spare a moment for your celebrated 'Angel-of-Peace' act?"

We say that this is inspired by the British Tory policy

MR. CHAIRMAN Order, order.

SHRI B. GUPTA:and I think it has to be taken note of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has a bee in his bonnet.

[Ms. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

ANNOUNCEMENT *RE*: EXTRA TIME FOR PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up the Private Members' Resolutions.

SHRI B. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, may I take a submission in connec-

tion with our discussion of the Private Members' Resolutions? Next week, on Friday we have to take up the Private Members' Bills and I believe that the Bills that we have will not take up much time. I, therefore, submit that we might take up Private Members' Resolutions also on that day, after we have discussed the Bills.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We would have had five hours today, but three hours have been taken away. Next Friday, does the House agree to continue discussion for three hours?

(No *hon.* Member dissented.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Very well.

RESOLUTION *RE*. U.S. MILITARY AID TO PAKISTAN—*continued*

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, the discussion on this Resolution, I take it, is in a sense a continuation of the discussion we have been having since yesterday and I believe that the Indo-Pakistan relations show up in a certain sense the weaknesses in some of the basic elements that go to constitute the foreign policy of the country. Last time when I was speaking, I asked myself the question as to why Pakistan, although it knew that if it should accept military aid from America it would be bartering away its freedom, even so agreed to accept that assistance. And the only answer that I could find was that rightly or wrongly Pakistan felt or feels that by accepting that assistance, it would be in a better position to deal with India in the solution of the Kashmir problem. I do not know how that can happen, in view of the expressed opinion of America that these weapons are not to be used against another country. But I had been to>

West Pakistan and I found that the prevalent feeling in that country seems to be that whatever America might have said or may want Pakistan to do, this military assistance would help them to deal better with India. That is the point which the Government of India will have to take into consideration.

I was suggesting that if the success or the strength of the foreign policy of a country was dependent upon the internal economic strength of that country and the relations of that country with its neighbours, then it must be admitted that however much we might take pride in what we had been able to achieve in Geneva, our real condition was not very happy and satisfactory. Economically we are still very poor and that is a constant threat to the establishment of a form of society in this country which would assure a democratic way of life. Our relations with our neighbours, as for instance, Pakistan, Ceylon or even Nepal, are not as they should be. When I mention Nepal, I do not mean the Government of Nepal but it is known that there is a section of the people there who rightly or wrongly, probably without knowing the real facts, are suspicious of the assistance that we have offered to them. But whatever Pakistan may do, we feel *i.e.* the party to which we belong feels that we should try our utmost to develop cordial and peaceful relations with Pakistan. If it is true as the Prime Minister has said, that basic facts will ultimately control and guide the foreign policy of any country, there are reasons to think that there are common grounds for Pakistan and India particularly, to have a common policy. Today, unfortunately, Pakistan has been led away and is not pursuing a policy which is to her own interest or to the interest of other countries in this region. But conditions may develop and such conditions have developed, I believe, on either side which may help to bring the two countries together. I refer to the floods, the recent floods which have

brought immense misery to both countries, to Pakistan as well as to ourselves. If such devastating floods are to be controlled properly and if such devastations are to be prevented, and if the people are to be saved from the misery which they have to undergo whenever there are floods, then it is necessary that the two countries should come 'together' and devise means by which these floods could be controlled. In the same manner, I feel that we should try to develop peaceful relations in various ways with Pakistan. Because if we believe that even America and Russia may be brought together on account of certain conditions which, if they are not adhered to, would bring about great devastation or bring about even the end of the world, then there is no reason to think that we would not be able to evolve conditions which will bring both the countries to a better frame of mind and enable them to live peacefully as neighbours. Certainly, we want Pakistan to prosper because unless Pakistan is prosperous and is economically strong, she would always be a constant threat in our flank. Therefore, it is necessary that the two countries should come together and try to evolve a common formula and I have no doubt in my mind that this is the correct policy to pursue.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Resolution gives us an opportunity to discuss one of the most important subjects which call for our constant attention, namely the U.S.-Pakistan Military Pact. Now, this matter has been debated in this and in the other House and it has also been discussed in the country by the people. The whole Pact has to be viewed in the context of the American war plans against the people of Asia and for sabotaging whatever efforts are being made for the consolidation of peace in our part of the world. It is also in the context of the present aggressive activities of Portugal, backed by the United States and British Imperialists that we have to view this particular Pact. It is not an isolated

[Shri B. Gupta.] event; it is from the Turko-Pakistan Pact that we came to the U. S.-Pakistan Pact and it is from the U. S.-Pakistan Pact that we are now proceeding to the SEATO, • proposed military agreement on the part of certain imperialist powers in order to create rival blocs in Asia so that they may make Asians fight Asians. It is very right that this Pact has to be opposed by all sections of the people and it gives us satisfaction to see that there is an issue on which it has been found possible for the Congressmen, Communists and even the Socialists and others to unite in order to forge a national front against the American threats. Unfortunately, however, these efforts have not been carried forward largely as a result of the policy of the Government.

Now, since the Prime Minister is here, I would like to tell him that he has at least got some Ministers in West Bengal who go about the country openly running down China, not saying a word against the American imperialists, not saying a word against the British but taking advantage of the platform in order to create hatred and a campaign against the Chinese Peoples' Republic with whom we have come to an agreement. I particularly refer to the speech made by Shri Ajoy Mukharji, Irrigation Minister of West Bengal on the 15th August 1954 at Tamluk. There he got up not merely to run down the Communists of India—that of course they will always do—but also to run down and slander the Chinese Peoples' Republic despite the circulars of the Congress Party that the people should be mobilised behind the Five Principles. There are also leading public men in the country who still continue to support the Americans and who do not see the importance of rallying the people against this threat. "The Statesman"—a paper which is patronised by the Congress these days, I am told—published a number of articles by one Nirad Chaudhury who was in the service of the Government and

who not only defended the U.S.-Pakistan Military Pact but also supported the atom and hydrogen bombs in the possession of the U.S. as something which is saving this sub-continent of ours. On the day on which Mr. Chou En-lai arrived in this country and was given a welcome from all quarters, there appeared in "The Statesman" a letter by that incorrigible A. D. Gorwala, who advised the Indian Government and the people of India not to give any quarter to that man, Mr. Chou En-lai, but to line up with the Americans. Then, an article appeared in the *Eastern Economist*, a paper owned by Mr. Birla, which even now indirectly asks the people to line up with the Americans. That is how the canvassing for the Americans is going on. Yesterday we heard the redoubtable gentleman of unbroken by-election defeats, Dr. Ambedkar, championing America. Now, I can quite understand and I would not so much mind this because I know that if the Americans had started an international political circus—putting Dr. Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-Shek and Dr. Adenauer of West Germany, Dr. Ambedkar's place would be assured there; there is no doubt about it. But at the same time, one must not overlook the fact that such people, when they express such sentiments, they reflect and indicate that the American lobby is very much at work in our country even at the present moment. Therefore, it is very necessary to take vigorous action against the American machinations in this country. Unfortunately, the tourists and the research students—they are old, some of them are perhaps even older than the Prime Minister himself—come here to do some research work; they come to the universities and say that they have come to learn after so many years about India. But we find it from the experience of the Calcutta University that they are here to sell their Eisenhower-Dulles stuff, nothing more than that. You find the American tourists coming and also the spying work that is being carried out in the frontiers of our country. This is very well known but then no action is being

taken and there are people, very highly placed, in the country who would never open their mouths against the Americans. We have in Dr. B. C. Roy, one such person.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, we are concerned with the U.S.-Pakistan Military Pact.

SHRI B. GUPTA: The Chief Minister of Bengal, if you don't like the names.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are concerned with the American Military aid to Pakistan.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): He is explaining the dangers of the Pact.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I cannot toe the official line in this matter. I shall certainly speak out the facts.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please speak on the Resolution.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I may tell you that the time has come for vigilance. Do not look out for the saboteurs only in Kashmir; they are everywhere in India, in some other places and some of them are highly placed. I would not name them but I mentioned Nirad Chaudhury whose article is available there in 'The Statesman'. He was a servant of this Government until recently. I know he has been sacked not for that article but for some other reason but Gorwala is there; Gorwala is still there who is given charge of commissions and all that, who produce reports for administrative reforms which we discuss. He is a person who brazenly pleads for lining up with the American warmongers and who does not find anything wrong in the U.S.-Pakistan Military Pact. Such people have to be kept at arms length; they have to be disarmed. That is what I am going to say.

At the same time, note has also to be taken of the economic aids. I know that the Prime Minister differs with us on that score; he thinks that nothing will be done and that we will not be

beaten by this kind of thing and that economic aid will not make this country line up with the Americans. Noble sentiments, no doubt, but the experience of the world shows that these aids have been precisely used for entangling the country into the dirty plans of the Americans. Great as he may be, there are other forces in the country who are pro-American. American diplomacy is something which is active not only in the economic and political field but also in other very dirty fields. We know what they do. We have seen them functioning in the Middle-East; we have seen them functioning in the Near-East; we know how they carry out 'palace revolutions' and all such things. This is something which has to be taken note of. The economic aids are being utilised by the Americans to entangle our country and, not only to entangle our country but to create the influence and the atmosphere in the country when they can carry on their propaganda. Therefore, they make it as if they are doing something good for us.

Now, much is said about the Community Projects. I would not go into that.

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, this has nothing to do with the Resolution. Please do not be irrelevant. The subject is about the U.S.-Pakistan Military aid.

SHRI B. GUPTA: That is the Resolution and I have been trying to show.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Community Projects have got nothing to do with the U.S.-Pakistan Military aid.

SHRI B. GUPTA: On a point of order, Sir. I know, Sir, you dislike these things. That is my trouble. I am never liked by the Deputy Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please speak on the Resolution.

SHRI B. GUPTA: It is my misfortune. I would read out the Resolution and I shall point out how my speech is relevant:

"This Council is of opinion that Government should invite a convention of the leaders of different political parties and prominent independents in the country to discuss the situation arising out of the proposed military aid by the U.S.A.".

I was precisely discussing that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: "..... to Pakistan....."

SHRI B. GUPTA: "..... to Pakistan and to suggest the line of action to be adopted by the nation in the matter".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You speak on that Resolution; nothing beyond that.

SHRI B. GUPTA: The threat is there; it is on the other side of the frontier. We know that it has got to be fought, We must understand that and we must see that the friends of Americans who may act at any moment as fifth columnists at any time are disarmed in this country. My words may seem unpalatable to the Chair but only the Americans and their friends would be happy if I did not say these things. I say that it is necessary to take action against them.

I would now come to another aspect. Have you ever thought over the fact as to who are supporting the U.S.-Pakistan Military Pact. The Prime Minister rightly pointed out that many countries in Asia have opposed it. I know Indonesia and Burma spoke against it. Afghanistan spoke against it. Also in Egypt there were voices raised against it. Certain Middle Eastern countries spoke against it though unofficially, not officially. Let us see who are supporting this. The

U.S.-Pakistan Military Pact is also supported, apart from the Americans, of course, by our Commonwealth friends. Sir Alexander Clutterbuck made a statement in Madras that he did not see anything wrong in the U.S.-Pakistan Military Pact.

Then the support came from the British Foreign Office which made a public statement in order to indicate their support to the U.S. Military-Pact. Now these are the people who supported the explosion of the hydrogen bomb. These are the people who are trying to get the SEATO ready. Now you must take note of this thing, you must see the enemy and his ally. Churchill today is the greatest ally of American Imperialism. We cannot fight Eisenhower without taking care, of Churchill also. Well, that is another point which I would like to draw the attention of the House to.

Now, the Prime Minister very rightly pointed out the national danger and he also suggested that we should have a national front. We can understand that. Now, a national front has to be built and based 'on a correct bold national policy and that policy is something in which the imperialists and their friends should be given no quarter whatsoever and above all that policy should not give any quarter to friends of American war-mongers who are highly placed in Government and there are too many of them lurking inside the Government and they are to be found out. If the Prime Minister does not find them out today, unfortunately for the country, it will be left to somebody else and at a very heavy cost to And them out some other day. Therefore, the Prime Minister of India who is undoubtedly a wise man should act betimes and should take notes from what had happened in other countries. That is why I say action is called for on all fronts. To fight against the U.S.-Pakistan Military Pact is a sacred honour for all Indians. We can give them a rebuff. We are already doing it. We are not frightened. We know

the Americans are sending troops; the American army is in East Bengal and also in the western part of Pakistan; more are coming. Military consignments are also about to be despatched by the United States of America to Pakistan. All these things are known. Now, we know that we are not going to put out military threats against Pakistan. Very rightly the Prime Minister has pointed out that our policy with regard to Pakistan should be a policy of peace. We want to stand by this thing whatever they may do. We know Pakistan today is a victim of American aggression, is the victim of American diplomacy which is based on "position of strength". We know all these things. We have full sympathies with the people of Pakistan. The election in East Bengal showed that the people of Pakistan are opposed to this diabolical military pact. That was revealed in the general elections in East Bengal and thereafter when newly elected 160 M.L.As. there issued a joint statement against 'his pact. Today Iskandar Mirza's regime has been set up there in order to silence the people of Pakistan, but we know that their voice will rise, rise again against this military pact. We want our voice to be mingled with that voice so that we may make common efforts in friendship and in amity against this American threat of aggression. At the same time I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister that he should look after his department, the secretariat, the ministerial *gaddis* because there are, I know, old friends of America still lurking there, who have not shed their friendship for the American imperialists. There was Dr. Ambedkar in his Cabinet who has now shown his hand. I think there are still more in such high places. The sooner they are removed the better for the country.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it almost appears as if this was a continuation of the debate which we had been having since yesterday.—I suppose it is pos-

sible, in terms of this Resolution, to talk about any matter—but the Resolution really is quite a simple one, that in view of the U.S. military aid to Pakistan, a conference of political leaders of various parties should be held. That Resolution was discussed, on the "last occasion. The Resolution was sent in February and discussed in April. Well, that was about six months ago. Whether that Resolution was appropriate then or not we might consider, but it seems like a piece of history, the same Resolution now, which has no relation to anything, to any present-day conditions, the problems we have to face now.

I must confess, I fail to understand' how the foreign policy of any country can be carried on by public or private conferences of leaders of various parties. It is another thing and a very desirable thing for consultations to take place between the leaders of , parties, important Members of Parliament, on important matters of foreign or domestic application. But to hold a kind of conference for the purpose, let us say, of this—because the U.S. aid is going to be given to Pakistan and, therefore, we hold a regular conference to discuss this—seems to me that the hon. Member who thought of this idea really could not have worked out the consequences of it because it may lead to fantastic conclusions, this way of dealing with this matter. The very approach at that time—now, of course, it is a different question—of rushing up and having a conference because something had happened showed, well, a lack of poise, an excitement losing our hold, our grip completely and getting too agitated and frightened, which was a wrong approach to the biggest thing, much less to this. Apart from that, as I said, how could such a body discuss all these matters? Practically, all people all over India reacted against this military aid to Pakistan by the United States, maybe some reactions were stronger than others, but we all thought it was a bad thing from the larger point of view of Asian and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

-call it what you like— and We expressed ourselves. There is no necessity for discussing that again by the proposed conference.

Then the next question arises, "What should one do about it?" What one can do about it may be on various planes, political, diplomatic, military, economic and all that. Certainly one can discuss that broadly. Even then I do not understand how under any set of circumstances almost this Resolution can be given effect to, of a conference of experts and others. Mind you, it does not even limit, it does not even say that leading Members of the Houses of Parliament should meet together, as we should, whenever necessity arises, but a kind of a public conference, which, it seems to me, almost is pushing away Parliament from the picture somewhat, and creating all kinds of psychological and other difficulties in the country, nationally and internationally.

So far as this Resolution is concerned, I do submit it is completely out of place and cannot possibly be accepted. I cannot under cover of this Resolution, discuss the particular field of foreign affairs again. But I would submit to you, Sir, and to the House that it is very unfortunate if any hon. Member brings in the names of numbers of people and attacks them here. It is usually the custom not to do so, when one deals with principles not to attack people who, to begin with, are not present here, and secondly who are not in a position possibly to reply. Now the hon. Member's political views may differ completely from those of the two or three gentlemen he named. I myself do not agree with those gentlemen, but that I submit is, it is not a proper convention for us to develop or allow to develop that these names should be bandied about here and severely criticised.

The hon. Member also referred to the U.K. High Commissioner because

what he had said somewhere in >.ras. I regret that he referred to him also in this connection because the U.K. High Commissioner cannot, in the nature of things, reply or say anything. Speaking from memory, I do not think the United Kingdom High Commissioner said anything to which one can take exception on the diplomatic plane. One may not agree with what he said. That is a different matter. And also remember that very often these foreign ambassadors and others do not say anything *suo motu*. You may say pressmen surround them and put questions to them and they have to reply on the spur of the moment; and then one takes that reply out of the context, when it is not a very considered statement and when it is only something said in answer to a particular question. Therefore, I do suggest that this type of criticism of diplomats—or indeed of anyone else—normally should not be made. Of course, if something is said, one cannot go about criticising newspaper editors, columnists, etc. That is their job in life, and for this House to enter the lists with columnists of newspapers hardly seems to me proper. Of course, if somebody, Indian or foreigner, misbehaves greatly, it is left to this House or any Member to bring it to the notice of this House for us to consider it. But this kind of criticism, of calling anybody names, stooges, etc., does not bring that atmosphere of quiet consideration which normally, I submit, should prevail in this House.

• SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I would like the Prime Minister to be a little less rigid about interpretation of this Resolution and to say something about Kashmir and Indo-Pakistan relations.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, I shall deal with Indo-Pakistan relations. They depended, apart from the general background, on three or four issues—Kashmir, canal waters, evacuee property. There are

other problems but they are not important. Now, for the last many months, there has been some kind of correspondence going on between the Prime Minister of Pakistan and me with regard to these various issues. Much has happened since then. The House will remember the fact that the United States aid to Pakistan produced a new situation and the course of our correspondence in regard to various issues was suddenly affected by it. I informed the Prime Minister of Pakistan that this new situation had arisen and we could not carry on those talks on that old basis. Not that the talks should not continue. I said, let us consider them, but certain facts that were presumed to prevail could no longer be presumed, because the whole balance in regard to our relations was likely to shift. That affected more particularly the Kashmir problem. There the matter rests. We have exchanged letters on that and only, I think, about a month ago I received his last letter, to which about a week ago I sent a reply.

In regard to the evacuee property problem, I am afraid my enthusiasm has been quite frustrated, even more so than in regard to any other problem. Only recently I reminded the Prime Minister of Pakistan that my last letter to him in regard to the evacuee property problem was dated 7th May 1954, and that it had not been replied to for some months now.

In regard to the canal waters issue, I think towards the end of 1951 the President of the World Bank came to India and talked to us, and in Pakistan talked to the then Prime Minister, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, and suggested that the World Bank might perhaps help in solving this issue. We said we were willing and then these talks started in 1952—more than two and a half years ago. At that time it was understood—that was the impression that I gathered from a talk with Mr. Black—that the World Bank's talks would last about

six months, just on the broad issues, and they would then, if an agreement was arrived at, continue with a further detailed exploration. Well, the six months were extended to a year; and the year became two years and two and a half years. We did not arrive at any agreement with Pakistan in regard to the canal waters issue. I would remind the House that our position all along was that there was quite enough water to go round. There it is only a question of proper distribution of that water, and maybe the erection of certain canals, link canals, reservoirs, etc. Pakistan did not fully accept that. I would also like to remind the House that on 4th May 1948 an agreement was arrived at between Pakistan and us, which laid down that regardless of the legal aspects of the question and without giving up our legal positions—Pakistan and ourselves—we agreed that India could gradually take more water out of those canals for its own use, provided it gave to Pakistan enough time to build up its link canals, etc., so that she may not suffer. We declared that it was not our wish to make the Pakistan agriculturists suffer. That would be disastrous for us. It was agreed that we should take that water gradually. As a matter of fact, during these six and a half years we have not taken any water, or hardly any. So the World Bank considered this matter and ultimately—because we could not come to an agreement—produced a proposal which they sent to both parties. Broadly speaking, the proposal was that the waters of some of the rivers should be reserved for India and some of the waters should be given to Pakistan, subject to minor modifications. Also, it was suggested that India should pay a considerable sum of money to enable Pakistan to build up those canals and other schemes to get additional water. This must have been, I think, round about March this year—maybe earlier, in February. Well, that cast a heavy burden upon us financially and otherwise. However, we decided to accept the general principle and have it worked

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] out in detail. Pakistan did not accept it. They sent a reply which was, tantamount to rejection, although they wanted further information. Therefore, there was some further correspondence, and ultimately we pointed out to the Bank their rejecting this. We are prepared to continue talks on this basis further. But we gave the Bank a notice, and we gave Pakistan a notice, a formal notice, of something that we had told them previously, many times informally, that is, that we were no longer bound by the assurance we had given at the time of the reference the Bank—the assurance that we would not lessen the supply of water. We said, "We go back to our agreement of 1948." Not that we are going to lessen it, but we said it was open to us to choose. At that time the Bhakra canal was opened. As a matter of fact, we have not lessened the flow all this time, and we have even allowed this whole season to go without taking water, which we could have done through the new Bhakra canal—to the detriment of the nearby agriculturists. But we were waiting for it. Well, the position was that we had accepted the proposals of the World Bank, although Pakistan had practically not accepted them. They wanted all kinds of explanations. They have now, in a sense, accepted them with some kind of proviso that if it does not work out well, the matter would be reconsidered and the question reviewed. Anyhow, we hope that on the basis of the World Bank proposals further consideration will take place. I understand that representatives of the World Bank will be coming here in some weeks' time—I think, in the beginning of October—to consider specially an *ad hoc* agreement between the two countries, apart from a permanent agreement, so that this Bhakra canal, supplies of water, etc., will have to be considered.

Well, I mentioned three matters. One matter which I might mention

about this meeting at Baguio—the South-East Asian Conference. Now,

from one approach to it, whether that is within the terms of the Charter or not, I am not going into the legal or constitutional issue. But it does seem to me that the provision some regional organisation that the Charter gave us can hardly be applied to these types of organisations that have grown up, whether it is NATO or whether it is SEATO. I am not, for the moment, referring to the strict legal interpretation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. If I may say so, it spreads out and becomes something different from what it was. That is one aspect. Then there is another aspect—the SEATO. It has been pointed out by Mr. Krishna Menon that it is not merely a treaty of some countries promising to do something to each other, whether it is a military alliance or anything else. But hardly does a treaty of some countries do something to other countries to protect them. This is very odd. It is rather a new conception of two countries coming together and discussing what they will do to a third country or a fourth country. So, here, one of the basic things of the Geneva Conference was—again I am not interpreting it strictly legally—that these Indochina countries should remain neutral, should not go this way or that way. That is a very vital thing. In fact, the Geneva Conference almost broke down on that issue. On the one side, let us see the French. The allies of France could not tolerate the possibility of those countries being used against them in future. On the other side, China could not tolerate those countries being used against China—as bases or anything. So, the only way out of that difficulty was for those countries not to be used by this group or that group. That is the basic thing. Now, if anything is done which affects that basic position of Indo-China as a neutral area, the whole conception behind the Geneva Conference decisions is

shaken. And I do not know what the South-East Asian Conference might or might not do. But if it does something which shakes that impression, it shakes the basis of the agreement to some extent, not only psychologically, but practically also. As I said, this conception of countries agreeing to protect the other countries, whether the other countries want it or not, is, if I may say so, an old conception, which lasted at the time of the first World War.

Then there is another interesting thing. Suppose there is some kind of a military alliance. Then the result is that some of the effect of the other alliances that might exist is spread out on the other countries. I do not know if I have made myself clear. There may be, let us say, an agreement by the United States to give military aid to Pakistan. There may be another agreement about military aid to some other country. Now, if in the South-East Asian Organisation it takes a military shape, and if there is a common pool, then those separate alliances and agreements also affect the common pool and produce new difficulties. It is rather difficult, I say, to discuss this matter, because one discusses in the air. One does not know what the Baguio Conference might or might not decide. I am, therefore, merely pointing out to the House the problems that arise, the difficulties that arise, and arise unnecessarily, at this stage when we have made some progress towards improving the atmosphere of South-East Asia and the world.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, there seems to be a similarity between the Resolution before the House and the one which was moved and passed a little while ago. On the previous motion, I wanted to say that every section of the people

the country, irrespective of their considerations, heartily supported

and endorsed the foreign policy adumbrated and pursued by the Prime Minister and the Government of India, whether it be with regard to the power blocs in the world or Pakistan or Indo-China. Korea or French possessions or any question relating to the Portuguese territories,

because the people know, and are fully convinced, that the policy pursued by the Government of India is based upon the establishment, firm though gradual, of peace and goodwill in the world and justice to all

countries and parties concerned. The people, as a matter of fact, are pleased with the results that have accrued so far in certain spheres in which this policy had occasion to operate.

Now, coming to this question of American aid to Pakistan, it has, as was stated by the Prime Minister, become a matter of past history, but since this question agitated the minds of the people of India at a time when this question was fresh and since it continues to affect the ideas of the people here. I think, one or two words from me would not be irrelevant or out-of-date. Pakistan is, of course, an independent and sovereign State. Nobody disputes that fact. That country is free to follow her own policies and she is the master of her affairs in her own country, but then it is also understandable that in the management of her own affairs it is necessary that she should do things that it would not encroach upon the rights and interests of other countries, particularly her neighbours. Now, this alliance or pact sets in motion the process of the old colonialism again. Our country emerged from the tentacles of colonialism and imperialism only recently. So also did Pakistan, and now for us to be confronted with the same process once again is really a very sad affair. In the olden days colonialism started in the same way as it is being sought to be started now. They began with some trade relations, trade concessions, and then with alliances and so on. Particularly when a weaker country seeks aid

[Janab M. Muhammad Ismail
Saheb.]

from a stronger country, she necessarily comes in course of time under the control of the stronger country. There is no escaping from that fact, and if that stronger country, is involved in war, the weaker country also has necessarily to take part in that war. And when that weaker country happens to be the neighbour of another country, that neighbouring country has every right to be perturbed over that eventuality. That is the rational explanation of the anxiety of India over this matter. Therefore, it cannot be said that our country—India—is interfering unnecessarily and unjustifiably in a matter concerning only her neighbour. This is a matter over which the whole world is agitated today. Colonialism or imperialism or whatever you may call it is now being considered to be a dying force in the world. That being so, our neighbour, we are anxious, should not indulge in setting in motion that process once again. Whatever happens, I only want to say that every section of the people of this country, whether they be rich or poor, whether they be Hindus, Muslims or Christians, will be behind the Government solidly in whatever action they may take in this connection. This Resolution was said, by the Prime Minister, to be out of date today. There is a reason for it, of course, but what I thought was that this Resolution did not want a conference to be convened for the purpose of adumbrating a foreign policy and pressing it upon the Government of India. This Resolution, if anything, only attempts to strengthen the hands of the Government in any action, any step, they may propose to take in this connection. Therefore, I think there is no harm in this Resolution being accepted by the House. Once again I want to say that whatever may be the step that the Government is obliged to take, whatever be the policy which it is compelled to pursue in this connection, every section of the people of this country will be behind the Government solidly and firmly.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I rise to speak on the Resolution moved long long ago by my hon. friend, Mr. Mathur. At the outset, I may tell him that the Resolution has now become rather stale, and stale food, as we all know, causes indigestion. Therefore, it will not be proper for him to press this Resolution any further for the consideration of the House. This time may be better utilised in some other way.

Now, so far as the Resolution itself is concerned, I was surprised to read the wording of it: "This Council is of opinion that Government should invite a convention of the leaders of different political parties and prominent independents in the country..." To me it appears that this is the thing that the Government of India is doing almost every day of the year, in one part of the country or another. There are legislatures in all parts of the country, and there people of different political parties and prominent independents like my hon. friends. Dr. Mudaliar and Dr. Kunzru, meet and discuss things including of course the U.S.-Pakistan Military Aid Pact. The U.S. Military aid to Pakistan has been discussed several times in this House as well as in the State Legislatures. So far as calling of conventions is concerned, they are being held almost daily and therefore this contemplated convention will serve no useful purpose.

So far as the military aid itself is concerned. I am not at all disturbed about it. If our neighbour, Pakistan, which is unfortunately very much inexperienced up till now, decide to take military aid from an imperialist country like the U.S.A., we can only express our sympathy, our pity, for our neighbour, but we cannot prevent her from doing it. The best that we can do is to keep cool and to desist from taking action like that ourselves. You will remember that the U. S. President offered similar military aid to India and tried to drag us also into his newly invented trap, but vigilant as we were, the statesmen that our

leaders are, we refused the aid point blank and told him that, when we had condemned a thing like that in the case of our • neighbour, we could not agree ourselves to receive that sort of aid. When it was wrong for Pakistan to accept military aid from the United States of America, we said, it would be equally wrong for us to accept it and, therefore, we did nothing of the sort. So to my mind there is no necessity for discussing this thing which is now almost forgotten. It has had no very material and destructive effect on our country. We are vigilant, we are cautious, we are careful, we know, we know what stuff Pakistan is made of, we know what the trick of the U.S.A.—to take into its protection almost all the countries of the world—is. There is a tug of war going on between two blocs led by Russia and America but then we, as the world knows, have got our own independent way of thinking, independent way of action and, therefore, we don't mind what others do. I would therefore suggest to my hon. friend Mr. Mathur to withdraw the Resolution which is neither here nor there.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Resolution of my much esteemed friend, Mr. Mathur. Now I have failed to understand why the hon. Prime Minister could not see his way to accept this most innocuous Resolution.

SHM GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Does it serve any purpose now?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am coming to it. What it seeks is this. It seeks in its essentials that the foreign policy of India should not be the policy of a party to be announced in public meetings or market places. It should be a policy which will reflect the maximum measure of agreement. In other words, the Resolution aims at making our foreign policy, the policy of the nation. It should have the vitality of the agreed policy of the nation so that it can be pursued very effectively. Now, the hon. Prime

43 RSD

Minister contended that this Resolution is out of date. Probably he laid undue emphasis on the wording of the Resolution wherein "proposed military aid by the U.S.A. to Pakistan" has been stated categorically. Now, of course, it is an apparent fact but certain contingencies have accrued and have been accruing from that U.S. grant of military aid to Pakistan. It is a continuous process. Therefore, it has been mentioned in this Resolution "situation arising out of the proposed military aid by the U.S.A. to Pakistan." Now we are all aware of how the balance of power has been changed in Asia with Pakistan playing a very leading role in the Middle East under the aegis of the U.S.A. Really we have been left in the lurch. We have many outstanding problems to solve.

In this context, it pains me to confess that the foreign policy that has been pursued by the Government of India is at its best a policy pursued by a party and at its worst, a policy dictated by an individual. I may here cite certain illustrations. Now newspaper-readers must have been aware how hotly the Indo-Burmese rice deal is being debated in the Parliament of Burma. It is being debated there but we finalized the deal behind the back of Parliament. The Food Minister comes one blooming morning and lays a paper on the Table and congratulates himself over a deal that he has entered with Burma. Now let us go to U.S.A. The question of foreign aid to India was being debated for weeks both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. It was being debated there and various view-points were presented as to whether the foreign aid should be given to India or not. That was a very humiliating debate, so far as India is concerned; but I ask in all fairness, in all seriousness—let the hon. Members disabuse their mind of all party affiliations—'Was it ever discussed in this Parliament? Was any opportunity ever afforded to this Parliament to decide whether we should accept the various financial aids from the U.S.A. or not?

[Shri S. Mahanty.] No. Similarly, Indo-Ceylon relations. This question is being debated—very hotly—in the Ceylonese Parliament, but not so in India. Therefore, I venture to suggest that, at its worst, the Indian foreign policy is a policy dictated by an individual and, at its best, it is a policy dictated or dittoed by a party and announced from the ramparts of the Red Fort or in public places. The hon. the Prime Minister asked, "What do we propose?" He asked, "Do you suggest that we should convene a conference?" ~5f course, yes. What we intend is that it should be a conference not in the Ramlila grounds but *in camera*. Why do you consider that it is undesirable? Now, if I want to go and multiply instances, I can go on but the several instances that I have cited will be enough to convince the House that this Parliament is being given precious little chance to discuss many important issues which arise out of our foreign policy. Now what has happened? A lot of things have been said on Indo-China. I also share in the glory that is ours. But what is after all this Geneva Conference of which so much has been said? Public memory is proverbially short. Every one has managed to forget that after the Berlin Conference, between the cessation of the Berlin Conference and the initiation of the Geneva Conference, our Prime Minister

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahanty, again you are going astray. The Resolution is on American military aid to Pakistan.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am afraid, they will do the same in the proposed conference.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am coming to it. All these situations arise out of U.S. military aid to Pakistan.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must be relevant.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI A. K. I

CHANDA): YOU could have said all this yesterday.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am coming to it. It is not good to be impatient. You must first listen to me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want you to be relevant. Please speak on the Resolution.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I know my responsibilities. If I am irrelevant you can call me to order. The policy which is being pursued in respect of Indo-China or the Geneva Conference was never referred to Parliament nor was it even referred to the Congress Parliamentary Party which only knows how to vote. Therefore, most humbly I venture to suggest that the foreign policy should have the vitality of a unified nation, so that it can be effectively pursued by the hon. the Prime Minister. We don't want to stand in his way—let us not be misunderstood as standing in his way—we want to give him all our moral support. Therefore, with all humility I say that all that this Resolution seeks is that In order that our foreign policy may be fruitful, may be effective, may be vital it should be the foreign policy of a nation (a by taking into account various points of view of various parties but not of a party or that of an individual. With these remarks I commend this Resolution to the House for its approval.

سردار بدھ سنگھ (جموں اینڈ

کشمیر): جناب دیتی چیئرمین صاحب!

یہ جو ریزولیشن پیش کیا گیا ہے

اس سے بجائے اس کے کہ معامہ

سلجیہ اور کوئی مفید نتیجہ نکلے

کئی قسم کی خطرناک پیچیدگیاں

پیدا ہونے کا احتمال ہے۔ اس وقت

تک اس مسئلہ کے اوپر تمام پارٹیوں

کے لیڈران اور انڈیپنڈنٹ معزز

ممبران نے اپنی اپنی رائے دی ہے اور

شاید ہی کوئی بات رہ گئی ہو جو کہ قسطنطنیہ میں نہیں آئی ہو - جہاں گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کی فارن پالیسی پر مختلف خیالات کا اظہار کیا جاتا ہے وہاں کشمیر کا مسئلہ ایک مختلف نوعیت کا ہے - اسکی بالکل الگ صورت ہے - یو - این - او - میں یہ مسئلہ صرف اس لئے لایا گیا تھا کہ قبائلیوں کو پاکستان نے اپنی ملٹری ایڈ دے کر نہتے کشمیریوں کے اوپر جو چارحانہ حملہ کرنے کے لئے بھیجا تھا اسے روکا جائے کیونکہ انہوں نے وہاں قتل عام کیا اور خون خرابہ کیا - جو کچھ ہوا وہ آپ سب کو معلوم ہے اور یہ کوئی پرانی ہسٹری نہیں ہے بلکہ یہ چیز اب بھی تازہ ہے - ابھی وہ سلسلہ پھر سے جنگ کی باتوں کا چل رہا ہے ایک طرح سے جنگ جاری ہے گو سیز فائر لائن عارضی بن گئی ہے - مگر سیز فائر لائن کے دونوں طرف ہر وقت توپیں اور ہندوتپیں بھری ہوئی تیار رہتی ہوں - اسے پاکستان کے پرائم منسٹر نے تسلیم کیا ہے اور یہ روز روشن کی طرح ظاہر ہے کہ دونوں طرف توپیں اور ہندوتپیں بھری ہوئی تیار ہیں - کوئی قطعی فیصلہ ابھی تک نہیں ہوا ہے اور کوئی قطعی بات چیت ابھی طے نہیں ہوئی ہے - یہ مسئلہ ویسے کا ویسا ہی اب بھی چل رہا ہے - یو

این - او - نے بھی ایک طرح سے ہار کر کھینچا ہے کہ آپس میں فیصلہ کر لو -

ابھی انریڈل پرائم منسٹر جوامر لال جی نے بتایا کہ کس حد تک وہ اس معاملہ کو صلح سے حل کرنے کے حق میں ہیں - لیکن آج بھی اس وقت بھی دوسری طرف سے جہاد کا نعرہ لگایا جا رہا ہے - اور خوف و ہراس سے ملک کو تیار کیا جا رہا ہے اور کہا جا رہا ہے کہ کشمیر پر حملہ کریں گے کشمیر کو لیکر رہیں گے - کشمیر کے بغیر پاکستان کسی کام کا نہیں ہے جب کہ ابھی بھی وہاں کسی قسم کی کرائسس ہوتی ہے تو وہاں کے منسٹرس اور وہاں کے کرسچاری وہاں کی گورنمنٹ کو بچانے کے لئے فوراً کشمیر کی آنیوالی جنگ کا اعلان کر دیتے ہیں اور جنگ کی آواز بلند کرتے دھتے ہیں - تاکہ عوام کی توجہ اصل مسئلہ سے ہٹ جائے -

اب سوال پیدا یہ ہوتا ہے کہ اگر اس طرح کا کوئی کلوریشن بنایا جائے تو وہ کیا فیصلہ کرے گا - ہم نے درخواست کی کہ ہم پر حملہ ہوا ہے ہم نہتے مارے جا رہے ہیں تباہ وہ برباد ہو رہے ہیں ہماری امداد کی جائے ہم نے بنا کسی شرط کو لگائے ایکسیشن کیا یعنی الصاق کیا - اور اس وقت ہماری رہاست کی جتنی باؤندری تھی کواہانہ تک گڑھی حبیب اللہ تک وہ ساری

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

کی ساری ہم نے کہا کہ آپ کی
ہے اور اسکا آپ ڈیفینس کریں۔ ہم نے
کوئی شرط نہیں لگائی اور وہ ہمارا
پکا الحاق تھا۔ مارنٹائیٹن صاحب
نے کہا کہ ٹھیک ہے ہم آ رہے ہیں
اور تمہاری مدد کریں گے لیکن
ہماری خواہش ہے کہ جب کبھی
ریٹرس واپس چلے جائیں یا جب
ان کو وہاں سے نکال دیا جائے،
جو لوگ اپنے گھروں سے چلے گئے وہ
واپس آ جائیں اور امن قائم ہو
جائے تو پھر اس بارے میں رائے
لی لی جائے۔ ہماری یہ خواہش نہیں
تھی اور ہم نے ایسا کبھی نہیں
کہا تھا لیکن لارڈ مارنٹائیٹن صاحب
آپ جانتے ہیں کہ انگریزوں کی
پالیسی کو چلا رہے تھے اس لئے
انہوں نے ایسا کہ دیا۔ ہم بار بار کہہ
چکے ہیں کہ ہماری یہ خواہش
نہیں ہے اور نہ تھی اور اب تو
ہماری کانسٹی ٹیوٹ اسبلی نے
بھی یہ فیصلہ کیا ہے کہ ہمارا
یہ الحاق مکمل ہے اٹل ہے۔ میں
مانتا ہوں کہ جو یہ پرائم منسٹر
صاحب کی طرف سے کہا جاتا ہے
کہ ہمارا کمنٹمنٹ ہے تو ٹھیک ہے۔
پلیٹ چواہر لال نہرو ہمارے شاندار
پرائم منسٹر ہیں۔ ہمارا ملک
ہندوستان بڑا شاندار ہے۔ اور جو وعدہ
آپکا ہے اس پر آپکو قائم رہنا
چاہیئے۔ مگر حالات بدل چکے ہیں۔

پرائی باتوں کی بنا پر بات چیت
کرنا حاصل ہے لیکن بارہا میں
اپنی کئی سہیچوں میں کہہ چکا
ہوں کہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا نے بھی
کچھ کمنٹمنٹ ہم لوگوں سے کیا ہے۔
کہ جو ۲۸ ہزار مربع میل رقبہ
پاکستان میں ادھر چلا گیا ہے اور
دس لاکھ انسان جو کہ وہاں بھیڑ
بکری کی طرح اس کے قبضہ میں
چلے گئے ہیں ان کے لئے بھی آپ نے اور
ہم نے وعدہ کیا ہے کہ ہم ایک
ایک انچ زمین واپس لیکر دہیں
گے اور لیں گے۔ ہم اب تک اس
وعدہ ایٹائی کا انتظار کر رہے ہیں۔

اب سوال یہ پیدا ہوتا ہے کہ
اس معاملہ کو یو۔ این۔ او۔ سے واپس
لیں یا انتظار کریں۔ آپ نے درخواست
کی تھی کہ دوسرے ملک والے نے
حملہ کیا ہے اس لئے اس کو روکا
جائے۔ لیکن یو۔ این۔ او۔ نے اس بارے
میں اب تک کوئی فیصلہ نہیں
کیا اور ہم قطعی طور پر مایوس
ہو چکے ہیں۔ آج سے نہیں بلکہ
کئی سال سے دنیا دیکھ رہی ہے کہ
انصاف کرنا تو دور رہا ایک مجرم
کوہ ایک ظالم کو، قاتل کو، چور کو،
ڈاکو کو، قتل اور خون کرنے والے کو
اور جس پر خونریزی کی گئی ہے
جو قتل کیا گیا ہے جسکا خون کیا
گیا ہے جو بے گناہ مارا گیا ہے اور
جو مظلوم ہے ان دونوں کو ایک

ہی سطح پر رکھ دیا ہے - میں نہیں سمجھتا کہ یو-این-او-کیسی عدالت ہے - اس عدالت پر آپ بھروسہ رکھتے ہیں - ہم تو اس سے قطعی مایوس ہو گئے ہیں - اس کو اتنی بھی جرات نہیں ہوئی کہ وہ کہہ سکے کہ پاکستان نے حملہ کیا ہے - ڈکسن صاحب وہاں کے چیف تھے انہوں نے تحقیقات کی اور صاف صاف لفظوں میں کہہ دیا کہ پاکستان قصوروار ہے اس نے حملہ کیا ہے اس کی زیادتی ہے - لیکن پھر بھی کوئی ایکشن نہیں لیا گیا - دنیا جانتی ہے کہ امریکہ جدھر چاہے ادھر یو-این-او-کو گھما دیتا ہے - وہاں اس کا طوطی بول رہا ہے - یہ بھی کوئی عدالت ہے - جب اب تک یو-این-او-اس بارے میں کوئی قطعی فیصلہ نہیں کر سکی تو اب ہمیں یو-این-او-پر کوئی اعتبار نہیں - گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا اس سوال کو یو-این-او-کے پاس لے گئی تھی اور اس سے کہا کہ پاکستان کو روکو - لیکن کچھ نہیں ہوا اور پاکستان ہم کو برابر دھمکی دے رہا ہے ہم تباہ و برباد ہوئے اور اب تک در بدر ہو رہے ہیں - میں نیشنل کانفرنس کے ممبر کی حیثیت سے ہی نہیں بول رہا ہوں بلکہ میں خود معہ لواحقین تباہ و برباد ہو گیا ہوں - ہمارا گھر جائداد پاکستان میں ہے - اس ریاست میں میرا

کوئی گھر نہیں ہے - میری ایک انچ بھی زمین یا کوئی بھی گھر بھارت میں نہیں ہے - پاکستان لاکھوں روپے کی میری میرے رشتہ داروں اور میری لڑکی کی اور دیگر ہزاروں ہم وطن بھائیوں کی جائدادیں تھیں - لیکن ہم سے کہا جاتا ہے کہ انتظار کرو ہم دیکھینگے - یہ مسئلہ ایک انٹرنیشنل مسئلہ بن گیا ہے اور ہم آہستہ آہستہ صلح سے اور سمجھوتہ سے بات کریں گے - تھپک ہے ہم بھروسہ کر چکے ہیں اور اپنے پرائم منسٹر پر پورا بھروسہ کرتے ہیں - جب ہم نے ایک دفعہ سوچ سمجھ کر گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا سے ایکسیشن کر لیا ہے تو ہم کو آپکے حکم یا مشورہ اور آپکے ساتھ معاہدہ کے مطابق قانون کو ماننا ہے اور آپکے ساتھ چلتا ہے - لیکن آپ دیکھیں کہ مہرپور، مظفرآباد اور کوٹلی وغیرہ کا جو سارا کا سارا ۲۸ ہزار مربع سین کا علاقہ چلا گیا ہے اور وہاں سے جو دو لاکھ رقبہ جی بن کر آئے ہیں جنکا کوئی گھر نہیں ہے جنکے پاس کوئی پیسہ نہیں ہے انکو ایک پیسہ معاوضہ نہیں ملا ان کے بارے میں کیا کرنا ہے ؟ ہم سے کہتے ہیں کہ انتظار کرو - تو آپ اس طرح کا کنوینشن بنا کر کیا فیصلہ کرائینگے - کچھ سمجھ میں نہیں آتا - امریکہ ایڈ دیتا ہے تو دیئے دو لیکن آپکو باخبر رہنا چاہیئے - دوست دشمن

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

کا بھیہ کھل گیا ہے کہا جاتا ہے کہ کوئی ایڈ کیوں نہ لے۔ ہر کوئی لیتا لیکن خطرناک نتائج کا سامنا کرنا ہوگا ہم کو باخبر رہنا چاہیئے۔ امریکہ نے جو ایڈ دی ہے وہ دراصل کشمیر کو ہرج کرنے کے لئے دی ہے۔ اور ظاہر ہے کہ کشمیر پر حملہ کرنے اور زیادہ ظلم اور کشت و خون کرنے کے لئے دی ہے اس لئے ہم سب کو تیار ہر تیار رہنا چاہیئے۔ جب ہم نے گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کے ساتھ ایکسیشن کیا ہے تو گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا و انڈیا کے تمام لوگوں کو صرف ہمارے لئے ہی نہیں بلکہ اپنی شان عزت و وقار قائم رکھنے کے لئے اپنی سلطنت کو قائم رکھنے کے لئے پوری طرح سے تیار رہنا چاہیئے میری سچہ میں نہیں آتا کہ آپ کنوینشن بلاتیں گے تو کنوینشن کیا فیصلہ کریگا۔ اور اسکی کیا قدر و قیمت ہوگی۔

بات صاف ہے کہ یو۔ این۔ او۔ سے مقدمہ واپس لو اور پاکستان کو نوٹس دو کہ حدود ریاست میں ٹھہرنے کی تمہاری کوئی ضرورت نہیں ہے واپس اچھے ملک میں چلے جاؤ۔ بلاشبہ ہم گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کو سپورٹ کرتے ہیں پرائم منسٹر کی عزت کرتے ہیں اور اس معاملہ میں جتنے لہزیشن والے ہیں سب ان کے ساتھ ہیں۔ کشمیر کے معاملہ

میں کوئی اپوزیشن نہیں ہے۔ اس مسئلہ پر کوئی مختلف رائے نہیں ہے۔ ہم اپوزیشن والوں کے بھی بڑے احساسد ہیں کہ آپکو ہمارا درد ہے اور ہماری مصیبتوں کا آپکو احساس ہے۔ تو صاف بات کے لئے وہ صرف یہ ہے کہ یو۔ این۔ او۔ سے اس معاملہ کو واپس لیا جائے۔ اس پر آپ سب لوگ زور دیں کہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا پاکستان کو نوٹس دیدے کہ مہربانی کر کے آپ چلے جائیں، اور جس طرح ہو سکے ہمارا علاقہ ہمیں واپس دلایا جائے۔

ہم نے ساری ریاست کا ایکسیشن کیا ہے۔ لیکن ۲۸ ہزار مربع میل کا رقبہ پاکستان میں چلا گیا ہے۔ عدلاً اس کا قبضہ ہے وہ اسے ہضم کر کے بیٹھا ہوا ہے۔ سوکالڈ آزاد کشمیر کا تو محض نام ہی ہے ورنہ اسے کسی ملک نے بلکہ خود پاکستان نے بھی ریگنلائز نہیں کیا ہے۔ امریکہ گلگت میں آئے بنا رہا ہے۔ دوسری جگہ بھی آئے بنا رہا ہے۔ امریکہ کی مدد سے پاکستان ہماری ریاست میں چار میل سے دو سو میل تک گھسا ہوا آئے بنا رہا ہے۔ گلگت کا اڈا دراصل امریکہ کی مدد سے بنا رکھا ہے جو رشیہ (روس) کی حدود کے نزدیک ہے۔ کل ہمارے لرنیڈ مسٹر ڈاکٹر امبیڈکر صاحب نے کہا کہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا ہاتھال کشمیر میں جو ٹل

بنا رہی ہے وہ بڑی بھاری غلطی ہے۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ جب تک بھارت کا ایک بھی آدمی قائم رہے گا وہ پرائم منسٹر اور گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کو خراج تحسین دے گا کہ انہوں نے ایک بہتری کا کام کیا ہے۔ اس کماری سے لیکر لدان و گلگت تک راستہ آسان بنانے کے لئے ایک ٹرل کیا اگر ریلوے لائن بھی بننا لیں تو اچھا ہے ڈیفینس کیلئے ان کاموں کی اشد ضرورت ہے۔ ڈاکٹر امبیڈکر صاحب نے کہا کہ اس ٹرل کے بن جانے سے بڑی بڑی فکرو ہو جائے گی۔ انہیں ریشیا کی فکرو ہو گئی کہ وہ اس راستہ سے پٹھانکوٹ تک آ سکتا ہے لیکن امریکہ کی فکرو کبھی نہیں ہوئی کہ وہ کہاں تک پہنچ گیا ہے۔ وہ گلگت تک پہنچ گیا ہے اور وہاں ایروڈروم بن کر بیٹھا ہے۔ وہاں اس کے ہوائی جہاز آ جا سکتے ہیں۔ تو کیا روس اور چین اس بات کو جانتے نہیں۔ کیا وہ مردہ ہیں۔ سو رہے ہیں۔ نہیں وہ سب زندہ ہیں اور ہر بات کو جانتے ہیں روس جانتا ہے چین جانتا ہے کہ امریکہ کیا کر رہا ہے۔ اور کس لئے کشمیر میں آئے بنانے کے لئے پاکستان کو ملتی امداد دے رہا ہے۔

روس اور چین اس وقت تک چپ ہیں جب تک کہ وہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہم ہندوستانی ان کے دوست

ہیں۔ کشمیر کے اندر امریکہ اور دوسرے ملک جو بھی کر رہے ہیں ان کے بارے میں روس اور چین کو اچھی طرح سے معلومات حاصل ہیں۔ یہ ان ملکوں کی حرکتوں کو اچھی طرح سے جانتے ہیں اور واچ کرتے ہیں۔ وہ امن پسند لوگ ہیں۔ جنگ کے خلاف ہیں وہ کسی سے لڑائی کرنا نہیں چاہتے جب تک کہ انکی آزادی پر کوئی آنچ نہ آ جائے یا ان کی سر زمین پر کوئی خطرہ نہ ہو۔ پاکستان کو امریکہ سے جو مدد مل رہی ہے اس سے ہندوستان چین اور روس کو جو خطرہ ہو سکتا ہے اس سے یہ لوگ بیخبر نہیں ہیں۔ دنیا کی کوئی طاقت روس اور چین کو اپنے بچاؤ کے حق کے استعمال سے نہیں روک سکتی ہے۔ وہ اپنے محفوظ و بچاؤ کے بارے میں بے خبر نہیں ہیں۔ ہمارا ان کے ساتھ دوستانہ تعلق ہے۔ وہ نہیں چاہتے اور نہ ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ اس وقت کسی قسم کی غلط فہمی یا دشمنی دنیا میں پھیل جائے اور جنگ کی صورت بن جائے۔ مگر ہمارے امبیڈکر صاحب نے کل اس ہاؤس کے اندر جو تقریر کی اس سے یہ معلوم ہوتا تھا کہ وہ امریکہ اور برطین کی یعنی سامراج وادیوں کی نمائندگی کر رہے ہیں۔ ہمارے امبیڈکر صاحب نے جو کہ ایک ہندوستانی ہیں جنکے دل میں

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

ہندوستانوں کے لئے درد ہونا چاہیئے
اپنی آنکھوں سے دیکھ لیا ہے کہ
کشمیر کے معاملہ میں برٹین اور
امریکہ یعنی سامراج وادیوں نے کس
طرح سے ہندوستان کی مخالفت کی
ہے۔ کوریا میں کیا حالت پیدا کر
دی۔ اندو چائنا میں کس طرح
سے مداخلت کی اور اب گوا میں
اندر اندر سے ان لوگوں نے کیا رویہ
اختیار کیا ہوا ہے۔ اور کیا کرنے
جا رہے ہیں۔ کیا امپریڈر صاحب
یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ان لوگوں کا ساتھ
دیا جائے۔ اور قریب کے پر امن
جنگ نہ چاہنے والے طاقتور دوست
ملکوں سے بگاڑ کیا جائے۔ اگر پاکستان
نے اس گتھ جوڑ سے اپنے آپ اور
تمام ایشیا کو خطرہ میں ڈالا ہے
تو ہم ایسی غلطی کبھی نہیں کریں گے۔

جب کشمیر پر پہلے پہل پاکستان
کی طرف سے قبائلیوں کا حملہ ہوا
تو ان لوگوں کی طرف سے کہا گیا
تھا کہ ہم کسی طرح کی مدد
نہیں کر رہے ہیں۔ مگر بعد میں
کئی طرح کے ہتھیار اور گولہ بارود
ہماری فوجوں کے ہاتھ لگے جن سے
یہ صاف ظاہر ہوتا تھا کہ ان لوگوں
نے مدد کی ہے۔ اور پاکستان کا
بھی اس میں پورا پورا ہاتھ ہے۔

جب یو این او میں بھارت کی
طرف سے کشمیر کا معاملہ پیش

کہا گیا تو ان دنوں ملکوں نے ہر
بات میں بھارت کی مخالفت کی
اور نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ ابھی تک کشمیر
کا مسئلہ یو این او میں لٹکا ہوا
ہے۔ اب ہمیں کب تک انتظار
کرنا ہوگا۔ انتظار کرتے کرتے ہم لوگ
مایوس ہو گئے ہیں۔ اس لئے میں
کہتا ہوں کہ یو این او سے کشمیر
کا مسئلہ واپس لے لیا جانا چاہیئے۔
جب تک وہاں سے اس مسئلہ کو
واپس نہیں لیا جاتا تب تک اپنے
علاقہ کو واپس لینے کا مسئلہ حل
نہیں ہو سکتا ہے۔ آج پاکستان کے
پاس ہمارے بہت سے علاقے موجود
ہیں۔ ایک طرف تو یہ لوگ یو
این او میں کہتے ہیں کہ پاکستان
نے کشمیر پر حملہ نہیں کیا ہے قبائلیوں
نے حملہ کیا ہے دوسری طرف
پاکستان ہمارے ملک کا بہت سا حصہ
دبائے بیٹھا ہے اسکی فوجیں معہ
گولہ بارود سب فائر لائن پر بیٹھی
ہیں۔ اگر یہ حملہ نہیں ہے تو پھر
کیا ہے۔ مگر اس پر بھی پاکستان
کو حملہ آور نہیں مانا جاتا ہے۔
آج پاکستان کی مدد کرنے سے امریکہ
ان جگہوں پر اپنے فوجی اڈے بنا
رہا ہے۔ وہ صرف اس لئے کہ طاقت
کے زور سے کشمیر کو ہونپ کیا جائے۔
پاکستان بار بار ہندوستان کو دشمن
کہتا ہے وہ بار بار یہ کہتا ہے کہ جب
تک کشمیر کو نہیں لے لیا جائے گا
تب تک پاکستان کی آزادی پوری

نہیں ہوئی - کئی من چلے وہاں سے کہتے ہیں کہ اگر کشمیر کو لے لیا گیا تو پتھانکوت کیا دلی کے اوپر پاکستان کا چھٹا آسانی سے لہرایا جا سکتا ہے - تو میرا کہنا یہ ہے کہ اگر کشمیر ہے تو ہندوستان بھی قائم ہے - ہمارے امپیدکر صاحب کہتے ہیں کہ کشمیر میں تفل نہیں بدائی جانی چاہیئے - اگر بدائی گئی تو دشمن اس کا استعمال کر لے گا ان کا اشارہ رشیا کی طرف ہے - مگر امپیدکر صاحب کو یہ معلوم نہیں ہے کہ رشیا ہمارا دشمن نہیں بلکہ ہمیں سامراج وادیوں سے خطرہ ہے اور پھر آجکل کی لڑائی میں فوجیں جنگلوں اور پہاڑوں میں پیدل مارچ کرتی ہیں اور پیرا شوت سے بھی آ سکتی ہیں ہوائی جہازوں کو کون روک سکتا ہے کیا سڑکیں، ریلیں اور تفل اس لئے نہ بنائے جائیں کہ کسی وقت دشمن آ سکتا ہے - یہ کس قدر بھدی دلیل ہے ہمارے امپیدکر صاحب نے غالباً نہ لاسہ دیکھا نہ تبت دیکھا اور نہ ہی کشمیر کو خاص کر الراج دسترکت کی حدود کو اچھی طرح دیکھا اور سمجھا ہے - میں نے سارا کشمیر اور الراج دسترکت اور اسکی سرحدات کو دیکھا ہے ان سب جگہوں کا پانچ سال تک سیٹلمینٹ سروے کے سلسلے میں دورہ کیا ہے اور میں وہاں کی حدود کی چھ چھہ زمین

کا واقف ہوں اور وہاں کے حالات جانتا ہوں - اس بنا پر میں یہ باتیں کہہ رہا ہوں - کہ امریکہ کی فوجی امداد پاکستان کو ملنے کا دراصل مقصد کیا ہے اسے اچھی طرح سمجھ لیا جائے - جب تک بھارت کی طرف سے جموں اور کشمیر کو ریل کے ذریعہ نہیں جوڑا جاتا تب تک لڑائی کے موقعوں پر ہم کو بہت پریشانیوں کا مقابلہ کرنا ہوگا -

اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ امپیدکر صاحب نے یہ بھی کہا تھا کہ چین اور روس کی طرف سے بھی کشمیر کو خطرہ ہے - لیکن یہ دونوں ملک ہمارے پڑوسی ہیں - برسوں سے ہمارے ان کے ساتھ اچھے تعلقات چلے آ رہے ہیں - یہ ملک امن پسند ہیں ان کے یہ اصول کہ جنگ نہیں ہونی چاہیئے - پیس (امن) رہنا چاہیئے ہمارے جیسے ہیں - وہاں پر مزدوروں اور کسانوں کی بھلائی کے لئے کام ہوتے ہیں تو کس طرح سے یہ مان لیا جائے کہ یہ لوگ کشمیر کے ذریعہ ہندوستان پر حملہ کریں گے - امریکہ اور پاکستان کے درمیان جو فوجی سمجھوتہ ہوا ہے اسکا اثر یہ ہوا ہے کہ آج سارے پاکستان میں امریکہ کی فوجیں اور فوجی سامان پہنچ رہا ہے - یہاں پر جو ریزولوشن لیا گیا ہے کہ سب پارٹیوں کا ایک کنوینشن پاکستان کو امریکی امداد

[سردار بدیع سنگھ]

دینے پر جو صورت حال پیدا ہوگئی ہے اس پر غور کرنے کے لئے بلایا جائے۔ مناسب معلوم نہیں ہوتا ہے آج ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ ہندوستان کا بچہ بچہ یہ کہہ دے کہ کشمیر کا معاملہ جو یو این او میں گیا ہے اس کو وہاں سے واپس لے لیا جائے کہ اس سے انصاف کی امید نہیں رہی اور پاکستان کے ساتھ کشمیر کے مسئلہ پر کسی قسم کی پات نہ کی جائے۔ پاکستان جو ہمارے حصے اپنے قبضہ میں کئے ہوئے ہے ان کو جلد سے جلد آزاد کرایا جائے۔ ہمارا جو ۲۸ ہزار مربع میل کا علاقہ پاکستان کے قبضہ میں چلا گیا ہے جب تک وہ واپس نہیں ہو جاتا ہے تب تک ہملوگ چین سے نہیں بیٹھ سکتے۔ آخر کب تک ہم اس طرح کی حالت میں رہیں گے۔ ہم سے یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ انتظار کرو جب تک کہ کشمیر کے مسئلہ کا فیصلہ نہیں ہو جاتا تب تک معاوضہ نہیں مل سکتا ہے۔ ہمارے بہت سے لوگوں کے گھر و زمینیں پاکستان میں پڑی ہوئی ہیں اور رفیوجی بہت ہی پریشان حال ہیں۔ آخر انتظار کرنے کی کوئی حد ہوتی ہے۔ ہم نے ایک سیکولر و عالی شان حکومت و ملک کے ساتھ پورا الحاق کیا ہے وہ اسی خواہش اور یقین سے کہ ہم کو ہر طرح کی پہل لیں

ملینگی بلاشبہ کافی سے زیادہ امداد ملی اس ملک کی اتنی بڑی فوج ہے اتنی بڑی پارلیمنٹ ہے اور اس کے پاس اتنا روپیہ ہے پھر بھی ہم سے کہا جاتا ہے کہ معاوضہ کیلئے اور ملک کے حصہ کو واپس لینے کے لئے انتظار کرو۔ پہلے ہم سے کہا گیا تھا کہ جب تک کشمیر پوری طرح بھارت کے ساتھ الحاق نہیں کر لیتا ہے تب تک اور باتیں نہیں ہو سکتی ہیں۔ مگر اب جبکہ کشمیر پوری طرح بھارت کے ساتھ مل گیا ہے تو اب انتظار کرنے کا کوئی سوال ہی نہیں اٹھتا ہے۔

میں پھر اس ریزولوشن کے بارے میں کہوں گا۔ اسوقت کنوینشن کرنے کی ضرورت نہیں ہے۔ بلکہ ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ کشمیر کا مسئلہ یو این او سے ایکدم واپس لے لیا جائے اور ہماری سرحد سے چار میل سے (۲۰۰) دو سو میل تک کی دوری پر جو دشمن بیٹھا ہوا ہے اور جو ہماری زمین کو قبضہ میں کئے ہوئے ہے سے باہر کیا جائے اور اس علاقہ کو واپس لیا جائے۔ وہاں پر صرف تیل ہی بنانے کی ضرورت نہیں ہے بلکہ لداخ و گلگت تک ریل کا سلسلہ بنا دیا جائے۔ اگر اس طرح کی کارروائی کی جائے گی تو کشمیر اور بھارت دونوں ہی کا تینفینس تحفظ اور مستقل سہولت مضبوط ہو گا۔ لہذا میں معترم معصک سے

لس ریپزیولیشن کو واپس لینے کی درخواست کرتا ہوں اور عرض کرتا ہوں کہ جو باتیں میں نے بتلائی ہیں ان کو جلد سے جلد عمل میں لایا جائے۔

—सरदार बुध सिंह (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : जनाब डिप्टी चेरमन साहब, यह जो रेजोल्यूशन पेश किया गया है, इससे बजाय इसके कि मामला सुलझे और कोई मुफ़ीद नतीजा निकले, कई किस्म की खतरनाक पेचीदगियाँ पैदा होने का एह्तमाल है। इस वक्त तक इस मसले के ऊपर तमाम पार्टियों के लीडरान और इनडिपेंडेंट मुअज़ज़ मेम्बरान ने अपनी अपनी राय दी है और शायद ही कोई बात रह गई हो जो कि डिस्कशन में नहीं आई हो। जहाँ गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की फारेन पालिसी पर मुस्तलिफ़ ख्यालात का इज़हार किया जाता है वहाँ काश्मीर का मसला एक मुस्तलिफ़ नौवियत का है। इसकी बिल्कुल अलग सूत है। यू० एन० ओ० में यह मसला सिर्फ़ इसलिये लाया गया था कि कबायलियों को पाकिस्तान ने अपनी मिलिट्री एड देकर निहत्थे काश्मीरियों के ऊपर जो ज़ारहाना हमला करने के लिये भेजा था, उसे रोका जाय। क्योंकि उन्होंने वहाँ कत्ले-आम किया और खून खराबा किया। जो कुछ हुआ वह आप सब को मालूम है और यह कोई पुरानी हिस्ट्री नहीं है, बल्कि यह चीज़ अब भी ताज़ा है। अभी वह सिलसिला फिर से जंग की बातों का चल रहा है। एक तरह से जंग जारी है। गो सीज़ फ़ायर स्थायन आर्जी बन गई है। मगर सीज़ फ़ायर लाइन के दोनों तरफ़ हर वक्त तोपें

और बन्दूकें भरी हुई तैयार रहती हैं। इसे पाकिस्तान के प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने तसलीम किया है और यह रोज़े रोशन की तरह जाहिर है कि दोनों तरफ़ तोपें और बन्दूकें भरी हुई तैयार हैं। कोई कतई फ़ैसला अभी तक नहीं हुआ है, और कोई कतई बातचीत अभी तक नहीं हुई है। यह मसला वैसे का वैसे ही अब भी चल रहा है। यू० एन० ओ० ने भी एक तरह से हार कर कह दिया है कि आपस में फ़ैसला कर लो।

अभी आनरेबिल प्राइम मिनिस्टर जवाहरलाल जो ने बताया कि किस हद तक वह इस मामले को सुलह से हल करने के हक़ में है। लेकिन आज भी, इस वक्त भी, दूसरी तरफ़ से जिहाद का नारा लगाया जा रहा है और ख़ौफ़ व हراس से मुल्क को तैयार किया जा रहा है और कहा जा रहा है कि काश्मीर पर हमला करेंगे, काश्मीर को लेकर रहेंगे, काश्मीर के बग़ैर पाकिस्तान किसी काम का नहीं है। जब कभी भी वहाँ किसी किस्म को काइसेस होता है तो वहाँ के मिनिस्टर्स और वहाँ के कर्मचारों, वहाँ की गवर्नमेंट को बचाने के लिये फ़ौरन काश्मीर को आने वाली जंग का ऐलान कर देते हैं और जंग की आवाज़ बुलंद करते रहते हैं ताकि अवाम को तबज़्जह असल मसले से हट जाय।

अब सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि अगर इस तरह का कोई कन्वेंशन बनाया जाय तो वह क्या फ़ैसला करेगा। हमने दरखास्त की कि हम पर हमला हुआ है, हम निहत्थे मारे जा रहे हैं, तबाह व बरबाद हो रहे हैं; हमारा इमदाद की जाय। हमने बिना किसी शर्त को लगाये एक्सेशन किया या तो इल्हाक किया और उस वक्त हमारी रियासत की जितनी

[सरदार बुधु सिंह]

बाउन्डी थी, कोहाला तक, गद्दी हबी-बुउल्ला तक, वह सारी की सारी, हमने कहा कि आप की है और इसका आप डिफेंस करें, हमने कोई शर्त नहीं लगाई और वह हमारा पक्का इल्हाक था। माउण्टबेटन साहब ने कहा कि ठीक है, हम आ रहे हैं, और तुम्हारी मदद करेंगे; लेकिन हमारी स्वाहिस है कि जब कभी रेडर्स वापस चले जायें या जब उनको वहां से निकाल दिया जाय; जो लोग अपने घरों से चले गये हैं वह वापस आ जायें और अमन कायम हो जायें; तो फिर इस बारे में राय ले ली जाय। हमारी यह स्वाहिस नहीं थी और हम ने ऐसा कभी नहीं कहा था लेकिन लार्ड माउण्टबेटन साहब, आप जानते हैं कि अंग्रेजों की पालिसी को चला रहे थे, इसलिये उन्होंने ऐसा कह दिया। हम बारहा कह चुके हैं कि हमारी यह स्वाहिस नहीं है और न थी। और अब तो हमारी कांस्टीट्यूण्ट एसेम्बली ने भी यह फ़ैसला किया है कि हमारा यह इल्हाक मुकम्मिल है, अटल है। मैं मानता हूं कि जो यह प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि हमारा कमिटमेंट है तो ठीक पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू हमारे शानदार प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं, हमारा मुल्क हिन्दुस्तान बड़ा शानदार है और जो वायदा आपका है, उस पर आपको कायम रहना चाहिये, मगर हालात बदल चुके हैं। पुरानी बातों की बिना पर बातचीत करना लाहासिल है। लेकिन बारहा मैं अपनी कई स्पेशों में कह चुका हूं कि गवर्नमेंट आफ

इंडिया ने भी कुछ कमिटमेंट हम लोगों से किया है कि जो अट्टाइस हजार मुरबा मील रकबा पाकिस्तान में उधर चला गया है और दस लाख इंसान जो कि वहां भेड़ बकरो की तरह उसके कब्जे में चले गये हैं उनके लिए भी आपने और हमने वादा किया है कि हम एक एक इंच ज़मीन वापिस ले कर रहेंगे और लेंगे। हम अब तक इस वादा इफ़ाई का इंतज़ार कर रहे हैं।

अब सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि इस मामले को यू० एन० ओ० से वापस लें या इंतज़ार करें? आप ने दरखास्त की थी कि दूसरे मुल्क वाले ने हमला किया है, इसलिये उसको रोका जाये, लेकिन यू० एन० ओ० ने इस बारे में अब तक कोई फ़ैसला नहीं किया। और हम कतई तौर पर मायूस हो चुके हैं। आज से नहीं बल्कि कई साल से दुनिया देख रही है कि इंसान करना तो दूर रहा; एक मुजरिम को, एक जालिम को, कातिल को, चोर को, डाकू को, कत्ल और खून करने वाले को; और जिस पर खुरेजों की गई है, जो कत्ल किया गया है, जिसका खून किया गया है, जो बेगुनाह मारा गया है और जो मजलूम हैं उन दोनों को एक ही सतह पर रख दिया गया है। मैं नहीं समझता कि यू० एन० ओ० कैसी अदालत है। उस अदालत पर आप भरोसा रखते हैं। हम तो उससे कतई मायूस हो गये हैं। उसको इतनी भी जुरत नहीं हुई कि वह कह सके कि पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया है। डिक्सन साहब वहां के जज थे, उन्होंने तहकीकात की और साफ़ साफ़ लपजों में कह दिया कि पाकिस्तान कसूरवार है, उसने हमला किया है, उसकी ज्यादाती है। लेकिन फिर भी कोई

एक्शन नहीं लिया गया है । दुनिया जानती है कि अमेरिका जिधर चाहे उधर यू० एन० ओ० को घुमा देता है । वहाँ उसकी तूती बोल रही है । यह भी कोई अदालत है । अब तक यू० एन० ओ० इस बारे में कोई कतई फ़ैसला नहीं कर सकी तो अब हमें यू० एन० ओ० पर कोई एतबार नहीं । गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया इस सवाल को यू० एन० ओ० के पास ले गई थी और उससे कहा था कि पाकिस्तान को रोको । लेकिन कुछ नहीं हुआ और पाकिस्तान हमको बराबर धमकी दे रहा है । हम तबाह व बरबाद हुये, और अब तक दर बंदर हो रहे हैं । मैं नेशनल काँग्रेस के मेम्बर का हैसियत से ही नहीं बोल रहा हूँ बल्कि मैं खुद मये लबाहकीन तबाह व बरबाद हो गया हूँ । हमारा घर जायदाद पाकिस्तान में है । इस रियासत में मेरा कोई घर नहीं है । मेरी एक इंच भी जमीन या कोई भी घर भारत में नहीं है । पाकिस्तान में लाखों रुपयों की मेरी, मेरे रिश्तेदारों की और मेरी लड़की की, और दीगर हजारों हम वतन भाइयों की जायदादें थीं । लेकिन हम से कहा जाता है कि इंतजार करो, हम देखेंगे यह मसला एक इंटरनेशनल मसला बन गया है और हम आहिस्ता आहिस्ता सुल्ह से और समझौता से बात करेंगे । ठीक है, हम भरोसा कर चुके हैं और अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर पूरा भरोसा करते हैं । जब हमने एक दफ़ा सोच समझ कर गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया से एक्सेशन कर लिया है तो हमको आप के हुक्म या मशविरे, और आपके साथ मुआहिदे के मुताबिक कानून को मानना है और आपके साथ चलना है । लेकिन आप देखें कि मीरपुर मुजफ़्फ़राबाद और कोटली वगैरा का जो सारा का सारा

अट्ठाईस हजार मुरब्बा मील का इलाका चला गया है और वहाँ से जो दो लाख रिक्कूजी बन कर आये हैं, जिनका कोई घर नहीं, जिनके पास कोई पैसा नहीं है, उनको एक पैसा मुआविजा नहीं मिला । उनके बारे में क्या करना है ? हमसे कहते हैं कि इंतजार करो तो आप इस तरह का कंवेन्शन करा कर क्या फ़ैसला करायेंगे । कुछ समझ में नहीं आता । अमेरिका एड देता है तो देने दो । लेकिन आपको बाख़बर रहना चाहिये । दोस्त दुश्मन का भेद खुल गया है । कहा जाता है कि कोई एड क्यों न ले, हर कोई लेगा । मगर खतरनाक नतायज का सामना करना होगा । लेकिन हमको बाख़बर रहना चाहिये । अमेरिका ने जो एड दी है, वह दरअसल काश्मीर को हड़प करने के लिये दी है और जाहिर है काश्मीर पर हमला करने और ज्यादा जुल्म और कुश्तो खून करने के लिये दी है । इस लिये हम सब को तैयार व तैयार रहना चाहिये । जब हमने गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया के साथ एक्सेशन किया है तो गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया के तमाम लोगों को सिर्फ़ हमारे लिये ही नहीं बल्कि अपनी शान, इज्जत व वकार कायम रखने के लिये, अपनी सल्तनत को कायम रखने के लिये पूरी तरह से तैयार रहना चाहिये । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता, आप कंवेन्शन बनायेंगे तो कंवेन्शन क्या फ़ैसला करेगा और उसको क्या कदर व कीमत होगी । बात साफ़ है कि यू० एन० ओ० से मुकदमा वापिस लो, और पाकिस्तान को नोटिस दो कि हुद्द रियासत में ठहरने का तुम्हारा कोई ज़रूरत नहीं है, वापिस अपने मुल्क में चले जाओ । बिला शुवाह हम गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया को सपोर्ट करते हैं, प्राइम

[सरदार बुधसिंह]

मिनिस्टर की इज्जत करते हैं, और इस मामले में जितने अपोजीशन वाले हैं सब उनके साथ हैं। काश्मीर के मामले में कोई अपोजीशन नहीं है। इस मामले पर कोई मुह्तलिफ राय नहीं है। हम अपोजीशन वालों के भी बड़े अहसानमंद हैं कि आपको हमारा दर्द है और हमारे मुसीबतों का आप को एहसास है। तो साफ़ बात कहिये वह सिर्फ यह है कि यू० एन० ओ० से इस मामले को वापिस लिया जाय। इस पर आप सब लोग जोर दें। गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया पाकिस्तान को नोटिस दे दे कि मेहरबानी करके अब आप चले जायें और जिस तरह हो सके, हमारा इलाका हमें वापिस दिलाया जाय।

हमने सारी रियासत का एक्सेशन किया है, लेकिन अट्टाईस हजार मुरब्बा मील का रकबा पाकिस्तान में चला गया। अमलन उसका कब्जा है। वह उसको हजम करके बैठा हुआ है। सोकाल्ड आजाद काश्मीर का महज नाम ही है वरना इसे किसी मुल्क ने बल्कि खुद पाकिस्तान ने भी रिकग्नाइज नहीं किया है। अमेरिका गिलगित में अट्टे बना रहा है, दूसरी जगह भी अट्टे बना रहा है। अमेरिका की मदद से पाकिस्तान हमारे रियासत में चार मील से दो सौ मील तक घुसा हुआ अट्टे बना रहा है। गिलगित का अट्टा दरअसल अमेरिका की मदद से बना रहा है, जो रशिया (रूस) के हुदूद के नजदीक है। कल हमारे लनेंड मेम्बर डा० अम्बेदकर साहब ने कहा कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया यह बानेहाल काश्मीर में जो टनेल बना रहा है वह बड़ा भारी गलती है। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब तक भारत का एक भी आदमी कायम रहेगा वह प्राइम मिनिस्टर और गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को खराजे तहसीम देगा। उन्होंने

एक बेहतरीन काम किया है। राज-कुमारी से ले कर लद्दाख और गिलगित तक रास्ता आसान बनाने के लिए एक टनेल क्या अगर रेलवे लाइन भी बना लें तो अच्छा है। डिफेंस के लिए इन कामों की अशह जरूरत है। डा० अम्बेदकर साहब ने कहा कि इस टनेल के बन जाने से बड़े गड़बड़ी हो जायगा। उन्हें रशिया का फ्रिक् हो गई कि वह इस रास्ते से पठानकोट तक आ सकता है। लेकिन अमेरिका की कभी फ्रिक् नहीं हुई कि वह कहां तक पहुंच गया है। वह गिलगित तक पहुंच गया है और वहां एयरोड्रोम बना कर बैठा है। वहां उसके हवाई जहाज आ जा सकते हैं। क्या रूस और चीन इस बात को जानते नहीं हैं? क्या वह मुर्दा है, सो रहे हैं? नहीं, वह सब जिंदा हैं और हर बात को जानते हैं। रूस जानता है कि अमेरिका क्या कर रहा है और किस लिए काश्मीर में अट्टे बनाने के लिए पाकिस्तान को मिलिट्री इमदाद दे रहा है।

रूस और चीन उसी वक़्त तक चुप हैं जब तक कि वह समझते हैं कि हम हिन्दुस्तानों उनके दोस्त हैं। काश्मीर के अन्दर अमेरिका और दूसरे मुल्क जो भी कर रहे हैं, उनके बारे में रूस और चीन को अच्छी तरह से मालूमत हासिल है। ये उन मुल्कों की हरकतों को अच्छे तरह से जानते हैं, और वाच करते हैं। वो अमन पसंद लोग हैं, जंग के खिलाफ़ हैं; वे किसी से लड़ाई करना नहीं चाहते, जब तक कि उनकी आजादी पर कोई आंच न आ जाए या उनकी सरजमीन पर कोई खतरा न हो। पाकिस्तान को अमेरिका से जो मदद मिल रही है उससे हिन्दुस्तान, चीन और रूस को जो खतरा हो सकता है, उससे यह लोग बेखबर नहीं हैं।

दुनिया की कोई ताकत रूस और चीन को अपने बचाव के हक के इस्तेमाल से नहीं रोक सकती है। वह अपने तहफफुज और बचाव के बारे में बेखबर नहीं हैं। हमारा उनके साथ दोस्ताना ताल्लुक है। वह नहीं चाहते और न हम चाहते हैं कि इस वक़्त किसी किस्म की गलतफहमी या दुश्मनी दुनिया में फैल जाय, और जंग की सूरत बन जाय। मगर हमारे अम्बेदकर साहब ने कल इस हाउस के अन्दर जो तकरीर की, उससे यह मालूम होता था कि वह अमेरिका और ब्रिटेन की यानी साम्राज्यवादियों की नुमायंदगी कर रहे ह, हमारे अम्बेदकर साहब ने जो कि एक हिन्दुस्तानी हैं जिनके दिल में हिन्दुस्तानियों के लिये दर्द होना चाहिये, अपनी आँखों से देख लिया है कि काश्मीर के मामले में ब्रिटेन और अमेरिका यानी साम्राज्यवादियों ने किस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान की मुखालिफ़त की है, कोरिया में क्या हालत पैदा कर दी, इंडो-चाइना में किस तरह से मदाख़िलत की और अब गोआ में अंदर अंदर से उन लोगों ने क्या रक़बा अस्तियार किया हुआ है और क्या करने जा रहे हैं। क्या अम्बेदकर साहब ये चाहते हैं कि उन लोगों का साथ दिया जाय और करीब के पुरज्मन और जंग न चाहने वाले ताकतवर दोस्त मुल्कों से बिगाड़ किया जाय? अगर पाकिस्तान ने इस गठजोड़ से अपने आप और तमाम एशिया को ख़तरे में डाला है, तो हम कभी ऐसी गलती नहीं करेंगे।

जब काश्मीर पर पहले पहल पाकिस्तान की तरफ़ से क़वायलियों का हमला हुआ, तो उन लोगों की तरफ़ से कहा गया था कि हम किसी तरह की मदद नहीं कर रहे हैं। मगर बाद में कई

तरह के हथियार और गोला बारूद हमारी फ़ौजों के हाथ लगे जिनसे ये साफ़ जाहिर होता था कि उन लोगों ने मदद की है और पाकिस्तान का भी इसमें पूरा पूरा हाथ है। जब यू० एन० ओ० में भारत की तरफ़ से काश्मीर का मामला पेश किया गया तो उन दोनों मुल्कों ने हर बात में भारत की मुखालिफ़त की और नतीजा यह हुआ कि अभी तक काश्मीर का मामला यू० एन० ओ० में लटका हुआ है। अब हमें कब तक इंतज़ार करना होगा? हम लोग इंतज़ार करते करते मायूस हो गये हैं। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि यू० एन० ओ० से काश्मीर का मसला वापिस ले लेना चाहिये। जब तक वहाँ से इस मसले को वापिस नहीं लिया जाता तब तक अपने इलाके को वापिस लेने का मसला हल नहीं हो सकता। आज पाकिस्तान के पास हमारे बहुत से इलाके मौजूद हैं। एक तरफ़ तो ये लोग यू० एन० ओ० में यह कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर पर हमला नहीं किया है, क़वायलियों ने किया है; दूसरी तरफ़ पाकिस्तान हमारे मुल्क का बहुत सा हिस्सा दबाये बैठा है। उसकी फ़ौजें मय गोला बारूद सीज फायर लाइन पर बैठी हैं। अगर हमला नहीं है तो फिर क्या है? मगर इस पर भी पाकिस्तान को हमलावर नहीं माना जाता है। आज पाकिस्तान की मदद करने से अमेरिका उन जगहों पर अपने फ़ौजी अड्डे बना रहा है। वह सिर्फ़ इसलिए कि ताकत के जोर से काश्मीर को हड़प लिया जाय। पाकिस्तान बार बार हिन्दुस्तान को अपना दुश्मन समझता है। वह बार बार यह कहता है कि जब तक काश्मीर को नहीं ले लिया जायगा तब तक पाकिस्तान की

[सरदार बुधसिंह]

आजादी पुरी नहीं होगी। कई मनचले वहां से कहते हैं कि अगर काश्मीर को ले लिया गया, तो पठानकोट क्या दिल्ली के ऊपर पाकिस्तान का झंडा आसानी से लहराया जा सकता है। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर काश्मीर है तो हिन्दुस्तान भी कायम है। हमारे अंबेदकर साहब कहते हैं कि काश्मीर में टनेल नहीं बनाई जानी चाहिए। अगर बनाई गई तो दुश्मन उसका इस्तेमाल कर लेगा। उनका इशारा रशिया की तरफ है। मगर अंबेदकर साहब को यह नहीं मालूम है कि रशिया हमारा दुश्मन नहीं बल्कि हमें साम्राज्यवादियों से खतरा है। और फिर आजकल लड़ाई में फौजें जंगलों और पहाड़ों में पैदल मार्च करती हैं, और पैराशूट से भी आ सकती हैं। हवाई जहाजों को कौन रोक सकता है? क्या सड़कें रेलें और टनेल इसलिए न बनाई जायें कि किसी वक्त दुश्मन आ सकता है। यह किस कदर भद्दी दलील है। हमारे अंबेदकर साहब ने न लहासा देखा, न तिब्बत देखा और न ही काश्मीर को, खासकर लद्दाख डिस्ट्रिक्ट की हुदूद को, अच्छी तरह से देखा और समझा है। मैंने सारा काश्मीर और लद्दाख डिस्ट्रिक्ट और उसकी सरहदात को देखा है। इन सब जगहों का पांच साल तक सेटलमेंट सर्वे के सिलसिले में दौरा किया है, मैं वहां की हुदूद की चप्पा चप्पा जमीन का चाकिफ हूं और वहां के हालात जानता हूं। इसी बिना पर मैं यह बातें कह रहा हूं कि अमेरिका की फौजों इमदाद पाकिस्तान को मिलने का दरअसल मकसद क्या है, इसे अच्छी तरह समझ लिया जाय। जब तक भारत की तरफ से जम्मू और काश्मीर को रेल के जरिये नहीं जोड़ा जाता, तब तक लड़ाई

के मौकों पर हम को बहुत परेशानियों का मुकाबिला करना होगा।

इसके साथ ही साथ अंबेदकर साहब ने यह भी कहा था कि चीन और रूस की तरफ से भी काश्मीर को खतरा है। लेकिन यह दोनों मुल्क हमारे पड़ोसी हैं। बरसों से हमारे इनके साथ अच्छे ताल्लुकात चले आ रहे हैं। ये मुल्क अमन पसंद हैं। इनके ये उसूल कि जंग नहीं होनी चाहिए, अमन रहना चाहिए, हमारे जैसे हैं। वहां पर मजदूरों और किसानों की भलाई के लिये काम होते हैं, तो किस तरह से यह मान लिया जाय कि ये लोग काश्मीर के जरिये हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करेंगे। अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान के दमियान जो फौजों समझौता हुआ है, उसका असर यह हुआ कि आज सारे पाकिस्तान में अमेरिका की फौजें और फौजों सामान पहुंच रहा है।

यहां पर जो रिजोल्यूशन लाया गया है कि सब पार्टियों का एक कंवेंशन पाकिस्तान को अमरीको इमदाद देने पर जो सूरतहाल पैदा हो गई है उस पर गौर करने के लिये बुलाया जाय, मुनासिब नहीं मालूम होता। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हिन्दुस्तान का बच्चा बच्चा यह कह दे कि काश्मीर का मामला जो यू० एन० ओ० में गया है, उसको वहां से वापिस ले लिया जाय, क्योंकि उससे इंसोफ़ को उम्मीद नहीं रही और पाकिस्तान के साथ काश्मीर के मसले पर किसी किस्म की बात न की जाये। पाकिस्तान जो हमारे हिस्से अपने कब्जे में किये हुये है, उनको जल्द से जल्द आजाद कराया जाय। हमारा जो अट्ठाईस हजार मुरब्बा मील

का इलाका पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में चला गया है, जब तक वह वापिस नहीं हो जाता है, तब तक हम लोग चैन से नहीं बैठ सकते। आखिर जब तक हम इस तरह के हालात में रहेंगे। हमसे कहा जाता है कि इंतजार करो; जब तक कि काश्मीर के मामले का फैसला नहीं हो जाता तब तक मुआवजा नहीं मिल सकता है। हमारे बहुत से लोगों के घर व जमीनें पाकिस्तान में पड़ो हई हैं और रिफ्यूज बहुत हैं परेशान हाल हैं। आखिर इंतजार की कोई हद होती है। हमने एक सेक्यूलर व आलोचना हुकूमत व मुल्क के साथ पूरा इल्हाक किया है। वह इसी स्वाहिश और यत्नीन से कि हमको हर तरह की सहूलियतें मिलेंगी। बिला शुबहा काफ़ी से ज्यादा इमदाद मिले। इस मुल्क के इतना बड़ी फ़ौज है, इतना बड़ा पालिया-मेंट है और इसके पास इतना रुपया है, फिर भी हमसे कहा जाता है कि मुआवजे के लिए और मुल्क के हिस्से को वापिस लेने के लिए इंतजार करो। पहले हमसे कहा गया था कि जब तक काश्मीर पूरा तरह भारत के साथ इल्हाक नहीं कर लेता है तब तक और बातें नहीं हो सकती हैं। मगर अब जब कि काश्मीर पूरा तरह भारत के साथ मिल गया है, तो अब इंतजार करने का कोई सवाल ही नहीं उठता है।

मैं फिर इस रेजोल्यूशन के बारे में कहूंगा। इस बात कन्वेंशन करने का जरूरत नहीं है बल्कि जरूरत इस बात की है कि काश्मीर का मसला यू० एन० ओ० से एक दम वापिस ले लिया जाय और हमारे सरहद से चा० मील से दो नौ मील तक जो दुश्मन बैठा हुआ है,

43 RSD

और जो हमारी जमीन को कब्जे में किये हुये है, उसे बाहर किया जाय, और उस इलाके को वापिस लिया जाय। वहाँ पर सिर्फ ट्रेल हैं बनाने के जरूरत नहीं हैं बल्कि लड़ाई और गिलगित तक रेल का सिलसिला बना दिया जाय। अगर इस तरह के कार्रवाई का जायेगी तो काश्मीर और भारत दोनों का डिफेंस तहफूज व सुस्तकिल सम्बन्ध मजबूत होगा। लिहाजा मैं मोहतरम मोहुरिक से इस रेजोल्यूशन को वापिस लेने की दरदवास्त करता हूँ और अर्ज करता हूँ कि जो बातें मैंने बतलाई हैं, उनको जल्द से जल्द अमल में लाया जाय।

SHRI GULSHER AHMED (Vindhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is very strange that such a Resolution has been moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Mathur. I do not think he can give any example of any country where such a thing has ever been done. In a matter like this, where serious considerations are required, you can't just call people belonging to different parties in a convention to discuss where emotional speeches will be made more frequently than any thing else.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Why do you presume so many things?

SHRI GULSHER AHMED: Because history has shown that every country which is independent, when faced with such a situation had not acted like that. In matters like this, when we are dealing with international situations, we have to be very delicate and cautious and restrained. I do not think any purpose could be served by calling for a meeting of all the political parties in the form of a convention to discuss about the military aid to Pakistan. If the Mover had moved a different Resolution on the following lines that "the Prime Minister should

[Shri Gulsher Ahmed.] consult the leading Members of Parliament to consider the situation arising out of the aid given by U.S. to Pakistan", there would have been some sense but I cannot understand whether there is any sense in calling all political parties, especially in a country like India where we have got nearly a dozen political parties, to discuss a matter like this. Nothing would be achieved. In England where there are only two major parties and who have got their well defined foreign policies, there also this practice does not exist. Some of the political parties here in India are big and some are very small and I think none of the opposition parties have come up to the level of the Congress Party at the moment; they have not got any definite policy and they have never had the responsibility of conducting the foreign policy of the country. In view of the circumstances, I do not think any purpose could be served by calling a convention like the one which has been envisaged in the Resolution.

The second point that I want to stress before this House is that the foreign policy of this country, as has been said by the Prime Minister and some other hon. Members also in this House, is a policy, the foundation stone of which was laid long long ago, in the form of the various resolutions of the Indian National Congress. So far as I remember, the first time the Indian National Congress discussed foreign affairs was in the year 1921 at the Haripura Congress when they sent their sympathies to the Turkish people. I am subject to correction, but I know that it was about 50 or 60 years ago. At that time the Indian National Congress started taking interest in what was happening outside India and ever since, they have been consistently trying to enunciate certain principles of their foreign policy and I am sure all the Members of the House and all the hon. Members who belong to different political parties in India were supporting the Indian National Congress then.

The main principles of the foreign policy of the Indian National Congress were four; first was hatred for war, and an abiding desire to bring peace through negotiations. The second main principle of the foreign policy of the Congress was opposition to imperialism, and its twin sister fascism, which could easily be shown and proved by various resolutions that the Congress had passed, in the years before 1947.

MB. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member need not dilate on the principles of the foreign policy. They have been already debated earlier. He may confine his remarks to the Resolution.

SHRI GULSHER AHMED: The broad principle on which the foreign policy of this country is based is, I think, the policy which has been responsible for raising the stature of this country in international affairs. I do not see any country in the world which within a seven-year period has raised or increased its status in the sphere of foreign affairs as India has done. It has been due to the result of those fundamental principles which the Congress Party has laid down after due consideration, those are being followed by the Government of India after independence.

So my humble submission is that I do not think that the Resolution, in the form in which it has been moved in this House, can be accepted, and I hope hon. Members will not agree with the Resolution and will throw it out. Thank you very much.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Sir, I do not think, I will take much time. What I wish to say, is this. Apart from the arguments that have already been urged against this Resolution that it is unprecedented, unusual, extraordinary and so on, my point is that no Government could function on the basis of this Resolution. It is not only the question of the military aid to Pakistan that, confronts or will confront the Government. There will

ne a hundred things of this nature cropping up almost every day all the year round, and, if the principle that is contained in this Resolution is to be accepted and the procedure indicated followed, then let us see where it will land us. Today it is a question of military aid to Pakistan and the situation that may arise thereby. Tomorrow it may be a question of SEATO, the third day with regard to French possessions, the fourth day with regard to Goa. Now if for each such situation we have got to convene a conference of various political parties and prominent independents, where will it land us? I say it will be virtually abdicating the functions of the Government in the first place. In the second place, what are we here in the Parliament to do? We have also got to abdicate our functions and think that we are not sufficiently representative of the country. I ask again: Where will that land us and what will be the value of any decisions which the Parliament may take? Can you characterise a body such as Parliament as being not sufficiently representative of the country? Is it not better than any convention which is contemplated in this Resolution? These are the main grounds, on which I wish to oppose the Resolution. And going a little further. I would ask which are these political parties? Are the political parties contemplated in this Resolution represented in the Parliament or are they not? If they are, why duplicate the function? If they are not, are they worth being summoned for any conference? To me it is amazing how a procedure like this is being sought for tackling a problem of this nature. And then what about prominent independent members? What representative capacity will they have to commit this whole country? Have they been able to get into Parliament or not? If they are not already in Parliament what value would their words have and how far will their words carry conviction to the country? And then, is there any Government anywhere which will discuss all such important matters in an

open conference before taking decisions? They have a certain amount of responsibility and the decisions should be taken in a fairly confidential manner. If this convention is to be useful, it must tackle also all the allied problems.

I can adduce a number of other arguments also, but I think these few are enough to carry home the conviction that it is a very dangerous principle that is involved in this Resolution.

So I would beg of my friend Mr. Mathur, for whom I have very great regard, to have some deference for this House and withdraw this Resolution.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I won't take more than a few minutes because there is nothing new that can be said after the statement made by the Prime Minister elucidating all the points. I might notice one or two points urged by certain Members of this Sabha in which a complaint has been made that Government has not always tried to take into their confidence even this Parliament. That is an accusation which is not at all tenable. Government have always found time to discuss in a very detailed and lengthy manner the External Affairs Ministry's various aspects, and the international situation has, if anything, loomed very large during the course of the discussions in this Sabha as also in Lok Sabha.

Now, so far as this particular question itself is concerned—the United States-Pakistan Military Alliance, or military aid by the United States to Pakistan—this matter was discussed in considerable length at the time of the last session both in this Sabha as well as in the Lok Sabha. Therefore, to say that it is Government's policy or Government's desire to bypass this hon. House or not to place all its aspects in the House is something which is not at all correct.

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

The other point that I want to urge on behalf of the Government is that Government know the reactions that have been shown as a result of this United States-Pakistan Military Alliance or military aid—whatever name we may give it—throughout the country, and the various political parties and the various sections of this House have been uniformly opposed to that alliance and Government greatly welcome that idea. As to what further is to be discussed with regard to that matter is difficult to understand except, to find out as to what should be the means to tackle the situation. On that point also the various suggestions that have been made from time to time, as to what action is necessary in the international sphere or in our internal affairs, what economic or social steps are necessary, what is to be done for creating the internal strength and forces to combat such a feeling, what is to be the attitude of the people and the Government in a situation of this nature, that both the people and the Government have to show a certain amount of restraint, not to show any panic, have been discussed at considerable length. Therefore, it is difficult to understand as to what else is required to be discussed in a conference of the type which is contemplated in the Resolution. And further, as has been pointed out by a large number of hon. Members of this House, the constitution or the calling of a conference of this nature would amount to bypassing the Parliament and, therefore, Government can well presume that all the people who have to be consulted are represented in this House, both belonging to parties and the independent Members also—because there are sections of this House who do call themselves independent. Therefore, if the Government proceeds on this presumption that the various sections of the people in this country are represented in this Sabha or in the Lok Sabha, that presumption can well be acted upon and it is difficult to visualise as to what other type of conference can be contemplated where

all these matters could be discussed or suggestions could be put forward. Government have always given its due consideration, and have always considered the various suggestions put forward in this House, with the greatest respect. And therefore, there is nothing further that could be achieved by convening a conference of the type which is suggested in this Resolution. Therefore, both from the point of view of its workability and from the point of view of the dangerous precedents that might follow a constitutional character by convening such a conference, Government's position is that it is not at all necessary, and that we could proceed alone on the lines already pursued by the Government.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: May I request the hon. Minister to throw some light on this subject: What has been the impact of this U.S.A.-Pakistan aid agreement, and what steps have the Government taken? The Government criticised this agreement so much, and they explained inside this House as well as outside that this is very much to the detriment of the country's interests. May I know, what steps have already been taken by the Government to meet this threat? If some light is thrown on this subject, it will be much better, and it will facilitate my attitude towards this Resolution. The main question is this. You have only argued on one point that no useful purpose can be served by a conference. But you have not said a word as to what is the impact of the U.S. aid to Pakistan, and what steps the Government have taken against the threat about which they themselves talked so much.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: This was exactly the point that was answered by hon. the Prime Minister. This Resolution contemplates a particular course of action to be adopted for tackling something about which Government have already clarified their position. And if a general debate on this whole aspect, of going

into the merits one way or the other, is sought to be raised certainly that cannot be achieved by moving a Resolution of this type, because the operative part of the Resolution is that a conference should be convened to discuss that matter. And the Government have clearly pointed out that the convening of this conference will not serve any useful purpose. It is not a feasible proposition, apart from that, because another hon. Member, I think, Mr. Ghose, while the Prime Minister was about to conclude his remarks, said that something might be stated in a general way about the Indo-Pakistan relations. With regard to the points which today are of considerable concern to the Government of India, so far as these two countries are concerned, Government's position, as it stands today—and the steps that are taken—was also clarified. Now, so far as counting of the steps taken, particularly as a result of this United States military aid, is concerned, this thing has been viewed in the general perspective of all the various relations and of our conduct in the matter of Kashmir, in the matter of canal waters, in the matter of evacuee property, and so on and so forth. All these matters that are always discussed form a complete picture, and to say that some categorisation should be laid down under which it should be grouped that A, B, C, etc., things have been done, I think, will not be a correct approach. The whole thing has to be viewed together. And there is nothing further to be added to what the hon. the Prime Minister has stated in the course of the debate this morning.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must express my deep gratitude to the Chair and to this House as a whole for giving an exceptional treatment to this Resolution in the last session, by not permitting it to lapse. The very fact that the whole House adopted this attitude to the Resolution and accorded a very special treatment to it by overriding the rules which we have framed for the conduct of business in

this House shows that they felt that there was something very important in this Resolution, and something which must be discussed. This Resolution was permitted to be taken as the first item in the next session. It was very obvious from the I.P.M.

attitude that the House adopted at that time that the entire House was agreed on the importance and value of this Resolution, but I find a change of attitude today. I find a change of attitude because the hon. the Prime Minister who happened to be here—with all respect to him I might say—never cared to understand the implications of this, never cared to look into what I said when I moved this Resolution. He was living absolutely in his own imagination. He made his own presumptions and assumptions and he went on criticising on that basis. He asserted that possibly this Resolution was moved in the month of February in some moment of excitement or under a fear complex. If only the hon. the Prime Minister had taken care to acquaint himself with what I said then, he would not have any reason or justification to make such an observation, because in my opening speech I made quite clear what prompted me to move this Resolution and that there was absolutely no fears entertained by me about this U.S.-Pakistan Aid Agreement.

The next thing that the hon. the Prime Minister said and following him in a chorus has been said by other Congress Members is that no useful purpose will be served by convening the sort of conference which I have proposed in this Resolution. If you will remember, what happened when we first came to hear of aid being given to Pakistan was that there were all sorts of speeches about it, the Congress Party in particular adopted a sort of programme, they sent advice to all their Pradesh Congress Committees and District Congress Committees to discuss this matter in open meetings, to have processions and all

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] that sort of thing. Some such things happened and after that, everything collapsed. It is a regret to me to say that the whole problem has been dealt with, at any rate, by the Congress Party in a tactless fashion and in a manner which has been very much to the detriment of the entire country. That was why I suggested that on this vital point which affects us very much and the repercussions of which have been visualised by us well and proper, any programme that was drawn up should have the backing of all the political parties, the backing of all the important persons in the country. My hon. friend, Mr. Ghose, who represents the Praja-Socialist Party here, forgets what he said during the foreign affairs debate last time. He said that his Party was very unhappy about the attitude that the Congress Party had taken up in this matter. He said that the campaign that was carried on by us was absolutely of a negative character and that you could not keep the country in suspense for all time. He was very correct when he mentioned it. Your propaganda was of a negative character.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have only fifteen minutes to reply and you have already taken up more than seven minutes.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I had to justify one point and refute the criticism that they have offered.

We have got to understand that since I spoke last time there has been some crystallisation of opinion on this matter. The entire world opinion is drifting towards the condemnation of such military pacts and such military alliances and agreements. But in spite of all our protests or appeals what has happened is that this agreement between Pakistan and U.S.A. was signed on the 19th May after this Resolution was moved and I cannot understand why my hon. friends say that it is a stale matter. As a matter of fact it is a matter which is a bold j

reality today. When I moved this Resolution the agreement had not been signed. The agreement was signed on the 19th May and that agreement has been signed in spite of all our protests and appeals and that agreement is a bold reality today. I would like to invite the attention of my hon. friend to the speech made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan only on the 14th of this month. There he mentioned in that speech that Pakistan was absolutely incomplete without Kashmir, that they must go ahead and liberate these 4 million Kashmiris there, and he went on in a fantastic manner and he said that mosques were being desecrated and that Muslims were being converted and all sorts of utter fantastic nonsense.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: All this may be true and it may be perfectly relevant on the floor of the Parliament, but the question is whether a convention is needed for the purpose.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: That of course I have answered. I am afraid you were not here. All this is utter fantastic nonsense but may I remind the rulers of this country, the leaders of this country that they talked about the fantastic character of the proposal when it was first mooted that Pakistan should be carved out? All the leaders here believed that the very idea of Pakistan was fantastic and they believed it so till the last moment but Pakistan is a reality today and all these things which are being said by the hon. the Prime Minister of the other country may be considered by us to be utterly fantastic but those fantastic things are there and we must remember that we have got to deal with fantastic people. How to deal with them?—that is the whole question. My friends say that it is for the Government and Parliament to decide. Certainly, it is for the Government and Parliament to decide but in such matters you require the co-operation of the entire country. You have got to mobilize the entire country. It

is not only the army which will be able to defend this country. We have seen in all these areas where warfare has been going on that in spite of the arm France, or the war materials which were being dumped by Americans there stiff resistance was there because it is the people's will that matters more than anything else. We have got to build the people's will. We have got to educate our people, we have got to tell them what their responsibility is and we have got to tell them how to behave in this matter and for this certainly a conference of the nature which I have advocated is most essential and it is only through such conferences that we can achieve certain results and educate the people.

I will make certain concrete suggestions. We must definitely strengthen our intelligence and security departments. It is unfortunate that I have got to say that it is not what it should be. Apart from educating our people, we have to mobilize them. Again, we have to strengthen our border and I can claim to speak with a little amount of experience that it is not only the police and the military patrols which are important at these borders. What the police and the military patrols could not achieve in stopping the border raids, was definitely achieved by the Home Guards there. There are so many things—a hundred and one things which could be suggested for which you require the active co-operation of the people and that active co-operation of the people can only be achieved through such a conference by mobilizing all the national leaders and mobilizing all the people. When I suggested this conference, I was deeply conscious of the fact that it was at least one point on which everyone was fully agreed and there could be no question of any difference of opinion. People would have come forward and people would certainly have toed the lines decided at the conference and something really remarkable could have been achieved. But the attitude of the Government is that it is a thing of the past. This is exactly my complaint, that we are going

to acquiesce in the situation and we are forgetting that here is a most unfortunate reality that is there and we are doing absolutely nothing. And we are told this is a stale Resolution. But here is the situation and we have to face it. I have got to accommodate my friend here and enable him to move another Resolution and so I will sit down; otherwise I could have talked on this Resolution for any length and to the conviction of my friends.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want me to put the Resolution to vote?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Well, Sir, I have no reason to withdraw the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I change the word "Council" to "House" and omit the word "proposed" occurring in your Resolution.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I wiH put the Resolution as amended by me.

The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should invite a convention of the leaders of different political parties and prominent independents in the country to discuss the situation arising out of the military aid by the U.S.A. to Pakistan and to suggest the line of action to be adopted by the nation in the matter."

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION *RE*. LAND REFORM LEGISLATION IN STATES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, for the *next* Resolution, Mr. Sunda-rayya.