

**श्री शिव नारायण :** हर पोलिटिकल पार्टी के लीडर्स के एकाउंट को इस हाउस में पेश किया जाए ।

**श्री हरि विष्णु कामत :** मंजूर है ।

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** I do not think so.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** आपने हमेशा यह कहा है कि किसी प्रश्न का जवाब प्रगर नहीं देना है तो तीन कारणों को देकर ही या इनमें से किसी एक कारण को देकर ही ऐसा किया जा सकता है । एक तो यह है कि ऐसा करना मार्बजनिक हित में नहीं है, दूसरा यह है कि जानकारी इकट्ठा करने में इतना पैसा और समय बरबाद होगा कि उससे कोई फायदा नहीं होगा और तीसरा यह है कि यह जानकारी कहीं मिल नहीं सकती है । इन तीन कारणों में से एक भी कारण प्रधान मंत्री जी ने नहीं दिया है । क्या वजह है कि मंत्रियों की जायदाद और सम्पत्ति के बारे में, साथ साथ उनके कुटुम्ब के जो सदस्य हैं और मेरा खयाल है कि सदस्य का मतलब होना चाहिये एक पीढ़ी तक के रिश्तेदार, इनकी सम्पत्ति और जायदाद के बारे में जानकारी सदन के सामने रखने में प्रधान मंत्री तैयार नहीं है । इसमें आपको क्या एतराज है? इन में से एक भी कारण उन्होंने नहीं कहा है ।

**Dr. Sarojini Mahishi:** The code of conduct was accepted and everything is being submitted according to the provisions of the code of conduct.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Are we concerned with the code? We never discussed it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I might be given time to look into it as to whether the Government can withhold any information on any other account, apart from these three counts, or not.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** इन में से एक भी उन्होंने नहीं कहा है ।

**Shri Ranga:** In view of the fact that this so-called code of conduct was supposed to have been evolved only by the leaders of the ruling party or the leaders of the Government, has not the time come when the Government should be willing to consult Opposition leaders also before they finalise it, as otherwise it would be only a one-sided code of conduct, which is not accepted by the country as a whole? Otherwise, there is no sense in that. Let us all put our heads together (Interruptions).

**Mr. Speaker:** The reaction of the Government is desired. They want to know whether the Government is prepared to consult the leaders of the Opposition just now.

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** No, Sir.

#### Implementation of Tashkent Agreement

+

\*1545. **Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:**  
**Shri D. C. Sharma:**  
**Shri Rajdeo Singh:**  
**Dr. Mahadeva Prasad:**  
**Shri Krishna Deo Tripathi:**  
**Shri Bal Krishna Singh:**  
**Shri Bishwanath Roy:**  
**Shri Firodia:**  
**Shri Linga Reddy:**

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state the progress made up-to-date in the implementation of the Tashkent agreement?

**The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh):** Except for military withdrawals and disengagement, restoration of normal diplomatic relations, exchange of prisoners of war and limited resumption of postal and tele-communication links, the progress on implementation of other provisions of the Tashkent Declaration is held up as Pakistan does not seem interested in further normalisation of relations between the two countries.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** The hon. Prime Minister is reported to have stated that she was not feeling happy about the implementation and she was attaching great importance to restoring the Tashkent spirit. She indicated she will take certain positive steps. May I know what positive steps the Prime Minister has in her mind and what steps have been taken or are proposed to be taken?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi):** I said I would think about this matter and we are thinking about it.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** May I know what the External Affairs Minister's own assessment is about the *volte face* of Pakistan? What is his own assessment of the reason why Pakistan has completely changed its attitude, and instead of talking about the letter and spirit of the Tashkent agreement, the External Affairs Minister on the other side is talking of nothing but confrontation? May I know what is his assessment and reaction?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** It is correct that Pakistani leaders had given us the impression that they are implementing the Tashkent declaration. This was their attitude for about 4 weeks or so after the signing of the Tashkent declaration. Thereafter, they suddenly changed their attitude and we noticed a complete reversal of their original attitude, when we went to Rawalpindi for the inter-ministerial meeting. About the reason for it, it can only be an assessment and I attempted some such assessment when the debate took place on the Ministry's demands. There are two things which I would like to mention. There is a school of thought which holds that the internal situation in Pakistan is such that to meet that, they are whipping up the hate-India campaign. Secondly, the growing closeness of relations between China and Pakistan also appears to

be responsible for this change of attitude. It has deteriorated ever since and the latest Press report I saw—I cannot confirm it—says that the Pakistani Foreign Minister is reported to have said that Pakistan is to continue the confrontation with India. That is a very unfortunate expression. It would have been good if he had taken note of the result of this attitude of confrontation that was adopted by other countries. We on our side still continue to hope that the Tashkent declaration to which the Pakistan President has solemnly subscribed should be the guiding principle of relationship between India and Pakistan.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** When the late Prime Minister of India met President Ayub Khan of Pakistan at Tashkent, it was decided that we could not have any no-war pact with them, but it was also decided that in future the use of force for the settlement of disputes between India and Pakistan would be abjured. In the light of that, may I ask how far it is in keeping with the Tashkent spirit that they are building a duplicate of the Ichhogil Canal near Sialkot and they are settling Mujahids and Razakars on the border between India and Pakistan, and that they are still trying to send infiltrators into Jammu and Kashmir, if not in large numbers at least in sizeable numbers?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Obviously, any such acts of the type mentioned by the hon. Member are not consistent with the Tashkent Declaration, and these actions which have been resorted to are certainly not consistent with the main objective of the Tashkent Declaration, to reduce tensions and to create an atmosphere where all outstanding differences and disputes between the two countries should be resolved by peaceful means. With regard to the third part of the hon. Member's question, about sending infiltrators, I have information that whatever may be their intentions they have not succeeded in

sending infiltrators into Jammu and Kashmir.

**Shri Bishwanath Roy:** In view of the statements and actions by the Government of Pakistan against the spirit of the Tashkent Agreement, may I know whether any reaction of the Soviet Union has been known to the Government of India; if so, what is that reaction?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** As I have informed this House before, we have kept the Soviet Union and other friendly and interested countries informed about the attitude of Pakistan in relation to its obligations under the Tashkent Declaration, and the Soviet Union, naturally, do not feel happy when they see that Pakistan is not observing its duties and responsibilities under the Tashkent Declaration.

**Shri Linga Reddy:** May I know whether the breach of the Tashkent Declaration has been brought to the notice of the Security Council—U.N.O.—and, if so, what is their reaction?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** It is not necessary. Because the Tashkent Declaration was not signed in the Security Council or within the framework of the Security Council functioning, it is not necessary for us to go to the Security Council to make a complaint, about Pakistan's non-observance of the terms of the Tashkent Declaration.

**Shri Tyagi:** I wonder if the Government do appreciate that in the international world it is always the position of strength that pays dividends. Pakistan, despite the fact that they are making friends with China, have not yet lost their western allies. In the light of this fact, are the Government keeping vigilant about the citizens of India on the other side of the cease-fire line? The other day the hon. Minister was pleased to say that the other side of Kashmir was also an integral part of India. The latest information which I wanted to ascertain was,

whether it is a fact that after our vacating of the land on the Haji Pir side Pakistan has evacuated about 20 villages to build up its defence installations on our territory and, if that is so, whether the Government has not made any protest to the U.N.O. or the Security Council about their building these defence installations on our territory which we vacated on the understanding that Pakistan would not take to any offensive measures? And, same is the case on the Sialkot front. I wonder if the Government is vigilant enough....

**Mr. Speaker:** The question has been too long.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** The actual conditions that have to be observed by either side in relation to the cease-fire line are embodied in the cease-fire agreement to which both India and Pakistan subscribed in the United Nations. That is the governing factor and any contravention of the cease-fire terms about the violation of the agreement is brought to the notice of the Security Council as also of the Observers. It is no doubt correct that Pakistan always raises a propagandist tune in relation to what is happening in Jammu and Kashmir which is an integral part of India. They conveniently forget that the conditions of the people in the Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir are much worse and also forget the type of things that they sometimes demand about the people in Jammu and Kashmir who, I may add, are enjoying democratic rights; there is a constitutional Government functioning. They do not at all compare the condition of the people in Jammu and Kashmir with that of those who live in Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir.

**Shri Tyagi:** Sir, my question definitely was about heavy installations which they are putting up and which will make it impossible for us to recover our territory. Has the Government taken any action or have they got information that those installa-

tions are being put up there on that side?

**Shri Ranga:** Have they made any protest?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I did try to cover this when I said that the addition to the defence potential on either side is covered by the agreements to which we subscribed.... (*Interruption.*)

**Shri Tyagi:** That everybody knows.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** ...at the time of signing of the cease-fire agreement. On this actual fact that they are trying to strengthen their position, we have received information.

**Shri Tyagi:** In that case why not attack in advance?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Any violation of the cease-fire agreement will certainly be taken up with the appropriate authority.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Sir, we wanted factual information.

**Shri Warior:** Apart from the growing relationship of Pakistan with China which has encouraged the violation of the provisions of the Tashkent Agreement, has the attitude of USA also encouraged Pakistan? Has Government made any assessment of that?

**Shri Kapur Singh:** No, no.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** The Chinese attitude was known in the form of the joint statements and the highly provocative speeches made by the Chinese leaders at the time of their last visit to Pakistan. It is very difficult for me to pinpoint any statement that might have been made by United States leaders which could be construed as giving any encouragement to Pakistan to go back upon the Tashkent Declaration.

**Shri P. Venkatasubbalah:** May I know whether Government is aware of the fact that in contravention of the Tashkent Agreement Pakistan is massing troops on our borders; if that is so, what action Government proposes to take?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** This question also is covered by certain arrangements about which the Defence Minister made some statement, about the presence of troops, and I am sure that any contravention of that arrangement and agreement will be taken up by our Defence Ministry with their opposite number.

**Shri Narendra Singh Mahida:** In reply to the question of Shri Mahavir Tyagi, the Foreign Minister replied that Government will approach the proper authority at the proper time. May I know which authority Government proposes to approach at the proper time?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** As I mentioned earlier, the cease-fire agreement is there and violations of that have to be brought to the notice of the UN Observers and the Security Council.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Since our experience has been that the United Nations as a possible arbiter of our difficulties with Pakistan should be ruled out because they cannot help, how does Government proceed to secure a solution of the Kashmir problem which Pakistan claims as a dispute and we deny it and Tashkent calls upon us to settle all disputes by peaceful negotiations? Are we not having a kind of rethinking in regard to the settlement of the Kashmir question; or, are we thinking in terms of what the External Affairs Ministry's words seem to indicate very threateningly, namely, that we are likely to go again before the United Nations for some kind of a settlement?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I do not know wherefrom the hon Member has got the feeling which he has mentioned in the concluding part of his question.

I have said it before, and I repeat, that for all differences and disputes between India and Pakistan, the two countries have agreed, according to the Tashkent Declaration, to resolve them by peaceful means and not to resort to the use of force for the settlement thereof. We have never shown any unwillingness to discuss any matter that might be raised by Pakistan and we will continue our efforts to resolve whatever may be the disputes and differences between our two countries by peaceful means.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** One part of the question has not been answered that there is no rethinking on the Kashmir issue. If you don't say that, that will create a lot of difficulty.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** What I understood from Mr. Mukerjee's question was rethinking on position rather than on the substantive question. On the substantive question, I have reiterated the position more than once that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India.

**Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee:** From the replies of the hon. Minister, we are not able to understand what the position of the Government of India is. What the country requires now is a directive. A certain situation exists. What is the Government's position on that? Pakistan and India have approximately 5000 miles of contiguous land border. Is it the Government's policy to retaliate or to project our desire for friendship and, if it is the latter, are we only going to depend on Government to Government negotiations or are we going to channelise other processes like propaganda machinery to project the Government's stand to Pakistan and the international world because apart from the Pakistan Government there are the Pakistani people and it is as necessary to reach them as it is necessary to reach the international world? May I know from the hon. Minister what is the Government's stand, what is the directive to the country?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I broadly agree with the analysis of the lady Member and also the suggestions that are implicit in a part of the question. The two are not mutually contradictory or exclusive. We have to continue our efforts at the Governmental level to resolve differences by peaceful means. Our attitude should be to work for conditions in which good neighbourly relations should be established between the people of India and the people of Pakistan and any non-governmental effort is most welcome in that direction. I would like to add a warning that at the present moment this is likely to be met with considerable difficulties as Pakistan leaders are always trying to say that they believe in confrontation rather than in easing of tensions. At the same time, we should continue our efforts to ease tensions rather than heighten tensions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Hem Barua.

**Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee:** I wanted to know....

**Mr. Speaker:** He has agreed with most of what the hon. lady Member has said. She should be satisfied now.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Just now the hon. Minister said that the violations of the Tashkent Declaration by Pakistan have been brought to the notice of Soviet Russia. On the other hand, Pakistan has lodged a complaint with Soviet Russia that it is India who has violated the Tashkent Declaration and not Pakistan. In that context, may I know whether, of late, the attitude displayed by Soviet Russia, because of her growing economic ties with Pakistan, is lukewarm so far as our complaints lodged with Soviet Russia are concerned?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** For one thing, there is no question of lodging any complaint....

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Informing them.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Being a friendly country, we inform them about all the developments . . . .

**Shri Hem Barua:** Whether they are aware that Pakistan has lodged a complaint.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** We are not aware of any complaint as the hon. Member describes as having been filed by Pakistan and I cannot imagine as to what complaint they can have. . . .

**Shri Hem Barua:** Pakistan have lodged complaints.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** So far as making allegations is concerned, any allegations can be made whether they are right or wrong. But the hon. Member should be clear in his mind that there is no cause for any such complaint and if any complaint or any allegation based on incorrect facts is made, he should ignore it rather than highlight it here.

On the last part, I would request the hon. Member not to suggest things for which there is no justification. There is no question of any thing lukewarm in these things. It is not fair that these things are raised on the floor of the House.

**Shri Hem Barua:** A personal clarification.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is nothing that should be explained here. . . .

**Shri Hem Barua:** The hon. Minister does not know whether Pakistan has lodged any complaint with Soviet Russia against India. When the hon. Minister suggested about sending an emissary by Soviet Russia to Pakistan, Pakistan wrote back to Soviet Russia telling her, "you need not send an emissary to us because it is India who has violated the Tashkent agreement and not we".

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Bhawrat Jha Asad:** May I know whether the reported statement

of Mr. Bhutto to have prolonged confrontation with India in collusion with China and Pakistan building up very heavy concentrations at Haji Pir by liquidating 20 villages has been brought to the notice of the United Kingdom who called us an aggressor then and the U.S.A. who has now decided to supply lethal weapons to Pakistan and if so, what are their reactions on this—of U.K. as the senior partner of the Commonwealth and of the U.S.A., our benefactor?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** About the supply of arms or any agreement to supply arms, I do not think that there has yet been any assurance by any of the Western countries to supply lethal weapons to Pakistan. On this question we are keeping the friendly countries, including U.K., U.S.A., USSR, France and other important friendly countries, informed of the developments in our relationship and whereas we should continue to keep them informed, it is perhaps too much to expect that immediately their reactions would be available. It takes some time before the other countries make up their minds and they want generally to listen to the other side also; that is part of international life.

#### Admission of China in the United Nations

\*1546. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attitude of Government with regard to admission of China in the United Nations has since changed in any way;

(b) if so, the present position in this regard;

(c) whether there has been any change in the attitude of other important countries which have been opposing Chinese admission to this World body; and

(d) if so the nature of such change discernable?