

ernment to pay you only Rs. 2. You can go in appeal and, no doubt, you will succeed. It is not mere hearsay. I myself had a plot of land in Delhi. When that land was acquired and compensation was paid it was so ridiculously low that I myself went to court. I asked the man concerned why the price fixed by him was so low when the market price was not less than Rs. 30 or Rs. 32 per square yard in that particular locality. His reply was that he knew it but his instructions were that he should pay only that low compensation and that I could go in appeal. When I went in appeal I got Rs. 8 per square yard and now I am going to the High court. All this means persecution. How long can a private individual fight against the Government. The Government fights with the money of the tax-payer whereas an individual fights with his own resources. That is an unequal fight. It is not correct, not right, not equitable, that Government should use these powers to harass people and pass orders which are contrary to the provisions of the law.

So I want an assurance from Government that in the matter of payment of compensation they will follow the exact letter of the law, namely, that compensation will be paid on the basis of the market value prevailing on the date of issue of notification, plus 15 per cent solatium.

15 hrs.

As I said, this particular provision was made during the emergency in the wake of the Chinese aggression. What is the justification today for continuing such a legislation? On the one hand, you say that the emergency has ended; on the one hand you say that the powers taken under the Defence of India Rules are no longer valid; and in the same breath you bring forward the same law, issue an Ordinance and come to this House for passing it into law. If

this particular provision was made because of the emergency, the emergency having ceased, there should really be no need for acquisition.

Thirdly, Government have more resources than any private individual. If your officers are in need of accommodation

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member may resume his seat and continue his speech after the adjournment motion is over.

SHR C. C. DESAI: But the adjournment motion will go on till 6 O'clock. So, it will be only tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: After the adjournment motion is disposed of, he will have to resume his speech, if he so desires.

15.01 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT
 —contd.

SUPPLY OF ARMS BY U.S.S.R. TO
 PAKISTAN—contd.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Sir, I move:

"That the House do now adjourn".

There comes a time in the history of nations when the hard realities of life will overwhelm the puppy love of adolescence. This change of life seems to have come over our Government and it is about to acquire some wisdom teeth—perhaps. For years our rulers have been suffering under the grand delusion that India's importance was a historic fact and that we can strut the world, giving advice, preaching morality and talking peace. Unfortunately, that smugness was wiped off our face when the Chinese in 1962 attacked us and are still squat.

[Shri Piloo Mody]

ling on thousands of miles of our territory totally unaware of our historical importance.

This buried the first major plank of our foreign policy when Hindi-Chini bhai bhai became Hindi-Chini hai hai. In those days I remember Jawaharlal Nehru reciting from *Glimpses of World History* and talking about our historic ties and the ancient trade and the permanent and traditional friendship that bound our two countries together. In 1962 all this evaporated into thin air—a grim reminder of the fact that in the affairs of a nation there are no permanent friends and no permanent enemies but only permanent interests.

The Soviets are now going to supply arms to Pakistan. Nobody seems to know what arms they are going to get. Some say “wait and see”; others think that they are only “defensive weapons”, but no one seems to know why. Why are the Soviets doing this? Why are they giving arms to Pakistan?

There is no doubt, even though our Foreign Office may not yet have realised it, that the Soviets are making their next big thrust and propaganda offensive in the Persian Gulf. They have already started flirting with Iran and their trade missions have reached as far as Bahrain. Naturally in this move Pakistan excites their fancy. Of course, there is the more formal and official excuse that the USSR is trying to wean Pakistan away from the Chinese spheres of influence. Why are they selling defensive arms to Pakistan? If by selling defensive arms they can wean Pakistan and achieve that laudable objective, it would be a very good thing; but whether they will succeed or not is a matter of pure conjecture.

Whatever their reasons are—we are not particularly concerned with their reasons—the fact of the matter is: Is the Soviet Union not aware of the fact that giving Pakistan these arms is going to create trouble for our country?

Have they no fear of offending us? Have they no fear of losing our friendship? Do they take us so much for granted; or, do they know that because of our own folly we have committed this country to the Soviet Union and have enslaved our economy in a manner in which the Soviets can turn round and say, “We are going to do this and if you do not like it, go and jump in the lake”?

According to Premier Kosygin, all this supply of arms is being done for the promotion of peace in the sub-continent. The Government's most favoured paper, the *Patriot*, has accused pro-American parties and like-minded members of the Congress Parliamentary Party of trying to create anti-Soviet propaganda, with which Premier Kosygin of course concurs and accuses these elements of sabotaging Indo-USSR friendship; but the innocent act of giving arms to Pakistan and increasing the tension in this sub-continent is nowhere responsible for what is happening!

New Age, Moscow's mouthpiece in India has gone one step further and says that the Soviet supply of arms to Pakistan is a blow to the global strategy of the American imperialists and, therefore, in India's national interest. I do not know how we are expected to believe this sort of drivel.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peer-made): You will not understand it.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Premier Kosygin has gone on to say that the giving of arms has been decided from the point of view of friendship between India and the Soviet Union. Any force that tries to put a wedge into this will be destroyed, he says. He goes on further to say that this giving of arms is going to make our friendship grow from strength to strength. After all, why should it not? Our very own Prime Minister has assured him that what they do with giving Soviet arms is none of our business, though, she is not very happy

about it. Our foreign policy, she maintains, will undergo no change. With such a categorical assurance the Soviet Union can do what it likes. Our friendship will have to improve with the Soviet Union and grow from strength to strength because as Pakistan gets stronger we will become more and more dependent on the Soviet Union. I maintain that this is not friendship, this is blackmail!

It is now a matter of historic fact that we have sold our economy to the Soviet Union and that we are getting deeper and deeper into their clutches for the last few years. We have been appeasing them in every conceivable way, pandering to them and ultimately surrendering to them. In trade, in commerce, in industry, in our foreign policy, even in our defence, all along, they have been playing us for suckers. Take the rupee payments of which the balance is highly in our favour. Because it is so, the Soviets are forcing us to buy their arms, obsolete arms. Let us not forget that the Soviet Union operates a command economy, a totalitarian economy, and for fear of the cold war they have converted their economy from production of goods to production of armaments. They have been stocked with these armaments for the last few years and are looking around to see for some place to unload them. They have found weaker nations like ours and they have been using these arsenals of theirs to enhance their diplomacy. The result is that our army, our air force, our navy are all equipped with Soviet arms. Missiles, fighters, bombers, submarines—all come from the Soviet Union. This is why we have become so completely helpless, that is why we are afraid of offending them. If so, I maintain that this is a singular failure of the foreign policy of this Government.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli):
We should have bought it all from America.

SHRI PILOO MODY: At least the equipment would have worked then.

The real tragedy of it all has been that India is the only country in the world, out of 20 countries to which the Soviets supply arms which is paying full Soviet prices for the arms that we get; all other countries are supplied arms at substantial discounts, going up to 90 per cent. Sometimes, we pay original prices for obsolete equipment—anything that the traffic will bear.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour): No more obsolete than what the British sold us.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The Soviets are forcing us to buy planes for the IAC. They do not even make passenger planes. They make only military planes which they later convert for passenger use. They have been offering us this bullock-cart, the TU-134, in preference to the Boeing-737, DC-9 and the BAC-111.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: What about Bhilai and Durgapur?

SHRI PILOO MODY: If you will read *Commerce* magazine of June 22nd, you will find that there is a complete breakdown of operating costs, and they have come to the conclusion that the break-even point of the TU-134 is 101 per cent, which means that in addition to all plane loads going filled with passengers, the co-pilot would also have to be a passenger before that trip can make a profit. When we rejected it, the Soviets said 'Why do you reject this? You take them now and later on you can trade them in for the yet-to-be-built TU-154,—if of course, it will fly.

Rumania which has been making herculean efforts to get out of the clutches of the Soviet economy had the courage to reject the TU-134 and replace its fleet of IL-18 by the BAC-111.

[Shri Piloo Mody]

In the matter of trade, India has been buying nickel from the Soviet Union at twice the price at which the Soviet Union itself sells to the rest of the world.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thanks to the STC.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Then, I come to Soviet kerosene. We have been obliged to buy kerosene from the Soviet Union in spite of the fact that we could make it very easily in our own country.

As for traditional exports like tea and cashewnuts, we are losing our foreign markets because they have been diverted to rupee payment areas from where they are occasionally re-exported, sometimes without even reaching their destination, earning foreign exchange for our co-partners in this rupee trade area.

Read yesterday's *Hindustan Times* and read about Soviet technology at Rishikesh. The Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals have not been able to make simple consumable penicillin after seven years and they are now thinking of producing animal feed with those expensive machines. You have no doubt heard of the Madras Surgical Instruments. I will say no more about it.

But the most daring exploit of all has been the attempt by the Soviet Union to high-jack the exploration of oil in the area known as Bombay High. TENNACO, a company of the United States, had offered a deal to explore oil in Bombay High and to bring the most expensive and sophisticated equipment for the purpose of doing this at their cost. If no oil was found, it would not cost the Indian Government a single paisa. But if oil was found it would be exploited on the basis of 80 per cent to us and 20 per cent to them. This is the most favourable oil deal that has ever been offered by any oil company to any country.

SHRI NAMBIAR: Question.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Even Shri Malaviya's brain-child, the ONGC, has approved of it. As a matter of fact, the UAR which has no diplomatic relations with the USA has accepted a similar but not so favourable a deal.

Nasser, who is more socialist than our Prime Minister, more pro-Soviet, but in contradiction more intelligent, has found nothing wrong with it. But in India, the pets of the Soviets within our Government, 'We need not do this; we shall explore this oil together. Let us start digging around in knee-deep waters in the Gulf of Cambay and then we will develop a technology'. The Soviets do not have any technology for deep-sea drilling, and they said 'We will develop a technology, and sooner or later, we will make the machines to explore Bombay High'. What is this? This is learning at our expense. This is what I call technical aid in reverse, because after learning from us how to do deep-sea drilling, they will naturally go and exploit their deposits in the Caspian Sea. Because of this tomfoolery, the TENNACO deal has been hanging fire since December last year, costing this country Rs. 5 crores worth of valuable foreign exchange per month. Loss up to date: Rs. 40 crores. Future anticipated loss: unlimited.

SHRI NAMBIAR: Rs. 400 crores.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Whether it is the MIGs or whether it is the Bokaro steel plant, Indian interests, Indian technicians, and Indian know-how are playing second fiddle to Soviet interests and convenience.

The Public Accounts Committee has very successfully disclosed what loss this country is suffering as a result of rupee payments. We have had defective tyres that were given to the Defence Ministry to be sent to the front. As for the tractors that we have received are concerned, they are cluttering up the junkyards of this

country. None of them are operating at all, and in the supply of spares, the Soviets are charging us high prices and exploiting us with profits as high as 200 to 300 per cent.

Then, I come to devaluation. When we devalued our currency, when we fixed the rate of exchange between the rupee and the rouble, it was fixed unduly unreasonably high in favour of the rouble.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: Who forced us to devalue?

SHRI PILOO MODY: Now, we have the most spectacular of all suggestions that we should dovetail our plan into the Soviet economy. After that, it would be impossible for us to disagree with the Soviet Union on any point whatsoever, no matter how small. We shall not only become a satellite of the Soviet Union, but we may ultimately even become a republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which, of course, will make both my friend's sitting here extremely happy.

SHRI NAMBIAR: How can Shri Piloo Mody be the satellite of anybody?

SHRI PILOO MODY: A very positive sign of the self-confidence that the Soviets have acquired about Indian servility is the presumption with which they have suggested that the Ganges water dispute should be solved on the basis of the Indus river water agreement. Unfortunately, we have not acquired the strength to suggest to the Soviets that they should solve their border problems with China over Outer Mongolia on the same basis as the Kutch Award.

While the economies of the Soviet satellites such as Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland and Hungary are making desperate efforts to get out of the stranglehold of the Soviet economy, we are talking in terms of dovetailing ours into their with the ease of a shoe-horn.

There has been a change in the Soviet pattern of diplomacy since 1965, and this has not even begun to have any repercussions on Indo-Soviet relationships. The Persian Gulf operation, and the concomitant attitude of the Soviet Union towards Pakistan, has gone unnoticed by both Government and press. Instead, some cock-and-bull arguments are being advanced about how giving arms to Pakistan is going to wean it away from China. A mouse is expected to move a mountain, the only victim being the man who believes it. Or, is the Soviet Union hoping that strengthening the Pakistani arsenal is going to make India panic so that we are going to rush and buy more and more of those obsolete arms of which they seem to have an unlimited supply? Defensive weapons, they say they are going to give to Pakistan. Defence against whom? I can understand Pakistan thinking that we are going to attack it. But I cannot understand the Soviet Union not knowing of our peaceful intentions vis-a-vis Pakistan. And if they still, after all this flirtation, do not know of our intentions, then this is another aspect of the failure of our foreign policy.

We hear constant reiteration about what friend the Soviet Union is of ours, chanted with the frequency of a mantra. But Soviet propaganda has not spared anyone except the Moscow communists with its foul, vituperous and false broadcasts on Radio Peace and Progress. If that is their idea of peace and progress, they can keep it. I can understand the glee with which this Government listens to the pornographical stuff that Radio Peace and Progress dishes out against my party and my leaders. But let them not forget that their own right wing is being attacked, and in fact, the Government of Orissa itself. Is the Government of Orissa something different and divisible from this Government? Is this Government not able to protect its citizens or even itself against this sort of malicious and false propaganda? What sort of pusillanimous

[Shri Pileo Mody]

perambulation is this? I would tell the Soviet Union to stop those damn broadcasts. And to Hell with the consequences.

In 1954, the United States started arming Pakistan against the Soviet Union. All of us, quite rightly, were mortified that these arms would be used against us. In fact, we were mortified at the gullibility, call it stupidity, of the United States to indulge in something like that. At that time, all of us, including Jawaharlal Nehru, categorically condemned the supply of arms as an unfriendly act towards India and, for months, he went on to do that. Although we have been bitten once and we are faced with a similar situation, what do we see? We see Jawaharlal Nehru's daughter come and whimper, and say, "We are not happy about it." At that time, it was a thorough gentleman like General Eisenhower who gave a categorical assurance that these arms would not be used against us. Unfortunately, he was not in a position to fulfil that assurance. And now we are asked to take the word from the non-yet-purged-or-about-to-be-purged Kosygin. And we are expected to accept it?

Let me quote what the high priests of communism have said. Lenin said:

"Promises are like pie-crust-made to be broken. It would be mad and criminal to tie our hands by entering into an agreement of any permanence with anybody."

And this is what Stalin said:

"Words have no relation to actions. Otherwise, what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions are another."

I am not attacking the Soviet Government. I have nothing against it. I am attacking this Government, this Council of Ministers and their foreign policy. Let the Soviet Union give arms to Pakistan. We do not

care. It is their right to do so. But let us not prove to be the zany of Soviet designs.

It was at Soviet insistence that we met at Tashkent. It was Soviet leaders who presided over the Tashkent accord. Let it be Soviet Russia who will ultimately murder the Tashkent Agreement. We acclaim the spirit of Tashkent. We believe that we must make friends with Pakistan. It is our only salvation. We share the same sub-continent. They were our brothers only 20 years ago. They will always be our neighbours. But let us make friends with them in New Delhi or in Islamabad. We do not need any Soviet patronage. If in spite of our best efforts Pakistan should be foolish enough to attack us, we will deal with them in our own way. If the Patton tanks were not successful against us, Soviet missiles and the TU 16 bombers are not going to far any better. But the fear of admitting mistakes and the self-delusion that we suffer from is the worst crime that a responsible Government can perpetrate on its own people.

Why did we subject our revered President to the humiliation of the Soviet visit? It was like a B-class Hollywood romance in which the heroine was screaming at the top of her voice about her fidelity, virtue and virginity and at the same time she was having an amorous orgy with her husband's step-brother. To avoid public ridicule, the husband should have been planning his own amorous adventure in Washington, London, Bonn or Paris.

It is now public knowledge that even the Cabinet was divided on this issue. Further, the Kremlin has been quite thorough not only in planting its men in key positions of Government but also in flirting with many a Minister of our Government.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister a few questions. Are you surprised that Soviet Union are

giving arms to Pakistan? Were you not told about this when you were in Moscow at the time you were the Information and Broadcasting Minister? Did you at that time inform anyone or broadcast the information you had? When you became the Prime Minister, what use did you make of this information? In the 2½ years that you have been the Prime Minister, what have you done to warn the Soviet Union that if it indulged itself in the luxury of giving military aid to Pakistan, it would seriously damage the growing bonds of Indo-Soviet friendship? If you have done so and not succeeded in your efforts, what have you done to reappraise your foreign policy in the light of this Soviet perfidy? Are you committed to a policy of 'kick below and lick above'?

By contrast look at Pakistan. They started on the wrong foot with membership of SEATO and CENTO. They did everything that is possibly wrong for a foreign country to do. They made friends with China; they made friends with the Soviet Union. Yet, to day it is the only country that is getting arms from the Soviet Union, U.S. and China, including European countries and countries of the Muslim world. This is diplomacy. And here we are Spouting our non-alignment and sanctimonious humbug. All that we can do is to prostrate before we can make any friends. Let us shed this humiliation, this long history of appeasement. Let our Prime Minister use the umbrella to protect her tender skin from the sun or use it occasionally to whack one of her colleagues on the Treasury Benches. But let her not make it the symbol of our foreign policy.

Therefore, I insist that if we are to make friends with the Soviet Union, let it be on conditions of honour, on the very sound principle that they need us as badly as we need them. And to protect this honour, let us tell them that they shall not give any military weapons to Pakistan,

that they shall not interfere with the economy of our country, that our rupee trade agreements will work only on a commercial basis, mutually advantageous to both, that they shall not dictate our oil policy to us or how we should build our steel mills or, for that matter, what planes we shall buy, that they shall not poison the minds of our people by the foul vilifications of their broadcasts over Radio Peace and Progress; and, above all, that we shall not dovetail our Plans into the Soviet economy. If in spite of this they wish to be our friends, let us by all means embrace them; if not, let the devil take the hindmost.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the House do now adjourn."

Mr. Hanumanthaiya.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): I was greatly impressed with the eloquence of my hon. friend, Mr. Piloo Mody. I wish I had been, and the House had also been, greatly impressed by his intelligence. Matters of foreign policy have to command common confidence in the House. We have to proceed about our discussion, specially on this subject on which every one of us is perturbed, with dignity, decorum and self-confidence. To make use of the occasion to throw jibes at everybody, including the patriots who had served this country before, is hardly the way of consolidating the position of India vis-a-vis Soviet Union or Pakistan or any other country. I very much wish that the Swatantra Party, which usually takes a very sober attitude towards problems, had adopted a different tenor, different arguments and a different approach to this problem. Here is a problem on which there is no difference of opinion, whether it is between the Communist Party and the Congress or whether it is between the Jan Sangh and the Congress or the Opposition parties *inter se*. There

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

is hardly any difference of opinion. It is only a question of wording and in what shape it should be worded. Forgetting that this is a common approach to the question, and making a grievance of every move that can be plausibly sponsored is, to say the least, playing to the gallery, and not serving the true interests of the country. Here is a single pointed problem of Soviet Union selling some arms to Pakistan. Our Prime Minister was the first to make it clear and in as categorical a manner as possible for a Prime Minister to do, that this country feels unhappy about it. What more can be said? This country is known for its sobriety, culture and long civilisation. Whatever one speaks has to emanate out of this background. One cannot go on crying hoarse and using undignified word or argument against a sister country. Whatever is warranted by our history, civilisation and culture has been succinctly, reasonably and concisely stated by the Prime Minister.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): No. no.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: The point of some of the Opposition parties as to whether it should be in the form of a resolution or in the form of a statement is a distinction without a difference. As has been made clear by Government, when the USA gave military aid to Pakistan to the tune of 1½ to 2 billion dollars, we protested. We never broke off diplomatic relations. Nor did we discontinue economic co-operation and collaboration in other fields. We digested the difficulty of the military aid to Pakistan, though of that dimension. But we had the confidence, we had the restraint to see that other fields of co-operation were not affected. Likewise is the approach of Government in the present case. We are not ashamed of it. We feel dissatisfied, we are not happy with what has happened, but to say that every touch of the Soviet Union is contaminated is to take an extreme view and become liable to the charge by Mr.

Kosygin or anyone else that there are certain sections of opinion in India who are interested merely in seeing that our friendship with the Soviet Union is put an end to, instead of correcting the situation that has arisen in a wrong manner. We are interested only in rectifying a mistake done. Even in the best of relationships, even in family relationships sometimes misunderstandings do arise. That is the way of the world.

It may be said that with some objective, with some motive or with some intention, the Soviet Union has agreed to sell some defence equipment. It must be noted that this is a sale as against the free gift of American aid of the dimension I mentioned. It is now understood that the whole of India, irrespective of parties, feels unhappy. I do not suppose the Soviet Government and leaders who are very particular about the friendship being continued and developed will not take note of this dissatisfaction. It is only the closed mind of the Swatantra Party or of Shri Piloo Mody which may not take note of public opinion. But the Soviet leaders are bound to take note of this dissatisfaction.

My hon. friend, Shri Piloo Mody, not only strayed into the foreign policy field, but also went into the entire length and breadth of foreign collaboration. I am in a position to state after careful examination of the various aspects of foreign collaboration, whether it is with Russia or with America or with Germany or with UK or any other country that foreign collaboration has a tale of its own. These collaborations are not charity shows; they are not meant exclusively to help your own country. They are commercial transactions. It is a question of competing intelligence between the Indians concerned and the foreigners concerned. They are bound to make the best of the bargain in a situation. In my opinion, these foreign collaborations have not been completely to the advantage of India; they have ended in many sec-

tors, in an imbalance in our foreign exchange position. This point requires a commission to study. The whole gamut of foreign collaboration has to be gone through and seen how many of them have worked profitably to India, how many have not, how many have to be continued and how many stopped. Therefore, this is not a field where you can accuse only the Soviet Union. Much more accusations can be hurled at other countries. Therefore, that argument in this connection would be an irrelevant argument.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna): Relevant argument.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: Every argument that criticises the Congress becomes relevant to my friend Acharya Kripalani. Therefore, there is no common point of argument between that approach and my approach which is a discriminating approach. Where there is something wrong I say it is wrong; where there is something right, I do say so.

The Prime Minister this morning made a great point. After the second world war the world pattern so changed that the world was divided into two blocks, and the cold war atmosphere enveloped the whole world as it were. I do not suppose my friends in the opposition will accuse India on that score. It happened, it is the natural flow of history, its currents and events with which India had nothing to do. All that we could do was to maintain our self-respect and say we were not going to be hangers on of either this bloc or that bloc. We have maintained consistently that dignified non-aligned approach up to this minute. There have been several occasions when this country has not been able to agree with Soviet Russia. There have been more occasions when we have not been able to agree with the USA. If an impartial, objective scrutiny is made of our foreign policy you will see that literally as well as truthfully we have never resorted to

kow-tow anybody's line continuously and all the time.

If Pakistan receives foreign aid from three contradictory forces, it is not the fault of India. We never asked these countries to simultaneously help Pakistan. To say that we are also responsible for that is to say that Mr. Piloo Mody is responsible for Mr. Kosygin's helping Pakistan. It is wholly irrelevant. It is one of the international inexplicable factors. Its explanation will probably be disclosed by subsequent events of history. It so happens that America helped Pakistan to the tune of 2 billion dollars, and now that marriage, the alliance in the *Kalyan mandap* of SEATO, CENTO and all that, is gone. After Pakistan's conflict with India, they have openly at any rate, stopped supplying any military aid to Pakistan. There may be here and there some small transactions which take place through Iran or Italy. Even that has stopped. Therefore, they ran to China. China is interested in sabotaging India internally as well as externally. Therefore, in order to satisfy its own hatred towards India, maybe it is helping Pakistan.

As to why the Soviet Union is helping Pakistan, many people make guesses. I do not want to base foreign policy on pure guesses. Let us wait. Let us see how it works. After all, it is a sale, and if Pakistan has to get this aid, it has to be paid in currency, rupees or whatever it is. Let us wait for a few months or a year and see how this sale affects Pakistan, affects China or India. This is one of those things which it is impossible to forecast. Interested people may be giving interested versions of their own impressions of this military aid.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Why should the Prime Minister given an opinion then? She could have waited.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: The Prime Minister is really wise; therefore, she is in that position. Any

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

Prime Minister has to give the reasons given by the other country for public consumption. You cannot go on attributing motives, twisting and interpreting the opinion of the other country. If Kossigin as a gentleman has given one particular explanation, as a Government we have to accept it and say that this is what Soviet Russia says. That is all that has been said. The foreign policy is undergoing changes not only so far as Soviet Russia is concerned but so far as America and China are also concerned. My friends say that the Indian policy should also change. I agree that it should change according to the interest of this country. It is the responsibility of the Members of the Opposition to create this condition instead of taking an attitude as that of Shri Piloo Mody's extreme, partisan and perfunctory attitude. No more propitious opportunity has been afforded than this opportunity to forge common front so far as foreign policy is concerned. The opinion is the same among both the Government and the Opposition Members or is almost the same. But on the paltry difference of whether it should be a statement or a resolution' we are kicking a big row. Every responsible opposition leader who is interested in a common approach to this problem must take advantage of this opportunity to see that as far as possible course is agreed upon.... (Interruptions.) The position taken by the Government is not only right; but history will judge that it is the correct stand that we have taken.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: As in the case of China.'

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: In respect of China, we took a stand. The other party betrayed. You can as well blame the house-owner for a theft committed by a dacoit. It is the dacoit who is in the right and no the house-owner—that is the argument that appears to weigh with my friend. If China betrayed us, it was not our fault.

15.44 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

I agree with the Opposition parties that if the Soviet Union is really sincere about the Indian friendship, they should discontinue showing in their maps Aksai China and NEFA area as belonging to China. Communiqués are merely formal and courteous documents. Visits of Heads of States are personal courtesies extended to individuals or officials. They should not be taken so seriously as we do. Even when we differ from one another, we may invite one another for a cup of tea; that does not mean that we change our political views. In the sphere of international relations, merely because there is a communique and there is a visit of either this President or that President—that does not indicate that our relations are one hundred per cent correct.

There are courtesies, and the courtesies, and the courtesies should not be magnified into propositions of foreign policy or of permanent relationship.

I very much wish that the Soviet Union takes note of these three things: the first is, if they really mean to continue this friendship which has really grown for the last 20 years, they have to rectify their maps and remove all suspicions in our minds. Secondly; they have to see whether they are helping the cause of socialism by helping a country which is wedded to feudalism; thirdly, whether they are helping international peace by helping a country whose one reason for existence is hating India and is trying all the time to do some aggression. These 20 years of friendship is good enough for them to revise their decision on the sale of arms to Pakistan. even if they have committed themselves to this position.

Public opinion in India is so strong that no party, whatever it is, can go

against this current. Even the communist party—from whatever I know from my private conversations with them—I feel they are first Indians, patriotic Indians more than anything else. If they had been consulted by the Politburo in Moscow, probably they would have given advice to them not to venture upon this step of encouraging an aggressor. Maybe they are not consulted; maybe they will be able to persuade them on their own party level. A day will come, I hope, when the wrong step taken by the Soviet Union will be rectified. The co-operation of the Opposition parties as well as delicate handling of the situation by the Government is the correct path to pursue in the meanwhile.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Vajpayee. I would request hon Member to adhere to the time-limit; a large number of Members are to take part in the debate.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : सभापति महोदय इस बात से इनकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि सोवियट रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये जाने के निर्णय से एक नयी तथा गम्भीर स्थिति पैदा हो गई है। हमें इस परिस्थिति का दुइता और आत्म-विश्वास के साथ सामना करना होगा। प्रधान मन्त्री ने अपने वक्तव्य में आज कहा था कि देश की सुरक्षा सरकार की दृष्टि में मैं सर्वांगिण अहत्व का स्थान लेगी। उन्होंने यह भी विश्वास प्रकट किया था कि कारकीर्ण जनता के संगठित समर्थन से जो नयी परिस्थिति पैदा हुई है उसका सकलतापूर्वक सामना

किया जा सकेगा। क्या यह अच्छा नहीं होता कि जनता को संगठित होकर नयी परिस्थिति का सामना करने के लिए उपदेश देन के साथ साथ यह सदन भी एक स्वर से सोवियट रूस के निर्णय की निन्दा करता और यह संकल्प घोषित करता कि भारत को अब अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना है हम किसी महाशक्ति के सहयोग और समर्थन के भरोसे अपने भविष्य को नहीं छोड़ सकते। कौन सी कठिनाई थी इस तरह का प्रस्ताव इस सदन में स्वीकार करने में? अगर हम इस सदन में एक स्वर से नहा बोल सकते तो देश को एक स्वर से बोलने के लिये कौन प्रेरित करेगा किस प्रकार प्रेरित किया जायगा? प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि इस तरह का प्रस्ताव पास करने की कोई परम्परा नहीं है। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस तरह की परिस्थिति पहले पैदा नहीं हुई थी। जब अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये तब हम रूस का भरोसा कर सकते थे लेकिन आज रूस ने ऐसा कदम उठाया है जिस से हमारी स्थिति और भी विषम हो गई है। दूसरी बात उस समय किसी ने इस तरह का प्रस्ताव पेश करने का सुझाव भी नहीं दिया था। मुझे विश्वास है कि अगर ऐसा सुझाव आता तो नेहरू जी उस का विरोध नहीं करते। उन्होंने स्वयं पाकिस्तान को अमरीका सहायता के खिलाफ एक आन्दोलन की पहल की थी। क्या प्रधान मंत्री महोदय इस तरह की पहल करने को तैयार हैं? नेहरू जी ने कांग्रेस को निर्देश दिया कि सारे देश में अमरीका के गलत कदम के खिलाफ जनमत को जाइत किया जाय और उस का प्रभावी रीति से प्रकटीकरण किया जाय। क्या आज की कांग्रेस सोवियट रूस के निर्णय के खिलाफ इस तरह का कदम उठाने को तैयार है? क्या प्रधान मंत्री महोदय अपने पिता के पदचिन्हों पर चलने को तैयार हैं?

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

एक और नरहू जी नभमरीकी सहायता के खिलाफ पहल की थी और दूसरी ओर प्रधान मंत्री महोदया रूस के निर्णय के खिलाफ जनता के रोष को दबाने के लिये समाचारपत्रों के सम्पादकों को और उन के सम्वाददाताओं को बुला कर उपदेश दे रही है । इस देश में प्रैस स्वतंत्र है और मुझे विश्वास है कि प्रैस अपना कर्तव्य करेगा लेकिन सरकार के दृष्टिकोण का अन्तर मैं स्पष्ट कर रहा हूँ ।

एक बात और है । अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को इस लिये हथियार दिये थे कि पाकिस्तान गाम्यवाद का प्रसार रोकेगा और वह अमरीका की विश्वव्यापी योजना का एक अंग बन जायेगा लेकिन रूस के नेताओं को यह समझने में कोई अघिक कठिनाई नहीं होनी चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान को मिलने वाले हथियार भारत के अलवा और किसी के विरुद्ध काम में नहीं प्रायेंगे । अमरीकी हथियार एक साथी को मिले थे और रूसी हथियार दिये जा रहे हैं उस पाकिस्तान को जो अभी रूस के साथ सैनिक गठबंधन में शामिल नहीं हुआ । इस के विपरीत पाकिस्तान अभी भी सिटो और सैटो का मेम्बर है । रूस की विदेशी नीति का उद्देश्य इन सैनिक गठबंधनों को तोड़ना है । इसी आधार पर आज तक रूस के नेता पाकिस्तान के प्रति इस तरह के नीति सम्बन्धी वक्तव्य देते रहे जिनके कि आधार पर हमारी सरकार ने समझा कि पाकिस्तान के प्रति सोवियट नीति में कोई आमूल परिवर्तन नहीं होगा ।

सभापति महोदय सन् 1964 में 14 फरवरी को रूस की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के प्रमुख नेता कामरेड माइकेल सुसलोव द्वारा

रूस की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की केन्द्रीय समिति के सामने जो बयान दिया गया था उस का एक अंश यहां पर उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ । बदले हुए संदर्भ में वह किस तरीके से लागू होता है इसे आप देखें और सारा सदन देखे । श्री सुसलोव चीन की आलोचना कर रहे थे कि चीन के नेता पाकिस्तान की मदद कर रहे हैं, पाकिस्तान का साथ दे रहे हैं और भारत के खिलाफ पाकिस्तान को हथियारबंद कर रहे हैं । उस पर टिप्पणी करती हुए श्री सुसलोव ने यह कहा था :

"While allowing relations with India, which everybody knows is not a member of military blocs, to deteriorate sharply, the Chinese leadership at the same time actually leagued together with Pakistan, a member of Seato and Cento, which are threatening peace and security of Asian peoples. It is a fact that having discarded their 'revolutionary phrase mongering', the Chinese leaders have in reality adopted a line that can hardly be dovetailed with the principled position of countries of the socialist commonwealth with regard to imperialist blocs.... The approach of the Chinese leaders to the choice of friends and allies is strange, to say the least."

कामरेड सुसलोव ने आगे कहा :

"How is it possible, it may be asked, to fling mud at socialist countries, at communist parties and at the same time with the whole world watching shower compliments on the reactionary regime in Pakistan? That is simply unthinkable.... Can anyone believe that the rapprochement with

Pakistan has been dictated by the interests of the development of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Asia against imperialists that the Chinese leaders talk so much about?"

जब पीकिंग ने पाकिस्तान के साथ गठबंधन किया तो मास्को की प्रतिक्रिया यह थी। आज वही मास्को पाकिस्तान को हथियारबंद करने जा रहा है। क्या पाकिस्तान का स्वरूप बदल गया है? क्या पाकिस्तान साम्राज्यवादी खेमे से बाहर निकल गया है; क्या पाकिस्तान अब सिएटा और सेंटो का मंडल नहीं है? क्या पाकिस्तान में अब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी गैरकानूनी नहीं है? पाकिस्तान का स्वरूप नहीं बदला है लेकिन मास्को के नेतृत्व की नीति बदली है और उस नीति का परिवर्तन हम को ठीक तरीके से समझना चाहिए।

प्रधानमंत्री महोदय कहती हैं कि उन्हें पता नहीं है कि क्या हथियार दिये जा रहे हैं। उन्हें यह भी पता नहीं है कि अभी हथियार मिलने शुरू हो गये हैं या भागे मिलने वाले हैं। लेकिन यह कहा जाता है कि सोवियत रूस ने हमें आश्वासन दिया है कि वे हथियार भारत के खिलाफ काम में नहीं लाये जायेंगे। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस तरीके के आश्वासन हम पहले भी आजमा चुके हैं। जिस कागज, पर यह आश्वासन लिखे जाते हैं उन आश्वासनों की कीमत उस कागज की कीमत के बराबर भी नहीं है क्योंकि अगर कागज कोरा होता तो उस की कुछ कीमत हो सकती थी लेकिन आश्वासन लिख कर वह कागज और भी रद्दी कर दिये जाते हैं। जो हथियार देते हैं। वही लोगों को आश्वासन देते हैं। यह पर्याप्त नहीं है। हथियार जिसके हाथ में जाता है उस का इरादा क्या है यह देखना होगा और अगर अमरीका पाकिस्तान को नहीं रोक सका तो सोवियत रूस रोक सकेगा इस मुगं मरीचिका में फंसने के लिए

हम तैयार नहीं हैं। एक तरफ तो यह कहा जाता है कि पाकिस्तान को मिलने वाले रूसी हथियार भारत के विरुद्ध काम में नहीं लाये जायेंगे दूसरी तरफ कहा जाता है कि जो हथियार हम दे रहे हैं वह रक्षा के लिए होंगे। यह दोनों परस्पर विरोधी बातें हैं। कौन से हथियार रक्षा के लिए हैं और कौन से आक्रमण के लिए हैं इन में कोई सीमा रेखा नहीं खींची जा सकती है।

15.56 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

जब सोवियत रूस ने पाकिस्तान को हैलीकाप्टर देने का निर्णय किया तो इस सरकार ने इस सदन में उस निर्णय की वकालत करने की कोशिश की थी। सोवियत रूस की नीति में परिवर्तन का संकेत हमें उस समय मिल गया था और हम सरकार से जानना चाहते हैं कि इतना दृढ़ संकेत मिलने के बाद भी उस ने सोवियत रूस के निर्णय को रोकने के लिये क्या किया? प्रधानमंत्री जी कहती हैं कि हर एक देश को दूसरे देश को हथियार देने का अधिकार है। लेकिन क्या हमें विरोध प्रकट करने का अधिकार नहीं है? अगर उन्हें अपने नीति बदलने का अधिकार है तो क्या नई परिस्थिति में अपनी नीति का पुनर्मूल्यांकन करके उस के पुनर्निर्धारण का हमें अधिकार नहीं है? जब अमरीका के हथियार इटली या ईरान के रास्ते पाकिस्तान को जाते हैं तो हम विरोधपत्र भेजते हैं यह जानते हुए भी कि उन्हें हथियार बेचने का अधिकार है। अगर हथियार हमारे हितों पर आंच लाते हैं तो हम उन की निन्दा करते हैं और उनके खिलाफ विरोधपत्र भेजते हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक रूस को कोई विरोधपत्र क्यों नहीं भेजा गया है? प्रधानमंत्री

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

महोदया कह सकती हैं कि हम चिट्ठियां लिख रहे हैं। यह चिट्ठी पत्नी अगर जनता की भावनाओं को ठीक तरीके से प्रकट नहीं करती तो उस की भाषा में और उस के भाव में परिवर्तन होना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न यह नहीं है कि रूस कितने हथियार दे रहा है और कौन से हथियार दे रहा है? प्रश्न यह है कि रूस की नीति में परिवर्तन हो गया है और उस परिवर्तन को ध्यान में रख कर हमें कदम बढ़ाने होंगे। आगे चल कर पाकिस्तान के ऊपर इन हथियारों का क्या परिणाम होगा इस की सहज स्त्री कल्पना की जा सकती है। हथियार मिलने के निर्णय से ही पाकिस्तान के नेताओं का स्वर बदल गया है। प्रधान मंत्री महोदया ने भी दबी ज़बान से उसका उल्लेख किया है मास्को में हथियार देने का फैसला हुआ और पाकिस्तान के विदेश मंत्री ने कहा कि हम काश्मीर में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय युद्धविराम रेखा को नहीं मानते हैं। फिर भी अर्गाद हुसैन ने 13 जुलाई को एक दूसरा वक्तव्य दिया है:

"The Pakistan Foreign Minister warned yesterday, the 13th July that if India remained obdurate over Jammu and Kashmir and other disputes, Pakistan was ready to meet any situation."

इसका भाव यह है कि अगर भारत काश्मीर पर झुकेगा नहीं तो हम हर परिस्थिति के लिये तैयार हैं। हमें युद्ध की धमकियां भी जा रही हैं। रूसी हथियार पाकर पाकिस्तान का हौसला और बढ़ा है। पाकिस्तान के नेता भारत के विरुद्ध घणा की भावना से भरे हुए हैं। 1965 की पराजय को वह भूले नहीं हैं। क्या सोवियत रूस हमें और पाकिस्तान को निकट लाने के लिये हथियार दे रहा है, क्या इस क्षेत्र में स्थिरता पैदा करने के लिये हथियार दे रहा है, क्या तनाव कम करने के लिये हथियार दे रहा है? सोवियत रूस के उद्देश्य क्या हैं यह समझने का हम

प्रयत्न करें, मगर उन का परिणाम हमारे ऊपर क्या होगा इस के बारे में देश में कोई मतभेद नहीं होना चाहिये, और हमें निश्चय करना चाहिये कि उन परिणामों को रोकने के लिये हम क्या कर सकते हैं।

16 hrs.

अभी तक पाकिस्तान के नेता काश्मीर की रट लगाते थे, अब उस के साथ फरक्का बैराज भी जुड़ गया है। प्रेजिडेंट अय्यूब ने कहा है कि काश्मीर और फरक्का बैराज यह बिन्यादी सवाल हैं, जब तक यह ठीक तरह से हल नहीं होंगे—और ठीक तरह से मतलब यह है कि पाकिस्तान की इच्छा के अनुसार हल नहीं होंगे—तब तक शांति नहीं होगी। और उसी समय प्रधान मंत्री कोसिजिन का पत्र भी मिलता है फरक्का बैराज के बारे में यह हवा का रुख बतलाता है।

प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा है कि वह किसी प्रकार का दबाव मंजूर नहीं करेगी। अगर सरकार में इतनी दृढ़ता होती तो राष्ट्रपति की रूस यात्रा के अवसर पर जो विज्ञापित प्रकाशित की गई है उस विज्ञापित का रूप कुछ भिन्न होता। उस में हम सोवियत रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये जाने का उल्लेख कर सकते थे। हम अपनी आशंका प्रकट कर सकते थे और रूस के नेता उस आशंका का निवारण करने वाला वाक्य जोड़ सकते थे। अगर विज्ञापित में रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये जाने का कोई उल्लेख नहीं। उस में हमें वह उपदेश दिया गया है कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ अपने झगड़े शांति के साथ हल करें। हमारे प्रतिनिधि इस बात पर बल दे सकते थे कि रूस चेकोस्लोवाकिया के साथ अपने झगड़े शांति के साथ और दूसरे देश के अरेबू मामलों में हस्तक्षेप न करने के प्राथमिक के महान सिद्धान्त के अनुसार हल करे। अगर

हमारे प्रतिनिधियों ने इस बात पर बल नहीं दिया। छोटा सा जैकोस्लोवाकिया आज सोवियत रूस की विस्तारवादी नीति का शिकार बनने जा रहा है। कल अगर रूस की फौजें जैकोस्लोवाकिया में घुस गईं तो इस सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया क्या होगी? अभी तक हंगरी के मामले में चुप रहने के पाप का कलंक इस सरकार के माथे से धुला नहीं है। रूसी फौजें वहां जायें इस से पहले चेतावनी देनी चाहिये नई दिल्ली को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ चार्टर का हवाला देते हुए, पंचशील के सिद्धान्तों को उल्लेख करते हुए कि संवियत रूस कोई ऐसा काम न करे जिस से शांति और दूसरे देशों की स्वतंत्रता का समादर करने की उस घोषणा पर पानी फिरे। मगर प्रधानमंत्री जैकोस्लोवाकिया के बारे में चुप हैं। रूस हमें यह उपदेश दे सकता है कि हम अपने झगड़े शांति से हल करें, मगर हम उन से न्याय की, नीति की, और सिद्धान्त की बात भी नहीं कह सकते? जब संयुक्त विज्ञप्ति तैयार करते समय हम रूसी दबाव का सामना नहीं कर सके, तो जब काश्मीर पर दबाव आयेगा, गंगा के जल पर, फरक्का बैराज पर रूस का दबाव पड़ेगा तब नई दिल्ली उस का सामना कर सकेगी, यह चाहते हुए भी मैं विश्वास नहीं कर सकता।

मुझे रूसी हथियारों का भय नहीं है और इस देश ने पाकिस्तान को मिलने वाले अमरीकी हथियारों का भी भय नहीं किया। भारत की जनता, सम्पूर्ण जन बल, हमारे साधन और अगर हम उन साधनों का उचित उपयोग कर सकें तो उन से उत्पन्न होने वाली हमारी शक्ति किसी बाहरी चुनौती का सामना कर सकती है। चिन्ता की बात रूस के हथियार नहीं हैं, चिन्ता की बात नई दिल्ली के निर्णय न करने का रवैया है। आप देखिये कि कैसी विचित्र स्थिति थी। हमारे राष्ट्रपति रूस की सदभावना यात्रा कर रहे थे, नगर नगर में भारत और रूस की मंत्री के लिये

व्याख्यान दे रहे थे और उसी समय हमारी प्रधानमंत्री गौहाटी में रूस के निर्णय की खतरनाक परिस्थिति का विवेचन कर रही थीं। अगर राष्ट्रपति को रूस जाने से पहले यह पता लग गया था कि रूस के नेताओं ने पाकिस्तान को हथियारबन्द करने का फैसला किया है तो राष्ट्रपति की यात्रा को स्थगित किया जा सकता था। रूस वाले बुरा मानते, मगर कभी कभी दुनिया के लोगों को यह भी समझाने की जरूरत है कि भारत भी बुरा मानता है और हमारी भावनाओं का भी आदर किया जाना चाहिये। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में कभी न कभी, किसी न किसी प्रकार का कठोर कदम उठाना जरूरी होता है। हम यात्रा रद्द न करते, स्थगित कर सकते थे लेकिन उसे स्थगित नहीं किया। राष्ट्रपति चले गये। उनके जाने के बाद प्रधानमंत्री रूसी निर्णय की आलोचना करने से रुक सकती थीं। एक जिम्मेदार सरकार के नाते इस सरकार के प्रवक्ता कह सकते थे कि हमें खबरें मिली हैं कि रूस इस तरह का निर्णय ले रहा है लेकिन जब तक राष्ट्रपति वापस नहीं आते तब तक हम इस के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहेंगे। किन्तु यह नहीं किया गया। एक और राष्ट्रपति सदभावना के भाषण दे रहे थे। दूसरी ओर प्रधानमंत्री जनता की उग्र भावना भड़क न जाये इस लिये उन पर ठंडा पानी डालने के लिये गौहाटी में बाढ़ का दिग्दर्शन करते हुए खतरनाक परिस्थिति का चित्रण कर रही थीं।

मुझे खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि विदेश मंत्रालय के कुछ अधिकारी राजनीति में दखल दे रहे हैं। इस बात की जांच होनी चाहिये कि सोवियत रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार देनेका निर्णय समाचारपत्रों तक कैसे पहुंचा। मैं समाचार-पत्रों को दोष नहीं दूंगा। उन का काम है खबरों का पता लगाना। मगर विदेश मंत्रालय के रहस्य

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

जनता तक कैसे पहुंच जाते हैं, विदेशों तक कैसे पहुंच जाते हैं इस की जांच होनी चाहिये। प्रधान मंत्री जिस घर में बैठी हुई है उस को जरा उन को ठीक करना चाहिये।

सोवियत रूस का निर्णय खतरनाक है। मगर बुराई में भी अच्छाई निकल सकती है यह अभिशाप बरदान बन सकता है, अगर यह हमारी आंखें खोलने के लिये काफी हो कि हम किसी पर भरोसा नहीं कर सकते। अन्ततोगत्वा हम को अपने पैरों पर खड़े होना पड़ेगा। लेकिन मुझे दुःख होता है जब कभी मैं प्रतिक्रियाओं को पढ़ता हूँ। लोग सुझाव देते हैं कि रूस ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने का निर्णय किया कर लिया है तो हम अमरीका की गोद में जा कर बैठ जायें। अगर हम ऐसा सोचते हैं या ऐसा करते हैं तो हम ने रूस के निर्णय से कोई सत्क नहीं सीखा। अब किसी की गोद में बैठने का समय नहीं है। कोई हमें गोद में बैठाये भी नहीं रखेगा। सब अपनी अपनी चालें चल रहे हैं। रूस की नजर हिन्द महासागर के ऊपर लगी हुई है। पाकिस्तान और अफगानिस्तान के द्वारा रूस समुद्र में पहुंचना चाहता है। वियतनाम में अमरीका की पराजय और सिंगापुर से ब्रिटेन के हटने के कारण जो रिक्तता पैदा हो गई है, सोवियत रूस उस रिक्तता को भी भरने की कोशिश कर सकता है।

प्रधान मंत्री इस सदन को और देश को विश्वास में लें और बतलायें कि रूस के साथ उन की क्या बातचीत चल रही है। रूस मित्रता का आश्वासन दे रहा है, और उन आश्वासनों को, अगर रूस उन के बारे में ईमानदार है तो, एक संधि का रूप दिया जा सकता है। क्या रूस भारत के साथ इस तरह की एक विधिवत सन्धि करने के लिये तैयार है जिस के अन्दर जो भी आश्वासन हमें दिये जा रहे हैं, भविष्य में हमारे समर्थन के जो वादे किये जा रहे हैं, उन को लिपिबद्ध किया जा सके? क्या

रूस हम को इस तरह का वचन देने के लिये तैयार है ?

दूसरी बात यह कि क्या सरकार असं-दिग्ध शब्दों में यह घोषणा करने के लिये तैयार है कि चाहे गंगाजल का सवाल हो, चाहे फरक्का के बैराज का, चाहे काश्मीर का सवाल हो, किसी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दबाव में वह नहीं आयेगी और वह कोई ऐसा निर्णय नहीं करेगी जो भारत की प्रतिष्ठा और भारत के हितों को आंच डालने वाला हो ? अंतिम बात हमें अपनी विदेश नीति का पुनर्मूल्यांकन करना होगा मैं पुनर्मूल्यांकन करने की बात कह रहा हूँ। एक जगह लात खा कर हम दूसरी जगह लात सहलाने के लिये नहीं जा सकते। मैंने अमरीका की बात कही। मैं उन लोगों से भी सहमत नहीं हूँ जो कहते हैं कि हमें तिनका दबा कर पीकिंग के सामने खड़े हो जाना चाहिये। हमारी नीति लचीली होनी चाहिये, हमारी नीति यथार्थवादी होनी चाहिये। रूस के निर्णय ने नये रास्ते हमारे सामने खोल दिये। हम पूर्व योरप की तरफ देख सकते हैं। दक्षिणी पूर्वी एशिया से अपने सम्बन्ध बढ़ा सकते हैं। आज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति विश्व को लेकर उतनी नहीं चलती जितनी क्षेत्रों को लेकर चलती है। जिस क्षेत्र में हम लोग हैं और जिस के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध जुड़े हैं उन क्षेत्रों के साथ, अलग अलग देशों के साथ अलग अलग हितों के आधार पर, व्यापक रूप से अपने हितों का संरक्षण करते हुए अगर हम विदेश नीति का पुन-निर्धारण कर सके और उसे अमल में लाने के तन्त्र को बदल सकें तो रूस के निर्णय से भी इस देश को एक ऐसी चोट लग सकती है जो निराशा पैदा न करे, मगर भविष्य के लिये नये संकल्प को जगाये। यह संकल्प देश में जगाया जा सकता है, मगर यह सरकार इस संकल्प को नहीं जगा सकती। यह इस

सरकार के बूते का रोग नहीं है। नए संकल्प को जगाने के लिये नई सरकार जरूरी है। इसी लिये मैं निन्दा के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन कर रहा हूँ।

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Gonda): I am rather unhappy that on this important occasion we are discussing this subject, which is fraught with grave seriousness in this country, through an adjournment motion....

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Government is responsible for that.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: I am not apportioning the blame now. I had hoped that some formula would be evolved which would make it possible for the largest number of members of this House, if not all, to stand together and tell the world that we are united in the face of such a threat.... (Interruptions)

SHRI M. L. SONDHY (New Delhi): Speak the truth. Remember what Gandhiji said. Remember what Acharya Kripalani said.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: I always remember that Acharya Kripalani is a very responsible member of this House and I am quite sure that he will raise his voice for what is right for the country.

I do not want this debate to descend into a debate of criticism and counter-criticism of parties. This is a time when we should rise above parties because the threat is to the country.

Let us see whether this situation has arisen out of our creation. This situation has arisen because Russia thought it fit to give arms aid to Pakistan. It is not a creation of the Government. We must accept that. Even if any blame has to be apportioned to the Government, you can say that the Government should have recognised the shift in Russia's policy

when the shift started and acquainted and educated the country that this change was coming. But when the change comes suddenly, it becomes a jolt. We feel let down as a felt let down in the case of China. We were sentimentally friendly towards China; we had goodwill for China, and when China tried to stab us in the back, we felt completely let down. Government should guard against it. Because, after all, Government does not function in the air; Government functions on the strength of the people. The Prime Minister in her statement has said: 'let us face it with the full support of the united people'. That is the right attitude. Let us face it with the support of the united parties and united people. You can face it with the full support of the united people, only if people are taken into confidence in proper time. Everything cannot be told to the public, but they should be taken into confidence and told as to where our country is going, what is the threat that looms large before us. If there is any fault of the Government, then certainly Government should be held responsible for this but the situation was not created by the Government; this has been created because of the shift in Russia's policy. Now at this juncture what do we find? We find that Pakistan is in a very happy position; Pakistan is being supported by the U.S.A., by the U.S.S.R. and by China whereas we feel that after all these years we have no friends. We have some friends no doubt but those friends are also partial friends....

AN HON. MEMBER: Dubious.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: I do not want to use the word 'dubious'. That the Russian position was shifting cannot be denied. Russia started with a position of unreserved support to India's position vis-a-vis Kashmir. In the Security Council we had the support of Russian veto. We are grateful to them for that. The USA and the UK never held the same attitude vis-a-vis Pakistan and India as Russia did. Please remember that

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

when Mr. Khrushchev came here, in his Press Conference in Srinagar, in his usual flamboyant manner, he said: 'if any one attacks India, specially Kashmir, all that you have to do is to stand on the mountains of Kashmir and beckon to us, your friends'. This is what Mr. Khrushchev said. From that position, they have now moved very far. Why are we feeling shocked or why do we feel this as a jolt? If you get a hit from a quarter from which you expected, it would not be a shock, it would not be a surprise, but if you get a hit from the quarter which you considered as a friend then it comes as a shock. Russia was friend to us. Now there has been a shift. This shift is not of recent occurrence. In 1964 in the Security Council, over the Kashmir issue, Russia did not support the finality of Kashmir's accession to India which it had done before. But it emphasised that direct negotiations should take place between India and Pakistan.

Then during the Tashkent conference, it was clear to anybody who had eyes to see that there was a reappraisal of Russia's policy. Russia had adopted a policy of studied neutrality. This agreement engineered by Russia did not do any great favour to us. We had to give back some of the most important strategic places such as Haji Pir, Kargil and others. I know what the military feel about it. I know how many valuable young lives were sacrificed to gain those points. And all those points now pose a danger and threat to us. We just gave them away because we wanted peace.

All this should have indicated to us that there was the beginning of a serious shift in Russia's policy. On top of this has come the supply of Soviet arms to Pakistan. This is a military threat. What is its full significance? Today the Prime Minister told us that we do not know what is the nature of the arms being supplied or the quantum thereof. May be she knows, but does not want to disclose--advisedly. But I would stress that the threat to us is not merely in terms of

the quantum or the quality of the arms. There is also another threat. Russia is supplying arms to Pakistan. We have also taken a lot of arms from Russia. Intentionally or otherwise, there is a risk of divulgence of military secrets with regard to the range, capacity and numerical strength of the supplies we have received from Russia.

This arms supply has also its political repercussions. What are they? We now see that Russia is very anxious to placate Pakistan. That explodes our assumption that Russia shares our analysis of the military and political situation as between India on the one side and Pakistan and China on the other. Our stand was that the real confrontation is between India and China, and our friends who wanted balance, peace and stability in this area should appreciate our position and help us. We thought Russia understood this position of ours and subscribed to this stand or theory of ours. We had assured Pakistan through the World Bank that we do not want to fight Pakistan unless we are attacked. Therefore, we thought that Russia understood our position and supported us. But now we know they do not share our views in this respect. We are told that in the whole world there is a shift, the blocs are breaking and each country is trying to do the best it can for itself. Very rightly; there is nothing wrong in it.

Why is there a shift in Russia's policy? It is because Pakistan is nearer to Russia's borders than India. Then as a *quid-pro-quo* to the winding up of the US espionage base near Peshawar, Russia want to help Pakistan. There is a temptation on the part of Russia to help Pakistan and wean her away from U.S.A. and China. Here also Russia's policy towards China comes in. Russia wants to contain China. She wants to hem in China from all sides—Pakistan, India, Burma, Thailand and so on. Pakistan, Burma, Thailand—all these countries have to take a particular stand, so that China can be contained.

In this grand strategy of containing China, a small think like the rights and wrongs of Indo-Pakistan relationship has to be overlooked. But, as one of the members said, if we are anxious to retain the friendship of Russia, I am sure Russia also should be equally anxious to retain our friendship. If they are anxious to retain this friendship, they should not do anything which hurts us so grievously. We feel that this arms deal is certainly going to hurt us grievously. Therefore, Russia should find a way to retain the friendship of both India and Pakistan if they so desire.

The question is: what should Government do to counter the influence of Pakistan? There are very few options before us, I do not want to spell them out, they are obvious to all, but if we had started to work it out earlier, perhaps we might have had greater manoeuvrability, we might have been able to adjust our position in a better way. In foreign policy, there is no position of rigidity. One can never say: once a friend, always a friend. We cannot follow a policy of *bhai bhai* eternally; we followed it and to our detriment we have seen how that policy in one moment was blown up by China. Therefore, our policy should be one of constant appraisal, reappraisal of the situation and of making changes. These are the requirements.

After all, the foreign policy of any country is motivated by self-interest. It is the most important thing. I hope our foreign policy also will be infused by that outlook of primary importance should be India's self-interest, India should be safe-guarded and strengthened. I do not wish to expand on this.

I want to say just a few words about the joint communique. This morning Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha also tried to express her distress over the joint communique that was recently issued by our President and the President of Soviet Union. First of all

there is the timing of the announcement of the arms deal. Should it have been made now? After all the President was not going all of a sudden on a private visit. It was known that the highest dignitary of this country was going and preparations had been made weeks and months ahead. could not this announcement have been deferred a little? Anyway, when it was made, we were put in a very awkward position, whether to accept, to cancel or postpone this visit. What were we to do? Whichever step we took, it was embarrassing. However, finally the President decided to go there and certainly he had to face a very embarrassing situation. On top of this, let us scrutinise the joint communique. The stand of the communique is that the two countries on a number of international problems hold identical or very close views therefore, it has unable them to cooperate effectively and constructively in the international arena in preventing war. This is the basic stand. This was issued against the immediate background of the arms aid to Pakistan! I think it was almost farcical. I would like to ask whether their arms aid has helped to enhance the peaceful atmosphere in the sub-continent or initiated a cold war atmosphere. In fact, the Prime Minister in her statement was very unhappy and told us in what strong terms she has written to Soviet Russia. She said that their action will not help peace, rather it will create a cold war situation. In fact, it has created a situation of cold war, because a few days before this, a statement was issued by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in which there is blustering and sabrerattling, and in fact it has been growing since then.

Another thing which has hurt us most is this. In an effort to equalise Pakistan and India, in the statement they have said that "the Soviet side appreciates the mutual efforts made by both sides for normalising Indo-Pakistan relations." I put a very big question mark over "mutual efforts".

SHRI NAMBIAR: It is the Tashkent spirit.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: Tashkent spirit is not unilateral; it is mutual. There are two sides to that spirit. Not only do we feel that Pakistan is not helping to implement the Tashkent agreement in the spirit in which it should have been; they have been very obstructionist; even the wounds inflicted in 1965 have not yet healed. For instance, communication by air is still suspended. The step by step approach by which we desired to settle the disputes between India and Pakistan has been rejected by them; they do not want to look at it and a new dispute has been created—the dispute about the Farakka barrage. To add insult to injury, we have received gratuitous advice that we should refer this to an international commission. I say that there is sufficient reason for India to feel agitated. I do not say that we should straightaway start a fight with them. They are our old friends and if they take a step which hurts us and goes against our interests, we have every right to tell them that all these years we had been good friends; now if you want to change your policy, please adjust your policy in such a way that at least it does not go against us.

I felt deeply humiliated that such a statement was signed. I do not know who advised the President because this joint communique means that the President also perhaps holds these views. I am sure that even if the President holds these views, India does not. I am sure that people in India do not feel that way about the "mutual efforts at normalisation"; whatever we may do, the efforts from Pakistan were half-hearted and are not worth mentioning. Therefore, there is reason for us to feel agitated and concerned. In the ultimate analysis we should try our level best to be self-reliant, strong and united to be able to face whatever threats come. I would, therefore, appeal to my

friends; please do not make political capital out of this situation; this is not the time for an adjournment motion; let this motion be withdrawn; let us all sit together and consider how at this juncture we can strengthen our country and help the Government to meet the situation... (Interruptions.)

MR. SPEAKER: Every speaker is exceeding the time limit; that means it will take a long time for us to complete this business. I should appeal to Members to avoid repetition and confine themselves to ten minutes so that one or two more speakers and also a Member from the independent could be given a chance.

SHRI MANOHARAN (Madras North): The country is rightly agitated over the issue that is before the House and the leaders of Parties have expressed their concern, anxiety, apprehensions and misgivings regarding the reported deal that is to be finalised between Russia and Pakistan. I am happy that none of the speakers have so far introduced unnecessary emotion or criticisms which would strain relations between India and Russia. For the past twenty years we have been asserting that Russia was a good friend of ours and one of the Cabinet Ministers who visited Russia very recently thought it fit to say over a cup of tea or something that Russia was our friend....

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that something?

SHRI MANOHARAN: We are deeply indebted to Russia on so many grounds; let us not ignore that.

In the field of technology, the vital field of defence, steel, oil, fertilisers and all, the amount of help or the quantum of help given by Soviet Russia can never be minimised and can never be forgotten. In the international context, no nation can claim isolation, as a sort of interdependence is always there. But my quarrel is, what right have we got politically or constitutionally or otherwise, to ask

Russia that she cannot give arms aid to Pakistan. It is perfectly within their jurisdiction.

But my basic question is this. For the past 20 years, Russia has been a very good friend of yours. Now, certainly the same good old friend has become our enemy No. 1. How? Who is responsible for that? Whether Russia is our enemy or whether we have to consider her otherwise, we are inclined to suspect the *bona fides* of Russia and the leaders of Russia. Why? Who is responsible for creating this sort of tension in the relations between Russia and the Government of India? I want to categorically put the question to the Government of India. We have got—by that I am convinced and the entire nation is convinced—a special knack of converting our good friends into enemies in no time. But for the past 20 years, if you take the record and if you take stock of the position of our country, you can readily understand that we have been losing our friends instead of gaining them. For the past so many years, Pakistan has been in a position to gain the friendship of countries all over the world. How Pakistan was able to do that and why we are not like that is a matter to be considered. Pakistan was able to get arms from China; she was able to get arms from America and very recently she was able to get arms from Russia, whereas we are losing friend all over the world. Is it simply because Russia has different designs so far as this sub-continent is concerned or is it a classic example of the scandalous collapse of your diplomacy? So far as I am concerned, I am convinced that it is nothing but the failure of our diplomacy in all fronts. We failed miserably in that. That creates complications and creates troubles and as a result Russia has its own shift.

Very recently, in the morning, the Prime Minister gave a statement which according to me is not all clear. On the contrary, it is vague. I was told by some that diplomacy means vagueness. In that way, I think the Prime

Minister is very diplomatic in telling us all this. Here is a sentence from her statement; she has rightly said it but wrongly followed:

“Every nation, whether member of a block or not, is trying to assert its own individuality in the conduct of its policies. The USA and the Soviet Union, conscious of the need to reduce the danger of a direct clash between them, are evidently reshaping their policies in accordance with the changing conditions.”

While this has been admitted by the Prime Minister that even Russia and the United States of America are constantly changing their external policies or the foreign policies according to the developments and events of the country, the question is whether we have done or have been doing or intend doing in the future anything regarding our foreign policy. The non-aligned policy is all right. But for all practical purposes, we have aligned ourselves with some blocs or countries. Non-alignment is not at all practised by the Government of India. What is our non-alignment policy today needs a re-definition and the foreign policy needs re-orientation.

Regarding this rift I want to say something. The entire country has been kept in darkness; whether it is by the Prime Minister or the Government, I do not know. But the day before yesterday or yesterday, the Deputy Prime Minister of this country has rightly pointed out that we are not worried about the quantum of weapons to be supplied by Pakistan. He has said it very correctly. It has been reported in the press that “Mr. Morarji Desai added an even sterner note by pointing out that what was important was not the quantum of arms given to Pakistan but the distinct shift in the Soviet attitude.” He has agreed that the shift took place, but the Prime Minister is not in a mood to agree that the shift took place. As Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani

[Shri Manoharan]

pointed out, the shift took place just two years back. When the Tashkent talks were on this shift took place. Two complete years were in the hands of the Government. We have got diplomatic missions abroad. We have got our Ministry of External Affairs here. We have got our personnel here. We have got our intelligence. I want to know whether these people have rightly informed the Prime Minister of the developments gradually taking place in the attitude of the Government of Russia and the shift which is gradually developing in the thinking of the Russian leaders. So I demand a probe into the affairs of the Ministry of External Affairs and our diplomatic missions working abroad. Our diplomatic missions working abroad are thoroughly incompetent as has been evidenced today.

So far as our diplomatic mission in Russia is concerned, they mislead the Prime Minister. They misguided the country. They were not able to understand, probe and study the mental reactions of the leaders of Soviet Russia. The net result is that we are not in a position to find out what is the true attitude of the Government of Russia. Even the Prime Minister was not able to say what is going on, whether the deal has been finalised. She says:

"We have to face this development as it presents itself. We do not know whether the Soviet Union has yet formalised an agreement with Pakistan for the supply of arms, nor do we have indications of the quantum or character of these arms or the terms and conditions of their delivery."

So what I request the Government of India is this. In case you feel that your diplomacy is a failure—it is a failure and a thorough failure—I request you to abolish all diplomatic missions abroad and have some people who know the job. It has been proved here that your diplomatic mission in Moscow believed the expectations of the people of India. Therefore, secondly, we must have a probe re-

garding the failure of diplomacy on the part of our mission working in Moscow. Thirdly, let us not unnecessarily introduce passion over this matter. As the Prime Minister said, there is no formalisation yet, no indication yet of the quantum etc. So we have got enough time to study the matter.

We can ask the Government of Russia to reconsider this issue. Shri Vajpayee was very strong, as usual, and he has been very critical. But I want to ask him one question. If we request the Government of Russia not to give arms to Pakistan so many reasons might be advanced by them and they might say that they have decided to give arms to Pakistan. What are you going to do then? Do you mean to say we can declare war on Russia? It is an impossibility. What I say is, let us face facts and realities. We can request the Government of Russia. Shri Morarji Desai has correctly said that we can ask the Government of Soviet Russia not to do this. In case the Government of Russia does this, it is unfortunate but it is perfectly within their reach. We can only draw the attention of the Government of Russia saying that the people are terribly agitated. Beyond that I doubt very much whether we can do anything. So let us not utter anything here which prejudice the Government of Russia. Let us not say anything which strains the relations between the Government of India and Russia. Let us at least learn from this incident. Let me ask the Government to reconsider its policies. This incident should be an eye-opener to the Government of India. Let us stand on our own legs. Let us build a vigorous India on those lines instead of cringing and crawling to countries all over the world not only for arms, not only for ammunition, not only for money and everything else. Let us create a healthy condition in this country.

I accuse the Government for whole bungling during the past twenty years. Because of your bungling, you have

muddied the whole lot. That is the exact reason why we are compelled to face such a kind of serious situation in this country. So many people have said that it is humiliating. Of course, it is humiliating. So many people have said it is painful. Naturally, it is painful. Beyond that, I can tell you that our national honour is at stake. So, I would request our Prime Minister, who is very reasonable, to see that non-alignment is re-defined. I would say to the Prime Minister on behalf of my party this much, that the foreign policy of your government requires reorientation. If you would be able to do something on these two points, then you can project our image sky high. On the other hand, if we follow the so-called policies, the policies of vacillation and oscillation, policies which lack dynamism, those policies which we have followed for the past twenty years. I am sure this country's honour will be in the mud.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, after listening to the hon. friends from the opposition, I was thinking whether we are really talking about shaping the foreign policy of India or the foreign policy of the world. because, all the exercises that have been made, gives the impression that we are controlling the entire complexes of the world international relationship. There was a lot of substance, I am not denying it, in what Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has said and a lot of substance in what Shri Manoharan was saying, that we should behave with dignity and also not try to over-act so that the relationship which we have built up with Russia for a long time would not be destroyed at the spur of the moment. There was also some, only some, content and wisdom in Shri Mody's argument that we have to be self-reliant—I would again emphasize only some, because when he was speaking I was thinking whether he was sleeping for the last twenty years and has just woken up to see, that non-alignment and

alignment policy and the complexes of the international relationship of 20 years, have been operating in the same context and in the same relationship with every country of the world. He talks of non-alignment in relation to alignment. Probably he does not realise—he should have realised it, because he is a very intelligent member; he is well-read; he has a very good mastery of the English language and I am sure he must be reading all the good newspapers in the world—and it is surprising to hear from him that non-alignment and alignment can be interchangeable international situations and that tomorrow this Parliament can really rise up from the sleep and immediately switch over, like the gear of a motor car from the third to second or first gear, from non-alignment to alignment because it is such an easy formula in the international relationship. When I heard this I was reminded of a song in a French film. Of course I am not singing it; I am only quoting it.

SHRI PILOO MODY: What a shame!

MR. SPEAKER: She should conclude in ten minutes.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Sir, I have worked so hard to prepare this. I would be grateful if you will give me at least 15 minutes.

Maurice Chevalier was singing a song in one of the American films. The wording of the song was: "my business is my business and your business is my business." Of all persons, Shri Mody, who is generally gentle in his behaviour—I find him very restrained and very reserved in his remarks—he is saying in this Parliament, talking to the eyes and ears of the world that this country's business is, of course, this country's business; but the entire world's business is also this country's business. This is not the way we can really deal with international relations.

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

The opposition has built up the argument about the inflexibility of our foreign policy. Shri Vajpayee was arguing very cogently that it is a difficult problem, with China, America and many other countries of the world on the side of Pakistan, and now the Soviet Union. He said that there has been a very great rigidity in our foreign policy and there has been little flexibility in our foreign policy. But I would like to ask hon. Members who are sitting to my right: Is it only the Government which is responsible for this rigidity in the foreign policy? Though the Government has been to blame, the Opposition also has been equally to blame for building up a rigidity in the Indian foreign Policy.

We build up our foreign policy on reaction. We always try to overdo it. I have been in this Parliament for the last 16—17 years and I have seen that whenever international affairs debate goes on, we indulge in historical perspective and talk of the mistakes we committed. Every country has committed mistakes in international affairs. Is not Russia committing some mistake today which is very visible to us? But I would not go into that. I would not talk about it as Shri Mody was talking as to what Russia is doing or is not doing. We are concerned about our own problem. We have committed some mistakes in the past. I have no inhibition in saying so.

It is only people who consider themselves too wise, like Shri Tapuriah, who never realise whether they committed any mistake. I am quite honest with myself and I have the courage to say that our Party and our Government has committed some mistakes in the past. But the Opposition has committed more mistakes in the past; and the charge that can be levied against the Opposition is that they have never provided any correctives or any solution to the problem like evolving a national entity in foreign affairs. They have always

played politics in the foreign affairs debates. That is how our foreign policy has been a policy of reaction. The Government reacts because the Opposition Members sitting here act in a vociferous manner. We saw this morning—I am not defending the Prime Minister—when she was making such an important statement on the floor of this House, as soon as she started answering supplementaries there was so much of interruption and interference in the argument. There might be a very embarrassing situation for the country. We have to face that situation with courage, conviction and dignity. But there was so much of interruption..... (*Interruption*).

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: So what?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Shri Sondhi must realise that he might be talking like this in a young woman's company but this is not the place where young women (*Interruption*).

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: This is a serious matter and you are making an insinuation. Interruptions are basic; they are parliamentary..... (*Interruption*).

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: We are quite used to Shri Sondhi's unmusical voice and his demonstrations..... (*Interruption*). That is not going to serve any purpose in this foreign policy debate. It will be better for his party if he keeps quiet.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Thank you, my grandmother.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: We are seeing right now how hon. Members opposite, with all the wisdom at their command of which a demonstration has been made right now, are showing this kind of wisdom of interrupting at the wrong moment as Shri Sondhi is doing. But I have no quarrel with him.

The argument I was building was, that we are conditioning our foreign policy to reactions. We have a reaction to any particular situation and try to condition our foreign policy to that reaction. In that process we overact to such an extent that we develop rigidity.

Even today, whatever may have happened in this particular situation, are we not tying the hands of the Government or—let us forget the Government for the time being—of the country with this kind of condemnatory utterances, in having flexibility in talks or discussions even with Soviet Russia?

Shri Mody said that we are getting all obsolete things from Russia. He spoke of the rupee payment and said that the economic structure is being built up in a wrong manner because of the Russian and eastern European countries' aid. I would like to ask Shri Mody—I know a little bit about that—whether his friends are not running from pillar to post, to the Commerce Ministry, to the Industries Ministry, to the Finance Ministry, to get all that aid and utilise it for their own purposes. Let the Government come out with an account of the aid received from East European countries as well as of the Soviet aid. I would like to know how much of it has gone to help Mr. Mody and his friends who run to New Delhi every now and then to get it.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PILOO MODY: I would like to know....

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I think, Mr. Mody has left everything but not chivalry. Let him sit down and after I finish let him ask . . .

SHRI PILOO MODY: How many of my friends are your friends?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: All your friends are my friends. But I do not deny East European aid. I have no inhibition in

accepting them. But I would certainly like to know that.

We talk of self-reliance. The hon. Members, sitting on my right, have argued how we can develop self-reliance in this country. Mr. Vajpayee, very cogently, said we have to evolve our foreign policy. I do accept that we have to evolve our foreign policy. The evolution of our foreign policy takes place today also in a certain changed context. Today, the entire world,—the international relationship, is undergoing a process of change and, therefore, we also can evolve our foreign policy according to the conditions prevailing in the international world. This is the time when we should have sat down coolly and tried to argue cogently what is the basis of Soviet aid to Pakistan.

Why has this happened? It is a big phenomenon. We cannot rule it out by creating heat in Parliament. This is a big issue of the international relationship. Why has there been so much change? Mr. Piloo Mody was talking about alignment. He has forgotten that America is having worst relationship with China and yet America is pleading China's case and blaming us, telling us "You have closed your doors to China and you refuse to talk to China." (*Interruption*) Can the hon. Members opposite tell us honestly and sincerely that they have helped us in opening the doors to China and in breaking the rigid attitude which we have built up for ourselves against China?

Let us take Pakistan. Pakistan was very anti-Soviet and Soviet Union was anti-Pakistan. If Soviet Union has been building up relationship with Pakistan for the last two or three years, it is not one way traffic. Pakistan has been trying to build up relationship for the last three or four years with Soviet Union. Pakistan succeeded in building up relationship with China though at that time China was inimical to the entire western bloc, as much as it was inimical to us.

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

In fact, it was less inimical to us and it was more inimical to Pakistan and all the military blocs like Iran, Turkey, SEATO, CENTO and America, and yet Pakistan exercised flexibility and the public opinion in Pakistan, like the hon. Members on the right, never opposed that.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: There is no public opinion there. (*Interruption*)

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI

SINHA: Do you want that we should reduce ourselves to that extent? Pleas stop interrupting me.

Sir, what I was trying to say was that when Pakistan started building up its relationship with China, nothing obstructed the steps of Pakistan. When Pakistan decided to give the base to American aircraft and build up a very strong American base in Peshawar, it was very much anti-Soviet because the base was entirely built up for fighting the Soviet forces and its allies. But when Pakistan decided to do away with that base as we know from the newspapers that the base is going to be demolished,—nobody opposed that move in Pakistan. That is how Pakistan gets flexibility in its foreign policy.

Here, whenever anything has happened, whenever any effort has been made by the Government to open the door for talks even in regard to Kachchativu, it is impossible for this Parliament to exercise a sober judgment on Kachchativu because Opposition Members made it impossible for us to talk to Ceylon. That is a kind of rigidity we bring about in our foreign policy.

These are the reasons why rigidity has been built up in regard to our foreign policy. (*Interruption*) This is not a matter on which interruptions and counter-interruptions should go on. It is a matter on which cool thinking is required. I want to know whether they share the national anxiety or whether they have to decide

this matter on the basis of the compulsions of political arithmetic, counting numbers as to how many votes they will get in the shape of propaganda value of any political party.

MR. SPEAKER: She should now sit down. I have rung the bell three times.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI
SINHA: My time was taken away by so many interruptions. I have one or two points to make....

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. Her time is over.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI
SINHA: I am not a person who disobeys you. I have to say something very important to the Government. I will take only two minutes. I would like to ask one or two questions.

MR. SPEAKER: If I made an exception in her case. I would get into trouble. I would, therefore, request her to sit down.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI
SINHA: I would request my party members to give me time. I have to make two or three important points. I would like to remind the Government of.....

MR. SPEAKER: I hope, the party members agree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Nobody agrees. I do not have the permission. The other members have to be called. They are not prepared to forgo their time. The hon. Member's time is over. She will please resume her seat.

Mr. Dange.

SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Central South): The question that we are debating as every one has said, is of great national importance and it is not of importance only to one particular party this side or that side. It is a serious situation no doubt as it

is put forward by a certain line of argument. The argument is this: Pakistan has committed aggression against India three times; it got arms once from America and once from China; and now the Soviet Union, which was not so long supporting Pakistan in any of its adventures, is giving arms to Pakistan. So, would it not be correct to conclude like this? Twice she used the arms given by China and by America against us and now when the third power gives arms to Pakistan, will they not be used against India? If they are going to be used according to that logic, then what should this country do? Naturally if that logic were accepted, what this country can do is what some of our members on this side are proposing to do. What they are proposing to do is to draw the conclusion that Soviet-Indian friendship has cracked: Soviet Russia is now more or less either neutral in its friendship towards us or is in an inimical position and, therefore, let us now turn our face back to somebody else.

17 hrs.

The first stage would be to carry out a hysterical propaganda against the Soviet Union, even bringing in questions of Czechoslovakia which are not relevant in this debate, even bringing in questions of Hungary which also are equally irrelevant . . . (*interruptions*). I understand Czechoslovakia. I am quite prepared to discuss it. Let us have a debate on that.

So I am just trying to understand the logic of those who want that Soviet-Indian friendship should now be taken as ended. Therefore, two conclusions are provided by those speakers. One is: now go somewhere else, in some other direction. The other solution proposed is: take to self-reliance. If as a result of this development, the slogan of self-reliance is to be followed more consistently, I am all for it. But those who are proposing self-reliance now in this debate on the question of arms are

the very forces who are objecting, to, obstructing and sabotaging self-reliance.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Who are they?

SHRI S. A. DANGE: Therefore, though the situation is such that it should cause concern to every Party, including the Communist Party of India, as regards the implications of this development, yet the solutions proposed are not common between us and the Opposition parties of other Groups; nor are the solutions quite common between us and the Congress Party either, though generally, on this question, the Congress Party has taken more or less a sober attitude, and the content of the Prime Minister's statement is not such as would lead to a posture of destroying the friendship between the Soviet Union and India. If that is the main content, we are all for it.

That is why our Party did not support the the adjournment motion because it is directed against the single question—questioning the friendship between the Soviet Union and India and proposing solutions which are no longer based on that friendship. That does not mean that we support all that Government were doing in regard to non-alignment, in regard to carrying out in practice the policy of non-alignment. That was why when the Prime Minister said that all our acts were vindicated, I was just smiling.

SHRI PILOO MODY: So was she.

SHRI S. A. DANGE: That non-alignment, though on the whole it is non-alignment, yet had sometimes some funny characteristics. For example you cut off trade with North Vietnam but allow the Houses of Mody's and Tatas to export trucks to South Vietnam (*Interruptions*). Mody has one family member in the Jamshedpur and TELCO concern—I know that.

[Shri S. A. Dange]

So we do not approve of this sort of double-dealing which is practised on that side and this side including the Mody House. We want to condemn it. That was why I was smiling about the claim made of vindication of non-alignment.

What is the next position we have to take? It is that Soviet-Indian friendship continues. The Soviet Union has made India more or less self-sufficient in lines for which we were begging many other countries, including the patrons of the Mody Houses. The Americans refused to give those things to us. It was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who from 1948 to 1954 refused to carry out a consistent non-alignment policy and tried his best to get help from America. When he failed in that, he went to the Soviet Union. It was not the Soviet Union which was trying to enter Indian economy or the Indian military field or Indian technique or anything else. The Soviet Union said: wherever there is a country which has got itself liberated or secured independence, we are there to help it. It was Lenin who in 1908 demanded when Lokmanya Tilak was sentenced and there was a strike in Bombay, that the British system should be destroyed and India should get independence. It was Molotov who in 1946 supported India's case for independence in the UN while all the other gentry were silent including the House of Modys and their supporters.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not in 1942 (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. A. DANGE: Therefore, the Soviet Union had all along stood for the independence of all colonial countries, of all dependent territories and all people who aspired for their independent development.

Now who developed oil technology in India? Those gentlemen who had come here, who had built stolen capacity in the Bombay refineries—I know what they are doing. I am not going into those details and get side-tracked. But the junk that Shri Mody talked

about is the junk of his family and his concern, not the junk of the Soviets. Soviet technology has been the cheapest and the best we have obtained from anywhere. Let this position be realised by those who talk about it. We are not debating the question of economics and trade and all that, but then there was sense in it. Taking advantage of this position now Mr. Mody began to talk of trade. Are we concerned with the security of the country or with trade? For him it is trade that matters. All these gentlemen here demanded, "I want no rouble trade, I want dollar trade. I want equivalence between the rupee and the rouble". So, the nation does not matter. The question of supplies of arms to Pakistan is not in debate but the dollar and rupee and trade is in question for these gentlemen.

They do not want rupee trade. The Soviet Union buys what is offered in exchange for what it gives, but they want a trading partner who demands hard gold, and when Mr. Morarji Desai fails to find it and he sheds tears, they clap because of the super profits they make out of it. Hence this attack on Soviet friendship. It is not from anxiety for India's security. They know what it is.

Who has given MIGs, which power? The Americans are ready to sell you squadrons of planes. But do they give factories to manufacture those aeroplanes? The Soviet Union has given not only squadrons but factories to make them. It is the Defence Ministry which has failed to set up the MIG factory and make India self-sufficient. Why have they failed? The Defence Ministry some years back went and negotiated arms supplies with the Soviet Union. They offered everything but our people went to England for a submarine. The British showed them a postcard picture of their submarine and asked them to carry it. When the Defence Ministry delegation was offered a real submarine by the Russians, they wired to the government of India whether they can buy. What was the reply?

Who wants self-respect, self-reliance, who wants the army and strength of India to be built up? A ban was put on the buying of the submarine until Pakistan attacked, and when we found that Pakistan had a submarine and we did not, these gentlemen agreed: the British and the Americans do not give, this is the only fellow left, so let us get from him. Four submarines were asked for. Naturally our security, our defence, our economy got linked with the best instruments which can be manufactured on this soil. That is the main point.

So, Soviet-Indian friendship endures. It has been more solid than the friendship of many other countries who pretended to be friends. Shall we destroy that? Has anybody demanded it? Directly no, indirectly yes. Our party stands for the continuation of Soviet-Indian friendship.

AN HON. MEMBER: It has to stand.

SHRI DANGE: I am very glad. Let there be a resolution that this House unanimously stands for Soviet friendship. Will you pass it? No. That preamble is not there, your preamble is "what of my trade and the profit I am making."

Then, why has this happened? Should we feel concerned about it? We should. Should we ask them why this has happened? We need not ask them. It is very plain. The Soviet Union, after the war, was being girdled by a series of stations built around their borders from Turkey and Iran to Pakistan. The U-2 was flown from Peshawar and we have not heard the knights of non-alignment and alignment protesting against it. If Mr. Mody had been given a seat, he would have liked to fly in that U-2 over the USSR. At that time nobody protested. Then things began to happen. The American imperialists lost all their prestige, military, political, economic; little Vietnam shattered the whole thing and ultimately, instead of being able to shoot the Vietnamese demo-

cratic Americans began shooting their Presidents. Wonderful 'American way of life'. Follow their camp and ask for that friendship' When that American prestige was destroyed, these countries began to waver in their attitude to the Soviet Union. Turkey said "we are also your friends", Iran said "we are also your friends". Pakistan said "we are also your friends". Should the Soviet Union say "no, we shall not be friends with you because we are friends with India"? Can we demand that? We cannot. Then what should we do? We have only to see that when the Soviet Union intervenes in Pakistan, it is in favour of peace and peaceful co-existence, it is for their development and does not lead to war. Now this argument is correct. But what guarantee is there? When the American gun was given to Pakistan that gun shot at us. What guarantee is there that when the Soviet gun is given, it will not shoot at us? But there is a difference, not in the guns but in the gun-giver and also in the gun-taker. The Americans always give their guns to foment troubles and civil wars and create enmity between two nations. The Soviet Union tries to bring about friendship between India and Pakistan. All of us want that. But it should not be done at our cost. If something wrong happens in Pakistan, we should feel concerned. I join everybody in expressing concern, even a little unhappiness, as the Prime Minister said. The question is: will this misfire? I do not say it will all prove correct; I do not know. Maybe, Pakistan may 'humbog' Soviet Union also as some of the Parties want us to 'humbog' Soviet Union. The Soviet line may fail; I do not know. If it fails we shall not be the sufferers. Why? Because, as everybody agrees, self-reliance is strength. We are strong enough to beat any offensive by Pakistan we have got enough power and we have shown that power. Where is the need to be panicky about it? Something has happened; it is completely out of our control. I dis-

[Shri S. A. Dange.]

agree on many things with Mr. Vajpayee; our parties are opposed to each other on many points. But I agree with him about self-reliance. I say: think of self reliance and Ranchi. In Ranchi there are wonderful instruments to manufacture weapons for the army and the defence of the country. Will Mr. Vajpayee help in not fomenting Hindu-Muslim riots in Ranchi and obstruct the achievement of the goal of self-reliance there? On Indo-Soviet friendship and self reliance we are all agreed. I do not accuse him of fomenting trouble; I ask him to help in stopping them. I wish to close on this note. The Soviet Union has not changed its policy towards India; it has changed its policy towards Pakistan because Pakistan has first changed its policy towards the Soviet Union. They did not offer to intervene in Tashkent. But we all wanted a settlement and they brought us together. Somebody said that they were equating us with Pakistan. When we signed the Tashkent treaty or any treaty for that matter the countries are treated as equals. Even if one Party to a treaty is Haiti—it may be a small country with just a lakh of people—it is equal with any other country. There is always the position of equality. That does not mean that Pakistan is equal to us in size or importance. But in matters of sovereignty and independence and diplomacy all countries are equal, big or small. So, let us keep up the cool atmosphere. When we agree with the line of approach of the Government, we do not hesitate to say, so because we are not afraid whether votes will come this way or that way; nor are we concerned here with your rupee value or dollar value. We agree with their approach that the Indo-Soviet friendship must continue; it should not be disturbed or broken and that Soviet Union acts this way because it expects that Pakistan might perhaps change by this gesture. It was the Soviet Union which disapproved of Chinese behaviour and it stated that Kashmir was part of India.

SHRI KANWARLAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): What is the present position.

SHRI S. A. DANGE: So long as that position has not changed, it remains. So, on two counts, we are in line with the Government. Pakistan agrees now to develop friendship with the Soviet Union even though China dislikes it. Therefore, there may be some signs of change. Let us hope those signs of change will become real and that Pakistan will find her way towards proper friendship with India and that we shall be relieved of all the anxieties that all sides are expressing in the country.

In the end, we must go forward to the people, not with the line of anti-Sovietism and a hysteria against them, not with the line of fear as if we are frightened now with the few MIGs that they might get, but with the line of self-confidence and a line of self-reliance, which lies in developing the best State-Sector industries that we have got.

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the difficulty in this debate is that whereas all of us are agreed about the seriousness of the situation arising out of Soviet Russia agreeing to sell arms to Pakistan, the way in which we want to show our displeasure or our anxiety is a very different way for different people. Whereas we agree in some parts with everybody who has spoken, it is difficult to agree with a lot that has been said by everybody. And that is where the position becomes difficult. But there is no doubt that this is a very serious situation which we have got to take note of and we have got to see and do things in such a manner that it increases our strength and does not decrease it; that it does not do anything which will weaken us in our relationships with anybody on account of our fault. If others want to break the relationships or weaken them, we need not quarrel with them, but we should not do anything to weaken the relations

in international affairs that we have with other people.

The policy in foreign affairs has come under very serious criticism not for the first time today; this is what I am used to hear at least for the last 12 years in this House so far as I am concerned.

SHRI NATH PAI: Still you do not try to learn or improve.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is not I who have to learn that. It is those who have been parrot-like repeating this who should learn: not myself. If one learns always from parrots, I do not know what will happen to man. That is all that I want to say. Parrots speak very beautifully and sweetly, but it is only imitation, and that is not what we want. We have a fixed policy of non-alignment. There are friends like Shri Piloo Mody who go on saying it is nonsensical. Now he shakes his head but that is what he said when he was speaking. Perhaps he has forgotten it.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Please read my speech; learn to listen also correctly.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I have heard him very carefully and I can say that what he has said about it is stronger than what I have said. Let him see the words. (*Interruption*) I do not wish to waste the time of the House because there are many Members yet to speak and I should not take more time. But this foreign policy, a policy of non-alignment, is a policy which has been accepted by the House also. It is not a policy which has been rejected by the House. It is said that it is weak or it is not properly done. That is what some people say. My hon. friend Shri Dange who spoke just before me was saying things wherein he said that he supports the Government.

But, at the same time, he brings in a criticism that the foreign policy of non-alignment has not remained non-aligned. Why? It is because what

he does not like we do in some matters and when we do some things which happen to fall in line with him then he says we are all right. But what does he do here? Here he was in withering criticism of several of his own comrades here whom he supports on many occasions when it suits him to condemn us, but when it comes only to his philosophy then he is a friend of nobody else except those who believe in that philosophy. I have no quarrel with it. That is natural. But my quarrel with him is this. Why should we have quarrel when I cannot support another philosophy? When I believe deeply in my philosophy, why should he want to say that this is not intelligent and that is intelligent? That is where he misuses his intelligence, and that is why he is mistaken in his philosophy also in my view. But I am not here to tell him that because he is sufficiently grounded in it and nothing will change him. On that score I have no doubt. I do not want him also to do that because it is good to have people like that. That also helps us to think properly. That also helps us to be clear and cultivate strength so that we can meet all kinds of opposition.

About our foreign policy and non-alignment policy nothing has been said how it has gone wrong. I would not say that there has been no weakness at any time in it or at no time one step has been taken that is not wrong. Let me be shown any country or any society which can say that it has carried out everything correctly in what it has believed and what it has professed. While professing, while trying to implement it, there are occasions when factors come in when differences of opinion come in and steps are taken which may not be agreeable to everybody and somebody may call it a mistake and some others may call it a proper thing. Just as my hon. friend, Shri Dange said just now that he welcomes the statement made by the Prime Minister....

AN HON. MEMBER: Not the whole of it.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That is what he said. That is where the whole rub lies. But when I say that I do not also approve of whatever he said except in one part then he will quarrel with me. This is where the whole difficulty comes in. I am more unhappy because on an occasion like this if we could have spoken with one voice it would have strengthened this country very much in the international world and everywhere. But it is not possible to do it. My hon. friends think it is possible to do it, but it is not possible to do so.

What is the slant in all they say. Their slant is not Soviet Russia. Their slant is this Government. That is all that they want to say. If they are sincere in this matter, if we could have been found to do what we want to do, why should there be only a resolution on which they stick out. There can be no unanimous resolution in this House on any matter like this. On any matter like this there will not be any unanimous resolution. I have no doubt about it (*Interruption*). We are expressing our opinion. This opinion is as valid as any resolution. Why is it not valid? Why is it necessary to have a resolution? I do not understand. If all of us speak with one voice, if all of us show our displeasure and say that this is a thing which hurts India, I think it will have far greater value than any resolution. It is not resolutions condemning anybody else that are good in international affairs. I do not think we should use very strong language against anybody. If we use it, it is wrong in my view. It is a failure. If it is against anybody, it is wrong. I would not say it is right.

श्री प्रबुल गनी वार (गुडगाँव) :
 आप तो अपोजीशन के लिए बड़ी सख्त भावाव उठाते हैं। सँगुएज आपकी बड़ी हाई होती है।

[**श्री عبدالغली वार :** آپ تو اپوزیشن کے لئے ہی سخت آواز اٹھاتے

ہوں - لہنگویج آپ کی ہی ہارش
 ہوتی ہے -]

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Let my hon. friend, who speaks like that, at random, at any time he likes, let him show where I have used discourteous remarks against him or against anybody. I have not used any discourteous word against anybody. If I feel strongly, I should be free to express my views. I do not want you to submit to me as I do not like to submit myself to anybody else. When we are talking here, if you say I speak strongly about it, do you mean to say that I should accept whichever or whatever case is put up by the opposition? If it is right, I will certainly accept it. But where it is wrong, I have got to show where it is wrong. Otherwise, my friends will not easily understand it.

श्री प्रबुल गनी वार : तभी तो आपको
 चालेंस परसेंट वोट मिले और हमें ग्राउ
 परसेंट।

[**श्री عبدالغلی وار :** تبھی تو
 آپکو چالیس پرسنٹ ووٹ ملے اور
 ہمیں ساٹھ پرسنٹ -]

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: There are some hon. friends who cannot be repressed or suppressed and I do not want to do that because they are excited. In excitement there is no room for it. I do not want to be excited by him or by anybody else.

When it is said that we should now see that Soviet Russia is unfriendly, I am afraid that would not be a correct appreciation of the situation. It is no doubt true that the giving of arms to Pakistan by Soviet Russia does show a shift in their policy. But that shift you are asking government to have every time. We are told every time that we must go on shifting our policies. That is what you are asking us

to do. And if Soviet Russia shifts for its own interest, and every country is bound to consider its own interest, we cannot quarrel over it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It is against our interest.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That is what I am saying. If it goes against our interest, we must tell them that it goes against our interest, and that is what we are doing, and that is what we have told them already. Before my hon. friends had any idea, our letter was sent to them and they were told in no uncertain terms that this is a thing which will hurt India.

But when it hurts India we have got to consider what we have got to do. I agree that we should be self-reliant, not only on this occasion but at every time. But saying that we should be self-reliant is one thing and being self-reliant immediately is another thing. I would like to know who is self-reliant to that extent in the world. Everybody has got to get something from everybody else. But it must not be obtained at the cost of one's self-respect or at the cost of one's independence. That is what we have got to ensure.

It was said that we condemned USA when they gave arms to Pakistan. That is true. But we did not spoil our relations for that. We have not spoiled our relations with anybody. It is only when Pakistan attacked us, made aggression against us, that we said now there cannot be good relations between India and Pakistan. Even then, we did not try to break up our relations completely, because we want to have good relations with all countries so that ultimately peace is established.

But that does not mean that in order to establish peace we should attack every one, become Don Quixotes and go on waving our words against everybody. That is not the way to get strong. Yes, my hon. friend, Shri Dange would be very happy if we

break up relations with USA. But he would be terribly grieved if we say the same thing about Soviet Russia.

While we are interested in saying nothing against either Soviet Russia or the United States of America, whenever we find it necessary to do so we give our views correctly, as we feel them. It is possible that we may be wrong, but we do try to give it correctly, and fairly to everybody. Sometimes the language may be strong; sometimes it may be soft; that is true.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You are getting older.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Well, I do not know whether my hon. friend will get old at all, because he still remains in the primary stage. I was only saying that when he started this debate, he was not as light as he usually is. He became very serious, very excited and lost his balance. That is perhaps what has happened to him. Otherwise, he would not have done that. He said that obsolete arms were given to us. There is no greater fallacy or no greater untruth than what my hon. friend has said. We are not so stupid here to see that we take junks from other people. Then we would not have won the battle against Pakistan, if we had done that kind of thing. This is a matter on which you have to be careful while making a statement. But there may sometimes be some things which may not be as good or as strong. But that is in relation to all countries and not in relation to only one country.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: He got it mixed up with the British arms.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: We are getting it from all places, not only from one place. If we can get it from various places, can we say that others should not get it from all these places? What right have we to say that? But we certainly have a right to say in this particular matter because of the behaviour of Pakistan during the last

[Shri Morarji Desai]

20 years, because of the manner it has behaved against India. That is what makes it serious.

When we say that there is a shift, the shift is because formerly Soviet Russia and Pakistan had no such close relations. I do not know why; whether it was Pakistan who did not want it because they were fully with the USA, and now that they have also been with China they think that they should be with everybody. That may be the reason. If this is the reason, why should Soviet Russia say that they will not be friends with them. Is it a condition that we can impose on anybody that if they are friends with us they should not be friends with other people? Then, nobody will be friends with us. And in that case how can we be friends both to the USA and Soviet Russia, Rumania, England, France and all people? With all people we try to remain friendly and that is what we should do. But we are certainly entitled to tell them that this is a thing which is not right because it will create difficulties where they will also find themselves in difficulty.

The Americans did it and they told us that those arms would not be used against us. But nobody could prevent it. If that is true of the USA, that would be true also of the USSR. How can anybody prevent another country from using the arms it has when it wants to use them? They may not get it next time from them. That is the only penalty they have to pay. But the world is such that if one country will not sell, another country will sell. It is, therefore, that we are not taking from any country any free arms. We are buying them from other countries because we do not want to mortgage ourselves. I have no doubt that a country, which goes on taking arms as free gift, will rule the day later on. I have no doubt in my mind about whatever may be the case. That is what we have always preserved. How has our foreign policy failed, I do not know.

It was also said by Shri Piloo Mody that our commerce also is very wrong. He wants us to have commerce, because that is his profession.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Correction; I am an architect.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: But he does not want us to have commerce with the Soviet Union because he says that this must be on commercial lines. It is on commercial lines. We are not paying more to the Soviet Union for anything than what we would pay to other people in the world. Wherever we have got to buy a thing only from one country and not from anywhere else, we have to pay something more. That is always there. Even if we buy from America like that, we have to pay a larger price. If something is available only from Soviet Russia, we have to pay a larger price for that. But my hon. friend will get angry when I buy from Soviet Russia and Shri Dange will get angry when I buy from the USA. I have got to steer clear from all these friends who make common cause only for breaking the Congress and not in order to benefit each other. I always wish that they come together and become a compact opposition. But that is a dream which will never be fulfilled.

SHRI PILOO MODY: That is your dream, not ours.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Then, I do not know how he said that nickel is brought at two times the price. I do not know from whence he has got it. I will certainly try to find it out.

SHRI VIRENDRAKUMAR SHAW (Junagadh): M.M.T.C.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali): Shri Dinesh Singh's figures are all wrong.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Do not commit yourself unnecessarily.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: There is not question of committing myself. I am not saying anything about the

price because I do not know anything about it just now. But, as I pointed out before, nickel is a commodity which we are not getting from anywhere. We are finding it difficult to get.

SHRI VIRENDRAKUMAR SHAH:
Canada.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Canada supplies only a certain amount; it does not supply more than that. That is the position everywhere. Even Russia does not supply us more than what they say they will supply. If we can get more from Canada, we will try to get it; but we must get nickel. If my friends can help me, I will give them an address of honour in that matter.

SHRI VIRENDRAKUMAR SHAH:
They are selling it cheaper to other countries and at much higher price to India.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Let my hon. friends get at that very price from any country and I am prepared to take it. What is the use of saying all this? This becomes utter nonsense when things are spoken without context.

Then, an argument was put forward about kerosene that we are buying kerosene from them. Why are we buying kerosene from them. We have got to buy. We are not able to produce sufficient kerosene. My hon. friend does not know that. We are not able to get sufficient kerosene. Our difficulty is that, in order to produce more kerosene we are having more and more petrol which we have got to sell outside. It does not become easy. We are in this process. It is in this matter that we will help more Soviet Russia and Rumania to find oil.

It is not that Soviet Russia has not been friendly with us. It has been friendly with us as other countries have been friendly with us and we have benefited by their friendliness.

We have not submitted to anybody in this matter. We have not bought friendship from anybody. Let me say that. In the international world, the people are friends for mutual benefit, not for obliging anybody. Neither Soviet Union obliges us nor do we oblige Soviet Union. Neither we oblige America nor America obliges us. Nobody obliges in the international world just as here none of you oblige each other.

SHRI NAMBIAR: Are you obliging each other?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Then, Government was challenged that it should declare that it will not submit to any pressure. Government have declared it times without number. In the matter of Farraka Barrage or Ganges waters, Soviet Russia has not told us that we should go to arbitration or we should take anybody as mediator. They have not told us. They only tell us, "Please talk on these matters" because Pakistan must have told them that we are not talking on these matters. We have not given a final reply to Pakistan about the ministerial level talks. This is under consideration. The Russia Government have not suggested arbitration. If they suggest arbitration, we will, certainly, tell them it is not their business to tell us. There is no question of submitting to anybody.

Take the non-proliferation treaty. We have refused to sign it even though both of super powers want us to sign it. We are not going to do it. Even if we do not get anything from them, we will not sign it unless it suits us to sign it.

We get PL 480 from America. But that does not mean that we will submit to any condition because PL 480 is given. But it is not right to say that they are also asking us to submit to any conditions. It will be unfair to tell either USA or Soviet Russia that they are trying to pressurise us. They may try to pressurise us if it suits them. I would not say that. But it

[Shri Morarji Desai]

is upto us not to be pressurised. Let me tell you that as long as this Government is in power, it will never be pressurised. That is all I have got to say.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to go over what has already been said nor do I want to rebut the arguments that our country has been independent of foreign pressure as has been said by the Deputy Prime Minister. I have only one thing to say about this Government. Today, the country is disturbed on what has been done by our friend who declared himself as a friend and whom we considered to be our friend. The people are agitated today and the responsibility is that of this Government which proclaimed times without number, even after the Tashkent Agreement, that there was no change in the policy of Russia and that they considered Russia as a permanent friend of India. It is very well for Morarji Bhai to say that they do not yield to pressure. But I have no doubt that they yielded to pressure when they accepted the Tashkent agreement, and they accepted it against all the promises that had been given to this country and to the Parliament. I say, this was a betrayal of the country. And I say again that it was a betrayal of the country to have referred the Kutch question to an international tribunal, when we had the experience of international tribunals. I say that they should have known this at that time, (Tashkent), but even after that they did not inform the country that the policy of Soviet Union was changing. They sent deputation after deputation to Russia. I say, there was a regular invasion of Indian people, great people, to Soviet Russia during the last two and a half months; not only were there delegations but Minister after Minister, as if they could find no other country, and they invaded Russia! The Chief of the Army went there; then the Commander-in-Chief went.

At what time? It was at the time when the arms were being given....

SHRI NATH PAI: Why is the Minister laughing? The President is the Commander-in-Chief.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: May I tell the Minister that our Commander-in-Chief is our Rashtrapati....

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): He is the Supreme Commander.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Yes; he is the Supreme Commander. I accept the mistake. The Supreme Commander also went there; the other Commander also went; then the Education Minister went; then the Commerce Minister went; then the Industries Minister went; then the Railway Minister went when there was a strike here. He was not able to come to a settlement with the firemen and when the firemen's strike was on, he went to Soviet Russia! At such a time no Minister worth his salt should have gone out; they could have found somebody else to accompany the Rashtrapathi. So, we had a regular invasion.

अगर हम हिन्दी में यह कहें कि रशा जो है वह सरालन का घर है, जरा जो चाहे चले आओ तो इस में कोई गलती नहीं होगी। सभी वरुं चले जा रहे हैं।

You blame the people that the people are excited. You tell us that you never submitted to pressure. I say that you submitted to pressure. You toyed with the independence of this country. I accuse you of having toyed with, rather sold, our best interests when you signed the Tashkent Agreement. I say, you sold our best interests when you referred the question to Kutch to a Tribunal, when you did not take advantage of the dissent note that one of the members of the Tribunal had given where he had said that the Kutch Report was not in consonance with the terms of reference. You did not take advantage of that and yet, you say that you do not submit to pressure. With what check are you talking? I say that you are submitting to pressure; all these year

you have submitted to pressure and yet, you are telling us that you do not submit to pressure! It is very easy to talk when you have the majority. You submitted to the pressure of China times without number. You were told that this was not a right policy and yet you went ahead. You said, "Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai", and then again you said, "Russia-Hindi Bhai Bhai". You are responsible for creating this situation. I have no doubt that Russia had an absolute right to sell arms wherever she got the price for selling them. Every nation does it. We ourselves get arms from others. If we protest, it will be like one beggar protesting that the other beggar gets more than what he gets. Has a beggar any right to protest? I absolutely believe that we have no right to protest against what has been done by Russia. But we expected at least a little consideration from a friend. Remember, it is not only Russia that has been friendly to us, but we have been friendly to Russia since 1917 even since this Revolution took place. Ever since that revolution took place, our great patriots, Jawaharlal Nehru, Jaya Prakash Narain, even Motilal Nehru, all these people visited Russia. They commended the Russian revolution to the world. They commended it to their own country. We have helped them in every way. So if they helped us, there is nothing great about it. It was mutual. Let no communist think that Russia alone has been helping us; but we have not been helping her. We have also been helping Russia.

So let us not talk in these terms. Let us not say that we are not amenable to pressure. We have been amenable to it. We have lost the advantages we got by the death of our young people. In the last war with Pakistan, we lost four times the officers that Pakistan lost. Yet whatever advantages we had got in our own territory, we gave away, when we had said umpteen times in this House and outside that those positions would

not be given up. And today our Deputy Prime Minister has the guts to say, has the courage to say, that we never yield to pressure.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: He has forgotten devaluation.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Let us be self-reliant. Does self-reliance mean that we should be self-reliant only in military matters? If I can put any wisdom into the heads of Congressmen, I say we must be independent economically, we must be independent industrially; we must be independent of all nations. We have got enough in this country. If we mobilise its resources, if we are economical, we can bring about self-reliance in this country.

We saw how the people can produce food grains and make us self-sufficient. But even when we are self-reliant, even when we have not enough granaries to put our own grain, we get grain from outside. This is a very strange attitude. When the Prime Minister talks of self-reliance, let us be self-reliant in the real sense.

If my friends in the Opposition will not mind, I would tell them: never bring a no-confidence motion against this Government. Many Congress people do not agree with this Government, but when Opposition Members bring in a motion like that, they gang up on the side of the Government. In private, they condemn the policies of this Government, but Opposition Members oblige them to gang up. I do not want to oblige them. If I have any word to say to the Congress, I say Congressmen must remember that the Congress Organisation is not to be subordinate to the Congress Government. It has a function to perform of its own. I know they have yet a sneaking regard for a person who has been longer in the Congress than any one of them present here, and therefore, I take advantage of that regard and tell them a few truths as their genuine friend.

[J. B. Kripalani]

When they ride on the band waggon of their government, this organisation has no will of its own. When the organisation supports everything that the government does, I say it is injuring itself; it is injuring the country, it is injuring the government itself. Then, what does the government become? It does not depend upon the organisation. The organisation does not speak out the will of the people. Then the government becomes a coterie government of self-perpetuating politicians. You are damning your government into this, I warn you. Let the Congress organisation have a will of its own and in major matters let that will be followed by the government, not that they follow the will of the government. It is on this point that I had a quarrel with the Government.

श्री मधु लिमये : (मुंबई): अध्यक्ष महोदय, उपप्रधान मंत्री ने अभी फरमाया कि सभी देश अपने राष्ट्रीय हित में काम करते हैं, कोई एक दूसरे पर अहसान करने के लिये काम नहीं करता और जहाँ जिसको फायदा है, उसी को लेकर वह अपना नाता-रिश्ता कायम करता है। मेरा ख्याल है कि सभी समझदार देशों और सरकारों के बारे में यह सही हो, लेकिन सवाल यह है कि क्या इन समझदार सरकारों में हमारी भी सरकार शामिल है—इस के बारे में मुझे जबरदस्त सन्देह है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या वजह है कि पाकिस्तान को सभी ऐसे देशों से आर्थिक और हथियारी मदद मिल रही है, जिनका आपस में दुश्मनी का रिश्ता है। पाकिस्तान को अमरीका से मदद मिली और मिल रही है, सोवियत रूस से मिल रही है, पश्चिमी जर्मनी से मिल रही है, चीन से मिल रही है और सभी लोग जानते हैं कि रूस और अमरीका, रूस और चीन का, जर्मनी और रूस का रिश्ता अच्छा नहीं है। लेकिन साथ साथ भारत जिसका यह दावा रहा है कि वह निपेक्षता की नीति

पर चल रहा है और दुनिया के सभी देशों के साथ दोस्ताना रिश्ता कायम करना चाहता है, जब हमारे ऊपर संकट आया—चीनी आक्रमण का और पाकिस्तानी हमले का—तो हमने देखा कि निपेक्षता की नीति में हमारे जो साथी रहे, वे भी हम लोगों के बारे में निपेक्ष, तटस्थ और उदासीन रहे। उसका सब से बड़ा कारण यह है कि जहाँ पाकिस्तान ने अपनी विदेशीनीति का न केवल प्रधान बल्कि एकमात्र लक्ष्य बनाया—भारत के विरुद्ध शक्ति इकट्ठा करना। हिन्दुस्तान की विदेशी नीति का एकमात्र तो छोड़िये, लेकिन प्रधान उद्देश्य भी राष्ट्रीय हित की रक्षा नहीं रहा।

इन्होंने कहा कि हम विदेशियों का हस्तक्षेप कभी कुबुल नहीं करेंगे, न विदेशियों के दबाव में आ कर काम करेंगे, लेकिन मैं उन को याद दिलाता चाहता हूँ, हमारी आजादी के प्रारम्भ से ही भयानक परनिर्भरता इस सरकार ने दिखाई है। मुझे याद आता है 1947 का काश्मीर का मामला। मैंने प्यारे लाल जी की किताब में पढ़ा था कि उस उमय राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी जी की सलाह भारत सरकार को अच्छी नहीं लगी, लेकिन जिन लोगों ने हमारे ऊपर अपना साम्राज्य चलाया, उन के प्रतिनिधि लार्ड माउन्टबेटन को सलाह इन को अच्छी लगी और उस पर ये चले। प्यारे लाल जी की किताब को आज मैं इस लिये उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ कि ऐसे मौके बार-बार इन 20 सालों में आये हैं, कम से कम अब वह फैसला करें कि किसी तीसरी शक्ति के कहने पर या उन के दबाव में आ कर वह काम नहीं करेंगे। प्यारे लाल जी ने लिखा है कि—

"As an e'eventh hour effort, Lord Mountbatten with Pandit Nehru's concurrence cabled Mr. Attlee that he should fly out immediately to India and try to resolve the crisis".

यानी काश्मीर का आई संज—

“...by personnel mediation. But Mr. Attlee declined and suggested that the United Nations was the proper channel. Accordingly, the Government of India under Lord Mountbatten's advice decided to refer the dispute to the UNO. Pandit Nehru described it as an act of faith....”

विपवास यानी अन्वविषवास । प्यारे लाल जी ने कहा है —

“...Gandhiji was not enamoured of taking any India-Pakistan dispute to an outside organisation. It would only get them monkey justice, he warned... Were Indian Union and Pakistan always to depend upon third party?”

यह राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी जी का कहना था, लेकिन ये उन के कहने पर नहीं चले । उस के बाद एक दफा नहीं, पचासों दफा विदेशियों के दबाव में आकर हमने एक के बाद एक करार किये, सिन्धु नदी के पानी के बटवारे का करार यह जो वर्ल्ड-बैंक है, जो अमरीका के प्रभाव में है, उस के दबाव में आ कर किया । कच्छ का करार विलसन साहब के हस्तक्षेप और मध्यस्थता के कारण, जौनसन साहब और कोसिगिन दोनों के दबाव के कारण किया और जैसा गांधी जी ने कहा था कच्छ का जो ट्रिब्यूनल रहा, उस के सामने हम को वन्दर का न्याय मिला और आज इस सरकार को बावजूद लाल बहादुर शास्त्री के इस आश्वासन के, जिसका त्रिक मीने पिछले सब में किया था—फंजरकोट, धारबनी, छाड़बैट, ये सब इलाके हमारे हैं और किसी कीमत पर ये इलाके हम नहीं देंगे, आज ये इलाके ये लोग पाकिस्तान को दे रहे हैं ।

इन्होंने कहा कि दबाव में आ कर कुछ नहीं कहते हैं, लेकिन ताश्कन्द में रूस के दबाव में आकर और रूस के हस्तक्षेप और मध्यस्थता को इन लोगों ने स्वीकार किया । मैं आज रूस और अमरीका को या ब्रिटेन को दोष नहीं देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि वे अपने अपने राष्ट्रीय स्वार्थों की रक्षा करने के लिये काम कर रहे हैं— मैं दोष इस निकम्मी सरकार को दे रहा हूँ । इन्होंने अपने हितों की रक्षा नहीं की । ये लोग ताश्कन्द गये और ताश्कन्द में जा कर रूस के दबाव में और अमरीका और विलसन साहब के दबाव में आ कर इन्होंने हाजीपीर, उड़ीपुत्र, टियवाल और कारगिल के इलाके को छोड़ दिया । इस के बाद भी, अध्यक्ष महोदय, इनकी आँखें नहीं खुलीं । मुझे डर है, आज मोरारजी भाई ने कहा है, किसी भी हालत में हम आणविक हथियारों के फैलाव पर रोक लगाने वाली जो सन्धि है, उस पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं करेंगे, लेकिन जैसे हाजीप.र. के बारे में कहा था, आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन शब्दों के बावजूद आप देखेंगे कि एक, दो, तीन सालों के अन्दर इस सन्धि पर ये लोग अपने सारे वायदों और शब्दों को भुंग कर अपने हस्ताक्षर करेंगे ।

मैं अभी विदेश यात्रा पर गया था और एक कम्युनिस्ट देश के नेताओं ने, रूमानिया के नेताओं ने कहा कि यू.एस.ए. ने नेशनल में जब इस सन्धि पर चर्चा चल रही थी, न केवल अमरीका का, रूस का इतना जबरदस्त दबाव था कि वह कई ऐसे देशों को, जिनको यह सन्धि पसन्द नहीं थी, उस पर हस्ताक्षर करने पड़े । इसलिये, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इन सारी चीजों को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ । सबाल यह है कि ये जो हथियार मिल रहे हैं—बापे साहब का कहना है कि इस से

[श्री मधु लिमये]

क्रान्ति प्रस्थापित होगी, इस से पाकिस्तान एक नये रास्ते पर चलेगा, लेकिन वे षोड़ा स्थाने हो गये, उन्होंने आगे कहा कि हो सकता है पाकिस्तान धोखा भी दे सकता है—

श्री श्री० प्र० डांगे : मैंने ऐसा नहीं कहा ।

श्री मधु लिमये : आपने यही कहा था—हो सकता है पाकिस्तान रूस को धोखा दे । ये कहते हैं "हो सकता है," मैं दावे के साथ कहता हूँ कि यह होने वाला है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब अमरीका और पाकिस्तान के बीच में सन्धि हुई, तो प्रेजिडेंट ब्राइजनहावर ने उस का बाकायदा एलान करने के एक दिन पहले प्रधान मंत्री को पत्र लिखा था । उसके शब्द मुझे याद हैं, वह मैं आपके सामने रखता हूँ क्योंकि कंसिगिन साहब आज उन्हीं शब्दों में बात कह रहे हैं :

"What we are proposing to do and what Pakistan is agreeing to is not directed in anyway against India, and I am confirming publicly that if our aid to any country including Pakistan is misused and directed against another in aggression, I will undertake immediately in accordance with my constitutional authority appropriate action both within and without the United Nations to thwart such aggression."

18 h.s.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, 1965 में ब्राइजनहावर साहब नहीं थे लेकिन उनके उत्तराधिकारी, जानसन साहब वहाँ मौजूद थे । इन्होंने कहा कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के अन्दर और बाहर हम इस आक्रमण का विरोध करने के लिए कार्यवाही करेंगे लेकिन उन्होंने क्या किया ? जो आक्रमणकारी था उसको भी हथियार न देने की घोषणा की और जो आक्रमण

का शिकार था उसके बारे में भी कहा कि आपको भी हथियार नहीं देंगे । इस तरह से ब्राइजनहावर ने जो अभिवचन दिया था उसपर कार्यवाही हुई ।

डांगे साहब ने कहा कि रूस के जो हथियार हैं उनसे हिन्दुस्तान को नुकसान नहीं होगा । अब इसके ऊपर कुछ लोग कह सकते हैं कि रूस की जो तोपें हैं उनमें से, गोली या गोला जो भी कहिये, नहीं निकलता है बल्कि उसमें से फूल कहिये या सदभाव के पत्र कहिये, वह निकलते हैं । लेकिन मैं ऐसा नहीं मानता । रूस के जहाँ तक हथियारों का सवाल है, वह हथियार खराब हैं, मैं ऐसा नहीं मानता । पिल्लू मोदी ऐसा मान सकते हैं लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे अमरीका हो या रूस हो, अपने देश के जो सबसे अच्छे हथियार हैं—आधुनिक—वह तो वे न हिन्दुरतान को और न किसी भी देश को ही देने वाले हैं । रूस अपने आणविक हथियार चीन को भी देने के लिए तैयार नहीं है । यही कारण रहा है रूस और चीन के बीच संघर्ष का । ऐसी हालत में मैं यह नहीं मानता कि सबसे अच्छे और आधुनिक हथियार वे दूसरों को देंगे लेकिन वे नये नये हथियार बनाते हैं और पुराने उनकी निगाह में खराब हो जाते हैं और वे हथियार हम लोग जो कि बहुत गरीब है उनकी दृष्टि में बहुत आधुनिक हैं जबकि वे अमरीका और रूस के लिए आधुनिक नहीं रहते । अध्यक्ष महोदय, सवाल यह है कि अमरीका ने जब यह फौजी सहायता दी तो उस वक्त हमारी सरकार के नेता ने साफ शब्दों में अपनी भावना को निवेदन किया था । मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि आज यह सही स्थिति बताने से क्यों हिचक रहे हैं । श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने कहा कि यह मैं नहीं कहती कि इससे हिन्दुस्तान को बड़ा खतरा हुआ है, लेकिन नेहरू साहब ने बार-बार उस समय कहा था :

"I dealt with the whole question not from the quantitative point of view, if I may say so, but the qualitative point of view. The thing itself is so bad; whether quantitatively it is exceedingly limited, did not matter to me. A thing so bad, as I said, is a reversal of history."

उन्होंने कड़े शब्दों में उन्होंने कहा था :
उन्होंने यह भी कहा था :

"The military aid given by the United States to Pakistan is likely to create the conditions which facilitate and encourage aggression."

आगे चलकर वे कहते हैं :

"Changing the balance of things in India and Asia."

उन्होंने कहा कि यह बहुत गम्भीर स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है। मुझे कहना है कि उस समय भी जो सबक सीखना चाहिये था वह हम लोगों ने नहीं सीखा और आज भी इस में जो सबक सीखना चाहिए, मैं समझता हूँ यह सरकार नहीं सीखना चाहती है। असल में जबतक देश हर चीज में आत्मनिर्भर नहीं बनता और आत्मनिर्भरता के साथ यह जो भ्रान्ति, परिकल्पना तथा अवास्तविकता की जो इनकी नीति है उसको जब तक यह सरकार नहीं बदलती है और यह सरकार और जनता दृढ़ संकल्प नहीं करती है कि किसी भी कीमत पर हम अपनी आज्ञा दी खाने के लिए या विदेशों के दबाव में जाकर काम करने लिए तैयार नहीं हैं, तब तक कुछ होने वाला नहीं है।

आज सबेरे अग्र्यक्ष महोदय, नक्शों की चर्चा की गई। मेरे पास सांविद्यट रूस की नयी एटलस है। यह क्रान्ति के बाद पचासवीं सालगिराह के अवसर पर

सारे सुघारे के साथ और आधुनिक जानकारी के आधार पर तैयार की गई है। आप चाहे तो एक दिन के लिए मैं इसको लाइब्रेरी में सदस्यों को दिखलाने के लिए रख सकता हूँ लेकिन मुझे वापिस मिलनी चाहिए। ताँ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें कश्मीर का एक बड़ा हिस्सा और आज़ाम, नेफा का एक बड़ा हिस्सा चीन का बतलया गया है। इससे पिल्लू मदी को खुशी होगी लेकिन इतनी जल्दी खुशी नहीं मनानी चाहिये क्योंकि अमरीका वासा एक दूसरा नक्शा भी है उसमें भी कश्मीर बिल्कुल अलग दिखलाया गया है। इसलिए इन नक्शों का कोई खास महत्व नहीं है बल्कि इसके पीछे इन देशों की जो भावना या नीति व्यक्त होती है उन्का असल में महत्व है। उसके बारे में मुझे कहना है कि आप यह भ्रान्ति और परिकल्पना छोड़ दीजिए और हिन्दुस्तान की नीति ठोस सिद्धांतों और राष्ट्रीय हित के आधार पर निर्धारित करें। इसके साथ ही जब हम कहते हैं कि आत्मनिर्भर बनना चाहिए तब आत्मनिर्भर केवल हथियारों के मामले में ही नहीं बल्कि सबसे पहले ताँ मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि खेती और कारखानों के बारे में जल्द से जल्द आत्मनिर्भर बनना चाहिए। आज देश अपनी बुनियादी आवश्यकताओं के लिए पी० एल० 480 कानून के तहत, अनाज जैसे मामले में, निर्भर है और सरकार ने ही अनाज के मामले में हवन निर्भर बनाया है। इसलिए अनाज के मामले में और खेती कारखानों के मामले में हमको आत्मनिर्भर बनना है।

अन्त में मैं राष्ट्रीय एकता की तरफ आता हूँ क्योंकि राष्ट्रीय एकता के बिना, सामाजिक एकता के बिना हमारा देश भजबूत नहीं हो पाएगा। अभी श्रीनगर में इसके लिए एक सम्मेलन भी बुलाया गया था। (अवधान)

[श्री मधु लिमये]

मैं केवल सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से कह रहा हूँ । आज देश में साम्प्रदायिक दंगे हो रहे हैं । मैं डांगे साहब से सहमत हूँ कि हमारे देश में जो विच्छेद और दबे हुए वर्ग के लोग हैं हिजिन और अदिवासी, अल्पसंख्यक हैं जब तक उनके मन में यह भावना रहेगी कि हमारा इस देश में कोई स्थान नहीं है तब तक इस देश के लिए एक जुट होकर विदेशी आक्रमण का मुहाबिला करना मुश्किल होगा, इसलिए मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा कि चाहे आसाम हो या केरल हो, जबतक वहाँ पर विदेशियों का हस्तक्षेप रहेगा, चाहे विदेशी चाय बागान के मालिक हों या विदेशी पादरी हों या दूसरे विदेशी हों, अगर हमारे आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करते रहेंगे तो काम कैसे चलेगा ? आज बांग्ला के पानी का मामला रुकने उठाया है, कल कहा जायेगा कि आसाम की पुनर्रचना के बारे में भी फूला फूला काम बरों । ये हमारे अन्दरूनी मामले हैं । तो सामाजिक एकरता और समानता के आधार पर, साम्प्रदायिकता जगमगड़ी को खत्म करके जब हम आगे बढ़ेंगे तभी वह संकल्प शक्ति, आध्यात्मिक और फौजी शक्ति एकत्र कर पायेंगे ।

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we meet today under a situation that is causing concern in every section of this House, in every part of this country, and I would like to stress on behalf of my party that as far as the anxiety over the Soviet arms aid to Pakistan is concerned I think that there is hardly any difference of opinion. The difference lies in this, that some people would like to make this an issue for criticising the Soviet Union more than is necessary. There are some friends who would like to use this occasion for changing our trade pattern, for changing our economic policy. We cannot make this an occasion for dealing in irrelevance.

There has been a shift in the Soviet policy.

The Prime Minister has said it, the Deputy Prime Minister has said it, but what happens? This was well-illustrated today and was so evident from the speech that Shri Madhu Limaye has just delivered. Here are things which have been said but the opposition refuses to listen to them. The opposition refuses to get together on a national issue like this and join with all other parties and put to our people the real situation we face.

The change that has come in the international sphere is not of our making. It does not mean that our policy of non-alignment has proved a failure. It only shows that the policy of blocs has proved a failure. And if evidence were needed of how relevant non-alignment is, we could not have seen a better exhibition than what we saw in the debate today. Every opposition party was lecturing to our party that we should follow the policy of non-alignment. For years President Ayub was full of admiration for the success of the Indian foreign policy and, if I am wrong one has only to refer to his book "Friends And not Masters. For years he has tried and today Pakistan is benefited by following a policy which was of our making.

What we face today and I would request hon. Members of the opposition as also members of this side to put it before the country, is that a situation has come where the two super-powers are coming more and more together, where the unity of interest of these two powers brings them so close together that they are prepared to bully, to browbeat all the other smaller nations. Soviet Russia, I am afraid, can no longer be counted as an ideological power. What has been done in the shape of giving of arms to Pakistan is not as important as the challenges that we will face tomorrow when pressure is brought to bear on us on the signing of the nuclear treaty, when pressure is brought to bear on us to hinder our growth.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): Why should you go to Geneva? We are a near-nuclear power. We should not join non-nuclear powers.

nces, for yet greater solidarity and if need be, we shall stand against the attack of any exploiter that may come or any aggressor that may tread on our soil.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH: I am not taking the advice of my brilliant friend, Professor Sondhi, who keeps on suggesting a tremendous number of negative and imaginative measures—we should not go there or to some other place. We always hear in this House about having a treaty with Soviet Russia, having a defence pact with Burma or some other country. Please let us remember that it is not for us alone to decide with whom we can have a pact or a treaty. This country has followed the path which Shri Vajpayee has advocated, the policy of independence, the policy of flexibility, the policy of peace, the policy that stood against exploitation by any other country. Only the opposition will not grant us this, and we do not grudge that, for it is the duty of the opposition to criticise us for what we do or what we do not do. Yet, it is also the duty of the opposition, for once, to go to our people and to tell our people that the time has come when India is about to breakthrough in the economic sphere, that we are going to see that pressure will be brought so that licences will be withheld, that all sorts of projects will be delayed because no country is really interested in India's growth. India is going to stand on its own. As Shri Limaye has admitted, he heard in Rumania that Russia is browbeating other nations to sign the non-proliferation treaty. India is one country that has refused to sign it. If we have to do something today, we do not have to protest to Soviet Russia. We are not a slavish people. It is not for us to go about sending protest notes, saying that you are wrong. There is only one people whom we have to go to and that is our own people. We have to tell them that the time has come for yet greater sacri-

I do not agree with Shri Dange who sees difference between the 'gun-givers.' The 'gun-giver' is always wrong and he is much more wrong if he happens to profess socialism, democracy and progress in this world. What the Soviet Union has done—and it is merely an opinion and not a protest—is something that is not fair, not just, not socialistic. One of the first losses in this country will be that the capitalists will try to create an opinion whereby progressive opinion in this country would suffer. We have to have a balance so that this thing is not misused and something small is not so made that the large interests of this country suffer. We shall be grateful to the Soviet Union for whatever it has done, but we cannot demand anything from this as of right. We are not their colony; we are not their dependency; we are not their responsibility. Our responsibility is to our people our responsibility is to stand by right principles and not to bow down. It is a fact that till we are a powerful nation there will be people who will bully us, who will try to exploit us and there will be pressures brought upon us from time to time. Yet everyday we have to our strength and to stand against these pressures, and I hope that we shall continue to withstand them, not by sending protests but by being self-reliant, responsible and flexible in our approach.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai): Mr. Speaker, this morning our Prime Minister told us that the entire foreign policy that has been pursued by the Government of India has been amply vindicated. I do not know on what she bases this statement. Has the fact that today the Soviet Union has

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

decided to give arms to Pakistan vindicated the entire foreign policy?

I am really unable to understand on what it is that she bases this statement. On the other hand, it has been admitted by the Deputy Prime Minister that there has been a shift in the policy of the Soviet Union. It is not a question of giving arms. That is not the major thing. To my mind, the major thing is whether there has been shift and whether this shift is only now. When our Government signed that agreement in Tashkent did it not notice a shift in the policy of the Government of the Soviet Union?

The other day, for example, our Prime Minister told a group of Congress Members to whom she talked—I am speaking from newspaper reports—that the Soviet Union's position with regard to Kashmir is that it is to be settled between India and Pakistan. Was that the position of the Soviet Union in 1954, 1963 or 1964? Absolutely not. Their position at that time was that Kashmir was an irrevocable part of India. Today they say that it is a matter to be settled between the two.

Therefore let us realise that what we are today discussing is not merely the question of giving some arms to Pakistan or anything like that. The fundamental question is what has happened to the entire foreign policy of the Government. Has it succeeded? That is the whole question. Of course, my Swatantra Party friends this morning said that they wanted the Government of India to follow a policy of real non-alignment. I am glad that they say that they want 'real non-alignment,' because their position, at any rate of the Swatantracharya, Shri Rajagopalachariar, has been that India's security lies in our having a military pact and in handing over the defence of this country to the United States.

SHRI RANGA: No.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I can quote chapter and verse from the *Svarajya*. This is what he had been writing day in and day out and Shri Minoo Masani had been stating. I am glad that they have changed that position.

SHRI NATH PAI: If they have.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: If they have. I am not absolutely certain that they have changed. That is a different matter. But my point is: Has our policy been one of real non-alignment. The Deputy Prime Minister said today that we have not been subjected to any pressure at all. It is good. I suppose it was on our own volition that we accepted devaluation, not because there was any American pressure. I suppose it was on our own volition that we agree we will not have trade with North Vietnam but we will have trade with South Vietnam. I suppose it was also on our own volition that we refused to allow, under the Sea Customs Act, books from North Vietnam while we allowed books from South Vietnam. This is wonderful non-alignment without any pressure.

My point is: After all how can there be an independent foreign policy? An independent foreign policy follows from an independent economy. So long as our Government during the last 20 years has refused to adopt its policy of making this country economically independent and strong, all talk of saying that we are following an independent foreign policy is just bunkum. You cannot do it. That is why we have been yielding to pressure from time to time. This is a basic fact of life that cannot be wished away. I am just talking about principles as the time at my disposal is very short.

It has been said that Pakistan has been able to get by its diplomacy, arms from China and it has been

able to get arms from USA and the Soviet Union. Why is it our diplomacy has failed? It is a very simple question. After all, diplomacy is not something which is exercised in the vacuum. Diplomacy must have a certain set of circumstances in which to operate. Diplomacy must have a certain fundamental backing on which to operate. We do not have independent backing because our economy is dependent upon somebody else. In the absence of that independence, we try to play between the two power blocs. There, a certain amount of independence is possible. Unfortunately, it has a certain limitation. Beyond that, you cannot go.

In the case of Pakistan, let us understand it. We thought we would be able to get aid from the United States. Why? Because we told them that we consider China to be our main enemy. They also considered they want to contain China. Therefore, there comes the help. Very good. Pakistan also said the something in the beginning. Then, later on what happens? Pakistan is able to exploit this particular situation that we have considered all along this particular along as the fundamental sheet-anchor of our foreign policy.

The hon. lady Member, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha, was saying that there has been absolute rigidity; there has been absolute rigidity in this particular question. But Pakistan is able to exploit particular situation when a situation arises. When Soviet Union wants that China has got to be isolated, Pakistan utilises that particular set of circumstances. She gets aid from U. S. A. from China and from everywhere. This is a fundamental fact of life which cannot be wished away. However much you might do, whatever you might do, so long as your foreign policy is tied to this sheet-anchor, it will not be possible for us to have any manoeuvring capacity. We have got to be

in this particular situation. That is our fundamental position.

The whole question, therefore, raised today is this. What is it we are going to do with regard to our foreign policy? Manoeuvrability we should, certainly, have. Apart from that, when we talk of independence of our foreign policy—my hon. friend Mr. Pilloo Mody talks so much about it—at least he came to the question: Why don't you allow Americans to do off-shore drilling? That is the independence the Swatantra people want—Why don't you enter into an agreement with the Americans whatever might be the conditions? That is the basic thing he was harping upon. Therefore, with all this, America wants you to fight; the Soviet Union wants you to fight, I do not know. It is after all, power politics in India. It is a very regrettable thing, the Soviet Union also entering into the field of power politics in India.

In the circumstances, our diplomacy has been so wonderful that we could not get any of our friends, either the Soviet Union or the United States or Great Britain, except our claims *vis-a-vis* China or *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. This is our wonderful position. He talked about the Soviet Union map. In 1967, they did not accept your claims *vis-a-vis* China. The United States did not accept that also. The other day, the hon. lady Member, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha talked about it. The United States does not accept your claims. I do not know what the position of Britain is. It is, probably, the same. They do not accept your claim with regard to Kashmir also. This is the wonderful position of our diplomacy. And yet they will say, 'you fight each other and you also fight China. Why? They may have their own interest in that. My whole point is this. Are we to pull the chestnut out of the fire for the Soviet Union or for America? My contention is that our policy during the

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

last ten years has been policy of pulling the chestnut out of the fire for other people. We did not think in terms of our own interest. We did not think not only in terms of our interest but also in terms of an independent foreign policy. On the other hand, we have been forced willy nilly to submit to pressures from those people to whomsoever we are beholden for getting economic aid, financial aid and so on. This is the fundamental thing. Therefore, when we have to discuss the whole question, I feel that unless we are able to discuss the whole question thoroughly and come to some understanding, an adjournment motion is not going to help. People have got different understandings; Mr. Piloo Mody has got a certain understanding; Mr Vajpayee, in spite of his assertion of independence—I do not know how he is going to assert that—has got a certain understanding. Therefore, I say that if we are serious about it, let us sit down and discuss it. Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha was saying that the rigidity must go. Certainly rigidity must go. How will that go unless in this country we are prepared to create an atmosphere for it? Certainly this rigidity must go and we must be able to open the ways of settlement of disputes with other countries so that we need not depend on other people. The Home Minister was saying the other day that they were betrayers of the country, they were the enemies of the country, they were traitors; in Parliament the statement was such. I am not angry with them for having said that. But realism will dawn on people, realism will dawn not only on the Congress Party but also, I am sure, on even the Swatantra Party, on the Jan Sangh and on every party that ultimately we have to be friends with our neighbours, we have to settle our problems with them.....(Interruptions).

Mrs. Tarkeswari Sinha was saying about it, that rigidity must go. (Interruptions)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Let us negotiate with China on Tibet first.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: So, unless we are able to do something on that and on that basis think of an independent foreign policy based upon our own strength, nothing is going to happen. After all, we are toyed between this power and that power and ultimately we will be the butt of every nation....

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member may conclude.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I do not have much time to develop that point. Finally I want to make one position clear and that is this. As far as my Party is concerned, we are opposed to any socialist country giving arms to any country except for the purpose of fighting imperialism.

18.30 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Anything else is playing power politics; be it done by China, be it done by the Soviet Union, be it done by any country, we are opposed to that particular position. That is why we say that so far as we are concerned, we must think of the seriousness of the situation that has arisen inside our country and think of a realignment of our foreign policy.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI (Berhampore): Many people wondered why on this question of the Pak-Soviet arms deal I even tabled a motion of censure against Government and lined up with friends of the Swatantra Party and the Jan Sangh from whom I stand politically poles apart. So I have to offer an explanation. I can do that only by dilating on one aspect of the matter which has so far not received sufficient attention. It has been mentioned by the Deputy Prime Minister also—refer to the new-found interest which the Soviet Union has started taking regarding our dispute with Pakistan over the Farraka Barrage. I need not dilate about other things because

they have been sufficiently discussed in this House. The Prime Minister and also the Deputy Prime Minister have said that the Soviet Prime Minister has exerted no pressure, that they had suggested no arbitration, they only suggested that we should settle our dispute with regard to Ganga waters with Pakistan peacefully.

Here I am reminded of two other facts in our relations with Pakistan. They pertain to the Berubari dispute and one other. Originally, there was no dispute, but suddenly on the Bengal border, after the two international tribunals dealt with the border question, Pakistan whipped up this dispute about Hili and Berubari. Our External Affairs department became wise and made a sort of package deal with regard to the eastern border. Pakistan give up its dispute with regard to its claims on Hili and we had to surrender half of Berubari. That is one experience.

Then the history of the Indus Waters dispute is there. That was a question over which, as President Ayub Khan has said in his autobiography, he was prepared to go to war with India.

In regard to the Ganga waters, although I am a layman with regard to irrigation engineering and all that, I know this much that whoever knows about East Bengal knows that irrigation waters is no problem so far as it is concerned. They came up with the Ganga-Kobadak project and are now talking of the Sanra barrage project. News has already appeared in the Pakistan press that they have approached the World Bank on this issue. In the case of the Indus waters, we had only the pressure of the USA and the World Bank upon us; this time it will be the pressure of the Soviet Union too added to that. All this is surely coming. It is no use the Prime Minister or the Deputy Prime Minister coming here and telling us that there is no kind

of pressure, that we are not going to accept the suggestion of arbitration or anything of the kind. If past experience is any guide, it is as sure as anything that over this matter we are in for serious reverses. I need not dilate on the importance of the Ganga barrage project, everybody knows that. On it the future of the port of Calcutta and the future economy of Eastern India depends. Two thirds of the work is already completed. Now if due to Soviet pressure or some kind of foreign pressure we agree to accept this matter as a dispute which we have to talk out with Pakistan, then we are surely facing a serious threat to our economic future.

In all these matters, in our relations with Pakistan, in our relations with big powers, somehow or other I feel that our policy makers are guided by dogma. Mr. Ramamurti and Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha referred to rigidity of approach. I do not say rigidity of approach. If the history and experience of the past twenty years is any guide, it is sheer complacency and nothing else. For the past three years, even before Tashkent, there have been sufficient indications that Soviet policy vis-a-vis India and Pakistan was changing. The Soviet Union still remains a friend and there is no doubt about the fact that he have an abiding interest in the continuing friendship of the Soviet Union, but have the External Affairs Ministry been vigilant enough, have our diplomats been vigilant, have our Government been vigilant? Why were these changes not followed, why were counter moves not taken? It has been said that we have lost our manoeuvrability. Why have we lost it? Because we have lost our leverage in Foreign Affairs.

The Prime Minister has referred to the fact that the old bi-partisan division of the world is no longer there, and even people belonging to former rival blocs are interested in making friends with the members of

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.]

the other bloc. That is quite true, but at the same time it is also true, a hard reality, that people, particularly big powers, do not sell arms to other countries only in order to foster peace. So we must be bold enough to tell the Soviet Union that their decision to sell arms to Pakistan will not be in the interests of peace or lessening of tension in the Indo-Pak sub-continent. As we did in the past in the case of U.S.A. when U.S.A. entered into a military alliance with Pakistan, in the case of the Soviet Union also, when their decision goes against our vital national security interests, whether in the matter of defence or in the matter of our vital waterways which we regard as our life line, we should give them sufficient indications and also let them know that we shall make counter-moves and find a remedy.

श्री शिव नारायण (वस्ती) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हम बड़े गम्भीर प्रश्न पर विचार कर रहे हैं। प्रत्येक मुल्क को इस बात का अधि-कार है कि वह चाहे जिस से व्यापार करे। तुलसीदास जी ने लिखा है : "जे न मित्र दुख होहि दुखारी, तिनहि विलोकत पातक भारी"। रूस हमारा मित्र है और अब तक उसने हमें शाहमाना साथ दिया है। इस लिये आज किसी छोटी सी बात को लेकर हमें इतने बड़े मित्र को खोना नहीं चाहिये। दाना दुश्मन नादान दोस्त से अच्छा होता है।

आज आपोजीशन ने अपने छोटपन को दिखाया। प्राइम मिनिस्टर के इस्टेटमेंट के बाद इस सदन में एक दो सवाल पूछ लिये जाते और सारे सदन को उसे स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये था। लेकिन आपोजीशन ने आज दिखा दिया कि हम बहुत हल्के हैं। अमरीका ने 1954 में पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये। हमारे 20,22 बरस के बच्चों ने उन हथियारों का मुकाबल किया और अपने छोटे नेट विमानों के द्वारा पाकिस्तान के जेटस को परास्त किया।

दुनिया को मालूम होना चाहिये कि हम कमजोर नहीं हैं। हम को हर एक क्षेत्र में आत्म-निर्भरता प्राप्त करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। "कर बहियाँ बलि आपनी तजो पराई आस"। पीछे जो घटनायें हुई हैं, सरकार को उन से सबक सीखना चाहिये।

हमारी नानएलाइनमेंट पालिसी के जन्म-दाता पंडित नेहरू थे। मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह उन की बेटो हैं। इस लिये उन को पंडित जी के दिखाये हुए मार्ग पर चलना चाहिये और उन की पालिसी पर अमल करना चाहिये। नान-एलानमेंट पालिसी कमजोर नहीं है। हम को जापान, इसरायल, इंग्लैंड, अमरीका आदि सब देशों से दोस्ती करनी चाहिये। जिस किसी देश से हमारा हित-साधन होता हो, हमें उस के साथ मित्रता करनी चाहिये। आखिर मित्रता क्या है? जिस से हमारा स्वार्थ सधेगा, उस के साथ हमारी मित्रता रहेगी।

मैं अपने देश के लोगों, विशेष कर नौजवानों, का आह्वान करता हूँ कि वे सब एक सूत्र में बंधे जायें। चाहे कोई कम्युनिस्ट हो सोशलिस्ट हो या जनसंघी हो, सब को देश की रक्षा के लिये एक हो जाना चाहिये। मैं श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी की प्रशंसा करना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने रूस या अमरीका पर, किसी भी देश पर, निर्भर न रह कर सेल्फ रेलायंस पर जोर दिया है। मैं आपोजीशन के लोगों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्हें देश की सही नेतृत्व और सही ज्ञान देना चाहिये। सरकार को भी यह देखना चाहिए कि हमारी नीति या कार्य में क्या गलती या कमी रही है।

यद्यपि हम ने पाकिस्तान को युद्ध में खड़े किया था, लेकिन ताशकंद में हमारी पालिसी फेल हो गई। हम को पाकिस्तान के साथ दिल्ली में बात करनी चाहिये थी। हम को ताशकंद नहीं जाना चाहिये था। जब शास्त्री जी ताशकंद जा रहे थे, तो मैं उन को यह कहते कहते रुक गया, "जीवेम शरदः शतम्"। बगल में श्री शचीन्द्र चौधरी खड़े थे। उन्होंने कहा, "आई विश यू गुड लक"। हम ने ताशकंद में अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को खोया है अब गवर्नमेंट को सचेत और सावधान रहना चाहिये।

रूस की ओर से पाकिस्तान को जो हथियार दिये जायेंगे, हमें उस से घबराना नहीं चाहिये जैसा कि अभी हमारे मित्र ने कहा है, अपना असली माल कोई नहीं देता है। मैं गाँव का रहने वाला आदमी हूँ। जब हम जमींदार के पास गेहूँ के बीज लेने के लिये जाते हैं, तो वह दो सेर पड़वा मिला देता है असली बीज नहीं देता है। इसी प्रकार कोई देश भी अपने असली अस्त्र नहीं देता है।

आज आवश्यकता से बात की है कि हमारे देश को एक जुट होकर रहना चाहिये। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो अपील की है, उसके अनुसार हम सब का मिल कर देश की गाड़ी को एक साथ आगे ले जाना चाहिये हिन्दू-मुस्लिम प्निटी इस देश और काँग्रेस का नारा है, और आगे भी रहेगा। वह नारा मिटने वाला नहीं है। पाहें हिन्दू हों, मुस्लिमान हों या हरिजन हों, अगर बम गिरेगा, तो सब मरेंगे। आज हमें अपने बार्डर पर सुरक्षा-व्यवस्था को मजबूत करना चाहिये। हमें अपनी ब्रेस्ट्स को टाइटन करना चाहिये। हम पाकिस्तान या किसी और देश से नहीं घबराते हम बम और एटम बम में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं। गांधी ने संसार और देश को अहिंसा का और नेहरू ने पंचशाल का नारा दिया था।

श्री वाजपेयी को याद होगी कि हमने इस पार्लियामेंट में गवर्नमेंट से यह डिमांड की थी कि श्री दीन दयाल उपाध्याय के मंडर की जांच कि जाये और देश के सामने असली पिकचर रखी जाये। अपने देश के अंदर चाहे हम सौ और पाँच हों, लेकिन दूसरों के मुकाबले में हमें एक सौ पाँच होना चाहिये।

अन्त में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें न रूस की मित्रता को खोना चाहिये और न अमरीका की मित्रता को खोना चाहिये हमें मजबूती के साथ अपने पाँवों पर खड़ा होना चाहिये। मैं विरोधों दल में भाग करता हूँ कि वह इस प्रस्ताव का वापस ल। मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया।

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when this report of the decision of Soviet Russia to supply arms to Pakistan was made public, we all thought and the country reacted like that, namely, that a situation has arisen which is probably more serious than what happened in 1962 when China committed aggression. This is a situation where we thought the whole country will stand as one man and show national solidarity to meet the new situation. So we expected that—and some of us suggested—it is good that the President of the country who at this moment in Soviet Russia was having talks with the Soviet leaders would report to the nation through Parliament. This is a national question; it is not a question to be decided by an Adjournment Motion or a no-confidence motion. We agree entirely that it affects the entire nation. Therefore, we expected that at least we shall try to evolve a national consensus on this issue and then change our entire policy and strategy, whatever it is, according to that formulation. But I am sorry to say—and I am now convinced after what has been said and

[Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedy.]

what has happened in the course of the last few days—that so long as this Government is in charge of our foreign policy, this country is not going to have any independent policy whatsoever. If it has anything, it is subservience to some country or other. That is very clear now.

It is very clear because the Prime Minister, as you all remember, also reacted; that this decision is fraught with great danger. Now, she is not even prepared to say what is the danger now. It is good that Shri Morarji Desai, the Deputy Prime Minister, now admits that there is a shift in policy so far as the Soviet Union is concerned. You know that nobody amongst those who have participated in this debate, either this side or that side, has questioned the wisdom of the Soviet Union to sell its arms to any country. We have no quarrel with the Soviet Union in that regard. Nobody is going to question that. But what we are questioning is, why is it that Soviet Russia which has all along stood behind us has taken this new policy. If it is a shift as has been admitted—I do not know whether the Prime Minister also agrees with the Deputy Prime Minister if it is a shift—when did the Government realise that there has been a shift? The Prime Minister says she does not know the quantum of supplies; she is not aware of any such thing. And then in the conference when they met the Opposition leaders—unfortunately I was not there—she is reported to have said that it did not come to them as a surprise. If it did not come to you as a surprise, when did you first know about this move? Will they tell us? I want to know if there was any talk—as early as in 1966 they met in Tashkent—between Kumaramangalam, our Chief of the Army Staff, and Sokolovsky and is it a fact that it was hinted then that they are going to supply arms to Pakistan?

I want to know whether it is not a fact from the time when Mikoyan visited this country in the year 1964

there has been a shift in the policy of Soviet Russia and no longer Soviet Russia was to us what it was before? Did they not press that we should have some rapprochement with Pakistan? The Deputy Prime Minister asserts that we are never amenable to international pressure. But the fact is that you have done anything at any time, it is by the pressure brought by the other countries.

Shri Vajpayee and other hon. friends here know what was behind the Tashkent Agreement. When the late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri went to Tashkent he had a meeting with the leaders of the Opposition. He was frank enough to admit certain things. He made a promise to the country that we will never vacate that area of Haji Pir, etc. By that time it was known that American was not helping us in the Paistan war and they were no longer with us. Therefore, we were solely dependent on Russia. When a pointed question was put to him Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had the sincerity to admit before us that he could demand a no-war pact and many other things but if Russia also wanted that we should somehow or other come to an agreement with Pakistan then probably it will be difficult for him to assert his own point of view. That made him, ultimately, to agree to the Tashkent Declaration and that probably was the cause of his death.

Therefore, let us admit that we are not in a position to say what we want to say. Shri Morarji Desai speaks of 'strong language'. The resolution which the PSP initiated before and wanted this House to adopt said: "This House regrets....". That did not condemn anybody. Is "regret" strong language? The meaning of the word "regret" in the Dictionary is: "distress or disappointment". Even that much you are not prepared to say. You are saying that you are unhappy and you are saying some other things, but you do not want this sovereign Parlia-

ment, which is the nations voice, to assert that we regret. Let us not hide facts. If you are following Gandhiji's honesty, let us honestly admit that we are in such a position today that we cannot even speak out our mind freely against Russia. This will be a clear admission of facts because it is known now that so far as Russia is concerned we cannot do that. I do not grudge it. It is good. When we were in difficulty Russia has extended to us cooperation in different fields. There is no quarrel about it. But what has happened to our position. In the matter of defence we are dependent. How can you say anything against Russia when even in the Fourth Five Year Plan we are expecting aid to the tune of Rs. 250 crores and Russia will assist us in 50 projects? In 1959 we had trade with Russia to the tune of Rs. 18 crores whereas in 1967, according to Government figures, it is to the tune of Rs. 170 crores. This is apart from the other big industries in which they are collaborating with us. Now they have promised to develop even trade relations in industries in which we are in great difficulties. Therefore, we are in such a helpless and miserable position that we are not in a position even to speak out our mind freely. When this country is reduced to this position, I do not think it can ever remain free.

When I say this, I am speaking with some amount of grief. Because, we always shout about non-alignment. Shri Morarji Desai asserts that this Parliament has not rejected it and the country has stood behind it. But what is the meaning of non-alignment? As the Prime Minister herself says, the whole international policy of different countries today is in a fluid condition. Yet, we parrot-like chant the mantram, non-alignment. What is the use? We want an active and positive policy. Merely by shouting non-alignment you do not help anybody; in fact, you harm yourself. Russians now pretty well that these people will not raise their

finger, whatever else they may do. That is why they are treating you like this. It is not a question of ideology. Pakistan does not believe in any ideology. Yet, you have to admit, the diplomacy of Pakistan has beaten you hollow.

I know with what pains Shri Dange was speaking in this House. He had no case. He was telling us how others have reacted. But I observed that he never told us what his own reaction is and what are the intentions of Soviet Russia in giving aid to Pakistan at this moment. Is it to expand the relationship of amity between India and Soviet Russia, by arming a war-like aggressor, Pakistan? Is that the intention? They are now equating India with Pakistan.

Therefore, in a situation like this, let us think seriously. Though we are not facing it now, it is very obvious that we have to face a very serious situation in the near future, because I feel and I believe by this arms aid, or sale (whatever you may call it) the threat to our security, even aggression by China and Pakistan collaborating with each other, is coming nearer. In such a situation the whole country has to be united. This Government must also declare that its reading of the situation is as we see it. That is needed today.

This adjournment motion, which has been brought here today, could have been avoided. It has been brought forward because the way in which the Government is behaving makes them deserve censure. At the same time, we must point out to them that they have to change their policies and change their ways.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, a great deal of ground has already been covered and so I will not take much time. From a message dated 14th July from Moscow we have got the information: "Russia will inform us before supplying arms to Pakistan." This is a UNI message.

[Shri Tennati Viswanatham]

Surely, the correspondent was very near our President at that time.

19 hrs.

This morning in the statement given by the Prime Minister we were told that three weeks prior to this day, the Soviet Government had already informed our Government that there would be some kind of military help and supply of arms to Pakistan by the Soviet Union.

Now, the question before us is: "What has our Government been doing in the interval" Apart from the question of the shift in Russian policy which has been taking place for some time, this is a definite act about which our Government had information, according to their statement, nearly three weeks prior to date.

The Prime Minister in the same breath also says that she does not know whether actually an agreement has been made or about the nature or quantity of the arms to be supplied. Is that a statement which Members of this Parliament expected from the Prime Minister of this country in the present contrast? That is our great difficulty.

I agree with all those who say that hard words and harsh words against a friendly country should not be said and that we should avoid no-confidence motions and adjournment motions. But, who brought about this situation? What was the difficulty for the Prime Minister to disclose a little more about what has been happening in and around our country? It is good of her that she has told us about the contents of the letter that she addressed to the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. But what is the consequence? What is the subsequent action? What has she to say; what has this Government to tell the people of this country? In this situation what is the policy which they want to follow? Is it simply saying, "Let us stand united and do not make politics out of it"? The Government bring about a situation, a crisis, and

then says, "Do not make politics out of it." That has been always the case with this Government.

No one is going to make politics out of this. But when we go back and when our friends ask us, "You 500 chosen Members of this nation, you have gone to Delhi; what is the present position; where are we; do we get aggression again from Paistan?", what is the answer which we could give to them with knowledge?

Today the Prime Minister has spoken not only to us but to all the 500 millions of this country. They will be anxiously looking into the newspapers tomorrow morning to see what she has said here. What is there in the statement which can enthuse this nation? The nation had been struck aghast when the news of arms supply to Pakistan came in the present context of political events and in the context of the helpful way in which Russia had been acting towards India all these years. Therefore what is it that she wants the people of our country to understand now after this adjournment motion or after the statement which has made? People are anxious to know what this Government is going to do.

Will this Government do anything? Will it always remain silent until all the forces gather against us, strengthen Pakistan by complacence, strengthen our enemies by complacence, allow by our complacence another Mizo Government, underground Naga Government to grow with the help of China and from an exile government?

Although she knew for three weeks that arms would be supplied—the Soviet Government had informed her about this—nothing has been done. It is this story of complacence that is the tragedy of our presentday political life in the country.

As one friend has said, and it is true, that we cannot have an independent foreign policy because we have

no independent economic life. But whose folly is this? After independence, instead of strengthening the country ourselves, the Government went on depending upon others and they thought that it was a very good game to get help from everybody. The Government thought nothing about our own self-reliance and of taking measures which could go for a self-reliant economy or defence. The Government went from nation to nation just like some improvident man and we always felt, that when a nation wanted to give help we were a nation commanding credit in the world.

Now, we are in a desperate position. The Finance Minister always says that our economy is in a desperate position but we are going to come round the corner. Which is the corner we are going to come round? Everybody agrees that the situation is dangerous. If the Government at least took the situation as not so serious, I would have understood. But the spokesmen of the Government have said that the situation is serious. That is why I expect the Prime Minister to take the entire House into confidence. Instead of inviting an adjournment motion or a No-Confidence motion or even a Call Attention notice, Government should have come with a proposition, on their own, laying down the policy and saying: "This is the policy, this is the position and these are the steps which have to be taken." This is what the nation expected of the Government.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we have had one more occasion on which the same sort of arguments have been put forward. I had presumed that the reason for this debate was the proposed Russian arms supply to Pakis-

tan. But it was used to talk about all types of things including trade and commerce, as Shri Piloo Mody did. We have one Member of the Swatantra Party supporting non-alignment while we have the mover of this adjournment motion, Shri Piloo Mody, speaking against it. At the same time, it was said that it is Pakistan's effort to become non-aligned that has helped her.

I was pleasantly surprised to hear Shri Piloo Mody regarding the UAR as a model when he spoke about a particular deal.

19.06 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*].

SHRI RANGA: He said that Nasser is more intelligent than you.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: It is in very bad taste to compare like that.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The point to be considered with regard to foreign collaboration is not the terms which are being given, or being got, but what the long-term concessions are and what will be the long-term economic as well as political consequences to the country. I had certainly thought that Shri Piloo Mody would have a sense of responsibility and would not throw his considerable weight in support of such fallacious arguments. The Deputy Prime Minister has replied to some of the points which he made. If we go into the facts, the situation can be made very clear and the fallaciousness of his arguments would be proved. But this is not a debate on economic affairs. I do not think it would be proper to take the time of the House on these matters.

The peculiar aspect of this debate is that most of what has been said about the main subject, that is, the Russian arms supplied Pakistan, is in support of what I have already said on the subject that is, the con-

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

cern with which we view it and the likely effect on Pakistan having this sort of encouragement. Many of the questions which were raised have already been replied to in the morning. For instance, as to the question of why we did not want to accept the resolution, it was not a question of quarrelling with the words of the resolution but with the very idea of it and whether, for the first time in its history, Parliament should pass such a resolution with regard to only one of the many countries from which Pakistan has been buying arms, specially when it has been receiving gifts of arms in vast quantities from other countries. That was the question there. It was not a question of words as has been made out by Shri Dwivedy's party

We have heard the usual arguments about being pressurised, and one hon. Member went to the extent of saying that even when a delegation goes somewhere, it is because of pressure. I think, the pressure is from the other side, that is, not those who invite but those who want to go. Delegations go where there are invitations and I do not know of any invitations from other countries such as the U.S.A. or any other country which have been refused. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PILOO MODY: Tourist ones.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: That is a matter of opinion.

Another question which seems to be a matter of opinion here is the definition of 'non-alignment'. Today we have seen that every party has given its own version of what 'non-alignment' should be. That, of course, was to be expected. . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us now hear yours.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have given my version at every single debate and I shall give it again. Do not think that you are going to escape it even if you want to.

Anyway I have welcomed this debate as I do any other debate because it does give the opportunity for us to re-state our position and it is of special importance at this moment when public opinion is disturbed and concerned.

The conduct of foreign affairs in a democratic society is always a difficult problem. Many things become more difficult because of the constant publicity. . . .

SHRI PILOO MODY: Pressures.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: No 'pressures' much as you would like to get me say that, but you are not going to succeed.

Even the countries which have a long history and tradition of modern Parliamentary institutions have not been able to find a real, satisfactory answer to this problem, because the issues we face are complex and many relevant factors are hidden or obscure even to specialists, to say nothing of lay people. On top of this, this is a subject, in dealing with which there are always many prejudices and misconceptions. Any responsible person, and more particularly the Government, has to deal with these matters in a spirit of discretion and with some reticence because other governments and other nations are involved and any loose or unguarded words would easily harm the very interests which we have to protect. But happily we are functioning as a democracy and the public is not only entitled to take active interests in foreign affairs and foreign policies, but we are glad to say that it is actually doing so. And it, therefore, becomes our duty to help to build up an enlightened public opinion on these matters, specially, as I said, at a moment like this when this news, this new development, has caused such a grave concern amongst the people.

A great many generalisations have been made, as is perhaps natural in a debate like this and as will continue to be made on a subject as wide as foreign policy. Some are sound, some could be accepted with qualifications and some, if I may say so with great respect, are completely pointless. But sweeping formulations, even if valid in the abstract, do not take us very far. We have to deal with concrete situations, each involving a variety of considerations and circumstances.

Many members have suggested that we must have a realistic approach. It is difficult to say what realism means in their minds or in their language, because, we have seen that each member described even the existing situation in a completely different light from the other.

Some members tried to point out a difference in what I had said and the words the Deputy Prime Minister used with regard to a shift in policy. I will just say that while hon. members are very happy to talk—and we like listening to their voices—unfortunately they do not like equally to listen to ours. Things that have been said again and again on the floor of the House are completely ignored, as if they had just never been said at all. My statement made this morning and also the remarks on this subject which I had made in the last few days talking either to members of the Opposition or to members of my own Party, was a description of the changing international scene. If a changing scene does not mean movement, I do not know what does. What I said was that if the Soviet Union has changed in some manner, we must see it in the context of all the other changes which have taken place. And when I said that we were not taken by surprise, it was not that some definite information had been given, but because, as hon. members know, speculation on this matter had been rife, and we certainly had indi-

cation that the Soviet Union wanted to have closer relations with Pakistan, although they assured us that this would in no way affect their own friendship with us or our own interests. We have no reason to believe that they would want to injure our interests in any way.

Friendship is not exclusive. If you are friends with a person, I do not think you can prevent that person from having friendship with another person. This is specially so in the context of the present situation where as I said this morning, all the landmarks of the international scene which we had considered to be almost permanent fixtures twenty years ago or even ten years ago are disappearing gradually, and the old tensions are no longer so sharp. Antagonisms which seemed very definite, and even tense of one bloc or another, are less sharp and now even the two super Powers, the USA and the USSR, try to multiply their contacts with each other and to build bridges, regardless of ideological and other differences, bypassing the bloc structures. This has naturally transformed the scene to a considerable extent. I cannot say whether this has helped to reduce tension, but it does seem that the breaking out of armed conflict is becoming more difficult. In this, it seems that the interests of the Soviet Union and the USA will coincide, and this is a factor which must be welcomed by us.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not in the case of local wars.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: That is why I had this morning said that our concern with this supply of arms to Pakistan was not because this would in any way immediately threaten us or that we did not feel strong enough to deal with any threat which might emerge, but only because of its encouragement to a particular hostile attitude which Pakistan takes with us.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

In this connection, Shri Ramamurti made a very interesting point. Obviously, we cannot always think in terms of enmity with our neighbours, but this is not a new point. Practically in every debate I have been saying that we do not take a rigid attitude on any of these subjects. We do keep the door open, and the very fact of our meeting with Pakistan and discussing various matters shows that we are willing to discuss items but naturally there has to be a proper atmosphere, and we cannot ignore our national interests.

Many speakers have harked back to the Tashkent declaration, to the Kutch Tribunal and to many other things like that. All those matters have been debated at great length here and replies have been given. So there is no point in going into them again. It may be that some hon. Members do not approve of what was done, but to say that we did it because somebody was sitting over us or was forcing us to sign on something, is I think a very unfair statement to make it is completely baseless.

I said earlier that when we express our great concern, and we have done so to the government of the Soviet Union in no uncertain terms, it was more because of this encouragement which the leaders of Pakistan would get. This morning I have mentioned as some hon. Members have also done, to the speeches made by some Pakistani leaders which have been rather hostile and have taken a harder view than they had been taking lately, but since then another speech has been made, I do not know whether we can place reliance on it, but I learn that the President of Pakistan, speaking in Teheran, has said that this deal would cause "no trouble whatsoever" between his country and India. I do not know what this means, but if it means that he is going to review his own stand and his country's stand and take a more friendly attitude, then certainly we will welcome it. As I have stated on

many occasions, we would welcome friendship with our neighbours, but it must not go against our national interests. I think that within our national interests there is plenty of scope for us to normalise our relations with Pakistan.

I was asked here for my own definition of our non-alignment. I have got here a speech which I made on a previous occasion, I think in April of this year, where I gave a definition of our policy. I do not know how we can change such a policy. If the hon. Members say that in the implementation of the policy there has been rigidity, certainly we can see how to be more flexible. Another Member rightly said that for some reasons, and those reasons were beyond our control, we have lost some of our manoeuvrability. That is because of aggression on our borders. That aggression did put us in a particular situation from where it was not easy to move around. We did feel that difficulty but it is something which we had to face; we cannot escape. I believe that even with that difficulty we have been widening our contacts. This I mentioned also this morning when I talked about my own visit to certain countries with which we had no enmity but also no close contacts. Similarly the Government has embarked upon bridge building activity and I feel that we are gaining new friends and new contacts and have far closer relations and understanding on economic co-operation with many countries.

I had given the definition of our objective.....

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: We remember that... (*Interruptions.*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I told you that you cannot escape it. I said on 5th April, 1968:

"...I believe that where there is friendship we must enlarge it, where there is indifference, we must remove it, and where there

is hostility, we should try to blunt it. What are permanent and set are certain values and interest about which we cannot compromise."

'This is a statement of policy and I do not see how any Member can quarrel with this objective. I feel that I have answered all the points...

SHRI M. L. SONDH: What about Eastern Europe where something has happened? The new winds of change in Eastern Europe? Czechoslovakia?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have said on a previous occasion that I am always happy to be reminded of any omissions by our foreign affairs expert! Eastern Europe was the very first place to which I gave consideration. Hon. Members will remember that my first foreign tour practically not my first but it was the first one really embarked on my own because the other was a previously committed one was to the Eastern European countries. On my return I informed the House about the winds of change and how these countries were trying to evolve their own personalities, individualities and identities. This process is continuing. The situation in Czechoslovakia is fluid and they are trying to come to a settlement of what their relationship should be with the Soviet Union.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: What is your reply about Czechoslovakia? What is your attitude and what is your policy?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: There is no question of having any attitude at this moment. There are certain problems. We believe that every country should sort out its problems.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Russia should not interfere in their affairs.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Why only Russia? Nobody... (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI M. L. SONDH: Pandit Nehru expressed our sentiments, as you will remember, in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian*... (*Interruptions.*) I do not see why the Congress Party should not be true to their ideology and uphold it. What is their hesitation about it? I am asking a clarification of what the hon. Prime Minister has said. She remembers Prague and Czechoslovakia. Why does she think that it is a far away country? That was said by Chamberlain.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: She is not clear at all. She must be clear.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS rose—

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is on her legs. May I request all the hon. Members to sit down? (*Interruption.*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: At the end I only wanted to say there was a lot of rumbling and thunder before this session met. But we found that even Shri Madhu Limaye could not evoke the usual fire in his speech. That just shows how hollow were the arguments used by the hon. Members of the Opposition. I hope that, after having said all that they had in mind, they will now withdraw the Adjournment Motion.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really very unhappy at the debate that has taken place today. A perfectly sound resolution was offered to this Government, and in this respect my work has been made very easy by what Shri Surendranath Dwivedy has said before me, a very simple, a very innocuous—if I may say so with some apology to my friend Shri Nath Pai—and a very straightforward resolution was offered to this Government so that it would be pos-

[Shri Piloo Mody]

sible that in matters of such grave importance, this country can present a solid, a united attitude in the face of a danger that we had already once experienced. When Pakistan attacked us, we know that this country had to suffer. It was all very well, during the days when arms being supplied, for a great many people including Jawaharlal Nehru to shout, and he carried on endlessly for months on end, against the American gift to Pakistan. But that was the opint at which some consensus should have been developed. Yes; when the war came and Pakistan was right at our door-steps, at that time we all, out of the good instincts of our own heart, combined together and we fought a valiant war. But this at best was a rearguard action. The time to shout is when the potential for such threats is first discovered.

I was not happy about moving this Adjournment Motion nor was anybody else on this side. But if we cannot even get this Government to say that "we regret the decision of the Soviet Union", if we are so pusillanimous that we cannot even "regret" something that the Soviet Union has done, this is the nadir of our courage? You could not muster that courage? Here is a mammoth, monolithic party which is going to join hands, and the accusation made against the Opposition is that when you have a vote of censure you unite them. I am not the conscience-keeper of these people. Let them vote anyway they like. But this does not in anyway affect me. What I wanted to say, I have said earlier. But I would have accepted their resolution because it would have shown that India is one country. What is the use of spending lakhs of rupees in Srinagar, mouthing a lot of sanctimonious nonsense, if you do not believe, if you do not feel that this country is one? Everything in this country has been reduced to *teri or meri*. This Congress party thinks that everything is ours and everything that is not ours is not to be considered. What was wrong in this re-

solution? And the argument that has been presented by the Prime Minister was that this was a novel innovation in parliamentary procedure. Sir, we are here innovating parliamentary procedures every day. Who is it, either here or on the other side of you, who is in any way conforming to parliamentary procedures as they exist? And what is the resolution of the House at which the Soviets are going to be so flabbergasted, by the unusual procedure we adopt, that they are going to cut off our aid, cut off our economic projects and cut off our factories and mills in which they have helped us?

But, coming to the debate itself, what was the purpose of whatever I said? I have been accused of saying that I am not in favour of non-alignment. First of all, I did not say it. Had I said it, I do not care, for the simple reason that I do not think any foreign policy should have a label put on it ahead of time. Every foreign policy should develop on the very simple grounds of self-interest and we must not talk about non-alignment as if it is the sacred cow of this country. I would very much like you, Sir, to put a piece of blank paper in front of the Treasury Bench, let alone the benches behind it, and let them each write out what they think about non-alignment. I guarantee that you will get 57 answers from them; and to accuse us that we do not know what non-alignment means is actually fantastic. It is quite true we do not know. If they do not know, how can we?

What have I said? Everything that I said today in my speech earlier, in moving the motion, was a pointer as to where this Government had sacrificed the country's self-interest. I have not at any time made any reference to show that the Soviet Union has always done this to us. We have received several good offers from the Soviet Union. We have also received several bad offers from the Soviet Union. I have only categorised those bad offers, that I know of from per-

sonal knowledge. Surely there are several other bad offers they know of from their personal knowledge which, unfortunately, I was not able to bring forward today. And, this was the purpose of the Adjournment Motion. Because of some reason unknown to me and to a great many of us, agreements are made which are not favourable to us. Therefore, one must obviously ask the question, 'why?'. If one cannot get a simple answer then one must attribute motives. I asked the Prime Minister certain simple questions. She has not bothered to reply. I do not blame her; she is probably embarrassed. But when we have a debate of this nature and we have dozen of speakers getting up and trying to defend the indefensible, one thing should be demanded at least by you, Sir, that (a) they first hear the speeches made and (b) that they understand whatever is said. Having been armed with these two potent weapons, not supplied by the Soviet Union or the United States but endowed from heaven, it would be possible then to debate somewhat more lucidly.

My hon. friend, Shri Hanumanthaiya refused to live up to his name and therefore I shall not deal with what he said. But we had a very angry lady also, to whom no matter who said what it was always attributed to Piloo Mody. I can only leave this motion in the hope that this preying on the mind of hers of Piloo Mody will give her sweet dreams and not nightmares.

As for my dear friend, Shri Dange—I have been accused of having made it possible for him to come to Parliament—he says he believes in logic. That is his strong point! In the process of logic, he has built a house for me, the house of Modys. There is the house of Tatas, there is the house of Birlas, I believe there is even a

house of Patanwala in Bombay. Now there is a house of Modys from which I am supposed, single-handedly, to defeat the Soviet Union and bring American imperialism into this country. He also laid claim that he knew the difference between junk and good machinery. I do not think that even he should credit himself with that capacity. Whatever other things he said about me and my family, I think would be best left unanswered. I am not too keen on having a very close look at his own pedigree.

Coming back to the problem of Soviet arms to Pakistan, as I said, I am a very unhappy man today, because I should have expected that these people, whom I do not treat differently—they are human beings; fire burns them, water wets them—I should have expected that by our reasonable dialogue, such as this, we might have been able to persuade them and to get them agree to something so that we can all say: "Yes, we are all Indians, we think alike when it comes to matters endangering the security of our country". Unfortunately, I have come to the firm conclusion after today that the only thing obsessing the minds of these people is what endangers the security of the Congress Party. And as I look around these expectant faces the only conclusion that I can draw is that what shows on these boards will not have been of any significance whatsoever, it will only prove that a great many people wear their hearts in their bellies.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do now adjourn".

The Lok Sabha divided:

AYES

Division No. 2]

[19.44 hrs.

Ahmed, Shri J.
 Amat, Shri D.
 Amin, Shri R. K.
 Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
 Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh
 Chittybabu, Shri C.
 Dandeker, Shri N.
 Deb., Shri D. N.
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
 Deygun, Shri Hardayal
 -Dhandapani, Shri
 Dipa, Shri A.
 Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
 Guha, Shri Samar
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra
 Joshi Shri S. M.
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Kameshwar Singh, Shri
 Kandappan, Shri S.
 Kapoor, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Kothari, Shri S. S.
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kripalani, Shri J. B.
 Kuchelar, Shri G.
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Limaye, Shri Madhu
 Madhok, Shri Bal Raj
 Maiti, Shri S. N.

Majhi, Shri Mahendra
 Meena, Shri Meetha Lal
 Misra, Shri Srinibas
 Mody, Shri Piloo
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Naik, Shri R. V.
 Nath Pai, Shri
 Nihal Singh, Shri
 Parmar, Shri D. R.
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
 Ramani, Shri K.
 Ranga, Shri
 Ray, Shri Rabi
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sequeira, Shri
 Sezhiyan, Shri
 Shah, Shri T. P.
 Sharma, Shri N. S.
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
 Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Sivasankaran, Shri
 Solanki, Shri P. N.
 Somani, Shri N. K.
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.
 Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
 Vidyarthi, Shri R. S.
 Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti

NOES

Achal Singh, Shri
 Adichan, Shri P. C.
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Aga, Shri Ahmad
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.
 Ankineedu, Shri
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata

Baswant, Shri
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri
 Bhandare, Shri R. D.
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 Biswas, Shri J. M.
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal

Chanda, Shri Anil K.	Janardhanan, Shri C.
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri	Jharkhande Rai, Shri
Chandrika Prasad, Shri	Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar	Kamala Kumari, Kumare
Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.	Karan Singh, Dr.
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh	Kasture, Shri A. S.
Chavan, Shri D. R.	Katham, Shri B. N.
Chavan, Shri Y. B.	Kedaria, Shri C. M.
Choudhary, Shri Valmiki	Kesri, Shri Sitaram
Damani, Shri S. R.	Khan, Shri Latafat Ali
Dange, Shri S. A.	Khanna, Shri P. K.
Das, Shri N. T.	Kinder Lal, Shri
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas	Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Dass, Shri C.	Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
Deoghare, Shri N. R.	Krishna, Shri M. R.
Desai, Shri Morarji	Kureel, Shri B. N.
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.	Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.	Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao, S.	Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Dhillon, Shri G. S.	Maharaj Singh, Shri
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri	Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
Dinesh Singh, Shri	Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Dixit, Shri G. C.	Mandal, Dr. P.
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar	Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
Ering, Shri D.	Mane, Shri Shankarrao
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri	Mangalathumadam, Shri
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira	Marandi, Shri
Ganesh, Shri K. R.	Master, Shri Bholu Nath
Ganga Devi, Shrimati	Meghachandra, Shri M.
Gavit, Shri Tukaram	Mehta, Shri Asoka
Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti	Mehta, Shri P. M.
Ghosh, Shri Parimal	Menon, Shri Govinda
Govind Das, Dr.	Minimata, Shrimati Agam Dass Guru
Gupta, Shri Indrajit	Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Gupta, Shri Lakhna Lal	Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan	Mishra, Shri G. S.
Hari Krishna, Shri	Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N.	Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
Heerji Bhai, Shri	Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri	Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Iqbal Singh, Shri	Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas	Naghnoor Shri M. N.
Jadhav, Shri V. N.	Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
Jaggiwan Ram, Shri	

Nair, Shri Vasudevan	Reddy, Shri Surendar
Nanda, Shri	Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
Nayar, Dr. Sushila	Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Oraon, Shri Kartik	Roy, Shrimati Uma
Pahadia, Shri	Sadhu Ram, Shri
Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila	Saha, Dr. S. K.
Pandey, Shri K. N.	Saleem, Shri M. Y.
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani	Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Pant, Shri K. C.	Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
Parmar, Shri Bhajibhai	Sanji Rupji, Shri
Partap Singh, Shri	Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Parthasarathy, Shri	Sapre, Shrimati Tara
Patel, Shri Manibhai J.	Sayeed, Shri P. M.
Patel, Shri Manubhai	Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
Patel, Shri N. N.	Sen, Shri P. G.
Patil, Shri A. V.	Sen, Dr. Ranen
Patil, Shri C. A.	Sethi, Shri P. C.
Patil, Shri Deorao	Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
Patil, Shri S. D.	Shah, Shri Manabendra
Patil, Shri T. A.	Shah, Shri Shantilal
Poonacha, Shri C. M.	Shambhu Nath, Shri
Pramanik, Shri J. N.	Sharma, Shri D. C.
Prasad, Shri Y. A.	Sharma, Shri M. R.
Radhabai, Shrimati B.	Sharma, Shri Yogendra
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri	Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Raj Deo Singh, Shri	Sheo Narain, Shri
Rajasekharan, Shri	Sher Singh, Shri
Raju, Shri D. B.	Sheth, Shri T. M.
Ram, Shri T.	Shinde, Shri Annasahib
Ram Dhan, Shri	Shinkre, Shri
Ram Dhani Das, Shri	Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
Ram Sewak, Shri	Shukla, Shri S. N.
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.	Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Ram Swarup, Shri	Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri	Singh, Shri D. N.
Randhir Singh, Shri	Sinha, Shri Mudrika
Rane, Shri	Sinha, Shri R. K.
Rao, Shri Jaganath	Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Rao, Dr. K. L.	Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi	Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
Rao, Shri Thirumala	Sonar, Dr. A. G.
Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.	Sonavane, Shri
Reddi, Shri G. S.	Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
Reddy, Shri P. Antony	Surendra Pal Singh, Shri

Suryanarayana, Shri K.
Swaran Singh, Shri
Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tula Ram, Shri
Uikey, Shri M. G.
Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri Prem Chand
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet

MR. SPEAKER: The result* of the division is: Ayes—61; Noes—206.

The motion was negatived.

19.47 hrs.

REQUISITIONING AND ACQUISITION OF IMMOVABLE PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri C. C. Desai to continue his speech. He is not present. Then, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो बिल हाउस के सामने रखा गया है, मैं इसका विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं ...

MR. SPEAKER: He may continue tomorrow. The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11 A.M.

19.48 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, July 23, 1968|Shravana 1, 1890 (Saka).

*The following Members also recorded their votes:—

AYES: Sarvashri Yashwant Singh Kushwah, S. M. Krishna, Raghughir Singh Shastri and K. P. Singh Deo.

NOES: Sarvashri Hanumanthaiya, Naval Kishore Sharma, Tamaskar and Asghar Husain.