

Third Series Vol, XLVII - No. 5

Wednesday, November 10, 1965  
Kartika 19, 1887 (Saka)

# LOK SABHA DEBATES

**(Thirteenth Session)**



*(Vol. XLVII contains Nos. 1 - 10)*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*Price : Rs. 1.00*

# CONTENTS

No. 5-Wednesday, November 10, 1965 Kartika 19, 1887 (Saka)

COLUMNS

## Oral Answers to Questions—

• Starred Questions Nos. 120 to 125	1011—47
Short Notice Question No. 1.	1047—49

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 126 to 149.	1049—66
Unstarred Questions Nos. 327 to 359, 361 to 372, 374 to 378 and 380 to 393.	1066—1100

## Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance—

Postponement of Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers	1100—01
--	---------

## Re: Calling Attention Notice—

(Query)	1102—03
---------	---------

Papers Laid on the Table	1103—08
--------------------------	---------

Message from Rajya Sabha	1109
--------------------------	------

Advocates (Amendment) Bill laid on the Table as passed by Rajya Sabha	1109
---	------

## Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—

Seventy-second Report	1109—10
-----------------------	---------

## Metal Corporation of India (Acquisition of Undertaking) Bill—

Introduced	1110—12
------------	---------

Statement re : Metal Corporation of India (Acquisition of Undertaking) Ordinance	1112—14
--	---------

## Motion re: Payment to World Bank and Release of Water under Indus

Waters Treaty	1114—1260
---------------	-----------

Dr. K. L. Rao	1114—30
---------------	---------

Shri Kapur Singh	1134—47
------------------	---------

Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh	1147—54
--------------------------	---------

Shri Indrajit Gupta	1154—67
---------------------	---------

Shri M. L. Dwivedi	1167—75
--------------------	---------

Shri Rameshwaranand	1175—85
---------------------	---------

Shri Shyam Dhar Misra	1185—93
-----------------------	---------

Shri Nath Pai	1193—1206
---------------	-----------

Shri Iqbal Singh	1206—15
------------------	---------

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia	1216—28
-----------------------	---------

Shri N. C. Chatterjee	1228—33
-----------------------	---------

Shri Karni Singhji	1233—39
--------------------	---------

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi	1214—44
-----------------------	---------

Shri A. N. Vidyalkar	1244—48
----------------------	---------

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri	1250—56
--------------------------	---------

\*The sign + marked above the name of a Member indicates that the question was actually asked on the floor of the House by that Member.



1007

1008

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, November 10, 1965/  
Kartika 19, 1887 (Saka).

*The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Yashpal Singh.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आपने पहले कहा था कि जब प्रश्न आया तब व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना, इसलिए मैं उठाना चाहता हूँ।

मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि यह जो 120 नम्बर का प्रश्न है वह एक ऐसे व्यक्ति के बारे में है जिसका सरकार से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है न इस सदन से कोई ताल्लुक है। अब आप यह न समझिए कि जो उनका वक्तव्य है उससे मैं सहमत हूँ। आप तो जानते ही हैं कि मेरी इन मामलों में उनके साथ बिल्कुल नहीं पटती। लेकिन मैं यह नहीं समझता कि कोई खानगी व्यक्ति कोई बयान दे या भाषण करे और उसके ऊपर यहां प्रश्न पूछा जाए। कल इसी प्रकार राजाजी के बारे में प्रश्न पूछा जाएगा, विनोबाजी के बारे में पूछा जाएगा, या और किसी दल के सदस्य के बारे में पूछा जाएगा। यह कहाँ तक उचित है, इसके बारे में मैं आपकी व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ।

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I would like to support my hon. friend Shri Madhu Limaye on three grounds. One is, Shri Namboodiripad is not a Member of this House; nor he is a member of the Government. While I do not

agree with his policies—I strongly oppose them, whether it is the question of Kashmir or of Aksai Chin—this is a matter of principle. I want to support Shri Madhu Limaye. My first ground, as I have said, is that Shri Namboodiripad is neither a Member of this House nor a member of the Government. Secondly, a similar question was raised in this House, when Shri Jayaprakash Narayan issued a statement and that statement came up in this House. It was mainly on Aksai Chin—and, if I am not mistaken—I speak subject to correction—on Kashmir. Not only this. About Nagaland also, a statement was made by Rev. Michael Scott, and on Kashmir by Rajaji. We were told by the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, in this House that ours is a democratic country and as such people have every right to say whatever they like, and when the Government feels that something that they are saying is subversive, then proper action will be taken against them.

Moreover, the question has been tabled on the basis of a press statement; we have not got any letter of Shri Namboodiripad. He has been changing his statement from place to place and from meeting to meeting. And so, I request you to kindly enlighten the House and guide us in this matter.

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I submit....

**Mr. Speaker:** I cannot allow a debate on this.

**Shri Hem Barua:** I just want to oppose what Shri Madhu Limaye and Shri Banerjee have said. My name is also here. While tabling this question, we gave a lot of consideration to the fact that we have..... (Inter-ruption).

**Mr. Speaker:** If I allowed this question, then I will give the reason also. He supports me. I am thankful to him. He need not give the reasons now.

**श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :** मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। अध्यक्ष महोदय, कोई भी व्यक्ति किसी प्रकार का वक्तव्य दे और उसके सम्बन्ध में यहाँ प्रश्न पूछा जाए, यह बहुत अनुचित है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके ऊपर कोई चर्चा यहाँ नहीं होनी चाहिए। अगर उनका वक्तव्य कानून के खिलाफ है तो सरकार उसकी छानबीन करके अगर उचित हो तो उनको दण्ड दे सकती है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** दंड देने या न देने का दूसरा सवाल है। यहाँ ऐक्शन का सवाल नहीं है।

No action is being taken against Shri Nambudiripad. The cases cited by Shri Banerjee are also different. Now, here is a gentleman who is a leader of one of our important parties; a large number of members of that party have been put in jail. Agitation has been going on. He gave a statement, and why I admitted the question was that Members feel probably that some action might have been taken if certainly a party has such views that are prejudicial to the security of the country. It is not Shri Nambudiripad's statement that is prominent here, but the security of the country; some members of the party are inside the jail. That was why I admitted it.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** अध्यक्ष महोदय ...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब आप बहस नहीं कर सकते।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मैं बहस नहीं कर रहा हूँ। आप व्यवस्था दीजिए।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं व्यवस्था दे चुका हूँ।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मैं व्यवस्था का प्रश्न आपके सामने पेश कर रहा हूँ आप एक एक कर के व्यवस्था दीजिए।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आपने एडमिनिस्ट्रिटी के बारे में पूछा। मैं ने उस का फैसला दे दिया।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मैं उसी को लेकर कहता हूँ कि आप फैसला दें। उसी पर आप व्यवस्था दे दें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं ने व्यवस्था दे दी।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मैंने सवाल पूछा था कि क्या ऐसे व्यक्ति के बारे में जिसका सरकार के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, न इस सदन के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध है, क्या ऐसे व्यक्ति ...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैंने सुन लिया।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** ऐसे व्यक्ति के बारे में यहाँ प्रश्न पूछे जा सकते हैं या नहीं इस पर मैं आपकी व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ। अगर आपकी व्यवस्था है कि पूछे जा सकते हैं तो आपन्दा के लिए ...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** हर एक सवाल अपने मैरिट पर तै होगा। अब आप बैठ जाइए, कार्रवाई में रुकावट न डालिए।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मेरे प्रश्न पर आप व्यवस्था दीजिए।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं ने व्यवस्था दे दी है। प्रार्डर, प्रार्डर।

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** उन्होंने यह कहा है कि ...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैंने सब सुन लिया और मैंने जवाब दे दिया यह ऐसा सवाल नहीं है ...

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** यह धमकी देने की जगह नहीं है। आप स्वीकर होकर धमकी लेते चले हैं ...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** क्यों नहीं दूंगा ? आप नहीं मानेंगे तो दूंगा ।

इस सवाल का कोई जनरल फैसला नहीं हो सकता कि कभी भी किसी इंडीवीजुअल के स्टेटमेंट पर मैं सवाल एलाऊ करूंगा या नहीं । जैसे सरकमस्टॉसेज होंगे इंडीवीजुअल केस के उनको देखना होगा । जैसा मौका होगा उसके मुताबिक इस तरह के सवाल को एडमिट करूंगा या नहीं करूंगा ।

**Shri Namboodiripad's views on Kashmir**

+

- \*120. **Shri Yashpal Singh:**  
**Shri Hem Barua:**  
**Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:**  
**Shri J. B. S. Bist:**  
**Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:**  
**Shri Hukam Chand**  
**Kachhavaia:**  
**Shri Kajroikar:**  
**Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:**  
**Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:**  
**Shri Sidheshwar Prasad:**  
**Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:**  
**Shri Gokaran Prasad:**  
**Shri Brij Raj Singh:**  
**Shri Mohammed Koya:**

**Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:**

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to a speech of Shri E. M. S. Namboodiripad, Left C. P. I. Leader of Kerala delivered in the beginning of October, 1965, in which he had expressed his views on the question of Kashmir; and

(b) if so, the reactions of the Government in the matter?

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government are keeping a close watch on such writings and utterances and will take at the appropriate time such action as is necessary.

**श्री यशपाल सिंह:** क्या सरकार बतला सकती है कि इस मौके पर शेख अब्दुल्ला और नम्बूद्रीपाद में सरकार क्या फर्क समझती है ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यह सवाल कैसे होगा ? आपको जो पूछना है वह पूछें ।

**श्री यशपाल सिंह:** दोनों में सरकार कोई तो डिस्टिक्मिनेशन करती होगी ? अगर नहीं करती है तो कह दे कि नहीं करती ।

**गृह-कार्य मंत्री (श्री नन्दा) :** शेख अब्दुल्ला अपनी जगह पर हैं । और नम्बूद्रीपाद अपने ढंग के आदमी हैं । इनमें मैं क्या मुकाबला करूंगा ।

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** नम्बूद्रीपाद ने सरकार से यह प्रार्थना की है जनता उनके भाषणों को सुनने प्राप्ती है तो उसको इस्टीम किया जाता है और उनके भाषण सुनने नहीं दिये जाते । उन्होंने इसके लिए पुलिस संरक्षण की प्रार्थना की है । क्या सरकार ने उनको संरक्षण देने के मामले पर गौर किया है ?

**श्री नन्दा :** पुलिस का फर्ज है सब को संरक्षण देने का जहाँ ला एंड आर्डर का सवाल हो ।

**श्री यशपाल सिंह:** क्या सरकार ने उनके भाषणों को सुनने का प्रबन्ध किया है ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** सुनने का प्रबन्ध नहीं करना है, प्रबन्ध तो ला एंड आर्डर का करना है । क्या उनके भाषण सुनने के लिए सरकार मीटिंग अरेंज करे ।

**Shri Hem Barua:** Sir, on the one hand, we have been saying that Kashmir is not negotiable—we have said so even in the Security Council—for Kashmir is an integral part of India and, on the other hand, here is Shri Namboodiripad going on challenging the very fundamentals of the policy that has been adopted by this country.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta** (Calcutta South West): So does Shri S. K. Patil.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Everybody who does, we will challenge him. Shri Namboodiripad has been challenging the very fundamentals of our policy by statements, one after the other, not one statement but by a series of statements.....

**Mr. Speaker:** What is his question?

**Shri Hem Barua:** The question will be this. In the context of that, why is it that the Government have not taken appropriate action so far against Shri Namboodiripad? Is it because he is an ex-Chief Minister of a State? Do you differentiate like that?

**Shri Nanda:** The Government has taken appropriate action in this case by the line it has taken. The utterances of the gentleman have cumulatively strengthened the patriotism in the country and exposed.....

**Shri Hem Barua:** Strengthened what?

**Shri Nanda:** .....and exposed those who have stood with Shri Namboodiripad.

**Shri Hem Barua:** This is no reply to my question. If by allowing the territorial integrity of this country to be challenged, we are going to strengthen patriotism in this country, that is a wrong line adopted by Mr. Nanda.

**Mr. Speaker:** That may be a wrong line.

**Shri Hem Barua:** There is no other reply to my question.

**Shri J. B. S. Bist:** May I know if the government is in communication with the gentleman concerned and if any members of his party have left the party because of that speech?

**Shri Nanda:** The speeches have produced some kind of crystallisation in that party. A number of people have disowned it and therefore they are veering round to a more patriotic line.

**Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:** Has the Government considered the view of Shri Namboodiripad as his party's view in referring to the statement that the party is not prepared to support the Government in retaking what Pakistan has been holding and what China has come to occupy?

**Shri Nanda:** In the first place, when we talk of the speech of Shri Namboodiripad, it depends on the date on which the speech was made, because the speeches have been very different on different dates. This has also been said, and certainly this is a statement which has been thoroughly deplored, disliked and condemned by all patriotic people.

**श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :** वामपंथी कम्युनिस्टों द्वारा जो देशद्रोह की कार्यवाही की गई उसमें काफी संख्या में लोग पकड़े गये तो क्या सरकार श्री नम्बूद्रीपाद ने जो भाषण दिया है उसको दृष्टि में रखते हुए इस पार्टी के ऊपर कोई प्रतिबन्ध लगाने का या उसे नाजायज करार देने का विचार रखती है ?

**श्री नन्दा :** जो कदम हमें उठाना है उसका उद्देश्य यह है कि उस का भयस्य वह हो जो कि हम चाहते हैं । उससे ज्यादा किसी के ऊपर कोई प्रतिबन्ध लगाने की बात नहीं है । हम जो ऐक्शन ले रहे हैं और उस से जो भयस्य चाहते हैं वह भयस्य पैदा होगा ।

**श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री :** केरल के राज्यपाल ने कभी भी श्री नम्बूद्रीपाद के इस प्रकार के वक्तव्य को देश के हित में नहीं बताया और गृह मंत्री के वक्तव्य से यह प्रतीत होता है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार भी ऐसा अनुभव करती है । अभी गुजरात के मुख्य मंत्री श्री हितेन्द्र देसाई ने इसी प्रकार का एक मजबूत निर्णय भी लिया है, इन सारी बातों के होने के बावजूद भी मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार इस प्रकार के भ्रामकियों के मुंह पर लगाम लगाने के लिये मजबूत कदम उठाने से क्यों डर रही है और

इस का मुख्य कारण क्या है उसे भी स्पष्ट बतलायें ?

श्री नन्दा : मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे सदस्य साहब समझ गये होंगे कि क्या कारण है ।

श्री प्रकाशजीर शास्त्री : मैं नहीं समझा ।

श्री मधु लिमये : कारण यह है कि इन को भी जेल में बंद होना पड़ेगा क्योंकि इन्होंने काश्मीर के एक तिहाई हिस्से से अधिक हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के हाथ में दे रखा है ।

श्री नन्दा : जो उद्देश्य हमारा है उसमें हानि नहीं हो रही है उस में कुछ लाभ हो रहा है । अब और अधिक विस्तार में समझाने में ज्यादा समय लगेगा ।

श्री प्रकाशजीर शास्त्री : मेरी भ्रमस बहुत मोटी है और गृह मंत्री जी ने यह कहा है कि सदस्य महोदय समझ गये होंगे लेकिन मैं समझ नहीं पाया इसलिए अगर आप उचित समझें तो इसे ठीक से समझा दें ताकि मैं भी इसे समझ सकूँ और मेरे साथ ही देश भी इसे समझ सकें ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जितना मंत्री जी ने कह दिया है और उस से समझा जा सकता है उतना समझ लीजिये ।

श्री हेम बब्रभा : समझ में नहीं आया साहब ।

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती : राष्ट्र की प्राप्ति और भीतरी सुरक्षा के विरुद्ध कोई व्यक्ति विशेष ऐसा वक्तव्य देता है जिससे कि स्पष्ट हानि हमारी होती है तो उनके विरुद्ध क्या भारतीय सुरक्षा अधिनियम के मातहत कोई ऐक्शन या कार्यवाही या प्रतिबंध लागू नहीं करना चाहिये ।

श्री नन्दा : मैं तो इसका जवाब दे चुका हूँ कि सैकड़ों को पकड़ा इसी व्याल से इसलिए कोई डर का तो सवाल है नहीं । श्री नम्बूदरीपाद चूँकि चीफ मिनिस्टर थे तो इससे कोई विशेष फर्क नहीं पड़ जाता है और हमें जो काम करना है भयवा कदम उठाना है वह कदम हम न उठाएँ ऐसी तो कोई बात है नहीं ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में जो उनका अपना वक्तव्य है वह इतना भयानक है कि उस व्यक्ति को किसी प्रकार से भी क्षमा नहीं किया जा सकता है लेकिन फिर भी सरकार उन पर जैसे हाथ डालना चाहिए वैसे हाथ नहीं डाल रही है तो क्या हाथ डालने के लिए वह अपराध जितना होना चाहिए वह उससे अपर्याप्त है ?

श्री नन्दा : मैं और क्या ज्यादा कह सकता हूँ ?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं . . . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब स्वामी जी, वह कहते हैं कि जितना जवाब देना था वह तो मैं दे चुका और उससे अधिक नहीं कह सकता तो अब मैं उसमें क्या कर सकता हूँ ?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा निवेदन यह है कि क्या वह अपराध पूरा नहीं हुआ उसमें कुछ कमी रह गयी और अभी उनको और भाषण देने की जरूरत है ताकि उन पर हाथ डाला जा सके ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने राय दे दी वह कहते हैं कि इससे ज्यादा वह जवाब नहीं दे सकते ।

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: The line that the Government seems to be taking is to give Shri Nambudiripad a long rope to hang himself with. We would like to know why this kind of latitude or line is not taken in respect of others who have propounded similar kind of views and why an excep-

tion is being made in the case of Shri Namboodiripad? It is evident from the statement made by the Home Minister that an exception is being made in the case of Shri Namboodiripad.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Minister has given the reasons of the Government. What else can I ask him to give?

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** We want to know the reason for an exception being made in the case of Shri Namboodiripad.

**Mr. Speaker:** That he has mentioned in reply to Shri Shastri.

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** स्वामी जी आप बैठ जाइये, व्यवस्था इस पर नहीं उठ सकती ।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** आप सुन तो लें ? मेरा कहना है कि इस सम्बन्ध में व्यवस्था उठती है ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अच्छा उठाइये व्यवस्था का सवाल ।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको धन्यवाद है कि आपने मुझे व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने का मौका दिया । निवेदन यह है कि इतने बड़े अपराधी पर भी हाथ नहीं डाला जाता और रूह मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि हम को इससे लाभ हो रहा है तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में अगर वे कुछ और वक्तव्य दे दें तो शायद उससे दुगना और चौगुना लाभ हो जायगा ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब इस का जवाब कौम दे सकता है ?

**श्री कपूर सिंह :** नन्दा जी दे सकते हैं ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैंने आपसे कहा कि इसमें कोई व्यवस्था का सवाल नहीं उठता है लेकिन आपने कहा कि उठ सकता है और

आप ने कह दिया । अब इसमें स्वामी जी व्यवस्था का क्या सवाल हुआ ?

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** जब मंत्री महोदय का उत्तर ठीक न हो तो उनसे ठीक उत्तर दिलवाने के लिये व्यवस्था का प्रश्न क्यों नहीं पैदा होता है ?

**Shri A. P. Sharma:** Just now the hon. Home Minister stated that whatever action Government considers necessary is being taken against Shri Namboodiripad and his party. In spite of the activities of the Communist Party and Shri Namboodiripad, may I know why Government is not considering it necessary to ban this party? What is the difficulty in the way of the Government in taking that action?

**Shri Nanda:** If I do not ban this party, then Members of the House and people outside can know what type of people the members of that party are. It is educating the people about the heinous line or stand taken by the party and its members on particular subjects.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I am happy that the hon. Minister has stated that a close watch is being kept on the various speeches made by members of political parties in our country about Kashmir. Kashmir is an integral part of India. I would like to know whether a similar watch is being kept on some of the leaders of the Swatantra Party also, who are questioning the integrity of Kashmir?

**Shri Nanda:** A watch is kept on everybody who makes such statements.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** What about Shri S. K. Patil? Are you keeping a watch on him also?

**Shri Nanda:** Shri S. K. Patil?

**Shri Kapur Singh:** May I ask whether there is any proposal before this

Government to assume power to control and regulate the free expression of opinion of citizens in the near future?

**Shri Nanda:** We are acting under the Constitution.

**Shrimati Savitri Nigam:** How is it that a very responsible spokesman of the Government of India, like the Governor of Kerala, holds a view different from that of the Home Ministry in this matter? Was he consulted before this final view was taken by the Home Minister?

**Shri Nanda:** The Governor of Kerala could have taken any action he pleased in the light of the conditions there.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** The statements of Shri Namboodiripad are being made front page news in Pakistani press and are being broadcast by Radio Pakistan. They are also circulated by the Pakistan Embassies to all the countries of the world. Besides taking action against him or his party, may I know what action the Government is taking to counteract the propaganda of Pakistan on all fronts so that our stand that Kashmir is an integral part of India does not lose ground in those countries?

**Shri Nanda:** The statement of Shri Namboodiripad will not add very much to the hundred per cent falsehood that Pakistan broadcasts otherwise. As to the point of time when anything has to be done about Shri Namboodiripad, as we have said, certainly we are watching what should be done then.

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** क्या मंत्री महोदय ने श्री नम्बूदरीपाद की काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में राय की पूरी जानकारी प्राप्त की है ; यदि हां, तो कुछ दूसरे नेताओं की काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में या भारत के अन्य इलाकों के सम्बन्ध में जो राय है, क्या वह राय श्री नम्बूदरीपाद की राय से मिलती-जुलती है ?

**श्री नन्दा :** अगर एक आदमी कोई एक बात कहे, तो उसका एक असर होता है, लेकिन जिसके कहने का कोई खतरा असर नहीं है, यह जरूरी नहीं है कि हम उसके बारे में भी वही एक्शन लें, जो हम पहले आदमी के बारे में लेते हैं ।

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने एक्शन की बात नहीं पूछी है । मैंने पूछा है कि कुछ दूसरे नेताओं की जो राय काश्मीर या दूसरे इलाकों के बारे में है, क्या वह श्री नम्बूदरीपाद की राय से मिलती-जुलती है ।

**श्री नन्दा :** कइयों से मिलती-जुलती होगी, कइयों से नहीं मिलती-जुलती होगी ।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ । प्रसन्न कहा जाता है कि "काश्मीर इज एन इन्टेग्रल पार्ट ऑफ इंडिया ।" जहाँ तक मैं समझ पाता हूँ, यह स्थिति नहीं है । स्थिति यह है कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का अंग है—“काश्मीर इज ए पार्ट ऑफ इंडिया ।” “इन्टेग्रल” शब्द जोड़ कर मंत्री महोदय और दूसरे लोग हमारी वर्तमान स्थिति को कमजोर करते हैं । इनके खिलाफ भी कोई कार्यवाही ली जाये । ( *Interruption* ) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने आपके सामने यह सवाल उठाया है, इस लिए नहीं कि . . . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं किस रूप के नीचे यह फैसला दे सकता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट इन्टेग्रल का इस्तेमाल न करे ? ( *Interruption* ) मैं यह फैसला नहीं दे सकता हूँ ।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** मुझे भी संशेयी नहीं आती है, लेकिन मामूली संशेयी तो मंत्री महोदय को भी आती होगी । ( *Interruption* )

**Shri Hem Barua:** What is the harm? "Integral" means "fully". Assam is an integral part of India. I take objection to this. We can use the

word "integral". I use the word "integral" knowing fully well that "integral part of India" means "fully part of India".

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He will please sit down.

### Supply of Jet Fuel

\*121. Shri A. N. Vidyalkar: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Western Oil Companies that enjoy virtual monopolies of oil supplies had been responsible for spreading out a false rumour during the Indo-Pak. conflict that India had fallen short of the Jet fuel as the supply arranged by Government with the Western sources had not been received;

(b) whether this false story was published by the following journals (i) *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly*, (ii) *Platt's Oilgram*, and (iii) *Capital of Calcutta*; and

(c) whether Government had considered the desirability of taking any action under the D.I.R. against the companies as well as against the Journals for spreading false rumours at the time of serious emergency?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir): (a) and (b). No, Sir. No report of shortage of jet fuel has come to Government's notice, but *Capital* in its issue of 2nd September and *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly* in its issue of 6th September carried incorrect reports about delay in receipt of ATF supplies arranged by Government from Western sources. No such report was published in *Platt's Oilgram*.

(c) Does not arise.

Shri A. N. Vidyalkar: What action was taken against the two papers that have been mentioned, *Capital* and the other one, with regard to their circulation? Was this news contradicted or what was done?

Shri Humayun Kabir: The first paper, the *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly*, published a long article in which it gave different points of view and incidentally had referred that according to certain reports the Western supply had not come. As soon as it was pointed out to them that the information was incorrect, they published a contradiction. So far as *Capital* is concerned, they also had expressed certain views and they have been told that since they are a paper in India, they should always ascertain the facts from authoritative sources before publishing any such incorrect news.

Shri A. N. Vidyalkar: I wanted to know what the Government did in order to remove the impression that was created by these papers and what action was taken against the papers because at a critical time they created that impression and, I know Sir, it was a general impression after these reports were published.

Shri Humayun Kabir: There was no cause for any action. It was an expression of opinion which was contradicted. There was no shortage of supply and this was stated again and again. I do not think any paper should be condemned or any action should be taken simply because they express certain opinions.

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय : इस बात को देखते हुए कि पश्चिमी तेल कम्पनियों ने दश में तेल का सकट उत्पन्न किया है क्या सरकार उन के खिलाफ भी कोई कार्यवाही कर रही है ?

Shri Humayun Kabir: The assumption is wrong; there was no sabotage of supply.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Is it not a fact that the supply of imported aviation fuel from other Western sources, which was arranged by the Minister, was not known in the beginning to these three Western oil companies, and did they not utilise this crisis to



demand higher prices for their fuel during the crisis?

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** Not during the crisis. When we secured a much higher discount, they naturally argued with us but the supplies were received towards the end of July and they have accepted the oil which we received from the Western sources.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** The Minister, in his reply, has said that, as the papers have contradicted what misleading news they had given, the Government is satisfied. When at a moment of crisis such misleading propaganda is done in this type of papers, may I know whether Government is contemplating taking some more drastic action than merely asking for a contradiction after the mischief is done?

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** As I said, it was a long editorial in which they had argued and said that the Government thought that the Talukdar Report did not go far enough whereas all private companies thought that the Talukdar Report was drastic. In that connection, they expressed an opinion. I do not think that we should go about condemning every paper in every part of the world simply because they express an opinion.

कानपुर के व्यापारों की गिरफ्तारी

+

\* 122. डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :

श्री मधु सिमये :

श्री बागड़ी :

श्री राम सेवक यादव :

श्री भानु प्रकाश सिंह :

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा :

श्री यशपाल सिंह :

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत :

श्री श्रीकार लाल बरवा :

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि कानपुर का

एक उद्योगपति हाल में पाकिस्तान को लोहे की चादरे भेजता हुआ पकड़ा गया था ;

(ख) क्या इस मामले की जांच केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो को सौंप दी गई है ; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो द्वारा की गयी जांच की मुख्य बातें क्या हैं ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री ल० ना० मिश्र) : (क) से (ग). सभा-पटल पर एक विवरण रख दिया गया है ।

### विवरण

(क) यह सूचना प्राप्त होने पर जंग न लगने वाली लोहे की नालीदार चादरें कानपुर से अहमदाबाद के निकट नरोदा रेलवे स्टेशन के लिए बुक की गई थी जिनके बारे में कहा जाता था कि वे पाकिस्तान ले जाई जायेंगी, कानपुर स्थित सरकार की रेलवे पुलिस ने 7 जुलाई, 1965 को 102 ऐसी चादरों के 2 बंडल जब्त कर लिये जो कानपुर के एक रेलवे से माल मंगाने और भेजने वाले एजेंट द्वारा नरोदा के लिये बुक कराई गई थी । उत्तर प्रदेश की सी० आई० डी० द्वारा जांच शुरू की गई । पहली नितम्बर, 1965 को एक जूडीशियल मजिस्ट्रेट के सामने दिए गए बयान में माल भेजने वाले एजेंट ने बताया कि यह माल कानपुर के एक व्यापारी का था । जब प्रागे की जांच की जा रही थी तब उक्त व्यापारी ने एजेंट का बयान लेने वाले मजिस्ट्रेट को घूस देने की कोशिश की एक जाल बिछाया गया और पहली सितम्बर, 1965 की रात को यह व्यापारी घूस देने की कोशिश करता हुआ मजिस्ट्रेट के निवास स्थान पर भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 165-क के अधीन गिरफ्तार किया गया । उसे आवश्यक वस्तु अधिनियम की धारा 3 और 7 तथा भारत मुन्ना नियमों की व्यवस्थाओं के अधीन भी गिरफ्तार किया गया ।

(ख) आवश्यक वस्तु अधिनियम तथा भारत सुरक्षा नियमों के अधीन मुख्य मामलों

के बारे में जांच का काम अब केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो को सौंप दिया गया है। उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार से अनुरोध किया गया है कि वह मजिस्ट्रेट को घूस देने के मामले की जांच भी केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो को सौंप दे क्योंकि यह मामला भी मुख्य मामले की एक शाखा है।

(ग) मुख्य मामले से सम्बन्धित कागजात केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो ने 6-10-1965 को उत्तर प्रदेश पुलिस से ले लिये। अभी भागे जांच चल रही है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि लोहे की चादरें पाकिस्तान में कहां धीर किस को भेजी गईं धीर इसमें किस श्रेणी के मंत्री, भ्रष्टाचार धीर रेल के भ्रष्टाचार जुड़े हुए हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : स्टेटमेंट में दिया गया है कि किस को भेजी गई। इस में रेल के भ्रष्टाचार का भी जिक्र है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मुश्किल यह है कि वह स्टेटमेंट मेरे पास तो है नहीं।

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : मैं माननीय सदस्य की थोड़ी सी मदद कर देता हूँ। जहां तक पाकिस्तान को भेजने का प्रश्न है, आरोप यह है कि पाकिस्तान को भेजने का इरादा था। वैसे वे चादरें भ्रष्टाचार के पास नरोदा रेलवे स्टेशन के लिए बूक की गई थीं। इस लिए अभी तक तो यह आरोप ही है कि ये पाकिस्तान भेजी जा रही थीं। यह बात अभी सिद्ध नहीं हुई है। इस बारे में सेंट्रल ब्यूरो आफ इन्वेस्टिगेशन तहकीकात कर रहा है। इस तहकीकात के बाद तथ्यों का पता चलेगा। जहां तक हमको सूचना मिली है, अभी तक ऐसा कोई आरोप नहीं है कि कोई मंत्री या रेलवे का कोई उच्च पदाधिकारी इसमें फंसा हुआ है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या यह क्लियरिंग एजेंट रेलवेज का है ?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : वे तो प्राइवेट शोरर हुआ करते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मंत्री महोदय ने सारी बुनियाद ही खत्म कर दी है। इस मामले की तहकीकात करते हुए सरकार को अब मान्य हुआ है कि भारत में लोहे की चादरों और भ्रष्टाचार वगैरह चीजों की कमी और उनके बढ़ते दामों का एक कारण तस्कर व्यापार रहा है। तो क्या सरकार कोई व्यापक तरीके सोच रही है और क्या उसने कोई कदम उठाया है, जिससे इस तरह का तस्कर व्यापार मिटे ?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : तस्कर व्यापार से बहुत सी चीजों की कमी हो जाती है और कुछ चीजें बढ़ भी जाती हैं, लेकिन इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि तस्कर व्यापार बहुत गलत और बहुत बुरी चीज है। जहां तक उसको रोकने के लिए पहले का सबाल है, हम लोगों ने उस को स्ट्रेंगथ किया है और कदम उठाए हैं, ताकि जहां तक हो सके, स्मगलिंग को खत्म किया जा सके।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैंने व्यापक जांच और व्यापक उपाय के बारे में पूछा है।

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : हम इन्टेन्सिव ढंग से काम कर रहे हैं।

श्री मधु सिमर : कानपुर के इस व्यापारी को जब गिरफ्तार किया गया, तब क्या उसके पास से सात सौ ट्रांजिस्टर रेडियो मिले और क्या सरकार के पास इस बात की खबर है कि यह व्यापारी सरकार के सचिव, मंत्री और दूसरे भ्रष्टाचारियों को खरीदने के लिए उनको ट्रांजिस्टर रेडियो बांटा करता था ?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : उनके घर की तलाशी हुई, जो काफी दिन तक चली। एसिस्टेंट कमिशनर, कलक्टर, सेंट्रल एक्साइज और स्थानीय पदाधिकारी मौजूद थे। कुछ

चीजें मिलीं, लेकिन कामर्शल क्वान्टिटी में नहीं मिलीं। मैं इस वक्त ठीक संख्या नहीं दे सकता हूं, लेकिन बहुत कम मात्रा में—दस, पांच—ट्रांजिस्टर मिले। यह बात प्रसत्य है कि वे सरकारी सचिव को या किसी को देने के लिये रखे गये थे। यह आरोप नहीं है।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : स्टेटमेंट में कहा गया है :

"While further investigations were in progress, the said trader of Kanpur...."

—that is, Mr. Agarwal—

"....is alleged to have made an attempt to bribe the Magistrate who recorded the statement of the Clearing Agent."

इससे साफ जाहिर होता है कि भगवान साहब ने जो भ्रचानक करोड़पति बन गए हैं दस साल में, मैजिस्ट्रेट को रिश्वत देने की कोशिश की। क्या इस बात की भी जांच होगी कि इन्होंने उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार में सचिव या मंत्री या धीर किसी को भी रिश्वत देने की कोशिश की और कितने लोगों ने उस रिश्वत को देशभक्ति के आधार पर स्वीकार किया और कितने धादमियों ने इन्कार किया? इसकी जांच भी सी० बी० धाई० करेगा या नहीं?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : करोड़पति बनने का जहां तक प्रश्न है यह चीज माननीय सदस्य ज्यादा जानते हैं क्योंकि ये उनके पड़ोसी हैं.....

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : हम तो आपसे जांच की बात कर रहे हैं।

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : जहां तक जांच की बात का सम्बन्ध है, हर तरह की तहकीकात होगी और जो भी इस दायरे में आए उसको पकड़ा जाएगा और कारबाई की जाएगी

चाहे वह कितना ही ऊंचे से ऊंचा व्यक्ति क्यों न हो।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I had tabled this question twice on two things. I thought that at least in the Central Parliament here we would be enlightened with more information by way of answers to questions. The U.P. Assembly was adjourned a day before that because the name was to be announced....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member can have recourse to some other procedure.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Transistor set or no transistor set, we should have answers to our questions.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन्होंने इन्कार किया है।

श्री० राज मनोहर लोहिया : बनर्जी साहब को भी कुछ देने की कोशिश की होगी। पड़ोसी हैं न।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : क्या वह सच है कि लक्ष्मीचन्द भगवान, भोला भगवान की फर्म से जो कि एक करोड़पति फर्म है, ताल्लुक रखते हैं और सरकारी धादमियों को इलीगल प्रेटिफिकेशन पट्टाबाया करते थे? मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूं कि कितनी गिरफ्तारियां हुई हैं और कितनों की जमानतें हुई हैं और कितने अभी जेल में हैं?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : जहां तक फर्म का सवाल है यह ठीक है कि लक्ष्मीचन्द भगवान का नाम है। उन्हीं की चादरें थीं। रेलवे फारवार्डिंग एजेंट ने उन्हीं का नाम दिया था और उनको गिरफ्तार भी किया गया था। जैसे बनर्जी साहब ने रिश्वत की बात कही है छः हजार रुपये देने वह जा रहा थे ट्रेप ले लिया गया याने जाल बिछाया गया और मुस्नदी से, चुस्नी से हमारी पुलिस और मैजिस्ट्रेट ने उनको गिरफ्तार किया। उन पर मुकदमा भी चल रहा है। दो महीने तक वह हवालात में रहे और

उसके बाद उनकी कोर्ट से उनकी जमानत हो गई—

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** He was always in jail hospital.

श्री स० ना० मिश्र : जो भी हो, वह जेल में थे और दो महीन के बाद कोर्ट से जमानत हो गई। जैसा माननीय सदस्य जानते हैं, ज्यूडिशरी इंडीपेंडेंट है। वहां से उनकी जमानत हुई।

जहां तक करोड़पति बनने का सवाल है, माली हालत का सवाल है, उसके बारे में मैं नहीं जानता हूं। लेकिन रिश्वत देने का आरोप है जिसकी जांच हो रही है।

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Is it a fact that this particular money-bag of Kanpur made a very tidy contribution of a lakh, perhaps more than two lakh of rupees to the Congress election fund during the 1962 elections, and is that the reason why Government are suspected of adopting a 'goody-softy' attitude in the matter and is that also the reason why the Chief Minister of U.P. was advised by the Centre not to make a statement in the U.P. Assembly while the matter was being processed at the Centre by the big bosses here?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** I may say that we are vigorously pursuing the matter and investigating the matter. It is very wrong and unfair, therefore, for my hon. friend to say like that. I do not know whether they have made any contributions. I am not aware of it. But so far as the first part of the question is concerned, namely the question of taking any steps against that firm or that party, we are very serious about it, and it will be unfair to say that we are soft or anything of that sort. So far as the statement is concerned, the statement has been made in the U.P. Legislature.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** By the Chief Minister of U.P.?

**Mr. Speaker:** He says that a statement has been made in the U.P. Assembly.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है। उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा तो एक दिन पहले ही स्थगित कर दी गई। उत्तर प्रदेश विधान परिषद में यह बयान दिया गया था। यह गलत बात घाप कह रहे हैं। घाप खड़े होकर माफी मांगिये।

श्री स० ना० मिश्र : घबराइये नहीं, अभी बता देता हूं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सीधी सी माफी मांगिये। विधान परिषद में बयान हुआ था, विधान सभा में नहीं।

श्री स० ना० मिश्र : यह मैं मान सकता हूं। लैजिस्लेचर तो हुई।

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I did not hear what he said about the Chief Minister of U.P. I wanted to know whether she was advised by the Government here....

**Mr. Speaker:** There a statement was made in the Council.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Not now, but then, in September. I want to know whether the Chief Minister of U.P. was advised not to make a statement there when the matter was being processed here and the matter was sought to be hushed up at the Centre by the big bosses here....

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** There is no question of hushing up the matter. We did not advise her like that. The investigation was in progress.

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda):** Where does the question of hushing up arise at all? As soon as the matter was brought to our notice

we took it up, and the Central Bureau of Investigation was brought into the picture so that it could be tackled very effectively. And it is being done. After our having done that, if we are still to be told that we are soft and so on, I do not quite understand it.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** My question was whether the hon. Minister advised her not to make a statement there?

**Shri Nanda:** No, we are not concerned with that.

**Shri Hem Barua:** On a point of order. It is a very serious matter. Shri Kamath asked whether this particular gentleman had made a contribution of Rs. 2 lakhs to the Congress fund during the elections. In reply, the Deputy Minister has said that it is an 'unfair, wrong and unfounded statement'. In the same breath, he said that he does not know whether the gentleman concerned had made any contribution to the Congress Party or to the Congress election fund. When he does not know whether he made any contribution, is it in order for him to say that Shri Kamath's statement is wrong, unfair and unfounded?

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Kamath had said so many things and not merely one. As regards the question about contribution having been made, he has said that he has no knowledge. About the other things, he has said that it is unfair.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** On a point of order now arising out of your ruling. As far as I understood him, he said that the first part of the statement, about contribution of Rs. 2 lakhs or more, was unfounded, unfair and all that. I do not think he referred to the rest of the statement in that context. The other thing I asked was whether the Chief Minister of U.P. was advised not to make any statement while the matter was being dealt with here at the Centre. There is no question of any baseless charge in that.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, no. . .

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** You are brushing it off lightly—I am sorry. My colleague Shri Hem Barua raised a point of order that the Deputy Minister, after having said that he does not know whether this money-bag made any contribution of Rs. 2 lakhs to the Congress fund, insisted that my statement was unfounded. How dare he say that?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am surprised that this attitude is taken and we are proceeding like this. When a point of order is raised, I give the decision. Then it is contested. Then some discussion takes place.

I had said that there were two or three things that Shri Kamath had said.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Two things.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right. Then also, about one, he said that he does not know. About the second, the Minister said that it is unfair, the imputation in it. What is wrong there?

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : लोहे की चादरें कितनी थीं और इनकी कीमत क्या थी ?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : चादरें जो पकड़ी गई हैं वे शायद 130 के करीब थीं। अभी मैं घाप को बता देता हूँ।

अप्यस महोदय : यह स्टेटमेंट में दिया हुआ है।

**Shri R. S. Pandey:** Apart from the Kanpur trader, how many other people have been arrested during the hostilities between India and Pakistan on the charge of smuggling goods to Pakistan?

**Mr. Speaker:** It is a general question.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** This is a very important question, apart from the scandal that may arise out of this whole affair. How is it that this

whole affair, where many government officials would be involved, where government at a very high level would be involved—in sending out iron sheets to Pakistan—how is it that this matter was not brought to the notice of Government directly, immediately as soon as this step was taken, and some information had to be led to the Government?

**Mr. Speaker:** He has answered it. He said it has not yet been established that it was intended for Pakistan. That is the allegation made. That is being inquired into. It was booked for Ahmedabad and it had reached there, but afterwards certain other developments took place. They have taken him into custody. The CBI is inquiring into it. Unless the inquiry is completed, how can he say that it was intended for Pakistan or not?

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** My question is very simple. If this was the object, namely, to send goods, particularly iron sheets, out of India to Pakistan, how is it that the Government of India did not come to know of it before this information was brought to their notice?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** We knew it, and we took steps. It was booked and when we came to know of it, the man was arrested. The CBI has taken over the inquiry from the State Government. It is seized of it and is looking into it very vigorously.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is: when it was intended to be sent to Pakistan, how is it that it took so long a time for Government to know? How is it that the Government had no information that some goods were being despatched to Pakistan?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** Only after this thing was detected, some people made allegations that this was being sent to Naroda with a view to being sent to Pakistan. That has yet to be established.

**Shri S. N. Chaturvedi:** What are the offences for which investigation

is being carried on. Is it being carried on only for offering a bribe or other offences also?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** Both, violation of the Essential Supplies Act and offering bribe.

**Mr. Speaker:** That also is given in the statement.

**श्री सरजू पाण्डेय:** अभी माननीय मंत्री जी ने बतलाया कि सी० बी० आई० को यह जांच सुपुर्द की गई है कि माल पाकिस्तान भेजा गया है या नहीं। कई माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि इसमें कुछ सरकार के बड़े कर्मचारियों का भी हाथ है। इस बात को देखते हुये क्या सी० बी० आई० को उनका कटौत करने के लिये कहा जायेगा ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** सी० बी० आई० खुद सब कुछ देख लेगी।

**श्री सरजू पाण्डेय:** अध्यक्ष महोदय, बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** जब सी० बी० आई० जांच कर रही है तो उससे कैसे कहा जाये कि वह क्या करे और क्या न करे।

**श्री हुकूम चन्द कछवाय:** मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या माननीय मंत्री जी के ध्यान में यह बात आई है कि श्री अग्रवाल ने कुछ ऊँचे सरकारी कर्मचारियों और मंत्रियों को समय-समय पर पाटियां घादि दी हैं और यह श्री अग्रवाल कानपुर सिटी काँग्रेस की कार्यकारिणी के एक बरिष्ठ सदस्य हैं ?

**श्री स० ना० निम्ब:** एक बात मैं कहूँ। बहुत धार दात उठाई गई और अभी भी कही गई कि काँग्रेस के मंत्री और उच्च पदाधिकारी लोग नाजायज फायदा उठाते हैं। काँग्रेस के मंत्री और उच्च सरकारी अधिकारी होना तो कोई बुरी बात

नहीं है। लेकिन जो भी खबरें हमारे पास आई हैं उन में ऐसी बात नहीं मालूम होती कि किसी मंत्री पर या उच्च पदाधिकारी पर कोई आरोप लगता हो। जहाँ एक चीजों का सवाल है मैं कहूँगा कि कुछ ताश मिले हैं उन के यहाँ, कुछ कम दामों के फाउंटन पेन मिले हैं और एक घाघ ट्रांजिस्टर सेट्स मिले हैं।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछराय : और यह जो पार्टियाँ दी गई हैं श्री भद्रवाल द्वारा जो कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्य हैं।

Shri Shrivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: What exactly is the ambit of the reference of this particular case handed over to the C.B.I. because this may be only one incident in a chain of incidents?

Mr. Speaker: That is given in the statement.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछराय : अध्यक्ष महोदय मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं आया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उत्तर आ गया है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछराय : मंत्री महोदय मेरे प्रश्न को समझे नहीं हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं समझे तो मैं क्या करूँ।

श्री किशन पटनायक : फावर्डिंग ऐजेंट और अन्य लोगों के जो अप्रान रेजिस्ट्रार या पुलिस के सामने हुये हैं उन में क्या है, और क्या उस की एक प्रति मंत्री महोदय टेबल पर रखेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह स्टेटमेंट यहाँ नहीं आ सकता।

## Fencing of Land Borders

+

\*123. Shri Gokulananda Mohanty:  
Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:  
Shri Siddheshwar Prasad:  
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:  
Shri P. C. Barooah:  
Shri Mohammed Koya:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the border States have submitted a proposal to erect wire fencing all along the land borders primarily to prevent infiltration;

(b) whether Government have considered the plan in all its aspects; and

(c) if so, the result thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) to (c). No, Sir. But a proposal initiated by the Central Government for the erection of barbed wire fencing along certain sectors of Assam East Pakistan border, is under consideration.

Shri Gokulananda Mohanty: May I know when Government propose to start this work and complete it?

Shri Hathi: We have sent the Director-General of Border Security to locate actually the areas where this can be done and assess what the cost would be and whether it would be feasible. After that we shall start.

Shri Gokulananda Mohanty: Did they consider the financial aspect?

Mr. Speaker: That is what is being examined.

Shri Hathi: It would depend upon the length for which we want the wire fencing, but at present it is estimated to be between Rs. 35 and Rs. 45 lakhs.

Mr. Speaker: P. C. Barooah, Basumatari.

Shri Basumatari: In view of the fact that most of the deportees are

returning to Assam and also in view of the fact that new infiltrators are pouring in like anything, may I know whether the Assam Government has proposed wire-fencing of the border of Assam with East Pakistan?

**Shri Hathi:** No, Sir.

**Shri R. Barua:** May I know whether in any other part of the world there is such demarcation of international boundaries?

**Shri Hathi:** I do not know.

**Shri Buta Singh:** With a view to prevent infiltration effectively, has the Government received any proposal or proposals from the State Governments of the border areas to supply arms to the people living in those areas; if so, what is the reaction of the Government of India to it?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is a different thing.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** In addition to fencing.

**Shri Buta Singh:** To prevent infiltration.

**Mr. Speaker:** That would be discussed separately.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I would like to know whether the Government have at any time considered the possibility of similar kind of fencing of our western borders?

**Shri Hathi:** We have not yet considered that aspect.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Is it not a fact that when this question of fencing the border was originally mooted, the Assam Government raised objections and then when the question of clearing a two-mile deep belt all along Assam-East Pakistan border was mooted, the Assam Government raised objection to that. In view of these objections may I know whether the Central Government have tried to probe into the mind of the Assam Government and tried to find out from them what measures they want

to check illegal infiltration from East Pakistan?

**Shri Nanda:** I may make it clear at once that the Assam Government never raised any objection to this question of barbed-wire fencing.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** Not only barbed-wire fencing but even concrete walls in Berlin have not been able to stop infiltration from the east to the west. Do not the government think that it would be futile to have such fencing and the way to tackle the problem of infiltration is to arm the people on the borders?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is a suggestion. Next question. Dr. Singhvi.

**Shri Nath Pal:** Have you really passed on to the next question? If you have not completely passed on to the next question....

**Mr. Speaker:** I have called the next question.

#### Commission to study Administrative Problems

+

\*124. **Dr. L. M. Singhvi:**  
**Shri J. B. S. Elst:**  
**Shrimati Vimla Devi:**  
**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:**  
**Shri Sidheshwar Prasad:**  
**Shri Jashvant Mehta:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Prime Minister's announcement to constitute a Commission of Enquiry to tackle the administrative problems of the country has been implemented; and

(b) if so, its composition, the terms of reference and the duration within which the Commission is likely to complete its work?

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda):** (a) and (b). It has been decided to appoint an Administrative Reforms Commission. The details are



under consideration and a resolution appointing the Commission is likely to be issued very soon.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** This matter has been under consideration for a very long time and has been delayed either knowingly or unwittingly. In the meanwhile the Home Minister has appointed a special consultative group. I would like to know whether it is proposed, in consequence of the constitution of this Commission, to shelve or supplant that consultative group and in particular whether it is proposed to institute a thorough probe into the existing system of administrative tribunals and evolving an adequate machinery for redress of public grievance such as the institution of ombudsman?

**Shri Nanda:** It is not at all intended to shelve, as the hon. Member had put it, the other activity intended to promote administrative reform including the committees which have been set up.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** The question has not been answered. I wanted to know whether it was the intention of the government to institute a thorough probe into the existing system of administrative tribunals and evolve an adequate system of redressing public grievances.

**Shri Nanda:** That is to say, how much of it will have to be dealt with by this commission. I am not able to say that at the moment.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** Is it a fact that Mr. Morarji Desai a member of this House has accepted the chairmanship of the proposed commission and whether the other personnel and composition of this Commission has also been considered and finalised and, if so, what are the details?

**Shri Nanda:** The personnel has not yet been finalised. Till it has become very definite and final, I do not think I should enter into that question here, at this stage.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** The Press has reported that from very authoritative sources.

**Mr. Speaker:** Unless they are finalised, he cannot say so.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** That is to say that the Press is a superior body to this House! He can say whether he has formally accepted or not. It is a question of fact. Has he been asked and has he accepted? That answer must come forward.

**Shri Nanda:** Before we finalise the personnel, several steps have to be taken. People may have to be sounded. But nothing final and definite has taken place..... (Interruptions)....even regarding the chairman.

**Shri J. B. S. Bist:** Has the Government fixed any time-limit?

**Shri Nanda:** I cannot say definitely now, but it is not intended.

जो घटनाएँ सिंह: हमारे जो घोड़े चले घा रहे हैं जिन को कलेक्टर कहते हैं या कहीं पर डिप्टी कमिश्नर कहते हैं, यह उस वक्त ये जब कि हमारे देश का दारोमदार रेवेन्यू पर था, लेकिन घाघ रेवेन्यू पर नहीं है। इस लिये कलेक्टर या डिप्टी कमिश्नर के घोड़े या जो ब्यूरोक्रेटिक चीज है, जब तक वह हमारे बीच में है तब तक जनता से संपर्क कायम नहीं हो सकता है। तो क्या सरकार ने यह स्याल किया है कि इस डिप्टी कमिश्नर के घोड़े को हटा कर कोई सेवक का घोड़ा कायम किया जाये?

अध्यक्ष महोदय: इस वक्त तो यह नहीं होगा।

**Shri Kapur Singh:** There are two functions to be performed; sometimes they may be joined in one person, but the functions which he has to perform are entirely different from one another.

**Shri Nath Pai:** May I know,—if he cannot enlighten the House as to the personnel, for whatever reasons, because we read it in the papers that some gentlemen have been sounded and they are giving their own condition and so on—whether he can tell us at least something about the nature of the work that will be entrusted to the Commission? Is he going to do some white-washing of the rickety administrative machinery or is the Commission to be charged with the duty of recasting radically and drastically the existing system of administration? What exactly does the Government have in mind?

**Shri Nanda:** The hon. Member goes too far when he says that it is a rickety administration. It has its deficiencies and therefore it is necessary to have a very comprehensive inquiry, and it will be a deep and comprehensive inquiry into practically all aspects that are of any value in regard to the administration of the country.

**Shri Nath Pai:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; you should extend to me the opportunity extended to Sardar Kapur Singh, my distinguished colleague. I had specifically asked, is he going to drastically recast it, and what will be the nature. He said all aspects will be touched; it is only this touching which has been going on all these years. The question is whether it will be reconstructed, recast drastically. We do not want touching and white-washing.

**Shri Nanda:** I said it will be looked into in depth. I feel touch and depth are two different things.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai seems to be unaware of the fact, which most of the Members in this House know, that the touch of Shri Nanda is all potent. Therefore, when he said he was going to touch, he meant everything that Shri Nath Pai desires him to do.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** We get conflicting reports; the Home Minister

sometimes accepts the principle of Ombudsman and sometimes rejects it. May we know if the Home Minister has come to any definite decision on this point or will that also be left to the Commission to be finalised after proper inquiry?

**Shri Nanda:** The Commission certainly will now deal with those aspects.

### Clash with Naga Hostiles

+

\*125. **Shri Rameshwar Tantia:**  
**Shri Himatsingka:**  
**Shri D. C. Sharma:**  
**Shri Basumatari:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Naga hostiles opened fire on our Border Security Forces on the night of the 27th September, 1965 along the Jorhat-Nagaland border;

(b) if so, the action taken by our Security Forces;

(c) the number of casualties suffered by our forces and by the Naga hostiles respectively;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the Naga hostiles were armed with light machine-guns and automatic weapons obtained from Pakistan; and

(e) if so, the measures taken by the Security Forces to deal with the Naga hostiles during the Indo-Pak conflict?

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra):** (a) Yes.

(b) The Security Forces immediately returned the fire and the hostiles ran away under cover of darkness.

(c) No casualty was suffered by the Security Forces. Government has no definite information of casualties suffered by the Naga hostiles.

(d) Naga hostiles are reported to be armed with light machine-guns. As the House knows a number of Nagas have got their training in

Pakistan. However, so far as this incident is concerned, there is no information to show that the weapons used by the Naga hostiles were obtained from Pakistan.

(e) During the conflict with Pakistan security measures were tightened by intensive patrol by Security Forces along the Assam-Nagaland Border. Village defence parties were also organised for rendering effective assistance to the Security Forces.

श्री रामेश्वर टांडिया: स्टेटमेंट में कहा गया है कि जो हथियार उनके पास थे वे पाकिस्तान के बने हुए नहीं मालूम देते थे। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वे कुछ हथियार छोड़ गये थे इस वक्त या इसके पहले या पीछे और वे किस देश के बने हुए थे?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र: इस बाक्य में वे कोई हथियार नहीं छोड़ गये।

श्री रामेश्वर टांडिया: प्राज १२ महीने से नागलैंड के बारे में पीस मिशन काम कर रहा है और इसके बावजूद भी बीच बीच में नागा लोग हमले कर रहे हैं, तो क्या सरकार पीस मिशन के काम को प्रागे चलने देगी या इसके बारे में कुछ और सोचेगी और इन के (नागा लोगों के) खिलाफ कड़ी कार्रवाई करेगी?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र: यह विषय विदेश मंत्रालय का है, इसलिये मैं इस पर राय नहीं दूंगा, लेकिन यह सत्य है कि कुछ बाक्ये होते रहे हैं।

Shri Himatsingka: Is the Government aware of the very unhealthy influence exercised by the missionaries over the Naga rebels and, if so, what action does the Government propose to take to control and ultimately eliminate such influence?

Shri L. N. Mishra: All these questions refer to the peace-talks that

have been carried on, and it is better that the question be referred to the External Affairs Ministry.

Shri D. C. Sharma: This Naga problem has been with us for a long time and every day that passes makes the Naga hostiles more and more anti-Indian and hostile. When the security forces have failed to tackle the problem and the village defence forces are only on paper, is the Government going to take some extra-precaution to see that the Naga hostiles are contained and they are not allowed to make these incursions?

Shri L. N. Mishra: As I said earlier, so far as security measures and law and order situation are concerned, the situation has much improved. I would draw the hon. Member's attention to the fact that this incident does not relate to the cease-fire area. It relates to Assam and Nagaland border where this particular incident took place. The law and order situation in Manipur has improved and the village security forces have done well.

Shri Basumatari: In view of the fact that a number of cattle have been lifted and killed sometimes, may I know what steps have been taken to prevent it, and whether there is any provision to compensate them for these losses?

Shri L. N. Mishra: I am not aware of this.

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: The Minister said that security measures are being tightened up. May I know what steps have been taken about the missionary work and how many missionaries are still there in Nagaland?

Shri L. N. Mishra: Missionaries are there. We have not closed any of them so far. They are functioning. All these things are under the consideration of the peace mission which is looking after the main problem.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Is it a fact that after the extension of invitation to the Naga rebel leader, Mr. Phizo by the peace mission, the hostile activi-

ties of the Naga hostiles have increased? If so, is it a fact that 1000 Naga hostiles are on their way to Pakistan to get military training?

**Shri Hem Barua:** 1500.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Is their number 1000 or 1500 and are they really on their way to Pakistan to get training by both Pakistanis and Chinese and then come back? If so, what steps have been taken by the Government to see that they are not allowed to come back?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** I will answer only the second part, because the first part refers to the Ministry of External Affairs. So far as training in Pakistan is concerned, it is a fact that they are getting regular training in Pakistan. We are trying to stop their entry into Nagaland. As the hon. Members know, in January, 1965, a number of Nagas wanted to enter Nagaland after getting training. We did not allow a large number of them to enter Nagaland.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** He said, a large number of hostile Nagas wanted to go and they were not allowed to go. Does it mean that the Government allowed some Nagas to go?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** I meant that some might have smuggled.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

**Shri P. C. Borooah:** May I know whether the activities of Naga hostiles have been on the increase since the Pak aggression on Kutch border and they are now trying to establish some parallel government in three sub-divisions inside Manipur and one ex-M.P. of that area is underground, and if so, what action the Government have taken in this matter?

**Shri L. N. Mishra:** So far as the three sub-divisions of Manipur are

concerned, the situation there has improved considerably in the course of the last few months, so far as law and order is concerned. About their activities in these sub-divisions, they have not increased much.

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आपका व्यवस्था का प्रश्न क्या है ?

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि परसों मैंने यह मामला सदन के सामने उठाया था और प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछा था कि क्या नागा विद्रोहियों को पाकिस्तान में प्रशिक्षण मिल रहा है हथियार चलाने का और वे लोग नागा प्रदेश में घुस रहे हैं। आज तो मंत्री महोदय ने कबूल किया कि ऐसा हो रहा है, लेकिन उस दिन प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि मैं पक्का नहीं जानता हूँ। आश्चर्यकार क्या सदन को इस बात की जानकारी मिलेगी कि उनके पास जो लाइट मशीनगनों आदि हथियार हैं वे उनको कहां से मिले हैं, और क्या उनको पाकिस्तान में सैनिक प्रशिक्षण मिल रहा है ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यहां पर अभी इतने सारे व्यवस्था के प्रश्न उठाये गये उनमें से मेरा खयाल है कि एक भी ऐसा नहीं था जोकि वाकई व्यवस्था का सवाल हो। क्वेश्चन आवर का प्राधा वक्त इन व्यवस्थाओं के उठाने में चला गया ।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** अब अगर सलत बात होती है और असंगत बातें कही जाती हैं तो क्या उन पर व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं उठा सकते हैं ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं मੈम्बर साहबान से दरखवास्त करूंगा कि वह खुद इस बारे में सोचें कि क्वेश्चन का केवल एक घंटा होता है और जोकि बहुत ही कीमती और उपयोगी होता है और अगर उस दौरान यह सारी व्यवस्थाएं न उठायी जायें तो और अधिक सवाल पूछे जा सकते हैं। हम अधिक क्वेश्चन का डिस्पोजल कर सकते हैं ।

श्री रत्नेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय :  
मैं.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : व्यवस्था का प्रश्न अब  
कोई नहीं है अगर होता तो मैं आपको बुला  
लेता ।

12 hrs.

#### SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

##### Supply of Crude oil to Agriculturalists in Gujarat

S.N.Q. 1. Shri Jashvant Mehta: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Gujarat Government have represented to the Central Government for immediate supply of crude oil to agriculturalists for wheat crop;

(b) if so, the steps Government have taken to overcome the difficult situation of supply of crude oil to agriculturalists in Gujarat State; and

(c) the reasons of the acute shortage which has affected and added to the scarcity situation in the deficit States in food?

**The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir):**

(a) to (c). The average monthly consumption of light diesel oil in Gujarat was 13,000 tonnes per month during 1964, but on account of the failure of the monsoons this year and the programme for increased agricultural production, the State Government made a request for 40,000 tonnes during the current month. Since production of light diesel oil could not be stepped up immediately, it was decided in consultation with the Gujarat Government that 25,000 tonnes would be supplied during the month of November, 1965 and attempts made to give some additional supply. Accordingly, arrangements have been made to despatch 4,000 tonnes by rail and 11,500 tonnes by sea by 10th November. Continuous watch is being kept to ensure that the quantity agreed to is actually supplied.

**Shri Jashvant Mehta:** The hon. Minister has not given, in answer to part (c) of the Question, the reasons for the acute shortage which has added to the scarcity situation in the deficit States in food. (Interruption).

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** The hon. Member did not follow the answer read out by me. The reasons have been given. In my reply I have said the failure of the monsoons and the programme for increased agricultural production led to a stepping up of the demand.

**Shri Jashvant Mehta:** May I know whether it has come to the notice of the Government that the main distributing company has created an artificial scare so that it can bargain in its price policy; if so, whether the Government is planning to take over the whole distribution from all the three companies, in the hands of the Government?

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** This question does not arise because the prices are controlled and they are sold at stipulated prices so far as the suppliers are concerned. At the retail trade it is for the State Government to see that the prices are not increased.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: अब यह फैसला घाप करेंगे या इसका फैसला मंत्री महोदय करेंगे कि यह सबाल उठता है या नहीं उठता है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जवाब तो उन्होंने दे दिया ।

**Shri Iqbal Singh:** May I know whether it is a fact that light-speed diesel oil and power are not available in the State of Punjab but permits are issued and it will affect most adversely the agricultural production in the State; if so, what action the Government propose to take in the matter?

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** This does not strictly arise out of this, but because this is a very important subject I will give the answer. So far as Punjab

is concerned, we have supplied HSD which is in demand there.

**Shri D. J. Nalk:** I want to know from the hon. Minister whether the supply of crude oil will be regular and timely in future, that is in the months of December, January and February which form the season for rabi?

**Shri Humayan Kabir:** It is not crude oil. If it were crude oil we would have given as much as they wanted because crude oil is produced in Gujarat itself. It is light diesel oil that they want and for that, as I have already stated, we have assured a supply of 25,000 tonnes this month and we will try to give something more. We have also drawn up a programme in consultation with the State Government to see that the supplies are maintained up to February, 1966.

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** May I know Government's reaction to the fact that acute scarcity of light diesel has nothing to do with the failure of monsoon or the demand of agriculturists for irrigation but it is due to adulteration of light diesel with high-speed diesel for sale as high-speed diesel?

**Shri Humayan Kabir:** No, Sir, there is a definite connection. Because of the failure of the monsoon the Gujarat Government have encouraged the agriculturists to put up stationary pumps which are run by light diesel. That is the connection.

#### WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

##### Exodus from Pakistan

\*126. **Shri Bagri:**

**Shri Madhu Limaye:**  
**Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:**  
**Shri P. B. Chakraverti:**  
**Shri P. C. Borooah:**  
**Shri Yashpal Singh:**  
**Shri Hukam Chand,**  
**Kachhavaia:**  
**Shrimati Savitri Nigam:**  
**Shrimati Renuka Borkataki:**

**Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:**  
**Shri Ramchandra Veerappa:**  
**Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:**

Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that hundreds of Hindu families are fleeing from Pakistan to seek refuge in India as a sequel to the Indo-Pak. conflict;

(b) if so, their number (State-wise) and the steps taken to rehabilitate them; and

(c) the measures taken to restore to them the properties left by them in Pakistan?

**The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi):** (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. About 638 Hindu families from West Pakistan and 147 families from East Pakistan have migrated into Rajasthan and Tripura respectively. The families who have migrated from West Pakistan are proposed to be settled in Barmer district and at other suitable places in Rajasthan. Specific schemes of rehabilitation or resettlement are being formulated. The East Pakistan migrants in Tripura, to the extent possible, would be taken to other States for rehabilitation as there is little scope in Tripura for absorption of more migrants.

(c) The question will be considered.

##### Surplus Government Staff

\*127. **Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the extent of surplus staff in the Central Secretariat and other Departments under the Central Government;

(b) similar staff in the State Governments; and

(c) whether Government have given any advice to the State Governments to bring about economy in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) Staff required for departments of the Central Government is sanctioned on the basis of requirements. Surpluses are sometimes located as a result of studies conducted by the Staff Inspection Unit or administrative improvements introduced. The studies conducted by the S.I.U. in 17 Ministries and 22 other offices from 1st April, 1964 upto 30th September, 1965 have shown that 1,527 posts in different grades were surplus to requirements. These have been or are being adjusted against existing deficiencies or additional requirements elsewhere.

(b) and (c). Economy in staff of State Governments is the responsibility of those Governments and no information is available of any surpluses retained by them. No specific instructions have been issued to State Governments on the subject; but through discussions relating to the Fourth Plan and mobilisation of resources for the same, they are fully aware of the need for enforcing strict economy in implementation of scheme and in expenditure on administration and staff.

खाद्य भान्दोलन के सम्बन्ध में  
गिरफ्तारियाँ

\* 128. श्री मधु लिमये :  
श्री बागड़ी :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार ने वर्तमान भारत-पाकिस्तान संघर्ष से उत्पन्न संकटकालीन स्थिति विरोधी दलों द्वारा खाद्य भान्दोलन वापस लेने तथा मुद्र प्रयासों को सुदृढ़ करने के निर्णय को ध्यान में रखते हुए, राज्य सरकारों को खाद्य भान्दोलन के सम्बन्ध में गिरफ्तार किये गये व्यक्तियों को छोड़ देने की हिदायतें दी हैं ;

(ख) क्या राज्य सरकारों को इस सम्बन्ध में जलाय गये मुकदमों को वापस लेने की भी सलाह दी गई है ; और

(ग) यदि हाँ, तो उस पर राज्य सरकारों की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री ल० ना० मिश्र) : (क) से (ग). राज्य सरकारों तथा संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के प्रशासनों को सलाह दी गई थी कि खाद्य भान्दोलन के बारे में निवारक निरोध के अधीन नजरबन्द तथा हिंसा के प्रतिरिक्त अन्य आपराधिक मामलों में अभियुक्त व्यक्तियों को छोड़ने की वाछनीयता पर विचार करें। राज्य सरकारों की इस बारे में प्रतिक्रिया यह है कि जहाँ तक सम्भव हो इस सुझाव पर धमल किया जाय।

#### Re-employment of Retired Civil Servants

\* 129. Shri S. M. Banerjee:  
Shri Yashpal Singh:  
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:  
Shri Subodh Hansda:  
Shri S. C. Samanta:  
Shri P. L. Barupal:  
Shri S. N. Chaturvedi:  
Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:  
Shri P. C. Borooah:  
Dr. Ranen Sen:  
Shri Dinan Bhattacharya:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 189 on the 25th August, 1965 and state:

(a) whether the Santhanam Committee's recommendations in respect of re-employment of retired Civil Servants in private service have since been implemented by Government; and

(b) if not, the reasons therefor and when these are likely to be implemented?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). The question whether the Santhanam Committee's recommendations could be implemented, is being considered and a decision is expected to be taken shortly.

#### Oil near Calcutta

\*130. Shri Parashar:  
 Shri Yashpal Singh:  
 Shri P. B. Chakraverti:  
 Shri P. C. Borooah:  
 Shri Kishen Pattnayak:  
 Shri Madhu Limaye:  
 Shri Bagri:  
 Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:  
 Shri M. L. Dwivedi:  
 Shri S. C. Samanta:  
 Shri S. N. Chaturvedi:  
 Shri Brij Raj Singh:  
 Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:  
 Shri Gokaran Prasad:

Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2602 on the 22nd September, 1965 regarding oil-bearing areas near Calcutta and state the further progress made in the exploration?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir): As a result of intensive seismic surveys carried out by the field parties of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission, an interesting structural feature has been delineated in the area. Preparatory action for starting drilling operations in October was taken in hand but has been delayed because of the conflict with Pakistan. The drilling operations are now likely to start in February, 1966.

#### Use of Hindi in Ministries

\*131. Shri Eshanu Prakash Singh:  
 Shri Kishen Pattnayak:  
 Shri Bagri:  
 Shri Madhu Limaye:

Shri D. N. Tiwary:  
 Shri S. C. Samanta:  
 Shri Yashpal Singh:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the progress so far made in the use of Hindi in all the Ministries of the Government of India; and

(b) when a complete switch-over to Hindi is likely to be achieved?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): Progress made in the actual use of Hindi for various official purposes of the Union is shown below:

#### STATEMENT

1. Letters received in Hindi from members of the public are replied to in Hindi.
2. Government resolutions are issued both in Hindi and English simultaneously.
3. Administrative reports, reports to Parliaments and Journals are published in Hindi also.
4. 10,000 departmental forms and 351 manuals have already been translated by the Central Hindi Directorate (Ministry of Education). Steps are being taken by the concerned Ministries for the printing of these forms and manuals in Hindi also.
5. Steps have been taken for the translation and printing of statutory and non-statutory rules including those forming part of manuals.
6. Arrangements have already been made for the publication in Hindi also of all parts of the Gazette of India excepting Part II relating to statutory matter.
7. Nothing in Hindi has been introduced in 276 Sections in the various Ministries so far.



(b) In the Official Languages Act, 1963, provision has been made for the use of both Hindi and the English language for various official purposes of the Union without any time limit. Therefore the question of complete switch-over to Hindi does not arise for the present.

# Financial Assistance to West Bengal

\*132. **Shri B. K. Das:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have any plan to render pecuniary help to the Government of West Bengal for relieving pressure on the economy of the State caused by a large number of new migrants from East Pakistan since the beginning of 1964 preferring to stay in that State without asking for any rehabilitation benefit from the Government; and

(b) if so, the broad outlines of the plan?

**The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi):** (a) and (b). The matter has been under discussion with the Government of West Bengal. They have been informed that, in respect of the sectors in which the existing development schemes may have to be expanded in order to relieve pressure on such sectors as a result of the new influx from East Pakistan, they might formulate detailed proposals for consideration by the Ministries of the Government of India concerned with those sectors, in consultation with the Ministry of Rehabilitation. It is understood that they would require increased assistance mainly for educational and medical facilities. Detailed proposals from the West Bengal Government are awaited.

# Pak. Infiltrations on Eastern Borders

\*133. **Shri P. R. Chakravarti:**  
**Shri P. C. Borooah:**  
**Shri Karni Singhji:**  
**Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:**  
**Shri S. N. Chattervedi:**

**Shri R. Barua:**  
**Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:**  
**Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government of West Bengal have been instructed to keep a strict watch over any possible infiltration by the Pakistani nationals into Indian territory from Dahagram and other Pakistani enclaves in the State;

(b) whether it is a fact that about 300 Pakistani nationals from Dahagram tried to cross into East Pakistan through the Indian territory of Tinbigha, under cover provided by Pakistani policemen; and

(c) whether the State Government have alerted their border security forces in Cooch-Bihar against the possibility of mass intrusion into Indian territory?

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathji):** (a) General instructions exist in regard to keeping watch over any possible infiltration of Pakistani nationals into Indian territory.

(b) Yes, but they were not allowed to do.

(c) Yes, Sir.

# Kidnapping of Naga Ex-Minister

\*134. **Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:**  
**Shri Ravindra Varma:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Mr. Othiko Daiho, a former Finance Minister of Manipur, was kidnapped by Naga Hostiles on the 6th September 1965; and

(b) if so, whether he has now been set free?

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of**

**Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi):** (a) and (b). Shri Othiko Daiho, a former Finance Minister of Manipur, is reported to have gone to village Sajouba on 3-9-1965. He returned to Imphal on 21-10-1965. Since no complaint of kidnapping was lodged by him, members of his family or by any other person, it may be assumed that he was not kidnapped.

**Petro-chemical Corporation in the Public Sector**

\*135. Shri P. C. Borooah:  
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:  
Shri Brij Raj Singh:  
Shri Gokaran Prasad:  
Shri Subodh Hansda:  
Shri S. C. Samanta:

Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 770 on the 22nd September, 1965 and state:

(a) whether a decision has since been taken on the proposal to set up a Petro-chemical Corporation in the public sector; and

(b) if so, the broad features thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Alagesam): (a) and (b). The matter is still under consideration of Government.

**जायूसों की गतिविधियाँ**

\* 136. श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी :

श्री स० चं० सामन्त :

श्री पाराशर :

श्री श० ना० चतुर्वेदी :

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :

श्री मोहसिन :

श्री प्र० चं० बरभा :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार ने हमारे विरोधी देशों के पंचमांगियों, जायूसों तथा घुसपैठियों

की तोड़-फोड़ करने की गतिविधियों को रोकने के लिये पर्याप्त प्रबन्ध कर रखा है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस व्यवस्था को स्थिति का प्रभावशाली ढंग से तथा विस्तृत पैमाने पर सामना करने के योग्य बनाने के लिये क्या निर्णय किये गये हैं ;

(ग) क्या सरकार ने इस भाष्य को कोई प्रादेश जारी किये हैं कि आवश्यक तथ्यों का निश्चय किये बिना केवल सन्देह होने पर ही किसी बफादार नागरिक के साथ दुर्व्यवहार न किया जाये अथवा उसे तंग न किया जाये और यदि हां, तो वे प्रादेश क्या हैं ; और

(घ) भ्रान्तरिक सुरक्षा तथा नागरिक सुरक्षा के लिये क्या उपाय किये जा रहे हैं ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री ल० ना० विष्णु) : (क) जी, हां ।

(ख) विस्तार से सूचना देना जनहित की दृष्टि से ठीक नहीं होगा ।

(ग) कोई खास प्रादेश जरूरी नहीं होते । जनता के लोगों के साथ व्यवहार में अत्यधिक सतर्कता बरतने तथा व्यक्तियों को परेशानी से बचाने पर लगातार जोर दिया गया है । और इसका यथोचित प्रभाव पड़ा है ।

(घ) भ्रान्तरिक सुरक्षा के उपायों में जायूसों, तोड़-फोड़ करने वालों तथा पंच-मांगियों के खिलाफ सतर्कता, प्रमुख निर्माणों की सुरक्षा, घुसपैठ को रोकना तथा सामान्यतः सम्भावित खतरों का सामना करने के लिये फौजी और पुलिस की ताकतों को बढ़ाना शामिल है । नागरिक सुरक्षा के बारे में होम गार्ड्स की संख्या बढ़ाना, प्रमुख निर्माणों तथा नागरिक क्षेत्रों की हवाई हमले से सुरक्षा के उपाय बरतना, बार्डन्स-मदति में सुधार करना और नागरिक प्रतिरक्षा कार्यक्रमों में जनता का पूर्ण सहयोग प्राप्त करना शामिल है ।

दिल्ली का राजनैतिक ढांचा

- \* 137. श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :  
 श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती :  
 श्री यशपाल सिंह :  
 श्री प्र० रं० चक्रवर्ती :  
 श्री क० ना० तिवारी :  
 श्री ज० ब० सिंह बिष्ट :  
 श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी :  
 श्री स० चं० सामन्त :  
 श्री पाराशर :  
 श्री श० ना० चतुर्वेदी :  
 श्री बी० चं० शर्मा :  
 श्री कृ० चं० पन्त :  
 श्री हिम्मत्सिंहका :  
 श्री रामेश्वर टाटिया :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) दिल्ली के राजनैतिक ढांचे में क्या अग्रतर प्रगति हुई है ;

(ख) इसे कब तक अन्तिम रूप दे दिया जायेगा ; और

(ग) क्या इससे सम्बन्धित योजना आगामी आम चुनावों से पहले ही बना ली जायेगी चाहे उसे कार्यान्वित बाद में किया जाये ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री स० ना० मिश्र) : (क) से (ग). एक विवरण जिसमें दिल्ली के पुनर्गठित प्रशासनिक ढांचे की योजना की मुख्य-मुख्य बातें दी गई थी 18 अगस्त, 1965 को तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 79 के उत्तर में लोक-सभा के सभा-पटन पर रख दिया गया था। इस योजना में निम्नलिखित व्यवस्थाएँ की गई हैं :—

(I) निम्नलिखित की संरचना में कुछ परिवर्तन :—

(i) दिल्ली का स्थानीय प्रशासन ;

(ii) दिल्ली नगर निगम; और

(iii) देहाती क्षेत्रों में पंचायती राज्य संगठन, और

(II) नगर निगम के कुछ उपक्रमों को परिनियत बोर्डों में परिवर्तित करना।

ऊपर (I)(i) में निदेशित परिवर्तनों को लागू करने वाला एक विधेयक, जिसका नाम दिल्ली प्रशासन विधेयक, 1965 है, चालू अधिवेशन में प्रस्तुत किया जायेगा। यह एक राजधानी परिषद् और क्षेत्र के प्रशासक को मदद देने के लिए एक कार्य-पालिका परिषद् की स्थापना की व्यवस्था करेगा। अन्य परिवर्तनों को लागू करने के लिए विधायी प्रबन्ध सदन में यथा-शीघ्र प्रस्तुत किये जायेंगे।

#### Black List of Contactmen

\*138. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:  
 Shri P. C. Borooah:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 788 on the 22nd September, 1965 and state:

(a) the total number of persons blacklisted; and

(b) the details of the malpractices indulged in by them?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) 105.

(b) These contactmen have been indulging in undesirable activities.

#### Detention of Britishers in Assam

\*139. Shri Kajrolkar:  
 Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:  
 Shrimati Beneka Barkataki:  
 Shri Yashpal Singh:  
 Shri Basumatari:  
 Shri Hukam Chand  
 Kachhavalva:  
 Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that three British nationals have been detained

in Upper Assam under the Defence of India Rules for suspected prejudicial activities against the State;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) whether they are on bail now?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) to (c). On the night of October 2, 1965, three planters, namely, Irving Bell, Jin George Watts and A.R.P.M. Edi, were returning to their gardens at about 0300 hours in a jeep apparently after heavy drinking. They were accosted by Village Defence Parties and asked to declare their identity and purpose of their journey. These planters are alleged to have become extremely angry at this, stating that they had been stopped a number of times earlier, and threatened the Village Defence Parties and were offensive to them. One of them is alleged to have written 'Long Live Pakistan' in the register of the Party, and another is alleged to have said "I am Ayub Khan". Police on investigation have submitted charge-sheet against all of them under sections 153/352/34 of the Indian Penal Code. They are in jail custody.

#### National Policy re: Oil Distribution

\*140. Shri D. C. Sharma:  
Shri Yashpal Singh:  
Shri A. N. Vidyalkar:  
Shri Kapur Singh:  
Shrimati Maimoona Sultan:  
Shri Kishen Pattinayak:  
Shri Mohammed Koya:

Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether a national policy of oil distribution is being formulated; and

(b) if so, the broad outlines thereof?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The policy is to make arrangements for distribution of oil products after taking into account indigenous production. The question

of regulating the growth of retail pump outlets is also under examination.

#### Drinking Water from Sea

\*141. Dr. Sarojini Mahishi:  
Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether a U.S. firm has offered to build in Bombay a joint plant to generate 200 million gallons of fresh water daily from the Sea water; and

(b) if so, the action taken in the matter?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

#### Intelligence System

\*142. Shri D. D. Pari:  
Shri Shiv Charan Gupta:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether in the light of the recent events, Government have evaluated the effectiveness of our Intelligence system;

(b) if so, in what manner the Intelligence work has been found weak; and

(c) the steps being taken to strengthen this machinery?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) to (c). Our Intelligence organisation has proved equal to the task. However, Government keeps the performance of its intelligence system under constant review and takes various measures to remedy deficiencies and strengthen the machinery. It is not in the public interest to disclose further details.

#### University for North Eastern Region

\*143. Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstar-

red Question No. 236 on the 18th August, 1965 and state:

(a) whether Government have since considered the question of setting up a University for the North Eastern region of India; and

(b) if so, the result thereof?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) and (b). The matter is still under consideration.

#### Prohibition

\*144. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether, with a view to augmenting the financial resources of the States, the State Governments are free, if they so desire, to scrap or modify the policy of prohibition; and

(b) if not, what advice or directive has been given by the Centre in this regard to each of the States?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) No, Sir; State Governments are not free to scrap or modify the policy of prohibition.

(b) Does not arise.

Enquiry against ex-Chief Ministers of Orissa

\*145. Shri Yashpal Singh:  
Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received representation from some Members of Parliament about 18 months ago demanding to hold a Judicial Inquiry against Shri Biju Patnayak and Shri Biren Mitra, former Chief Ministers of Orissa; and

(b) if so, the decision taken in the matter?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). Action taken in regard to allegations against the Orissa ex-Chief Ministers was already explained in the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on 22nd February, 1965. All demands from Members of Parliament were dealt with in the course of the proceedings in Lok Sabha during the discussion on the No-confidence Motion in the Lok Sabha on 15th and 16th March, 1965. Attention of the Hon'ble Members is also invited to the position explained in the course of supplementaries arising out of Starred Question No. 2 answered in Lok Sabha on 3rd November, 1965 i.e. any further action can be considered after P.A.C., Orissa, have considered the matter.

#### Cement concrete Products manufacturing Units

\*146. Shri Bagri:  
Shri Madhu Limaye:  
Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:  
Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:  
Shri Yashpal Singh:

Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that funds have been sanctioned for setting up cement-concrete products manufacturing units at Hoshangabad and other places in Madhya Pradesh;

(b) if so, when the work on the project is likely to begin; and

(c) the location of these units?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi): (a) Yes, Sir. Two such units have been sanctioned for being set up in Madhya Pradesh, one at Itarsi (District Hoshangabad) and the other at Mana (District Raipur).

(b) and (c). The scheme was sanctioned only on 24th September, 1965. The work at the Itarsi centre has already started. Speedy action is being taken to start the unit at Mana.

**West Indies Cricket Team's Tour**

- \*147. **Shri P. R. Chakraverti:**  
**Shri P. C. Borooah:**  
**Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:**

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Board of Control for Cricket in India received a cable from West Indies stating that on account of the unsettled conditions in India, the West Indies Board cancelled the proposed tour;

(b) whether the Indian Board had asked the West Indies to reconsider their suggestion to call off their tour of India as conditions were almost normal; and

(c) whether Government favoured the holding of national and international sport events in the country?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhakt Darshan):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) While Government favour the holding of national and international sports events in the country, the cases of international events proposed to be held in the country have to be examined on merits.

**Oil Reserves at Kathana (Cambay)**

- \*148. **Shri P. C. Borooah:**  
**Shri Sidheshwar Prasad:**  
**Shri Yashpal Singh:**

Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that oil has recently been struck at Kathana near Cambay;

(b) if so, the nature and estimated extent of the reserves; and

(c) the steps proposed to be taken for the exploitation of these reserves?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir):

(a) to (c). Yes, Sir; but the nature

and extent of the reserve and the possibility of its commercial exploitation will be known only after more exploratory wells have been drilled in the different parts of the structure.

**Extradition of Walcott**

- \*149. **Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:**  
**Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 485 on the 8th September, 1965 and state:

(a) the further developments in the matter of extradition of Mr. Walcott; and

(b) the present stage of the case?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). The opinion of the Senior Counsel in U.K., whether the evidence is sufficient for initiating extradition proceedings against Walcott and others, is still awaited.

**Objectionable Film Posters**

327. **Shri Bagri:**  
**Shri Madhu Limaye:**  
**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to ban the display of such film posters as produce an adverse effect on the youth of the country; and

(b) if so, when this ban is likely to be imposed?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) and (b). The Government have no such specific proposal under consideration. They are, however, exploring the possibility of tightening the law relating to obscenity.

नजरबन्द व्यक्ति

328. श्री मधु लिमये :

श्री बागड़ी :

श्री कोरला बंरंह्या :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) विभिन्न राज्यों में भारत सुरक्षा अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत आजकल कितने मार्क्सवादी साम्यवादी नजरबन्द हैं ;

(ख) उन्हें जेलों में परिवार-भत्ता, पेंशन, भोजन आदि कपड़ों के सम्बन्ध में क्या सुविधाएं प्रदान की जा रही हैं ;

(ग) क्या इन नजरबन्द व्यक्तियों ने उनके साथ किये जाने वाले व्यवहार के बारे में कोई शिकायत की है; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो उस पर सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री तथा प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में प्रतिरक्षा संभरण मंत्री (श्री हाथी) : (क) 31 अक्टूबर, 1965 को 1149 साम्यवादी साम्यवादी नजरबन्द थे ।

(ख) से (घ). उनकी नजरबन्दी की शर्तों तथा अन्य सम्बन्ध मामलों का संभालन उन नियमों के अनुसार होता है जो इस बारे में तथा अन्य कार्यपालन सम्बन्धी प्रश्नों के बारे में प्रत्येक राज्य में प्रचलित होते हैं । समय-समय पर नजरबन्दों से कुछ शिकायत प्राप्त हुई हैं और सरकार ने उनकी जांच कराने और प्रत्येक ऐसे मामले में जहां इकत हो उन्हें दूर करने के लिए कार्यवाही की है ।

#### Exploring of Oil and Gas

329. Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Oil and Natural Gas Commission has formulated a

countrywide programme of exploring oil and natural gas; and

(b) if so, the achievements to its credit to date and whether collaboration in the field work exists between the O.N.G.C. and the India Oil Corporation, Limited, another Government Organisation working in the same direction?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Commission has discovered and developed an oil field at Ankleshwar and a gas field at Cambay in Gujarat and production has commenced from these fields. Oil has also been struck at other places in Assam and Gujarat and production will be undertaken in due course. Interesting structures have been found in some other areas and exploration is continuing. Indian Oil Corporation is not concerned with exploration and production of crude oil but refining and distribution of petroleum products. Full details about field-wise drilling and production cannot be disclosed under the Defence of India Rules.

#### Arts College at Chelanoor

330. Shri A. K. Gopalan: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received a representation from a local Committee requesting for sanctioning an Arts College at Chelanoor near Calicut from the next academic year;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Committee have arranged 35 acres of land and Rs. 1,36,000 for this purpose;

(c) if so, the reaction of Government thereto; and

(d) whether it will be possible to give permission to start it in the next academic year?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) No, Sir.

(b) to (d). Do not arise.

### Sanskrit College, Pattambi

331. Shri A. K. Gopalan: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Sanskrit College at Pattambi (Kerala) is going to be upgraded as a first grade college with Arts and Science sections;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the public donated 15 acres of land for this purpose; and

(c) whether Government are giving priority to the matter?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha in due course.

### Complaints against Calicut Flying Squad

332. Shri A. K. Gopalan: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Calicut Flying Squad went to Kavery and Kuttikol, Thaliparamba Canannore in September and arrested some people, beat them on the spot and also at the police lock-up;

(b) whether Government have received any complaint in this regard;

(c) if so, whether any enquiry has been conducted; and

(d) if not, whether Government propose to conduct an enquiry in this regard?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathil): (a) to (d). The information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House as soon as possible.

### Family Allowance to Detenus

333. Shri A. K. Gopalan: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to introduce a uniform scheme for granting family allowance to the detenus;

(b) if so, when it will be finalised and implemented?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathil): (a) and (b). While there is no proposal to introduce a uniform scheme, it has been suggested to the State Governments that a minimum of Rs. 50/- per month may be granted as family allowance in deserving cases.

### Research Subjects

334. Shri Krishna Deo Tripathi: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state the names of Universities and Institutes where facilities of post-graduate and/or research are available in India in the following subjects:—

1. International Relations;
2. Public Administration;
3. Music;
4. Drawing and Painting;
5. Architecture; and
6. Nuclear Physics?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. ZI-5106/65].

### Grants to Degree Colleges

335. Shri Krishna Deo Tripathi: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the ceiling of non-recurring grant sanctioned by the University Grants Commission to the Degree Colleges;

(b) the names of the Degree Colleges and the total amount of non-recurring grants sanctioned over and above the ceiling; and

(c) the reasons therefor?



The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5107/65].

### Coaching Camps for cricket

336. Shri Ram Harkh Yadav: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Board of Control for Cricket in India proposes to hold two All-India Coaching Camps for school boys; and

(b) if so, the details of the Camps, starting date and the duration of the Camps?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhakt Darshan): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) One at Bombay from 27th November to 26th December, 1965, and the other at Hyderabad from 16th May to 30th June, 1966.

### Find of Old Coins near Jaipur

337. Shri Ram Harkh Yadav: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether a large number of earliest coins of the country were found in Rairh, 82 miles from Jaipur;

(b) if so, the details of the coins; and

(c) their antiquity and special features, if any?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhakt Darshan): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House, when available.

### सिंधी भाषा में मैट्रिक

338. श्री मधु तिमये :  
श्री बागड़ी :

क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार उन विद्यार्थियों को ऊंची कक्षाओं में दाखिला नहीं देती है जो सिंधी भाषा से मैट्रिकुलेशन परीक्षा पास करते हैं ;

(ख) क्या उत्तर प्रदेश तथा कुछ अन्य राज्यों में सिंधी भाषा को विदेशी भाषा समझा जाता है; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

शिक्षा मंत्री (श्री मु० क० बागल्ला) :

(क) से (ग). राज्य सरकार से सूचना उपलब्ध की जा रही है और यथा समय सभा पटल पर रख दी जाएगी ।

### Construction of New Markets in Delhi

339. Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:  
Shri Kishen Pattnayak:  
Shri Bagri:  
Shri Yashpal Singh:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Delhi Administration propose to construct 15 new markets in Delhi;

(b) if so, whether the sites for these markets have been selected; and

(c) the criteria to be followed for allotment of shops in these markets?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) to (c). The Delhi Administration directly does not have project for the construction of new markets in Delhi. Presumably the question refers to the Municipal Corporation of Delhi and the New Delhi Municipal Committee. The Municipal Corporation of Delhi propose to construct 19 new markets and sites have been selected. In addition to the G. B. Pant Super Market in Connaught Place area, which is nearing completion, the New Delhi Municipal Committee are taking up the construction of two more markets one in the Diplomatic Enclave area and the other on Irwin Road. Sites for these two markets have been selected.

The Municipal Corporation of Delhi propose allotting the shops in new markets to (i) displaced persons (ii) squatters removed from the site for the construction of the market; (iii) persons eligible under Slum Clearance and Jhuggi-Jhonpuri Scheme.

The New Delhi Municipal Committee are considering the adoption of criteria to be followed for allotment of shops in markets constructed within their jurisdiction.

#### **Raids on Shops in Delhi**

**340. Shri Yashpal Singh:**  
**Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2717 on the 23rd September, 1965 regarding the raids in Sadar Bazar, Delhi and state:

(a) whether the Sales Tax Officers took possession of the forged Accounts Books of the shopkeepers of Sadar Bazar, Delhi; and

(b) if so, the action taken or proposed to be taken against those firms?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) and (b). Officers of the Sales Tax Department, Delhi, took possession of Accounts Books of four shopkeepers of Sadar Bazar on 27th August, 1965 for further verification. The verification is in progress by Assessing authorities. Appropriate action will be taken after the results of the verification are known.

#### **Expenditure on Sheikh Abdullah**

**341. Shri P. C. Borooah:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the amount so far spent every month since the detention of Sheikh Abdullah on different items in regard to his maintenance in detention;

(b) the amount paid to his family for their maintenance during his detention; and

(c) the reasons for spending such large sums of money on his maintenance in detention?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5108/65].

(b) No maintenance allowance has been sanctioned for the family of Sheikh Abdullah.

(c) Keeping in view the way of life Sheikh Abdullah is used to, the amount spent on him is not considered to be excessive.

#### **Training in Rifle Shooting**

**342. Shri Rameshwar Tanti:**  
**Shri Himatsingka:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Delhi Administration has started short rifle-shooting courses in the Union Territory of Delhi;

(b) if so, whether Government have advised the other States to introduce this scheme; and

(c) whether Government propose to give such training to all able-bodied persons in the country in view of the Chinese and Pakistan threat to India?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) A Civilian Rifle Training Scheme was introduced by the Government of India. in co-operation with the State Governments in 1954, in pursuance of a resolution passed by the Lok Sabha. The aim of the Scheme is to train all the able-bodied citizens in the use of handling of rifles.

**Gasoline**

**343. Shri Yashpal Singh:  
Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:**

Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 611 on the 25th August, 1965 and state:

(a) whether the proposal that the octane number of motor gasoline should be increased from 79 to 83 has since been examined by Government;

(b) if not, the reasons for delay; and

(c) when the proposal is likely to be finalised?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemical (Shri Humayun Kabir):

(a) to (c). In view of the additional foreign exchange expenditure involved, the proposal has been kept in abeyance. It will be considered after the foreign exchange position improves.

**Export of Hamycin and Chlort  
tracyclin Hydrochloride**

**344. Shri Yashpal Singh:** Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2598 on the 22nd September, 1965, and state:

(a) whether the possibilities of exporting Chlort tracyclin Hydrochloride and other products have since been examined; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). Yes, the prospects of exporting Chlort tracyclin hydrochlorid are not bright. In the case of another product, Hamycin, however, Hindustan Antibiotics Limited have concluded an agreement with a firm in U.S.A. for its commercial exploitation. The agreement envisages payment of royalty on the sale of Hamycin. Bulk material valued at about Rs. 75,000 is being sent to the American firm.

**Oil in Port Canning Area**

**345. Shri S. C. Samanta:  
Shri Subodh Hanada:  
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:**

Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Seismic Survey for search in oil in Port Canning area near Calcutta has been completed;

(b) if so, whether suitable structures have been found for immediate drilling;

(c) whether it is also a fact that an American Oil Company struck gas in this area at a depth of 13,000 feet; and

(d) if so, whether any further action has been taken in the matter?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir):

(a), (b) and (d). No, Sir, but the work recently carried out by the Commission has indicated the presence of an interesting structural feature. It is proposed to drill a deep exploratory well and preparatory action is in hand.

(c) Yes, Sir.

**International Indian Ocean  
Expedition**

**346. Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to the Unstarred Question No. 212 on the 18th August, 1965 regarding International Indian Ocean Expedition and state:

(a) whether the research work carried on the Indian Ocean by the International Indian Ocean Expedition has been completed;

(b) if so, the result thereof; and

(c) if the answer to part (a) above be in the negative, when it is likely to be completed?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) Not yet, Sir.

(b) Information obtained on the physics, chemistry, biology and configuration of the ocean and continental shelves of the Bay of Bengal and Arabian Sea is being examined.

(c) The field programme of the expedition will conclude by December, 1965 but codification and study of data will take some more years.

#### **NEFA Administrative Reforms**

**347. Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:**  
**Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:**  
**Shri Kolla Venkaiah:**  
**Shri P. C. Borooah:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 172 on the 18th August, 1965 and state the further progress since made about the recommendations of Ering Committee reports on the NEFA Administrative Reforms?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): The present position regarding recommendations made by the Ering Committee is as follows:—

(i) Formation of different bodies at the village circle, district and agency level—the recommendations are under examination.

(ii) Change of nomenclature of Frontier Divisions and Political Officer—Since the 1st September, 1965, five frontier Divisions of NEFA are known as Districts. The Political Officers, Additional Political Officers and Assistant Political Officers are now known as Deputy Commissioners, Additional Deputy Commissioners and Assistant Commissioners. A Regulation known as the NEFA Administration Regulation 1965 has been promulgated to this effect.

(iii) The matter is still under consideration.

(iv) The matter is being examined.

(v) Language Policy of NEFA—the question is under active consideration.

(vi) Supply of Electricity—The NEFA Administration has already issued orders for the supply of electricity to the villages.

(vii) Transport buses for NEFA—Co-operative Societies have already been formed for running of transport services.

#### **Detenus**

**348. Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:**  
 Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of detenus in various jails in the country as on the 31st October, 1965, Statewise; and

(b) the causes of such detention?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). The required information is being collected from the State Governments and will be placed on the Table of the House.

#### **All India Judicial Service**

**349. Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:**  
 Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 213 on the 18th August, 1965 and state:

(a) whether Government have finalised the scheme of setting up an All-India Judicial Service in the country;

(b) if so, its broad features; and

(c) if the answer to part (a) above be in negative, when it is likely to be set up and what are the causes of delay?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) to (c). The matter is still under consideration.

### Manufacture of Magnesium

350. Shri Umanath: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Central Electro-Chemical Research Institute, Karaikudi has almost perfected a process for the manufacture of magnesium from Salem's high quality of magnesite;

(b) if so, the particulars thereof; and

(c) the action taken by Government to apply the process formula for mass production of magnesium from Salem magnesite?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) to (c). At the instance of the Madras Government, the Institute has undertaken pilot plant trials for the production of magnesium metal from Salem magnesite. The object is to standardise conditions for the production of 12 kg. of magnesium metal per day of 24 hrs. The work is in progress and the process has not yet been perfected.

### Institute of Oceanography

351. Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:  
Shri Yashpal Singh:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 612 on the 25th August, 1965 regarding the Institute of Oceanography and state:

(a) whether any decision for its location has since been considered; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) Not yet, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

### Brahmi Manuscript found in USSR

352. Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:  
Shri Yashpal Singh:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a manuscript in Brahmi has been discovered

covered in U.S.S.R. according to the Press report published in the Times of India dated the 29th September, 1965; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) and (b). No further information beyond what has appeared in the Press is available with the Government of India.

### Migrants from Pakistan-occupied areas of J. and K.

353. Shri Linga Reddy: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state the measures devised to give relief to the migrants from the Pakistan-occupied areas of Jammu and Kashmir, specially after the outbreak of the recent hostilities between India and Pakistan?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi): It has been decided to provide the following facilities:—

1. Tented accommodation;
2. Free rations of Atta, Dal and Salt, these are being replaced by cash doles shortly;
3. Clothing;
4. Quilts and/or blankets;
5. Utensils;
6. Lanterns;
7. Medical and Public Health facilities in the camps;
8. Employment to the able-bodied.
9. Education for children; and
10. Postal facilities.

### Vocational bias to Education

354. Shri Linga Reddy: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the steps taken by Government to give a vocational bias to education at various levels; and

(b) the extent to which such measures have been useful in tackling the problem of unemployment in the country?

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education (Shrimati Soundaram Ramachandran):** (a) The steps taken are:—

1. Orientation of elementary schools to the Basic pattern, by introduction of appropriate crafts.
2. Provision of diversified courses.
3. Establishment of Junior Technical Schools.
4. Special training of craft teachers required for vocational courses.
5. Establishment of Polytechnics and colleges.
6. Financial assistance to State Governments for strengthening of vocational courses.

(b) The practical content of courses is intended to give to the students professional skills for undertaking jobs in the particular profession. They are therefore in a better position, than the unskilled students, to obtain and retain employment.

#### **Pay Scales of Survey of India Employees**

**355. Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether any decision has been taken to revise the pay scales of class III and IV employees of the Survey of India;

(b) if not, the reasons therefor; and

(c) when a decision is likely to be taken?

**The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla):** (a) to (c). After careful consideration of the question of revision of the scales of pay in the Survey of India, it has been decided that a revision of all the scales of pay which were revised as recently as in 1960 on the lines suggested by the Second Pay Commission is not necessary. Individual cases, where justification for revision exists, will be considered by the Government.

#### **Murder of Naga Leader**

**356. Shrimati Benuka Barkataki:**  
**Shri Ravindra Varma:**  
**Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah:**  
**Shri Hukam Chand**  
**Kachhavaia:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Mr. Z. Yarbao, President of the Tangkhul Long was killed by the Naga Hostiles on the 2nd October, 1965; and

(b) if so, the action taken to apprehend the hostiles responsible for the murder?

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Five persons have so far been arrested in connection with the investigation of this murder and one Company of Manipur Rifles has been deployed to restore confidence among the people. A collective fine of Rs. 20,000 has also been imposed.

#### **Koyali Oil Refinery**

**357. Shri Subodh Hansda:** Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal to link Kandla Port to Koyali oil refinery by laying a pipe-line;

(b) if so, the estimated cost of this pipe line; and

(c) who will undertake this work?

**The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir):** (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

**Search of the Premises of certain persons connected with Punjab National Bank**

358. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 461 on the 15th September, 1965 regarding the search of the premises of certain persons connected with the Punjab National Bank and state:

(a) whether the scrutiny of the records has been completed; and

(b) if so, the result thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) Not yet.

(b) Does not arise.

**Gol Gumbad, Bijapur**

359. Shri R. G. Dubey: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to white-wash the interior of the Gol Gumbad at Bijapur; and

(b) if so, whether necessary funds have been sanctioned for the purpose?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhakt Darshan): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

**Stipend to Teachers under training**

361. Shri Mohammed Koya: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the language teachers taken for training in Kerala were given any stipend;

(b) when was it stopped;

(c) whether the trained teachers are given any additional pay;

(d) whether they are given their pay during the training period; and

(e) whether during this training period, their increments are stopped?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) to (e). The information is being obtained from the State Government and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

**Publishers' Association in India**

362. Shri Hem Raj: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 278 on the 18th August, 1965 and state:

(a) the progress since made in considering the proposals made by the Publishers' Association of India; and

(b) when the final decision is likely to be taken?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) and (b). A statement is attached. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5109/65].

**Western Himalayan Mountaineering Institute, Manali (Punjab)**

363. Shri Hem Raj: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 1225 on the 1st September, 1965 and state:

(a) the progress since made for the reorganisation of the Western Himalayan Mountaineering Institute at Manali (Punjab); and

(b) when the final decision is likely to be arrived at?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhakt Darshan): (a) The matter is still under consideration in consultation with the Punjab Government.

(b) This cannot be indicated precisely. Every effort is being made to expedite the decision.

**Russian Oil Supplies for India**

364. Shri Indralit Gupta: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Russian super-tankers are now successfully entering

the Hooghly river with oil supplies for India;

(b) the normal monthly quota of petroleum products discharged at Indian ports by the Soviet tankers; and

(c) whether India has recently requested an increase in this quota?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir): (a) No, Sir. Draft restrictions on the Hooghly river make it impossible even for medium-sized tankers to come up to Budge Budge.

(b) About 1.25 lakhs tonnes per month.

(c) The Indian Oil Corporation Limited are negotiating with Russian Suppliers for certain additional imports of kerosene.

जम्मू तथा काश्मीर में विस्थापित व्यक्तियों का बसाया जाना

365. श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :

क्या पुनर्वास मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या पाकिस्तान से विस्थापित हुए व्यक्तियों तथा भूतपूर्व सैनिकों को जम्मू तथा काश्मीर में बसाने का सरकार का विचार है; और

(ख) यदि नहीं, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं ?

पुनर्वास मंत्री (श्री श्यामा) : (क) और (ख). जम्मू तथा काश्मीर के स्थापित व्यक्तियों को जहाँ तक संभव होगा जम्मू तथा काश्मीर में ही बसाया जायेगा।

विस्थापित व्यक्तियों की श्रेणी किसी भी श्रेणी को जम्मू तथा काश्मीर में बसाने का प्रस्ताव नहीं है।

Allowance to Officials in Laccadives

366. Shri Mohammed Koya: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether an allowance of 40 per cent of the basic pay is given to Gov-

ernment officials working in the Laccadives;

(b) whether this concession is restricted only to those who are recruited from the mainland;

(c) whether a similar allowance is given to the islanders working in the mainland and different islands; and

(d) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). A special pay at the rate of 40 per cent of basic pay, subject to a maximum of Rs. 350 per mensem, is admissible only to persons directly recruited or deputed from the mainland for service under the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands Administration, when posted in the Islands.

(c) No.

(d) The concession mentioned at (a) above is an incentive for securing good officers from the mainland to go over to the islands for service.

House Rent Allowance to Officers in Laccadives

367. Shri Mohammed Koya: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the officers working in the Laccadives and Minicoy Islands are given any house rent allowance or free quarters;

(b) whether this concession is extended to local people working in places other than their own islands; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) Persons directly recruited or deputed from the mainland for service under the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi



Islands Administration, when posted in the islands, are allowed the concession of rent-free unfurnished accommodation. Where such accommodation is not provided to them, they are allowed house rent allowance in lieu thereof.

(b) No.

(c) The concession mentioned at (a) above is an incentive for securing good officers from the mainland to go over to the Islands for service.

#### Leave Facilities for Officers in Laccadives

368. Shri Mohammed Koya: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the leave of officers working in the Laccadive Islands and belonging to the mainland is counted from the date they reach the mainland;

(b) whether the journey time is counted as leave and whether any T.A. is paid during the journey period;

(c) whether the same criterion is applicable to the island officials working in the mainland and in the islands other than their own; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) Persons directly recruited or deputed from the mainland for service under the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands Administration and posted in the islands, are allowed the concession of joining time once a year while proceeding on and returning from leave. The joining time covers the period of the sea journey between the islands and the mainland.

(b) The joining time referred to in (a) above is treated as duty. In such cases, the officer is allowed free

sea passage for himself and the members of his family in Government-chartered ships and, in addition, is allowed the daily allowance of his grade for the period of the sea journey.

(c) No.

(d) The concession referred to in (a) above is an incentive for securing good officers from the mainland to go over to the Islands for service.

#### Anti-national Articles in Tamil Papers

369. Shri Balakrishnan: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it has been brought to the notice of Government that some of the Tamil newspapers were publishing anti-national articles during the period of emergency; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) Yes, Sir; some cases have come to the notice of Government.

(b) Such action as may be asked for will be taken.

#### Theft in Agra Fort

370. Shrimati Renuka Barkataki: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the copper fountain installed in the Turkish Bath at Agra Fort was stolen; and

(b) if so, whether the miscreants have been traced and the fountain recovered?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhakti Darshan): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

तस्कर व्यापार में लगे हुए मुसलमान

371. श्री ए० सा० बाबूपाल :

श्री धुनेश्वर मोना :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि भारत के विभिन्न राज्यों में कुछ मुसलमान ऐसे हैं जो सक्रिय स्वरूप से तस्कर व्यापार में लगे हुए हैं तथा जिनका सम्बन्ध पाकिस्तान से है; और

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो क्या वर्तमान संकट की दृष्टि से सरकार का विचार ऐसे व्यक्तियों पर कड़ी निगाह रखने अथवा उनके विरुद्ध भारत प्रतिरक्षा नियमों के अधीन कार्यवाही करने का है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री तथा प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में प्रतिरक्षा सभरण मंत्री (श्री हाथी) : (क) इस बुराई का सम्बन्ध किसी विशेष सन्दाय से नहीं है।

(ख) जी, हाँ।

**Ghost Transmitter in Delhi**

372. श्री P. L. Barupal:

श्री धुनेश्वर मोना:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it has been brought to his notice that a transmitter is being operated somewhere in Delhi area for passing information to Pakistan; and

(b) if so, the reasons for failure to detect the same so far?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) Government have no information if a transmitter is being operated in Delhi area for passing information against India to Pakistan.

(b) Does not arise.

**Arrest of a Ferozepur Priest**

374. श्री Onkar Lal Berwa:

श्री गोकर्ण प्रसाद:

श्री ब्रिज राज सिंग:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether a priest of the Ferozepur Church was arrested during the last week of September, 1965 under D.I.R.; and

(b) if so, the details of the charges against him?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathí): (a) and (b). One Father Edward of Ferozepur was arrested on 24th September, 1965 but after investigations it was decided not to proceed with prosecution.

**Off-shore drilling in Iran**

375. श्री Heda: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 479 on the 8th September, 1965 and state:

(a) when the off-shore drilling operations in Iran were started; and

(b) the progress made so far?

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir):

(a) On May 29, 1965.

(b) The first well has been drilled upto 3940 metres.

**Exemption to Tourists from Dry Law**

376. श्री M. R. Krishna:

श्री A. K. Gopalan:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that with a view to encouraging the tourist trade, Government have given a directive to the State Governments not to apply the dry law to the visiting tourists; and

(b) if so, whether all the State Governments have agreed to fall in line?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). In order to encourage tourist traffic, the Government of India have requested the State Governments, where drinking in public is banned, to permit the provision of a separate room in select high-class hotels for the exclusive use of foreign visitors. The State Governments have accepted the suggestion.

### पुनर्वास आयोग

377. श्री रोंकार बाल बेरबा : क्या पुनर्वास मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार ने पाकिस्तान से आये हुए शरणार्थियों के पुनर्वास तथा उनके दावा को न्य करने के लिए एक आयोग नियुक्त किया है ;

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो इसका कार्यालय कहाँ पर स्थित किया जायेगा ; और

(ग) सरकार द्वारा बनाई गई योजना के अन्तर्गत किन किन स्थानों पर शरणार्थियों को बसाया जायेगा ?

पुनर्वास मंत्री (श्री हथी) : (क) जी, नहीं ।

(ख) नहीं ।

(ग) हाल ही में हुए भारत-पाकिस्तान संघर्ष के रुत रुकने के बाद पाकिस्तान से 638 हिन्दू परिवार राजस्थान में आये हैं । उन्हें जिला बारमर तथा राजस्थान में अन्य उपयुक्त स्थानों पर बसाने की व्यवस्था की जा रही है ।

### Kurukshetra University

378. Dr. Mahadeva Prasad: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Kurukshetra University has decided

to start post-graduate diploma courses in Community Development, Panchayati Raj, Cooperation and Social Education; and

(b) which of the other universities have started or intend to start similar courses?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) Yes, Sir. The University has decided to start diploma courses in these subjects in 1966-67 subject to availability of funds.

(b) According to available information, the Nagpur University has a Diploma Course in Co-operation and the universities of Baroda, Andhra, Osmania, Sri Venkateswara and Gorakhpur intend to start a similar course. The Aligarh Muslim University has a proposal to start a post-graduate Diploma Course in Co-operation and Panchayati Raj.

### Colleges in Delhi

380. Shri Shiv Charan Gupta: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of new class rooms added to the existing colleges and the number of new colleges opened in Delhi this year;

(b) the number of students admitted this year in Pre-medical, B.Sc. and B. Com. courses; and

(c) the action proposed to be taken to accommodate new students next year?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) While no new class rooms have been added to the existing colleges, a new college for women with an admission capacity of 700 has been started at Timarpur from this year.

(b) Pre-Medical	601
B.Sc. (General)	1001
B.Sc. (Hons.)	432
B.Com.	841

(c) The requirements for the next academic year are being assessed.

# Setting up of Universities in Fourth Plan

381. Shrimati Vimla Deshmukh: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have decided not to set up any more Universities in the Fourth Plan; and

(b) if so, whether this ban will also apply to the establishment of Agricultural Universities?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) It is the view of the University Grants Commission, the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Education that, as far as possible, no new Universities should be started during the Fourth Plan period.

(b) No, Sir. The Fourth Plan Working Group on Agricultural Administration and Personnel and Education and Training has recommended in its report (1965) that if some States show interest in establishing agricultural universities in the next Plan, they should be encouraged to do so.

ब्लैक आउट के कारण उत्पादन में हानि

382. श्री हरकम चन्द कछवाय : क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण के कारण देश के विभिन्न भागों में जो ब्लैक आउट हुआ उससे केन्द्रीय सरकार को उत्पादन में कितनी हानि हुई ;

(ख) क्या उक्त ब्लैक आउट के कारण उत्पादन कम हो गया है ;

(ग) यदि हां, तो उसका पूरा ब्यौर क्या है ; और

(घ) उत्पादन में हुई कमी को पूरा करने के लिए क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री (स० ना० मिश्र) : (क) से (घ) सूचना एकत्रित की जा रही है और प्राप्त होते ही सदन के सभा-पटल पर रखी जायगी ।

## Kashmir Situation

383. Shrimati Mahmooda Sultan: Shri P. C. Borooah: Shri S. M. Banerjee:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Pakistan having failed in the battlefield, had again started engineering subversion in the State of Jammu and Kashmir;

(b) if so, the number and nature of such subversive incidents that have occurred in that State since the date of cease-fire between India and Pakistan, namely the 22nd September, 1965; and

(c) Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes, Sir, such an attempt has been made.

(b) Apart from violent demonstrations inspired by pro-Pakistan elements and staged by a section of the students, there have been 7 cases of explosion and 4 cases of recovery of explosives in the State. Some of the handgrenades had Pakistani markings. There have also been 6 cases of arson, 5 in Srinagar and 1 in Sopora. Some hand-written and lithographed posters were also seen pasted in certain towns containing inciting and pro-Pakistani material.

(c) The situation was dealt with firmly and except for sporadic minor incidents involving students normalcy has now been restored.

**Institute of Russian Studies**

284. Shri Mohsin:  
 Shri R. S. Pandey:  
 Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:  
 Shri Vasudevan Nair:  
 Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:  
 Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:  
 Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:  
 Shri Hukam Chand  
 Kachhavalaya:  
 Shri Bade:  
 Shri Yudhvir Singh:  
 Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:  
 Shrimati Maimoona Sultan:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that an institute of Russian Studies is to be set up in Delhi soon; and

(b) if so, the main objects of the Institute?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The main objects of the Institute are:

- (i) to provide facilities for study, research and dissemination of knowledge of Russian Language, Literature as well as Soviet Life and Culture by organising (a) One year Intensive course in Russian language; (b) Three year Honours degree course in Russian language and literature; (c) Refresher course for teachers in Russian language; and (d) Post-graduate courses in Area studies;
- (ii) to undertake and promote translation of books in Russian language into Indian languages and of books in Indian languages into Russian language;
- (iii) to organise lectures, seminars, symposia, conferences and the like;
- (iv) to institute and award fellowships, scholarships, student-

ships and loans, monetary assistance and prizes for the furtherance of the objects of the society; and

- (v) to invite, as and when feasible, scholars both from India and USSR to participate in lectures, seminars, conferences and workshops.

**Financial Assistance to Teachers**

285. Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:  
 Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the University Grants Commission has selected a large number of deserving candidates for supplementary award during 1965-66 under the scheme of financial assistance to the teachers in Universities and Colleges for undertaking research work; and

(b) if so, the number of candidates selected and the amount of Grant for the purpose?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Three hundred and thirty-six teachers have been selected for supplementary award during 1965-66 under the scheme of financial assistance to teachers in Universities and colleges for undertaking research or learned work and a grant of Rs. 3,12,710 has been sanctioned for the purpose.

**Quinine Factory in Fourth Plan**

336. Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to instal a Quinine factory in West Bengal during the Fourth Plan;

(b) if so, with whose collaboration and the amount of money involved; and

(c) when it is likely to go into production?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Alagesan): (a) No such proposal is under the consideration of Government.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

#### Trombay Fertilizer Factory

387. Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Trombay factory of the Fertilizer Corporation has gone into production;

(b) if so, what will be the annual production; and

(c) the amount of money involved?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Alagesan): (a) Yes. Trial production is in progress.

(b) The factory is installed to produce 99,000 tonnes of urea and 330,000 tonnes of nitrophosphate.

(c) Total cost of the Project is estimated to be about Rs. 36.38 crores.

#### यूगोस्लाविया से पेट्रोल के उत्पाद

388. श्री योगेश्वर झा : क्या पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या भारत को पेट्रोल तथा पेट्रोल के अन्य उत्पादों की सप्लाई के लिए सरकार ने यूगोस्लाविया सरकार से एक करार किया है; और

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो उसकी मुख्य बातें क्या हैं ?

पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्री (श्री हुमायूँ कबिर) : (क) जी, नहीं ।

(ख) प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

#### Re-imposition of Black-out

389. Shri Kajrolkar: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the black-out has been re-imposed in some parts of the country;

(b) if so, in which parts;

(c) for how long this black-out is to be continued; and

(d) whether Pathankot was again attacked by the Pakistanis after the cease-fire agreement?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

(d) No, Sir.

#### Beating of Students

390. Shri Vishram Prasad: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a boy was beaten to death by a school teacher in Delhi; and

(b) if so, whether Government propose to issue uniform instructions to all the educational institutions in India in this regard?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) No, Sir; this has not been proved by the enquiries made so far.

(b) No, Sir. The State Governments and Union Territory Administrations are competent to issue such instructions. Delhi Administration and municipal bodies have also issued instructions already.

#### Setting up of New University in U.P.

391. Shri K. C. Pant: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether one more University is proposed to be set up in Uttar Pradesh during the Third Plan period;

(b) if so, the region where the proposed University will be set up; and

(c) the estimated cost and the details thereof?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government of Uttar Pradesh have proposed that the University be established at Naini Tal.

(c) The establishment of the University is estimated to involve an expenditure of about Rs. 20 lakhs during the Third Plan. The details of the estimates are not available.

#### Gorakhpur Fertilizer Factory

392. Shri K. C. Pant: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the work on the construction of the Fertilizer factory at Gorakhpur is not progressing according to the schedule;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) the measures taken by Government to see that the progress of the plant is according to schedule?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Alagesan): (a) to (c). The progress of the factory was slow in the initial stages due to delay in the acquisition of land and finalisation of civil works contracts. The present progress is, however, very satisfactory.

#### Fertilizer Plants

393. Shri M. S. Murti: Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether the examination of the offer of M/s. Voest of Austria for the supply of plants to manufacture certain types of fertilizers under the Austrian Credit has since been completed; and

(b) if so, the result thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). The matter is still under examination.

12.06 hrs.

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

#### POSTPONEMENT OF AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE IN ALGIERS

Shri Rameshwar Tantia (Sikar): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

The postponement of the Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers and the reaction of the Government of India thereto.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sawaran Singh): It is a long six-page statement. Shall I read it?

Mr. Speaker: It may be laid on the Table of the House. I will give some other opportunity to members to ask questions.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, if you will remember you have ruled that whenever such long statements are laid on the Table of the House a brief summary of it should be given by the Minister. Otherwise, it will become a habit for the Ministers to lay statements in response to Calling Attention Notices on the Table of the House.

Mr. Speaker: When a statement is so long, it would take a long time to read it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: A summary can be given by the Minister. For instance, a summary of the Governor's report in the case of Kerala was laid on the Table.

12.09 hrs.

**Mr. Speaker:** If it is a summary it will not be useful for asking questions because the details will not be there. I will get it distributed. Then, day after tomorrow I will give an opportunity to members to ask questions.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I lay the statement on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5105/65.]

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshanabad):** Sir, on a point of order. In consonance with the salutary practice that you have laid down for starred questions and short notice questions that whenever a statement is to be laid on the Table advance copies thereof should be made available in the Notice Office so that members can study it and get ready for asking questions, I would suggest that the same practice may be followed in the case of Calling Attention Notices also.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I agree. Copies will be made available.

**Mr. Speaker:** I follow the hon. Member. In the case of questions when a statement is laid on the Table advance copies are placed in the Notice Office so that those members who are interested in that can read it and come prepared for asking questions. He has suggested that the same procedure may be followed in the case of Calling Attention Notices. I will certainly agree to that. In the case of Calling Attention Notices also the same procedure might be adopted.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha):** Whenever Ministers make statements they should be brief and to the point instead of being long as their speeches.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** May I know when this Calling Attention Notice will be taken up for asking questions?

**Mr. Speaker:** I will see. If it could not be done tomorrow, I will fix day after tomorrow.

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):** इतना मैं भ्रज कर दूँ कि जिस तरीके से हर चीज को लम्बान में कहने की विदेश मंत्री सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह को बहुत ज्यादा भ्रूल है उसी तरीके से ज्यादा चीज को थोड़े में वे कहना सीख जायें तो हमारे यहां भी दुनिया में भी बड़ा फायदा होगा।

# RE: CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE (Query)

**श्री मधु लिमये (मुंजर):** एक बात मैं ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव के बारे में भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि क्योंकि वह एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मामला है और वह एक ऐसा मसला है जो कि मजदूरों से सम्बन्धित है। 22 हजार मजदूर मिलों में काम करते हैं वह मिलें बन्द होने जा रही हैं।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** इस तरह आप उसे नहीं ले सकते हैं।

**श्री मधु लिमये:** एक लाख लोगों की ज़िदगी का सवाल है....

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** मैंने कहा तो कि इस तरह नहीं ले सकते।

**श्री मधु लिमये:** आप केवल दो बातें मेरी सुन लीजिये फिर मैं बैठ जाता हूँ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** इस तरीके से नहीं हो सकता।

**श्री मधु लिमये:** यह केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन मामला आता है प्राविडेंट फंड का....

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** आइए, आइए।

**श्री मधु लिमये:** एक मिनट सुन लीजिये कि इसमें क्या है।



**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं सुन लूंगा लेकिन इस तरह से नहीं।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** यहां ही क्यों नहीं सुन लेते ताकि बाक़ी लोग भी सुन लें ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** घांटेर, घांटेर।

12.11 hrs.

## PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

### ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON ASSURANCES

The Minister of Communications and Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given by Ministers during the various sessions of Third Lok Sabha shown against each:

- (i) Supplementary Statement No. 1—Twelfth Session, 1965.
- (ii) Supplementary Statement No. V—Eleventh Session, 1965.
- (iii) Supplementary Statement No. IX—Tenth Session, 1964.
- (iv) Supplementary Statement No. XI—Ninth Session, 1964.
- (v) Supplementary Statement No. VI—Eighth Session, 1964.
- (vi) Supplementary Statement No. XVI—Seventh Session, 1964.
- (vii) Supplementary Statement No. XIX—Fourth Session, 1963.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5092/65.]

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** When a similar statement was being laid on the Table last time I and some other Members raised the

question of foreign exchange given to the various Ministers who have gone abroad during the inter-session period in 1964 and 1965 and the reply of Shri Bhagat was that the information is being collected. Of course, he did not say that it will be laid on the Table of the House. Then we reminded him by a question saying that we wanted the information up to July 1964. May I request the Minister, through you, to supply this information. This information is necessary to see that the Ministers did not misuse foreign exchange or foreign exchange was not granted to them frivolously when it was not needed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does he say that there was an assurance?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** There was an assurance by the Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will find out and get it examined. He cannot say off-hand whether there was an assurance or not.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad):** I was happy to read in the papers during the last recess that the Lok Sabha Secretary, under your wise guidance and in the efficient discharge of his duties, had written to the Ministries concerned that many, many—innumerable practically—assurances had been pending implementation, and no statement had been laid on the Table in compliance with the assurance or promise given in this House as far back as 1962, three years ago; and the Lok Sabha Secretary, if I remember aright, had asked the Ministries to address themselves to this task and make a statement in this session as to whether they intend to comply with their promises or assurances pending since 1962, for three or four years. It has become a farce, a parliamentary farce. Do you not agree?

**Mr. Speaker:** I will see to it. I will see the previous statement as well as the assurances.

**Shri P. K. Deo** (Kalahandi): On a point of order, Sir. In this regard I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is a parliamentary committee on assurances and promises. In the Order Paper we find that the power of presentation of the report of the Assurances Committee is being usurped by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. It is against all practice. The Estimates Committee or Public Accounts Committee Chairmen present their reports to the House. Why should the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs usurp the right of the Committee on Promises and Assurances? It is because of this that there are so many assurances which are not fulfilled.

**Mr. Speaker:** He has to give decisions or the action taken. I think, on that account, the Minister has been presenting this report here. Does the hon. Minister want to say anything?

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** I would look into certain complaints which have been made. I should be very much obliged if the hon. Member would give me....

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath.** The Lok Sabha Secretariat has written to all the Ministries.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** I would look into it.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It is not for me.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** It concerns the Ministries of Government; therefore, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has to collect that information.

**Shri Morarka** (Jhunjhunu): May I say a word? There is a misunderstanding. What the hon. Minister is presenting is statements on assurances given by the Ministers. When the report of the Committee on Assurances is presented, it is presented only by the Chairman of the Committee. What the hon. Minister is

presenting now is the statement about the compliance of those assurances.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have said that it is about the action that the Government has taken on those assurances.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** He should ascertain from his colleagues, the Ministers, whether it is so.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, he has said that.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH TRAINING

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education** (Shrimati Soundaram Ramachandran): Sir, on behalf of Shri M. C. Chaglia, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Annual Report of the National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi, for the year 1963-64, along with the Annual Accounts and the Audit Report thereon. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5093/65].

#### RULES UNDER THE APPRENTICES ACT

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour and Employment** (Shri R. K. Malviya): Sir, on behalf of Shri D. Sanjivayya, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Rules under sub-section (3) of section 37 of the Apprentices Act, 1961:—

- (i) The Apprenticeship (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 1964, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 155 in Gazette of India dated the 23rd January, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5094/65.]
- (ii) The Apprenticeship (Amendment) Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1242 in Gazette of India dated the 28th August, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5095/65.]

**NOTIFICATIONS UNDER KERALA FIRE FORCE ACT AND ALL INDIA SERVICES ACT**

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): Sir, on behalf of Shri Hathi, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (3) of section 35 of the Kerala Fire Force Act, 1962, read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 24th March, 1965, issued by the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President, in relation to the State of Kerala:—

- (i) Notification S.R.O. No. 155/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 19th May, 1964, containing rules in respect of the members of the Kerala Fire Service. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5097/65].

- (ii) Notification G.O. (P) No. 181 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 23rd February, 1965, containing rules in respect of the members of the Kerala Fire Subordinate Service. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5096/65].

(2) a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 1553 published in Gazette of India dated the 23rd October, 1965 making a certain amendment to the Indian Administrative Service (Pay) Rules, 1954, under sub-section (2) of section 3 of the All India Services Act, 1951, [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5098/65].

**NOTIFICATIONS UNDER EMERGENCY RISKS (GOODS) INSURANCE ACT AND EMERGENCY RISKS (FACILITIES) INSURANCE ACT.**

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Rameshwar Sahu): Sir, on behalf of Shri B. R. Bhagat, I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (6) of section 5 of the Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance Act, 1962:—

- (i) The Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance (Third

Amendment) Scheme, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 2913 in the Gazette of India dated the 15th September, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5099/65].

- (ii) The Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance (Fourth Amendment) Scheme, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 3093 in the Gazette of India dated the 28th September, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5100/65].

- (iii) The Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance (Fifth Amendment) Scheme, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 3158 in the Gazette of India dated the 7th October, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5101/65].

(2) a copy each of the following notifications under sub-section (7) of section 3 of the Emergency Risks (Factories) Insurance Act, 1962:—

- (i) The Emergency Risks (Factories) Insurance (Third Amendment) Scheme, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 2914 in the Gazette of India dated the 15th September, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5102/65].

- (ii) The Emergency Risks (Factories) Insurance (Fourth Amendment) Scheme, 1965, published in Notification No. 3094 in the Gazette of India dated the 28th September, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5103/65].

- (iii) The Emergency Risks (Factories) Insurance (Fifth Amendment) Scheme, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 3159 in the Gazette of India dated the 7th October, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5104/65].

12:14 hrs.

## MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

**Secretary:** Sir, I have to report the following Message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

'In accordance with the provisions of rule 111 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1965, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd November, 1965.'

12:14½ hrs.

## ADVOCATES (AMENDMENT) BILL

**Secretary:** Sir, I lay on the Table of the House the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1965, as passed by Rajya Sabha.

12:14½ hrs.

## COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

## SEVENTY-SECOND REPORT

**Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao** (Shimoga): Sir, I beg to present the Seventy-second Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

**Shri Hem Barua** (Gauhati): May I congratulate you, Sir, on your entering into a pact with the Russia Ambassador here in Delhi to live long? God bless you for a long life!

**Mr. Speaker:** That is his wish. I have not said anything and no report has been made in that respect.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): The House wants...

**Mr. Speaker:** I have no desire to live so long—I would not like to. I have had long enough span.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** But we want you and the world wants you.

12:15 hrs.

METAL CORPORATION OF INDIA  
(ACQUISITION OF UNDERTAKING)  
BILL\*

**The Minister of Steel and Mines (Shri Sanjiva Reddy):** Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the acquisition of the undertaking of the Metal Corporation of India Limited for the purpose of enabling the Central Government in the public interest to exploit, to the fullest extent possible, zinc and lead deposits in and around the Zawar area in the State of Rajasthan and to utilise those minerals in such manner as to subserve the common good.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the acquisition of the undertaking of the Metal Corporation of India Limited for the purpose of enabling the Central Government in the public interest to exploit, to the fullest extent possible, zinc and lead deposits in and around the Zawar area in the State of Rajasthan and to utilise those minerals in such manner as to subserve the common good."

**Shri S. M. Banerjee** rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** Does he want to oppose the introduction?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee** (Kanpur): Yes, Sir. The Metal Corporation of India (Acquisition of Undertaking) Bill is being moved in this House and a statement regarding Ordinance will also be laid on the Table after this. I may inform this House that there were some negotiations going on bet-

\*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, section 2, dated 10.11.65.

ween the Metal Corporation of India Limited and the Government of India. I am surprised that this Ordinance was brought on 22nd October, 1965, when summons had already been issued and it was known to the country and to the Hon. Minister in particular that this House was going to meet from 3rd November. In this connection I may invite your kind attention to a previous question on Land Acquisition. You remember, at that time....

**Mr. Speaker:** Is he objecting to the passing of Ordinance?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** It is all inter-linked. Before I lend my support to this Bill at the introduction stage, I want to seek certain clarifications.

**Mr. Speaker:** At this moment, only if you want to oppose the introduction, you can make out a case for it.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I am coming to that.

**Mr. Speaker:** He may state briefly why he wants to oppose.

**Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur):** Usually at the stage of introduction, no opposition is made.

**Mr. Speaker:** Generally it is not done. But if the Member wants, he can oppose the introduction of the Bill.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** This Bill could have been brought without the Ordinance being issued on the 22nd October, when the Parliament was meeting on 3rd November.

**Mr. Speaker:** That objection can be taken when the Bill comes before the House. That is a different thing. At this stage the Bill is only being introduced.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Please see the order paper....

**Mr. Speaker:** We are only introducing a Bill, but he jumps to the next stage; that would come afterwards.

The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the acquisition of the undertaking of the Metal Corporation of India Limited for the purpose of enabling the Central Government in the public interest to exploit, to the fullest extent possible, zinc and lead deposits in and around the Zawar area in the State of Rajasthan and to utilise those minerals in such manner as to subserve the common good."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Sanjiva Reddy:** I introduce the Bill.

12.18 hrs.

# STATEMENT RE: METAL CORPORATION OF INDIA (ACQUISITION OF UNDERTAKING) ORDINANCE

**The Minister of Steel and Mines (Shri Sanjiva Reddy):** I beg to lay on the Table an explanatory statement giving reasons for immediate legislation by the Metal Corporation of India (Acquisition of Undertaking) Ordinance, 1965, as required under Rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5127/65].

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Banerjee's objection is that no Ordinance was necessary when the House was to meet on 3rd November. This would be discussed when we take up the Bill.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** Kindly hear me, Sir. My basic objection is that an Ordinance should not

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

be issued when the Government knows that the session is fast approaching. I know there was a seven-day discussion on this point on Land Acquisition; it was ultimately brought in the form of a Bill. On 22nd October, 1965, this Ordinance was issued. It was said in the Ordinance that Government was in need of zinc and lead and on 14th September, 1965, the control order was issued. I am surprised—I want the Hon. Minister to correct me if I am wrong—that not an ounce of—no question of tonnes—zinc or lead was required for Defence purposes. This Corporation has now been taken over by the Government. I want to know whether one of the big industrialists of this country wanted to negotiate and take over the Corporation. Of course, he could not take it. I also want to know whether after this a new corporation is going to be formed by Government with its registered office in Rajasthan. Is this corporation going to be a wholly Government organisation or are big businessmen like Birlas also going to be associated with it? If another businessman is being brought in, then I want to know the reason for the same. I would also like to know whether Government had a desire to nationalise the whole thing or it has been taken over because some other businessman is interested.

**Mr. Speaker:** This is not the stage when that can be discussed.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** They should tell us why the ordinance was issued, and why zinc and lead was not being lifted.

**Mr. Speaker:** An Ordinance had been passed, and now a Bill has been introduced in its place to be passed by this House so that it could replace that Ordinance. The hon. Member can take up all these points at the stage when the Bill is taken up.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** It is necessary to take them up now. I do not

object to the Bill, but I would like to know the necessity for having passed that ordinance when the session was approaching. . .

**Mr. Speaker:** That could be discussed when the Bill comes up.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Previously, you allowed the hon. Minister to reply at least.

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall give the hon. Member an opportunity when the appropriate occasion comes.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** My basic objection is this. What was the necessity for this Ordinance when the House was going to sit?...

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, Dr. K. L. Rao.

12.22 hrs.

# MOTION RE: PAYMENT TO WORLD BANK AND RELEASE OF WATER UNDER INDUS WATERS TREATY

**The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Dr. K. L. Rao):** I beg to move....

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** Before the hon. Minister proceeds with his motion, I would like to ask for one small explanation. It seems that Government are determined to play down the importance of the subject-matter which the House is called upon to discuss now. The Ministry headed by Dr. K. L. Rao has very little to do with the payment; the subject-matter is germane to the question of our relationship with Pakistan. We had thought that Government would take it up very seriously, because the whole House and the whole country is agitated over it; it is not a technical matter with which the Ministry of Irrigation and Power is concerned, but we think that it is a political issue; it is an

issue which is concerned with our whole relationship with Pakistan. Either the Minister of External Affairs or better still, the Prime Minister must be here to initiate the debate.

May I say that on the previous occasion when this matter was discussed in the House, it was the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru who gave the reply. I do not want this to appear to be derogatory to the status of Dr. K. L. Rao who does a good job under very difficult conditions, and taking into consideration how Ministers perform, he is a good Minister.

Neither the Leader of the House is here nor the hon. Minister of External Affairs is here. May I have an assurance from you that one of them at least will be here?

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall just find out. I certainly like this suggestion and I also support it. It would be desirable if either the External Affairs Minister or the Leader of the House himself could be here. The House would like to have their presence.

**Shri Nath Pal:** Thank you for this.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** I beg to move:

"That the payment of Sixth Annual Instalment to the World Bank and releases of water, under the Indus Waters Treaty 1960, be taken into consideration."

While moving this motion, I wish to submit in the first instance a brief outline of the events that have happened, leading to the signing of this treaty and explain a few important provisions of the treaty.

When India was partitioned in 1947, the boundary cut across the Indus river systems without having any re-

gard either to the physical or to the hydrological features of the basin and without any reference to the areas irrigated at that time or to be brought under irrigation later on. Thus, the Madhopur headworks were allotted to India while the Central Bari Doab Canal which irrigated some areas in Pakistan had gone to Pakistan. Similarly, the Ferozepur headworks are in India, while the Dipalpur channels irrigating certain areas are in Pakistan. Thus, the trouble arose almost immediately after the partition regarding the supplies of water to this system of areas, which is a very extensive one, namely the Sutlej system of areas, which is nearly 43 lakhs acres in Pakistan as against 40 lakhs acres in India. And unfortunately the Punjab Partition Committee did not make any rules at the time in this regard. So, later on, this came to a head. Finally, in 1948, on the 4th May, there was an Inter-Dominion Conference held, and an agreement was arrived at between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan. That agreement stated that India would allow water to the areas in Pakistan under the Sutlej which it had been enjoying for a very long time and that these waters would be gradually reduced and Pakistan should make alternative arrangements.

Now, this was the agreement, according to which the waters were to be distributed. But then, Pakistan, as it seems to be its habit, even before this agreement was signed, was secretly trying to dig up a channel to divert the waters of the Sutlej, by construction of a channel upstream of Ferozepore, so that if this was not detected in time, the eastern canals and the Bikaner canal would have gone dry—that is, those that are in India. So India promptly noted this and protested against it. Then those works were given up. India having got a hint of this, then proceeded with the construction of the Harike Barrage, 40 miles upstream of Ferozepore, where the Sutlej passes

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

through entirely Indian territory and safeguarded our interest by ensuring that the Ferozepore headworks were not put out of action, so that the waters would be available to the eastern canals and the Bikaner canal on our side.

At the same time, Pakistan also felt there might be danger arising out of this for themselves as well. So they began the construction of the Bambanwala-Ravi-Bedian-Dipalpur canal. This canal, to which I will refer later—this is the Ichhogil canal—was started in 1948. This was started by Pakistan as a sort of precautionary measures for themselves to divert the water to their own system; in case India did not give water, they would try to get the water from Chenab through their canals.

Now, the relations between the two Governments were not, naturally, smooth, because this problem was not settled. Pakistan at one stage, wanted to take it to the Security Council and the International Court of Justice. But India refused to accept adjudication of these natural resources and said that this must be settled only by agreement and by negotiation. At this stage, the World Bank offered their services to settle this issue. This was in 1951. It took them three years to formulate their proposals. In 1954, they formulated their proposals. Then it took 6 years for the Government of Pakistan to accept those proposals; while India readily accepted those proposals, the Pakistan Government took nearly 6 years to accept them. So that finally, an agreement was signed between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan together with the signature of the World Bank President, in September 1960, to be effective from April 1, 1960. This is, in short, the history of this Indus Waters Treaty of 1960 which is the subject of our discussion.

I will now briefly mention the important provisions of the Treaty. The

Treaty provides that the three eastern canals, namely, Ravi, Beas and Sutlej, the waters thereof, would be used entirely by India and the three western canals, Indus, Jhelum and Chenab, entirely by Pakistan, with some reservation for us. The lands that are there in Pakistan which are under irrigation of the eastern rivers, that is, those whose waters will be utilised completely by India, are, as I mentioned, about 43 lakh acres; these are to be irrigated by waters which are to be brought from the other three river-systems, that is, the western rivers. So that what are called replacement works have to be undertaken to have those waters brought from the western system in replacement of the waters from the eastern system meant exclusively for us. These waters from the western system have to be brought through links to the Ravi, Beas and Sutlej so that these areas in Pakistan, previously irrigated by the waters from the eastern rivers, may be irrigated by these western rivers.

Then the problem was who was to bear the cost. That was a very difficult problem, because the cost of this plus the development of the Indus came to about Rs. 700 crores. The World Bank came to assist the whole affair, and they gave by way of loans and grants as much as Rs. 620 crores, 60 per cent of it was outright grant, and the countries that contributed for this were Australia, Canada, New Zealand, U.K., U.S.A., and the World Bank.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South-West): And West Germany.

Dr. K. L. Rao: And West Germany. India also contributed Rs. 83 crores. That was the amount which was fixed after a lot of argument. It was a fixed contribution. All this money was constituted as a separate fund called the Indus Basin Development Fund, entirely to be manned and managed by the World Bank. The World Bank is the administrator of this fund. I will come to that later.



So, the money was advanced by these countries and the World Bank in order to meet the cost of these replacement works. Also, it was stipulated that these replacement works must be completed in ten years, commencing from 1960. By 1970 all the replacement works must be completed, and the waters that were there before, being enjoyed by Pakistan from the Sutlej will be transferred to India, and India can completely utilise all these waters.

They have also been allowed another three years as an extension of the transition in order to provide for any breakdown, any kind of accident, by which the works might get extended, but, for this, Pakistan has to pay some penalty. The penalty is of the order of Rs. 4 crores every year. If they want extension of one year, they must pay Rs. 4 crores; if they want extension of three years, they have to pay as much as Rs. 12½ crores, in pound sterling. Also, it was stipulated in the arrangement by which the waters of the Ravi and Sutlej required for Pakistan are to be led into the canal system, the cost and maintenance of the works, Madhopur and Ferozepur Barrages, would be paid by Pakistan. The question arose whether it was in Sterling. Pakistan said no. Whatever it is, they are now paying Rs. 44 lakhs every year in pound sterling under protest. That is about the Eastern rivers.

So far as the Treaty is concerned, we will be entitled to the full utilisation of the three eastern rivers. Not only this. We are also entitled to irrigate 7 lakh acres in Jammu and Kashmir from the three western rivers. More important than all this is the fact that we are at liberty to develop hydro-electric power from these rivers—6½ million K.W. power, which is two-third of what the whole of India has today. All this power we can develop ourselves and utilise in India. Of this we have developed only 0.4 million K.W., almost all of which is Bhakra's contribution. So, a large amount of electric power also

can be developed. So, these are some of the provisions.

Hon. Members will note that in Punjab there is a heavy amount of waterlogging, and one of the reasons for this is poor drainage. Therefore, drainage is as important as irrigation. There are four very big drains which pass out from India to Pakistan—the Hudiara drain, Kasur drain, etc. All these drains have also to be maintained in full and correct condition by Pakistan. These are the main advantages that have been arrived at by the Treaty by India.

This Treaty was discussed in the House exactly five years back in November, 1960 and supported by the House. It has received the assent of the House, and it was entered into.

Before I discuss what we did, whether we should have observed the Treaty, I would like to submit something about the Ichhogil Canal, which is something which comes up very often in the discussion. It was, as I said, a canal started by Pakistan in order to take the waters from the Chenab to feed the Dipalpur canal in 1948. When we took up the construction of the Harike Barrage, they thought they should also be careful as they did not know when India might cut off their water, and so they constructed the Upper Chenab Canal, the Bamnanwala and Ravi canals, about 108 miles long. This canal passes under Ravi by a syphon; Ravi river goes above and this canal goes underneath.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): Let him not bring the main issue before the House with these details and technicalities.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** Many hon. Members would ask for the details about this canal and so I am saying them. This canal was started in 1948 and completed well before the treaty and the money for this has come from Pakistan funds. The world bank has not paid any amount for this. That is the reason why I have been stress-

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

ing this a little bit and it will be useful for the Members to know these points. We found the pill boxes constructed on this side of the canal. We do not know exactly when they were constructed. On one of them it had been written, January, 1965. It may be correct or it may not be correct. We find that these were constructed 150 feet from the canal on the left side, that is, towards India. There was another row about a thousand feet away, at intervals of half a mile or so.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur): On the other side, they are just on the bank. I have seen myself... (Interruptions.)

Shri Shivaaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): There are underground gun positions towards Lahore side of the canal.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: They are on the banks of the canal on the other side.

Dr. K. L. Rao: It looks like that.

Mr. Speaker: Members have gone there and seen for themselves. They will have their opportunity. Let us hear him now... (Interruptions). Members are getting impatient. Really, it is not the agreement details that they want to discuss; it is the political aspect that they want to discuss.

Dr. K. L. Rao: I am coming to that. Because this would come up during discussion, I am describing a few of the details. One of the points that may be referred to is that the funds were used for constructing pill boxes in the canal area. I saw those pill boxes myself. Before I go further, I may say that the each pill box may cost about Rs. 5,000. I do not know how many pill boxes are there and that information is not available to us. But the whole cost on them, I would estimate, would not be more

than Rs. 5-10 lakhs. Members are agitated quite correctly....

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Is he defending Pakistan here? We are not at all agitated. We want to know facts.

Mr. Speaker: He is giving the facts.

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : कोई ऐसी बात यहां न कही जाए, जिसका लाभ पाकिस्तान को हो, इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : फैक्ट्स तो भाने चाहिए, नहीं तो आप इसका क्या करेंगे।

श्री नाथ पाई : फैक्ट्स तो आ गये हैं, यह सूचना तो उपलब्ध है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह फैक्ट्स देना चाहते हैं।

Dr. K. L. Rao: I wanted to give some facts by way of introduction. I will now come to the subject proper. Hon. Members are agitated about two aspects and are anxious to know something about those two issues. One issue pertains whether this instalment should have been paid or not. Secondly, whether the waters, in view of the fact that there is scarcity now, should have been withheld. These are the two points on which hon. Members are, quite correctly, agitated. I myself feel, and for that matter of that, every citizen of India will feel...

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुन तो लें।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : यहां प्रत्यक्ष उत्तर दिया जा रहा है इस धोर मैं आपका ध्यान दिखाना चाहता हूं। मेरे पास "हिन्दु-

मान—“पाकिस्तान” सम्बंध नामक पुस्तक है, मैं जिसकी इनके प्रकाशन विभाग ने प्रकाशित किया है, मैंने नहीं पढ़ाया है। इसमें बड़े स्पष्ट रूप से लिखा है कि पाकिस्तान की, जब सम्बन्ध टूटने लगे तो लगभग 55 करोड़ रुपया उसकी भलाई के लिए भारत ने दिया और 83 करोड़ नाम लाख रुपया और दिया। यहाँ कहा जा रहा है कि पाकिस्तान ने अपने पैरों से पिल बाकसेज बनाये हैं। मैं नहीं समझता कि यह किताब झूठी है या सही महोदय झूठ बोल रहे हैं।

Dr. K. L. Rao: I was submitting that every citizen of India, who is highly educated (Interruption) every citizen of this country wants satisfaction on these two points, because, they are anxious that whatever we do must not increase the military potential of Pakistan. It is quite correct, and I am sure that Pakistan has already shown weakness, and I am also sure that even if they do something in future, our jawans will take care of it. But in a case like this, in a discussion of this type, we should be very careful and very calm and we should very carefully study and consider the various aspects. As regards Pakistan, it has nothing to lose; it has no reputation to lose, while we, India, have a certain standing and respect in the world. Therefore, even those nations which are not friendly recognise our honesty and our standing, and so, I submit that the standing of India has to be taken into consideration, and we have got to consider this question very carefully.

I shall now proceed to give the House the reasons which weighed with the Government in taking this decision on this matter. First, with regard to the payment, we have already paid five instalments, and this is the sixth annual instalment which has been made, and this is made not to the Pakistan Government—this has

got to be noted and this is most important—but it is paid to the Indus Basin Development Fund which is maintained by the World Bank, and the World Bank is the administrator of this fund. It is a very important point which, I submit, the hon. Members must take note of. The World Bank is the administrator. . . .

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): All these facts are known.

Dr. K. L. Rao: . . . and the contracts are made in the name of the World Bank, and most of the contractors, nearly 80 per cent of them—are foreign contractors, and the World Bank gives this money by way of foreign exchange, and the World Bank supervises it and scrutinises the amount and this money is intended solely for the construction of the replacement works

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But foreign exchange is more important than rupee exchange.

Dr. K. L. Rao: That is what I am saying. That is what exactly I am submitting.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: They are more advantageous to Pakistan, my dear friend.

Dr. K. L. Rao: Pakistan is not getting foreign exchange. That is what I want hon. Members to understand. The foreign exchange is not given to Pakistan at all. The foreign exchange is paid directly to the contractors, and the contractors are all foreign contractors. The World Bank has given an assurance in this respect that the foreign exchange payments are made to the contractors and not to Pakistan. Why I am saying this is, hon. Members are afraid that the money is being used for the construction of pill-boxes. That is one of the points. But the cost of the pill-boxes may not go beyond the order of Rs. 5 to Rs. 10 lakhs, but here, we are concerned with crores of rupees given through the World Bank.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** Does the Minister know how many pill-boxes are there, when he is talking like that? (*Interruption*).

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** I am sure they have calculated some of them. I thought that the House may recollect it, whatever it is.

Now, there is another point. This treaty, about which we are concerned greatly, is not a direct treaty between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan alone; there is the World Bank coming in. This is, so to say, a tripartite agreement which has been entered into, and we are members of the World Bank. India is one of those few countries which have got a permanent executive director on the World Bank, and therefore, when we are dealing with the World Bank, we have got to be very careful in our dealings and we do not want to cause any embarrassment or become a defaulter. We do not want to be a defaulter; the World Bank has given us financial assistance, and they have been helpful in getting the consortium, and other aids from various countries. Whatever it is, we cannot take any hostile attitude with reference to the World Bank on this issue.

There is another very important point, and that is, we have paid so far five instalments. This is the sixth instalment, and we have paid Rs. 50 crores. If we stop at this and become a defaulter and pull back, the whole treaty will be thrown into confusion. The benefits that are accruing to us will all be now delayed, and probably, the whole scheme may take an entirely different pattern. Therefore, it was at the time when the treaty was being entered into that proper discussion should have taken place in the House. But having gone far, for more than half-way, six years have gone by and we have only four years more—at this stage, to go back on the treaty, would mean that the whole amount of money paid so far becomes infructuous.

Then again, what is more important is this. What is the object of this treaty and what is the object of the process that we have gone through? The object is to secure the best utilisation of the waters for India for the development of our land. We want to irrigate 33 lakh acres in the arid, desert regions of Rajasthan and we want to irrigate a large amount of land in Punjab also. In fact, we were irrigating at the time of partition only 40 lakh acres. Now, we are going to irrigate 120 lakh acres with these waters. After all, there is a certain amount of obligation in respect of the treaty which we have to discharge and we must respect the treaty. Suppose we do not do so, then the development will be in jeopardy and there will be delay and retardation of the development which I am sure the House will not like, especially when we have gone far. We have now been constructing the Pong dam and also the canals at a cost of so many crores of rupees. At this stage, at this crucial hour, having gone half-way, it would be putting the whole money into jeopardy, at danger, if we did not observe the treaty.

What are the benefits that we are receiving. As I submitted, we were irrigating only 40 lakh acres at the time of partition, 1946-47. Now we are irrigating 78 lakh acres; which is double of what it was.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** One question: if we give water to Pakistan, there will be less water for us.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** I will come to that.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** I thought that if we gave less water to Pakistan, we would have more water, and the Punjab Government has been crying that it has not got enough water for its own needs.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** I am coming to that: I was dealing with the payment issue. I said that we are making this payment. We make these payments because we do not want any

kind of harm to be done to the treaty to which we are a party. This money is being spent only on the replacement works. This money is being administered by the World Bank. The total amount of Rs. 83 crores is not the whole amount that is being spent. The World Bank gives to Pakistan something like Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 70 crores every year. Our portion will be only Rs. 8 crores. So, it is not as if we hold back the money and can thus thwart completely the progress of these works. Why I am submitting these facts when we are discussing this issue is because the House has to consider these facts very clamly and see the various aspects. With regard to the waters, I would submit that hon. Members should listen to the facts very patiently, because, there is a lot in the facts; and facts can tell the real tale. The facts are like this: We are giving water at two places, one at a place on Ravi on the Central Bari Doab Channel; that irrigates about 6 lakh acres in Pakistan. We are giving water at that point; according to the treaty, we have to give water at that point. There is another point at which water is given, and that is at Ferozepur, on the canals on the river itself. These are the two points at which we give water. The treaty lays down the very detailed conditions, and the detailed formula. They have not left any kind of doubt with regard to this. The treaty lays down everything completely covering every inch of it. This year the Central Bari Doab Channels have to be given water according to the indents placed by Pakistan. Fortunately Pakistan has not sent any indent and so we did not give any water. As a result, Amritsar and Gurdaspur had the full benefit of this water.

But this year is one of the worst years in the history of India from the point of view of rainfall. There has been very heavy deficit of rainfall. To give some interesting statistics, Ganga at Narrora carried only 30 per cent of water compared to last year. Saroda at Bambasa carried only 40

per cent and Ghagra at Elgin bridge had only 50 per cent. They are this much worse. In Punjab it is not like that. Sutlej carries 70 per cent and Beas 65 per cent Ravi carried much more. So, it just happened that in Punjab the position was not very bad. We are always deficit in water because of our expansion. This year during the khariff period, the Punjab irrigated 4 lakh acres more than what it did last year. Of course, I give credit to Punjab for having done it.

**श्री गुलशन (भटिंडा) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री जी गलत कह रहे हैं। पंजाब के लोगों को ज्यादा पानी नहीं दिया गया है। पंजाब को पानी मिला ही नहीं है जिसके कि कारण पंजाब की बहुत सारी ऐसी जमीन है जो कि सिंचाई में महलूम रह जायगी।

**श्री रामेश्वराम :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री जी इतना घसट्य बोल रहे हैं कि शायद मेरी समझ में यमराज के यहां भी इतना झूठ न बोला जाता होगा।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** घांड़र, घांड़र। मंत्री जी को झूँट बाधा के अपनी बात पूरी कर लेने दीजिये।

**Dr. K. L. Rao :** I agree that Yamuna was very bad; there was very little water. But I pay a tribute to the Punjab Government. They have taken a number of steps. Anticipating this trouble, they have put in more of electrification and tubewells. They have taken many other steps to see that they irrigate as much as possible. They have reached a very high figure this year. Maybe in the rabi period, they may have some trouble, but they are not anticipating very much.

There is another point which I want hon. Members to note. At the second point at Ferozepore, it is not a fixed amount of water—so many thousand cusecs or something like

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

that. It is a percentage—79 per cent. Whatever water comes in, you take off a certain percentage. If there is less water, you take less. If there is more, you take more. Then, about this 79 per cent of the Beas, probably one may feel it is a very huge amount, but we must see that in Sutlej, we do not give any water at all. Pakistan's share comes to 25 per cent of the three rivers taken together. We are today giving them 25 per cent of the total water flowing in all the three rivers. Therefore, the observance of this treaty is a very essential thing. I wish I had distributed copies of the treaty. Then probably....

**Shri Nath Pal:** We have got it.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** I am very happy. If you read it, you will find that in case of any difference whatsoever, immediately Pakistan can go to a neutral expert, to an arbitration board and so on. Suppose Pakistan resorts to that, they will easily create a complete confusion. We have already irrigated 78 lakhs of acres and we are going to do the rest of 40 lakhs acres and we are going to supply water for the Rajasthan Canal and so many other projects. All that will be upset. Pakistan will be glad to revert back to the 1947 position and say, "we must have the waters of these three rivers only; we do not want to have it from the other rivers." That is the confusion they will bring about.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** Pakistan made this agreement to oblige us!

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** Probably a speech in 1960 would be different. But having adopted the treaty and gone with it for nearly...

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore):** He had better go through the speeches made in 1960, tearing this agreement to pieces and showing how it was to our disadvantage. When I spoke so strongly about it, it was said that mine was a rabid speech. Now every word of it has come true.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City):** Don't overdo its benefits.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** I am not going into the merits. I only submit, having got along with the agreement and having come to a certain stage, at this stage if we want to go back, it is not proper. We must see the other points also. We are going to get out of this so much amount of water, which is very difficult to obtain. There is no point in going back at this stage.

Under the treaty it has been laid down that Pakistan can go to a neutral expert or an arbitration board, in which case there will be complete confusion. So, we have got to watch very carefully and we should not give a chance to Pakistan to get out at this stage and cause confusion. We are interested in our development, but they are not interested in their own development. (Interruptions).

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. members will have an opportunity to have their say. Now they must hear the minister patiently.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** The breaking of the treaty at this stage is not a desirable one and not at all proper having regard to this fact that this treaty is a sort of tripartite treaty and not merely between India and Pakistan. We have spent crores of money over this and at this stage it is really not in the best interests of our country to do anything that will go against the due observance of the treaty.

I am sure there will be quite a large number of members participating in the discussion. I shall be glad to note down their points and I will feel it a privilege to try to answer them. I would only say that by the due observance of this treaty India comes out as a stable and mature country.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the payment of Sixth annual instalment to the World Bank and releases of water, under

the Indus Waters Treaty, 1960, be taken into consideration."

What about the time-limit?

An hon. Member: The whole day.

Mr. Speaker: That total time has already been fixed. I am talking about the time-limit on speeches. Will 15 minutes be all right?

Shri Nath Pal: No, no.

13.00 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Let it be 20 minutes for the first spokesman of the Party, for the leaders, and 15 minutes for other speakers.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I am constrained to bring to your notice that your earlier directive has not been complied with, and neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of External Affairs is present in the House. It is a grave affront to you and to the House. You ordered them to be present here.

Mr. Speaker: They are having an emergency Cabinet meeting and the desires of the House have been conveyed to the hon. Ministers. They will try to make available as much time as possible and they will be here.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kapur Singh—

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, बैकल्पिक प्रस्ताव ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री कर्जी सिंहजी ने एक मबस्तीट्यूट मोशन दिया है। वह सही नहीं है। क्या माननीय सदस्य ने भी कोई मोशन दिया है ?

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री : जी हाँ।

श्री मधु सिन्घे (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प.सं.सि में मेरा बैकल्पिक प्रस्ताव पढ़ता हूँ। क्या आप उस को काट देंगे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर माननीय सदस्य का प्रस्ताव पढ़ता है, तो मैं पहले उनको बुला लेता हूँ।

श्री मधु सिन्घे : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर यह रखा जाये :—

"मिथु जन मंघि, 1960 के धनवर्ग जन देने और विश्व बैंक का छठा वार्षिक किरत की प्रदायगी के बारे में विचार करने के पश्चात् यह सभा सरकार में सिफारिश करनी है कि पाकिस्तान द्वारा किये गये विभिन्न संधियों के तथा प्राचबामनों के उल्फवनों तथा 5 अगस्त, 1965 को किये गये प्राचमण को ध्यान में रखते हुए यह किरतों की प्रदायगी तथा जन देना स्थगित किया जाये।" (1)

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कंगरा) : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर यह रखा जाये :—

"मिथु जन मंघि, 1960 के धनवर्ग जन देने और विश्व बैंक का छठा वार्षिक किरत की प्रदायगी के बारे में विचार करने के पश्चात् यह सभा इस पर खेद प्रकट करनी है कि इस मामले में सरकार ने जनता तथा राज्य सरकारों की राय की प्रचक्षेता की है।" (2)

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

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

"This House, having considered the payment of sixth annual instalment to the World Bank and releases of water, under the Indus Waters Treaty, 1960, and the behaviour of Pakistan towards India, recommends to the Government that the Indus Waters Treaty of 1960 be reviewed." (3)

**श्री प्रकाशचरित शास्त्री :** मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर यह रखा जाये :—

"सिन्धु जल संधि, 1960 के अन्तर्गत जल देने और विषय बैंक को छोटी वार्षिक किस्त की प्रदायगी के बारे में विचार करने के पश्चात् इस सभा की यह राय है कि पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण के बाद, पाकिस्तान को 8 करोड़ रुपये की किस्त दे कर भारत सरकार ने भारतीय कर-दाताओं के साथ अन्याय किया है और इसलिये यह सभा सरकार के निर्णय से अपनी प्रसहमति व्यक्त करती है।" (4)

**Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaia** (Dewas): Sir, I beg to move that for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the payment of sixth annual instalment to the World Bank and releases of water, under the Indus Waters Treaty, 1960, is opinion that in view of the present conflict with Pakistan, the payment be not made till our ships are released by Pakistan." (5).

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

**श्री मधु लिमये :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या आप समय बढ़ायेगे ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** माननीय सदस्य डिस्कशन को शुरू होने दें।

**Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, if any further argument was needed in support of the observation which was made by my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, that it should be the Prime Minister or the Minister of External Affairs who should take charge of this debate, this argument has been amply provided by the performance which the Minister of Irrigation has just now made in this House.

Sir, it is no pleasure to have to rise to support the Government action, now under discussion, for two reasons. Firstly, the conduct and the performance of the Government during the past years have not been such as to merit any approbation or support from those who wish well of this country, such as we on this side of the House.

**An hon. Member:** Only?

**Shri Kapur Singh:** Not "only" we are one of them (*Interruption*). Secondly, any payments made or sought to be made to Pakistan at this moment smack of disrespect to the memory of those who have recently laid down their lives in defence of the frontiers of this country against the wanton aggression by Pakistan. But, Sir, nevertheless, on a dispassionate consideration of the whole matter, it seems clear to me that the Government action must be supported, for what they have done is, on the balance, in national interest.



It will be recalled that this debate has been triggered by two observations that were made on the statements that were laid on the Table by Dr. K. L. Rao on 4th November, 1965. One of them was by an hon. Member, on this side of the House, to the effect that the statements contained many things which he described as "sweeping", and the other was your own observation, Sir, to the effect that certain provisions in this Treaty were "strange provisions"—the reference was to Annexure H to the Indus Waters Treaty.

11.05 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

These provisions, which were described as "strange provisions", Mr. Deputy-Speaker, by the hon. Speaker, relate to stipulation obliging us to release stated quantities of irrigation water to Pakistan, irrespective of our own requirements.

Any cool examination of the relevant facts before us will make it clear that neither the statements made by Dr. K. L. Rao on 4th November, or today, are "sweeping"—in the sense of being infected with inaccuracies—nor the provisions of Annexure H, described by the hon. Speaker as "strange," are strange in the sense that they were agreed to by our Government without due regard to national interest.

It would be best for me to support my observations in this matter by taking a bird's-eye-view of the provisions of the Indus Waters Treaty which lie at the basis of the debate which we are holding today. This Indus Waters Treaty of 1960 contains three or four provisions which are vital and relevant to the debate which we are holding. They are: Article V, Article IV(1), Article IX and Article II(5). Those who have read this Treaty know that Article V makes it clear that this Treaty was being made:

"In consideration of the fact that the system of works referred to in Article IV(1) is the replacement from the western rivers and other sources of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which on 15th August, 1947 were dependent on water supplies from eastern rivers, India agrees to make a fixed contribution of Pounds Sterling 62,060,000 towards the cost of these works."

India, by this provision, agreed to make a fixed contribution of Pounds Sterling 62,060,000 towards the cost of these works. Sub-clause (2) of this provision made it clear that this sum "shall be paid in ten equal instalments on the 1st of November of each year; "the first of such annual instalments shall be paid on 1st November, 1960." Sub-clause (3) said:

"These instalments shall be paid to the Bank for the credit of the Indus Basin Development Fund to be established."

Sub-clause (4) said that the payment "shall be made without deduction or set off on account of any financial claims of India on Pakistan arising otherwise than under the provisions of this Treaty." The sub-clause (6) of this provision said that these provisions—

"shall not be construed as conferring upon India any right to participate in the decisions as to the system of works which Pakistan constructs....or as constituting an assumption of any responsibility by India....in regard to such works."

Article IV(1) said that Pakistan shall use its best endeavours to construct a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from western rivers, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent for water supplies from eastern rivers. Article IX says that any dispute of fact, interpretation or application of

[Shri Kapur Singh]

the Treaty shall first be settled by Indus Commissioners of the two Governments, failing which by an agreed neutral expert, and even if he fails to solve it, then the matter shall go to agreed mediators, and even if that does not bring about the desired results, then an arbitration court shall be constituted. Article II(5) of the Treaty fixes a period of transition in which India shall limit its withdrawals for agricultural purposes or extraction for storage from the eastern rivers and also make deliveries to Pakistan from eastern rivers. This period, as we have been now told, is for ten years and can be extended to 13 years through mutual agreement.

Now, what is sweeping, what is wrong, what is inexact in the statements of fact which have been made on behalf of the Government by Dr. Rao, either on 4th November or today? They, it is true, do not agree with certain impressions and notions in the minds of the public and certain members of this House. It would be best to go to the genesis, to the origin, of these impressions and notions to understand properly as to why so much objection has been taken to Government action in this respect. For that purpose I beg of your leave to refer to a news flash which appeared in the *Economic Times* of Bombay, dated, 2nd October 1965. Herein it was said as a headline "India may suspend payment to Pakistan under Indus Treaty", and it was supposed to have originated from "Our own New Delhi Bureau", and its date-line was "New Delhi, October 1". It says:

"The Union Government is considering a proposal to suspend the payment of future instalments due from it to Pakistan under the Indus Waters Treaty if Pakistan persists in its present aggressive postures."

Further on it says:

"According to well-informed circles here, there is enough evidence at hand to show that Pakistan has not properly utilised the money paid by India and the World Bank for constructing link canals. On the other hand, Pakistan seems to have diverted sizable funds and materials for building pill-boxes and bunkers alongside the banks of Ichhogil Canal, a link canal constructed by Pakistan under the Indus Valley Treaty."

It goes on:

"This diversion of funds and materials grossly violates the terms of the Treaty and as such India is not bound to honour these."

Further on it says for the benefit of hon. Members of this House and those who are interested in the legal aspects of the matter:

"Students of international law also point out that it is an established practice of international law that all treaties, agreements and protocols between two countries are automatically suspended if they are engaged in armed conflict, whether or not there is a formal declaration of war between them."

This is the genesis of the anxiety and uneasiness which prevail in the minds of the members of this House and in the minds of the public at large.

This news flash has made out three points. One point is that Pakistan has misutilized the funds contributed by India. Dr. Rao, in his today's speech as well as in the paper which he laid on the Table on 4th November, has made it clear that these funds are actually used by foreign contractors under the super-

vision of the World Bank. The question of Pakistan having misutilized these funds could simply not arise unless the foreign contractors, with the collusion of the World Bank, have given Pakistan some advantages to which Pakistan was not entitled in respect of the utilisation of the funds. But that would be a matter which would not come under either the purview of this House or under the provisions of the Treaty which we are discussing.

Secondly, this newspaper has put into the minds of the people that Ichhogil Canal was constructed out of these funds. Dr. Rao has now informed us that Ichhogil Canal construction work commenced in the year 1948, soon after partition, and that it was actually completed in the year 1955. Here I may point out that it is ancient wisdom that nothing should be done, either by the press or by public men or by those who hold responsible positions to disturb the minds of the public and the masses. If such attempts are made to produce impressions which have no factual basis, then it becomes difficult to control the passions of the people, and in a way of government like ours, namely, the democratic way of government, this can lead to a tremendous amount of harm both to the country and nation and the world at large.

Besides these two arguments which I have mentioned, another argument which has been generally advanced against the action which the Government has taken in making the payment which was due on 1st November 1965 is that, diversion of such funds grossly violates the terms of the Treaty and as such India is not bound to honour it. I have already read out the relevant provisions of article V and sub-clause (6) which make it clear that the terms of the Treaty have not been violated in view of the facts which have now been disclosed to us by Government. Sub-clause (6) of article V provides that no provision in this Treaty shall be construed as conferring upon India

any right to participate in the decisions as to the system of works which Pakistan constructs.

Again, let us have a look at article IX with regard to disputes. When a situation arises where we hold that the provisions of this Treaty have not been properly observed, which includes also our grievance, if we make it, that any funds that we have given to the World Bank have not been properly utilized by Pakistan, then this Treaty provides that in such a contingency first of all the dispute shall be referred to the Indus Commissioners of both the Governments, and if they fail to come to any accepted conclusion, it shall be handed over to an agreed neutral expert; if he does not come to an acceptable decision, then it will be referred to an agreed mediator or mediators and, lastly, it may be referred to an arbitration court. I will come later to the point whether outside the Treaty, in the context of the Treaty we can repudiate it. For the moment I am arguing that there is no provision whatsoever in the Treaty which gives us any right whatsoever to repudiate outright either the provisions of this Treaty or to suspend instalments which are due on dates specified in this Treaty.

Another argument that has been advanced, time and again, for this Government not making this payment on the 1st of November 1965 is that, the international law gives us the power to suspend this treaty because there is a conflict between Pakistan and India. To this the reply is simple. Firstly, the conflict between Pakistan and India has itself been suspended. Secondly, we have no conflict with the World Bank which is also a party to this Treaty. Therefore, this argument of international law that bipartite international treaties are automatically suspended during the conflict has no relevance to the situation which we are discussing.

Some people might say, some people have been heard to say outside this House and in public that we should, under the circumstances of this case,

[Shri Kapur Singh]

In view of the provocations which Pakistan has given us, in view of the attitude which Pakistan has shown towards the ethics of international conduct and towards the desirability of observing international treaties, we should now repudiate this Treaty altogether. Sir, I can understand the anger and passions out of which such an argument arises. But treating international treaties as simple scraps of paper is not child's play. Kaiser William and Hitler learnt from hard experience as to what it means to repudiate international treaties outright, for reasons which appeared to them to be plausible, but which the world at large may not accept as plausible.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Let us also remember that Chamberlain learnt to his cost that appeasing an aggressor does not pay.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** The hon. Shri Nath Pai has converted my argument of not repudiating international treaties as scrap papers into my urging or my pleading that aggressors should be appeased. This is a position which I have never taken. He is putting words into my mouth which are far from my intention or words which I have never spoken here.

As I was saying, it is not child's play to repudiate international treaties and they cannot be repudiated even by spurious or dreamed up arguments such as my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, has suggested.

India, particularly at the present moment of her critical situation, is hardly in a position to play Kaiser or Fuehrer, even if her ethical traditions permitted her to do so. I hope and pray, India will never join this unenviable gang of treaty-breakers.

Now let us turn to the suspicion that provisions of Annexure H to the Treaty are "strange", as the hon. Speaker observed on the 4th November, 1965—in the sense of being prejudicial to the national interests.

This objection is most suitably met in a leading article of the *Hindustan Times*, dated the 6th November, 1965, and I crave your indulgence to permit me to quote a few lines out of it. It says:—

"The decision to release water in terms of the transitional arrangements outlined in Annexure H of the Treaty is somewhat complicated by the fact that our own needs of water are desperate. But under the Treaty, the obligation to release the water is uncircumscribed by any considerations of our own needs. Whether such a lacuna should have been allowed to creep into the Treaty is arguable, though in fairness to those who worked hard on the agreement it should be said that no agreement would probably have been possible if it had had to provide for too many contingencies of this kind."

I could not reply to this point in better words than those I have read from the *Hindustan Times*. Herein this objection has been stated in most suitable terms.

In another leader, in the *Times of India*, of the 8th November, 1965, a reply has been given to this objection which also I wish to quote. It says:—

"But it was in India's interest to have signed the Treaty even if it did not lead to an improvement in relations with Pakistan. The Treaty gives India the exclusive use of the waters of the Sutlej, the Beas and the Ravi once the transitional period is over on March 31, 1970".

So, even this stipulation in Annexure H is eventually, and on the balance, in the interest of India.

Let us, therefore, be clear in our minds that whatever the failings of the leaders of this Government—here I wish to say in parenthesis, that the

whole of Indian Sea became the ink and all the reeds growing on the banks of the seven sacred rivers of India were converted into pens, they would not suffice to write out fully the failings and misdeeds of this Government—but they are not guilty either in this case or, as far as I know, in other such cases of one failing, that is, selling out national interests to Pakistan. Therefore, credit should be given where credit is due.

May I say here that during the last hundred years Governments have based their defence policies on an estimate of their potential enemies' military capacity rather than their intentions, on the reasonable ground that the latter are more difficult to discover and may change in any event. Now that we have made it clear to Pakistan around Srinagar in 1947, and on the fields of Wagah and Sialkot this year that, Pakistan must not try to settle her differences with us on the military battleground, let us give up all postures of petulance and exhibitionism and behave towards Pakistan as dignified and mature men.

The last—and I conceive, the real—argument against the action of the Government is that because Pakistan has confiscated our cargoes and because their distinguished foreign statesman, Bhutto, has called Indians, "dogs", let us retaliate by dishonouring the Indus Treaty. This seems to me to be the real argument which has triggered off the emotions and passions which have set this House against the action of this Government. To reply to this argument, I pose three questions.

The first question is: Is it, the repudiation of the Treaty, in conformity with the international image of ourselves that we have been endeavouring to project? The second question is: Can we inflict any substantial damage on Pakistan by withholding an instalment due under the Indus Treaty? The third question is: Is it in our self-interest, in the interest of India itself, to do so? I say that the answer to all these three questions is in the nega-

tive. Our international image, as we all know, is that of a lover of peace, a promoter of international law, an opponent of colonial exploitation and a supporter of induction of ethical norms into international conduct. How shall this image be either vivified or improved upon by our defaulting on the Indus Treaty payments?

The second suggestion is with regard to the damage, substantial damage. Can we inflict on Pakistan substantial damage by refusing to make this payment? If we can inflict some substantial damage, it would be an argument worth considering; but I say, our default can only result in further sympathies and material aid being proffered to Pakistan by foreign countries and by further hardening of feeling towards India. This is a development which we cannot afford to invite upon ourselves.

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

**Shri Kapur Singh:** I am concluding. With regard to the argument of self-interest, this argument has been answered by the excerpts which I read from the *Times of India*. Another argument has been provided by a hand-out which the Government has distributed to Members of this House today, namely, that if we repudiate this Treaty, it will provide Pakistan with material for reviving its earlier propaganda that it is essential for it to have Kashmir; otherwise, India may interfere with the flow of the western rivers in their head reaches to the detriment of Pakistan.

The last argument remains, namely, the conduct of Mr. Bhutto in calling us "dogs" which has materially contributed towards the anger and passion which we had been obliged to induct into this matter as well as in other postures and attitudes towards Pakistan. I have never had the pleasure of meeting this interesting young man, but from what one learns of him through his performances on the domestic and international stages, he is a very well read man and a very

[Shri Kapur Singh]

well educated man, but all his studies do not seem to have produced any curbs on his cultural behavioural patterns. Let me put his outburst against India in its true perspective. When he called Indians, "dogs", he was not hinting at our canine ancestry, which ancestry, he knows he shares with us; he was merely employing the cultural rhetoric of some Islamic communities when at war.

I seem to remember numerous instances in the history of Islamic Arabs, Iranians, Turks and Mongols, where they refer to their opponents in war time as "dogs". I have, this morning, been able to lay my finger precisely at two such instances. In a manuscript in the British Museum Library, called *Tarikh Hussain*, written in 1798, there is a reference to the collection of Sikhs at Jandiala in Punjab and in this folio it is said:—

دهستان از کل پنجاب جمع شده قریب  
هشتاد هشتاد هزار سوار فرام قلعه  
جندیه را محاصره نمود

Translated, it means: "The dogs collected from the entire Punjab in numbers amounting to 70,000 or 80,000 and they besieged the Fort of Jandiala".

Again, in another Persian manuscript, which is lying in the District Records of Dera Ismail Khan, called, Jangnameh by Qazi Noor Mohammad, written in the year 1765, it is said in reference to the Sikhs:—

دونا هم نه بشد مہان سگان  
نه درونی بود پوشده بدرگان  
که زانی و سارق نه دارند دوست  
دگو خصمت شان هم ناکوست

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): May I draw your attention....

Shri R. Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur): He might translate it also.

Shri Kapur Singh: Let me translate this excerpt from the manuscript.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: On a point of order, Sir.

Shri Kapur Singh: Let me finish; then he can raise it. I am not yielding.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: A point of order must be heard. The hon. Speaker fixed the time limit of 15 minutes and 10 minutes....

Shri Nath Pal: 25 minutes for leaders.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You have been ringing the bell....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have rung only one bell.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: More than 15 times.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. Please sit down.

Shri Kapur Singh: I have been asked to translate it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may finish it now.

Shri Kapur Singh: I am translating this excerpt of Persian from the manuscript I have just referred to. This means that, "adultery is absolutely impermissible amongst these dogs—he is referring to Sikhs—and so is theft; they give no quarter to a philanderer or a thief; every thing else in them is evil."

So, when Mr. Bhutto called Indians, "dogs", he was merely employing a cultural idiom of his people to indicate that he hates Indians because

they are at war with his people. This would seem to me to be hardly a good ground for our repudiating an international Treaty.

I support unreservedly the action taken by the Government in making punctual payment of the instalment due on the 1st November, 1965, under the Indus Waters Treaty.

**श्री भानु प्रकाश सिंह (रायगढ़) :** माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, घाठ करोड़ रुपया जो सिन्धु जल समझौते के अन्तर्गत दिया गया है उससे देश के अन्दर एक रोष उत्पन्न हुआ है और उस रोष का प्रति-बिम्ब देश के प्रतिनिधियों में हुआ है यह एक स्वाभाविक बात है। पाकिस्तान ने अभी जो हमारे देश पर हमला किया है और उस सम्बन्ध में हमें जो जानकारी प्राप्त हुई है कि उस ने इन्डोगिल नहर और गिल बाक्सैज बनाए हैं, उस के कारण जनता में इस पर रोष का होना कोई अजीब बात नहीं है।

मुझे इस बात की प्रसन्नता है कि सरकार ने इस विषय पर चर्चा का प्रबन्ध दे कर जन प्रतिनिधियों को इस बारे में अपने विचार सदन के सामने रखने का मौका दिया। जहाँ तक इस विवाद का प्रश्न है इसके दो पहलू हैं और उन दोनों पर विचार करना चाहिए। पहला तो यह है कि जो वर्तमान नदियाँ पाकिस्तान में हैं वे सन् 1947 के पहले हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर थी और उस का भाग थी, और दूसरा पहलू काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में है जहाँ से कुछ नदियाँ निकलती हैं।

हमें यह न भूलना चाहिए कि वर्तमान संधि के अनुसार पाकिस्तान जहाँ नहरें बनाने की योजना बना रहा है यह सन् 1947 के पहले वह हिस्सा था जहाँ पर नहरों से सिंचाई हुआ करती थी। देश के विभाजन के बाद यह हिस्सा पाकिस्तान में चला गया, और पाकिस्तान को इस कारण से यह अधिकार प्राप्त हुआ कि वह इन नदियों में पानी ले सके। जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नदियाँ होती हैं उन पर किसी एक देश विशेष का अधिकार

नहीं होता। हमें अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जिम्मेदारीयों को भी निभाना आवश्यक है। इन सब बातों को देखते हुए यह आवश्यक हो गया है कि पाकिस्तान को किसी प्रकार से इन नदियों से पानी मिले। यदि पाकिस्तान इन नदियों पर अपने बांध बना कर उनमें से नहरें निकालता, तो यह आवश्यक हो जाता कि हमेशा के लिए हमें इन नदियों से पाकिस्तान को पानी देना पड़ेगा। इस समझौते के अन्तर्गत, जहाँ तक मैं समझता हूँ, इस बात पर पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में एक समझौता हुआ कि पाकिस्तान 1970 तक जो पश्चिमी नदियाँ हैं, सिन्धु, झेलम, ब्यास, उन से नहरें बना कर अपने लिए पानी की व्यवस्था कर ले और तब तक पूर्वी नदियों से अपना पानी ले, और सन् 1970 के पश्चात् फिर हम यह पानी उस को ही देंगे हमारा भी इसमें एक ब्याज था, इसमें हमारे देश का हित था। इसलिए हमको उस को 80 करोड़ रुपया देने की संधि करनी पड़ी। जब पाकिस्तान की नहरें बन जायेंगी तो हम इस नदियों से शत प्रतिशत पानी अपने लिए लेने लेंगे और इस पानी को लेने के पश्चात् हमारे देश के अन्दर, पंजाब और राजस्थान में, 120 लाख एकड़ भूमि में अनाज उत्पन्न हो सकेगा और वह इतना होगा कि उससे हमें साल भर में सौ करोड़ रुपया मिल सकेगा। जब एक साल में हमको इससे सौ करोड़ रुपया मिलने की सम्भावना है तो पाकिस्तान को 80 करोड़ रुपया देने से कोई नुकसान नहीं हुआ। यदि हम यह समझौता नहीं करते तो पाकिस्तान निश्चित रूप से इन नदियों का पानी लेता और हम उसको नहीं रोक सकते थे।

दूसरी बात यह है कि यदि सन् 1970 तक पाकिस्तान नहरें न बना पाए तो हम उसे तीन साल का समय और देंगे जिसके लिए उसे हर साल हमको चार करोड़ रुपया देना पड़ेगा। लेकिन मुझे यह जानकारी है कि यह काम बड़ी तेजी से चल रहा है और

## [श्री भानु प्रकाश सिंह]

इसमें हमारे देश का हित है कि यह काम जल्दी हो, सुचारु रूप से हो। इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि जो हम मदद दे रहे हैं वह देते रहें ताकि जल्दी से जल्दी हम इन नदियों का पानी अपने अधिकार में ले सकें।

इस सन्धि के अन्तर्गत, जहां तक मुझे जानकारी है, हमने जो 80 करोड़ रुपया दिया है उससे आगे हमें और कुछ देने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, चाहे कीमतें बढ़ जायें चाहे अन्य रोड़े आ जाएं। हम 80 करोड़ से एक पैसा भी अधिक देने को तैयार नहीं हैं। और जहां तक विश्व बैंक का सवाल है, वह पाकिस्तान को 620 करोड़ रुपया दे चुकी है और आगे और अधिक भी वह उसे दे सकती है। तो एक प्रश्न तो आपके हित का है।

दूसरा प्रश्न काश्मीर का है। कुछ नदियां काश्मीर की सीमा में निकलती हैं। पाकिस्तान को डर है कि ऐसा न हो कि हिन्दुस्तान इन नदियों को रोक दे। मैं इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूं। हमारे खयाल में पाकिस्तान का यह भय निर्मूल है, इसका कोई आधार नहीं है। आज तक के 18 साल के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यवहार में हमने यह साबित कर दिया है कि हम ऐसा नहीं कर सकते क्योंकि हमने इस अवधि में कोई ऐसा कार्य नहीं किया है जिससे पाकिस्तान को इस प्रकार का डर हो। लेकिन मुझे यह भय है कि यदि काश्मीर के बारे में हम ने दृढ़ता नहीं दिखायी और काश्मीर को हमने अपने साथ नहीं रखा, तो पाकिस्तान के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यवहार को देख कर हमको यह आशंका हो सकती है कि कहीं वह इन नदियों को न रोक दे उस के ऐसा करने में कोई अजीबोगरीब बात नहीं होगी, पाकिस्तान का जो व्यवहार अभी तक हमारे साथ रहा है उस को देखते हुए। तो मेरा व्यक्तिगत मत है कि हम को इस विषय में बहुत कानूनी बातों में नहीं जाना चाहिए। हमको यह देखना चाहिए कि हमारे देश का हित किस में है। हमें इस

बात को देखना चाहिए कि सब से अधिक हमारी जनता किस प्रकार लाभान्वित हो सकती है क्योंकि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों के अन्दर कानून और कांस्टीट्यूशनलिटी बहुत ज्यादा नहीं चलती है। मेरा ऐसा खयाल है कि इन सब बातों का भारत सरकार को विदेशों में और खास तौर पर यू० एन० प्रो० में अच्छा ज्ञान प्राप्त हुआ है। वहां पर तो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति ही कार्य करती है अतएव मैं शासन से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जो भी वह इस विषय में कदम उठावे या जो भी वह इस विषय में कार्य करे उसमें यह देखे कि किस प्रकार हमारे देश का अधिक से अधिक हित होता है। जिसमें हमारे देश की अधिक से अधिक भलाई हो उसी को सरकार को महसूस देना चाहिए।

और बातों के साथ मैं काश्मीर के विषय में एक और बात कहना चाहता हूं क्योंकि काश्मीर भी नहरों के प्रश्न से संबंधित है। कहा गया है कि यदि हम ने नहर के समझौते को अमान्य नहीं किया तो पाकिस्तान इनके लिए जोर लगा सकता है कि काश्मीर उसको मिल जाए। मेरा खयाल है कि पाकिस्तान के लिये काश्मीर का मिलना एतना महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है जितना कि पानी मिलना पाकिस्तान बगैर काश्मीर के तो एक बार जिन्दा रह सकता है लेकिन बगैर इस बीज के वह जिन्दा नहीं रह सकता और इस बात हमको ध्यान रखना चाहिए और गवर्नमेंट इस पर विचार करे। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हमें यह सन्धि तोड़ देनी चाहिए, मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हमें सन्धि के अनुसार कार्रवाई नहीं करनी चाहिए, लेकिन अगर हम काश्मीर के मामले को लेकर और इस बात को लेकर कि हमारे यहां मानसून फेल हो गया है और राजस्थान और पंजाब में फसलें खराब हो रही हैं, थोड़ा सा राजनीतिक लीवर एप्लाइ करे तो उचित होगा।



जहां तक सन्धि का प्रश्न है, मैं इसका पूर्ण रूप से समर्थन करता हूँ क्योंकि यह सन्धि अन्त में हमारे देश के लिए आवश्यक है। जो आठ करोड़ रुपया हमने दिया है वह कोई बहुत बड़ी रकम नहीं है। हम इस आठ करोड़ को मिला कर 48 करोड़ रुपया दे चुके हैं। हमें 32 करोड़ रुपया और देना है।

अभी 32 करोड़ रुपया हम को और देना बाकी है और यदि वह रुपया देना बंद कर दिया जाय तो हम ने जो 48 करोड़ रुपया दिया है वह व्यर्थ से जायगा और बदनामी उलट होगी। इसलिए यह हमारे हित में है कि हम जल्दी से जल्दी यह कार्य पूरा करें ताकि वह पानी जो अभी ले रहे हैं 50 प्रतिशत के करीब वह पानी बिल्कुल बंद हो जाय और सारे का सारा पानी हम ले सकें। यह सन्धि निश्चित रूप से हमारे देशवासियों के हित में है और यह होनी चाहिए। मैं इस का पूर्ण रूप से समर्थन करता हूँ।

एक दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता कि जहां तक कश्मीर के मामले का प्रश्न है पाकिस्तान यदि कश्मीर के लिए प्लविसाइट की बात करता है जहां तक कि यह नदियां बहती हैं और जिनको कि वह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मानता है और इसलिए मैं कश्मीर की बात कर रहा हूँ तो क्यों नहीं वह उस कश्मीर के हिस्से में जिसको कि वह आजाद कश्मीर कहता है जिसको कि उसने कभी भी पाकिस्तान का अभिन्न अंग नहीं कहा, उसे हमेशा आजाद कश्मीर कहा और जहां कि मुसलमान लोग रहते हैं तो वकील पाकिस्तान के वहां पर वह प्लविसाइट क्यों नहीं कराता? वहां पर जनमत करा ले और देखे कि उस जनमत का क्या परिणाम होता है? लेकिन वह जनमत होना चाहिए एफोएशियन कंटीड के तत्वावधान में और रूस उसका सदस्य होना चाहिए...

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : माननीय सदस्य कश्मीर में जनमत कराने की बात आखिर

किस आधार पर कह रहे हैं? क्या पाकिस्तान स्वयं अपने यहां अपने भागों को पञ्चूनिस्तान, बलोचिस्तान और ईस्ट बंगाल में जनमत कराने को तैयार है? जोकि पाकिस्तान के साथ नहीं रहना चाहते?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : स्वामी जी, आप शान्त रहिए। माननीय सदस्य को समाप्त करने दीजिए। आपको भी मौका बोलने के लिए मिलेगा।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : क्या पाकिस्तान उनको यह आत्मनिर्णय का अधिकार देगा? कश्मीर में जनमत कराने की बात तो आप कहते हैं लेकिन पाकिस्तान को उसका आप सुझाव क्यों नहीं देते?

श्री भानु प्रकाश सिंह : श्रीमन्, मैं आजाद कश्मीर में पाकिस्तान द्वारा जनमत कराये जाने की बात कह रहा हूँ। मैं उस तथ्यावधि आजाद कश्मीर की बात कर रहा हूँ जोकि वास्तव में हिन्दुस्तान का एक अंग है और जोकि इस समय पाकिस्तान के अधिभूत कब्जे में है। पाकिस्तान वाले उस कश्मीर के हिस्से को आजाद कश्मीर कहते हैं। उसके लिए मेरा यह सुझाव है कि जो पाकिस्तान बहुत ज्यादा जनमत की बात करता है तो क्यों नहीं वह कश्मीर के उस हिस्से में यह जनमत कराये जिसको कि वह अपना अभिन्न अंग नहीं मानता है। मुख्य बात यह है कि आज तक कभी भी पाकिस्तान ने उस कश्मीर के हिस्से को जोकि उनके गैरकानूनी कब्जे में है कभी भी उसे पाकिस्तान का हिस्सा नहीं कहा है जबकि हम बाबर आज तक उस कश्मीर के हिस्से में जोकि हमारे कब्जे में है वह हमेशा हिन्दुस्तान का अभिन्न अंग रहा है। वैसे हम समूचे जम्मू व कश्मीर राज्य को अपना अभिन्न अंग मानते हैं हालांकि वह एक-तिहाई हिस्सा अभी भी हमारे पास नहीं है और वह पाकिस्तान के गैरकानूनी व उबरदस्ती के कब्जे में है। वह भी हमारा ही एक हिस्सा है। मैं तो यह इंगित कर रहा था कि बूक

[श्री भानु प्रकाश सिंह]

पाकिस्तान कोई संवैधानिक या क़ानूनी तौर तरीक़े नहीं मानता है चाहे वह हमारे सम्बन्ध में हों चाहे वह औरों के सम्बन्ध में हों। अभी तक इन पिछले 18 सालों में उसने यू० एन० प्रो० में इस बात को हमेशा साबित किया है कि उसने वही बात की है जो कि उसके स्वार्थ में होती है। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन यह है कि यदि हमारे हित में कभी इस तरह की कोई बात हो तो हम को निश्चित रूप से यह कार्य करना चाहिए लेकिन जहां तक नहरी पानी संधि का प्रश्न है मैं इस बात से पूर्ण रूप में सहमत हूँ कि जो कुछ दुष्प्रा है वह उचित है और यह होना चाहिए।

अन्त में मैं पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के सम्बन्धों के बारे में विनये कर जो विदेश मंत्री हैं उनका ध्यान आकषित करना चाहता हूँ हालांकि वह यहां पर इस समय मौजूद हैं नहीं तो भी मैं उन से यह निवेदन कर्हूंगा कि चाहे वह हमारा नहरी विवाद हो चाहे वह हिन्दुस्तान-पाकिस्तान का विवाद हो और चाहे वह हमारे अन्य विवाद हों, पाकिस्तान ने जहां भी उसे मौका मिलता है वहां पर हमेशा यह बताने की कोशिश की है कि हम ग़लती पर हैं और उसकी चर्चा हमेशा यू० एन० प्रो० और दूसरे देशों में होती है। मैं अपने विदेश मंत्री से यह ज़रा निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह कम से कम दूसरे देशों में और यू० एन० प्रो० में इस बात को ज़रूर कर्हें कि पाकिस्तान ग़लत व भ्रामक प्रचार कर रहा है और हम न्याय पर हैं। आज बाहर हालत यह हो रही है :—

“हम धाह भी भरते हैं तो हो जते हैं बदनाम, वह क़त्ल भी करते हैं तो चर्चा भी नहीं होती।”

इसलिए श्रीमन्, कम से कम ऐसी स्थिति घानी चाहिए ताकि जो सही बातें हों और जो हमारे देश के हित में हों वे सर्वोपरि होनी चाहिए यह कह कर मैं इस निष्पत्ति का समर्थन कर के बैठ जाता हूँ।

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** A few minutes ago I was hoping to be heard by at least one of the three signatories to this treaty because he was present here, but he seems to have departed again...

**Shri Nath Pai:** Departed?

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** I do not know what the position is because this matter has been mentioned several times since this debate began. I am glad that the hon. Minister of External Affairs who is the only signatory to that treaty who is present now is again entering the House. I hope he will follow the course of this debate with some interest.

Our contractual obligations under this treaty are very well known. There is no need to go on recapitulating them. The hon. Minister of Irrigation and Power dealt with this matter in a way which could be split up into two parts. On the one hand he tried to make a very enthusiastic defence of every single provision of this treaty as though everything contained in it was ultimately to India's benefit, and he maintained that there was nothing in the terms of the treaty itself which was in any way harmful to India or disadvantageous to India. That is one portion of his argument.

The other portion, of course, was whether it was politically desirable or expedient or not to depart from those contractual obligations in any way today because of the situation which had arisen as a result of Pakistani aggression.

May I just mention one or two things which I think the hon. Minister has not quite correctly represented to the House? He said that anybody who had objections to the provisions of this treaty should have raised them at the time of the treaty itself, particularly regarding the payments that we were supposed to make in foreign exchange. May I remind

him—I have gone through the records very carefully—the debate on this matter took place in this House in November, 1960, and one of the main points raised by several Members at that time was why the opinion of this House and the approval of Parliament had not been taken before Government actually signed this treaty, because the treaty had been signed in September, and the matter was brought up for discussion before this House in November. The late Prime Minister in his reply to those arguments maintained that it was the right of the Government—and constitutionally it is their right—to enter into an agreement, and he said that only the technicalities relating to exchange of instruments of ratification were still left to be completed. But I must say one thing that while raising the principal objections at that time, which I find in the course of the record of that debate, in which many prominent Members of this House participated in the shape of critics including the now Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, they did not in my opinion object very much to the detailed provisions of this treaty. The main objections which were raised fall into three categories. One objection was on the constitutional point whether Government had done the right thing in signing this treaty without getting the prior approval of Parliament. The second point was regarding the payment of Rs. 83 crores, where the main criticism made was why we agreed to pay in sterling instead of in rupees—not that we should not pay anything at all; the third criticism made was regarding Pakistan's own record of perfidy, and many Members expressed their apprehension on the floor of this House that we could not depend upon Pakistan to carry out conscientiously the terms of the treaty. I think I have made a fairly objective summary of, as I could find, most of the criticism raised in this House at that time. It is not true to say that no criticisms were made or that the Government was very willing to listen to the criticisms, because it was already a fait

accompli when it was brought before this House.

Then I must point out another slight matter of record. Just now the Irrigation and Power Minister said that fortunately no indents for water have been received so far this year from Pakistan and, therefore, we have not had to supply any water to them. I was glad to hear that. But I would like to know why this statement which he has made today here had not been issued publicly earlier, because not content with receiving the water supplies and the money which we have to give them and which we have paid just now, on the 1st November, the latest instalment, Pakistan has counter-accused us. There is a newspaper report dated Nov. 5 from Rawalpindi which says that a government spokesman on their side has said that India was not observing the Indus Waters Treaty. It is they who are charging us, that India has not been supplying Pakistan's due share of the water supply to the Central Bari Doab Canal and the Sutlej Valley Canal. He said that the Central Bari Doab Canal has not been receiving water from India since Sept. 23, that is to say, since the date of the cease fire. Now the Minister tells us something different. It is a very important matter. This kind of thing is being propagated through the press throughout the world whereas the Minister tells us now that no indents for water have been received from Pakistan and, therefore, no water has been supplied, and we are not obliged to supply since no indents have been received. If what he has stated is the correct position, why did not Government make its position clear earlier. If this debate had not come up, nobody would have been any the wiser because we have only read about Pakistan's charge against us in the papers.

As far as the provisions of this Treaty are concerned, the obligations we have undertaken for supply of water and so on, I have not much to say, because there is plenty of evidence

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

in the treaty to show that the matter was gone into very carefully by our own engineers; and certainly, I am not an engineer or technical man and so I cannot say. Even now the Minister has said that there will be ample water for our purposes. His predecessor at that time, Hafiz Moham-mad Ibrahim also said on the floor of the House:

"As far as the irrigation needs of India are concerned, within Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh and East Punjab, the water India can take under the Treaty from the western rivers is enough for the needs of these areas which are irrigated at present and those which will be irrigated later".

Because many members had raised this question of the development of our own cultivable area and the possibility of water being insufficient for the purpose. The Minister said:

"For both purposes, sufficient water has been allowed. Seven to ten million acre feet is the quantity which may be taken. That is enough for that area, no more can be used there for irrigation".

I take it these are responsible statements made by the Government before Parliament. Therefore, under normal circumstances, I have no reason to doubt that even under the Treaty we have taken ample care to see that we are not deprived of the water which is essential for our own cultivable purposes. But I am surprised to find that this Treaty makes no provision, no allowance whatsoever, for any changed circumstances, however temporary that change may be. Suppose there is a particular year when our country is badly afflicted by drought or by monsoon or by locust pest. Even in such a year, there is no allowance whatsoever made in this Treaty whereby we can claim some amount of allowance or exemption—partial exemption—for that year because of a particularly

critical circumstance in that year for our own agriculture or our own rainfall. There is no provision made for that. Therefore, if many members are complaining,—because this is a very bad year, particularly for the Punjab, Rajasthan and other areas which are suffering from drought—they are very well justified in doing so, because there seems to have been a total lack of foresight in that no provision for any kind of contingency of this sort has been made in the terms of this Treaty.

About the payment which has been made in sterling, other members have raised the point; I do not wish to repeat it. But I find that our Government suffers from some sort of a pathetic infatuation with the World Bank. The World Bank is not an entity floating in a vacuum. There are 8 countries which are participating in this particular project of the World Bank regarding the construction of replacement works in Pakistan. Of these, one is the USA, one is West Germany—whose anti-tank cobra missiles were also in the Punjab two months ago—and the other countries are of the Commonwealth. So when we say that the World Bank is something to which we must always bow down with respect and which should never suspect for a single moment and all that, I refuse to be a party to that kind of infatuation. The concrete facts of the matter are that certain countries are involved. Those countries are known—if they were not known to hon. Members opposite before, I hope at least now they are after August-September—to have the most venomous kind of bias against India wherever Pakistan is concerned. But in 1964, this World Bank—of which I am talking—had submitted certain proposals to both countries on the basis of which it suggested that a treaty should be drawn up. We find that ultimately in 1960, it is those proposals of the World Bank which have been incorporated almost in toto in the terms of the 1960 Treaty. If one reads through the debate which took

place in this House in November 1960, one finds both the late Prime Minister and the present Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission waxing eloquent and indignant about any criticism made by anybody about the bona fides of the World Bank and suggesting that it is beyond suspicion, we must have no kind of grouse against it whatsoever.

Now I find that this World Bank has been given even more powers, supervisory and inspection powers, under this Treaty than even the Joint Indus Commission which comprises representatives of both India and Pakistan. One may say that they are contributing the major part of the money, he who pays the piper calls the tune and, therefore, they should be allowed to do everything. But we are also paying; we may be paying less than the World Bank all the same, we are paying for works to be constructed in another country. We are contributing to that for a transitional period of ten years; but we find that it is specifically provided in the Treaty that India will have no right whatsoever in participating in the decisions regarding the construction of those works in Pakistan, none whatsoever. This entire power vests only with the World Bank and we accepted it without a murmur.

Then there is no provision, as I said, for any modification, even temporary, in the event of any kind of natural calamities which may afflict us. There is no provision either for any kind of review of the working of the Treaty and for necessary amendments in the light of any changed circumstances which may arise—there is one, to which I will come later, but that is wholly in favour of Pakistan and against us. A machinery has been set up. That machinery has been referred to here as two Commissioners, one representing India and the other representing Pakistan, who are to function as a Joint Commission. I would like to know one thing in view of the talk which has gone on here about whether Pakistan has diverted

funds from this Indus Basin Development Fund for other purposes, particularly for war preparations. Article VIII of the Treaty says that these two Commissioners who jointly constitute the Permanent Indus Commission will undertake, once in every five years, a general tour of inspection of the various developments and works. I would first like to have this information from the hon. Minister. It is just a little over five years since the Treaty was signed. According to the obligations of this Treaty, during these five years, there must have been at least one—at least one—general inspection tour, a joint tour of the two Permanent Indus Commissioners, to look into all these works see how the development work is proceeding. Not only that. There is a clause which says that if either of the Commissioners makes a request, on that request this Commission will jointly and promptly undertake inspection tours of such works as may be considered necessary for ascertainment of facts. I want to know whether up to date this joint Commission has ever met or not; if it has met, what are the reports it has submitted; has it ever undertaken this joint inspection tour which it is obligatory to make once in five years; if so, what is its report; if it has not done so, why not?

14 hrs.

If anything is brought to his notice, our Commissioner can ask for a prompt inspection of any particular works in order to ascertain the facts. He is given this power. Has he ever done this? Has he ever had any occasion to make such a request; if so, what was the fate of such a request; was it acceded to, or turned down by Pakistan? We do not know anything about it.

I say these things for this reason that certain military works have been constructed along the Ichhogil Canal or anywhere else. I take it that they

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

were not constructed overnight. What was our Commissioner doing? I do not know who that gentleman is, I do not want to be unnecessarily harsh on him, but I say that our Commissioner, not as a person but as an entity in this Treaty, has got certain powers and obligations. It is not correct, as the Minister said casually in the course of his speech, that these areas of the Ichhogil Canal are not available to us for inspection. They are available through our Commissioner, but we have no record as to what the Commissioner has done or what the joint Commission has done, what its report says, etc.

Personally, speaking for myself, I do not believe that it was necessary for Pakistan to divert money from this Indus Development Fund to construct a few pill boxes. Why should they do it? They are getting ample money for military assistance from other places, we know it. Do we think that people who can supply them with Patton tanks and Sabre Jets cannot give them money to construct pill boxes and bunkers on the Ichhogil Canal? I am really distressed to find that the way an uproar has been created in the country that this money has been diverted for that purpose, is really giving, in effect, an alibi to the military partners of Pakistan who have supplied it with things much more lethal than a few miserable pill boxes.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** The hon. Member was asking whether our Commissioner had inspected the works and seen the Ichhogil Canal and so on. I want to submit that quite a large number of meetings took place between both the Commissioners and the annual reports are laid on the Table of the House every year in June, and they have been laid for the last five years. Also, he will kindly see that according to the definition of works they cannot go to the canals. The only places they can see are the river works, because it is the rivers which we have divided among ourselves. Therefore,

they cannot go anywhere to these canal works. That is why we have not gone to the Ichhogil or other canals. And then the Treaty provides very specifically that India cannot question anything about these canals.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** Thanks for the clarification. That only buttresses my argument that we have entered into some loose and undesirable clauses in this Treaty.

Nothing has been forthcoming so far which can be called evidence in the real sense of the word to show that this money has been diverted by Pakistan for unlawful purposes. If it has been done, it could only have been done with the collusion of the World Bank, there is no other way in which it could have been done, because the World Bank has got supreme powers of direction, inspection, control, management and so on. Therefore, we cannot have it both ways. If this thing has been done, if Government believes it has been done,—at least Government does not say clearly yet, they say they have no evidence—then we must see the World Bank, or these six countries which make up the World Bank for this purpose, in their true colours. If it has not been done, or there is no evidence, we should not go on repeating this parrot-like all the time and giving an alibi unnecessarily to these people who have supplied Pakistan with much worse things than pill boxes. They can easily supply them money for construction of pill boxes also. So, I am not prepared to ditto the Minister's statement that everything in this Treaty is very fine and all that.

I may just point out that there is an emergency provision, which he should also have pointed out, because there I think we have had the luckiest escape of all. There is Article 10, the emergency provision, from which we had a very narrow escape, which says that if at any time before 31st March, 1965 (that means we escaped by about

five months only) Pakistan tells the Bank—I am not quoting verbatim, I am paraphrasing—that because of the outbreak of large-scale international hostilities arising out of causes beyond Pakistan's control, it could not obtain the necessary materials and equipment for completion of these replacement works by the target date, which is 31st March, 1973—ten years plus another three years which are allowed on the basis of payment of some penalty to us—and if the Bank, after consulting India (it will, of course, be generous enough to consult us) is satisfied that Pakistan's statement is correct, then the Bank's good offices will have to be sought by Pakistan and India together for any necessary modification in the Treaty. It does not say "international hostilities other than any hostilities between India and Pakistan", but there was enough mischief in this provision in this Article 10 for Pakistan to have utilised its recent hostilities to have come forward and said: "India has committed aggression on us, this is international hostility under this Article 10; therefore, the World Bank should now come along and force India to agree to further modifications of this Treaty." Somehow the time-table has gone wrong. I do not know whether originally some aggression was planned before 31st March, 1965, by Pakistan.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** There is one Phase I in the Treaty, that is why they have put it. Anyhow, as the hon. Member, said it is good.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** You mean you are lucky, fortunate. Why did you agree to such a thing? I am raising that point.

Nobody has got any illusions about Pakistan or Pakistan's record. We all know that and it can be repeated here *ad nauseum* how they have become almost professional law-breakers, that there is no single agreement or Treaty which has been made between India and Pakistan which they have not violated partly or wholly at some time

or other. We know that. It is also a fact that there are many things which go to show that they are nursing quite aggressive designs, with some sort of an eye on these waters also. You will find that Gen. Ayub or Marshal Ayub—I do not know how he likes to be called—had made this statement publicly four or five years ago: -

"By accepting the procedure for joint inspections of the river courses, India has, by implication, conceded the principle of Joint control extending to the upper regions of the Chenab and Jhelum and joint control comprehends joint possession."

This was the way he casually interpreted this thing before the press at one time.

Then we had the recent aggression in Kashmir, and it is through Kashmir that some of these rivers flow, it is in Kashmir that they have their upper reaches. If the armed attack of the First Armoured Division of Pakistan had not been smashed in the Kasur-Khem Karan sector, it is a known fact, plans captured from the enemy showed, that they intended to cut the Beas at the Beas Bridge on the Grand Trunk Road, to seize the Beas right down to Ferozepore where the headworks are situated. From so many moves of theirs we can see that they are got their eye on the river courses and on the canals also. We have to thank our armed forces that at least this plan to seize the Beas Bridge and cut off the Grand Trunk Road at that point was foiled.

There is no point in asking why they agreed to all this, because it is not possible to undo all these things now. The late Prime Minister, speaking in that debate said here: "We purchased a settlement, if you like. We purchased peace, and it is good for both countries." That was the hope with which he did it. If he had been alive now, he would have been the first man to agree that his hopes have been thwarted by Pakistan's aggression.

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

It was admitted here by him that we had agreed to some very unpalatable things in the larger interest of getting peaceful relations stabilised between the two countries. Some Members may feel that he was ill advised and some may also feel, as I feel sometimes, it is very easy to be wise after the event. Anyway my point is that there is a political question which arises. Although there are many things which are undesirable and in my view disadvantageous to India in this treaty, can we now come forward and say that we should suspend it or that our obligations should be suspended or we should repudiate the treaty I do not know if anybody wants to say that. There are a number of amendments which call for suspension or something couched in a similar language. The framers of the amendment have probably not had the courage to be more blunt and open. But the amendments cannot be implemented unless it is done by the non-implementation of our obligations under the treaty. I submit that it is not possible. I feel that some sort of a review of the terms of this treaty are necessary. But it is up to the government to make an assessment and review, in the light of past experience and also the recent experience and on that basis, if it is possible for them to move the United Nations, the World Bank and approach Pakistan too, when conditions are a little more normal—I do not think that anybody will agree to what we say now—to try and get some modification in this, although it is not permissible, within the framework of the treaty from what I can make out. We will have to wait at least five years for that.

Further, I am against any stopping of water supplies. Our enemy is not the people of Pakistan. One of the most noble war aims we have declared is that we are not fighting the people of Pakistan; we are fighting the military dictatorship which rules over them and the only result of stoppage

of water supply is to turn that area into desert and stop whatever the poor peasants do there. That is not our aim in this war. Therefore, we should not go in for that kind of thing. And if I may say so, Pakistan has proclaimed openly on more than one occasion the doctrine of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. This is the language of gangsterism in international politics. That is the language of a people who have earned for themselves a name for breaking the laws all the time. We do not want to stoop to that level. Some minister today has hit the headlines, I find, in the morning papers, and it seems that some Members of the ruling party are very much on the war path. I do not know what they said yesterday at their own party meeting. But one of them succeeded in hitting the headlines in a big way this morning. But I would request them not to stoop down to the same position of Pakistan and to indulge in that same kind of language and the same kind of behaviour which we are accustomed to see from Pakistan. Therefore, although I do not for a moment subscribe to what the Minister has said about the treaty being wonderful and perfect and beautiful and so on—I do not accept that argument—we have entered into that treaty, and we cannot also prove that Pakistan has violated the particular treaty. If that was a fact, despite everything else I would have said that we could unilaterally violate this particular treaty. We can certainly have then good ground for saying that we are not going to adhere to the treaty. No such argument had been advanced. Therefore, in these circumstances, there should be no more talk of repudiating the treaty or suspending our obligations under the treaty itself. Government should at least devote some attention and thought whether it is possible in some future date, if not just now, within the next period of five years, to secure certain modifications of this treaty so that at least normal provisions are in-



incorporated in it, in the view of the changed circumstances or in the view of certain special circumstances which may occur in a particular time there may be some scope for modification and review.

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सिन्धु जल पाकिस्तान को देने के सम्बन्ध में मैंने तर्कों को सुना है और मंत्री महोदय ने जो बातें बतलाई हैं उन पर भी मैंने पूरा पूरा ध्यान दिया है। मैं यह अनुभव करता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय ने जो तर्क दिये हैं वे युक्तिसंगत हैं, कानूनी हैं और इस सन्धि के मुताबिक हम अपनी शर्तों का रूपया देना भी चाहते थे और सन्धि को मानना भी चाहते थे। इसलिये मैं इसका विरोध नहीं करूँगा और यह नहीं कहूँगा कि सिन्धु जल देने की बात हमें ठप्प कर देनी चाहिये या रूपयों की किस्त जो हमें देनी थी वह नहीं देनी चाहिये थी। किन्तु इससे पहले कि मैं इस पर अधिक प्रकाश डालूँ, कुछ बातें मैं मंत्री महोदय के समक्ष रखना चाहता हूँ।

उदाहरण के लिए अभी मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया कि जो इच्छोगिल नहर है वह पाकिस्तान ने सन् 1948 के पूर्व बनाई थी। यह सम्भव हो सकता है कि नहर की खुदाई सन् 1948 के पूर्व हो गई हो। लेकिन अभी हाल ही में मैं और दस बारह अन्य संसद् सदस्य उस नहर के पास तक गये थे। मैं ने यह देखा कि वह नहर पक्की की गई थी सीमेंट, चूने और ईट से। मंत्री महोदय ने अभी बतलाया कि इच्छोगिल नहर के ऊपर यह पिल बाक्सेज या कवच कोठरिया नहीं हैं बल्कि उस से सी या डेढ़ सी गज के फासले पर बनी हुई हैं। हो सकता है कि मंत्री महोदय के पास जो समाचार प्राये हों उन के मुताबिक उनका कबन सच हो, लेकिन जो कुछ मैं ने आँखों से देखा वह यह बात है कि नहर के ठीक ऊपर ही यह पिल बाक्सेज बने हुए हैं और पिल बाक्सेज जो हैं वह चार चार पांच पांच फीट मोटी रिफ्लेक्टिंग कांक्रिट के बने हुए हैं। उन में छोटी छोटी दरारें हैं जिन से वह बर कर सकते हैं चारों तरफ निशाना लगा

कर के। यही नहीं कि यह पिल बाक्सेज इच्छोगिल नहर के उस पार ही हैं बल्कि इस पार भी बने हुए हैं साथ ही उस से फलींग दो फलींग के फासले पर दूसरी कतार पिल बाक्सेज की है जिन का जिक्र मंत्री महोदय ने किया। उन के देखने से भी यह पता चलता है कि वह 1948 के बने नहीं बल्कि तीन चार साल पहले के ही बने हुए हैं।

इसलिये जब हम ने विश्व बैंक से यह शर्त की थी तो हमें इस बात का भी पता लगा लेना चाहिये था कि जो नहर 1948 में बनाई गई उस को कांक्रिट और सीमेंट से पक्का करने की क्या जरूरत थी और उस के किनारे इस प्रकार के पिल बाक्सेज बनाने की क्या जरूरत थी। यदि सन् 1960 में, जब हम ने यह सन्धि की थी, हमारी जानकारी में यह बातें नहीं आई थीं, तो जरूर या तो विश्व बैंक ने हम से कुछ बातें छिपाई हैं या जो हमें सूचना देने वाली एजेंसियां हैं वह फोक कर गई और उन्होंने हमें यह नहीं बतलाया और हम ने जान बूझ कर इस बारे में रूपया लगाने की शर्त स्वीकार कर ली जिस का नाजायज लाभ पाकिस्तान ने उठाया। यह बात लिखित नहीं हो सकती है कि पाकिस्तान ने उस नहर को फीजी तैयारी के लिये बनाने में रूपया उठाया इसलिये अगर उन की जानकारी में यह बात नहीं थी और प्रज्ञान में ऐसी बात हो गई है तो हमें इस में कोई धांपल नहीं है, लेकिन अविध्य में ऐसी कोई भी बात नहीं होनी चाहिये जिस के बारे में जानकारी न हो और हम घोषणा खा जायें।

मंत्री महोदय ने यह बतलाया कि यह समय वादविवाद का नहीं है क्योंकि सन्धि खामू है। यह सही है कि वादविवाद का सही समय उस समय था जब कि सन्धि हो रही थी। लेकिन मैं कि बात कहना चाहता हूँ। कल्पना कीजिये कि मैं ने एक बड़ा सुन्दर मकान बनाया है और तय किया है कि मैं उस स्थान पर रहूँगा। लेकिन बीच में ही कहीं से एक भूचाल आ जाये और उस की छत चूँचड़ा

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

कर मेरे ऊपर गिरने वाली हो तो क्या मैं उस मकान से भाग नहीं जाऊंगा, मैं जबर्दस्ती उसके नीचे बना रहूंगा ताकि छत मेरे ऊपर धाकर गिरे? मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसे मौके पर हमें भाग जाना चाहिये। इसी तरह से हम को साफ साफ विश्व बैंक से कह देना चाहिये या कि पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी देश था, हम ने सन्धि की थी जल देने की। हम 50 करोड़ रुपये भी दे चुके हैं सन् 1960 से। लेकिन क्या उसके बाद भी हम को देना चाहिये ताकि पाकिस्तान हम से युद्ध करे। सन् 1965 में उस ने भारत पर आक्रमण बोल दिया है। आक्रमण के दौरान में हालत क्या है। यह जो नहर बनाई गई है, उस का इस्तेमाल किस लिये किया जा रहा है। मैं श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त के तर्कों से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि हमें नहर का पानी बन्द नहीं करना चाहिये। मैं किसानों की खेती के विरुद्ध नहीं हूँ, मैं नहीं कहता कि उन को जल न दिया जाये, लेकिन जो कुछ मैं ने वहाँ देखा वह यह है कि जिन किसानों को हम पानी दे रहे थे जमीन की सिंचाई के लिये उन के पक्के मकानों में बारूद के भण्डार थे, हथगोले थे, तरह तरह के हथियार थे जिन के भण्डार से अगर कभी भी धाप की फौजें वहाँ जायें या कोई अन्य लोग वहाँ जायें तो वह उन पर बार कर सकते थे। धाखिर उन्होंने यह चीजें क्यों इकट्ठी कीं। हो सकता है कि डर के मारे उन्होंने ऐसा किया हो। हर घर में छिपने के पक्के स्थान बने हुए थे। धाखिर इस का मतलब क्या है। इस का मतलब यह है कि जहाँ नहर बनी थी वहाँ पर साथ ही साथ जिस इलाके को हम पानी दे रहे थे उस का उन्होंने दुरुपयोग किया और जो रुपये उस के लिये मिलता था उस से बारूद खरीद कर लाई गई, हथगोले लाये गये और तरह तरह के हथियार लाये गये। हर घर में ये थे। यह बात विचित्र घबराहट है कि जिनको हम पानी दे रहे हैं उसके बदले में वे हमको इस प्रकार हाथ पकड़ा रहे हैं।

सिंचाई और विद्युत् मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री श्यामचर मिश्र) : क्या धाप का मतलब यह है कि किसानों ने उस रुपये से गोला बारूद खरीदा ?

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मेरा मतलब यह था कि जिन किसानों का हम पोषण करने की व्यवस्था कर रहे थे वे ही किसान हमारे विरुद्ध पाकिस्तान द्वारा दिये गये हथियारों का प्रयोग कर रहे थे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वे भी तो पाकिस्तानी हैं।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : एक बहुत विचित्र बात मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में याद आ गयी। जब मैं स्पेलकोट क्षेत्र में गया तो मैं ने देखा कि जब हमारी सेना ने करीब 230 गांव पर उस क्षेत्र में कब्जा किया, तो पाकिस्तान हमारे हमले के पहले ही अपना सब सामान और आदमियों को वहाँ से ले गया था, लेकिन यह विचित्र बात थी कि अपने कुत्तों को वह वहीं छोड़ गया था। जब पाकिस्तानी कुत्ते हमें देखते थे तो बहुत बुरी तरह से भागते थे। हो सकता है कि इन कुत्तों की ही जुल्फेकार भली भुट्टो को याद आयी हो और उन्होंने उन पाकिस्तानी कुत्तों को, जो कि अब भारत में हैं, भारतीय कुत्ते कह दिया हो। खैर उनका क्या खयाल था यह तो वही जानें, लेकिन वे कुत्ते हमने घबराहट देखे, जिनका कोई स्वामी नहीं था और यहाँ से वहाँ भटक रहे थे।

आपने सुना होगा कि दुनिया में नहरें बनती हैं और बाहत में भी बनती हैं। लेकिन यह आपन न सुना होगा कि कोई नहर १५-२० फीट गहरी हो या ११० फीट चौड़ी हो। पानी की सिंचाई के लिये पांच सात फीट गहरी नहरें होती हैं। लेकिन पाकिस्तान की यह नहर १५-२० फीट गहरी और ११० फीट चौड़ी थी। उसका तात्पर्य यह था कि जब कोई शत्रु उस रास्ते से पाकिस्तान

को भावे तो यह नहर उसके लिए बाधा का काम दे। हम ने जो सन्धि की थी वह अच्छे इरादे से की थी लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने उसका दुरुपयोग किया है। हम को जब तक इस बात का पता नहीं था तब भी बात थी लेकिन आज हम को इस का पता चल गया है। आज हमारे इंजीनियर उसको जाकर देख सकते हैं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी जब स्यालकोट का दौरा कर रहे थे तो उन्होंने नहर के किनारे किनारे पिल बाक्स देखे थे। वे तीन चार साल के बने हुए हैं, पहले के नहीं हैं। मेरा कहना है कि जो हिन्दुस्तान ने सन्धि की है और उसके जो अनुभव उसे हुए हैं उनको ध्यान में रखना होगा। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि इस सन्धि को तोड़ देना चाहिए। जो हमारे पास कागजात हैं उनसे हमको पता चलता है कि पाकिस्तान को पूर्वी नदियों से 43 लाख एकड़ जमीन की सिंचाई का लाभ हो रहा है और सन् 1970 के बाद यह लाभ समाप्त हो जायेगा। इसका अर्थ यह है कि वह सारा का सारा पानी उस समय के बाद हमको मिल सकेगा।

साथ ही साथ हमको इन कागजात से यह भी मालूम हुआ है कि यदि हम सन्धि को तोड़ देते हैं तो वह लाभ हमको नहीं होगा। इसलिए लाभ का तो हमें ध्यान रखना ही होगा। साथ ही साथ पड़ोसी देश को भी हम हानि नहीं पहुंचाना चाहते। हमारी पाकिस्तान की जनता से कोई दुश्मनी नहीं है। लेकिन हमने देखा कि पाकिस्तान निरन्तर तैयारी करके भारत से लड़ना चाहता था। हो सकता है कि उसने अपने बचाव के लिए यह तैयारी की हो और यह सोचा हो कि भारत इधर आक्रमण करे। इसलिए उसने रास्ते में ऐसी बड़ी बाधाएं पैदा कर दीं कि हिन्दुस्तान उसका कुछ न कर सके और वह चाहे तो हिन्दुस्तान का सब कुछ कर सके। जब पाकिस्तान ने यह नहर बनायी तो वह क्या कठिनाइयां खड़ी कर रहा है यह हम नहीं जान पाये और इसलिए हम ने उसके बिद्वद् आग्रह नहीं किया कि वह 15-20 फीट

गहरी और 110 फीट चौड़ी नहर न बनावे और उसके किनारे पिल बाक्स न बनावे। हम पहले इन चीजों को देख नहीं पाये थे। लेकिन अब तो हम ने जाकर इन चीजों को देख लिया है। इसलिए हमें इससे सबक लेना चाहिए और इस सन्धि को मानते हुए भविष्य में कोई ऐसी सन्धि नहीं करनी चाहिए जिससे हमारे देश को हानि हो, और यदि इस सन्धि के बारे में कुछ करना अब भी सम्भव हो तो विश्व बैंक से बात करना चाहिए कि हम सन्धि को मानते थे, लेकिन अब विशेष समस्याएं उत्पन्न हो गयी हैं। अब आपकी क्या राय है।

आपने यह बहुत अच्छा किया कि इस रकम का भुगतान रुपयों में किया फारिन एक्सचेंज में नहीं किया। लेकिन इस बात की गारंटी होनी चाहिए कि यह रुपया ऐसे कामों में नहीं व्यय किया जायेगा जिन से पाकिस्तान को फौजी तैयारियों में सहायता मिले। अगर विश्व बैंक आपको यह आश्वासन दे दे तो अच्छी बात है।

डा० आ० बी० धने (नागपुर)  
गारंटी किससे मांगते हो ?

बी म० ला० द्विवेदी : विश्व बैंक से।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अमरीका विश्व बैंक को रुपया देता है।

बी म० ला० द्विवेदी : तो हमको अमरीका से ही यह आश्वासन मांगना चाहिए। अगर अमरीका हमको यह गारंटी दे दे तो ठीक होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसी गारंटी मिल जाये तो अच्छा होगा कि हम जो यह रुपया दे रहे हैं और भागे जो रुपया देंगे उसका दुरुपयोग नहीं होगा और वह पाकिस्तान की फौजी शक्ति बढ़ाने के लिये काम में नहीं लाया जायेगा।

इस सन्धि के बारे में बहुत सी बातों पर प्रकाश डाला गया और यह बतलाया गया कि इस का किस प्रकार से दुरुपयोग किया गया है।

[श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी]

लेकिन मैं आप से एक बात यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान ने जो पाकिस्तान को पानी दिया उस समझौते के अन्तर्गत यह बतलाया गया है कि 69 प्रति शत पानी पाकिस्तान को मिलेगा एक जगह पर और उस जगह से तीस प्रति शत पानी राजस्थान को मिलेगा। लेकिन राजस्थान को वह 30 प्रतिशत पानी नहीं मिल रहा है, केवल दस प्रतिशत पानी राजस्थान को मिल रहा है। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि पाकिस्तान ने सन्धि के उस भाग का पालन नहीं किया जिसके अनुसार राजस्थान को 30 प्रतिशत पानी मिलना था। हमें इस बात की जाँच करनी चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान ने वह पानी क्यों नहीं दिया और हमें इस का प्राश्नासन लेना चाहिए कि भागे वह इस पानी को देता रहेगा। श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने बतलाया कि उन्होंने सन्धि को तोड़ा नहीं है . . . .

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** May I submit to the hon. Member that the water is not given by Pakistan? On the Rajasthan Canal, we regulate the water.

**श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी :** लेकिन पानी तो पाकिस्तान हो कर जाता था ।

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** Pakistan has nothing to do with the regulation.

**श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी :** मैं यह मानता हूँ लेकिन पाकिस्तान में नहरों का टेल एंड है और जब पाकिस्तान 69 पर सेंट पानी का उपयोग कर लेता है तो उसको 30 पर सेंट राजस्थान के लिए देना चाहिए। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हुआ, राजस्थान को केवल दस प्रति शत पानी दिया गया है। इसलिए जो नहरी सन्धि है उससे हमारी जनता को हानि हुई है। ऐसी बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। ऐसा क्यों हुआ उसका आप पता लगायें और इसका निराकरण करें और भविष्य में ऐसी गलती न करें।

कहा गया कि इस सन्धि के बारे में सन् 1960 में इस सदन में बाद विवाद हो चुका है। लेकिन सदन को क्या विश्वास था सन् 1960 में कि पाकिस्तान सन् 1965 में हमारे ऊपर हमला कर देगा।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** उस वक्त भी कुछ सदस्यों ने इस पर आप्रलोप किया था।

**श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी :** यह ठीक है। लेकिन उस समय हमने विश्व बैंक के सहयोग से यह बात स्वीकार कर ली। आज हम यह नहीं कहना चाहते कि सन्धि का पालन न कीजिये। हम यह भी नहीं कहते कि सन्धि का खयाल न दीजिये हम यह भी नहीं कहते कि जल को रोक दीजिये, लेकिन हम यह कहते हैं कि इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाये कि भारतीय हितों को क्षति न होनी चाहिए और हम जो खयाल दे रहे हैं उसका पाकिस्तान द्वारा दुरुपयोग न होना चाहिए। विश्व बैंक को हमें इसका प्राश्नासन देना चाहिए। लेकिन यदि उसमें ऐसा करने की सामर्थ्य नहीं है तो हमें उससे कह देना चाहिए कि हमारा एक सदस्य उसके बोर्ड पर होना चाहिए कि जो कि काम की निगरानी कर सके, जो विदेशी ठेकेदारों के काम की निगरानी कर सके कि जो काम वे करते हैं वह वास्तव में संचाई के लिए नहरों के निर्माण में होता है, पाकिस्तान की सुरक्षा के लिए नहीं। हमको देखना होगा कि पाकिस्तान राजस्थान को क्यों पानी नहीं देता। आज हम को अन्धे हो कर उसे रकम नहीं देते जाना चाहिए। हमें यह देखना चाहिए कि वह उसका क्या करता है। पिछले अनुभवों से हमको सबक मिल चुका है कि उसने हमारे धन का दुरुपयोग किया। भागे ऐसा नहो सके इसलिए यह लाजिमी है कि किसी तटस्थ देश का एक सदस्य विश्व बैंक के बोर्ड पर हो जो इस काम की निगरानी रखे और इस बात का हमें लेखा जोखा दे सके कि जो धन हम देते हैं और जो पानी दे रहे हैं उसका दुरुपयोग नहीं होता और हमारा धन

सुरक्षा के कार्यों में पाकिस्तान खर्च नहीं करता, बल्कि जिस काम के लिए दिया जाता है उसी में लगता है ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपको यह भ्रवसर देने के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ । मैं मंत्री महोदय के उन तर्कों का समर्थन करता हूँ जो उन्होंने खन्धि का पालन करने के लिए दिये हैं । मैं उनके इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ ।

श्री रामेश्वरराजन्ध :

“यंक्रदसि ध्रुवसा तस्यभाने  
ध्रुव्यं क्षेताम् मनसा रेजमाने  
यन्नाधि सूर्य उदतो विमाती  
कस्मिंदेवाय हविषा विधेम ।”

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम ने वेद में पढ़ा है कि देवता लोग जो पाप करते हैं हम उसके पाप से किसी तरह छट कर रहें । देवताओं का पाप कौन सा है ? यह जो संधि के लिए कहा जा रहा है कि हमें उसे तोड़ना नहीं चाहिए मैं कहता हूँ कि यह करना ही नहीं चाहिए था । यह हमारे देवताओं ने पाप किया उस समय के जो शासक थे और जिन्होंने यह संधि की थी यह पाप उन्होंने किया था । उन्होंने यह संधि क्यों की ? पंजाब के विभाजन के पश्चात् केवल दो नदियाँ भारत में आईं । एक नहर दोनों देशों में सम्मिलित रही और शेष 22 पाकिस्तान में चली गयी । इन दो ही नदियों का केन्द्र जो है पानी का वह हमारी ओर रहा । यद्यपि पाकिस्तान के पास सिंचाई का पूरा प्रबन्ध था तो भी जो दो नहर आईं उन में से भी हम ने उसे पानी दिया । हमारी जमीन सूखी पड़ी थी । हमारी भूमि भ्रष्ट उपजाने के ज्यादा योग्य नहीं थी तो भी पाकिस्तान को प्रसन्न करने के लिए हमने उसे पानी और क्या क्या नहीं दिया । हमने एक नहीं बरन् धनेकों धूल की है । भारत का विभाजन करके हमने पाकिस्तान को अपना सवा के लिए एक शत्रु बना कर रखा ।

हम ने जब पाकिस्तान के पास पसा नहीं था तो अपनी सिविल और सेना को नौकरी देने के लिए भारत का 55 करोड़ रुपया दिया उस को मजबूत बनाने के लिए और 83 करोड़ 30 लाख रुपया इस संधि के अधीन देश कृतस्वयं सोSव जनर्मास हमारे देवताओं ने पंडित नेहरू ने दिया । हम ने तो राजनीति शास्त्र में यह पढ़ा है :—

“देवकृतस्य ऐन सो ध्रुवयजनमसि”—

शत्रु को अपने से सबल न बनने दे ।

यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य का विषय है कि हमारे शासक उस नीति को पढ़े नहीं है और न ही उसे पढ़ना चाहते हैं और न उसके अनुसार आचरण करना चाहते हैं । अर्थात् अपने पड़ोसी को कभी अपने से सबल नहीं बनने देना चाहिये । यदि पड़ोसी राजा तुम से सबल हो गया तो तुम्हें उस के सामने झुक कर रहना पड़ेगा और अगर नहीं झुकोगे तो तुम को रगड़ दिया जायेगा । परन्तु दुर्भाग्य है कि यह भारत के जो दो शत्रु हैं पाकिस्तान और चीन इन दोनों अपने शत्रुओं को हम ने सबल किया और अपनी मूर्खता से सबल किया जिसे हम स्वीकार करन्न नहीं चाहते हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं बड़ा स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी जो एक सज्जन कम्युनिस्ट सदस्य श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त कह रहे थे कि हम को संधि तोड़नी नहीं चाहिए पाकिस्तान के साथ में और पाकिस्तान जैसा नहीं होना चाहिए वह बात उनकी एकदम अनुचित है । मैं उन से पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्यों नहीं तोड़नी चाहिए ? दरअसल वह उनके मित्र भी हैं और उनके मित्र के साथी भी हैं इसलिए माननीय सदस्य क्यों न ऐसा कहने लगे ? वे ऐसा क्यों नहीं कह सकते वह समझ में आ सकता है । लेकिन जहाँ तक हम सारे भारतवासियों का सवाल है क्यों नहीं उसे तोड़ना चाहिए ? हमने तो अपने यहां यह पढ़ा है :—

“मठम् प्रति मातृयम समाचरेत्” ।

[ श्री रामेश्वरानन्द ]

यदि कोई सज्जन व्यक्ति हो तो उसके सामने जरूर हाथ जोड़ो और सज्जनतापूर्वक और विनयपूर्वक उसके साथ पेश आओ लेकिन अगर कोई शठ हो और दुष्ट हो तो उसके साथ आप को भी शठता बर्तनी पड़ेगी । जैसे को तैसा देना पड़ेगा । मैं नहीं समझता कि उन माननीय सदस्य द्वारा ऐसी बात कैसे कही गई ? वह स्वयं अपने पड़ोसियों के साथ क्या बर्ताव करते होंगे और क्या दूसरी पार्टियों को वह रगड़ा नहीं देते होंगे जो आज हमें यह उपदेश देने लगे हैं ? मुझ तो यह देख कर बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है कि यह सारे के सारे उपदेश हम को ही झाड़ते हैं, पाकिस्तान के पास एक भी नहीं जाता । यदि विभाजन के समय ये नदियां दुर्भाग्य से पाकिस्तान में आ जातीं और वह भाग जो पाकिस्तान का है वह हमारे पास आ जाता तो क्या पाकिस्तान हम को इतना रुपया दे बैठा ? वह दे कैसे सकता था ?

हम जानते हैं कि अभी आप को एक आपत्ति हुई कि भुट्टो ने आप को कुत्ता कह दिया । उसने केवल कुत्ता ही नहीं कहा बल्कि और भी बहुत कुछ कहा है । उस ने तो यह भी कहा कि यह उस भारत के लोग हैं जोकि हजारों वर्ष हमारे गुलाम रहे हैं । उन के दिमाग में यह है कि अब फिर भारत पर शासन करेंगे । दरअसल कुत्ते खाली भुट्टो ने ही नहीं कहा है वह तो चीनियों ने भी हमें कहा था । जब वह तिब्बत पर आक्रमण कर रहे थे और हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने संसद में यह कहा था कि किसी को अधिकार नहीं है तिब्बत पर अधिकार जमाने का तो वहां चीनियों ने यह कहा था कि पंडित नेहरू और पंडित नेहरू के साथी सामंजस्यवाद के पालतू कुत्ते हैं । अब आप को तो पुराना अभ्यास है यह सब सुनते रहने का । लेकिन मुझे बड़ा दुःख और ठेस लगी है और मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हम भुट्टो से इसका बदला लेंगे ।

हमारे नेताओं के लिए जो उसने गाली और अपशब्द कहे हैं हम उसका मीके पर बदला लेंगे और उन्हें बतलायेंगे कि किस को कुत्ता कहा जाता है । इस बात का बदला अवश्य लिया जाना चाहिए । मैं आप को यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जितना रुपया हम ने दिया है वह रुपया क्या कोई देना जरूरी था ? कौन हमारे दादा परदादा यह कह कर मरे थे कि देखना पाकिस्तान को जरूर देना । कौन महात्मा गांधी ने लिख कर भेजा था या पहले नेता आप को कह गये थे कि पाकिस्तान को जरूर देना ? यदि इस तरह से सब कुछ पाकिस्तान को दे देकर उसे मजबूत बनाते जाना है तो फिर उससे लड़ने के लिए क्यों जाते हो । अगर उसे सबल बनाना ही हमारा उद्देश्य है तो फिर उससे आवश्यकता क्या पड़ गयी लड़ने की ? आप उस से लड़ते क्यों हो ? मैं यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि यह जो इस प्रकार की भारत सरकार की द्विलमिन नीति है यह नीति आप तो जायेगी लेकिन देश को भी ले जायेगी ।

मैं आप के सामने दुःख भरे शब्दों में कह रहा हूं कि हमारे शत्रु पाकिस्तान और चीन यदि यह जानना चाहें कि हमारे नेताओं ने प्रधान मंत्री आदि ने कितना साग कितनी दाल और किनी रोटियां अमुक दिन खाई हैं तो इसका अम्यूब खां और चाऊ एन साई को पता लग जाता है । उनको आपके भोजन तक के बारे में सब कुछ पता चल जाया करता है लेकिन दुर्भाग्य का विषय यह है कि इसके बिचरोत हम भारत के लोगों को भारत के शासकों को वहां के विशेष विशेष काण्डों तक का कोई पता नहीं लगता । यहां भारत की बातें पाकिस्तान और चीन वालों को इसलिए पता लग जाती हैं कि उनके एजेंट यहां करोड़ों की संख्या में बैठे हैं । करोड़ों की संख्या में काले नाग यहां दूध पी रहे हैं

घौर हमारी सरकार की इसी गलत नीति के आधार पर पीते भी रहेंगे ।

अभी एक सज्जन कह रहे थे कि कश्मीर के उस गुलाम हिस्से में मतदान हो जाना चाहिए । हमको तो कहना चाहते हो लेकिन क्या वह यह सुझाव मियां भुट्टो और पाकिस्तान के शासकों को भी दें कि जो लोग पकूनिस्तान मांग रहे हैं, बिलोचिस्तान मांग रहे हैं और जो पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के लोग पाकिस्तान के साथ रहना पसन्द नहीं करते, उनको पाकिस्तान यह आत्मनिर्णय का अधिकार दे । मानदीय सदस्य उनसे कहें तो जाकर कि यह कश्मीर में जनमतसंग्रह अय्यूब साहब और भुट्टो साहब आप हमसे क्या मांगते हैं, पहले आप उनको इसका अधिकार दे दीजिये बाद में हम देखेंगे और इस पर सोचेंगे । लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि उस बारे में कोई सोचने का प्रश्न ही नहीं आता है । हमने वह विधान पढ़ा है जो अंग्रेजी सरकार ने अपने सदन में पास किया था कि हम भारत को सन् 48 से पहले पहले स्वतन्त्र कर देंगे भारत के हम दो भाग करेंगे । एक वह इलाके जहाँ मुसलमान अधिक बसते हैं वह पाकिस्तान कहलायेगा और ऐसे इलाके जहाँ हिन्दू अधिक बसते हैं वह हिन्दुस्तान बनेगा देशी रियासतों को हम स्वतन्त्रता देंगे और रियासतों के शासकों को इस बात की आजादी होगी कि वह चाहे तो पाकिस्तान के साथ मिलें या हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मिलें । अब इसके अनुसार जब कश्मीर के उस समय के शासक महाराजा भारतीय संघ में मिले गये तो पाकिस्तान को इस बात का क्या अधिकार था कि वह कश्मीर के ऊपर आक्रमण करता जो कि हिन्दुस्तान का भाग बन गई थी । यह जो सुरक्षा परिषद् बनी है या कहीं कोई कौंसिल बनी है यह तमाम लोग कह नहीं पाये कि इस बारे में अपराधी कौन है ? इसके लिए उत्तरदायी कौन है ? दरघसन होता यह है कि कोई एक सेर अपराध करता है दूसरा दो सेर अपराध करता है और इसलिए

अपराधी को अपराधी नहीं कह सकते । आज की इस दुनिया में कोई अपराधी को अपराधी नहीं कहता है । अंग्रेज और अमरीका वाले जानते हैं कि यदि हम यह कह दें कि पाकिस्तान अपराधी है और कश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है तो पाकिस्तान यह कहेगा कि तुमने यहां जो अपने बायुयानों के घड़बड़े बना रखे हैं उन्हें उठाओ । तुम तो पहले यहां से चलो हिन्दुस्तान से मैं पीछे निबटूंगा । आज चीन क्यों कहने लगा ? चीन हमारे पक्ष में क्यों बोलेगा क्योंकि उसने भी तो भारत के एक बहुत बड़े भाग को जिसे कि उसे पाकिस्तान से मिला है उसे अपने कब्जे में दाख रक्खा है । जो हमने दिया सो तो दिया लेकिन उसको पाकिस्तान ने भी दे रक्खा है । इसलिए आपकी बात करे कौन ?

कुछ लोग आज इस बात को बार बार कहते हैं कि वहां कश्मीर में मुसलमान ज्यादा हैं तो मैं उनको कहना चाहता हूं कि दोनों ईस्ट और वैस्ट पाकिस्तान में कुल मिला कर 9 करोड़ मुसलमान हैं और इस तरह आप देखेंगे कि कहीं भी वहां पर भारत से ज्यादा मुसलमान नहीं हैं न पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में और न पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान में । ऐसी हालत में क्या भारत के लोग यह नहीं मांग कर सकते कि चूंकि अकेले भारत में अभी भी पांच करोड़ मुसलमान बसते हैं इसलिए पाकिस्तान हमको मिलना चाहिए लेकिन यह कोई कहने को तैयार नहीं उलटे हमको यह सन्देश देते हैं हमको यह सुझाव देते हैं कि पाकिस्तान का यह हक है । क्या पाकिस्तान मुसलमानों का ठेकेदार है । और यह क्या बात है कि जहां भी मुसलमान ज्यादा हैं वह पाकिस्तान में मिले, मुस्लिम बहुल इसाके पाकिस्तान को मिलना ही चाहिए, तो काबुल और कंधार को वह क्यों नहीं लेते हैं ? काबुल कंधार की तरफ मुंह क्यों नहीं करते ? वह उधर क्यों नहीं जाना चाहते ? मुसलमान आनन्द के साथ में रहने हैं यहां । यहाँ के मुसलमान जानते हैं कि पाकिस्तान में

## [श्री रामेश्वरानन्द]

उनकी क्या दशा होगी । यदि हमारे चागला साहब पाकिस्तान चले जायें, तो उन बेचारों का वहां पर क्या बनेगा ? क्या उनको वहां पर कोई शिक्षा मन्त्री बनायेगा ? यदि हमारे उपराष्ट्रपति पाकिस्तान चले जायें, तो क्या वहां पर उन को कोई ऊंचा स्थान दिया जायेगा ? भारत का प्रत्येक मुसलमान भारत को समझता है । यह हिन्दुस्तान वह हिन्दुस्तान है, जिसमें पांच करोड़ मुसलमान भाई बैठे हुए हैं । एक भी भाई उधर मुंह नहीं करता है । नमाज के समय चाहे वे उधर मुंह करें, लेकिन पाकिस्तान की तरफ मुंह करना, पाकिस्तान जाना, कोई पसन्द नहीं करता है । मुसलमान जानते हैं कि वहां पर उन गरीबों का कुछ नहीं बनेगा ।

इस कारण कोई भी मुसलमान यह नहीं चाहता है कि काश्मीर पाकिस्तान में जाये । हां, मस्जिदों में कुछ लोग बैठे हुए हैं, जो इस मांग का समर्थन करते हैं । पाकिस्तान की मांग भी मस्जिद वालों ने ही की थी । वह मांग सब मुसलमानों की तरफ से नहीं की गई थी । जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, मस्जिद वाले इस मांग के समर्थक हो सकते हैं, लेकिन किसान से ले कर व्यापारी तक कोई भी साधारण मुसलमान जो कि भारत में रहता है, यह नहीं चाहता है कि काश्मीर का निर्णय पाकिस्तान के हक में होना चाहिए ।

मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा कि हमने पाकिस्तान के साथ जो सन्धि की है, इस को न मानने से हमारा नुकसान होगा । कौनसा नुकसान होगा ? अगर हम पाकिस्तान को पंसा न दें, तो कौन कीड़ी की टांग टूट जायेगी ? हम दान में क्या दे रहे हैं । हमारी इच्छा है कि हम दें या न दें । अगर कोई

भिखमंगा जिसके घर से खाता है, उसी घर के विरुद्ध लड़ लेकर खड़ा हो जाये और उसके लोगों को मारने लगे, तो दुनिया में क्या ऐसा कोई दानी है, जो उस भिखमंगे को दान दिये चला जाये ?

श्री युद्धवीर सिंह (महेन्द्रगढ़) : हिन्दुस्तान है ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं इस सरकार को यह कहना चाहता हूं कि वह दाताओं की दृष्टि से सोचे । पाकिस्तान जिस प्रकार का देश है, इसको हमने न धाज तक समझा है और न अब भी समझने की कोशिश करते हैं । उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, घर में दो तरह के बालक होते हैं—घ्राप के घर में भी होंगे—, जिनमें से एक बालक तो इतना भ्रष्ट होता है कि वह जरा सी बात कहने से बिल्कुल ठीक हो जाता है और दूसरा धूर्त बालक होता है, जिसका काम यह है कि सबसे ज्यादा खाने, पढ़ने न जाये, कोई काम न करे, लेटा रहे और घर में कलह रहे । तो इस धूर्त बालक का क्या इलाज है ? इसका केवल एक ही इलाज है कि उस की माता, बूढ़ा या बहन उसके कोमल कपोलों पर हल्के हल्के दो चपत लगा दे । इससे वह सीधा रहता है । पाकिस्तान के लिए भी इसके सिवाये और कोई इलाज नहीं है । पाकिस्तान ऐसी जाति और बिरादरी का बना हुआ है, जो चौदहवीं सदी से धाज तक न स्वयं सुख से रही और न किसी पड़ोसी भले धार्मिकों को सुख से रहने दिया । हम हजार बरस से उन को देख रहे हैं, लेकिन हमारे देश के नेता अब भी इस बात की कोशिश करते हैं कि रियायतें दे कर पाकिस्तान को सन्तुष्ट किया जाये ।



हमने वेद में पढ़ा है : "विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तदवेद उभयसह।" इसका अर्थ यह है कि विद्या और अविद्या दोनों को जानो। यह बात तो समझ में आती है कि विद्या को जानें, लेकिन अविद्या को क्यों जानें? अतः वेद कहता है कि किसी की गांठ तो मत काटो, लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो कि अपनी गांठ कटवा बैठो, इस लिए गिरहकट की विद्या अविद्या है उसे भी जरूर जानो। इसका तात्पर्य यह है कि कल मत करो, चोरी मत करो, लेकिन कल और चोरी करने वालों की सब बातों को सीख लो, वरना उन से बच नहीं सकोगे।

मैं मानता हूँ कि दूसरों को कष्ट पहुँचाना बहुत बुरा है और मेरे जैसा व्यक्ति तो हमेशा इससे बचने का बहुत यत्न करता है। लेकिन मैं मन्त्री महोदय से नम्रता से पूछता हूँ कि यह ठीक है कि दूसरों को दुख देना बिल्कुल बुरा है, लेकिन क्या दूसरों के हाथ से स्वयं कल होना या दुख पाना किसी धर्म, वेद या शास्त्र में लिखा है। वह यह भी बतायें कि यदि हमारी स्थिति पाकिस्तान की सी होती, तो क्या पाकिस्तान ने हमारी भलाई के लिए कभी इतना रुपया दिया होता, क्या वह इस सन्धि पर कायम रहता। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान इस बोधी सन्धि को कभी न मानता।

यह ठीक है कि भारत में लोग किसी न किसी बात पर जरूर इकट्ठे हो जाते हैं, लेकिन भारत का यह दुर्भाग्य है कि शत्रु देश के लोग, शत्रुओं के एजेंट इस देश में घुसे हुए हैं।

मन्त्री महोदय ने अभी कहा कि हमने इतनी सिचाई की व्यवस्था की, हमने इतना पानी दिया। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि यह सब कुछ काबूजी व्यवस्था है। वह जरा मीके पर आ कर देखें। मैं बाहर की बात नहीं, केवल पंजाब की बात कहता हूँ। पंजाब में पिछले वर्ष के प्राधा भी चाबल नहीं होगा। होता यह है कि वहाँ से अधिकारी लोग मन्त्री महोदय को

घांकड़े दे देते हैं और मन्त्री महोदय उनको यहाँ सुना देते हैं। यहाँ भी ऐसे लोग बैठे हैं, जिनको खेती से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। कुछ समय पहले एक माननीय सदस्य ने खाद्य मन्त्री से पूछ लिया कि घनी वर्षा होने के कारण उदं और मूंग की फसल खराब हो गई है, इस लिए खाद्य मन्त्री कृपा करके बतायें कि रबी की फसल में कौनसी ऐसी दालें हैं, जिन को बोने से दाल की कमी पूरी हो सके। मिनिस्टर साहब को तो कोई जवाब नहीं प्राया और अध्यक्ष उस माननीय सदस्य को ताड़ने लगे कि तुम मिनिस्टर को खराब करना चाहते हो। हम उन को खराब नहीं करना चाहते— हम उनका सुधार करना चाहते हैं।

मैंने स्वयं राय साहब को लोगों की कठिनाइयों के बारे में कई सौ चिट्ठियाँ भेजी हैं। हमारे पास लोग अपनी कठिनाइयाँ ले कर आते हैं। हम उनके पत्र मिनिस्टर साहब को भेज देते हैं। दुर्भाग्य है कि उनको हिन्दी नहीं आती है। वह किसी से काम लेते होंगे, जो कि इन के हस्ताक्षर करा कर उत्तर दे देते हैं। लोग कहते हैं कि स्वामी जी पानी की व्यवस्था करेंगे। मैं कहता हूँ कि राय साहब पानी की व्यवस्था करेंगे। केवल करनाम में एक सहस्र ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं, जिन्होंने सिक्क्यूरिटी भर दी है, सब कुछ कर दिया है और बिजली बालों के द्वार पर बैठे हैं, लेकिन उन को ट्यूब-वैल के लिए बिजली नहीं मिलती है। यह सारे पंजाब की स्थिति है। मुझे पता नहीं है कि मन्त्री महोदय बिजली और नहर बालों को पैसे देते हैं या नहीं, लेकिन उन्होंने जनता को ब्रूस रखा है।

सदन में उनका बहुमत है, इस लिए उनकी चलेगी लेकिन यह अधिक देर तक नहीं चलने वाली है। अन्त में अन्त्याय का सत्यानास होने वाला है।

अन्त में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार दड़ रहे, पक्की रहे। अगर कोई उसको ज़ता दिखाए, तो वह लटठ दिखाए। अगर कोई

## [ श्री रामेश्वरानन्द ]

सट्ट दिखाए, तो सरकार भाला दिखाए । अगर कोई उसको भाला दिखाए, तो वह धी नाट धी दिखाए। अगर कोई धीनाट धी दिखाए तो वह गोला फेंके । पाकिस्तान इसी तरह ठीक हो सकता है, अन्यथा नहीं ।

**श्री श्यामधर मिश्र :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्यों और देश भर को मालूम है कि पाकिस्तान सरकार के प्रति भारत सरकार क्या सोच रही है, किस तरह ने हमारी सरकार ने उसका प्रत्याचार देखा है ऐसी हालत में किसी माननीय सदस्य का यह धर्म लगाना या यह कहना कि सिन्धु बांटी योजना के अन्तर्गत जो कुछ पैसा दिया जा रहा है, पानी दिया जा रहा है, वह इस लिए दिया जा रहा है कि पाकिस्तान के प्रति हमारा प्रेम है या हम उसके प्रति उदारता दिखाना चाहते हैं, तो वह बात सत्य से बिल्कुल परे है, वह बात बिल्कुल ठीक नहीं है । इस योजना के बारे में, जिसको इस सदन ने 1960 में पाम किया, मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहूंगा क्योंकि डा० राव और अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने उसके बारे में काफी कहा है । पांच बरस से हम उस सन्धि को कार्यान्वित कर रहे हैं । हम पाकिस्तान को पानी दे रहे हैं और इस अवधि में हमने पाकिस्तान को करीब करीब 40, 42 करोड़ रुपये दिया है । हम उस सन्धि की अवधि के करीब करीब बीच में खड़े हुए हैं । यह कहा जा सकता है कि प्राधा काम हुआ है और प्राधा काम बाकी है । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस पेमेंट को इस हालत में देखा जाना चाहिये, पानी को देने को इस हालत में देखना चाहिये । अगर हम पेमेंट न करें और पानी न दें तो प्राधा हमें नुकसान है या नहीं, प्राधा पाकिस्तान की जीत होती है या हमारी हार होती है या हमारी जीत होती है, इस दृष्टि से हमें इसको देखना है । एक बात मैं सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ । जब इस देश का विभाजन हुआ तो करीब करीब इन नदियों से जिनकी प्राज यहाँ अर्ध

है, सतलुज, ब्यास और रावी, करीब करीब 120 लाख एकड़ सिंचाई के लिए पानी प्राप्त होने की सम्भावना थी । आज भी वह है । उस में से करीब करीब चालीस लाख एकड़ हिन्दुस्तान को मिलता था । करीब करीब 40-45 लाख एकड़ पाकिस्तान के हिस्से को मिलता था । करीब करीब उतना ही पानी बच जाता था । 40-45 लाख एकड़ के लायक पानी बच जाता था जो कि समुद्र में चला जाता था, जो कि नदियों से निकल जाता था । हमारे सामने समस्या यह थी कि हम अधिक से अधिक इन नदियों के पानी का कैसे प्रयोग करें । एक समझौता हुआ । इस समझौते के अन्दर यह तय किया गया कि दस बरस के बाद जो पूरा पानी था यानी 120 लाख एकड़ के लिए वह भारत के लोग प्रयोग कर सकते हैं । उसमें से केवल 40 लाख एकड़ के लिए ही पानी हम प्रयोग करते थे । आज की हालत में 1965 में भारत के लोग 80 लाख एकड़ के लिये ईस्टर्न रिबरज के पानी का इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं । करीब 40-45 लाख एकड़ ऐसा है जिसको 1970 या अधिक से अधिक प्रेस दीजिये तो एक दो या तीन बरस में उसके बाद जब उनके रिप्लेसमेंट वर्क्स न बँया हो जाते हैं तो भारत के निवासियों को, पंजाब के निवासियों को, राजस्थान के निवासियों को करीब करीब 120 लाख एकड़ पर पानी पूरे तौर से मिलेगा ।

उसके लिए समझौता किया गया कि रिप्लेसमेंट वर्क्स पाकिस्तान में बनाये जायें । पाकिस्तान स्वभावतः यह नहीं चाहता था कि यह पानी हिन्दुस्तान से ले जब तक कि पाकिस्तान को कहीं से और पानी उसके बदले में न मिले । इसलिए यह बात प्राई कि जब इन नदियों से पानी लेना है और दूसरी नदियों से पाकिस्तान पानी ले तो रिप्लेसमेंट वर्क्स किये जायें । इसलिए एक समझौता हुआ । उस समझौते को होते होते घाट बरस गये । उसमें

करीब करोड़ छः सात सौ करोड़ रुपये का खर्च रिप्लेसमेंट्स के लिए पाकिस्तान के हिसाब से होता था। माननीय सदस्य उस समय की बात को याद करें, प्रोसीडिंग्स को देखें और उनको पता चलेगा कि पाकिस्तान उस समय यह चाहता था कि हिन्दुस्तान छः सात सौ करोड़ रुपया दे। हिन्दुस्तान ने कहा कि हम नहीं दे सकते हैं। यह हमारा काम नहीं है। हम दूसरी ओर से पानी ले जायेंगे। बहुत डिसकशन्स हुईं, एक्सपर्ट्स बैठे, इंटरनेशनल एक्सपर्ट्स आए, हमारे एक्सपर्ट्स आए, उनके आए। अन्त में यह तय हुआ कि करीब करोड़ छः सात सौ करोड़ रुपया जो लगेगा उसमें हिन्दुस्तान केवल अस्सी करोड़ रुपया दे...

**श्री इकबाल सिंह (फीरोजपुर) :** 1948 के समझौते के मुताबिक एक पैसा भी हिन्दुस्तान को नहीं देना था।

**श्री श्यामधर मिश्र :** मैं 1960 की बात कर रहा हूँ, 1948 की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ जिसको इस सदन ने स्वीकार किया है। मैं यह कह रहा था कि उस में अस्सी करोड़ की बात आई। अस्सी करोड़ में से हमने 40-42 करोड़ पांच बरस में दे दिया। इस साल करीब आठ करोड़ और दिया गया है। इस तरह से करीब पचास करोड़ रुपया दे दिया गया है।

वो चीजें हो सकती हैं। एक तो यह कि हम अगर इस पैसे को न दें, इस पानी को न दें तो हमारा क्या फायदा होगा या क्या फायदा होता। अगर हमारा फायदा होता है तो इंटरनेशनल एग्जामेंट के रहते हुए भी हम फिर एक बार इस पर सोच सकते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार सोच सकती है, गौर कर सकती है। इस पर विचार हुआ है। लेकिन कोई हमें विशेष फायदा नहीं होता। होता क्या है? आज अगर हम इसको रोक लेते हैं तो वही हालत होती है कि बाकी छ करोड़ दे कर दुनिया यह कहेगी कि

हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को देखिये, चालीस करोड़ और पेमेंट करने पर यह 120 लाख एकड़ पानी की मालिक होती .....

**श्री योगेन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) :** हिन्दुस्तान का बटवारा जब हो गया .....

**श्री श्यामधर मिश्र :** प्रायः बाद में पूछ लीजिये। राब सहब भी बैठे हुए हैं, वह भी बोलेंगे। मैं यह कह रहा था कि उस पेमेंट को देने से, उस पानी को देने से सबमुब हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि किस तरह हमारा फायदा होता है। अगर हम 120 लाख एकड़ पंजाब और राजस्थान के इलाके को पानी दे सकेंगे चाहे पांच बरस के बाद, 1970 के बाद तो अनुमान यह लगाया गया है कि सालाना इस पानी से करीब अस्सी या सौ करोड़ रुपये का गल्ला पैदा होगा। अगर हम आधी पेमेंट करने के बाद आज यह कह देते कि यह एक इंटरनेशनल ट्रीटी है और यह ट्रीटी खाली हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच होती, पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच होती तो भी हम इस पर खूब सोचते कि क्या करें। लेकिन आज तो यह जो ट्रीटी है यह ट्राईपार्टाइट ट्रीटी है, तीन पार्टियों के बीच हुई एक ट्रीटी है और वर्ल्ड बैंक इसमें इनवाल्ड है। प्रायः यह भी न भूलें कि आज तो वर्ल्ड बैंक को हमने आठ करोड़ रुपया दिया है लेकिन उसी वर्ल्ड बैंक से हमको आज तक करीब छः सात सौ करोड़ रुपया डायरेक्टली लॉज के तौर पर मिला है और वर्ल्ड बैंक की मॅम्बर स्टेट्स ने हजार करोड़ रुपया हमें दिया। यह रुपया न देकर एक एटमासफीयर हम पैदा कर दें, एक हवा फैला दें कि भारत सरकार को देखो जिसने दुनिया के सामने यह ट्रीटी की है और यही उसको बायोलैट करती है। हमने हजार करोड़ या पांच सौ करोड़ जो लिया है, उसके सम्बन्ध में बैसी स्थिति में वे क्या सोचेंगे। अगर साफ होता हो तो हम इसको सोचें भी। और अगर फायदा

### [श्री श्यामधर मिश्र]

हो तो हम करें। अगर हम पानी रोक लें तो डैमेजिज के लिए पाकिस्तान सरकार जा सकती है। हम नहीं जानते हैं कि डैमेजिज कितने होंगे। हो सकता है कि घाठ करोड़ से भी अधिक के हों किसी साल के।

इंटरनेशनल नियम हैं रिपारियन यूज आफ वाटर के, अगर रिपारियन, लोअर रिपारियन के। पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में ही वाटर के यूज के बारे में भ्रम से बात नहीं हो सकती है। रिबर के वाटर के यूज के सम्बन्ध में नियम हैं, उप-नियम हैं। कनाडा और अमेरिका में आप देखें। थाईलैंड अर्थात् श्याम में देखें, लाओस में देखें। वहां पर भी अगर रिपारियन है, लोअर रिपारियन है। यह कहीं नहीं लिखा है कि जो तीन नदियों का पानी है वह हिन्दुस्तान का है। पाकिस्तान इसको कंटेस्ट करता है। उसके सम्बन्ध में नियम और उप-नियम जो दुनिया के हैं, दुनिया के राष्ट्रों के हैं, वही नियम और उपनियम हैं। ऐसी सूरत में इकतरफा हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं। अगर ऐसा हम कह दें तो भाज ईस्ट पाकिस्तान है और वहां हमारे झगड़े खड़े हो सकते हैं। ब्रह्मपुत्र हमारा अगर रिजन है। फराका बैरेज हम बना रहे हैं। तीस्ता का पानी है। पाकिस्तान ने झगड़े उठाये हुए हैं। अब वह कहेगा कि इनका विश्वास नहीं है। वह गारंटी मांग सकता है।

श्री इकबाल सिंह : मतलब यह है कि पाकिस्तान करार का उल्लंघन सकता जाए और हम कुछ न करें ?

श्री श्यामधर मिश्र : यह कदापि मतलब नहीं है। करार के उल्लंघन से अगर कोई फायदा होता हो तो हम इसको दूसरी बार बैठ कर सोचें लेकिन फिर भी जहां तक हो सके हम उल्लंघन न करें तो अच्छा हो। लेकिन अगर उसमें कोई फायदा हो तो

जरूर उसको हम लें। हमारा मतलब यह है कि करार के उल्लंघन से हमें कदापि फायदा नहीं है, न अल्टीमेटनी और न इमीडियेटली बल्कि हमारा इंटरनेशनल वर्ल्ड में दुनिया में नुकसान है। एक काम चल रहा है जो कि घाघे से अधिक हो चुका है। घाघे से अधिक हम प्रगति कर चुके हैं। केवल थोड़ा सा बाकी है। चार पांच बरस में हमें पूरा पानी मिलेगा, राजस्थान के इलाके को मिलेगा, पंजाब के इलाके को मिलेगा। वहां पैदावार भी तब काफी बढ़ सकती है। बीच में ही घारा को हम दूसरी एक बिधा दे दें यह तो हमारे लिये ठीक नहीं होगा।

श्री प्र० सि० सहगल (बिलासपुर) : चार पांच बरस के बाद पानी मिलेगा, इसकी क्या गारंटी है। क्या गारंटी है कि पाकिस्तान अपने वादे को पूरा करेगा जब कि अभी तक उसने पूरा नहीं किया है।

श्री श्यामधर मिश्र : कोई गारंटी की जरूरत नहीं है। मैंने बताया है कि यह पानी तो हमारे हाथ में है। गारंटी की क्या जरूरत है। 1970 की तारीख बीतने के बाद पानी हम उसको नहीं देंगे। इंटरनेशनल एग््रीमेंट को हम पूरा करेंगे। यह बात कहना कि क्या गारंटी है कि पाकिस्तान हमें भलाउ करेगा पानी इस्तेमाल करने के लिए तो वह ट्रीटी हमारी गारंटी है। और हम उसकी गारंटी हैं। पाकिस्तान की कृपा पर पानी मिलने का सवाल नहीं है। पाकिस्तान की बजह से हमें पानी नहीं मिल रहा है। वह पानी तो 1970 के बाद हमें मिलेगा ही। एक दो बरस की ग्रेस है। एक साल अधिक हो तो चार करोड़ रुपया कम्पेंसेशन के तौर पर उसे देना होगा, दो साल ज्यादा हो जायें तो घाठ करोड़ और तीन साल हों तो बाएह या तेरह करोड़। इससे अधिक नहीं हो

सकता है मैं यहां पर एक बात साफ कर देना चाहता हूं। अभी माननीय सदस्य श्री डिबेदी न एक बात कही और वह यह कि डिफेंस के लिये कैनाल्स बगैरह का इस्तेमाल हुआ है डा० राब ने पहले ही कहा कि इच्छोगिल कैनाल जो है वह सन् 1960 के पहले, सन् 1956 तक बन चुकी थी। सन 1960 में हमारा एग्जिमेंट हुआ।

15 hrs.

**श्री म० सा० डिबेदी :** मैंने निवेदन किया कि जो नहर बनी है उस के एम्बेन्कमेंट केवल तीन या चार साल पहले बने हुए हैं।

**श्री श्यामधर मिश्र :** मैं इस बात की ओर ध्यान रहा था कि जो पिल बाक्सेज बने हुए हैं वह बहुत थोड़े हैं। उनकी संख्या तो हमको कैसे मालूम हो सकती है क्योंकि भारत सरकार के कब्जे में तो कुछ ही मील का इलाका है, लेकिन जो इन्डिकेन्स हैं उनसे पता चलता है कि उनके लिये बहुत रुपया नहीं चाहिये। केवल कुछ लाख रुपया ही लगता है जहां 620 करोड़ रुपया की ट्रीटी है उसमें से केवल दो या चार लाख रुपया वह पिल बाक्सेज के लिये इस्तेमाल करते हैं। यह ठीक है कि यह मिसयूज है लेकिन वर्ल्ड बैंक ने हमको ऐश्वर्य किया है, टेनीश्याम देवर के कहा है कि वह देखेंगे कि उसका मिसयूज नहीं होता है उन्होंने इसके लिये रुपया नहीं दिया है।

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :** गवर्नमेंट खुद अपने धाप का कंट्रिब्यूशन करती है। एक और डा० राब कहते हैं कि पता नहीं कितने पिल बाक्सेज हैं, दूसरी ओर श्री मिश्र कहते हैं कि केवल दो या चार लाख रुपया खर्च करते हैं। जब सरकार को पता ही नहीं कि पिल बाक्सेज कितने हैं तब दो या चार लाख रु० का पता कैसे लगा।

**श्री श्यामधर मिश्र :** डा० राब की बात का ही मैं हवाला देता हूं। जो इलाके नहर की बगल में हमारे पास हैं उनमें एक सेट

पैटर्न पिल बाक्सेज का बना हुआ है। मैंने जा कर देखा, डा० राब ने जाकर देखा और शायद माननीय सदस्यों ने भी देखा होगा। वहां पर पिल बाक्सेज की दो लाइनें हैं।

**श्री म० सा० डिबेदी :** तीन लाइनें हैं।

**श्री श्यामधर मिश्र :** बलिये, मैं धाप की ही बात मान लेता हूं।

**श्री गु० सि० मुसाफिर (अमृतसर) :** नहर के दोनों तरफ हैं।

**श्री श्यामधर मिश्र :** मैं सरदार साहब का कहना भी मान लेता हूं। देखने पर हम लोगों को लगा कि कुछ गजों के फासले पर, दो सौ या चार सौ गजों के फासले पर पिल बाक्सेज बने हुए हैं। जो इलाके हमारे कब्जे में हैं पाकिस्तान के उनमें वह एक सेट पैटर्न से बने हुए हैं। इच्छोगिल कैनाल 50 मील लम्बी है। अगर उसी पैटर्न को धाप मान लीजिये, जिसका केवल अनुमान हो सकता है, तो यह कहा जा सकता है कि इन पिल बाक्सेज की संख्या 100 या 200 के बीच में होगी। उन पिल बाक्सेज को मैंने देखा है, डा० राब ने भी देखा है, सब ने देखा है, मेरा तो अनुमान है कि एक पिल बाक्सेज के ऊपर अधिक से अधिक 5 हजार रु० लगा होगा। इससे ज्यादा नहीं लगता है। **छाई ऐस एड वि छाउटर साइड।** फिर भी यह अनुमान ही है क्योंकि पाकिस्तान हम से पूछ कर पिल बाक्सेज नहीं बनायेगा। फिर भी यह संख्या बहुत ज्यादा नहीं है।

प्राचीर में मैं एक बात जानना चाहता हूं। जब पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान से लड़ रहा है तो हम यह उम्मीद क्यों करें कि वह अपने इलाके में पिल बाक्सेज या दूसरी कोई चीज नहीं बनायेगा। हम अपनी डिफेंस की बातें करेंगे और वह अपनी डिफेंस मजबूत बनायेगा। हमें यह देखना होगा कि कैनाल के अन्दर

## [श्री क्यामधर मिश्र]

उसने जो कुछ बनाया है आया वह इस रुपये से बना है या नहीं। इसके लिये हमें वर्ल्ड बैंक ने एश्योरेस दिया है, जिस को मानना होगा, कि इस रुपये से कैनल में या किसी दूसरी जगह कोई चीज डिफेन्स की चीज नहीं बनी है। लड़ाई में न पाकिस्तान हमारे ऊपर कोई कृपा करेगा न हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान के ऊपर कोई कृपा करना चाहता है। यह जो वाटर रिलीज है वह कोई भारत सरकार की कमजोरी की नीति नहीं है। यह केवल प्रैक्टिकल पालिटिक्स है, एम्प्रीडि-एन्सी है और इंटरनेशनल आब्लिगेशन है जिसको तोड़ने से कोई लाभ नहीं होता। (Interruptions.) अगर बिना कमजोर हुए भारत सरकार शरीफ बन सके तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उसे मजबूत रहना चाहिये और शराफत भी दिखलानी चाहिये। इसलिये यह जो भ्रम है कि डिफेन्स के लिये रुपया दिया जा रहा है मेरी समझ से यह भ्रम ठीक नहीं है। अगर यह भ्रम है कि हम पाकिस्तान पर कोई बड़ी कृपा कर रहे हैं तो यह बात भी सही नहीं है। केवल यह हमारी प्रैक्टिकल पालिटिक्स है और इंटरनेशनल आब्लिगेशन है जिसे हम पूरा कर रहे हैं और इसको सदन को मान लेना चाहिये।

**Shri Nath Pal:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is necessary to keep the debate in its proper perspective and focus. Many things have been said today which by themselves are interesting but are not germane to the subject matter before the House. The question of payment of Rs. 8 crores to Pakistan has got to be viewed and assessed and judgment passed not with reference to the Treaty of 1960 but in relation to and in the context of what is happening today. If we miss this perspective and this focus, I think this debate was better never raised. If there has been any concern in the country, if people are feeling agitated—and some members have

thought it fit to refer to this feeling of excitement—the reason is not because we are niggardly with regard to payment, not because we are indifferent to our international obligations, but simply because the payment has got to be examined against the background of Pakistan's present postures towards this country. If we do that then only would it be possible, I think, to get a real answer to the question that is being asked.

I am distressed, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that in spite of the clear injunction given by the Speaker, neither the Prime Minister nor the Foreign Minister is present in the House. I am very conscious of the presence of the charming lady representing the Ministry of External Affairs. But I want once again to warn the Government against trying to soft pedal this debate. This debate has nothing to do with an amount or a sum or this particular Treaty. This debate has to concern itself all the while with our relationship with Pakistan. This debate cannot take place without that background, without that context in mind.

I should like first, therefore, to disabuse the mind of this House with regard to certain misconceptions and illusions that are being deliberately fostered by this Government to defend its indefensible posture with regard to this Treaty. In the first place, the Government claims that this is a tripartite agreement. The Minister concerned in the course of his statement before the House has stated:

"It is to be noted that the Indus Waters Treaty, 1960 is in effect a tripartite pact between the Governments of India and Pakistan and the World Bank."

I do not know how Dr. Rao persuaded himself to read into the Treaty something which does not exist there. Sir, may I very briefly draw your

attention, and his too, to the preamble which opens like this:

"The Government of India and the Government of Pakistan, being equally desirous of attaining the most complete and satisfactory utilisation of the Indus system of rivers . . . have resolved to conclude a Treaty . . ."

It is a treaty between these two Governments. The World Bank is not a party to this treaty. It comes in what capacity? It comes in the capacity of a limited function which has been given, namely, that of an agent. The function of the World Bank is that of a banker. We have no obligation towards the World Bank.

May I here, therefore, draw your attention to the relevant Chapter of this Treaty? The Treaty has been signed by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on behalf of India and Mohammad Ayub Khan on behalf of Pakistan and the Treaty ends there. There is a signature of Mr. Iliff on behalf of the World Bank but the limitation of the assignment of the World Bank is very clearly defined. Not only the signature comes after the Treaty proper has been signed but it says:

"For the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the purposes specified in Articles V and X and Annexures, F, G and H."

Everyone who wants to have this Treaty wants to create this misconception that somehow we may be free to defy our obligations towards Pakistan because of Pakistan's misdeeds to this country but can we adopt the same kind of attitude towards the World Bank. But the Bank is not concerned with it. If what I have quoted is not enough—I hope you will take due note of that—Bank is a signatory only in a limited capacity. That is what the Treaty itself stipulates in Articles V and X. The money that is to be paid by India to Pakistan is to be channelised through the

agency of the World Bank. The Bank, therefore, has a very limited function. If you want to pay money, do pay it, but do not take shelter behind false postures and false pleas.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** I may inform the hon. Member that this matter was gone into at length by the Ministry of Law and they have very definitely come to the conclusion that it is in effect a tripartite pact.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Well, I have very great respect for the gentlemen who sit in the Ministry of Law, but, I think, we are not going to be impressed by just citing the learned men of the Law Ministry, that they have given their verdict. Even their verdict will have to be substantiated by referring to the Treaty and in the Treaty, I want to know, what is the function of the Bank except that the Bank will be receiving the money which India has obligated to pay. He is now taking shelter by shifting the responsibility and saying, "I may be agreeing with you, Shri Nath Pai, that the Bank is not directly concerned; but the wise men of the Law Ministry have said so".

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** But the opinion of the wise men of the Law Ministry has always been corrected by the law courts.

**Shri Nath Pai:** I am very grateful to the hon. Member from the ruling Party.

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** He says that because he is not the Law Minister.

**Shri Nath Pai:** May I point out that not only the Treaty makes no provision for any kind of obligation on the part of India towards the Bank but that was precisely the understanding of the man who defended the Treaty in this House. The then Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, said in this House on the 30th November, 1960, in defence of the Treaty:—

"The Bank has nothing to do with our relations with Pakistan or with payments to Pakistan."

[Shri Nath Pal]

He further says:—

"All kinds of money are going to be paid to Pakistan by the World Bank. The Bank is a signatory in that sense and that part of it."

What further evidence do you want? But, if you are still not satisfied and if you are going to throw in my face and in the face of the House the opinion of the wise men of the Law Ministry, may I quote the then Prime Minister further? He said:—

"not the exact payment or payments or whatever we have to do to Pakistan or they have to do to us. The Bank has no business here."

Yesterday, somebody told the Congress Parliamentary Party—it is regularly being trotted out in the press—that we cannot repudiate our obligations to the World Bank. How long are you going to tell Parliament this? How are you going to honour obligations which you never undertook? You are trying to raise a fictitious plea which has no foundation in fact either in the Treaty or in the interpretation Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru placed on this Treaty.

The real perspective is provided by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru further. I wish, sometimes they studied and took into consideration what happened when the Treaty was under fire in this House and, I think, the leading papers of those days had criticized the Treaty. The Treaty was regarded as inequitable and unfair to India. I do not want to go into that; some hon. Members have tried to touch upon that aspect of the Treaty too. The Treaty was inequitable because when the division of waters came, Pakistan was having three and a half times per capita use of water compared with India. The Treaty was inequitable because Pakistan was rightly at the most entitled to 75 per cent of the waters of the Indus Basin and she

was given, under the provisions of the Treaty, 80 per cent. Pakistan cannot use all the water that has been given to her. Pakistan does not have enough irrigable land for which all this water can be used. The Treaty, therefore, was inequitable, unfair, unjust to India. Nonetheless, this Government entered into this Treaty.

Why did it do so? Here I should like to quote what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had to say in justification of the Treaty. He said:—

"In the circumstances this is a right payment. We purchase a settlement, if you like; we purchase peace with Pakistan, if you like."

He said that taking into consideration the wider aspect of Indo-Pakistani relations, this is a payment to win Pakistan's goodwill, to win Pakistan's friendship, to persuade Pakistan. That is the context in which I want the House also to see it.

Again and again he was giving the technical reasons for the present decision. I would like to remind that the Treaty originally—a wrong one, unfair and inequitable—was justified by holding the House and the country the carrot of improved Indo-Pakistani relations. That is what the Preamble stipulates. Why did we enter into this Treaty? We entered into this Treaty "in a spirit of goodwill and friendship". How much goodwill and how much friendship is flowing from Pakistan today to this country?

An hon. Member: No goodwill.

Shri Nath Pal: It is this thing which we have constantly to bear in mind. I have quoted the then Prime Minister of India; may I say what was the attitude of Mahatma Gandhi? You are hoping today to propitiate Pakistan by giving these Rs. 8 crores. I am not suggesting that we repudiate this Treaty or any treaty which India has



entered into. It will be a sad day when India will blatantly seek to repudiate her international obligations. That is not my plea at all. What we are trying to submit to this House and to this Government is: Take into consideration the realities as they exist today; take into consideration the fact of Pakistan's unremitting, unceasing hostility, enmity towards this country and adopt an adequate posture. You are not going to propitiate the gods of Pindi by going on making this kind of concessions.

**Shri D. C. Sharma** (Gurdaspur): Why do you call them "gods of Pindi"? They are the devils.

**Shri Nath Pal:** I thought, the professor, who is a learned scholar in English, knows what I have in mind.

Shri Shastri said and, I thought, epitomised the sentiments of this country when, in his radio broadcast, he told us that this country cannot go from cease-fire to cease-fire. Noble sentiments indeed! Are we to go from concession to concession in the hope, in the fond, vain hope, in the futile hope that one day Pakistan will smile on India? This cannot be. Long and bitter is the experience that we have gained by trying to please Pakistan, to appease Pakistan, to propitiate Pakistan. This is what I would like to read from this book on Mahatma Gandhi. In this book it is pointed out that the payment of Rs. 55 crores was made to Pakistan in the hope that the present suspicion and hostility towards India will be replaced by goodwill. Did it happen? We made the payment.

That was not the only thing. Before that Gandhiji had to fast to persuade the nation because it was felt that this is a wrong payment. Gandhiji intervened and persuaded a reluctant leadership to part with Rs. 55 crores. But it was not only Rs. 55 crores that India gave to Pakistan to win Pakistan's goodwill, to persuade Pakistan to be a good neighbour, to persuade Pakistan to have faith in the common

future of the two countries; it was not only this sacrifice, but India made the biggest sacrifice that any nation ever could have thought of making. Ultimately, we cannot afford to forget that Gandhiji laid down his life at the altar of Indo-Pakistani friendship; but even this supreme sacrifice, the greatest sacrifice India has made, did not make any difference to Pakistan's leaders. Unrelenting, their hostility continues towards this country. This was one plea.

I would like to say what Sardar Patel, when he agreed to make all the payments, had to say before this House. This is Sardar Patel speaking on the 12th December, 1947:—

"I hope the new State of Pakistan and their Government will regard this settlement as a gesture of our friendliness and goodwill. The successful implementation of these conclusions obviously depends on the continuation of the spirit of accommodation and conciliation on both sides."

Then, this Home Minister of India goes to entertain this forlorn hope:—

"I hope, therefore, that, not only in the interests of the successful implementation of these conclusions but also in the interests of peace and prosperity in both the Dominions, cordiality, tolerance and amity will continue to guide both of us in the solution of other problems which demand urgent and speedy disentanglement."

All these hopes—the hopes of Mahatma Gandhi, the hopes of Sardar Patel and the hopes which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru entertained when he signed this particular Treaty in 1960—lie in ashes today. It is this background of the past bitter experience that we have to take into consideration.

[Shri Nath Pai]

When, originally, the Treaty was signed, it was not a bilateral treaty; it was a unilateral gift of India's resources to Pakistan. It was a kind of *jaladan* or *sampattidan* made by India to Pakistan. The Treaty presupposes give-and-take, but this was a unilateral gift. I recall the strong criticism Shri H. C. Mathur made at that time while participating in the debate. He roundly criticized it and condemned it. I do not want to go now into past history.

The second argument raised by the Prime Minister is our international obligations and the third arguments is penalty. What are the obligations of a country towards Pakistan? What are our obligations towards Pakistan? May I ask the House, what are the obligations of any country towards an aggressor?

**An hon. Member:** None.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Are our obligations to help the aggressor, to sustain him, to aid him, to abet him, to strengthen him for further aggression; or, is our only obligations towards Pakistan to see that we fathom her designs towards this country and do everything in our power to thwart those designs and defeat those designs; or, are we to go on helping, encouraging, sustaining Pakistan in its position of hostility? They talk of stipulation, obligation. When are they going to discard this cobweb, these illusions, in spite of this long bitter experience of the past 18 years? You entered into that unjustifiable agreement with Pakistan on Kutch and we were told that in the hope of goodwill, we are making these concessions. The nation was against it; the better judgement of this House was against it. It was contrary to the solemn pledge given to this House by the Resolution which was unanimously adopted by the House.

But there was the forlorn hope entertained by the Government that

at least this new concession would bring Pakistan nearer the path of reason and good neighbourliness. But what has happened today? Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would like to point out here that we must go to the main cause and not be sidetracked into these bylanes of misconception. I think Mr. Bhutto's speech needs to be taken more seriously. I am not worried, I am not perturbed, I am not disturbed, by the vulgar language he has chosen to use with regard to us, but I am interested in the main body, the thinking underlying it, the philosophy, the philosophy of religious apartheid, on which Pakistan is built and sustained, which is the very foundation of Pakistan's religious fanaticism, religious bigotry, religious hatred, which his speech symbolises and without Pakistan cannot exist. That is the thing with which we are in conflict. Mr. Bhutto said that he would fight for thousand years. We do not know when Mr. Bhutto fought in his life. I do not see, for that matter, one man in the entire leadership of Pakistan today, who raised his small hands, his small fingers, against the British rule; they just acquiesced in the slavery, in the subjugation, of this country. Had the British continued, of course, Mr. Bhutto would have been knighted, O.B.E. and what not. I am not interested in Mr. Bhutto's personal performance; I am only interested in the kind of philosophy which he symbolises in his speech before the U.N. Security Council—India is at war. Mr. Bhutto says that he will fight us for one thousand years. He is welcome to do that, but I would like to tell Mr. Bhutto and his friends that this country has been waging a war, not for the past one thousand years but for thousands of years, against the kind of intolerance, the kind of bigotry, the kind of apartheid, which Mr. Bhutto and Pakistan today symbolises, and to a certain extent we have now a victory against that kind of religious intolerance. It is symbolised by our Constitution, it is symbolised

lised by the fact that Hindus, Muslims and Christians are all joining in retaliating the Pakistani aggression. This war of India will continue. It is not Pakistani arms, it is not the Patton tanks, not the sabre jets, not the 104 F, not the recoilless guns supplied by Pakistan's allies to Pakistan, but it is the philosophy which Mr. Bhutto once again adumbrated, expounded, dilated on, in the U.N. Security Council; it is this philosophy against which India is at war and will continue to be at war; we have got to be at war against this philosophy. It was this philosophy which resulted in the partition of the country and the massacre of the millions of our countrymen. This philosophy needs a blow.

We are talking about our obligations to Pakistan. I would like not only Rs. 8 crores but a few more crores to be given if there is any reasonable ground to believe, to persuade ourselves to believe that, in return for this sacrifice of India, there will be Pakistani friendship, Pakistani goodwill, Pakistani's good neighbourly behaviour. Then any sacrifice, we should make willingly and no sacrifice is too great. But what has been the record of Pakistan towards this country? One after another, betrayal after betrayal; not one; we can enumerate them. The latest example is that she will take every opportunity to violate every treaty towards this country, every obligation towards this country there is no length to which she will not go if she can persuade herself that going like that will harm India, will cause hurt to India's cause.

Leave aside the aggression of 1947. Leave aside the past history. Even today, after the so-called Ceasefire—only the day before yesterday the Defence Minister told this country—there have been one thousand violations of the Ceasefire Line by Pakistan. Within 24 hours of the Ceasefire Agreement, Pakistan committed an aggression in Rajasthan, occupied

more than 500 sq. miles, and continues to be in possession of that. Within a few hours of the signing of the Pact of Ceasefire, Pakistan bombed Amritsar. Was it in pursuance of the Treaty?

Shri D. C. Sharma: It is not 500 sq. miles; it is only 11 or 12 hamlets.

Shri Nath Pal: Well, it was 500. If it is less, I am happy. I stand corrected. I think we will be equally happy if the Government comes forward and says that. I do not know the authenticity of the statement that he is making. But if the Foreign Minister or the Prime Minister or the Defence Minister will make this statement, I think I will share the joy with him.

Which is the Treaty that Pakistan has honoured towards this country? She used napalm bombs which was contrary to international obligations and went on bombing the civilian population. Is it not forbidden under the international law that deadly weapons will not be used against civilian population? She not only used it but she used it even after the cessation of hostilities. Was it a friendly act on her part to send thousands of infiltrators to Kashmir? Was it a friendly act to go on bombing Jodhpur even after the cessation of hostilities? Is it a friendly act she is showing today? What is the obligation that Pakistan has honoured? I would like the House to consider it dispassionately.

What is the international law with regard to the freedom of the high seas? Pakistan continues to commit acts of piracy. Neutral ships which happen to call at Karachi are seized; Indian goods are offloaded and a semblance of legality is created. This act of piracy is sought to be given an international legal semblance by creating the fictitious prize courts and we are told that Indian property has been seized. How long are we going to turn a blind eye to this kind of thing. If in spite of all

[Shri Nath Pail]

these we are going to continue to hope that, by giving a little more money, by agreeing to cede a little more territory, we are going to win the Pakistani goodwill, we are in for a good deal of trouble.

Before I conclude, I want to warn. I am for the repudiation of the Treaty. I demand that this payment be suspended for the time being. There is the talk of penalty which the Prime Minister has mentioned. The Prime Minister has threatened about penalty. I do not see any penalty, the penalties that will follow. I do not see any provision for any penalty. There is a provision for arbitration. The penalty of being firm may be a heavy one, but the penalty of making concession to aggressors is much heavier, much onerous and may, in the long run, prove disastrous. Bending knees before the aggressor, making any kind of concession to an aggressor when the aggression is not vacated is, in the long run, the worst kind of penalty that we may have to pay. Actually we have been paying a penalty for the past eighteen years. It is for this weak policy towards Pakistan that this nation has been paying a continuous penalty. So we continue to do it.

I have one plea. If you want to make any concession to Pakistan, demand at least this much of Pakistan today. Let us not persuade ourselves that the danger is over. Let us not fall into a sense of complacency which seized this country the moment the danger from China was over in November, 1963. The danger continues; if any thing, it has aggravated. Secretly Pakistan is replenishing her armoury; her open allies and secret allies are helping her. If Pakistan wants friendship, if you want to make any concession, let the good come from Pakistan. Let Pakistan unequivocally withdraw the infiltrators who are no other but Pakistani agents. Let Pakistan with-

draw her forces from Chhamb. Let Pakistan vacate her aggression in Kutch and Rajasthan. Let Pakistan release the ships which she has seized. Let Pakistan get back the territory which she has bartered to China. Let Pakistan denounce the conspiracy she has entered into with China to dismember India. Let us get reconciled to the fact of long-term Pakistani hostilities. Let us work firmly with faith for friendship but let us be reconciled to the fact that the Pakistani hostilities will continue for a long time to come and we cannot buy it by making small payments. It is this inflexible will that is being tested; it is not India's tanks that are being tested in the plains of the Punjab; it is India's will to live as a free nation that is being tested every day. Let there be a sufficient demonstration of that. Let us not be worried about world opinion; we can afford to ignore world opinion. The United Nations was not created to defend India, but we were born and that is our greatest obligation and commitment to defend this country. It is not the U.N.'s commitment; it is the commitment of India. This is the highest and the most sacred obligation that we have undertaken. I hope the House in passing its judgment will be mindful of this greatest commitment or obligation which we owe towards India.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** My hon. friend has just repeated what the hon. Prime Minister had said the other day. The hon. Prime Minister had stated, let Pakistan do this, let Pakistan do that and so on. My hon. friend has repeated the same things today.

**Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana):** He shares the good sentiments of the hon. Prime Minister.

**श्री इकबाल सिंह (फिरोजपुर) :**  
डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, डा० राव साहब की  
तकरीर को सुन कर मुझे उन पर चफसोस

हुआ कि वह गवर्नमेंट की इस कार्यवाही को डिफेंड कर रहे हैं। इस हाउस ने 1956 और 1958 में जो कुछ कहा था, 1960 में यह एप्रोमेंट होने के बाद यहां पर मायुर साहब और रघुनाथ सिंह जी ने जो कुछ कहा था, अगर इस मिनिस्ट्री ने उस को सुन लिया होता, तो शायद आज उन की यह हालत न होती।

15.32 hrs.

[SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI in the Chair].

अगर हम तारीख को देखें, तो मालूम होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बनने का कोई नौ, दस महीने के बाद 4 अप्रैल, 1948 को दोनों मुल्कों में एक समझौता हुआ, जिस पर दोनों मुल्कों के प्राइम मिनिस्ट्रों के दस्तखत हैं। उस समझौते के मुताबिक हमारी यह प्राबलियेशन नहीं थी कि हम पाकिस्तान में बनती हुई नहरों का पैसा बेंग या उस को पानी बेंग। उस समझौते के मुताबिक पाकिस्तान ने यह माना था कि प्राहिस्ता प्राहिस्ता हिन्दुस्तान यह पानी ले सकता है और हमारा उस पर कोई हकू नहीं है। वह समझौता चलता गया। मुझे अफसोस होता है, लोग इस बारे में गलत राय देते हैं और गलत हिस्ट्री बघोट करते हैं, क्योंकि इस तरह से वे बहुत दूर तक नहीं जा सकते हैं।

1951 में इस मिनिस्ट्री के कुछ अफसरों ने कहा कि वर्ल्ड बैंक पैसा देगा, इसलिये और कोई बात न की जाये। पाकिस्तान 1948 में ही इच्छोगिल कैनल और आस्टरनेटिव अर्रेजमेंट्स की कोशिश कर रहा था। 1956 में वे कम्पलीट हो गये और 1960 में इस गवर्नमेंट ने समझौता कर लिया। पाकिस्तान 1948 के समझौते के मुताबिक हर बात के लिए तैयार रहना चाहता था। उस ने रेया से ले कर रेया बांच बनाई, उस के बाद इच्छोगिल कैनल बनाई दीपालपुर में डाल कर कदीर बांच बनाई, वह हिन्दुस्तान के बरखिलाफ एक

किष्म की डिफेंस लाइन बनाना चाहता था।

उस वक्त के हिन्दुस्तान के जी० प्रो० सी०, वैस्ट्रन कमांड, ने इस मिनिस्ट्री को प्रोटेस्ट किया कि पाकिस्तान यह इच्छोगिल कैनल नहीं बना रहा है, वह एक एन्टी-टैंक डिच बना रहा है। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान के काबिल प्रादमियों ने उस बात नहीं सुना, उस प्रोटेस्ट को नोट नहीं किया। आज तारीख अपने आप को दोहरा रही है। उस वक्त गवर्नमेंट ने पालियामेंट की आवाज को नहीं सुना। हमारे कुछ प्रादमी कहते थे कि यह बड़ा धच्छा है, बिल्कुल ठीक हो जायेगा, पाकिस्तान से पानी मिल जायेगा। सरकार ने कभी पालियामेंट की बात सुनने की जहमत गवारा नहीं की : आज यह उसी का सबका है।

उस वक्त पाकिस्तान अपनी डिफेंस लाइन बना रहा था, लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने उस के साथ समझौते करते वक्त कभी देश के इंट्रेस्ट्स का ख्याल नहीं किया। उस समझौते में लिखा जा सकता था कि टुडियारा ड्रेन का डिस्चार्ज इस से कम नहीं होगा, लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने यह बात कभी नहीं कही कि पालेवाल से ले कर बबलपुरा और बबलपुरा से ले कर गंदासिह वाला तक जो कनाल बनी है वह हिन्दुस्तान के बरखिलाफ एक एन्टी-टैंक डिच है, इस से ज्यादा उस की बुकमत नहीं है। उस वक्त इस मिनिस्ट्री ने हमारी बात नहीं सुनी। आज कहा जाता है कि यह कोई डिफेंसिव मैजर नहीं है।

जिस वक्त समझौता डिस्कस हो रहा था, उस वक्त हम ने प्रोस्टेट किया कि पाकिस्तान अपनी नहरों की कीमत इन्फ्लेट कर रहा है, इसलिये कि उस ने बहुत सी चीज बनानी है, जिन में ये सारे डिफेंसिव मैजर्स हैं। सिन्ध बेसिन के आस्टरनेटिव अर्रेजमेंट्स के लिए 600 करोड़ रुपये तय किया गया है। गवर्नमेंट ने इस इन्फ्लेशन को दूर करने और उस को रद्द करने की कोशिश नहीं की है। गवर्नमेंट

[श्री शकबाल सिंह]

तो एक बात को सामने रख कर चलती रही कि यह नया समझौता एक अच्छा समझौता होगा और उस से शायद फायदा होगा।

वह पुरानी तारीख है, मैं उस को छोड़ देता हूँ। लेकिन मैं धाज पूछता हूँ कि धाज हिन्दुस्तान का कितना पानी गर्मी के दिनों में पाकिस्तान को जाता है। क्या गवर्नमेंट ने इस बात की कोशिश की है कि जो पानी हमारा है, एप्रीमेंट के मुताबिक हमारा है, जिस को लेने के हम हकदार हैं, उस की रिप्लेसमेंट की जाये। पाकिस्तान ने 1956 में ही अपनी रिप्लेसमेंट पूरी कर ली है। छत्ते सालों के बाद भी गवर्नमेंट के पास राबी की रिप्लेसमेंट के लिए कोई स्कीम नहीं है। अगर कोई स्कीम है भी, तो वह इन्वेस्टी-मेंशन की स्टेज से धागे नहीं गई है। प्लानिंग कमिशन कहता है कि थ्रीग डेम नहीं बनाना चाहिए, क्योंकि उस से लाभ नहीं होगा। प्लानिंग कमिशन और सेंट्रल वाटर एंड पावर कमिशन उस की इन्वेस्टीगेशन की स्टेज से धागे नहीं गए।

अगर एक मिनट के लिए मान लिया जाये कि यह समझौता 1970 तक चलता है, तो सरकार 1970 में कितना पानी रोक सकेगी, जो पानी हिन्दुस्तान का हो गया, जिस पर पाकिस्तान का कोई हक नहीं है, जिस पानी के लिए हिन्दुस्तान ने, उस के जबानों ने और किसानों ने कुर्बानियाँ की हैं। धाज हिन्दुस्तान के किसान कम पानी से कर अपना गुजारा कर रहे हैं। लेकिन अगर 1970 तक गवर्नमेंट की रिप्लेसमेंट पूरी नहीं होती है, तो सिर्फ एक मिलियन एकड़ की रिप्लेसमेंट है, उस के बाद गवर्नमेंट के पास और स्कीम नहीं है।

पीछे क्या हुआ, इस से मुझे कोई जगदा गिला नहीं है। मुझे गिला है कि धाज भी गवर्नमेंट माँई हुई है और धाज भी धागे के लिए कुछ नहीं करना चाहती है। मिनिस्टर

साहब की मिनिस्ट्री में कोई इनिशिएटिव नहीं है, वहाँ कोई बात नहीं सुनी जाती है। किसान मेरे पास धागे है और कहते है कि पाकिस्तान खारा बाँच से पानी लेता था और वह पानी छोड़ कर हमारे टैंकों को धागे बढ़ने से रोक सकता था। लेकिन हमारी प्राबलियेशन तो यह थी कि हम पाकिस्तान को पानी दें। गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि इस एप्रीमेंट के जरिए हम इस तरह से बंध गए हैं कि हम इस से निकल नहीं सकते हैं। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ, लेकिन बंधा कौन? यह गवर्नमेंट खुद ही तो बंधी थी, पाकिस्तान नहीं बंधा था। धाज पाकिस्तान की कोई प्राबलियेशन नहीं है। वह चाहे, तो कुछ भी न करे। उस ने इनपलेटिड कास्ट दी, जिस की वजह से डिफेंस की सारी चीजें बना कर भी उस के पास पैसा बचता है, लेकिन सरकार ने इस बारे में कुछ नहीं सोचा और कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की।

बेचारी पंजाब गवर्नमेंट हमेशा इस के खिलाफ प्रोटैस्ट करती रही। उस के इंजीनियर मुझे हमेशा कहते रहे कि सेंट्रल वाले यह क्या करने लगे हैं, ये हमारी धवाज नहीं सुनते। वे लोग सालहा साल तक प्रोटैस्ट करते रहे, लेकिन अभी उन की धवाज नहीं सुनी गई और धाज भी उन की धाज नहीं सुनी जाती है। धाज उन की धावाज रिप्लेसमेंट बनाने के बारे में नहीं सुनी जाती है। और उस वक्त एप्रीमेंट करते हुए नहीं सुनी गई।

पंजाब के किसान की जो धावाज पंजाब गवर्नमेंट के जरिये धानी है, अगर गवर्नमेंट उस को नहीं सुनेगी, तो वह गलत फैसला करेगी, जिस का गलत नतीजा निकलेगा। इसी लिये धाज हिन्दुस्तान को ऐसे गलत नतीजों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है, जिस के बारे में हाउस का एक एक मेम्बर कह रहा है कि यह एप्रीमेंट गलत था, क्योंकि वह हिन्दुस्तान के हक में नहीं था। जिन्हो न यह

एग्जीमेंट किया और हमारी धावाज को नहीं सुना, उन को गवर्नमेंट ने पक्ष भूषण दे दिया— शायद इस लिये कि वह इतना गलत एग्जीमेंट कर के आए है, उन्होंने ने हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ ऐसा काम किया है, जिस से हिन्दुस्तान कभी नहीं निकल सकेगा ।

उस वक्त एक अल्टरनेटिव एरेंजमेंट था । हिन्दुस्तान की प्रोपोजल थी कि हम बुनाब का पानी रावी में डालेंगे और उस के बाद पाकिस्तान को पानी देंगे, लेकिन पाकिस्तान उस को नहीं माना । जो भी अल्टरनेटिव एग्जीमेंट गवर्नमेंट के सामने आया, वह उस को मानती चली गयी । पाकिस्तान के दिमाग में हमेशा यही बात थी, कि इस एग्जीमेंट से जितना बनिफिट हो सके, वह ले लिया जाये, उस के बाद इस एग्जीमेंट को मानें या न मानें । यही बात आज भी उस के सामने है, जिस के मुताबिक वह काम कर रहा है ।

गवर्नमेंट ने पालियामेंट, पंजाब और उस के किसानों की धावाज को न सुना और यह एग्जीमेंट कर लिया लेकिन वह पंजाब के किसानों की दशा को देखें । आज किसान देश के आखिरी गांव पर बैठा है । उस के घर पर बम पड़ते हैं, लेकिन वह फिर भी मजबूती से बैठा है, लेकिन जब वह उन आदमियों के पास पानी जाते देखता है, जिन्होंने उस के घर तबाह किये, तो उस को फफसोस होता है ।

मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है कि पंजाब में चार लाख एकड़ ज्यादा जमीन को पानी मिलेगा । इस दफा पंजाब में पचास परसेन्ट कम पैदावार हुई है । और आईदा कोई पानी नहीं आता है, तो खी का फसल इतनी कम होगी कि कोई अन्दाजा नही लगाया जा सकता है । इसलिए मुझे पता नहीं कि किस ने उन को कह दिया कि चार लाख एकड़ ज्यादा जमीन को पानी मिलेगा । यह ठीक है कि कि पंजाब का किसान रजिलियन्ट है, बहादुर है । वह इस बात की कोशिश करेगा कि

प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो अपील की है, वह पूरी मेहनत कर के उस को पूरा करे । लेकिन हालत यह है कि पिछले साल से घाघा भी पानी उस को नहीं मिला ।

मिनिस्टर साहब उस एग्जीमेंट को जस्टिफाई करते हैं और कहते हैं कि वर्ल्ड बैंक से इतना लेना है, इतना देना है । वर्ल्ड बैंक तो समझोते में था ही नहीं । वह हिन्दुस्तान से रुपया लेता है और उस को आगे दे देता है । वह इस से ज्यादा कुछ नहीं करता है । लेकिन इस समझौते के मुताबिक पाकिस्तान की क्या आक्लिगेशन है ? क्या गवर्नमेंट ने कभी पाकिस्तान की आक्लिगेशन को जानने की कोशिश की ? हमारे कमिश्नर को वहां जाने नहीं दिया जाता है । क्या गवर्नमेंट ने कभी उस बात को पालियामेंट के सामने रख कर उस के बरखिलाफ कहा ? गवर्नमेंट हर एक बात पर सबमिट करती जा रही है और पाकिस्तान यह समझता है कि हिन्दुस्तान इस से बंधा हुआ है और वह इस को तोड़ नहीं सकेगा, इसलिए जहां तक हो सके, ज्यादा से ज्यादा कीमत ले लें ? उस के खिलाफ इस हाउस में रिजेंटमेंट है । कई चीजें ऐसी भी होती हैं जो कि समझोते के भी बरखिलाफ होती हैं ।

सब से ज्यादा अगर इस देश के किसी इलाके को इससे दुख है तो वह मेरे इलाके को है । उसके बाद महाराजा कर्णी सिंहजी का इलाका आता है । फिर अमृतसर जिले का इलाका आता है । ये सभी लोग बहुत दुखी हैं । उनको पानी नहीं मिलता है । लेकिन पाकिस्तान को पानी दे दिया जाता है । पाकिस्तान को पानी दिये जाने पर वे बहुत दुखी हैं । उनकी एक धावाज है कि उनको पानी मिले । मैं फिर कहता हूं कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान का भला इसमें है कि पाकिस्तान को पानी दिया जाए तो आप ऐसा भी कर सकते हैं । लेकिन जो गलतियां आप कर चुके हैं उनको आप दोहराते न जायें । उनका आप कंटिन्यू न करते जायें । अगर हिन्दुस्तान

## [श्री इकबाल सिंह]

की गवर्नमेंट की, हिन्दुस्तान की इसमें इज्जत है तो इस इज्जत को बरकरार रखने के लिए हम और भी तकलीफ बरदास्त करने के लिए तैयार हैं और बरदास्त करेंगे और आप इस समझौते को जारी रख सकते हैं। लेकिन आप एक बात जरूर करें। आप इसका पक्का इन्तजाम करें कि 1970 के बाद हम पूरा पूरा पानी का इस्तेमाल करें। उस वक्त राव साहब या उनकी जगह पर और कोई अगर मिनिस्टर तब हो, तो वह यह न कहे कि आज भी पांचस परसेंट पानी पाकिस्तान में इसलिए जाएगा क्योंकि हम बीस साल तक सोचे रहे हैं, हमने पूरे इंतजामात नहीं किये हैं। कोई भी इस तरह की बात को बरदास्त नहीं करेगा। कोई भी इस तरह की चीज को नहीं मानेगा। आज भी आप सोचे हुए हैं। रिव्नेसमेंट्स के सिल-सिले में कोई बात नहीं कर रहे हैं। जो पानी है कैसे उसका हिन्दुस्तान में इस्तेमाल किया जाए, इसके क्या इन्तजाम हों, क्या क्या करने की जरूरत है, यह सब आप नहीं कर रहे हैं। दो दरियाओं की तो आपके पास प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं लेकिन तीसरे दरिया के बारे में कोई प्रोजेक्ट नहीं है और न आपने कुछ किया है। यीन डैम जो कि रावी पर बनना है, उसके बारे में आपने कुछ नहीं किया है। आप दसवां हिस्सा पानी का नहीं रोक सकते हैं। अगर आपने 1970 तक ये सब काम नहीं किये तो आपके पास तब क्या जवाब होगा। आप कहेंगे कि बीस साल लगते हैं एक डैम बनाने में इस वास्ते 1990 तक पाकिस्तान को पानी जाएगा तो उस वक्त आप अपनी इस बात को जस्टिफाई नहीं कर सकेंगे। इसका कारण यह होगा कि आपने जो आपको करना चाहिये था नहीं किया। उस वक्त आपके लिए इस चीज को जस्टिफाई करना बड़ा मुश्किल हो जाएगा।

आप सोचें कि आपके क्या आम्बिशनेज हैं और पाकिस्तान के क्या आम्बिशनेज हैं।

अगर हमको अपने आम्बलीगेशंज पूरे करने हैं तो पाकिस्तान को भी आप मजबूर करें कि वह अपने आम्बलीगेशंज पूरे करे। उस दिन के बाद हम पानी बिल्कुल न दें। पैसा अगर देना है तो वर्ल्ड बैंक को कहें कि इन-वैस्टीगेशन होना चाहिये। पाकिस्तान को अगर उसने कोई डिफेंस के मंजर बनाने हैं तो हम उसके लिए पैसा नहीं देंगे। पाकिस्तान ने जो कास्ट को इनफ्लेट किया है उसके बारे में हम गौर करना चाहते हैं। इस पर तो कम से कम वर्ल्ड बैंक गौर करे, ऐसा तो हम उससे कह सकते हैं। अगर पाकिस्तान ने यह दीवार बनानी है हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ, हिन्दुस्तान की फौज के खिलाफ, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के खिलाफ तो हम उसको ऐसा नहीं करने दे सकते हैं। अगर वह चाहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान को नुकसान पहुंचे तो हम इसको बरदास्त नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस तरह से काम अगर पाकिस्तान करता है और हम देखते रहते हैं, पैसे देते रहते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान की जनता आपके साथ नहीं होगी। इस वास्ते आपको विचार करना चाहिये कि रुपये का कहीं गलत इस्तेमाल तो नहीं हो रहा है। इण्डोगिल कैनाल ही एक नहर नहीं थी। इसको डिफेंसिव मंजर के तौर पर भी इस्तेमाल किया जा सकता था। अगर इस तरह के डिफेंसिव मैशर्ज के तौर पर नहरों को बनाना है तो उसके लिये पैसा देना कहां तक वाजिब है, इसके बारे में भी आप वर्ल्ड बैंक को कह सकते हैं और उससे कह सकते हैं कि वह इस पहलू पर भी गौर करे।

हमारे नाथपाई जी ने कहा है कि हमारा और पाकिस्तान का समझौता है, वर्ल्ड बैंक इस समझौते में नहीं भाता है। लेकिन अगर आप कहते हैं कि भाता है तो जितनी आम्बलीगेशंज हमारे ऊपर हैं, उतनी ही पाकिस्तान के ऊपर भी हैं, वर्ल्ड बैंक के ऊपर भी हैं। अगर पाकिस्तान इन आम्बलीगेशंज को नहीं मानता है तो आप भी उसको खू



सकते हैं कि हम कैसे मानें। हमारी जनता हमें कैसे इनको मानने दे सकती है।

आप पैसे देते आ रहे हैं। इस साल भी आपने पैसे दे दिये हैं। अब आप इस साल में यह देखें कि पाकिस्तान का रबैया कैसा है, उसका अरेंजमेंट कैसा है। अगर आपके इंडस वाटर के कमिश्नर को वहां नहीं जाने देते हैं तो फिर आपके ऊपर कोई आन्लीगेशन कैसे रहता है। आप हर बात को एग्जामिन करें। हर बात के बारे में आप सोचें। सब से बड़ी गलती आप ने यह की है कि आप ने कभी उन लोगों की बात को नहीं सुना है, उन लोगों की आवाज को नहीं सुना है जो आप को इस के बारे में बतलाने की इबाहिश रखते रहे हैं। अब भी मैं कहता हूं कि कुछ मੈम्बर्स पार्लियामेंट की आप कमेटी बनायें। उस कमेटी के साथ बैठ कर आप सोच विचार करें इस चीज के सभी पहलुओं पर। इस में कांग्रेस के भी मੈम्बर हो सकते हैं और बिरोधी दलों के भी हो सकते हैं। यह कमेटी सोच विचार करे कि इस समझौते का फ्रन्ट डग से पालन कैसे कर सकते हैं, इम्प्लेमेंट कैसे कर सकते हैं। अगर पाकिस्तान जिद्द करता है तो कैसे निकला जा सकता है, इस पर इस कमेटी में सोच विचार हो सकता है।

एक बार फिर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप पैसा देना चाहते हैं तो दें। लेकिन आप देखें कि पिछली तारीख न दोहराई जाए। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के जख्मों को बता कर आप पाकिस्तान को पैसा दें जो यह एक सही रास्ता होगा। हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों के जो जख्म हैं, उन को बता कर आप पाकिस्तान को पैसा दें। आप उन को यह बता सकते हैं कि इस किस्म के हासलात हैं। यहां किसानों को पानी नहीं मिलता है और पाकिस्तान को पानी जाता है तो आप जान सकते हैं कि यहां के लोगों की क्या फीलिन्स हो सकती हैं, उन के जख्मों कितने बढ़ सकते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : संधि के खिलाफ ज्यादा तर लोग बोले हैं लेकिन फ्रन्ट में वे कमजोरी दिखाते गये और कहते गये कि सन्धि को तो मानना चाहिए। मैं साफ साफ कह देना चाहता हूं कि यह संधि अगर बहुत मजबूत हो तब तो टूट चुकी है और अगर कमजोर होना चाहते हो तो कम से कम स्वयं गित हो चुकी है। वह क्यों, यह मैं बता देना चाहता हूं।

मैं इच्छोगिल नहर के बारे में पहले कुछ तथ्य बता देना चाहता हूं।

यह केवल पैसे और पानी का मामला नहीं है। इच्छोगिल नहर के ऊपर 56 पुल हैं और उन में से एक एक पुल पर 80-80 टन से ज्यादा बजन का टैंक, यानी पैटन टैंक चल सकता है। इस छोटी सी नहर पर 56 पुल हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि यह अद्वितीय नहर है।

उस के साथ साथ दूसरी बात बताऊँ कि कसूर और खेमकरण के बीच में एक सुरंग बनी हुई है जिस सुरंग का इस युद्ध से बड़ा जबर्दस्त सम्बन्ध था, जिस सुरंग के पानी को बन्द कर के पाकिस्तान ने अपनी पलटनें छिया कर ऐसे भेजी कि भारत की पलटनें फंस गईं। खेमकरण और कसूर वाली जगह हमारी मात हुई तो उस का कारण यह इच्छोगिल नहर की सुरंग था। तोपची बम्बों के बारे में और ज्यादा मैं नहीं कहना चाहता हूं। लेकिन इस इच्छोगिल नहर को हमेशा याद रखो, इस का हमेशा ध्यान रखो जब आप इस सिन्धु पानी संधि के ऊपर सोच विचार करें।

मैंने अभी कहा कि कम से कम जो कमजोर लोग भी हैं उन्हें इस संधि को स्वयं गित समझना चाहिए। मैं आप का ध्यान दफा 8, और उस के भाग 4(बी) की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूं। यह अंग्रेजी में है और मैं इसे पढ़े देता हूं। यह पाकिस्तान और भारत दोनों के कमिश्नरों से सम्बन्ध रखती है।

## [डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

- (d) to undertake promptly, at the request of either Commissioner, a tour of inspection of such works or sites on the Rivers as may be considered necessary by him for ascertaining the facts connected with those works or sites;

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं थोड़ा सा अर्ज यह कर दूँ कि जब माननीय इंड्रजीत गुप्त जी ने पांच बरस वाली बात कही तो अगर वह जरा इस अनुच्छेद को भी पढ़ देते तो उन को पता चल जाता कि पांच बरस नहीं, बल्कि हमेशा धीरे-धीरे वक्त हमारे कमिश्नर चाहें तो काम करा सकते हैं। जब यह पैसा दिया या उस के एक क्षण पहले भी कमिश्नर कह सकते थे कि हमें यह पहले जांच करनी है, तब उस के बाद हम कोई कार्रवाई करेंगे। यह धारा 8, 4(बी) जो मैं ने धारा को पढ़ कर सुनाया है, उस के मताबिक है। माननीय राव साहब ने उस पर कहा है कि इन सब धाराओं का मतलब पाकिस्तान इस तरह से लगा सकता है कि हम सिर्फ नदियां देखने दे सकते हैं, नदियों के साथ जो नहरें बगीरह लगी हुई हैं उन को नहीं देखने देते हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस का यह अर्थ लगाना बिल्कुल गलत है। इस का कारण यह है कि धारा 1 धीरे-धीरे उप-धारा 3 में नदी का मतलब बताया गया है। वैसे धारा 7 में जहां कहीं रिबन धारों तो समझा जाए कि ये सब नदियां होती हैं। धारा 1 की उपधारा 3 में यह है :

"The term 'Indus'.... means the named river (including connecting Lakes, if any) and all its tributaries."

ये शब्द बिल्कुल साफ है। कर्नलिंग लेक्स में इच्छागिल नहर आ जाती है। फिर भी कोई इस का अर्थ यह लगाता है कि कर्नलिंग लेक केवल प्राकृतिक झील हो सकती है तो मैं कहूंगा कि वह अर्थ लगता है। कर्नलिंग लेक के अर्थ के अनुसार प्राकृतिक धीरे-धीरे आदमी के हाथ की बनवाई हुई चीज हो सकती है।

कम से कम लड़ाई के लिए कर्नलिंग लेक्स के लिए जो मैं ने अभी परिभाषा बताई है उस को डा० राव साहब याद रखें। अब मामला बहुत देर का हो गया है, लेकिन याद रखें तो अच्छा है।

धारा 9 में बिल्कुल साफ तौर से जो मतभेद और झगड़ हैं उनके सुलझाने का रास्ता बतलाया गया है। रास्ता यह है कि अगर कोई मतभेद है धीरे-धीरे किसी विशेषज्ञ द्वारा वह हल नहीं हो सकता हो तो दोनों कमिश्नरों में से कोई भी उस मतभेद को झगड़े का रूप दे करके एक पंच प्रदासत के लिये दखिस्त कर सकता है।

"A Court of Arbitration shall be constituted to resolve the dispute."

मैं इस समय इस सरकार के ऊपर एक बयानकर्ता आरोप लगाना चाहता हूँ कि उसने इन धाराओं का इस्तेमाल नहीं किया और बहुत जल्दी में पाकिस्तान को पैसा दे दिया, इस सन्धि को स्थगित नहीं किया। मतभेद को झगड़े का स्वरूप नहीं दिया जबकि यह धारायें बिल्कुल साफ धारायें सामने हैं। धीरे-धीरे किसने नहीं किया जब इस पर धारा सोच विचार करने लगेंगे तो मामला धीरे-धीरे बढ़-बढ़ हो जायेगा। मैं थोड़ा सा सोच विचार करूंगा कि क्यों ऐसा नहीं किया। खाली धारा का ध्यान इस पर भी खींच दूँ कि यह सन्धि तो टूट ही चुकी है। उस का उसमें जिक्र हुआ है क्योंकि उस सन्धि के प्राक्कथन में कहा गया है कि अधिकारों धीरे-धीरे कर्तव्यों को निश्चित करने के लिये एक सद्भावना धीरे-धीरे दोस्ती की भावना में यह काम किया जा रहा है। सद्भावना धीरे-धीरे दोस्ती यह दो चीजें जरूरी हैं अधिकार धीरे-धीरे कर्तव्य के लिये। फिर कहा गया है कि जो भी सवाल आगे चल करके उठें उनको सुलझाने

के लिये एक सहयोग की भावना की जरूरत है। एक सहयोग की भावना एक तरफ और दूसरी तरफ दोस्ती की भावना। प्राक्कथन में निहायत निश्चित शब्द हैं।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं खास तौर से धपना एक निजी अनुभव बता देता हूँ। सन् 1961-62 में दुनिया के एक बड़े नामी जज डगलस मुझ से लड़ पड़े थे इस सन्धि को ले कर। मैं ने तब तक सन्धि को पढ़ा नहीं था। लेकिन मैं जानता था कि यह सब सन्धियाँ किसी छोटे से दापरे के ऊपर फैसला करवा लेती हैं, मगर बड़े सवालों के ऊपर कोई फैसला नहीं हो पाता है। जिस का नतीजा यह है कि बक्ती तौर पर ऐसा लगता है कि मामला तो हल हो गया और चीज हाथ लग गई, लेकिन हाथ लगा कुछ नहीं करता। तो जज डगलस ने इस पर बहुत जोर दिया कि देखो, तुम्हारे देश ने गजब का काम किया है जिस को बहुत से देश नहीं कर पाये। तभी मैंने जज डगलस से कहा कि देखो जज, धमरीकी उदारवादियों में यह दोष हमेशा से रहा है, उदारवादी, जो धमरीका के कट्टरपन्थी हैं उन के बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता, लेकिन जो उदारवादी हैं वह किसी भी प्रश्न के एक सीमित टुकड़े को देखा करते हैं और दूसरे सीमित टुकड़े को देख कर के भी उस के अल्पकालिक महत्व पर खुश या नाखुश हो जाया करते हैं। उन की दृष्टि लम्बी नहीं होती और वह पूरा मसला देख नहीं पाते। तो जस्टिस डगलस और उनके जैसे जितने भी धमरीका के उदारवादी हैं मैं उन से कहूँगा कि इस प्रकार की सन्धियाँ बजाय दुनिया में शान्ति और सद्भावना की मात्रा को बढ़ाने के दुनिया में एक वैमनस्य और द्वेष और घन्त में युद्ध की मात्रा को बढ़ाया करती है।

इसलिये मेरा यह कहना है कि धाप की लोक सभा में मैं जो प्रश्न उठा रहा हूँ वह शास्त्री बनाम राम सुभग सिंह नहीं वह सवाल शास्त्री बनाम शास्त्री है क्योंकि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री दो जीब धी धी सिर से बोला करते

हैं एक साथ। अक्सर इसी लोक सभा में कई प्रश्नों पर बोलते हुए वह कह दिया करते हैं कि पाकिस्तान धाक्रमणकारी है, पाकिस्तान शत्रु है और साथ ही कहते हैं कि सुरक्षा परिषद और दुनिया हमारे ऊपर बहुत ज्यादा धन्याय कर रही है कि वह पाकिस्तान को धाक्रमणकारी और शत्रु नहीं मानती। दुनिया वाले पलट कर इन्हीं प्रधानमंत्रियों को कह सकते हैं कि हजरत, जब धापने सिन्धु नदी के पानी पर बहस की थी तब तो ऐसा लगा कि मामला बहुत बढ़िया है, शत्रु और धाक्रमणकारी का मामला है ही नहीं, मामला तो कुछ दोस्तों में छटपट हो जाने का है और धागे बनाते चलते रहने का है। इस लिये मैं इस सरकार से बिल्कुल साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह दो सिर एक साथ रख कर बातचीत करना बन्द करे कि जब मन में धाये तब तो मुँह से युद्ध की धाग बरसा जाया करे और जब मन में धाये तब दूसरे मुँहसे शान्ति की बर्फ उगल दिया करे। इस का नतीजा यह होता है कि उस समय कोई विचार धच्छी तरह से हो नहीं पाता। मनमाने तौर से यहाँ तक दे दिया जाता है और मेरे जैसे धादमी के लिये कठिनाई हो जाती है कि तक को बुद्धि के धाधार पर तौल दें क्योंकि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री युद्ध में या किसी वक्त पता नहीं कौन सा मुँह खोल देंगे, कभी शान्ति वाला खोल देंगे कभी धाग वाला खोल देंगे। मेरे जैसा धादमी तो कोई न कोई कसौटी, कोई धाधार और बुनियाद चाहता है तर्कों वाला।

इस लिये मैं धाप से इच्छागिल नहर के बारे में कहना चाहूँगा कि जब इसके 56 पुलों का इस्तेमाल दुष्सा और जब कसूर और खेमकरण वाली मुरंगों का इस्तेमाल दुष्सा और जब उससे भारतीय पलटनों की काफी नाका-याबी हुई या भारत सरकार की हुई, जिस को धाप जानते ही है, जिस चीज पर पदा पड़ रहा है, उस पर धाप विचार करें। भारत

## [डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

सरकार का जो निकम्मापन और नालायकपन इस लड़ाई में हुआ है उस का क्या कारण था। एक तरफ तो पैटन थे। अमरीका के बारे में मुझे इस वक्त कुछ नहीं कहना लेकिन दूसरी तरफ मैं आपसे इस वक्त रूसी पी० टी० 76 टैंकों के बारे में जरूर कहना चाहूंगा। उन को चर्चा इस लोक सभा में नहीं हुई और जहां तक मैं जानता हूं प्रबुधारा में भी नहीं हुई। मैं बतलाना नहीं चाहूंगा कि कितने टैंक थे लेकिन इतना जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि पी० टी० 76 रूसी टैंकों ने इन रीटन टैंकों का अच्छी तरह से मुकाबला किया है। हिन्दुस्तान के प्रबुधारा में पैन्डुरियन का जिक्र तो प्रश्नर दूंगा है जो कि प्रश्नों का है, लेकिन रूसी पी० टी० 76 का नहीं हुआ। मैं जान-बूझ कर नहीं बतला रहा हूं कि वह किस तादाद में थे। परन्तु इससे कमो यह मत समझना कि मैं ऊपर की हर बात को बढ़िया समझता हूं और अमरीका की हर बात को खराब समझता हूं। इस मामले में रूस ने अमरीका से ज्यादा भारत के प्रति सद्भावना और दोस्ती का बर-ताव किया है। इतना ही मैं कहना चाहता हूं। मगर इसके साथ साथ यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि लाहौर तक भारतीय पलटन पहुंच नहीं पाई इसमें जितना कसूर भारतीय पलटन अथवा भारत सरकार का है उतना निकम्मापन और नालायकपन उन का नहीं, लेकिन मुझे शक होता है, और धाज वह शक श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त के भाषण से मजबूत हो गया, कि कभी किसी मौके पर रूस ने भारत से कहा न हो कि देखो, लाहौर मत लेना, यह काम अच्छा नहीं। ऐसा काम दोस्तों को नहीं करना चाहिये। मेरे जैसा धार्मिक जब लाहौर लेने की बात करता है तो मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूं, क्योंकि इसका जिक्र परदेशी प्रबुधारा में भी हुआ है, प्रश्नों के यहां भी हुआ है कि सोवियट कहते हैं कि पूर्ब बंगाल ले लो, लाहौर ले लो, कि मैं कोई मुक्ति युद्ध नहीं कराना चाहता। किसी इलाके में मुक्ति युद्ध नहीं कराना चाहता। इस लड़ाई में मेरा

पाकिस्तान से कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। लेकिन जब पाकिस्तान अथवा चीन हमारे ऊपर हमला करता है, युद्ध करता है, अपनी पलटन हमारे देश में घुसा देता है, उस समय के बारे में जरूर कहना चाहता हूं कि जब अपनी पलटन निकल पड़े तो उन को अच्छी तरह से कारगर होना चाहिये। कहीं बीच में नहीं रुक जाना चाहिये। बीच में पैर में मोच नहीं आ जानी चाहिये, सैकड़ों की संख्या में इच्छोगिल के तोपची बक्सों को देख कर घबरा नहीं जाना चाहिये। अगर ऐसा होता तो पिछले युद्ध में मैजिनो लकीर जो थी उस के सामने जर्मन पलटन बिल्कुल रुक कर खड़ी हो गई होती। यह जो चार इंच या आठ इंच वाले बक्से हैं उनमें क्या कुछ दम है। उन सब को काट कूट कर हम भागे बढ़ जा सकते थे। यह इच्छोगिल नहर इतनी वाहिदात नहर है लेकिन उसने भारतीय पलटनों को अथवा भारत सरकार, न जाने किस को कहूं, मजबूर किया एक निहायत नामाकूल बेवकूफी पलटनी मामले में करने के लिये, यानी राजस्थान के जरिये सिन्ध के ऊपर हमला करने के लिये जो कि बिल्कुल खराब चीज थी और होनी नहीं चाहिये थी। मैं समझता हूं कि जब इच्छोगिल में आपने उन तोपची बन्दूकों को देखा और जिस वक्त देखा कि सुरंगों ने उस रास्ते को काट कट दिया, उस वक्त आप घबरा गये। पहला घस्का तो एक हद तक सफल हुआ लेकिन दूसरा घस्का देने के पहले एक तरफ तो बिजय चौक बाला दिल नाजुक हो गया और दूसरी तरफ मुझे श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त के भाषण से ऐसा लगता है कि रूसी लोगों ने भी कुछ थोड़ा सा इधर उधर का सन्देश भेज दिया कि तुम जरा सम्भल कर चलना। इस के ऊपर अगर कुछ रूसियों को सफाई देनी हो तो दें। मेरा दिल उनके लिए धाजकल कुछ दोस्ती का हो रहा है। मुझे बतला के चलें तो अच्छा।

16 hrs.

लाहौर और तिब्बत की जब मैं बातें करता हूं तो इसलिए कि लाहौर अगर भारतीय

पलटन ने ले लिया होगा तो प्राज्ञ हमें यह मुसीबत न देखनी पड़ी होती। प्राज्ञ हासत यह है कि पाकिस्तान की सरकार कहती है और वहां की जनता विश्वास करती है कि पाकिस्तान ने लड़ाई जीत ली है। यह बात बिल्कुल निश्चित रूप से आप से कह रहा हूँ। पाकिस्तान के दस करोड़ प्राधमियों में मुभकिन है कि एक करोड़ या पचास लाख को छोड़कर बाकी इस बात का विश्वास करते हैं कि पाकिस्तान ने लड़ाई जीत ली है। यहां भी मैं दब कर रह रहा हूँ, बहुत सी बातें नहीं बताता। दबने की बात मुझे इसलिए कहनी पड़ती है कि कहीं कोई ऐसी बात न कह दूँ कि जिससे सरकार का नालायकपन साबित हो जाए और पाकिस्तान को फायदा हो जाए। तो यह सोच कर मैं अपनी जीभ पर बड़ा नियंत्रण लगाए हुए हूँ। लेकिन साथ साथ यह भी याद रखना चाहिए कि यहां पर झूठ बोलकर हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को भ्रम में डाला जा रहा है जैसे हमने लड़ाई बहुत अच्छी तरह फतह कर ली हों। ऐसी बात नहीं है। तो पहली बात तो यह है कि स्थिति का अवलोकन करके आप भविष्य के लिये नतीजें निकालें। और इस सन्धि के सिलसिले में मैं आपको एक खत और कुछ रूई दिखा देना चाहता हूँ। यह रूई पाकिस्तान की जमीन में पैदा हुई है। यह मुझको पल्टन के एक भफसर ने भेजी थी। मैं उसका बड़ा कृतज्ञ हूँ। शायद यह रूई . . . . .

**पुनर्वास मंत्री (श्री त्यागी) :** आप इसका निहाफ बना लीजिए।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** इसका निहाफ बना सकते हैं त्यागी साहब अपने ही लिए। वह जितने लम्बे चीड़े हैं उनके लिए यह काफी होगा।

मुझे यह रूई भेजी गयी थी दिवाली का दीपक जलाने के लिए। क्योंकि यह पल्टन का पत्र है इसलिये पुलिस ने इस को पड़ लिया

होगा। मेरे सारे पत्र पड़ लिए जाने हैं। तो मैं उस भफसर का नाम आपको बताता हूँ। वह है मेजर कुंवर जीत सिंह। उन्होंने यह पत्र भेजा और यह रूई दिवाली का दीया जलाने के लिए ! (व्यवधान)

अभी तो मैं बहुत सी चीजें नहीं बतला रहा हूँ। त्यागी जी मैं इस वक़्त बे बहुत सी बातें नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि जो दुनिया और इतिहास की निगाहों में आप को निश्चय साबित करें। अभी मैं अपनी जीभ रोके हुए हूँ। लेकिन इस मेजर की मैं पद करता हूँ। उस का प्रेम तो देखिये। शायद यह रूई पाकिस्तान के उस इलाके से आयी है जहां इच्छोगिल नहर बनी है। मैं उस भफसर को और अपने सिपाहियों को भारत की जनता की ओर से एक सन्देश देना चाहता हूँ। वह अभी जिस जमीन पर पढ़ेंगे गए हैं, प्रागे उस से दूर भी पढ़ेंगे सकते हैं। क्योंकि यह मेरा पूरा विश्वास है कि या तो हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का महा संघ बनेगा वरना दो पांच दस बरस के अन्दर अन्दर एक बड़ा युद्ध होगा, हो कर रहेगा। और उस वक़्त हो सकता है कि हमारी पल्टन उन के इलाके में लम्बी पढ़ेंगे जाए। तो मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस जमीन पर आप पढ़ेंगे हो, वह शत्रु की जमीन नहीं है। उस का रौंदना नहीं। वह जमीन अपनी है। उस का प्याज करना। वहां के लोग अपने हैं वहां की सरकार जालिम है लेकिन वहां के लोग, मद औरत अपने हैं। मैं अपने भफसरों और अपने सिपाहियों से कहना चाहता हूँ जो काम यह सरकार नहीं किया करती, कि पाकिस्तान में बसने वाले सगं का और खास तौर से औरतों को हमारी पल्टन के भफसर और सिपाही अपने बहिन समझें, तभी जा कर यह सारी कार्रवाई कारगर होगी। और हम वारतब में हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के भेद का खत्म कर सकेंगे। मैं इस भफसर को और इस पल्टन को इस रूई के सम्बन्ध में यह सन्देश

## [डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

देना चाहता हूं। मैं समझता हूं कि आप सब इस सन्देश पर अपनी छाप लगाएंगे।

**श्री राबेलास व्यास (उज्जैन) :** जिस पाकिस्तान के हिस्से में हम पहुंचे हैं वहां कोई भाई बहिन है ही नहीं, वे तो चले गए हैं।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** इस बार तो आप आगे नहीं बढ़े, मोच आ गयी थी। मैं अभी की नहीं कह रहा हूं। इस वक़्त तो वे लोग राजस्थान में ज्यादा आ गए हैं। लेकिन अगली दफा जब कि आप के दिल मजबूत हो जाएं, जब शायद विजय चौक में दूसरे लोग आ जाएं, रूस और अमरीका को सबुद्धि आ जाए। और आप के सिपाही लाहौर में पहुंचे तो हमारे सिपाही लोगों को मालूम होना चाहिए कि उस वक़्त वह उस जमीन को रो दें, उस को अपनी जमीन समझें। ऐसा करेंगे तो वहां के लोग उन को पूजेंगे। इसलिए मुझे यह कहना जरूरी है।

**श्री त्यागी :** जहां पर हमारी फौजें पहुंची हैं, वहां पर जो पाकिस्तानी हैं उन लोगों ने कहा है कि बड़ी गनीमत हुई कि आप आ गए, हम बड़ी मुसीबत में थे।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** त्यागी जी, आप मुझे उक्तानो मत, वरना आप की सब हरकतों पर मुझे बोलना पड़ेगा। मैं इस वक़्त खाली यह कहना चाहता हूं कि भविष्य को ठीक करो, गलती को छोड़ो।

अब जो पानी की कमी हुई है, इस सिन्धु पानी सिन्धु के कारण उससे अकाल की स्थिति पैदा हो गई है, खास तौर से राजस्थान में, और उत्तर प्रदेश में भी उस का असर पड़ रहा है। जब अनाज की कमी पड़ती है तो यह न समझना चाहिए कि केवल राजस्थान में ही कमी पड़ी है। उस का असर तो उत्तर प्रदेश पर भी पड़ेगा। आप को मैं एक राजस्थानी

कहावत सुनाना चाहता हूं इकाल के बारे में। अगर आप इजाजत देते तो एक कवि ने जो अकाल के बारे में लिखा है वह मैं सुनाता। लेकिन खैर, उस को जाने दो। मैं यह बहावत सुनाए देता हूं। इस पर राजस्थान के बांधोंस वाले खास तौर से ध्यान दें। वह इस प्रकार है :

पद जंगल घड़ कीटड़ो, बांधां बायड़मेर,  
भूला चूबां जेधपुर, घांघां जैरुमेर।

इस अकाल के दौर तो महाराजा बरनी सिंह जी के बीबाहेर में है, और इस का घड़ कांटेड़े में है, इस की बाहें बाड़मेर में हैं। यह भूला चूबा चर्भ जोधपुर में भी पहुंच जाता है लेकिन उस का घर जैरुमेर में है। मेरे एक मित्र ने इस पर एक कविता लिखी थी, लेकिन मैं इस वक़्त उसे नहीं सुनाता। उस कवि ने अकाल की स्थिति के बारे में लिखा है कि आज भारत में इकाल की स्थिति इतनी भयंकर हो गयी है कि केवल राजस्थान में उस की बांह और पैर नहीं है, बल्कि सारे देश में यह चीज फैल गयी है।

और इसलिये मैं बहुत शान्त हो कर के एक बात कहना चाहता हूं। इस को आप कृपा कर के धमकी न समझें। अबसर मेरी बातों को लोग धमकी समझ लेते हैं। लेकिन यह बात निश्चित रूप से साफ रहे कि अगर युद्ध चर्भ चलता है और उसके चलते हुए अकाल पड़ता है तब तो मेरे जैसे लोग और समाजवादी दल उस अकाल को गोली की मार की तरह स्वीकार कर लेंगे। गुस्सा आएगा, लेकिन चप रहेंगे। लेकिन जब लड़ाई नहीं चल रही हो, युद्ध बन्दी हो, गोली बन्दी हो, तब भी अगर अकाल रहता है और उस वक़्त कहा जाता है कि यह सिन्धु उस सिन्धु के कारण हम कुछ नहीं कर पा रहे हैं और यहां यह दे रहे हैं और वहां वह दे रहे हैं, तो मैं इतना साफ कहना चाहता हूं कि मेरे जैसे लोग

उस पर न केवल अपनी जीभ खोलेंगे बल्कि कुछ न कुछ कार्रवाई कर के उस भ्रकाल को लाने वाली संस्था, यानी भारत सरकार को खत्म करने की कोशिश करेंगे। इसलिये इस के बारे में बहुत शान्त हो कर धीरे गम्भीर रूप से विचार हो जाना चाहिए, वरना फिर जब घटनायें हो जाती हैं तो पबारा जाते हैं और कहते हैं कि बिहार में क्या हो गया, वहां क्या हो गया।

अन्त में मैं खास तौर से एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री दो सिर के हो कर न रहें क्योंकि दो सिर वाले लोग अच्छे नहीं हुआ करते हैं।

श्री ज० भ० कृपालानी : रावण के दस सिर थे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं मानता हूँ, लेकिन रावण जैसा विद्वान होना घासान नहीं है।

भारत को पिछले 1500 सालों की परम्परा को देखते हुए जब कभी हमारा जैसा धादमी कोई प्रश्न उठाता है शान्ति का तब तो प्रधान मंत्री साहब का वह मुँह खुल जाता है कि पाकिस्तान धाक्रमणकारी है। पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया सुरक्षा परिषद् पहले इस मामले को तय करे तब हम कोई धीरे मामले पर सोच विचार करने जायेंगे। जो धादमी अपना यह मुँह खोल लेता है उस धादमी की सरकार की तरफ से सिंधु पानी संधि के बारे में धाज जिस तरीके की चर्चा हुई मुझे हैरत होती है कि धाखिर उस धादमी के कोई बुद्धि है, कोई जीभ है, कोई सिर है या सिर्फ मोके बेमोके जो जब चाहा कहते रहो धीरे बाहवाही लूटते रहो धीरे जहाँ कहीं भी जैसे काम चलें वैसा कह दिया करो। इसलिये बहुत शान्ति से धीरे ठंडे दिल से मैं निवेदन करता हूँ वह हजरत नहीं हैं लेकिन उन की जगह विदेश मंत्री साहब है, देखो एक जीभ रखो, एक सिर रखो। यह मैं समझ सकता हूँ कि कभी किसी बात को पूरा करने के लिए पूरक

बीज चलती है। लेकिन उल्टी बीज साथ साथ नहीं चल सकती। पाकिस्तान धाक्रमणकारी है धीरे पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती करनी है धीरे शान्ति बना कर रखनी है। यह दोनों बीजों साथ साथ चलाने की कोशिश करते हो मालूम होता है कहीं सुन रक्खा है कि दुनिया में एक समुद्र है जहाँ दानानल है तो उसका नतीजा क्या होता है? तनाव बढ़ता रहता है धीरे इस के बारे में मैं भी कहता हूँ हमेशा तनाव जब देखो तनाव, धाज युद्ध नहीं, गोली नहीं चल रही है, लेकिन मन में तनाव है, पाकिस्तान के लोगों के मन में तनाव है, भारत के लोगों के मन में तनाव है। यह तनाव चलता रहता है। मुझे कई दफे शक होता है कि कहीं यह धाप दोनों ने धापस में समझौता तो नहीं कर लिया है कि इस तनाव को कायम रख कर भारत धीरे पाकिस्तान की जनता पर लगातार धन्याय करते चले जाओ। यह तनाव खत्म होना चाहिए। एक सिर रख कर, एक बोली रख कर इस तनाव को खत्म करो। जिस तरीके से जैसे भी हो या फिर हिम्मत कर के धगर कह दिया है कि यह इतना बड़ा शास्त्र है तो फिर जरा हिम्मत कर के जाओ, पाकिस्तान से शान्ति करो धीरे धगर चाहते हो कि यह मसला हल हो, तनाव खत्म हो तो मैं कहूँगा कि यह संधि तो पाकिस्तान ने खत्म कर दी है। पाकिस्तानी कार्यवाहियों के कारण संधि टूट चुकी है। इसलिये संधि की सम्बन्धित धारा भी खत्म हो गयी है। इस पर भी, धगर धाब धाप 8 करोड़ रुपये वे चुके हैं तो बहुत बुरा काम धाप ने किया। उस के लिए धाब मैं क्या शब्द धाप के लिये इस्तेमाल करूँ? बहुत ही बुरा काम किया है लेकिन सब से ज्यादा बुरा काम धाप ने यह किया कि धाप देश में सोच को बिल्कुल बिगाड़ते चले जा रहे हैं।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Sir, may I speak sitting? I am not well.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we should not lose sight of

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

the real issue before the House. You know in the morning we demanded the presence of the Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs here; it was not out of disrespect for the hon. Minister who is in charge of this subject, but because we intended to point out that this is not really a problem of irrigation or a problem of water but it is a political issue which must be tackled properly.

What is the issue that is before the House? The issue is, Pakistan has been misbehaving. Can we trust them? Could we not have done something? This is so preposterous a thing that faces us. As a student of international law, I want to declare with absolute emphasis, the Government would have been perfectly justified in repudiating this treaty. I am reading from Openheim's International Law. "The outbreak of war cancels all political treaties between the belligerents; the only treaty that does not come to an end is the treaty which deals with war;" that is, the treatment of prisoners of war and so on. "Non-political treaties not intended to set up a permanent condition of things can be cancelled at the discretion of either party." What we point out is that this treaty can be cancelled.

We are not in favour of repudiating our international obligation in a light-hearted manner. We are not going to do it. I entirely repudiate the stand taken by Sardar Kapur Singh which is not fair to this country, to the Government and to this House. He thinks we are taking up an attitude of censuring the Government or criticising it because Shri Bhutto made a vituperative speech in the Security Council. That is not true. We are not going to degrade ourselves by going down to the level of rancour and mere verification and imitate Mr Bhutto. But I want to point out one thing seriously. As has been announced by Sardar Swaran Singh,

Washington has asked the countries belonging to NATO and SEATO not to give Pakistan any arms, because that might be misapplied and misused. We know that this was the undertaking given to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and to India. But those guarantees and assurances have been cast to the winds. What is the guarantee that the arms will not be supplied and, if supplied, will not be used against India? We cannot trust them; we do not believe in any such undertakings.

We have read in the papers and we are deeply perturbed. It is very good of the Prime Minister to send for the opposition leaders this morning. But our fundamental objection is, why do you call us, why do you summon the parliament to a debate which is really a post mortem examination of the whole thing? Why don't you call us before you made the payment? Is this the way to treat Parliament—after actually making the payment, after having made it a *fait accompli*, then call the opposition leaders and then place the whole matter before the Parliament? This is not the way to treat the Parliament and opposition leaders or the country. The country is deeply perturbed because they think this is something which is not done in the interests of the nation, which is really pursuing the old policy of senseless appeasement of Pakistan; and therefore, they want this thing to be repudiated.

What is the statement attributed to the minister? He is not an irresponsible person. We are convinced that this Ichhogil Canal is really a Maginot Line; it has been used as a Maginot Line. Also, our money is being paid for that now. It is no good the minister saying this has been paid for some constructions which were made four or five years back. Are you now compelling India to make payment for something which is really a military operation area? Are you really making us pay for



something which was used against India in the last conflict? That is the real point. Why should they have pill boxes in a canal area; why underground tunnels and bridges of this capacity that Patton tanks can go over them? What is the good of the minister saying there are not so many hundreds of pill boxes but they are much less in number? All this shows that this is part of some military scheme for the purpose of fighting India. Should Indian taxpayers be made to pay Rs. 8 crores or anything when we know this has been used for the purpose of building up military operation areas and that has been used against us? That is the real point. Neither the Prime Minister nor any other minister could satisfy us. We would not be satisfied unless and until we know that this charge is wrong. It is no good Mr. Indrajit Gupta saying that the minister has done something which is not very creditable. He has only done his duty. It is his duty to bring to the notice of the country that we are really paying for something which is part of Pakistan military preparation for fighting India and which has been used as such. Let us know whether that is the thing or not. You were there, Mr. Chairman, and you know we wanted a definite assurance which could not be conveyed to us that it was not so. Neither the Prime Minister nor any other minister could say that. Can the ministry assure us that this charge is not correct? We are deeply perturbed. It will not be fair to the jawans; it will have a demoralising effect on the entire nation. You will find in today's papers a distinguished lady saying, "I was going to make an offer of my jewellery of gold that I have for national defence. But after I read about this payment of Rs. 8 crores and how Rs. 10 crores of cargo have been seized in this blatant manner by Pakistan and we are sitting helpless, I am reconsidering my decision." It would create a very bad effect on the country. Why don't you stop it? Dr. Lohia was perfectly right. If I may draw your attention to Article

9(1), there it is said that any question which arises between the parties concerning the interpretation of the Treaty or concerning the application of the Treaty can be settled in the manner indicated in that Article 9. First of all you can discuss and then you can have a court of arbitration. We can easily raise a dispute as to the facts. We can easily raise a dispute both as to the application of the Treaty and the interpretation of the Treaty.

Sir, the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who signed this along with Field Marshal Ayub could never have dreamt that this money would be utilised for the purpose of putting up military installations for fighting India, killing our jawans and treating these pill boxes as convenient posts for shooting down Indians. I submit, that was never the intention. Therefore, basically, the doctrine of implied term applies. This is all subject to the implied term that it is liable to frustration if one does something which is basically opposed, which is cardinally opposed to this Treaty. They have done it. I, therefore, submit that this Treaty stands violated by them. Its basis has been frustrated. We can repudiate it. If we did not repudiate it, we could have raised the issue under this Article and gone to a court of arbitration. There is no point in coming to us after the whole thing has been done. Even now you should raise the point before the Indus Commission and before the World Bank and ask them to let us know whether this is being utilised or this has not been utilised for other purposes, whether this has been applied or mis-applied in this manner. Unless we know that we cannot possibly ratify the action of the Government in paying these crores of rupees of the Indian taxpayers.

16.22 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

It is no good saying that we have not paid the money to Pakistan. We have paid the money to the World Bank for the purpose of paying for

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

what has been done by Pakistan on its own territory. Therefore, it is indirectly paying to Pakistan. It is not an excuse which should at all be accepted. I submit, Sir, that is the real issue and that issue should be clarified at the political level; if not clarified, that should be reviewed, that should be subject to scrutiny.

**Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, India has just emerged victorious from a war that we have had with Pakistan and scarcely has the dust been brushed off our uniforms that the fact has been presented before us that Rs. 8 crores have been paid as one of the instalments according to the Indus Waters Treaty of 1960. Under normal conditions, I am sure, no Indian would have opposed a thing like this. But coming as it does, immediately on the cease-fire and immediately following a war which was started by Pakistan, I feel that it is indeed a great mistake for the Government to go ahead honouring treaties which normally, as a result of war, should automatically have been abrogated.

The Prime Minister has made a statement to say that the Government is keen to honour its pledges as far as the Indus Waters Treaty is concerned, and I think we would like to say that under normal conditions the gesture of any government to honour its pledges is something to be proud of. But at the present juncture I feel that this is completely uncalled for. If I had been in the place of the Government myself, I am sure we would have supported such a stand in peace time, but I would urge upon the Prime Minister today that he should look at the feelings of the people, see how greatly they are disturbed, how greatly they resent this payment and then come to any future decisions with regard to any future payments.

It was mentioned this morning by some people that although we claim that there was a war with Pakistan,

it was in fact an undeclared war and therefore we should go on honouring these pledges under the Indus Waters Treaty. I do not wish to go any further into this matter but, Sir you know as well as anybody else that this was perhaps one of the grimmest battles that we Indians had to fight and, whether it was a declared war or not, the fact remains that thousands of Indians lost their lives in the defence of our country. At this stage to keep on giving water and hard-earned money of the country to our enemy is something which we should certainly think twice about.

There was some mention about a penalty clause. I have been looking into the Indus Waters Treaty myself and I have so far not been able to come to the penalty clause, I hope the Minister will enlighten us about this. Perhaps one of the most interesting parts of this Treaty is its preamble which I quote:

"The Government of India and the Government of Pakistan, being equally desirous of attaining the most complete and satisfactory utilisation of the waters of the Indus system of rivers and recognising the need, therefore, of fixing and delimiting, in a spirit of goodwill and friendship".

—I emphasise the term "in a spirit of goodwill and friendship—

"the rights and obligations of each in relation to the other concerning the use of these waters and of making provision for the settlement, in a co-operative spirit".

—underline the words "in a co-operative spirit"—

"of all such questions as may hereafter arise in regard to the interpretation or application of the provisions agreed upon herein, have resolved to conclude a Treaty in furtherance of these objectives, and for

this purpose have named as their plenipotentiaries:"

Now the preamble I think states absolutely clearly that when this treaty was made by our Prime Minister Nehru and Shri Ayub Khan of Pakistan it was more than clear that reasonably friendly relations would continue and Prime Minister Nehru wanted that friendly relations should be developed between the two countries. But where is the climate today for the continuance of the Indus Waters Treaty? Where is the friendly spirit between the two countries when we see that Pakistan has aggressed against the integrity of our country?

The Indus Waters Treaty is well-known and I think Shri Nath Pai has put the entire bedate in a proper perspective as between India and Pakistan and the World Bank. Prime Minister Nehru had always stressed that no matter what the differences might be between our country and Pakistan, India at no time was against the people of Pakistan and in fact did not at any stage wish to see that by cutting of water supply, the Pakistani farmers were harmed. It is because of this and because of that spirit of our goodwill that this Treaty was arrived at, and I am quite sure that our present Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, feels equally the same way, feels the same concern for the people of Pakistan who are working on the soil. Our difference of opinion is with the Government of Pakistan.

The question now to be asked is whether the conditions of the preamble have been justified in view of the changed circumstances and viewed in the context of Pakistan's armed aggression with the object of destroying our country's territorial integrity, and as a result of this whether it is still incumbent upon India to continue honouring its commitments knowing full well that huge amounts of money paid yearly to Pakistan are utilized

for building that country's war machine to be directed at us. It should clearly be understood that there is a great deal of difference between war and peace. An agreement made at the time of peace may not possibly be carried through in times of war. If Pakistan insists on us to honour our international commitments and agreements in favour of that country, surely it is the duty on the part of Pakistan not to do anything which might go against the spirit of such an agreement. And we do not have to look very far to find how Pakistan has time and again violated these things—for instance, the incursions first in Kutch and then again in Kashmir, later on, when the war started, the harassment of our Embassy personnel in Pakistan not only that, the impounding of our ships, virtually violating the maritime law and as if that was not enough, the insult shown to some of the officers of our Ministry of Irrigation and Power who were working almost in the capacity of the officials of the United Nations on the Indus Waters Treaty itself. When a very senior officer went over to Pakistan on their invitation, he was refused entry into Pakistan. The obvious reason, of course, was that they did not wish any Indian officer to see their military preparations and the money that we were giving them being used for war-like preparations. But we know what the truth is and it is up to us to see, when in fact all these preparations of war are being made by Pakistan with the money that we are giving them whether we should not start thinking afresh and stop these payments from now onwards.

The question would certainly come up at the end of five years when Pakistan may ask for another extension of three years. I feel, in the mood in which the Government is today, they may like to extend it by another three years. I would like to urge upon Government that if they

[Shri Karni Singhji]

cannot abrogate this Treaty today, for God's sake do not extend it by another three years. If Pakistan is unable to complete its irrigation projects, the only reason is that all this money was being spent for the most dastardly aggression against India with the result that the machinery has been slowed down. Then, why should we be bound to extend it by another three years?

Our country is facing the spectre of famine. All over, there is great shortage of foodstuffs and a great deal of our foreign exchange has to be diverted towards the import of foodstuffs. Surely, Pakistan is to a large extent responsible for creating a claimate between India and America resulting in slowing down the PL-480 aid. If Pakistan had not embroiled India in a war, I am quite sure that this aid would have continued unabated. Admittedly the United States has made certain statements with regard to PL-480 aid and its continuance; nevertheless, there is no doubt that the people in our country have been faced with the spectre of food hardships and for that we must blame Pakistan entirely.

I would like to make a brief observation now as to how this particular agreement of the Indus Waters Treaty affects Rajasthan. A very direct effect of the Indus Waters Treaty has been felt in Rajasthan where in the Gang Canal, against a normal supply of 2,700 cusecs of water that have flowed regularly into this canal ever since the Anderson Award of 1935, only 700 cusecs are allowed to flow through the canal since the time the Indus Waters Treaty of 1960 came into force. All these years there has been a downward trend in the foodgrains production in this area, whereas it should have actually increased by the application of new methods of agricultural operations.

We hear very often that crops are withering for lack of supplies of water through the canal. Only a couple of

days ago a deputation of public representatives called upon the Prime Minister, and called upon the Minister of Irrigation and Power and placed before them their grievances, telling them exactly how our agricultural production is being retarded; how the sowing of the rabi crop has virtually been almost given up and the crops that have already been sown are withering. I am very happy to say that the Minister has been good enough to see that a certain amount of increase in the water took place but I do hope that this will be substantial to permit sufficient crops to be grown and help the Grow More Food Campaign.

As you know, Sir, the northern portions of Rajasthan, what are known as the Ganganagar District of Bikaner Division, are serviced by three canal systems—the Gang Canal brought by Maharaja Ganga Singhji in 1927; the Bhakra Canal system which was planned by him but which came through soon after World War II in the time of Maharaja Sadul Singhji and the gigantic Rajasthan Canal system, one of the mightiest canals in the world planned by free India's architects. All the three of these are servicing the vast desert lands of Rajasthan from the Punjab rivers; but much of this expectation is negated with regard to the food production if the amount of water flowing through these canals is reduced.

I should like to give you a brief idea of how the supplies of Indus waters come into the Gang Canal and other canal systems of Rajasthan. I may mention, the Gang Canal at one time was serviced by the Sutlej but now the water in this canal is allowed after distribution of waters stipulated in the Indus Waters Treaty which came into force in 1960 to Pakistan, whether it is the waters of Beas, or the waters of Sutlej stored at Bhakra. The distribution of the share that came to India is done between Punjab and Rajasthan accord-

ing to the understanding between these two State Governments.

But the fact remains that against the original 2,7000 cusecs in the Gang Canal, since the Treaty came into force in 1960, there has been a gradual reduction and waters as low as 700 cusecs are only released which is greatly affecting the agricultural operations. It will also be of interest to note that according to the reports I have just been getting from the Gang Canal District, kharif crops have suffered to the extent of 50 per cent, garden crops or orchards by 60 per cent and the sowing of wheat now will affect the normal production by 45 per cent as water has to be diverted both for sugarcane as well as for food crops. On the whole, Ganganagar District has suffered since this Treaty has been signed in 1960. It is, therefore, understandable that those of us who hail from Rajasthan are naturally anxious about this situation.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He may finish.

**Shri Karni Singhji:** I shall not take more than a minute. I shall just conclude my observations by merely saying that international agreements and treaties are based on bilateral acceptance of the conditions contained therein. Just as in the case of Kashmir any references to a plebiscite by us some time ago have been made moribund by Pakistan's non-adherence to the conditions laid down in the Security Council's Resolutions of 13th August, 1948, vis-a-vis the withdrawal of their troops, similarly in the case of the Indus Waters Treaty also Pakistan has been guilty of violating the very spirit which is reflected in the Preamble of the Indus Waters Treaty of 1960 and has thereby created a situation where our country can justifiably take a stand that it is no longer bound to honour, on a unilateral basis, the conditions laid down in the Treaty itself.

I, therefore, now repeat in support of my substitute motion that Pakis-

tan has, by its very acts of aggression, forfeited its rights to benefits from the Indus Waters Treaty and India is no longer obliged to honour the Treaty obligations as conditions due to the recent Indo-Pak war have materially changed them, absolving India of any further obligations with regard to the operation of the Treaty in question.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I think it will take a little longer. Shall we sit upto 5:30 P.M.? How much time would the Minister want for the reply?

**Dr. K. L. Rao:** Half an hour or twenty minutes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then I shall call the Minister at 5:00 P.M. Shri S. N. Chaturvedi.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** On a point of order. So many members are standing to catch your eye, but you are giving an opportunity to a member sitting. I think it is specifically provided in the rules that only a member who stands shall catch the eye of the Speaker. I think this rule is not followed by the Chair.

**Shri Nath Pal:** I am afraid once again my objection will not be misconstrued by my friend, the Hon. Minister. Mr. Deputy-Speaker the debate is being distorted. We want a political reply. I want Mr. Swaran Singh or the Prime Minister to reply. If the Prime Minister does not want to reply, then we are not interested in the reply at all. We have already heard the Hon. Minister. What we want is a political reply to this question. Why are they making a mockery of this debate?

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** One more point I want to raise. In this debate more time has been given to the hon. Members belonging to the Opposition. Only very few Members have been called from the Congress side. I therefore, suggest that the debate on this be extended and the Hon. Minister be asked to reply tomorrow.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri S. N. Chaturvedi.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** What is your decision on my point of order?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no point of order.

**Shri Warior (Trichur):** We would like to know whether we would get a reply from Shri Swaran Singh.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not know. It is for Government to choose their spokesman.

**Shri Warior:** Let Dr. K. L. Rao reply. But we would like to know whether Shri Swaran Singh is intervening or not. Let us get at least this information.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is for Government to decide.

**Shri Nath Pal:** If Dr. K. L. Rao replies, then we shall walk out.

**श्री श० ना० चतुर्वेदी (फिरोजाबाद) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, पाकिस्तान का पिछले 18 वर्ष का इतिहास भारत के प्रति शत्रुता और विश्वासघात का इतिहास रहा है। यही मनोवृत्ति उस ने भारत के प्रति निरन्तर प्रदर्शित की है। तब यह स्वाभाविक है कि भारतीय जनता का मन बड़ा क्षुब्ध हो इस बात के ऊपर कि जो देश हमारे राष्ट्र की बरबादी के लिए सदा तत्पर है, उस को हम अपने पानी से सींचें, उस का पोषण करें। यह स्थिति ऐसी है जिस से सभी के मन चिंतित हैं। सवास यह नहीं है कि यह पानी देने में हम लोग किसी भी अपने इंटरनेशनल आर्गनिसेशन का उल्लंघन करेंगे। सवाल तो यह है कि हम एक बड़ी अवास्तविक स्थिति में रह रहे हैं। जब कि हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण हुआ, जब कि हमारे जो पाकिस्तान में हुई कमिश्नर थे उन का अपमान हुआ, निरन्तर जितनी ट्रिटीज हुई उन का उल्लंघन हुआ और उस के बाद भी हम इस अवास्तविकता का पोषण करते जा रहे हैं। अब भी हमारे उन के बीच में कोई बार नहीं है, हमारे उन के डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशन्स वैसे के वैसे बने हुए हैं। अगर हम ने इस का फायदा उठा कर सीधे बात कही होती और अपने डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशन्स

तोड़ कर कहते कि भारत पाकिस्तान के बीच आज युद्ध है तो स्वतः हमारी जो ट्रिटीज थीं, जो आर्गनिसेशन्स थे, वह खत्म हो जाते और यह सवाल ही पैदा न होता कि आज हम उन को यह रुपये दें या न दें। इस लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो दिक्कत आई है वह विशेषतः इसी बात की वजह से आई है।

इतना सब कुछ हुआ, लड़ाईयां हुई, खून बहा, हजारों आदमी मारे गये, घायल हुए, हमारे प्रतिनिधियों का अपमान हुआ, लेकिन हम अब भी यह समझते हैं कि हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच में आज भी लड़ाई नहीं है। अगर आज लड़ाई नहीं है तो हमारे सामने इस तरह की समस्याएँ निरन्तर आती रहेंगी क्योंकि पाकिस्तान का तो एक रवैया शुरू से रहा है। उस ने आज तक किसी ट्रिटी या किसी आर्गनिसेशन को पूरा नहीं किया। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की जैसी क्याति है, जैसा उस का नैतिक स्तर है, उस के अनुसार वह जो भी बचन देती है उस से बंध जाती है। इस वास्ते जितनी भी ट्रिटीज होंगी उन से हम बंधते चले जायेंगे जब कि दूसरी पार्टी किसी भी तरह से उन से बंधी हुई नहीं होगी।

मैं इन सब बातों को दोहराना नहीं चाहता लेकिन एक बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज लोग पूछते हैं कि इस रुपये का उपयोग लड़ाई के लिए हुआ या नहीं। जो लोग वहां गये हैं या जिन्होंने ने नहर को देखा है उन को उससे प्रत्यक्ष मालूम हुआ है कि इन्फ्रोग्रिड नहर का उपयोग और उसका निर्माण इस ढंग से हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान की लड़ाई में काम आये। वरना जिस तरह की वह बनी है उस तरह की नहीं बनती। मैं यह जरूर चाहता था कि सरकार रुपये देने के पहले कम से कम वर्ल्ड बैंक से यह पूछती कि क्या इस रुपये का उपयोग भारत के विरुद्ध हुआ है और क्या यह नहर इस दृष्टि से निर्मित नहीं की गई है कि वह फौजी काम में आये। अगर वर्ल्ड बैंक यह एंशंस देता कि नहीं, वहां पर ऐसे टनेज्स की जरूरत थी या जो

पिस बाक्सेज बने हैं उनकी नहर के लिये जरूरत थी और तब हम यह रूपाय देते तो यह बात हमारी समझ में आती कि हमने अपने प्राक्सिगेशन को पूरा किया है। लेकिन मुझे नहीं मालूम कि प्राया इस प्रकार का कोई स्पेसिफिक क्वेश्चन बहर्द बैंक से पूछा गया है।

हमने जो कुछ देखा है उस के आधार पर मैं यह कहता हूँ कि ईस ट्रिटी के मातहत जिस उद्देश्य के लिये रूपाय दिया गया था उसके लिये रूपाय नहीं लगाया गया है तो हमारे ऊपर यह बाध्यता नहीं है कि हम उसका पेमेंट करें। अगर ऐसा होता तो कम से कम हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को सन्तोष तो होता, और लोग समझते, कि हाँ, यह बात पहले हमने समझ ली, सुन ली और उसके बाद हमें प्राशवासन मिला गया इंटरनेशनल बैंक की तरफ से कि उसका दुष्योग्य नहीं हुआ है, बल्कि रूपाय उसी काम में लगा है जिस उद्देश्य के लिये वह दिया गया था। इससे हम लोगों को कुछ प्राशवासन मिलता। लेकिन आज जिस तरह से हुआ है उससे लोगों के मन में तो बड़ा खोभ है ही, साथ ही इस तरह की चीज होती रही है कि सड़ाई भी चल रही है और हमारे विरुद्ध निरन्तर नकसी युद्ध विराम का उत्सर्जन हो रहा है तथा हमारे देश के भाग हथियाये जा रहे हैं।

मैं समझता हूँ कि सब से पहली जरूरत जो है वह बहुत साफ है कि जो युद्ध की स्थिति भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच में है उसको स्वीकार करना चाहिये और हमारे डिप्लोमैटिक रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्स की जो बेइज्जती प्रबवा प्रनादर हुआ है उसको देखते हुए हम अपने डिप्लोमैटिक रिसेग्नस खरम कर दें। इससे हम अपने प्राक्सिगेशनस मे मुक्त हो जायेंगे और जो समस्या आज हमारे सामने है वह नहीं उठेगी। इस वक्त जो रूपाय दे दिया गया वह तो शायद गवर्नमेंट को मजबूरी थी लेकिन प्रागे के लिये यह

जरूर सोचना चाहिये कि हम रूपाय देने बास नहीं है। अगर हम इसी तरह से पेमेंट करते रहते हैं तो आज की वी स्थिति बनी रहेगी।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Vidyalankar.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे एक व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ। जिन लोगों के बैकस्पिक प्रस्ताव है वे यहां पांच घण्टे से बैठे हुए हैं और जैसा कि व्यास जी ने कहा वह आपकी इच्छा पकड़ना चाहते हैं। यहां पर प्राखिर कोई परम्परा तो होनी चाहिये यह तो नहीं कि जिस प्रकार प्राप के मन में प्राये उसी प्रकार समय दिया जायें।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am trying to give chance to as many Members as possible.

श्री राधेनाथ व्यास : समय और बढ़ाया जाय, जैसा कि यहां पर कहा गया था जिससे प्राप और लोगों को दक्षिणोर्ध्व कर सकें।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We have to close the debate today.

**Shri Radhahal Vyas:** If we cannot catch your eye, what is the use of our sitting here?

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : प्राप की प्राख उठती ही नहीं है। नीचे की ओर ही गयी रहती है। यह हमारा दुर्भाग्य है।

**Shri A. N. Vidyalankar (Hoshiarpur):** I have tried to persuade myself to speak in favour of the action taken by Government, but after long efforts in that direction, I have not been able to convince myself that we could not do anything else and what we have done was the only honourable course for us to adopt.

I strongly feel, and quite agree with Shri Nath Pai, that this is a political question, not a technical one. Of

[Shri A. N. Vidyalankar]

course, the Minister of Irrigation and Power, has given us a lot of information, but he has not been able to give political reasons.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** He is a retired government servant.

**Shri A. N. Vidyalankar:** I feel it is the House's desire that the political reasons compelling Government to pay all this money and permit the water to Pakistan after all that has happened during recent months should have been given. I still expect that those reasons would be given.

The hon. Minister referred to the water being used in Punjab for agriculture. I think that was not very much relevant. There is well irrigation also there. There are other alternative sources of irrigation. The question really is whether, in view of what has happened during all these months, was it absolutely necessary under the treaty, and was it proper for us to have done what we did, and whether in what we have done we have acted consistent with our self-respect and honour?

I think we are not living in normal times. We have tried for the last 18 years to develop friendly relations with Pakistan and we have failed. When this treaty was signed, it was signed with all genuineness and all sincerity in the hope that our relations with Pakistan would be cordial and they would become friendly. And those expectations were there. For 18 years we have lived in this hope and have tried to improve our relations with them. But I think the recent events were a culmination of our efforts. After all these efforts, we have not succeeded, and at present we are in a different mood, the country is in a different mood; Pakistan also is in a different mood. So, this was, I think, the most inopportune time for implementing that Treaty. Many hon. friends have shown by arguments, which I need not repeat,

that there was enough scope in the Treaty for at least postponing the payment. Also, I feel that Government should have anticipated the mood of the country, the mood of this Parliament. Parliament was going to meet, they could have waited and consulted Parliament, they could have consulted the all-party committee that was constituted last time, which consists of Members from the Opposition as well as the Congress Party. Therefore, I have tried my best to persuade myself, but I have not been able to convince myself that whatever action the Government has taken was absolutely necessary. Government should not have been in a hurry to take that action.

What can we do at present? The payment has been made, but the payment has been made to the World Bank. I expect that the Government should at least challenge the expenditure that Pakistan had incurred so far, it should write to the World Bank that unless we were satisfied on the question of the previous expenditure, the money should not be used. Government should at least tell the World Bank that immediately a proper enquiry should be made either by the Joint Commission on which India and Pakistan are represented by their Commissioners, or by any other impartial commission as to how that expenditure has been incurred, where Pakistan has spent all that money, how these canals have been used by Pakistan to serve as a defence line. As an hon. Member hinted, long ago—it was in 1955 or 1956—our army officers, responsible officers, senior officers, had drawn the attention of the Government to the construction of this defence line by Pakistan, the Ichhogil and other canals. They suggested that if Pakistan constructed the Ichhogil Canal, we should also construct a defence line using the Hudiera Channel for the purpose. But we just dismissed that proposal. Even the PAP officers had informed the Government that the Ichhogil Canal and



pill boxes were being constructed. I had an impression earlier that our intelligence had failed, that they did not inform the Government sufficiently in time, but that is wrong. In fact, the Government was well informed, Government knew all these things that were happening, how preparations were being made. Therefore, it passes my imagination why all these things were just ignored.

Whatever has happened has happened, the past is past, but I think that, taking the mood in which we find the country and this House today, Government should adopt a different attitude, should think of what can be done. I have suggested that at least next year we should be firm, we should not make any payment, and this House should be firm that next year no payment should be made unless we were satisfied that the money that we were giving to Pakistan was not going to be used for any sinister purpose. This year also we should approach the world bank and say that we are not satisfied with the supervision that they had been exercising and we should get the whole matter properly investigated. Whatever might be the treaty this is an inherent right of every country; if they became a party to a treaty they should be satisfied that the other party was also fulfilling all the provisions of the treaty in letter and in spirit and if the money that was paid was properly utilised. We are not very much concerned with technical questions, such as how many pill boxes had been constructed and what amount had been spent on each pill-box. We take this question in a general way. How Pakistan had been using the money received for this purpose is a matter for investigation and it is for the government to get this investigation done and to inform the House. There are suspicions and doubts among our people with knowledge and information and among people who have been fighting on the front also. I need not name the people. When we visited those areas, even those jawans told us

so. After all we should adopt some kind of policy taking fully into account what Pakistan had been doing. We should realise that we are living not in normal times but in abnormal times. Our relationship with Pakistan has not become normal it is still abnormal. We should take decisions taking these abnormal times into consideration. That is what I wanted to submit. I hope this political aspect will be dealt with by the Minister when he replies, I assure him that so far as our aims and the spirit are concerned we are all one, and agree on the point that we should have the best of relations with every country in the world, even with Pakistan we do not want war; we have never desired war; no Member of this House wants war. Still, we want to live in peace with dignity; to have friendly relations with every country does not mean that we should give away our honour and dignity. We want friendship with dignity and honour. That is all I wanted to say.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr. Rao.**

**Shri Nath Pal:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, may I assure Dr. Rao that I have the highest regard for him. He is a good minister, an honest and able Minister but we had hoped that when the reply would come it would be on political grounds. If the government is determined to show such a contempt for the unanimous wish of the House that this matter be treated as political, and not technical, poor Dr. Rao should not be made a scapegoat for the unanimous decision of the cabinet. Either the External Affairs Minister or the Prime Minister should reply. The Speaker this morning more or less gave a ruling that it was a correct suggestion and we were assured by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that he would carry out our wishes. They are insisting in making this a mockery of a debate—I hope Dr. Rao will not misunderstand me. We do not indulge in walk-outs. But if they are making such a mockery of a serious subject of the debate where we raised points which are basic matter of international relations with Pakistan, reducing it

(Shri Nath Pai)

to a contemptible technological matter, we have no alternative but to walk out.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** They are reducing an important debate to a farce.

[Then Shri Nath Pai and Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath left the House.]

17 hrs.

**Shri Yashpal Singh:** The Minister of External Affairs may reply.

श्री इकम बन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन्होंने जो कहा है मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ और सदन से वाक आउट करता हूँ ।

(Shri Kachhavaia then left the House.)

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, डा० के० एल० राव पाकिस्तान हमारा पानी पिएँ इसका जवाब तो दे सकते हैं, लेकिन पाकिस्तान पानी भी पिएँ और खून भी पिएँ इसका जवाब डा० राव नहीं दे सकते । क्योंकि घाय़ डा० राव को जवाब देने के लिए बुला रहे हैं, इसलिए मैं सदन का बहिष्कार करता हूँ ।

(Shri Prakash Vir Shastri then left the House.)

श्री राघेलाल श्यास : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि कल प्रधान मंत्री या विदेश मंत्री इसका जवाब दें और बहस जारी रखी जाए !

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** May I make one suggestion, Sir? As my hon. friend said, this is not a party question, and when foreign affairs are concerned, we must take the whole House and the country with us. We also must be persuaded to plead for the Government and the country. This is not a matter on which the Minister of State should answer. This is a matter which

affects are emotions of 44 crores of people, and we are asked to raise the morale of the people. I would like to make a definite suggestion: tomorrow let the Prime Minister reply. This is not for Dr. Rao to reply.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is for the Government to choose its spokesman; I cannot compel anybody.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** This is not a matter for Dr. Rao.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda):** I would like to support what Shri Hanumanthaiya has said.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I also support Shri Hanumanthaiya.

**Shri Radhe Lal Vyas:** Let the motion be put before the House.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राय मेहरबानी कर के सुन लीजिये ।

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Those who are affected by the treaty have not yet been given an opportunity to speak. Are they put on the blacklist by you or by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs?

**The Minister of Communications and Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** The Prime Minister has come. The feeling is that we should reply tomorrow.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bhadur Shastri):** I shall say a few words now.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह एग्जिमेंट या समझौता जिसके कि सम्बन्ध में आज बहस हुई है और जिसकी कि वजह से हम को यह खपया वर्गेरह देना पड़ा है यह एक पुराना समझौता है पुराना एग्जिमेंट है । यह एग्जिमेंट इन्ड्रजीत गुप्त शायद यहां मेंबर थे जबकि यह एग्जिमेंट प्राया और यह दोनों हाउसेज में पेश हुआ और मंजूर हुआ था । सही हुआ हो या गलत लेकिन वह मंजूर हुआ था ।

**श्री इन्द्रजीत मुख :** सिगनेचर होने के बाद धाया है ।

**श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री :** मगर इंट्रोड्यूस किया । हाउस ने माना । ऐसे ही मानता है । गवर्नमेंट एग्जिमेंट करती है और वह बात फिर पार्लियामेंट के सामने आती है और पार्लियामेंट उस को मानती है या नहीं मानती है । और वह बात भ्रम है । लेकिन एक वह समझौता और एक एग्जिमेंट हुआ वह इस हाउस में पेश किया गया और हाउस ने इस को माना । अब वह एग्जिमेंट कैसा है उसकी मैरिट्स और डिमरिट्स पुरानी बात है अब उसमें इस वक्त हम नहीं जा सकते हैं कि पहले क्या हुआ । सिबुएशन बदलती रहती है । स्थिति निरन्तर बदलती रहती है । अब आज इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि वर्ल्ड बैंक उस फंड का ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटर है । उस वक्त प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने चाहे जो कहा जैसा कि श्री नाथपाई ने कहा लेकिन यह एक बिलकुल क्लियर फैक्ट हमारे सामने है कि वर्ल्ड बैंक ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटर है और सारे बैंक फंड्स को वह ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटर करता है । जो कुछ भी रुपया वह जो तमाम मुल्क देते हैं वह वहां जाता है और उसमें डिपॉजिट होता है । वह कोई एक हमारा प्रोकेला हिन्दुस्तान या इंडिया का प्रोकेला उस में कंट्रिब्यूशन नहीं है । हमारा कंट्रिब्यूशन बहुत थोड़ा है । करीब 600 करोड़ रुपये के कंट्रीब्यूशन हैं, 620 करोड़ रुपये के और उस में हमारा शायद 81 करोड़ या 83 करोड़ का कंट्रीब्यूशन है । इसलिए यह जो फैक्ट है कि वर्ल्ड बैंक उस को ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटर करता है वह चलाता है तो जहां तक उसमें कोई सुपरविजन बर्ररह की बात है उसमें इंडिया का कोई प्रखर्यार नहीं है न ही एग्जिमेंट में उस की कोई गंजाइश है । वह इंडस फंड जो है, एक दूसरा डेवसपमेंट फंड उस इंडस बेसिन फंड में एक प्राविजन है कि इंडिया और पाकिस्तान दोनों के दो रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्स देखते हैं मगर वह देखते हैं केवल रिवर वर्क्स के बारे में । उस में कोई कैनाल

और उस के इस्पेंशन की बात नहीं है । जहां तक वर्ल्ड बैंक का सवाल है मैं ने उन से पूछा श्री । वर्ल्ड बैंक इस को बहुत साफ कहता है कि कोई इस का पैसा पाकिस्तान को नहीं जाता । दूसरी बात यह कि कोई यह डिफैस एफर्ट्स के लिए इस में रुपया लगा अब जहां तक हमारी इन्फोर्मेशन है, हम ने पूछा हम ने पता लगाया हमें यही खबर है यही इन्फोर्मेशन हम को दी गई है कि इस में फीज या डिफैस एफर्ट्स बर्ररह के रिफर्सिबल में यह रुपया नहीं लगा है । वर्ल्ड बैंक काफ़ी इरकी जांच पड़ताल करता है । ध्याप जानते हैं कि वर्ल्ड बैंक जो पैसा देता है किसी भी मुल्क को तो वह इस बात के लिए बड़ा कैरफुल रहता है कि वह पैसा उसी काम के लिए खर्च हो । जिस काम के लिए वर्ल्ड बैंक रुपया देता है । वह बहुत जीलियस है इस चीज में कि कोई उसका पैसा और किसी चीज या काम के लिए यूज न हो । अब यों तो हम कुछ नहीं कह सकते लेकिन जहां तक हम को मालूम है उस का कोई पैसा पाकिस्तान ने खर्च किया हो बार एफर्ट्स के लिए ऐसी बात नहीं है ।

यह पिलबीसेज बर्ररह की बात बड़ी गई । अब जहां तक पिलबीसेज के बनने का सवाल है हम नहीं बह सक्ते कि पिलबीसेज इस में से बने या वहां से बाहर से बने । लेकिन इस में से बनने का सवाल नहीं पैदा होता । कोई बड़ी कौर्टर्नल चीज नहीं है ।

पिलबीसेज में 5000, 10,000 या 15,000 का सारा खर्च है . . .

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** पिलबीसेज पाकिस्तान ने बनाये बितने है कुछ इसका भी पता है ?

**श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री :** अब मैं उनका ठीक नम्बर तो नहीं जानता कि वे कितने बने हैं । 20 हों, 25 हों, 35 हों या इससे ज्यादा हों, चाहे कुछ हों लेकिन यह मान लेना चाहिए

## [श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री]

कि 10 लाख, 50 लाख या 1 करोड़ रुपये  
अगर उस पर खर्च भी हो तो आफ्टर वॉल...

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** वाकी चीजें  
भी हैं।

**श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री :** वाकी चीजें  
नहीं हैं। जो टनल वगैरह के बारे में कहा  
गया उसे डाक्टर राव ने एक्सप्लेन किया ही  
हंगा। प्रेजिडेंट कोई उस के नीचे से  
पैसेज बनाया है ताकि उस के नीचे से टैंक  
चलाया जाय। डा० राव ने उसे एक्सप्लेन  
किया है और बतलाया कि वह बात नहीं है।  
बिल्कुल एक नॉर्मल तरीके से जो एक कैनल  
बनती है और जितनी रिवर्स उसके नीचे से  
पास करती हैं तो उस तरीके का जो अर्रेंजमेंट  
या जो स्ट्रक्चर बनता है वह स्ट्रक्चर वहां  
पर है।

वह पिलबोक्सेज जैसे भी कोई कौस्टली  
चीज नहीं है। ऐसा तो नहीं है कि इस पर  
रुपया खर्च ही नहीं होता लेकिन कोई बहुत  
ज्यादा रुपया खर्च नहीं होता है।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** जो 56 पुल बने हैं  
उन पर टैंक चलते हैं।

**श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री :** वह पुल भी  
बहुत पहले बने। वह पुल भी बने और वह  
कैनल भी बनी जैसी कि राव साहब ने कहा  
वह एग्जामेंट के बहुत पहले बने। इसलिए यह  
बात कि हम उसको जो रुपया देते हैं उस को  
पाकिस्तान इस्तेमाल करता है बार परपजैज  
के लिए तो यह बात ठीक नहीं लगती है।  
और हम ने कोशिश तो की इस वक्त कि हम  
उसको रूपीज में दें एक नौन कन्वर्टिबिल,  
वर्ल्ड बैंक को इस शर्त पर दिया।

कहा है कि कुछ समय के बाद वह उस को  
कन्वर्ट करायेंगे। इस वक्त कोई स्टर्लिंग  
या डालर की बात नहीं है इसलिए इस में  
कोई सवाल पैदा नहीं होता कि वह पाकिस्तान

को मिले और वह उसे किसी काम के लिए  
यूज करे। अब एक एग्जामेंट है और उस  
एग्जामेंट में यह ठीक है कि एक तरफ लड़ाई है।  
मैं उस फीलिंग को अच्छे तरीके से समझता  
हूं जोकि थानरेबुल मेम्बर्स की इस बारे में है।  
यह बात नहीं है कि हम उस को महसूस नहीं  
करते। हम ने उस पर भी काफी सोचा।  
हम ने कोई खुशी के साथ ऐसा नहीं कहा कि  
अच्छा भाई इस को मानते हैं। काफी उस को  
हम ने सोचा। उस के तमाम लीगल इम्प्ली-  
केंशंस को एग्जामिन किया, ला मिनिस्ट्री से  
पूछा, श्री बागला को कंसल्ट किया और सारा  
उस को एग्जामिन किया। हम जितना भी  
उस को पूरी तरह कर सकते थे हम ने किया।  
अब उसी के साथ आज जो एक इंटरनेशनल  
सिचुएशन भी जो आज बैंकप्राउन्ड है उस को  
भी हमें अपने सामने रखना है। आज एक  
चीज दुनिया के सामने है, कश्मीर ईश्यू का  
एक सवाल पेश है और हम यह भी जानते  
हैं कि दुनिया में आम तौर पर उस के बारे में  
कैसी और क्या ओपीनियन है, क्या राय है,  
एक पोलिटिकल सिचुएशन है उस सिचुएशन  
में हमें कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं करनी चाहिए  
जिससे हम रौंग या फाल्स में पड़ जायं या  
यह कहा जाय कि देखो भाई यह हमें पानी भी  
नहीं देते हैं। पाकिस्तान कह सकता है कि  
यह भारत हमें पानी नहीं देता है तो अगर  
हम कश्मीर को चाहते हैं या मांगते हैं तो क्या  
हम शलती करते हैं? यह तो हम को पानी  
देने को तैयार नहीं तो फिर इसलिए कश्मीर  
का हमारा क्लेम करना कोई शलत चीज  
नहीं है। बहुत से ऐसे इश्यूज हैं, जिन को  
पाकिस्तान रोक कर सकता है, जिस से दुनिया  
के सामने हमारी पोजीशन शलत साबित हो।

इस एग्जामेंट में एक पिनल्टी क्लोज है।  
अगर हम यह पेमेंट नहीं करते हैं, तो इस बारे  
में एक इंटरनेशनल ऐजन्सी सैट अप की जा  
सकती है, जो कि इस सारे मैटर को देखे,  
एग्जामिन करे और जहां तक मालूम होता है,

आवियसली हम उस में चलती में पाये जायेंगे, क्योंकि हम पेमेंट नहीं करते हैं। इन टर्मज् आफ़ दि एग्ज़ीमेंट धरर इस तरह की कोई इन्टरनेशनल बाडी सेट अप हो, तो हमारे सामने एक आफ़वर्ड सिटुएशन ध्रायेगी। हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि वह कहाँ तक ठीक होगा। मान लीजिये कि धरर पिनेल्टी उस रकम से भी ज्यादा हो जाये, जो हम एक्स्ट्रासली पेमेंट कर रहे हैं, तो पोसीशन धीर ख़राब हो जाती है। पिनेल्टी कम हो या ज्यादा, वह एक अलग बात है, लेकिन हमें इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना है कि दुनिया के सामने हमारी पिक्ट्यर या इमेज शलत न बने।

डा० लोहिया साहब ने जो यह कहा कि या तो एक दम लड़ाई धीर या पीस, वह लाजिकली तो ठीक है, मगर दुनिया तो बिल्कुल इस तरह नहीं चलती है कि या कम्पलीट एंड टोटल वार धीर या टोटल पीस। दुनिया में धाम तोर पर बीच की पोसीशन चलती है। कहीं कुछ पीस भी है, कहीं कन्फ्लिक्ट है, कहीं सैटलमेंट धीर कम्प्रोमाइस है, कहीं नहीं है। पाकिस्तान ने हम पर जो एटेक किया, एग्ज़ेन किया, उस का हम ने मजबूती से जवाब दिया धीर मैंने हमेशा कहा है कि धरर कोई ऐसी सिटुएशन फिर ध्रायेगी, तो हम उस का जवाब देंगे, क्योंकि हम ने अपनी नेशन धीर देश की धानर धीर इन्टेग्रिटी को बचाना है। लेकिन जब हम यह कहते हैं, तो उस के मानी ये नहीं है कि दूसरे मैटर्ज में भी हम बिल्कुल एक्स्ट्रीम व्यू लें। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन्टरनेशनल दुनिया तो इतनी इम्प्लिकैशन में नहीं जाती है धीर न हमारी फ़ीलिंग्स को समझती है।

**श्री हरि किष्णु कावत :** उस को समझाना पड़ेगा।

**श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री :** हमारी इस कार्यवाही से दुनिया यह समझेगी कि भारत एक रीजनेबल मुक्त है, उस ने इतनी क्रिटिकल सिटुएशन में रहते हुए भी, जिस में कन्फ्लिक्ट धीर एक तरह की वार भी,

दूसरी साइड्स में एक रीजनेबल व्यू धीर एट्टीट्यूड धरनाया है।

जैसा कि मैं ने कहा है, इस में बात तो डायरेक्टली वर्ल्ड बैंक की धाली है। श्री इन्वजीत गुत ने इस बारे में कुछ कहा है। यह ठीक है कि हम वर्ल्ड बैंक को देवता नहीं मानते हैं हम उस की पूजा नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन यह भी ठीक है कि हम उस को होस्टाइल समझ कर डंडे, लाठी धीर राइफल से भी नहीं मारते हैं। इस बारे में एक बैलेंसड व्यू लेना पड़ता है। जहाँ तक इकोनोमिक डेवलपमेंट का तात्पर्य है, हम ने धरने प्लान्ज में, वर्ल्ड बैंक की मदद ली है धीर हम को उस से काफी बड़ी सहायता धीर ऐड मिली है। इस का मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम हमेशा उस पर निर्भर रहना चाहते हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि जहाँ तक हो, हम सैल्फ-रिलायंट बनें, लेकिन सैल्फ-रिलायंट एक दिन या एक बरस में नहीं बना जा सकता है। ऐसी हालत में हम को इन तमाम फैक्टर्ज को कन्सिडरेशन में ले कर वर्ल्ड बैंक के प्रति धरना एट्टीट्यूड धीर कब धरनाना पड़ता है।

इस लिए माननीय सदस्यों से मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हम उन की भावनाओं धीर फीलिंग्स को धरणी तरह समझते हैं—समझ सकते हैं। इस की वजह से कुछ लोगों के मन में बेचैनी हो, वह भी हम समझ सकते हैं। मगर धब सारी बातों धीर तमाम पृष्ठभूमि को देखते हुए हमें मुनासिब लगता है कि जो फ़ैसला गवर्नमेंट ने किया है, वह फ़ैसला हो गया है धीर हाउस को उसे मानना चाहिए।

**श्री हरि किष्णु कावत :** क्या वर्ल्ड बैंक इस बात की गारण्टी दे सकता है कि पाकिस्तान इस पूँजी का हिन्दुस्तान पर फिर धाकधम करने के लिये दुस्व्ययोग नहीं करेगा।

**श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री :** हम नहीं जानते हैं कि वर्ल्ड बैंक कब कह सकता है या नहीं कह सकता है।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : क्या वह गारण्टी दे सकता है ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : वह क्या गारण्टी देगा, लेकिन पाकिस्तान जो करेगा, उस का जवाब हम देंगे ।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : मिल कर देंगे ।

श्री मधु लिमये : कच्छ सीमा के बारे में छः सात साल पहले हुए करार, सिन्धु नदी के पानी के बंटवारे के करार और अन्य करारों में दोस्ती, सहयोग और सद्भावना की जो बातें रहती हैं, उन सब बातों का जब उल्लंघन होता है, तो क्या सरकार इन सन्धियों के बारे में पुनर्विचार नहीं कर सकती है और यह जो हम किस्त दे रहे हैं, पानी दे रहे हैं क्या हम कम से कम उन को स्थगित नहीं कर सकते हैं ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : हम ने सब कुछ सोचा था । इस पर जरूर विचार किया गया था । स्थगित करने की बात भी सोची थी, मगर तमाम बातों को देखते हुए हमें इस समय यही लगा कि अभी यही कदम उठाना ठीक है ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : जब सरकार को पता है कि पाकिस्तान ने धमरीका को यह भ्रष्टावासन दिया था कि नेपाम बम और दूसरे हथियारों को हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जायेगा और फिर भी उस ने उन को इस्तेमाल किया, तो फिर सरकार के पास इस बात की क्या गारण्टी है कि हम जो रुपया पाकिस्तान को हम दे रहे हैं, वह इस को डिफेंस पर खर्च के लिए इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा ? जब पाकिस्तान धमरीका के साथ झूठ बोल सकता है, वर्ल्ड पालिटिक्स में लोगों को धोखा दे सकता है तो इस बात की क्या गारण्टी है कि वह अपना वादा निभायेगा ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : अभी इस बात की गंजाइस नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान के पास

वह रुपया जायेगा या वह उस का इस्तेमाल करेगा ।

श्री नाथ बाई : भाखिर प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां भा गये और . . . . .

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Please speak in English.

Shri Nath Pal: I am sorry, my hon. friend from Mysore has requested me to speak in English. I am grateful to the Prime Minister for.....

एक माननीय सदस्य : हिन्दी में बोलिये ।

श्री नाथ बाई : मुझे समाधान है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां उपस्थित हो गए और उन्होंने खुद जवाब दिया । क्या माननीय संसद्-कार्य मंत्री का यह काम नहीं था कि हमें इस बात की इतिहा दी जाये कि वह भा रहे हैं, जब कि सुबह से हम ने इस बात की क्वाहिश जाहिर की थी कि भाज की बहस का उत्तर प्रधान मंत्री की तरफ से दिया जाये ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : मैं एक मीटिंग में था और जैसे ही पांच बजने में पांच मिनट बाकी रहे, मैं वहां से बहुत तेजी से दौड़ा प्राया यहां घाने के लिए । मैं पहले नहीं भा सका ।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : इस की पूर्ण सूचना नहीं मिली ।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : वह मिल जानी चाहिए थी ।

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : मैं अभी उठा ही था कि

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motions 2 and 4 are disapproval motions. I will take them first. Is Shri Yashpal Singh withdrawing his motion?

Shri Yashpal Singh: No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then I will first put substitute motion No. 2 to the vote of the House.

The substitute motion No. 2 was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Prakash Vir Shastri is not here. I will put his substitute motion, No. 4, to the vote of the House.

The substitute motion No. 4 was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does Shri Madhu Limaye want his substitute motion to be put to the vote?

श्री मधुलिमये : जी हां

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put substitute motion No. 1 to the vote of the House.

The substitute motion No. 1 was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri and Shri S. M. Banerjee are not present. I will put substitute motion No. 3 to the vote of the House.

The substitute motion No. 3 was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Bade, Shri Kachhavaia and Shri Yudhvir Singh are not present. I will now put substitute motion No. 5 to the vote of the House.

The substitute motion No. 5 was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The discussion is over.

17. 20 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, November 11, 1965/Kartika 20, 1887 (Saka).