

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

दोनों तरफ़ से एक, एक आदमी उनके कंधों के साथ लगे हुए थे और उनको अपने साथ साथ चलाते हुए ले गये। उन्हें बिल्कुल घसीटा नहीं गया। अगर ऐसा किसी ने किया हो तो मैं उस पर सख्त ऐक्शन लेने के लिए तैयार हूँ लेकिन घसीटा नहीं गया। अब आप ही बतलाइये अगर कोई आदमी बैठ जाय, उसको बाहर चले जाने के लिए कहा जाय और वह जाने से इंकार करे तो कुछ तो करना हो पड़ेगा कि जिससे उसको निकाला जा सके। मेम्बर साहब इस में मेरी इमदाद नहीं करते बल्कि उलटे इस में एक चीज चाहते हैं कि यह जो अनुशासन है उसको खराब किया जाय। मेम्बर साहबान का फर्ज हो जाता है कि वह अनुशासन कायम रखने में हमारी मदद करें। अलबत्ता अगर कोई किसी तरह की दुर्व्यवहार आदि की मेम्बरों को कोई शिकायत हो तो मैं आगे और भी इसमें सहक्रीकात करने के लिये तैयार हूँ।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी एक बात सुन लीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आप मेरी केवल एक बात सुन लें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : स्वामी जी, मैं आप से रोज़ प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि इस तरह आप खड़े हो कर बोलने की जिद न किया करें। मुझे आगे कार्यवाही चलाने दीजिये।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : कल भी मैं कहना चाहता था और आज भी मैं खड़ा हो रहा हूँ लेकिन आप मुझे अपनी बात रखने की

इजाजत नहीं दे रहे हैं। मैं व्यवस्था का सबाल उठा रहा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस में कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न पैदा नहीं होता है। एक कार्यवाही खत्म हुई है और दूसरी अब शुरू होने वाली है उसके दरमियान व्यवस्था की कोई बात पैदा नहीं होती है।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : चूँकि आप मुझे अपनी बात रखने की आज्ञा नहीं दे रहे हैं इसलिए मैं विरोधस्वरूप सदन का त्याग करता हूँ।

[Shri Rameshwaranand then left the House].

12.07 hrs.

MOTION RE: SITUATION ARISING OUT OF REPEATED AND CONTINUING ATTACKS BY ARMED FORCES OF PAKISTAN ON KUTCH BORDER

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): I beg to move:

"That the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border be taken into consideration".

There have been serious and frequent engagements. Our men are defending our frontiers with exemplary valour (Applause) and I should like to tell them that this House and all the people of this country stand solidly behind them, (Applause) and will consider no sacrifice too great to meet this challenge to our territorial integrity. (Applause):

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : कंजरकोट अभी पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है और यह लोग तालियां बजा रहे हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन तालियों को बंद करवाइये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब ताली बजाना क्या कोई गुनाह है ?

श्री किशन पटनायक : यह क्या हंसी की बात है जो तालियां बजा रहे हैं यह तो शर्म की बात है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ताली बजाने से मैं उन्हें रोक नहीं सकता ।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : कोई खुशी का मुकाम तो होना चाहिए । कंजरकोट पर अभी भी पाकिस्तान का कब्जा है तो यह हमारे लिए खुशी का मुकाम होना चाहिए या गम का ? तालियां तो खुशी के मौके पर बजाई जाती हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि इस तरीके से काम नहीं चलेगा । अगर आप खुशने को भी तैयार नहीं हैं तो बाहर जा सकते हैं लेकिन किसी को ताली बजाने से मैं कैसे रोक सकता हूँ ? अब ताली बजाना क्या कोई गुनाह है ? जिसको पसन्द आये वह बजाय और जिसको पसन्द न आये वह न बजाये । यह ताली बजाना कोई नई चीज नहीं हो गई है । ताली कहां नहीं बजाई जाती ? क्या अपोजीशन की तरफ से जब स्पीचिंग होती है तो उधर वालों द्वारा ताली नहीं बजाई जाती है ?

श्री बागड़ी : ताली जीत और खुशी में बजाई जानी चाहिए न कि हार व गम में ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: The situation which we are facing today is undoubtedly grave. I think the House would like to have a connected account of the events leading up to the situation that exists today.

During the last few months, Pakistan has been resorting periodically to firing and clashes at several points in the Indo-Pakistan borders, both in the east as well as in the west. Our men have taken defensive action at

all these points effectively but with great restraint. The clashes on the Kutch border are the latest in the series of incidents which Pakistan has chosen to indulge in.

Sometime ago, Pakistani patrols were noticed moving on a track close to the Kutch-Sind border. On being challenged by our patrols, the Pakistani patrols claimed that they were moving on a track which was the old customs track and within Pakistan territory. It was also noticed that Pakistan had occupied Kanjarkot and established a standing post there. In accordance with paragraph three of the Ground Rules, the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Rajkot Rangers took up the matter with the Director General, West Pakistan Rangers, and called for a meeting to discuss the situation and to determine the *status quo*. The Director General, West Pakistan Rangers, did not attend, but sent his local Commander who had a meeting with the DIG, Rajkot Rangers. This, however, led to no result and encounters between our patrols and those of Pakistan continued.

On April 9, in the early hours of the morning, our border post at Sardar was attacked with heavy mortar and MMG fire followed by artillery fire from 25-pounder guns under cover of which two battalions of the Pakistan regular army belonging to 51 Infantry Brigade advanced towards the post. Details of this encounter have already been given to the House in the statement by the Home Minister on the 12th April. The fact that this attack was premeditated and pre-planned was quite clear from the documents captured from the Pakistan prisoners and from their interrogation.

The plan of assault on our border post by the Pakistan army was drawn up in the second week of March, and movement of troops began thereafter. Orders for the attack were apparently given on April 7, and the attack was launched in the early hours of

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri].

April 8. Therefrom, as the House knows, the Chief of the Army Staff was instructed to take over operational control of the border, and army units moved into Vigokot the same evening.

The Pakistani firings and shellings, however continued, to which our armed forces have replied. Since then, Pakistani armed attacks of increasing intensity have been continuing at many points into our territory south of the Kutch-Sind border. On April 24, our coy. post at Point 84 was shelled in the morning and later attacked by Pakistan infantry supported by tanks and other armour. On April 26, Pakistan armed forces, again with tanks and armoured vehicles, attacked our border post at Biar Bet. These attacks are still continuing.

Pakistani armed action is a naked act of aggression. They have attacked Indian post: deep into Indian territory 6 to 8 miles south of the border, a territory which on Pakistan's own admission has never been in its possession. Hon. Members have, no doubt, seen the statement of the Pakistan Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto, on the 15th April, in which he said, defending the Pakistan possession: 'It must be remembered that the central fact is that this is a dispute over territory which lies roughly north of the 24th parallel.'

"The dispute has arisen not because the boundary is undemarcated, but because the disputed territory is in India's adverse possession."

This is what he had said. In other words, Pakistan has chosen to mount an armed attack on territory over which Pakistan has never exercised possession, and over which Pakistan in fact admits India's possession. Pakistan thus stands self-condemned. It has used force for changing the *status quo* and for vindicating its

territorial claims. This is contrary to the United Nations Charter and to the Ground Rules under the Indo-Pakistan Border Agreement of 1960. Pakistan's behaviour, in fact, amounts to a clear and open aggression on our territory.

As is usual with Pakistan, even while discussions had been in progress through diplomatic channels to settle the matter peacefully, Pakistan has been intensifying its attack and moving in tanks and heavy artillery to attack our posts.

On April 19, the Foreign Secretary handed over a formulation to the High Commissioner which, in substance, was the same as what the Pakistan Foreign Office had suggested to our High Commission in Karachi a few days earlier, namely that there should be a cease-fire to be followed by talks at official level with a view to the determination and restoration of the *status quo ante*, and later a high level meeting between the two Governments to discuss the boundary question.

On the morning of the 24th April, the Pakistan High Commissioner handed over an alternative formulation to the Foreign Secretary, according to which cease-fire was to be followed by the withdrawal of the armed forces of both India and Pakistan, whether civil or military, from certain areas which they contended were the disputed territory. But earlier the same morning, even before this new formulation had been presented, Pakistan had launched a heavy attack in brigade strength on our post at Point 84, west of Chad Bet, with heavy artillery.

Throughout this period, Pakistan has been making shifting claims and conflicting statements. At the meeting between the DIG, Rajkot Rangers and Lt. Col. Aftab Ali, Commandant of the Indus Rangers at Kanjarkot on 15th February, 1965.

they said that they had not occupied Kanjarkot, but that they were patrolling the area up to the track south of Kanjarkot, which according to them was the old customs track adjoining Surai and Ding.

In the Government of Pakistan note dated 1st March, 1965, which was in answer to our protest note of 18th February, 1965, it was stated by the Pakistan Government that Kanjarkot Fort had not been occupied by the Indus Rangers. Today not only Pakistan is in occupation of the Kanjarkot Fort, but it has gone much beyond its claim of patrolling upto the customs track.

श्री मधु लिनवे (मुंगेर): फिर भी ताली
 बजा रहे है ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Pakistan today is laying claim to a large area south of the Kutch-Sind boundary and north of the 24th parallel. I want to state clearly and emphatically that we reject and repudiate these claims in their entirety.

Pakistan claims that the Rann of Kutch is an inland sea, and therefore Pakistan is entitled to half of this area. This is completely untenable. The Rann of Kutch is not an inland sea and has never been recognised as such. Long before the creation of Pakistan, the then British Government of India decided formally in 1906 that it was more correct to define the Rann of Kutch as a 'marsh' rather than as a 'lake' or 'inland sea.' That the Rann of Kutch is marsh is indisputable. It has all the flora and fauna of marsh land with marsh-grown grass in abundance and other characteristics. What happens is that during the monsoon period, because of the strong winds and the high tides in the Arabian Sea, this low-lying area gets flooded by seawater. Furthermore, in the monsoon period, it receives fresh water from the swollen rivers. The area, therefore, is flooded from about the middle of May till the end of October. It is mostly dry and partly a marshland during the remainder of the year.

Pakistan's claims also ignore the historical fact that even though the Kutch-Sind border is undemarcated, it is well-defined on maps and well-recognised in fact. Prior to the partition of India, the Kutch-Sind border separated the then British-Indian province of Sind and the Indian State of Kutch. Not being an international boundary then, it did not need to be demarcated. The boundary itself was, however, well-defined in all official maps during the years dating from 1872 to 1943, and even later, and was well-known and well-established. The boundary has also been described in detail in official documents over the last three quarters of a century prior to the Partition of India. The boundary shown in the official maps of undivided India prior to August 15, 1947, cannot be questioned. The official gazetteer of the province of Sind published in March, 1907, the Gazetteer of India of the Bombay Presidency published in 1909 and the Imperial Gazetteer of India published by the British Secretary of State for India in 1908 are all categorical about the Rann of Kutch being outside the province of Sind. In all the documents of the political department of the then British Government of India of 1937, 1939 and 1942, defining the political charges of the various officers, the Rann of Kutch was invariably shown as falling within the Western India States Agency and never as falling within the province of Sind. As the House is aware, the entire Western India States Agency became part of India as a result of accession.

The totality of the evidence leaves no basis whatsoever for any dispute regarding the border between the Sind Province and Kutch. Ever since these recent intrusions commenced, the Government of India suggested repeatedly to Pakistan that meetings should be held between local officials and also talks be held at a higher level. For instance, we suggested to the Pakistan Government that the Surveyors-General of the two coun-

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

tries should meet to discuss the problem of demarcation. Pakistan refused; we reminded Pakistan of the ground rules and the desirability of a meeting between the local commanders for the restoration of the *status quo*. We also suggested in our note of the 18th February that there should be a meeting between the representatives of the two governments at whatever level considered appropriate by Pakistan and repeated this suggestion later more than once. Despite these endeavours there was no proper response from Pakistan.

On the 13th April, 1965, the Pakistan Government made a three-step proposal suggesting cease-fire and secondly, inter-governmental meeting to determine what was the *status quo* which should be restored and thirdly, a higher level meeting. The Government of India authorised their High Commissioner the very next day, that is, on the 14th April, to convey the acceptance of these proposals. It is to be deeply regretted that the Government of Pakistan later went back on their own proposals. On 19th April, the Government of India repeated that the proposal for cease-fire should be accepted forthwith. But instead of accepting this proposal, the Government of Pakistan put forward an entirely new formula on the 23rd April which, as I have already mentioned, required the withdrawal of Indian forces from what Pakistan chooses to call unilaterally as disputed territory, but which in fact indisputably is entirely our own. Pakistan has since been persisting in this demand. This attitude on their part means a virtual rejection of all our efforts to wean them away from war-like postures.

Sir, I have made this rather long narrative in order to give the House a complete picture of the false nature of Pakistan's claims, its sinister designs and the naked and reckless use of force by Pakistan against us. It is

apparent that one of the prime reasons of Pakistan's irrational behaviour is the obsessive hatred against India which Pakistani leaders, Pakistani press and communal fanatics in Pakistan have worked into their system over the past two decades. The events which I have just described have caused us all the gravest concern. Ever since the attainment of independence, India has stood for peace, international amity and goodwill. India has a living and vital stake in peace, because we want to concentrate attention on improving the living standards of millions of our people. In the utilisation of our limited resources, we have always given primacy to plans and projects for economic development. It should, therefore, be obvious to anyone who is prepared to look at things objectively that India can possibly have no interest in provoking border incidents or in building up an atmosphere of strife.

However, our neighbours, both China and Pakistan, have chosen to adopt an attitude of aggressive hostility towards India. Lately they seem to have joined hands to act in concert against India. In these circumstances, the duty of the Government is quite clear and this duty will be discharged fully and effectively. The entire resources of the country in men and material will be employed, to defend our frontiers and to preserve our territorial integrity. I know that each one of our 450 million people of India is today prepared to make any sacrifice in defence of the motherland. We will prefer to live in poverty for as long as necessary, but we will not allow our freedom to be subverted.

The specific question which we have to consider—and by this I mean not only the Government, but this House and indeed the whole country, is what course we should now pursue? Which path do we take? We are prepared to take the path of peace,

but we cannot follow it alone. Pakistan must decide to give up its war-like activities. If it does, I see no reason why this simple fact of determining what was the actual boundary between the erstwhile province of Sind and the State of Kutch and what is the boundary between India and Pakistan cannot be settled across the table. It need not even be a negotiating table. It is more a question of finding out the fact, rather than of negotiating a settlement.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): That is the point.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It can be done by experts on both sides. All this is possible provided there is an immediate cessation of hostilities and restoration of the *status quo ante*.

I should like to tell the House that on the Kutch Border Pakistan has many advantages. What is more, our soldiers are occupying posts in areas which will soon be submerged in water and from where they will, therefore, necessarily have to withdraw. If Pakistan continues to discard reason and persists in its aggressive activities our army will defend the country and it will decide its own strategy and the employment of its manpower and equipment in the manner which it deems best.

Countries who are friendly to us have urged that a cease fire should be agreed to as soon as possible. We are ready to respond to these appeals. But, at the same time, I must tell the House that we have also to be ready for the alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I have uttered these words after the most serious thought and with full consciousness of my responsibilities. This is one of the most fateful moments of our times. I realise that both India and Pakistan stand poised at the cross-roads of history. The path of reason and sanity, of peace and harmony is still open. Even while our police and later our army have been defending

our soil with commendable courage in the face of heavy odds, the path to peace has not been blocked. But it is a path on which we cannot walk alone. It takes two to make friendship and peace.

It is my earnest hope that the point of no return will not be reached and that Pakistan will still agree to cease fire in accordance with its own proposals of April 13 which India had accepted.

I know at this hour every Indian is asking himself only one question. What can he do for his country and how can he participate in the nation's endeavour to defend our freedom and territorial integrity. To them and to all our people I want to address this appeal. Wherever you are and whatever your avocation, you should work with true dedication. Bring out the best in you and serve the country selflessly. The supreme need of the hour is national unity—unity not of the word but of the heart. All Indians, of whatever faith or profession, have to stand solidly together and prepare themselves for hardships and sacrifices. Let us give no quarter to any ideas that tend to divide us. Let us all work together with a new sense of national discipline and with an inspired feeling of dedication to the cause of country's freedom and integrity. And I would close by asking this august House to give its wholehearted and mighty support to the Government at this momentous hour.

Mr. Speaker Motion moved:

"That the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border be taken into consideration."

There are some substitute motions.

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय (रसड़ा) : श्रीमान
 मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ :—

"कि मूल संकल्प के स्थान पर निम्न-
 लिखित रखा जाए, अर्थात्—कच्छ

[श्री सरजू पाण्डेय]

सीमा पर पाकिस्तान के सशस्त्र बलों द्वारा बार बार और लगातार किए जा रहे आक्रमणों से उत्पन्न स्थिति पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह सभा सरकार से अनुरोध करती है कि भारत-पाक सीमा पर पाकिस्तानियों की आक्रमणात्मक स्थिति को समाप्त किया जाए।”

(1)

Shri Hukam Chand Kachhaviya (Dewas): Sir, I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border, is of the opinion that the Government have failed to defend the borders of the country and urges upon the Government to take vigorous steps to drive out the aggressors immediately.” (2)

श्री प्रकाशश्रीर शास्त्री (विजनीर) : श्रीमन्, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि मूल संकल्प के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाए, अर्थात्:

“कच्छ सीमा पर पाकिस्तान के सशस्त्र बलों द्वारा बार बार और लगातार किए जा रहे आक्रमणों से उत्पन्न स्थिति पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस सभा की यह राय है कि सरकार भारत-पाक सीमाओं पर पाकिस्तान द्वारा निर्मित तनाव और परिस्थिति का सामना करने में अक्षम रही है और यह सभा सरकार से अनुरोध करती है कि देश की अखंडता को अक्षुण्ण बनाए रखने के लिए कोई कसर उठा कर न रखे।” (3)

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Sir, I beg to move:

That for the original motion the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border, and while urging on the people of the country to stand unanimously behind all efforts to defend the inviolability of the country's borders and its territorial integrity with all strength at their command, regrets that Government policy in regard to the question of the defence of the Indo-Pak border has been marked uptill now by utter lack of firmness, consistency and concern for national security on the diplomatic and military planes.” (4)

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Sir, I beg to move: That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border is of the opinion that Government must formulate a firm policy to meet the obvious Sino-Pakistan strategy of keeping India pre-occupied with border invasions.” (6)

श्री मधु लिमये : श्रीमन्, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि मूल संकल्प के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाए, अर्थात्:—

“कि कच्छ सीमा पर पाकिस्तान के सशस्त्र बलों द्वारा बार बार और लगातार किए जा रहे आक्रमणों से उत्पन्न स्थिति पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस सभा की यह राय है कि कच्छ की सीमा पर भारत की एक एक इंच भूमि वापस लिए बिना भारतीय सेना के द्वारा न गोलाबारी बन्द होनी चाहिए और न ही भारत-पाकिस्तान

के बीच कोई सशस्त्र संघि होनी चाहिए ।”
 (7)

श्री बागड़ी : श्रीमन, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ ।

कि मूल संकल्प के स्थान पर निम्न-लिखित रखा जावे, अर्थात् :—

“कच्छ सीमा पर पाकिस्तान के सशस्त्र बलों द्वारा बार-बार और लगातार किए जा रहे आक्रमणों से उत्पन्न स्थिति पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह सभा :

(क) हिन्दुस्तान की चीन और पाकिस्तान के साथ लम्बी सीमा पर लगातार किए गए हमलों का ठोस और मुक्कम्मिल जवाब देने में सरकार की असफलता पर,

(ख) आक्रमण की शिकार बनी हुई भूमि को विवाद ग्रस्त और बीरान कहने पर,

(ग) पाकिस्तान के साथ भारत-पाकिस्तान महासंघ बनाने के आधार पर बातचीत के लिए हमेशा तैयार रहते हुए कच्छ की सीमा पर एक-एक इंच भूमि को वापिस लिए बिना गोलाबारी बन्द न करने की नीति को घोषित करने में असफलता पर, और

(घ) आक्रमण का सामना करने के लिए स्वयं जरूरी संकल्प शक्ति न दिखाने तथा जनता में इसके लिये आवश्यक मनोबल पैदा न करने पर सरकार की तीव्र आलोचना करती है ।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, I beg to move:

(i) That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of

Pakistan on the Kutch border, places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of the police force as well as of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontier and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our motherland, and with hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India.” (9)

(ii) That for the original motion, the following be substituted namely:

“This House having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border, regrets the failure of the Government—

(a) to anticipate Pakistan's designs or plans to grab the Rann of Kutch,

(b) to make adequate military preparations to meet Pakistan's challenge.

(c) to evict the Pakistan forces from the positions and posts they have forcibly occupied;

(d) to evolve and formulate a clearly defined policy of resolute determination to punish the aggressor and uphold national honour and

(e) to assess the military implications of Sino-Pakistan collusion in the context of national security.” (10)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Permit me to state, Sir, that amendment No. 9 is a verbatim copy of the operative part of the motion moved by the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in November 1962 in the context of the Chinese aggression, and I hope the House will therefore, unanimously adopt this substitute motion.

Mr. Speaker: I only want to know whether the substitution is being moved or not.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I wanted to bring it to the notice of the House because the Government is in the habit of opposing our amendments and resolutions. It was moved by Shri Nehru himself in November 1962.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Sir, I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border, is of the opinion that the Government has failed to take adequate and prompt action to meet the situation and urges upon the Government—

- (a) to throw out the aggressors who have occupied Indian territory without any further loss of time; and
 - (b) not to enter into any Conference or negotiation with Pakistan unless the Pakistan forces withdraw forthwith from the Indian territory.”
- (11)

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

This House having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border, is of the opinion that the policy of drift adopted by the Government in its relations with Pakistan has brought the country to brink of ruin and disgrace and that imperative steps should be taken to replace the present policy with a

strong cogent and logical policy to meet the challenge of Pakistan.” (12)

Mr. Speaker: The original motion and the substitute motions are now before the House.

श्री निशन पटनायक : मेरे संशोधन का जो अंग्रेजी अनुवाद सरकुलेट हुआ है उस में कुछ गलती है, मैं उसको ठीक सुना दूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो आपने हिन्दी में लिखा है वही मैं पढ़ दूँगा।

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that the Prime Minister has at last chosen to take the House into his confidence and appeal to this House and through this House to the people of this great country to achieve unity of the heart. As the people and Parliament had displayed so very readily, abundantly and patriotically on the last occasion when a similar appeal was made by the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, when the Communist Chinese Government and their forces attacked our country, so also I am confident that even now and in times to come when these troubles continue to dog our steps, our country, our people and our Parliament under your leadership and the leadership of the Rashtrapathi, will be able to display their unity of heart and offer what all they can offer in order to protect the country's freedom.

I am also glad the Prime Minister has chosen to place this poser also before our country, that is, if we are to make a choice between poverty on one side and freedom on the other, we would first give our preference to freedom and then do all that is necessary in order to safeguard our freedom, and thereafter begin to do all other things that may be needed, that may be possible, that may be expected by our people on the lines on which they have had their plans.

At the same time, it is relevant for us to examine for a while why we have come to this impasse, this unfortunate position. I do not wish to be satisfied with merely fault finding, but a certain courageous examination of what we have been doing till now that we should have come to be faced with the present situation would be necessary in order to enable us to have a proper conception of what we have to do today and tomorrow in order to safeguard our freedom.

The hon. Prime Minister said just now that we are being attacked there in Kanjarkot in the Kutch area, our claims are entirely justified and theirs are unjustified. They themselves had admitted through their Foreign Minister that we are in possession and we have been in possession of that area—as they call it ‘adverse possession’. Therefore, as the Prime Minister has rightly said, what they are doing is a naked aggression, inexcusable attack on our area and on our forces. If there is any conscience at all in the world today at the United Nations and anywhere else, certainly those statesmen who happen to enjoy the good fortune of being the keepers of that conscience should certainly intervene and support us in our claim that Pakistan should withdraw unconditionally and that too immediately, from these positions of aggression, the positions that she has occupied, positions over which she had no right whatsoever. Agreed. But, is there that conscience? That is where the whole question comes in. In the absence of an energetic and active conscience of that type, and at that level, what is it that we should do? Surely, the Government should have been aware of the fact that such a conscience does not exist there. With all these 17 or 18 years of our experience of the United Nations, they should have known it.

Therefore, was it not the duty of the Government to have been preparing themselves in every possible manner, on the ground with our forces, on the diplomatic level in

international affairs, rather in the whole policy of the Government themselves, so that it would be possible for them to enable our country to meet such a contingency as this, and even worse contingencies too? My fear is, my charge is, that the Government has not been doing just that, what has been necessary, all this time.

When my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, was good enough to call some of us, leaders of the Opposition groups, to a conference with himself along with his own friends, we were told that as early as in January this Government came to know of the aggressive intentions of Pakistan in this particular area. They had already come and established themselves there in Kanjarkot. Was it then not the proper time for them. I asked them on that occasion and I am now revealing it, when they should have invoked the aid of our armed forces?

We were told that even at that time when we were called, the Government was in possession of the information that Pakistani troops were there to the tune of three brigades, they had the aid of two aerodromes, one all-weather aerodrome fit for receiving all types of aircraft, they had very good roads, they were in an advantageous position, they did not depend upon more frontier policemen, they had already massed them in troops and equipped them well. As against that, what was it that our Government had been doing? Why is it that it was content to leave it to the tender mercies and the bravery of a few of our border police, who were making occasional visits and patrolling that border area, heroic as they were, brave as they were and self-sacrificing as they were? When we put this question, there was no answer. Fortunately, two days after that the Home Minister was generous enough to hand over his control over our border policing to our Defence Minis-

[Shri Ranga]

ter. Within this house itself, within the house of the Government, there was that delay, there was that division, there was that lack of unity.

Now, having given it over to the defence forces, they say now: we are in a very difficult position because very soon the monsoon is going to overtake this Rann and it is going to be flooded by the sea, as well as by the rivers, therefore, special steps will have to be taken in order to protect our people on this side, as well as the other side. But do we have, even now, the necessary communications right up to the edge of the submergible Rann? Only yesterday, my hon. friend, Shri Himmatsinghji, from this side of the House, was accusing the Government for having neglected the construction of roads, jeepable roads and roads fit for military vehicles, construction of bridges and other preparations. Only very recently, may be 60 or 70 hours ago, the Defence Minister had gone to that area in order to see whether he could possibly help our troops to remain and take shelter in that terrible summer which is going to come there in that area. All this time, they did not think of this need at all. Yet, the hon. Prime Minister comes and tell us now that they have become aware of the national responsibility. They were not awake till now. Now they want us also to wake up and join them in achieving the national united front in order to remove these marauders and these aggressors.

Should we confine our attention only to Kutch? I am glad the Prime Minister has said that on the whole of our borders and frontiers with Pakistan, there have been occasional troubles here and there. Indeed, the whole nation is alive to it, as it has been alive for many years. One cannot but admire the resilience of our opponents and, by doing so, you would be learning some lessons. The moment that Pakistan came to realise that there was trouble bet-

ween us and China and the honeymoon that was achieved by the late Prime Minister had gone, evaporated into thin air, into the Himalayan air, they were resourceful enough, unscrupulous enough and designing enough politically and diplomatically to turn round and say that there cannot be talks only between China and India, there must be talks between China and India as well as themselves, because they held that part of Kashmir which they had gained by their aggression. And soon after that, they started making overtures towards China and they succeeded. We have lost the friendship of China for no fault of ours. But they have gained the friendship of China, and that is how they have been going all round. Recently, they have gone to other countries too. There was a time when we were sponsoring the claims of China for membership of the United Nations. Now, Pakistan has taken over that mission, with the result that she has got more and more of friends, with all the diplomatic skill and finesse as well as resources of China behind her. And not being satisfied with it, she has gone to the extent of baiting even America, whom she had been befriending for a long time, by joining hands with us in condemning American bombing over Viet Minh. Well, she had joined our excellent company in trying to weaken this fight that is going on for democracy as against the Communist aggression over Viet Nam. Why has she done it? In order to recommend herself all the more by China. And to whom have we recommended ourselves by our shouts "stop this bombing" "stop this bombing", this kind of nervous excitement? Have we gained any friendship? Have we gained any real friends? Whereas, on the other hand, she has been strengthening her friendship with China. Pakistan has been gaining more and more friends, from Turkey right up to Peking on this side and also with

Indonesia on the other side. Once there was such great friendship, undying friendship, as we were told by the previous Prime Minister, between Indonesia and ourselves. What is the position between Indonesia and ourselves today? We had an ally and friend in Malaysia. What have we done with her or how have we treated her when she got into trouble with Indonesia? We said: oh, let all these troubles and disputes be settled in a peaceful manner; we are prepared to offer our services, if you want. No wonder, today England and America have learnt that lesson from us and are remaining completely unaffected by our present troubles. Only they come and tell us: "please be friends, why do you quarrel, why are you behaving like bad boys and not like friends." Did we not do the same thing and we are doing it even now towards others. They are only repeating it, clinging it in our face.

Look at the other side; the design of China. She has been gaining too in her friendship of the African nations. What is our position? Except for the Arab nations, whose friendship we are maintaining at the cost of a matter of honour so far as Israel is concerned are all the other nations now committed to us? Are they friendly? Are they with us? They are not. But are they not with Pakistan? Can you be sure of that? The Government wants us to depend upon the assurances given by our diplomats. We know how our diplomats are behaving. The other day when Sheikh Abdullah was there in Algiers, our Ministry found it necessary to allow our Ambassador to be absent from the station. That is the way these ambassadors are behaving. What sort of advice can you possibly expect from that kind of service? Therefore my charge is that today we do not have any reliable, effective friends in Africa and in Asia. Burma? It is terror-stricken, if she is not already on the other side and of her own choice. Ceylon? In spite of the recent

change in Government, she is anxious to continue the earlier friendship with China, if not to improve upon it. Then, who is our friend?

Thanks to the activities and the bad policies of this Prime Minister as well as the previous Prime Minister, we have come to be isolated, just when we are so badly in need of friends. It was all right to indulge in the luxury of saying, "We are enemies of none; we are friends of everybody". I was also along with our friends when we were saying all this. But when? When we had no troubles; when all other people were in troubles, other people sought our good offices. Ever since we began to get into troubles, we were drawn into trouble, was it not the duty of the Government to have had the necessary resilience, broadmindedness and sense of history to be able to re-orientate their own foreign policy? We have been saying so. But some of the congressmen have been attacking us, some of these other friends in the opposition also have been attacking us, as if in any way our patriotism could possibly be diluted with any kind of affection for any other nation or for any other ideal but the affection for our country and the ideal of national freedom.

Let me assure you that my leader as well as myself and so many of us, not only myself but so many of these Opposition parties' Members also were able to make our own contribution in our own humble way under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and also under the leadership of Netaji in order to win our national freedom. When we were lying down in those jails, not knowing when we were going to be released because we were detenus, we were dreaming of the freedom of this sub-continent as a whole, not a sub-continent being riven into two countries as it has come to be, unfortunately for us. After it has come to be divided in this manner, we have had to reconcile ourselves. We accepted the helpless advice of Mahatma Gandhi. He did not like this partition; he hated it,

[Shri Ranga]

yet he said, "All right, now this is partitioned; make peace with them, wish well of these Pakistanis and you try to continue to be free on your own side and achieve prosperity". Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru....

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Who says? Gandhiji was against it.

Shri Ranga: I did not say that Gandhiji accepted partition, but Gandhiji did not want us to go to war against Pakistan once it came into existence. He wanted us to make friends with Pakistan. I am saying that in spite of Mahatma Gandhi, in spite of many of us, Pakistan came into existence.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Rajaji sponsored it.

An hon. Member: What about Rajaji?

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): At Allahabad.

Shri Ranga: It is very easy for some of our friends to say, "What about Rajaji?" If it had not been for Rajaji's statesmanship, there would not have been this Punjab, it would have been in Pakistan; there would not have been any West Bengal it would have been in Pakistan. What is the use of thinking on these cheap terms? (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: We should allow the debate to proceed more seriously.

Shri Ranga: My quarrel with Pakistan is that she has come to be blessed with a leadership throughout, which has thought it fit to carry on this campaign, as our Prime Minister has just now said rightly, of hatred towards us. I feel, it has been unjustified entirely; they had no need at all for it. Yet, because they could not escape from the travails of the birth of their State—it was born out of hatred—unfortunately, the overflow of it has gone on and it has poisoned not only them but has been poisoning our political life....

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): It is bound to be.

Shri Ranga: It is bound to be. I need not go into all that nor am I concerned today with this.

Pakistan has become stronger in the international sphere. It has gained more friends. We have become weaker. We have lost our friends. On top of it, Pakistan has become the fast ally of Communist China. I do not want to invite any more trouble from other friends, other type of Communists. One thing is clear on the authority of the Home Minister. These Left Communist are an additional source of strength to China as well as to Pakistan and Pakistan has, in addition to that, several other friends also who, from time to time, give evidence of their existence by the bombings and other things that they are indulging in New Delhi, Kashmir and various other places.

When we have become so weak, is it not the duty of the Government even now—I expected the Prime Minister to give some indication; he wants us all and the country to make all sacrifices—to sacrifice some of their dogmas, some of their shibboleths, some of their notions, earlier prejudices and present practices? Is it not time for them to come and say, "Yes, we are also prepared; we will join hands with you, sit across the table and discuss all these things as to what all has got to be done by way of changing the whole economic, social and political policy of this Government, of this country, in order to be in a position to strengthen ourselves".

Yesterday, the Defence Minister was saying, "Oh! we have got enough strength to stand up to China and Pakistan". With all sense of responsibility. I say that we should not make a statement like that.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Whole India stands behind him.

Mr. Speaker: He has to hear the view of individual Members.

Shri Ranga: First of all, I do not have information enough to be able to accept or refute his statement. Secondly, the Chinese and the Pakistanis and others who are opposed to us, I am sure, are in possession of better and greater information than we have; therefore, they might be able not only to take the warning but also laugh in their sleeves and take into their head to create trouble also. We do not want any more trouble. We are having trouble enough now straightaway on the Pakistan border. It is quite possible there may be trouble on the Chinese border. The other day, my hon. friend, Shri Hem Barua, paid the penalty for his patriotic outburst, . . . (*Interruption*) unseasonal as it was by expressing his great anxiety that China and Pakistan are likely to create trouble on the whole of the extensive frontiers which we have, which we are suffering from. That is what is going to happen. Where is China going to strike us, when is she going to strike us and at whose request—to oblige Pakistan, to oblige herself—all these questions arise. When that happens what will be the attitude of Soviet Russia?

13 hrs.

My hon. friends were quite glad because their Ambassador and other people had assured them that the Russian Government had said, "No, no; in regard to Kashmir our attitude has not changed." Maybe; but in regard to all other issues, all other troubles, what attitude is Soviet Russia going to assume? President Ayub Khan has said, "Oh! It would go on unfolding itself just as a flower goes on unfolding itself in course of time." So, we cannot expect much help. What help is Soviet Russia able to give to her friend Viet Minh? It is a token help. She is giving some help it is token. Is it going to be of much help to them? Why is it so? It is because she cannot upset China too nor can she help China. She is in

that mood today. Will she not be in that mood in regard to us? Then, what will be our position with regard to America and England? Are they going to come to our rescue? Did they not come to our rescue as soon as the aggression had occurred? How many things have happened ever since?

Shri Yallamanda Reddy (Markapur): They will give arms to Pakistan and rescue my hon. friend.

Shri Ranga: They will not give even that much. Anyhow, that is the position. Therefore, we cannot count upon them. On whom is this Prime Minister going to count? Is it on our 450 million people?

Several hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Ranga: Agreed, I want to add my voice of appreciation to the voice raised by the late Prime Minister in placing on record the House's appreciation of the valiant struggle of the Police force as well as of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers and which paid its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down and who are laying down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our motherland. I repeat that homage once again in all humility. Now is it enough for our 450 million people standing alone by themselves to be able to stand this aggression that is coming upon us in a piece-meal fashion? When it comes in a wholesale fashion, I do not know what will happen. It is now coming in a piece-meal fashion. It is a wasting process; it is a running sore. Would it be possible for us to deal with them without any friends? Would it be possible for us to deal with this situation with the liabilities that we are suffering from, political and economic?

Sir, I appeal to the Prime Minister to do the needful from his side. If he does not do it, he would be forfeiting his moral right to ask us to be on his side and to stand by him. When there was an attack, on England

[Shri Ranga]

by Hitler, there was a party like this for them with as much strength. But it had patriotism enough to drop one leader and invite another from among its own leaders to take charge, to change the whole character of the Government in order to provide the necessary leadership for that nation. I cannot feel confident that this Government has got that moral strength or this ruling Party would be able to exercise such a moral strength as to be able to provide that kind of a broadminded, far-sighted, courageous leadership that is necessary today, tomorrow and day after, as long as this threat of Chinese aggression and the present aggression from Pakistan continues.

He called us the other day to take us into confidence—it was already too late—and he called in the aid of the Army—it was already too late—and afterwards I said, "For God's sake, do call us from time to time and take us into confidence because Pakistan is carrying on propaganda." I myself and everyone of the Members is getting their pamphlets everyday refuting what we say. Is it not proper that he should have heeded the advice which I conveyed to him in a letter, that he should be calling the leaders of the Opposition from time to time in order to help them to understand the situation properly, fully and truthfully? He has not done it—I do not know for what purpose. Now he comes and asks for our cooperation. I can only say, his Government must deserve our cooperation.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it goes without saying that we are confronted with a grave situation. We are confronted with the test, not only of our nerves but of our strength, of our character and our understanding of forces which are operating to make or mar the kind of world we all wish for.

Sir, in regard to Pakistan this country has followed, ever since the foundation of Pakistan, a policy of

forbearance. We have sometimes almost turned the other cheek. We have not been perfect; we have made mistakes. But from the other side, from Pakistan, there has come continuous provocation and unending stream of refugees have come with their tale of woe and are coming still. From the notorious days, when the raid on Kashmir took place and the illegal occupation followed of nearly half of the area of Jammu and Kashmir State there has happened a whole series of ugly incidents. Recently, in a few hectic weeks, we have had news of the shelling of Dahagram in the north-east; 64 violations in one week along the Jammu and Kashmir cease-fire line; reports of menacing troop movements along the border on the Pakistan side from Tripura, Kashmir and elsewhere and they have culminated in the enormity in Kutch where repeated and continuing attack with tanks and heavy artillery, as the Prime Minister has told us, has taken place.

Last week, I was in Gujarat for a couple of days and I could sense something of the feelings of our people in regard to the Kutch martyrs, as they call them, in regard to those who have laid down their lives fighting in the cause of the defence of our country and I noticed also a good deal of feeling in regard to the default of the Government both at the level of the Gujarat State and at the level of the Union Government. But at this present moment perhaps it is better that we do not go into an examination of whatever defaults that might have taken place on our side. What requires to be said today is that we are determined unitedly to defend our country's integrity, that we will not allow the rulers of Pakistan to secure their unjust claims to Indian territory by military pressure and black-mail. If they continue this miserable game of pushing us about in order to humiliate us as her peculiar combination of friends, China and the United States of America, try to do, they shall have also to be

taught a lesson. We have never ruled out, and as the Prime Minister has said again, we shall never rule out all respectable and self-respecting avenues for arriving at a just settlement. But we stand firm with steely resolutions on the issue of the sanctity and the defence of our country.

I do wish Prof. Ranga had woken to some realisation at least of one salient fact which is that Pakistan's attacks have been facilitated by arms received from the United States of America. It is necessary to recall today, with all the earnestness at our command, that the connivance of Anglo-American imperialists is the biggest political weapon which Pakistan hopes to be able to employ against us.

I remember what Maulana Abul Kalam Azad had written in his book published posthumously *India wins Freedom* where he had said that Pakistan was put up because it was likely to be a British base of operations against India, and I know, and I can shout from the house-tops, a realisation which ought to sink in the minds of the Government of this country, that the British and the Americans have never yet forgiven us for being free and for trying to pursue an independent foreign policy and an independent effort at developing our own economy. I wish Professor Ranga and his friends had also remembered that only the other day, perhaps the day before yesterday, the Foreign Minister came before us to tell us about the base which the British and the Americans were going to have somewhere near Mauritius because they wanted to make sure of the Indian ocean territory; they are not satisfied with the chain of bases which they have got from the Mediterranean to the Pacific and they want now to consolidate their Indian Ocean control by having a base which would be powered with a nuclear arsenal which can blow up our part of the world in no time.

It should be remembered that the United States remains Pakistan's principal international patron. Even in the matter of supplying India rather

out-of-date aircraft which Pakistan already has got in plenty, the United States is firmly opposed because that might offend the susceptibilities of the United States' friend Pakistan. The United States has consistently armed Pakistan with modern weapons, while refusing to supply them to India, and unmistakable evidence of the employment of US arms by Pakistan against India has come into the possession of the Government of our country.

In *The Himes of India* of today's date, there is a report that the Government of India has material which it can produce; and that the Government of India is prepared to produce the serial numbers and photographic evidence of American equipment which is being used by Pakistan against us. The report adds—I am quoting —.

“At the request of the US Embassy, the Government of India is holding over the release to the world press of the photographs of M-48 tanks which Pakistan is using on the Kutch border. These tanks were supplied by the US Aid to Pakistan under the military aid Programme for her defence against communism.”

This is what the American friends of Pakistan are doing today, and the United States forgets its old pledges to India; pledges given even in the days of the late unlamented John Foster Dulles that the arms supplied to Pakistan would not be used against India. And on their part, the American military personnel come over to examine the kind of thing which they have supplied to us and to make sure that we do not employ them against Pakistan. We have not the slightest intention of using this kind of weapon against Pakistan. We do not want to fight Pakistan, and we want to avoid a fight with our sister-country. But the American authorities are behaving in this most egregious fashion. The American military mission comes from time to time to Delhi and they make the fullest enquiries on instructions from Washington, and they know very

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

well that India was not using any American equipment in her clashes with Pakistan, and yet this kind of thing goes on and with impunity Pakistan uses American weapons.

American weapons have been found not only in those areas where Pakistan is operating against us, but I know for a fact, because I had been to Nagaland, that even in Nagaland, those hostile Nagas who have been to Pakistan bring back certain weapons which they have employed against us and among those weapons are weapons with US markings. This is a fact that also has been vouchsafed for authoritatively in Nagaland.

What I mean to say is that just as in the American cancellation of the invitation to our Prime Minister, our national honour was involved, in the American participation in the attack mounted on our country by Pakistan, our national security is also involved. We find that the interests of China and Pakistan which are both anti-Indian, which have an obsessive feeling in regard to our country, as the Prime Minister put it, coincide to a dangerous degree. But what has happened as far as we are concerned? Because of China, we go nearer to the United States in the hope that we should be good boys in the eyes of the American imperialists; and they would help us properly; but they do not help us because that is not the way in which the world is ordered. If for defence, for food and for development, we rely on the Americans and the Anglo-American camp, the Western Camp, as it is generally called, in the way that we do, then we shall be inviting disaster. Countries like the UAR or like Indonesia have told off the Americans, if aid cannot come on self-respecting terms, and they have got away with it, and they have not suffered. It is only when we show a stronger attitude—particularly the newly liberated countries which have thrown off the colonial yoke have to show a stronger attitude in regard to countries like these colonial powers, the Anglo-Ame-

rican combination—that real dividends would be forthcoming. The weaker we are, the more likely are we to be bullied, and the world expects us to assert our honour, and then only our security will be guaranteed. We have found this kind of thing happening in regard to Phizo, in regard to Sheikh Abdullah and in regard to the wider issue of Kashmir. Everywhere, we have been subjected to blackmail. We have been sought to be 'pressured' into submission to the actions of certain powers in the world. An example of them is now being egregiously enacted by the activities of Pakistan. The Pakistani operations in the swampy and sandy and supposedly oil-rich Rann of Kutch which from our side is a very difficult terrain, a great deal more difficult to deal with than from the side of Pakistan, are therefore, a very illuminating pointer. When skrimishing has developed into serious violation of our border positions and even of territory well inside our border, the position certainly has got to be rectified. There must be no truckling down to the Pakistani threat either in the Rann of Kutch or elsewhere, which must be answered, but there must be no refusal at the same time—and I am glad the Prime Minister has said it—to have talks on terms that are acceptable to India's dignity.

Pakistan's political and military manoeuvres to put us in the wrong in the eyes of other countries also have got to be borne in mind. Let us not walk into the trap which is being laid by the Pakistan Government. Let us tell the whole story. Let us tell the whole story to all our friends. Let us prepare for instance for the Algiers Conference where the Afro-Asian countries are going to meet, and tell them the whole story. The unvarnished story that the Prime Minister has given us might be made fun of by those people who believe in the order of the mighty man's domination, but it is an unvarnished story of how forbearing India has tried to be, and yet in spite of this, this kind of action is coming

from that side. Therefore, I believe that Government should take a lesson from what has happened and explain the whole position not only to us but to others as well. Sometimes, we are not taken into confidence, and my hon. friend Professor Ranga is correct in pointing out how Government seems to ignore so many of us who are here in this House only because we happen to be critics of Government; Government does not care to take us into confidence but, of course, when Government really wants the united determination of the country to be finding concrete expression, it will have to take notice of the rest of us.

Quite apart from that, there are our friends and our potential friends, and even some countries which are not particularly friendly to us at the moment to whom we have to explain the whole position, to show how forbearing we have been, and how we say we are for civilised conduct and yet at the same time there is no response, tangibly speaking, from the Pakistan side. It is only when we do that we shall be able to pursue a policy which would be successful.

Some of us might have suggestions in regard to how military operations, if they are necessary, should be conducted. I feel a great deal of humility in regard to this matter. If I presume to have some military advice to give to Government, I would speak about it to my hon. friend the Defence Minister and not speak about it in this House. I think that not too much barking but concentration on the power to bite, when biting is needed, is very much needed. And I would certainly reprobate certain things which are sometimes very unfortunately being said. Nothing is more insensate than to suggest, for example, that we should take retaliatory action like—it has been suggested—an attack on East Bengal which is supposedly Pakistan's weak point.

Sir, communal and other incendiaries who masquerade as defenders of the nation have to be isolated, or we are in for disaster. Day before yes-

terday, when this matter came up, I had happened to say that there should be no glib talk in regard to war. I am glad that the Prime Minister supports basically the point of view which I had put forward. I shudder to think of a full-scale Indo-Pakistani conflict, because it would automatically involve communal dangers of a sort which I refuse to speak of. . . .

Shri Raghunath Singh: If it is forced on us, then?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: There are minorities in both countries. Pakistani rulers do not care about elementary political and moral decencies and would think little of staging pogroms against minorities in East Bengal. There are about 7 to 8 million of them still there. But we must see that nothing of that kind of beastliness is permitted to take place either here or there. This is a secular country. Our Muslim fellow-citizens have declared, as my hon. friend, the representative of the Muslim League of Kerala, Shri Koya, said the other day, that they are at one with the rest of us as regards maintaining the integrity of our country.

We have gone through agony. We have gone through experiences which we shall never wish to see repeated, and we must ensure that no incendiary element, communal or otherwise is allowed to fan communal conflict; and we must maintain communal harmony at all costs.

I was happy to hear Shri Nanda yesterday repeating, for example, what he had said last year in regard to the urgency, the absolute imperative urgency, of maintaining communal harmony, particularly when the necessity for a united stand to repel the kind of attack which Pakistan has made makes it imperative also for us to concentrate on the absolute essentiality of maintaining communal harmony.

Government must also do something, to which Shri Nanda made reference yesterday, namely, maintain the price line, keep the hoarders and profiteers in check. Yesterday, Shri Nanda told us that because of this country being

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

in something like a danger, there should be no *bandhs*, Bharat *bandh* or any other kind of *bandh*. Nobody takes recourse to these *bandhs*, for the pleasure of it. But I would tell Government: please remember that in November 1962, also the Home Minister—I remember it very vividly—made a very blazing declaration that he would force and hold the price line. But the experience of these last 2½ years has shown that far from holding the price line, it has skyrocketed in a fashion which has really caused great damage to the interest of our people.

Therefore, Government cannot eat the cake and have it too, Government cannot just ask the people to sacrifice everything for the sake of the country, and at the same time make conditions almost impossible for the people. When there is crisis and danger to the country, we all stay united, but it must not be at the cost of avoidable privation to the working people who are the overwhelming majority of our people.

As I said before, we are confronting a test of our nerves, a test of our strength, a test of our understanding. Let us, therefore, take steps accordingly. No more talks which go round and round the mulberry bush, but talks with a purpose and alongside of it, every step, military and peaceful, needed to maintain the atmosphere for that kind of talk.

Let us try and concentrate all our resources to defeat Pakistan's military-cum-political manouvre, both in the camp of the Afro-Asian countries and in the camp of the Anglo-American powers. Let us get clear of the ugly role, particularly of such countries as the United States, the UK and its friends. Let us preserve communal peace as the very apple of our eye. Let us fashion a long-term policy of indispensable economic and political strength which we can independently muster with help, whenever possible, from friendly countries on terms which are acceptable, because it is only when we do that that we shall be able

to find answers to the kind of provocative questions which Pakistan has posed before us.

I feel, therefore, that this is a moment, a moment of grave import, when we should all combine in order to defeat the dangers with which the country is confronted. But this is a time also for thinking, a time for introspection, a time to examine why and how so many of our policies in spite of the quality of forbearance, have failed and then and then alone shall we be able to forge a real answer to our present troubles.

Shri Ansar Harvani: Sir, It was Robert Clive who forced India to come under British domination at Palassey. It was Mountbatten who created conditions for foreign intervention in this country by partition. We accepted partition with full grace, with full magnanimity. We accepted the sovereignty and integrity of Pakistan. We fought for the freedom of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent and though we suffered for the freedom of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent, the Pakistani leaders did nothing for the freedom of this country. The freedom which they are now enjoying was won as a result of the sufferings and sacrifices of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. In return for these sufferings and sacrifices, they put in Jail Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and other fighters of freedom in Pakistan. At the same time, we tried our best to have good relations with Pakistan.

Today Pakistan has committed aggression in Kutch. It is nothing new. For the last 17 years, Pakistan has been indulging in aggression against us. Aggression first started in Kashmir, and from time to time thereafter, at various points it has been committing aggression on our territory. We thoroughly condemn it.

I represent a constituency which has a population of only 8 per cent Muslims. That shows the secular character, the non-communal character of this country. I was born a Muslim and I live a Muslim. I declare here

and now that every Muslim in India, man, woman and child, will lay down his or her life for the defence of the country. It is my country. It is my country as much as the country of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri or Shri Nanda. We will be behind them when the time comes to lay down our lives and sacrifice ourselves for the freedom and integrity of this country.

Before I proceed further, I want to point out that in spite of 17 years of freedom, Pakistan has not attained cohesion. It is an artificial country; its sovereignty is artificial. Have you ever heard anywhere of a country divided into two by 1300 miles without having any link between the two parts? What is common between East Pakistan and West Pakistan? History, language, culture, terrain—nothing except religion. If religion could be a binding force, Pakistan would have become part of Afghanistan and Iran. But today the relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan are as bad as those between India and Pakistan.

The only binding force between East Pakistan and West Pakistan is hatred of India, fear of India. As long as East Pakistan and West Pakistan continue with only this in common, the sovereignty of India is always in danger and we should take care and strengthen our forces on the borders. I have full confidence in the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister that they will do their best to defend our borders from the enemy who will continue an enemy for a long time to come.

From time to time, I have been asking on the floor of the House as to what type of arms are being used by Pakistanis when they raid our borders. Unfortunately in the past, the reply of the Government used to be elusive. But now Government have accepted that American arms have been used by Pakistanis. I appeal to my Prime Minister and my Foreign Minister to inform the friendly countries like the USA that we thoroughly resent that American arms are being used against us on our border and it is an unfriend-

ly act, and the sooner they stop the arms flow to Pakistan the better for the relations between India and Pakistan.

We should also take up the matter with UK, another great country and leader of the Commonwealth, whose leaders make pious appeals to us to settle our disputes. What about their help to Pakistan? They are also helping Pakistan. Will they take the initiative to expel from the Commonwealth a member which has committed aggression against another brother-member of the Commonwealth? We should take the initiative and tell the Britain to take the initiative to expel Pakistan from the Commonwealth for it has committed aggression on a fellow-Commonwealth country.

There are certain well-meaning people who often talk of Indo-Pakistan amity.

There is a great Socialist leader who often talks of a confederation between India and Pakistan, but such people fail to understand the character of Pakistan. A confederation with Pakistan or amity between India and Pakistan is a mirage and cannot come about as long as the present character of Pakistan continues.

We should give full support to our fighters there. I take this opportunity to salute those people who are standing on the heights of Himalayas in Kashmir, in snowbound heights, defending this country. I salute those people who are fighting in the marshy land of Kutch, who are doing their best, and I assure you and I assure our Government that every man and woman of this country is behind the Government. It is a national issue, it is not a communal issue, party issue. Every one will support them.

With these words, I support the Government, and I assure you that we will fight and fight for the freedom and integrity of this country.

Shri P. R. Chakraverti (Dhanbad):
I, as a student of history, have to

[Shri P. R. Chakraverti]

recount here the incidents that led to the birth of Pakistan. I had been in East Bengal 45 years facing the onslaughts of the founders of Pakistan, the fanatically minded communalists. The incident that I am going to relate will make clear the particular character and tenor of their temperament. In non-partitioned Bengal, there were five Muslim Ministers from my city, namely Dacca. Within ten miles of the city of Dacca, there was a village of 18,000 Muslims, all weavers, the best skilled artisans of India, who were adept in the art of manufacturing muslin and making Jamdani sarees. These five Ministers were present in a meeting and I asked them only one question. I asked them how it was that they allowed people of their own community, their own brethren, these artists and artisans to die of starvation in 1943 because of the non-supply of yarn, which was available only in the black market.

13.32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The question touched their hearts, but no answer was forthcoming. It is they who were responsible for the communal bickerings and for working against the people who fought for the liberation of India, especially on the eastern side of India. I have spent 45 years of my life there, and so I know. This is the origin of the present regime of Pakistan, with which the people of both East and West Pakistan have been tied together. It is dominated by particular persons who always deviate from the right type of policy which alone can help to generate a climate of democracy and socialism. It is in the very nature of the vicious circumstances that led to the growth of Pakistan that prompts it to be inimically opposed to what India stands for.

If they could not save their own community people when they were suffering what accounted for it?

What does it indicate? It indicates that they had no love for the people who had been suffering, that they were in the hands of feudal lords, the lackeys of the British Imperialism and the proteges of their masters, that they only wanted to prosper at the cost of the millions of people in the east as well as the west.

So, today when Pakistan turns its forces against India, it is obvious that it wants to divert the people's urges, their aspirations for growth, to another channel, thereby making them a prey to their fascist designs and to their wanton dictates which always go against the fundamental tenets of democracy.

As you know, in East Pakistan, there has been a systematic and continuous uprising against the present system of government which is a military despotism, and the people there have all along been fighting and trying to assert themselves. The people on the eastern side are far from the western side of Pakistan. Indeed, it is true that geographically and also psychically, the people in the two parts have nothing in common specially with those who make them serve and keep them in perpetual destitution and poverty. So, we have to understand that before we take up our disputes with Pakistan and their repercussion.

Pakistan has been trying to wage war against India because of all these factors. Obviously they want to divert the attention of the people there bypassing their demands. As such, we must be very careful to see that today if aggression by Pakistan has to be faced, we do not confound the issues, and thereby make the people belonging to minority communities who are still left over there, especially in East Pakistan, victims of their carnage and genocide. Accustomed as they are to these forms of killings, ruthless murders, raids and massa-

ces, they are as yet waiting for another chance to deal the most terrible, the heaviest blow to the people who are made to live there, the minorities numbering more than 8 1/2 millions including Hindus, Christians, Buddhists and tribals.

When these people were coming out in the year 1964, I cautioned the Government that it was only one phase of the tactics, of the manoeuvres of Pakistan to fully squeeze the life-blood of the minorities there, and that we had to be careful. The late Prime Minister was generous enough to state that these people would get chances of seeking shelter in India, if they so willed. The restrictions were withdrawn and they felt satisfied with the professions and unreserved statements of the leaders here.

Today I again draw the attention of the Prime Minister to this fact that in the wake of warfare there will be a terrible form of psychological and psychic reaction against the people there who are against absolute military dictatorship and those who profess their belief in democracy and self-determination. Let us be sure that the people on the other side, the Minority community members, are not again made to suffer because of the restrictions which have been recently imposed by India. It is a peculiar form of our interpretation of historical development that we always try to interpret everything in the light of certain factors which do not come within the range of historical facts if scientifically analysed. As such I may again say that today India must be vigilant and scrupulously alert on all the frontiers, because it is an attack not in one place isolated from the others. It will be an all-round attack and against the basic things of life for which we worked for decades and ultimately became free. The people of Pakistan have yet to feel the glow of freedom, which has been denied to them these 17 years. I want to reiterate that because the minority community is still living there, we

cannot close our borders, seal off our borders on the technical plea that they have to get migration certificates before they are allowed entry into India.

I would again request the Prime Minister and the other members of his Cabinet to understand the implication that any trouble on any front West or East means a direct menace to the people who are still left over there. This may happen irrespective of the fact that we in India believe in, work for and fight for certain basic principles and give scope for self expression to all irrespective of community, religion, faith or any other distinction. We can't forget that these minorities in Pakistan have all along been made to suffer, they have been used as the meat in the sandwich for the repast of the communal-minded Muslim Leaguers of Pakistan. So, today we must be very cautious to see the implications of the recent restrictions which have been imposed on the people who have been trying to seek shelter in India not because of the lure of money, not because of the lure of land or any other benefit, but because they have been squeezed out, because they felt insecure about the honour of their women, the safety of their lives or anything else that belonged to them so long as they stayed there.

So, when they are seeking shelter here, on the definite assurance of the authorities here, relying on the statements made by the leaders of India, let them not be made to wait at the frontiers of India which are thousands of miles long and denied entry here. I would again repeat here today, let us fulfil the promise to fight the aggressive designs of Pakistan which is motivated by a sinister feeling of hatred and spite which has been persistently followed from the year 1947 against India. In spite of our offer of friendship and goodwill towards them, we did not evoke any response.

[Shri P. R. Chakraverti]

Today, we must bear in mind that this section of the people who are living on the other side in East Pakistan, those eight and a half millions of non-muslims, are still to be taken into account, and they should be saved. The question of sealing off the borders now should be discarded and they must be allowed to have free entry into India when they decide to leave Pakistan whenever they seek shelter here. There is no question of having migration certificate or any other document. That is my honest appeal. In the name of humanity, in the name of the people who have served us, in the name of the people who have given us all along their unstinted support in our freedom struggle, I again appeal to the people who count here, to the authorities here, and especially to the Prime Minister, "please see that the borders should not be sealed off and those people should be allowed to come here whenever they feel unsafe, to come to the place where they rightly belong."

श्री भागवत झा आजाद (भागलपुर):

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम सभी यह मानते हैं कि आज ऐसे समय में, जब कि देश के सामने बहुत कठिन समस्याएँ हैं, यह सदन एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न पर विचार कर रहा है। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने आज जो बयान इस सदन में दिया है और जो अपील उन्होंने राष्ट्र के नाम प्रसारित की है, उस के लिए हम उन को हृदय से धन्यवाद देते हैं।

आज उन्होंने अपने भाषण में यह पूर्णतया बता दिया है कि यद्यपि हम हिन्दुस्तान-वासी शान्ति के पोषक हैं और हम ने बराबर, हर कीमत पर, शान्ति को बनाये रखने का प्रयास किया है, लेकिन इस का यह अर्थ नहीं हो सकता कि हम अपनी सीमाओं का उल्लंघन वर्दाशत करें या अपने राष्ट्र की कोई भूमि किसी को अर्पण कर के शान्ति स्थापित करने का प्रयत्न करें। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने

सदन के सामने जो बयान दिया है और जो आंकड़े तथा तथ्य सदन के सामने रखे हैं, सचमुच उन से यह साफ़ प्रकट हो जाता है कि हमारी जिन सीमाओं का आज पाकिस्तान अतिक्रमण कर रहा है, वे सीमाएँ और वह भूमि सब हमारी हैं।

इस समय पाकिस्तान ने जो रवैया अख्तियार किया है, वह कोई नई बात नहीं है। हम ने बराबर पाकिस्तान की ओर दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया है, लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने बराबर उस हाथ को काटने का प्रयत्न किया है। देश के बंटवारे के समय से ले कर हम ने बराबर हर प्रश्न को, हर विषय को, सलाह-मशिवरे से तय करने का प्रयत्न किया है, चाहे पाकिस्तान का रुख किसी भी प्रकार का क्यों न रहा हो। देश के बंटवारे के समय हम ने पाकिस्तान के साथ सम्पत्ति के सम्बन्ध में जो समझौता किया, चाहे वह सम्पत्ति चल या अचल हो, स्थल सेना, वायु सेना या जल सेना की सम्पत्ति हो या कोई भी अन्य सम्पत्ति हो, उस के अनुसार हम ने पाकिस्तान को उस के उचित हिस्से से अधिक दिया।

उस के बाद भी जब जब कोई विवाद-प्रस्त प्रश्न हमारे सामने आये, हम ने उन को उचित तरीके से और उदारतापूर्वक तय करने का प्रयत्न किया। आज भी पाकिस्तान की तरफ़ हमारा करोड़ों रुपये का कर्ज है, जिस को पाकिस्तान ने आज तक नहीं दिया है। लेकिन फिर भी हम ने पाकिस्तान के साथ संतुलन का बर्ताव रखा है। जहाँ तक नहरी पानी का सवाल है, आज तक जो रुख पाकिस्तान अख्तियार करता रहा है, अगर वही रुख हम भी अख्तियार करते, तो हम नहरी पानी को बन्द कर के सम्पूर्ण पाकिस्तान को वीरान कर सकते थे। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की बह भावना कभी नहीं रही और न रहेगी। इसलिए हम ने नहरी पानी का उचित रूप से इस्तजाम किया।

उसके साथ साथ जब जब भी देश की सीमाओं के सम्बन्ध में झगड़े के प्रश्न आये, हम ने उन को शान्ति के साथ सुलझाने की कोशिश की। आज 1960 के जिस एग्रीमेंट का हवाला दिया जाता है, जिस के लिए हमारे देश के विदेश सचिव और पाकिस्तान के विदेश सचिव मिले थे, उस में यही सीमा ही नहीं है, बल्कि वे अन्य सीमायें हैं, जहां उन के वाटर के हैडवर्क्स हमारे देश में थे और हम ने उन के बारे में समुचित समझौता किया। 1960 के उस एग्रीमेंट में स्पष्ट लिखा हुआ है—इन्टरनेशनल डीफ़्रंटो बाउंड्री नोन टू दि लोकल कमांडर्ज एंड दि पीपल, अर्थात् कच्छ और सिंध के बीच की वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा, जो कि दोनों देशों की सेना, कमांडर्ज और जनता को पूर्ण रूप में मालूम है। आज से नहीं, अठारहवीं शताब्दी से—उस समय से, जब कि देश का बंटवारा नहीं हुआ था, सारे संसार को हमारी वह सीमा मालूम है। हम ने किसी भी ऐसी सीमा का दावा नहीं किया है, किसी भी ऐसी भूमि की मांग नहीं की है, जो कभी भी, किसी भी हालत में, हमारी इन सीमाओं से परे हो।

लेकिन जैसा कि हम सभी जानते हैं, पाकिस्तान का संस्थापन ही गलत रूप में हुआ है। और आज पाकिस्तान में एक तानाशाही सरकार है और अयूब वहां का डिक्टेटर है, जिस ने संसार के सब से बड़ी तानाशाही, जुल्मी, चीन से अपना सम्बन्ध बढ़ाया है। इसलिए आज प्रश्न सीमा का नहीं है, बल्कि प्रश्न तो यह है कि चीन और पाकिस्तान और चीन के तानाशाह, माओ-त्से-तुंग, तथा पाकिस्तान के तानाशाह, अयूब, की आंखों में संसार के सब से बड़े पनपने वाले गणतंत्र की उन्नति और प्रगति खलती है और इसलिए वे चाहते हैं कि वे एक दूसरे के साथ मिल कर हमारी सम्पूर्ण, हज़ारों मील लम्बी, सीमाओं को जागृत रखें, उन पर मुठभेड़ें करते रहें, ताकि हमारे देश की आर्थिक प्रगति और हमारी योजनायें—हमारी तृतीय

योजना और आने वाली चतुर्थ योजना—खटाई में पड़ जायें और हम अपने देश के नागरिकों के मुंह की रोटी छिन कर उन के हाथों में बन्दूक दें। जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है, हम यह चाहते हैं और हम बराबर इस शान्ति-नीति के पोषक रहे हैं और रहेंगे, लेकिन अगर पाकिस्तान हमारी शान्ति-प्रियता और मैत्री की नीति का अर्थ हमारी कमजोरी समझता है, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने आज इस सदन में दिये गये अपने बयान और देश के नाम की गई अपील में बहुत ही स्पष्ट और मजबूत शब्दों में इस बात का आह्वान किया है कि यह देश किसी भी कीमत पर, कोई भी कुर्बानी दे कर, अपनी सीमा का, अपना आज़ादी का और अपनी सार्वभौमिकता का संरक्षण करेगा और यह सदन तथा इस देश की कोटि-कोटि जनता इस निश्चय में उनके साथ है।

आज जो यह कहा जा रहा है कि हम को पाकिस्तान की आक्रामक कार्यवाहियों का कड़ा जवाब देना चाहिए, मैं उस से सहमत हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि यह सदन और इस देश की जनता यह चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान का पूरी तरह से मुकाबला किया जाये, लेकिन हम यह भी जानते हैं कि संसार में जब जब भी, कहीं भी, किसी तानाशाह ने एक गणतंत्र पर आक्रमण किया है, उस से गणतंत्र को शुरू शुरू में हार खानी पड़ी है। यह आज की बात नहीं है, बल्कि प्रथम और द्वितीय महायुद्धों के उदाहरण हमारे सामने हैं। आज तक किसी भी गणतंत्र ने, किसी भी ऐसे देश के प्रधान मंत्री ने, जो कि वहां के सदन के समक्ष जवाबदेह है, गणतंत्र के आधार पर बनी हुई किसी भी सरकार ने कभी भी अपने देश की जनता के मुख से रोटी छिन कर बन्दूक नहीं दी है, बल्कि उस ने बराबर अपने देश की आर्थिक प्रगति की है। यहां तक कि द्वितीय महायुद्ध में सब से बहादुर राष्ट्र, ब्रिटेन, के प्रधान मंत्री, चर्चिल, को अपने देश को दो साल तक यह समझाना पड़ा कि हम क्यों हार रहे हैं—इसलिए कि ब्रिटेन ने

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

हिटलर की तरह अपने देश में जनता के सुख-साधनों को लूट कर बन्दूक तैयार नहीं की थीं ।

उसी प्रकार हिन्दुस्तान के प्रथम प्रधान मंत्री, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, ने इस देश को बे योजनायें दीं, जिनके बल पर, जिस भूखे और नंगे हिन्दुस्तान को ब्रिटेन छोड़ कर गया था, उस को आर्थिक दृष्टि से मजबूत बनाया गया । इसी कारण जब चीन ने हमारे देश पर आक्रमण किया, उस समय सम्पूर्ण राष्ट्र ने, जिस की आर्थिक नींव बहुत मजबूत और दृढ़ थी, एक हो कर उस का मुकाबला किया । हमारी उसी नीति का परिणाम यह है कि आज भी हम बौखलाये नहीं हैं और हम निश्चित रूप से पाकिस्तान की आक्रामक नीति का जोरदार मुकाबला करेंगे । हम पाकिस्तान की इस बर्बरतापूर्ण और द्वेषपूर्ण नीति तथा उस की निरंकुशता का विरोध करते हैं, लेकिन साथ ही साथ, जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है, हम इस बात के समर्थक हैं कि हम शान्ति का दरवाजा, बातचीत का दरवाजा बराबर खुला रखें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय की कृपा से हाल ही में मुझे कुछ विदेशों में घूमने का अवसर मिला । मैं इंग्लैंड गया और पूर्वी यूरोप के देशों में यूगोस्लाविया, ग्रीस तथा लेबनान और जोर्डन गया । इन तमाम देशों में इस बात की निश्चयपूर्वक सराहना की जाती है कि इस के बावजूद कि चीन ने हम पर बर्बरतापूर्ण हमला किया और इस के बावजूद कि पाकिस्तान बराबर हमारी सीमाओं पर छेड़खानी करता है, हमारे साथ दयाबाजी करता है, मक्कारी करता है, 439 मिलियन लोगों के इस मुल्क ने, इसकी सरकार ने और इस के प्रधान मंत्री ने उन के साथ जो बर्ताव किया है, यह एक छोटे और नीच राष्ट्र के नहीं, बल्कि एक महान् राष्ट्र के योग्य है ।

मेरा खयाल है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के आज के वक्तव्य से सम्पूर्ण संसार में इस बात की जरूर प्रतिष्ठा होगी, इस बात की जरूर प्रशंसा होगी कि जहां हिन्दुस्तान अपनी शान्तिपूर्ण नीति का पोषक है वहां साथ ही साथ वह इस बात को कभी भी बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकता है कि जो सीमायें पूर्ण रूप में निश्चित हैं, जो सीमायें आज से नहीं 18वीं शताब्दी में सिंध प्रदेश और कच्छ राज्य के बीच तय हुई थीं, उन सीमाओं का अतिक्रमण किसी भी हालत में बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जायेगा । 1960 का जो एग्रीमेंट था उस में भी पांच छः प्रश्नों का हवाला दिया गया था । उन में से चार पर तो सुलह हो गई और एक दो पर नहीं । उस एग्रीमेंट में यह स्पष्ट रूप से लिखा हुआ है :

"the two countries will collect further material on this issue".

हमारा विश्वास है कि उसके बाद हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने पाकिस्तान के साथ मैटीरियल जमा करके, आंकड़ों को तैयार करके बात करने की कोशिश की है लेकिन पाकिस्तान बात करने पर आमादा नहीं है । पाकिस्तान समझता है कि उसको अमरीका आदि देशों से हथियार मिल गये हैं और वह मजबूत स्थिति में हो गया है । आज तो उसके मित्र देश अमरीका को भी देखना चाहिये, उसके दूसरे मित्रों को भी देखना चाहिये, ब्रिटेन को भी देखना चाहिये जिन्होंने उसे काफी हथियार दिये हैं और जिन हथियारों के सम्बन्ध में अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति ने कहा था कि इनका प्रयोग हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ नहीं होगा, आज उनका प्रयोग हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ हो रहा है या नहीं हो रहा है । उस वक्त उन्होंने यह दुहाई दी थी, जोर जोर से कहा था कि जो अस्त्र हम पाकिस्तान को दे रहे हैं

उन अस्त्रों का प्रयोग हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ नहीं किया जायेगा। यह भी कहा गया था कि जो अस्त्र हिन्दुस्तान को दिये गये हैं उनका प्रयोग पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ नहीं होगा। उन आशवासनों के बावजूद भी अगर आज उन अस्त्रों का प्रयोग हमारी सीमाओं का अतिक्रमण करने के लिए किया जाता है, उन हथियारों के द्वारा आक्रमण किया जाता है तो निश्चय ही हम अपनी सरकार का आह्वान करेंगे, अपनी सरकार से निवेदन करेंगे कि वह भी उन आक्रमणों का जोरदार मुकाबला करे, हम भी अपनी सीमाओं की रक्षा करने में पीछे न रहें।

आज ये सीमायें फौज के सुपुर्द कर दी गई हैं। इस अवस्था में हमें इसके बारे में और अधिक विस्तृत बयान देने की कोशिश नहीं करनी चाहिये, बयान देने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं होनी चाहिये। जब कहीं युद्ध की स्थिति होती है तो ये नहीं देखा जाता है कि कौन पांच मील पीछे हटा और कौन दस मील पीछे हटा।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप क्या कभी किसी श्री इलाके में आगे बढ़े हैं ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाब : जब युद्ध की स्थिति होती है, जब संकट काल की स्थिति होती है जब दो देशों की फौजों में लड़ाई होती है तो हर देश को अपनी सुविधा के अनुसार अपनी स्ट्रेटेजी को देखते हुए, अपनी स्ट्रेटेजिक पोजिशन के अनुसार लड़ना होता है... फ्रंट्स और फिगरज आपके सामने रख दिए गए हैं। मैं आपको ब्रैन कहां से ला दू ? देश के नाम पर चिल्लाने वाले मधु लिमये साहब को तथा उनके साथियों को देश के सबालों का कोई ख्याल नहीं है, देश की इज्जत का कोई ख्याल नहीं है, वे तो यही चाहते हैं कि कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट को जिस किसी तरह से भी हूँ सके पीटो। लेकिन मैं उनको याद दि-

लाना चाहता हूँ कि उनके साथ देश नहीं है, जो चिल्लाने वाले माननीय सदस्य हैं, वे इस देश का प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं करते हैं, इस देश का प्रतिनिधित्व इस सदन में हम लोग करते हैं। चार को छोड़ कर उनके साथ कोई नहीं है। ये चार सदस्य दिन रात, सुबह शाम बराबर यही कहते हैं कि इस सरकार ने जनता का विश्वास खो दिया है। अगर विश्वास खो दिया है तो मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वे क्यों नहीं आते हैं, मधु लिमये साहब क्यों सरकार नहीं बनाते हैं ? इसका कारण यह है कि उनको न अक्ल है, न बुद्धि है और न ही उनके साथ मेजोरिटी है। वे समझते कुछ नहीं हैं, सिर्फ चिल्लाना जानते हैं (इंटर-प्रांश)

अन्त में इन चिल्लाने वाले मित्रों को मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपके चिल्लाने से देश की स्थिति मजबूत नहीं हो सकती है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो आज बयान दिया है वह बहुत मजबूती से दिया है और बागड़ी साहब उसको समझने की कोशिश करें। उनको अंग्रेजी तो नहीं आती है लेकिन उसका उल्था हिन्दी में उनको मिल जानना चाहिये और वह मिल भी गया होगा। वह समझें कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने यह कहा है कि यह सदन उनके साथ है, यह देश उनके साथ है। हम शान्ति के प्रतीक हैं और चाहते हैं देश में तथा संसार में शान्ति कायम हो। लेकिन अगर हमारे देश की अखण्डता, इस देश की सार्वभौमिकता और इस देश की स्वतंत्रता पर आघात होता है तो जैसा प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है इस देश का हर व्यक्ति और इस देश की सारी सामग्री देश की रक्षा करने के काम में जुटा दी जाएगी और पाकिस्तान का मुकाबला किया जाएगा। पाकिस्तान दस करोड़ का मुल्क है, डरपोक मुल्क है बर्बरतापूर्ण कार्य करने वाला मुल्क है, जुल्म करने वाला मुल्क है, और उसे हमारे आगे घुटने टेकने होंगे क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान की नीति देश की अखण्डता बनाये रखने की नीति है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (बाराणसी) : उप-ध्वक्ष महोदय, आचार्य रंगा जी ने बड़ी सुन्दर भाषा में हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री के वक्तव्य की आलोचना की है। लेकिन उनको मालूम होना चाहिये कि हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री और भारत सरकार अब पाकिस्तान की भाषा को समझने लग गए हैं। बहुत दिनों के बाद यह समय आया है जब कि उस भाषा को जिस भाषा का पाकिस्तान प्रयोग करता है, उस बात को जिस बात को पाकिस्तान कहता है, उन शब्दों को जिन का प्रयोग पाकिस्तान करता है, उनको हमने समझना आरम्भ किया है। आचार्य रंगा और प्रोफेसर हिरेन मुखर्जी से हमें यह अपेक्षा थी कि लोकतन्त्री शासन प्रणाली का, उसकी परम्परा का पालन करते हुए जैसे पर्ल हार्बर के ऊपर जब आक्रमण हुआ था और रिपब्लिकन पार्टी के नेताओं ने जिन्होंने प्रेजिडेंट रूजवेल्ट का वरोध किया था सब से पहले जाकर कहा था कि उनकी पार्टी चाहे जो भी बात हो, चूँकि आज अमरीका के ऊपर हमला हुआ है, हम आपसे आगे रहेंगे, उसी तरह से हम भी विरोधी पक्ष से वही आशा और अपेक्षा रखते थे कि वे भी उन्हीं भावनाओं को भी प्रदर्शित करेगा लेकिन आज उन भावनाओं का अभाव है, ऐसा मुझे दिखाई पड़ता है

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : हैं।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : हैं तो उसके लिए धन्यवाद।

सेक्रेटरी आफ स्टेट डलेस साहब ने एक स्टेटमेंट दिया था जब हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ से प्रोटेस्ट किया गया था कि पाकिस्तान को जो आर्म्स दिये जा रहे हैं उनका प्रयोग भारत के विरुद्ध हो सकता है, जिस में उन्होंने कहा था कि हम जो एड पाकिस्तान को दे रहे हैं उसका प्रयोग हिन्दुस्तान के विरुद्ध नहीं होगा। साथ ही साथ वहाँ के राजनीतिक नेताओं ने भी स्टेटमेंट दिये थे कि अगर पाकिस्तान इन का प्रयोग हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ करता है

तो वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ है। आज मैं अमरीका को इन स्टेट्समैनों, उन राजनीतिज्ञों द्वारा कही गई बातों को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ और मैं पुछना चाहता हूँ कि आज उनकी वाणी कहाँ है, उन्होंने जो प्रतिज्ञा की थी, जो विश्वास दिलाया था, उस का क्या हुआ ? मैं याद इसलिए दिलाता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष जो कहता था वह ठीक कहता था और पाकिस्तान जो कहता था वह विल्कुल मिथ्या था, विल्कुल गलत था।

इस के साथ ही साथ एक दो प्रोपोजल इस वक्त दुनिया में चल रहे हैं। अमरीका और य. के. चाहते हैं कि सीज फायर हो जाए। शायद ऐसा कोई प्रोपोजल भारत सरकार के पास आने वाला है। काहिरा में भी इस प्रकार की चर्चा हो रही है। सीज फायर हो जाए। मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो सीज फायर है, चीन और पाकिस्तान के साथ। हमको सीज फायर का बहुत कटु अनुभव है। इस वास्ते अब हम तीसरे सीज फायर के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं।

अगर अमरीका और यू० के० कोई ऐसा प्रोपोजल दें तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो यहाँ स्टेटमेंट दिया था उसी को मैं दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक पाकिस्तान कंजरकोट को खाली नहीं करता है, जब तक स्टेट्स-को पूर्ववत् नहीं होता है तब तक सीज फायर का कोई प्रश्न नहीं उठता है।

इसके साथ साथ मैं यू० के० को भी याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ। यू० के० ने एक सब-मैरीन पाकिस्तान को देने के वास्ते कहा है। मैं यू० के० को भी चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे अमरीका के आर्म्स हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ प्रयोग किया गया है उसी प्रकार से यू० के० का सब-मैरीन हिन्दुस्तान की नेवी के खिलाफ भी प्रयोग किया जा सकता है और ऐसा नहीं किया जाएगा, इसकी क्या गारंटी है। इसलिए मैं अमरीका और यू० के० से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ भी सैनिक सहायता पाकिस्तान को दी जा रही है उस सैनिक सहायता को

तुरन्त और अखिलम्ब बन्द कर दिया जाए । अगर ऐसा नहीं होता है तो हिन्दुस्तान को सोचना पड़ेगा कि कामनवैल्य का क्या अर्थ है और कामनवैल्य में हमको रहना है या नहीं रहना है । हम कामनवैल्य के देशों से तथा यू० के० से भी यह आशा करते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के साथ कोई ऐसा व्यवहार नहीं होना चाहिए जो कि एक भाई के साथ होते व्यवहार का विरोधी न हो सके ।

हिन्दुस्तान के उत्तर में सीज फायर है । पश्चिम में सीज फायर है । सू पूर्व में सीज फायर है । और दक्षिण में भी थोड़े से हिस्से में सीज फायर है । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सीज फायर की बला से हमें दूर रहना चाहिये । जैसा सुरक्षा मंत्री ने कहा है । जैसे आज प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि 45 करोड़ लोगों को हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा की जिम्मेदारी उठानी है । हम उस जिम्मेदारी को उठाने के लिए तैयार हैं । लेकिन इस सीज फायर के मायाजाल में हम को नहीं पड़ना चाहिये ।

14 hrs.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : अब 48 करोड़ हो चुकी है ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : डा० लोहिया जरा मुझे समझने की कोशिश करें । अगर आप देखें तो इस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान में नौ जगहों पर इंटरजन हुआ है । नौ जगहों पर खतरा पैदा हो गया है । दो स्थान तो काश्मीर में हैं, तीसरा स्थान जम्मू की इंटरनैशनल बाउंडरी पर, चौथा स्थान पंजाब, पांचवां स्थान असम, छठा स्थान त्रिपुरा, और सातवां तथा आठवां स्थान में लाठीटीला और करीमगंज, और नौवां स्थान दहलुआ में । इस प्रकार से आप देखेंगे कि नौ स्थानों पर आज पाकिस्तान की सेना लगी हुई है । हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर आक्रमण करना चाहती है । लिहाजा मैं कहना चाहता हूँ हमें होशियारी के साथ और दुढ़

संकल्प के साथ उठना चाहिये । सरकार को भी ताकत के साथ उठना चाहिए जब कि इस सरकार के पीछे इतनी बड़ी मेजोरिटी है । इतना बड़ा देश हिन्दुस्तान है । और 45 करोड़ आदमियों की एक ध्वनि है ।

पाकिस्तान की टेडेंसी क्या है । जैसा श्री अंसार हरवानी ने कहा उस में मैं एक शब्द और भी जोड़ना चाहता हूँ । उन्होंने कहा कि पाकिस्तान नान-सैकुलर स्टेट है । और हम सैकुलर स्टेट है । हमारी आइडियोलोजी और पाकिस्तान की आइडियोलोजी में फर्क है । पाकिस्तान कहता है :

“हंस के लिया पाकिस्तान, लड़ के लेंगे हिन्दुस्तान”

पाटिशन के समय यह नारा उठा था । आज फिर पाकिस्तान के अखबारों में यही नारा उठाया जा रहा है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम तो पाकिस्तान के लोगों में हंसी देखना चाहते हैं । पाकिस्तान की बच्चों की शांतिमय हंसी । उन के मुख पर हम सम्पन्नता की हंसी देखना चाहते हैं । हम वह हंसी नहीं देखना चाहते हैं कि जो कि दुर्गा की हंसी होती है, चंडिका की हंसी होती है । मैं वहां लक्ष्मी की हंसी देखना चाहता हूँ । इसलिये समय है कि पाकिस्तान समझ जाये कि हिन्दुस्तान लेशमात्र भी लड़ाई से डरता नहीं है । हिन्दुस्तान लड़ने के लिए तैयार है । हिन्दुस्तान पीछे नहीं है, हिन्दुस्तान का बच्चा बच्चा इस के लिये हमेशा तैयार रहेगा ।

जैसा श्री अंसार हरवानी ने कहा है पाकिस्तान में डिमाक्रेसी नहीं है । जहां डिमाक्रेसी नहीं होती वहां तानाशाही होती है, और तानाशाह लोग हमेशा इस बात का प्रयास करते हैं कि जनता चाहे दुखी हो, जनता में चाहे बुभुक्षा हो, वह हमेशा उस की भावना को दूसरी तरफ डाइरेक्ट करने के लिए कोई उपाय सोचते रहें । पाकिस्तान के पास एक छोटा सा हथियार है हिन्दुओं के खिलाफ आवाज उठाना, हिन्दुस्तान के

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

खिलाफ आवाज उठाना, जिहाद के वास्ते आवाज उठाना, काफिरों को मारने के वास्ते आवाज उठाना । आज पाकिस्तान के सारे अखबार जिहाद के नारे से भरे हैं । लेकिन जिहाद किस के खिलाफ । हिन्दुओं के खिलाफ और हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ । आखिर जिहाद किस के खिलाफ है । हम लोग किस की सन्तान हैं । हम लोग उन की सन्तान हैं जोकि सात सौ वर्ष तक लड़ते रहे, जिन की स्त्रियां सती होती रहीं, जिन के लोग लड़ते लड़ते मर गये लेकिन कभी भी हथियार नहीं डाले । हम भारतवर्ष की वह सन्तान हैं । हम जानते हैं कि हमारा भूतकाल का इतिहास क्या था । हम उस बात से शिक्षा लेते हैं कि जो कुछ भूतकाल में हुआ, भविष्य में या वर्तमान काल में उस की पुनरावृत्ति न हो । अब हिन्दुस्तान जाग गया है । आज हिन्दुस्तान खड़ा है ।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह तानाशाही आज पाकिस्तान को उसी रास्ते पर ले जा रही है जिस रास्ते पर हिटलर जर्मनी को ले गया था जिस रास्ते पर इटली को मुसोलिनी और फासिस्ट पार्टी ले गई थी । उसी रास्ते पर आज पाकिस्तान जा रहा है । मैं ईस्ट बंगाल के लोगों से और पाकिस्तान की आम जनता से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान का वहां की जनता के साथ कोई रोष नहीं है, पाकिस्तान के पुरुष हमारे भाई हैं वहां की स्त्रियां हमारी बहनें हैं, हमारा उन का खून एक है और हम उन से लड़ना नहीं चाहते लेकिन पाकिस्तान की यह मनोवृत्ति जिस में जिहाद की भावना भरी है, जिस ने स्पष्ट कहा है कि लड़ के लेंगे हिन्दुस्तान इस के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिये हम तैयार हैं ।

कहा जाता है कि :

जर जमीन जोरू

और के न तो और के ।

जर, जमीन और जोरू यह चीजें ताकत से रहती हैं फोर्स से रहती हैं । अगर आप में ताकत नहीं है तो यह दूसरों की हो सकती है । इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान इस बात को समझता है । हिन्दुस्तान आज तैयार है, जोर के साथ तैयार है, शक्ति के साथ तैयार है । हम हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करेंगे । हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करने में हम पीछे नहीं रहेंगे । प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने आज जो सुन्दर सिद्धान्त जनता के सामने और देश के सामने रक्खा है उस के पीछे हम लोग एक दृढ़ दीवार की तरह से खड़े हैं और सारा देश खड़ा है ।

श्री उ० मू० श्रिवेदी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज ऐसे विषय पर बोलने के लिये खड़ा होना पड़ता है तो हम लोगों को बड़ा दुःख पड़ चुका है । आज हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बोलते हुए कहा कि हमारे ऊपर जो आक्रमण हुआ है वह नेकेड एंड रेकलेस यूज आफ फोर्स है । ऐसे शब्द का प्रयोग उन्होंने किया । मैं चाहता हूँ कि जब कभी आइन्दा इस मसले पर कुछ विचार किया जाये तो इस वाक्य को बराबर याद रक्खा जाये । कच्छ की सीमा पर हमारे ऊपर जो आक्रमण हुआ है वह कोई बोर्डर की लड़ाई नहीं है, वह कोई सीमा की लड़ाई नहीं है । कुदरत ने हमारी भूमि और कच्छ के बीच में जो सीमा निर्धारित की है वह ऐसी है कि कच्छ से ऊपर सिध की भूमि लगभग पांच सौ से एक हजार फीट ऊंची चली गई है । जहां तक रन का सम्बन्ध है उस के लिए संस्कृत का एक शब्द है "इश्टण" । "इश्टण" का मतलब है नमक वाली भूमि, खारी भूमि, और इस का प्रचलित प्रयोग मेवाड़ जैसे प्रदेशों में होता है । जिस जमीन पर पानी हमेशा खड़ा रहता है और गर्मी में सूख जाता है या हट जाता है उसे रन कहते हैं । इस तरह से कच्छ का रन बन गया । इसलिये जो कच्छ

का रन है वह किसी भी प्रकार से सिंध का रन नहीं कहला सकता ।

इस भूमि के लिए सत्तरह सालों से आज तक कभी भी पाकिस्तान ने आवाज नहीं उठाई । आज अचानक हमला करने के बाद पाकिस्तान को सूझा कि अब कुछ तो बहाना बतलाना होगा । आप देखिये कि आज के स्टेट्समैन में एक तरफ, एक ही जगह पर, एक ही सफ़हा पर दो खबरें छरी हुई हैं । एक ओर तो अय्यूब खां जैसा बड़ी दम्भी पुरुष कहता है कि "सौज फ़ायर इन कच्छ" दूसरी तरफ वह अपील करता इंडिया को, जिस का हमारे यहां के एक एक बुद्धिमान या अशुद्धिमान अखबार नवीस ने सत्कार किया है । उन को सोचना चाहिये और इस दम्भी पुरुष के इस वाक्य पर हलकना नहीं चाहिये । उसी पत्र में उसी जगह पर छपा हुआ है कि "पाक फोर्सेज विल स्टेट इन कच्छ ।" हम को धोस देता है भुट्टो । कहता है कि 3400 वर्ग मील भूमि हमारे पास से छुड़ायेगा, जबर्दस्ती छुड़ायेगा । कच्छ से हम नहीं हटेंगे और इस आदमी को हमें जवाब देना होगा । एक तरफ एक दम्भी आदमी एक बात कहता है और दूसरी तरफ एक लवाड़ी दूसरी बात कहता है । इन लवाड़ियों को हमें निकालना होगा, हमारे पास ऐसी ताकत होनी चाहिये कि हम इन लवाड़ियों को एक सबक सिखा सकें । आज प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने दो वाक्य कहे हैं । मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह उन्हीं वाक्यों पर दृढ़ रहें ।

आज श्री रघुनाथ सिंह ने बड़ी अच्छी बात कह दी । रघुनाथ सिंह जी जब बोलते हैं तो मालूम होता है कि कोई जन संघ के मेम्बर हैं । लेकिन आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप के साथ सारा जन संघ है, सारा देश है । 45 करोड़ प्रजा आप के साथ है । आप दृढ़ रहें, हम दृढ़ हैं । आप

आगे मत बढ़िये, हम आगे बढ़ने के लिए तैयार हैं । आप खून बचाइये, हम बहाने के लिये तैयार हैं, लेकिन मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि वह तब होगा जब आप इस बात पर दृढ़ हो जायें कि हमें इन आदमियों को निकालना है, इन दुश्मनों को निकालना है जिन्होंने कसम खाई है हमारे साथ दुश्मनी की । उन दुश्मनों को अगर हम नहीं निकालेंगे तो हमारे साथ हमारी इज्जत नहीं है, भारतवर्ष की इज्जत नहीं है, भारतीयता की इज्जत नहीं है । जो आदमी इस बात पर तुले हुए हैं और भारतीयता को नष्ट करने के लिए एक ही मार्ग उन्हीं ने अपनाया है उन्हें हमें सबक सिखलाना होगा । जब तक हम उन को सबक नहीं सिखलायेंगे तब तक हमारे मन को शांति नहीं हो सकती है । हमें सोचना चाहिये कि इस के बिना हम नपुंसक कहलाने लायक रहेंगे । श्री रघुनाथ सिंह ने कहा कि "जोर, जमीन जोरू जोर के जोर हटे और की" । यह बात बिल्कुल सही है । अगर हमारे पास जोर नहीं है तो हमारी जमीन और की हो कर रहेगी । हमारे पास से कंजरकोट जाता है । कंजरकोट के बारे में आप ने अपने आई० जी० पी० को बुलाया । आसाम में तीन लाख पाकिस्तानियों को घुसाने वाला आई० जी० पी० आप ने गुजरात के नजर कर दिया और उसने होम मिनिस्टर हितेन्द्र देसाई को नहीं बतलाया कि पाकिस्तानियों ने हमारी 13,400 एकड़ जमीन बबा ली है । ऐसे आदमी को आप ने गुजरात भेजा । आप को मालूम होना चाहिये कि कैसे आदमियों को रखना चाहिए । हमारी स्टेट रिजर्व पुलिस के वायरलैस रिसेवर पर आपरेटर उन को खबर भेजता है और आप उन पर ऐतबार करते हो । यह आप के लिए शर्म की बात है । आप को देखना होगा कि हम यह क्या कर रहे हैं, किस के आसरे कर रहे हैं, किस के आसरे हम चल रहे हैं । हम को अपनी आंखें खोलनी होंगी । अगर कोई इस तरफ आप का ध्यान

[श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

दिलाता है तो उस को आप कम्युनल कह देते हो। आप हमारे ऊपर तो आसानी से इल्जाम लगा देते हो, लेकिन मेरे पास तार आए हैं दाऊदी बोहरा प्रगति मंडल की और से कि मुसलमानों के नेता हिज होलीनेस ताहिर सईफुद्दीन मुल्लाजी को आप ने पाकिस्तान जाने की इजाजत दी है। यह मुल्ला जी हमारे देश का पैसा पाकिस्तान में लगा कर वहां 11 कम्पनियां चला रहे हैं। मैं आप को उन के नाम भी बता सकता हूँ। इस आदमी ने हमारा करोड़ों रुपया पाकिस्तान भेज दिया है, करोड़ों रुपया फारिन एक्सचेंज का हम से लूट कर इस ने पाकिस्तान भेजा है और आप उस पर ऐतबार करते हो। इन कम्पनियों के नाम इस प्रकार हैं।

1- सईफी डेवेलपमेंट कारपोरेशन, 2- बाईसिकिल जेनेरल एंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स लिमिटेड, 3- हाशिमि कार कम्पनी लिमिटेड, 4- मोअज्जम इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड, 5- सुलतान प्रेस लिमिटेड, 6- मुसलिम रोलिंग मिल्स लिमिटेड, 7- बन्दूकवाला कारबौनिक एसिड गैस लिमिटेड आदि।

जिन चीजों की हमारी मिलिटरी को जरूरत होती है उन को सप्लाई करने का ठेका आप ने इन को दे रखा है। और इन के सारे के सारे डाइरेक्टर मुसलमान हैं और मुल्ला जी के आदमी हैं। इन के 227 आदमियों का कुनबा है और यह एक गुट बनाए हुए हैं। लेकिन हम अपनी आंखें खोलने को तैयार नहीं हैं। हम कब तक अपनी आंखें बन्द रखेंगे।

पुनर्वास मंत्री (श्री त्यागी) : क्या नाम बताया।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : ताहिर सईफुद्दीन मुल्लाजी, हिज होलीनेस। उन के लड़के और लड़कियां शहजादे और शाहजादियां

कहलाते हैं और उन की संख्या 227 है क्योंकि मुल्ला जी बहुत सी औरतें रखते हैं। ऐसी बातें जो हमारे पास आती हैं उन की तरफ हम आप की तवज्जह दिलाते हैं और आप लोग चुपचाप बैठे हुए हैं।

Shri Tyagi: How is the Government responsible for this?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is the Government which is responsible for these men. These are the words of Shri B. G. Kher.

मैं आप को क्या बताऊँ, आप की समझ में नहीं आता। आप इस आदमी पर टैक्स नहीं लगा सकते, यह और आदमियों पर टैक्स लगाता है। इन के बारे में पाकिस्तान का पत्र डान इस तरह से लिखता है कि इस आदमी को हिन्दुस्तान में इतना अधिकार है कि अगर वह कहीं पर चाहता है तो उस के लिए ट्रेन रुक जाती है, जब वह चाहता है तो चलती है। वह नमाज पढ़ने ट्रेन से उतरता है तो कलक्टर उस के लिए तैयार रहता है। जब तक वह नमाज नहीं पढ़ लेता गाड़ी आगे नहीं बढ़ सकती।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : यह कौन सी रेलवे है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह कहां की बात है।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : यह अपने मुल्क में होता है। यह आदमी सूरत में रहता है।

मेरा अपना और सारे देश के लोगों का कर्तव्य है कि हम देश की सीमा की सुरक्षा करें। यह किसी एक आदमी का काम नहीं है। यह हम सब का काम है। हम सब को इस काम में जुटने के लिए तैयार होना पड़ेगा।

आप ने देखा कि सन् 1956 में एक ब्ल्यू प्रिंट तैयार हुआ था आटोमैटिक राइफल बनाने का। बदकिस्मती से उस वक्त एक मिनिस्टर साहब आ गए। उन्होंने ने कहा कि रूस वालों से पूछ लें। वह उन से पूछने गए और इस में 6 साल लगा दिये। सन् 1960 में ऐसी बन्दूक बनी जो चल नहीं सकती थी। फिर उस की तरफ तबज्जह दी गयी और सन् 1964 में कुछ राइफल्स बनीं। आप कितनी आटोमैटिक राइफल्स बना रहे हैं? एक दिन में दो हजार का प्रोडक्शन होना चाहिए। उस की जगह आप कितनी बना रहे हो यह हाउस को बताओ। आप आंख खोल कर देखो। मैं एक बात कहने में घबराता हूँ लेकिन कहे बिना नहीं रहूंगा क्योंकि ऐसा करना मैं अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ। आप ने पिछले दिनों चालीस हजार आदमियों को डिमोबिलाइज कर दिया। क्या सरकार को मालूम नहीं था कि हमारी क्या हालत है? क्या आप की आंखें बन्द थीं? क्या आप ने अन्धा चश्मा लगा रखा है कि ऐसे झोके पर चालीस हजार आदमियों को डिमोबिलाइज कर दिया। आप यहां बैठे बातें बनाते हो। आज मुझे नजर डालने पर कोई ऐसा आदमी नजर नहीं आता जिस की ओर उंगली उठा कर मैं कह सकूँ कि यह हमारे देश का बहुत अच्छा नेता हो सकता है।

श्री राणा : यह कौन से आदमियों की तरफ इशारा है जिनको कि डिमोबिलाइज कर दिया गया है ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : वे टैरीटोरियल आर्मी के आदमी हैं। मैं यह कहना नहीं चाहता था, आप ने जबरदस्ती कहलवा दिया।

मैं क्षितिज की तरफ देखता हूँ तो कोई नेता दिखता नहीं। कोई यह नहीं कहता कि हम अपोजीशन वाले गद्दी पर

बैठ जायेंगे, हम नहीं बैठ सकते। हम तो आप पर विश्वास करें, लेकिन हम चाहते हैं कि आप उस विश्वास के अनुसार दृढ़ता दिखावें।

आज हमारी पालिसी इल्लाजिकल होती जा रही है। हम दूसरों के बारे में इस तरह बात करते हैं जिससे हम को दूसरे लोग यह प्रमाणपत्र दें कि हम बहुत बढ़िया आदमी हैं। लेकिन इधर पाकिस्तान नौ महीने से हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा कर रहा है और हम चुपचाप बैठे हैं। पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी लड़ाई चल रही है और हम इस झगड़े को टेबिल पर बैठ कर तै करना चाहते हैं। यह झगड़ा एकास दि टेबिल तै नहीं हो होगा। किसी आदमी के साथ बैठ कर यह तै नहीं होगा। इन लोगों ने हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा कर लिया है, इन को बाहर निकाल दो और इतना ही नहीं बल्कि उन की जमीन में दस मील अन्दर घुस जाओ और फिर कहो कि आओ बेटा अब हम तुम से बात करेंगे।

हमारे ऊपर पिछले 17 सालों में पाकिस्तान के 6 या 7 हजार हमले हो चुके हैं। क्या लाहौर हमारे लिए बहुत दूर है? हम उसे एक दिन में ले सकते हैं। हम ऐसा करें तो उन की अक्ल ठिकाने आ जायगी। लेकिन हम फालतू बैठे हुए हैं। हम यह बताना चाहते हैं कि सचमुच में हम बड़े न्यायप्रिय हैं, हम गैर इन्साफी नहीं करेंगे, और कोई दूसरा हमारे साथ गैर इन्साफी करे तो हम उसको बरदाश्त करेंगे, जब कोई हमारी जमीन ले लेगा तब उस से छीनने जायेंगे। मैं आप से विनम्रता से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अब समय आ गया है कि हमें उन को सबक सिखाना चाहिए।

शठम् प्रति शाठ्यम् कुर्यात्—हमको करना होगा। जो जैसा हो उसके साथ वैसा ही व्यवहार करना चाहिए। हम :

[श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

अपने अपने आदमियों को उनके सामने मरने के लिए झोक देते हैं। आप सब तरफ देखें। बाढ़ाहोती में एक बात हो रही है। मैं गवर्नमेंट से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसे यह न समझना चाहिए कि यह बारडर का हमला है। अभी यह बात हमारी समझ में नहीं आ रही है। चीन एक तरफ बैठा है, वह तैयार है। दिल्ली के सारे अखबार लिख रहे हैं कि अगस्त में शेख अब्दुल्ला चीनी फौज ले कर आवेगा। मौका आने पर वह काश्मीर की तरफ से और चीन पूर्व की तरफ से हमारे ऊपर हमला कर सकता है और पाकिस्तान हम को दूसरी तरफ से रौन्द देगा। तब क्या स्थिति होगी? हमारी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है। आज भी हम दूसरों की बातें कर रहे हैं। वियतनाम की तरफ हम देख रहे हैं और उस के बारे में फालतू बातें कर रहे हैं और इस प्रकार अमरीका को, जो हमारी बोस्ती चाहता है, अपने से विमुख कर रहे हैं। हमको सब की क्या पड़ी है, हमको अपनी तरफ देखना चाहिये। अगर चीन वियतनाम में अमरीका से लड़ा रहता है तो उसे उलझा रहने दें। इस बीच हम पाकिस्तान को दुरुस्त कर दें। मेरे समझ में नहीं आता कि हम ऐसी बातें क्यों कहते हैं जिन से हमारा नुकसान हो सकता है। हम इधर भी देखते हैं और उधर भी देखते हैं अपनी तरफ नहीं देखते और जो हमारा दोस्त बनना चाहता है उस के प्रति हमारी इल्लाजिकल नीति चल ही है। य कब तक होगा?

मैंने पिछली दफा कहा था कि ट्यूनीसिया के प्रेसीडेंट बोर्गीवा ने कहा कि अरब जो जिद कर रहे हैं कि इजराइल के साथ वह गलत बात है। हम इ नी भी हिम्मत नहीं कर सके हैं। अपने लोगों को स्कार्प-शिप स्वीकार कर के इजराइल नहीं जाने दते।

अपने देश में हम हथियार बनाने को तैयार नहीं हैं और फालतू का प्राइवेट सेक्टर और लिक सेक्टर खड़ा कर रखा है। मैं कहता हूँ कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में ऐसे लोग हैं जो आप को बहुत अच्छी बन्दूक बना कर दे सकते हैं लेकिन आप उन को बनाने की इजाजत नहीं देते मैं पुछना चाहता हूँ कि इसका क्या कारण है

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने देश का संरक्षण करने के लिए हम का पाकिस्तान से दृढ़ता से बातें रनी होंगी। इस वक्त मैं बहुत सी बातें नहीं कह सकता हूँ। मैं खुद चाहता था और मेरे मन की यह इच्छा थी कि आप एक जग बैठ कर हम लोगों से अर्थात् अपोजीशन वालों को साथ में ले कर बात करते और हम को सारी बातें बतलाते।

आज मैं कई ऐसी बातें कह गया हूँगा जिनका कि दुरुपयोग हो सकता है और इसी तरह से आप भी कई ऐसी बातें यहां पर कह सकते हैं जिन का कि दुरुपयोग हो सकता है। जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रक्खा गया है जरूरत इस बात की है कि उस पर मजबूती के साथ अमल किया जाय। देश को मजबूत बनाइये और दृढ़ता के साथ इन पाकिस्तानी आक्रमणकारियों को अपनी सीमाओं के पीछे परे धकेल दीजिये। अगर सरकार दरअसल प्रस्ताव को इस तरह दृढ़ता से कार्यान्वित करती है तो आप विश्वास मानिये सारा देश आप के पीछे है, इस देश का बच्चा बच्चा इस काम में आप के पीछे रहेगा। अगर इस तरह से आप अपना इलाका जी कर गद्दी पर बैठते हैं तो उस में किसी को कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। हमें आप के सत्ता की कुर्सी पर बने रहने में कोई ऐतराज नहीं होगा अगर आप भारत की आजादी, इज्जत व मान प्रतिष्ठा को बनाये रखते हैं। लेकिन जैसाकि अभी

तक हम देखते आये हैं अगर आप ने वही पुरानी नीति बर्ती और मार खाते चले गये और अगर भारतवर्ष की नाक कटती रही तो निश्चित रूप से आप इस गद्दी पर बैठने के लायक नहीं हैं ।

श्री श० ना० चतुर्वेदी (फिरोजाबाद) :
 आज माननीय प्रधान मंत्री के भाषण में जो दृढ़ता का स्वर मिला है उस से मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश के मानस पर बहुत अच्छा असर पड़ेगा ।

पाकिस्तान से हमारा विवाद जिस रोज़ से यह बना है, निरन्तर चल रहा है । हम ने यथासम्भव उस से मैत्री बढ़ाने की चेष्टा की है लेकिन हमारे सब प्रयास विफल हुए और आगे भी उन के सफल होने की कोई ऐसी सम्भावना नहीं है क्योंकि पाकिस्तान का जन्म ही घृणा और द्वेष में हुआ था । घृणा और द्वेष द्वारा ही वह पालित और पोषित है । घृणा और द्वेष के द्वारा ही वहाँ के जो नेता हैं वह अपनी सत्ता वहाँ पर कायम रखना चाहते हैं, इसलिए हम को बड़ा सतर्क हो कर अपनी नीति निर्धारित करना है और अपने दुश्मन का मुकाबला करना है । पिछले इतिहास से भी हमें सबक लेना चाहिए । सिद्धांत अपने में बहुत सुन्दर होता है लेकिन नया हमारा इतिहास यह नहीं बतलाता कि हमारे पास बरता और शौर्य की कमी न होते हुए भी इस देश को हजारों वर्ष की गुलामी अपने सिर ओढ़नी पड़ी ? क्या पृथ्वीराज और मुहम्मद गौरी का इतिहास हमारे सामने नहीं है ? जहाँ तक वीरता और शौर्य का सवाल है राजपूतों का इतिहास अपना सानी नहीं रखता था लेकिन फिर भी हम अपने देश की स्वतंत्रता को सुरक्षित नहीं रख सके और विदेशियों द्वारा यह देश गुलाम बनाया गया ।

इसी तरीके से जब पश्चिमी लोग हमारे देश में आये तो हम ने उन का इतना स्वागत व विश्वास किया कि वह भी हमारे ऊपर हावी हुए और उन्होंने भी भारत को 200 वर्ष तक गुलामी की बेड़ियों में जकड़े रखा । जब से हम स्वतंत्र हुए हैं हम ने एक नैन एलाइनमेंट की नीति निर्धारित की है । वैसे नौन एलाइनमेंट की नीति बहुत सुन्दर है लेकिन एक बात हमें सोचनी चाहिए कि अगर हमारे पास शक्ति नहीं है अगर हमें अपनी रक्षा के लिए भी किसी दूसरे का मुँह खरना पड़ता है तो वह नैन एलाइनमेंट मारी चले वाली नहीं है और हमारी स्वातंत्र्य खतरे में पड़ जायगी । ज़रूरत हमें इस बात की है कि हम अपने मित्र बढ़ायें । जो हमारे दुश्मन का दुश्मन होता है वह राजनीति में स्वभावतः मारा मित्र बन जाता है । उस को हमें त्यागना नहीं चाहिए । बहुत सी जगहों पर हम अकारण ही ऐसी बात कह देते हैं जिससे हमारा कोई सीधा सम्बन्ध न होते हुए भी हम ऐसे मित्रों को कण्ट कर देते हैं जिनसे कि हमको बराबर सहायता मिलती रही है ।

कश्मीर का मामला ले लीजिये जहाँ हमारा पाकिस्तान से निरन्तर संघर्ष चल रहा है । कितनी बार बातचीत हुई पर वह अभी तक हमारी भूमि पर वहाँ गैर कानूनी कब्जा जमाये बैठा हुआ है । इसलिए जब भी कभी बातचीत का मसला आता है तो मेरे मन में एक शंका उत्पन्न होती है कि न जाने हम और क्या पाकिस्तान को कन्सेशन न दे बैठें । मुझे तो आक्रमण से ज्यादा खतरनाक ऐसी बातचीत लगती है । काश्मीर में पहले पाकिस्तान को आक्रामक कहते रहे और अपनी भूमि वापस लेने की बात कहते थे, बाद को धीरे धीरे यह होने लगा । हमारी ही तरफ से यह फार्मूला आया कि होल्ड व्हाट यू हैव । उसके बाद कि जो सीज़र फायर लाइन है उसके ऐडजस्टमेंट तक के

(श्री श० ना० चव्बेदी)

लिए भी हम तैयार हो गये और अब अन्त में मांडिश्शन की बात आने लगी। आज हालत यहां तक पहुंच गयी है कि शेख अब्दुल्ला सैल्फ डिटरमिनेशन की बात करते हुए यहां से चले गये और अब बाहर विदेशों में भारत विरोधी प्रचार जारों से कर रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान के प्रति जो हमारी मैत्रीपूर्ण सद्भावना रही और उस से समझौता करने की हमारी इच्छा रही उसका मतलब उन्होंने यह लगाया कि हम में कमजोरी है। इसलिये पाकिस्तान को और से उसकी मांग बढ़नी गई अपने कहा कि कश्मीर में अगर आप जनमत संग्रह नहीं करना चाहते, उस के कराने में आप को कुछ अड़चन महसूस होती है और आप ऐसा समझते हैं कि वहां पर इसके फलस्वरूप साम्प्रदायिक दंगे फिसाद हो जायेंगे तो आप हमको वैसे ही कश्मीर सांग दोजिए। सारी काश्मीर की वजहों हमारे हवाले कर दीजिये आज जब वह हमारी भूमि पर जबरदस्ती और कानूनी कब्जा किये हुए है ऐसी हालत में हमारी तरफ से उसके साथ समझौता और शांति कायम करने की बात करना एक अजीब सी बात मालूम होती है। अलबत्ता जिस रोज हम उनको अपने यहां से निकाल कर बाहर कर दे उस रोज अगर हम शान्ति की बात कहें तो दुनिया भी उस की बकत करेगी।

मैं आप से यह निवेदन करता हूँ कि हम अपने विकास का कार्य कर रहे हैं लेकिन यदि हम अपने ऊपर होने वाले हमलों का मुंहतोड़ उत्तर नहीं दे पाते तो उसका हमारे देश के मनोबल पर बुरा असर पड़ता है जिससे हमारे विकास कार्यों को भी उतनी प्रगति नहीं हो पाती जितनी कि होनी चाहिए। आज मुझे यह देख कर बड़ी खुशी हुई कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने दृढ़ता के साथ किसी भी आक्रमण का मुकाबला करने की बात कही है और हम किसी तरीके की कोई बातचीत या निगो शिर्शंगस नहीं करेंगे जब तक कि स्टेट्स को एंटी स्थापित न हो जाय अर्थात् हमारा कब्जा

का सम्पूर्ण इलाका दुश्मनों से खाली न हो जाय।

जैसा कि अभी पूर्व वक्ताओं ने कहा कि इस सीज फायर लाइन का हमें बड़ा कटु अनुभव है। हमारे दुश्मनों की यह चाल हो गई है कि वह पहले आकर हमारी जमीन पर ऊपर अधिकार कर लेते हैं और अधिकार कर लेने के बाद फिर वह कहते हैं कि आइये हम और आप एकौस दी टेबुल बैठ कर फँसला कर लें। पाकिस्तान आज यही पालिसी अपना रहा है। आज जो पाकिस्तान कह रहा है वह ठीक चीन वालों की सी चाल है। ठीक चीन की तरह से पहले तो उसने हमारे इलाके पर कब्जा कर लिया और अब 3500 वर्ग-मील क्षेत्रफल जोकि भारत की भूमि है उसका वह दावा पेश कर रहा है। इस बारे में पहले भी कई दफे मिनिस्टर श्रीकैम्बेज एक्सेटरनाल एफेयर्स से ऐतराज कर चुका हूँ कि यह जो आप डिस्प्यूटेड टैरीटरी की बात अक्सर कहते हैं उस से हमारे पक्ष में बड़ी कमजोरी आती है। जो इलाका हमारा अपना है उसको हमें साफ तौर से ऐलान करना चाहिए कि वह इलाका निश्चित से हमारा है और महज चूँकि पाकिस्तान कहता है कि उस पर उनका क्लेम है तो इस वजह से वह डिस्प्यूटेड टैरीटरी मान लिया जाय यह चीज ठीक नहीं है। इसका परिणाम हमारे देश के लिए हितकर नहीं होता है। अब जब पाकिस्तान हमारे 3500 वर्ग-मील भूमि के लिए अपना दावा पेश कर रहा है इसलिए यदि हम उसे डिस्प्यूटेड टैरीटरी कहें तो इसका अंत कहां हो वाला है और इस तरह से तो एक दिन सारा भारतवर्ष ही डिस्प्यूटेड टैरीटरी करार दे दिया जायगा। जो चीज हमारी अपनी है उसको हमें साफ तौर से अपनी कहनी चाहिए। अगर वहां पर डकैतों की तरह से घुस आये हों तो हमको पहले उनको वहां से निकालना चाहिए और फिर उनसे कोई बातचीत करनी चाहिए। हम महज पाकिस्तान के कहने से किसी भी

अपने इजाके को डिस्प्यूटेड टैरीटरी न कहें। इसमें हम को सब लोगों का समर्थन प्राप्त होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि सारी पार्टियाँ देश की इस बारे में एक मत हैं कि आज हमारे ऊपर जो यह बर्बरतापूर्ण आक्रमण हुआ है उसे हम सब भारतवासी मिल कर विफल कर दें और आक्राणकारियों को अपनी सीमाओं के बाहर खदेड़ दें। आज देश का बच्चा बच्चा इसके लिए तैयार है और देश की रक्षा की खातिर अपना सर्वस्व त्याग करने और बलिदान करने को तैयार है। ऐसी भावना होने से निश्चित रूप से देश की शक्ति बढ़ती है। इस से देश कमजोर होने वाला नहीं है। पाकिस्तान का तो आक्रमण चल ही रहा है और हम उसका सहास-पूर्वक मुकाबला कर रहे हैं लेकिन अगर चीन ने भी भारत पर हमला कर दिया तो हमें उससे भी लड़ना होगा और दोनों का खूब डट कर अच्छे तरीके से मुकाबला करना होगा। हम यह आज अच्छी तरह से समझ लें कि अब बातचीत करने का समय नहीं रहा है, काम करने का समय है और देश को एकता के सूत्र में बंध कर दृढ़ता से शत्रु का मुकाबला करने की जरूरत है। हमारे सिपाही जोकि मोर्चों पर शत्रु से लोहा ले रहे हैं उन को हमें पूरी पूरी शक्ति देनी चाहिए और देश में जो छोटे मोटे झगड़े हैं उन को कुछ समय के लिए हमें ताक में उठा कर रख देना चाहिये क्योंकि उससे हमारा व्यर्थ में ध्यान मुख्य समस्या से हटता है और जो मोर्चों पर लड़ रहे हैं उस पर भी एक बड़ा बुरा असर पड़ता है। अलीगढ़ का ही उदाहरण लें। वहाँ अभी जो कांड हुआ है वह कितना लज्जाजनक है।

इसके साथ ही हम को इस बात के बारे में बड़ी सतर्कता से निगाह रखनी चाहिए कि जो हमारे भीतर के दुश्मन हैं, हम उन की तरफ से बेखबर न हो जायें। हमारी उदारता ऐसी नहीं होनी चाहिए कि देश की सिक्यूरिटी और सुरक्षा के लिए खतरा

उत्पन्न हो जाये। उदारता ठीक है, अच्छी है। हम ने अपने देश में एक सैकुलर स्टेट कायम की है और यहां पर किसी के साथ कोई भेद-भाव नहीं है। लेकिन इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए कि जिन लोगों के ऊपर संदेह है, उन लोगों को ऐसी जगहों पर नहीं रखना चाहिए, जो कि देश की सुरक्षा के लिए महत्वपूर्ण हैं और उन लोगों के बारे में हम को विशेष सतर्क रहना चाहिए। जो आज भी पाकिस्तान से सम्बन्ध बनाए हुए हैं।

अन्त में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम ने जो दृढ़ निश्चय किया है, हम उस पर अटल रहें और देश की सुरक्षा और स्वतंत्रता को कायम रखें।

Shri Oza (Surendranagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, after about a week's stay in my home State of Gujarat I returned last night to the capital. During my stay I toured several parts of my State, and as to what I saw I think I should take the House into confidence. I saw a deep sense of concern and anxiety at the recent developments of our borders. Everywhere, in spite of the grave problems that our State is facing today, problems such as prices of food going up, prices of other consumer commodities going up, and other acute problems which require the immediate attention of both the Government and the people, the people's minds were pre-occupied with this great sense of anxiety about the borders.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Talk of India not of your State.

Shri Oza: I am not talking of my State, . . .

Shri J. B. Kripalan: Even today they talk of their States.

Shri Oza:..... I am talking about the people who are on our borders. In spite of that, I found people's readiness for any sacrifice to defend our borders.

[Shri Oza]

Gujarat is known for its peace-loving temperament. Still, everywhere, all around, I came across a very high sense of fortitude and bravery. Everybody was willing not only to suffer, as our Prime Minister said, in privation on the border, but also to do everything that the nation calls upon him to do.

But at the same time I saw a sense of frustration, a sense of despair at the way in which the Government is trying to handle the situation. When I entered this chamber this morning I must confess that I was not free from that feeling of frustration. But when I heard the hon. the Prime Minister, taking us into confidence, all my feeling of despair was gone, and today I am as confident as any other Members of this House that we are going to face this situation squarely and boldly.

I thought that the hon. friends from the opposition benches would also be affected by the spirit in which the Prime Minister today declared the nation's policy towards the recent developments on our borders. And I thought that they would also rise to the occasion when the Prime Minister said that between poverty and protection of our frontiers we will certainly select the latter. We are of course steeped in poverty; we have undertaken various Plans to remove it. But between defence and development, if anything is to be given priority, we will give priority to defence, and development will wait for some time if it is absolutely necessary. But unfortunately they could not resist the temptation of letting this Government be blamed for some faults, imaginary or otherwise, of the past or of the present. But I am sure the rest of the House shares the feelings of the hon. the Prime Minister and will not grudge anything that is necessary for the protection of our frontiers.

We know, Sir, that before the Army took over, say, on the 19th April or so, the brave S.R.Ps of Gujarat were holding the whole line, equipped as

they were with whatever weapons were available to them, and trained as they were for the limited purpose of patrolling that line. These S.R.P. jawans and the D.I.G. have suffered the onslaught of the artillery of the army of Pakistan. My tributes go to those who have laid down their lives. In Kutch and other places also people have spontaneously paid their tributes to the jawans who have held the fort till the Army took over. They have done a very marvellous job, and I think the House will join me in paying our tribute to the D.I.G. of Rajkot, Mr. Sen, and his colleagues who have faced the storm very bravely.

This raises a question as to whose is the responsibility of holding this line when there is trouble. I think the S.R.P. can be expected to patrol it only for the limited purpose of preventing smuggling and other border skirmishes, as they are not initiated for the purpose of defending the boundaries but for the limited purpose of seeing that law and order is preserved. But whenever the slightest doubt arises that on the other side people are activated not for such minor purpose but for extending the frontiers, I think the Army should immediately take over, they should not wait for a moment. They should not throw away the responsibility of protecting the boundaries of the nation to the S.R.P. who are there for the limited purpose, as I said, of preventing smuggling and other things.

In this case also I think some delay has occurred before the Army took over. Now that it has taken over, I will not go into the details of how things have been done and what has happened.

We also find from what the Prime Minister has said that because of the peculiar difficulties of the topography and terrain, Pakistan has chosen this particular time. It has found that our difficulties are going to be their temptations and also their opportunity. It

is true that the season will be against us and that we will be facing some difficulty. But as, I think, so many Members have pointed out, the time has come when we should also start difficulty. But as, I think, so many Pakistan is talking to us. There might be some places where they will also be in such a delicate position. Maybe, in the border of Kutch we are in a more delicate position. But on the whole frontier between India and Pakistan there must be some points where we can also teach them the language that their difficulties will be our opportunity and temptations also, and we will occupy the places in lieu of what places they have occupied on this side. I think the time has come when we should start talking that language. By temperament we are all peace-loving, we do not like war. But, by and large, what is the feeling of the people of India? The people of India feel that Pakistan is taking too much liberty with our attitude. Because we are temperamentally docile or something like that, they think that any liberty can be taken.

Now the time has come, if we want to keep up the morale of the Army and the people, when Government should be more firm and take decisive action in the border. We come across so many jawans who say, "we are well equipped and can give a good fight to Pakistan". We do not want to project our frontiers any further but we do want to protect whatever we have got and nobody can place any foot into it illegally. The time has come when we should make this very clear to all our neighbours. Otherwise, from November 1962 people are always talking, and this is the talk of the town, that anybody, any of our neighbours, can take any liberty with us. But, as I said, if we want to keep up the morale of the people, of the Army and of our countrymen, we should talk in a very decisive and firm tone. And it was very heartening to hear the speech of the hon. the Prime Minister. I thought this is a similar occasion as November, 1962

when, under the leadership of our late Prime Minister, we all stood up and took a vow that at all costs we are going to protect our frontiers. In the same way this is an occasion on which we should all stand like one man and say, "nothing doing, we are not going to allow any of our neighbours to take any liberty with us." If we keep the spirit in which the Prime Minister has made the statement, I think it will go a long way in creating a good morale in this country. Sir, that is all that I wanted to say.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in this hour of great peril, the whole nation should act as one man to face our enemy at the border. We are in the midst of an undeclared war and I think the situation today is more serious than what it was in 1962.

Now, Sir, although I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister for unity at this hour, I do not think there was any need for renewing the appeal to the people of this country. The people of this country in these matters have never failed. The people have given abundant evidence of their patriotism when the call came after the Chinese invasion. In this Parliament, all Members, including the Members of the Opposition, have vested powers with the Government, which are unheard of even in dictatorial countries. In our democracy we have thus unanimously entrusted Government with this responsibility of driving out the aggressors from our land. The powers given by Parliament are there. But, what has Government done so far? God alone knows when it will be able to free our soil from the aggressors.

Sir, I was expecting that the Prime Minister, when he makes this appeal, will make a political assessment of the whole situation and also indicate—it is not only a military affair—the future line of action that he proposes to take. I want to know from the Prime Minister whether what has happened

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

in Kutch is an isolated incident or an unexpected attack. Even after the reverses which we had in 1962, if it is said that we are unprepared or that we are unaware, then, Sir, I would humbly say, this Government is incapable of defending our country; it is incapable of giving any resistance; it can not save the country and it can not mobilise the people for this purpose.

We, in this Parliament, both in regard to China and Pakistan, have several times raised this question, but we had been accused as war-mongers; and the peace-mongers have brought war on our doors and have surrendered parts of our territory to the enemy. (An hon. Member: Shame, shame). I say this because I feel that there is something lacking very seriously in the minds of this Government, and, excuse me, Members even from the ruling party which supports this Government, have not realised this. It is a good indication today. I find from the speeches of the hon. Members of the Congress party that they have been advocating stiff and rough line which they want the Government to take on this occasion. What step has the Prime Minister chosen to adopt at Kutch? I am glad the Prime Minister has made it clear. It was made clear several times before. Even Prime Minister Nehru said in August, 1960, in this House that so far as Kutch area is concerned, there is no border dispute. The demarcation is to be done by surveyors. There is no question of ceasefire, this or that, on this question. But Pakistan has a design, as the Foreign Minister Bhutto has said categorically. They want half of Kutch. They want 3500 sq. miles of the 9,000 sq. miles area of the Rann of Kutch.

Now, the present strategy seems to be that we are logistically in a disadvantageous position. The entire area would be submerged by water; no military operations would be possible by our Government. Pakistan has deliberately planned to capture those areas of 3,500 sq. miles. They want

to keep the areas in their possess on so that when actual operations start later, they will be in possession of those areas which they wanted. That seems to be their strategy. And, when we see that the entire frontier of our country is alive, and we are also alert, how did we not visualise this, let alone whether our army is there, whether our defence force is there, whether they will be able to guard the entire frontier. I am not going to debate on that point.

Now, Sir, it has been seen both in the case of Pakistan and in the case of China, that they have selected the weakest zone in our borders. When there was this question of building road in Ladakh, in the Aksai Chin area, we raised this matter and we were told: Not a blade of grass grows there and so nothing doing, it is of no consequence. Here also it may be argued that it is uninhabited, it is a marshy area. (Interruption).

Shri P. R. Patel (Patna): Who says that? The Prime Minister says that he will fight.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Let him fight and drive away the enemy. That is not the question. The question is this. If we are really serious about the territorial integrity of our country, of our borders, whether it is marshy, whether it is in an uninhabited place, whether a blade of grass grows there or not, it is as important for us as any other region, and we should have taken care to see that these areas remain inviolable. Now, Sir, what have the other countries done? Even in Israel, Nagev, one of their border areas, which was a desert, now they have new settlements there. They have armed those citizens to fight the enemy. Why, Sir, we do not find so many invasions, intrusions and attacks in the Punjab?

Shri P. R. Patel: It seems the hon. Member has not seen a desert. He is comparing with other countries.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Please do not interrupt. Why, Sir, we do not find so many invasions, intrusions and attacks in the Punjab frontier? That is because we have our villagers there, sturdy farmers, punjabis who can be equal match to any Pakistani invader. If they cannot fight at least we will be in a position to know what the enemies are doing in that region. If militarily it was not possible to take action, at least we should have done this. We should have taken steps to populate these areas, build roads and communications etc. so that this area is connected with the other regions of our land. The Government totally neglected this aspect, although we had been told several times, that we consider Pakistan as Enemy No. 1 for a number of years.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): We fight not the people, we fight the rulers.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Yes certainly. It is Pakistan military dictatorship that is attacking our country.

Sir, our Government realises the mistake only after the mischief is done. What has happened during the course of the past few months which he himself was narrating here?

They started with Tripura. They had cease-fire, at Cooch Behar. After three months they came to Karimganj on the Assam frontier. Then they came here to Kanjarkot and in Kanjarkot, the Prime Minister was trying to impress upon us by giving the sequence of events as to how this Government, as soon as they got the news whether at the State level or other levels, have done whatever was possible for them to do.

I have got a copy of the sequence of events which the Government circulated last night. It will be seen from this statement, on their own admission, that they actually found

three Pakistani nationals, arrested and released near Kanjarkot in May 1964. From that time the trouble started at this place. Then what happens? On January 25, 1965, on their own admission, Pakistani intrusions noticed including the 18-mile track $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles inside Indian border. All these facts were before them; but, probably, our present Prime Minister, Shri Shastri, is very much touchy if anybody says, "You are deviating from Nehru's policy". So, he is strictly adhering to that policy.

What is that policy? If the country is attacked, send a protest note—that is the policy.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): Shame.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: So, he has taken no time to send a protest note. What happens? In these matters we have been completely outmanoeuvred by Pakistan. The Pakistan Rangers occupied Kanjarkot on February 10, but on February 17 Indian patrols found Kanjarkot Fort deserted. From February 17 to March, 1, there were no Pakistan Rangers in Kanjarkot area. Why did we not then go there and establish ourselves there which was our own area? There was no water coming then. There was no other difficulty. But till the 9th April we had not given this matter over to our military. It was left at the state level. The police was trying to talk to the police of Pakistan.

And what about the Central Government? This is another fallacy with this Government. It was claimed that the responsibility was of the Gujarat Government. In the Gujarat Assembly when this matter was raised, they said, "No; there is nothing; we are prepared to face any emergency", as is said here. The Central Government was either completely ignorant or there was no co-ordination or communication between the two governments, or there was no communication between the Home Ministry and the Defence Ministry.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): I may correct the statement of the hon. Member.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Whatever it is, the fact remains that the Central Government did not take proper action even after these areas were occupied.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Government denied that there was any attack.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Gujarat Government denied that there was any attack. But the whole question is that the area was occupied by Pakistanis. . . .

Dr. M. S. Aney: Not by attack.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: and vacated, still, we did not take possession of those places.

To my mind, there is a deep game in all that is happening. It is not that Pakistan is prepared to face India militarily. I do not think any power in the world would advise Pakistan that way or Pakistan would ever be able to conquer this country.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You must except China.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: But behind all this, the real game is being played by China. This is a pre-planned and calculated attack. China has just cleverly sent Pakistan to the forefront. If you see, all these things have happened after Chou En-lai's visit to Pakistan. It has been reported in the press that some top-ranking Chinese military officers have gone to East Pakistan. When such is the situation, Pakistan today is, not only politically, diplomatically but, I would say, militarily also, an ally of our enemy, when we are meeting this contingency, aggression, we must not isolate Pakistan from China and if we do that our whole thinking will be wrong, our action will be wrong.

Sir, I accuse this Government and the Prime Minister that they probably helping in this attack on India. this aspect of the question. I could never think that a Prime Minister, when he goes out of our country to Nepal when the Pakistanis have come and occupied our own areas, has not a word to say about the Pakistani danger. He was throwing out advice to other countries: Do not bomb North Viet Nam; do not do this. They were throwing advice to others; they had no time to look to their own interest and what is happening to our own country.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): This was truly following Nehru.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Some Members, particularly Communists, also prompted that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Let us be realists; let us face the situation as it is. If you want to mobilise the people, you must indicate the line, the determination, the firmness that is needed to-day. Now we must also realise that it is not only China but, I accuse, the Americans are negatively helping in this attack on India. There are so many explanations given by the Americans, but I do not see why it is, when there has been proof of American ammunition being used by Pakistan against India, that not a word has come from the State Department or any spokesman of the American Government condemning this.

We are also getting military aid both from America and Britain. So many conditions are imposed upon us. Even there is an inspecting gang here to see whether we were using it against Pakistan or not. But so far as this matter is concerned, whereas America is presented in this country as the greatest saviour of democracy and there is a military dictatorship functioning in Pakistan which is com-

pletely a military ally of China, there is not a word of condemnation.

Therefore the situation is very serious. We should not expect that like 1962 some outside help would come in abundance. We must also take note of the change of administration in America. Mr. Johnson is not Kennedy. When Mr. Johnson was visiting Pakistan as Vice-President in 1960, was it not Mr. Ayub Khan who told him in plain words that the ammunition that they were receiving from America were not receiving just to keep it in cottonwool and that they wanted to use it against Afghanistan and India? He used it against Afghanistan and they have used it against India now.

Therefore if the USA is really keen for Indian friendship as India is, its connivance at Pak use of American hardware against us must be stopped.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: How many minutes have I taken?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: 20 minutes.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Give me 10 minutes more. I will finish in 10 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Five minutes more he can take. There are other parties also waiting.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I will try to finish.

It is clear that if there is any confrontation—and I have a doubt that probably China is waiting for the occasion—between Russia and America in Viet Nam, it will be no wonder if, after we deploy our entire defence forces to meet the Pakistani danger on the entire border, China may not come in its true colours at the appropriate time. That danger is there and in such a situation we have to depend

more on our own strength, on our own people, and we should not look to Western countries for support but to our neighbours. In recent times, there has been a change in some of the neighbouring countries. Our relationship with Nepal is better today and I hope with the change of administration in Ceylon, the situation would also improve there.

15 hrs.

Sir, the Prime Minister, while speaking, indicated that there are proposals from other countries for cease-fire. I say, there is no occasion for that. He should not agree to any such talk or to any mediation by anybody on this matter. We should not commit the blunder of taking this matter to the U.N.O. or to any other international body. Let me warn him, if any other country comes with any proposal, like Colombo proposals, not to fall into that trap. We must mobilise our own people for facing this danger.

The Prime Minister—today, of course, he reiterated—on other occasions said that we must give a free hand to the Army, let the Army deal with this problem. I am in complete agreement that in matters of defence let the Army be the deciding authority. But the Army must act in the manner in which a politician decision is taken. Now, here as Mr. Ranga pointed out, when they knew this happening, they called the Army at a time when the enemy had occupied our territory and made our position very difficult. That is not the way to hand over the question to the Army. The Army must choose its own defence. If at a particular point it is not possible to hit back on account of logistic reasons, then the Army must be given freedom to take retaliatory action to put the enemy on the defensive. We are always on the defensive. At least once let us take the initiative to put our army on the offensive. It is not that our Army has had a set-back in NEFA or Ladakh, but it is the politician who did not permit the Army to do as it

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

thought proper. So, when you talk of Army, the Army which has a glorious record as that, if they are given this opportunity—I think, they are in a much better position than Pakistan in spite of a military dictator there—they will beat back the enemy and teach them a lesson. They must do it in such a manner that not only our country would be mobilised but the enemy will understand that it is not so easy, however mighty a force like China may be at its back, to nibble at our frontier and to offend us like this.

Shri Tyagi: Shall we count on your cooperation?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I can only say the enemy understands the language of strength. I can give you one instance. When U-2 flights were captured in Russia and the base was Peshawar, what did Mr. Khrushchev do? He caught hold of the Pakistan diplomat and told him that if Peshawar was going to be the base, then Peshawar would cease to find a place in the map of the world. And that flight stopped from that day. The enemy understands only this language of strength.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, I have certain constructive suggestions to make. Whatever may be the defence preparations to build up the morale of the people, what do we find? We find that Pakistani and Chinese Embassies in this country are nothing but centres of espionage. That fact has been proved. We receive everyday from the Pakistan High Commissioner's office—you must have also received it—these pamphlets. What do they send to you. They send you these things saying as monitored from Radio Pakistan. They dole out these things in this country when the enemy is fighting us. Do these countries, China and Pakistan, allow our diplomats in their countries to do this? Can

you not stop these things? Can you not close down these Consulates in Calcutta and Shillong? Can you not restrict their activities here in Delhi?

I also want that we should tighten our security not only in the country but also in the Army establishments. Then, I was told—we do not get any news as to what is happening—that when there was Coronation in Sikkim, a direct invitation was sent by the Sikkim Durbar to the Pakistani Military Attache to be present there. We did not know anything about this. We only knew about it when that particular Military Attache wanted an innerline permit to go there. I was also told that just a few days back, a Pakistani military official went to our Naval Headquarters. He visited our Naval Headquarters. There are restrictions and even our civilians are not permitted to go there. But this Pakistani official with a military uniform went inside our Naval Headquarters. I do not know with whom he talked and what he did. At least when we are in such a situation, there should be strict watch on the people going to our Army establishments. Even if the Chief of the Army is entering the Army establishments, he should show his identity card and then enter into it.

Lastly, since this is a very delicate matter, I must say there are in our country crores of minorities and in such a situation—there may be some communal frenzy in this country—some elements would like to take advantage of the situation and create bitterness amongst the communities. I think, if that is done, that would be doing the greatest disservice to the country and we would be playing into the hands of China and Pakistan. So, our Government, our countrymen as a whole, should see to it that activities of such elements are curbed and we have amity and cooperation.

In conclusion, I would only say this much. What is necessary today? As I said, there is no question of making

an appeal to anybody. The entire Indian population is patriotic enough to come forward to face this danger.

What is needed today is a dynamic political leadership, the determination which will enthuse the people, arouse the people, to meet this danger. But I find that that is completely absent. Whatever be your policies, whatever be your defects, however much we may have quarreled with you—you may score a point here and there in this Parliament—but when this danger has to be faced by the whole nation, you have to rethink, you have to reorientate, you have to provide dynamic leadership which can mobilise the whole country. Then only we can face this danger.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I share the concern expressed from both sides of the House about the actions and the motivations of Pakistan. We have come to a stage when we have to take a grave decision. In doing that, we must know and study the entire picture of Indo-Pakistan relations.

I submit that during the last seventeen years Pakistan has been an irritation, and in fact, a nuisance to India. We started with the refugee problem. Refugees started pouring in not in thousands but in millions, and after seventeen years they are still pouring in. First, there was the question of Hindus being thrown out of Pakistan. Then came the turn of Christians, and the latest news is that the Ansars from West Punjab and the North-West Frontier Province are throwing out the Bengali Muslims from their homes in East Pakistan. There is a feeling of ferment and a feeling of dissatisfaction and a feeling of revolt in East Bengal. But, unfortunately they have no leadership and they do not know what to do. I admit that there had been a movement of people from India to Pakistan as well, but that was at the time when there was communal frenzy and partition madness, but once the things were settled in this country

secularism was established. Here there are about 50 million Muslims, which number is more than the entire population of West Pakistan. Even the Pakistani Muslims who have infiltrated into Assam are refusing to go from here. In this country we have the inheritance of the *risnis* of the *Upnishads*, and the freedom and security of the minorities had been rebaptised with the blood of the Mahatma, and I say that it is immortal. That is the position today. That being so, we have to see why Pakistan is taking up this posture which she has been continuing during the last seventeen years.

I submit that Pakistan has been created not by Mr. Jinnah but by the British Government. Pakistan and Israel are the two theocratic States in the whole world, and one has been planted in India and the other in Arabia as a cancer to eat into the vitals of the two nations. That being so, Pakistan naturally follows the policy of the British Government.

I remember that nearly thirty-five or forty years ago, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan was a student at the same time and at the same place along with me, and he tried very hard at that time to rope me in also into the Muslim League. I had told him then that he was functioning as a pawn in the hands of the British and he was playing the British game and thinking that he was doing a great contribution and service to the country. I agree with one hon. Member who has spoken earlier, that Britain has never forgotten this injury which India did to the entire British Empire by liquidating it, and, therefore, she had created Pakistan for the purpose of dividing this country, and has been using that country against our motherland.

If you analyse the broadcasts of the the BBC for the last seventeen years, you will find right through a bias in favour of Pakistan. Even yesterday, they had broadcast that the Army was fighting and was round about Delhi, and at the same time they gave the

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

news that the Pakistan President was appealing for peace. The BBC never seems to remember that we had a no-war-declaration offer still standing, and we had been making that offer for the last seventeen years. The BBC never seems to realise that the hon. Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, in spite of so many provocations, in spite of the feeling in the country, as is evident from the speeches from all sections of the House, for action, for revenge and for the establishment of our integrity and regaining our soil, is offering a friendly hand as a gesture of peace, but all these are unknown to the broadcasts of the BBC. How is that so? I think that it is very cleverly done. The BBC has got the reputation of being fair, that is why it is very effective, and the BBC is being used as an instrument for Pakistan's propaganda.

15.16 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO *in the Chair*]

When my hon. friend opposite criticise the Government for their weakness to combat the propaganda abroad, they fail to realise the great ally in the BBC, that Pakistan has got.

As regards the collusion between Pakistan and China, I would like to remind this House of the work done during the time of Israel's attack on Egypt. There was a secret agreement between Israel and England, between Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Anthony Eden, which even some of the Members of the British Cabinet were not aware of. They had timed it in such a way that England was to intervene as a country which was interested in peace and which wanted to keep the two fighting peoples apart, and that was the scheme then. Today, I ask you: Do you think that anybody in his senses can conceive of that diplomatic skill and that Machiavellian mind which is necessary to make an arrangement with China and to defy and displease the greatest, friend and the biggest power in the world, name-

ly the USA? How is it that in America there was so little reaction in regard to this collusion between China and Pakistan? Any little communist activity and conspiracy anywhere in the world put America into panic but here an ally-member of the SEATO to whom they are supplying arms goes and makes an alliance with China, and comes back and gives advice to President Johnson, yet it seems to have had no effect. Is it not possible that there is some other hand behind this, and USA is advised that this is all a show-piece only and it should not be taken seriously, and that it is only to bring pressure on India to settle the question of Kashmir, and at the same time American can use Pakistan as a spy in China? Otherwise, there is no way of explaining the situation. Therefore, we must guard ourselves against our so-called friends. I charge the British Government to have been continuously trying to sabotage and wreck the prosperity and future of this country. I can say this definitely about the Tories in England. I do not know about the work of Mr. Harold Wilson's Government, but only a future demonstration of their work will show whether we can change our stand.

Now, the time has come when we should entirely rely on our strength. And what is our strength? Apart from guns and rifles and all that our real strength is the 450 million people of this country. If we have this large mass of people united and determined. I maintain, arms or no arms, no country in the world can penetrate into and occupy any part of our country.

Therefore, I would like to humbly appeal to the Opposition to forget their political role. This is not the time to pinpoint this defect or that defect; this is the time to forget these things and go forward, not to say that what is done is wrong, something was done wrong last year, it should have been done in some other way and so on. Let them give some positive sugges-

tions as to what we should do. I agree with Shri Dwivedy that Shri Shastri should call Members of the Opposition more frequently for consultations and ask them what they can contribute for the safety and security of the country.

I also say this to them. This is a fight between India and Pakistan. Please, for heaven's sake do not turn it into a Hindu-Muslim question and therefore loyalty and disloyalty, you cannot characterise it in communal terms. There have been so many people who have been loyal to China; they are behind bars now. They are not members of the Muslim community. So the division must not be communal but between loyalty and disloyalty, between India and Pakistan. I am a member of the Muslim community. This country is mine. I am a citizen of this country. I have the same rights as those of Shastriji, Jawaharlalji and Mahatma Gandhi. Therefore, please do not treat this matter in that manner. You must create trust, and give people the freedom to express themselves freely and willingly, and freely and willingly offer themselves for the service of the country.

At the same time, I would ask my Muslim brethren to come forward and do their bit also. They must remember that one community has been perturbed and has suffered because of the atrocities in Pakistan. There is a natural reaction which falls on you too. Therefore, it is your duty to come forward and create confidence in the community that you are prepared to do your utmost and you are prepared to give your life for the country which is yours.

That being the case, I maintain that this is a time of reckoning. We all have to think now, not that a wrong has been done by this man or that man, but how all of us, individually and collectively, can contribute for the security and welfare of this nation. If everyone of us asks that

question and replies in his own humble way, it will be the greatest contribution he can make for his country's well-being and the biggest slap on the face of Pakistan.

I have said before that war in Asia or Africa is utter madness. If pursuit of peace is really weakness, I accept that that weakness. We have always been pursuing the path of peace. We never seek any land from any part of the world. We are not crusaders in search of men's souls. We want to carry the message of peace to the world. Whenever and wherever we have raised our voice, it was for the freedom of other lands and for peace everywhere.

It was charged by the Opposition that we were not militarily prepared. We are not militarily prepared just because of our attitude, our approach which is peaceful. That does not mean that we will have peace at any price. When the honour of the country or the integrity of the country is at stake, whether we have arms or no arms, as Panditji said, we must be prepared to fight even with our bare arms, to defy and repeal the invader.

I welcome the speech of Shastriji because it is a firm and clear statement of our stand. I also welcome the fact that he has not closed the door of peace, because peace is part of our being. Peace is the message not only of Shastriji or Kripalaniji; it is the message of India to the world. Therefore, when he has kept the door open, that is the greatest contribution he has made.

I make a last appeal to my friends in the Opposition. Even today, there was some objection when there was clapping. If Shastriji praises the work of our jawans in Ladakh or Kutch should we not feel glad and clap? What is there to be ashamed of? What is the criterion? Is this a sort of a jungle where a man who has got a bigger arm and has forcibly occupied

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

a piece of land is the bravest man? No, pursuit of peace requires a greater measure of courage than war. I therefore submit that the House will pursue the path of peace ultimately, and at the same time, be prepared for the worst.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सभापति महोदय, इस बहस में प्रधान, विदेश और रक्षा मंत्री, इन तीनों को रहना चाहिये था और इस वक्त सदन में एक भी नहीं है, इस का न सिर्फ़ मुझ को अफसोस है, बल्कि इस से दुनिया को शक होगा कि यह मामला खाली नोक-झोंक का तो नहीं है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : त्यागी जी हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अगर त्यागी जी प्रधान मंत्री बन जाते तो, फिर कहना ही क्या था।

आधी रात का वक्त था। हिन्दुस्तान की फ़ौजें हैदराबाद के लिए कूच कर चुकी थीं। तब सर सेनापति प्रधान मंत्री के घर पहुंचे और उन को कहा कि पाकिस्तान ने भी अपनी सेनाओं का जमाव कर लिया है और वह हमला करने वाला है। तब प्रधान मंत्री ने आधी रात के बाद सरदार पटेल को टेलीफोन किया और कहा कि पाकिस्तान की सेनाओं का जमाव हो चुका है। सरदार ने कहा, "तो"—कुछ और नहीं, सिर्फ़ "तो"। फिर प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि पाकिस्तान की सेनायें सभी सीमाओं पर हिन्दुस्तान में घुसने वाली हैं। फिर सरदार पटेल ने कहा "तो"। मैंने सुना है कि इस तरह से और बातचीत हुई और फिर टेलीफोन बन्द हो गया।

आज मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता कि सरदार पटेल की जरूरत है। वह बिल्कुल फिजूल बात होगी। लेकिन मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस दृढ़ता की जरूरत है, जो

किसी एक फैसले को कर लेने के बाद उस पर कायम रहती है और उस के अनुसार काम किया करती है।

मैं इस वक्त जंग की बात नहीं करना चाहता—और इन लोगों ने भी कोई जंग की बातें नहीं की हैं। इस बहस में अगर सार लाना होता, तो यह बात फैसल हो जाती कि क्या यह नोक-झोंक है या युद्ध है। अभी तक यह बात बिल्कुल साफ़ नहीं है, बिल्कुल एक धुंधला मामला है। कोई भी नतीजा निकाला जा सकता है कि नोक-झोंक है या युद्ध है।

दृढ़ता की जब मैं बात करता हूँ, तो मैं उसको भी साफ़ कर दूँ। अब तक यह सरकार बहुत कुछ खो चुकी है—लांगजू, बाराहोती, लदाख, अक्साई चिन—काश्मीर के इलाके को छोड़ ही दें—और अब कच्छ। हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को और पाकिस्तान के लोगों को ऐसा महसूस होने लग गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान कि किसी भी जमीन को किसी भी वक्त छीना जा सकता है। इसलिए आपको दृढ़ता के साथ इस बात को सोचना चाहिये कि इस बार जो कंजरकोट छीना गया है उसको वापिस लिये बिना हिन्दुस्तान अब से चैन से बैठे रहने वाला नहीं है। पिछली जमीनों की बात मैं नहीं करता हूँ। कोई गलत न समझ बैठे। बड़ा आसान होता है उन लोगों के लिए कह देना कि इधर तो सब युद्धवादी बैठे हुए हैं। मैं हथियार पसन्द नहीं करता हूँ, यह मैं साफ़ कह देना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मेरे सामने कोई दूसरा रास्ता रह नहीं गया है। निकालने की कोशिश तो मैं कर रहा हूँ। किन्तु जब तक यह राज्य हिन्दुस्तान का है हमें फैसला करना है कि अब कंजरकोट की जो जमीन है वह वापिस लेनी है और आगे भी अगर वहीं किसी ने चाहे चीन हो या पाकिस्तान हो और चाहे और कोई भी देश क्यों न हो, हमारे

देश की किसी भी जमीन पर, किसी भी भाग पर हमला किया तो हमें आखिरी फैसले तक जाना है। या तो राज्य खत्म हो जाना है या फिर अपनी जमीन को बचा कर रखना है। इस फैसले को करते वक़्त दिमाग को हमें बिल्कुल साफ रखना चाहिये कि हम किस ओर बढ़ें।

जो व्यापक मसला है हिन्द पाक का उस पर कोई रोशनी नहीं डाली गई है, उस का कोई जिक्र नहीं हुआ है। हिन्द पाक का रिश्ता ऐसा है कि हम लोग साधारण दोस्ती की हालत में रह नहीं सकते हैं। या तो हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की दुश्मनी होगी और या हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान दोनों एक देश बनगे। बीच की कोई स्थिति चल नहीं सकती है। यह चीज़ पिछले सतरह बरसों ने साबित कर दी है। मैं इसके लिए कोई तवारीख़ भग या दूसरा कारण नहीं बतलाना चाहता हूँ। यह बिल्कुल साफ़ बात है कि थोड़े से समय के लिए, एक दो चार पांच सात साल के लिए यह सम्भव है कि दोस्ती हो लेकिन वह दोस्ती या तो बढ़ेगी एके की तरफ या फिर उसके दूसरे तरीके निकलेंगे। एके की भी कई मंजिलें शान्त हैं। महासंघ होता है, फिर एका होता है। या फिर वह दोस्तों बिगड़ती चली जाएगी और दुश्मनी हो जाएगी। मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि नहरी सामझीता जब हुआ था तो लोगों ने कहा था कि अब तो सारा मामला खत्म हो गया, अब दोनों बिल्कुल दोस्ती से रहेंगे। वह कहाँ हुई? एक दो साल तक मुहब्बत और इश्कबाजी चलती रही फिर मामला बिगड़ गया। यह होता ही रहेगा। या तो ये दोनों देश एक हो कर रहेंगे या फिर दुश्मनी में चलेंगे। इस बात का हमें फैसला कर लेना चाहिये। इस चीज़ को मैं पाकिस्तान की जनता को भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ, न सिर्फ़ हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को ही फिर मैं इसका नतीजा निकालना चाहता हूँ। अगर कंज़रकोट को वापिस लेना चाह

हो तो पानी बगैरह की बात न किया करो, बरसात है, पानी इकट्ठा हो रहा है, इस तरह की बात मत किया करो। लांगजू है, वह पहाड़ी है, चीनी ऊपर से नीचे चले आ रहे हैं, इस तरह की बातें मत किया करो। ये सारी बातें फिजूल हैं। एक फैसला करो, फिर उसके बाद यह भी देखोगे कि पूर्वी बंगाल क्या है? जैसे जरा ने दो टुकड़ों को जोड़ करके उसे जरासंघ बना दिया था वैसे ही दो अप्राकृतिक नकली टुकड़ों को जोड़ करके पाकिस्तान बना है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मामला आखिर तक अगर जाता है तो पूर्वी बंगाल सिर्फ़ चार पांच दिन की चीज़ है और पूर्वी बंगाल चौथे या पांचवें दिन हिन्दुस्तान के कब्जे में आ जाता है। किसी को यह नहीं समझना चाहिये कि यह मामला इतना आसान है कि पाकिस्तान इधर और उधर बंध जाएगा। जरासंघ को भी फाड़ने के लिए कृष्ण ने सिखाया था। लेकिन कौन है यहां सिखाने वाला आप लोगों को?

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : आप हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं हूँ? लेकिन ये जितने लोग हैं आज मैं इनकी अक्ल के बारे में कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ। इनकी थोड़ी अक्ल है। ये और सीखें। मेरा कहना इनके काम आएगा। थोड़ा अक्ल-मन्द बनो तो काम आ जाएगा। इससे ज्यादा कड़ा शब्द मैं इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। जिस तरह से जरासंघ वाला मामला था उसी तरह से पूर्वी बंगाल वाला मामला है। यह आप को भी जानना चाहिये और पाकिस्तान वाले तो जानते ही हैं। इसीलिए वे इतना बबराते हैं। इसीलिए वे हमेशा आप से दुश्मनी की हालत में रहेंगे।

मैंने अपने आपको रोक कर रखा है। पूर्वी बंगाल से मुझ को न जाने कितनी चिट्ठियाँ और तार आते रहते हैं। मैं बोला नहीं करता हूँ क्योंकि मेरे दिमाग में सब कुछ होते हुए भी अभी भी महासंघ का चित्र है। इतना बस

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

कुछ कह देने के बाद भी एका तो आखिर कभी होना ही है ।

कुछ लोगों ने मुझे बहुत बुरा भसा सुनाया है और कहा है कि क्या महासंघ की बात करते हो । आज भी एक हजरत ने सुना दिया और उसके साथ साथ यह भी जोड़ दिया "जब तक वहां वह हकूमत है" । अंसार साहब ने मुझे गालियां दीं, बहुत दे डालीं और बाद में जोड़ा "जब तक वहां वह हकूमत है" । उनको यह भी कहना चाहिये था कि "जब तक यहां यह हकूमत है" । यह भी जोड़ दिया करो । जिस दिन हिन्दुस्तान की हकूमत जनता की ओर समाजवादी हो जाएगी उस दिन मुम्किन है कि पाकिस्तान में अयूब-शाही के खिलाफ भी पाकिस्तान की जनता बगावत करे और फिर दोनों देशों की जनता फिर से इस देश को एक कर दे । वह लम्बी बात हुई । लेकिन अभी मैं महासंघ की बात कर रहा हूँ

श्री तथागी : पहले उधर बगावत कराओ ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया मुझ को वहां भेजना चाहते हो ? इस वास्ते भेजना चाहते हो कि इस देश में तुम्हारी सब बातें आसान हो जाया करें । यह इतना आसान नहीं है ।

हमेशा पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में सोचते वक्त पाकिस्तान की सरकार और पाकिस्तान की जनता में आपको फर्क करना चाहिये । जहां एक हाथ में दण्ड हो वहां दूसरे हाथ में अभय दान रहना चाहिये । पाकिस्तान की जनता और हिन्दुस्तान की जनता भाई थे, अब भी भाई हैं चाहे एक दूसरे का गला काटें । ये हमेशा भाई रहेंगे । एक देश बन कर रहेगा । इसलिए अभय दान की मुद्रा कभी हिन्दुस्तान को नहीं छोड़नी चाहिये चाहे जितना दण्ड हाथ में उठाना पड़े ।

मैं बड़े अफसोस के साथ जो खबर आज छपी है, उसकी तरफ आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ और वह है अमरीकी अध्यापक की खबर जो यहां कुछ घ्रसे पहले राजदूत थे । मेरा मतलब प्रो० गालब्रेथ से है । उन्होंने कहा है कि जब वह यहां राजदूत थे तब उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को मना किया था कि वह बढ़ती हुई चीनी फौजों के ऊपर हवाई हमला न करे । उन्होंने कहा था कि यह उनकी सलाह थी कि, चीनियों के ऊपर हवाई हमला मत करो । सब से पहले मैं एक काम करना चाहता हूँ । पंडित नेहरू इस वक्त यहां नहीं हैं । खैर, मैं तो ईश्वर को मानता नहीं हूँ

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्या बात कर रहे हैं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप मानते हो तो देखो देश की क्या हालत कर रखी है । कुछ बना ही नहीं । पंडित नेहरू के प्रति मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ । जो कुछ भी मैंने उनकी निन्दा की चीन के ऊपर हवाई हमला न करने के कारण आज मैं उसको यहां वापिस लेता हूँ और मैं यह कहता हूँ कि अमरीकी विद्वान प्रोफेसर को यहां राजदूत बैठा करके जबकि हमारी बीस हजार वर्गमील जमीन चीन छीन चुका था, और अपनी पलटनें बढ़ा चुका था, क्या पड़ा था यह कहने को कि तुम हवाई हमला मत करो ? क्या अमरीका की बीस हजार वर्ग मील जमीन चली जाए तो कोई अमरीकी यह कहेगा कि अपनी जमीन की रक्षा मत करो, हवाई हमला मत करो ? यह प्रश्न बिल्कुल साफ है । यह हमारे सामने एक बात ले आता है । जहां तक रंगीन और कमजोर लोगों के देशों का सवाल है उनकी जमीनें चाहे इधर जायें चाहे उधर जायें इन शक्तिशाली देशों को उसकी कोई परवा नहीं हुआ करती है । यह बात मैं बहुत अफसोस के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ । मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि अगर कोई अमरीकी अमरीका में

इन सभी विदेशी नीति के मामलों में ज्यादा सोच विचार करता है तो उसको इसके ऊपर कुछ राय देनी चाहिये ।

मैं उन लोगों में से एक रहा हूँ कि पिछले कई दिनों से दक्षिण एशिया में चाहते रहे हैं कि वियतनाम के ऊपर हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार कुछ न बोले क्योंकि दक्षिण एशिया में मैं कुछ ऐसा नहीं करना चाहता जिससे चीन की या उत्तरी वियतनाम की शक्ति बढ़े । लेकिन यह अमरीकी प्रोफेसर ऐसी बात कहते हैं जो यहां पर राजदूत रह चुके हैं, इसको आप देखें ।

इसके साथ साथ एक और बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ जो जोसेफ स्टालिन के बारे में है । मैं स्टालिन का भक्त नहीं हूँ और न ही साम्यवाद का भक्त हूँ, यह मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ । लेकिन मेनन साहब जो हिन्दुस्तान के राजदूत थे मास्को में उनकी स्टालिन के साथ जो बातचीत हुई उसका एक हवाला उन्होंने लिखा है । स्टालिन साहब ने मेनन से कहा, अपने मेनन साहब से नहीं, दूसरे मेनन जो हैं, के० पी० एस० मेनन साहब, कि क्या तुम यहां पर कोरिया वगैरह की बात करने आये हो, बात करो मुझ से हिन्दुस्तान की और पाकिस्तान की । तुम्हारे देश को कृत्रिम रूप से तोड़ कर रक्खा गया है, उसे फिर से एक करने की बात मुझ से कहो, या महासंघ की बात कहो । खैर, वह स्टालिन की बात थी । पता नहीं ख्रूश्चेव की क्या राय थी, पता नहीं ब्रेज्नेव या कोसिजिन की क्या राय है, लेकिन मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में जो कोई आदमी भी दूरदृष्टि रखता है और न्याय की बात सोचता है और शांति से काम करना चाहता है उसे किसी न किसी रूप में इस सिद्धान्त को अपनाना ही पड़ेगा कि जो कोई देश नकली रूप से दो हिस्सों में तोड़े गये हैं उन को फिर से जोड़ने के लिये महासंघ शुरू करना होगा । यही रूस को अपनाना होगा, यही अमरीका

को अपनाना पड़ेगा । इसलिये रूस और पाकिस्तान दोनों को पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान सम्बन्धी मामले में जो भी झगड़ा चल पड़ा है उस पर बुनियादी तौर से कुछ सोचना और विचारना शुरू करना होगा ।

यह सही है कि यहां पर अक्सर जिक्र किया जाता है कि अमरीका के हथियार पाकिस्तानियों के पास पाये गये । तो क्या यह सवाल नहीं पूछा जा सकता कि चीनियों के पास कितने रूसी हथियार थे । ऐसी छोटी छोटी तफसील की चीजों में देशों को नहीं लड़ाना चाहिये । आज दुनिया इतनी पेचीदा हो गई है कि रूस वाले चीन को न जाने कौन कौन सी मदद देते रहे हैं और वे भी रहे हैं लेकिन आज वह कहते हैं कि हमारा उन का झगड़ा है । इसी तरह से अमरीका वाले भी दे रहे हैं । तो छोटे सवालों में न फंस कर बड़े सवाल को हमें उठाना चाहिये कि क्या अमरीका और रूस सारे संसार में शांति को कायम रखने के लिये हिन्द पाक महासंघ और एकता के विचार को अपनाने के लिये तैयार हैं । मैं कह चुका हूँ कि यह सिद्धान्त पूर्वी जर्मनी और पश्चिमी जर्मनी पर भी लगता है, वियतनाम पर भी लगता है, कोरिया और दूसरी जगहों पर भी लगता है । रक्षा मंत्री जी इस समय नहीं हैं, मुझे कहना पड़ता है . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : रेकार्ड पर रहेगा

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह तो आ ही जाएगा, लेकिन अक्सर मंत्रियों का यह कहना है कि जब वह नहीं रहते तब मैं बोलने का आदी हूँ ।

सभापति महोदय : आप का समय खत्म हो गया ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अभी मैं आधे तक आया हूँ । जब आप आखिरी घंटी बजायेंगे तब मैं बैठ जाऊंगा । अभी मत बजाइये, मुझे कह लेने दीजिये ।

Mr. Chairman: I have given him a warning. I would request the hon. Member not to reserve important points to the last; they may be lost for want of time.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप कहे तो मैं अभी बैठ जाता हूँ। लेकिन जितनी देर आप मुझे बोलना देना चाहें उतनी देर आप घंटी न बजायें। आप आखिरी घंटी बजा दीजिए और मैं बैठ जाऊंगा। मेरी आप से इतनी प्रार्थना है।

15:43 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री लोहिया जी ने दम पन्द्रह दिनों में अक्सर ऐसी बातें बोलते रहे हैं कि मुझे उन से हैरानी हुई। ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि एक आदमी जिस की मसलियाँ बिल्कुल खत्म हो चुकी हैं, उन को मचकाता है, ऐसे जैसे कि पहलवान मचकाया करते हैं। जब देखो तब वह पहलवानी से मसलियाँ मचकाया करते हैं कि चीन से लड़ लेंगे, पाकिस्तान से लड़ लेंगे। यह पुराना तरीका हो गया है। इस वक्त हिन्दुस्तानी को गम्भीरता से बोलना चाहिये। ठीक है, हम कमजोर हैं, लेकिन अब हम ने फैसला किया है कि अपनी और किसी जमीन को जाने नहीं देंगे। हम लड़ेंगे चाहे जितनी मुसीबत हो, चाहे जितनी ताकत आये। मुमकिन है कि हम को शुरू में हारना पड़े, लेकिन हम आखिर तक लड़ेंगे। तब तक जब तक या तो हमारा राज्य खत्म हो जायेगा या फिर हम अपनी सब जमीनें वापस ले लेंगे। इस तरह से बोलना चाहिये रक्षा मंत्री को न कि वह झूठी, मूठी फिजूल की गर्मी दिलाने वाली बात कहें कि इस का सामना कर लेंगे, उस का सामना कर लेंगे।

इस सम्बन्ध में आपां थोड़ा सा पाकिस्तान की तरफ भी ध्यान दें। यह लोग अक्सर नाजगो समझोता पाकिस्तान को दिया करते हैं। बार बार कहते हैं कि हम ने समझोता दे रक्खा है।

है कि जंग मत करो, आओ मिल जाओ। हमारी सरकार यह कहती है। लेकिन याद करो, सन् 1959 के आस पास, ठीक सन् मुझे याद नहीं, अय्यूब खां ने भी हिन्दुस्तान को एक संयुक्त सुरक्षा का न्योता दिया था। उस को इस सरकार ने यों ही ठुकरा दिया था। यह दोनों ही सरकारें इस ढंग की हो गयी हैं। आप अगर मेरी सलाह मानते हैं तो चाहे जितनी लड़ाई करें, चाहे जितनी बरबादी करें, लेकिन एक और समझोते का न्योता दें और वह है महासंघ का समझोता। उस के लिये आप किसी भी प्रकार का त्याग उठाने के लिये तैयार रहें। हो सकता है कि राष्ट्रपति पाकिस्तान का हो तब प्रधान मंत्री हिन्दुस्तान का हो। इस तरीके के पचासों तरीके निकाले जा सकते हैं। मनुष्य का दिमाग ऐसा है कि संवैधानिक तरीका निकाला ही जा सकता है। जहाँ पर प्रधान मंत्री साहब ने एकता बगैरह की अपील की हम लोगों से, उस की कोई जरूरत नहीं, आखिर, मैं यहां शेखी नहीं बघारता लेकिन जिना आप में से कोई भी आदमी इस देश की सुरक्षा के लिये उत्सुक है, कम से कम उतना तो हम भी हैं। कम से कम इतने। शायद इस से ज्यादा हों, लेकिन इतने तो हैं ही। यह अपील फजूल मत किया करो क्योंकि सत्तरह वर्षों से इस देश को बरबाद करने के बाद इस देश की रक्षा करने के लिये आप कह रहे हैं। दूर की बात क्या कहूँ, आज ही प्रधान मंत्री ने गरीबी और आजादी के बीच में मुकाबला किया है। क्या मतलब है उस मुकाबले का क्या गरीब रह कर आजाद रह पाओगे। असम्भव बात है। इसलिये अमीर बनने की कोशिश करो। जब मैं अमीर की बात करता हूँ तो आप जैसे नहीं, सारे 48 करोड़ लोगों के जीवन स्तर को ऊंचा उठाने की कोशिश करो, तब मुकाबला कर पाओगे पाकिस्तान का और चीन का।

आजकल मेरा थोड़ा सा पत्र व्यवहार चल रहा है प्रधान मंत्री साहब से। मैंने उन को

लिखा था कि यह मेरा उन को आखिरी खत है। इन्हिलिये कि कोई असर नहीं पड़ा करता। और वह खत मैं ने प्रधान मंत्री को नहीं लिखा था, वह खत मैं ने लिखा था "प्रिय श्री नेता" को। "नेता" को क्योंकि वह इस सारे सदन के नेता हैं। इसलिये मेरे भी नेता हुए उस हद तक। तो मैं ने "प्रिय श्री नेता" को लिखा था कि आप की सरकार पिछले सतरह अठारह सालों से "विवादग्रस्त" शब्द का इस्तेमाल कर के देशद्रोह करती रही है। इस शब्द का इस्तेमाल तुम बन्द करो।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप का समय समाप्त हो गया।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अच्छा।

श्री बागड़ी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, खत्म तो कर लेने दीजिये। पांच मिनट में खत्म कर देंगे। वह अपना फिकरा भी पूरा नहीं कर पाये हैं। आप ने दूसरे मैम्बरों को 35, 40 मिनट तक दिये हैं।

Shrimati Vijya Lakshmi Pandit: (Phulpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the debate in the House today stems from the drama that is being enacted in the Kanjarkot area. It is a strange irony history that is being enacted there, where Pakistan is using American arms and weaponry to further Chinese aims in South-East Asia. We had always been somewhat surprised at the selection of the particular area which Pakistan chose to create this fresh disturbance, but with each method that she has employed, a pattern has emerged which clearly reveals the Chinese mastermind behind the planning.

It was in 1954 that the Government of India as well as many responsible representatives of the Government abroad tried to impress upon the United States Government that the arms they were supplying to Pakistan allegedly for the suppression of communism might be used against India. To-

day this has been revealed most clearly and emphatically. It was in 1946 that I happened to be in the USA. That was the time when the Indian National Armies in Malaya and Singapore were fighting and a letter was smuggled to me in America, pointing out that many of these soldiers, much that they were trying to do, meaning the INA, were being destroyed by the British at that time with arms aid which they had received under the lend-lease agreement from America. I was permitted to make a broadcast; I called it "The Challenge of Asia" and I tried to point out that while Europe was fighting for freedom, Asian aims were being suppressed by the aid given by the very supporters of freedom. This broadcast somehow came to the attention of President Truman, who invited to come and meet him. I spoke to him about this paradox and I remember vividly how he looked at me and said, "How is one to prevent the use of arms that have already been given?" Of course, he was right.

When this massive arms aid started going to Pakistan, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles; assured us repeatedly that the arms aid given to Pakistan would be used for defending themselves against communism and aggression from without and no part of it will be used against India. Many were the occasions on which ambassadors of this country as well as the Government tried to explain how such a thing might be possible in the state of affairs that was going on between the two countries and by virtue of the fact that we at that time were not receiving solid arms aid which came to us subsequently and which still remains far less than what has been given to Pakistan.

Pakistan's action has created tension throughout India and has driven an inevitable wedge between us and America as well as causing very deep concern throughout the Afro-Asian world to whom we look for support and assistance in the implementation of many of our objectives.

[Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit]

15.53 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

This, of course, is again according to the classic Chinese pattern. I need not remind the House how during the last decade, China has kept various areas in South-east Asia in turmoil for her own purposes. In Vietnam, she has encouraged the Vietcong to fight South Vietnam. In Laos, she has given full support to Pathet Lao to fight against the neutralist regime. Indonesia is encouraged to attack Malaysia. On the Indian sub-continent, Pakistan has embarked on an altogether massive and dangerous form of irritation of India, which very clearly shows the hallmark of Chinese planning.

In the news of the last few months, we have seen repeated references to the exchange of visits between top-ranking political and military leaders Pakistan and China for the purpose of high-level consultations. China has chosen this particular time to invite Pakistan aggression as a way, in my humble opinion, of diverting the attention from her own impotence in Vietnam. We do not wish to help in escalating the war. I am sure vast numbers of people in this country are behind the Prime Minister when he appeals again and again for quite thought and civilised action for people coming round conference tables and trying to find out ways and means out of a situation, which is already very ugly and which threatens to become much worse. But whilst not desiring escalation either of our own problem or elsewhere, we want to help towards a peaceful solution and towards this end the Prime Minister has already joined the meaningful appeal of the 17 non-aligned nations. The same type of appeal has been made to our Pakistani neighbours. But this appeal made to Vietnam has been brusquely and rudely rejected by China showing clearly that China intends to fight to the last Vietnamese soldier.

There has been a good deal of talk in the House today about action. When we are involved in a situation of this kind, action presumably means war.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Not necessarily.

Shrimati Vijaylakshmi Pandit: I know the word itself does not mean it, but the impression given is some step should be taken. Constant references to every inch of our territory being taken back and things of that sort have only one connotation. How does one get them back? They have been seized by force. They are not going to be given back on a golden salver. They have to be taken back by force. Therefore, with deep respect, I would suggest that we all support the Prime Minister in exploring every honorable method of settlement in order to show to Pakistan that we wish to have peace in a civilised way. But if this is not possible, even though we may be pledged to policies other than violence, there comes a time in the history of every nation when policies have to be reversed.

There has been constant reference today to policies of the present government as well as the policies of the late Prime Minister. The charge which is becoming all too common inside and outside this House is that these policies are out-moded and they have led the country into great many difficulties. Human memories are terribly short. There is nothing so easy as making one's mind forget what one does not wish to remember. But I would remind some of those people who are shouting for a change of policy that had it not been for the particular policy that we adopted in the early days of our independence—I refer to the policy of non-alignment—today, I do not mean 28th April, we should not have been able to reach the place we took in the world. It is because we enunciated a policy which was sound for newly developing countries that the ancient countries of

Asia and the young countries of Africa, all took up the same policy. It is today these countries which are sitting in judgment, not the hon. members of the opposition who are only speaking from the point of expediency.

16 hrs.

श्री मधु सिन्घे : लेकिन उन शिों में से किसी ने भी अपनी जमीन नहीं खोई है ।
 (इंटरप्शन)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : देखिये मेरे भाषण में भी अन्तरबाधा हुई थी । मैं कोई भाषण नहीं कर रहा हूँ । मैं तो सिर्फ यही कह रहा हूँ कि किसी और देश ने जमीन नहीं खोई खाली इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ ।

श्री भागवत शा आजाद : उन को प्रथम और द्वितीय महायुद्ध की बात याद करनी चाहिए ।

श्री बागड़ी : जमीन खो चुके हो और आगे भी खोते रहो ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि वह इस तरह दखल क्यों दे रहे हैं । अब डैमोक्रेसी में हकूमत को अपोजीशन वालों की सब बातें सुननी पड़ती हैं और अपोजीशन वालों को ट्रेजरी बैंचेज वालों की । इस तरह से घबड़ाने की क्या जरूरत है ?

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: So to day, Sir, I am entirely in favour of assessment and reassessment of policies whenever and wherever necessary because no policy is sacrosanct, it is not the Bhagwat Gita or the Bible or the Koran—and if necessary it must be changed, but I do beg to submit that it is not proper to talk losely about policies which are paying us dividends today, and if and when

An hon. Member: What are the dividends?

Shri Brij Raj Singh (Dumilly): Is this the dividend from Pakistan (*Interruption*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से कैसे काम चलेगा ?

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: And, if and when the time comes for any reappraisal of these policies, I am confident—and I am sure a great part of the country will stand by what I say—that our Government will fully consider all aspects before they make a change, and if any change is ever made it will be not because we have been high-pressured into it but because we consider it to be, first of all, in the interest of India, and, secondly, contributing to the welfare of humanity. That has been always our way (*Interruptions*).

Shri Ranga: What are the dividends?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : समझने की कोशिश करिये ।

Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit: Now, Sir, often the question is being raised about reason why Pakistan has friends and India is losing her friends. It is true that we do not seem to be in quite the favourable position we were a little while ago, but I would like to repeat what Professor Mukerjee said a little while ago about the question of our not being forgiven for being independent. This, Sir, is true. I have, as you know, had the privilege of being abroad for many years and having to deal with those who are erstwhile masters of our country, and—I do not refer only to the British, but to all colonial rulers—there is this little lingering hurt in their minds that India should stand up and dare to voice opinions which were unpopular in the world but keeping to her own independent line, what she thought was best for herself which Pakistan did not. Pakistan became a pale reflection of the countries from which she sought aid. God forbid that any time, in any circumstance India

[Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit]

should follow suit. We wish to be nobody's satellite. We are a proud country with a big inheritance, and if we make mistakes, if we fall from time to time, we have the strength to stand up (*Interruption*) Sir, I have the strength to talk louder than the Opposition, so I shall go on so long as you permit me.

Then, the other thing is that because these things are known to us—I am not saying anything new and I have no new information with me—we have to remind ourselves that we must continue to watch the next moves of China very carefully and assess them with accuracy. I am sure everybody in this House is acquainted with Mao Tse-tung's famous dictum on military strategy. "Where there is strong opposition" he says, "do not attack, but divert attention by attacking a weak position". It might be suggested that China is even now planning another front for, undoubtedly, the Kanjarkot front is a sign of Sino-Pakistan collusion for something else. Because, if this is true, it still does not mean that we spend our energy and our time in mutual accusations and criticism. I would have thought that this is a moment of such great threat, not only to ourselves but to much else in the world, that we would all forget any shortcomings which either side may have. So, I am surprised when people of the eminence of the hon. leader of the Swatantra Party talk about the contribution of various members of the Opposition to the national struggle.

Shri Ranga: Yes, but I did not accuse you.

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: I do not know. My own feeling is that if anybody had the honour of contributing, then there is no need to reiterate that and plead for oneself, because hundred years ago one has sown a grain of mustard seed towards the freedom of a great country like India. The point is, what is the hon.

Member of the Opposition doing today? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend has made herself responsible for saying, for hinting, that we have asked for some compensation. We did not get any compensation. She knows who has got the maximum possible compensation. I know it.... (*Interruptions*)

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Barh): It does not become a member of the stature of Shri Ranga to make such serious reflections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us sit and hear calmly.

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: I would like to apologize to Shri Ranga. I did not mean him personally. I was making a general reference to his Party.

I would like to say one thing before I end. We today really stand at the cross-roads of history—it is a phrase which is often used, sometimes loosely; sometimes it becomes stale by repetition—and it happens that today if we take a wrong turning, we are irretrievably lost, and for years to come this great country will not be able to achieve its destiny. Therefore, while on the one hand I hold no brief for the Prime Minister—he is fully able to defend the charges that have been made against him—I would like to say that at this moment decency demands, patriotism demands, love of humanity and civilized behaviour demand that we join with him, sink our differences and give a reply to Pakistan in no unmistakable manner. It is only in this fashion that we could hope to impress the world; not by a divided House and a divided country.

श्री मधु लिमये : मह देश का पैसा विदेशों में बर्बाद कर रही थी आज हमें यहाँ पर सिखा रहा है ?

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: Just one more thing I would like to say. There has been talk of peaceful means not being the way in which one can get back territory. Well, as I have said before, living in the kind of world in which we do, in which the nuclear weapon has a higher position in man's mind than the eternal spiritual truths which have helped us to survive through the ages, living in this world, it may be that because of following a wrong action we may be plunged into taking action, forced into certain action which is against our best interests. All I ask is that whatever action our Government take, and our peoples sponsor, should not be against our interests and the interests of those humane causes for which many great men in India have worked and died through the ages.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : पहले भाषण का अन्त सफाया कर दिया है।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : उन्होंने आप के भाषण का सफाया किया है।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The proceedings cannot be conducted in this manner. The debates have to be carried on in an orderly manner. Others should listen. Shri Frank Anthony.

Shri Frank Anthony: Mr. Speaker, Sir, my motion is:

"This House, having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border, is of the opinion that Government must formulate a firm policy to meet the obvious Sino-Pakistan strategy of keeping India pre-occupied with border invasions."

Sir, I feel that my motion is a minimum motion. I feel that this debate and events that have led up to it mark a watershed in our military

and, indeed, in our foreign affairs. I feel that correspondingly these events should mark for the Government a watershed in respect of our policies, military, and in foreign affairs.

Sir, I was one of those who had hoped and almost prayed for a detente with Pakistan. More than once I had pleaded with the late Prime Minister emphasizing the need for such a detente because I was one of those who believed that the security of this sub-continent could only be achieved by India and Pakistan facing outwards towards the common enemy of Asia and, indeed, of the civilized world, Chinese Communism.

The Prime Minister was quite frank. He was of the view that it was not only a question of Kashmir or merely a question of Kashmir. His view was that even if we handed Kashmir to Pakistan on a platter, because Pakistan had been born in hatred, bred in hatred and continued to live in hate, it will always find or create causes for tension and strife between India and Pakistan. I did not agree with the Prime Minister in this. I continued to hope for this detente.

I was a member of the Indo-Pakistan Conciliation Committee hoping, praying that somewhere somehow, we will be able to break through this wall of hatred. Today, I confess, with a sense of sorrow, my complete disillusionment. I believe today that the whole philosophy of Pakistan is a philosophy of hate; it is a philosophy that has not only affected its foreign policy, it is a philosophy which has affected the average Pakistani official and, indeed, the non-official. I am sorry to say that.

Recently, I was a delegate to the Commonwealth Relations Conference. I have this advantage over Congressmen that I am able to meet people over a glass of whisky, which is a wonderful communicator, and I met delegates from other countries, Australians and Canadians, and they asked

[Shri Frank Anthony]

me this over a glass of whisky.....
(*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: It is a wonderful communicator, but the question is whether the communication conveyed at that time is the correct one.

Shri Frank Anthony: It is a friendly communicator.

They asked me why Indians do not seem to bother generally about Pakistan, not only was there no hate towards Pakistan, not even illwill; on the other hand, they told me with regret that Pakistani delegates had an obsessive hate for India they spent all their walking hours doing nothing but preaching hate and venom against India. I am not suggesting for one moment that we should emulate it because I believe that a nation, like an individual, which lives in hate is corroded and ultimately is destroyed by hate. But I see today this hate motivation in everything that Pakistan has done and continues to do. Pakistan, as we know, is a member of SEATO. Presumably, the paramount objective of SEATO is to contain Chinese communism. But what was Pakistan's objective? Obviously, Pakistan's objective was to delude the British and, even more so, the Americans into giving them arms to be used ostensibly against China. But Pakistan's sole objective has been to use that arms aid against India which she is doing in the Kutch area today. I see this hate motivation, and Pakistan is so blinded by it that it is prepared to play the Chinese game so long as and only if it injures India. It is indeed surprising that the Pakistan leaders seem to be so blinded by this philosophy of hate that they are unaware of the elementary fact that if at any time India is subverted or assimilated to communism, then the position of Pakistan, as an independent country, will not be worth a week's purchase. Even that elementary fact Pakistan seem to have lost sight of today. I feel that

there is this concerted strategy, a Sino-Pakistan strategy, of probing our borders, of attacking us, of keeping the whole border alive, in order that we might string out our armed forces, disperse our armed strength, and distract us from our urgent nation building activities.

I agree with Mrs. Pandit that the challenge today is not only to the Government. The challenge, in the first place, is to the Indian people. The challenge, in fact, is to the character and the fibre of every individual Indian. As to how we answer that challenge, and particularly the Members of this House who have not only the privilege but the trust of speaking for the people of India, that will determine the democratic future of this country. If we answer it in a hysterical way, if we answer it in an undisciplined way by squabbling among ourselves, by screaming at one another, by having petty political fratricidal strife, then what will be the condition of India? We will only weaken and destroy our people because we will weaken and destroy their morale. I feel this, that if we continue to shout at one another, and have this petty political strife at this time of crisis, we would only fulfil the hope of China and Pakistan.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Frank Anthony: We will only fulfil their hope that we are a country that is divided, that we are so petty, we so lack a sense of vision and we so lack a sense of discipline that when it comes to the crunch, we are not able to endure the test. Even China and Pakistan do not escalate this into a hot war, we are going to be faced with a long period of a cold war. It is going to be a long period of psychological attrition, and in one way that test is going to be more critical and it is going to be more difficult than even a hot war. This is going to be the test of the character of the Indian people, of our fibre,

of our capacity for stability, our capacity for endurance, our capacity to hold together as long as this crisis continues.

I am not suggesting for one moment that we should not criticise the Government, condemn it, when it deserves to be condemned—God knows the Government has committed enough mistakes—and I know what I am going to say will not commend itself particularly to Mrs. Pandit. But not only the country but the Shastri Government today is reaping the whirlwind of the almost incredible catalogue of mistakes of the past 17 years. The country is reaping that whirlwind—Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai and keeping our Armed forces weak and ill-equipped, and my friend Acharya Kripalani cannot escape his share. He was one of the persons who used to insist on our armed forces being kept weak and ill-equipped....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: No, no,

Shri Frank Anthony: The people in the Opposition used to indulge in that. (*Interruptions*). Internally, there was this tragic blunder of the linguistic reorganisation of States.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Did my hon. friend oppose it?

Shri Frank Anthony: I alone had opposed it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He had opposed it alone? (*Interruptions*)

Shri Frank Anthony: I say that I alone had opposed it in this House. I had opposed this tragic blunder, this hostage to disintegration. But let that go. Then, there was this failure on the food front. Why? It was because essentially of our feet-dragging State Governments, broken up with sordid petty political quarrels and political throat-cutting. These have been the failures and the mistakes of the past. But I am not unduly concerned with these defects, because they are also the defects

common to democracy. I think they seem to be an institution endemic in democracy, for people criticise one another and they mistake freedom for licence. I do not think that we go in for political throat-cutting more than the Americans do; sometimes, they do it almost literally, and we know that. I do not think that by and large, we are more corrupt than even the British. I could give many examples of how corrupt the British are and to what extent their companies evade tax. I had listened to a remark of Mr. Morrisson that half the companies in Britain or more than half declared their total income at £250 a year and the managing directors commute between the National Assistance Board and the Savoy Grille in their Bentley cars. He was only talking about the measures of corruption. I only wanted to point that out.

What I was going to say was this. It is in the final analysis the index of the character and worth of a democratic nation that in a crisis it closes its ranks, and that is the crisis that we are faced with today, and that is the test of our character.

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती : कच्छ
के आक्रमण के बारे में भी कहिये ।

Shri Frank Anthony: I am coming to that.

Today, the challenge is to the Government also, because I believe that the country has reached the crossroads of its democratic destiny. With all due respect to Mrs. Pandit, I would say that we no longer can afford not only the indecisions but the paralysis of the past seventeen years, being non-aligned to our own interests. Mrs. Pandit had said 'Look at the dividends that we have received from all over the world as a result of our non-alignment.' What are the dividends? They are only humiliation, shame and friendlessness.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: We can only give him facts and figures but not the brain. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Is this the manner in which we should conduct the debate?

Shri Frank Anthony: And I say this that Government cannot afford to be, not a prisoner of indecision, but a prisoner—and now the cap may fit—of the communists, the crypto-communists and the fellow-travellers in the ranks of the ruling party; no longer can it afford to be the prisoner of communists.....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: He is an agent of British imperialism. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Kapur Singh: I would request that this remark should be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members should take care and they, should exercise some restraint over themselves. Otherwise democracy cannot prosper.....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: He started it and not I. He should not have spoken like that.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : चोर की दाढ़ी में तिनका ।

Shri Kapur Singh: His remarks about the hon. Member being an agent of British imperialism should be expunged. I move that those remarks should be expunged.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of any expunction....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: My hon. friend is only a nominated Member of the House. He should remember that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Such motives are not to be attributed.

Shri Frank Anthony: I do not want to demean myself by bandying personalities in this kind of unbecoming language. I could do it if I wanted.

Shri Ranga: We do take objection to this remark. My hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony did not mention the name of Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. Is it proper for Shri Azad to make such a remark?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Can he call a Congress Member like that? I am a Congressman, and I cannot tolerate it. He cannot call us like that.

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): He must tolerate it. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: I am really surprised at this. Is this the manner in which we should conduct our affairs? Everyone tries to excel the other.

Shri Lahri Singh (Rohtak): It is not everyone, but only Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad is excelling.

Mr. Speaker: What is the hon. Member himself doing now? There ought to be some limit. I was pulling up Shri Azad also. I was addressing him and pointing out that he ought not to have made those remarks.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : आजाद जी के बारे में कोई क्या कह सकता है । आजादी है उन को ।

Shri Frank Anthony: Let me come to the immediate problem....

Mr. Speaker: I am rather bewildered that Members take pleasure in creating this disorder on all sides. That is not a proper method. We have got to be rather ashamed of this behaviour.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Who starts it? Everytime it is started by the Congress Party. The provocation comes from them every time and on every matter.

Mr. Speaker: It comes from all sides, not from one side only.

Shri Ranga: We would be satisfied if you look at them sometimes.

Mr. Speaker: When he is speaking, I have to look at the Opposition side.

Shri Warior (Trichur): When we say something, they shout. When we behave in an orderly way, this is their reaction.

Mr. Speaker: Is this the manner he calls himself orderly?

Shri Frank Anthony: I was coming to the immediate problem.

I was asked: what about this position in Kutch? I believe that the immediate imperative problem is a clear, firm border policy. That is the gravamen of my motion. Obviously, as I have said, Pakistan is going to try and distract us or stampede us into stringing out and dispersing our armed forces instead of keeping them as we should—the Defence Minister will know more about that than I do—as a compact, mobile striking force, necessary for defence and indeed if necessary for attack where called upon to do so, in order to repel or drive out an invader.

Here I would ask Government to consider one thing. I do not think that our border can now be left to the vagaries of State Governments, to the State police forces. I do not want to point a finger at them, but by and large, they are ill-equipped, ill-trained and often ill-led. I think that the border policing will have to be done—we cannot string out our armed forces for the purpose—by a quasi-military organisation. I would ask Government to consider whether it would not be advisable to form such a para-military organisation, largely officered by members of the armed forces, ex-army officers, present army officers, under military discipline and military training. They would do this. They would form an

extremely valuable second line of defence which we have not got in this country.

I am not for a moment suggesting that we emulate the Chinese who have two or three million as the first line of defence, and a highly-trained militia of between 10 and 15 million; but we do need a very good second line of defence.

People have talked about Pakistan having an advantage and some have criticised Government on that score. But let us realise this that an aggressor always has an advantage, because he chooses the time and he chooses the place which is most advantageous to him. We know that they have chosen Kutch because they have a considerable logistical advantage, as the Prime Minister pointed out. Kanjarkot and the area now invaded by Pakistan never formed part of the Province of Sind. As far as I remember, it was the Independence Act of 1947 which Pakistan accepted, which accepted that the boundaries of Pakistan in this area would be co-terminous with the boundaries of the former Province of Sind. The boundaries of the former Province of Sind never included Kanjarkot; they never included the present areas invaded by Pakistan. All the British maps of that period, all the maps, show clearly that this area was never a part of Sind, that Pakistan has not the semblance of a claim over it.

I feel that today we have many reasons for gratification. I say this, in spite of what some Members of the Opposition may say, that the ravages to our military machine have been repaired. And I say this with some knowledge that the army today is in fine shape, that its morale is high, that its training is very tough indeed, and that the arms and equipment that we are manufacturing in India are of the very finest quality, many of them much better than anything that either Britain or America could ever give us.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

I say that, and I say this also that the period of the betrayal of NEFA, thank God, is behind us, the period when Generals were selected not because of their fighting qualities or their experience, but because of their being courtiers or politicians. Today, thank God the position has changed. I do not want to mention people by name, but it is a matter for assurance to the country that we have got a Chief of Army Staff who is a first-class soldier. I happen to know the General who is in operational command in Kutch. He is not only one of our best, finest fighting Generals, he is one of our most brilliant Generals. And I say this, that whatever temporary setbacks there may be, for God's sake, though some politicians howl ignorantly, if the operational commander considers that a withdrawal here is necessary, let them withdraw, because they will know where and when to attack.

And I say this: today we may be in a position of logistical disadvantage, but sooner or later, and I believe sooner, you will find that with these really good Generals we have got, and an army whose morale is sky high, and with our incomparable fighting jawans, as I told somebody the other day, we will be able, if Pakistan persists in aggression, to hit them not only for a six, but we will be able to hit them for sixtysix.

I want to say this also that internally we will have to pursue a certain policy. I am glad the hon. Home Minister is here. We will have to ensure that neither the Communist fifth column, nor the communal mischief-makers, weaken us internally. The Home Minister will have to ensure that. He will have to see not only that the Communist fifth column and the communal mischief-makers do not weaken us, but he will have to see that he does not leave it to the feet-dragging State police. He may have to give orders from now, that at the first signs of mischief by communal elements and their allies, the goondas, whatever security force there is must

shoot and shoot to kill, and you will never have any communal trouble in this country. The Home Minister knows that as soon as he gave the order to shoot to kill in West Bengal, goondas and communalists disappeared. He must give that order.

I say this that I only pray that Pakistan will not escalate this into a war. Surely the leaders of Pakistan are not completely blinded... We do not want to indulge in ranting braggodocio here, but anybody who knows anything about military matters will say this that Pakistan militarily is a monstrosity, it is utterly untenable. Tomorrow if Pakistan seeks resort to war, I have no doubt that East Pakistan would be a sitting duck militarily and that we can cut West Pakistan into little bits. But who wants to do it? That is what I am praying, that Pakistan even today will see sense, because I believe that our principal preoccupation is with China, and our principal pre-occupation must continue to be with the Chinese. And because of that I feel, with all due respect to Mrs. Pandit, that we must—I do not know what you are going to do with them—give a decent burial, more properly a decent cremation, to all the unreal and disastrous slogans and mantras of the past; let them be given a decent cremation.

I say that for Chinese confrontation, and that is our principal pre-occupation, we must have friends; let us not have allies. In the past, because of pressure from the Communists and crypto-Communists in the Congress ranks, the Government has gratuitously antagonised those who could, who are the only people who could, help us. All right, let us criticise our friends, but for God's sake, why do we not criticise our enemies, why do we not criticise our potential enemies and the satellites of our enemies, why do we not criticise North Vietnam, why do we not criticise Indonesia? Do not let Communist clamour from the Congress ranks make us worry unduly about what our friends may be doing in the Indian Ocean. In spite of its

name, the Indian Ocean does not belong to us. If there is a confrontation with China, we will need friends there and we may need those friends not only in the Indian Ocean, but we may need them in the Bay of Bengal. Do not, under Communist pressure, antagonise them.

I endorse entirely Mrs. Pandit's plea that we must continue to behave in a civilised and statesmanlike manner. Let us talk. Let us negotiate on reasonable terms. We have today a not negligible military capacity. Let us remember that. We have a not negligible military capacity. It is growing. We have a tremendous military potential. And let us speak with that knowledge; let us speak from that knowledge, quietly but firmly, as a country today that has to be reckoned with; as a country, as I said, which has a growing military capacity and tremendous military potential.

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon Prime Minister, in submitting the motion that the House is now considering, set the tone of this debate. He also enunciated without any room for misunderstanding, the policy of our Government, that is to say, that the Government is determined upon a militant defensive position as well as a considered diplomatic offensive. This is the only way we can secure the integrity of this country with the resources which any country of our age and size can have.

Having said that, I want to remind this House that on this day, 16 years and six months ago, almost to a day i.e. on the 28th October, 1947—when what has today culminated in Kanjarkot began very nearly a quarter of a million Pakistani personnel were assembled in the territory of the Union of India in that State of Jammu and Kashmir, and the aggression against India began. From that period till now, we have the position of what one may call the probing of the frontiers or of firing across the frontiers, whatever it may be. It has escalated not only in quantity but in the variety of action and subversion, such as the aggression by their armed units inside

our country in various ways, and therefore, we have this permanent hostility from Pakistan.

Now, we find one country, Pakistan, which came into being less than a generation ago. Therefore, whatever may be the political incidents, it is very difficult for us to think of Pakistan entirely in terms of a foreign country. But I beg to submit that it is time we considered her as a separate sovereign, if somewhat unfriendly nation. She is a sovereign nation which exists, and which did not want to be with us. Mr. Jinnah said, "I would rather like to sit alone in a desolate island than to be part of India."

Pakistan has its own problems. I beg to submit that even as an academic proposition for us to suggest that we should confederate with them would certainly create difficulties for us and also create doubts in Pakistan, as "confederation" is only another word for trying to unite by conquest. Therefore, we must accept this partition and recognise that we are two separate countries. Pakistan was born, as Shri Frank Anthony said, in circumstances which are not very creditable to us or to her; it is probably a country without much pride of ancestry so far as the political history is concerned, and perhaps without hope of the progeny of peaceful development and progress. But there it is.

Having said that, I may point out that perhaps it would again be a mistake for us to regard the Prime Minister's motion—and I speak for myself—as merely concerned with what Mrs. Pandit called a drama, that is, the incidents on the Kutch-Sind border. This is not due to the prowess on our side or Pakistan's side or the lack of it on either side; it is merely due to the conditions which Nature decides. Probably it will take a different turn in a few days. When the monsoon sets in. But that does not mean that the war that began 17 and a half years ago would stop in that way.

Now, we are in this position. It has repeatedly stated that we have now

[Shri Krishna Menon]

a much larger army considerably more arms, and therefore we are able to meet this difficulty in a way which could not be done before. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are well aware of the fact that it is customary in this House to debate Pakistan under Home Affairs and Kashmir under Foreign Affairs. This is not somebody's mistake, but it expresses a political outlook.

We have therefore to consider what Pakistan really means. In the last 10 to 15 years, she has received a billion dollars worth of military equipment; I do not know about the last two years, but till then more than half her military budget has been provided from outside. She had her due share—two-fifths or whatever it is—of the military equipment at the time of partition. If she had augmented it by her own resources, as a military opponent she would not have been so prominent. In fact, before 1955, Pakistan at no time threatened us on the Kashmir front as she did afterwards. There is a considerable amount of equipment that has come in and also training and modernisation of her armed forces. Latterly she also entered into, we may not perhaps say, an alliance, but a companionate relationship with China. As the late Prime Minister used to say, the only common factor as between Pakistan and China is their common hostility to and nothing else. so, we have to consider what we can do to lower the striking power of the other side. One thing, of course, is to add to our own, which is being done. It should not be regarded as opposition to a friendly country or enunciation of her foreign policy to suggest that the United States assured us time after time—Mr. Dulles, told me so many times himself that “these arms are not intended to be used against you” I asked jocularly, “Have guns that fire only in one direction been made?” He said, “No; if they are used against you, we will step in and stop them”. The same thing has been repeatedly said to our late Prime Minister privately and publicly.

These arms, we were assured, were intended to stop communism. Even then, we could not understand how tanks of the second world war could be used against the Soviet Union from Rawalpindi. It must be a military feat of some kind. So, obviously this equipment was intended by Pakistan to be used against us. It must be said to the credit of Pakistani leaders that during the debates on Kashmir and as other times, they made no secret of that fact. They said, we are not bound by this; we will use everything we have. Those who have read the SEATO agreement will discover there is nothing provided in that that this equipment should not be used for any other purpose. It can be used at the discretion of the people to whom it is given. On the 2nd May, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, accompanied by his Chief of Air Staff and the Director General of the Foreign Office will be attending SEATO's annual conference. Although France is staying out of this conference, Pakistan is still a part of this conference, even though she has, as I said, a companionate arrangement with China. If the purpose of this alliance is to stop communism, and since we have no information that China is going to abandon communism—she may have a different brand of communism, but she is still regarded as a communist country—therefore, this strange combination is to our great disadvantage.

So far as our own position is concerned, we have to strengthen both these aspects to which the Prime Minister referred. In this chamber public speaking is neither the occasion nor the place for us to think aloud, to throw out suggestions or to appear more informed than those who are dealing daily with these matters as to how an offensive should be fought, who should be withdrawn and who should be posted, this, that or the other. But one would say that so far as the diplomatic side of it is concerned, we are largely responsible for going round the world saying that Pakistan and China have an edge over

us in the Middle-east countries and Africa. I say, this is not true. It is an adverse reflection on the political maturity and intelligence of the Middle-East countries. It is quite true they are not going to carry our burdens and adopt our quarrels, they are not going to say the same thing as we say. But the propaganda by Pakistan, largely based upon theocracy, based upon hatred of India, for maligning our leaders like Nehru, has cut no ice among any thinking people in the Middle East for the vast masses of their population. They have not forgotten, not only not forgotten, they will remember, our common ties. They are always conscious of the common ties of anti-imperialism, of past history and also the fact that without any instruction, without any guidance, without any request from us, each of these countries has greatly or very quickly adopted the same way of looking at things.

Therefore, we, on the one hand, have to follow the policy of not yielding any more territory. We have in fact not yielded any territory. Illegal occupation which will be ended is not yielding. It is impossible for any country to post troops on every square inch of its frontier. I rather agree with Shri Anthony, but not in the same way, that the time has come for us to abandon this myth that the provincial police, the C.R.P. can man our frontiers, whereas on the other side there is an army of nearly 2.5 to 3.00 million regular services and 2 million reserves and also the Pakistani army which has the regular Pakistan forces and various so-called para-military forces which are part of the regular army.

Since the attack on Kanjarkot there has been very considerable intrusions across the cease-fire line in Jammu and Kashmir. The use of weapons in that area is totally against all agreements that she has entered into. In the 500 yard belt on the cease-fire line no soldiers are supposed to go and no arms are supposed to be carried even by civilians. But the Observer corps, which un-

fortunately until recently had not been able to find fault with Pakistan with their own eyes—they have also condemned us—have said that the armed intruders are either Pakistani civilians or policemen coming with fire-arms or it is discontented Kashmiris from Indian-administered Kashmir who are rebelling against their own Government. That has been the position in the past. But now, as the Defence Minister stated in the House the other day, the number of these raids have increased. They have broken all past records. It used to be traditionally about 90 to 100 a year. But, I believe, that now they do as much in two or three months. Now that it has escalated to that extent, I think it is time for us to consider whether the guarding operations on the cease-fire line which are now undertaken by the corps of Observers are adequately done and done in our favour.

We also have to take into account the fact that while ten years ago at the time of Bandung there was a great deal of Asian solidarity—today also there is a great deal of Asian solidarity, and Asian and African solidarity. The essence of this kind of movement is that as they grow, some of the deficiencies will appear. Therefore, there are quarrels between Asian countries, and the doctrine that Mr. Dulles put forward, of Asians fighting against Asians, seems to appear everywhere.

Therefore, while the Pakistan attack upon us would have to be met by force, I hope the Prime Minister, the Government and the country will support very warmly and keep on repeating the idea that in no circumstances could this country say that we will not negotiate. We will negotiate with the devil himself, but we will not negotiate on the basis of surrendering our sovereignty. That is our position. That has been our position all these years. Whatever anybody may say against the basis of our policy, we will negotiate. It may be that physically we may be pushed back, and very often these things happen even

[Shri Krishna Menon]

with powerful countries. Therefore, at no time would we abandon this idea of negotiation.

But President Ayub also says the same thing. Two days ago in Dacca he said: "Why should there be war between India and Pakistan? We have settled so many problems without war and without going to the United Nations. So why do we not settle it in this way? What is Kanjarkot and Rann of Kutch? It is a piece of saline desolate territory." If it is a piece of saline and desolate territory why does he wage war about it unless he likes salt rather than anything else.

Then, there is the question of propaganda in regard to this. I am not one of those who think that any government sending out the largest quantity of literature is doing more propaganda than anybody else, because other people do not read your propaganda literature. But it was interesting to see Pakistan Foreign Office mentioning in a press release yesterday, while not mentioning the Prime Minister in terms, that the Government of India has been telling a white lie in saying that Pakistan tanks were deployed in the Rann of Kutch area. It said the terrain of saline land of Kutch is not negotiable by tanks. But, in the following line, the Release says that Indian tanks were there!

Now I come to the political aspect of this thing. I have referred to the 28th of October, 1947. From that time onwards, since the Pakistani Chinese alliance came into being the strategy of Pakistan has not changed; that is to say, they come into our territory like the policemen, beat the people first and then ask questions; they believe in beating first and then asking questions afterwards. They come into our territory and say that now this is a disputed territory. Dispute always arises as a result of aggression, and that is why this fine distinction between dispute and situation. Pakistan has always tried to concert everything into a dispute and then

proclaim to the world that they are not there. For example, when Kashmir was invaded, we appealed to the Security Council. But the defence of Pakistan for four or five months was that this is mischievous propaganda by India and that they are not just there. When the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan came to Karachi, and during an on-the-spot inspection they found Pakistan troops in Poonch. When Sir Zafrula Khan was faced with this question in the Security Council on earlier occasions, he had said "we have not got a single soldier in Kashmir and we are not invading India". When he was confronted with this evidence of this Commission, he said: Yes, we have got three brigades of troops in Poonch, because if we did not invade India, India would have invaded us. (Laughter). Now, this is not a laughing matter. This part of the philosophy, the idea that if you do not invade others, they will invade you is the law of the serpent; not of the human being; and it is that kind of preventive war *a la* Hitler which Pakistan has always been following.

I want to submit that if as a result of the conditions which are not under the control of India or Pakistan, if there should be a slowing down of the present difficult position, this country has naturally to be careful about the rest of the borders. It is for us, Members of Parliament and other people, to face up to the situation before it actually arises. Here again, there is no question of another aggression. It is one regular aggression. Today Pakistan and China have become one enemy. Only a few days ago the Chinese have again advanced into our territory, in Ladakh according to newspaper reports. Whether they will launch another attack or not, one cannot say. But the fact is that we are tied down by one or the other; it is one holding the ring for the other. A part of their strategy has always been to hit and run. I think the time has come

when we leave this hit-and-run race, and take the initiative, instead of allowing others to set the field. We would have to settle down with Pakistan only on the basis that we are two separate countries and that this animal, when hurt, will bite back. Then, well it is not necessary for us to say that we will recover every inch of our territory; it goes without saying that the frontiers of this country are inviolate and so they will remain.

With regard to the Kutch frontier, no question of dispute can arise, because Kutch came into the Union, not as part of the Act of British Parliament of the 3rd June 1947, which applied only to British India, because Kutch was not part of British India. Kutch acceded to India and, therefore, became part of the Indian Union. Therefore, the whole of that territory which was under the suzerainty of the Maharao of Kutch became part of the Indian Union. So, there can be no question of a few feet being on this side or that side, because there was no question of plebiscite, there was no argument and, what is more, Pakistan all these 17 years had laid no claim to it.

Then, this area is not just a piece of saline land or something. The Pakistan claim now is for 3,500 sq. miles of territory. 3,500 sq. miles is half the Rann of Kutch and one-sixth of the whole area of that former State. So, it is a very big part of the present State of Gujarat. Therefore, when in a few weeks time perhaps the water will be too deep for an infantry soldier and too shallow for a ship, then there will be some change. Perhaps then, there will be probings somewhere else and the Government naturally would have to meet the situation. Parliament and people, have also to be prepared. It is not enough for us to say that having gone away from Kutch they will come somewhere else and therefore it is. It is not somewhere else in a different way; it is part of one being invasion.

On the diplomatic side, it would

be idle to think that without world public opinion, however powerful armies may be and however wealthy countries may be, one would be able to assert one's own position. Consider the position of Britain when she invaded Egypt; or even today when a very powerful country like the United States is bombing in Viet Nam, her own people and other countries in the world are protesting against it and, naturally, it shakes them up. Therefore, on the diplomatic front, it is more essential now than ever that we make our position better understood to Afro-Asian people. I want to say that it is a great mistake for us to try and sell other people's propaganda and say that our stock is down with these peoples. It is not true. They have regard for India, because of the fact that we were the earliest liberated countries and have assisted in the promotion of this ideal of independence as such. But it is not sufficient for us to propagate; we have to show it by example. It is not the criticism of Government or anybody to say that we give somehow the impression to the world that we are down and out and we are begging from everybody, that our economy is likely to be controlled by others.

I think, it is also necessary that we should remind both Britain and the United States who have repeatedly said that their arms would not be used against us that in allowing the use of such arms against us, they are putting into practice the Dulles doctrine of Asians fighting against Asians.

I want to express my sincere appreciation of the composite and concrete policy put forward by the Prime Minister and I hope that this motion will be passed without any dissenting voice.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as the debate has proceeded, I frankly confess, I felt a little dismayed at some of the speeches that were made from both sides of the House. But as the debate proceeded further and

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

eminent speakers from the Government side rose to defend Government's position, I started feeling a little bit intrigued also, particularly by the speech of the eminent Member, Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit. She spoke of the drama that is being enacted in Kanjarkot where American arms, which were intended for fighting Communism, were being used against India despite definite assurances held out by American leaders that these arms would not be allowed to be used against India.

16.59 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

But in that very context she went on and diluted on the policy of non-alignment. I do not know what is the relievance of non-alignment in the context of a fight between India and Pakistan. We find ourselves in an unenviable position when we find that Pakistan, which has taken an aggressive position against us in a new area, in the Rann of Kutch, is also a military ally of the United States. I would ask, in all humility and with due respect Mrs. Pandit: What is the point of non-alignment in the present context? Non-alignment is all right when it is a question of our taking sides between warring power blocs. But when our own territorial integrity and our own national security is in danger—even the late Prime Minister said it—in defending our own frontiers, there can be no question of any non-alignment. I feel that the whole question of non-alignment in the present context, in the present conflict between India and Pakistan, is absolutely irrelevant and meaningless.

17 hrs.

Now, the question is: What are we going to do? The Prime Minister was absolutely correct when he reminded the House that we are standing at a cross--road and the cross-road is the road where war and peace separate, either we take the road to war or armed conflict, or the road to negotia-

tions. So far as negotiations are concerned, it is quite all right that our Government had expressed readiness to negotiate on terms which Pakistan Government declared but on which the Government has gone back. But the present position is that the Pakistan Government has gone back on those terms and is not willing to negotiate or is not showing any signs that they are willing to negotiate at all. Therefore, let us take a solemn decision as to what we have to do in order to rescue ourselves from the danger that has arisen to our national security. It is quite clear that logistically and militarily, we are in a disadvantageous position in the Rann of Kutch area and we must leave it to the armed leaders to decide what should be the strategic move. But may I ask the Government: Has the clearance been given to the military leaders to take such steps as they think are adequate to meet the threat to our national security that has arisen? As far as I have understood Government's decision, they have handed over the question of border security in that particular sector and the operational control of manning that border, to the Army. But supposing Pakistan does not want to come to terms and goes on continuing in its aggressive activities, then is the Army free to make such military moves as it thinks fit? If that decision is not taken,—that is one of the most serious decisions that this country can take—if that clearance is not given to the Army, then there is no meaning in coming to the House and telling the country that the strategic moves would be decided by the Army. Strategic moves for what?

So far as this Government is concerned, even our recent experience with regard to the border question not only in Kutch but in other areas also hardly evoked any confidence that that clearance would be given to the Army to take such moves as it

thinks best for guarding national security all over, in regard to the Indo-Pakistan frontier.

A little time ago or a short while ago, there was another trouble that was there in West Bengal in Cooch-Bihar. There, I can say with authority that the West Bengal Government which was charged with the defence of that border and the guarding of that border did really take very strong and firm measures, and indicated to the Pakistan Government that they were not prepared to put up with any nonsense from the other side, and very strong measures were taken by the West Bengal Government and the West Bengal Border Police. But the entire State Government and the people of West Bengal felt humiliated at the way in which over the head of the West Bengal Government a cease-fire was arranged, and the High Commissioner of India in Pakistan who flew from Karachi to Dacca did not have the courtesy even to consult the Chief Minister under whose orders those strong measures had been taken. I can say with some knowledge that the entire West Bengal, all parties in the State legislature, and the people of West Bengal felt humiliated at the way they were treated.

It is not only a question of Kanjar-kot and Kutch but it is the whole question of Indo-Pakistan relations and the security of the Indo-Pakistan frontiers. I want to ask a straight question of Government have they really made up their mind and are prepared to tell the country and declare to the whole world that 'come what may, we are ready to see this thing through'? If they do not make that categorical declaration, whatever appeals for unity the Prime Minister may have made, they were welcome declarations, welcome appeals, welcome expressions of a firm resolve, but this House has seen many such declarations of resolve, and nothing has happened so far. So I ask Government to make a very categorical statement whether that kind of decision has been taken or

not. If the Prime Minister can make that statement, the whole country will be electrified.

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): In the long history of Pakistan's provocative activities on different segments of their sprawling border with India, the recent attacks on the Kutch-Sind border were unparalleled in design and magnitude. They were not mere encroachments made by local forces; they were military operations on a planned scale constituting an unprovoked violation of our frontier, namely, the Kutch-Sind border. This border follows a well-established border. The border and ground rules laid down were accepted by Ayub Khan himself in 1960. According to these rules, any dispute about the undemarcated border areas should at once be taken up by official teams from both sides. But the Sind-Kutch border has already been demarcated; even if there had been any doubts in the mind of Pakistan, they should have come to negotiating Table. But Pakistan does not probably believe in peaceful negotiation and has resorted to this dangerous experiment of nibbling at our borders.

We should impress on the Pakistan Government and the whole world that our conciliatory attitude should not be mistaken for weakness. If the only answer to aggression is to vacate it, we should be prepared for taking that action.

Here I may say that we, the members of the DMK, are one with the Prime Minister and other Members of the House, and with the whole country, in repelling aggression, in vacating aggression wherever it has happened. Now that it has happened in the Kutch-Sind border, we are one. We want to defend not only the Kutch-Sind border, but we want to defend India. We want to defend democracy. We want to defend freedom and democracy can we settle our differences. I do not want to hide the fact that there are serious differences between us. We have got bitter disappointments. We want many solutions to come in a de-

[Shri Sezhiyan]

mocratic way. But once the base of democracy is demolished, nothing will be left either for you or for us. Therefore, in maintaining the integrity of India, freedom of India and democracy in India, we are one. In fact, we are more anxious than you, because if China comes or Pakistan enters, we may not have even the little freedom we have now, and even the little democratic semblance now available in the country to ask questions, to ventilate our differences and disappointments, even that freedom may be lost.

That is why though we form a small minority here, though we do not form a very big party, still we believe in democracy. That is why we want to keep up democracy, save it from aggression from an alien country; in that we are one with the Prime Minister and others in their genuine efforts to repel aggression.

Here I want to invite the attention of the Speaker and the House to the solemn pledge we took on November 14, 1962. Then we took a solemn pledge to expel and drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India. We also noted the vast amount of surcharged feeling and enthusiasm available in the country. I want to know what happened to that enthusiasm and the confidence placed in you. All the Members of the House, irrespective of political leanings, irrespective of party affiliations, irrespective of community, all the people in the country were one, united, and they placed all the available resources at your disposal. I have to point out very sorrowfully that the confidence placed in the Government, that the opportunities given to them were frittered away for party interests. They did not canalise all the confidence reposed in the Government and the enthusiasm of the people.

I do not want the same thing to be repeated again, because history seems to have a peculiar way of repeating itself. If we go through the present

border disputes, we see that here is a close resemblance, with Pakistan emulating the example of her favourite ally China. Just as China did in Aksaichin, Pakistan has embarked on infiltration and aggression on the same pattern. Their strategy is to grab some areas, to demand something more, and at the end show willingness to come to negotiation. The same kind of strategy has been employed by Pakistan in the Kutch-Sind border. In Aksaichin we were told that China entered our territory and built a road. The same thing has happened here. About 20 square miles strip of land has been occupied by Pakistan armies, and they have constructed a road between New Ding in our own area and Surai in Pakistan. I do not know how this was allowed to happen. The same pattern is followed by them, and the same mistakes are committed by us.

Therefore, when we want to repel this aggression, we should be very clear in our minds. While we do not want a hot war to take place between India and Pakistan, we should impress on Pakistan that if nothing happens to our protest notes, if nothing comes out of negotiations, we should be prepared to take a hot war on our hands and drive the Pakistanis out and vacate the aggression that they have committed. We should impress on our enemies, whether it is China or Pakistan, that aggression does not pay.

It is regrettable that the Government have been complacent in that area all these years. While the Chinese aggression came all of a sudden and took us by surprise, Pakistan had made no pretence all these years that they were friendly with us. But all these years we have allowed them to build roads, to get all the logistical advantage and we have not been able to meet any exigencies there.

Here, I want to make one or two constructive suggestions. The first and foremost task is to improve our

transport and communications facilities. We should be able to rush our troops to any trouble spot quickly and without loss of time. At the time of the Chinese aggression, we were told that the terrain was mountainous, that we had logistical troubles. Now we are told that the area in Kutch is sandy and marshy. I do not know what we expect from our aggressors. Do we expect that they should move their troops in a place where we can move without much difficulty? We have got a long sprawling border, and all along the border we should be able to concentrate our defence in a better way.

As I said earlier, we are out to defend our democracy, to defend our freedom. In this question no communal feeling should be brought in. We are not fighting against Muslim Pakistan, but against Pakistan that has committed aggression on India. We are not fighting for a Hindu India, but for India as a whole. Therefore, in this question, without any communal feeling or any political motive, whether we belong to this party or that, the ruling party or the Opposition, we should all unite together in expelling the aggression that has been perpetrated on our borders, not only the Kutch-Sind border, but NEFA and other borders wherever aggression has taken place. We should unite and tell the aggressor to get out of India. Whatever differences we have among ourselves we will settle them democratically. We do not want anybody to nibble at our borders at our expense.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the House will forgive me for narrating a personal episode. It was in 1950, when the Congress party held one of its most historic and momentous meetings. The memory of that meeting is still very much in my mind and is ingrained in my mind. When I attended that meeting, there were some great giants in that meeting. There was Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, a noble and in-

veterate foe of the Muslim League; there was Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, the greatest orator of the Indian Parliament. The discussion was about the Pakistan-India trouble, and at that time, the trouble was looming so very large in the horizon of the day that it compelled Liaquat Ali Khan to come down to Delhi on Easter day.

At that meeting, the talk was on war even a much more and bigger scale than here. Excitement was running high. My distinguished friend Acharya Kripalani was there with his very distinguished lady. I was then a new Member of Parliament, and I did not understand much of what was said. I also spoke on that occasion, and I will repeat what I said on that day. I hope you will bear with me for saying it. I said that it is not easy to talk about war; it is not a question of youngmen courting imprisonment but thousands will be dead in Bombay and Delhi and this very Parliament will be brought down to ruin. And many speakers that day yelled me down. Some said, "shut up and sit down". But I said "You cannot cow me down, and I am going to express my opinion." I said Mahatma Gandhi should have been here. He opposed partition in every shape and form and manner. When more and more people were asking me to shut up and sit down, there was some gentleman who, I heard, was asking the others to shut up and sit down. He was asking the others to sit down, and I heard that voice from behind. I was frightened; because I found it was the great Jawaharlal Nehru asking the others to sit down. He said, "Let Alva speak. I share Alva's views." These words got ingrained in my mind from then on. I was very grateful to him. But those days are over. This is a day when I could say, let a hundred Parliaments be burnt down into ashes and let all our buildings go down into ruins but we cannot permit one single inch of our territory to go in-

[Joachim Alva]

to the hands of Pakistan. Pakistan has stabbed us in the back. Pakistan has opened the gate for China which has now entered this great sub-continent of India so that it may sit on our heads. The British were the foster-fathers of partition of the land. But for the British, there would have been no partition of this country.

Look at the standing army of Pakistan, and the army that then existed in undivided India. There was a great book entitled *Communal Triangle* written by Ashoka Mehta and Achyut Patwardhan; they wrote that book in the Nasik jail. They were distinguished patriots. I was their companion in jail in 1930—32. They said in that book that in 1914 the percentage of Sikhs in the army was 19.2, but in 1930, it came down to 13.5 per cent. The Punjabi Muslims were to the extent of 11.1 per cent in 1914; they are all now colonels in Pakistan army. But the percentage rose to 22.6 in 1930. Then came the Pathans. Their percentage was 6.2 in 1914, and it rose to 6.35 in 1930. The Hindustani Muslims were to the extent of 14.1 per cent in 1914. Thus, we know that the Muslims were in a very high majority in the army. They had a fine army, a standing army in the British days, and the British were the foster-fathers of the partition of the country. Today, we are strangled. The only man who nobly fought to the end was Mahatma Gandhi who never came to the Constituent Assembly. But I sat with his son, the late Devdas Gandhi, in the gallery at that midnight session of the Constituent Assembly. I remember that Mahatma Gandhi refused to come and Mahatma Gandhi had the foresight and his foresight has been proved to the hilt. He died a hero and a martyr. He was opposed to partition.

We thought that with the partitioning of the country one great danger would be over. But we have now got 20 dangers around our neck. I have been to China. I know how dreadful that country can be as a foe of Asian independence and

Indian nationalism. When China and Pakistan carried on their negotiations on the parallel of the Japanese negotiations, Japan sought peace with America, with Cordell Hull, soon after Pearl Harbour was smashed up along with the British and other war vessels. This Pakistan has been created by the British. We cannot forget the gentlemen, the people, who have created Pakistan and who are now quietly behind the scene. We are now engaged in a deadly battle with Pakistan. But the men and women in Pakistan are of our own flesh and blood, and now after partition through the malevolence and hatred, Pakistan has turned into our enemy; Pakistan has become our enemy No. 1. Pakistan and China have become our enemies, A & B respectively. Until we clear out Pakistan from Karjarkot, we have no hope. Unless we put hope and confidence in our army and people, we cannot build up our country. The morale of our army is very high now. We have to stand by them. When they are dying in the cold heights of NEFA for our security, the politicians cannot let them down. This is very serious. After the British created Pakistan, the Americans came in and filled the vacuum. America thought that with its billions of dollars, it could buy every country. We know the story of the harlot. She had one lover, but when she became rich, she gave him up and took another lover from a distant land.

I met the then Vice-President of America, Mr. Nixon when he was speaking to the then President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. I spoke to him briefly: I asked, is it true that you are going to Karachi from here and America is arming Pakistan? He said, yes, boldly. I asked, "Do you know what will happen to us?" He said, "yes". I asked, "Do you know where we shall go?" He said, "yes". The next day he was going round the lobby and I never looked at his face. Mr. Nixon had a good licking at the

hands of the great and noble Kennedy. I saw him and Kennedy arguing on the television four times and he ran away from the fifth television fight, when he was defeated. Mr. Nixon and Mr. Dulles joined together in putting a noose around us.

Pakistan made a treaty with China by which China has got nearly 16,000 square miles of territory around Kashmir. After this pound of flesh, the wages of sin, which Pakistan has malevolently earned, we can have no friendship with Pakistan any more. What I spoke here in 1950 is a thing of the past; what you and I felt in 1950 is a thing of the past. When our borders are being threatened it is time that like Churchill, we gathered up wisdom and courage. I saw the great film on Churchill's life "The Finest Hours". Everybody should see it and derive inspiration from it. We shall fight unto the last. Great Britain is a tiny island, but it triumphed against Nazism. Here we are a great land, we have got resources, men and great leaders. The present generation of our leaders are those who have seen the freedom struggle for decades. It is not like Ayub who was an ordinary major when we were struggling for freedom; he is now brandishing the sword. These are important considerations.

There is also the great problem between China and Russia. They can never come together. Mentally and psychologically they are opposed to each other. They might have been great friends, but the sunshine of their friendship is over. If America bombs China, Russia will fall into the arms of China, because their own border will have to be protected. But China being militarily weak as against Russia, China cannot afford to create trouble against Russia for open out a massive scale war against us at present.

We have to take back Kanjarkot whatever the cost may be. We have to take this post and show our strength and guts. Unless we take

it, we have no hope. This is a great land. Hindus and Sikhs have been pumped out forcibly out of Pakistan. Even the poor hill-tribe Christians have come last on the scene. But ours is the land where highest tolerance is shown to every religion. Pakistan has lost all its sense of decency, when it knows there are 50 million Muslims in this land. An American expert has said that by 2000 Pakistan will triple its population. In 2065 the population of Pakistan will be 2000 millions. These figures appeared in the *Dawn* only three days ago.

China is aiming to crush every country economically. China joined up with Indonesia and has had a run on Malaya. She has bought up over a million pounds worth of Malayan currency which is more than 10 per cent of her currency. This is an economic disaster that is threatening us. We have got many black legs. They have sold their rupees at the rate of 24 per pound in Switzerland and Hongkong. China is gathering this in Switzerland and Hongkong to fight us economically and make Pakistan a stooge. This is the worst danger that is facing us. We should fight all this in a spirit of unity. The immediate problem is to eject the enemy from Kanjarkot and take proper steps towards that end.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Sir, this debate is taking place on the floor of the House today at a very momentous period. The emergency which we have been following for some time has taken a new shape, a new validity and a new realisation has come that the country has to be prepared to live with nerves of irritation. Whatever may have been said by hon. Members on this side or that side, there is no difference on this fact that so far as the suffering to be tolerated in this country for saving the dignity of this country is concerned there cannot be two opinions in this country. However much we may have to suffer internally, however much we may have to live with certain de-

[Shrimati Tarkeshwarj Sinha]

nials, the first and foremost consideration with each one of us today is that we shall stand united in this adversity for preserving the dignity of this country.

Therefore, what is on test in this country today is not what Pakistan has taken and how we are going to replace it, but the people's will to resist, the will which will survive all these onslaughts. And very aptly, I would like to point out an article which has appeared in one of the daily papers in Delhi. Very pertinently the title of that article is that Pakistan's target is not a piece of territory in the Rann of Kutch or some other area but Pakistan's target is Indian minds. I agree with my sister Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit when she said that this is not an isolated instance or somebody's brain-wave, this is a planned campaign to wreck our people physically and morally, and a nation which refuses to be wrecked morally cannot be defeated physically. That has been the history of the world. Even a mighty country like the British Empire, even the mighty military force of France have seen this. The Maginot Line which nobody believed could be demolished was demolished by the German forces. That was the time when everybody felt that the countries who were facing those onslaughts, the countries who were being invaded and rapidly being demolished by German armies were going to be broken into pieces. But some of the leaders of those countries who faced these ravages of war for four years without even a hope of victory at that time survived by the morality and the courage that they could keep up. That is why I think that this is what Pakistan is aiming at. For that we, as Members of Parliament who represent the democratic sentiments of this country, have to behave and by our expressions we have to show this difference between a democratic country and a non-democratic country in the world. Here patience

is required of a democracy. Here is a country, here is a Parliament, here is a Prime Minister who at this juncture of emergency has allowed a free discussion to take place. It shows courage on the part of the Prime Minister that he himself suggested a discussion of this subject because of the seriousness of the situation. This shows the courage of a person who believes in the democratic pattern of life who is the custodian of the prestige and dignity of this House as the leader of the House. Instead of succumbing to any pressure he, himself welcomed this proposition, took courage in both hands to have a discussion on this subject. That is the biggest difference between Pakistan and India. In Pakistan, whatever may happen, nobody can really open his lips. But here is a country which at this juncture of emergency, is talking freely and giving expressions to its sentiments. Therefore, it is my submission to the Members of Parliament that the strength that should have come from democracy, the strength which democracy gives to the country, that should not be allowed to become its weakness; it should not be allowed to generate an impression that Pakistan is morally in a stronger position than India and that we are ourselves feeling the weakness of our nation.

Here are some of the areas which have been taken over by Pakistan. I am not going into the merits of how that area can be won over back. These are the things which should not be played with by politicians or Parliament. They have to be decided by the military on grounds of strategy—what should be done, where should be the bases and so on in order to vacate the aggression. I am sorry to say that the moment we bring political handling of the situation where military operation is needed we are making mistakes and thereby we are demoralising the army. The army should be in supreme command wherever it is required and we should all have faith in their ingeniousness, in

their determination, in their loyalty and in their patriotism. Here is the army which has got our blessing. The Parliament has blessed the performance of the army and the country has blessed the performance of the army. Let the army also behave in the way we would like it to behave. Let it exercise its discretion and we will not interfere with its day-to-day affairs. Let us not sit in judgment over the army. The question of strategy, when to challenge and when to move back, that is a point which should be beyond the purview of this discussion by Parliament. That is my humble opinion... (*interruptions*). I do not know why these hon. Members of the opposition do not want to preserve the dignity and the seriousness of the situation by interrupting me at this moment. I am not able to understand it.

Therefore, I would like to submit to the House that if we all do our duty, we as Members of Parliament, the Government as Government, if nothing is neglected, we shall prove ourselves once again able to defend our country from the menace of tyranny and aggression. Because, no other country of the world has suffered tyranny and aggression much more than we have suffered. And if necessary, we are prepared to suffer for years to come. Here I am reminded of the words of the great leader of strategy and war Sir Winston Churchill, who said that, if necessary, we shall fight for years and, if necessary, alone.

Then I would like to submit one other thing. More than what we do, it is for Britain and America today to do a little heart-searching. They say from housetops that they want to preserve democracy at any cost. Here is a country which has the traditions of democracy; here is a country which has passed through the teething trouble of democracy. This democratic country is passing through certain troubles, certain difficulties. Yet, so far as the democratic traditions are concerned we refuse to break away

from this pattern; we want to sustain that pattern for today, tomorrow and the day after. This border conflict may be an isolated incident somewhere but it is a challenge to those countries which shout from their housetops about defending democracy.

The aim and ambition of Pakistan is not this. They do not want the Rann of Kutch. They want to provoke us. Either we take all the Indian Army to the Rann of Kutch by being demoralised and say that everything is bad, we must concentrate on that and there should be our army to stay there and get stagnated; or, we should be provoked into some retaliation which may again provoke Pakistan to have counter-retaliation. We know, we are not going to involve ourselves in that kind of maze. We know the psychology of Pakistan.

But I would certainly say to America and Britain, who want to preserve democracy, that it is to them that Pakistan has thrown this challenge, not to us. Pakistan wants to test their nerve and how they stand up to this situation. Pakistan says from the housetops that they have not committed aggression. When Shri Krishna Menon reminded the House that they say that their tanks had not been deployed but Indian tanks had been deployed, I was thinking whether we have brought our tanks from Lahore.

Therefore, at this moment we must accept this challenge with dignity, with force and with compassion also and we should not be provoked to make statements which may destroy our dignity to a certain extent.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: May I request Sir, that I may be given a few minutes?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give you.

श्री प्रकाश बीर शास्त्री : उपाध्यक्ष जी, पाकिस्तान का शासन इस समय एक ऐसे व्यक्तित्व के हाथ में है, जो सिवाय युद्ध के कोई दूसरी भाषा नहीं जानता है। भारत सरकार को पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में कुछ भी निर्णय लेने से पहले इस बात पर अवश्य विचार कर लेना चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में जो भूलें वह अब तक करती चली आई है, कच्छ की इस घटना के बाद उन भूलों की पुनरावृत्ति न हो।

भारत सरकार ने सब से पहली भूल उस समय की, जब पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में हिन्दुओं का तीन बार महाविनाश हुआ और भारत सरकार मुंह पर पट्टी बांध कर बैठी रही। पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में दूसरी भूल भारत सरकार ने तब की, जब काश्मीर की लड़ाई को बीच में रोका गया। भारत सरकार की तीसरी सब से बड़ी भूल यह है कि हमारी 2519 मील लम्बी सीमा में से अभी तक केवल 1695 मील का सीमांकन हो पाया है और बाकी की हमारी सीमा अंकन से रहित है। इसी प्रकार असम, मणिपुर, त्रिपुरा, और पश्चिमी बंगाल में जो लाखों पाकिस्तानी आकर बस गए हैं और भारत सरकार उन के निष्कासन के सम्बन्ध में मानवीय दृष्टि के नाम पर दया दिखा रही है, यह भारत सरकार की उन से भी बड़ी भूल है। सरकार की इस गलत नीति के परिणामस्वरूप हमारी सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों में कितनी बड़ी संख्या में पाकिस्तानी आ कर बस गये हैं, उस सम्बन्ध में मैं राजस्थान, पंजाब और दूसरे क्षेत्रों को छोड़ कर केवल कच्छ से सम्बन्धित ही कुछ आंकड़े देना चाहता हूँ। 1951 से 1961 तक कच्छ में कुल मिला कर आबादी बढ़ने का अनुपात 18 प्रतिशत है, जब कि मुसलमानों की आबादी वहाँ पर 26 प्रतिशत के हिसाब से बढ़ी है। इसी से पाकिस्तान के इरादों का पता लगाया जा सकता है कि वह कब से हमारे इस क्षेत्र में आक्रामक कार्यवाहियाँ करने की तैयारी कर रहा है।

कच्छ के भूतपूर्व महाराज श्री हिम्मत्सिंह जी ने कल यह कहा था कि इस बारे में 1960 में भारत सरकार को सावधान किया गया, लेकिन भारत सरकार की असावधानी का यह परिणाम रहा कि जिस समय जनवरी, 1965 में हमारी सेनायें वहाँ पर गई और उन्होंने कंजरकोट के ध्वंसावशेषों में पाकिस्तानी सिपाहियों को घूमते हुए देखा, तो उन्होंने एक हल्के मुकाबले से उन को पीछे हटा दिया, लेकिन पाकिस्तानी सेनाओं का अतिक्रमण किसी प्रकार बन्द नहीं हुआ। जब मार्च में दोबारा हमारे राजकोट रेंजर्स के लोग वहाँ पर गए और सिध रेंजर्स के साथ उन के दो दो हाथ हुए, तो उस समय हम को यह पता लगा कि पाकिस्तान कंजरकोट के पास से अपनी एक सड़क भी बना चुका है, जो सुराही से डींग तक जाती है, जिस के केवल दसवें हिस्से को छोड़ कर सारी की सारी सड़क भारतीय भाग में से हो कर निकलती है। यह भूल बिल्कुल उसी प्रकार की है कि लद्दाख में चीन अपनी सड़क बनाता रहा और भारत सरकार उस के सम्बन्ध में सोती रही। मुझे भय है कि वहाँ इस प्रकार की भूल भारत सरकार जैसलमेर के रेगिस्तान में पाकिस्तान की ओर से बनाई जा रही सड़क के सम्बन्ध में भी न कर रही है।

आज कच्छ में जो युद्ध की स्थिति है, उस में पाकिस्तान स्वाभाविक रूप से लाभ की स्थिति में इसलिए है कि कच्छ सीमा से केवल दस मील दूर उन का रहीम का बाजार रेलवे स्टेशन आ जाता है, जब कि भारत का रेलवे स्टेशन कच्छ की सीमा से साठ मील दूर जा कर पड़ता है। इसी प्रकार पाकिस्तान का बादिन हवाई अड्डा वहाँ से केवल तीस किलोमीटर यानी 22 मील के लगभग पड़ता है, जब कि हमारा छोटा हवाई अड्डा भुज में और बड़ा हवाई अड्डा जामनगर में है। इस के अतिरिक्त भारतीय सीमा में हमारी ओर लम्बा रेगिस्तान है, जब कि उस ओर पाकिस्तान ने अपनी बस्तियाँ बना रखी हैं।

लेकिन इन कठिनाइयों के बावजूद भी भारतीय सेनाओं ने जिस शौर्य का परिचय दिया है और जब से यह सीमा उन के साथ में सौंपी गई है, तब से उन्होंने उस की रक्षा के लिए जिस वीरता का परिचय दिया है, उसके लिए भारतीय वासी भारतीय सेनाओं और भारतीय सिपाहियों के ऋणी हैं ।

इस के बाद मैं आप का ध्यान पाकिस्तानी प्रचार के ढंग की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ । सऊदी अरेबिया और इंडोनेशिया के मुस्लिम सम्मेलनों में पाकिस्तान ने यह प्रचार किया कि भारत का मुसलमान सुरक्षित नहीं है और इसलिये उस की मुक्ति के लिये फिर भारत का विभाजन किया जाय । पाकिस्तान ने इस प्रकार विदेशों में प्रचार कर के भारतीय मुसलमानों को उभारना चाहा । मेरा अनुमान है कि कच्छ की इन घटनाओं के पीछे जहाँ और कई कारण होंगे, वहाँ एक बड़ा कारण यह भी है कि अल्जीरिया कांफ्रेंस से पहले पाकिस्तान इस प्रकार के वातावरण का निर्माण करना चाहता है, जिस का प्रभाव अल्जीरिया कांफ्रेंस की चर्चाओं पर पड़े और इस के साथ ही प्रधान मंत्री, श्री शास्त्री, की मास्को-यात्रा पर भी इन बातों का प्रभाव पड़े । इस से भी बढ़ कर पाकिस्तान की पान-इस्लामिक ब्लाक की जो योजना है, वह भी इन घटनाओं के पीछे है । आज पाकिस्तान के मुसोलिनो, जनरल अयूब, की जो तानाशाही मनोवृत्ति है और जिस ढंग से वे अपने कदम उठा रहे हैं, उस को भी हमें विशेष रूप से अपनी दृष्टि के सामने रखना चाहिए ।

मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता हुई, जब मैं ने कल समाचारपत्रों में कुछ राष्ट्रीय मुसलमानों का निर्भीकतापूर्ण वक्तव्य पढ़ा और आज श्री अन्सार हरवानी का यह निर्भीकतापूर्ण वक्तव्य सुना कि सारा भारत राष्ट्र देश की रक्षा के नाम पर एक हो कर खड़ा हो गया है । इस के लिए मैं उन को साधुवाद देना चाहता हूँ ।

परन्तु इस के साथ ही साथ मैं विदेश मंत्री, गृह मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री तीनों से यह भी

कहना चाहता हूँ कि इतना सब कुछ हो जाने के बाद, भी देश में इस संकट काल में कुछ इस प्रकार की घटनायें घट रही हैं, जिन को वे सामान्य समझ कर न छोड़ें । अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम विश्वविद्यालय के उपकुलपति के ऊपर आक्रमण केवल प्रवेश को ले कर नहीं हुआ । टीकाराम गर्ज डिग्री कालेज की लड़कियों पर अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम विश्वविद्यालय के लड़कों द्वारा जो अभद्र व्यवहार किया गया जिस की कल उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा में भी चर्चा हुई है, वह कोई सामान्य बात नहीं है, बल्कि देश के वातावरण को भ्रन्दर से उभारने और उत्तेजित करने वाली बात है ।

इसी सम्बन्ध में मैं भारत की राजधानी, दिल्ली, से निकलने वाले कुछ अंग्रेजी पत्रों की नीतियों के बारे में विशेष रूप से कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ । मुझे इस बात को कहते हुए दुख है कि पले शोख अब्दुल्ला के सम्बन्ध में भी राजधानी से निकलने वाले कुछ अंग्रेजी पत्रों का रुख भी भारत-विरोधी रहा है । लेकिन आज भी दिल्ली से कुछ इस प्रकार के पत्र निकल रहे हैं, जिन में प्रकाशित होने वाले समाचारों, सम्पादकीय लेखों और चित्रों से भारत और भारत सरकार की नीति को बल नहीं मिलता है । उदाहरण के रूप में मैं दो चित्र प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री, श्री शास्त्री, जब नेपाल-यात्रा से लौट कर पालम एयरोड्रोम पर आए, तो उस समय रक्षा मंत्री और गृह मंत्री से मिलते हुए उन का एक चित्र समाचारपत्रों में प्रकाशित हुआ है । आप जानते हैं कि फोटो लेने वाला फोटो लेते समय आठ दस फोटो तो लेता ही है । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यही फोटो छापने के लिए रह गया था, जिस में रक्षा मंत्री और गृह-मंत्री इस विशेष भयभीत चेहरे में प्रधान मंत्री जी से बात कर रहे थे ? क्या इस प्रकार की फोटो को छापने के पीछे एक विशेष भावना का परिचय हम को ही मिलता है ? इस के अलावा क्या रक्षा मंत्री का केव यही फोटो छापने के लिए रह गया

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

था, जिस में वह भी एक विशेष मुद्रा में बँटे हुए दिखाए गए हैं ? भारत की राजधानी से ये जो समाचारपत्र निकल रहे हैं, उन के पीछे एक विशेष मनोवृत्ति कार्य कर रही है। मैं चाहूँगा कि भारत सरकार इन तमाम बातों पर भी ध्यान दें। मुझे यह भी पता लगा है कि देश में कुछ इस प्रकार की मजदूर यूनियनों हैं, जिनमें एक विशेष वर्ग भारत के संरक्षण मंत्री के खिलाफ और भारत सरकार के विरोध में विशेष रूप से प्रचार कर रहा है।

एक बात मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को पाकिस्तान की चाल के सम्बन्ध में और कहना चाहता हूँ। पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति, जेनेरल अरब, जब से चीन और रूस होकर लौटे हैं, तब से वह उसी रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं, जिस रास्ते पर चीन चला था पहले हमारे कुछ हिस्से पर उस ने अधिकार कर लिया, फिर अपने कुछ समर्थक राष्ट्रों को आगे बढ़ा कर समझौते की बातचीत कराई, लेकिन फिर भी हमारी उस धरती पर अधिकार किए हुए बैठा रहा और वहाँ से हटने की कोई बात नहीं करता है। मुझे यह भी डर लग रहा है कि कंजरकोट की चौकी खाली करने से पहले और भारतीय धरती पर पाकिस्तानी सेनाओं के रहते हुए कहीं पाकिस्तान अपने समर्थक मित्र-राष्ट्रों के द्वारा भारत सरकार के सामने युद्ध-विराम का प्रस्ताव न रखवाए और उन मित्रों को बीच में ला कर भारत सरकार को विवश न करे, जिस से हमारी स्थिति फिर उसी तरह उलझ कर रह जाय। इसलिये आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि इस बातचीत के सिलसिले को हम को लम्बा नहीं ले जाना चाहिए।

हम को स्पष्ट भाषा में कह देना चाहिए कि जब तक हमारी धरती का एक इंच भी पाकिस्तानी सेनाओं के हाथ में है, तब तक भारत सरकार पाकिस्तान से किसी प्रकार की कोई बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। हम को यह स्पष्ट नीति घोषित कर देनी चाहिए और हम को यह समझ लेना चाहिए कि

कच्छ का हमला केवल कच्छ का हमला ही नहीं है, बल्कि उस के पीछे पाकिस्तान के कुछ और भी इरादे हैं। हम पाकिस्तान से केवल एक ही शर्त पर बात कर सकते हैं और वह शर्त यही हो सकती है।

जिस समय भगवान कृष्ण सन्धि का प्रस्ताव लेकर दुर्योधन के पास चले, उस समय द्रौपदी ने उन को ये शब्द कहे कि भाई कृष्ण, तुम दुर्योधन से सन्धि का प्रस्ताव तो करो, लेकिन मेरे इन खुले हुए बालों को भूल कर दुर्योधन के साथ सन्धि न करना श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, जो कि हमारे देश के प्रधान मन्त्री हैं, कि आप पाकिस्तान के साथ बात करें, लेकिन उन सैनिकों को भूल कर, जिनकी पत्नियाँ आज इसमें विधवा बन गई हैं, पाकिस्तान के साथ बात करेंगे तो आप भारत का अपमान करेंगे।

अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए मैं एक बात विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हम को गांधीवादी तरीका अपनाना चाहिये जो कि काश्मीर पर आक्रमण के समय गांधीजी ने सलाह दी थी। जब उनसे पूछा गया कि बापू, काश्मीर पर पाकिस्तान का आक्रमण हुआ है, क्या हमें अपनी फौज वहाँ भेजनी चाहिये। गांधी जी ने जो राय दी वह मैंने अंग्रेजी की एक पुस्तक में पढ़ी है। पुस्तक का नाम है **नाउ दिस कैन बी टोल्ड**। उसमें गांधी जी ने कहा कि मेरी अपनी राय है कि हिन्दुस्तान अपनी फौजें काश्मीर में भेज कर पहाड़ों में क्यों कट-बाता है। अगर पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर पर हमला किया है तो हिन्दुस्तान को अपनी फौजें लाहौर के रास्ते कराची में भेजना चाहिये। वह भी समय फिर आ गया है। हमारे संरक्षण मन्त्री को इसी मार्ग से विचार करना चाहिये।

दूसरे हमारी फौजों से हर वर्ष दस हजार के लगभग जवान रिटायर होते हैं। उन्हें अपनी सीमाओं पर सुविधा देकर बसाया जाये क्योंकि हमें युद्धोन्माद में पागल राष्ट्र के साथ मुकाबला करना है।

अन्त में मैं अपने रक्षा मन्त्री से एक बात कह कर समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह इस बात को थोड़ा सा सोचें। जिन घड़ियों में उनको रक्षा का भार सौंपा गया है उनको ध्यान में रखते हुए देश को हमारे संरक्षण मन्त्री से बड़ी बड़ी आशाएँ हैं। और मुझे इस बात को कहते हुए प्रसन्नता भी होती है कि अब तक हमारे संरक्षण मन्त्री द्वारा जितना कार्य हुआ वह भारत के गौरव और भारत की प्रतिष्ठाके सर्वथा अनुकूल रहा है। इसी विश्वास के आधार पर मुझे को यह कहना है कि जब उन्होंने पाकिस्तान के साथ शंख फूंक ही दिया है तो वे कम से कम पाकिस्तान को ऐसी एक चोट जरूर दें जिससे जनरल अयूब और पाकिस्तान के शासक अगली पीढ़ी से भी यह कह कर जायें कि हिन्दुस्तान पर आख न उठाना।

श्री इकबाल सिंह (फीरोजपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जिस माहोल में हम यहाँ पर मिल रहे हैं और जिस माहोल में इस हाउस में बहस हो रही है, उसके सिलसिले में मैं सबसे पहले यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान ने कच्छ और सिंध के बार्डर पर इसलिये हमला किया कि वह अपने ढंग से कार्रवाई कर सके। इसी लिये पाकिस्तान ने नागालैण्ड से लेकर नेफा या काश्मीर में हर जगह हिन्दुस्तान के लिये मुसीबत पैदा की है। अगर कोई इलाका बाकी था जहाँ हम पाकिस्तान के साथ अमन से रहते थे तो वह यही एक इलाका था। लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने इस इलाके को अब इस लिये चुना है कि वह समझता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की मुसीबत के लिये एक और फ्रण्ट पैदा किया जाये। यह फ्रण्ट भी इस किस्म का है जो कि बिल्कुल नया है और बाकी फ्रण्ट्स से बहुत दूर है और जिसकी रक्षा के लिये हिन्दुस्तान को बहुत बड़े साधन करने पड़ेंगे, जिस के लिये हिन्दुस्तान की फौजों को एक अलाहदा और इन्डिपेन्डन्ट ढंग से फंशन करना पड़ेगा। पाकिस्तान को इससे कुछ फायदा हो सकता है इस लिये उन्होंने एक नया फ्रण्ट खोला है हिन्दुस्तान की मुसीबत को बढ़ाने के लिये और अपने ढंग से हिन्दुस्तान को नुकसान पहुँचाने के लिये।

मैं मानता हूँ कि कच्छ के इलाके को डिफेन्ड करना बहुत मुश्किल काम है, मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि वहाँ जो सिचुएशन है क्लाइमेट के तौर पर, जियाप्रेफी के तौर पर, वह बहुत मुश्किल है। लेकिन इसके बावजूद हिन्दुस्तान की बहादुर सेनाएँ उसको डिफेन्ड कर रही हैं और जो एरिया हमारा पाकिस्तान के पास है उसे हमें उससे वापस लेना है। इस सिलसिले में कमाण्डरों को क्या करना है, यह मैं नहीं कहना चाहता, लेकिन एक बात से इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि कुछ दिनों में वहाँ बरसात होगी और पाकिस्तान ने एक ऐसा टाइम चुना है जिसमें शायद वह कुछ फायदा उठा जाएगा। वह सोचता है कि बरसात के सिलसिले में वहाँ कुछ कासिप्ल-केशनस हों और कुछ पाकिस्तान को कैंडिड मिल जाये और पाकिस्तान दुनिया के सामने कुछ कह सके।

कए बात नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि यह जो नया फ्रण्ट पाकिस्तान ने बाकी फ्रण्ट्स से बहुत दूर कायम किया है वह हमारे लिये मुसीबत का वायस बन सकता है। लेकिन पाकिस्तान को भी हम को बतलाना चाहिये कि यह हमारी खुशकिस्मती है कि आज उन्होंने कराची के दरवाजे पर हमें बुलाया है। वक्त आयेगा जब हिन्दुस्तान की सेना ताकतवर होकर हमेशा के लिये कराची के सिर पर बैठी रहेगी। उसके बाद पाकिस्तान के मिलीटरी एक्पर्ट्स समझेंगे कि जिस चाल में वह हिन्दुस्तान को लाना चाहते थे उसके बखिलाफ हम उन को उसी चाल में ले आये हैं। पाकिस्तान की जितनी फौजें हैं वह उन फ्रण्ट्स पर बैठी हैं जहाँ पर गोलियां चलें या राइफलें फायर हों तो उनको आसानी होती है। आज पाकिस्तान की 60 परसेन्ट से ज्यादा फौजें हिन्दुस्तान के उन इलाकों में हैं जहाँ पर हर रोज कोई न कोई सरगमी रहती है, जहाँ हर रोज कोई न कोई नई साजिश रहती है, जहाँ हर रोज कोई न कोई झगड़ा रहता है। पाकिस्तान को सोचना चाहिये कि एक पड़ोसी देश के नाते, जिस देशको

[श्री इकबाल सिंह]

हम आज से पन्द्रह बीस साल पहले एक में पाते थे। आज हिन्दुस्तान इसलिये नहीं तकसीम हुआ है कि मसले पैदा हों, हम चाहते थे कि मसले हल हों। आज पाकिस्तान और चाइना ने इकट्ठे होकर इस देश की मुसीबत को बढ़ाया है। आज पाकिस्तान की 60 परसेंट के करीब फौजें हिन्दुस्तान के हर फ्रंट पर हैं। इसका क्या असर हो सकता है इसको अध्यक्ष महोदय मुझ से ज्यादा जानते हैं।

मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं उस जगह से आता हूँ जहाँ से पाकिस्तान बार्डर पांच या छः मील के फासले पर है। पंजाब का हर एक आदमी जब उस हिस्से में अपने घर जाता है तो वहाँ के लोग कहते हैं कि डर की कोई बात नहीं है। ज्यों ज्यों हम वहाँ से दूर और दिल्ली के पास आते जाते हैं तब सुनाई पड़ता है कि बार्डर पर खतरा है। वहाँ पर लोगों ने हर जगहों पर खेत किये हुए हैं। वहाँ के किसान पाकिस्तान से नहीं डरते हैं बल्कि पाकिस्तान ही हम से डरता है। मैं इस सदन में कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ के किसानों ने एक मिसाल कायम की हुई है। पाकिस्तान में जो बंजर इलाका है वहाँ आज पाकिस्तान ने नई दुश्मनी पैदा की हुई है। वह बंजर इलाके आज पाकिस्तान अपने फौजी अफसरों को देना चाहता है ताकि फीरोजपुर, अमृतसर और गुरदासपुर जैसे बार्डर के जिलों के बहादुर किसानों के लिये नई मुसीबत पैदा हो। मैं शास्त्री जी से इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर उन लोगों को हथियार दे दें तो हम उन को पाकिस्तान के भागों में जितनी दूर चाहें भगा सकते हैं।

एक बात मैं प्रधान मन्त्री से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज तक उन बार्डर्स पर पी० ए० पी० और पुलिस थी। किसी जगह पर रिजर्व पुलिस थी और किसी जगह पर पी० ए० पी० थी किसी जगह पर राजपूत रेजिमेंट्स थे वहीं पर बैस्ट बंगाल रेजिमेंट्स थे; आज तक वह ठीक थे।

आज जिस ढंग के हालात हैं उनमें हमको सेमी मिलीटरी आर्गनाइजेशन या मिलीटरी या आर्मेजेशन तैयार करना चाहिये। जिसने इंडेपेंडेंटली उन जगहों को देखा है, वहाँ की वर्किंग को देखा है वह जानता है कि आज तक वह बात ठीक थी, लेकिन आने वाले दिनों क्या होने वाला है कोई नहीं कह सकता। इसलिये आवश्यक है कि इस चीज को बदला जाये। हम सेमी मिलीटरी आर्गनाइजेशन बनाये या मिलीटरी आफिसर्स जो हैं उनकी कमान्ड हो ताकि किसी मुसीबत के वक़्त में वह मिलीटरी ढंग से सिचुएशन से डील कर सकें। दुनिया में ऐसे मुल्क भी हैं जहाँ पर बार्डर पर पुलिस है, दुनिया में ऐसे भी मुल्क हैं जहाँ वार्डर पर मिलीटरी रेजिमेंट्स हैं। इस लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि आज की सिचुएशन में सारे बार्डर्स को पुलिस पर छोड़ना मुनासिब नहीं है। जल्दी से जल्दी गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया कोई निर्णय ले और मिलीटरी आफिसर्स के नीचे बार्डर्स को रक्खा जाये।

इसके अलावा हिन्दुस्तान की मिलीटरी में कोई दस हजार से लेकर पन्द्रह हजार आदमी तक हर साल रिटायर होते हैं। श्री शास्त्री उन सब आदमियों को अब पाकिस्तान बार्डर पर बसायें तो पाकिस्तान इस बात को सोचेगा, इस बात को महसूस करेगा कि उसको कोई ज्यादाती नहीं करनी चाहिये।

पाकिस्तान एक ऐसी स्वायत्त है जिसने अपने पड़ोसी मुल्कों से दुश्मनी पैदा की है। वह एक ऐसा आइलैंड है जो कि दुश्मनी और ट्रेचरी पर कायम रहना चाहता है क्योंकि उसने हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ चीन से समझौता किया है। उनकी कोई बात इकट्ठी नहीं है, उनका सोच विचार इकट्ठा नहीं है, उनकी आइडियोलॉजी इकट्ठी नहीं है। एक तरफ पाकिस्तान सिआटो में बैठा है दूसरी तरफ वह चीन के साथ दोस्ती चलाता है जो आज एशिया के लिये सबसे बड़ा खतरा है वह उसके हुकमरां हैं।

मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्त के नाते से रहना चाहते हैं। पाकिस्तान को भी हमारे साथ दोस्त के नाते से रहना चाहिये। जो आदमी आज बार्डर पर बैठ हुए हैं उनका इंटरैस्ट इसी में है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान अमन से रहे। लेकिन अगर पाकिस्तान झगड़े पर तुला हुआ है तो यह बात तय है कि इस झगड़े में नुकसान पाकिस्तान को होगा क्योंकि हो सकता है कि हम ऐसी जगह स्ट्राइक कर दें जिस जगह पर पाकिस्तान रोल आफ हो जाये।

18 hrs.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: It is very delicate and anxious times through which we are passing, and I have been told by many a wise man that at such a time people should be careful about the words that they utter, but I submit that it is at such a time that truth shall be told. Truth can injure no cause. What Pakistan has done is not of so much concern, but the pattern of aggression is the same with which we are familiar in the case of China, and the pattern of our reaction also appears to be the same.

We allowed China to aggress on our land. We thought that it was a democratic nation, that what had happened there was only an agrarian revolution, and that it was a progressive Government that had been established. We thought that Tibet had a reactionary, medieval and feudal Government, and we thought that the Tibetan people would be better off under the Chinese than under the Dalai Lama. Therefore, not only did we recognise the nominal suzerainty of China over Tibet, but we converted that into sovereignty of China and ourselves began to call Tibet the Tibetan region of China. It is not that warning voices were not uttered, but no heed was paid to them.

Then we had a Treaty in 1954, and then we did not do anything about our borders. We had no talk with the Chinese about our borders, and

three months after that, the aggression of China began, which culminated in 1962 in a fullfledged invasion of India. We were sleeping all the time. We believed, and it was said in this House, that China had no military designs, that China was a peaceful country. We said *Hindi Chini bhai bhai*.

In 1962 our President went to NEFA and he, who is not supposed to take part in politics, was constrained to say that we had been negligent and complacent. This was in the case of China, but we cannot say that it has been otherwise in the case of Pakistan. Pakistan never made its intentions secret, it spoke of them from the housetops.

If then we were not careful, then I say that it is not only negligence but it is culpable negligence. I remember once Mahatma Gandhi had inadvertently signed a document which, when he brought before the working committee, we pointed out as his mistake. You will be surprised, and the House will be surprised to note that he said that "I am a *badmash* to have signed that document." When I remonstrated with him, he said those in whose hands the lives of millions of people lay, if they make a mistake, it is not a mistake but it is a sin. It is immoral. This was his attitude. What was our reaction? About China, we repeatedly said that not an inch of our sacred soil will be given to the Chinese though we ought to have said that we could have given them a few acres of land to bury their dead. But we did nothing of that sort. Three years have passed, and we are negotiating and negotiating, and we were told that we will negotiate till the bitter end. The bitter end is this: that they have occupied what they wanted.

As regards Pakistan, in 1956, Pakistani police forces invaded this very area which is in question today, and they were driven away by our police. Was it not time then for our Government to rouse itself to the

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

trouble that would come in future? It was a very sensitive spot. It is an area in which half the year you cannot move on account of the flood and the monsoon and the sea-water coming in. Though it is said that the Pakistani armies are today in a higher position than ours, I ask, what is that higher position. There are no Himalayan mountains there, 6,000 ft or 5,000 ft. I think the hills that they occupy would be little bigger than the hills we have round about Delhi. And yet we cannot dislodge them. Why? We are unwilling to use our air arms to drive them out. It could be a question of a few hours. But we cannot do that, and why we cannot do that, only the Government knows. We have not built up an aerial force that is requisite, and yet it is the same thing as happened in the case of China. We were told, however weak we may be in the Ladakh areas, we are very strong in the NEFA area, and then it was said, "Let China be swept away with a broom." Today, I am very sorry to say that our Defence Minister has spoken certain words. What does he say? He says I am able and we are able to take both China and Pakistan together. I wish our Ministers talked a little less and thought a little more. It will be more helpful to the country not to talk in these terms.

Our Defence Minister is a Maratha. He must remember that Shivaji,—Chatrapati—did not talk. He talked with his Bhavani sword. That was the language in which he talked, and it was with that that he brought to the knees the greatest empire that existed in those days. It is not with words that we fight: but it is only with words we want to bring about the peace of the world. I am sorry to say that we are considered to be the greatest humbugs going on in the world. Our words have no relation to our deeds. What we say is for public consumption and not to be acted upon. I am sorry I have to use these words. But it is in such critical times than a man is called upon to

speak the truth that is in him. Remember what Lloyd George said in 1940, when bombs were falling over London. (You will please allow my neighbour to read it, because I cannot read in this light).

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Lloyd George said:

"Will anybody tell me that he is satisfied with what we have done about aeroplanes, tanks, guns, especially anti-aircraft guns? Is any one here satisfied with the steps we took to train an Army to use them? Nobody is satisfied. The whole world knows that."

Shri J. B. Kripalani: The whole world knows that. But we do not know.

It is good that the Prime Minister should call for the cooperation of the 400 million and odd people living in India. It is good that he should call for the unity of the country. May I humbly submit to him, before you call upon this country to unite and cooperate, does the Government cooperate with the people? Cooperation needs two sides. If the Government cooperates with the people in their difficulties, the people will also cooperate with the Government. Let the Government cooperate with the people in giving them food, clothing, housing, education and other primary necessities of life; and they will see that the people will rise as one man, as they rose in 1962. But how did you utilise their enthusiasm? 3 years have passed and you did not do anything. You do not expect the people to rouse themselves always for a cause which you have no intention of pursuing any further. It was said in this House that we will negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end. The bitter end is that China occupies what she wanted. The bitter end with Pakistan will be that Pakistan will occupy what it has occupied. I am afraid we will be where we are, talking and talking of peace in the world, helping other

countries as if we can bring about peace. There was a little arrangement between nations about atom bombs. There was some check put upon them. Who put them? It was America and Russia. Where were we then? It was they who brought about some little control over those armaments. We must realise our position.

Let us know what for our cooperation is wanted. Is it wanted for corruption, inefficiency, negligence? When Government are not able to take away the evils that are eating into the very vitals of the nation, when they do not want to cooperate with the people in these things, they want us to cooperate in some higher fields. They want unity of the country. This Government will have the unity of this country the day that the Cabinets are united, the Congress is united and the Government are united. Each Cabinet in this country is divided into those who are dissidents and those who are ministerialists—the ministers are dissidents and the non-ministers are ministerialists! Is this the way to rule the country? You ask for unity. You will get it. Let the Congress unite, and then the country will unite the next day as it was united before independence.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, amongst clash of words we should not cloud the issue. The real issue is: at this critical hour when India's integrity is in danger should we respond to the Prime Minister's appeal? What is his appeal? His appeal is that all sections of the House and all sections of the country should stand by him, the Defence Minister, the Government and the military forces. Sir, our answer is that we will sink all unessential differences and we will stand by the Prime Minister and by the Cabinet, on one condition that he shall declare unhesitatingly that there shall be no pursuit of the old policy of futile appeasement of Pakistan.

Sir, in this House I had the privilege to move the Kashmir Resolution and

I remember, when Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister sitting opposite me, I strongly deprecated the bungle that our Government did in ordering the cease fire. When our valiant Jawans had practically cleared the whole country and Kashmir was to be completely free from the freebooters who had invaded the territory, shortly before that the unfortunate ceasefire order was issued and today Kashmir is still in danger and one-third of the territory is in hostile occupation. The Kashmir bungle is still troubling us from time to time. Therefore, we are terribly afraid of the policy of appeasement.

Sir, after Takergram fell, after it was illegally conquered and occupied by Pakistani forces, I had the privilege to preside over a big convention called by all sections of the people at a place called Karimganj in Assam. I was there along with some other Members of this House—Shri Kamath was there and there was also Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhury—and after the conference I came back and reported to Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri who was then the Home Minister. I told him, for heaven's sake take stern action, take strong action. I was told to do it, by responsible Assam leaders. I had the privilege to appear for the Assam National Congress before the Boundary Commission. I pleaded before that Commission that India—Assam—should get Takergram and Karimganj. Although I ultimately succeeded, it was my regret to find that due to our pusillanimity at least 2,50,000 illegal Pakistani infiltrations have taken place. That was done because there were some people high up in the Assam Administration who were helping them. I came to see Shri Shastri and asked him to beware of it. I asked him to seal the border. I asked him to throw them out and not to allow them to remain. I also went to the Prime Minister and reported to him. But, Sir, time was wasted and no action was taken. Time was wasted in deciding whether it should be a brick-built masonry wall or a corrugated iron fencing.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

They were very soft to the Pakistani infiltrators and now they are more than half a million or nearly one million, and we are faced with all these difficulties.

Therefore, what we say is be clear in your policy that you will eject the aggressors. Declare that there shall be no mercy, no confabulations over it. I am sorry to say, in spite of my great respect for Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit, that she was very unfair to the Opposition. Sir, we in the Opposition yield to none in our patriotism, in our adherence to India's territorial integrity. We yield it none in the Cabinet, none who adorn the Treasury Benches, in our passionate adherence to maintain India's territorial integrity. But this is not the way to do it. We have faith in our army. We have faith in our jawans. But this policy should go. This policy of appeasement, this policy of vacillation, this policy of indecision should go.

Sir, I do not want to rake up the past. You know this has happened with China. The real trouble is not in Kutch. I shall, Sir, with your permission read out a report from the latest *Hindustan Times*.

It says:

"East Pakistan troops massed on both Bengal and Assam border."

They are possibly following diversionary tactics. Coming to this particular area, it is absolutely useless even though they are massing troops there. Our report is that the Chinese generals and Chinese officers are operating in East Pakistan and helping the alignment of the troops. Then what is the report from Calcutta:

"Although there is a period of comparative clam along the West Bengal East Pakistan border since the Chief Secretaries' Conference in Dacca, the news has now rea-

ched here that the East Pakistan Government has mobilised the troops on Rampur and Jalpaiguri border."

Then, there is a very big concentration of troops near Beru Bari and other areas. Anything may happen there. It is quite clear that they are pursuing the Chinese tactics, the peculiar strategy of China,—coming and occupying our territory and then telling us "there will be cease-fire, we will withdraw, you also withdraw". We have to withdraw from our own territory. This is acquiescence in aggression. As a student of international law, I unhesitatingly say that the outrage that Pakistan has committed can in international law be described as an act of illegal free-bootery; it is nothing but international brigandage. It must be quite clear to all right-thinking men and it should be exposed thoroughly.

There should be no compromise, no vacillation, no indecision, no more attempts at confabulation or conference unless they are completely thrown out from the areas they have illegally occupied. Possibly, this is only diversionary tactics. Next the attack will come on NEFA, or West Bengal or Assam from East Pakistan where troops have been mobilised and massed. Assam also is in great danger. Rather, both Assam and Bengal are in danger, and it is much more serious than this Kutch affair. After all, this is really a new strategy and the Chinese are behind them. The Chinese Generals, who are good adepts in that art, there are actually helping them, they are mobilising them and they are advising them. That greater danger and menace must be met.

We are with the Prime Minister; we are with the Defence Minister. We have faith in our Jawans; in their valour, in their courage, in their patriotism. But there is only one condition, that you shall not be deflected from your duty by the pursuit of the old policy of senseless appeasement.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have heard with great interest and attention to the speeches of the hon. Members, and I must express by gratefulness to them for the support they have extended to the Government for the policies they have to pursue. It will give us added strength in our resolve to face the present situation. And I would very much like to appeal to them once again that what they have said will certainly be kept in mind, and we would go ahead with what we have decided to do in this regard with firm and courageous determination.

18.24 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Some hon. Members have referred to our basic international policies. I do not want to go into them at present. They could be considered or dealt with at some other appropriate time. However, I must say that our policies are well thought out and, as far as we can see, they are in the best interests of our country.

Shri Ranga: Question.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: We have our friends, both in the West and in the East. We have the best of relationship with our neighbouring countries, except of course, with China and Pakistan.

I feel that our basic policies are important, whether it is of non-alignment or of peaceful co-existence, disarmament and peace, because what is important is that we must preserve our freedom and independence and these policies do help us in maintaining our freedom of action, and also in our thinking we can and we will remain free and independent. This is most important because when we are passing through a transitional period of our history it is absolutely important that we must keep in mind as to what our attitude is going to be towards our own problems as well as towards the problems which are facing the world.

We have pursued the policy of peace throughout the world so far and our late Prime Minister succeeded a number of times in averting difficult situations, crises, in the past. Of course, it placed India on the map of the world; but that is not so important. What is important is that India was able to make its own contribution towards the maintenance of peace in the world.

Some hon. Members have referred to our failings. I do not want to deny it completely or say that what they said was wholly incorrect, but now we are faced with a particular situation and we have to face it boldly and squarely. Whatever the situation and howsoever we are placed, we have no doubt that we will try to meet it and meet it in the best manner possible.

Pakistan has created a very serious situation for us, but, as I said this morning, I do feel that, even in the present situation, if Pakistan would be willing to the proposals which Pakistan herself had made some time back and to which we had given our acceptance, that is, the proposal of ceasefire and the restoration of *status quo ante*, we will be prepared to meet and talk. What would be the result of our discussions, one cannot say.

श्री बागड़ी : पंद्रह दिन में सीज़ फायर हो जायेगा ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But if our talks and discussions could prevent a major violent conflagration, it would be good for us and for the world. In any case, I would certainly like to avoid it so that this does not escalate into a war. However, it all depends on Pakistan as to what their attitude is going to be.

Pakistan has been saying that it is we who have made the aggression. This is absolutely wrong and baseless.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : वह पक्के राजनीतिक खिलाड़ी हैं ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would like to tell the world that India is entirely within its own borders. We have not gone an inch or entered into the territory of Pakistan even by an inch. But what Pakistan has been trying to preach to the world is just in accordance with the kind of propaganda and publicity they make, half truths and, if I might say so, full untruths and untruthful propaganda—of course, we cannot compete with Pakistan in that matter.

However, what they have been telling, as I said, is wholly incorrect and wrong and we fully known what our position is and where we stand.

I would like to say that if Pakistan still sticks to her present attitude—well, there is a limit to patience—we will certainly have to meet the situation as firmly and as effectively as possible. I still might say, let us hope for the best. But if we are faced with this menace, the menace as it exists today, we will have to fight this menace with the utmost strength at our command.

श्री बागड़ी : एक सवाल मैं करना चाहता हूँ . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब रहने दीजिये ।

श्री बागड़ी : अपनी ही धरती के लिए ये विवादग्रस्त क्षेत्र शब्द का प्रयोग क्यों करते हैं ? अपनी ही ज़मीन के बारे में विवादग्रस्त शब्द का इस्तेमाल न किया करे । यह बहुत . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री बागड़ी : इसके बिना, इसका जवाब दिये बिना इस बहस का कोई मतलब नहीं रह जाता है ।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member would sit down.

Substitute Motions Nos. 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11 and 12 are for disapproval of policy. Does any mover wish his subs-

titute motion to be put separately? No. I shall now put all of them together to the vote of the House.

The Substitute motions were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: There is Substitute Motion No. 9. Am I required to put it separately?

Shri Nath Pai: Yes.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I accept Substitute Motion No. 9.

Shri Nath Pai: It may be read out.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I would request you to ask the House to pass it standing as was done in November, 1962.

Shri Ranga No, no.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border, places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of the police force as well as of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontier and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our motherland, and with hopes and faith this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: After the acceptance of Substitute Motion No. 9, Substitute Motions No. 1, 6 and 7 are barred.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : 7 अलग है ।

11745 *Pakistani Forces* VAISAKHA 8, 1887 (SAKA) *attack on* 11746
Kutch border (M)

प्रध्यक्ष महोदय : वह बाड है ।

stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11 A.M.

श्री किशन पटनायक : बाडे कैसे हो गई

18.35 hrs.

के ?

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday the 29th April, 1965/Vaisakha 9 1887 (Saka).

Mr. Speaker: They are barred. They cannot be taken up. The House now