

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

Planning will be taken up for consideration by the House after the voting of the Demands pertaining to the Ministry of Irrigation and Power, The Demands of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation will be taken up immediately thereafter. This has been mutually agreed to by the Ministers of Health and Labour.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): They have mutually agreed, but what about us? You may remember that when we were discussing it in the Business Advisory Committee, it was said that at least this should not be disturbed, otherwise it would upset everybody's programme.

**Mr. Speaker:** It was so arranged, but something has happened, because more time has been taken on certain Ministries. Mr. Jagjivan Ram had programmed to go out on the 14th, and to that he is committed, and now because they have been pushed back, he is not able to go.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): May I make a request? I find from the progress made so far that it would be difficult to save the Home Ministry's Demands from the guillotine, because we are already behind the schedule by four days. Now it will be almost impossible to save them. Therefore, I would request him, when he comes next week, to change the order slightly, so that the Home Ministry may be saved from the guillotine.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** I am going to extend the date also.

17.40 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: FREE MOVEMENT OF FOODGRAINS IN THE COUNTRY—Contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to put the resolution of Shri Tan Singh to the vote of the House. The question is:

"This House is of opinion that the system of compulsory mono-

poly procurement and all zonal and other barriers to the free movement of foodgrains throughout the country be abolished immediately."

*The motion was negatived.*

17.40½ hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS  
EIGHTY-FOURTH REPORT

**Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao** (Shimoga): Sir, I move:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th April, 1966."

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-fourth Report of the Committee on private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th April, 1966."

*The motion was adopted.*

17.41 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. PACIFIC CONCORD AGAINST COMMUNIST CHINESE EXPANSIONISM

**Shri Ranga:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

"That this House is of opinion that Government should initiate steps for development of Pacific concord, embodying firm defensive understandings with Japan and Australia and other democratic countries concerned with a view to contain Communist Chinese expansionism."

17.42 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

This morning, the Prime Minister observed that the Swatantra party does not accept the foreign policy of

the Government. I wish to make this offer and give a chance by this resolution for finding a *via media* for having a common foreign policy, at least in one aspect of our foreign affairs at this stage. It is common ground between all the political parties, including the Left Communists, that China has committed aggression, that the Chinese treatment of India was unjustified, and all the other parties are also agreed that China poses today an aggressive stance towards India, and China is indeed a live threat to the defence of freedom and territorial integrity of India. I think the government also agrees with this and it is for this reason that government has not been willing to develop any contacts with China because China has not been ready to accept the Colombo proposals and establish her peaceful *bona fides*. In those circumstances, how can there be any disagreement between the different political parties in this House who believe in Democracy when we say that we should concert measures in such a manner as to strengthen our own defences and protect our territorial integrity and our national independence. There was a time when I had to differ very strongly and seriously over a very long period with my old friend Pandit Nehru because he did the blunder, according to me, of recognising Chinese sovereignty over Tibet, allowing China to gobble up Tibet and destroy her autonomy. In spite of protests by me and others, Pandit Nehru pursued that policy over a number of years and we know the consequence thereof. Those consequences followed on the very lines which we had for shadowed and warned him against. Yet he did not heed our advice. Over a distance of 2700 miles on our Himalayan borders, we have allowed China to become our next-door neighbour. The Himalayas which were silent had become alive, which were cold had become too hot, all because China was ready to go there. Now because there are two Chinas, we have to call this China which has become our neighbour.

Communist China. It is not because she is Communist that she has become so expansionist and has posed such a threat to us, that communism has something to do with it. That was the case in Soviet Russia for sometime and a number of years in other parts of the world, but Soviet Russia has changed its programmes and policies. China has not. Indeed, China does not even heed the advice that is being tendered repeatedly by Soviet Russia. China now admittedly is expansionist, has become too powerful and is growing more and more powerful with her atomic arsenal; China poses this threat and danger to us in India, and she poses this threat not only to India but to the other countries also in the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean. It is through mere chance that Indonesia is slowly getting out of her grips. Otherwise, with Indonesia on the side of China, China's threat to India from the seas also would have grown very powerful.

Fortunately, for us, there is some weakness on the part of China in that regard, but yet, China is still there. Our Defence Minister has been telling us from time to time that Chinese troops are being massed on the Himalayan borders and China is making friends with Burma. Burma may be friends with us, but we are not so powerful as China in order to be sure of Burma's goodwill at the moment when we will need such goodwill against China.

Several other countries are getting frightened of China. Under these circumstances, what is it that we have to do? The Defence Minister was going about saying in a very brave fashion that even if China as well as Pakistan were to pose a threat against India or to march against us any time, the Indian defence forces are capable of looking after themselves. This is a vain boast and what is more, a misleading boast. It does harm to the country because India by herself is not in a position, no country in the Pacific or Indian Ocean is strong enough, to stand up to Commu-

[Shri Ranga]

nist China as she is. It is an obvious fact, and yet the Defence Minister wants to close his eyes to this threat

Pakistan also is there. Pakistan and China have been flirting with each other, are coming into each other's bosom. The other day, the Chinese President went to Rawalpindi and it was the Chinese arms that were displayed there, including MIG planes and tanks. What is the significance of this? With all that, can we be quite sure that China would not play mischief? Supposing she does play mischief, even supposing, let us hope, Pakistan would continue to be loyal to the Tashkent agreement, and therefore she would not try to attack India simultaneously with China—this is a big if—even supposing she chooses to remain neutral will her goodwill be on India's side or on the side of China? Supposing her goodwill is also on the side of India, and she continues to be friendly, even then, would not the Chinese military strength be big enough to threaten our freedom, to swallow large chunks of our own territory? It would be so strong; then, how can we feel sure that by ourselves, we would be able to resist Chinese aggression? Would Russia come to our rescue at that time? Is it not quite so obvious to everybody, whatever may be the differences between Russia and China, that Russia certainly will not range herself against China for ideological purposes and from the point of view of her own world leadership of all the communist movement in all the countries and from her own internal needs and demands from her people? We cannot expect any help from Russia. Therefore, it stands to reason that we should try and explore the possibilities of winning friends among all those other countries which are also as immediately and as intensely threatened as we are, if not to the same extent, at least in the same manner—Ceylon, Malaysia, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, Philippines and Japan—and a number of those countries have rang-

ed themselves already against Chinese imperialism. They are trying their best to concert measures to develop their defence forces to be able to resist Chinese aggression. But they themselves do not feel strong enough to resist China effectively. They are also in need of other friends. That is why Australia has got into the SEATO, ANZUS and various other pacts. Japan has been seeking the assistance of USA. Sir, which is better? Is it better for each of them and also for us to seek assistance from America or some other country, or is it better that all of us should so manage our affairs, reach each other's hearts, agree to shake hands with each other, develop that much of understanding as firmly as we possibly can and try to see how far and in what manner we can co-ordinate our plans, our ordnance factories, production of arms, stockpiles, etc. and development of our defence forces, including guerillas and other things in such a manner that if and when any serious threat comes from China, we would be in a position to stand the first onslaught as effectively as we can, and certainly more effectively than if we alone have to face China? That is our suggestion.

Why should we wait until any one of those countries takes the initiative? There was a time not so long ago, when the Vice-Premier of Japan visited India and we made that suggestion to the Government. We do not know what the government has done, unfortunately the government was not in a position to assure the country that we are able to win the agreement of Japan to side with India whenever the Chinese threat becomes a live and burning one.

What is the attitude of Japan? They consider themselves, like us, a world power. Addressing the Americans, the Japanese Prime Minister himself said not so long ago:

"Now that we are indeed a world power, we must assume the responsibilities that accompany this role. We are as concerned as you are—"

possibly more so—about Communist China's aggressive tendencies. Thus we understand and agree with your policy of preventing Communist China's military expansion into neighbouring areas. The United States deserves the highest respect for its unceasing efforts to maintain peace and stability in this part of the world. Although Japan is constitutionally barred from providing military assistance to these efforts, we will continue to exercise all the other means we can to help promote economic growth and political stability in the area."

In Japan too they have their own party politics and difficulties with their press and public opinion. They have been trying their best in a willy-nilly fashion to amend their Constitution in such a way that it would be possible for them to make necessary allotments in their finances for the development of their own defence forces, without having to depend entirely as they do now on USA. If they know that we are so very keen on this kind of concord, it would certainly strengthen the hands of all those people who would like to make that constitutional amendment and develop their own defence forces, so that their own strength vis-a-vis communist expansionism would come to be developed.

Secondly, there is Australia. The Australian Foreign Minister has said:

"The development of Communist China with its present population of over 700 million into a modern industrial State is and will continue to be a matter of primary significance to Australia. China has persisted with a programme of nuclear development. It must be assumed that if China diverts such a large proportion of its economic resources to a military effort, it looks on that effort as extremely important."

He continues to say:

"Now when one talks either of creating a deterrent or of trying to

build a world favourable to the preservation of international principles, and unfavourable for aggression one must realise that Australia cannot do it itself by its unaided efforts. We have to join with others in order to bring this about."

How frank they are! They are not ashamed to confess the inadequacy in standing up to the Chinese Communist expansionism. On the other hand, that is not the position with us. Weak as we are, we want to appear as if we are very bold, very strong. That is one of the surest ways of self-deceit, a national disease also. Then he says:

"We get the unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan."

They are conscious of what is happening here between India and Pakistan. He says:

"China used the occasion to try to complicate and aggravate that situation. It suits China to have Pakistan and India in conflict with each other. It also suits China to have war continuing in South Vietnam. It suits China to have uncertainty and unrest in Indonesia. It suits China to have the apprehensions of subversion that there is in Thailand. There is no interest in serving Chinese policy or the aims of Chinese communism in a cease-fire or discussions."

It is a notorious fact how China has been opposed to the Tashkent Agreement and the standstill agreement in regard to atomic test bans. Only today the news comes that China flirts with the idea of a long-time war and a short-time war. With whom? With the other greatest power, atomic power in the world—the United States of America. It is only a make-believe to go on calling the United States of America an imperialist power. Actually, the fact is that she is vying with America. Does she do it only with the atomic power at her disposal? She is doing it in the diplo-

[Shri Ranga]

matic world from one country to another, almost from one continent to another. In conference after conference on the international field, wherever China has had an opportunity of playing her role, she has been trying her best to gain more and more friends for herself. She has been doing it even with USSR, not to speak of United States of America. Such is the power that is opposed to us. Such is the threat that is ranged against us.

Under these circumstances, would it be advisable for us to rely upon America alone. I know that last time when China attacked us it was the deterrent effect of the offer of whole-hearted support, immediate support of England and America which was responsible for that cease-fire.

**Shri Vasudevan Nair** (Ambalappuzha): No, no.

18 hrs.

**Shri Ranga:** Maybe, my hon. friend would have liked that cease-fire not to have taken place at all. Anyhow, that was responsible for the cease-fire. There may be a kind of lurking hope in the hearts of the Government and the ministers that, after all, when that miserable position comes to face us, of China attacking our country, America is bound to rush to our rescue. England is bound to rush to our help. That would be a mirage. What is more is, that would not be dignified. Thirdly, that would not be dependable. What is even more is, that would be suicidal. If, on the other hand, we try and gain the co-operation of as many of these nations as possible, in the Pacific Ocean and Indian Ocean, and bring about this Pacific concord just as there was between France and England before the Second World War *entente cordiale*, then we will be in a better position to welcome, accept and utilise all that assistance America or England or any of the other countries may be willing

to give. Therefore, my point is this. It would not be right that we should depend on Soviet Russia, because Soviet Russia would not be able to come to our rescue. It will not be right, it will not be self-respecting and it will not be proper to depend on America, England and such other countries on that side, because that would also be dangerous. If we remain by ourselves without any other additional support, that is also dangerous. So, we have got to invite the co-operation of USSR in developing our industrial strength as well as our defence potential, to the extent that USSR is willing to offer and will continue to offer, as she has done till now. It would also be in our interest to welcome whatever assistance America would be willing to give. These two are useful. But we should not depend on them alone. If, on the other hand, we combine ourselves with all these various nations here, big and strong as they are—Japan from the industrial point of view is one of the strongest and one of the best and most powerful countries of the world with a disciplined population—if we assure ourselves of their support and that of the Philippines—the Philippines, as you know, have been very great champions of democracy; it was the Philippines who appreciated the championship for democracy that some of thinkers in our country have developed and, therefore, they honour them—they have the largest claim in controlling and containing Chinese expansionism; then, there is Australia and New Zealand also, besides Malaysia; if we could only assure ourselves of their goodwill and support, moral support, then and then alone will we be in a safe position. Therefore, Sir, I move this motion.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that Government should initiate steps for development of Pacific concord, embodying firm defensive

10177 Pacific Concord CHAITRA 17, 1888 (SAKA) against Chinese expansionism 10178  
(Res.)

understandings with Japan and Australia and other democratic countries concerned with a view to contain Communist Chinese expansionism."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The bell is being rung. The bell has stopped ringing. There is no quorum. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

18.05 hrs.

**Shri Hukam Chand Kachchavalya (Dewas):** Sir, on a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, April 11, 1968/Chaitra 21, 1888 (Saka).*

---