

in Notification No. S.O. 4588 in Gazette of India dated the 21st December, 1967, under section 296 of the Income-tax Act, 1961. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-216/68.]

(2) A copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 :—

(i) G.S.R. 278 published in Gazette of India dated the 7th February, 1968.

(ii) G.S.R. 279 published in Gazette of India dated the 7th February, 1968.

(iii) G.S.R. 280 published in Gazette of India dated the 7th February, 1968.

(iv) G.S.R. 281 published in Gazette of India dated the 7th February, 1968.

(v) G.S.R. 320 published in Gazette of India dated the 17th February, 1968.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-215/68.]

(3) A copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 and section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944 :—

(i) The Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Twenty-second Amendment Rules, 1968, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 318 in Gazette of India dated the 17th February, 1968.

(ii) The Customs & Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Twenty-third Amendment Rules, 1968, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 319 in Gazette of India dated the 17th February, 1968. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-217/68.]

PROCLAMATION BY PRESIDENT UNDER ARTICLE 356 OF THE CONSTITUTION AND REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF U.P.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : On behalf of Shri Y. B. CHAVAN, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers :—

(1) Proclamation dated the 25th February, 1968, issued by the President under article 356 of the Constitution, assuming to himself all functions of the Government of the State of Uttar Pradesh.

(2) Order dated the 25th February, 1968, made by the President, in pursuance of sub-clause (1) of clause (c) of the Proclamation at item No. (1) above.

(3) Report of the Governor of Uttar Pradesh, dated the 22nd February, 1968 to President. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-215/68.]

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS (GENERAL) 1967-68

SHRI K. C. PANT : On behalf of Shri Morarji Desai I beg to present a statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1967-68.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

TWENTIETH REPORT

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I beg to present the Twentieth Report of the Public Accounts Committee on Review of Defence Budget—Consolidation of Revenue Demands.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

FORTYFIFTH REPORT

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH : I beg to present the Fortyfifth Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of

Finance—Review of Defence Budget—
Consolidation of Revenue Demands.

12.06 Hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN
THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER : The House will now take up the Motion of No-confidence in the Council of Ministers to be moved by Shri Bal Raj Madhok.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : Sir, I beg to move :

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers."

I am moving this motion of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers for their failure to discharge the most elementary duties that is, to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country. According to all political scientists all through the history this has been considered the first duty of any government worth the name, and this government has been failing in discharging this duty all through.

Twenty years back the leaders of the party which rules today let down this country when they accepted partition in spite of their opposition to two-nation theory, and a large part of the country was given away to Pakistan. Then, what remained, that at least should have been protected. But, even that has not been protected. Soon after the achievement of freedom and partition, Pakistan attacked Kashmir. It was an unprovoked aggression and we could have thrown Pakistan out. But, instead of doing that, we rushed to UNO, then we had a cease-fire and the result was that Pakistan got 35,000 sq. miles of our territory. Pakistan is sitting tight over that territory, and that was the fruit of aggression that she got at that time, and that set the pattern of Indo-Pak relations. Even since, Pakistan has been following an aggressive policy towards India. Her rulers first make fantastic claims, then occupy our territory and we sit tightly in the name of peace, in the name of international agreements and

all that. This has been the pattern. If you look at the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, Nehru-Noon Pact, Indus Water Agreement or the Swaran Singh Sheik Agreement, the same pattern follows and Pakistan stands to gain by it every time.

The rulers and leaders of Pakistan realise that an aggressive policy against India pays a rich dividend. They have a vested interest in keeping up tension with India because they realise that if they learn to co-exist with India in peace the very *raison d'être* for existence of Pakistan as a separate State will disappear. So, whatever the excuse be, they will keep up the tension. We are always surrendering before them, and the present case of Kutch is the latest of that series of surrenders before the enemies of the country at the cost of India's territorial integrity.

Now, what is this Kutch question? When India was partitioned, Pakistan was given Sind, Baluchistan, North West Frontier Province, a part of Punjab and a part of Bengal. The boundary of Sind was well-defined. Only the boundary of Pakistan in Punjab and in Bengal was laid down by Radcliffe Award. Therefore, if anything was to be settled in regard to boundaries between India and Pakistan, it was in regard to that half of Punjab and half of Bengal, and there too Radcliffe had laid down the principles. He had drawn the maps and given description on paper and he had laid down in his award itself that where there is discrepancy between the map and the description given on the paper, then that description on the paper should be taken as the final word. Therefore whatever territorial or boundary disputes we had with Pakistan, they pertained only to Bengal and the Punjab.

So far as the boundary of Sindh and Kutch is concerned, there was no question of a dispute. It had been settled for centuries past and anyone who goes to Kutch and sees the whole area can see it for himself. I was there only yesterday. The Rann does not lie between Kutch and Sind; it lies entirely in Kutch. There is a *banni* or bank on this side of Kutch and a *banni* or bank on the other side of the Rann. That is called Dhara Banni. Beyond that,