

poses had been brought down to 12 paise per kwt in all the States;

(b) if not, in which of the States the rate is higher;

(c) whether the Orissa Government have got any subsidy under this scheme so far; and

(d) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Dr. K. L. Rao): (a) and (b). In order to extend the benefits of pump irrigation on a large scale, it was felt that the rate for power supply to agriculturists in the different States should not exceed 12 paise per unit. Accordingly, a proposal to provide subsidy on electricity rates for agricultural purposes in excess of 12 paise per unit, to be shared equally by the Centre and the States concerned, was agreed to by the Government of India initially for a period of 3 years from 1966-67.

At present the rate for agricultural power supply is higher than 12 paise per unit in Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and in areas which are being served by diesel sets in Madhya Pradesh and Orissa.

(c) No request for any subsidy has been received from the Government of Orissa so far.

(d) Does not arise.

12.25 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED FORCIBLE POSSESSION OF INDIAN TERRITORY IN ASSAM BY PAKISTAN

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta (Delhi Sadar): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

"Reported statement of the Chief Minister of Assam about the

forcible possession of 948 bighas of Indian territory in the Lathitilla Dumabari area of Assam by Pakistan."

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister of Assam, while answering a Question in the State Assembly on 6th July, 1967 had stated that approximately 748 bighas of land (and not 948 bighas as mentioned in the Notice) in the Lathitilla-Dumabari area of Assam had been occupied by Pakistan. The Chief Minister was referring to a working arrangement which has been arrived at between India and Pakistan in the Lathitilla-Dumabari area. The circumstances under which this working arrangement was arrived at are given below:

The dispute concerns the interpretation of the Radcliffe Award in respect of five villages known as Putnigaon, Karkhana Putnigaon, Borputnigaon, Lathitilla and Dumabari in the Cachar-Sylhet sector of the Assam-East Pakistan border. The total area of these five villages is 1.84 sq. miles. The dispute arose due to divergence between the description of the boundary line in the Radcliffe Award and the map showing the line accompanying the description. Pakistan considers that the description and the map agree *inter se* whereas India holds that the description in the Award does not tally with the line drawn on the map and consequently the line is not acceptable in terms of the specific proviso made by Sir Radcliffe himself that "in the event of any divergence between the line as delineated on the map and as described... the written description is to prevail."

As a result of this difference of interpretation of the Radcliffe Award, this area became the scene of border frings on quite a few occasions in the past. After some negotiations, a military working boundary was agreed upon by the two countries in this region in 1959. It was agreed that

until the demarcation has been completed, civilian jurisdiction in the area will vest in the Assam Government. However, Pakistan started violating the status quo through intrusions and encroachments into the villages in question since January, 1962. By November, 1962, Pakistan had occupied the entire Lathitilla village and by July, 1963, she had extended her forcible occupation to part of Duma-bari village as well.

Efforts made to bring peace to this area did not succeed, and Pakistan maintained the tension by resorting to periodic firings.

In an effort to reduce the tension in this area, an offer was made to the Government of Pakistan through diplomatic channels in August, 1963, for a crash demarcation of this area by the Central Surveys of India and Pakistan. Two meetings were held between the Surveyors-General of India and Pakistan at Dacca and New Delhi in December, 1963 and January, 1964. These meetings, however, proved infructuous and Pakistanis did not even agree to sign the minutes of the meetings.

No further progress in regard to the settlement of this dispute could be made despite our efforts. The intermittent firings continued. The September, 1965 conflict intervened meanwhile. After the signing of the Tashkent Declaration, the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Eastern Command of India and the General Officer Commanding, 14th Infantry Division of Pakistan met on February 1, 1966 with the object of finding ways and means of reducing tension on the Eastern borders with Pakistan. In pursuance of the agreement reached at this meetings, the Sector Commanders of India and Pakistan held a meeting at Lathitilla on February 8, 1966 at which a military working boundary in respect of these five villages was agreed upon. According to this working arrangement, Pakistan retained possession of about 249 acres

(approx. 748 bighas) of various type of land belonging to 4 out of the 5 villages referred to earlier. The village Putnigaon was not affected by this working boundary.

The above working boundary agreement between the Sector Commanders is only a temporary arrangement, and does not bestow any permanent rights on either side. This fact has been clearly mentioned in the arrangement itself. It will hold good only as long as the border in this area is not permanently demarcated by the Survey officials of the two sides.

I may state here that the Directors of Land Records and Surveys of Assam and East Pakistan are meeting periodically to draw up programmes for demarcation of the Assam-East Pakistan border. The demarcation in this area is yet to be jointly carried out and that would finally settle the matter and possession duly transferred to the concerned States.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी व्यवस्था, स्पष्टीकरण और प्रार्थना है ।

Mr. Speaker: Vyavastha will have precedence, not spashtikaran.

श्री मधु लिमये : व्यवस्था तो पहले ही है, मैं उस पर ही पहले बोलना चाहता हूँ ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: (Kanpur) Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Both are points of orders. Let me hear Shri Limaye first.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यहाँ हम सभी लोगों ने कसम खाई है कि इस देश की प्रादेशिक अखण्डता को हम टूटने नहीं देंगे । मंत्री महोदय ने श्री कसम खाई है । मैंने भी खाई है, सभी लोगों ने खाई है । यह मामला पिछले तीन-चार साल से उठाया

[श्री मधु लिमये]

बा रहा है, एक दफा एक बयान के रूप में उठा था

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order? Let him come to that instead of making a speech.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आ रहा हूँ उस पर । 27-8-63 को एक वधान के रूप में, फिर ध्यान आकर्षण के रूप में, फिर तारांकित प्रश्न के रूप में इसमें यह साफ कहा गया है और इसा पर मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है

Mr. Speaker: But what is the point of order?

श्री मधु लिमये : पहले पृष्ठ के अन्तिम हिस्से में ।

"By November 1962 Pakistan had occupied the entire Latitilla village and by July 1963 she had extended her forcible occupation to part of Dumabari village as well".

और आगे उन्होंने ने कहा है कि अभी सरकार ने जो पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता किया—सैक्टोरल एग्जिमेंट—उस में उन्होंने ने खुशी से चार गांवों की जमीन को पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में जाने दिया है, केवल पाकिस्तान ने जबरदस्ती नहीं लिया है, इन्होंने ने खुशी से जाने दिया है सैक्टोरल एग्जिमेंट के अन्तर्गत । अब मंत्री महोदय इस तरह की शाब्दिक और बेमतलब बात न करें कि हम ने कानून की निगाहों में सार्वभौम अधिकार कहाँ छोड़ा है । इस सदन में हम ने जो कसम खाई थी और हमारे संविधान में जो कहा गया है कि इस तरह का एक सार्वभौम गणराज्य का हम निर्माण करने जा रहे हैं, उस के विपरीत इन की सरकार का काम है । इस के बारे में खुलासा होना चाहिये कि इस तरह भारत का भूमि को उठा कर विदेशों को देते जाना कहाँ तक इनके अधिकार में है ?

Mr. Speaker: Now let me hear the point of order of Shri Banerjee.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Sir I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I will call him also.

Shri Sonavane: What was the point of order of the other hon. Member? You did not give any ruling. Members should not be allowed to raise any issue they like by way of point of order.

Mr. Speaker: If he wants to raise a point of order, I will give him an opportunity later. But by speaking across to Members, he cannot solve the problem; it will only aggravate it. Now, let me hear the point of order of Shri Banerjee. I will not allow speeches to be made in the form of point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In establishing my point of order I have to refer to the speeches made in 1962, 1963 and 1964.

Mr. Speaker: He cannot go on reading all the speeches.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Then I cannot establish my point of order.

Mr. Speaker: What is the rule under which he is raising it? Is it necessary to read the speeches to establish his point of order?

Shri Banga (Srikakulam): Let him state his facts. Then you may say whether it is relevant or not.

Mr. Speaker: Let him state the point first.

श्री मधु लिमये : रंगा साहब, उस वक्त आप आन्ध्र की सिचुई के बारे में बोल रहे थे, अब जमीन के बारे में हम को बोलने दोजिये ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly allow me to speak at least. My point of order is this. In his statement the

hon. Minister has stated that Pakistan has occupied Lathitilla and Dumabari area. My point is that in reply to a previous question the then Prime Minister, the late lamented Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and the then Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan misled the House or the hon. Minister is misleading the House now.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: Both are misleading the House.

श्री कान्वर लाल गुप्ता : इन्होंने ने गुमराह करने की कोशिश की है ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly allow me to proceed. On 21st September 1964 a question was asked by Dr. Swell:

"whether it is a fact that Pakistan has been making war-like preparations."

and the reply by Shri Y. B. Chavan was:

"Pakistan is still continuing to improve the defence in Lathitilla and Dumabari area."

They never said that it was occupied by Pakistan. They say in 1967 that it was occupied in 1962.

He said further:

"Probably, the reference is to ploughing and not harvesting. No ploughing has been done in the Lathitilla status quo area by either side since 23rd July, 1964."

He also said that negotiations were going on. This is the first thing.

The second thing is that there was a calling-attention notice tabled by me in 1963 when Pakistani flags were hoisted in the Lathitilla area. On that my question was:—

"It is stated in yesterday's statement that this particular area where the Pakistanis had hoisted their flag on the 14th is considered disputed area by our Government."

Our late lamented Prime Minister considered it to be a disputed area to which Pakistan took exception; they had occupied it.

My question was:—

"On what basis is this area considered to be disputed area? Is this the reason why Pakistanis hoist their flag there and if so, is the Government likely to change their position after these repeated intrusions? Knowing full well it is we who have declared it as a disputed area."

To this the late Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, replied:—

"It is disputed area. It is a question of interpretation of the old Radcliffe's award."

Then, a question was asked by Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath whether it was a fact that many people had come secretly in that area and had hoisted the Pakistani flag. And, Panditji said:

"No, Sir; I have not seen this extra-ordinary statement to which the hon. Member refers. But such information as we have is that these small flags were secretly put up by the people who came from Pakistan that morning."

Even on 27th August, 1963, nobody informed this House that these two villages had been occupied by them. Not only this, I go a step further.

Again, in December 1963 I gave another calling-attention notice about the reported firing by Pakistanis in Lathitilla when there was renewed firing and Shrimati Lakshmi Menon made a statement. When a question was asked by Shri P. C. Borooah:—

"...whether the continued hostilities on the India-Pakistan border are a clear indication of Pakistan's sinister designs of ag-

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

gression to occupy Indian territory in that region by force",

what was the reply of the then Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru? It was:—

"As far as I understand," he says, that this kind of firing is considered to mean that Pakistan wants to invade Indian territory by force. I do not think that is a right inference in any large sense. The Lathitilla area, the House will remember, is a disputed area."

These are all the old statements and today in 1967 we are told that these two villages are under the occupation of Pakistan. At that time there was a furore when we said that they had occupied it and that they had hoisted their flag.

I want your ruling on this point whether it is open to a minister to declare a fact in 1967 which was concealed by them then. Who is correct—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Chavan or Shri Chagla? I want your ruling on that.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Let me say something about Shri Banerjee's point of order. About bringing an inaccuracy in a statement to the notice of the Chair there is Direction 115 in the Directions by the Speaker, which reads:

"A member wishing to point out any mistake or inaccuracy in a statement made by a Minister or any other member shall, before referring to the matter in the House, write to the Speaker pointing out the particulars of the mistake or inaccuracy and seek his permission to raise the matter in the House."

श्री मधु लिमये : यह गलती की बात नहीं है, इन-एक्यूरेसी की बात नहीं है,

गुमराह करने की बात है, मिसलीड करने की बात है, सदन के साथ धोखा हो रहा है, गलत-बयानी की है

Mr. Speaker: I am sure about it. Now, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: I want to raise a point of order.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): It is a question involving the territory of the country.

Mr. Speaker: Everybody agrees.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: On this border there have been a number of cases in which there is a discrepancy in the area shown in the maps and in the description given by the Radcliffe Award, as in the case of Karimganj and so many other border areas. If all these discrepancies are accepted by the Government of India as disputed territory, it will mean that a lot of area will go to Pakistan and Karimgang, about which also a similar discrepancy exists, will come to us. My point is whether in a case where any territorial dispute is involved and where Government concedes either explicitly or implicitly, as they have done in the case of these 748 bighas, they can do it without informing and consulting Parliament, whether it is one square inch or one square mile."

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I do not know how you allow Call Attention notices, what is the test for allowing them.... (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: You are putting a question to the Speaker here in the House and you want me to answer it here in the House.

Shri Hem Barua: The Chief Minister of Assam has made a statement on the floor of the Assam Assembly about the occupation by Pakistan of 948 bighas of Indian territory in the Lathitilla-Dumabari area of Assam. The hon. Minister here has, rather repro-

duced the statement made by the Chief Minister of Assam on the floor of the Assam Assembly. What we are interested to know is what steps he is going to take to re-occupy or recover the territory. He has not said anything about it. The Chief Minister of Assam cannot say what steps he propose to take to re-occupy or recover the territory. It is for the hon. Minister here to say that. He has not said that. He has reproduced the statement made by the Chief Minister of Assam. The hon. Minister belongs to the Union Government and he should come out with the steps to be taken to re-occupy or recover the territory occupied by Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri Hem Barua: That is the point of order.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta rose—

Mr. Speaker: You can ask a question.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: I want to raise a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear Shri Kripalaniji.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Guna): So far the question that is raised is of the territory. But, I suppose, in that territory some people are living. Their allegiance is towards India and now by the transfer of this territory, the Government obliges them to transfer their allegiance to Pakistan, whether temporarily or permanently. Has the Government obliges them to transfer citizens of their democratic rights and put them under a dictatorship in Pakistan?

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): With due respect to you and in all humility I submit that when you tried to cover up the lapses on the part of the Government by saying that 'inaccuracy'—It may be there—cannot be the subject-matter of a point of order and you rightly quoted Direction 115, I may

say that the matter objected to here is not on the ground of inaccuracy. The charge against the Government is totally different. Inaccuracy is accidental; misleading is deliberate and calculated. When the Government persistently gives a wrong statement, it cannot be, in any term of the law, be called an inaccuracy.

Mr. Speaker: Can you solve the problem by raising a point of order? There are other methods for that. If there is anything wrong, it must be brought to the House. I entirely agree with you. But there are other ways for that.

श्री मधु लिमये : बिल्कुल बातें साफ हैं । आप उन को रैप्रिमांड करिये ।

Shri Nath Pal: You will perhaps recall that the whole House is often agitated about the lackadaisical manner in which the Government replies wherever the question of any territory is involved. It is sometimes casual and there is an uproar in the House and then they are tempted in making a statement which has not received sufficient study on their part and proper application of their mind to that.

We find, on this issue, many times we have raised the questions and different Ministers who were called upon to reply have given mutually contradictory statements. Today, he gives a mild shock to us that the territory which we have been claiming as disputed territory has been occupied by Pakistan. Under what process? If this is not misleading, what is the meaning of the word 'misleading'? I am not saying it is deliberate. Perhaps, it is deliberate. Do you think it is accidental?

Mr. Speaker: If there is something which you do not approve, in what the Minister has said, as I said, there are other methods to take that up. I do not mean to say that it should not be questioned and that it should be taken for granted. I am not sitting here to say that. There are other methods for

[Mr. Speaker]

that. There is the provision in the rules. The hon. Members of the House have a right to ask for a discussion, one-hour discussion or anything.

श्री मधु लिमये : विशेषाधिकार प्रस्ताव, प्रोक्लेज मोशन मान लिया जाय ।

Mr. Speaker: I am here to allow a discussion. I am not objecting to that. But I do not like this sort of discussion in the name of raising points of order. That is my regret. In the name of raising points of order, all this is going on. I am not happy about it. I am prepared to allow a discussion if there is something serious. For instance, here, by simply asking a few questions and by raising points of order, in 10 minutes, the problem is not going to be solved. It is a serious problem. I agree with the hon. Members. If they have to clarify a little more, if we have to understand the problem and also understand the Minister's point of view, we should have a discussion. I am allowing the maximum number of discussions on any important problem. Now, Mr. Hem Barua asked me on what criteria I allow the Call Attention notices. The only regret today is that his name is not there and it is a matter of Assam, without Mr. Hem Barua Assam being discussed, and it is something criminal which the Speaker has done. He is putting the Speaker in the dock asking on what criteria I allow the Call Attention notices. It is not proper and fair for a senior hon. Member to do it.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of personal clarification. When I said that, I did not mean any disrespect to you; I wanted to be clear in my mind.

Mr. Speaker: All right. I accept it. Thank you.

Shri Hem Barua: I submitted a call-attention notice . . . (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: That is all right.

Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta.

Shri Hem Barua: After the Chief Minister of Assam made a furore, he has come with this disclosure.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सरकार देश की सोमाग्रों के डिफेंस के साथ हमेशा खिलवाड़ करती रही है जो चीज अभी चांगला साहब ने बताई मैं कह सकता हूँ कि यह सरकार ने देश के साथ विश्वासघात किया है। देश के साथ भी किया है और पार्लियामेंट के साथ भी उन्होंने विश्वासघात किया है। जो आज यह बताने लगे हैं कि अब पाकिस्तान ने 4 गांवों पर कब्जा कर लिया है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सरकार की नीति ऐसी रहता है कि या तो उन्हें पता हा नहीं रहता कि हमारे फंटीयर्स कौन से हैं . . .

Mr. Speaker: Come to the question. He can speak on this in the debate on External Affairs.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : मुझे अपना क्वेश्चन कर लेने दीजिये । जब कोई देश कब्जा कर लेता है तब यह जागते हैं और उसके बाद कोशिश यह करते हैं कि किसी को न बताया जाय और अन्धर, अन्धर ही चीज सुलझ जाये । डर की वजह से जो कब्जा करता है उस को भी कुछ कहना नहीं चाहते क्योंकि कहीं लड़ाई न हो जाय लेकिन अध्यक्ष महोदय जितना यह लड़ाई से डरते हैं . . .

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow this. He is making a speech about foreign affairs. He is supposed to seek only clarification.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: I have taken only two minutes, Sir. I am not making any speech.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाह रहा हूँ कि कौन सी तारीख को पाकिस्तान ने उस जगह पर कब्जा किया था और आपने पार्लियामेंट को कब बताया पहली बार ? पार्लियामेंट को आप ने यह कब बताया कि उस जगह पर पाकिस्तान ने कब्जा कर लिया है और दूसरी बात क्या

आप ने इस के बाद कभी यह विश्वास दिलाया कि उन की यह जमीन पाकिस्तान से ले ली जायगी और तासरो चीज जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ आखिर में कि क्या इस के अलावा और भी कोई डिस्प्यूटेड टैरीटरी है जो आप की किन्हीं फाइलों में रखी हो और आप ने न बताई हो वह और जो भी डिस्प्यूटेड टैरीटरी हो या कोई हमारे देश की जमीन दूसरों के पास हो, उन के कब्जे में चली गई हो तो उस की तकसिल हमें एक बार आप दे दोजिये, सारी तकसिल दे दोजिये। उस के बारे में सरकार क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है और क्या सरकार यह विश्वास दिलायेगी कि जो यह झगड़े वाला जमीन है या हमारी जमीन दूसरों के पास है उसे हम वापिस लेंगे और अगर कोई शांति से नहीं देगा तो जो भी क्रम उठाना आवश्यक होगा हम उस के लिए उठावेंगे।

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Speaker, I will start by giving an assurance to this House that, as far as this Government is concerned, we will not give to Pakistan or yield to Pakistan even one inch of the land that belongs to this country; we have also not done so. (Interruptions).

May I now come to the point which is before the House today? My hon. friend, Mr. Gupta, wanted me to give a list of all disputed areas. I have not come to answer that. If a proper question is asked....

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: Will he lay it on the Table of the House?

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: This is a very important point, Sir.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It does not arise out of this question.

Shri Banga: What about the other question? (Interruptions).

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am coming to that.

Beginning with January, 1962, the Pakistani civilians led by the Eastern Pakistani Rifles, started violating all the status quo agreements. They started harassing the people of Lathitilla village in various ways and made life so difficult for them that they ultimately had to vacate the area in November, 1962. Continuing this process of sending their nationals, followed by the EPR, the Pakistanis had, by now, gained control of the whole of Lathitilla and parts of Dumabari, Borputni and Karkhana Putni villages. May I say this that there is no question of any dispute? Our contention is that all these five villages belong to us.

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन उन को दे दिये हैं ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I please finish my answer?

श्री मधु लिमये : ये कहते हैं कि यह भूमि हमारी है लेकिन ले लो आप।

श्री सु० क० चागला : हमने नहीं दे दी।

My hon. friend Shri Madhu Limaye is quite wrong when he says that we handed this over to Pakistan. It was taken....

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : इस तरह से तो सारी जमीन देश की आप पाकिस्तान को दे रहे हैं।

Pakistan unlawfully and violently occupied part of our territory....

Shri K. Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore): What were you doing? (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लिमये : आप के पास हथियार नहीं हैं ? आप को 960 करोड़ रुपया देते हैं। किस तरह से आप उस को खर्च करते हैं ?

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : मिनिस्टर को रिजाइन करना चाहिये इस इशू पर।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us suppose that the answer is not satisfactory....

Shri Nath Pal: Not at all.

Mr. Speaker: It is not satisfactory not only for the hon. Members on the Opposition Benches but also for those on the Congress side; so, it is not a question of one side only. If the answer is not satisfactory, then day after tomorrow, we shall be discussing the Demands for Grants relating to the External Affairs Ministry....

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: This is a specific matter which has been raised now.

Mr. Speaker: If there is no satisfactory answer even after the discussion on the Demands for Grants relating to the External Affairs Ministry, the whole House is there, and we can certainly think of some other discussion also.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
जरा भी हया हो, जरा भी गर्म हो, जरा
भी देश भक्ति की भावना इनके अन्दर हो तो
फौरन इन्हें हस्ताफा देना चाहिये ।

Mr. Speaker: The importance of the matter should not be reduced by too many Members getting up and shouting. Not only the Members on the Opposition Benches but even the Members on the Congress Benches are agitated over this because I find that some Congress Members have also got up to put questions. Therefore, the importance of the matter should not be reduced by too many Members shouting simultaneously. It is not only the Opposition but the Congress Members also who are agitated over this.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): There is no question of shouting....

Mr. Speaker: If at the time of the discussion of the Demands of the External Affairs Ministry also, there is no satisfactory answer, then naturally they have a right to expect something from the Speaker, and this question

may be discussed separately by having some one-hour discussion or something like that, by which time the hon. Minister also will be able to come prepared... Now, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. I think the hon. Minister has finished his reply. If he wants to say anything, he can say it.

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I finish what I was going to say? I want the record to be clear; because of these interruptions, the record is not complete, and if I do not complete it, then next time the charge may be levelled that the hon. Minister misled the House. (*Interruptions*).

I hope hon. Members will show me some indulgence and some patience to which I am entitled. After I finish what I have to say, they can shout at me and they can do what they like. But let me finish the answer.

I have given already the date when Pakistan unlawfully and violently occupied part of our territory. Then, I have been asked to say what we did.

Shri Ranga: When did he inform the House?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am not going into that now, because that is not the question, I am not dealing with the question when we informed the House.

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त : मेरे सवाल का जवाब वह दे रहे हैं यह? मेरा स्पेसिफिक सवाल था ।

श्री मधु सिन्घे : इन्होंने ने पूछा है कि कब सदन को पहली बार बताया ?

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: When did he inform the House?

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I please finish my answer?

I have pointed out in my statement what action we took to take back this territory. The final thing is that after the 1965 conflict, after the Tashkent Declaration, there is a temporary military arrangement which is not

final, which does not affect our rights. The agreement specifically says that 'it is without prejudice to our rights. And the thing that we are doing now is this. Please look at the last paragraph of my statement which reads thus:

"I may state here that the directors of Land Records and Surveys of Assam and East Pakistan are meeting periodically to draw up programmes of demarcation of the Assam-East Pakistan border. The demarcation in this area is yet to be jointly carried out and that would finally settle the matter and possession duly transferred to the concerned States."

My hon. friend, Shri Kripalani, said that we have transferred these villages. We have not.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: You have.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: You have accepted *de facto* control of these by Pakistan. You may not have accepted *de jure* control. But once you have accepted *de facto* control by Pakistan, *de jure* control will follow later.

Shri M. C. Chagla: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: This kind of cross talk cannot go on. Shri Shastri.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: He has not replied to the question as to when did they inform Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: This is a very important question.

Mr. Speaker: I know. That is why I have called Shri P. V. Shastri.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) :

वे पांच गांव हैं, चाहे पांच सौ गांव हैं, 748 बीघा है या 748 इंच भूमि है लेकिन क्या सिद्धान्ततः यह बात सत्य नहीं है कि वह भारत की भूमि है और उसकी रक्षा

की जिम्मेदारी केन्द्रीय सरकार की है ? अभी विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने एक दुखद वक्तव्य यहां पर दिया है। मैं समझता हूं कि असम के मुख्य मंत्री का इस बात के लिए तो हमें आभारी होना पड़ेगा कि उन्होंने सब से पहले हमारी आखें खोलीं। जिस चीज को केन्द्रीय सरकार छिपाती रही उस चीज को असम के मुख्य मंत्री ने वहां की विधान सभा में कह कर देश को और पार्लियामेंट को सावधान किया। यह सब कुछ होने के बावजूद विदेश मंत्री आज इस बात को बतायें कि जब केन्द्रीय सरकार की जानकारी में पहले पहल यह बात आई और यह निश्चय हुआ कि जिस भूमि को पाकिस्तान ने कानूनी ढंग से या किसी भी ढंग से अपने अधिकार में कर लिया है, उसको हम देर या सवर वापिस लेंगे। क्या इसका निर्णय कैबिनेट के स्तर पर हुआ कि अभी हमें शक्ति से पाकिस्तान को पीछे नहीं करना है या सैनिक अधिकारियों के स्तर पर इसका निर्णय हुआ कि वह चीज अभी तक पाकिस्तान के अधिकार में रहेगी ? कैबिनेट के स्तर पर निर्णय हुआ तो कब हुआ और अगर सैनिक अधिकारियों के स्तर पर हुआ तो कब हुआ ? साथ ही मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्यों अब तक इस सारी बात को पार्लियामेंट से छिपा कर रखा गया ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I entirely agree with my hon. friend that whether it is one mile or one bigha, if it is part of our country, it is sacred territory and we will see to it that it remains with our country. (Interruptions)...

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): Action, action.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I will come to action.

Shri Hem Barua: Why don't you push Pakistan out from there?

Shri M. C. Chagla: On the question of demarcation of the boundary, we-

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

have the Radcliffe Award which gives a map. The map differs from the text. The Radcliffe report itself says that when there is a discrepancy, the text shall prevail. Our contention, and rightful contention, is that according to the text, these five villages belong to us, not to Pakistan. Pakistan does not accept that contention.

Shri Hem Barua: Why don't you push out Pakistan from there?

Shri M. C. Chagla: When it comes to it, we will push them out, but at present . . .

Shri M. C. Chagla:

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : आपके रहते हुए कभी भी वह समय नहीं आएगा ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: समय कब आएगा यह मैं आपको बताता हूँ ।

We are now trying to see, with the assistance of the Surveyors-General and the Land Records people, whether we can draw the line according to the Radcliffe Award. If we fail, then the question will come: what is the next step we should take?

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri P. K. Deo to raise question of privilege.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: This is very important...

Mr. Speaker: I have gone to the next item.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : कब इन्होंने पार्लियामेंट को बताया यह बहु इम्पोर्टेंट है ।

Mr. Speaker: This House stands adjourned for lunch to meet again at 2 o'clock.

12.59 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha reassembled at Fourteen of the Clock after Lunch.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

RE: CALLING ATTENTION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. P. K. Deo has to submit something.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : जब सदन स्वयंसेवक हुआ था तो कालिंग एटेंशन चल रहा था ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That was closed.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: That was not closed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When Speaker left, he had already called Mr. P. K. Deo because he had to submit something regarding the privilege matter. So far as the call attention is concerned, I was present in the House, he said either on the External Affairs demands or if you want some special debate or discussion for this purpose, he is prepared to consider a request within the provisions of the rules, but it would not be proper to say it was not closed. It was closed. That is on record.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : आप एक मिनट सुन तो लीजिए ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If I permit you, why not permit some one else? There is some limit. Let us abide by some rule. I am not permitting. Please resume your seat.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ने उस समय यह सवाल किया था कि इस बारे में कैबिनेट ने डिसिजन लिया या किस ने लिया । उस सवाल का जवाब नहीं दिया गया । यह बड़ा सीरियस मेटर है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do recognise this is a serious matter, but this is not the occasion to raise it.