

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

so? It was Mr. Mir Mumtaz Daulatana, the Chief Minister of West Punjab, who said about the United Nations—mark his words which I am quoting “If the United Nations proves to be a band of thieves....”—I do not know why we have not been able to propagate these things to the entire world—“If the United Nations proves to be a band of thieves, we will have nothing to do with it.”

He said that the United Nations has become a band of thieves, and yet the United States of America, Britain and other countries take pride in supporting Pakistan which has branded them as thieves they being members of the United Nations. This is our mistake that we have not had enough publicity to take these things to the world forum and make Pakistan appear as she is, in her true perspective. That has been a mistake on our part. I am sure it is now time to realise that publicity is not that publicity where we can have a frontal attack in anything and get our things done; publicity should be intelligent, publicity should be continuing and publicity should be sensitive. Then only we can reach our goal.

Once again, Sir, I would like to congratulate Sardar Swaran Singh. Really his performance has been very good. I think his performance has been very good. He has made the other countries of the world realise that they cannot get away with any situation as they like. Let us make it clear that they cannot get away with any situation as they like, at any time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

श्री मौर्य : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उस घदला बदली में हम लोगों का समय चला जाता है। हम तरह की व्यदम्बा होनी चाहिए कि हमको पता चल सके कि हम बोलेंगे या नहीं। हम तैयारी कर के आते हैं और समय नहीं मिलता।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मंत्री नुर्नें या नहीं—

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I have moved a substitute motion. I want to know whether I will be allowed to have my say on that or not.

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear the Prime Minister first. Then I will see whether I can accommodate some more hon. Members. If the House decides to sit for some more time, then certainly I can give them a chance.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Then it will not be possible to give them a chance.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri):

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

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

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

Shri Kanga: It was very unsatisfactory.

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

There were difficulties in Burma and our people were coming away from Burma. That was a situation which created a good deal of suffering amongst our people. I requested our Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, to visit Burma. He went there and had talks with the Burmese Government. Though I do not say that all the problems have been solved yet some improvements were made. Previously our people were coming from Burma after completely leaving their assets behind. Some change took place in that position and, at least for the time being, the tension that was prevalent at that time was considerably reduced. Soon after that the President of Burma, Gen. Ne Win visited India. He came to Delhi and we had useful talks. I have no doubt that it has definitely improved our relations; while there may be some hitches, our relationship with Burma is exceedingly good at the present moment.

I went to Kathmandu in Nepal myself and I had talks there. I would not like to go into that matter further. I would merely like to say

that the relationship between Nepal and India is very good.

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

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

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

On my return here we sent up proposals to Pakistan. We said that a meeting of the Home Ministers might be fixed. A date was actually fixed. It was later on postponed by Pakistan. Then, another date was fixed and even that was also postponed. Ultimately nothing happened. When we reminded the Pakistan Government that the meeting did not materialise and what they proposed to do, of course, then they said, "Conditions are rather at the present moment difficult" or there were elections etc. and, therefore, they said, this meeting could not be held. This happened in the case of Pakistan.

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

After a while—I need not go into that again; but, as the House is aware—Pakistan made an aggression on the Rann of Kutch and it was a sudden attack; it was an attack made with full strength. Even then we felt that in case this matter could be settled peacefully we should try to do so. We had said that in case Pakistan would vacate the Rann of Kutch, we would be prepared to meet and discuss. But Pakistan took some time. Ultimately, we came to an agreement. However, even with this agreement Pakistan, it is clear, was not satisfied. They felt that this was a means to achieve something. Even this agreement on the Rann of Kutch

provoked them to further aggression. They thought that they could compel us or force us to agree either to the separation of Jammu and Kashmir or to the merger of Jammu and Kashmir with Pakistan or whatever they may have had in their mind. However, they felt that through force they could compel us to agree to their demands and, therefore, even of course before the ink was dry, as it is said, on the Rann of Kutch agreement, Pakistan made a further attack on Kashmir and this time first it was through infiltrators. As the House is aware, thousands of infiltrators came into Jammu and Kashmir territory with deadly arms and weapons. There is—I would not deny—fairly dangerous potential; there are enough of mischievous people in Jammu and Kashmir and it was expected, perhaps by Pakistan, that they would be helpful to these infiltrators who had come into the territory in large numbers. Of course, these infiltrators tried their level best to create some kind of disorder and chaos in Jammu and Kashmir. It has been the practice and habit of Pakistan to create such situations, specially when a meeting of the United Nations or of the Security Council is held. They had been doing it for the last two years. This year also this was one of their plans to show to the world that Jammu and Kashmir is in chaos, there is complete confusion and disorder, and that India had practically no control over Jammu and Kashmir. Of course, they did not succeed in it.

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

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

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This is the second aggression.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Therefore, it was important that the Security Council should have considered over this matter carefully and seriously. But it seems that the Secu-

rity council is not willing to do so. However, the result is obvious. The result now is that Pakistan is committing violations of cease-fire almost everyday. There are serious incidents there are minor incidents and more than a thousand incidents have taken place so far. This is so, as I said, because of the attitude adopted by the Security Council. Pakistan, if I might say so, feels encouraged to indulge in these things.

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

Secondly, it is true that, in Rajasthan areas, they are there; we have

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

taken some action; we have made them vacate some posts and it will be..... (Interruptions).

श्री रामलोक यदव (बाराबंकी) :
राजस्थान में कितनी भूमि पर जलका
कब्जा है ?

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

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

"Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Secretary-General, that when consequent upon cease-fire becoming effective, further details, are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infiltrations that have taken place. I would also like to state categorically that no pressures or attacks will deflect us from our firm resolve to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of Jammu & Kashmir is an integral part."

This was what I had said in the very beginning, and I had made it clear to the Secretary-General. I had laid this letter on the Table of the House and I had made a statement also then, and, therefore, I can only assure

the House that we cannot deviate from this position and we will never do so.

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

Kashmir, in fact, not discuss but perhaps part with it and hand it over to Pakistan, a proposition which is wholly impossible and absolutely unacceptable to us.

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

17 hrs.

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

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

On the question of non-alignment, I would not like to say much. But I am glad that Shri Masani has at least somewhat subscribed to it for the first time, because I have never heard him before saying that we should have the best of relationship with the USSR. This time at least he said that India should build up good relationship with the Soviet

Republic. So to that extent, I think the principle of non-alignment does not require my putting forward any other argument. Shri Masani is there and no better argument is required than that he agrees with this proposition. I think it is essential and good that we have the best of relationship with the Soviet Republic. I need not add that it would be impossible for us to forget the way they have helped us during a difficult period. We have good relationship and we will build it up, and I have no doubt that our bonds of friendship, will further get stronger day by day.

I might also say that we know that the United States does not see eye to eye with us on the Indo-Pakistan issue. We have our differences with them, but it would not be advisable for us not to have good relationship with the United States also. We have many things in common with the United States. We have also our differences with them. It is these two powers, the USA and the USSR, which to a very large extent can maintain peace in this world. It will be good if these two countries, holding entirely different ideologies and having different patterns of government altogether, live in peace so that the world lives in peace. After all, it is peace that the world is ultimately thirsting for. Every man in the world at least desires it barring governments' attitudes—governments' attitudes are different. But the people as such are tired of wars and they know the sufferings they have to undergo. Therefore, it is good—I do not say that India can play a very important role in that, but if we can do a bit, we will be most happy—it is good that these two countries live in peaceful co-existence—there is co-existence between them—so that all the developing countries could get help and assistance from them, and the world lives in happiness and peace.

I would only like to say one thing more, that it is true that we have friends as such who will come out

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

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

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Except Jordan.

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

Of course, our attitude against colonialism has been there from the very beginning, from Gandhiji's time. In fact, he was the man who took the leadership and fought the first battle against colonialism, and when he fought it, of course, India became free, and after that most of the Asian countries also got their freedom. And

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Tibet also. I am glad to see him smile. He smilingly agrees.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I must say that I am extremely sorry about what is happening in Tibet.

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

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Coy maiden.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: That he is outside always. If you meet Shri Mukerjee in the lobby, you will find him behaving just like a coy maiden! Here of course in the House, it is entirely different. Well, I had never said that I shall not visit the United States of America. Even at that time, even in the beginning when this was cancelled, even then I had said, and the Foreign Minister had replied that it will depend on the convenience of the Prime Minister—he had said—“to

visit America.' Therefore, I would like to make it clear that there is no such refusal as such on my part. And I might also add and say to Mrs. Renu Chakravartty that it is not necessary to wrangle for any invitation. Mr. Patil did not go there for that purpose at all. The invitation is very much there, and if necessary, of course, it can come again. But that is not a matter for which a particular person has to be sent to wrangle about it. But the timing of it, when I should go, it is entirely for me to decide, of course, subject to the convenience of the President also. But it is entirely for me to decide when I should go and when I should not.

There is one thing I would like to make clear. There are some doubts

perhaps in the minds of Mrs. Renu Chakravartty and someone else about that. I cannot be pressurised into accepting anything which would go against the stand we have taken in this House and outside.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know from the House whether we can sit for half an hour more.

Several hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Then the House stands adjourned.

17.12 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, November, 17 1965/Kartika 26, 1887 (Saka).