

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED OCCUPATION OF 10 SQ. MILES OF INDIAN TERRITORY BY PAKISTAN

Mr. Speaker: Calling attention notice (*Interruption*).

Shri Hem Barua (Maugaldai): Spoke in Assamese—

The trouble is, may I tell you point-blank, that you have departed from the convention....

Mr. Speaker: Today I have.

Shri Hem Barua: Parliament has unhappily been reduced to a pandemonium, to a mockery.

Mr. Speaker: Let him read out his notice.

Shri Hem Barua: How can I read it out when there is so much noise all round?

I call the attention of Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

Reported occupation of 10 square miles of Indian territory by Pakistan in Ichaichari-Patichari maujas of Tripura.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Since partition, Pakistan has been raising a territorial claim on an area of about 5 and not 10 square miles situated on the headwaters of the Fenny river on Tripura-East Pakistan border. This area lies between the Fenny river (Asalong channel) on the east and the Ranga Fenny on the west. The boundary in this area has not yet been demarcated. Pakistan claims that her boundary is upto Ranga Fenny whereas we maintain that Asalong channel forms the boundary between East Pakistan and Tripura.

This question was discussed at the Minister level conference between India and Pakistan held in 1959 wherein it was agreed that both the Governments should

further study the records relating to this problem and indicate their respective positions for further discussion between the two Governments. The examination of the records on both sides was made but the representatives of the two Governments could not arrive at a mutually acceptable position.

With the object of maintaining peace on the border in this sector pending demarcation of the international boundary, it had been decided by the civil authorities on both sides on 20th April, 1958 that *status quo* should be maintained in respect of the disputed portion of the land. Pakistan, however, did not honour this agreement. Their Police personnel began intruding into this area soon after the signing of this agreement. There were frequent troubles including armed clashes due to the aggressive attitude of the East Pakistan Rifles personnel. Following some serious incidents, a cease-fire agreement was arrived at on 15 October, 1962. The agreement also provided that all the border forces of both sides should withdraw from the disputed area. The Government of Pakistan again did not honour the agreement. They not only concentrated East Pakistan Rifles personnel in this area but also started inducting their nationals into the area and collecting land revenue and Gharchukti taxes from the people in the disputed territory. The matter was taken up with the Government of Pakistan at various levels but without any success.

After the signing of the Tashkent Declaration the GOC-in-C, Eastern Command (India) and GOC, 14 Infantry Division (Pakistan) met on February 1, 1966 to devise measures for reducing tension on the borders. In pursuance of these decisions arrived at this meeting, the Sector Commanders of the two countries met in Belonia town on 13th February, 1966. At this meeting the two sides agreed to maintain the *status quo* in this area. There have been no further developments in this regard so far.

This matter was first discussed in connection with Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 837 answered on 12th April, 1965. A statement giving a list of areas held

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

in adverse possession by Pakistan which included the Ichaichari-Patichari Mauzas was also placed on the Table of the House on 10th March, 1966.

Shri Hem Barua : Prior to the occupation of this portion of Indian territory on the Tripura-East Pakistan border by Pakistan there was a sort of a shooting war between India and Pakistan. Then a cease-fire agreement was signed by both the parties on the 15th October, 1962 and the cease-fire agreement stipulates that pending settlement of the problem or the dispute, *status quo* shall be maintained both by India and Pakistan. Now what has happened? Since 15th October, 1962 Pakistan has not only occupied the entire territory of five square miles but has extended her jurisdiction over ten square miles and, at the same time, imposed her civil administration there, built roads and houses and established schools. True it is that the Tripura State Government has sent protest notes to Pakistan but as usual Pakistan has consigned those protest notes to the waste paper basket. In that connection may I know why is it that our Government have not told Pakistan pointblank that by violating the *status quo* Pakistan has violated the cease-fire agreement and that if she continues to violate the cease-fire agreement India will have no other alternative but the painful alternative of sending her troops in the area to re-occupy this territory because according to the Radcliffe Award this territory belongs to India and not to Pakistan?

An hon. Member: Well said.

Shri M. C. Chagla : We have protested to Pakistan and pointed out in no unmistakable terms that she has violated both the *status quo* and the cease-fire agreement. Our position is quite clear. We say that if it is a disputed area, the *status quo* must be observed and the cease-fire must be there till the dispute is resolved. But, unfortunately, as I have pointed out, Pakistan has intruded into this and occupied it.

Shri Hem Barua: What about Pakistan violating the cease-fire agreement?

Shri M. C. Chagla : That is what I am pointing out. We have pointed out to Pakistan that she has violated the cease-fire agreement.

Shri Hem Barua: The hon. Minister has said that he has pointed out to Pakistan that Pakistan has violated the cease-fire agreement. That is a patent fact. Everybody knows it that Pakistan has violated the cease-fire agreement. Would he rest on his oars and would he rest on the fact that he has pointed out the violation of the cease-fire agreement to Pakistan or would he go and move a step further to reoccupy the territory? That is what I wanted to know from him.

Shri M. C. Chagla : We are still trying at the diplomatic level to persuade Pakistan to withdraw from this area which she has unlawfully occupied.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : क्या कर्मा मंत्री महोदय इस बात पर सोचते हैं कि इस देश को आवादी 51 करोड़ है और पाकिस्तान को आवादी 10-11 करोड़ है ? आपको लोक संख्या करीब पांच गुना है। साधनों में आप ज्यादा शक्तिशाली हैं। ऐसा होते हुए भी पिछले बौस वर्ष में एक एक करके हमारे देश के कई टुकड़े पाकिस्तान के हाथ में चले जा रहे हैं। उसका विवरण भी दिया गया है। आजाद काश्मीर को आपने नहीं जोड़ा था। लेकिन उसके बगैर यह जितना सारा इलाका है जोकि पाकिस्तान के हाथ में चला गया है इसके बारे में मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह नपुंसक नीति, जो आपकी है, इसको आप कब छोड़ेंगे और जितना इलाका पाकिस्तान ने लिया है उतना ही उसका इलाका जहाँ आपके लिये सम्भव होगा, उसको आप कब लेने का फंसला करेंगे ? क्या कितना दिन आप यह काम करेंगे कि जितना इलाका उन्होंने लिया है उतना आप भी लेंगे ? भ्रमर आप से लेते हैं उनका ताँ क्या आप नहीं समझते हैं कि वे बातचीत के लिये तैयार हो जायेंगे और तब कोई सम्मानपूर्ण समझौता हो जायेगा ? मैं अपने प्रश्न का सीधा जवाब चाहता हूँ।

यह नपुंसक नीति अद्य कब छोड़ेंगे कि हमारे देश के लिये लाँछन है . . .

Mr. Speaker: You need not repeat it. Once is all right. Repetition is not going to help.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह मामूली सवाल नहीं है। चागला साहब ने तो नहीं हमने वचन से ही आजादी का लड़ाई लड़ी है। हमने कभी नहीं सोचा था कि इस तरह की चीज होगी।

Mr. Speaker: Repeating 'napunsak neeti' half a dozen times is not going to help.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा यह सवाल है कि जितना इलाका उनके कब्जे में चला गया है क्या उतना ही इलाका आप उनका ले लेंगे ताकि कोई सम्मानपूर्ण समझौते का रास्ता खुल जाये ? प्रॉटेस्ट नोट में या राजनीतिक स्तर पर बातचीत करने में यह नहीं होगा।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am painfully conscious of the fact that during these years Pakistan has intruded into our territory and occupied some portions of it. No one feels it more than I do. My hon. friend is not right when he says that. I have been thinking about it.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप खाक फोल करते हैं।

Shri M. C. Chagla: The question is as to what policy we should pursue. My hon. friend suggests a military conflict. He wants us to occupy territories of Pakistan commensurate with the territories which Pakistan has occupied. This is his suggestion for a policy. It would be a drastic change from the policy that we have been pursuing.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या इनकी पालिसी, नीति अपना इलाका छोड़ने की है ? क्या इनकी पालिसी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भूदान यज्ञ की है ?

1926 (A) LSD—2.

Shri M. C. Chagla: No, Sir.

श्री मधु लिमये : ये वचन खाते हैं मुल्क की प्रभुता और भार्वाभिकता की रक्षा की और अब कहते हैं कि इससे पालिसी में बेंज होगा। इसका क्या मतलब है ? देश की प्रभुता और प्रादेशिक अक्षुण्णता की रक्षा करना इनका कर्तव्य है। इसमें कहीं कोई नई नीति नहीं है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: He is not suggesting taking back our territory; he is suggesting occupying the territory in Pakistan.

श्री मधु लिमये : हाँ, अपनी सार्व-भार्वभिकता की रक्षा करने के लिये।

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): Without reciprocal action you cannot deal with Pakistan.

Shri Piloos Mody (Godha): What is the purpose of your policy?

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : मैं मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान इस बात की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने 31 जुलाई, 1967 को यह सवाल पूछा था कि हमारे कौन कौन से एरियाज पाकिस्तान के एडवर्स पोजीशन में हैं और कौन से डिस्पूटिड एरियाज हैं। माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने बताया कि त्रिपुरा-ईस्ट पाकिस्तान बार्डर पर इच्छाचारी-पटीचारी विसेज डिस्पूटिड टैरीटरी है। उन्होंने उसको एडवर्स पोजीशन की सूची में नहीं दिया। उन्होंने भागलपुर विसेज नियर भगरताला एयरोड्रोम को एडवर्स पोजीशन में बताया। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी केवल छः गज जमीन पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है। लेकिन आज वह कहते हैं कि पांच मील है, जब कि चीफ मिनिस्टर कहते हैं कि हमारी दस मील जमीन पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह जान-बूझ कर हाउस को मिसगैड करना चाहते हैं या जो पाप उन्होंने किया है, उसको छिपाना चाहते हैं और इस तरह अपने देश के हिस्सों को दुश्मनों की तलारी में डेते जाना और

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त]

उसको लोक सभा तथा देश से छिपाना कहाँ तक उचित है। इस बारे में स्पष्टीकरण दें।

क्या मंत्री महोदय बगैर लोक सभा को बताए, बगैर यहाँ स्टेटमेंट दिये, बगैर कोई व्हाइट पेपर निकाले पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता कर सकते हैं कि वह हमारे किसी हिस्से पर कब्जा किये रखे ? यह इलाका एक बार हमने वापिस ले लिया था, लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने जबदस्ती दोबारा उस को ले लिया है। क्या सरकार की यह पालिसी नहीं है कि वह पाकिस्तान के साथ रिसीप्रोकल बेसिस पर व्यवहार करे—जो पाकिस्तान करे, उसके बदले में हम भी वैसा ही स्टेप्स लें, अगर नहीं है, और अगर हमारे प्रोटेस्ट नोट का कोई असर नहीं होता है, तो सरकार क्या कार्यवाही करेगी ?

Shri M. C. Chagla : My hon. friend is not fair to me. If he will look at the statement which he refers to, the heading clearly points out the disputed areas on the India-China and Indo-Pakistan borders under possession of foreign countries. When we deal with Pakistan we have mentioned this very area, that is, Ichai-chari and Patichari Mauzas in the Fenny River area. The position with regard to areas in possession of Pakistan is that certain areas are in dispute and we have pointed out which of these areas are in possession of Pakistan. About other areas there is no dispute; Pakistan admits our claim but Pakistan has not handed over to us those areas because she says not till the final settlement takes place. We have some areas also which we admit belong to Pakistan.

Shri Hem Barua : Do not forget one thing, that Pakistan has occupied all the disputed areas.

Shri M. C. Chagla : There are areas, as I said, which are in possession of Pakistan about which there is no dispute.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok : How do you call them disputed ? Because Pakistan disputes them ? You have yourself said that according to the Radcliffe Award this area belongs to us.

Shri M. C. Chagla : I cannot help Pakistan disputing it; can I ?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok : Then, any area disputed by Pakistan will become Pakistan's, is it ?

श्री भृगु लिभये : क्या दिल्ली भी डिस्पूटिड एरिया है ?

Shri M. C. Chagla : As I said, Pakistan disputes some areas..... (Interruption).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok : It is not an ordinary matter. The Minister must be clear about this.

Shri M. C. Chagla : This particular village, Bhagalpur village, comes in an area which is not disputed. But pending a general settlement where there will be exchange between Pakistan and India of territories which are not disputed, they remain either in possession of Pakistan.. (Interruption).

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta : How does he define the term "disputed" ?

अगर कल पाकिस्तान यह कहे कि दिल्ली भी उसका हिस्सा है, तो क्या वह भी डिस्पूटिड टैरीटरी हो जायेगा ?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok : I want the Prime Ministry to say something about it. We expect, the whole country expects that. Pakistan is in a murderous mood and we expect some kind of an adventure in the next two or three months. If she takes over some more of our area, you will come after two or three months to tell us that more area has been disputed. We want a clear assurance that no part of the country will be allowed to be taken over by Pakistan. This assurance must come from the Prime Minister..... (Interruption).

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे सवाल का जवाब नहीं दिया गया है। मैंने कहा था कि.....

Mr. Speaker : No, please. Nothing to be taken down.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : ***