

## ASSEMBLY DEBATES

### NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF PAKISTAN

Saturday, the 20th November, 1965

The National Assembly of Pakistan met in the Assembly Chamber (Ayub Hall), Rawalpindi, at nine of the clock, in the morning, Mr. Speaker (Mr. Justice Abdul Jabbar Khan) in the Chair.

---

(Recitation from the Holy Quran)

---

### STARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

#### FIRMS PRODUCING OPTICAL GOODS

57. \*Dr. Aleem-al-Razee: Will the Minister for Industries be pleased to state the number of firms producing optical goods in Pakistan and of those in East Pakistan?

Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan: Forty-one and twenty-five respectively.

Dr. Aleem-al-Razee: Since the people of East Pakistan seem to be blind, what steps do the Government contemplate to encourage the optical goods producing firms in East Pakistan?

Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan: Will you kindly repeat?

Dr. Aleem-al-Razee: I will. My question was: since the people of East Pakistan seem to be blind what steps do Government propose to take to encourage the industries producing optical goods in East Pakistan?

Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan: Sir, as far as the Government knows, they are not blind, but if Dr. Razee has got any specific information about the blindness, he may tell us.

Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury: May I know from the honourable Parliamentary Secretary for Industries as to whether the raw materials necessary for the production of optical goods are available in East Pakistan or you have to import it from abroad?

Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan: Sir, for that I require notice. Efforts are being made to meet the requirement locally.

#### TELEPHONE EXCHANGE IN GULBERG

58. \*Mr. Aleem-al-Razee: Will the Minister for Communications be pleased to state:

(a) the total expenditure incurred on the establishment of the telephone exchange in Gulberg residential area in Lahore; and

(b) whether it is a fact that the said telephone exchange contains 10,000 lines and that the number of subscribers is only 500 ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol:** (a) Rs. 52,40,000.

(b) No. The total capacity is 1,500 lines only of which 1,157 connections have been given.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury:** May I know how it could be possible for the Government to set up a line of 1,500 capacity whereas it appears that 1,157 connections were hitherto taken a time when you could not change the old boards in Sub-division and District Towns ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol:** Sir, as far as the utilization of the lines are concerned, an exchange is never used to its full capacity and it is always working either at 90 or 95 per cent. At 95 per cent the number of lines which can be used would be 1,425 of which 1,157 connections have already been given and there is a pending demand for about 300 lines. This will take the load on the exchange which is supposed to be or considered to be optimum. Regarding the objection raised by the honourable Member on the provision of these connections in Gulberg when we have not been able to replace old exchanges, it would be appreciated that it is a question of priority. The residential area of Gulberg houses has very important Government offices and it is necessary that these officials should be contactable at all times so that at the time of emergency, as it occurred, they are not cut off.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman:** Will the Parliamentary Secretary please inform when this exchange of Gulberg was installed ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol:** Sir, I do not have the information in my brief, but according to personal knowledge it was about a year ago.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman:** Sir, it is evident that within a year almost 80 per cent of the capacity of the exchange has been exhausted then why an elaborate scheme for covering phone requirements for five years has not been drawn up. It is hoped that it will be completed within a very short time because there is great difficulty for having telephone connections in the Gulberg area.

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is very strange that the Opposition blows hot and cold in the same breath. On one side, we hear that these lines should not have been provided because other places have more importance and, on the other, we hear that we should have provided more lines.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman:** Is it a fact that Government is accustomed to having short sighted policy because we have seen other exchanges too ? But whenever an extension was made in any exchange, it was filled up within a year and people had to suffer ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol:** It is a matter of satisfaction that the Government is always under-estimating the growth rate of Pakistan because it shows that the economy of this country is very dynamic ; the people of this country are very dynamic and I pray to God that it always remains so.

**A Member : Lack of foresight !**

TEA PRODUCTION IN PAKISTAN

59. \***Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan** : Will the Minister for Commerce be pleased to state :

(a) the quantity of tea produced in Pakistan during 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65 ;

(b) the quantity of tea consumed in the country during 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65 ;

(c) the quantity of tea exported during 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65, and the foreign exchange earned, year-wise ; and

(d) whether there has been any increase in the price of different brands of tea consumed in the country and the reasons therefor ?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury** : (a), (b) and (c) A statement is placed on the Table of the House.

(d) Yes. The apparent reason is a shortfall in the production of tea this year compared to last year and consequent increase in internal auction prices.

*Statement showing figures of production, consumption and export of Pakistani Tea*

Year	production (million lbs.)	Consumption (Estimated million lbs.)	Export (million lbs.)	Foreign Exchange earned (Crore Rupees)
1	2	3	4	5
1961-62	58.46	47.47	11.36	2.41
1962-63	51.83	49.57	3.11	1.02
1963-64	55.53	51.67	Nil	0.01
1964-65	63.20	55.00	5.28	0.98

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan** : Will the honourable Parliamentary Secretary please look at the figure of 1963-64 in which the production is 55 million pounds and the consumption is only 51.67 million pounds and the export is nil, what is the reason of having no export that year ?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury** : There was no need to export in that year.

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan** : Will the Parliamentary Secretary please tell us whether it is a fact that Government does not want to earn foreign exchange ?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury** : That is your opinion, but it is not correct.

**Mr. Speaker** : Next question.

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan** : Sir, Minister is on his legs.

**Mr. Speaker** : Do you like to reply to the question ?

**Mr. Ghulam Faruque:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the figures of production and consumption without taking into consideration the other factors which go to the normal marketing of the tea are likely to be deceptive. In 1963-64, the production was 55.53 million pound; the consumption estimated to be 51.67. These are figures that have been quoted to the best of ability, but it is extremely difficult with the consumption all over East and West Pakistan to get accurate figure. In my opinion, there is a big margin for error in the figures of consumption. The other thing is that there is always a pipeline. Tea has to come from East Pakistan. At this stage we find that tea has to be in the pipeline there. But I can give assurance that we are watching the matter very carefully.

**Dr. Aleem-al-Razee:** Is it a fact that since the honourable Minister consumed more tea, there is no export?

#### ACREAGE OF TEA PLANTATION IN PAKISTAN

60. **\*Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan:** Will the Minister for Commerce be pleased to state the acreage of tea plantation in Pakistan during the years 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65, and the steps taken so far to grow more tea in the country?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury:** The acreage under tea was as follows:

on 31st March, 1961	..	..	..	..	78,891 acres
on 31st March, 1962	..	..	..	..	80,696 acres
on 31st March, 1963	..	..	..	..	83,699 acres
on 31st March, 1964	..	..	..	..	87,655 acres
on 31st March, 1965	..	..	..	..	91,540 acres

The steps taken to grow more tea are enumerated in the statement placed on the Table of the House.

*Statement showing the steps been taken by Government in recent years to grow more tea*

1. *Compulsory expansion.*—Under the provisions of the Pakistan Tea Ordinance, 1959, all tea gardens in Pakistan were directed, with effect from 1959, to expand the area under tea cultivation, compulsorily, by a minimum of 3% per annum. Under this scheme, a total of 12,894 acres of land had been brought under tea by the end of 1964-65.

2. *Setting up of new gardens.*—Approximately 14,700 acres of new land had been allotted to 17 parties for setting up new tea gardens. Under the terms of the lease, the allottees are required to bring 50% of the area under tea cultivation within 7 years of the allotment.

3. *Rehabilitation of derelict gardens.*—Approximately 7,250 acres of land of derelict tea gardens has been allotted to 7 parties for rehabilitation.

4. *Utilisation of excess lands of existing gardens.*—The Tea Development Committee of the Pakistan Tea Board has initiated a scheme for the utilisation of about 41,000 acres of land, in the existing tea estates, which is suitable for tea cultivation, but has not been utilised for this purpose so far. The scheme aims at bringing 50% of this land under tea cultivation within a period of seven years.

5. *Infilling and Replanting.*—The work of infilling and replanting of new tea plants in natural vacancies and old tea areas in existing gardens is being pursued vigorously. A total of 35,230 acres have been infilled during the last six years. Replanting is proceeding at the rate of 2% per annum.

6. *Other measures.*—In addition to the above, Government has been helping the tea gardens to increase their production through grant of loans at concessional rates to tea estates, tax holiday for new gardens, liberal import licence for essential requirements, like machinery, insecticides, seeds fertilizers, etc. Government is also carrying out a survey for artificial irrigation of tea gardens in the districts of Sylhet and Chittagong to enable the tea gardens to take up artificial irrigation to improve yield and to prevent recurrent losses due to drought.

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan:** Will the honourable Parliamentary Secretary please state whether it is a fact that quite a few of the new gardens which were given to some of the people as political patronage have not yet started the most initial work there?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury:** I require notice for this.

**Dr. Aleem-al-Razee:** Will the honourable Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to disclose the names of those seventeen parties to whom new tea gardens have been allotted?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury:** I require notice for this also.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury:** It appears from the answer that during the year 1963 the acreage in tea cultivation was 33,699 whereas the production was the lowest in comparison to other figures available here for five years. Will the Parliamentary Secretary please tell me whether Government is prepared to have any enquiry as to the lesser production particularly that year?

**Mr. Ghulam Faruque:** Sir, the Government carried out a detailed investigation into it. It was brought about by drought conditions. A special committee was appointed to investigate the matter and action is already in hand. Progressively over a period of years it would enable the hazards arising out of the climatic conditions to be overcome to a certain extent. That matter is in hand.

#### CEMENT FACTORIES IN EAST PAKISTAN

61. **\*Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan:** Will the Minister for Industries be pleased to refer to his press statement at Chittagong recently regarding the establishment of two cement factories in East Pakistan and state the steps taken so far to establish the said factories?

**Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan:** East Pakistan Industrial Development Corporation have undertaken a feasibility study for economic mining of Sunamganj lime-stone deposits and basing a cement factory on this source.

As for the second factory based on lime-stone imported from Burma, the matter is under consideration. If this proposition is found feasible, the matter will be pursued further.

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan:** Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to state whether it is a fact that for the Sunamganj lime-stone cement factory a private party was already given a go-ahead signal. They were given foreign exchange to get foreign experts. They brought foreign experts. They got feasibility report and they were going ahead of the project when it was taken over and given to the E.P.I.D.C.

**Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan:** As far as the first part is concerned, I think it is baseless. As far as E.P.I.D.C. is concerned, it should be made very clear that the Geological Department and other surveys are being carried out. The economic feasibility of the matter is under consideration and it will be taken into consideration and the decision will be taken later on.

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan:** Is it not a fact that the private party got the feasibility report done by a Japanese Consultant which was approved by the Government of Pakistan?

**Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan:** I have made it clear and I have nothing to do. I have very clearly stated that so far there is no party which has been entrusted with this job.

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan:** Will the honourable Minister for Industries kindly state whether it is a fact that a private party in East Pakistan got the feasibility study of the cement factory done by the foreign experts, Japanese Consulting Institute, with the approval from the Government of Pakistan.

**Mr. Altaf Hussain:** The position is that the private party concerned did carry out certain feasibility studies which were not considered satisfactory by the E.P.I.D.C. and the private party concerned did not make full utilization of the lease given to it with the result that the setting up of a cement factory or factories in East Pakistan based on indigenous lime-stone has been unconsciously delayed. Therefore, it has been considered necessary in the interest of East Pakistan and in order to set up as quickly as possible a cement factory in East Pakistan that E.P.I.D.C. should undertake proper feasibility studies and as soon as this is done, the cement factory will be started. The private party concerned who had been given certain rights will be associated, if it is found possible in any manner, with the project.

**Begum Mariam Hashimuddin Ahmed:** Will the honourable Minister for Industries please state the reason why so much time was wasted in giving it to a private party which turned out to be unsuccessful in such an important matter?

**Mr. Altaf Hussain:** For the simple reason that the Government wanted to give as much encouragement as possible to the private parties; and it is only when they fail that the Government takes it up.

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan:** Will the Minister for Industries kindly state whether the party was ever informed by the Government—only once, not twice—that the pace of their work was not satisfactory?

**A Member:** Supplementary, Sir.

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan:** Sir, my question has not been answered.

**Mr. Altaf Hussain :** I have given a complete answer. What else do you want ?

**Mr. Mukhlesuzzaman Khan :** Whether the fact that their work was unsatisfactory was ever intimated to them ?

**Mr. Altaf Hussain :** There may not have been any official communication ; but to the best of my knowledge now or before I became a Minister it was done.

**Dr. Aleem-al-Razee :** Will the honourable Minister for Industries be pleased to tell the House the price of one bag of cement in East Pakistan and also in West Pakistan ?

**Mr. Altaf Hussain :** Notice please.

**Mr. Speaker :** Question No. 62 !

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury :** Will the Minister for Industries please tell me the name of that private party ?

*(Interruptions)*

**Mr. Altaf Hussain :** If the honourable Member puts in a supplementary question, we will find out the party.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury :** It is a supplementary question.

#### IMPORT OF CEMENT AGAINST BONUS VOUCHERS

62. \***Mr. A. B. M. Nurul Islam** (put by Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury) : Will the Minister for Commerce be pleased to state whether it is a fact that in future cement will be imported against bonus vouchers only ? If so, why ?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** In West Pakistan cement is importable on bonus vouchers only. In East Pakistan it is importable under the free list.

The position will be reviewed at the time of formulation of the next Import Policy.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury :** Will the honourable Parliamentary Secretary please give me the reason why cement is imported in West Pakistan through bonus vouchers, and in East Pakistan through free list ?

**Mr. Ghulam Faruque :** The reasons are obvious. In West Pakistan there is a fairly large production capacity of cement, and there are occasions when cement is surplus here. The allowing of cement to come in under bonus vouchers to West Pakistan is to provide for need of some special kind of cement which is not produced in the country. Also, I think, it acts as a check on the price so that the prices are kept under control.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury :** May I know from the honourable Minister as to whether these two types of cement in both the wings make any difference in prices ?

**Mr. Ghulam Faruque:** I could not quite understand the question.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury:** I wanted to know from the honourable Minister as to whether the difference in the way of import makes any difference of the price of cement in both the wings.

**Mr. Ghulam Faruque:** Sir, I have not got the exact calculations; but if the intention of the honourable Member is that cement is more expensive in West Pakistan, or is it that by allowing bonus vouchers for the import of cement in West Pakistan whether we are able to push up the price or push it down, I have not been able to follow it. The prices are there, and now lot of cement is coming to East Pakistan from foreign countries. I think that at the present moment it is coming from China. I have not really got to the bottom of what the honourable Member is asking for.

**Mr. Habibur Rahman:** Is the honourable Minister aware that cement is not imported now-a-days, and thereby its price has gone up to Rs. 14.00.

(Interruptions)

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury:** Answer, Sir.

**Mr. Habibur Rahman:** Shall I repeat the question? Is the honourable Commerce Minister aware that cement is not importable under free list now-a-days, and thereby the prices of cement have gone up to Rs. 14 or Rs. 15 per bag in East Pakistan?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury:** No; it is still available under the free list.

**Mr. Habibur Rahman:** It is only allowed to be imported from China now-a-days.

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury:** It is because of the emergency that the imports of cement have been tied to China only.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury:** May I know from the honourable Parliamentary Secretary as to whether it is within his knowledge that the price of cement has gone so high in East Pakistan that it has already reached Rs. 15 per bag of cement there or Rs. 300 per ton?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury:** If there is any rise in the price of cement, it is due to the present emergency, as there is a lot of dislocation in the communication system. Due to this emergency, Sir, there was a blocked of passage from one place to another, and that is the reason for the increase in the price of cement.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury:** How are you going to relieve the people of that difficulty? You know it is hindering the development of East Pakistan very seriously.

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury:** Government is aware of this situation and is looking into the matter.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury:** Looking, looking, and doing nothing.

## PAKISTAN TEA BOARD

63. \*Mr. Ajmal Ali Choudhury : Will the Minister for Commerce be pleased to state :

(a) the person who received the largest number of votes for selection as a member of the Pakistan Tea Board to represent the proprietary tea interests in the election held by the Pakistan Tea Association as per Board's letter No. 3537/1A-2/60, dated the 1st May, 1963 ; and

(b) the number of votes received by Khan Bahadur Mujibur Rahman who was eventually nominated to the Pakistan Tea Board in the election mentioned in (a) above ?

Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury : (a) It is understood that in the informal ballot organized by the Pakistan Tea Association for the purpose of recommending a nominee of the proprietary Tea Estates, Mr. Aminur Rashid Choudhury secured the largest number of votes.

(b) Khan Mujibur Rahman Khan was nominated to the Tea Board by the Central Government under clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Tea Ordinance, 1959. The nomination was not made in pursuance of the ballot referred to in (a) above. Information is not readily available with regard to the number of votes secured by him.

Mr. Ajmal Ali Choudhury : May I know from the honourable Parliamentary Secretary as to what he actually means by "informal ballot" ?

Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury : It was an informal ballot. It was held by the members of the Tea Association. The Government asked the Tea Association to send the name of some nominee, and accordingly informally the Association held the ballot there. It was not prescribed and there are no hard and fast rules that the nominee is to be selected by a ballot.

Mr. Ajmal Ali Choudhury : This is not my question, Sir. I wanted to know from the honourable Parliamentary Secretary what he actually means by an "informal ballot."

Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury : There was no prescribed rule of selecting a nominee to the Tea Board by the Tea Association on the basis of a ballot. They were not also authorized to just select a nominee by the system of ballot. So it was informally held by the Association.

Mr. Hasan A. Shaikh : Is this method of excluding the majority the method of the present regime of democracy ? Is it the brand of the present regime of democracy ?

Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury : I request the honourable Member here that in the matter of the appointment of a member to the Tea Board the question of democracy does not arise.

## SPECIAL ALLOCATION OF FOREIGN EXCHANGE TO AN OFFICER OF PAKISTAN FOREIGN SERVICE

64. \*Mr. Ajmal Ali Choudhury : Will the Minister for Foreign Affairs be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that an officer of the Pakistan Foreign Service has been allowed a special foreign exchange quota of Rs. 2,000.00 per month ever since he joined that Service ; and

(b) if the answer to (a) above be in the affirmative, the reasons thereof, and whether Government propose to continue this concession to him; if so, the reasons therefor?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** (a) Yes.

(b) The foreign exchange was agreed after taking into consideration the special circumstances of the officer concerned.

The Government does not intend to continue this concession indefinitely and for this reason reviews the case every year on merits.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury:** Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to state to whom the foreign exchange was allocated under such special circumstances?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** The officer concerned is the second son of His Highness the Nawab of Bahawalpur and the amount has been sanctioned to him in order to enable him to maintain his social status. He was appointed to the Foreign Service in pursuance of Government policy that the rulers' children should be encouraged to join Government service. The quota granted to him is from his own means. The name of the officer is Prince Abbasi.

**Mr. Hasan A. Shaikh:** It is a part of the project which depicts 'poor Pakistan' or is it 'princely Pakistan'?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** He represents the 'poor Pakistan' abroad, such as Pakistan is abroad and, as I said, this is to encourage the sons of the Chiefs to join Foreign Service and because of the poor pay the amount was allocated to him in keeping with his status. It will not continue for a long time to come.

**Mr. Ajmal Ali Chowdhury:** How long will it continue?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** As long as the Government feels it necessary.

**Dr. Aleem-al-Razee:** Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to state whether the assignment of this gentleman was absolutely indispensable for the Government of Pakistan to propagate foreign policy of Basic Democracies?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** It was done in 1950 and I have given the reasons and it is not considered advisable to bring about a change of contract, agreed upon by the previous regime.

**Dr. Aleem-al-Razee:** How do you profess to be a revolutionary Government if you do not want to change undesirable things of the previous.

#### APPLICATION OF DR. JAMSHED BAKHT FOR RETURN TO PAKISTAN

65. **\*Mr. Ajmal Ali Choudhury:** Will the Minister for Foreign Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether one, Dr. Jamshed Bakht of Sylhet, had applied to the Pakistan Embassy in Rome for financial help to enable him to return to Pakistan in 1958; and

(b) whether it is a fact that he was given £ 80 as help to enable him to return to Pakistan; if so, whether this amount was recovered from him?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** (a) and (b) Material for answer is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House in due course.

**Mr. Ajmal Ali Choudhury:** Any action has been taken?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** The material is being collected by Government.

**Mr. Ajmal Ali Choudhury:** Why Government did not take action before?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** He is going on asking questions when I have already said that material is being collected.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF PAKISTANI LABOUR IN GERMANY

66. **\*Mr. Ajmal Ali Choudhury:** Will the Minister for Foreign Affairs be pleased to state whether Government was ever approached by the Government of Federal Republic of Germany to allow 80,000 migrants to go to that country? If so, is it a fact that Government refused to allow migrants to go to that country? If so, why?

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim Malik:** No such request was received from the Government of Federal Republic of Germany. It was in fact the Government of Pakistan who approached the Federal Government of West Germany to consider the employment of Pakistani labour in that country. In a note addressed by our Embassy in Bad Godesberg to the Minister of Interior of West Germany in July, 1965, we suggested that a joint German-Pakistan body should be set up in Pakistan and suitable Pakistani labourers—both skilled and unskilled—selected for working in West Germany.

This proposal was made with the view that it would, on the one hand, provide employment to our people in West Germany and, on the other hand, earn foreign exchange, which could be used for offsetting the deficit in our balance of payments with West Germany.

We are pursuing this matter which is now under the consideration of the Government of West Germany.

#### U.N.-PAK, DRILLING PROJECT

67. **\*Mir Nabi Baksh Zehri** (put by Mr. Hasan A. Shaikh): Will the Minister for Natural Resources be pleased to state:

(a) the results of drilling done by the Geological Survey of Pakistan or under the UN-PAK Drilling Project in Sor Range, Sinjahi and Degari areas; and

(b) whether drilling has been carried out in the Sinjahi coal mining area; if not, the reasons therefor, and the approximate date by which the drilling, if any, will be done in the said area?

**Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan:** (a) A statement showing the results of drilling by the Geological Survey of Pakistan and the UN-PAK Mineral Survey Project is placed on the Table of the House.

(b) The Geological Survey of Pakistan has not carried out any drilling in the Sinjdhi coal mining area. Drilling in that area is not considered necessary as it is undertaken only when geological and geophysical studies do not provide sufficient information for understanding sub-surface structure. The area has already been mapped in all possible details. The behaviour of the coal seam has been studied thoroughly. Siesmic investigations have also been made. With this data the geology of the area is well understood.

STATEMENT SHOWING THE DETAILED RESULTS OF ALL THE 17 BORE HOLES DRILLED IN SOR RANGE-DEGARI-SINJDHI AREA BY THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF PAKISTAN AND THE UN-PAK MINERAL SURVEY PROJECT.

**Hole No. 1**

*Location.*—Lease No. 102, new area, Central Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—331 feet.

*Remarks.*—Hole was drilled to obtain information about the sub-surface structure.

No coal.

**Hole No. 2**

*Location.*—Lease No. 102, new area, Central Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—237 feet.

*Remarks.*—No coal hole drilled to test the sub-surface structure.

**Hole No. 3**

*Location.*—Lease No. 92 Northern Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—431 feet.

*Remarks.*—2 coal seams; first at 249 feet with thickness of 1 foot and the other at 378 feet also with thickness of 1 foot.

**Hole No. 4**

*Location.*—New Area, Central Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—438 feet.

*Remarks.*—4 feet thick coal bed at 449 feet.

**Hole No. 5**

*Location.*—Lease No. 5, Degari.

*Depth of Hole.*—169 feet.

*Remarks.*—9 inches coal bed at 109 feet.

**Hole No. 6**

*Location.*—Lease No. 5, Degari.

*Depth of Hole.*—392 feet.

*Remarks.*—Coal bed of 7 inches at 318 feet.

**Hole No. 7**

*Location.*—South of Lease No. 59, Northern Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—600 feet.

*Remarks.*—No coal. Hole was drilled to obtain geologic information.

**Hole No. 8**

*Location.*—Lease No. 58, Northern Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—260 feet.

*Remarks.*—4 feet of coal bed at 223 feet.

**Hole No. 9**

*Location.*—Lease No. 3, Degari.

*Depth of Hole.*—271 feet.

*Remarks.*—1 foot coal bed at 264 feet.

**Hole No. 10**

*Location.*—Lease No. 2, Degari.

*Depth of Hole.*—1,411 feet.

*Remarks.*—Repeated mechanical troubles made it difficult to drill beyond this depth. No coal seam was encountered up to this depth.

**Hole No. 11**

*Location.*—Lease No. 2, Degari.

*Depth of Hole.*—1,378 feet.

*Remarks.*—No coal.

**Hole No. 12**

*Location.*—Lease No. 2, Degari.

*Depth of Hole.*—761 feet.

*Remarks.*—No coal.

**Hole No. 13**

*Location.*—Lease No. 2, Degari.

*Depth of Hole.*—788 feet.

*Remarks.*—No coal.

**Hole No. 14 (WDH-11)**

*Location.*—South of lease No. 102, new area, Central Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—2,171 feet.

*Remarks.*—No coal. Could not reach coal bed due to mechanical trouble.

**Hole No. 15 (WDH-12)**

*Location.*—Between hole No. 14 and coal out crop, Central Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—1,508 feet.

*Remarks.*—Coal beds at 1,429 feet and at 1,433 feet—with thickness of 1½ feet and 4½ feet.

**Hole No. 16 (WDH-14)**

*Location.*—About 1 mile west of hole No. 15, Central Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—1,968 feet.

*Remarks.*—Coal seams at two places, first at 1,847 feet with 6 inches of thickness and second at 1,868 feet with 1 foot of thickness.

**Hole No. 17 (WDH-15)**

*Location.*—½ mile north of Ushbul Spring—Northern Sor Range.

*Depth of Hole.*—1,019 feet.

*Remarks.*—Hole abandoned at 1,200 feet. No coal seam encountered up to this depth.

## DEMOTION OF A TELEGRAPH SUPERVISOR

68. \***Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Will the Minister for Communications be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that Mr. Taleb Ali, an employee of the Telegraph and Telephone Department in Dacca, who is a matriculate, has been demoted after officiating as Telegraph Supervisor for eight years; and

(b) whether it is a fact that the Telegraph Supervisors who are non-matriculate and junior to Mr. Taleb Ali have already been confirmed or absorbed as Telegraph Supervisors ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: (a) No. Mr. Taleb Ali was only a Telegraph Supervisor, a purely stop-gap arrangement made when regularly recruited and trained Engineering Supervisors were not available. Under the normal rules he was replaced by a qualified Engineering Supervisor.

(b) No. Only those who have completed the prescribed training courses for an Engineering Supervisor's appointment have been absorbed in the cadre. Mr. Taleb Ali has not qualified at any of these courses and is, therefore, not eligible for appointment as an Engineering Supervisor.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to state why the particular employee was employed as a stop-gap arrangement for 8 years ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: The technical services are generally lacking not only in this particular case, but practically in every walk of Pakistani life and it takes time to educate and train skilled people. It is very gratifying that we have been able to replace unskilled people with skilled people at such junior level.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** Is it not a fact that some of the temporary supervisors who were also employed on the basis of a stop-gap arrangement and who were junior to him and who were non-matriculate were absorbed ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** Others who were absorbed have qualified by passing the examination prescribed by the Government, though they were junior to Mr. Taleb Ali.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** Is it not a fact that Mr. Taleb Ali had earned good confidential report but he was not spared for the training ; this is a case of injustice. I wish the Parliamentary Secretary to assure me that he will call for the files and render justice to his case.

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** I assure the honourable Member that if injustice has been done to him, it will be looked into, but according to the brief that I have in my possession, Mr. Taleb Ali did not take the trouble and the advantage of completing the prescribed course and, therefore, he had to suffer.

**Mr. Hasan A. Shaikh :** Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to state whether he has any powers to call for the files ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** I assure the honourable Member that in cases which relate to parliamentary affairs the Secretariat is very considerate and affords utmost co-operation.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** It is responsibility of the superior officers who have not spared him for training which should have enabled him to qualify for the examination.

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** Sir, I have already said we shall look into it.

**Mr. Mohammad Abdul Matin (Pabna) :** Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to state whether Mr. Taleb Ali was enjoying all the privileges as a Supervisor for last eight years ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** I do not know what privileges Mr. Abdul Matin is referring to ?

**Mr. Mohammad Abdul Matin (Pabna) :** Privileges like pay, allowances and other things as Supervisor.

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** Mr. Taleb Ali was enjoying all those privileges as admissible under the rules.

**Mr. Mohammad Abdul Matin (Pabna) :** Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to state what was the purpose to keep Mr. Taleb in service when he was not found suitable to be absorbed in the permanent cadre as supervisor because he had technical quality. I do not know what was the purpose for the Government to give him all the allowances for last 8 years.

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** The purpose was that there was nobody else available for appointment and it is only when trained qualified persons who had passed the course became available that Mr. Taleb Ali was replaced.

## TELEPHONES FOR THANAS

69. \***Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Will the Minister for Communications be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Police Stations connected so far by telephone under the thana scheme in East Pakistan; and

(b) the approximate period within which all the thanas of East Pakistan will be connected by telephone?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: (a) 345.

(b) By the end of this year.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Will the Parliamentary Secretary kindly inform us whether all the Police Stations in East Pakistan have been connected with the telephone?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: Sir, I do not have a list of the Police Stations which have been connected with telephone but from the brief I have with me I can say that about 345 thanas have been connected. The remaining 68 thanas are in the process of being connected either by land lines or by high frequency radio and this work will be completed by the end of the year.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Is the Parliamentary Secretary aware of the fact that the progress of the thana scheme has already been stopped in East Pakistan?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: No, Sir; this is incorrect. This is a project to which the Government attaches great importance.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Is the Parliamentary Secretary aware of the fact that in some of the thanas the telephones have been installed in the local Muslim League Offices instead of installing the telephone in the Post Offices which is the regular practice?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: Sir, this is absolutely incorrect and I deny it.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Is it a fact that a telephone has been installed in the Arai Hazar Muslim League Office instead of installing it in the Post Office?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: This is a specific question and I would like notice for this.

**Dr. Aleem-al-Razee**: Will the Parliamentary Secretary please tell the House that the Public Call Office established in the Nagarpur within the District of Mymensingh and Tangail Sub-Division remains out of order normally five days in a week?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: This may be one of the instances where machines fail man, but we try to keep the services going on as efficiently as possible.

## TELEPHONE EXCHANGE AT GOPALDI BAZAR

70. \***Mr. A. S. M Sulaiman**: Will the Minister for Communications be pleased to state the steps taken so far for installing a telephone exchange at Gopaldi Bazar and P.C.O. at Baradi Bazar in the Dacca District ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: The provision of an Exchange at Gopaldi Bazar and P.C.O. at Baradi Bazar having been found unremunerative, further action has not been taken.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Will the Parliamentary Secretary kindly inform the House what are the consideration of unremunerative installations ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: Sir, the Department has a particular formula by which it works out the economics of any particular exchange and, according to the brief which I have, the cost of the exchange was such that it would be prohibitive and would take a very very long time to pay for ; and the Department, being a commercial organisation, did not feel it could undertake this heavy expenditure at the cost of the Government Exchequer.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Is the Parliamentary Secretary aware of the fact that Gopaldi Bazar is one of the important commercial centres not only in East Pakistan but as compared with any other market in the country as well. Therē are sufficient applications for telephones and will the Parliamentary Secretary consider their cases for installing telephones.

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: The Government would certainly be prepared to consider the cases where it can be proved that a particular expenditure is remunerative and justifiable.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman**: Is the Parliamentary Secretary aware of the fact that there has been a Telegraph Office in Baradi Bazar in the Dacca District and installation of a telephone is absolutely justifiable ? Will he look into this case ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: We will look into this case and I must again emphasise that only if it is a commercially feasible proposition, it will be taken into consideration.

**Al-haj Moulvi Sultan Ahmed**: Will the Parliamentary Secretary kindly tell the House whether the Government has any plan to connect the Sandwip Island which is an off-shore Island, with a telephone. This island is always affected by cyclone. Is there any proposal that it shall be connected with the telephone very soon ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol**: I am sorry I could not hear at all. Could you please repeat ?

**Al-haj Moulvi Sultan Ahmed**: Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to tell the House whether he has got any plan of connecting Sandwip Island which off-shore Island of Chittagong with a telephone because it is far away from the main land and which is always in danger of cyclones every year ; whether there is any proposal to connect it with a telephone.

**Mr. Abdus Sobur Khan :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, though this particular question has got absolutely no bearing on the question just before the House, yet for the satisfaction of the honourable Member I may tell him that out of 345 Thanas which have already been provided with telephones only 68 thanas are yet to be connected of which 45 forecast weather and the remaining thanas are connected by high frequencies radio communication. And these 45 thanas are particularly meant for weather forecast and to communicate storms signal much ahead of time. For that reason the land line is not supposed to be of any much assistance. So far as the particular thanas are concerned, I would like to inform the honourable Member that order for procurement of radio equipment has already been placed and delivery is expected in about two months time. This entire work which is popularly known as the 'storm belt' will be completed by the end of this year.

BRANCH POST OFFICE AT KALAPAHARIA UNION

71. **\*Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** Will the Minister for Communications be pleased to state the steps taken so far to open a branch Post Office at Kalapaharia Union in the Arahazar Police Station in East Pakistan ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** A post office at Azarkandi, the headquarters of the Union Council Kalapaharia, is being opened shortly.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** Will the Parliamentary Secretary inform us whether it is possible to complete the Post Office within this year.

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** It would be completed as soon as it is possible to do so.

**Dr. Aleem-al-Razee :** Is it a fact that the Branch Post Office is so far located in the house of the Chairman; and not in a separate building ?

**Mian Muhammad Rafique Saigol :** This is incorrect.

AMOUNT COLLECTED ON ACCOUNT OF WAR INSURANCE

72. **\*Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** Will the Minister for Commerce be pleased to state :

(a) the amount collected so far on account of War Insurance after the 9th September, 1965, from both the wings, wing-wise ; and

(b) the total amount of war claims paid to the insurers in East and West Pakistan, separately ?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** (a) The amount collected as premium on account of War Risks Insurance from 9th September, 1965 up-to-date is as follows :—

					Rs.
(i) West Pakistan	...	...	...	...	79,79,908
(ii) East Pakistan	...	...	...	...	11,02,350
			Total	...	<u>90,82,258</u>

(b) No claims have so far been paid out of the War Risks Insurance Fund.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** Is the Parliamentary Secretary aware of the fact that during the last emergency the Government of India has seized a good number of ships carrying valuable articles to Pakistan. What arrangements have been made for claiming the damages by the importers of Pakistan.

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** I require notice for that.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** What amount of time you are likely to take? The session is going to end. The Pakistani importers are suffering very badly. Can we expect that the information will be placed before this House during this session?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** If it is possible, then it will be placed before this House in this session. Information is being collected and if we get the information, we will place it before the House.

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury :** May I know from the Parliamentary Secretary whether the Government has got any figure of those goods which were looted by India in deep seas, particularly near the Andaman Islands?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** There is no information yet. The matter will be looked into and I require notice for that.

**Mr. Mohammad Abdul Matin (Pabna) :** Will the Parliamentary Secretary be pleased to state what will be the legal position for covering the war risk insurance after the cease-fire is there?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** It is a matter of policy.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** Does the Parliamentary Secretary take the responsibility of paying the claims for all those articles which have been seized by the Indian authorities?

**Mr. Mizanur Rahman Chowdhury :** Looted, not seized.

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** It is a matter of law. It may be clarified from the honourable Law Minister.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** Under what policy do you take the insurance premium when you do not know that the claims would be paid by the Government?

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** This will be looked into according to the legal aspects of the matter.

**Mr. A. S. M. Sulaiman :** The law which allows them to collect premium allows them to pay the claims also.

**Mr. Nural Haque Choudhury :** Yes, the law is there. The claims will be paid.

**Mr. Speaker :** Questions over.

MOTION RE EMERGENCY SITUATION CREATED BY ARMED  
AGGRESSION BY INDIA—concluded.

**Mr. Speaker :** We will now have discussion on the motion. That this House do take into immediate consideration the emergency situation created by armed aggression by India against Pakistan.

Mr. Nurul Amin.

**Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the honourable Leader of the Opposition would finish his speech I would like to speak on the motion. I want to make my ideas clear to my countrymen on this important subject.

**Mr. Speaker:** I looked for you yesterday. You were not present.

**Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury:** Sir, may I draw your attention to Chapter XV of the Rules of Procedure of this House which you have taken an oath to observe. In Chapter XV there is no provision that the Speaker will call a particular Member to speak. The provision is that any Member could stand up and when he is recognised by the Speaker, he would take the floor.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Speaker has a list before him and he calls the Members accordingly.

**Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury:** The Speaker is the master of this House. Nobody has got the right to dictate him. I had the privilege of administering that oath of office to you as the outgoing Speaker of the House. I seek protection of that oath of office when I say that I have got the right to speak.

**Mr. Speaker:** You had every right to speak yesterday. When I called your name you were absent: It cannot be helped. The list was agreed to by both the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House. If you can accuse anybody, it is your Leader.

**Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury:** I would have accused him if there had been a provision in the rules. Had there been any provision in these Rules that the Speaker will take names from the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, I would have sought their protection, and not yours. Sir, it will go down in parliamentary history that you are denying the floor to your predecessor in office who had the privilege to administer oath of office to you. It will also go down in parliamentary history how this House is being conducted.

**Makhdumzada Syed Hamid Raza Gilani:** On a point of order. Sir, the House wants to hear Mr. Chowdhury's speech. (*House in a chorus spoke: "We want to hear Mr. Chowdhury."*)

**Mr. Speaker:** All right, Mr. Chowdhury is allowed ten minutes to finish his speech.

**Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury:** Sir, the hon'ble Leader of the Opposition was on his legs. He must have his say first. Otherwise, he will be annoyed with me.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will request him not to be annoyed by you.

**Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury (East Pakistan):** He will be annoyed with you and not with me now. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I congratulate you for recognising the convention of this House and for agreeing to conform to the Rules of Procedure of the House that you have the sole right to recognise any Member for taking the floor.

Sir, the Motion before the House is the situation arising out of the Indian aggression. Sir, I will catalogue one by one the particular situations that have arisen as a result of Indian aggression. One situation that has arisen is that we must be always on our guard against the Indians and they can never be trusted. This is the first lesson we have learnt from the recent Indian aggression. Secondly, Sir, we should evacuate those areas which are threatened by Indian invaders. Thirdly, we must take all necessary steps to forestall any future Indian aggression. Fourthly, we should choose our friends in the international fields amongst those who stood by us in our hour of trial.

The most important matter for the consideration of those who are in authority according to me is: how to make the people of Pakistan trained in the use of arms for the defence of their country. Sir, ours is a peculiar geography with one part of the country more than thousand miles away from the other part intervened by an enemical country and in the political set-up of the world, we have a big neighbour who had never accepted the sovereign State of Pakistan. It is the need of the hour that we must have our people trained in the use of arms for the defence of the country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, of course, I am quite conscious about the fact that the Government has its financial limitation. Nevertheless, it is a must that our people must know the use of arms. More so, in view of the standing Indian threat to our sovereignty. I have a suggestion to make. My categorical suggestion is that nobody in any University should be granted a degree unless he has passed the elementary military training. In fact, nobody should be allowed appointment in Civil Service or in any Class I or Class II Services unless he produced a certificate of elementary military training. That is the first step. I don't insist on complete military training because it may not be possible to impart that sort of training to the entire public. But everybody in this country must be given elementary military training so that he could defend his country against aggression.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasise again as I have emphasised in my earlier intervention, in the House that our Armed Forces did their best and their performances saved Pakistan through the grace of God. We have all praise for them and we have words of encouragement for them. But, Sir, when there is war, there are two fronts for the country to fight, i.e., fighting the aggressor in the battle field and fighting the enemy on the diplomatic front. In my opinion, diplomatic front, if not more important, is at least equally important as the battle front. There are innumerable instances in history that victory in the diplomatic front always decided the ultimate result of conflict amongst nations irrespective of victories in the battle front. So nations always strive to put in their most skilful and experienced politicians in the foreign office. A friend of mine asked me as to what is diplomacy. I, on my part, asked him about his view about diplomacy first. He said, Sir, in his opinion diplomacy was neither a game of intrigue nor a game which could be played successfully by an apprentice in politics. In his opinion, diplomacy was not also Teddyism. Diplomacy is an art which can only be conducted by one successfully who has mature experience of conducting of human affairs. Sir, I did not tell my friend whether I agreed with him or disagreed with his views on diplomacy, since I had no interest in pleasing or displeasing him. But, Sir, according to me, diplomacy is an art which calls for

[Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury]

handling by most experienced and skil-ful political wisdom for successful culmination in a particular way. I have a feeling, Sir, that whatever we have done in the United Nations, on the face of it, everybody in Pakistan was of the opinion that the resolution of the 20th September by U.N. Security Council on Kashmir was most unsatisfactory and, in fact, Pro-Indian. But, Sir, when on the 4th of November same resolution of 20th September was confirmed, surprisingly an announcement came from the Foreign Minister that it was a satisfactory resolution. I thought on the face of it, it was not so. But it might possibly be satisfactory because the Foreign Minister had said so. As you know, Sir, sometimes diplomats argue in camera and they sometimes get commitments. May be our Foreign Minister also got a commitment from big powers regarding holding of plebiscite in Kashmir. So may be he has his own reasons to pronounce November 4 resolution on Kashmir as satisfactory. I must congratulate the President of Pakistan that during the emergency and before that and after the war, his statements were dignified and appropriate. But, Sir, may I appeal to everybody in this country including those in authority not to embarrass the President of Pakistan by statements, which will not improve the situation, rather may lead to further deterioration. Successful diplomacy will be to win more friends without hurting old friends. That is exactly what a diplomat would strive for. I am sure the Foreign Office is quite conscious about it.

I wonder and the people would also wonder and say how is it that in 1948 when Pakistan was not so strong, we had a categorical unanimous resolution from the Security Council of the U.N. indicating plebiscite in Kashmir whereas in 1965 when we are much stronger than in 1948 we have a resolution from the Security Council of the U.N. which favoured India and never cared to mention about plebiscite in Kashmir completely ignoring the 1948 resolution of the Council. In fact, such Pro-Indian resolution was almost unanimous, except that Jordan abstained. 1965 resolution of the Security Council on Kashmir indicates positively complete collapse in our diplomatic front in comparison with our position in 1948. I am sure the Foreign Minister will clarify the position. We all know he is a good speaker. I congratulate the B. B. C. for paying him a tribute. I wish a representative of the B.B.C. was in the Security Council to advise the members to get us a resolution to have a plebiscite in Kashmir. I am sure the Foreign Minister, whose task is arduous but who is a good speaker with good energy, with his diplomacy will win Kashmir for Pakistan. We are eagerly waiting for that.

Let me express our gratitude to all friendly countries who stood by Pakistan in our hour of trial and peril. I also thank those foreign countries, who had been helping us since the birth of Pakistan. I also thank those countries who passed the resolution in 1948 categorically stating that there will be a plebiscite in Kashmir. Let us not abuse anybody, that is not diplomacy. Let us try to have more and more friends. We should retain our old friends and we should have more friends. Abusing and slandering does not convince anybody to become friends or to continue friendship. I am sure the Foreign Office is alert on this point.

Sir, as far as the United States is concerned, they had been our friends. I must say that big powers including the U.S. were instrumental in getting us the resolution in 1948. I must say the U.S. and other big powers helped us in the field of economy as well as in other fields. May be their present policy does not suit the interest of Pakistan. But, Sir, it is not necessary to abuse them. If any nation cannot be our friend, it does not necessarily follow that we shall make them our enemy. We must be thankful for help but we must not antagonise any nation unnecessarily. Playing to the gallery, unmindful of implications in National and International spheres could only be resorted to by political novices and political adventures. Political wisdom and statesmanship will look well ahead and will care not only for the present but also for the future and always in national interest. I would like to state that the honourable Minister, Mr. Faruque, made a very balanced statement day before yesterday that we should not abuse anybody unnecessarily. That is true. We should not antagonise anybody. We should take lessons from the statements of the President of Pakistan, which were so sober and balanced.

Let me appeal to the members of the Security Council and say that at the present time the U.N. Organisation is on trial to justify its existence. If the world nations want to save the United Nations for world peace and save that world body from extinction, they must proceed on the basis of the Charter of the U.N. and the most important part of the U.N. Charter, is recognition of the right of self-determination of people which could only bring lasting peace in the world and in case of Kashmir, U.N. is pledge-bound to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir in the light of 1948 resolution.

I agree, Sir, we have a great responsibility towards the people of Kashmir who are living under constant agony. Our Muslim brethren are suffering. We have a responsibility no doubt. We have a moral responsibility to help them as much as we can. We cannot and must not forget them and we will help them with all our might, keeping always in view the interest of the sovereignty of Pakistan before us. If we exist in the international field as a strong sovereign nation, with our sovereignty and integrity in tact, and very much in tact, it would be possible to help anybody. I believe and my opinion about international diplomacy of a sovereign nation is based on 'friendship with all and unnecessary enmity with none'. We should have more friends and we shall not unnecessarily make more enemies and we should not lose our old friends. We are grateful to the Republic of China for the help and cooperation they gave us during Indian aggression. We are also grateful to the President of Indonesia and to other countries of the world who came forward to help us. It is gratifying that almost all the Muslim countries came to our help in our hour of trial and peril. Of the 18 nations that spoke in the General Assembly of the U.N. favouring plebiscite in Kashmir, 11 were Muslim countries who are Members of the Arab League. On that score we are successful. The flag of Islam is rising and unity of the Muslim-world is getting stronger day by day, and the responsibility for consolidating further that unity rests to a great extent on Pakistan because the concept of Pakistan came in the minds of the Muslims in order to strengthen the unity of the Muslim-world and further the honour of the flag of Islam. I hope the authority in power will keep it in mind. In view of the statement

[Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury]  
of the Foreign Minister, the 4th of November resolution was a satisfactory one. I thank all the big powers who passed that 'satisfactory' resolution.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Hasan A. Shaikh:** What about Jordan ?

**Mr. A. K. M. Fazlul Quader Chowdhury:** Of course, all members of the Arab world. I am sorry Jordan was not happy over the resolution.

**Mr. Nurul Amin** (Leader of the Opposition) : I understand, Sir, that there are some other Members of the Government Party whom the House may like to hear. Let the list be exhausted.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any other Member from the Government Party who wants to speak ?

*(Some Members rose in their seats)*

**Mr. Speaker:** In that case we will have to hold a session in the evening also, if it is agreed.

**Mr. Nurul Amin:** There is indiscipline in the Government Party, and you are also not enforcing your right and authority, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I asked the House.

**Mr. Nurul Amin:** It is not for the House, it is for you to decide as to who will speak and who will not. If you go on vacillating, if you go on revising decisions then there will be no finality in the decision.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not revising my decision. I understand the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House came to an agreed settlement as to who will be speaking and I followed the list as far as practicable and then now as there are other Government Members who are ready to speak, you cannot say anything to them but it is the Leader of the House who can say.

I now call upon you (Leader of the Opposition) to speak.

**Mr. Nurul Amin:** Agreements now-a-days are more honoured in their breach; there was an agreement but what has happened to that ?

**Mr. Speaker:** I call upon you to speak.

**Mr. Nurul Amin:** I want to know from you, Sir, whether any other Member from the Government side will be allowed to speak after me ?

**Mr. Speaker:** No. I am not going to allow them.

**Mr. Nurul Amin:** Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the motion that is before this House for discussion embraces a vast subject. It will take hours and hours, days and days to touch even the fringe of the various angles and the point that have been attracted by this all-embracing motion, now before the House. It takes us back to the history of Indo-Pakistan sub-continent beyond thousand years. It takes us back to our relations amongst various people residing in the sub-continent of India before we achieved independence. It also does not rule out the consideration of our relationship with our neighbours, with our friends and our future policy with regard to our relationship with the world outside. It also concentrates our attention to

what has appeared and come to the surface as a whole in the 17 days of undeclared war between India and Pakistan on account of this cowardly aggression by India on the soil of Pakistan. But as the time at my disposal is very limited, I shall make a passing reference to certain matters and may devote more time to some other points which I may, in my humble opinion, consider to be important from the point of view of the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the aggression, the cowardly aggression by India on the soil of Pakistan is not a crime against an individual or a group of individuals, not against the particular Government but it is a diabolical crime against a nation. It reveals the psychology of Indian leadership which they were entertaining not only since the partition, since the emergence of this great country of Pakistan but from the very day when the Muslims were trying to wrest their just rights from the unwilling hands of the then Government or foreign rulers, which were under the influence of the majority community, the Hindus, in India. If we take into consideration the history of the struggle between Hindus or Muslims and the leaders of the two great organizations, I mean the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, for the independence of the sub-continent, we will find that the Congress leadership, which was also under the influence of the Hindu psychology was always trying to evade very reasonable solution which was offered on the side of the Muslim leadership. I do not like to dilate upon the 14 points that were offered by Mr. Jinnah, laterly Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the Founder of the Nation; I do not like to discuss the Lucknow Pact between the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, which was, in fact, much less than what Muslims demanded later on, and the Congress had to yield to the partition of India. They thought that the Muslims could always be befooled, the Muslims were a weak nation; they were disorganized; they would not be able to put up their demands unitedly and they could not have one leadership. Therefore, it was their policy to put them off on this or that excuse and deny them their just and legitimate rights which they were demanding. Now, Sir, it is a matter of history that if the Indian Congress at that time had agreed to the 14 points of Mr. Jinnah or to the Lucknow Pact, perhaps the Pakistan movement would have been much deferred, might have been taken to the next century but in their shortsightedness they followed a mean policy and they wanted to deprive us of our just rights and the result is now before us. India resisted the just demand of Pakistan tooth and nail, supported by our erstwhile rulers, the British, who also were enamoured of the slogan of one India because it was of their own making. India, which was consolidated from Khaiber Pass to Cape Comorin was due to the British rule. They had a sort of love and affection for one India. So, the line of thinking of those who could give us independence, namely, the British Rulers and those who were thwarting our efforts, namely, the Congress headed by Mahatma Gandhi coincided, *i.e.*, one undivided India. The indivisibility of India was as much dear to Mahatma Gandhi as perhaps it was to the British Rulers. They thought that it was not possible—it was not practicable. It took years and years, various arguments, numerous sittings, talks and conversations to convince the British that Pakistan was a practicable proposition. They thought that it was economically impracticable on account of interception of territory which was not friendly to Pakistan by a thousand miles as the two wings of Pakistan were lying far distant from each other. It was, therefore, a political impractic-

[Mr. Nurul Amin]

ability. These were the arguments that were put forward by political Pandits both in foreign countries and in India but it was the determination of a hundred million Muslims of undivided India, it was the force of will, it was the unity and it was the great leadership of Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah that made it practicable. Those who considered the idea of Pakistan to be a whim or a dream of somebody, realised within a time shorter than anybody else could imagine that it proved to be a fact. It is this nation that now stands face to face again in confrontation with India.

Now, Sir, it must be remembered that the emergence of Pakistan and emergence of India as two independent nations was a matter of agreement between the Indian leadership and Muslim leadership. It was not achieved by armed conflict by conquering one by the other, by suppressing one nation by the other, but it was an agreed solution. What was the agreement that was arrived at between the then leaders of the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League? The agreement was that for the best interests of both the countries, that for the best interests of the teeming millions of the people and that for the best interests of the minorities living in the two countries the best solution is that we part with each other. We make a division of India and we try to live as friendly countries as possible as we can and try without entangling ourselves in warfare; to develop and improve the standard of living of the teeming millions who were exploited for centuries by Imperialists. That was the idea with which the agreement was arrived at between the two leaderships. At that time nobody knew that either of the party had any reservation in its mind with regard to that agreement. Of course, Partition had some unpleasant memory in its trial which could not be avoided, but so far as the leadership is concerned, it was a matter of satisfaction to both the parties as the Partition was an act of agreement between the parties. It was not thrust upon by a third party. Now, Sir, it appears that since the Partition—since Pakistan emerged as an independent and sovereign nation—signs of psychological change in the Indian leadership were visible. They were visible even before because when the Cabinet Mission came with a proposal for giving some sort of consolation to the advocates of Pakistan and giving full satisfaction to those who were against the vivisection of India the Congress in the first instance accepted the Cabinet Mission proposals. The Muslim League also accepted it unreservedly. But since the Muslim League accepted it, Pandit Nehru came out with a statement that he would deal with the matter in any way he liked because he would have the majority in the Constituent Assembly and he would not be bound by the solemn assurances given by the Cabinet Mission to the Muslim League which induced the latter to join in that scheme. Since that was issued, as you know, Sir, the Muslim League was forced to reject that proposal. Quaid-i-Azam said that he could not surrender to the "brute majority" of the Congress. This was a wrong decision of Nehru. That was due to a peculiar mentality which is still hovering over India. It was mentioned by no less a person than the right hand man of Pandit Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in his book 'India wins freedom'. He has characterised it as an act of folly, and of indiscretion on the part of Pandit Nehru to make that statement and to force the Muslim League to reject that proposal and to force the partition of India. We are not responsible for the partition of India.

It is the Congress leaders who are responsible for the partition of India and as a result of their own policy they now find that another nation has grown side by side with them. They are trying to undo that nation. It is that psychology which we find in every negotiation, in every agreement, in every commitment and in every assurance that is made by India. India makes these agreements and gives the assurance in one moment and the next moment she tries to find out some sort of excuse to resile and to go out of that agreement. This is the mentality that is pervading the entire history of the dispute between India and Pakistan. This is the mentality that is responsible for the present situation in which both India and Pakistan are placed. Now, Sir, the invasion of India on the 6th of September on the sacred soil of Pakistan has been condemned by all nations of the world. It must be condemned because if there is any sense of morality still left, if there is any justice in the world, nobody can support an act of aggression by a nation on another neighbour, an innocent neighbour which does not desire aggression at all. By the grace of Allah our boys, our Armed Forces have given a befitting reply to that aggression. They have pushed them back. They have repelled the aggression successfully and "Insha Allah" they will do so in future if and when such an aggression comes from India.

This 17-day war has given us some insight into some of the points which we did not so long discover or could know both internal and external affairs. We have known our strength. We have also known our weaknesses. That is why it is said that good comes out of evil. Many good things have come out of this evil. By evil design of India we have been benefited in many ways. Where does our strength lie? Our strength lies in the fact that we have once again proved and demonstrated not only to ourselves, not only to India but to the world as a whole that Pakistan cannot be ignored by any country. Whatever might be the might of any country, whatever might be the evil design of any nation, whatever might be the resources and manpower, the will of Pakistanis is sufficient to repel all these evil designs. That is a proved fact now. It is not only our Armed Forces that have won the war in the battle-fields but it is the 100 million citizens of Pakistan who unitedly stood like a rock against the Indian aggression. Our Armed Forces were backed by the entire nation. There could be no two opinion about that. This is a good thing that has come out of this war. We have come to know what our nation is. It was demonstrated once in the prepartition days; it was demonstrated before and after the partition in forties that the nation can stand as one solid man like a rock. It has again been demonstrated in 1965 that it can stand in the hour of our need. It is also demonstrated that our Army is a national Army in the true sense of the term. There is no difference between Punjabis, Pathans, Sindhis, Baluchis and Bengalis. They stood like one man. They forgot about their provincial colour. They forgot about their provincial needs and requirements. They subdued all their demands, all their grievances to the greater call of the nation and they fought the 17-day war. We had no occasion to judge for ourselves and to show to others that ours is a National Army because we did not have such an occasion before. India has provided that occasion and we are thankful to India that we have just tested our boys and we are now proud of them that they stand as a National Army and can defend our frontiers and we can safely rely for our security on our Armed Forces. Now, Sir, it has also, as I have said,

[Mr. Nurul Amin]

demonstrated the unity amongst the people, unity for the great cause, unity for the preservation of our sovereignty, for our security, for maintaining our borders. We have no expansionist design. We fight in self-defence. It is a natural right, a birth-right of everyone to fight in self-defence. It is allowed in individual case; it is allowed in the case of a nation also and we are fighting in self-defence and I can tell you that the zeal with which an Army and people can fight for self-defence is much more greater than the Army which fights for lust of power, for lust of expansion of the territory and that is a trump card with us because we have no sordid design to encroach upon anybody else's land; that we fight for a just cause, we fight for righteousness. That is our safeguard and we hope by the grace of Allah justice will always take us to victory to victory, to glory to glory. Now that the people are united, it is for the Government of the day to take advantage of the situation and to think out as to how this enthusiasm, this unity can be maintained for all times to come. The unity that was achieved in the wake of independence between 1940 and 1948 waned away. The unity which has been achieved today may also wane away in course of time. It is for the Government of the day to think over the matter and to find out some means, some solution as to how to take advantage of the situation and to make this unity a permanent incidence for all times to come so that nothing can deviate the nation from the right course. It is for the Government of the day to take the people into confidence in the real sense of the term. They should not be complacent by seeing what is happening on the surface. They should think over the matter, find out how far the people and the Government can be welded in thought and action which will strengthen the Government; and at a time when such unity of thought and action is necessary, it is an enlightened leadership only that can unite the nation on political plane.

Now, Sir, I am sorry to find that while the President is trying to have the unity in the country which is necessary—the backing of the people which is again necessary—the advice he receives is not always healthy. Already the House which he built in his dream to be invincible seems to have shown the signs of cracks. It is in the very nature of the system. It is not a good augury. So, Sir, I also draw the attention of the President to this side of the question which has come up before this House, which I have noticed with regret. It may be that some system was introduced, something was put in some way, but it will not be a sin to have a re-thinking on that. To err is human; but to rectify is wisdom. (Hear, hear).

Sir, I would now take you to the other question. This war has also shown that there is no difference between martial and non-martial race. This theory which was invented by some interested quarters should be thrown to the wind, and we should go on recruiting army from all areas of the country, so that there may be pan admixture of an army, and give a national character to that army. That should be taken into consideration.

Another factor that has come to light is this; that we were deficient in many respects. It is quite natural. I do not want to hold any *post mortem* on what has happened in the past, who was responsible, what were our defects and what were our deficiencies. It is for the future historians to apportion the blame and the praise to particular persons or

group of persons ; but for me I shall be satisfied if the realization is there in the proper quarter that there was some drawback in us which has got to be immediately mended. I was heartened to listen to the speech delivered by the Defence Adviser the other day, that we are trying to pool all our resources to make our defence requirements self-sufficient. That is the policy which must be followed with as much quickness and honesty as possible. We must not be dependent either on one particular country or a group of countries for ourselves. Of course, it will be necessary for us to take help from other countries, but primarily we must be self-sufficient in our defence. We must exhaust all our resources to put our defence requirements into proper keel ; and I was glad to know from the Defence Adviser that all arrangement is being made in both the wings for proper action in that direction. No country will respect you, no country will come to give you any help, unless you can show your worth, unless you can show that you have got also your potential for that. That is what we want that the country should build now.

Now, Sir, with regard to the other point that was raised by the Defence Adviser, that defence must be looked upon as a whole. I agree. I am not an expert, but I agree on principle. But as we are situated poles asunder, although the broad policy of defence must be one, there must be self-sufficiency in each wing of Pakistan. That must be taken into consideration, and must be kept in view in preparing and giving effect to any scheme of future development in that direction.

Sir, I would now come to another point : whether the present state of things, the present state of emergency, should continue. Of course, as we hear the threats coming from India every day from no less a person than the philosopher-President, Dr. Radha Krishnon, that he is also preparing for another round against Pakistan, I shall not advise the Government not to make good and effective preparation to meet that challenge ; but, at the same time, it should not be the policy of the Government that on our part we should try to create a situation for it, and hold ourselves responsible in future. When we have once got a fore-warning from the Government of India that they without any consideration for the universal principles and policy, attack a sovereign country : they may do so whenever they like or in whatever area they choose to do so, whether it is in the East or West and for that we must be ready. I have no doubt in my mind that whatever may be the high-sounding words used by India, by the Grace of Allah we have got such mettle in us that we shall be able to repel the future attack or aggression with better and far more success than before. But a war for India is certainly ruinous to its vast majority of the population. She is trying to hide the facts as to what has happened during the 17 days of war, but foreign correspondents have given an impartial account of what happened during the 17 days of war. It has been admitted in all the countries that Pakistani Army is much superior than the Indian Army. It has been seen by the people that the Pakistani Army has fought one against six and the Indians could not advance an inch and they were kept where the Pakistani Army wanted them to be. This fact also proves that those who backed the Indians in order that they may be of any help to them in future hostilities with some big country have been disillusioned. I think, they should also reassess their estimate about India ; whether it was in the year 1962 against a bigger army or it was in the year 1965 against a smaller army, the fate of the Indian army was the same. It will not be

[Mr. Nurul Amin]

expedient for any country to depend on India for containing any big power ; it is putting up paper wall. They should reassess and rethink the policy. Pakistan in this area has got a very important position not only by its geographical situation but also on account of its highly superior army and for the determination of the people with their high moral sense always standing for justice and fairness supporting the right cause not only in Kashmir but everywhere all over the world ; that is a country which is far more dependable and will be useful at the time of need than a country which looks a vast one, has much larger population, but has not got any potential strength in itself ; that is a fact to be realized by those who are entirely dependent on India.

Now, Sir, it will be another matter to think whether there can be at any time friendship between India and Pakistan. There is a school of thought who thinks that judging by their past performance friendship with India is to be ruled out. They think ; there is no possibility of any friendship between India and Pakistan ; but as an old man, I still hope that we should go on placing before them reasons, and arguments, so that at some time or the other their sense of reasoning may respond to us ; their conscience may be pricked, though some think that it is hoping against hope. India does not belong to Shastri, Chavan and Nanda only ; India also belongs to people like Raja Gopal Achari, Jai Prakash Narayan, Shri Parkash, Mr. Numjudripad and Miss Mridula Sarabai. There is a section of people in India who feel that Indian policy with regard to Kashmir is wrong ; that India is resiling from her international commitments. They are finding fault with the policy of the present Government. I have no doubt in my mind that the days are not far distant when these forces will come up and will subdue the coterie which is now in power. So, when I speak of re-conciliation I have an eye on those who think in that line, who have already seen reasons, who are also thinking in our line. Let us try to win their friendship. So, my appeal to the people of India who are the worst sufferers in this war, is that they should rise against the present Government and force them to take their hands off from further war-mongering which is bringing serious miseries to India ; the people are starving ; they are depending on American wheat aid ; they cannot be self-sufficient in food in any foreseeable future. So, they should try to raise their heads and see that the leadership sees reason. It is not that I make this speech owing to any weakness in our stand but peace in this area is the uppermost consideration in my mind. The peace in the world is the goal of Pakistan. We must try and exhaust all the probable avenues for reaching that goal. We are ready as before and we shall not be lacking in defending ourselves and giving effective reply to any attack that India may plan. Now, Sir, it is difficult because negotiating with India is to pick up mercury with fork they are vacillating always. You cannot catch them anywhere but still go on trying and expose them as much as you can before the world.

Now coming to our relationship with our friendly countries I would refer to the relationship we have with the United States of America and the United Kingdom. So far as Pakistan is concerned, it has not in any way shown any sign of slackness in continuing that relationship. There has been some misunderstanding and that has got to be examined. Who is responsible for that misunderstanding, and who has let down

whom. We were friends ; we are friends. America is a great country which has got a vast influence on India. It seems she is a bit more inclined towards India. What is the reason for that ? So far as Pakistan is concerned, Pakistan has not budget an inch from the cordial and friendly relationship which it had with America since 1953 or 1954. It was rather increased and grew deeper and deeper. Pakistan entered into several Pacts in which America was interested like Baghdad Pact, which was later on known as CENTO Pact, and the SEATO. Pakistan was a member of all these Pacts and it was done with the collaboration of America. What was the purpose of entering into these Pacts and these Treaties ? Was it for enjoying a club life or to have a cup of tea there or to play tennis or to have something more ? There must be some understanding, some agreement. What was that understanding and agreement ? Are we not in a position to examine whether those agreements and understandings, whether those assurances have been honoured by both the parties ? If Pakistan has failed in that, Pakistan will be held responsible for that. If America has not fulfilled those assurances, America should search her heart again and find the solution. Sir, the bigger nations must create confidence in smaller nations. How can they create that confidence in smaller nations unless they fulfil the assurances given solemnly to the smaller nations. That is the principle which must be kept in view when the talks between the countries go on.

The United Nations Organisation which was created for the sake of keeping peace in the world ; in the United Nations Organisation in which the membership is now 117 of which barring about 10 or 12 countries, all can be classed as smaller nations, small countries. These countries have got to be given full assurances and the confidence has got to be created in these small countries by the big nations that whatever assurances whatever commitments, whatever agreements are entered into by these big nations will be honoured and fulfilled. If that is so, the smaller nations will certainly have respect and regard for the bigger nations. There is no other way to keep these smaller nations with the big nations. Well, if any power thinks that Pakistan can be taken for granted, they are sadly mistaken. Pakistan will go by its own interest and if she finds that her interest is jeopardised, that her sovereignty, her security is in any way jeopardised, she will not hesitate to come out of that position or Pact. That is the criterion. Barring that, any other reasonable talk they are prepared to have with any country for their mutual interest. The more the big nations will show their resilement from the commitments, the less will be confidence of the smaller nation in them. They will think thrice before they contract any friendship with these nations. So I would suggest that this point of view has got to be taken into consideration by the big nations. America, no doubt, is a big nation. U.S.S.R, is another big nation. Their responsibility is much more than any other country to keep and maintain peace in the world. If peace is broken in any part of the globe, it will be they who will be responsible for the dire consequences because of the mishandling of the situation. It will be the Big Powers who will be responsible and not small ones because they have neither the resources nor the intention to create any trouble to break peace either at home or abroad.

Now, Sir, I may remind this House that when Pakistan entered into the Baghdad Pact in 1953, Pandit Nehru said that this entry of Pakistan into the Baghdad Pact had brought cold war nearer to India's borders

[Mr. Nurul Amin]

and Pakistan did it as an ally of America. Then again in 1954 he said that it is a step not only towards war, even world war, but one that will bring the war right up to the Indian doors. That is what Pandit Nehru said. Since then Pandit Nehru and Indian leadership was thinking as to how they can put a wedge between America and Pakistan. Her policy of neutrality, co-existence, her friendship with China, although at that time the Bandung Conference was held all this was merely an eye-wash and in her heart of hearts she was thinking of courting American friendship. Failing in all their methods, of cajoling and chicanery, they raised a bogey that China was attacking them. Pandit Nehru, as a shrewd politician, knew that that would be the right medicine for America which will have effect because the Americans are very allergic to China and it produced the desired results. As soon as that was done, without consulting Pakistan, they began to supply massive arms to India. They did it in spite of protests by Pakistan. It was always said on behalf of America that these arms will not be used against Pakistan and they stood almost surety that these arms would not be used against Pakistan. On behalf of Pakistan the protest was always there and it was pointed out to them that this China bogey is only for the purpose of making themselves strong, not to fight China, but Pakistan, because India is not in a position to fight China, India cannot fight China and India will not fight China. That is a fact which our friends, the Americans, could not understand. That is why it is said that without understanding the full implications they were backing the wrong horse. Their purpose would not be served because even if the arms were supplied the Indian soldiers were not equal to that. They cannot stop China from any attack even if they want to do so. I do not think that China will ever attack India. But if it is argued that China may, at some future time, attack India and extend its sphere of activities in that area, well, it is not India which will be able to prevent her. They have not got the proper mettle in them. Their army has proved incompetent not only to fight against China but against a much smaller army of Pakistan. So from that point of view I do not believe that India can be a bulwark against China. But if that be the argument of our friend, America, even then Pakistan is an important factor. India alone is not in any way competent to serve the purpose.

Now, Sir, in 1956 the State Department of the USA made this public statement with regard to the Baghdad Pact, now CENTO :

“The United States affirms its support for the collective efforts of these (i.e., Baghdad Pact) nations to maintain their independence. A threat to the territorial integrity or political independence of the Members would be viewed by the United States with the utmost gravity.”

That is a public statement made by the State Department of the United States on 27th November, 1956.

Then again in November 1957 Mr. Feroz Khan Noon, who was Pakistan's Foreign Minister at that time, after having a long talk with the Secretary of State of the USA, Mr. John Foster Dulles, issued this statement in Washington in the press under the very nose of the Government and was not contradicted. It said :

“I had a full and satisfactory discussion with the Secretary of State, Dulles, with respect to various matters of mutual concern. Among other things I raised with Secretary Dulles the

question of assistance which Pakistan could expect from the United States in the event it was the subject of armed aggression. Secretary Dulles referred to the relations of the United States with Pakistan under SEATO, the joint Resolution on the Middle East and association of the United States pursuant thereto with the Middle East Baghdad Pact countries and obligation of the United Nations. He left me in no doubt that the United States would promptly and effectively come to the assistance of Pakistan if we are subjected to armed aggression which, however, the United States did not anticipate."

This was a solemn assurance given by the USA. Thereafter, Sir, in 1959, there was a bilateral agreement between USA and Pakistan. These are public documents. I do not know how many private assurances have been given :

"In case of aggression against Pakistan the Government of USA, in accordance with the Constitution of the USA, will take such appropriate action including the use of armed force as may be mutually agreed upon and as is envisaged in the Joint Resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East in order to assist the Government of Pakistan at its request."

Thereafter, Sir, in 1961, a joint communique was issued by the two Governments, which is known as the Ayub-Kennedy Joint Communique, dated the 13th July, 1961, which says :

"The Government of the United States records as vital to its national interest and to world peace the preservation of independence and integrity of Pakistan. The U. S. A. and Pakistan also re-affirm the value of existing collective security arrangements as an instrument for defence against aggression."

The present Ambassador of USA, Mr. Walter P. McConaughy, issued a statement on the 19th November, 1962, in a press conference. He said :

"The United States in turn has assured the Pakistan Government that if this assistance, namely, the United States military aid to India should be misused or misdirected against another country in aggression, the United States would undertake immediately, in accordance with constitutional authority, appropriate action, both within and without the United Nations to thwart such aggression by India."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, these are the public assurances and commitments made by the United States Government. I only refer to these things not to accuse the Government of the United States of America but to remind them of what commitments they made to Pakistan and how far they have fulfilled those commitments. It is for them to judge. It is for them to examine and analyse how far this has been fulfilled during this 17 days war between India and Pakistan. We naturally expected that America would come to our help, that America would stop arms supply to India, that America would put other pressure on India to stop this aggression, which was uncalled for, which was condemned by all the nations of the world. But whether they did so or not, it is for them to consider.

[Mr. Nurul Amin]

Now, Sir, it may be said that so far as the United Nations is concerned, the Americans have successfully tried to pass a cease-fire resolution, but under the agreements referred to they are also bound to do whatever lay in their power both within the United Nations Organization and outside. Nothing has been done so far as outside influence is concerned. Something might have been done within the United Nations, within the Security Council, but whether that is satisfactory or not, whether that is capable of different interpretations by different persons, by different countries, by the countries concerned, by the parties concerned, that is to be seen in future. If they really mean, that the cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces are inter-linked with the solution of Kashmir affairs, that is well and good. But if they have also some reservation in their mind, that cease-fire withdrawal of armed forces from the border and the political solution of Kashmir are different matters, and should be tackled on different planes, I think it may not be fair on the part of Pakistan to act upon that because we stand by the commitment which we made to the Kashmiris. It is not only our commitment, it was India's commitment; the world knows how many times they have committed that they will grant them the right of self-determination. I don't want to recapitulate it. All the archives of the United Nations' Office are full with the record of the negotiations between India and Pakistan and the measures that were taken by the United Nations to come to a solution. But it seems to me strange that the United States, if they mean business, cannot bring India to senses and to see reason and to come to a conference table and arrive at a solution on this point. Everybody must know that Kashmir problem is such that we cannot abandon it at any time. Under no circumstances, Pakistan can let down the Kashmiris; Pakistan cannot do that. Their interest is bound with our interest. We do not want Kashmir. We are not claimant of Kashmir. We are simply advocates of Kashmir. We want to secure that right of self-determination for them. We do not want that the vote should be cast in favour of Pakistan. We want that the world organisation should see that the Kashmiris have a right to vote freely. Let them vote in favour of Pakistan, in favour of India, or in their own favour. I will not mind it. But our duty will be finished if we find that a situation has been created in which the Kashmiris have been able to exercise their vote for self-determination freely and fairly. That is what we want.

Now, Sir, it has been proved by the blood of our martyrs how near and dear this Kashmir question is to our heart. But for the Kashmir question, our young men would not have given their blood in Sialkot, in Lahore and on other fronts. So, if even then the magnitude of this question is not realized by the world organization, I do not know when they will realise it. If the atrocities committed on the unarmed people of Kashmir do not shock the conscience of the world, I don't know what other thing will shock their conscience. Has the world become conscienceless or have they got any conscience left? If so, they have got to come to the rescue of the Kashmiris.

Sir, with regard to the United Nations, I submit that it is not doing its duty. I shall not dilate upon that. I shall only reproduce a few lines from the speech of a freedom fighter, a President of a small country, like Ireland, de-Valera, who was presiding over the session of the League of Nations in the year 1932. I believe that what he said can

be used word for word by any President of the Security Council at the present moment by replacing the League of Nations with the United Nations. He said that—

“Both friends and enemies of the League feel that the testing times has come. They are watching to see if that test would reveal a weakness presaging ultimate dissolution or a strength that would be assurance of a renewal of vigour and growth. There were on all sides complaint, criticism and suspicion. People are complaining that the League is devoting its activities to matters of secondary or minor importance while vital international problems which touch the very existence of the peoples are being shelved, postponed or ignored. That quality of status did not apply in the things that mattered and that the smaller states, while being given a voice, had little real influence in the final determination of the League's action. Out beyond these walls there is the public opinion of the world and if the League is to prosper or even to survive, it must obtain the support and confidence of that public opinion. In the final analysis, the League has no sanctions but the force of World opinion.”

These words can apply at the present moment equally even after the lapse of 25 years and I would point out that if the United Nations stands for the cohesion of all the forces of all the Members, it must do justice to the smaller nations when justice is called for. It should not be used as a ground for collusion of a few but as one for coalition of all. Next, Sir, I am coming to the end of my speech.

While it has been noticed that there is a change of attitude and realization in the mind of the big powers—the United States, the U.S.S.R., France, the U.K., who it seems mean business, I have a great hope that if all these powers try to bring about a solution of Kashmir problem, it will be possible for them to do that. It will be inexpedient and lack of foresight on their part to keep this couldren bubbling and this volcano in Kashmir, to keep this time-bomb set on there, which may at any time burst and not only bring this area of the world into conflict and cause breach of peace but it may create conflagration which may engulf the entire globe. This they have got to take into consideration because the Pakistanis have stood by the Kashmiris not by word of mouth but by the blood of their sons. There is a feeling that our big friends—the Americans—are annoyed with us because we are friendly with our next door neighbour, China. China is a big power, it cannot be ignored. We are a small nation, we have got to have friendship with all our neighbours. We are trying to have friendship with India, so what is the harm if we have friendship with China. That does not mean that we are going from one camp to the other. We do not belong to any camp; we belong neither to West nor do we intend to go to the East. We belong to our own camp. We follow our own independent policy. That must be clearly understood. When we make friends with our neighbours, with Big Powers, we do it in the hope that in times of need they will come to our help for our economic development, for our existence, for every way that we need them, because a friend in need is a friend indeed. China has got to be recognized in this area. She is powerful and a time will come when the United States of America and China will sit on the same

[Mr. Nurul Amin]

table in the Security Council, in the United Nations Organization and it is in the interest of the world peace that she should be admitted into that organization. She should not be allowed to be out of that organization. So, Sir, with these words, I conclude my speech and I would say that we must follow a policy which will create more friendship with our old friends and also create new friendship with others. Thank you.

**A Member :** Very good.

**Mr. Speaker :** I call upon the Leader of the House to speak.

**Mr. Mohd. N. A. Lashkar :** No break.

**A Member :** No need for tea.

**Mr. Abdus Sobur Khan (Leader of the House) :** Sir, before I start to address the august House I have got a message from the Commander-in-Chief of the Army to convey to all Members, irrespective of their party affiliation and irrespective of their location in this House, that for the words of praise and tributes that have been paid to them during the last 3 days' debate, he, on behalf of the Armed Forces, feels overwhelmed and he acknowledges it with extreme gratitude. He also wants to inform us that they did not perform any miracle; they only did what their sense of duty prompted and he assures that you will find the Armed Forces performing their duty in future whenever a situation demands. Sir, in the resolution which was moved by me here on the floor of the House, there was no mention about the gallant defence put up by the people of Sialkot, Lahore, Rajasthan and civilian population which were bombed in Sargodha, Peshawar, Kohat, Rangpur, Thakurgaon, Chittagong, Dacca, Lalmonirhat and Jessore but, Sir, I did not include it in that part of the Resolution because of the fact that these areas are well represented by their chosen representatives and it is beyond any shadow of doubt that the high morale and the spirit of sacrifice that have been demonstrated by these people will inspire the rest of the nation, whenever any such exigency arises. Sir, a doubt has been expressed in many quarters and I have got reason to believe that there are some reasons too to suppose or to apprehend if America or the C.I.A. had any direct hand into the armed conflict with India. Sir, this doubt has been voiced from many responsible quarters inside the country and from abroad. But, Sir, with fullest responsibility I can say, as I have personally been in the States myself, I have tasted their hospitality, I have mixed with a cross-section of their public opinion and I know the press in the United States which probably is all powerful and the extent of civil liberty enjoyed by the people of America and in view of all that it cannot be possible for America to be responsible for any direct armed clash with India, because the people and press of America would not have liked that. Because in both the countries where America has got a tremendous amount of say, it is not correct and proper to say that America was directly responsible for this armed conflict between India and Pakistan. But, Sir, one thing I want you to remember and that is that soon after the border conflicts which took place between China and India, with a view to containing China, both America and USSR started to arm India to the teeth. Both our friends with whom we have had defensive alliances, and the USSR thought it necessary to supply massive arms to India. It was

said that in order to stop Chinese expansionism, it is necessary that the second largest world population should be armed and equipped to contain China. Sir, our President at that time very clearly and in a very unmistakable language pronounced that India is not capable of fighting against China and particularly China has got no expansionist design in India. These massive arms which have created imbalance in this part of the sub-continent will one day be used against all her neighbours, particularly, against Pakistan. What President spoke in 1962 of the tragedy and irony of fate has come true literally, morally and physically in 1965. At that time our friends and these powers did not realise that the neighbours of India, particularly Pakistan, were apprehensive about this arms aid—massive arms aid to India.

We have followed a persistent policy of cultivating friendly relations with our immediate neighbours Burma, Nepal, Ceylon and with all these countries we have got at the moment the best of friendly relations and despite our sincere efforts we have not been able to cultivate friendly relations with India. What was the difficulty? If Burma could settle her border difficulty with China around a table, if Nepal could resolve all their border troubles or problems around and if Pakistan could also create an understanding, so far as the border demarcation with China is concerned, amicably around a table, what was the reason that India failed to do so. The bogey of expansionism of China does not hold good because last year I myself had been to Peking. I had a talk with one of the greatest leaders of China and deliberately I do not mention his name. I asked him, "How is it that when you reached up to the outskirts of Tezpur and when you were in a very convenient position to take possession of entire Assam with all its oil-fields, suddenly you returned back to your line of control"? What was the reason? The reason was, he said, that despite the best mobile units that we had got in that region, we tried our level best to stop the fleeing Indian army. With our best mobile units we could not contain them. We could not fire on them. He said, "If there is no enemy within the sight we cannot waste bullets by firing into the area and naturally we had to come back into our own line of control." We did not want to occupy any territory of India, he added. It is never our intention to occupy any portion of India at all. In the same context, he told me that they are at the moment busy in arranging food and clothing for the seven hundred million people and what would they do with a country with 450 million people who are now completely at the verge of starvation, famine and ruination. Who will be going to take additional responsibility of clothing and fooding for these 450 million people. So, they had to go back to their own line of control.

Sir, it is very clearly stated that China is after following a policy of expansionism. If it be to enlarge one sphere of things, I have got nothing to say. If it is stated that they are anxious to enlarge the sphere of commercial activities, may I ask: is there any large country in the globe which is not anxious to increase its sphere of commercial activities? Today particularly Pakistan is anxious to establish its commercial relations with almost all the countries irrespective of the East or of the West. There has been a plenty of misunderstanding about genuine intention of China and there has been a gross misrepresentation about the intentions of China excepting South Korea. Just I wonder if they can find out a single instance in Laos or even in Viet-Nam. We have seen not a single Chinese has been captured. It is true that

[Mr. Abdus Sobur Khan]

Chinese machineries—Chinese armaments—have been used. It is true but it does not hold good. During the struggle between Pakistan and India, India used American armaments. India used Russian armaments. Can they deny it that the armaments which were given to them for defending against Chinese attack were used against Pakistan? America completely equipped six Mountain Divisions to contain China and the Mountain Divisions were deployed against Pakistan Army on the Western Front.

**Members:** Shame, shame.

**Mr. Abdus Sobur Khan:** May I ask if this policy is not of expansionism? Then who can escape this blame when arms supplied by America and Russia were used against Pakistan during the fateful period of those seventeen days. Sir, we know and the world at large knows that India is not capable of containing China. I asked the same friend of mine in Peking, "You handed over the war prisoners, but how is it that you handed back the armaments that you seized from fleeing Indian army completely oiled and greased." The reply came from my friend who is one of the top-notchers in China that after their troops returned back to the line of control they found that the armaments and equipments used by India were quite different. They did not know how to maintain. So, before handing them back, they gave some job to their boys and that was to oil and grease it. And along with war prisoners they handed back those armaments because they did not require them.

Sir, it is true, and, recently—call it a battle of yak or whatever it might be—an ultimatum which was given by China served the purpose in so far as, before the period expired, India had removed those fifty-eight barracks without a single fire being shot. It has often been alleged that China was in collusion with Pakistan. Sir, may I ask from this august House a question. Today a cease-fire exists. Of course, hostility also exists. Then a cease-fire in terms of the United Nations between Pakistan and India also exists. Intermittent firing and surreptitious attempts to infiltrate into our own territory are still going on. But you have noticed that even yesterday the border clashes occurred in Sikkim border between India and China. They will never deliberately come to an understanding with China to keep this sub-continent in a state of peace and stability because they continue to have these border skirmishes only to make the Western powers jittery so that they pour in more money, more economic aid and more military hardware to bolster up the ruined and shattered economy of India. Sir, America is regarded to be a bastion of anti-Communism. They are supposed to be Mecca of anti-Communism. China is a big nation and a powerful nation. Pakistan being a smaller nation, we cannot afford to have any quarrel with a big power like China and when our friendship is more fruitful, more enjoyable, is there any sense why we can make China hostile to us now. Anti-Communist America is rushing arms aid to India. American supersonic jets are being matched with MIGs supplied by U.S.S.R. In India the ground-to-air missiles of U.S.S.R. are being matched by mountain guns supplied by the United States of America. Sir, for the settlement of our border dispute with China, according to American press, we are accused of flirting with China. May I ask, by spending a couple of years in honeymooning with U.S.S.R., how far India has been

able to maintain her verginity. Sir, it is a question I ask of the American people through their leaders. They have got to think about it because we do not understand what harm we have done. What is the reason of straining our relations with India? Our friendship with China has not brought about any change in the social structure which we had and it has not brought in the so-called communist infiltration or invasion into this country. We are maintaining our ideology, our own fiscal policy, but there has been a deliberate attempt to mislead and influence the American public opinion and their leaders, too, to do injustice to us. I think in cooler moments, the American people and their leaders will think that this misunderstanding has been created not because of any fault on our side but because probably they want this misunderstanding to be created. They feel that India is a very big State and to contain China India is a must. The same thing is thought of by U.S.S.R. Unfortunately both belonging to the socialist world are divided today. It is not my intention to poke my nose into the domestic affairs of any other country. But the point is that both the countries equally love India because both of them want to contain China and they believe that India can contain China. But the fact is that India is not capable of containing China, if we are ever confronted with that hard reality.

Sir, very recently it has been announced that America has stopped economic and military aid both to Pakistan and to India. Very well. Probably it is one of the wisest decisions and wisdom is their exclusive monopoly. But may I ask: by stopping military and economic aid who is going to be harmed in a much more worse manner. All the armaments and all the equipment, I have told the other day, we had from only one source of supply and that was the United States of America. Today they have stopped economic aid and military aid to both India and Pakistan. Sir, we are aligned with the United States with SEATO and CENTO and we can seek a moral justification that in the hour of our trial, as has been very efficiently pointed out by my esteemed friend, the Leader of the Opposition, the SEATO and CENTO through which we are aligned with the U.S.A., while India is allegedly non-aligned should have given aid to us. So stoppage of military aid and economic aid has been much more harmful to us than to India. It may be that we are not being able to get any replacement from America, but may I ask them: what prevents India from getting further military assistance and quite a number of squadrons of MIGs and quite a number of air-to-air missiles since the hostility broke, from Russia, from Israel, from Korea? What prevents India from getting this arm supplies from these countries? So, apparently it looks very well that America has decided not to give arms or economic aid to India and Pakistan. But militarily it is more ruinous and more disadvantageous to us. I believe this aspect of the question will also be taken into consideration by both American public and American leaders.

Now, Sir, as has been already mentioned by my President, we are in search of friends, and not masters. Sir, we are not an ungrateful people. The assistance that we have received from the United States, the assistance and economic aid that we have got during the First Five-Year Plan, during the Second Five-Year Plan, and the assistance which we expect from the United States, has been very helpful. Sir, I invite members of the World Bank, I invite the members of the Consortium

[Mr. Abdus Sobur Khan]

countries, to come here and see for themselves if we have been able to utilize every penny that has been given in the shape of aid or credit to our country. So, Sir, I invite them to come and to inspect whether we have abused any of their credits or grants which were made available to us, and we are grateful to them for their assistance. Sir, we are Mussalmans, and we are not ungrateful. We know that in various ways America has been of great assistance to us, and with gratitude we remember that. But, Sir, at the same time, I want to express that we are also, at long last, in the process of establishing friendly relations with Soviet Union also, and we expect that for the fulfilment of the Third Five-Year Plan, the U.S.A., Japan, West Germany, Canada, Australia, the U.K., Eastern and Western Europe will come to our assistance, so that we can carry on with our Third Five-Year Plan; and, at the same time, our peaceful intentions are amply manifested in the friendship that we have been able to establish through R.C.D. amongst Turkey, Iran and Pakistan for our mutual development. Sir, the alliance that we have been able to establish will, with the passage of time, prove to be one of the most beneficial things for the entire region for its economic growth and its material prosperity. At the same time, Sir, I also want to mention that we have received aid from China as well. An interest-free loan which we have received also from the U.K., we have also received loan from China. It is not my intention to plead for China; but I believe the China bogey is so powerful to-day in America that the American public opinion is not allowed to see reason; and we would appreciate that they see reason, and be very clear in their own mind.

Now, Sir, let me characterize about India. Well, India, as you know, had never been a composite whole except under foreign domination. The history before Mogul and Pathan rule shows that it was divided and sub-divided. Only during the Mogul-Pathan rule did it become a composite whole. India can never remain a composite whole, Sir, because of her peculiar social customs and their peculiar behaviour towards the other minority communities, due to which it can never remain together. It is only the foreign power which has kept India together, otherwise India was never a composite whole; it can never be a composite whole. For that reason to-day the Indian Leaders, with the passage of time, are making no secret that they are determined to annul the Partition. But I can tell you, Sir, that the hundred million people of Pakistan will never allow, whatever might be the consequence, to annul the Partition; and if they think that they can convert Pakistan into a satellite of India, they are sadly mistaken. Whatever might be the consequence, every man and woman of Pakistan will face it.

Sir, what is India to-day? It is a vast prison camp. More than sixty thousand people, more than seventy thousand people, are in jails today. People who raise their voice of opposition, their voice is stifled and they are put behind the bars. There is no room for free opinion or public criticism in India. There is no freedom of the press in India, not to speak of the heinous and maltreatment that is being meted out to minorities. Sir, the bankrupt Congress leadership today is only subsisting on the war cry against Pakistan; otherwise hunger and sufferings are rampant there, and industrial growth has been completely stopped, and India is at the verge of ruin. The Congress policy has been found out to be hollow, and only war-mongering and war slogans against

Pakistan are keeping them seated. The Congress leaders think that only by this way they will be in a position to retain power; that by speaking venom and hatred against Pakistan they can remain in power. But I can tell you this much, Sir, that Indian lobby today is very powerful in the western world; but it is not very far off when, like Chiang kai-shek, Shastri, Chavan, Nanda, Choudhri & Co. will be thinking of conquering the mainland of India from. . . (Thumping). That day is not very far off, Sir.

Sir, now let me come back to the position in which we are finding ourselves in Kashmir today. I leave this for my great friend, the Foreign Minister, to mention to you; but, Sir, I would like only to tell that of the four permanent Members of the Security Council, France, of course, has given her support. Sir, I can tell you the barbarity that is being perpetrated on the Muslims in Kashmir. Even the cannibals of New Guinea would blush to see the atrocity, the amount of monstrous atrocity and torture, that is being unleashed on the people of Kashmir. Sir, if you ask about infiltrators, may I ask whether the school and college students, both boys and girls of Srinagar, are also infiltrators? How do they feel like when their young daughters are raped before their fathers and husbands? How do they feel like when the breasts of young girls are cut before their guardians? It is a thing, Sir, which would make the primitive man blush to think about the atrocity and genocide that is being perpetrated in Kashmir. What is the sight today in Kashmir? Sir, streams of people are flowing from there. Their able-bodied men and young girls have been taken away; either they have been burnt alive or they have been killed. The old men and women, catching the hand of their grand-children, grand-daughters and grand-sons, are marching towards Azad Kashmir, probably they are marching towards eternity, in search of shelter, in search of civilization, in search of food, in search of succour.

Sir, I do not want to make out any more points, because I know that the whole House is anxious to hear our esteemed Foreign Minister. I had many other points to say, but I think the rest of the points will be covered by him. I have got only one appeal to make to the nation. Please be prepared to shed more blood, more tears and more sweat; and we know our cause is just; and, "Insha Allah", justice in the end shall prevail.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Foreign Minister will now wind up the debate.

**Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto** (Minister for Foreign Affairs): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to apologize to the House for not being present here yesterday to hear the honourable Members on this important motion. As you know, I have been slightly indisposed, and it is only because of my indisposition that I have been denied the privilege of listening to the Members of the House. At the same time, Sir, I want you to know that through my friend and colleague, Malik Muhammad Qasim, Parliamentary Secretary for Defence, I have been kept in the picture on the various issues raised by the honourable Members of this House.

I would like to express the Government's gratification to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Members of the Opposition for the patriotic, united and steadfast support that they have given to the Government in

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

this gravest national emergency that has faced Pakistan. Their co-operation, sense of understanding, has, indeed, been a source of inspiration to the Government. It is not possible for a few people who compose the Government to face such difficult and Himalayan responsibilities without the combined support of all the people in the country; and by the patriotic stand that the Opposition leaders and Members have taken, they have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the nation stands indivisibly united for meeting this grave emergency that faces our beloved country. The whole nation, Sir, stands united, and there can be no doubt about it; and this, Sir, is our greatest source of comfort and satisfaction. We are pitted against a mighty and powerful neighbour; but because this nation stands firmly united, courageously united, we are able to meet the overwhelming odds that we face bravely and with a sense of confidence and courage.

Sir, this crisis has taught us many lessons. At a time of trial people discover many facets of their individual and collective character. This crisis has shown that the fact of East Pakistan being separated by a thousand miles of alien territory is in no way a deterrent or impediment to the solidarity and unity of Pakistan. This crisis has shown that East and West Pakistan are the two mighty and dynamic pillars of Islam galvanized against the decadent society of India. (Thumping) Our brethren from Bengal, from the distant lands, have stood shoulder to shoulder with the soldiers in the battlefront and in the trenches of the Lahore sector and the Sialkot front. They have fought courageously and honourably to protect the sacred soil of Pakistan. The Pathans have shown their traditional valour; the Baluchs have fought bravely; the desert people of Sind, the Hurs, have held their ramparts in the deserts of Rajasthan and Sind heroically; the refugees who are Pakistanis in every sense of the word have shown their valour and the greatest devotion and love for the country and, above all, Sir, Punjab has shown that it is the sword arm of the sub-continent. The bravery and valour which the people of Lahore and Sialkot demonstrated in this crisis leaves no doubt in any one's mind that these are the people who were capable of fighting and struggling against the combined onslaught of the British and Indian majority community for the creation of Pakistan which was then regarded as an impossible task. No task is impossible for them; every task is capable of achievement.

The Armed Forces of Pakistan to whom glowing tributes have rightly been paid by every Member of this House have also shown that they are amongst the finest fighting material that the world has known. It is not possible for an army to withstand a massive offensive which is launched by an enemy. A very momentous aggression is capable of finding its own objectives. Here the Indian army was held at bay. It was made to stand still in spite of the fact that it had launched a treacherous and massive attack at the nerve centre of Pakistan. This in itself was a great achievement—the fact that Lahore, which is only 15 to 16 miles from the Indian frontiers, was protected and saved from the Indian army. The tributes which the people of Pakistan paid to the Armed Forces of Pakistan were rightly paid. We have known that in the past the capture of important centres had pervading influence on the conduct of war; we have seen how Napoleon who swept across Russia was unable to take Moscow although he went deep, and his army went deep into Russian territory; the fact that he failed to capture Moscow, in spite of the territory his forces had taken, showed that they had been defeated; the fact

that Hitler in the last war in spite of the fact that he penetrated deep into the Soviet territory, was unable to take Moscow showed that he had been defeated. Here is a demonstration of the fact that the Indian army was not capable of achieving the objective of taking Lahore for the fact that it was held at bay—held at its own frontiers. It was a magnificent achievement of the people and the Armed Forces of Pakistan. Our war is a people's war. The Indian may have bigger army; they may overwhelm us in numbers; but they must know that as far as Pakistan is concerned, they will have to fight every man, woman and child of Pakistan; they will have to fight in the streets, in the houses and in the villages of Dacca, Chittagong, Lahore, Kalat, every part of Pakistan, before they can consider themselves victorious; it is just not possible. The Indian war-lords must know that the defeat of Pakistan is impossible. Just as they were unable to prevent the creation of Pakistan, so also it is absolutely impossible for them to think that Pakistan will ever be defeated by the Indian hordes merely because of superior numbers or because they have an army which has been supported from various sources and it is augmented by various countries.

Sir, as I have said, the nation has been united and has stood like steel. We have also received overwhelming support from the world and I underscore 'overwhelming'. It has truly been overwhelming and in contradistinction India stood alone and isolated. This is an admission which the Prime Minister of India made to his own nation. The greatest and most spontaneous support came to Pakistan from the down-trodden, under-privileged and oppressed proletarian nations of Asia and Africa; and this is natural because the pain that we felt is the pain they feel. They know our struggle is a struggle for decolonization, just as their own struggle has been for decolonization. The nations of Asia and Africa know what it means to be oppressed; what it means to be tyrannized; they know how a people must face bravely and courageously, whatever odds, a wanton and monstrous aggressor, because they also have faced aggression. Our experience we have in common with them. We have waged the same struggle, and, as Mr. Mashur Rahman said, this is a collective struggle; indeed, this is a collective struggle. There is no difference whatsoever in the process of decolonization in Jammu and Kashmir, in southern Rhodesia or in any other part of Asia and Africa. That is why the nations of Asia and Africa were in the forefront, in the vanguard of the movement for the support of Pakistan, because they knew that Pakistan was suffering in the way they have suffered, that our call for justice was their call for justice; our call for redress of the people's rights in Jammu and Kashmir was also their cry and their struggle which they also have waged heroically against superior odds, against overwhelming numbers; that is why the nations of Asia and Africa were in the forefront, in the vanguard of the support that Pakistan received in the struggle against the aggression that India launched against Pakistan.

Sir, I would be failing in my duty if I do not refer to some of the countries which gave us outright support in our struggle. This is not an easy undertaking. Sir, other nations have their own problems and difficulties to consider before they can commit themselves without qualification, without reservation for a just and an honourable cause. Sometimes we should ask ourselves the question that—suppose two countries, far away from our frontiers, are engaged in the struggle, and although

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

we may have sympathy with one against the other, would it be easy for our nation to commit itself or do the same thing that others have done for us? Sir, it is from this point of view that I would like to refer to the support that we received outright and without reservations from a number of countries in Asia and Africa.

Iran and Turkey gave us unqualified support and, Sir, it is with some pride and satisfaction that I wish to mention that our R.C.D. partners, the great Iranian and Turkish nations, stood by us and rendered moral and material support to us in the time of crisis against Indian aggression. Iran declared, and I quote, "The Iranian Government and people with all the moral and material resources at their command stand ready to support Pakistan in this hour of most urgent need to safeguard her territorial integrity and political sovereignty." A large number of Iranians volunteered to fight the Indian aggression side by side with Pakistan. Iranian nurses came to serve the wounded Pakistani soldiers. The Iranian Prime Minister flew to Ankara to consult the Turkish Prime Minister as to how best they could assist us in our fight against Indian aggression. In a communique issued after the meeting the Iranian and Turkish Prime Ministers declared on 11th September, 1965, and I quote: "The initiation by India of large scale military operations across the internationally recognised border of Pakistan threatens peace not only in the region but throughout the world." They added and I quote again: "As long as the Jammu and Kashmir dispute remains unsolved, the recurrence of such a grave situation cannot be ruled out and [they] reaffirm the solidarity which links Turkey, Iran and Pakistan and declare that they are ready to support Pakistan, a brother, an ally Pakistan." The Iranian Prime Minister and the Turkish Foreign Minister came to Pakistan to consult the Pakistani leaders and the Pakistan Government about the assistance they could give to Pakistan. On the diplomatic front, Iranian and Turkish Governments supported and advocated Pakistan's case. The Turkish President wrote to President Johnson and Prime Minister Harold Wilson. The Iranian Ambassadors in London and Washington under instructions from their Government took up the question with those Governments as if this was their own question. The veteran Turkish leader, Mr. Ismat Inonu, who fought the battle of independence along with Kamal Ataturk in Turkey to repel the aggression on Turkish soil and helped in making modern Turkey I quote Ismat Pasha: "The aggression launched against Pakistan is downright unjustified. This aggression is aimed at usurping Pakistan's legitimate right over Jammu and Kashmir which has been irrefutably handed over to India. This is again totally unjustified." The fullest support which we have received from the Government of Iran and Turkey during our trial doubly show the solidarity of the RCD countries and it cemented further the bonds of friendship, of brotherhood, of common understanding.

I now, Sir, refer to the great and glorious support which Pakistan received from the Republic of Indonesia and here, Sir, I can do no better than recall the words of President Ahmad Soekarno. President Soekarno while addressing the Islamic Unity Party on September 13th said, and I quote: "President Soekarno on behalf of the Indonesian people has deliberately chosen to side with Pakistan in its conflict with India because in this struggle there is justice in the cause for which Pakistan is fighting." He said, "do not be like Malayasia and say, we are

friends of both, therefore, neutral. There is no neutrality when a principle is involved. There is no compromise when truth is there. I say to those foreign correspondents and diplomats who are present here to carry my words and dispatch them to all corners, for truth is here manifest and must be supported against Indian aggression". Indonesia, Sir, with its one hundred million people or more has been a tower strength during our trial, which has forged unshakable bonds of loyalty, love, partnership and brotherhood. The unreserved support given by the people of Indonesia has touched the innermost core of our heart and built a reservoir of goodwill and love amongst all our people. In acknowledging in the General Assembly of the United Nations on the 28th of September the support that the people of Indonesia gave to Pakistan, I voiced the feeling of the people of Pakistan when I had said : "From this rostrum permit me on behalf of the Government and the people of Pakistan to pay a lasting tribute to the President of Indonesia, to the Government of Indonesia and to the great people of Indonesia who gave us their unstinted support in our hour of trial. The people of Pakistan shall not forget the true friendship given by the Indonesian President and the Indonesian people. The bonds that bind our people have been tested in this crisis and have become stronger."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I now come to another great and powerful Asian country which gave Pakistan unstinted support: that is the People's Republic of China.

China reacted immediately and spontaneously to Indian aggression against Pakistan and condemned this unprovoked attack as well as India's suppression of the freedom struggle of the Kashmiri people in the strongest terms. A statement issued by the Chinese Government on 7th September 1965 declared *inter alia* :

"India's aggression against any one of its neighbours concerns all its neighbours."

The statement expressed confidence that "with the sympathy and support of the peace-loving countries and the peoples of Asia and the whole world, the one hundred million people of Pakistan will rise as one man to save their country and finally drive back Indian aggressors. The Chinese Government also reaffirm its support to the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir on which the Indian Government had given commitments to Pakistan and to the people of Jammu and Kashmir."

Throughout the period of conflict Chinese Government and people continued to support Pakistan's heroic resistance and offered to give Pakistan all assistance in its just struggle. This consistent support from the great Power with a population of seven hundred million people was a source of great encouragement to Pakistan.

And here again from the rostrum of the UN General Assembly I acknowledged the support which the People's Republic of China gave to Pakistan. I declared :

"Our great neighbour to the North, People's Republic of China, gave us full moral support and, rising high above ideological differences, upheld the cause of righteousness and condemned the war of aggression launched against us by India."

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

Sir, the support which the People's Republic of China in this great crisis gave to Pakistan is, indeed, a matter of great significance for a number of reasons. First of all, by any definition of the term, China is a Great Power. She is a Great Power in the sense that she has a right to occupy her place in the Security Council of the United Nations as a Permanent Member. She is a Great Power because she possesses atomic weapons like other Great Powers and is now one of the nuclear powers. She is a Great Power because there can be no meaningful disarmament in the world without the participation of China. She is a Great Power because no important dispute of Asia can be settled without the co-operation and participation of the People's Republic of China. So, the support that we got from this Great Power is, indeed, significant and meaningful.

In addition to the support we have received from the People's Republic of China, we have had support from other Asian countries like Ceylon. The Prime Minister of Ceylon declared in the Ceylonese Parliament that Indian aggression against Pakistan was deplorable. The Leader of the Opposition, Madam Bandranayaka, condemned Indian aggression against Pakistan. We have received support from the Philippines, from Japan, from North Vietnam and from the people of Afghanistan. In every Afghan home there were prayers for Pakistan and they felt the struggle to be their own struggle. According to the Newsweek, Afghans condemned the wanton Indian attack on Pakistan. They considered it as their own cause and as their own fight. We would like to pay a lasting tribute to the people of that great country who stood by us and supported us and sympathised with us in the moment of great crisis.

Sir, the whole of the Arab world for the first time collectively supported our position on Jammu and Kashmir at Casablanca. The Casablanca Resolution will go down as a historic document. It created complete disillusionment and frustration in India. The Indian leaders had begun to use their usual tactics of blackmail and threats on the Arab Governments by saying that they could respond more constructively and positively to Israel if the Arab countries pursued their support to Pakistan. But the Arab Governments were not deterred and collectively at Casablanca there was a Resolution in support of the just and honourable settlement of Jammu and Kashmir dispute. We pay homage and we show our gratitude to the great Arab world with whom we have unbreakable religious, historical and cultural ties. In particular it is necessary for us to mention the overwhelming support we received from Saudi Arabia, Syria and Jordan, both inside and outside the Security Council, (cheers) and from Sudan, Iraq, Morocco, Tunisia, and, above all, Algeria which is the beaconlight of the people's right of self-determination.

I would also like to mention the whole-hearted support we received from Albania. The outright and completely unreserved support which Pakistan got from Iran, Turkey, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iraq, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Sudan, Albania, China and Indonesia is the support of more than half of humanity. In terms of nations it numbers a dozen or more. But in terms of people (and in final and ultimate analysis it is the people who matter) more than half of humanity stand shoulder to shoulder with Pakistan in its just struggle.

In Africa also we received overwhelming support and sympathy in the Security Council. The representative of Ivory Coast in the Security Council compared India to South Africa. I think it is a valid and objective comparison, because India is to Asia what South Africa is to Africa. We received support from Somalia, Nigeria, Tanzania, Togo, from Mali and Senegal and from many of the other African States.

Going to the distant continent of Latin America, with whom we have hardly any contact—few diplomatic missions. We have only one Mission in Brazil. That is all we have in the whole of Latin America whereas India has diplomatic representation in Brazil, Argentine, Venezuela, Mexico, Cuba and a number of other Latin American countries. We have representation only in Brazil. But in spite of the fact that Latin America is far away and we hardly have any contact with that great Continent, nonetheless, on the question of Jammu and Kashmir, the Latin American States have always given us deep and profound support. Whenever the question of Jammu and Kashmir has gone to the Security Council we have received support from Latin America because here it is not only a question of contact or diplomatic relations, here the fundamental and uncompromisable question of self-determination is involved. That is why in spite of India's efforts and in spite of India's forensic and strenuous ways and methods, the States of Latin America have supported us in the Security Council. This time the representative of Uruguay who was the President of the Security Council had this to say :

“If we have a wounded bleeding foot we have to apply anaesthesia and cure it. We have to get over the crisis. It is true, but would it be wise or sufficient to do all that and then merely replace the foot in the same shoe. If there is still the nail in the shoe which causes difficulty and immediately reopens the same wound what would be gained. How can we consider logically the resistance to coming face to face with the cause of the crisis if no guarantee is given that at least it would call for immediate attention of the Security Council”.

And then he went on to say :

“In 1948 and 1957 the Security Council established Commissions and entrusted the President of the Council to collect direct information on the spot. This experience was fruitful. If such action was opportune my delegation would support the entrusting to our President or to a special Three-man Committee the task of gathering impressions on the situation in Jammu and Kashmir without possessing the power to investigate”.

“Shortly the Security Council is to discuss other problems concerning the self-determination of people. Its legal authority and moral and political strength are increased depending on the attitudes and the conduct adopted. What the Council may say or do regarding the lamentable situation confronting us will have a direct bearing on the situation with which the Council may have to deal tomorrow”.

These were the words of the representative of Uruguay.

This shows the strength of our cause. Although our resources are limited, we don't have diplomatic missions in every country as India has, we don't have the resources or the power to propagate in every corner

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

of the world, despite the fact that there is no contact with all the countries of the world, nonetheless, all the countries, even those as far away as Uruguay, have come in support of the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. This shows how much strength the people of Pakistan have on the question of Kashmir. If Pakistan were to be isolated, we would know the difficulties of isolation. Therefore, please appreciate the strength and the value of international support. India, which is wholly and totally isolated, laments the fact of its isolation. And here is Pakistan, which is upholding a righteous cause, which has not abandoned the cause of Kashmir, is mustering greater and greater support throughout the world. These are mostly the pillars of our strength in the liberation of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

So also in Eastern Europe, more and more States are getting directly interested and involved, and who believe that there must be a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. A few years ago Eastern Europe was blank to us. There are countries in other parts of the world with which we do not have any contact, but Eastern Europe is not far away from us, and yet a few years ago Eastern Europe was blank to us. We had no contact with it, we had no trade and dealings with it, whereas India had made strong efforts to penetrate Eastern Europe, like Czechoslovakia, Rumania and others, where they had diplomatic relations and we had no contact whatsoever. For us the rest of the world was two or three countries, and perhaps one country. There was no other world except that, and now that we have made efforts and we have established contacts and propagated our views, and we have explained the righteousness of our cause, that we are the aggrieved party, there is more and more sympathy and support in Eastern Europe and the Scandinavian countries.

The Foreign Minister of Rumania had useful discussions with me on the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir, and I hope from Moscow I will be able to pay a day's visit to Rumania as well. There is a greater realization throughout the world, even in Eastern Europe, with which although we are close, we have had no contact so far. Now we are trying to get universal support on the question of Jammu and Kashmir.

I now come to Western Europe and without casting any aspersion or showing any disrespect for any great country of Western Europe, I must say that two important countries, *i.e.*, France and West Germany, supported Pakistan on the question of the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The other countries of Western Europe also supported us. West Germany again and again said that on the question of self-determination there can be no compromise. France—another Great Power, a member of the Security Council and one which played an exceptionally constructive and positive role in the Security Council, both in September as well as in November—true to the great traditions of France, the mother of all revolutions and the mother of fraternity, equality and freedom, has taken a positive, courageous and right stand on the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir.

You must also, Sir, remember France's position in the present-day world. Today France has got an exceptional influence in Africa, especially amongst the French-speaking African States. France occupies a

unique position in the heart of Europe. Apart from her influence in Eastern Europe as well as with the Soviet Union, France has established special relations with China in Asia, and it believes that no problem or no dispute of Asia can really be permanently settled without the participation of the People's Republic of China. As in Asia the Great Power of Asia supported us on the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir, so in Europe, France and Germany supported the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. So much so that when Madam Pandit visited Paris and had met Gen. De Gaulle, after the meeting with him, she held a Press Conference and there expressed disappointment and said that it was unfortunate that people there did not appreciate India's position.

What is unfortunate about that? What is there to appreciate about India's position that she has to lament that the people of the world do not appreciate the Indian position? We know India is sending delegations helter-skelter throughout the world, but what purpose will it serve? It will help in exposing the Indian perfidy. What explanation will they offer to the countries that they are visiting? Will they tell them that they enter into international agreements and it is their right to break international agreements? Will they tell them that no pledge was given to the people of Jammu and Kashmir for exercising the right of self-determination? It is no use saying Kashmir is an integral part of India. That is not going to make Kashmir an integral part of India. Kashmir cannot become an integral part of India.

The United Kingdom has also maintained its traditional position on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and it must be said to the credit of the United Kingdom that the Prime Minister of United Kingdom condemned in no uncertain terms the Indian aggression on the territory of Pakistan. In its condemning India's aggression on Pakistan, what has been the reaction in India? In India Indian leaders have threatened to leave the Commonwealth. They have threatened to nationalize British assets in India. Now the British, of all the foreign powers, know the Indians quite well. They have had about two hundred years dealings with them. They know that these are empty threats. These threats cannot be implemented. India has no great love for the Commonwealth. It is in the Commonwealth merely because Pakistan is in the Commonwealth and India will remain in the Commonwealth as long as Pakistan is there. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. If India will quit the Commonwealth merely because they have taken the side of the righteous cause, then Pakistan has also the same right, but in spite of our many differences with Great Britain—on the partition there were anomalies, which were perpetrated against Pakistan—Pakistan has not taken the position that with every turn, every adjustment of the situation we should threaten to leave the Commonwealth, or threaten to take such action which we have no intention of taking. Also, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Shastri, has said that if the Great Powers, including the United States, were to try and impose a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, they will have nothing to do with the Great Powers. Prime Minister Shastri, who goes about as a little Napoleon throughout India, says that he will have nothing to do with the Great Powers if they tried to impose a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. Let us ponder over that, Mr. Speaker. India, which receives 9 million tons of foodgrains from the United States of America every year, which means 20,000 tons

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

per day, is solely dependent for economic assistance as well as military assistance; these assistances are understandable. All under-developed countries require economic assistance from more opulent countries. There is nothing shameful about it because these loans are repaid, because it is not averse to sovereignty but, it is strange for a country, like India to give such a threat to the Big Powers, whose fragile, poverty-stricken and miserable people have no food, and yet for a colonial ambition on the State of Jammu and Kashmir, they should have the audacity to turn round and say that we would have nothing to do with you if you try and bring about justice. Now, suppose United States of America were to impress upon India to come to a fair settlement about Jammu and Kashmir, what is immoral about it. If United States or any other Great Power impresses upon India to do that that is not doing something immoral or reprehensible or wrong. So, if Pakistan tells U.S.A. you must use your influence to settle this dispute because you promised yourself that the people of Jammu and Kashmir like any other people will have the right of self-determination, because objectively self-determination is involved, because by using our influence we will bring peace and tranquillity and happiness to the people of the sub-continent, which means over 500 million people, where is any immorality involved, where is the question of using influence in the wrong direction involved? If, of course, the United States were to say to India that they must give away part of India like Madras to some other country or certain other part; if there was something wrong, one could understand. Here you could use your great and powerful influence fairly. Is that unjust or immoral? Because when you use your influence in the right direction even the people of India will be finally grateful to all those powers who use that influence in the right direction which will bring peace to the sub-continent, which will alleviate misery, which will bring an end to exploitation, which will bring an end to genocide, to human misery, to human rancour, to the savagery and brutalities that are being committed in the State; all this will be put to an end. Is that not the just and moral obligation of the whole world, including the Great Powers? Sir, a country like India is dependent on United States for 900 million tons of foodgrains a year and economic assistance. India's economic situation today is in a critical state. It is almost facing bankruptcy. It is dependent on the economic assistance of United States and, to a lesser extent, of U.S.S.R. and it requires and needs military assistance in addition. If the Great Powers were to use their influence positively and constructively to bring about peace and happiness for 500 million people, it is not an immoral exercise or unjustified exercise of moral position which they have to do. If the Great Powers can determine the future of Europe, if they can take a blue pencil and decide this part goes to U.S.S.R.—Czechoslovakia, Germany and others, this is what happened at Yalta Conference—if they can have Yalta Conference to bring about peace which nobody respects, is not an honourable peace more desirable? Why cannot they have the same Yalta Concept for Asia? Is there any difference between Europeans and Asians, is peace not as important to Asia as it is to Europe? Is misery any different for people of Asia than it is for people of Europe? Is genocide any different, when it was perpetrated by Hitler against European Jews, as is being perpetrated against Kashmiris of Jammu and Kashmir? Do we not feel pain in the same way as people of Europe feel? Are not tears of the same colour, do they not come from the same eyes whether they are Asian eyes or European eyes? Is there not need

that there should be the same inhibition to compel India to do the right thing; to compel India to face international conscience to give to the people of Jammu and Kashmir the right of self-determination which they have pledged to them?

The United States position in this crisis has been mentioned eloquently both by the Leader of the House and by the Leader of the Opposition and by a number of Members of the House. I do not want to repeat what has been said and it is true that in the last three years fortuitously and due to circumstances it has been my responsibility to shoulder the crisis and to articulate Pakistan's pains and pangs in respect of United States policy towards this country. But this is a responsibility which I owe not only to Government but to a hundred million people of Pakistan, a responsibility I have carried out, I have been carrying on courageously and with conviction. Pakistan has done no wrong to the United States of America. I would want any objective person to tabulate the grievances of the United States of America as against Pakistan and I would want, not an objective person, but even a child to tabulate the grievances we have against the United States and let it be an unequal tabulation; let it be, on the one hand, a scholar and, on the other, a child because whatever has happened in the last two to three years has been unfortunately directed against the vital interests of Pakistan culminating in the aggression which was launched by India against us. Had it not been for the military augmentation of India's war machinery, India would never have dared to launch an aggression against Pakistan. And we feared this all the time. We have not gone mad, we have not lost our sense that we should unnecessarily have a policy of strain and stress with a great country like United States of America with whom we share a special relationship. I know that some of the Members of the Opposition, and understandably, have said that it is necessary to have good relations with all the Great Powers. But this is also a truism. It is obvious; it is necessary to have good relations with all the Great Powers. Who does not want that? That has been our very purpose. It has been our endeavour all the time. This has been our effort, but you see at the same time you must weigh equities; you must put them in a balance; you must see changed realities; you must have objective considerations; you must see changes in policies. After all policies are dynamic, they are not permanent; it is not that United States of America had some special love and romance for Pakistan, therefore its global policies should not change. How should this Government be held responsible if the United States global policies changed, which bring about a certain stress and strain in our relationship. This Government would be all the more anxious to have a solid good relationship with the United States of America for the simple reason that we have pursued our foreign policy of establishing good relations with the whole world. I am not being critical of any Government because this is a time of national crisis. I am just mentioning the factual position. Up to 1958 we had no contact—I repeat, no contact—with the great power like the Soviet Union. Was that right and realistic that we should have had no relations with a great powerhouse, as my ambassador to Moscow describes the Soviet Union as a powerhouse to the north, so close to Pakistan, a great power with all its resources, industrial potential, with all its ability to help and support any other country. With them we had no contacts at all; absolutely none. It was for the first time in 1961 that we established our first economic agreement with the Soviet Union.

[Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto]

Is that not shameful that our foreign policy was so geared that we had put all the eggs in one basket? Is it realistic not to have any relations with the Soviet Union? How many times Pandit Nehru visited the Soviet Union; how many Indian delegations went? What special efforts were made by Indian leaders to establish special relations with Soviet Union? You must check all that, in the totality of events, in its historical perspective. It is all very well to say why this Government did not get support from the Soviet Union? You have to consider the historical situation and in respect of Soviet Union this Government has made profound changes and our relations with the Soviet Union have improved vastly. There is a great improvement in our relations with the Soviet Union now. If we want to improve our relations with a country with whom we had no contacts, surely it follows that we would like to consolidate our relations with a country with whom we already had good relations. We had made from 1958 to 1962 great efforts. Please consider all the measures that this Government took to establish good relations and to consolidate good relations with the United States of America. This is the same Government, composing of Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan and his cabinet, which may have changed from person to person. What happened, from 1958 to 1962? This Government went even further than other Governments in establishing good relations with the United States of America. India which is our mortal enemy—India which is determined to destroy us—but because it was in view of the global interest of the United States of America we made special efforts from 1958 to 1962 to have good relations with India also, in the interest and in the enhancement of the global policy of the United States of America. But a time comes when the people have to cry halt and say thus far and no further, if it comes to jeopardising the interests of a country. This is all that we have done and said to the United States that by arming India, by giving to India teeth, by giving India military might and military power, all that will happen is that all those guns will be directed against Pakistan and against no other country. In doing so strains have been created. We are sad—we are unhappy—we do not like it, but we cannot abandon our national security, we cannot abandon our national rights. This is the position of the people of Pakistan and it is in this context and in these circumstances that the President of Pakistan is going to visit the United States of America. Our hands are clean, our conscience is clear. We have nothing to conceal. We are the aggrieved party. Let us discuss it. Let us discuss it a thousand times. Be it at Presidential level or at any level because an appraisal will show that not only are we not opposed to America but our apprehensions have come out true and it has been justified by the lives and the blood that has been shed for these seventeen days. These seventeen days which shook the sub-continent need not have taken place—we would not have shaken the sub-continent had it not been for the arrogance of India—and this arrogance came about because India believes that it has the military might and the military potential and it has an armada and the force to destroy Pakistan. But India can never destroy Pakistan even if India gets help from the whole world. It is just not possible to destroy and decimate a valiant and a valorous nation of a hundred million and this much I would like to tell the House that India wants thirty Divisions. India can have sixty Divisions if it wants. India wants an atom bomb at Trombay. It can have its Trombays and it can have its Tchombays, but the question is that it cannot intimidate Pakistan. If India wants to have an atom bomb,

let her have the bomb because, as Mr. Sobur has said, there are such things as paper tigers and to use the word 'tiger' in context of India is not correct. Even if you say paper tiger, do not use the word 'tiger' in that context. It is inconceivable, it is not possible and if India is to have an atom bomb, the people of Pakistan will be prepared to eat grass, but they will also have an atom bomb.

Now, Sir, I would like to say that on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute you cannot take a neutral attitude. It is not possible to take a neutral attitude in a situation where there is an aggressor and an aggressed, where there is an oppressor and an oppressed, where there is an exploiter and the exploited, where there is a dominator and the dominated, where there is an attacker and the attacked. How can you be neutral in a situation like that? What we expect the whole world to do is to take an impartial attitude to determine the issues involved impartially—whether self-determination is involved, whether an international agreement is involved, whether people are being oppressed or not. In taking an impartial attitude, they will definitely come to the correct decision which will be the support of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. So, it is not a question of supporting Pakistan. It is not some blind romance that people either like Pakistan or India, that we like Pakistanis therefore we support Pakistan—we like India because they are snake charmers. This is not the question. The question here is to determine the issue on its merits—on the rights and wrongs that are involved, not that India is big and Pakistan is small or that Pakistan has the Khyber and India has the Taj Mahal. That is not at all involved. The question here is the question of international morality—of adjudication, of sitting as you are sitting, Mr. Speaker, and judging as to who is wrong and who is right, who has committed mistakes and who has broken promises and who has given the pledges. It is on that basis. If countries come to a decision, India should not say that these countries have gone against us. These countries have gone in the right direction. They have supported truth and justice and they are supporting truth and justice. They are not supporting Pakistan. It so happens that Pakistan must support truth and justice because that is the ideology of Pakistan and the dictate of Islam. We support the people of Jammu and Kashmir for the redress of their grievances, not because of any territorial aggrandisement, but because Islam enjoins upon us to support the oppressed whether they be in Kashmir or elsewhere in the world. It is a dictation of our national interest. It is a dictation of our ideology. It is a dictation of our religion and we cannot abandon any of these principles. We cannot abandon any of these positions.

Mr. Speaker, you know that the Soviet Union has offered its good offices and Pakistan has accepted the good offices of the Soviet Union. We believe that this is a positive and a constructive gesture. Soviet Union is concerned about an international dispute with regard to a territory which previously it regarded and considered to be an integral part of India. Now that it has taken this important initiative, it naturally implies that the Soviet Union recognises this dispute not only by offering his good offices' initiative but also by the position that the Soviet Union took in the Security Council where unlike in the past it did not veto the Resolution, where it supported the Resolution of September 20 and agreed to the Resolution of November 4, but abstained on an entirely different

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

ground. These are all important and positive signs. We hope that in the mutuality of our interests, in our efforts to impress on the Soviet leaders that peace and goodwill can only come by settling the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, *Insha allah* eventually we will be able to get the powerful and mighty support on a right and just cause from the Government and the people of the Soviet Union as well.

Now, Sir, I come to Malaysia. We have been asked by a Member of the Opposition why Pakistan broke relations with Malaysia and why did it not break relations with the USSR or with India. Now, Sir, we broke relations with Malaysia, not because this State supported India on the question of Jammu and Kashmir. That is not the reason. In the past there have been, as I have said, Soviet veto and support for the Indians. There have been one or two other stray countries which have supported India on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute for their own reasons—Ethiopia and Yugoslavia. We have not broken relations with Ethiopia and Yugoslavia. It is not because Malaysia supported India on Jammu and Kashmir dispute that we broke relations with Malaysia. We broke relations with Malaysia because Malaysia challenged the very existence of Pakistan. Malaysia had every right to support India if they chose to do so. They could have committed all the perfidies. They could have committed all the chicaneries and supported India. That is understandable, but I would like to read out to the House some of the statements made by the Malaysian representative in the Security Council. Malaysian representative said that the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is due to establishment of Pakistan. And then he said that :

“the Jammu and Kashmir dispute originated because Pakistan was created”.

And then on the right of self-determination and the United Nations Resolutions, this representative said—I quote him :

“ancient Resolutions from the musty records of the past.”.

Now here is a country which challenged the very basis of the State for which Pakistanis had to wage a heroic struggle against the might of British Imperialism and against the opposition of the majority community of India, their homes were torn as under. Refugees in millions had to sacrifice their lives, their honour and wage a great struggle which has been one of the greatest chapters of the peoples' struggle for independence and who carved out a State of a hundred million Muslims in the sub-continent with all the sacrifices. They should live to see it. Why the representative of this wobbling State from whom Singapore has already seceded should question the very basis of Pakistan? What other honourable course had an honourable people been left with? Germany and the United States have waged war against each other. United Kingdom and Germany have waged war against each other. Soviet Union and Germany have waged war against each other. Have they ever questioned the sovereignty and the existence of each other? Then not only that. After this unparalleled and unprovoked reference to the establishment of Pakistan we gave an opportunity to the Malaysian Government. We addressed an *aide memoire* to the Malaysian Government and said that the representative of Malaysia had unnecessarily and without any justification challenged the very basis of the existence of Pakistan and they would

please clarify the position. We gave an opportunity to the Malaysian Government to clarify the situation. And they could have dissociated themselves from the references made by the representative of Malaysia. But, instead of that, the Malaysian Government said, "we fully support each and every word of what the Malaysian representative had said in the Security Council". Therefore, Pakistan was left with no other honourable course but to sever diplomatic relations with Malaysia and I hope the House will understand and appreciate that this was the position and these were the circumstances under which we broke diplomatic relations with Malaysia.

Now, in this respect, Mr. Speaker, some reference has been made to the work of our Ambassador. I do not think it is a right practice to mention Ambassadors' performances or their disabilities by name in the House. I think the practice in the past had been and the Leader of the Opposition will bear me out that names were not mentioned and individuals were not mentioned. In this respect if there are any complaints against any envoy or any ambassador, surely this can be made. This can be made to the Government. This could be made to me, to the Foreign Secretary, to the President. But I would implore the House to continue the practice and the tradition which this House has maintained in the past of not mentioning either in praise or in blame the individuals. There is limitation to the work of an ambassador or an envoy. He cannot change the fundamental policies of his Government. It is not fair to expect that from an envoy or an ambassador; and in so far as this particular case is concerned, our representative in Malaysia, let me inform you, Sir, that I and the Foreign Office and the Government are fully satisfied with the sedulous and earnest effort Ambassador Hasan has made in Malaysia and it is not on his account, not because of him that there had been this attitude of Malaysia. There are other considerations. India's influence in Malaysia, Pakistan-Indonesia relations; Indonesia-Malaysia hostilities and a number of other factors which are beyond the scope of an envoy and I would like to repeat that Ambassador Hasan within the limitations of policy objectives had conducted himself with exemplary zeal and skill.

Reference was made to our dissatisfaction with the September 20 Resolution and our satisfaction with the Resolution of 5th November. I believe that the Law Minister has already dilated on this matter but as the observation came from an eminent Member of this House for whom I have very great respect, Shah Azizur Rahman, I would like to take some time of the House to explain the position. In so far as our attitude to the United Nations is concerned, the sense of frustration, the sense of disappointment which we have had to experience in the last 18 years over the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, I think, I left no doubt in the minds of the United Nations and of the Security Council of our apprehensions and our fears and frustration from the Security Council and the United Nations. On the 22nd of September in the Security Council itself I said that "a cessation of hostilities is not enough. The Security Council, the most important organ of the United Nations must now address itself to the heart of the problem. For 18 years it has played and toyed with the future of Kashmir. It can no longer make a plaything or toy out of 5 million people. It is the moral responsibility of the Security Council to address itself to a meaningful, a lasting solution of the problem of Jammu and Kashmir. The Security Council has been seized of

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

the problem for 18 years. There are more documents, more resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir—the most fundamental problem facing the world today—than on any other problem. Is it not ironical that with regard to a conflict that may lead to world conflagration—and the present situation has shown that it is possible for the conflict to lead to world conflagration—the Security Council has shown its lethargy, its indolence'. I was here a year ago and the Security Council was not prepared to give Pakistan a piece of paper or a Resolution. It did not even want to consider the problem. It thought that it was a dead issue; that it was dormant. This can never be a dead issue; it can never be dormant. This is the last chance for the Security Council to put all its force, all its energy, all its moral responsibility behind a fair and equitable and honourable solution of Jammu and Kashmir dispute. History does not wait for Councils, organisations or institutions just as it does not wait for individuals. Ultimately we shall have to be the final determiners of our own course. Let me tell the Security Council on behalf of my Government that if now after this last chance that we are giving the Security Council, it does not put its full force, full moral responsibility and full weight behind an equitable and honourable settlement of Jammu and Kashmir dispute, Pakistan will have to leave the United Nations. I am not saying that in the form of an ultimatum. I am saying it as I am honour bound to respect the very purpose of the Charter. In leaving the United Nations, Pakistan would be fulfilling the Charter of the United Nations and then one-third or more of the world will be outside this organisation and some countries which call themselves States will be members of the Security Council."

Then again in the same respect, as far as the inadequacies of the Security Council are concerned, again on the 25th October at the time of the latest Resolution I said:

"I speak this evening with a bleeding heart. I come from the battle-fields of Pakistan where we have fought a monstrous and habitual aggressor and I tell you, Sir, that we are prepared for the ultimate consequences, but we shall never surrender our honour and our self-respect. The Security Council must know this. The permanent members of the United Nations must know this that Pakistan will face extinction; we shall face decimation; we shall face destruction, but we shall honour our pledge because we are an honourable people and this much you must know".

Then again to them I said: "The security council gave a pledge to the people of Jammu and Kashmir that they would not be placed under the sovereignty which was imposed on them by an immoral army of occupation. On 27th September the Council constituted its prestige and power to go into the heart of the problem and to secure a just and honourable settlement of the dispute. The question is: should the Council allow the other party to veto its efforts? If so, then one must be candid and say that the United Nations which we took upon as an institution of the world's conscience is now a destitute of courage and drained of all its power and its moral resources. The long history of Jammu and Kashmir dispute is sufficient proof of how India's wilfulness has been encouraged

by the seeming helplessness of Council. The betrayal of Ethiopia when it was pitted against Italy brought death and dishonour to the League of Nations. How can the consequent history of the United Nations betrayal of Jammu and Kashmir be any different? The betrayal of Czechoslovakia before Hitler's hordes involved the world in a disastrous war. The calculation of power interests in the case of Jammu and Kashmir may point differently today but while these are bound to be ephemeral, the world laws are eternal and inexorable. If it were a question of obtaining any kind of peace, there would be no need for a Security Council; there would be no need for the United Nations. Why not have Hitler's peace? Why not have Chengaiz Khan's peace? You can have peace on the terms of the victor. You can have dishonourable peace at any time. Why should there have been a San Francisco Conference at which you, Mr. President, represented Uruguay and put your signature to the charter? Was that your concept when you went as a representative of the Uruguay to the San Francisco Conference that there should be peace on any terms? Peace on any term is always easy to achieve. Peace on any term is something that can be achieved without war. It can be achieved on the basis of dishonour, on the basis of surrender. The United Nations came into being with its charter to achieve, not peace on any terms, but a just and an equitable peace."

So, we made our position quite clear to the Security Council on its inadequacies, on our sense of frustration, on our sense of disappointment. But, at the same time, on the 4th of November, when this second Resolution was passed, you must remember that it was in an entirely different context. The first resolution was passed when there was war, bloodshed and hostilities; and they were anxious willy-nilly under any circumstances to have a resolution so that there should be a cease-fire. Then it had three parts to it: cease-fire, withdrawals, and the pledges to assist in settling the Jammu and Kashmir dispute under the cloud of war. Not only under the cloud of war but when hostilities were taking place. The Resolution of 4th November was passed when there was a cease-fire, in entirely different circumstances. The Security Council Members argued with us that "We already have a resolution; we have already committed to it." But we said, "No; there is genocide taking place in Kashmir. New developments have been taking place, for which the Security Council must meet again." It was in the teeth of India's opposition. India said that she would not attend the Council meeting; that she would have nothing to do with it. And then there were certain elements sympathetic to the Indian position, and who also did not want the Security Council meeting. So it was out of gratitude and sense of appreciation for the efforts of France, a permanent member, and other non-permanent members including Jordan, who had associated themselves with us for a resolution and for a meeting of the Security Council, that in the United Nations itself we had to express our thanks and appreciation to them for having made sedulous and tireless efforts to not only have a Council meeting in the teeth of India's opposition, supported by powerful elements, but for not succumbing to India's boycott and for proceeding with the resolution, which reaffirmed in all its parts the resolution of September 20th. It was in that limited context, and in that situation that in the United Nations, satisfaction and appreciation was expressed. But if you ask, "Are you satisfied with the situation?", then I can only quote what

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

I said to the Security Council itself. So I hope that explains the position. As far as the United Nations is concerned, this is a grave issue. It is not that for the first time the United Nations has told us, "Lay down your arms. We will assist in bringing about a settlement." Eighteen years ago the United Nations told the people of Pakistan, "Lay down your arms; have a cease-fire; and we will give you a settlement—an honourable and just settlement"; and there were two resolutions of August 1948 and January 1949, committing the whole power and prestige of the United Nations and the Security Council members, including the Great Powers, to an honourable and just settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

Now, Sir, what happened in these 18 years? So much so that, when in 1963 and 1964 I went back, some of the members said to me that this is a dead issue; that this is a dead horse you are flogging; and one representative of a Great Power said, "Please do not bring internal questions to the forum of the United Nations. Do not exploit the United Nations for internal consumption." And to that extent, Sir, they were not prepared even to have a resolution. That was the position. And now, again, the people of Pakistan had to make the ultimate sacrifices to wage a heroic struggle, and again the United Nations, being wise by its experience, should have again interposed itself with threats of its sanctions to stop the fighting and this time to bring a settlement. Surely the United Nations should be wiser by its experience. If it feels that the problem is so complicated and so difficult, then it should not intervene again, and say that, although we know that it is a difficult problem and a complicated problem, nonetheless this time we are determined to settle it. Is the United Nations so powerful that it can tell Pakistan, "Stop!"; that it can tell Pakistan that all the lives that have been shed be in vain, and at the same time so powerless, so powerless as not to be able to tell India that you must honour your commitment? This is a juxtaposition. This is a question of double standards. Either the United Nations apply the same standards for India and Pakistan, or it must say that the greatest betrayal has been committed against the people of Pakistan for the second time in less than two decades. So, after all, we have a right to reappraise our whole attitude to the United Nations in the circumstances, if the United Nations fails to fulfil its own commitments, its own Charter. What does the Charter of the United Nations say? The Charter of the United Nations, in clear terms, in its own Preamble and in Article 1, has this to say. The Preamble says--

#### WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED

- to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
- to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small, and
- to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

AND FOR THESE ENDS

to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and

to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security,...

Then in Article 1 it says—

The Purposes of the United Nations are :

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end : to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace ;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace ;”

So, the Preamble talks about saving the scourage of war, which twice in our life has brought untold sorrow to mankind and Article 1 says : it commits its own Charter to promote international security and to settle international disputes which are a threat to peace. Is it not right for us to question the effectiveness or the power of the United Nations, if again a war is waged on the people of Pakistan and I think the time has come when the United Nations must take a courageous and right position in respect of countries which do not honour its own resolutions ; we have got South Africa which has defied the United Nations resolutions ; we have got Israel which has defeated the United Nations resolution and we have India that has defied the United Nations resolutions. The first moral obligation is to expel countries in the future from the United Nations Organization which do not implement the United Nations resolutions. We are with the people of Africa to support the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations, we are with all the people of Arab world for the expulsion of Israel from the United Nations and we hope that the whole of Arabia and the whole of Asian and African world and the whole of Latin America will be with us for our demand for the expulsion of India from the United Nations because there is no difference in the resolutions of the United Nations between Israel, South Africa and India. The United Nations should now ceaselessly struggle for the expulsion of those monstrous States who have dishonoured the charter of the United Nations and have committed aggression and flouted international law and morality. These are the grave issues which the people of Pakistan will have to decide and determine ; these are issues which will have to go to the people of Pakistan for their determination ; it is not for certain persons to say that we should not reappraise our attitude to the United Nations in spite of its betrayal. It is not for the Members of the Opposition to tell us that we should not reappraise our attitude ; it is not for any of our colleagues to say that we should not reappraise our attitude to the United Nations ; it is for the people who will have ultimately to decide what attitude they must take with the United Nations.

[Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto]

Now, Sir, as far as the struggle for Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, as I have said, whatever may be India's strength, her battalions, her divisions, her atom bomb, her support in the world, we cannot abandon the people of Jammu and Kashmir. India should know this, the whole world should know this; let it be said in a spirit of solemnity; in a spirit of serenity with all calmness and calculation at our command that we cannot abandon the people of Jammu and Kashmir irrespective of the consequences. Why do I say that? I say that because international law is involved; international morality is involved; faith is involved; race is involved; religion is involved; geography is involved and, above all, justice is involved. If we are to surrender the people of Jammu and Kashmir, we will be surrendering Pakistan; the surrender of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is like the surrender of Dacca, or Lahore, or Chitagong, or Karachi. They are a part of us, indivisible, indistinguishable, inseparable part of us and they shall remain a part of us all the time irrespective of the temporary expediencies and the temporary situation. The redemption of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is not an obsession with us; it is our moral and religious obligation. Individuals may come and go; Governments may come and go, but we cannot abandon the people of Jammu and Kashmir and there is no question here of anything emotional or subjective being involved. This is a problem which goes to the heart of the very basis of Pakistan, for the struggle of Pakistan and for the culmination of Pakistan as a great and glorious State. Hundred million people of Pakistan—men, women and children—are prepared to stand united like steel not merely because sentiment is involved. This history of the last September and October events shows that it is not a question of obsession here; every Pakistani felt its heart throb; it is a manifestation of the most glorious aspects of human beings to wage a struggle, in spite of the consequences, for their brothers, for the right of the people to free themselves and liberate themselves from the oppression of foreign yoke; and, Sir, that is why unfortunately there has to be confrontation with India. We do not want confrontation; we seek peace; all people seek peace and we, in particular, to remove the burden of poverty from our shoulders; we want to wipe out misery and want and disease. We want to give a better and honourable life to our people, we seek peace more than the opulent States. We know the meaning of peace, but at the same time there has to be confrontation with India because India holds us in bondage in Jammu and Kashmir and unless and until we break that bondage there will never be real peace, real progress, real betterment, because if our economic condition improves, even if we have a better life and a better lot, yet our conscience will be in pain because with opulence and prosperity we will see oppression in Jammu and Kashmir. Will that be any satisfaction to us? Will the nightmares come to an end and will we be able to sleep with a clear and clean conscience knowing that we have a more materially better life, yet our people in Jammu and Kashmir are getting oppressed more and more and for ever and ever darkness grows by the day and that their children should be slaughtered, their women dishonoured and oppression become complete. Therefore, it has to be confrontation until we achieve our victory. We cannot have *mushaira* one day and murder the next day; we cannot say let there be goodwill between India and Pakistan; by goodwill the situation will improve. We had goodwill before, from 1958 to 1961 and what had happened?

India said ; " do not disturb the goodwill by discussing Kashmir ". So, we know the experience of the past ; we know the fraud of goodwill. How can you deceive the people of Pakistan ? So, confrontation must remain till the problem of Jammu and Kashmir is settled. The people of Pakistan must know the situation. The Bible says : Blessed are the peacemakers ; and we want peace : we want to put an end to confrontation ; we want a perpetual peace with India ; geography is there which cannot be denied—the realities of the situation. But India must also accept the realities of the situation ; it is not only that Pakistan should accept the realities of the situation. India must accept and face the realities of the situation and that cannot be done by saying that Kashmir is an integral part of India. They must face the reality ; they must know what the world knows and they must settle it. They will relieve the burden from the shoulders of their people who are starving. Why should they take the additional liability of the five million people of Jammu and Kashmir. Indians are spending crores in holding Kashmir in subjugation. The British abandoned their colonies when the British empire became weak. Now that India is weak, they should abandon Jammu and Kashmir. If they abandon Jammu and Kashmir, it will be better for them. And, finally, Sir, if there is doubt after a long long and profitable debate in which I again pay tributes to the sense of patriotism of the leaders and the Members of the Opposition that they have shown and thereby demonstrated the indivisible unity of the people of Pakistan—finally, if after this there is any doubt or any misgiving about the situation or how it has been faced, as I would say, in that event, let there be a people's court ; let the people of Sialkot, the people of Lahore, the people of Dacca, the people of Hyderabad and the people of Peshawar, let our people of the cities and those who have suffered most, decide and if they want our heads, we will give them our heads.

Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker :** The discussion on the motion moved by the Foreign Minister is over. The House is adjourned to meet again at 9 a.m. on 22nd November, 1965.

---

The Assembly adjourned till nine of the clock, in the morning, on Monday, the 22nd November, 1965.