

CONTENTS

Sl. No.	Year/Date	Subject	Page No.
		Preface	
1.	18.9.1964	Motion of No-confidence in the Council of Ministers	1
2.	9.12.1964	Statement Regarding visit to United Kingdom	31
3.	25.2.1965	Statement Regarding Language Issue	36
4.	2.3.1965	Motion of Thanks on President's Address	39
5.	16.3.1965	No-confidence Motion in the Council of Minister	53
6.	11.5.1965	Statement Regarding Situation on Kutch-Sind Border and visit to the USSR	57
7.	16.8.1965	Motion Regarding Indo-Pakistan Agreement on Gujarat-West Pakistan Border	65
8.	26.8.1965	No-Confidence Motion in the Council of Ministers	70
9.	16.9.1965	Statement Regarding Discussion with Secretary General of United Nations	81
10.	17.9.1965	Statement Regarding Chinese Note	86
11.	20.9.1965	Statement Regarding Chinese Ultimatum	90
12.	22.9.1965	Statement Regarding Ceasefire and Other Matters	93
13.	24.9.1965	Statement on UN Security Council Resolution Regarding Ceasefire between India and Pakistan and Resolution Regarding India Quitting the Commonwealth	98

Sl. No.	Year/Date	Subject	Page No.
14.	5.11.1965	Statement Regarding Indo-Pakistan Relations	102
15.	16.11.1965	Motion regarding International Situation	109
16.	10.12.1965	Statement regarding Proposed Meeting with President Ayub Khan at Tashkent and Other Matters	119

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

18 September, 1964

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have tried to keep the level of the debate high and I am thankful that they did not consider it advisable to indulge in personal attack or to refer to certain individual matters. On the whole the speeches, although critical — and highly critical — were such that one could not take objection to them. I must, however, admit that the most disappointing speech, was from Shri Hiren Mukerjee, as I had expected much better from him.

I would like the hon. Members kindly not to interrupt because I have not done so. I felt clearing up many matters while hon. Members of the Opposition were speaking, but I deliberately avoided it. Therefore, I would beg of hon. Members kindly not to interrupt till I have finished.

Even in this debate reference was made frequently to the food situation. I do realise that the situation is still difficult and I can well understand the concern of hon. Members over this matters; but I need not go into details as the Food and Agriculture Minister has already dealt with this problem in an elaborate manner.

The main point before us today is: How do we deal with the present situation — I mean, the difficulties about food? There is no doubt that we have to take two steps. Firstly, we have to get foodgrains from within the country, from wherever it is possible or from wherever it is available, whether it is Punjab, Madhya Pradesh or Andhra Pradesh. How do we get it is a separate matter on which much has been said. The second alternative is to import from abroad. At the present moment howsoever we may dislike the import of foodgrains from abroad, there is no choice for us but to depend upon imports from different countries. If in the course of the next few months we are able to import a good quantity of wheat and rice, it would be possible for us to tide over the present difficulty.

Fair price shops are very important. Perhaps, I might not have followed Dr. Lohia correctly or fully, but he said that there was an idea of closing the fair price shops. As far as I am aware there is no such intention at all. In fact, we want to increase the number of fair price shops and we may have to do it in the course of the next few weeks, if it is found necessary.

But what is important is that these fair price shops should be managed well. There is no point in hiding the fact that from the fair price shops here is a good deal of leakage. I was told that in one of the States, about 25 per cent to 30 per cent of the cereals provided to the fair price shops were smuggled out or leaked out and they were sold in the open market. Therefore, it becomes essential that there should be a constant vigilance and watch over these fair price shops. I might also add that specially in the rural areas the fair price shops have not functioned properly and it is important, of course, that the administration should deal with it. It would also be advisable for the panchayats to take more interest in it and for other non-officials to keep an eye on the better functioning of the fair price shops.

It has also to be remembered — I have not got the exact figures with me just at present — that we have during the last three years subsidised foodgrains of the fair price shops to a very great extent. I think in 1961, it was roundabout Rs. 15 to 16 crore; it increased to Rs. 21 crore in 1962; it rose up to Rs. 36 or 37 crore in 1963 and it seems that in the year 1964 the figure might go up to Rs. 50 crore. So, it is obvious that the Government is keen and particular that those who cannot afford to purchase foodgrains in the open market should get foodgrains at cheaper prices from the fair price shops and the Government will be prepared to subsidise as much as they can till such time these fair price shops are essential and necessary.

As I said, there are still some difficult areas and specially Uttar Pradesh is badly affected. North Bihar is also in a difficult situation and those areas which have been affected by flood are in a bad way. Even the Punjab which is a granary of food for us, for the country, or at least for the northern part of our country, is under serious difficulties especially in the Rohtak-Jhajjar area and, of course, a large area of Delhi is also in an exceedingly bad way. So, these flood affected areas have to be helped much. There are problem similarly in Gujarat and in the rural areas of Maharashtra. There also much is being done and — I would not say because perhaps the Members from Maharashtra might get somewhat angry — they are at the port and as soon as the foodgrain is unloaded, they manage to keep it with themselves. However we do not mind it because Maharashtra is a deficit State and if they manage to get foodgrains in some way or the other we should not resent it.

But apart from this problem of flood, what is more important is the water-logging in Punjab and in parts of U.P. and in some other States. I think that if the problem of water-logging is solved in Punjab, we may get about 2 lakhs tons or at least about a lakh tons of wheat from that area. It is a very fertile area, but large

tracts are uncultivable or have become uncultivable because of water-logging. It is not even possible for them to sow their rabi crops. Formerly, of course, when an area was affected by floods, the kisan was not able to sow the kharif crop or the kharif crop sown was damaged, but they depended upon the rabi crop. But in the flood-affected areas, the situation has come to such a passe that there is the danger of their not being able to sow even the rabi crops. In the water-logged areas the things are still worse. As I said, for years together, they have not been able to produce anything.

I am referring to this matter because I feel that very special attention is called for by the different Departments concerned. I do not know, but I am merely expressing the view of an expert or a great engineer; he has said that because of the canals which have been constructed during the last few years, and some of the bridges of the Railways or the culverts of the Railways and also because of some roads which have been built, many areas have been affected, and because of there being no coordination between the different departments, the water-logging persists or it has resulted in continued water-logging.

I am sorry I am critical of the Government or of the administration, but I can with my own experience say that no department is prepared to shoulder the responsibility. If you mention it to the Railways, they say 'We have nothing to do with it; the bridges or the culverts were built a long time back'. If you go to the Transport Ministry, they will say 'Well, the roads are all right, and, therefore, there should be no problem'. If you refer to the Irrigation Department, of course, they are a law unto themselves.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹

I think the responsibility must be fixed, and we cannot function in the present manner. It is not that I am mentioning it here only. In fact, when I met the secretaries of all the Ministries, I emphasised this fact, and I appealed to them and also advised them that there should be better coordination. We are a very big and vast Government, and naturally, every Ministry is becoming bigger and bigger. It becomes, therefore, essential that there should be proper coordination.

I would like only to add one more sentence, namely that it is essential that loading, unloading and also quick despatch to different areas should be expedited and arranged efficiently. Of course, as regards loading and un-loading, it will be the ports which are mainly concerned. Then come the Railways. Things have considerably

improved during this period. There has been quick loading and unloading. As regards labour, there was some difficulty, but they have responded well and the Railways have also carried on their work efficiently and effectively during this period.

This is, of course, for the short period, if we are thinking of the short-term. As I said, I do not want to take a complacent view. I think our responsibility is very great and I see difficult days ahead, at least for these two months September and of October. Till the new harvest has come, there will be difficulties ahead.

May be, at least for a month. But I do not want in any way to create some kind of a feeling of demoralisation in the country or amongst ourselves. I have no doubt that we will be able to tide over the present difficulty without any serious trouble.

As for the imports which are to come, there has been some delay because of difficulties in the American ports. Yet, several countries have helped us in diverting their ships to India and it would, therefore, be possible for us to get adequate food during the third week of this month.

As I said, I do not envisage any special difficulty to feed our people. May not be to their entire satisfaction yet we will not have to face any special situation.

But eventually and essentially, what is most important is the increased production of foodgrains. Towards this end, I would merely mention two new steps which we propose to take. There is the production side of it and there is the distribution part. In so far as production is concerned, the Food Minister has announced that we want to fix the price of foodgrains for producers. I say that this is a revolutionary step. It has not been done so far, although we have been thinking about it for some time. Yet I cannot ignore what Dr. Lohia said the other day. Lohia Saheb said that if we give higher prices to the producer, it would mean constant increase in or higher price of foodgrains. It is an aspect of this problem which will have to be carefully considered. And it has also to be realised that for a country like the United States of America, it is easy to fix high prices or higher prices. Their economy is an economy of prosperity. Our economy is an economy of, I won't say poverty, but anyhow....

What I would like to appeal to hon'ble Members is this, that they should kindly lend their help to us in this regard. It is very easy to form unions and organisations and demand higher wages, and I think it might be done. But to begin with, if we start with that kind of thing, if any political party starts with that kind of

agitation, my feeling is that it will be killing the scheme itself. It is desirable that this matter should be considered by an objective authority, by an objective body, a body of experts which should consider the question of fixation of price for an *ad hoc* announcement, because we do not want to delay the matter much. The prices for *rabi* crops have to be announced soon, because sowing will begin sometime in the month of November, or slightly earlier or later in some places. Therefore, the announcement for the *rabi* crop about the price for the producer has to be made soon. We have appointed a committee of some of our experts and officials here in the Centre, with Shri L. K. Jha as its Chairman, and Finance, Food and other Ministries concerned are all represented on it. Their report will be submitted I think in the next week in so far as producer's prices are concerned. By the end of this month I hope they will also be able to submit their report in regard to the prices to be fixed for wholesalers and retailers. This work has also been referred to them. So, it is a difficult task, no doubt. But this committee, at least for the next year, will do this task. After that, I hope, in the month of January, the Prices Commission will be set up, and it would be a permanent body, and will, of course, continue to do this work in future.

I do not want to say much on how the kisan should be helped in regard to increasing production. Much has already been said. It might be said that I take a conservative view, but I feel that in the given circumstances what is essential is that the kisan should be helped to the utmost in a small way. What I mean is may be, mechanised farming etc. is good, and we may have Suratgarh farms, not one but others also. We should have them as experimental, demonstration farms. It would also help us in adding to our present food production, but by and large, it is not possible for the cultivator to take to mechanised farming. I fear that if we do that, we will have to import machinery from outside in large quantities and we will have to add to our loans and to our foreign exchange. And secondly, if we take to mechanised farming etc. now difficulties will arise as there is no technical personnel available; some are there, but if we do it in a large measure, unless we have got the personnel, the result would be that this machinery will continue lying unused for months and months together. So, instead of being beneficial to the kisans, it would be definitely harmful. As I said, we may go in for this at a later stage, but just at present, what is needed is that the kisan should get water, the kisan should get better seeds, the kisan should get manures, the kisan should get the necessary credit facilities. If we can give these things to the kisan, I have absolutely no doubt

that he will produce the results.

I remember very well what Pandit Jawaharlalji used to say. He always emphasized this, and said that he did not want these big bull-dozers, tractors etc., that he only wanted to give the kisan slightly improved ploughs and other improved implements which could be produced in this country. If any repairs etc. were necessary, he said the kisans themselves could do it, or people should be taught and trained to take to that work. I feel exactly the same way, and therefore, I would suggest that the Government should concentrate on this, and I have no doubt that the hon'ble Members will also agree with it.

One thing more, I have said earlier, and I might repeat it, that the community development blocks will have a special responsibility in this matter. I have suggested, and Shri S. K. Deyji, my colleague, has entirely agreed with it that the community development blocks, during the next few years, should concentrate on increased food production and nothing else. They can, of course, do other things, but the main part of their work would be helping the kisans to increase their production. I would go even to the length of suggesting that it should be the responsibility of the community development officers to survey each and every field; there should be a proper survey made as to what has been the production of a particular field, what progress was made during the next six months, or if there was no progress made, what were the obstacles and what were the difficulties of the kisans. Those difficulties and obstacles must be rectified. There should be a regular chart. I do not suggest that we should merely work on paper. My desire is, in fact—I may perhaps be wrong,—but I sometimes feel—that all the jeeps from the community development blocks should be withdrawn.

It may be that I may be making an exaggerated statement, but I feel that unless the workers and the block development officers walk on foot, they will never visit the villages.

Let the officers there, or the workers, visit only a few villages, I would not mind; if they can, let them visit all the villages, but let them visit at least a few, and concentrate on their work and actually mingle and mix with the kisans. Then alone they will be able to enthuse them.

If the hon'ble Members want, they can put questions later on.

xxx

xxx

xxx²

I am suggesting all this in all seriousness, because I think that whenever we go to any city, of course, the bigger cities apart, whenever we go to any other city, it would be much better for us to stay in a village rather than in a dak bungalow, and I suggest this because when I advise my officers or officers of the Government, when I advise the block development officers to go and mix and live with the people, it would not be advisable on our part to remain behind, for the Ministers not to set a real and good example.

I say this. I want to draw up some kind of a plan or scheme for this. I do not want to make the task of the Ministers or others impossible. But some kind of a plan or scheme has to be drawn up in accordance with which we have to function without of course creating any kind of impediment in our work.

As I said the real problem is increased production. I would not say that this problem is going to be solved or self-efficiency is going to be achieved in the course of the next one or two years. We must think in terms of at least 6-8 years during which we will have to build up a reserve as well as do our utmost to increase our agricultural production but this progress should be a steady progress and should as far as possible be a progress from year to year. However, one cannot completely ensure that there are no troubles for the cultivators, for the kisans and the rural areas. There may be floods or droughts; there may be frosts and what not. So, these things will also have to be kept in mind. I know even a great country like Russia which has done wonders, is still faced with shortage of foodgrains. I find, not recently but about a year or two before, whenever Premier Khrushchev spoke he was critical of the work of his agricultural department and recently, I am not quite sure of the figures but about a million tons of foodgrains....

Whatever it is, they have imported foodgrains from the United States or, may be, from some other countries. Perhaps it is mostly from the United States. I am not saying this in any deprecatory spirit at all. I am merely mentioning this fact that we should realise our difficulties. If a country like the USSR sometimes finds it convenient to import or necessary to import, you can well imagine what our position in this country will be, faced as we are with many problems.

Now, about distribution: it is important. The Food and Agriculture Minister has already spoken about the setting up of an All India Foodgrains Corporation. It is also a new step we want to begin with. Of course we do not want to monopolise or create monopolies in the sense that the Government only will deal with foodgrains. It is an experiment and I think we should carefully start with it and try to succeed. The

Foodgrains Corporation will start its work, I cannot say exactly when, perhaps very soon; maybe sometime in January or perhaps a month later. It is in a way State trading and if we succeed in it we can take another step. I may be excused if I say that it is not a question of any ideology; there is no question of ideology involved in so far as food matters are concerned. It is an essential thing and it is the responsibility of the Government to give food to the people at reasonable price. It should be seen that there is no scarcity or shortage. This should be our objective. Some hon'ble Members have said that we are now going over to State trading. Perhaps some hon'ble Members from the Opposition are critical of us. But may I say in a country like Japan which believes only in or mostly believes in private trade, in a country like Japan the State procures all the foodgrains or rice produced in Japan: complete, and full procurement by the State. Not only that. Distribution also is done by the Government of Japan. I am told that 36,000 or 40,000 retail Shops—somebody says 54,000 retail shops—are in Japan to distribute them. They do it because as I said their objective is to supply foodgrains at reasonable prices to the consumers and also give adequate price to the producer. These are the two objectives before them. I am told that they have done it very well and very effectively. One thing has to be remembered: they subsidise foodgrains on a very big scale may be. 100 crores or 125 or 136 crores. The amount is very big. Therefore, while we talk of this, we have to remember our general economic position. It would not be so easy for us if in India we have to give about Rs. 136 crores as subsidy as we will be faced with a very difficult situation.

As I said, they do it and they have done it well. But there are some snags in it. I would not like to go into them. It is, therefore, important to understand that as a matter of theoretical policy only we do not do this or that. There are various practical steps to be taken, various practical aspects to be taken into consideration and then we have to decide as to what is best for the country as a whole. We will not hesitate to go to the farthest length to help the producer and the consumer in so far as the supply of foodgrains is concerned.

I might add one thing more. There is a feeling in the States that they have to depend upon the Centre. I am sorry I am a bit critical but it is true that the States depend so much on the Centre for the supply of wheat or rice. It has become necessary and they might do so. But this trend has to be changed and a new psychology has to be created in the States and the States should think in other terms. States which are actually deficit will have some problems, greater problems

than the surplus States ; even those States which are more or less self-sufficient, if not surplus, can meet their needs and requirements. Even they depend on the Centre and, therefore, it has its own adverse effect on the administration. They do not put in their best effort to produce more because they know that ultimately the Centre will find foodgrains. This is not a very happy situation. Sometimes I feel that, for a few years, if it really becomes necessary, the Centre might take the responsibility of feeding the bigger cities and for the rest of the area the States must find their own cereals and foodgrains, whether that is wheat or rice or coarse grains. The present position is coarse grain is not generally being consumed and people ask for more wheat and more rice. But if we try. As I said to introduce this kind of a scheme, cities would be the main problem of the deficit areas as well as some of the surplus areas.

We will have to examine this matter, but in order to change the present trend, if it is essential the Centre might, for a few years, say that we take their responsibility for the bigger cities. I do not confine myself to Calcutta. Bombay, Madras or Delhi ; there are other cities also, for example, Kanpur, Lucknow, or Allahabad or Patna as other similar cities. I hope that this aspect of the matter will be considered so that the States try to become more self-sufficient.

I wanted to refer to some of the other matters: the high prices of other articles or commodities which are of common use like cloth, sugar, vegetable oil, oil, vegetables, matchboxes and even bicycle tyres and tubes, salt, etc.

It will take much time and therefore, as I said, I would not go into this matter, but it is essential that at least for some of these items—they may be 8, 10 or 12—their prices should be fixed and they should be sold only at fixed prices. Of course, for cloth, a scheme has already been drawn up, and the Ministry of Commerce has decided that the prices of the popular varieties of cloth will be controlled by law—that is sarees long cloth dhoties, drill, shirting etc. I do not know much about the varieties of cloth. These common varieties, popular and cheaper varieties of cloth should be sold at reasonable prices. Shri Manubhai Shah has informed me that very soon the prices will be controlled by law, statutorily controlled ; there will be no longer voluntary control.

I might inform the hon. Member that in so far as drugs and medicines are concerned, my information is that the prices have not gone up at all.

I may inform the hon'ble Member that I sent some of the officers to the

shops ; they went quietly ; the shopkeepers had no knowledge , and a surprise check was made. Not that they want as officers ; they made purchases and after having made the purchases, they came and reported to me ; they gave a report to the department. In so far as matches were concerned, they said they wanted vouchers but the vouchers were not given to them. In one shop, matches were being sold at a premium of one paisa. All these reports have come. In so far as medicines and drugs are concerned, they are being sold at a reasonable price and almost at fixed prices.

As I said, I am more particular or more keen that the common man should get this relief. Of course, there are richer people ; they could purchase superfine cloth or might take superfine drugs. Let them pay for them, but we feel and our real concern is for the poorer and weaker sections of society.

I think I have said much about the food position. Let me now go over to industry. Whether it is agriculture or industry, they have all to be viewed under the shadow of our Plans, under that umbrella, the Five Year Plans. Both agriculture and industry form a vital part of the Plan. In so far as Planning is concerned, I need not repeat that it is absolutely essential for our country, and unless there is somebody which could consider these matters objectively and is in a position to prepare an integrated plan, we will be faced with enormous problems. There has to be an integrated plan otherwise if there is no plan or no Planning Commission there will be some kind of chaos : every Ministry, Planning Commission, there will be some kind of chaos : every Ministry, every department running for itself, and the people as a whole would naturally suffer. Therefore, the philosophy of Planning is wholly acceptable to us and, as you all know, the third Plan is continuing and will continue, and we are in the midst of preparing the fourth Five Year Plan.

I was rather amazed to listen to the speech of Shri Dandekar. Shri Dandekar tried to paint a picture in which, during the last 17 years— perhaps he wanted to say that during the last 17 years—we have not been able to achieve practically anything. Instead of having solved the problems, he said we have created problems. I can understand Shri Dandekar expressing that view, because he has had very little to do with public life. I do not question his ability and his knowledge, because I have some experience of it, as he functioned as an Officer in the field of shipping.

When I was Transport Minister, he was with the Scindias ; he was deputed by the Government of India to serve there ; his services were lent. I know, and I am

told, that he was one of the most brilliant ICS officers ; yet, it does not mean that he really is in contact with the wishes and desires of the people or that he is in a position to really to understand the problems of the common man. He may be or he is a modern man and he must be in touch with modern society I am not unfortunately.

I would like to quote some figures ; hon'ble Members of the Opposition express their doubts, but I may mention some figures. During the last 17 years, the per capita consumption of foodgrains has gone up from 13.5 ounces to 15.3 ounces ; that of cotton from 10.98 metres to 14.63 metres. This has happened between 1951 and 1963. I would also like to quote some figures regarding the increase in per capita consumption of a number of items in respect of which there is every reason to believe that it is not the rich who have stepped up their consumption but the middle and the lower income groups who are now consuming more. Take, sugar for example. In 1950-51, the consumption per annum per capita was 3.2 ; in 1963-64, it was 5.2—an increase of about 63 per cent. In tea, there has been an increase of about 27 per cent ; vanaspati, 73 per cent ; paper, 179 per cent ; bicycles, 251 per cent ; sewing machines, 244 per cent, and electric fans 261 per cent.

This will indicate as to what has been done in the field of production and, also, how consumption has increased. I am sorry, I had some other figures also but I do not want to take more of your time. I would like to say that these 17 years have been the years of a mighty endeavour by the people of India under the leadership of a great and noble leader, Pandit Jawaharlalji, for uplifting the masses from the abyss of poverty, disease, squalor and ignorance. In that process, certain problems have undoubtedly arisen, but they are necessarily the problems of a developing economy. There is an unavoidable period of travail which a country has to go through in order to attain prosperity. During these 17 years we have adopted for ourselves a democratic constitution, we have held three general elections and we have set firmly the democratic system of government in our country. Inevitably, in the process of development problems, even serious problems, arise, but they cannot be viewed in isolation. We have numerous problems to face, but these are the problems of a nation which is marching ahead. We are proud of this legacy and we are accordingly honoured by the trust which has been placed in our hands after the departure of our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sir, much has been said about corruption. As the Home Minister said the other day, I was responsible for the setting up of the Santhanam Commission, and I

fully remember that although the question of political people whether in Government or in some other capacity, as Member of Parliament or Members of Assemblies, was not covered by the terms of reference given to them, when Shri Santhanam asked me as to what he should do in this regard I did tell him that I shall be grateful if he will or the Santhanam Committee will give its informal views on the matter to me. They have done it, and it is now necessary that we should consider their recommendations most carefully and try to adopt them.

In so far as dealing with this matter is concerned, well, Nandaji has been good enough to pass on the responsibility to me. While speaking the other day, he said that in so far as the political part of it is concerned it is the Prime Minister who will have to take the responsibility to deal with that matter. Well, it is a very difficult, and delicate task but I do not want to shirk that responsibility. It is, however, important that there should be certain conventions. The law is really not very effective in these matters. It is exceedingly difficult to prove a case or to prove the charge. Therefore, certain conventions have to be built up. In that regard, I would like to say that we, all the ministers, will have to agree to this, that once the Prime Minister or the Chief Minister tells any one of his colleagues that he feels there is a *prima facie* case or he feels that there is something which is not correct, the minister should immediately tender his resignation.

Sir, I also want to suggest that our Chief Ministers hold very responsible positions. They run the whole State, very big and important States—and even smaller States are in no way less important. Therefore, the Chief Minister cannot also shirk his responsibility. It is neither wise nor good for the Chief Minister to pass on all his problems to the Prime Minister. The Chief Minister they must deal with their own colleagues first. Of course, if they find it almost impossible to deal with them they can certainly refer the matter to me and I shall try to deal with it as best as I can.

Well firstly, I would like that the Chief Ministers should remain above board and there should be no finger pointed towards them. I am sorry, some things have been said in this House about the Chief Ministers, but I can say that in some of the cases when formerly enquiries were made nothing was really found. I know in a number of cases Panditji looked into the matter himself.

xxx

xxx

xxx³

After all, I do not say that they are not responsible to the country, but the point is that they are members of an organization which must look into all these matters. What they do is, they go to the Press first and to the organisation later on. It is, therefore, that we hear so much about complaints having been made against various Chief Ministers.

What I was suggesting was this. The allegation should be made in a responsible manner, and if there are complaints against the Chief Ministers I know they will have no hesitation either in asking for an enquiry, or, if they so desire, in referring that matter to the Prime Minister, and I shall try to deal with it. Please do not interrupt me.

Sir, I was merely emphasizing the fact that the Chief Ministers have also to realise their responsibility which is indeed great; they do so, and I would like to leave most of the matters to them. If there are, as I said complaints against them, it is up to them to decide and refer them to me. But I would be the last person to give an impression to the world that this country is seething with corruption.

I say, Sir, with a full sense of responsibility that India is a place where integrity is given the highest consideration and the highest respect. In this country the Prime Minister is, I mean, practically given a secondary place. If there is a good, honest man like Vinoba Bhave I have no importance in the eyes of the people as Prime Minister. Of course I leave out Pandit Jawaharlalji; he was a different person altogether.

Vinobaji, for example, lives just like a sadhu. He is given the highest respect and the highest consideration in this country. I can say, Sir, that by and large this country is an honest country, this country has maintained certain standards.

Secondly, I would also like to say this. Hon. Members have to realise the fact that either officers and Ministers have a certain right to exercise discretion.

xxx

xxx

xxx⁴

But I say that we have a right to exercise our discretion. If there is no discretion provided for the Ministers, the administration will become wooden and unresponsive. Whether it is the officers or the Ministers, they have to exercise certain discretion and not exactly go inch by inch and word by word according to rules and in support of the rules. I remember, in jail, if the rules were strictly observed I could not move alone, because the rule is that you have to move in twos, you have to walk in twos, you have to eat in twos. I know, in Uttar Pradesh at least these

rules are there.

And I said it will be most unfortunate if the officers, if the administrators will waiver in taking decisions at the right moment and for the right thing. Unless we have that faith in them it would create enormous difficulty, because most of the administration is run by the administrators, by the officers, and not by the Ministers. These aspects have to be borne in mind.

In this connection I might also refer to what was said about the inclusion of Shri Sanjiva Reddy in the Cabinet. I have no time ; otherwise I would have referred to what Shri Hiren Mukerjee said about the present Cabinet. But I shall not go into that now. He has every right to criticise us. Perhaps I might take some other occasion to reply to his charges. However, about Shri Sanjiva Reddy, some remarks were made about his inclusion. But I might say that hon. Members are perhaps aware that the nationalisation of transport has been strongly opposed by those who are already engaged in this business. I know it for a fact. I have been also Minister for Transport in Uttar Pradesh and I had to deal with it. In fact it was Uttar Pradesh which took up the nationalisation of road transport first, and I fully remember that whenever any route was taken over there were protests from the transport operators, and there was a good deal of litigation also.

The same thing happened in Andhra. I think the House may perhaps be aware that the High Court of Andhra gave the verdict that the allegations were not proved...

The Supreme Court, however, held that the allegations against the Chief Minister stood un rebutted. This was the only remark, I mean the main thing—I am not quoting the exact sentence of the Supreme Court Judgement. But their objection was mainly on the fact that the allegations stood un rebutted. Shri Sanjiva Reddy was not a party...

xxx

xxx

xxx⁵

Now, I would like to refer to what Shri Hiren Mukerjee said the other day. He charged me with a number of things. He suggested that I had deviated from Pandit Nehru's policies. If he will permit me to say so, it should not be difficult for a professor to know the correct position. But since he happens to be a Communist, it is difficult for him to think outside the framework of the Communist idea. May I tell him that a democracy there is nothing like deviation or deviationist? It does not

find a place in the dictionary of a democracy. In a democracy there is every opportunity for re-thinking and freedom for the formation of new schemes and policies.

I said on the very first day of my election, and on more than one occasion later, that the Government of India will continue to follow the policy of Nehruji in international matters and democratic socialism will continue to be our objective in our domestic policy. In spite of that, Shri Hiren Mukerjee has made so much criticism of what he thinks I have done or propose to do. I would not have said all these things, or what I want to say now, but it is time that I might make it quite clear as to what my attitude is in regard to this particular objection raised by Shri Hiren Mukerjee. Otherwise, every time, quite frequently, either Shri Hiren Mukerjee or his colleagues will get up and say that I am deviating and start censuring me.

May I repeat that in a democracy there is full freedom for re-thinking and independent thinking? May I also remind him of what happened during our freedom struggle days? I know it personally at least for the last 40 or 42 years. What happened when Mahatma Gandhi took over the leadership? There was a complete over-haul, complete change in philosophy, policy, technique and programmes. Mahatma Gandhi completely deviated from Lok Manya Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh and Lala Lajpat Rai.

xxx

xxx

xxx⁶

And may I say what happened in the case of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru himself? In a way, Gandhiji was the preceptor of Jawaharlalji, guru in a sense, because Jawaharlalji was not taking part in politics in all seriousness in the Home Rule days; he took seriously to politics when Gandhiji came into the field, because he felt that here was a man who believed in revolution, who believed in change and who believed in action. So, he was attracted towards Gandhiji. But did he entirely agree with Gandhiji? No. And yet could you find a more loyal and devoted person to Gandhiji than Jawaharlalji? I say, he loved Gandhiji immensely and he gave his fullest loyalty to Gandhiji; yet, he had his own way of thinking, independent way of thinking. Although he did not believe in non-violence, yet when he found the way Gandhiji worked it and the success he achieved, he said "I am a complete convert to non-violence and non-violent techniques". Of course, it did not mean that he accepted non-violence as a creed. He didn't. And yet when Gandhiji said "if you want to achieve good ends, you must adopt good means also", it attracted Jawaharlalji most. I remember that because he talked to us about it and he also made public statements. If possible, I shall refer to a Part of his speech which he delivered at the

banquet given to Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin where he said that he believed in good means. Therefore, without fully agreeing with Gandhiji, he had his own way of thinking and approach.

He was a man who stood for peace and non-violence. In the message of non-violence he saw a picture of peace in the whole world. In his mind he felt "here is a man who is preaching non-violence". Of course, his idea of its application was not restricted to India. Gandhiji had said "if you succeed in India, this message will spread throughout the world". But Nehruji had an international approach. So he in his own way took non-violence to the world platform, to the world forum and in a practical way preached disarmament, worked for it and did his best to make various proposals so that disarmament may be successful. He saved many wars, or a few wars, by what he did to maintain peace in the world. When he joined the Government, it was not possible for him to put into effect each and every idea of Gandhiji. But this does not mean that he was in any way disloyal to Gandhiji or he did not do what was right.

Why restrict ourselves to India? What is happening or what has happened in Russia? What did Lenin do? When the first Communist Government was formed, Lenin tried to put into effect fully all the policies enunciated by Marx in *Das Kapital*—free kitchens, free travelling, free stamps; everything was almost free. Everybody could go and take his food from the Government kitchen. Then, there were several programmes of nationalisation etc. What happened? Lenin found after some time that it was impossible to work some of them. So, he announced a new economic policy (NEP) and it was put into effect. It was departure from what Marx had actually said in his book.

Now, Lenin goes and Stalin comes. What does he do? I need not tell the House—everyone of you is aware—as to what Stalin did. In fact, he was totally different from Lenin. I consider Lenin to be one of the biggest revolutionaries of the world. But if I might say—I hope, I would be excused—I consider Stalin not to be a revolutionary at all. Whether one agrees with it or not is a different matter, but Stalin used the Government machine for continuing his rein over the Soviet land until he lived. For him it was just a struggle for power throughout his life.

Now, let us consider the policy Premier Khrushchev is pursuing. He has censured Stalin—and his policies also—in the strongest terms possible. The basic ideology is wholly acceptable to Premier Khrushchev—in fact, he is the greatest exponent of this theory in the modern times—but he has flatly refused to tread the

beaten track and has adopted a new programme and technique.

I need not refer to Mao Tse-tung who is another important figure in the Communist world and whose ways of doing things are known, or perhaps well-known.

As I said, I consider Premier Khrushchev to be one of the most important distinguished leaders of the world. I say so because he refuses to walk on the beaten track. A leader generally, if he is really the leader, does not walk on beaten tracks because in the political field situations change, men change, conditions change environments change and the real leader must give the reply to the changing conditions.

We will try to work on our own as far as possible. We do not want to drag in the name of Pandit Jawaharlalji for covering our lapses and inefficiencies. We will never do that. We must own the entire responsibility for what we do. But we cannot forget our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlalji, our Prime Minister, our hero with whom we worked for 40 years, for about half a century. We can never forget him; we will ever remember him and we will try to follow in his footsteps in the best manner possible.

But I might add that I have learnt two things from him. I say this in all sincerity and in all earnestness. Therefore I will be brutally frank because it is better that I clear up my position. As I said, I had learnt two things from Panditji. The first was his great capacity to work with his colleagues who even differed from him in certain matters. It was not easily possible in the vast organisation of the Congress—I am talking of the pre-independent era—for everyone to see eye to eye with each other. I know, Acharya Kripalani himself differed a good deal; Sardar Patel and others differed, but I do not want to name them here. But it was possible for Jawaharlalji to have carried on with all of them. When he took the reins of Government, he adopted the same policy. He formed his Cabinet with all those who had played the most eminent part in our national struggle.

I know Shri Hiren Mukerjee criticized me about the formation of the Cabinet; but I might tell him that in the present context, it would be suicidal if the Congress did not give a united leadership and thus carry the whole country with it. May I say that I knew Jawaharlalji better than most of those who are sitting on the Opposition Benches? He was one of the noblest men and never wanted to hurt the feelings of others; yet, of course, as you know, he was our biggest hero and a great fighter?

May I, with your permission, Sir, relate a small story? When Jawaharlalji

differed strongly with Tandonji, who was then the Congress President, he was of the view that Tandonji should resign from his office, I came all the way from Lucknow to speak to him. I would not like to go into the details. But when Jawaharlalji was elected the President of the Indian National Congress, he was good enough to ask me to work with him as the General Secretary. I told him about my embarrassment. He did not tell me anything then. But I was surprised when he told me the next morning that he had himself approached Tandonji and asked him to become a member of the Working Committee. Tandonji was deeply touched by this offer and readily agreed to accept it. Panditji again asked me to accept the General Secretaryship which I did and tried to serve him with the utmost devotion.

That was his method; that was his technique, whether on the national scene or in the international sphere, his method was that of co-operation even amongst diverse elements. I know, as I said, he differed very strongly with Tandonji and, if he could deal with Tandonji in that manner, the House can easily imagine what would be his attitude towards others with whom he might have differed slightly here and there, but was more or less in a position to work with them very well.

xxx

xxx

xxx⁷

I should not discuss Panditji, but I felt that Panditji was one of the innocent men going about on this earth and in this country. I may repeat what I told Panditji one day. I said, "I am a much cleverer man than yourself, Panditji".

Of course, if he knew that a person was bad then he would not believe him, but if any person went to him and told him his difficulties or said, "All this is quite wrong; I am being maligned", he believed in it. Yes; because it was just out of his innocence. When I analyse myself, I feel, I am not so honest. An honest man, generally, will-not accept others as dishonest unless it has been proved. I went and told Panditji, "Panditji, these people come to you. You are the biggest leader. You are the Prime Minister. We come before you and present ourselves in the best of forms possible". When we went to him, of course, we all bowed and tried to be as good as possible. He was, as I said, so good. In these matters it was difficult to find another man so noble, so high and so good. This was his quality, I mean, carrying the diverse elements with him. Gandhiji's greatest gift was this that he was able to carry the entire nation with him. Of course, on basic fundamental matters, when he differed, he differed and those who differed were kept on. But generally, by and large, Gandhiji's effort was to carry the whole nation with him. After Gandhiji, there

was another man. It was his policy too, as far as possible, to carry the differing elements with him.

May I, Sir, with your permission quote what Panditji said at the banquet given in honour of Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev? Talking of the growing understanding between India and U.S.S.R.—it does not only relate to U.S.S.R; hon. Members will find his general approach to other problem, also—he says:

"...Understanding and friendship have progressively grown even though the paths we have pursued in our respective countries have varied."

Mark these words; he is so clear and categorical. He is speaking before Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev. He says:

".... Understanding and friendship have progressively grown even though the paths we have pursued in our respective countries have varied."

Further, he says:

"We in India have been conditioned by our heritage and by our great leaders as well as by the peaceful methods we adopted in our struggle for freedom. Much more so, therefore, do we believe in world peace and cooperation. We believe not only that the ends to be achieved should be good but also that the means employed should be good or else new problems arise and the objective itself changes."

Mark these words; they are very important. They are being addressed to two great leaders of Russia.

Then he said:

"We believe also that the great cause of the human progress cannot be served through violence and hatred and that it is only through friendly and cooperative endeavour that the problems of the world can be solved. Hence, our hand of friendship is stretched to every nation and to every people."

Then, at the end almost he says: "We are in no camp and in no military alliance. The only camp we should like to be in is the camps of peace and goodwill. We should include as many countries as possible and we should be opposed to none. The only alliance we seek is an alliance based on goodwill and cooperation. If peace is sought after, it has to be by the methods of peace and the language of peace and goodwill."

Sir, I think these few sentences paint very clearly and completely the stand of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I think, if we are honest enough—I hope we will be honest—I have no doubt that we will pursue the same policy.

Sir, I have also to add that I cannot function entirely on my own. Is it thought by Prof. Hiren Mukerjee that it is all entirely my own doing—I am sure he does not accept it but anyhow he has said it practically in so many words—I am, Sir, a member of an organisation, a political organisation, and I sit in this place on behalf of that political organisation. That organisation has recently amended its objectives, its goal, and the Congress—I am referring to the Congress organisation—has adopted democratic socialism as the objective for the Indian National Congress.

The mandate is quite clear and it is under that mandate that this Government has to function, it is not an organisation of some Individuals. It is the biggest political organisation in the country today. And all I can say is that the Congress, the Congress President and all its members, whether of the higher bodies or the lower bodies, are all in the hands of the common people. It is on account of this that the Congress will always find it impossible not to identify itself with the masses and with the common people. Its existence will vanish the day it will drift apart from that policy. Therefore, it is clear that we have to implement the policies enunciated, or the objectives which have been adopted, by the Indian National Congress. So, I do not function here as an individual. I cannot deviate from the basic fundamental policy. This amendment was made during Panditji's life time and I have no doubt that the Congress will implement it. We will try to reach that objective and we should be in a position to reach it as early as we can.

May I appeal to Shri H. N. Mukerjee that he should not try to divide us? Of course, he talked about me and about my other colleagues. But even in that small good thing, while referring to anticorruption, he gave his sympathies for Shri Nanda because in his view other Members of the Cabinet had completely isolated themselves from it. I was amazed at this coming, as it did from Shri H. N. Mukerjee—these tactics may be good outside, but not in Parliament at least—from a sober, wise and able man like Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

I cannot fall a prey to his tactics. I am clever enough in that way. But I sympathise with him. It is not that I am completely upset, but I am merely upset over what he said personally about me *vis-a-vis* Panditji. This has hurt me, I must say, I was not able to raise my head that day and I could not look into his eye; I

must admit. It hurt me deeply. As regards his criticisms about our policies, about our way of doing things, about administration etc. I am prepared to accept many things and admit many things and shall try to rectify them. But this kind of personal references and personal attacks, I feel, was wholly unjustified and was absolutely wrong, and it does not behove an hon. Member here.

xxx

xxx

xxx⁸

He did say that. I would submit that you have to look to our decisions, the decisions of the Cabinet, and the decisions of the Government. As regards statements by Ministers, of course, there should not be complete freedom, there should be restraint, and yet the Members of the Cabinet do express their views sometimes in one way and sometimes in the other way, but by and large, they have the collective responsibility, and every Minister has to realise and understand the fact that the decisions of the Government are final and nothing should be said against the decisions taken by the Government as a whole.

xxx

xxx

xxx⁹

I would like to conclude by affirming our firm faith in democracy and socialism. This is the objective and goal, as I said, of the Indian National Congress. An amendment was recently made. I am part of this great political organisation which has not only fought for and achieved independence for our country but has also during the last 17 years of independence, striven continuously to provide political stability as well as social justice to our people.

To my mind, socialism in India must mean a better deal for the great mass of our people who are engaged in agriculture, the large number of workers who are engaged in the various factories and the middle classes who have suffered much during the period of rising prices. These are what I call the common men of my country. As the head of the Government, it would be my continuous endeavour to see that these objectives are realised and that a social and economic order is established in which the welfare of our people is assured. Thank you.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹⁰



BACK NOTE

I. Motion of No-confidence in the Council of Ministers, 18 September, 1964

1. SHRI HEM BARUA : It seems that there is no co-ordination. That is a reflection on yourself.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI : I am accepting it; I have myself said that; I should be held responsible for that. But what I want to emphasise is that the administration has to realise its responsibility in this matter. This kind of working in watertight compartments between one department and another must go.

2. SHRI HEM BARUA : It is your pious wish, or is it going to be implemented ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI : This is not going to be a pious wish, and I would go to the length of telling the House that it will be our job, the Job of the Ministers, to go and stay in villages.

3. AN HON. MEMBER : Kairon ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI : I am not referring to Kairon. I shall say word or two about Kairon also. But in so far as other Ministers were concerned, I know he himself went over the whole file, page after page, read them and yet he said he was not the fit person to give any opinion and he referred the matters to a very high legal authority.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : That is why Sanyal has been killed.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI : It is not fair, not proper, to make that kind of reflection. Of course, the hon. Member must depend on what the Home Minister has to say on that matter. An enquiry is already being made. As I said, in some cases which were very fully and thoroughly gone into nothing practical came out. It has become a fashion of the day, and I must admit, I say it with shame and sorrow, that members of our party in the States have not behaved properly, in the sense that they level charges, they make allegations without proper enquiry. I do not deny their right to do it, but what I want to tell them is this : as Members of the Congress Party their first responsibility is to the organisation.

4. J.B. KRIPALANI : Why not bring Vinobaji into the Government ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI : Well perhaps neither Acharya Kripalani nor Vinobaji will ever come to this side !

5. SHRI KOYA (Koshikoda): Then why did he resign ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: Please wait. Since it stood unrebutted, since he himself did not file any affidavit—well, it might be said, "why did he not file an affidavit?" I might say that he would have filed an affidavit unhesitatingly. But the fact was that the legal advice was that it was unnecessary for him to do so. The High Court itself observed that it was not necessary for Shri Sanjiva Reddy to have filed any affidavit. So the House will see that there was some difference of opinion even between the High Court and the Supreme Court. But it was the advice of the legal department of the then Chief Minister, Shri Sanjiva Reddy not to file an affidavit. He could not do it on his own. He took the advice from them and accepted it. I would say, Sir, that this was purely a technical non-compliance of procedure.

I do not want to mention as to what we did in a similar matter about Mr. Kairon. A similar case had happened. It was mentioned in this House, and it was said then also that as it was purely a technical matter, Mr. Kairon need not resign. And he did not resign.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: But Shri Sanjiva Reddy felt that after the verdict of the Supreme Court he should not remain in office. I think instead of expressing our appreciation for that gesture it would be unfortunate if we criticise him for it.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Have you read the Supreme Court Judgement? It is very clearly stated that Shri Sanjiva Reddy actually influenced the Corporation who only a few days ago had taken another decision; and the authorities said that it was because of the opinion of Shri Sanjiva Reddy that in a part of Kurnool, it was nationalised and in another part it was not. And the other part was where the transport owners had supported him.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I would be prepared to discuss with the hon. Member the whole judgement. I have not read it but in the last portion they have concluded in this way that as these charges have not been rebutted, therefore

they felt that these charges stand.

When Shri Sanjiva Reddy decided to resign, this matter was referred to the Central Parliamentary Board. They considered it and they commended the action of Shri Sanjiva Reddy which was in consonance with the high traditions of democracy. In fact the Parliamentary Board placed on record its deep appreciation of the keen sense of duty displayed by Shri Sanjiva Reddy. But because of his personal feelings the Parliamentary Board accepted his resignation. I do not think there was any question of any kind of ban on his rejoining the government. Therefore, I do not think there should be any valid objection to his inclusion in the Cabinet.

6. SHRI HEM BARUA: Please do not use the word "deviated".

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I am sorry. I quite agree with him. I am using it for the benefit of Professor Mukerjee; he might be able to understand it better. Till then the policy was that there should be tit for tat. Lok Manya Tilak went to the extent of suggesting that he would be agreeable to responsive co-operation. Shri Aurobindo and many of his other followers felt that there was no alternative but to resort to arms and use weapons and arms in order to fight the British Government or authorities. Then comes Mahatma Gandhi. He completely disagrees with them and adopts a new philosophy and a new technique. Will you condemn Gandhiji for this? I hope Professor Mukerjee will be good enough at least to excuse Gandhiji if not me?

7. SHRI HEM BARUA: You must call that high-class diplomacy.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I entirely differ from Shri Hem Barua, if he will permit me to say so.

8. SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta Central): I would like the hon. Prime Minister to point out where exactly was the personal attack.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: He did say it. He has tried to say throughout that I was deviating from Nehru's policy.

SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE: Does not the hon. Prime Minister know that when the Prime Minister is referred to, he is referred to as representative of the entire Cabinet and not as an individual?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: He did say that.

9. SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: Where was the personal attack?

On a point of order, Sir. The Prime Minister of this country chooses to report over and over again that somebody who happens to be in this instance made a personal attack. I know the language in which I spoke to a certain extent, and I want to find out where exactly was the personal attack. If I had made a personal attack, I would certainly say that I am sorry about it because I had no such thing in mind. I made a political attack. If the Prime Minister does not understand the difference between personal attack and political attack, I am very sorry. I did not want to say all this, and I never interrupted him throughout his speech, and I did not wish to do so, but he gives unnecessary provocation. He should know better than that.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I wish that he had the same feelings when he was actually speaking. Unfortunately, he referred to me as a split personality. He should not forget that fact. Can there be a worse personal attack on me than these observations ?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: I sympathise with you for your knowledge of the language.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I did not want to go into that, but I do feel that the observations made by Shri H. N. Mukerjee were highly objectionable and absolutely wrong. I felt amused that he should preach me about consistency. What did the Communist Party do ? The Communist Party can enter into an alliance with the DMK and with any communal organisation ; because if it helps them in their election, they will do all that. I did not want to repeat these things. But who has got a split personality ? Is it the leaders and members of the communist party or I who am sitting here ? When he makes that kind of attack, he should not have forgotten this...

SHRI NAMBIAR: Which party joined the Muslim League in Kerala at the time of elections. It was the Congress Party which did it. You preach something else to others, but you practise the same thing.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I did not want to say all these things. The Communist Party, I am sorry to repeat it, was in doubt even when there was an aggression on this country by China.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: There was no doubt.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: They were doubtful. I might say that

more or less, and of course they said it, that they put India and China on the same level. They said 'Oh' there is aggression? One does not know who the aggressor is. And there was severe criticism even in those days, I know, of Panditji; himself and of the Government and also of others. These are past matters. I did not want to refer to them. But when they talk of split personality, I would say that if the members of the Communist Party cannot be clear in their minds as to who the aggressor was, I do not know what they are going to do with this country, and how they will conduct the affairs of this if they were to come to power...

SHRI RAGHUNATH SINGH: They will never come to power.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: Anyhow, I must give credit...

SHRI KAPUR SINGH: Ban them.

DR. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA (Farrukhabad): The Colombo proposal is yours and the relationship with China is yours too.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: But, anyhow, I must give credit to Shri H. N. Mukerjee for one thing. I would not like to be unfair to him at least now. It has now dawned upon him that the policies of China and Mao Tse-Tung are not correct, that they are wrong, and that theirs is an expansionist policy and a policy of aggression. This is what recently Shri S. A. Dange himself has said. But, anyhow, even if it dawns late, even if he gets to this after the sunset, even then it is good, and there is no harm in that.

I do not want to say much more, because I have already taken a good deal of time. I do not want to say much on international matters in this debate....

SHRI HEM BARUA: That was what we were interested in. We were interested in knowing something about China and our policy on the border dispute, Kashmir and all that.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I say this because there will be a debate on international affairs, and perhaps my colleague will also deal with the matter. But I would like to say that it is clear that we have followed a well-set course for a number of years in the international field and in international matters. As I have said earlier, we believe in non-alignment and in the pursuit of peaceful methods for the settlement of international disputes. We are equally clear that colonies should not exist and that racialism should be resisted. Coexistence is a wholesome and absolutely

sound policy which was initiated and strengthened by our late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlalji. We wholeheartedly endorse it and it is a great achievement of the policy of coexistence that in certain matters even the biggest powers are coming closer to each other. Any threat or danger of war would be curious for the world, specially for countries like India who are engaged in fighting an exceedingly difficult problem, that of poverty and unemployment.

About Shri Jaya Prakash Narain, I want to make one point clear. Reference was made to him by Shri Chatterjee. I might make it quite clear that he did not carry any letter from me for the President of Pakistan.

SHRI RAGHUNATH SINGH: It was published in the papers like that.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: It is absolutely wrong. Of course, he is very keen that India and Pakistan should come together. He feels that even communalism can be fought better both in India as well as in Pakistan, if both come close to each other. I do not want to come in his way in his effort. In fact, I agree with him that it would be in the self-interest of both the countries to live in peace.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: What about Aksai Chin?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: In regard to Kashmir and the talk of Aksai Chin, some friends of the Communist Party are very happy. But when he talks of Pakistan, they become angry.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I am not at all angry. I say he had no business to say that. If somebody talks about these things, you put him in prison. Why not put him in prison?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: In regard to Kashmir, I do not want to say much; there is also not enough time. But the late Prime Minister and I also have made public pronouncements on more than one occasion. The Government's stand remains the same. But I would, in any case, like to meet President Ayub for an exchange of views.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur): No harm.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I must say that I do not fancy the idea of keeping in complete isolation and not talking or discussing with others. We have always tolerated difference of opinion, and I feel pained when I see sometimes an exhibition occasionally of intolerance.

About China, I have nothing much to add. The position remains the same,

although I do not rule out talks and discussions with them also, in case it is considered necessary.

I would like to recall what the late President Kennedy said in his inaugural address :

"Let us never negotiate but of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate".

I think that is the best principle which should be accepted by us in this country.

SHRI HEM BARUA: That is all right. We wanted to know about our immediate problem with China.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: As regards what is being done on our frontiers and for strengthening our defence forces, our Defence Minister would be making an elaborate statement.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I wanted to know on the political plane, our immediate problem with China.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I said that there is no change in the present position, and the Defence Minister would be making an elaborate statement on Monday. I hope Members will get enough information from that statement. I only wanted to add a word about Malaysia, we have no doubt good relations with Malaysia, and there is nothing new about it. It would be unfortunate if the sovereignty of Malaysia is disturbed by use of force. We have, however, always supported the idea of Indonesia and Malaysia trying to settle matters between themselves.

I like the idea suggested by Shri Krishna Menon yesterday that the non-aligned nations conference should move in this matter and try to settle these differences.

10. SHRI BAGRI: Prime Minister should say that the treaty will not be done by giving the land that China has encroached. Let the Prime Minister clarify that we will not take any decision by losing our land to China.

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI (Bijnor): As the Prime Minister said in the beginning of his statement that we should not put any interference in his speech. If you have any question then ask it later. After the release of Sheikh Abdullah, the internal situation in Kashmir is deteriorating and the way the Muslims of the country. MLAs and MPs are being beaten up, openly there is a threat of rebellion and this is

being said that there is no value to the assurance of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in Kashmir, the opinion will be counted even if the sun starts rising from the east to the west, and in such a situation, if you bring the person here again and again and give such encouragement, then it is creating all kinds of doubts among the people of Kashmir. I want the Prime Minister to tell the country today through the House that what is the position of the Government of India with respect to Sheikh Abdullah and why he is being treated like this.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: As far as Kashmir is concerned, Sheikh Abdullah was released, and if you release a man after ten to twelve years, then there is nothing great about it. The second thing is that, when a person leaves after ten, twelve or eight or nine years, then some things will remain in his heart. At the same time when he was arrested he must have had some thought process and point of view. After release from jail, he has expressed those views only. And I believe that there is nothing to worry in this. It is true that in the manifestation of the idea, if any such views get expressed which will endanger the peace of the country, then action should definitely be taken.

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI: You spoke about freedom of speech in this House but if somebody talks about dividing the country into fragments Govt. can never tolerate. In this context, when Sheikh Abdullah is speaking along such lines, why the Government is tolerating him?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: After that Sheikh Abdullah has slowed down the talk of separation. Yes, it is necessary that he has his own clear opinion about Kashmir, but he does not want to create any such situation which will cause unrest in the country or in the country. Especially they are worried that they should not do any such thing which will spoil the communal atmosphere, communal situation. So in all these cases, I do not think that there is any such concern or trouble for us? One more thing.

The second thing is that the problem of Kashmir is only between them. Some people support Sheikh Saheb and some people do not support him. They have a little conflict with each other. His arrangement is done by the government, he is stopped, arrested. I think we should take this matter patiently. And whenever we take any decision regarding this, we will do it after thinking carefully and taking good care that the country is not harmed. How can we make such a decision without

thinking ?

As far as China is concerned, it is for me to say today whether we will get the vacation done or....

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: As far as the conversation is concerned, my own opinion is that I never want to block the way of dialogue. But perhaps Dr. Lohia Saheb will get angry, but if we get a chance to talk respectfully, we should not refuse to talk, this is my opinion.

DR. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: Where am I angry? I am always ready to talk. When I am ready to talk to you, you must talk to China. But you always say in your speech that we will not make any treaty with China by losing the honor of India—I don't say compromise—instead you say that we will not make any treaty with China by losing the land of India. Make this thing clear.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: As far as giving a piece of land to India is concerned, it is impossible for any one person, whether he is the Prime Minister. I can't do that myself.

DR. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: You are saying this since August 5, 1947?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: But the question of not giving land and not taking it is a different question. Our opinion on that side is clear. But it is a matter of course that we don't know at what time Dr. Lohia sahib who is against us today may become our friends tomorrow.

DR. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: I am still your friend.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: The statement from there says that peace can be brought to the world.

But I regret that when we start following that principle even a little bit, it is understood that we are showing weakness. I would like to request you that a man who can talk calmly is not weak, he used to be strong in heart. And if we can talk to China in peace—I have said that before and I say so today—then we will do that but what will be the result cannot be said. But how is it possible for the Government of India to do whatever harms the nation.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: What will you do for the land which is with China? Will it stay the same or will you take it back?

STATEMENT REGARDING VISIT TO
UNITED KINGDOM

9 December, 1964

In response to an invitation from the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, I visited London from 3rd to 6th December, 1964. The period of my stay in the U.K. had necessarily to be brief but the visit was indeed useful.

Before my meetings with the U.K. Premier and other Ministers, I was happy to have had an opportunity of meeting Her Majesty the Queen.

A wide range of subjects came up for discussion during my meetings with Mr. Harold Wilson and several of his Cabinet colleagues. We exchanged views fully and frankly in a friendly and informal atmosphere.

There was no formal agenda for discussions. However, some of the topics on which there was an exchange of views, were as follows :

(i) The complex international situation as seen from Delhi and London, particularly the difficult situations in South East Asia, South Asia and Africa.

(ii) Problems of peace, disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, United Nations, the proposal regarding the multilateral force, freedom for the remaining colonies and programmes of assistance to developing countries.

(iii) Balance of payment problem of the U.K.

(iv) India's programmes of development and India's defence needs.

As the House knows I had not gone to the United Kingdom with any specific requests or proposals. These exchanges of views were, however, very useful. The U.K. Prime Minister and his colleagues stressed the importance of having frequent opportunities at various levels to exchange views in an informal manner so as to understand each other's points of view even if we cannot agree on certain specific matters. They felt that in the complex and difficult world situation personal discussions of this nature would help the larger interest of world peace and disarmament and assist the promotion of economic and social progress, particularly in the developing countries.

One of the matters which is of special importance to India and which has attracted much attention in the U.K. also is that of the recent explosion of a nuclear device by the Chinese and its impact on the nuclear policy of the Government of

India. Our views on this question are well known. India is determined to pursue the path of peace and to work for the elimination of the nuclear menace which faces mankind today. The non-nuclear countries in particular have to give serious thought to this matter and the Government of India are already in touch with several other governments on this subject. Equally, it is the responsibility of the great nuclear powers, particularly the USA and USSR, to think of concrete steps for the elimination of the threat that overhangs mankind. We must not forget that the nuclear danger is a menace for the entire people of the world. Our views were stated categorically and they were welcomed.

I was much impressed and touched by the warmth of friendship amongst the Government and other leaders of public opinion in U.K. for India and the Indian people.

I have extended an invitation to the U.K. Prime Minister and Mrs. Wilson to visit India and they have been good enough to accept this invitation. We look forward to this visit.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹

BACK NOTE

II. Statement Regarding Visit to United Kingdom, 9 December, 1964

1. SHRI YASHPAL SINGH (Kairana): Has it also been considered that if China does not stop making atomic bombs, then what measures will be taken ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I have said earlier what is the remedy for this. But the real solution is that we do not allow the Chinese atom bomb to be used for power.

SHRI SWELL: May I know whether before making this suggestion the Prime Minister has ascertained the feelings of the two major nuclear countries the United States of America and Soviet Union ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: No, Sir, I have not done so.

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI (Bijnor): It is well known in India, and also in other countries of the world that one of the reasons for Pakistan's firm stand with regard to Kashmir is that Britain and America are supporting Pakistan, so what do you know ? May the India Prime Minister have had some consultation with the British Prime Minister regarding the problem of Kashmir, if so, what is his view in this regards ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: He did not say anything specific on this, but when the matter was raised, I put my views of the Government of India in front of him. After that he didn't say anything else.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): May I know whether the attention of our hon. Prime Minister was drawn to a statement made by Britain's Commonwealth Secretary in the House of Commons to the effect that in giving arms aid to India Britain has imposed three conditions and out of these three conditions one stipulates that Britain has the right to observe and inspect the use of arms given to India by Britain and the staff attached to the High Commissioner's Office here would do that; if so, may I know whether our Prime Minister while discussing our defence needs, as he has stated in his statement, had any discussion on this particular point which is, I would say, one which goes against the prestige of this country ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I am sorry I have not seen this statement of Mr. Bottomley.

SHRI HEM BARUA: He made it in the House of Commons.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: If he has said any such thing we will

have to take it up with the U.K. Government.

SHRI JASHVANT MEHTA (Bhavnagar): Sir, the Prime Minister made a very important statement regarding the guarantee given by the nuclear powers—the USA and the USSR— against the nuclear danger to the non-nuclear powers. May I know whether the Government has ascertained the reaction of the U.K. Prime Minister on this subject?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: Well, Sir, the U.K. Prime Minister could not say anything definitely in this regard, but he did feel that the nuclear powers should consider ways and means so that the non-nuclear powers are not put in a dangerous position or, some how the threat, for example, of China or of the nuclear countries is reduced.

SHRI NATH PAI: Sir, may I know from the Prime Minister if he had this idea of, what is called, a joint shield or, better, a nuclear shield to be provided by the USSR and USA to mitigate the danger to those powers and countries which are not in possession of atomic weapons, and whether it is a fact that Mr. Wilson undertook to discuss the same idea with Mr. Johnson during his ensuing visit?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: What the hon. Member has said in the first part of his question is more or less correct. I did not use the word "shield" or any such, word, but I said it is the responsibility of the nuclear powers, to consider how to mitigate the danger and menace of the use of nuclear weapons by the nuclear powers. As for the other part of his question, it is for the Prime Minister of Britain to decide. He did not indicate any such thing.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Barrackpore): May I know whether the Prime Minister made any specific proposal, as he has done in his reply to China, to see that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty is further extended for the final elimination of making of nuclear weapons and destruction of stockpiles and also to extend it to France and China? I want to know whether such a proposal, which he has specifically mentioned on more than one occasion here, was made by him to Mr. Wilson?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I did suggest to him that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty should be further extended, but in different ways; that is, if the atmospheric tests are banned at present, the underground tests also should be further banned and in other ways also it should be extended. Of course, it follows—but I did not mention—naturally, that there should be an appeal both to China as well as to France to sign the Moscow Test Ban Treaty. But I did not make that suggestion.

STATEMENT REGARDING LANGUAGE ISSUE

25 February, 1965

Sir, the meeting of Chief Ministers of States, convened to consider the language issue, met on 23rd and 24th February, 1965. The meeting strongly deplored the incitement to violence in order to give expression to grievances of any kind and urged that strong action should be taken to put down lawlessness. It considered that recourse to violence and destruction of public property cut at the very root of the democratic process, which required that all differences should be settled by methods of discussion and persuasion.

The meeting felt that all those who were in a position to influence public opinion should speak out frankly against use of violence and mobilise public support for settling disputes and differences in an orderly way. At the same time, the conference recalled that genuine difficulties as well as unwarranted apprehensions aroused by misleading propaganda must be speedily removed. The conference recalled that through the provisions on the subject in the Constitution, through the enactment of the Official Languages Act, through the decision to have a trilingual basis for education and through the assurance given on the floor of the Lok Sabha by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and reiterated and amplified by me in a broadcast to the nation on 11th February 1965, both the long-term objectives and the need to move towards them with necessary caution had already been spelt out.

Hindi is the official language of the Union and English is to continue as an associate language. There was no question of making any modification in these basic decisions on which alone a sound policy could be evolved. What needed consideration was a number of practical issues arising therefrom, including the amendment of the Official Languages Act, 1963, to give effect to the assurances referred to above. The Chief Ministers agreed that the examination of these issues should be taken in hand. The importance of ensuring equality of opportunity, as enjoined by the Constitution, between people belonging to different parts of the country, was emphasized by many Chief Ministers.

Reference was also made to the question of the various States having an equitable share in the All India Services. The need for evolving a sound system of moderation for examinations for All India and higher Central Services before the

introduction of Hindi as an optional medium, was emphasized. It was further urged that consideration should be given to the introduction of regional languages as media for these examinations. It was suggested that before any decisions are taken on these questions, a study of all the aspects involved should be undertaken in cooperation with the Union Public Service Commission.

The working of the three language formula evolved by the Chief Ministers' Conference on national integration and accepted by the State Governments were reviewed. It was decided that this formula should be fully, and effectively implemented in all the States. It was urged that in accordance with this formula, the study of an Indian language in current use, preferably one of the southern languages, apart from Hindi and English, in the Hindi-speaking areas and of Hindi, along with the regional languages and English in the non-Hindi speaking areas would further promote the sense of national unity and encourage better and freer communication between the people in the different parts of the country. Necessary action will now be taken by the Union Government in pursuance of the above decisions.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹

BACK NOTE

III. Statement Regarding Language Issue, 25 February, 1965

1. SHRI NATH PAI : May I ask whether the Prime Minister because of the unrepresentative character of the Chief Ministers—it is serious thing that they do not represent anything more than the ministerial wings of the Congress in the different States—will make a serious effort to reach a solution of this very delicate and explosive problem by creating a national consensus and, secondly, whether he will take steps to bring into life once again the body which was doing some useful work called the National Integration Council ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI : I do not quite agree with what Shri Nath Pai has said about the Chief Ministers that they represent only the Congress Party.....

SHRI NATH PAI : The ministerial wings of the Congress Party.

MR. SPEAKER : You may not agree. You have to listen.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI : They may be the representative of the Congress Party but they are in-charge of the administration of the whole State and therefore, they hold a very important position. In regard to having a discussion with others, I have already said that we will hold a meeting of the leaders of various political parties in the Parliament and I shall be able to arrange it soon. We may also, as he has said, revive the National Integration Conference. The meeting of that Conference might also be held.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

2 March, 1965

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion on the President's Address was a prolonged one and it was but natural that almost every member who spoke made a reference to the language problem. No doubt, the language problem assumed a serious proportion during the last one month and it took a sudden turn for the worst, especially in the State of Madras. The violence committed there was something unimaginable. A number of people were killed, murdered and there were lootings, burnings and other forms of violence. I must say that it was most regrettable and deplorable.

Shri Hiren Mukerjee suggested that a new chapter should be opened and we might, perhaps, forget it and ignore it. I can understand the students doing something which was wrong just at the spur of the moment. They might have taken part—and they did take part—in some of these activities. But, as I said, one could understand and take a lenient view of things in their case; but there is no doubt that quite a large number of anti-social elements participated in it.

They were responsible for murders and violence. I do not think that we can ignore those who took part in arson, looting and murders. If they are left alone, unchecked and unpunished, it would lead to a very bad situation and it might become almost impossible for our society to function peacefully. It is, therefore, necessary that the law should take its own course in their case. I have had talks with the Chief Minister of Madras and I do think that he will try to do whatever is best in the present circumstances.

In so far as the merit of the question is concerned, I can only say that what Pandit Jawaharlalji had said, the assurances given by him will be fulfilled unequivocally and without any reservation. I have said it before and I want to repeat it again.

As the House is aware, we have had discussions here in the Parliament. We have had discussions outside also with the Chief Ministers and others and various issues have been raised in that connection on that subject, the question of amending of the Languages Act, the question of the three -language formula and some other points like the medium of examination being all the regional languages. Also, it was said that there should be an equitable share in the services.

These are some of the main points which were raised and they have to be studied and carefully examined. I do not want to suggest that I have no views in the

matter. I have clear and categorical views in regard to all these points, but I do not want to express any opinion at the present moment because if we feel that all these points should be studied further and carefully examined, it would be advisable that I or the House should also express its opinion a little later when we have received the notes or reports after the examination has been completed.

However, I would like to say that there could be no question of imposition of Hindi and those who do not know Hindi can continue with English, as even after what was announced on the 26th January, 1965 when Hindi was declared as the official language of the Union it was said that English will continue. In accordance with the Official Languages Act English continues and will continue.

The question of regional languages is very important and I would like to make it absolutely clear that there is no question of imposition or replacement of the regional languages by Hindi. It has been said in some places, specially in Madras, that Tamil will no longer find a place in the State either as the medium of instructions or in governmental work. This is absolutely wrong and baseless. In fact, we attach great importance to the regional languages and we would very much like that all the State Governments should use the regional language.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹

I was submitting before the House that the languages spoken in different States are to be encouraged and fully supported. It is open to the State Governments and, as far as I know, most of the States Governments have already adopted their national language as the State language for official work.

Most of the State Governments have adopted their language as the official language of the State. I would also like that for the development of these State or national languages and also for Hindi the Central Government should render necessary financial assistance. It should give them as much support, specially financial support, as is possible.

I would also say that it is better that this problem is fully and carefully considered because it would not be advisable to change our decisions on this matter frequently. I, therefore, welcome the idea that we might devote a little more time and study the various pros and cons of this matter fully and then take a decision which would be almost final—of course, there is nothing final in the world—we take a decision taking a long-range view of things.

Sir, I would like to say that we have to consider the language problem in the national perspective. It is not that we can consider each and every language spoken in this country as one which should be the official language of the whole country—it would not be possible—and in accordance with the Constitution, we have accepted Hindi as the official language of the Union, I think that it is essential that there should be one common language, one link language for the country. Otherwise, it would mean a departmentalisation of India.....

It would mean a compartmentalisation of our country; it would lead to some kind of disintegration. For, if we only learn the State language and there is no common language learnt, then after some time we shall find ourselves in a position in which it would not be possible for us to communicate with each other. Language is one of the cementing forces; it is an element which joins up and which integrates the country. Therefore, I suggest that Hindi is accepted or should be accepted or has been accepted as the official language of the Union.

But the point is that we should not do anything which would lead to disintegration instead of integration of the country. It is, therefore, essential that we should go slow in this matter. We cannot precipitate things. We cannot, as I said, impose it, and we shall have to wait and see that Hindi is learnt by the people of every State. Naturally, it will take time. I need not clear up the position that there is no question of any kind of handicap being imposed on those who do not know Hindi if they are in service ; well, they can use English. But if they voluntarily learn Hindi it is a different matter altogether. The Home Ministry has made arrangements for the teaching of Hindi, it is up to the officials to take advantage of it and learn it. I do not think that there will be any objection to the voluntary learning of Hindi. However, either in the matter of recruitment or in the matter of promotion, there is going to be no handicap for those who do not know Hindi. It is essential, therefore, that we should take a much wider view of things and deal with this problem, as I said, in the broad national perspective.

In regard to food, we have passed anxious days, but we can now say that at least those critical periods are over. Yet, we have still to face difficulties. Fortunately, we have had a good rice crop.

The production figure of rice is about 39 million tonnes, and we expect that

we shall have a very good wheat crop also. If nothing unusual happen ; we may have a bumper crop of wheat. For the time being, stocks are available in the market.

And we are in the process of making procurement. From all the surplus States, rice is being procured at some places by the Centre directly and in other places by the State Government. The total target of procurement is to the tune of 19.5 lakhs tonnes, and the actual procurement of today is about 7.6 lakh tonnes besides what the State Governments have procured on their own, which is about 2.8 lakh tonnes. So, if we take the States' figures also into account, then we have procured about 10 lakh tonnes or a little more than that. There is still time and if we are able to reach the target which we hope we might do, then there will be a good opportunity for building up a reserve stock. Naturally, we will have also to import. With the help of imports and indigenous production, we may be able to build up a good buffer stock. I am not one who is very much in favour of importing foodgrains, and I would very much like that our imports should be reduced. But for some time to come, at least for the next few years, it does not seem probable that it would be possible for us to build up a good reserve or buffer stock without the help of imports.

Therefore, as I said, with the help of imports and indigenous production, if we are in a position to build up a good buffer stock, it would be possible for us to overcome the stress and strain during the lean periods or lean months. There is no doubt that increased agricultural production is a matter of the highest importance, and we have to give the highest importance to agriculture. In the Plan itself, we have laid the utmost emphasis on agriculture with a view to increase production. As the House knows, there are some difficulties in the way of imports because of the strike in the United States of America. The month of March may be somewhat difficult for us and the State Governments and the Chief Ministers will have to take it in an understanding spirit. However, we are taking other measures to import from other countries. These months are important, because from the middle of April or the first week of April, we will be getting the new stocks of wheat, and so during this period we have to be extra careful and take necessary steps in order to meet the requirements of the people.

I would appeal to the State Governments to concentrate on increased agricultural production. It is mainly their concern and their responsibility.

A number of steps have been suggested with a view to increasing agricultural production. I am sure they will be adopted and accepted by the State Governments. They are trying to do their best. They have a full realisation of the fact that they must increase their agricultural production either because they know that either they do it or they might, I would not say they would perish, but anyhow, they realise that otherwise it would mean a serious setback for them and for their people.

I would like indeed that there should be field-to-field survey, and it should be seen whether the production in the field is raised or not, whether production goes up; if it does not, if there is reduction, then the causes for reduction should be tackled. If we go into these details, I am sure it would have the desired effect.

In so far as prices are concerned, it is, no doubt, a matter which has caused us concern, and which is causing us concern even now. But only the other day our Finance Minister presented the Budget. He has taken, or he proposes, many fiscal and monetary measures. I do hope that those measures will lead to curbing down the rise in prices.

I would also say that the budget proposals will lead to the general strengthening of our economy. The proposals go towards helping to some extent,—if not to a large extent, to some extent,— the common man. I mean this is a trend and this trend will have to continue. It may not be possible to do it at a stretch or just immediately or at once or at a time. However, taking everything into consideration, the Budget which has been presented by the Finance Minister is a balanced budget and has kept in view the needs and requirements of the weaker section of our community.

xxx

xxx

xxx²

It is also necessary that we should have more factories, more concerns and more plants in the public sector. Setting up of industries in the public sector means non-concentration of money in a few hands; it also helps in giving employment to people as well as adding to our national income. What we have done in the public sector projects is that we have taken up basic industries and heavy industries. They have a long gestation period. They do not immediately start giving profit. Even in spite of what I have said just now, wherever they have come up, they have helped in building up other major industries and a large number of ancillary industries. In fact, towns and cities have developed round about them and thousands and thousands of people have found employment.

It was said that the public sector projects were not doing well. Well, there may be one or two cases.

xxx

xxx

xxx³

Shri Mukerjee said that there has been a major shift in our policy in regard to and in favour of foreign capital. It would be better if I quote what Pandit Jawaharlalji had stated in Parliament on 6th April, 1949....

...enunciating the policy of the State in regard to foreign capital, the same policy has continued since then, he said:

"Government have stated before that as a rule the major interest in ownership and effective control of an undertaking should be in Indian hands."

Then the statement continues to say:

"Obviously, there can be no hard and fast rule in this matter. Government will not object to foreign capital having control of a concern for a limited period if it is found to be in the national interest and each individual case will be dealt with on its merits."

The statement adds further that:

"The stress on the need to regulate, in the national interest, the scope and manner of foreign capital arose from past association of foreign capital and control with foreign domination of the economy of the country, but circumstances today are quite different. The object of our regulation should, therefore, be the utilisation of foreign capital not only because national savings will not be enough for the rapid development of the country on the scale we wish, but also because in many cases scientific, technical and industrial knowledge and capital equipment can best be secured along with foreign capital."

Further on, he has added that foreign interests would be permitted to earn profits subject only to regulations common to all, and there can be no hard and fast rule etc.

xxx

xxx

xxx⁴

Generally our desire is that we should have majority shareholding wherever foreign concerns collaborate with an Indian party or with the Government, but there may be some cases in which it might to be possible to have Indian majority shares

because the technical knowhow is not available to us ; sometimes it might also not be possible to find the necessary foreign exchange, and generally, so far as public sector projects are concerned, in case we have to accept it, we have to do so in the case of basic and heavy industries. However, our general policy, as I said, remains the same. I would also like to add that even if there is a majority shareholding, it might be for a limited period. Later on, the concerns or the plants or the companies might sell their shares to Indian parties. We can impose it as one of the conditions in our agreement with them, and we do keep this thing in view whenever we enter into an agreement with foreign concerns. Each and every case which comes up is very carefully scrutinised and examined. In a few cases, they may have to accept majority shareholding, however, with the condition that as far as possible, ultimately they might become minority partners in the concerns which are set up here.

I was saying that we have as our objective socialism and we are trying to pursue that objective through our different plans, and planning is a very difficult problem for us because on the one hand the gap is tremendous ; between what the people want and what we can do, there is such a wide gulf that it becomes so difficult for the planners to decide as to what the size of the Plan should be. If they look to the needs and requirements, they have to provide for a much bigger plan. Then the resources have also to be found and it is important that we should be very careful about finding the resources and in the light of the actual resources only, the plan could be drawn up.

However, two things are important. As I said, we should have a very careful examination of the position of our resources. Secondly, it should be seen that production will match the investment. If there is greater investment and production is not adequate, naturally then it leads to inflationary tendencies. We have also to be careful about the implementation of our plan ; I must say it has to be much more effective and efficient implementation. We should see to it that there is quick execution of each project.

I would suggest that in order to achieve effective and quicker implementation we should keep three or four things in mind. Firstly, there should be planning in depth, that is, greater details for each project should be prepared ; secondly, there should be a time-and-cost schedule for each unit. Thirdly, there should be a machinery to keep a watch on the progress. Fourthly, there should be advance preparatory action within this year on some of the Fourth Plan projects.

Lastly, it is essential that there should be larger facilities for training of personnel. So, we have to keep these points in view and I am sure that if we keep them in view, it would be possible for us to go ahead with our Plan and also to complete our projects in time.

There is not much time but there but there more some disturbance in between when I referred to foreign policy. In regard to foreign affairs, we stick to our basic policies. They are quite clear and naturally our desire is to remain friendly with all countries. And we as a developing country want that there should be peace in the world: not that it is purely with a selfish view that we say this. But there is no doubt about it, that quite a large part of the world is in the process of development. Those countries which have attained their freedom recently are backward in many ways, especially economically, and therefore, they would never like that the peace of the world should be disturbed. It is important that there should be the policy of co-existence which should be generally acceptable to all. Because, even if we differ in ideology or in other matters with other countries, it should not be impossible for us to live together peacefully. Therefore, the policy of non-alignment and co-existence becomes absolutely important and essential for us. We of course stick to them and it would be our effort to see that we co-operate with other countries also who pursue these policies.

On the question of South Vietnam, a serious situation has developed, and one fears whether the conflict might not escalate. Recently, on behalf of the Government of India, we issued a statement suggesting that this conflict should end and that hostilities should cease immediately, and a Geneva type conference should be held.

We have written also to the United States of America, to the USSR Government and also to some non-aligned countries. I have received replies from some countries. They have generally welcomed this idea. They have supported the idea of ending the hostilities and they also want that some kind of conference or dialogue should be held.

xxx

xxx

xxx

In so far as NEFA is concerned, we are there and very much there. Even on the Ladakh front wherever we were we are at present. But taking any further steps

towards vacation of the aggression.

I shall finish my speech in another five minutes. I just want to refer to one or two other subjects.

Shri Homi Daji said that there is a shift to the right and that I have shifted to the right. I do not know if he is also not to the right of some other party. At least for us it is a matter of some interest and amusement that even in the Communist party there are now two groups, rightists and leftists. We were always being accused of being rightists.

They also sail in the same boat. We are going neither to the right nor to the left; we are going forward, instead of going to the right or to the left.

Then he further levelled charges that there are differences in the party and that different statements are being made by different people. Well, in so far as differences in political parties are concerned, the Congress alone should not be blamed. The Communist Party is itself divided. Look at the kind of statements which are being made in Kerala by Shri Achutha Menon and others against Shri E. M. S. Namboodiripad. In the Swatantra party also there are different views, some holding views different from those expressed by others.

Even in the Socialist Party now there has been division.

I might say that it is not correct at all.

The Congress has been like this since 1920. It is not as if the Congress has assumed this position today. It has been like this since 1920, when Dr. Lohia was in the Congress. He was one of those who held views different from the majority opinion in the Congress.

If he will excuse me, I would only like to say that although he is a very able man and he is held in esteem by us, somehow, I was always a moderate in that respect and I never agreed with the views of Dr. Lohia.

I would like to say that the Congress is a big organisation and if some views are expressed which are different from mine or that of others. I do not think we need take it very seriously.

If it is said that there is a shift, that there are differences or that fighting is going on, I do not accept that at all. In fact, I would say, as was said perhaps by

one of our Members, during the recent months the people have shown their fullest confidence in the Congress.

Not only in Panchayat elections but in all the Assembly and Parliament by-elections.

I might say that national unity is the need of the hour. Recent events in the country have touched everyone of the hon. Members. The lessons of these events must not be allowed to be lost upon us. Those who incited passions were no friends of the country. They sought to undo within a few days the mighty and heroic efforts of those innumerable patriots who sacrificed themselves to secure independence and to build up a united India. The Members of Parliament do not represent here a constituency nor a region but the country as a whole and they are bound by law and by oath to maintain the integrity of our mother-land. In the forum of Parliament we must think of the entire nation and of all the people.

Some doubt has been expressed about the strength of Government.

As I said just now, dialogues or discussions do not mean that we have no mind of our own.

In a democratic set-up there should be freedom of expression and freedom of speech.

When I say this, I do not mean that there should be no discipline. There has to be some discipline in a party and, of course, in the Government it has to be much more. There has to be a feeling of collective responsibility and I do agree that we have, the members of the Cabinet, to speak with one voice.

They tendered their resignations. But what Shri Daji said is that I am being pushed this side or that side. So, I might tell him that my mind is quite clear about our policies and programmes. I know what the basic tenets are. I might tell him that no group or individual can make me deviate from these basic tenets.

May I say at the end that this Government means to rule and govern the country subject to certain traditions which are so valuable to democracy.

BACK NOTE

IV. Motion of Thanks on President's Address, 2 March, 1965

1. SHRI SURENDRANAATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): There is no language as regional language; all are national languages.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: True, but merely in order to make it clear I am using that word. However, even the national languages—if you want, I might accept it....

SHRI RANGA (Chittoor): Non-Hindi languages.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: used in the States . . .

2. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Barrackpore): But will the relief be passed on to the common man?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: Of course, the objective is to reduce disparity in life and in income. What he has proposed, a tax on urban property, is also a move in that direction.

3. SHRI RANGA: Question.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: But by and large, I have no doubt that the public sector projects have done well and are doing well.

Prof. Ranga referred to the Presidents Address and especially to the point that there will be no deficit financing. I would merely like to tell him that the Finance Minister has been able to demonstrate it in his Budget. He has produced a balanced Budget in spite of the heavy demands of defence.

SHRI RANGA: What a balance!

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I would also not share Prof. Ranga's views that production will not rise. I may point out that the growth in the national income in the Third year of the Plan was higher than in the first two. I hope I am not unduly optimistic if I say that the last year of the Third Plan will probably show the highest rate of annual growth that we have achieved so far.

4. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: He did not live to see what Bonn has done to UAR.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: We have many things in common with

UAR....

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: We should take a lesson.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: ... and we have separate patterns in some ways in the two countries.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: I hope they will not be identical.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I would like to say that the same policy continues.

5. SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): What is the response from the USA and USSR in particular ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I have not received final replies from them.

SHRI NATH PAI: You have received only acknowledgments for your letters.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: Yes; acknowledgment, but besides that, they have to some extent indicated also what their approach is. However, I would not like to go into them at present, till we have received final replies from them.

SHRI KAPUR SINGH (Ludhiana): Are the replies favourable or hostile ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: The replies which I have received are favourable and not hostile.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: What is the Government's attitude to Malaysia-Indonesia confrontation ? Nothing has been said in the Address also.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: On, Malaysia and Indonesia, we have always suggested that there should be no confrontation between the two-countries. I am glad to notice that there is some effort to bring about some kind of peaceful discussions between the two countries.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Is India making some effort ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: Not India; there are other countries which are doing it. I do hope that it would be possible for the two countries to sit round the table with the help of others. We would never like that Indonesia and Malaysia should fight amongst themselves.

In regard to the Afro-Asian conference, I would not like to say much except that I do hope that this conference will uphold the policies of non-alignment, co-

existence, disarmament, peace and anti-colonialism. I do hope that this conference will strengthen Afro-Asian solidarity and also strengthen the forces of peace and co-operation among the Afro-Asian family.

In regard to China, I have nothing much to say except that they have already exploded an atom bomb, and there is a report that they might explode another atom bomb. However, we do not want to follow in the footsteps of China and we have decided that we do not propose to manufacture the atom bomb in India. However, we will continue the development of our nuclear devices for peaceful purposes and we are going head with it.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: What about the Colombo proposals ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: The Colombo proposals are there where they are.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: Will you make bombs or not ?

SPEAKER: Now you listen, you are right !

SHRI ONKARLAL BERWA (KOTA): Tell me something about Kashmir also.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: Will you manufacture atom bomb or not. If not, then why are you developing atomic power ?

SPEAKER SIR: It seems a bit strange that I should say peace, peace to Swami Ji. If I tell Swami Ji to keep calm, it is a very strange thing.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: What to do, Speaker Sir.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: We have gone to the farthest length and we have nothing more to say in that matter, because it is the proposal of the Colombo countries.

SHRI NATH PAI: I am sorry ; I do not want to interrupt the Prime Minister, but that would not be an adequate reply for the Prime Minister speaking for the first time on this very vital issue. By the resolution passed by this House on 14th November, 1962, he is under an obligation to see that the territory occupied by China by force will be retrieved by this country by using all means. That was the unanimous decision. This is his first commitment to this Parliament and to this country and it is no use saying that the Colombo proposals are dead and buried.

What alternative measures Government has in mind, I want to hear something about that.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: That pledge is there. I hope the hon. Member does not expect us to go and attack China today.

SHRI NATH PAI: We want that our territory should be liberated.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: All these matters are to be considered taking into view the various implications. There is, for example, our own preparation. Then, preparation apart, we have to consider whether the time is appropriate for it. It is not that we can take such drastic steps immediately or without considering the various implications of the problem. Therefore, I said that the pledge is there and we have to prepare our country for it.

SHRI RANGA: Is this the way that we are reiterating our national determination? Are you, Sir, satisfied? We are not satisfied. There does not seem to be even that ring of determination, not to speak of the spirit of it, to get our country vacated of foreign aggression.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member shall have further opportunities.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: If the hon. Member thinks that I am going to attack China tomorrow, I am sorry I cannot.....

SHRI NATH PAI: The Prime Minister twice told us that we are putting questions as if we expect him to attack China. I think it is unfair. The Prime Minister realises that it is we who are the victims of an attack. Nobody in this country ever suggested that we attack China. When we suggest that you redeem the pledge given, you insinuate that we are suggesting that we attack China. If you go into MEFA or Ladakh do we attack China? We move in our own territory which is in the occupation of the enemy, and to call it an attack is I think a travesty of truth.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

16 March, 1965

Lot of heat has been generated during this debate. People from both the sides want to stress that what they say is correct and final. But we must look into this question dispassionately.

As for the question of Shri Patnayak or Shri Mitra is concerned, the President received certain complaints, he referred those complaints to the Government. In order to see whether there is some *prima facie* case or not. I referred the matter to a Cabinet sub-Committee which comprised of some Senior Ministers.

The CBI report was also placed before the Committee. A questionnaire of about 100 questions was sent to Shri Mitra and Patnayak. After receiving the replies, the Committee again questioned them on these points which they considered that those points were not replied in a satisfactory manner. They sent documents to the sub-committee in support of their statements.

Although I am not a lawyer, yet I know that CBI report is not final. They have to take the case to a court of law where the decision may be in their favour or against them.

According to the replies received to the questionnaire and the documents received, the Committee arrived at the conclusion that certain improprieties were committed. But as far as the question of money is concerned, according to the sub-committee the case is not proved. When I received the report, and on seeing that improprieties have been proved, I asked Shri Mitra and Patnayak to resign.

The hon. Members may be remembering that when I took charge of this new responsibility, I had assured the House that whenever there would be any complaint against a minister. I will first of all see whether there is a *prima facie* case against him or not. If the *prima facie* case is there, I will ask him either to resign or face an enquiry Commission. And so long as the enquiry Commission is sitting they cannot continue in their post of Minister or Chief Minister. If the Commission of enquiry acquits them, then they can again occupy their post. This is the policy which I have followed.

When I received the information about improprieties. I informed Shri Mitra and Shri Patnayak about the findings of the Cabinet Sub-Committee and

told them that I leave the decision to their own sense of duty and responsibility, I want to give this credit to them that both of them resigned from their respective posts. Now there has been some talk of misappropriation or other improprieties from the other side. I want to inform them that the Comptroller and Auditor General is looking into all these things. His enquiry will be thorough and final and then on its basis they can be proceeded against in a court of law.

I cannot understand this demand for setting up of a Commission of enquiry. If the findings of the enquiry of Commission are against them, then also we can ask them to resign. As far as prosecution is concerned, it is not for the Central Government to do. But we have already asked them to resign. We have saved lot of time. Therefore, I cannot understand this demand for Commission of enquiry.

I said something about taking decision at political level; I did not mean by that that if there is any charge of misappropriation against me or my colleagues, there should not be any prosecution. What I meant was that that the action should be taken by me or the Government here so that we can ask him to resign. There has been a Profumo case in England recently where Defence secrets were involved, but was only asked to resign.

The first thing I want to submit is that to hold enquiry against a Chief Minister, who has the full support of the party, is not a small thing. Any-how, we held the enquiry against the Chief Minister and then asked him to resign. But you consider it an ordinary thing. It is not possible for me to do witch hunting but I will do full justice. I think I have done my duty and I have not shown any weakness anywhere. It is wrong to say that we have been cowed down by some pressure.

It is correct that the Home Minister said that there was lot of mismanagement and action was called for. But he said this when no enquiry had been conducted. Therefore, I think that whatever Government have done is perfectly correct and no more action is called for.

Other political parties have also been in power and there have been charges of corruption against their minister. But no action has ever been taken by those political parties. Therefore, to say, that we are all honest and others are dishonest is not appropriate. We are all human beings and suffer from certain weaknesses. We must, therefore, try to build an atmosphere, for which purpose we have evolved a code of conduct.

As for our responsibility, for being in power, is concerned, we do not want to escape from that responsibility. It is being said that there is indecision and drift in our policy. I want to know where is the drift? Our basic policies are quite clear, it may be non-alignment, it may be peaceful co-existence or disarmament. We are trying to maintain good relations with all those countries who are not our enemies. We have not lost the friendship of a single country during this period. It may be U.S.A. or U.S.S.R., they have assured of their continued friendship with us.

As far as our economic policy or food policy is concerned, we are following the policies which we had formulated. We want to keep the food zones, because we want to build buffer stocks. It can only be done with the help of surplus states. After we have buffer stocks we can review our policy. Due to our policy, the prices of foodgrains are coming down and with it the prices of other commodities will also fall. We have not presented a deficit budget this time and we have tried that it should have a healthy effect on our policy. We want to help the weaker section of the society. In the end I would say that this Government is working resolutely and will work resolutely.

BACK NOTE

V. No-confidence Motion in the Council of Minister, 16 March, 1965.

NIL

STATEMENT REGARDING SITUATION ON KUTCH-SIND
BORDER AND VISIT TO THE USSR

11 May, 1965

After making any statement on the 28th April, 1965, I have been informing the House from time to time about the developments which have been taking place in regard to the situation on the Kutch-Sind border.

The initiative which Prime Minister Wilson took some days ago has been followed up and gradually concrete proposals have been evolved with a view to bringing about a satisfactory settlement of the problem. We have made it clear on every occasion that a ceasefire would be possible only on the basis of a simultaneous agreement for the restoration of the *status quo ante* as on 1st January, 1965. We have also indicated clearly that only when such a restoration has been effected we would be ready to have recourse to the procedures which had already been agreed to between the two Governments for demarcating the border where this had not already been done.

In the communications from the British Government, various points of detail have been put forward for consideration by both the Governments. So far, no final draft has been prepared or presented. All I would say is that consistently with the stand which I have taken on the floor of this House, we attach the greatest importance to the restoration of the *status quo ante*, and we have indicated our willingness to proceed thereafter to negotiations at Ministers' level, followed, if necessary, by a reference to an impartial tribunal as contemplated in the earlier agreements on the subject.

Our policy and our intentions are quite clear and unequivocal. We do not believe in talking with one voice here and with another voice there. We do not believe in talking of peace at one place and committing aggression at another. Our position has been made known to the whole world in the clearest possible terms.

I want hon. Members to have the assurance that our Armed Forces are ready and determined to defend the territorial integrity of the country. They have been greatly strengthened in their determination by the united and powerful support which this House and the people of India all over have extended ever since the crisis began.

I am leaving for Moscow tomorrow morning, and I know I would be carrying with me your good wishes and fraternal greetings to the friendly people of the USSR, people who have stood by us in hours of trial and anxiety.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹

I am thankful to hon. members for their very kind remarks and observations. I may inform the House that I have made the necessary arrangements and the whole responsibility would devolve on my senior colleagues in the Cabinet. They will be completely in charge of all the work.

Collectively when the Cabinet meets and the senior-most member of the Cabinet will preside over it.

Gulzari Lal Nandaji is the senior-most member of the Cabinet.

Shri Mukerjee has expressed his misgivings in regard to certain matters. As I have said, I have not questioned the *bona fides* of the U. K. Prime Minister and I do not propose to do so. But I can assure him that there will be no appeasement on fundamentals. That will never happen.

So far as Mr. Dwivedy's observations are concerned, we have already laid the utmost stress what whatever has to be done should be expedited. I can say with confidence that the U.K. Prime Minister is definitely trying to expedite it and he wants that whatever the decision, it should be arrived at as early as possible.

So far as Mr. Anthony's observations are concerned, regarding Kanjarkot, Biarbet and Chadbet, our stand is quite clear and positive that they form part and parcel of Kutch and we are not prepared to deviate from that stand.

The House has been meeting all these months and we have greatly benefited by the advice and various suggestions made in this House. But now when the House rises, may I assure hon. members of one thing? We know the general background. The broad policies of the Government have been mentioned in this House and the House also has generally given its acceptance and agreement to these broad policies. In that broad context, this Government would try to discharge its responsibilities fully and effectively. I would like that this House and the hon. members should have some faith in the Government.

BACK NOTE

VI. Statement Regarding Situation on Kutch-Sind Border and Prime Minister's Visit to The USSR, 11 May, 1965

1. SHRI RANGA (Chittoor): I join with all my friends in wishing god-speed to our Prime Minister in the forthcoming journey and the discussions that he is going to carry on.

This morning one suggestion was made by my hon. friend Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, and it was a very good suggestion, and I hope the Prime Minister must have already given some thought to it and would do something by next morning in that regard so that this country would know that while he is away, during these very trying times the second in command in this Government could be expected to act on his behalf with the same authority even though he will still continue to be our Prime Minister outside our country.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): Inside and outside, both.

SHRI RANGA: Outside and inside.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Wherever he is

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA (Katihar): Though physically outside.

SHRI RANGA: In regard to this particular matter, I am glad he has said that the defence forces would be kept in proper spirit and attuned to the needs of the times and the crisis also that is facing us. I am only anxious that no effort should be made by any one during his absence and during this particular trying period to do things in a hasty fashion or in a hot temper and force issues and thus complicate matters and make it more difficult for him and the Government than what it is today.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta Central): I am sure the house will offer its best wishes to the Prime Minister as he journeys to the Soviet Union tomorrow morning. He said how very friendly the attitude of the Soviet Union has been. I am reminded of the visit of our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, to the Soviet Union last time, and when he came back, from that country, when he said good-bye to that country, he said in unforgettable words that he was 'Leaving a part of his heart in the Soviet Union'.

SHRI HARI VISHNU Kamath (Hoshan-gabad): Will he leave his whole heart there?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: The Soviet Union has stood by us in very difficult times, and I do hope that Shri Shastri, when he goes there, will find even greater support for India's cause, at a time when we are in some stress.

In regard to the other matter, I confess I have certain misgivings about the goings-on of the UK Government, because I cannot help forgetting that along with the United States, they have helped Pakistan at our cost every time, over Kashmir and so many other issues. And I have a suspicion that there might be an attempt at manoeuvre, so that we can be wheedled into a kind of appeasement which we do not wish. But I am willing to trust the bonafides of the Government so far as the defence of the integrity of our country's borders is concerned. Without that kind of trust, the parliamentary system cannot work. I do have that trust and I do wish to have from the Prime Minister an assurance that we would not be wheedled by whatever kind of pressure into a kind of appeasement which would be against the kind of principles which he has already formulated.

SHRI U. M. TRIVEDI (Mandsaur): I have heard the statement of the Prime Minister with not very easy qualms. Although I wish him godspeed, yet I feel that in his going there, he must be extremely careful in the utterances which are likely to come out, which should not, in any manner, jeopardise our already very slightly strained relations which we find on all sides. We are passing through very difficult times. There is no doubt about it. We have good friends in the USSR. There is no doubt about it. But we have also other good friends about us, some whose present position and present attitude have not been very helpful. They might have their reasons, but we must do our best to see that those reasons which have prompted them to show any coolness towards us are wiped out, and that the relations with friendly countries that we had established so far continue as friendly and helpful to us in the present times.

I certainly wish him godspeed, but he should remember that the country's fate is now at stake, and he should do all that we all expect of him for the sake of the country.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara): The Prime Minister is

going to honour a commitment that he probably made earlier for a visit to the Soviet Union. I do not know whether it was too late for him at this stage to cancel the trip or postpone it in view of the critical situation in the country. I would have preferred if this visit could have been postponed to some other date.

The talks are going on, as he says, and they have not yet come to any final stage, but whatever the final outcome of these talks may be, I would like this Government to make it known to the British Prime Minister that a final decision should be made known to us by the time the Prime Minister returns that is, within a week's time. Probably the tactics are to prolong the talks, and naturally, because of the monsoon, and because that area will be waterlogged and submerged, there will be a natural ceasefire, and we will not be in a position to take whatever military action we would like to take to drive out the aggressor. So, I would like very much that a time limit should be given, so that whatever talks are continuing may come to a final stage within a week's time.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): We join in wishing the Prime Minister every success in his mission.

I think it will be rather critical in certain ways. I am only a little concerned about the latter part of the Prime Minister's statement.

The first part is fairly clear. He said that there would be no reference to any kind of arbitration unless there was a restoration of the *status quo ante* as on 1st January, 1965. I am not questioning anybody's *bona fides*, but the Prime Minister's statement that certain details have been worked out may prove to be a snare. If we accept details under the guise of a boundary dispute, I am a little afraid that, unless the Prime Minister spells it out beyond a peradventure that Kanjarkot, Chad Bet and Biar Bat are not subjects of territorial dispute, we may be embroiled in a boundary dispute which will recoil against us. I would request him to make it clear beyond a peradventure that these areas particularly are not subjects of a boundary dispute.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI (Berhampur): I join my voice with those of other Members who have wished godspeed to the Prime Minister in his Russian visit and hope that good for the country and the nation will come out of it. These days we have not many friends, but the Soviet Union has stood steadfast by us, and we hope that the Prime Minister's visit would strengthen the strong bonds of friendship which are already there.

But, so far as our present state of relationship with Pakistan is concerned, it is

just one step short of war Whatever may be the feelings of the Government, the man in the street is actually asking the question whether it would be war or peace. Looking at the state of things as they are in the West Pakistan border, in the Assam border, in the Assam-Latitila border, looking at the things and events that were happening in Kashmir where people shout Pakistan zindabad or China zindabad, people are not in an easy mood and the Prime Minister and the Government should remember that even if their patience may be very strong and unlimited, there is always a limit to the patience of the people and that aspect of the matter should be borne in mind.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE (Munger): I am glad that the Prime Minister is visiting Russia. Russia is a country that fell victim to an invading Rakshsi government twenty five years ago? It is my desire that the Prime Minister should also place before the leaders of Russia the fact that China, the monstrous invader of this era, has become a victim of that and has also claimed the territory of Russia. Prime Minister, try to present the next version of China in front of the Russian leaders, this is a request I want to make to them.

As far as Kuchh is concerned, the news that has appeared in the Times of India today about the revised suggestion of Britain has caused great concern to me—and I think all the members of this House, because it It has been said that it is the proposal of Britain that India should withdraw its army from areas like Chhadwet etc. and Pakistan should withdraw its army from areas like Kanjarkot etc. In practice, the result of this proposal will be that the demand of Pakistan will be accepted that the area above the 24th latitude. The area is disputed and the armies of both countries should be withdrawn from this area. I think that the concern which is in my mind is also in the mind of all the members of the House. Therefore, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to this point.

Therefore, it should be made very clear that as far as India is concerned, not only in Chhadwet, but also in the area of Viarbet and Kanjarkot, in all areas, we should have the right to have cursed troops - not just police contingents Because that is our area. The Prime Minister should clearly keep this matter in front of the country.

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI (Bijnor): Sir, Prime Minister is going on a visit to one of our neighboring countries, so I express my best wishes to him along with my colleagues, but today I can only express my best wishes. Congratulations will be given to the Prime Minister on the day when he succeeds from there and returns.

The Prime Minister will remember that when our country was attacked by China, the situation was almost the same as it is today. Our first Prime Minister announced at the Madras airport that we had ordered our troops to drive out the Chinese from our borders. After they went abroad, there was a fierce attack on our borders, due to which some part of our land is still under the control of the enemy. The Prime Minister is leaving tomorrow, but it would have been better if he had given some indication in his statement that who will look after his responsibility in this one week and whether he is going by giving them the right or not in this one week. If a dire situation arises, the possibility of which is increasing very rapidly, then he can take an authoritative decision in the same way as the Prime Minister would have taken while in India.

Secondly, through you, I want to reiterate what I said to the Government this morning. Today is the last sitting of this session of Lok Sabha. After a while we will leave here for a long time and go to our respective work areas. During this crisis, as long as the sitting of the Parliament continued, the country had a great confidence that our representatives are sitting here to express our feelings in the Parliament. Our voice is reaching the ears of the government and we also take answers from the government. When we are bidding farewell for such a long time, in the meantime some big ups and downs will come in our country which is also natural. If the Parliament is not functioning at such a time, then there must be some medium for the countrymen to take the side of the government or their voice to the ears of the government in times of crisis. For that only my own suggestion is that a small committee should be formed consisting of some representatives of the ruling party and also of the opposition parties and that committee should meet regularly with the representatives of the government once a week or ten days, the whole situation keep taking the information of and keep getting that information to the whole country, so that the countrymen, whose mind has a great concern, keep getting full information about the situation from time to time. The country remains with you in the same way as of now through this national crisis! Yes, stay with you in the same way.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Perambalur): I join others in this House in wishing the Prime Minister well in his forthcoming tour to Russia and I hope efforts will be taken to cement further the friendship between the two countries.

Sir, we are passing through very critical times and as my hon. friend Shri Prakash Vir Shastri just now said, it should be made well-known to the country,

namely, when the Prime Minister is away, who is the person in the Cabinet who will discharge the duties and taking up the responsibilities. I hope it is time that he names some Deputy Prime Minister to look after the affairs of the Government in his absence.

I want to impress on the House one thing. It has been the pattern about aggression everywhere: that aggression first takes place; then a ceasefire is offered; and then peace talks begin. And there is always the tendency for the ceasefire line to harden quite for a number of years. I want this to be avoided; whenever ceasefire is being thought of, all these aspects have to be considered before any final decision is taken by the Government.

SHRI MAURYA (Aligarh): Respected Prime Minister is going to visit Moscow and further strengthen the bonds of great friendship of India with it. On behalf of my team, I extend my best wishes to him in this auspicious work. But at the time of this crisis, while the rebels are raising their heads, there is a fire in the valley of Kashmir, Red China is occupying the land of Hindustan and neighboring Pakistan is attacking India with great power, I must pray this I will nominate any member of a special cabinet in his absence, as suggested by my colleagues here, to carry out this great task.

Simultaneously, contact should be maintained with the representatives of the opposing parties.

The good work for which he is going where his scholarship is with him and the great competence of the government machinery is with him, I would also pray that here especially about the fight in the battlefield of Kuchh or the issue of Kashmir. When a difficult environment arises about the country, then also keep in mind the feelings of the country and the self-respect of the country.

MOTION REGARDING INDO-PAKISTAN AGREEMENT
ON GUJARAT— WEST PAKISTAN BORDER

16 August, 1965

Sir, I can very well understand the feelings of the hon. Members of this House, the views or the opinion of the Members of the Opposition and also of the Members of this side. It is highly regrettable that the proceedings of the House are not allowed to be carried on in a manner which would be in consonance with the dignity of this House. There is constant disturbance, even when you; Sir, are standing, you are not allowed to speak. Whenever a Minister is speaking or replying, he is continuously interrupted. There should be some decorum in the House and if we do not observe that decorum, I am very sorry to say. We would be presenting an image which would go totally against us not only in India but outside also. I would, therefore, beg, through you to the Hon. Members that in future let us observe some rules and regulations.

In so far as this particular matter is concerned, of course, it is not the first time that Bagriji has behaved in this manner. But I would request you that you may please agree to waive the rules and allow the Law Minister to move another motion. I have every hope that the whole House will agree with it.

As I told you in the beginning, I would refer to some of the points raised just now when I reply to the debate because it would be better I hear the full debate and then refer to those points.

The House will recall that the last session of the Lok Sabha devolved considerable time and attention, and rightly so, to the developing situation between India and Pakistan on the Kutch-Sind border culminating in the inroads committed by Pakistani armed forces in the Rann of Kutch.

I had made a number of statements in the House. It would be recalled that, as a result of Pakistani armed intrusions into the Rann of Kutch and their aggressions committed against us, there was serious danger of a military conflict between India and Pakistan which, in the very nature of things, could not have been confined merely to the Kutch-Sind border. As I said in my statement in this august House on April 28, that was one of the most fateful moments of our times and both India and Pakistan stood poised at the crossroads of history. I made it quite clear then and afterwards that we are a nation, pledged to peace but that at the same time we are determined to defend our country.

Throughout those difficult days we were subjected to great provocations. Pakistan did everything to wash away the bridges of peace and to engulf the two countries in a military conflict, the consequences of which would have been grave for both. However, the firm steps that we took, including the despatch of troops to the frontiers to meet the threat posed by the concentration of troops on the other side made Pakistan realise that it should not hope to get away with aggression.

I cannot but make a reference to the present situation as it exists in Kashmir. It is a new situation, full of the most serious potentialities. A large number of raiders in civilian disguise, but heavily armed, have come across the ceasefire line and are indulging in serious acts of sabotage and destruction. These raiders are being spotted out and dealt with firmly and effectively. The number of those killed, wounded and captured is now fairly large. Our valiant security forces, both army and police, are acting with exemplary valour.

The two situations to which I have made a reference arose at different points of time and I have no doubt whatsoever that the manner in which Government dealt with them was the best possible in the circumstances. I would urge the House to consider the Gujarat-West Pakistan Border Agreement in the light of the stand that Government had taken while the Parliament was still in session and which was stated in this august House on more than one occasion.

May I now refer to the Gujarat-West Pakistan Border Agreement in some detail? As the House is aware, on April 28, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, wrote to me and to President Ayub Khan expressing great concern at the situation that had developed in regard to the Kutch-Sind border. He suggested a ceasefire to be followed by withdrawal of troops and restoration of the *status quo* as on 1st January, 1965 and thereafter talks between the two Governments. These proposals basically conformed to the stand consistently taken by the Indian Government in the fruitless exchange of notes which had taken place between the Governments of India and Pakistan in the months of March and April. I, therefore, replied to Mr. Wilson accepting these principles. Thereafter followed a long process of negotiations on details. Through the intermediary of U. K. High Commissioners in India and Pakistan and the United Kingdom Government eventually on the 30th June, 1965, an agreement was signed between India and Pakistan.

The main elements of this Agreement are: a ceasefire on both sides to be followed by withdrawal of forces and restoration of *status quo* as prevailing on the 1st

January, 1965. Once these are accomplished, there has to be a meeting between the Ministers of India and Pakistan and if such a meeting is unable to resolve the boundary issue, a three-man impartial tribunal is to be constituted to give its findings on the subjects. A time-table is set out in the Agreement for these various steps. The withdrawal of forces from the Rann of Kutch is to be completed within seven days of the ceasefire. Restoration of the *status quo* in its entirety, including resumption of normal police patrolling is to be completed within a month from the date of ceasefire. The Ministers' meeting is to conclude discussions within two months and the tribunal is to be act up within four months of the ceasefire.

The Agreement is in conformity with the Indo-Pakistan Border Agreements of 1959 and 1960. In connection with the latter, I would like to recall that those Agreements were placed before the House on the 16th November, 1959 and 9th February, 1960, respectively, and statements thereon had then been made by the late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the Minister for State, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.

Hon. Members will recall that, in my statement before the House in the last session, I had said that we would agree to talk, but only if Pakistan's aggression was vacated and the *status quo ante* was restored. I had also stated that Pakistan would have to vacate Kanjarkot. All this has been complied with. There is no Pakistani force now in Kanjarkot; Bihar Bet and other points which they had occupied have also been vacated.

As regards patrolling also, the position would be restored as on 1st January, 1965. The officials of the two Governments have met to sort out details.

I should like to say a few words with regard to the *status quo ante*. The Agreement restores the *status quo* as on 1st January, 1965. Generally speaking, implicit in the concept of *status quo* is adherence to the position prevailing at a given time. In agreeing to the restoration of the *status quo ante*, we have not introduced any new principle.

The question as to what the actual position in regard to various matters on the 1st January, 1965, was one of fact and not of any sovereign rights. The restoration of that position was considered essential in order to get Pakistan's aggression vacated—the aggression which Pakistan had committed in April, 1965. The interim period, while the question of demarcation of the boundary is being pursued, would be of a short-term duration. As I have said already, there is a definite time schedule for the

entire work to be completed even If it becomes necessary to refer the matter to the tribunal. It is perfectly clear that the boundary would be demarcated on the basis of documentary evidence and the *de facto* interim position would have no relevance whatsoever.

One matter about the Agreement which has caused some comment is that of patrolling. On this question also the actual position obtaining on the 1st January, 1965 had to be restored. The Pakistan Government put forward the claim before the United Kingdom Government, who were acting as intermediary, that it was patrolling on that day over a wide area in the Rann of Kutch.

This claim was found to be without foundation except with regard to a small track close to the international border, over which Pakistani patrols, were said to have passed beginning India had taken a firm stand. I should make it clear, however, that the use of this track does not, in any manner, confer any rights on Pakistan.

The authority of India is complete and extends to the whole of the Rann of Kutch.

A few words more about Kashmir before I conclude. All my colleagues and I myself share fully the grave anxiety which I know fills the minds of all hon. Members. As the hon. Members are aware, the armed raiders have crossed the ceasefire line deceitfully in civilian disguise. According to information available, and as has just now been said by the Defence Minister, these people had been specially trained to indulge in acts of sabotage and destruction by the armed forces and officers of Pakistan. Our security forces are dealing with these raiders in the only manner appropriate to the situation. From the statements made by the prisoners, it would appear that the present operations have been planned and are being directed with the approval of the authorities in Pakistan.

The situation in Kashmir is fully under control. The raiders are being tracked down even with the help of the local population. It may take a little time to apprehend all the raiders but the operations are proceeding satisfactorily. The Government and the people of Kashmir are prepared to face the challenge and I would like to pay my tribute to the courage of the people and to the boldness and determination shown by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir under the distinguished leadership of G.M. Sadiq Sahib.

Hard days lie ahead, but we have to face the future with bold resolution. The price of freedom is paid not once but continuously. We have to be prepared as a country to pay that price.

So far as Government are concerned we have dealt with the developing situation, whether in relation to Kutch or in relation to Kashmir, in the best manner possible in our circumstances. Government will continue to do so in the days ahead, but their hands would be greatly strengthened by the mighty support they get from this House.

BACK NOTE

VII. Motion Regarding Indo-Pakistan Agreement on Gujarat- West Pakistan Border,
16 August, 1965

NIL

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION IN THE COUNCIL
OF MINISTERS

26 August, 1965

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Members of the Opposition are free to move a No-Confidence Motion whenever they so like. But I would merely like to say that to make it, more or less, a routine matter in every session of the House is perhaps not setting up a very healthy precedent and especially in the present context of things. I would merely say that this Motion is very regrettable.

I am thankful to Mr. Masani for the few good words he spoke about me. We differ in our views and we belong to different parties, but this should not cause any bitterness at all between us. We have worked for more than thirty years together and I think it should sustain our old acquaintance and friendship.

The main attack on our policies has been that we have made a very big Plan and this Plan will cause great difficulties for us. As the House is aware, soon after our independence, we had to concentrate on the economic development of the country. Naturally this was the first and foremost task for the Government and we have pursued it to the maximum extent possible.

What was the context in which we decided that we should try to develop our country on a planned basis? Sir, we have, of course, our own ideology and our own policy, but we felt that we need not have a very dogmatic approach but it was essential that there should be planned development and we felt—or the Government felt—that there should be regular Five-Year Plans.

Our problem is that our needs are tremendous. We have been subjected to slavery for a long period and we find ourselves in an extremely miserable position because, wherever and in whichever direction we go, we find, that the country is backward; whether it is roads, ports, railways, power, electricity, industry, mines or any other field, we find that we are extremely backward and we have to catch up with the events. But we should also realise that, for that, we have to find the necessary resources. What are we to do if the needs and requirements are great? We have to fulfil those needs and requirements and, in fact, what we have planned for falls far short of fulfilling our needs and requirements. Whether it is the State Governments or even, if I might say so, the Members of Parliament or others, they all want the various things to be done and different measures and steps taken to remove many of the deficiencies which prevail in the country. This compels us to

have a bigger Plan and it is in this context that we find that we have to draw up a bigger Plan every time because we have to catch up with the tempo which the earlier Plans have created. If we do not do it, then it would mean the stagnation of our economy which would ultimately result in the misery of our people.

As I was saying, in the present circumstances we have no alternative but to go in for a bigger plan, because the country wants it and the country needs tremendous changes and great developments. Even our industrialists will also, I have no doubt, want a much bigger plan. But, of course, they would like to depend on getting aid and help more and more from foreign countries. Of course, we can not accept that policy, because we have to depend more and more on ourselves, I do not mean to suggest that we do not want aid or help from other countries, but ultimately our objective has to be to reduce the quantum of help which we get from abroad. In fact, a much bigger plan was proposed in the Planning Commission; various committees met and there was a suggestion to have a plan of about Rs. 27,000 crores first and then of Rs. 24,000 crores.

There was even a suggestion for a plan of Rs. 30,000 crores. But after having taken everything into consideration we felt that we must look to the resources as well. There is no point in just being an idealist. Before we accept any plan, we must see what the resources are and how far it would be feasible to find both the external and internal resources. After having had talks with the Chief Ministers of various States, we came to the conclusion that it would be possible for them to find the necessary resources which had to be found from the States, and the Centre also would be in a position to find the necessary resources. So, in these circumstances, we agreed to this figure of Rs. 21,500 crore.

However, I must say that we will have to keep a constant watch on the resources position, and if we find that necessary resources are not forthcoming we will have to review the position, I do not think that this would happen, but yet I would like to say that we must find the necessary resources; but if we do not get them, whether by the states or by the Centre, then we will have to review our position most carefully. In fact, every year at the time of the presentation of the Budget, the resources position will be carefully examined. It is necessary that we tap new resources and new sources. I know there will be taxation. We will try to get funds from our public sector projects through their earnings. There will be savings. All these elements will help in finding the necessary resources.

I have, however, a feeling that in regard to taxes, we can certainly tap new avenues. But in some cases, we have also to consider if a particular taxation measure has not reached the saturation point, and if it means almost a no-return, then we have to review the position. We have to consider it, because what we want is a constant flow of money and resources for our plan, and we should not certainly give the impression that there has to be taxation for taxation's sake.

We will also have to be very careful in regard to our foreign exchange position. We do not know what we will get from other countries with a view to finding necessary foreign exchange resources for the plan. But yet the picture does not seem to be very dim; the prospects seem to be, on the whole, fairly satisfactory. However, I would not like to express my views categorically one way or the other. Yet an effort has to be made, and our Finance Minister would soon be going to the United States and to some other countries with a view to discuss matters and see that necessary resources are made available for the Fourth Five Year Plan.

Of course, in a socialist society, the public sector has to receive the highest priority. I would not like to say much as to how our public sector projects have functioned.

But as far as I can say, except for a few projects, on the whole the other projects have functioned very well indeed.

In fact, the Finance Minister the other day mentioned the figures, the profits and earnings from the public sector projects. If we do not have the desire and necessary strength to run these public sector projects profitably — it is not merely a question of ideology — we will certainly have to reconsider. But I have no doubt that in a few years, in course of time, our public sector projects will be doing much better than the private sector projects. We have made considerable improvement in management, and we will have to effect further improvements, but it is necessary that the public sector projects should cover as many areas as possible. Of course, we have the private sector projects, and they have to play their own role. I would say that Government will try to help them as much as it can in order to achieve the targets which have been prescribed for them. Shri Masani paid compliments to Pakistan for the progress they have made. I do not grudge it.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹

I would not like to go into details, and, I do not want to compare ourselves with other countries. Still, some kind of propaganda is being carried on, and

therefore I thought I should make it clear as to what kind of progress Pakistan has made. It is only after a long period of very slow growth in the 1950's that Pakistan's economy has begun to grow rapidly, at over 5% per annum since 1959-60. Agriculture which grew only by 1.3 per cent per annum in the 1950's shows a rate of increase of 3.5% since 1959-60, which is about the average rate of growth of Indian agriculture over a much longer period. The rate of growth in India in 1964-65 was 7.33 per cent, according to estimates just published.

No less important is the fact that Pakistan's development had been accompanied by a much greater disparity in income between the poor and the rich, and I shall quote what Mr. R. F. Hussain has written in *The Times*, London, on August 18th. He had said :

"In the economic sphere there is great activity and on the whole the country gives an impression of expansion. There are more jobs and more moneys in people's pocket, but the disparity between the rich and the poor has increased alarmingly. The differences in their living conditions is glaring.

The rich areas are remarkably clean and the poor disgustingly dirty. On paper vast sums of money are allocated to improve conditions, but all too often the money finds its way into the private pocket."

I do not say that we have completely removed all disparities. There are disparities in our country. Of course, there is a section which has reaped enormous benefits, and yet our effort has been to make an all-round development, all-round progress. There are sections in our country which are suffering or have suffered, yet it can not be denied that a very large number of our people, their size is very great, have benefited by our plans and programmes, I would also like to add that compared with our population and with the area, Pakistan has got almost double the aid which we have received from other countries. That is a factor with which greater development is possible.

I know that we are facing a difficult situation in so far as food is concerned. It has caused us great concern during the last month and a half. This is rather a strange situation but unfortunately there has been a short fall in the rains. This caused a special kind of situation creating doubts in the minds of the farmers as well as traders. The result is that there has been a shortage of foodgrains in some parts of the country and there have been special difficulties in certain pockets. Luckily, we have now got the rains and it has given some relief. It has to be realised that the bigger wholesalers and if I may say so big farmers have got foodgrains with them and

they will have to be tackled.

I know there will be some difficulty in handling the big farmers but the State Governments have no alternative, the State Governments will have to handle and tackle the big farmers ; they should try to persuade them, whatever the methods be. But this has to be tackled and they have to be handled.

Secondly, we are getting imports and we expect to get adequate imports and we will try to help the areas which are in difficulties and try to help them as much as we can. This is of course the short term remedy. Immediately we have to do these things. Ultimately it is only greater production which will solve this problem and we attach the highest importance for that to the agricultural sector. Mr. Masani said that our allocation was rather very small and he mentioned this in percentage. In terms of percentage it may not be large as compared to what it was in the Third Plan and I would merely like to tell him that in actual amounts the allocation is double. For instance in the Third Plan the allocation was Rs. 1,091 crore. Now, in the Fourth Plan, it is Rs. 2,400 crore. In irrigation, power and rural works and rehabilitation and two or three other items which are connected with agriculture, there has been consistent increase; there are big increases in the Fourth Plan as compared to the Third Plan. If irrigation, power, small industries, transport—all connected with the rural areas—if all these various items which directly benefit agricultural production are included, it will be found that the total figure comes to Rs. 4,387 crore as compared to Rs. 2,141 crore in the Third Plan. So, the allocation is quite big.

The point is whether it would be possible for this sector to absorb all this amount of money; it would be absorbed, naturally we will feel very happy. Not only that, I am prepared to say that in case there is any dearth of money for the agricultural sector, it would be found, and it would naturally be given the highest priority. Secondly, if there is to be any cut in any field, it will not be done in the case of agriculture. We may have to do it in some other sector but not in agriculture.

I would also like to say that what I had suggested was that in the first year of the fourth Five Year Plan, the highest allocation will be made for agriculture. I had said that the Planning Commission should give thought to it and also that they should prepare an integrated plan of agriculture. I do not know how it has appeared in the newspapers. I did not get either any oral or written information from the Planning Commission that they did not agree with this approach. What has appeared in some newspapers is absolutely incorrect. In fact, as I said, the Planning Commission

is preparing an integrated plan of agriculture with the necessary inputs and all that; they should prepare a coordinated picture of agricultural development. They are doing it, and I have no doubt that the plan that they will draw up for agriculture will certainly put agriculture on a sound footing.

A reference has been made to planning. It has been said that the biggest evil is perhaps the planning of our country's economic development and for that perhaps the Planning Commission is held responsible, I would merely say that in this vast country, with enormous problems, we cannot go ahead with the economic development without having a plan with us. And if there is no plan, we will present a distorted picture of our economy. I would like to tell Shri Masani that it is not only the socialist countries who have got planning bodies. Even in the United Kingdom there are two bodies which they have set up for planning.

The Planning Commission has been given its task, and it has to complete that task. It has completely to follow the policies of the Government. There is absolutely no reason to suggest that they can superimpose their views on the Government. But certainly there is constant consultation and discussion and more or less we agree amongst ourselves. Generally we find that we see eye to eye with each other. As I said, U.K. France or other countries have a planning agency. Besides that, I might add that the World Bank, to which I think Mr. Masani will attach importance, also has suggested that there should be a proper plan for development. They will consider giving aid or loan only if a country has got a proper plan for development. In the circumstances, to suggest that planning itself is some kind of evil will not be correct at all. To some extent, I think with some reservation. Mr. Dandeker agreed with it.

We have to depend more and more on ourselves and we must contribute the maximum, the country will have to give the maximum, in the form of taxes or in other forms. The imposts which have been levied might be heavy, but yet it is an indication of the fact that we want to contribute our best for the fourth plan and for helping in building up our economy. These imposts do not touch the common man at all...or needs or items which are daily necessities of life.

What is more important is that in the fourth plan, we must see that there is no deficit financing. Inflationary tendencies have to be checked and curbed. So, even if we have to undertake some burden, we should be willing to do so, so that at least there is no further inflation in our country and the prices are contained within a reasonable limit.

There is some doubt in the minds of the people whether these imports or checks on imports might not affect our production. There is some substance in it. We will certainly have to consider as to what steps should be taken so that the increase in production is not handicapped. Naturally for raw materials and components, we need free foreign exchange and special efforts will have to be made to get it, so that production, specially in small-scale industries and even bigger industries, does not suffer.

Of course, in a regulated economy, there have to be controls and some regulations and checks. But I do feel that we have also to review side by side whether certain controls could not be lifted. After all, firstly, it is necessary that there should be minimum checks and counter-checks in so far as the setting up of industries is concerned. And, secondly, as I said, if necessary, controls in certain—of course, where it is absolutely essential—cases may be lifted. For example, we have recently lifted controls over some special qualities of steel and pig iron, and we have also decided it in principle that cement would be decontrolled except for the quantity which is needed by the Government. So we have to keep under constant review the kind of regulations, checks and controls we have, because it is essential that production should increase and nothing will help the country more than increased production in different directions.

Sir, I must say that the picture which Shri Dandekar painted the other day was as if there had been no progress at all and this country is just going to ruins. I would merely say that over the period of 14 years since we embarked upon planned economic development the real national income of the country has gone up by about 69 per cent, despite increase in population. The real income per head of the population increased by about 27 per cent.

Production of foodgrains has gone up by over 54 per cent, the agricultural production as a whole rose by about 40 per cent in 1963-64 the per capita availability of cereals, cloth and a range of manufactured articles has gone up since 1931, industrial production as a whole has been diversified and has increased by over 145 per cent, the generation of electricity is now five times more than what it was at the beginning of the First Plan. Hardly any crude oil was produced or refined in 1950. In 1964 the figures were 2.2 million tonnes and 9 million tonne- respectively. The production of steel presents a similar picture and in the matter of extension of irrigation facilities what has been done over the three Plan-period represents much more than the progress over half a century and in fact more than which preceded it. At the beginning of the First Plan the total gross area irrigated from all sources was

about 55.8 million acres. Major and medium irrigation schemes taken up in the first three Plans have alone an aggregate potential of about 44 million acres.

With what we propose to do in the matter of additional irrigation facilities over the Fourth Plan, all but a small proportion of irrigable area in the country would be provided with irrigation facilities. In this field, our achievements could perhaps compare with the best elsewhere. Simultaneously, there has been a large expansion in social services and transport capacity. When all is said and done, this, in the aggregate, represents no mean order of progress.

I do not mean, Sir, to suggest that everything is satisfactory. We have to make considerable progress. And, we have to tackle the much more difficult problems the country is faced with. I might, Sir, add that what is more important here is the implementation of our programmes and policies. It has often been said that we have been lacking in proper implementation and execution of our programmes and policies. We have been looking into this matter. There have been various study groups functioning. But I have often felt that, perhaps, these patch-works or these small efforts are not going to meet the situation, and I am of the opinion that there should be a high-power commission to go into this matter. Because, it must cover the whole gamut of administration. There is the Secretariat, there are the directorates and, then we have also the administration in the districts. I think both these aspects are very important and they must be tackled by a commission which would be sufficiently powerful. I have no doubt that if we have a commission of distinguished people, it will produce adequate results. Their recommendations will be such as would help in improving our administration in building up our Secretariat and also in building up the services working in the field. So, in this context, I do hope that this proposal will generally be endorsed and approved, and I think it is an important proposal.

I would not like to say much on other matters, but I have merely to request this House and also the people outside that we are at the present moment involved in a grim struggle with Pakistan in Kashmir and this is a time in which we should get the support and co-operation of all.

I am sorry for what has happened, I shall not take more time of the House. However, I would like to say that any kind of activity which leads to violence, or which would be inciting violence in some form or another would be most unfortunate in the present circumstances.

There can be meetings, protests, demonstrations and processions. We have no objection to any kind of opposition which is more or less peaceful and we will certainly listen to their views.

Of course, it would be left to Government to decide its course of action. Any kind of violence would be most unfortunate, especially in the present circumstances, and it would be exceedingly difficult for the Government to put up with it.

In regard to Kashmir I do not want to say much. I have already expressed my views on what course or line of action we propose to take in Kashmir. But these incidents, our capturing of certain posts, should not put us in a state of complacency. The situation is much more difficult and much more grave. It is not going to be a short-term affair; it is going to be a prolonged thing. Therefore, we have to prepare our country to meet this menace and to meet the situation. In this any help or support from any quarter, even from those who oppose us, would be most welcome.

We are passing through critical days and we are passing through fire. We have no doubt that it is fire. But I would only like to say that this Government, which is passing through fire, will come out of it much brighter and much more stronger. In the face of this opposition motion I want to tell the House that it is this Government and the party to which we belong which will deliver the goods.

BACK NOTE

VIII. No—Confidence Motion in the Council of Ministers, 26 August, 1965

1. SHRI M.R. MASANI (Rajkot) : I did not, somebody else perhaps.
SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI : Perhaps someone else said it.

STATEMENT REGARDING DISCUSSION WITH SECRETARY GENERAL
OF UNITED NATIONS

16 September, 1965

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Sir, as the hon. Members are aware, the Secretary-General of the United Nations U. Thant, arrived in New Delhi on September 12, 1965 and after staying here for three days he left yesterday for New York. We welcomed him amongst ourselves not only as a high dignitary but also as representative of the world organisation on which lies the heavy responsibility of preserving international peace.

The Secretary-General and I had free and frank discussions. He met the Foreign Minister and also saw the Defence Minister. During the discussions the Secretary-General drew attention to the grave implications of the present conflict specially in relation to the welfare of the 600 million people belonging to India and Pakistan. He referred to the Security Council Resolutions of September 4 and 6, and appealed that a ceasefire should be ordered immediately by both countries.

I gave a factual narration of the events as they had taken place and pointed out that the present conflict was not of our seeking; it was started by Pakistan when thousands of armed infiltrators invaded our State of Jammu and Kashmir commencing from August 5, 1965 with the objective of destroying or capturing vital positions such as airports, police stations and bridges and ultimately of seizing power forcibly from the State Government at Srinagar. Finding that its initial invasion had largely failed, Pakistan had launched, on 1st September, 1965 a massive armed attack not only across the ceasefire line but across the international frontier as well. Pakistan had thus not only started the conflict but had further escalated it in such a manner as to leave India with no choice except to take counter measures in self defence. I explained all this to the Secretary-General and told him that the present conflict had been forced upon us by Pakistani aggression. We were determined, however to preserve fully and completely the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of Jammu and Kashmir formed an integral part; nor could we accept a situation in which Pakistan may continue its armed aggressions on India time and again.

The Secretary-General was particularly anxious that as a first step we should agree to the ceasefire and to the cessation of hostilities. I told him that a ceasefire in regard to the fighting between the troops was understandable but the question of raiders would still remain on our hands. I pointed out that we would have to

continue to deal effectively with these raiders, many of whom were still at large in the State of Jammu and Kashmir unless, of course, Pakistan undertook to withdraw them from our territory.

We went into the pros and cons of the ceasefire in some detail. Subsequently, I received a letter from the Secretary-General in which his appeal for a ceasefire was reiterated. A copy of this letter has been placed on the Table of the House.

After full consideration of all aspects, we sent a reply of which also a copy is laid on the Table of House.

As the hon. Members would see from a perusal of this letter, we raised no objection to the Secretary-Generals proposal for a ceasefire. However, in regard to certain matters of vital importance to India, we made our stand perfectly clear. For instance, as already stated, we would have to deal with the raiders who were still sporadically attacking public property or harassing the people in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Also, we could not possibly revert to a situation in which we may find ourselves once again unable to prevent infiltrations or to deal effectively with those who had already come in.

In regard to the political aspect of the question, we made it clear that we were fully determined to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of India, of which the State of Jammu and Kashmir was an integral part. From this resolve we could never be deflected, no matter what the pressure or the threat. These were not conditions attached to our acceptance of the ceasefire but were meant to be a clear and unequivocal reiteration of our stand in regard to these vital matters.

Late in the evening of 14th September I received a further letter from the Secretary-General, saying that he could not give any undertaking to which I sent a letter yesterday morning pointing out that as a matter of fact we had not asked him to give any undertaking to us. Our acceptance of the ceasefire proposal thus complied fully with the appeal of the Secretary-General. Copies of these letters have also been laid on the Table of the House.

The Secretary-General told me prior to his departure from New Delhi that if by the evening of the 15th September, 1965 Pakistan did not give a reply agreeing to the ceasefire, we should take it that an agreement on this question had not been

possible. Since no such acceptance was received by the stipulated time, an announcement was made that our defence forces will have to continue the operations with unabated vigour.

Although the Secretary-General's present effort to bring about a stoppage of hostilities in order to pave the way for peace has not been fruitful through no lack of co-operation from us, he intends, as he has announced, to pursue his efforts further, and just before leaving Delhi he sent me a further letter, a copy of which is being placed on the Table of the House.

We will send a considered reply as soon as possible.

As hon. Members would see, we have made every effort to extend all cooperation to the United Nations in its efforts to restore peace and we accepted the Secretary-General's proposal for an immediate ceasefire. Pakistan, on the other hand, has given no such acceptance, in fact, the indications are that she is intent upon continuing the fight unless her own plan involving withdrawal of the armed forces of India and Pakistan from the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir, the induction of the United Nations Force and a plebiscite within three months thereafter is agreed to.

Let me state on the floor of this House that not one of these conditions is acceptable to India.

It is obvious now that Pakistan launched an aggression on India by 5th August, 1965, with a view to making an attempt to revive the settled issue of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. She wants to force a decision by naked aggression. This we cannot possibly allow. We have no alternative, therefore but to carry on our struggle. We fully realise that the present armed conflict between India and Pakistan will cause untold hardships and misery to people in both countries. However, I am confident that our countrymen would cheerfully undergo those hardships but they would not allow an aggressor to endanger our freedom or to annex our territories.

I have seen some press reports of President Ayub Khan's press conference of yesterday. Among other things he is reported to have observed that good sense required that India and Pakistan live together in peace. If this is a new and sincere thought, I would greatly welcome it however belated it might be. But if past experience is any guide, these remarks would appear to be part of a propaganda to beguile the world. Previously also President Ayub has talked of the virtue of peace

and has followed it up by unprovoked aggression on India in Kutch and subsequently in Kashmir. President Ayub has I trust by now seen the result of Pakistan's policy of hate and hostility against India.

As the circumstances exist today, the nation has to be continuously alert and be ready for any sacrifice to preserve our freedom and integrity. I am greatly beholden to the Parliament, to all the political parties and, indeed, to the entire nation for their united stand against the aggressor. I want also to express once again the gratitude of the nation to the valiant armed forces who have already demonstrated that they are capable not only of defending our frontiers but also of delivering crushing blows to the invader. Their deeds of heroism will make a glorious chapter in the annals of India. This Parliament and the whole country is proud of them. I am confident that we will continue to meet this challenge with the same determination and courage.

BACK NOTE

IX. Statement Regarding Discussion with Secretary General of United Nations,
16 September, 1965

NIL

STATEMENT REGARDING CHINESE NOTE

17 September, 1965

I want to inform the House that this morning we received a communication from the Chinese Government demanding that within three days we should dismantle our defence installations which they allege are located on their side of the border in Tibet across the Sikkim border. I might for the benefit of the House, read out the relevant portions of the communication, although I would be placing the communication and our reply on the Table of the House.

"In its notes the Indian Government continues to resort to its usual subterfuges in an attempt to deny the intruding activities of Indian troops along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary. This attempt cannot possibly succeed. Since ceasefire and troop withdrawal were effected along the Sino-Indian border by China on her own initiative in 1962. Indian troops have never stopped their provocations and there have been more than 300 intrusions into China either by ground or by air. The Chinese Government has repeatedly lodged protests with the Indian Government and served warnings to it, and has successively notified some friendly countries. The facts are there, and they cannot be denied by the Indian Government by mere quibbling. Moreover, the Chinese Government has four times proposed the Sino-Indian Joint Investigation into India's illegal construction of military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary but has each time been refused by the Indian Government. Now the Indian Government pretentiously says that the matter can be settled if only an Independent and neutral observer should go to the border to see for himself. It further shamelessly asserts that Indian troops have never crossed the Sikkim-China boundary which has been formally delimited and that India has not built any military works either on the Chinese side of the border or on the border itself. This is a bare-faced lie. How can it hope to deceive anyone ?

As is known to everybody, the Indian Government has long been using the territory of Sikkim against China. Since September 1962, not to mention earlier times, Indian troops have crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, which was delimited long ago, and have built a large number of military works for aggression either on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on

the boundary itself. There are now fifty six such military works, large and small, which they have built in the past few years all over the important passes along the China-Sikkim boundary, thus want only encroaching upon China territory and violating her sovereignty. In these years the Chinese Government has made thirteen representations to the Indian Government. But the Indian Government has all along turned a deaf ear to them and does not have the slightest respect for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Far from stopping its acts of aggression, the Indian Government has intensified them by ordering its troops to intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocations."

We are sending a reply to all those points and as I said I shall place the reply on the table of the House. I will read out the relevant portions of our reply.

"Ever since the Sino-Indian border problem was raised by the Chinese Government, the Government of India had made strenuous attempts to settle the question peacefully and with honour. Even after the unprovoked Chinese attack across the border in October-November, 1962, the Government of India consistently followed the policy of seeking a peaceful settlement honourable to both the parties concerned.

As has been pointed out in various notes to the Chinese Government in the past, the Government of India has given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to cross the international boundary in the Eastern and the Middle Sectors and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. The Government of India are satisfied after careful and detailed investigations, that Indian personnel as well as aircraft have fully carried out their instructions and have not transgressed the international boundary and the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector at any time at any place. The Government of India are, therefore, absolutely convinced that the allegations contained in the Chinese note under reply are completely groundless. The Government of India are constrained to reject these allegations and to reassert emphatically that they do not accept the claims to vast areas of Indian territory in the Western, Middle and Eastern Sectors of the border put forward in the Chinese note under reply. As regards China's stand on Kashmir and on the present unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, it is nothing but interference on the part of China calculated to prolong and to enlarge the conflict."

The background of the matter is that in September 1962 some defence structures were constructed on the Sikkim side of the Sino-Indian frontier. These structures have not been in occupation since the cessation of hostilities in November, 1962. Since the Chinese Government alleged that some of these structures were on their side of the border India had in its note of September 12, 1965 gone to the extent of suggesting that an Independent Observer be allowed to go to this border to see for himself the actual state of affairs. The Chinese Government has not unfortunately, accepted this reasonable proposal and has reiterated its proposal for Joint inspection. In our reply which is being sent today, we are informing the Chinese Government that their contention is entirely incorrect. Nevertheless, as an earnest of our desire to give no ground to the Chinese for making this a pretext for aggressive action, we are informing them that we have no objection to a joint inspection of those points of the Sikkim-Tibet border where Indian personnel are alleged to have set up military structures in Tibetan territory. The Government of India on their part are prepared to arrange such an inspection as early as possible, at an appropriate official level, on a mutually convenient date.

We have sent a reply to the Chinese note accordingly and hope that Chinese Government would agree to action being taken as proposed. Copies of the Chinese note and our reply have been placed on the Table of the House.

I know the House would feel concerned about the intentions of the Chinese Government. We do hope that China would not take advantage of the present situation and attack India. The House may rest assured that we are fully vigilant and that if we are attacked we shall fight for our freedom with grim determination. The might of China will not deter us from defending our territorial integrity. I shall keep the House informed of further developments.

BACK NOTE

X. Statement Regarding Chinese Note, 17 September, 1965

NIL

STATEMENT REGARDING CHINESE ULTIMATUM

20 September, 1965

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I place on the Table of the House the text of a further note which was handed over to our Charge d'Affaires in Peking yesterday.

The House will recall that we had taken an attitude calculated to maintain peace when replying to the last note which we had received from the Chinese Government. It is clear from the kind of response which China has sent that what China is looking for is not a redress of grievances, real or imaginary, but some excuse to start its aggressive activities again, this time acting in collusion with its ally, Pakistan. The extension of the time-limit for the ultimatum was in our view, no more than a device to gain time to watch what comes out of the discussions in the Security Council.

The allegations which China has been making in the series of notes that it has been sending to us, are such that they would hardly justify any civilized Government in having recourse to force, even if the allegations were true. If there are any structures on Chinese territory in areas where the border is delimited and not in dispute even according to the Chinese, surely, there is nothing to prevent the Chinese Government from having them removed, instead of suggesting to us that we should have them removed, which would only be possible by our men going into their territory. Similarly no one can imagine that any Government would threaten another on the ground that their cattle have been lifted or on the ground that out of the thousands of Tibetans who have sought asylum in this country two or four are being detained here against their wishes.

To justify its aggressive attitude, China is pretending to be a guardian of Asian countries who, according to China, are being bullied by India. The basic objective of China, therefore, is to claim for itself a position of dominance in Asia which no self-respecting nation in Asia is prepared to recognize. Large or small, strong or weak, every country in Asia has the fullest right to preserve its independence and sovereignty on terms of equality. The dominance of the Chinese cannot be accepted by any of them, We reject China's claim to tell us anything about what we should or should not do about Kashmir which is an integral part of India. Our offer of resolving the differences over these minor matters by peaceful means is still open.

However, China's aggressive intentions are clear from the fact that even while they have in their note extended the time-limit by 72 hours, in actual fact they have

started firing at our border posts both in Sikkim and in Ladakh.

If, China persists in aggression, we shall defend ourselves by all means at our disposal.

A formal reply to the Chinese note will be sent later today.

May I say a word that we have just now received the full text of the resolution passed in the Security Council ? Naturally it deserves our very careful consideration, and I might be making a statement on that tomorrow in the House.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹

BACK NOTE

XI. Statement Regarding Chinese Ultimatum, 20 September, 1965

1. SHRI NATH PAI : I am not putting a question, Sir. He said that the Chinese have started firing across the frontier. We want to know whether we are going to be just content with the sending of a note or that the orders to the Indian army are, "If they fire, you fire back." This must be clarified. Sir, you should not try to stall this clarification. We have been extremely cooperative and patient. We do not want to wait till tomorrow to know something from the press. We want to know it from the Prime Minister. He is replying to it.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: I would merely like to say that we will resist them and we will fight them ...

DR RAM MANOHAR LOHIA : Speaker Sir, only one thing. The way our forces have reached to Sialkot and Lahore, in similar fashion whether they will chase the wild beasts of Peaking or not in Tibet? Honourable Prime Minister should respond to it. This is not an issue to cut the jokes.

STATEMENT REGARDING CEASEFIRE AND OTHER MATTERS

22 September, 1965

I place on the table of the House a copy of the Security Council resolution dated the 20th September 1965, relating to the current conflict between India and Pakistan—a conflict which commenced on the 5th August, 1965. When Pakistan launched a massive attack on India by sending thousands of armed infiltrators across the ceasefire line in our State of Jammu and Kashmir.

As the Hon'ble Members would see, the Security Council had demanded that both Governments should order a ceasefire effective from 12.30 p.m. Indian Standard Time today, the 22nd September, 1965. On the question of ceasefire, the views of the Government of India were stated in detail and without any ambiguity in my letters of September 14 and 15, 1965, addressed to the Secretary-General. As stated in these letters, the Government of India had clearly accepted that they would order a ceasefire without any preconditions on being informed that Pakistan had agreed to do the same. On receiving the Security Council resolution, therefore, we sent a communication to the Secretary-General, in accordance with our earlier stand. Informing him that we would be prepared to issue Orders for a simple ceasefire effective from the appointed time and date, provided Pakistan agreed to do likewise. A copy of this communication is also placed on the Table of the House. Throughout yesterday, there was no further message from the Secretary-General, but in the early hours of this morning we received a message from him advising us to order a unilateral ceasefire in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Security Council resolution, with the proviso that our troops could fire back if they were attacked. This, of course, was entirely impossible. In a battle which is continuing, it is just not possible for one side to ask its soldiers to stop firing, leaving the other side free to continue its operations. Our representative at the United Nations was, therefore, instructed to inform the Secretary-General accordingly.

A further report was received a short while ago that at the request of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, an emergent meeting; of the Security Council was convened at which an announcement was made, on behalf of Pakistan that they also had agreed to issue orders for a ceasefire and cessation of hostilities. From our side, the requisite orders are now being issued to our field commanders to effect a complete ceasefire by 3.30 am tomorrow morning.

The Security Council Resolution refers to other matters which will require consideration subsequently. However, the policy of the Government of India in

regard to matters which are of vital importance to us and which relate to the present conflict, has been stated by me on more than one occasion on the floor of this House and also in my recent communications to the Secretary-General.

I do not propose to go into any further details at the present stage. Detailed discussions will have to take place and there would have to be a fuller study of the problems to which I have just referred. For this purpose, our representative at the United Nations will keep himself available to the Secretary-General.

There will now be a cessation of hostilities. Peace is good. However, there is still a threat from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, which he held out today, while speaking in the Security Council. We have, therefore, to be very watchful and vigilant.

The nation has recently been going through its greatest trial. The times have been difficult but they have served a great purpose. The whole world knows now that the people of India—Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Parsees and others—constitute a united nation with a determined common will and purpose. On the battle front, the supreme sacrifice has been made by the members of all communities who have shown that they are Indians first and Indians last.

To our armed forces, I would like to pay on behalf of this Parliament and the entire country, our warmest tributes. By their valour and heroism they have given a new confidence to the people of India. Those who have lost their beloved on the battle front, have made a contribution to the preservation of our independence, which will never be forgotten by a grateful nation. Their sorrow and their pride are shared by the whole country.

Mr. Speaker Sir, I would now seek your permission to express to all the members of this august House, to all the political parties in the country, to the leaders of public opinion, of labour organisations of business and industry, and of many other Voluntary associations, my feelings of the deepest gratitude. In the hour of trial each one of the 470 million people of this country stood up shoulder to shoulder to meet the challenge to our freedom.

I should like to inform the House that on 18th September, 1965, I received a message from Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, USSR offering his good offices for bringing about improved relations between India and Pakistan. Mr. Kosygin is impelled by noble intentions. No one can ever contest the view that ultimately India and Pakistan will have to live together as peaceful

neighbours. We cannot therefore say no to any efforts, which may help to bring, about such a situation, made by those who are sincere and genuine in their feelings of goodwill and friendship. I have, therefore, informed Mr. Kosygin today that we would welcome his efforts and good offices.

I would also like to give the House some further details about the tragic accident in which the other day, we suffered a grievous loss. Investigations conducted on the spot show that the aircraft in which Shri Balvantray Mehta was travelling, was shot down by a Pakistani plane. The marks on the fuselage establish that gun fire had been used. Preliminary investigations by the Air Force authorities who also have visited the scene confirm that the aircraft was shot down at a low height. The ammunition recovered at the site of the crash also proves that the attacking aircraft was a Pakistani plane. That a non-combatant civilian aircraft should have been shot down in this manner is one of the most inhuman acts which we must all deplore and condemn. Shri Balvantrayji, his wife and the others who were travelling with him have laid down their lives, at the altar of the freedom of the country. Their names will remain enshrined in our memory.

We are still faced with the Chinese ultimatum. The House is aware that almost at the same time when the Chinese Government announced the extension of the time-limit of the ultimatum to India by 72 hours on September 19, their troops started provocative activities at several points of the border. On the Sikkim border, about which the Chinese have been making baseless and threatening allegations, the Chinese troops crossed the well-known and delimited boundary at Dongchui La and Nathu La on 20th and 21st of September respectively. They fired at our observation posts. They have tried also to intrude into our other territories. Our armed forces have clear instructions to repel the aggressor.

Yesterday, we sent a reply to the Chinese note of September 20 in which India was alleged to have intruded into Dum Chale and committed armed provocation. The Chinese charge was rejected as a fabrication and a cover-up for the intrusion and firing at Tsakur to which I have referred a little while ago.

The House is aware that on September 19, the Chinese Government sent us a note couched in unbecoming language, extending the period of the ultimatum, making demands for destruction of military structures etc. A copy of our reply has been placed on the table of the House together with copies of two other notes we sent yesterday. Regarding the so-called military structures we have already told the Chinese Government that if after joint inspection any structures are found on the

Tibetan side of the border there can be no objection to their being demolished. I have been told that China has announced that some of these so-called structures have been destroyed by our troops while withdrawing. All this is a product of their imagination.

I must tell the House that we view with grave concern the Chinese activities on the border and the armed intrusions into our territory. We have urged the Chinese Government in our note of September 21 replying to the Chinese note of September 19 to fore-sake the path of belligerence and intimidation and to return to the path of peace and reason in its relations with India. I hope that even at this late hour China will respond to this call and prevent a major crisis.

We do not know what the Chinese will do next. We have, however, to remain vigilant all along the frontier.

There are times of the greatest trial for the nation, but the people all over the country are now in that mood which alone ensure the preservation of country's freedom. We may have to face many ups and downs, but I know the people have steeled themselves into a resolve to meet even this bigger challenge. On our Armed forces, there may be a heavier responsibility. I have no doubt that they are in good spirits, We have no intention of under-estimating the gravity of the situation. But we have resolved firmly to meet this challenge to our freedom.

BACK NOTE

XII. Statement Regarding Ceasefire and Other Matters,
22 September, 1965

NIL

STATEMENT ON UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION
REGARDING CEASEFIRE BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN AND
RESOLUTION REGARDING INDIA QUITTING
THE COMMONWEALTH

24 September, 1965

Mr. Speaker Sir, I must express my gratitude to all the hon. Members who have participated in the debate today. There have been several speakers, and they have expressed themselves in words of their choice. But I have heard from every side of the House only one voice—the voice of patriotism, of national will to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of India no matter who the invader may be. This is the voice of the people of India expressed in unmistakable terms through their chosen representatives in Parliament; this is the voice of the sovereign will of the people, Hon. Members would permit me to recall that, while speaking in this House in April last, I had appealed for the unity of heart amongst our people. That unity has been achieved in the fullest measure and has been demonstrated effectively in these critical days. In fact, it is this unity which has been the biggest source of strength to all of us in these testing times.

The ceasefire has already come about in spite of Pakistan's intransigence. It is likely that when we consider the subsequent step, further difficulties and complications might arise. It is by no means going to be an easy task, specially in view of the threats given even after the acceptance of the ceasefire, by President Ayub Khan and his Foreign Minister, I have made India's position absolutely clear in my letter of 14th September, 1965 addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Our understanding of the three resolutions of the Security Council is that they are applicable to both regular forces and the infiltrators from Pakistan. Pakistan must own and discharge the responsibility of withdrawing the infiltrators from our State of Jammu and Kashmir. However, they are continuing to disclaim all responsibility for the infiltration despite the report of the Secretary-General himself. If Pakistan persists in this attitude. India alone must deal with the infiltrators effectively and force them out. Moreover, we shall never allow any arrangement for the future in which there may be possibilities of further infiltrations.

About our State of Jammu and Kashmir, the House knows our stand which is firm and clear. This State is an integral part of India, a constituent unit of the federal

union of India. There is hardly any case for exercise of self-determination again. The people of Jammu and Kashmir have already exercised the right of self-determination through three General Elections held on the basis of universal adult franchise.

I feel grateful for and heartened by the unanimity of support for the policy which the Government has followed in meeting the challenge of recent aggression. However, I would like to say that dangers still lie ahead even after a ceasefire has become effective. These dangers are very real indeed. We should surely be prepared to meet them and our preparations will not be relaxed.

Shri Peter Alvares had expressed the opinion that the Soviet Union had apparently agreed to "de-freezing" the Kashmir question. It would not be correct to say so. The Soviet Union is today an ardent champion of peace. They have known the horrors of war and they do want, in a friendly spirit, to endeavour to bring about an improvement in the relationship between India and Pakistan. Their intentions are pure and we have, therefore, welcomed their initiative.

Discussion on the non-official resolution of Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad will be carried over to the next session. I would not, therefore, like to say anything just at present.

Some hon. Members have referred to the work of our Diplomatic Missions abroad. I can tell the House with complete sincerity that on the present occasion each one of our Missions has been alert and vigilant. They have done a good job in keeping the Government to which they are accredited fully informed of the developments and of the justness of our cause. The attitude which some Governments take is not in my view dependent upon or even affected by what our Ambassadors have to say. There are preconceived notions and prejudices which one has to contend with. It must, nevertheless, be our persistent effort to project our case in the best possible manner and to win friends for India in all parts of the world.

A few words are necessary, Mr. Speaker, about the home front. The momentum which the nation has gained will have to be kept up, our defence preparedness will have to be improved continuously, we will have to remain vigilant all along our frontiers. For strengthening our defences, a good deal of sacrifice will be needed on the part of the country as a whole. We may all have to accept privations and even our economic development may have to be slowed down somewhat in order that our defences are not weakened.

To the tasks that lie ahead, we shall address ourselves in a realistic manner and in full awareness of the fact that self-reliance must be our watchword. I am grateful to this august House for the magnificent support which it has given in these historic times.

Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the House to Authorise you to convey, through our Defence Minister, the admiration and gratitude of this House to our Armed Forces for the splendid job they have done.

I would also, with your permission like to suggest that the House should rise and observe a minute's silence to honour the memory of those soldiers, airmen, policemen and civilians who have become martyrs in the defence of their motherland.

BACK NOTE

XIII. Statement on United Nations Security Council Resolution Regarding Ceasefire between India and Pakistan and Resolution Regarding India Quitting the Commonwealth, 24 September, 1965

NIL

STATEMENT REGARDING INDO-PAKISTAN RELATIONS

5 November, 1965

In the statement which I had made in this House on 24th September, 1965, I had given an account of the developments culminating in a ceasefire coming into force between India and Pakistan at 3:30 a.m. on the 23rd September, 1965, I do not wish to take up the time of the House by going into details about subsequent happening which I have been fully reported in the Press. I would instead try to present the broad picture of the later developments and to share with the House Government's views and thoughts on the various issues that have yet to be resolved.

The ceasefire is still far from being fully effective. The main reason for this is the fact that Pakistani Forces have continuously tried to occupy posts and areas which were not in their hands when the ceasefire came into effect. It is these violations by Pakistan that account for the uneasy conditions that prevail in areas where our troops are facing the Pakistan army. The House will recall that the actual hour of the ceasefire had to be put off by fifteen hours beyond the dead-line set in the Security Council Resolution of 20th September, 1965 because Pakistan delayed its acceptance of the ceasefire till the last minute. During this period which elapsed between the acceptance of ceasefire by both countries and its actual coming into force, Pakistani forces were actively engaged in trying to occupy fresh territory wherever possible and particularly in South-West Rajasthan. Even after the ceasefire, Pakistani troops did occupy a few posts and villages in Rajasthan, which are separated from each other by long distances and are located in areas, where there had been no fighting before.

Apart from Rajasthan, in the Fazilka Sector on the 24th and 25th September in the Tithwal area on the 11th October, Pakistan launched major attacks in total disregard of the ceasefire. In the Chhamb area too, they have repeatedly tried to move forward after the ceasefire.

The ceasefire Agreement cannot stand in the way of our troops regaining territory treacherously occupied after the ceasefire came into effect. Wherever such violations have occurred, we have obviously no choice left except to deal with the situation and foil the Pakistani designs. Our taking such remedial action cannot be considered a violation of the ceasefire. It is necessary that the Security Council should give serious thought to this aspect of the matter. We have been regularly drawing their attention to the ceasefire violations by Pakistan, the total number of

which now adds upto about a thousand. The Security Council must ensure that there are no more violations of the ceasefire and that the places occupied after the ceasefire are vacated forthwith. If real progress is to be made on the road to peace, the ceasefire must be made truly effective. Until the ceasefire becomes effective, it is not possible to proceed to the subsequent step of withdrawal of armed personnel. This was emphasized by me in a letter dated the 18th October, 1965 to the Secretary-General. I place on the Table of the House copies of communications exchanged between the Government of India and the UN. Secretary-General and between our Permanent Representative on the U.N. and the President of the Security Council.

Another factor of the greatest importance in any discussion on withdrawals is the manner in which we can be assured that the infiltration technique which Pakistan initiated on the 5th August, 1965 will not be repeated again. I had emphasized this point in my discussions and correspondence with the Secretary-General even before the ceasefire came into being, As far as I am aware no statement has been made by any Indian delegate to the UN or to the U.N. Security Council which has been inconsistent with whatever I have said in this House. I find it necessary to revert to this point with even greater emphasis, because we have reports of a fresh build-up of infiltrators in Pakistan occupied Kashmir and in the tribal areas. The tragic events of the last few months should have made the UN and the Security Council realise that prevention is not only better but easier than cure. If firm action had been taken when infiltration began and General Nimmo reported on it, perhaps much of the tragic loss of life and property which followed, could have been avoided. At that time, despite all our efforts, strong and prompt action was not taken. I do hope that the Secretary-General will start immediate investigations into what is going on in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir in preparation, for unleashing a fresh wave of infiltrators.

I cannot help expressing the feeling that the world would be saved much trouble and misery if aggression is not countenanced anywhere and objective efforts are made to identify the aggressor. In the recent conflict the fact of Pakistani aggression could be seen by any one who wanted to. The Chief UN Observer gave a clear and objective verdict. The Security Council itself referred to August 5 as the crucial date. On this date, India had taken no action, it was Pakistan that had started sending massive waves of infiltrators and clearly she was the aggressor. Impliedly Pakistan's aggression was noted but this certainly was not enough. A clear verdict

was necessary and a body which is charged with the important responsibility of preserving world peace must necessarily be prepared to give a clear verdict. It is all the more necessary, because a new technique is being adopted under which invasions are launched in disguise and forces of destruction are unleashed without the usual declaration of war. It is for this reason that India had been urging from the beginning that Pakistan should be identified as the aggressor. On its part, Pakistan has been denying all along its complicity in sending infiltrators into Kashmir. The actual position is however, so clear that any impartial urgency could testify to it. I would still like to suggest that the aggressor, in the recent conflict, be identified, by some such method.

Pakistan it seems is not really interested either in a ceasefire, which it grudgingly accepted in form but not in substance, or in the subsequent steps which the Security Council Resolution on the subject contemplates, namely, the withdrawal of all armed personnel which includes not only troops but also other infiltrators. Pakistan is pleading instead for immediate steps for bringing about what it describes as a political settlement. Translated into plain words Pakistan wants the Security Council to give it what neither its armed infiltrators nor its regular troops could give it. With this object Pakistan's Foreign Minister engineered a meeting of the Security Council and tried to have a discussion on the internal situation in Kashmir making all kinds of wild and baseless accusations. Our Foreign Minister made it quite clear that while we were ready to cooperate with the Security Council in the task of restoring peace, we would not participate in any discussion on matters relating to our internal affairs. When it became clear that Mr. Bhutto could not be restrained from raising matters pertaining to the internal administration of our State of Jammu and Kashmir the Indian delegation abstained from taking part in subsequent meetings of the Security Council.

If Pakistan wants to end the present tense situation, let it first honour and respect the Ceasefire Agreement. Let it put an end to daily violations of the ceasefire. Let it then withdraw its armed personnel from our territory and we shall also withdraw our troops from the areas under our occupation in Pakistan. More important than any of these things, let Pakistan stop the various things which it is doing apparently in preparation for a fresh trial of strength. Let it stop the recruitment of irregular forces in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. Let it put a stop to the digging of trenches and putting up of military structures which is going on at so many places

just across the present ceasefire line. Let it give up its attempts to acquire arms and ammunition. Let it release the goods, the cargo and the vessels it has seized. Let it also give up its collusion with China which is based only on a common hatred of India and is aimed at weakening and disintegrating this country. Let Pakistan, to put it briefly, first restore normal relations before we can discuss how to establish better relations.

Once Pakistan genuinely embarks upon the path of peace, the Government and the people of India will be ready to reciprocate. Unfortunately, all the evidence that we have about Pakistan's intentions shows no signs of any change of heart, any re-thinking, any desire to prefer peace to war. In these circumstances, we have to shape our policy on two planes, as it were. On the one hand, we have to be careful not to allow ourselves to be swayed by the same atmosphere of hatred, which the Pakistani leaders have tried to build up, and not to depart from the fundamentals of our policy—of peace, of secularism and of economic development. On the other hand, we have to be vigilant and prepared to meet any threat at any time on any part of our territory.

In our relations with Pakistan, we shall continue to behave in accordance with the canons of civilised society. Pakistan, violated all diplomatic immunities by subjecting our High Commission in Pakistan to a search at the point of rifles and bayonets. Even though the movements and activities of the personnel of the Pakistan High Commission in Delhi were restricted, they enjoyed every protection and lived in safety and without molestation of any kind. Rather than retaliate against them, we decided to recall our High Commissioner from Pakistan and it is not our intention to send him back in the immediate future.

There has been a good deal of discussion with regard to the question of payment of our due, under the Indus Waters Treaty. The Minister of Irrigation and Power yesterday made a statement and the House is going to discuss this question. We do not wish to go back on commitments solemnly entered into by us, whether in regard to the Indus Waters Treaty or under the Kutch Agreement. While we are always ready to meet force with strength, we shall continue to honour our pledged word.

Regarding the seizure of our ships and cargoes by Pakistan, the Minister for Transport has already made a statement in this House.

On the plan of preparedness, we are doing all that is necessary. We are fully alive to the fact that at a time of their own choosing Pakistan and its ally China might decide to act against us in concert and we have, therefore, to be always on our guard against any eventuality. In our defence effort, we want to achieve self-reliance to the maximum extent possible and in the shortest possible time. Our soldiers who are fighting at the front are fully entitled to the best that this country can give them, and in this effort we must not be found wanting.

A new Department of Defence Supplies has been created in the Ministry of Defence with the prime object of locating capacity within the country for those items, whether they are spare parts or components or complete equipments needed for our defence for which we are dependent on imports. Even so, we may have to import either arms or the machinery to produce them. It was this imperative need that made me appeal to our people to subscribe to the Gold Bonds in a massive way. We have got to harness a substantial part of the gold reserves in this country and put them to the service of the nation, if we are to be strong and self-reliant. We have given considerable thought to the new Defence Loans and the National Defence Gold Bond Scheme, which are now in operation, and we have tried to take a practical view and give whatever inducements are possible. In themselves, these schemes are a useful investment, but what is more important, they represent a vital contribution to the nation's defence effort. Our countrymen today are imbued with a fierce determination to offer any sacrifice to make the country strong. I have every hope, therefore, that people will respond suitably to these schemes and especially that of the Gold Bonds in order to attain this objective.

The House would naturally want to know how we view the likely course of future events so far as Indo-Pakistan relations are concerned. Our own position is quite clear. We want to live in peace with Pakistan. We have never taken the initiative in forsaking the path of peace nor shall we do so in future. We do not want to annex any part of Pakistan's territory. But, the restoration of peace and its future preservation can be assured only if Pakistan gives up the stormy course of wanton aggression. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman propitiate any aggressor. Threatened as we are, with a renewal of aggression, we have to be ever vigilant and ready.

Looking at all the circumstances, there is every possibility that the period of travail which began, in August last may continue for a long time. As a nation, we have to be prepared to meet this many-sided challenge. There is, therefore, no

room for complacency. At the same time, the experience of the recent past must fill us all with a new confidence. Hon'ble Members would be gratified to know that when I visited the forward areas in the Lahore and Sialkot Sectors three weeks ago, I found the soldiers and the airmen imbued with the highest morale. Most of them had fought in the battlefield and had seen some of their colleagues laying down their lives heroically in defence of the Motherland. On behalf of this House, and indeed on behalf of all the people of India, I conveyed to them our feeling of highest appreciation and deep gratitude and told them how the entire nation was united in its determination to fight the invader.

I have been able also to go to other places and to see millions of persons, all resolved to meet any hardship and to make any sacrifice. Undoubtedly, the people are facing difficulties, but these are not felt nor mentioned. It seems that there is a regeneration, and millions of our countrymen are ready to give of their best to make the nation self-reliant and strong. Towards this single common purpose, I know that this House and this Nation will flinch from no danger and count no sacrifice too great.

BACK NOTE

XIV. Statement regarding Indo-Pakistan Relations, 5 November, 1965

NIL

MOTION REGARDING INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

16 November, 1965

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened to many of the speeches made in the House. I do not propose to cover all the points, but I shall refer to some of them Only. My colleague, the Foreign Minister, while replying lo the debate, might he able to cover the rest of the points.

Sir, in the very beginning, I would like to say that when I took over this office my first attention was drawn towards our neighbouring countries and it was my feeling that we had many problems to face in this country, tremendous problems, and they had to be faced and they had to be tackled. I wanted that there should be peace in India and, as far as possible we should build up better relationships with the neighbouring States.

The Ceylon Prime Minister came here in the very beginning, about a year before, almost when this new government came into office. There was a problem hanging for a long time between Ceylon and India. I do not say that whatever we agreed to between Ceylon and India, the agreement, entered into, was wholly satisfactory or it satisfied all the people concerned.

xxx

xxx

xxx¹

I myself have said it. Yet, our effort was that, if possible, we should try to tackle it and resolve it. We had a long discussion here in Delhi for about a week or perhaps a little more than that, and ultimately we entered into an agreement. That agreement is yet to be implemented, and I am glad that the new Prime Minister of Ceylon is rather keen to implement it. He is, if I might say so, taking a very wholesome view, a liberal view in regard to this agreement. I greatly welcome it. In any case, the relations between Indian and Ceylon had improved and we do have friendly relations between the two countries.

There were difficulties in Burma and our people were coming away from Burma. That was a situation which created a good deal of suffering amongst our people. I requested our Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, to visit Burma. He went there and had talks with the Burmese Government. Though I do not say that all the problems have been solved yet some improvements were made. Previously our people were coming from Burma after completely leaving their assets behind. Some change took place in that position and, at least for the time

being, the tension that was prevalent at that time was considerably reduced. Soon after that the President of Burma, Gen. Ne Win visited India. He came to Delhi and we had useful talks. I have no doubt that it has definitely improved our relations; while there may be some hitches, our relationship with Burma is exceedingly good at the present moment.

I went to Kathmandu in Nepal myself and I had talks there, I would not like to go into that matter further. I would merely like to say that the relationship between Nepal and India is very good.

Ofcourse, the relationship has always to be improved upon and we have to do as much as we can in that direction. I may say that we did try to tackle these three important neighbouring countries in the beginning and, on the whole, some good effects were produced.

I might also add that in the beginning it was my desire that we should have better relations with Pakistan also, I felt that it would be good for India if Pakistan and India lived peacefully and in a friendly way. It is for this reason that I decided to visit Karachi. While returning from Cairo I went to Karachi and I had talks with President Ayub. I must say that it did create some impression on me. Because, when we talked amongst ourselves we felt that some of the burning problems between India and Pakistan should be resolved and should be settled. For example, we felt that the skirmishes that were occurring frequently on the borders should come to an end. Then there was the question of refugees, I said that millions of refugees have come from East Pakistan to India. He also referred to some of the Muslims who are being sent out of India. He said that Indian Muslims are being sent out. I said that we are prepared to look into that matter. He suggested that there should be a meeting for discussing this matter. He was very particular that the conflicts or skirmishes which occur on the border should be stopped. So, he himself suggested that the military authorities of the two countries might meet, discuss and evolve a formula. Similarly, he suggested that there should be a meeting of the Home Ministers of both the countries to discuss the question of refugees and evictees as he described it. I said that these proposal are most welcome to me and that we will be only too glad to have talks with them.

On my return here we sent up proposals to Pakistan. We said that a meeting of the Home Ministers might be fixed. A date was actually fixed. It was later on postponed by Pakistan. Then, another date was fixed and even that was also

postponed. Ultimately nothing happened. When we reminded the Pakistan Government that the meeting did not materialise and what they proposed to do, of course, then they said, "Conditions are rather at the present moment difficult" or there were elections etc. and, therefore, they said, this meeting could not be held. This happened in the case of Pakistan.

As I said, our desire was to live peacefully amongst ourselves. Between ourselves we wanted that we should develop better relationship, of course, it was far from my imagination that Pakistan was preparing entirely for something else. On the one hand. President Ayub talked of these things and talked of having mutual talks and, discussions; on the other, it seems that Pakistan was making preparations for forcing our hands to concede certain matters to them, to surrender on certain points— whether it was in regard to the Rann of Kutch or it was in regard to Jammu and Kashmir.

After a while—I need not go into that again; but, as the House is aware—Pakistan made an aggression on the Rann of Kutch and it was a sudden attack; it was an attack made with full strength. Even then we felt that in case this matter could be settled peacefully we should try to do so. We had said that in case Pakistan would vacate the Rann of Kutch, we would be prepared to meet and discuss. But Pakistan took some time. Ultimately, we came to an agreement. However, even with this agreement Pakistan, it is clear, was not satisfied. They felt that this was a means to achieve something. Even this agreement on the Rann of Kutch provoked them to further aggression. They thought that they could compel us or force us to agree either to the separation of Jammu and Kashmir or to the merger of Jammu and Kashmir with Pakistan or whatever they may have had in their mind. However, they felt that through force they could compel us to agree to their demands and, therefore, even of course before the ink was dry, as it is said, on the Rann of Kutch agreement, Pakistan made a further attack on Kashmir and this time first it was through infiltrators. As the House is aware, thousands of infiltrators came into Jammu and Kashmir territory with deadly arms and weapons. There is—I would not deny—fairly dangerous potential; there are enough of mischievous people in Jammu and Kashmir and it was expected, perhaps by Pakistan, that they would be helpful to these infiltrators who had come into the territory in large numbers. Of course, these infiltrators tried their level best to create some kind of disorder and chaos in Jammu and Kashmir. It has been the practice and habit of Pakistan to create such situations, specially, when a meeting of the United Nations or of the Security Council is held.

They had been doing it for the last two years. This year also this was one of their plans to show to the world that Jammu and Kashmir is in chaos, there is complete confusion and disorder, and that India had practically no control over Jammu and Kashmir. Of course, they did not succeed in it.

Again, they made an aggression on the Chhamb area. Of course, this was a regular attack. Formerly, whereas it was a disguised attack, the attack on Chhamb was a regular attack with the full strength of their armour and weapons—they had come there—and there was, of course, a regular fight. When Pakistan sent infiltrators, we raised our voice of protest. We did say that a large number of infiltrators were coming into Jammu and Kashmir and that it was an attack from Pakistan.

When they made an attack on Chhamb, we again made it clear that they had not only crossed the ceasefire line but they had also crossed the international border. Even then, no country in the world, practically no one, said anything about it. They all kept quiet. But as soon as we moved towards Lahore, there were statements made and there were writings in the newspapers and the press that India had made an aggression on Pakistan. I would not like to say much on this I would only say that this was the most unfortunate and the most unfair and unjust attitude taken by some of the countries with which we are friendly.

However, this matter was ultimately referred to the Security Council and the Security Council considered this. We said that it was necessary that the aggressor should be identified first. Although it was said as I have said just now, that India had aggressed or made an aggression on Pakistan I think, now perhaps the whole world fully realises or knows the fact as to who the real aggressor was. We said in the very beginning that the Security Council should first identify the aggressor. I am exceedingly sorry to say that the Security Council did not do so, If the Security Council had done it, some of the problem would have been solved automatically. They had done it earlier in the case of some countries. They had done so in the case of Korea. In two or three cases definitely the Security Council had identified the aggressor. We said so because we felt that in case you do not identify the aggressor, you give encouragement to the aggressor to make further attacks and commit further aggression.

Therefore, it was important that the Security Council should have considered over this matter carefully and seriously. But it seems that the Security council is not willing to do so. However, the result is obvious. The result now is that Pakistan is

committing violations of ceasefire almost everyday. There are serious incidents, there are minor incidents and more than a thousand incidents have taken place so far. This is so, as I said, because of the attitude adopted by the Security Council. Pakistan, if I might say so, feels encouraged to indulge in these things.

I do not know what their intentions are. But on the one hand it seems that they want to show to their people that Pakistan is still fighting. To create a wrong impression they have set their people in a particular way. In fact, they have fed them with the news or reports that they have driven away India. India has been defeated and something of that kind. But I need not go into that at all. I think at last the intelligentsia of Pakistan know well as to what is the position and what happened during this conflict between India and Pakistan. A large tract of Pakistan is under the occupation of our Army. This question of ceasefire violations might continue still it has been suggested that we should consider the proposal of withdrawals. I had written to the Secretary-General that it would be advisable that the question of ceasefire is settled first, or if the ceasefire stabilises, then perhaps it might be better to proceed further to consider the next step of withdrawals. But anyhow the Security Council has decided and they have laid the utmost stress on ceasefire and withdrawals to be considered more or less simultaneously. We are prepared to consider it: we are prepared to discuss it, but I would like to make two things clear : one is that, in so far as ceasefire violations are concerned. If Pakistan infiltrates into our territory now, we cannot afford to tolerate it, we will never tolerate it and we will hit them back.

Secondly. It is true that, in Rajasthan areas, they are there; we have taken some action; we have made them vacate some posts and it will be.

Please listen to me. After all, when a discussion is going on, you must allow the speaker to have his say and Parliament is meant for that, it should not be that only if I entirely agree with you, you will listen to me or hear me ; that is not the correct convention. The hon. members might say many things with which I may not agree, but I would listen to them most carefully. After all, this House must be used for that purpose, for having a free exchange of views and for having free discussions.

Secondly, about the withdrawal, as I said. I have made our position categorically clear. In fact, in the very first letter to the Secretary-General, when he was here. I had said :

"Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Secretary-General, that when consequent upon ceasefire becoming effective, further details, are considered, we shall

not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infiltrations that have taken place. I would also like to state categorically that no pressures or attacks will deflect us from our firm resolve to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of Jammu & Kashmir is an integral part."

This was what I had said in the very beginning, and I had made it clear to the Secretary-General. I had laid this letter on the Table of the House and I had made a statement also then, and, therefore. I can only assure the House that we cannot deviate from this position and we will never do so.

There has been some talk about my meeting with President Ayub. As the House is aware, this suggestion was made in the very beginning by the Soviet Government. I do not know what the attitude of Pakistan would be. In any case, we had agreed that we would be prepared to accept the good offices of Mr. Kosygin in this matter. But there is one thing that I would like to make clear, if this talk is going to be held with a view to discuss only Kashmir and settle Kashmir, this talk will never bear any fruit; nor will it bear any fruit if it is just about the present position of Jammu and Kashmir. As I have said, I am not going to deviate from that position at all. But one thing is clear. If it is suggested—of course, there should be an appropriate time for it, but still even if it is suggested—that we should have some talks on the total relationship between India and Pakistan, that India and Pakistan should live as good neighbours and there are many points on which we could discuss between ourselves, then, of course, as I have said, although I do not think that this is the right or the appropriate time, yet I will not like to say 'No' to it. Of course, we cannot ignore the history and the geography of Pakistan as it is placed and as it has developed. We have to live as neighbours. If we can live peacefully, so much the better for us, and for both the countries. If they want to discuss the border skirmishes, if they want to discuss about the better utilisation of river waters, if they want to discuss about the refugees, if they want to discuss other matters, well, certainly, we would be prepared to discuss these with them, But, as far as I am aware. President Ayub or least his Foreign Minister has only one thing in mind and he thinks that the real solution of amity and of better relationship between India and Pakistan is for India to discuss Kashmir, in fact, not discuss but perhaps part with it and hand it over to Pakistan, a proposition which is wholly impossible and absolutely unacceptable to us.

I have nothing much to say about China, but I must say that what had happened the other day was not a good omen. It is difficult to say what China and Pakistan are preparing for. But if there is a Joint attack on us later on, sooner or later, of course, we would be faced with a serious situation. It would be wrong to think that we can just throw them out. It is always difficult to fight on two fronts. So we have to realise the difficulties and the gravity of the situation. As I said, it would mean a lot for us; it would be a heavy burden, a heavy cost both in life and In arms, ammunitions, in every thing.

Therefore, we will have to face a difficult situation. But I know that the country will have to steel itself to fight that might with all its strength, with all the strength that it commands. In fact, the real strength is our own strength, the strength of the country; and we get the help of other countries also when we are really strong.

Therefore, it is must important that we build up our strength, our defence strength, our economic strength, our industrial strength. All that is essential if we have to face the challenge of these two countries if they come up with a joint purpose and a joint effort.

On the question of non-alignment, I would not like to say much. But I am glad that Shri Masani has atleast somewhat subscribed to it for the first time, because I have never heard him before saying that we should have the best of relationship with the USSR This time at least be said that India should build up good relationship with the Soviet Republic. So to that extent, I think the principle of non-alignment does not require my putting forward any other argument. Shri Masani is there and no better argument is required than that he agrees with this proposition. I think it is essential and good that we have the best of relationship with the Soviet Republic. I need not add that It would be impossible for us to forget the way they have helped us during a difficult period. We have good relationship and we will build it up, and I have no doubt that our bonds of friendship, will further get stronger day by day.

I might also say that we know that the United States does not see eye to eye with us on the Indo-Pakistan issue. We have our differences with them, but it would not be advisable for us not to have good relationship with the United States also. We have many things in common with the United States, We have also our differences with them. It is these two powers, the USA and the USSR, which to a

very large extent can maintain peace in this world. It will be good if these two countries, holding entirely different ideologies and having different patterns of government altogether, live in peace so that the world live in peace. After all, it is peace that the world is ultimately thirsting for. Every man in the world at least desires it barring governments' attitudes—government's attitude are different But the people as such are tired of wars and they know the sufferings they have to undergo. Therefore, it is good—I do not say that India, can play a very important role in that, but if we can do a bit, we will be most happy—it is good that these two countries live in peaceful coexistence—there is co-existence between them—so that all the developing countries could get help and assistance from them, and the world lives in happiness and peace.

I would only like to say one thing more, that it is true that we have friends as such who will come out and openly support us. It is true that there are not many. Some Member had said that even Pakistan had not many friends, but I do not want to compete with them in this matter. The point is that whenever there is a conflict, most of the countries do not want to take sides, do not want to express themselves openly and frankly. These days, whenever there is a conflict, every one tries to bring about peace, to bring about a settlement, and all the statements, are made more or less in the same direction. We have also done it, and we also do it. Whenever there is a conflict, India has always tried that should be settled peacefully. Therefore, there is nothing new. We should not feel that there is something absolutely new happening in which we do not get direct support from different countries.

There are certain countries in the Middle East, among the Arab countries also, which were wholly opposed to us, and yet it must be admitted, at least it gives me some satisfaction to say, that the Arab summit, when it met, did not take sides at all, and they appealed for peace.

The Arab summit unanimously passed a resolution, and Jordan, of course, said something in the Security Council which was wholly opposed to us. Therefore, I said it gives us some satisfaction at least that the Arab summit did not take sides, and they expressed the view that the matter should be settled peacefully.

Of course, our attitude against colonialism has been there from the very beginning, from Gandhiji's time. In fact, he was the man who took the leadership and fought the first battle against colonialism, and when he fought it, of course,

India became free, and after that most of the Asian countries also got their freedom. And something unique has happened in the history of the world that in the last few years almost the whole of the African continent is free and has become independent, It is unfortunate that there are still some countries left which are under colonial rule—whether it is Angola or Mozambique, and now has come Rhodesia.

As I said, Southern Rhodesia has declared independence unilaterally which is something monstrous. We have always said that we believe in the rule of the majority, we believe in the one-man one-vote principle, and therefore we do not recognise Rhodesia's action at all. We would very much like to give our full support to the African majority living in Rhodesia, They should get the earliest opportunity to rule over their own country.

I am sorry I have taken more of your time. I would only like to say a word about my visit to the United States of America. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty and Shri Mukerjee had said something. He compared me to some kind of shy maiden or whatever it was.

That he is outside always. If you meet Shri Mukerjee in the lobby, you will find him behaving just like a coy maiden! Here of course in the House, it is entirely different. Well, I had never said that I shall not visit the United States of America. Even at that time, even in the beginning when this was cancelled, even then I had said, and the Foreign Minister had replied that it will depend on the convenience of the Prime Minister—he had said—to visit America'. Therefore, I would like to make it clear that there is no such refusal as such on my part. And I might also add and say to Mrs. Renu Chakravartty that it is not necessary to wrangle for any invitation. Mr. Patil did not go there for that purpose at all. The invitation is very much there, and if necessary, of course, it can come again But that is not a matter for which a particular person has to be sent to wrangle about it. But the timing of it, when I should go, it is entirely for me to decide, of course, subject to the convenience of the President also. But it is entirely for me to decide when I should go and when I should not.

There is one thing I would like to make clear. There are some doubts perhaps in the minds of Mrs. Renu Chakravartty and someone else about that. I cannot be pressurised into accepting anything which would go against the stand we have taken in this House and outside.

BACK NOTE

XV. Motion Regarding International Situation, 16 November, 1965

1. SHRI RANGA: It was very unsatisfactory.

STATEMENT REGARDING PROPOSED MEETING WITH PRESIDENT
AYUB KHAN AT TASHKENT AND OTHER MATTERS

10 December, 1965

Sir, on 18th September, I received a communication from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Kosygin, proposing a meeting in Tashkent between President Ayub Khan and myself under the good offices of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, if the parties so desired, for the re-establishment of peace between India and Pakistan. I sent a reply on 22nd September to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR in which I agreed to his proposal for a meeting between President Ayub Khan and myself in Tashkent, to discuss the question of restoration of peaceful relations between India and Pakistan. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR had sent a similar communication to President Ayub Khan. As could be gathered from President Ayub Khan's communication to Mr. Kosygin a summary of which was later published in the Soviet press, the Pakistan President thanked the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for his proposal and made reservations to the effect that the talks could only be held after the ground had been prepared and that this could be done first in the Security Council. I informed the House on 22nd September of Mr. Kosygin's proposal and our acceptance of it.

On November 16, I was informed by Mr. Kosygin that he had received a communication from the Pakistan Foreign Minister on behalf of the President of Pakistan, urging that talks between President Ayub and myself should take place in Tashkent as proposed by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The Chairman asked for my views on the proposed meeting and as I stated in the House on 16th November. I did not say no to the proposal. At the same time, I made it clear that so far as the Kashmir question was concerned it was not possible for us to deviate from the position that Kashmir was a part of India and that there was no question of parting with our territories.

Following upon this, there were informal consultations in Moscow between our Ambassador and the Soviet Government and I was also met by the Soviet Ambassador. I received a communication on November 27, from Mr. Kosygin in which I was informed that the Pakistan President was prepared to have the proposed talks in Tashkent without any pre-conditions. Certain tentative suggestions were communicated to me about, the date of the meeting. I replied to Mr. Kosygin agreeing to a meeting in the first week of January 1966, and it has since been announced that this meeting will commence on January 4, 1966.

We on our part have agreed to the Tashkent meeting as we believe in establishing peaceful and good neighbourly relations through discussions. I have made it clear that our discussions in Tashkent should cover the totality of relations between India and Pakistan so that the two countries can live on the basis of enduring peace and mutual cooperation.

The facts of history and geography make it imperative that India and Pakistan should have harmonious and mutually cooperative relations. We have always believed that war and military conflict cannot provide a real solution to any problem between nations. If Pakistan has agreed to these talks with a genuine realisation that peace is preferable to conflict, the coming meeting at Tashkent may be worthwhile.

I would like to take this opportunity also to make a brief report to the House about the present situation on our borders and to inform the House about certain visits abroad which I am scheduled to undertake during the coming weeks.

A situation of uneasy truce still continues on our western borders with Pakistan and, despite a ceasefire agreement, Pakistan is committing violations at different places at different times. Our armed forces have been dealing with this situation with considerable restraint, though naturally they have defended their positions.

In Rajasthan sector, as the House is aware, Pakistan has occupied certain isolated posts subsequent to the ceasefire becoming effective, in complete disregard of the agreement which she had accepted. This situation could not possibly be countenanced. Accordingly, action has been taken to rectify the situation, and some progress has been made.

The Chinese also have stepped up their activities on our frontiers. They attempted intrusions at a number of places. What their real objectives are, it is difficult to say. It is apparent, however, that they want to maintain an atmosphere of tension all the time and to keep up their pressure.

Altogether, the situation on our frontiers is such as to call for continuous vigilance and the country must remain on guard against the collusive activities of Pakistan and China. Our armed forces are alert and vigilant. We must remember, however, that the situation that we face will not be short-lived.

I would like to inform the House that in the coming weeks I propose to visit the United States of America and the Union of Burma, at the invitation of the Governments of these two friendly countries. I am looking forward to meeting President Johnson and the friendly American people. Between India and the United

States of America, there are many things in common. I am confident that my forthcoming talks with President Johnson, which are scheduled to commence on February 1, 1966, would lead to a closer understanding between our two countries and to a better appreciation of each other's point of view. I should like to express my sincere thanks to President Johnson whose decision in regard to accelerated food aid would help substantially in tiding over the present difficult food situation.

The House would recall that, some months ago, we were honoured by the visit of General Ne Win, President of the Union of Burma. At that' time, the President had very kindly invited me to visit Burma and, ever since then, I have been looking forward to visiting this friendly neighbour of ours. I am very glad, therefore, that I would now have the opportunity of doing so very shortly. I shall leave for Burma on the morning of Monday, December 20, and will return to India on the morning of Thursday, December 23.

Important talks lie ahead, and I have no doubt that I shall carry with me the good wishes of ail the Honourable Members of this august House. To the people of the countries that I visit, I shall convey the warm good wishes of the people of India. It is our duty and our responsibility to explain our attitudes and our policies to the peoples of the world in an endeavour to gain their understanding. I think it is necessary for us to reiterate that India stands firmly for peace and for international amity. We seek friendship with all, more especially with our neighbours. We want to devote our energies to the vital task of developing our economy and improving the living standards of our people. The monies that we spend today on defence, we would much rather spend on fighting poverty, were it act for the serious threat to our territorial integrity all along our frontiers. The problems that will arise will be challenging, and these, I need hardly tell the House, will be attended to with every caution and care.

The country is still passing through critical days. We have to face and overcome difficult internal problems of our own on the food front and also in the matter of resources. I have no doubt that this challenge of the time provides an opportunity for us all to put forth our best. There is fresh thinking every where on the part of individuals and also on the part of the nation as a whole. There is a new realisation that we must do on our own as much and as far as possible. Recent months have shown that our greatest strength is the unity of our people. Where national problems

are involved, the people of India stand together as one man. I am very thankful indeed to all the political parties for the very cooperative attitude they have adopted in these difficult times. It is my sincere hope that this feeling will continue to be sustained. Let us continue to work together and thus shape our common destiny.

BACK NOTE

XVI. Statement Regarding Proposed Meeting with President Ayub Khan at Tashkent
and Other Matters, 10 December, 1965

NIL