

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Before I proceed to read my calling attention, I would like to register a protest through you at the practice the Government has developed. Knowing that this matter is pending before you, the Government has tried to reply to it by a so-called spokesman speaking to the press. Now, you have again and again warned the Government not to resort to this kind of devious means. The Government and the Prime Minister knew that the matter was pending and you had admitted my motion and that of another member. I would like to draw your attention to the first page of the *Delhi Statesman* here where it is said that Government thinks that it is so much better that the Mangla Dam has been completed because it will take the burden from India. This is an extraordinary way of treating Parliament that when a motion has been admitted by the Speaker the Government will try to deal with it not by coming to the floor of the house but by taking resort to so-called spokesmen who have confidential talks with the press. I have nothing against informing the press, but Government has a duty to Parliament. This is an organised method. Mr. Chagla did it before and this is repeated. I want your ruling. Either there is meaning in bringing a motion before you, or they go on making a mockery of it. May I know where we stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The normally accepted convention is that when any subject is before the House, no statement is made. No ruling is needed for that. May I request him to put the question.

SHRI NATH PAI: I hope the Prime Minister has heard the Speaker's ruling, and will accordingly advise her colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER: It was a press interview. No Statement was made.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): It is put in the vaguest manner. They do not give the name of anybody, neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of External Affairs. They say spokesman of the Government. If they take to these means, where is the protection?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर): अद्यक्ष महोदय, अभी प्रधान मंत्री एक वक्तव्य करने वाली हैं जो चीन के बारे में जिसमें

कहा जायगा कि स्पोकसमैन ने कुछ कहा हमें पता नहीं है। यह स्पोकसमैन हैं कौन? यह किस के इशारे पर काम करते हैं?

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever it is, after all, when a subject is before the House, naturally the authority of the statement is only from the Ministers, and I wish the spokesmen will not interfere with this, the Minister making a statement.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): We are all thankful to you for your last observation. This is not the first time that the spokesman takes upon himself this responsibility. On an earlier occasion, when the Deputy Prime Minister also was involved, a similar spokesman in another Ministry or the same Ministry committed the same kind of blunder. I hope the Prime Minister will take to heart what you have said, and see that these spokesmen are not multiplied.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): You have rightly wished that the spokesmen would not step in on future occasions like this, but on a previous occasion you wished like that, but your wish has not been implemented by these people. That is the trouble.

12.05 Hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

PRIME MINISTER'S MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT AYUB KHAN RE. MANGLA DAM

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that she may make a statement thereon. The printed form says "he" and so it should be corrected.

"The Prime Minister's message to President Ayub Khan of Pakistan congratulating him on the completion of the Mangla Dam".

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Sir, while overflying West Pakistan on my way to Moscow, as is customary, I sent a message of greetings to the President of Pakistan. I expressed the

(CA)

hope that the successful conclusion of the talks on the restoration of telecommunications would lead to further progress in our mutual relations. I also conveyed my congratulations on the completion of the Mangla Dam. This did not imply any departure from our stand as to the status of the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir on the other side of the cease-fire line.

The Indus Waters treaty was signed by India and Pakistan in September, 1960. It was placed before the Lok Sabha in November, 1960 and ratified in December, 1960. As provided in the preamble, the treaty had for its aim: and I quote:

"the most complete and satisfactory utilisation of the waters of the Indus system of rivers"

by India and Pakistan.

Accordingly, the treaty allocated the waters of the three western rivers, that is, Indus, Jhelum and the Chenab, to Pakistan and those of the Sutlej, Ravi and the Beas to India. As provided in article IV(1) of the treaty, and I quote:

"Pakistan shall use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation with due regard to expedition and economy that part of a system of works which will accomplish 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 the eastern rivers."

Under the aegis of the World Bank, an Indus Development Fund was set up to which a number of countries contributed funds for the replacement works envisaged in the treaty and for connected development works. Under the treaty, India undertook to make a fixed contribution towards the cost of the replacement works in Pakistan.

On the completion of the Mangla Dam, more water will be available to Pakistan which in turn will also enable India to make additional withdrawals from the eastern rivers for her own use. The Indian Commissioner appointed under the terms of the treaty has been periodically visiting the dam site along with his Pakistani counterpart. This fact had been mentioned

in the annual reports of the Indus Commission which were placed on the Table of the House on June 16, 1962 and August 18, 1965. The Indian Commissioner is now discussing the extent of the withdrawals which India can make because of the earlier completion of the Mangla Dam and other works.

The Mangla Dam is located on the international border between the Indian territory of the Jammu and Kashmir State in the occupation of Pakistan and that of West Pakistan. Our protests which relate to a period prior to the conclusion of the Indus Waters Treaty of 1960 were intended to safeguard our sovereign rights over the territory involved. The treaty itself safeguards these rights under article XI(1) (b) as follows:

"Nothing contained in this treaty and nothing arising out of the execution thereof shall be construed as constituting a recognition or waiver (whether tacit, by implication or otherwise), of any rights or claims whatsoever of either of the parties other than those rights or claims which are expressly recognised or waived in this treaty."

On the 16th November, 1959, Prime Minister Nehru said in the Lok Sabha in reply to supplementary questions on starred question No. 2 regarding the Mangla Dam and I quote:

"...the hon. Member is correct in thinking that it (Mangla Dam) may be connected with the canal water issue. In that sense, there is no question of any dispute; the dispute is about Kashmir, if you like. The other is the question of an arrangement about canal waters, about which we are dealing with Pakistan. . .

"...there are two parts of this matter. One is a question that arises over our territory in Kashmir State even though that might now be occupied by Pakistan, and our claim that they should not do anything on the territory which is ours. That is one question which is part of the Kashmir issue. The other question is connected with the canal waters, as to the best use that might be made of canal waters for India and for Pakistan. In that connection, the US Government and the World Bank,

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

and perhaps various other governments, are, at the instance of the World Bank, offering considerable sums of money to Pakistan. That is not our concern—what money they offer to Pakistan in connection with the development of their canal system."

The position of the Government of India was reiterated in this House, in answer to questions, on several occasions, viz. on 17th February, 1960 and 30th November, 1960 by Prime Minister Nehru, and on 31st August, 1961 by his Parliamentary Secretary. There has been no departure whatsoever from that position.

The construction of the Mangla Dam has aroused much international interest not only because of the financial contributions made by a number of foreign countries but also as an engineering feat. A number of Foreign dignitaries are expected to be present at the opening of the Dam. The completion of this irrigation system will now benefit millions of human beings in our neighbouring country and also in our own as it will enable us to draw more water for Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan.

I should like to end by recalling that it has been our firm conviction that India and Pakistan can cooperate with each other in a meaningful way for the benefit of our respective peoples.

SHRI NATH PAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we had originally tabled adjournment motions on this subject. In view of the length of the statement and the importance of the subject, I would plead with you to be a little patient with us, since we have agreed at your behest that it should be taken up as a Calling Attention notice, though the matter deserves to be discussed as an adjournment motion.

The Prime Minister has spoken long, but said very little. Most of what she has said is a second thought. Her single inadvertence has falsified India's position in the UN and made a mockery of the heroic sacrifices of the people of Kashmir and our brave soldiers. Never was so vital a national interest so lightly compromised in such an irresponsible manner. I will refer to the relevant documents. The first is the United Nations Year Book for 1957. This is the Government of India's protest lodged

by the then Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. I would like particularly those who cheered the Prime Minister to see this protest and try to see whether it goes in harmony with the statement just now read by the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Those protests were all made before the Indus Waters Treaty.....

SHRI NATH PAI: The Prime Minister's exact words are:

"I take this opportunity to congratulate the people of Pakistan on the completion of the Mangla Dam which soon you will be formally inaugurating."

When we congratulate, we confer our blessings. Either we take the stand that there is aggression by Pakistan, or has the Government reversed that position and has started acquiescing in Pakistan's aggression in Kashmir? How else can we go on congratulating the enemy unless we want to reward aggression? Only recently we were told that this Government will not sit idle when the aggressor is trying to reap the harvest of aggression. Are the fruits of aggression to be denied only when the aggression is by somebody else against somebody else's territory? But so far as this country is concerned the aggressor can reap the harvest of his aggression. The Government of India's protest is like this:

"In the letter dated 21st August the representative of India referring to a Press report on the subject cited the execution of the Mangla Dam project by the Government of Pakistan as a further instance of Pakistan's consolidating its authority over the Indian territory of Jammu and Kashmir and of the exploitation of that territory to the disadvantage of the people of the State and for the benefit of the people of Pakistan. Pakistan's action, the Indian representative added....(Interruption)

I must, Mr. Speaker, keep it on record. I am not making a speech here. I am citing the authority of the Government of India. The Government of India, again, on 20th January, 1958, used even stronger language and said:

"Thus, for its own benefit Pakistan had taken further steps to exploit the people and the resources of the territory of the Union of India which it continued to occupy in defiance of the Security Council Resolution of 17th January, 1948 and UNCIP Resolution of 13th August, 1948 and 5th January 1949. Moreover, Pakistan was forging ahead (I want the Prime Minister to listen to this) with the construction of the Mangla Dam against pronounced opposition from the people of the area."

Have the people of the area withdrawn their opposition? Do we know the wishes of the people of that area? When you give this blessing on the completion of the Dam, what does it mean? Either the people have withdrawn their opposition or we have given up our position.

Finally, the latest, Mr. Speaker, on this is this protest from the Government of India:

"On 7th August, 1959, India drew attention to a Radio Pakistan broadcast of 17th July, 1959 (this is before the Security Council) the effect that the construction of Mangla Dam was to be speeded up during the year. India called it a further violation by Pakistan of Indian territory."

At least on three occasions, Sir, the Government of India took the position before the Security Council that proceeding with the completion of the Mangla Dam is a violation of the sovereignty of India, is a negation of the wishes of the people of that area and is in utter contempt of the resolutions of the United Nations.

I know something about Indo-Pakistan Indus Valley Treaty. We debated it here. We participated in that debate and I know what was said. Reference has been made to the World Bank and the United States pouring money. You paid Rs. 84 crores of the poor tax-payer's money to Pakistan for its completion. It does not lie in the mouth of the Government which gave Rs. 84 crores of money to Pakistan today to go on pointing accusing fingers on the World Bank.

Sir, now I will ask this question of the Prime Minister. Though she has said that our position remains, how does she recon-

cile her congratulatory message? So far as good wishes are concerned we will go one step further than that. We have no quarrel. While flying over the territory of Pakistan the Prime Minister of India sent good wishes. So far as effort is concerned to improve relations I think we will all agree, but we do not want anybody's friendship at the cost of India's territorial sovereignty. She says we will continue our efforts to improve relations. What is the price? Have we given up the position that we took all these years since 1947 when Pakistan first committed aggression in Kashmir? Have we resiled from that position? In that case, why do we persist in our complaints before the United Nations? If we are not, then why are we not withdrawing our complaints. If our position remains that every inch of Kashmir, the so-called Azad Kashmir of Pakistan, is an integral part of India, how do you give your blessings by this congratulatory message? Does it not amount to acquiescence in aggression? How is she going to undo the damage that this message has done?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Shri Nath Pai has obviously ignored all that I have said in my statement.....

SHRI NATH PAI: I followed it most carefully.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: As I have stated very clearly, our rights remain inviolable. That is made quite clear in my statement. It also stands embodied in the Indus Waters Treaty.

I did state that there has been no change in our position. I can go on repeating it as many times as you like. As I have already explained, the protests relate to a period prior to the signing of the Indus Waters Treaty. The protests were made, as Shri Nath Pai has pointed out, in the years 1957, 1958 and 1959. When the Indus Waters Treaty was signed in 1960, the Treaty itself contained a provision safeguarding our sovereign right on the territory involved, which the protests were intended to protect. Therefore, our position in regard to the Kashmir question is in no way compromised. It is fully safeguarded, as I have said already two or three times, by article XI (1) (b) of the Indus Waters treaty. I do not think we are now discussing the merits or demerits of the Induswaters

Treaty, which has been discussed in this House on many an occasion. Here I should like to read out what Shastriji stated on that occasion when this subject was discussed here. He said:

“उस सिचुएशन में हमें कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं करनी चाहिये जिससे हम रंग या फाल्स में पड़ जायें या कहा जाए कि देखो भाई ये हमें पानी भी नहीं देते हैं। पाकिस्तान कह सकता है कि यह भारत हमें पानी नहीं देता है। तो अगर हम काश्मीर को चाहते हैं या मांगते हैं तो क्या हम गलती करते हैं ?”

We have to view this question in the wider context. I can understand emotions being aroused and I can also sympathize with them. As the House knows, I have been very closely connected with the independence struggle of Kashmir from an early date.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): How does it fit into the picture?

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi): How does emotion come in here? It is a question of fact. How much of territory of Jammu and Kashmir, which belongs to us, has been submerged by this dam? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If hon. Members go on interrupting like this, it will be difficult to proceed.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : We are not talking of emotions; we are asking for facts.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Sir, you in your wisdom should prevent all members, including the Prime Minister, from arousing emotions like that. She has made reference to a fact which is totally irrelevant.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : इधर बीस साल से हिन्दुस्तान को कानूनी और शाब्दिक माया जाल में फंसाया जा रहा है। एक-एक कर हमारी भूमि का हिस्सा विदेशियों के हाथ में चला जा रहा है। उस पर वे इस तरह के डैम बना रहे हैं, लदाख में सड़कें बना रहे हैं, लाठी-टीला डुमाबाड़ी इलाके में फौजी बन्दोबस्त बंकरस आदि का कर रहे हैं। इस तरह के

सारे काम विदेशी हमारी भूमि पर कर रहे हैं। इन सारे कामों को आशीर्वाद दे रहे हैं सरकारी प्रवक्ता। साथ-साथ सदन को बेवकूफ बनाने के लिए यह भी कह रहे हैं कि हमने अपनी प्रभुसत्ता को कहां छोड़ा है, सावरन राइट्स तो हैं ही। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस तरह की बातों का कोई मतलब नहीं रहता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार एक दफा सदन के सामने और देश के सामने आए और यह साफ-साफ कहे कि यह प्रभुसत्ता का या सार्वभौम अधिकारों की जो हम बात करते हैं वह बकवास है, उस का कोई मतलब नहीं है, जो इलाका चला गया है वह हमेशा के लिए चला गया है, हम लोगों में हिम्मत नहीं है, उसको वापिस लेने की। हम देख चुके हैं कि हमारे फौजियों ने खून बहा कर हाजीपीर ऊड़ी पुंछ, टियवाल, कारगिल आदि के इलाके को ले लिया और उसके बाद इन्होंने ताशकन्द के तहत उसको वापिस दे दिया। हो सकता है कि यह भी ताशकन्द के वातावरण में आकर किया गया हो। यह भी हो सकता है कि हम पर दबाव डाला जा रहा है अमरीका की ओर से या रूस की ओर से, किसी से भी हो, उससे मुझे कोई मतलब नहीं है। विदेशी ताकतें हम लोगों के ऊपर दबाव डाल रही हैं यह भी हो सकता है कि ताशकन्द के प्रभाव में आकर ही यह सन्देश भेजा गया हो क्योंकि वह रूस जा रही थीं और वहां से लौट रही थीं। इसलिए हो सकता है कि मंगला डैम के सम्पन्न होने पर उन्होंने अपना आशीर्वाद और शुभकामनाओं का सन्देश दिया हो।

आज में प्रधान मंत्री से साफ-साफ जवाब चाहता हूँ कि एक ओर जब वह प्रभुसत्ता की बात करती हैं और कहती हैं कि वह हमारा इलाका है तो क्या वह ऐसा मानती हैं कि करोड़ों रुपया खर्च करने के बाद जो डैम बना है, जो सड़कें बनती हैं, जो फौजी बंकर आदि बनाये जाते हैं या दूसरे काम किये जाते हैं इन सब को करने के पश्चात् क्या कभी यह इलाका हम को वापिस मिलने वाला है ?

(CA)

में इसका साफ जवाब चाहता हूँ। जब तक इसकी सफाई नहीं होगी तब तक इस तरह के वक्तव्यों का कोई मतलब नहीं है।

एक और बात में कहना चाहता हूँ। इस सदन के सामने इन्होंने अनलाफुल एक्टिविटीज बिल रखा था

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह दूसरी चीज है।

श्री मधु लिमये : इसी से सम्बन्ध है। अगर हमारी भूमि का कोई हिस्सा विदेशियों को देने की बात करने वाली संस्था या व्यक्ति हो तो उस पर रोक लगाने के लिए यह अनलाफुल एक्टिविटीज बिल लाया गया था और मैं समझता हूँ कि सब से ज्यादा हमारी भूमि के हिस्से को अलग करने का काम अगर किसी ने किया है तो इन लोगों ने किया है। मेरा आरोप यह है कि इस तरह के आशीर्वाद और शुभकामनाओं के सन्देश दे कर एक तरह से हमारे ऊपर बलात्कार और अत्याचार करने वाले लोगों के साथ उन्होंने अपनी सहानुभूति प्रकट की है। इस वास्ते जो प्रश्न मैंने किया है उसका मैं साफ-साफ जवाब चाहता हूँ।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : यह प्रश्न बहुत दफा यहां उठाया गया है और बहुत दफा इसका उत्तर भी दिया गया है। इसका उत्तर हमारे दो पहले प्रधान मंत्री भी दे चुके हैं। और आज मैं भी इसके लिये तैयार हूँ—एक दफा नहीं, दो दफा नहीं, हजार बार या जितनी भी बार आप कहें मैं उत्तर देने को तैयार हूँ। मैं कह रही थी कि हमारी जो जम्मू काश्मीर पर राय है, जो हमारा स्टैंड है, चाहे सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में हो और चाहे यहां हो, वह स्टैंड वही है, उससे हम जरा भी पीछे नहीं हटे हैं

श्री मधु लिमये : आप स्टैंड की बात कर रही हैं, मैंने भूमि की बात की है।

श्री नाथ पाई : भूमि से हटते हैं स्टैंड से नहीं।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : हमारा जो डिटर-मिनेशन है वह भी उतना ही मजबूत है। लेकिन हम किस तरह से उन चीजों के बारे में बात करें, वह प्रश्न हमारे सामने जरूर आता है। लेकिन मंगला डैम बन गया

श्री म० ला० सोंधी (नई दिल्ली) : इजराईल ने जब ले ली तब तो आप कहते हैं कि वह छोड़ दे (इंटरप्वांज)

SHRI NATH PAI: The Prime Minister is prepared to give up our territory but not our stand.

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : हम अब भी उतने ही जोर से कहते हैं कि हमारी जमीन जो भी दुश्मन ने ली है वह उनको छोड़नी चाहिये। एक सैंकिड के लिए भी नहीं कह रहे हैं (इंटरप्वांज)

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप तो बधाई देती हैं।

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. It is not proper to interrupt like this. When a question is asked, they must patiently hear the reply. Whether they like it or not, they have to hear it patiently.

श्री मधु लिमये : जवाब कहाँ आया है ? उत्तर आना चाहिये। हमारे इलाके पर डैम बन रहे हैं, सड़कें बन रही हैं, फोर्टिफिकेशन बन रहे हैं, फिर भी यह कह रही हैं कि हमारी भूमि है। ये हमारी सीमा के अन्दर हैं, पूछ लीजिये इन को।

MR. SPEAKER: She has given her reply. Now Shri D.C. Sharma is not here. Shri Kachwai.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : Are you convinced with her reply? स्टैंड नहीं छोड़ती हैं, जमीन छोड़ती जा रही हैं।

MR. SPEAKER: The question was about roads and all that.

श्री मधु लिमये : डैम फोरटिफिकेशन, सड़कें एक ही चीज हैं। विदेशी लोग बना रहे हैं हमारी भूमि पर।

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) : Let her complete her reply.

MR. SPEAKER : She has given the reply.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I was in the middle of my reply when they shouted me down. Therefore, I sat down.

श्री मधु लिमये : अनुशासित करने के लिए स्वीकर हैं। आप को इसकी जरूरत नहीं है।

SHRI NATH PAI : There was no question of shouting her down. Nobody has shouted her down. Sir, is it fair to say that she was shouted down? All that we did was to ask for an elucidation. The only simple point is this. She stands firm on her stand. What about standing firm on our territory? Give a reply to this.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Unless there is some order, I am not going to request the Prime Minister to say anything. Every minute, there is shouting. You do not allow anybody to speak.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Whatever it is, since the question has been posed, the Prime Minister should give a clarification.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The position has not changed in any way...

SHRI NATH PAI : The territory has changed.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The territory has not changed.....

SHRI K. N. TIWARY (Bettiah) : Why interruption? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Even one sentence you do not allow her to say.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Pakistan has occupied certain areas of Indian territory. We have made clear what we feel about this and also our intention of taking back Indian territory. In this position, there is no change. The building of the Mangla Dam does not change this in any way. This was, as I read out from Shastriji's statement, merely some thing...

AN HON. MEMBER : It has changed now.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It has not changed. On the contrary, it has been accepted in the Indus Waters Treaty, as I read out here. This does not, in any way constitute a recognition of a waiver of our rights or claims. Therefore, this position is very clear and unambiguous. (Interruption). In our eyes that territory remains Indian territory. As I said, what is involved here is the much wider question as to how we deal with these matters, whether it is a question only of talking about it or whether something else can be done about it.....

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Which will you prefer?

SHRI K. N. TIWARY : Why this running commentary?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : As far as the Jan Sangh is concerned, we have had a very basic difference of opinion with them right from the beginning..... (Interruptions)

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK : This is no reply.....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. I am requesting for order now.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा कहना यह है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी हम पर कृपा क्यों कर रही हैं? उन को सारे देश का संतोष करना है। यह किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री जी पार्टियों को बांटने की कोशिश न करें।

श्री मधु लिमये : यही तो चालाकी है। इस चालाकी में प्रश्न खत्म हो गया।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अभी श्री मधु लिमये के प्रश्न का उत्तर देते हुए कहा है कि हमारा जो स्टैंड है, हम उस को छोड़ नहीं सकते। क्या हम यह मान लें कि पिछले बीस सालों से पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर के कुछ हिस्से को जो गुलाम काश्मीर बना रखा है, अपने स्टैंड के हिसाब से वह उसे छुड़ाने में असमर्थ हैं? क्या इस बात का कोई हिसाब

है कि मंगला डैम में कितनी भूमि जल में डूबेगी ? वहाँ से जो लोग उजाड़े गए और जिन को जम्मू-काश्मीर में बसाया गया, उन को अभी तक कोई मुआवजा नहीं दिया गया। उन को यह आश्वासन दिया गया था कि उनको वापस भेजा जायेगा। मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब गुलाम काश्मीर हमें वापस मिल जायेगा, तो क्या सरकार मंगला डैम को तुड़वाने के लिए तैयार होगी।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : यह बात तो सब डैम्प के बारे में कही जा सकती है। हम ने जितने भी डैम बनाए हैं, लोगों को वहाँ से हटाना पड़ा। यह तो बिल्कुल दूसरा प्रश्न है। अगर कोई डैम बनाने से सारी जनता को लाभ पहुंचता है, उन की ज़मीन की सिंचाई होती है, तो उस के लिए ज़मीन तो लेनी पड़ती है। मुझे तो मालूम नहीं था कि अभी मैं ने जो कुछ कहा है, वह कहना कुछ इनसल्ट होगा। शायद श्री वाजपेयी मेरी बात को समझे नहीं। मैंने तो खाली यह कहा है कि एक डिफरेंस ऑफ ओपीनियन है। समझ में नहीं आता कि उस से ये लोग नाराज क्यों हों।

(इंटरप्वांज)

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK : The question is: how much territory has been submerged?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : When one is not allowed to finish a sentence, then they do not know what one is going to say. They start making a noise before one is allowed to finish.

What I was trying to say is this. In the manner of looking at various things, we have had a basic difference of opinion with them. I am not trying to divide anybody. I want to finish with this matter before I come to the other questions. From the beginning, it is a question of how one deals with another nation or another person. It does not mean giving up one's rights or, in any way, weakening one's case. Surely, nobody can think Gandhiji was weak on any issue. When it came to a question of making payments to Pakistan in the middle of a conflict, he insisted that we should pay our share. Similarly, during the last conflict, Shastriji approved of the payment

of our instalment. So, what I am saying is that nothing new has happened. We have had a particular outlook. We are determined not to say anything which might prejudice our national interest in any way. On this, we all stand solid. But on the other hand, we must not say anything that provides grist to the mill of Pakistani propaganda which, I am sorry, we do quite often in this House.... (Interruptions)

SHRI NATH PAI : It is a reflection on this House.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : She may be having some difficulties in the Congress Working Committee....(Interruptions)

SHRI HEM BARUA : It is a reflection on the House.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : We are arguing in the national interest; she is talking of party interest..... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You can take it up later on. Now it is a separate question.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have not said, this side or that side..... (Interruptions) I am not accusing anybody; I am not saying that they are doing this through malice or lack of national interest. They are giving wrong meaning to what I have said.

SHRI HEM BARUA : It is a reflection on the House.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Now, the total fill volume involved is 122 million cubic yards; about 80,000 people have been affected and the area of 65,000 acres has been submerged.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : She has given that number also.

Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri.

श्री हुकम चंद कछवाय : उजड़े हुए लोगों को मुआवजा नहीं मिला है, उन को बसाइए। उन्हें क्या सहायता दी है यह बताइए।

MR. SPEAKER : She has given the acreage and the number.

श्री हुकम चंद कछवाय : उन को मुआवजा कितना दिया गया ? उन को मुआवजा नहीं दिया गया।

MR. SPEAKER : Will he kindly sit down? She has given the acreage and the number of people. She has given all the details. I am satisfied with that. If I cannot satisfy you, I cannot help it. (Interruptions)

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, 1947 में काश्मीर में हुए संघर्ष के बाद जिन पाकिस्तानी हत्यारों ने 1965 में हमारे जवानों के खून से हाथ रंगे और जो पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्रपति ताश्कंद समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर करने के बाद जिसमें हमें अपने एक प्यारे प्रधान मंत्री से हाथ धोना पड़ा, आज भी फ्रांस और दूसरे देशों में हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ जहर उगलता फिर रहा है और जिस मंगला बांध के निर्माण के प्रारम्भ काल में भारतीय अधिकृत क्षेत्र काश्मीर के लगभग 17 गांवों से 25 और 30 हजार के बीच आदिमियों को उजड़ना पड़ा उस मंगला बांध का निर्माण पूरा होने पर प्रधान मंत्री का पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्रपति को बधाई देना क्या भारतीयों के घावों पर नमक छिड़कने का काम नहीं करेगा ?

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ प्रधान मंत्री से कि आज जो प्रधान मंत्री ने यह कहा है कि मंगला बांध के निर्माण से काश्मीर के संबंध में जो भारत सरकार का स्टैंड है उस में किसी प्रकार का परिवर्तन नहीं होता तो तो प्रधान मंत्री के वह अक्लमंद सलाहकार जिन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री को उस समय पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्रपति को बधाई देने की प्रेरणा दी उन्होंने क्यों यह नहीं कहा कि बधाई देने के साथ-साथ पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्रपति को यह भी कह दें कि इस बधाई का अभिप्राय काश्मीर के संबंध में भारत के स्टैंड में कोई परिवर्तन न माना जाये ? एक ओर प्रधान मंत्री यह कहती हैं कि भारत सरकार के काश्मीर संबंधी स्टैंड में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं और दूसरी ओर मंगला बांध के निर्माण पर बधाई

देती हैं, कम-से-कम मेरे जैसे कम अक्ल वाले की समझ में यह बात नहीं आती कि यह दोनों बातें किस तरह एक साथ कही जा सकती हैं और दुनिया में कैसे इस बधाई संदेश को देने के बाद काश्मीर के अपने स्टैंड के ऊपर भारत सरकार हिम्मत के साथ कह सकती है कि काश्मीर की एक-एक चप्पा धरती हमारी है ?

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : दुनिया इस बात को खूब अच्छी तरह से समझती है । क्योंकि इंटरनेशनल संबंधों में कुछ ऐसी चीजें होती हैं, जैसे ऐसा संदेश भेजने का कायदा है, यह कायदा है, जो भी जाता है चाहे उस का दोस्त हो चाहे (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER : If at every stage and at every sentence, she has to satisfy, it will be impossible not only for her but for any Prime Minister.

Now we go to the next item. Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय,अध्यक्ष महोदयअध्यक्ष महोदय यह तरीका नहीं है कि आप एक प्रश्न का उत्तर न आने दें और दूसरी चीजों को लें । अगर यह प्रकार रहेगा तो हमारे इस संसद् में बैठने का क्या अर्थ है ? अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर आप का यह प्रकार है तो आप के इस निर्णय के खिलाफ मैं इस सदन का बहिष्कार करता हूँ । यह गलत निर्णय दिया आपने कि प्रधान मंत्री को आप उत्तर भी नहीं देने देते और अगला विषय प्रारम्भ कर रहे हैं ।

(श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री सदन त्याग कर चले गए)