

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We take up Discussion under Rule 193.

SOME HON. MEMBERS rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order.

DR. KAILAS (Bombay South): There was a Committee of Parliament, the Petitions Committee...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order.

श्री हुकमचन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मंत्री महोदय ने एक प्रश्न का भी उत्तर नहीं दिया है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On this, it cannot be done. He says it is under the consideration of Government. I do not see what the excitement is about.

DR. KAILAS: He should have referred to what the Committee on Petitions has said.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Discussion under Rule 193. Shri Samar Guha. (Interruptions) Order, order. Shri Samar Guha.

**\*\*श्री हुकम चंद कछवाय**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record. (Interruptions) Shri Samar Guha. I do not understand why Shri Samar Guha is so tame, so gentle today. I have called your name many times. You are extraordinarily tame and gentle today. I do not know why.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): rose—

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: The Minister of External Affairs must be present.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is a valid point. (Interruption).

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. The difficulty is, when one business is concluded, instead of one Member getting up and drawing my attention, five, six or seven Members speak at the same time. I do not know what is going on. That is my difficulty.

Now, that is a valid point. We are taking up this discussion on the statement by the Minister of External Affairs regarding the meeting of representatives of India and Pakistan. I do not see the Minister of External Affairs. How can the discussion take place?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI KEDAR NATH SINGH): He is coming. (Interruption).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not the way; the whole business is held up because a particular Member of the Government is absent. This is not the way how the House should be treated. Either I adjourn the House for 10 to 15 minutes until the Minister is ready to come, or, we keep quiet here until the Minister comes.

I adjourn the House for 10 minutes until the Minister is ready. We meet again at 4.21 p.m.

16.11 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned till twenty-one minutes past Sixteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled at twenty three minutes past Sixteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

DISCUSSION RE: MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN IN NEW DELHI

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I was coming to the House and I thought that the first speaker at any rate could start because some members of the Council of Ministers were present and the general convention has been that if any member of the Treasury Benches is present the discussion can start, unless of course the Minister concerned is expected to make a statement. I am sorry for the inconvenience.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Deputy Minister should at least have been here.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I think the convention has been that if there is any member of the Treasury Benches present, then at any rate the work can start.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): After the torrential showering of bouquets and greetings on the Simla Agreement, the Government, the Government of India tried to create some kind of a colourful rainbow of hope and faith in this Indo-Pak Simla detente. It appears even before the ink on the agreement dried clouds started gathering on the skies of Pakistan and the vision of Pakistan getting blurred and one of my friends reminded me very justly that not rain of China but the storm of China gathering from the eastern side. When it appeared that the whole of the Simla agreement was going to be scuttled there was an SOS from our Prime Minister to resuscitate the drooping spirit of the

Simla agreement. The last agreement reached between the officials of India and Pakistan is another example of our classical faith, I should rather say inexhaustible faith, in the credibility of Mr. Bhutto, the hero of thousand years war against India.

I have in my participation in the discussion on the Simla agreement made it amply clear that as a socialist, as a democrat, as one born in India, when that India was not termed as the Indian sub-continent, India having a history of the part—still I have not lost the vision of that India—I made it explicitly clear that we want peace and peace is an absolute necessity not only for our survival but for the very existence of the people of this sub-continent. But in the discussion I made it clear that after 25 years of conflict, bitterness, chaos and communal feuds...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Instead of these generalities, why not come to the communicque? You have limited time.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This will go on upto 6 o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: But there are many members who want to speak.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: After 25 years of bitterness and conflict, we had got a historic opportunity to create a real condition in this sub-continent for durable peace. But unfortunately because of our over-bearing faith in an unfaithful politician, like Mr. Bhutto we have missed that opportunity. Again I should say that, keeping almost all the important points vague, unexpressed and concealed in the document of the last Indo-Pakistan agreement, we have made another costly mistake. None of the major objectives... (Interruption). Please do not disturb me that way.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not disturbing you. I am only trying to clarify which mistake—with regard to this official level meeting or what?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You are not in the treasury benches. You are an umpire.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am only trying to follow what you are saying.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: None of the major objectives has been achieved, whether it is normalisation of relationship between India and Pakistan or durable peace. It was not the letter, but it was the hope—a hope was expressed on the floor of this House and outside that soon after the signing of the Simla agreement. Bangla Desh will be recognised by Pakistan. It was hailed by many as a positive achievement on the part of India that we have compelled Pakistan to commit itself to the

principle of bilateralism and bilateral negotiations with India. But what do we find after a month? We find that the prospect of durable peace has not only receded, but it has gone far beyond the horizon of our reach. The most important point that was hailed as our positive achievement was the commitment of Pakistan to bilateral negotiations with India. But now for Pakistan bilateralism has assumed a multi-lateral meaning. As I said, before the ink of the Simla agreement dried, we find that Pakistan has successfully brought in the UNO.

When we say, UNO has no role in Kashmir, Pakistan from the beginning, even till today, is insisting that UNO has a positive role to play in our dispute over Kashmir with Pakistan. Pakistan has successfully brought in another country China. Not only UNO but even China has been brought in for deciding the relations between India and Pakistan. China has not only vetoed the admission of Bangladesh into U.N. but even Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of China rushed to Pindi when the officials talks were going on in India. There was an official note from Pindi about it and Mr. Aziz Ahmed was asked to rush back to Pindi. To acquaint whom? Mr. Bhutto certainly. But he was also to acquaint the course of discussion, the result of discussion with India to their friend, China. On the same day, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan proclaimed that the cornerstone of the foreign policy of Pakistan is rests on an alliance and friendship with China.

Now, let us understand what Pakistan is saying. Although it has not been officially agreed, although it has not been officially quoted in the Simla Agreement, an impression was given that either before the next Summit talks or of official talks between the representatives of India and Pakistan, Bangladesh will be recognised. What has been the fate of recognition of Bangladesh? What has been the fate of our faith in Mr. Bhutto? We have seen that. We have also seen that the talks are going on and going on in regard to interpretation of the actual line of control and in regard to its delineation. We have seen in every press report that although two Generals were meeting, there were no positive results. About durable peace, it is better not to say much about it.

As I have already said, we have again made a costly blunder by agreeing to have an understanding, by agreeing to sign an agreement with Pakistan at official level, to withdraw our troops by 15th September. It is not some sort of an agreement. It is

said that it was a recommendatory agreement, and that the officials will recommend to their respective Governments the results achieved by them. What was the result? The Government of India agreed that by 4th September, the delineation along the actual line of control in Kashmir will be completed and by 15th, India will withdraw its armed forces from the occupied territory. Still, indirectly, a hint has been given by our External Affairs Minister, both inside and outside the House, and an impression has been given again, that faith again, that hope again, that before the date of the next Summit meet is decided, Pakistan will recognise Bangladesh.

What is the reply? What do we find? We now find that Pakistan feels it is a 'stickly problem'. I do not know whether it will loosen or stickiness will continue. Sir, you will remember, in this House, when the discussion about the Indo-Pakistan Summit talks was going on, I reminded, not once by several times that Bangladesh and India fought against Pakistan jointly, that they jointly signed the instrument of surrender of Pakistani army, it will be in all sense of propriety, in all sense of strengthening our fraternity with Bangladesh, that any peace treaty signed with Pakistan will have to be signed jointly by the fraternity of India and Bangladesh. If we had refused to agree to sit with Pakistan before Pakistan agreed to recognise Bangladesh, perhaps—why perhaps, certainly—the present problem, the present controversy, the present uncertainty in regard to the fate of Simla pact would not have arisen at all. That blunder the Government had committed by having bilateral talks with Pakistan and not trilateral talks—talks by the fraternity of India and Bangladesh with Pakistan. The result is that the prospects of normalisation of our relations with Pakistan are receding and the prospects of normalisation of our relations with China are also receding.

We have accused China very rightly. It professes itself to be a progressive country, a revolutionary country. But they have exposed themselves by blocking the entry of Bangladesh into U.N.O. But who is to blame? I should say that it is not Pakistan, not Pindi, but we are to blame ourselves because we lacked in availing a strategic opportunity that was within our grip. We did not utilise that strategic opportunity and China has taken advantage of that. (*Interruption*). You will all remember the whole politics, the ideology of Mr. Bhutto; you will remember that, when he was Foreign Minister, he wrote several articles. He said that the future of Pakistan and the politics of his party rested on the friendship and alliance with China. But he failed. Their friendship and alliance with

Pakistan had a big jolt during the last War. You will remember, in his National Assembly speech, Mr. Bhutto said—and I quote: "Yes, we got support from China, but with the tongue turned upside". (*Interruption*). These are not my words. These were the words of Mr. Bhutto. You heard the monitored report on Pakistan Radio, but I had the privilege of reading the whole of the original speech of Mr. Bhutto. It was because the hope of Pakistan on China was belied in the last War, Now China has got the opportunity to salvage the lost faith of Pakistan in China by rushing to Pindi on the one side and trying to block the entry of Bangladesh into the U.N.O. on the other.

As I had said, if we had made it a condition that India would not agree, under any circumstances, to sit with Pakistan, to sign any peace treaty with Pakistan until and unless Pakistan recognised Bangladesh, this problem would not have arisen and this new fraternity, the new axis that Pakistan is trying to build up with Peking again would not have arisen, perhaps China would not have got that opportunity.

It has been said that the letter of Simla Agreement is not so much important as the spirit involved in it—the spirit of durable peace. By that a pervasive and false spirit is tried to be created in this country and in this House also that the Government believe that Pakistan and Mr. Bhutto have almost undergone some kind of a political metamorphosis. But when you ask, 'If it is so' why not Mr. Bhutto... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I was told I would get... (*Interruption*). I do not know.

SHRI SAT PAL KAPUR (Patiala): He is not making any point.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The point is not in your head. Your head is blocked... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Instead of paying attention to them, why don't you pay attention to me? Now, please conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: How can I conclude? I was told... (*Interruptions*) I do not understand... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. What you were told, I do not know. If you want me to go strictly by the Rules, not more than one hour can be given to this entire discussion... (*Interruptions*). Order, please. I was just pointing out as to what are the Rules in the House because he said, 'I have been told that I will be given so much time'. I am not told that you will be given so much time. I am not aware that anybody has told you.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOHSI (Shajapur): Nor are we aware.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. I am only pointing out that if we are to go strictly by the Rules, not more than one hour will be given to the entire discussion out of which Mr. Guha has taken almost 20 minutes. Now, kindly conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: But there were so many disturbances...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If we are to go by one hour, then you should not be given more than 10 minutes. Now, please conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I want to draw your attention that when I raised the discussion on China, I said that the danger before India is now that Pakistan, instead of really having durable peace with India, having a real total approach of friendship and reconciliation with India, is trying to take advantage of the friendliness of India and is trying to develop a new Axis, an axis of Pindi, Peking and Tehran. This is the new Axis they are trying to develop. If it is so, the position will be that the whole prospect of durable peace will not only recede but will become completely illusory.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What do you mean by this?...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: At least I will take ten minutes more. I cannot conclude... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. No, No. Now, conclude please. I think you expect me to be fair to everybody in this House and I expect you to be fair also. You cannot say you should be given 10 minutes more. If I am to go by the Rules, I have given you more than double the time you should take. Now, kindly co-operate and try to conclude.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Sir, I was watching. His speech has taken only 8½ minutes.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I cannot understand this. You cannot control the House? At what time did I start?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. Controlling the House against heckling depends not only on the Chair, but it depends upon what a particular Member says at a particular time. Now, please conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: In his speech in the National Assembly of Pakistan, Mr. Bhutto said that Pakistan has not only been politically demolished but ideologically also demolished. The dilemma before

Pakistan now is either to have the friendship of India or to pursue the policy of politics of divergence which it pursued for the last 25 years. For the last 25 years, Pakistan pursued the policy of politics and the politics is the politics of discord, the politics of divergence of the two-nation theory. Not only that, Sir, the politics of denying Pakistan's identity with the history, geography and civilisation of the Indian sub-continent.

They are trying to revive a new theory. We have noticed that what Mr. Bhutto says is not a language of durable peace. He talks in terms of Muslim Bengal. On the 14th of August, what did he say? He said, our two-nation theory is still continuing; our Muslim-nation theory is still continuing. This is their attitude...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a good note on which you can conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: If they develop this new axis, what will happen? There will be two flanks instead of one, apart from one from West Asia and the other from China. Pakistan is trying to identify itself not as a sub-continental country but as a West Asian country. By that Pakistan is trying to revive the theory of 'Pan Islamism'. The Pan Islamic theory if developed will give a new life for revival of the decadent Muslim nation theory, theoretic theory for Pakistan.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have said all that.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Let me conclude. This is the danger before us; this is the mistake we have made, without taking the overall picture of durable peace. I will make a last minute appeal to the Government. Before Pakistan agrees to recognise Bangladesh and agrees to accept in letter and in spirit the idea of bilateralism in the relations between India and Pakistan, India should not agree to withdraw our troops from the occupied territory. You are relying too much on the strategy of holding the POWs. As you have seen already, Mr. Bhutto is trying to activate international propaganda against India. You should know what China has in its arena; you should know its strategy. We should see this strategy of China...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now you should conclude, Mr. Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: If we withdraw before Pakistan recognises Bangladesh, if we withdraw before they agree both in letter and in spirit to the principle of bilateralism, we will have another cause for regret.

श्री सतपाल कपूर : (पटियाला) : डिप्टी  
स्पीकर साहब, हमारे दोस्त मि० समर गुहा



ने इस मामले को बहुत हद तक उलझाने की कोशिश की है और सारे हाउस को कंप्यूज करने की तरफ उन्होंने कोशिश की है। मि० समर गुहा सिम्बल आफ कंप्यूजन हैं और हमें भी कंप्यूज करना चाहते हैं। जहां तक इस कांफ्लिक्ट को सेटिल करने का सवाल है, उस सिलसिले में जितने कदम उठाए गए उसमें हमारी पालिसी, इंडिया की पालिसी बहुत साफ और सीधी थी। हम किसी ताकत को दम्प्यान में लाकर समझौता नहीं करना चाहते थे। वे क्या करते हैं इनकी जिम्मेवारी हमारी नहीं है। ... (व्यवधान) ... इंडिया की पालिसी साफ और सीधी थी और हम उस पालिसी पर कायम हैं। हमारी कोशिश, हमारा तमाम जोर इस तरफ रहेगा कि हम इस खिन्ते जमीन पर यह कोशिश करें कि कोई तीसरी ताकत हमारे दम्प्यान में आकर हमारे झगड़े न निबटाये। इस कोशिश की तरफ हमने एक पहल की और उस पहल का नतीजा नज़दीक आया, शिमला समझौते की सूरत में।

दूसरे हमारे भाई समर गुहा ने जिक्र किया चीन का लेकिन वे इस बात का जिक्र नहीं कर पाते कि यू० ए० ए० की इस सिलसिले में क्या पालिसी है। वह उस तरफ ध्यान नहीं देते, उस की चर्चा नहीं करते...

**श्री समर गुहा :** निक्सन चाउ-एन-लाई भाई भाई हैं।

**श्री सतपाल कपूर :** एक भाई का जिक्र करते हैं और दूसरे भाई की तरफ आप आंख बन्द करते हैं यह मेरे छयाल में गलत करते हैं। अभी हमारे और पाकिस्तान के अधिकारियों की मुलाकात हुई उस में एक बात साफ हुई है कि हम अपनी पालिसी से, स्टैंड से अपनी नीति से कहीं हिले नहीं। हम ने ड्यूरेबिल पीस की बात कही और उन को यही बात समझायी। अब अगर वह उस तरफ चलते हैं तो यह उन के ही हित में है।

हम ने एक समझौता किया उस पर अमल हो रहा है। उस समझौते की कोई क्लज ऐसी

नहीं है जिस के बारे में कोई भाई यह कह सके कि उस क्लज को फ़लां पार्टी ने तोड़ा। यह ठीक है कि कुछ लोग दुनिया के मुमालिक, कुछ विंग पावर्स हैं जो यह चाहते हैं कि यह समझौता नाकाम हो, और इस हाउस में कुछ ऐसी पार्टियां और लोग हैं जिन को चिन्ता है, जिन की अपनी पोलिटिक्स यही है कि यह समझौता नाकाम हो जिस से वह श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की गवर्नमेंट पर अटक कर पायें। इसलिये जब कोई दुनिया की ताकत इस समझौते को तोड़ने की तरफ कदम उठाती है तो कुछ लोगों के चेहरे पर खुशी नज़र आती है। इस देश का इंटरेस्ट क्या है, इस खिन्ते जमीन का इंटरेस्ट क्या है ?

हमारा और पाकिस्तान का पर्मानेंट समझौता हुआ। हम जंगबाज़ी से दूर हों यही हमारा, और इस देश की 55 करोड़ जनता का इंटरेस्ट है और पाकिस्तान की जनता का इंटरेस्ट भी यही है। हम उस इंटरेस्ट की नुमाइन्दगी करते हैं, हम उस जज़बे की नुमाइन्दगी करते हैं और अपने लोगों की नुमाइन्दगी करते हैं और अपनी सरकार की तरफ से पाकिस्तान के लीडरों को और वहां की जनता को इस दलदल से निकालना चाहते हैं। लेकिन हमारे यहां और पाकिस्तान में इनके काउन्टर पार्ट्स हैं और वह यह चाहते हैं कि हम लोग जंगबन्दी की दलदल में फंसे रहें। कुछ वर्ल्ड पावर्स भी यह चाहती हैं। इसलिये इस मौके पर ऐसी बातें करना उचित नहीं है। मैं पूछ सकता हूं, हम ने पहले समझौता किया दूसरी बार यहां बातचीत हुई और तीन सितम्बर को हमारे कमन्डर्स बातचीत कर रहे हैं।

जंगी कैदियों के बारे में हमारा स्टैंड बिल्कुल साफ़ है। पाकिस्तान का इंटरेस्ट इस समझौते को कामयाब करने में है। अगर पाकिस्तान अपने इंटरेस्ट के खिलाफ़ जाता है तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी हमारे सर पर नहीं है। पाकिस्तान के ऐक्सट्रिमिस्ट्स, इन के काउन्टर पार्ट्स जो पाकिस्तान में हैं वे क्या चाहते हैं जंगी कैदी वापस आयें। वह किस तरह वापस आयेंगे ? जंगी कैदी तब तक वापस नहीं आयेंगे...

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** I protest against this. I want to set the record straight. I started by saying that there should be durable peace and Simla Pact was an opportunity for establishing durable peace. The hon. Member is completely distorting my speech. I never said that. I said that we had the greatest and historic opportunity of having a durable settlement. But we have missed this and we are now running only after a mirage of peace.

**श्री सतपाल कपूर :** पाकिस्तान के जंगी कैदियों के बारे में हमारा स्टैंड बिल्कुल साफ है। वार प्रिजनर्स के बारे में हम अपनी बातचीत पाकिस्तान से तब तक नहीं करेंगे जब तक तीसरा मुल्क, यानी बंगला देश को इस बातचीत में शामिल नहीं किया जाता क्योंकि वह देश इस में इनवाल्ड है। इस तरह से तीनों मुल्क—बांगला देश, भारत और पाकिस्तान बैठ कर इस पर सोच विचार करें। पाकिस्तान में ऐक्सट्रीमिस्ट्स हैं वह यह चाहते हैं कि जंगी कैदी भूटो साहब जल्दी वापस ले आयें। पाकिस्तान के इन्टरेस्ट में यह है कि वह जल्दी से जल्दी बांगला देश को तस्लीम करे ताकि जंगी कैदियों की रिहाई के मसले पर गौर किया जा सके। इसलिये आज अगर कुछ लोग यहां पर या वहां पर या दुनियां के दूसरे हिस्सों में, या कुछ बड़ी ताकतें पाकिस्तान को बरगलाती हैं तो हम तो अपना रास्ता नहीं छोड़ रहे हैं। हम अपने रास्ते पर कायम हैं। पाकिस्तान का इंटरेस्ट और पाकिस्तान की जनता का इंटरेस्ट इस बात में है कि वह जल्दी से जल्दी बंगला देश को तसलीम करे। इस लिये वे नहीं समझ पाता कि पाकिस्तान के लीडरान अपने इंटरेस्ट के खिलाफ चलेंगे।

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** Just to put the record straight...

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** What straight? What record? Whatever has gone on record is straight, because I have admitted it. What more do you expect?

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** Let there be a distortion, I want to make it very clear that in this House all the parties, except the Jan Sangh, had actually supported the spirit of the Simla Pact, only the Jan Sangh had totally opposed the Simla Pact. I want that to be put on the record in this House.

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE** (Calcutta North-East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Simla Agreement had received, as far as one can tell, nearly universal approval in this country, but the difficulty has arisen in regard to implementation of the terms of that Agreement. In the statement which the Minister of External Affairs laid on the Table the other day, if one reads between the lines, there is reason for a certain amount of perturbation. If the newspaper reports were correct in regard to the statement that the recent meeting of Indian and Pakistani officers could be salvaged from failure by the Prime Minister's last-minute intervention or some such dramatic event, than that itself is a disquieting fact. And the disquiet is warranted because of the well-known Pakistani Propensity towards getting out of the Simla Agreement, getting out of whatever commitments they have entered into if and when they can.

I would like to know from the External Affairs Minister a little more about what we are doing to make sure in international forums and elsewhere to prevent this kind of Pakistani activity which is now being conducted in the United Nations, in Dacca and elsewhere and elsewhere with the assistance of China's new-found friend, America. China and Pakistan colluding together in the United Nations and elsewhere to move in a manner which would go against the proper implementation of the Simla Agreement.

We have heard in the United Nations, Mr. Chiao Kuanhua's ferocious growls against India. We notice again again when the Chinese leaders come to Pakistan a Sino-Pak connivance of a sort which does not auger well as far as genuine implementation of the Simla Agreement is concerned. We see also that it did not take very long for President Bhutto to start misinterpreting what had been agreed to in Simla. I know our Ministers tell very correctly that whatever is laid down in black and white in an agreement is a great deal more important than an official pronouncement made perhaps on the spur of the moment somewhere either on the radio or in the press or something like that. But at the same time we know of this fact of President Bhutto being a kind of mercurial person who does, on account of a certain perverse variety of cleverness succeed in wriggling out of situations in which he finds himself. Therefore, progress towards peace in our sub-continent may not be as smooth as we desire. That is why we must be careful; we should not lower our guard.

17 hrs.

I am reminded, when I think of Mr. Bhutto, of a story which has been related by Clemenceau in regard to President Wilson. It seems at the time of Versailles

of 1919, somebody had asked Clemenceau whether in French 'disaster' and 'accident' mean the same thing. He said he had noticed in the streets of Paris news of a railway accident, and in the newspaper hoardings sometimes it was said 'disaster'—*"desastre en le chemin de fer;"* and in other places, it was written as 'accident'—*"l' accident sur le chemin de fer"*. He asked Clemenceau, "Mr. Clemenceau, does 'disaster' and 'accident' mean the same thing in French?" President Clemenceau told him, "No no; not at all. On the contrary, for instance, if President Wilson fell into a well, it would be an accident; if he got out of it, it would be a disaster."

If Mr. Bhutto had fallen into a well, diplomatically speaking, it is from his biographical point of view, an accident, but if he can be allowed to get out of it, it would be a disaster not only for India and Pakistan but for the rest of the world. And that is why I say we have to be very careful and we have to make sure about what we are doing.

I am trying to conclude because there is no time.

I would like the Minister to explain, now that the new cease fire line in Kashmir is considered by India and Pakistan to be entirely outside the jurisdiction of the United Nation or any third party—that is according to the Simla agreement—why is it that our two countries have not succeeded in disbanding or getting rid of the United Nations military observers group in India and Pakistan which is functioning in Kashmir even though they might be unemployed?

In the Simla agreement, it has been categorically held that the return of occupied territory on either side of the international boundary is only a first step towards a durable peace attainable only on the basis of an exclusively bilateral understanding; that is to say, a durable peace can be founded only upon an exclusively bilateral understanding between our two countries. In that case, in so far as the problem of Kashmir is concerned, we have to make sure that on no account shall we allow Pakistan to take it over to any international forum or to bring any other kind of hocus-pocus in regard to that problem.

I would like to have a clarification from the Minister in regard to the question of the return of the prisoners of war. I am happy he has reiterated the Indian position, which is that the return of Pakistani prisoners of war requires the approval of Bangladesh, because we had been functioning with a joint military command, and this approval of Bangladesh is not likely till Pakistan recognises Bangladesh. This is a very good stand that we have taken. I wish we stick to it. But my question is, how is it that in so far as the

world is concerned, India does not seem to be able to convince the different powers in the United Nations or elsewhere that there actually had been a joint India-Bangladesh command and that we cannot deal with the question of prisoners of war on our own alone to the exclusion of Bangladesh? All the world over, even some friendly countries are confused in regard to this question. They say, "Let India return the prisoners of war; India has got 90,000 odd Pakistani prisoners of war and under the Geneva convention they should be returned and India has always professed to behave very well. We know for a fact that India and Bangladesh had a joint command and these prisoners of war are prisoners of India and Bangladesh together, and unless Bangladesh agrees, we cannot let them go.. The world does not understand it. What are the reasons for the failure of India in the world forums to convince the powers, the members of the United Nations and other bodies of the very simple fact? Is it an account of not only the Sino-Pak-USA collusion but also on account of some default on our part, some default in so far as explaining our position is concerned?

I feel, therefore, that while the Simla agreement has been unanimously approved in this country, the implementation programmes are causing a great deal of headache. I read the statement placed on the Table of the House by the Minister, and I find that there are still some reasons for perturbation, but I do hope he would be able to say that India would stick to a principled position and India would be able to see to it that the miscreants either in China or in Pakistan or in the United States, or all of them together, would not be allowed to put again the peace of our sub-continent into jeopardy.

श्री दरबारा सिंह : (होशियारपुर) : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, श्री समर गुहा ने जो सवाल उठाया है, उस के मुतालिक मैं सिर्फ इतना ही अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि दुनियाँ में दो बड़ी जगें हुईं, लेकिन उन में भी आप को इतना सिविलाइज्ड प्रेसिडेंट नहीं मिलेगा कि फ्रातेह ने शिकस्तखुर्दा के साथ ऐसे मुहज्जब तरीके से सलूक किया हो। हम ने शिमला एग्रीमेंट इस लिए किया, ताकि हम इस सब-कान्टिनेंट में अमन के हालात पैदा कर सकें और उस के जरिये दुनियाँ भर में अमन कायम करने में मदद कर सकें। इसीलिए सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों ने शिमला एग्रीमेंट को सपोर्ट किया और उस की

सताईश की। यही नहीं, सारी दुनियां में लोगों और खासकर यू० एन० ओ० मुख्तलिफ मुल्कों, की तरफ से यह कहा गया कि वी आर सैटिसफाईड।

माननीय सदस्य ने बार-बार यह सवाल उठाया है कि जब हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में सब मामलों को बाई लेट्रल ढंग से हल करने का समझौता हुआ है, तो फिर पाकिस्तान के साथ चाइना के ताल्लुकात क्यों बढ़ रहे हैं। यह देखना हमारा काम नहीं है। जब बाइलेट्रल डिसिजन्ज के बारे में यह एग्रीमेंट नहीं हुआ था, तो उस वक्त भी पाकिस्तान के साथ चाइना के ताल्लुकात कोई कम नहीं थे—वे वैसे ही थे। अब तो पाकिस्तान को यह शऊर और होश आ गया है कि कोई भी दूसरा मुल्क, चाहे वह चाइना हो या यू० एस० ए०, वक्त पर उस को इमदाद नहीं दे सकेगा, इस लिये हमें इस सब-कान्टिनेंट में अमन लाने के लिये हाथ बढ़ाना चाहिए। इसी के नतीजे के तौर पर शिमला एग्रीमेंट हुआ है।

आज से नहीं, हम पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के वक्त से ही इस कोशिश में रहे हैं कि हमारा मुल्क और पाकिस्तान अमन से रहें। उन्होंने 1949 में कहा था कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ नो-वार पैक्ट करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन लियाकत अली ने उन के आफर को रिजेक्ट कर दिया 1959 में फिर यह प्रोपोजल सामने आया तो किसी बात पर—काश्मीर के सवाल पर—वह, बात फिर लटक गई। मौजूदा प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने 1968 में 15 अगस्त को कहा कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ नो-वार पैक्ट चाहते हैं। हम तो लगातार इस कोशिश में रहे हैं कि संसार भर में अमन कायम हो और इस के लिये हम चाहते हैं कि हम अपने पड़ोसी मुल्कों के साथ अमन कायम करें, ताकि हम दुनियां को दिखा सकें कि जिनके साथ हमारी लड़ाई हुई है, हम उन के साथ भी अमन से रहना चाहते हैं।

चाइना का सवाल बार-बार उठाया गया है। मैं श्री समर गुहा से पूछना चाहता हूं कि अगर हम पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ने लग जाए तो क्या चाइना उस की इमदाद करना छोड़ देगा। नहीं। हर एक मुल्क और खास तौर पर हर एक डेवेलपिंग कंट्री यह चाहेगा कि उस के यहां और उस के पड़ोसी मुल्कों में अमन कायम हो, ताकि उस की आर्थिक व्यवस्था, इकानोमिक कन्डीशन, में सुधार हो और जो रुपया जंगों पर खर्च किया जाता है, वह इकानोमिक कन्डीशन को बेहतर बनाने पर खर्च किया जायें। इस लिये हम अपने सब-कान्टिनेंट में और दुनियां भर में अमन चाहते हैं। सिर्फ कुछ जंगजू लोग ऐसे हैं, जो ताकत के नशे में डिकटा-टोरियल ढंग से दुनियां को हड़प करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के लोग, और सारे संसार के लोग, अमन चाहते हैं ताकि सब लोगों को रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान मिले और इस के लिये वे एजीटेशन कर रहे हैं।

हम ने ताश्कंद समझौता किया, हमने रशा से भी समझौता किया हम ने कई और मुल्कों से समझौता किया और हम हर मुल्क से समझौता करना चाहते हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि अमन कायम करने के लिये हम हर मुल्क की तरफ अपना हाथ बढ़ायें। लेकिन हमने यह एक रिसपेक्टफुल तरीके से किया है। यह नहीं कि हम ने सब कुछ दे दिया है और कुछ नहीं पाया है।

ऐसी बातें जो डिजैक्शन की लोग कर रहे हैं— (इंटरप्शज) अब गुहा साहब को तो एक फोबिया बना हुआ है चीन का लेकिन इसी हाउस में यह बात रखी गई है, हम लोगों ने चीन को यू० एन० ओ० में एंट्री दिलाने के लिये कोशिश की तो इसमें कोई दो रायें नहीं हैं कि दुनियां में जितना भी टशन है उसको क। करने के लिए लाजिमी तौर पर एमे हाजात पश किए जाएं जिस में दुनिया की सभी उन ताकतों का इन्वाल्वमेंट हो जो इस ताल्लुक रखती हैं, ताकि टैशन कम हो सके, ताकि एक बंदिश में आ कर लोग

कुछ स ढंग की बात सोच सकें कि दुनिया के आर्बिट में हमें कैसे रहना है। इसलिए मैं इल्तजा करता हूँ कि ऐसे सवाल जो नए सिरे से उठाए जा रहे हैं, जिन्हें के लिए सारे हिन्दु तान के लोगों ने, तमिल पाटियों ने, किन्हीं दो चार व्यक्तियों को छोड़ कर, सारे देश के लोगों ने इस बात की तसदीक की है कि शिमला ऐग्रीमेंट इस सब कांटेन्ट में अमन कायम करने के लिए अरर संसार को रास्ता दिखाने के लिए एक सही कदम है, इसलिए इन सवाल को न उठाया जाए।

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): Sir, our party spokesman has clearly mentioned our view about the Simla agreement. We fully supported the agreement. Now it is the follow-up action which we are discussing. I fully agree with the steps that have been taken, which will make it possible to maintain durable peace in our sub-continent. Even now if Pakistan does not recognise the reality of Bangladesh as an independent country, it will do so at its own peril. It will neither help the Pakistani people nor help to bring peace in this sub-continent. At the same time, we express our strong resentment at the behaviour of China in the UNO, because it blocked the entry of Bangladesh, which is a free country. Thereby it helped the reactionaries of the world and of this sub-continent. Only the reactionaries have been perturbed by the follow-up actions that have taken place about the delineation of the actual line of control in Kashmir and the other steps. We express our difference with the mover of this discussion as well as the Jana-Sangh, whose activities will not help the democratic movement in our country. If durable peace is there, we will be in a better position to fight against the reactionaries of our country as well as in the world. So, only reactionaries will be unhappy at this follow-up action. We do not want the intervention of any imperialist country; we want Pakistan and India to settle all their problems in a bilateral way. That is the easiest and the only solution to the problems in our sub-continent.

SHRI S. A. KADER (Bombay-Central-South): Sir, I was listening to the poetic speech of Mr. Samar Guha, with his rich imagination. With all his fanfare, one could see that the whole poetry was based on fear complex. I would leave it to the minister to reply to his points.

But he has raised some two or three points in which he has said about Pan-Islamic movement. Mr. Guha should understand what Pan-Islamic movement is. It

has always been in the air and it is always going to remain in the air. Even the Arab countries are not united. Iran and Arab countries do not consider themselves as a part of the Pan-Islamic movement...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why go into all that?

SHRI S. A. KADER: Because he has raised that thing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If he has been irrelevant, that does not mean you should also be irrelevant.

SHRI S. A. KADER: Anyway, the Pan-Islamic movement should not be taken as a fear complex. That fear is still in the mind of the hon. Member. I am sure that movement is never going to materialise. Though Pakistan may try its best, it will never materialise... (Interruption).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. I do not want compounding of irrelevancy here. If one Member is irrelevant, that does not mean the other Member should also become irrelevant. If that continues, where will we land?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: On a point of order, Sir. Is it befitting on the part of the Chair to remark that one part of the speech of a Member is irrelevant?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I want to know. Our whole objective of Simla Pact is based on the concept of durable peace. Durable peace means, ultimately, friendly reconciliation... (Interruption).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is very unfair, it is very unjust, I should say, to make this remark...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All this is irrelevant.

SHRI S. A. KADER: Sir, I bow to your ruling. I will not go into all these controversies. But the fear complex about Pakistan having Pan-Islamic movement has no context...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Will you accept with grace that you are irrelevant? Please come to the Pact, the subject-matter under discussion.

SHRI S. A. KADER: I will be more relevant, according to you.

The Simla Pact was initiated by the effort of our Prime Minister. It concluded in what is known as a bilateral agreement between the two countries. Some doubts had risen and the Prime Minister took another initiative by calling high officials of Pakistan to come over and clarify the position. What wrong has been done I fail to understand. If the charge is that we are not very careful about the implementation

of the Agreement, is it not clear that we are always watching and, whenever a new situation arises, at once, steps are taken to see that it is clarified? The calling of Pakistan officials is a step in that direction.

They have come here and, again, a kind of agreement has been made between our two Governments to be ratified, of course, and it will be ratified. What is it? Have we given away any point? Have we conceded any point to Pakistan? No. According to the mutual agreement, we have not conceded even a single point. On the contrary, we have clarified that unless and until the line in Kashmir is defined, the withdrawal of our troops will not take place. If the line is not defined, I think, the withdrawal will not take place. That is the step we have taken. It is not out of fear complex but it is out of our own strength that we have asked them to come to that term.

About Bangladesh and China and all these things, we are hearing many things. We are not concerned with that. Have we not made clear to Pakistan that unless and until Bangladesh is at the table, the prisoners of war question will not come at all? There cannot be any bilateral talk between India and Pakistan. Unless and until the joint command is present, the prisoners of war question will not be decided. What more do you want? The Simla Agreement, as it stands, has been further fortified by the recent agreement that has been brought about. It may be that we hear so many rumblings across the border. The people might say something in context and out of context on this issue. We are not to take into consideration that thing. We have to take into consideration only two things. One is our own strength and the other is the agreement written in black and white.

If that is to be implemented, I think, we have not done anything wrong in inviting these people and having a negotiation. India should try, till the last moment, to see that the Simla Pact, in its spirit and in action, is successful. If Pakistan backs out, it is for them to decide. But as far as we are concerned, it will be our responsibility to see that the last effort is made to see that the Simla Pact succeeds in the interest not only of our country but even in the interest of the whole sub-continent and even in the interest of world peace.

\*SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Salem): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Simla Pact between India and Pakistan has been hailed by more than 75% of the people of our country and also by many countries of the world. The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan signed this epoch-

making Pact on July 2-3 and it was hoped that the seeds of durable peace in the Indian sub-continent had been sown by this Pact. In spite of repeated efforts of the Military Commanders of both the countries, an agreement regarding the delineation of 17th December Cease Fire line in Jammu and Kashmir could not be reached. With a view to implementing the Simla Pact the Prime Minister of our country wrote to President Bhutto that a meeting between the officials of both the countries should be held to review the process of implementing this Pact and on that basis the recent Indo-Pakistan Joint Communique has been issued after successful deliberations of the officials of both the countries, laying down certain norms for implementing the Simla Pact.

Only after the 17th December Cease Fire line in Jammu and Kashmir is delineated, the troop withdrawals will take place. When we are making conscious efforts to implement the Simla Pact, it is regrettable that Pakistan Radio is indulging in mischievous and adverse propaganda about the implementation of the Simla Pact.

Sir, ten days before, the Chinese Government exercised its veto debarring the admission of Bangla Desh into the United Nations, when the Resolution was sponsored in the Security Council. It is unfortunate that China did not appreciate the good faith in our repeatedly supporting the admission of China into the world body during the past two decades, though America had been consistently thwarting the admission of China into the United Nations. By vetoing Bangla Desh's admission into the world body, I fear that China and Pakistan are hatching a conspiracy against India and Bangla Desh. When the officials of the two countries were meeting in New Delhi, a Chinese Vice Foreign Minister was having discussions with President Bhutto. It is obvious that China and Pakistan are colluding to perpetuate the disturbed conditions in the Indian sub-continent.

We say and we are also earnestly striving to have peaceful relations with Pakistan. We want to restore amity between India, Bangla Desh and Pakistan by settling the controversies peacefully. We are sure that durable peace alone will be good for India, Pakistan and Bangla Desh. I want to point out that if Pakistan wants to ensure a prosperous and peaceful future for her people, if Pakistan wants to act according to what she committed in writing, then she must put an end to Pakistan Radio's adverse reaction to Simla Pact and the recent Joint Communique and also to anti-Pact comments in Pakistan newspapers. Otherwise, this trend is bound to create suspicions in our minds.

\*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.



Sir, India wants to create a climate of good faith between two countries. India has been the strongest advocate for peaceful cooperation between countries of the world. We should wage an unrelenting struggle against tendencies, from whichever power it might come, to create tensions among the nations of the world. Through you, I would request the hon. Minister of Defence that we should be prepared to face any unforeseen eventuality. We should continue to be in a strong position militarily to face any danger that might come at any time from any source.

We have shown our good faith towards Pakistan on both the occasions—in signing the Simla Pact and also in signing the Joint Communique issued by the officials of two countries. Pakistan President seems to be taking a wrong direction. In the interest of durable peace in the Indian sub-continent, he should try to implement the Simla Pact. Here, I would only say that we should not vacate the Pakistan territory occupied by us during the recent war nor we should release the prisoners of war numbering a lakh nor we should withdraw our forces from the borders, till the 17th December Cease Fire line in Jammu and Kashmir is delineated. At the same time, India should endeavour earnestly till the end to find out mutually agreed solutions to the outstanding problems between the two countries on the basis of mutual faith and understanding and in the interest of durable peace in the Indian sub-continent so that the Governments of the countries in the area can work with single-minded devotion for the amelioration of the living conditions of the people in the sub-continent.

With these words; I conclude.

**श्री सैयद अहमद आगा (बारामूला):** जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, माननीय समर गुहा की तकरीर सुनी तो यह मालुम हुआ कि वह पिछले जमाने को देख रहे हैं। जब कि हमारी यह कोशिश है कि एशिया में अमन कायम हो। हम चाहते हैं कि इंडियन सब कान्टीनैट में पायदार अमन हो, हम चाहते हैं कि यह मुल्क तरक्की करें और उस लेवल पर आये जिस लेवल पर और तरक्की याफता मुल्क हैं। तो मुझे एक शेर याद आया :

परबर्दये आगोशे चमन यों तो हैं दोनों,  
कांटों की जुबां और हैं फूलों की जुबां और।

भुट्टो साहब ने कहा था कि हजार साल तक लड़ेंगे, लेकिन उसको वह अब खुद भूल गये।

**श्री समर गुहा :** भूले नहीं, उस की फिलोसाफिकल डेफिनीशन दे दी।

**श्री सैयद अहमद आगा :** हम ने शिमला ऐग्री-मेंट बाइलेटेरेलिज्म हासिल किया, क्या वह हमारी कामयाबी नहीं है। माननीय समर गुहा तो वह रोल अदा कर रहे हैं जो इम्पीरियलिस्ट पावर्स करती हैं। जैसे अग्रेजों ने दो नेशन की थ्योरी के आधार पर हमारे मुल्क के दो हिस्से कर दिये ताकि हम हमेशा लड़ते रहें। हम बाइलेटेरेलिज्म को कायम रखना चाहते हैं, लेकिन वह चाहते हैं कि कानफ्लिक्ट बना रहे। इसलिए हमारे और उन के एप्रोच में बहुत बड़ा फर्क है। इसलिए बाइलेटेरेलिज्म को कामयाब करना हमारे लिए मुफीद है और उस तरह की तमाम बातों को छोड़ दें जो बाइलेटेरेलिज्म कामयाब होने के मनफी है।

हम ने जंग नहीं की। हमारे मुल्क में एक करोड़ आदमी डकेल दिए गए। हमारी इच्छा थी कि वह अपने मुल्क को वापस जायें। इसलिये हमने उन की मदद की। मगर जब वैस्टर्न फ्रन्ट पर हमारे ऊपर हमला हुआ तो अपनी हिफाजत के लिये फ्रौजें भेजी गयीं। पाकिस्तान को जीतने के लिये नहीं गयीं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All that is history, known to everybody. What you say are all generalities and repetition of the known position.

**श्री सैयद अहमद आगा :** हमने अपने को डिफेंड किया। कहीं हम दस कदम आये गये तो कहीं वह एक कदम हमारी तरफ आये। तो उस के यह माने नहीं हैं कि वह दस कदम हमने जीता था। उन्होंने हमारी 50 मुरब्बा मील जमीन ली और हमने उसकी 5,000 मुरब्बा मील जमीन ले ली तो इस का मतलब यह नहीं है कि उस को अपने पास हम रखना चाहते हैं। क्यों कि जाहिर है कि हम ने टैरीटरी के लिये जंग नहीं की।

अब जो यह कहा जाता है कि फोर्सेज विंइडा मत करें, जो कब्जे में है उस को अपने पास रखें। यह हमारा कतई इरादा नहीं है। इस पर मुझे एक शेर याद आ गया :

[श्री सैयद अहमद आगा]

कल मैकदे से ले गया चप्पल मेरी कोई,  
पीरे मुरां के बूट लिये जा रहा हूं मैं ।

विदड्डा न करना गलत बात है । काश्मीर की बात यह है कि वहां पर यू० एन० अवजर्वर्स की प्रेजेन्स अब इरेलेवेंट हो गई है, इस लिये कि जिस सीज-फायरलाइन को वह सुपरवाइज कर रहे थे वह तो रही नहीं । वहां अब एक और लाइन है और वह है लाइन आफ एक्चुवल कंट्रोल — उसे पाकिस्तान भी मानता है और हम भी मानते हैं । इस लिये उन का कहना कि यू० एन० अवजर्वर्स वहां रहें यह गलत बात है । हम इस बात को नहीं मानते हैं और कहते हैं कि यू० एन० अवजर्वर्स को वहां से विदड्डा करना है । कम से कम हम उन की मौजूदगी का नोटिस नहीं ले रहे हैं । यह एक बहुत बड़ा अचीवमेंट है शिमला मुहायदे का ।

हम ने यह तय किया कि हम बाहमी मसाहत से बाहमी समझौते से, वाइलेटरल तरीके से अपने सारे झगड़े निपटायेंगे । हम एक मुस्तविल अमन चाहते हैं, जिस को पायदार अमन कहते हैं, इसलिये कि हम मुल्क की तरक्की चाहते हैं, आज यह वहाने लगाये जाते हैं कि बांगला देश को चूँकि अभी उन्होंने मान्यता नहीं दी है इसलिये हम फौजें विदड्डा न करें । बांगला देश तो रिकग्नाइज हो ही जायेगा । इस को अब कोई ताकत रोक नहीं सकती । वह एक सावरेन स्टेट बन गई है । दुनियां की कोई ताकत यह नहीं कह सकती कि वह सावरेन स्टेट नहीं है । वह सावरेन स्टेट है लेकिन हमारी कोशिश यह होनी चाहिये कि हम भुट्टो को इस काबिल बनायें कि वह उस को रिकग्नाइज कर सके । उस के लिये मुश्किलात पैदा करना ठीक नहीं है । उस की मुश्किलात पहले ही बहुत हैं, अब हम और नहीं पैदा करना चाहते । हम को भुट्टो को इस काबिल बनाना है कि वह भी बांगला देश को रिकग्नाइज कर सके और हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान और बंगला देश में एक मुस्तविल अमन कायम हो सके ।

श्री सید احمد آغا (بارہ مولا) :

جناب ڈہٹی میکر صاحب - مانیہ سمر گوہا کی تقریر سنی - تو یہ معلوم ہوا کہ یہ وہ پہلے زمانے کو دیکھ رہے ہیں - جبکہ ہماری یہ کوشش ہے کہ ایشیا میں امن قائم ہو - ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ انڈین سب کوئٹینٹ میں ہائیدار امن ہو - ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ یہ ملک ترقی کرے - اور اس لیول پر آئے جس لیول پر اور ترقی یافتہ ملک ہیں - تو مجھے یاد آیا :

پروردہ آغوش چمن یوں تو ہیں دونوں  
کائنات کی زبان اور ہے پھولوں کی زبان اور

بھٹو صاحب نے بھی کہا تھا کہ  
ہزار سال تک لڑینگے لیکن اس کو وہ  
خود بھول گئے -

شری سمر گوہا : یہ بھولے نہیں -  
اس کو فلسوفیکل ڈیفینیشن دے دی  
ہے -

شری سید احمد آغا : ہم نے شملہ  
ایگریمنٹ میں بائیلیٹریزم حاصل کیا -  
کیا وہ ہماری کامیابی نہیں ہے - مانیہ  
سمر گوہا تو وہ رول ادا کر رہے ہیں  
جو امپیریلٹ ہاور کرتی ہیں - جیسے  
انگریزوں نے دو نیشن کی تھیوری کے  
آدھار پر ہمارے ملک کے دو حصے کر  
دئے تاکہ ہم ہمیشہ لڑتے رہیں - ہم  
بائیلیٹریزم کو قائم رکھنا چاہتے ہیں -

لیکن وہ چاہتے ہیں کہ کنفلکٹ بنا رہے۔ اس لئے ہماری اور ان کی ایروج میں بہت بڑا فرق ہے۔ اس لئے بائیلیرلزم کو کامیاب کرنا ہمارے لئے مفید ہے۔ اور اس طرح کی تمام باتوں کو چھوڑ دیں جو بائیلیرلزم کو کامیاب ہونے کے منفی ہیں۔

ہم نے جنگ نہیں کی۔ ہمارے ملک میں ایک کروڑ آدمی دھکیل دئے گئے۔ ہماری اچھا تھی کہ وہ اپنے ملک کو واپس جائیں۔ اس لئے ہم نے ان کی مدد کی مگر جب ویسٹرن فرنٹ پر ہمارے اوپر حملہ ہوا تو اپنی حفاظت کے لئے فوجیں بھیجی گئیں۔ وہ پاکستان کو جیتنے کے لئے نہیں گئیں۔

شری سید احمد آغا : ہم نے اپنے گھو ڈیفینڈ کیا۔ کہیں ہم دس قدم آگے گئے۔ تو کہیں وہ ایک قدم ہماری طرف آئے تو اس کے یہ معنی نہیں ہیں کہ وہ دس قدم ہم نے جیتا تھا۔ انہوں نے ہماری پچاس مربہ میل زمین لی اور ہم نے ان کی پانچ ہزار مربہ میل زمین ے لی۔ تو اس کا مطلب یہ نہیں ہے کہ اس کو اپنے پاس رکھنا چاہتے ہیں۔ کیونکہ ظاہر ہے کہ ہم نے ٹریڈوری کے لئے جنگ نہیں کی۔ اب جو یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ فورسز ودڈرا مت کریں جو قبضے میں ہیں اس کو اپنے پاس رکھیں۔ یہ ہمارا قطعی

ارادہ نہیں ہے۔ اس پر مجھے ایک شعر یاد آ گیا :

کل میکدے میں لے گیا چپل میری کوئی  
پیر مغاں کے بوٹ لئے جا رہا ہوں میں  
ودڈرا نہ کرنا غلط بات ہے۔ کشمیر  
کی بات یہ ہے کہ وہاں پر یو این  
اوبزرور کی پریزنس اب ارریلیونٹ ہو  
گئی ہے۔ اس لئے کہ جس سیز فائیر  
لائن کو وہ سپروائیز کر رہے تھے۔  
وہ تو رہی نہیں۔ وہاں اب ایک  
اور لائن ہے۔ اور وہ ہے لائن آف  
ایکڑول کنٹرول۔ اسے پاکستان بھی  
مانتا ہے اور ہم بھی مانتے ہیں۔ اس  
لئے ان کا کہنا کہ یو این اوبزرور  
وہاں رہیں یہ غلط بات ہے۔ ہم اس  
بات کو نہیں مانتے ہیں۔ اور کہتے  
ہیں کہ یو این اوبزرور کو وہاں سے  
ودڈرا کرنا ہے۔ کم سے کم ہم ان  
کی موجودگی کا نوٹس نہیں لے رہے  
ہیں۔ یہ ایک بہت بڑا اچیومینٹ ہے  
شملہ معادے کا۔

ہم نے یہ طے کیا ہے کہ ہم  
باہمی مصالحت سے، باہمی سمجھوتے  
سے، بائیلیرل طریقوں سے اپنے سارے  
جھگڑے نپٹا لینگے۔ ہم ایک مستقل  
امن چاہتے ہیں۔ جس کو پائیدار امن  
کہتے ہیں۔ اس لئے کہ ہم ملک کی ترقی  
چاہتے ہیں۔ آج یہ بھانے لائے جاتے  
ہیں کہ بنگلہ دیش کو چونکہ ابھی

اتھوں نے مانتے نہیں دی ہے۔ اس لئے ہم فوج و دڈرا نہ کریں۔ بنگلہ دیش تو ریکگنائیز ہو ہی جائے گا۔ اس کو اب کوئی طاقت روک نہیں سکتی۔ وہ ایک ساورن سٹیٹ بن گئی ہے۔ دنیا کی کوئی طاقت یہ نہیں کہہ سکتی کہ وہ ساورن سٹیٹ نہیں ہے۔ وہ ساورن سٹیٹ ہے۔ لیکن ہماری کوشش یہ ہونی چاہئے کہ ہم بھٹو کو اس قابل بنائیں کہ وہ اس کو ریکگنائیز کر سکے۔ اس کے لئے مشکلات پیدا کرنا ٹھیک نہیں ہے۔ اس کی مشکلات پہلے ہی بہت ہیں۔ اب اور نہیں پیدا کرنا چاہئے۔ ہم کو بھٹو کو اس قابل بنانا ہے کہ وہ بھی بنگلہ دیش کو ریکگنائیز کر سکے۔ اور ہندوستان، پاکستان اور بنگلہ دیش میں ایک مستقل امن قائم ہو سکے۔

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : (शाजापुर) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय सब से पहले मैं अपना रोष प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ। पिछली बार जब समझौते की पुष्टि की गई तब दो तीन दिन बाद जो संसद मिलने वाली थी उस को ताक में रख कर पुष्टि की गई, और देश में शिमला समझौते के बारे में लोगों के मन में जो आशंकाएँ थीं उन्हें दूर करने के लिये दोनों देशों के प्रतिनिधियों के स्तर पर जो वार्ता हुई वह कोई मामूली वार्ता नहीं थी। वह वार्ता पांच दिन तक चली। क्या सरकार यह आवश्यक नहीं समझती कि वार्ता के सारे तथ्य और जानकारी सदन के सामने स्वयं आ कर पेश करे और जो सवाल हम करें उन का उत्तर दे? केवल यह कह देना कि सारा भारतवर्ष उन के साथ है कहां तक उचित है? आखिर भारतवर्ष में हम भी हैं फिर केवल हमारे

मन में आशंकाएँ नहीं हैं, आप के मन में भी आशंकाएँ हैं। उन का निराकरण करने के लिये आप ने उन के प्रतिनिधियों को यहां बुलाया। इस लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि उन आशंकाओं का निराकरण हुआ या नहीं, इस बात को जानने का हमारा अधिकार है। अगर आज सदन न बैठता, या सोमवार तक हमारी कार्रवाई नहीं चलती तो शायद यहां इस की चर्चा तक न होती इस लिये मैं सब से पहले इस बारे में अपना रोष प्रकट करता हूँ क्योंकि यहां पर जो वार्ता हुई उस में एक प्रमुख बात बतलाई गई है। वह यह है कि :

'They reaffirmed the determination of the two Governments to implement the provisions of the Simla agreement in letter and in spirit for the establishment of durable peace in the sub-continent.

It is a very important thing. The very basis of Simla talks was establishment of durable peace, in the sub-continent. It was a case of not only an amicable and friendly relation between India and Pakistan alone. There is a third country. Have you realised that?

जब हमने शिमला में बैठ कर यह तय किया कि आगे चल कर भारतीय उप-महाद्वीप में स्थायी शांति होगी उस समय क्या हमारी आंखों से यह बात ओझल हो गयी कि जैसे हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच मसले हैं, जिन को हम हल करेंगे, शांति के साथ हल करेंगे सौहार्द्र के साथ हल करेंगे वैसे ही पाकिस्तान और बांग्ला देश के बीच में मसले हैं जिन का हल होना बहुत जरूरी है। उन में से एक है युद्धबन्दी और दूसरा है बंगलाभाषी लोग जो पाकिस्तान में हैं और उर्दू-भाषी जो गंगला देश में हैं। उन का भविष्य क्या है, यह दोनों महत्वपूर्ण विषय हैं।

During the talks at Simla, at some level or the other, it was incumbent and imperative that we should have involved the Prime Minister of Bangla Desh, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman.

जो भी हम समझौता करें उसके अंदर बांगला देश की अनुमति या सहमति हमें नहीं मिलेगी, तो स्थायी शांति कैसे पैदा होगी, यह समझ में नहीं आता है। भारत और पाकिस्तान

के बीच में शांति भंग करने का मसला हमेशा काश्मीर रहा है। इसलिये जब तक काश्मीर के अन्दर एक शांति की हवा पैदा नहीं होती तब तक यह कहना कि स्थायी शांति स्थापित हो सकती है ठीक नहीं होगा। फिर चाहे आप बड़े बड़े पोस्टर और होर्डिन्ग कितने ही लगा लें। हमारी जो आशंकाएँ थीं वे अगर गलत निकलती तो हमें आनन्द होता, हमें दुख नहीं होता। हम भी यहीं चाहते हैं। कालेज में मुश् पर रवीन्द्रनाथ ठाकुर का असर हुआ।

We read the world wrong and say that it deceives us. It is not a question of Pakistan only but it is a question of China also.

चीन के साथ हम लोगों ने पंचशील समझौता किया था और उस वक्त किसी ने उसका विरोध नहीं किया।

In spite of that, why was Panchsheel shattered to pieces? Unless we go into it in details, सवाल केवल पाकिस्तान का नहीं है। हम जरूर चाहते हैं कि पड़ोसियों के साथ ही नहीं दुनिया भर के साथ हम शांति से रहें विद्वेष समाप्त हो। किन्तु हमारे चाहने पर क्या दुनिया चलती है?

If wishes were horses, beggars could ride.

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप जल्दी खत्म करें।

**श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी :** यह सवाल मैंने उठाया है। हमें समय चाहिये। हमारे मन में जो आशंकाएँ हैं उनका निराकरण तो होना ही चाहिये। अगर ऐसा नहीं होता है तो जनता में जा कर हम क्या बतायेंगे। मैं कुछ सवाल करना चाहता हूँ। बार बार हमारे विदेश मंत्री कह रहे हैं कि जम्मू काश्मीर में लीपा वैली में टिथवाल की दो दो चीकियाँ पाकिस्तान को छोड़नी पड़ेंगी। इसके बारे में आपका तब पैदा होती है जब जो आप कहते हैं उसकी पूर्ति नहीं होती है। पाकिस्तान के प्रतिनिधि यहाँ आए थे। क्या उन्होंने लिखित कोई आश्वासन इसके बारे में दशा है? Is it in black and white?

इसलिये मैं यह कहता हूँ कि समझौता जब हुआ तो उसके बाद पाकिस्तान के अध्यक्ष

ने उसके तुरन्त बाद पाकिस्तान की राष्ट्रीय असेम्बली में जो भाषण दिया, उसको लेकर हमने आपत्ति उठाई थी। मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता है क्या वास्तव में उस भाषण का गहरा अध्ययन किया गया था। और गहन अध्ययन के बाद सहों बात हमारे सामने आई क्या रखी गई थी? बजाय इसके कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री भुट्टो को समझने की और उनको समझाने की कोशिश करते उन्होंने वहाँ जन संघ को समझाने की कोशिश की। जो पत्र प्रतिनिधि वहाँ एकत्र हुए जब उन्होंने भुट्टो साहब से पूछा कि :

"You blow hot and cold at one and the same time." And he replied: "I am a product of the sub-continent where there is extreme cold and extreme heat."

उन्होंने कभी अपने आपको समझाने की कोशिश नहीं की। इसी ढंग से उन्होंने अपने आप को समझाया :

"If I blow hot and cold at the same time, it is because I am a product of the sub-continent."

ऐसी स्थिति में हमारे विदेश मंत्री उनको समझाने की कोशिश करते। वह समझाते हैं।

"It is for the internal consumption and it is only to convince the counterpart of Jan Sangh there in Pakistan."

पाकिस्तान में भी कोई जन संघ है जिस को समझाने के लिये उनको ऐसा करना पड़ता है? जन संघ तो यहाँ है। हम को समझाने के बजाय हम को दुतकारा जाता है।

**श्री स्वर्ण सिंह :** जन संघ वहाँ नहीं है लेकिन जन संघ जहनियत वहाँ है।

**श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी :** आप अगर हम को समझाने की कोशिश करें तो हम भी समझने की कोशिश करेंगे।

हम चाहते थे चव्हाण साहब भी इस वक्त यहाँ होते तो बहुत अच्छा होता क्योंकि ताशकन्द की टेबल पर ये दोनों विभूतियाँ मौजूद थीं इसलिये उनको अनुभव तो है ही। पाकिस्तान का भी अनुभव है और भुट्टो का भी है। आज द्विपक्षीय समझौता पाकिस्तान ने किया है और कहा है कि उस पर वह अमल करेगा। लेकिन ताशकन्द में जब रुसम-गमथ था और विदेश मंत्री जब हमारे दिनेश सिंह थे और उनको मैंने पूछा

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

था कि 1961 में गोआ की कार्रवाई के बाद आपको इस बात का अनुभव हुआ है क्यों कि

Unilateral good faith is not responded to in international affairs.

हमारे जो गोआ में बंदी थे क्या उन सब को छोड़ दिया गया है, ? क्या मैसकोनास को, मोहन रानाडे को छोड़ दिया गया है क्या ? नहीं छोड़ा गया था। ताशकंद की टेबल पर यही गलती फिर हमने की। पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ उस में पाकिस्तान के वास्ते जो अच्छी बातें थीं उन पर तो अमल किया बाकी पर अमल नहीं किया, इसकी सूचना मुझे लिखित रूप में दी गई थी। उस वक्त मध्यस्थ रूस था। क्या रूसको इस बात का पता था कि पाकिस्तान ने इस पर अमल नहीं किया, पूरा अमल नहीं किया तो उसने क्या किया ? आज हमने द्विपक्षीय समझौता किया है। इस समझौते के बारे में हमारे मन में जो शंकाएँ पैदा हुई हैं उनका हम चाहते हैं कि निराकरण हो और जो, बाधाएँ हमें मालूम देती हैं, उनका हम चाहते हैं। कि जवाब दिया जाए। इस विपक्षीय समझौते के बाद जम्मू काश्मीर में भी जो रेखा हम कह रहे हैं क्या उसको वह मानेगा ? हमने यह भी कहा है कि यू० एन० ओ० के निरीक्षकों के वहाँ रहने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन पाकिस्तान के प्रति—निधि यू० एन० ओ० में कहते हैं कि रहने की जरूरत है।

अभी जो प्रतिनिधि स्तर पर वार्ता हुई, क्या उस में पाकिस्तान ने इस बात को स्वीकार किया कि वहाँ पर यू० एन० ओ० के निरीक्षक नहीं रहेंगे ? क्या पाकिस्तान लीपा वैली की दोनों चाँकियाँ खाली कर देगा। शिमला समझौते के अनुसार डीलीनिगेशन आफ़ दि लाइन आफ़ कंट्रोल इन जम्मू एंड काश्मीर और सेनाओं का विद्वाय एक महीने में साथ साथ होना चाहिये था। वह एक महीने में क्यों नहीं हुआ ? इस सम्बन्ध में कौन सी कठिनाइयाँ आईं ? क्या उन कठिनाईयों को दूर करने की कोशिश की गई ? क्या उस बात को इस समझौते में कहीं अंकित किया गया है ? हम ने कहा था कि जम्मू—

काश्मीर में य० एन० ओ० के निरीक्षकों को रखने की जरूरत नहीं है। क्या पाकिस्तान ने हमारी इस बात को कैटेगोरिकली माना है ? अगर कि माना है, तो उस को अंत क्यों नहीं किया गया है ?

हमारा स्टैंड यह है कि युद्धबन्दियों की वापसी का मामला बांग्लादेश की अनुपस्थिति में तय नहीं किया जा सकता है। लेकिन पाकिस्तान के अध्यक्ष ने इस पर आपत्ति की थी। उन्होंने कहा था कि जब हमने एक द्विपक्षीय समझौता किया है, जब हम ने यह तय किया है कि हम सब विवादों को परस्पर बैठकर हल करना चाहते हैं, फिर बाँक्या गला देश को बीच में लाना द्विपक्षीय समझौते का उल्लंघन नहीं होगा। क्या इस का भी कोई निराकरण किया गया है ? क्या हमारे निराकरण को पाकिस्तान ने स्वीकार किया है ? क्या मंत्री महोदय की समझ में नहीं आ रहा है ?

It is reported in the press that President Bhutto had expressed his doubts that if India would like to abide by bilateralism, why then India Govt. wants to bring in Bangladesh in between.

यह जो वार्ता हुई है, it is because of certain grave doubts created in our minds.

वर्ना हम इस वार्ता का आयोजन क्यों करते ? क्या हम ने पाकिस्तान के प्रतिनिधियों के सामने अपनी ये आशंकाएँ प्रकट की थीं और क्या पाकिस्तान ने उन का कोई निराकरण किया ? ये सब बातें प्रैस में आ चुकी हैं। आज हम इस के बारे में बिल्कुल सही सही जानकारी चाहते हैं।

हम भी शांति चाहते हैं। (व्यवधान) मैं आज का आदमी नहीं हूँ। जब इस कांग्रेस का नाम राष्ट्र सभा था, मैं उस वक्त था इंडियन नेशनल कांग्रेस तो बाद में बनी। लोक मान्य तिलक के जमाने में इस को राष्ट्र सभा कहा जाता था। हम ने देखा कि एक राष्ट्र से दो हो गये और दो से तीन हो गये और our nation became a sub-continent including three nations. यह सब कुछ मैं देखना आया हूँ।

जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, हम भी शान्ति चाहते हैं, लेकिन सम्मान के साथ शान्ति अपने सामर्थ्य के बल—



बूते पर आती है। श्री सतपाल कपूर ने कहा है कि if Pakistan slides back, we are ready.

इस का मतलब है जंग। यह सरकार हमेशा जंग के खिलाफ आवाज उठाती रही है लेकिन फिर भी 1947, 1962, 1965 और 1971 में जंग हुई। यह जंग क्यों हुई? इन लोगों की वजह से हुई। जंग किसी के चाहने से नहीं होती है, बल्कि दुनिया में कुछ परिस्थितियाँ उत्पन्न होती हैं, जिन की वजह से जंग होती है।

Let us try to understand and appreciate the realities of life.

जब हम पाकिस्तान के साथ कोई समझौता करने के लिए बैठें, तो वह ऐसा समझौता हो, जिस में शान्ति-स्थायी शान्ति—की व्यवस्था हो और वह भी भारतीय उपमहाद्वीप में हम को दिखाई दे, यह बहुत आवश्यक है।

दिल्ली वार्ता के बाद हमारे अधिकारियों ने भारतीय पत्र-प्रतिनिधियों को वक्तव्य और अन्य विवरण को प्रति रात के साढ़े नौ बजे दो और उस पर भी यह एम्बार्गो लगा दिया कि उस को बारह बजे से पहले प्रसारित न किया जाये। इस की तुलना में पाकिस्तानी अधिकारियों ने सारी सामग्री उसी दिन साढ़े तोड़ पांच बजे विदेशी पत्र-प्रतिनिधियों को दे दी। इस तरह पाकिस्तान ने यहीं दिल्ली में समझौते को दिया। रेडियो पाकिस्तान लगातार यह कहता रहा:

The line will be delineated in the disturbed areas.

समझौता होते ही पाकिस्तान के प्रतिनिधियों ने हमें यह तमाचा मार दिया। हमारे पत्र-प्रतिनिधियों के साथ हमेशा ऐसा व्यवहार क्यों होता है, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। मेरी टाक्स क अबसर पर भी हम अपने पत्र-प्रतिनिधियों को अपने साथ नहीं ले गये। We had to depend upon only the foreign press. हमारा पिछला अनुभव रहा है कि पाकिस्तान हमेशा समझौतों को तोड़ता रहा है। इसलिए हमें सतर्कता से काम लेना चाहिए। हम शान्ति चाहते हैं लेकिन सम्मान के साथ शान्ति, अपने मायर्थ के बन-बूते पर शान्ति चाहते हैं। हम शान्ति के इच्छुक हैं, लेकिन ऐसी शान्ति नहीं।

which was disturbed during the last 25 years four times and we had to pay heavily.

इसी लिए हम कहते हैं कि भविष्य में हम सतर्कता से काम लें।

जो आशंकाएँ मैं ने बताई हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय उन के बारे में सही सही जवाब दें।

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we listened very carefully to the speeches of our hon. friends, particularly Shri Samar Guha and the hon. Member who spoke before me, Shri Jagannathrao Joshi. The speech just delivered was so full of sound and fury, but I must confess that it signified very little. He was full of anger right from the beginning. He said "I want to express my anger" and he was throughout, till the end of his speech, in anger. I tried to understand what was his conclusion, what was the constructive suggestion that he wanted to make by way of criticism against the whole approach and the last meeting that we have had.

As we know, the Simla agreement and also the present meeting had a basic objective of trying to achieve durable peace in the sub-continent. Therefore, the spirit that we had kept before us in the Simla agreement was to unite the people of this sub-continent. Whom did we have in mind? All the time we have had started that we were not at war with the people of Pakistan. The war was inflicted on us by the military dictatorship of Pakistan. We always maintained that we had all the sympathy and love and friendship and affection for the people of Pakistan, and therefore it is in that spirit that we have been approaching this entire problem.

There is a basic difference between the Jan Sangh's approach and our approach. The Jan Sangh has never reconciled itself even with the existence of Pakistan; let alone our relationship with Pakistan. Therefore, they do not want peace with equanimity; peace with friendship; peace with respect. They want peace by running down and humiliating Pakistan. That is not the approach of India or the Indian Government, and that cannot be the approach to achieve durable peace.

I may submit that there might be difficulties; no doubt. But in this entire approach, as even Bhutto has stated, after all it is a legacy not only of the last 25 years but even of a remoter past. And you cannot get over that in just 25 months. So, therefore, we will have to go cautiously. True, but we must do so with the positive objective that we want to be friendly with the people of Pakistan, and therein, let us give even the devil its own due.

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

You know the Foreign Minister of China, Mr. Chiu had come to Pakistan. It is stated that he acclaimed the Simla agreement, and he said that it should be implemented conscientiously. Therefore, at least, the declarations made do not show that even China is against the Simla agreement *per se* by itself or peace in the sub-continent. But its actions are otherwise. True. But we need not read much into it, because even last time we saw 111 countries were against us; did we worry about that? In international gatherings we have to be firm and stand on our own convictions. Therefore, I was sorry to see the attitude of the Jan Sangh in this country; last time, they opposed the Simla agreement; the entire agreement. What a scene they created? You remember what was the slogan that they shouted. One of their slogans was

जहां हमारा खून बहा वहां जमीन हमारी है ।

That was fantastic, because what did that mean? Not only in Rajasthan but *हारा खून बंगला देश में भी बहा* Do you have the check to say that even that *zamin* will be yours? That was the argument advanced by you. (Interruption) It appeared in the *Times of India*.

१ जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : उपाध्यक्ष महं दय, यह हमारे स्लोगन को गलत कोट कर रहे हैं । जहां हमारा बलिदान हुआ वह काश्मीर हमारा है, यह स्लोगन था । वे कह रहे हैं कि जहां हमारा खून बहा वह जमीन हमारी है और बांग्ला देश इसलिए हमारा है . . .

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I am not yielding.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: Do not shield something.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Therefore, the Jan Sangh's attitude has been always anti-national; in fact it was anti-peace as far as this subject is concerned.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: What business has he to say so? I object to this. He will have to take back his words. How is it anti-national?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your objection has gone on record; that should be enough.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: I never call anybody anti-national. I wanted clarification and let him get clarification for himself. If you cannot meet an argument by an argument, do not abuse. If you call

me anti-national and I call you anti-national, that will not serve any purpose.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: There is a saying in Sanskrit:

शषम् कोपेन पूरयेत् ।

(Interruption) Shri Jagannathrao Joshi has been full of *kop* right from the beginning and when there is *kopam* you know what will happen. That is all I wanted to say.

SHRI SHYAMANANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, to my mind the discussion seems to have derailed; it has taken the second place in the supplementary agenda as discussion on the Simla agreement.

We do not want to be in a hurry to pronounce a judgment on the success of the Simla agreement. That is neither fair to us nor to the other party. It would be extremely premature to judge the success of the Simla agreement at this stage. It is also our view that the implementation of an agreement like this is bound to face certain difficulties and hurdles and both sides should take these difficulties in their stride and should not be unduly unnerved by them.

We do not know what were the hurdles holding up the implementation of the Simla agreement which necessitated the convening of the official level conference in Delhi recently, whether that resulted from any basic difference in approach or attitude of the other party. The same might be said by the other party so far as we are concerned. Or do these difficulties stem from certain matters of detail. We really do not know anything about that . .

Of course we should do our best to make a success of it but there have been some experiences which dictate that we temper our optimism with a certain amount of caution and circumspection.

Before I get into the task of seeking clarifications—as was the intention when we proposed to the Speaker that we should have an opportunity for seeking clarifications—I must say that we are a little surprised that we do not get enough information about the implementation from our own Government and we are to be grateful to Pakistan for giving first hand information about the various stages of implementation. The Government of India never cares to inform the country about those steps. Mostly the announcement about the steps taken originate from Islamabad, not Delhi. That happened even at the time of the Simla agreement; that information was not shared with the country by our Government in the first instance.

It was by Pakistan that the announcement was first made. Similarly, about this meeting between the Commanders of the two sides, the information has come from the other side, not from our side. It is indeed a matter of some regret so far as the people in this country are concerned that our Government should not be keen to inform them about the steps that are being taken in this respect. The most crucial point about the recent conference seems to be about the delineation of the actual line of control in Jammu and Kashmir. I am not quite clear in my mind as to how the position of India is different. Probably there is a basic difference between the approaches of the two countries and we have to be made fully aware of this. How is the position of India different from the position of Pakistan so far as the delineation of the entire length of the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir is concerned? What exactly do they mean by the entire length of the line of control? Supposing the line of control as it existed in 1949 has been broken in half a dozen places, would the new line of control now originate from the six points at which the old line of control has been broken? Would they constitute the basis for the new alignment of the line? That is the point about which I want to know from the minister. The country must be made aware of this.

There is another valid point regarding this line of control and that relates to the word "prejudice". It says, "without prejudice to the recognised positions of both the parties". My humble question is whether this word "prejudice" is used in the legal sense of the term or in the physical sense of the term. It may well be in the legal sense of the term. That has been my understanding. If it is in the physical sense of the term, so far as the actual line of control is concerned, that does not have much of a meaning.

Another impression that comes to one's mind is about the delinking of Bangladesh from the operation of the Simla agreement. For all practical purposes, it seems that Bangladesh is delinked from the operation of the Simla agreement. Perhaps that was inherent in the way in which Bangladesh was excluded from the Simla summit. Probably that was also inherent in the concept of bilateral relations between Bangladesh and Pakistan. That was also because of the fact that the international community would like to have a kind of bilateral relationship developing between Bangladesh and Pakistan. But what I want to submit is, the Government of India always gave the impression, without much factual basis, that they were trying to get Bangladesh fully involved in this matter. But now it

seems that that make-believe is over. This communique issued after that—it may be that certain commentaries have come, but those commentaries do not form part of the communique as such—It seems that Bangladesh is, more or less, going back on this. It is also, more or less, clear that there would not be one line of control but a dual line of control. One line of control, whatever it means, is the delineation of the new line of control resulting from 17th December cease-fire. But Pakistan has never committed itself to say that it would not admit UN observers on its soil. So, UN observers will always be there. The disappearance of UN observers seems to exist only in the figment of imagination of the Government of India. So far as Pakistan is concerned, UN observers seem to be very much there. My submission is that this point which was blown up out of all proportions into a big thing has been deflated to an extent because we do not get any assurance on this point from the other side.

18 hrs.

Then, one word about rehabilitation of refugees. Here also, we do not get any concrete idea as to how refugees are to be enabled to get back to Pakistan with a reasonable measure of assurance of safety and security. We have general ideas no doubt so far as Pakistan is concerned. We are grateful to Pakistan and even to the Government of India for giving us that information. We have also got general ideas of the Government of India about these refugees. But we do not have any concrete ideas. Similarly, we have got general ideas of goodwill at the time of Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact. But at that time, there was this difference that at least there was a concrete pact to go by, even when Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact was concluded. But on this question of unfortunate refugees, we do not seem to have any concrete ideas as to how they are going to be enthused to get back to Pakistan. If they do not get back to Pakistan, what exactly it is that the Government of India propose to do about that.

Finally, a question that arises is whether we have made any strong efforts towards the normalisation of relations between the two countries, that is, the resumption of diplomatic relations, in the recent talks, and whether some steps are going to be taken in that direction. It seems to me that this subject is, more or less, forgotten although it should be the first real step towards normalisation of relation. I want to know whether certain talks have been held in this respect or certain communications have passed between the two countries in this respect.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, before I call the Minister to reply, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the following observations made by Shri Mavalankar, on 1st August, 1952:

"I myself wanted to say that whatever the business outside which any individual Minister or the Minister responsible may have, it is necessary to remember that no engagement outside can be higher or of greater importance than his presence in this House \* \* \* At least I personally feel that the absence from the House of the responsible Minister is perhaps not giving the House the attention and the respect that it is entitled to . . ."

After collating all that has been observed all that has passed in this House, the book on "Practice & Procedure of Parliament" by Kaul and Shukdher says:

"It is now an established convention that on important occasions like Question Hour, discussion on the Budget or the President's Address or the motion regarding international situation, concerned Ministers are required to be present in the House, as far as possible. On other occasions, the Minister or Ministers in charge of the business before the House are required to be present. In the case of unavoidable absence of the Minister in charge from the House, it is expected that an arrangement is made for some other Minister to take notes of the debate in the House . . ."

Now, when I saw neither the senior Minister nor Deputy Minister in the House, and I was not informed whether anybody had been authorised, I had to adjourn the House.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): The present debate, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, is related to my statement which I made after the conclusion of the talks between the delegations of India and Pakistan, and I have no intention to answer those points which relate to the Simla Agreement because there was a full-dress debate here and pros and cons were gone into in considerable detail and a near-consensus, except for one political party, emerged in the House in support of the Simla Agreement. I have no intention to reopen that debate because there is nothing new that has been said

today which was not said when the debate about the Simla Agreement itself took place and in which some of the hon. members who have now participated did participate even at that time.

The present meeting, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, between the representatives of the Governments of Pakistan and India took place because of the initiative taken by us to convene a meeting either in Delhi or in Islamabad because we thought that certain statements that had been made by spokesmen of Pakistan after the Simla Agreement and, I would also like to add, some of the attitudes that came to our notice—attitudes adopted by the Pakistan Commanders in the course of the talks about the delineation of the line of control—appeared to us to be not quite consistent with the letter and spirit of the Simla Agreement. Therefore, we thought it necessary that there should be a discussion between the representatives of the two Governments so that we may be able to review the situation and may again try to bring the parties back to the implementation of the Simla Agreement.

The two Delegations met in Delhi and there were discussions that took place for a long time, and at the end of the discussions, a Joint Statement was issued—I have placed a copy of that Joint Statement on the Table of the House. I would like to add that I also made a fairly detailed statement giving all the facts, chronological, and our assessment of the present situation.

It is interesting that the present discussion started on my statement which was also laid on the Table of the House with a copy of the Joint Statement. But in the debate that ensued, the critics have conveniently forgotten either the contents of my statement or, by and large, the contents of the Joint Statement signed by the representatives of the two Governments. And, in all humility, I would like to say that there has been a great deal of digression, exhibition of emotion—misplaced, to my mind, because unless, in our system, we clinch the points and raise any specific point, it is very difficult to deal with such a debate; it is very difficult to deal with emotion. I cannot match emotion with emotion. I can meet some points but I cannot meet emotions.

What are the points that have emerged and which require replies? I have no intention to repeat what is contained in my statement or in the Joint Statement. That is the property of the House. I have made my statement and I have placed a copy of the Joint Statement on the Table of the House. I would, therefore, confine myself to answering some of the points that have been raised.

One point has been raised: what will happen to the two posts in the Lippa Valley which, according to us, were taken by Pakistan after 17th December? The agreement is quite clear. Both the sides are committed that the line of control as it existed on 17th December will be restored and the two Commanders will settle that line of control.

And I have no doubt in my mind that these two posts cannot be retained by Pakistan because they were not with Pakistan on the 17th of December. So, the position was quite clear . . .

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: Was it not very clear in the Simla Agreement?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The Simla Agreement settled the principle, that the line as it existed on the 17th December has to be respected by the two sides. But, there may be a difference of opinion as to what was the line on the 17th of December. This is precisely the business of the two representatives and in this case, the two Governments have entrusted this responsibility to the Commanders because they were familiar with what was happening on the ground and if the line of control had been settled in Simla itself, then we should have withdrawn on the following day.

Under the Simla Agreement the principle was settled that the line of control as it existed on the 17th December has to be respected. But somebody has to show on the ground where the line is and also to delineate it on maps. So, this is the process which has been going on and I would like to remind this hon House . . . (Interruptions) that while I made the statement about the Simla Agreement, I had said that the question of delineation of the line of control and the question of withdrawal will have to be simultaneous . . .

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: That was very wise.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Now, as a matter of fact, according to this agreement, the line of control has to be delineated first and the withdrawals will take place eleven days later. So, if anything we have tried to give a concrete shape—within a time frame from the date the agreement has been arrived at. So, I do not see what objection can there be to this approach.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: There is no question of any objection. There is no clarification.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I am giving the clarification. I am glad that you are in a mood to listen to the clarification.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: Yes, of course, That is why we raised this subject.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: That is the object of this discussion.

Another point has been made. What is the role of the UN Observers in relation to the line of control? The reply is simple. The UN Observers were there in accordance with the Karachi agreement. There was a cease-fire line and the UN observers' role was to see that there were no disturbances of that cease-fire line and no violations of that cease-fire line. Now, there is no cease-fire line. There is a line of control. There is no Karachi Agreement and there is no UN role at all in relation to the line of control because the line of control did not exist when the UN Observers were there.

I would also like to draw the attention as to what is the agreement about this line of control . . .

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: We would like to know whether this fact was brought to the notice of Pakistan. It is the question of attitude of Pakistan. We want to know . . . (Interruptions). Otherwise, what is the use of raising this discussion?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I thought the Jana Sangh has amended their original attitude of obstructing . . .

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: Not exactly . . .

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: You have not abandoned that?

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: What is the clarification? . . . (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. How many times you will repeat a question?

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: I wanted a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He says he will give the clarification.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The line of control, in Jammu and Kashmir, resulting from the cease-fire of December 17, 1971, will be delineated along its entire length.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What does it mean?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I will explain the significance of that.

At the present moment I am on the question of UN Observers. Further maps showing this line will be exchanged by both sides. That is the second component.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

(3) Inviolability of the line of control will be ensured by both the sides . . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Without prejudice to their recognised position. . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: There is no question of UN Observers at all.

Now this point has been raised: What is the significance when it is said that this is without prejudice to the position of the two sides? This is a broad question. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify it. We have to remember, there is no final settlement about Jammu and Kashmir in this Simla agreement. The agreement is that there will be a final settlement. You cannot expect the other side to give up their legal attitude till there is a final settlement. What is meant in so many words is that our position in relation to Jammu and Kashmir is there—that is the legal position,—but notwithstanding that legal position there is the physical position on the ground so that there will be a new line of control delineated along the entire length.

At this stage I would like also to explain the significance as to why we now say that it is to be delineated on the entire length. There was an attempt on the side of Pakistan to say that the major part of the original cease-fire line was not disturbed in the course of war and there were only certain deviations or disturbances of that line. There was an argument which was put across—mistakenly according to us, and they did not stick to that argument in the course of the discussion—as if there could be some role for the UN along that portion which was not disturbed. But now, according to this agreement there is going to be a delineation of the line of control as it stood on December 17, in the entire length, which means, the line of control is what will emerge on the maps and on the ground, as a result of the agreement between the two countries, saying, this is the line of control, so that we can be doubly sure that there is no relationship with the 1949—cease-fire line, so that there may not be any argument later that something of the original thing is still left for which there may be some remote chance of UN observers coming.

This is the whole significance of the present agreement, that in view of the clear agreement between the two sides, the inviolability of the line of control will be observed by both the sides.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : It would be decided by the two commanders.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: By the two commanders. Yes. This has to be completed by the 4th. Now, this is so far as these two points which were raised were concerned.

Now, the hon. Member asked: Why was Bangladesh not present in the talks?

It is a very valid question. The answer is simple. The leaders of Bangladesh had taken a very clear position and they said, "we are not going to talk to any representative of Pakistan till we are on terms of equality," meaning thereby that till Pakistan recognises Bangladesh. The Bangladesh Prime Minister and Foreign Minister have made the position clear that they do not want to discuss anything with Pakistan unless they are on terms of equality, meaning thereby, that they will not discuss anything unless Pakistan recognises Bangladesh. It has been suggested perhaps by way of a complaint as if we have been remiss by not bringing Bangladesh to the conference table. This is a complete misunderstanding of the situation.

It would have been very unfair on our part to suggest to Bangladesh that they should come to the Conference table. It would not have been fair on us to suggest to Bangladesh that they should come to the conference table knowing full well that they have taken a stand that they would not go to the conference table unless Pakistan recognises Bangladesh.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Why did you go to conference table specifically without Bangladesh?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Because we are realists, we are not dreamers like you!

The point that I was making out was this. There are several matters; let us be quite candid; there are several matters which are purely of a bilateral character between us and Pakistan. The obvious case in point is that of the question of Jammu and Kashmir. Then, there were prisoners of war on the western side. On the western side, areas and changed hands as result of the vicissitudes of war. So, there were several matters which we had to discuss. And any more that takes place in establishing bilateral contacts and in trying to sort out whatever may be in the way is a welcome move, and we cannot take this attitude that unless this is satisfied, unless that is satisfied, we are not even prepared to talk. That is not wise; that is not in our national interest, and, therefore, it was quite proper, and in fact very much in our interest to start talks with Pakistan so that these matters which are purely bilateral between us and Pakistan should be capable



of being resolved; at any rate if they cannot be resolved, there should be an agreement about the manner in which they should be resolved, and I have enunciated the manner more than once. It is that all differences are to be resolved bilaterally. This is the cornerstone in the whole agreement. If we find that there is any deviation from this, we shall have no hesitation in getting in touch with Pakistan again and we shall remind them. 'This is the agreement, this act that you are doing is not consistent with the terms of the agreement, let us, both sides, adhere to the agreement', and this was the exercise that was attended to.

Then, a minor point was raised that the Pakistani delegation gave the copies of the joint statement to some foreign press, and, therefore, it is argued that this was such a serious matter that we should have gone to the length of saying that they have abrogated the agreement and therefore, the whole agreement goes. It is a very strange argument, which is difficult for me to understand. We also gave copies of the statement to our press well in advance. This is a well known thing which I think hon. Members with their vast experience should know.

**SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI:** Copies are given with an embargo "Not to be printed before 9.30 p.m."

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** It was agreed by both sides that this would not be published before midnight that evening. Even when there are embargos, our press is co-operative, and we give the copies to them before, and we put an embargo 'Not to be published before such and such time'. That is quite normal. I do not see what objection there can be to this. We had also supplied copies to our press people. But I am very glad that none of them used that in any manner till the time specified in the embargo had been reached. So, I do not see what was the point of grievance made in this connection. I had to mention this because the hon. Member from the Jan Sangh had sent to the Speaker in writing as if any great violation of a principle had been involved. There was nothing in it. It is just a normal way of dealing with the press that we give them advance information with an embargo.

Then, it was mentioned that it was a strange joint statement which talked of recommendations made to the Governments. Well, they were plenipotentiaries, and they were discussing on behalf of their Governments, and it was quite normal for them to

say that 'We are making these joint recommendations for their acceptance by both Governments'. Even when the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India, the heads of Governments, were discussing things, and when even they entered into an agreement at Simla, even that was subject to ratification. So, there was nothing wrong in that. But I would now like to take this opportunity of informing the House that these recommendations have been accepted by both Governments. Pakistan's acceptance of the recommendations has been conveyed to us, and we have also conveyed to them our acceptance of the recommendations which have been jointly made. This shows that there is willingness on both sides to adhere to the agreement and to the terms thereof.

Now some points have been raised and clarifications sought by the leader of the Congress Opposition. I have answered one of his points about delineation of the entire length; I have also tried to explain the non-presence of Bangla Desh in Simla; UN observers also I have touched upon. The only point left is the question of the displaced persons. About this the position is simple. These persons who have been displaced from Pakistan territory are the responsibility of the Government of Pakistan. They are legally responsible, they are morally responsible, and we should never permit Pakistan to get out of that responsibility. Therefore, we will continue to remind them, as we have always reminded them, that it is primarily their responsibility to create conditions in that part where these persons can feel that they can return in safety of their person and in safety of their property. Therefore, we will continue to remind Pakistan of this responsibility.

It was in this connection that I myself had written to the Minister in charge of Political Affairs of Pakistan, Mr. Jatoi, reminding him of the steps that they should take. The reply was belated—and this was one of the points that was a matter of worry to us. I have no hesitation in taking the House into confidence that the reply by Mr. Jatoi was despatched only after they received the letter of our Prime Minister pointing out that there are several matters which are causing us concern. Thereafter, Mr. Jatoi wrote the reply. But I must say that the reply is constructive. He has said that they are desirous of taking back all these people, and they will ensure that they live there in safety of every type. They have also agreed upon a certain plan of action. It is not just a vague idea, and I have also placed a copy of what has been agreed between the two Commanders, on

[Shri Swaran Singh]

the Table. There are fairly detailed steps to be taken in the form of locating the police and making arrangements when they should move, what should be the chronological order in which this movement takes place. So all that is there.

But I would like to add that any scheme which may appear to be good on paper may not turn to be good because it is a question of human psychology, how they react to it, whether they feel that the conditions that are now created there are such in which they can find it safe to return. It is our expectation that Pakistan would discharge their responsibility in this respect and would emulate, may be to a very small degree, what Bangla Desh has done, because they created the conditions there. Ali the 10 million or 9½ million who came here went back because they knew that they could return in safety and honour.

So it is for Pakistan now to create conditions where, if they want to discharge their responsibility which they squarely own, they have to create these conditions in which these people can feel that they could return there without their person or their property being damaged, without their honour being subjected to any pressure or any tension. So it is for the Pakistan Government, both at the political level as also at the administrative level, to create the necessary conditions. We must be realists; we must remember that still there may be some people who would like to come over to us, who may not find it possible to return; in all such cases, consistent with our traditions of tolerance, our traditions of attaching certain importance to human values, we would not take an inhuman view of the situation, and certainly we cannot shoot people, we cannot at the point of the bayonet compel them.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central): That need not be explained; that is our basic stand.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: This is the whole question about the refugees. So, I

would say that these meetings at the official level, of the representatives of the two sides, have brought back the Simla agreement on to the rails. We are approaching this problem not with any optimism but in a spirit of realism, and we have to ensure that there is no deviation from their side, they are perfectly entitled to come to us, if we deviate from the Simla agreement. It will be our endeavour, therefore, to implement the Simla agreement, because we feel that the interests of the people of India and of Pakistan, the interests of peace, are more important, and it is to achieve that durable peace that we entered into the Simla agreement, and we are determined to implement it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: One sentence, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: After a long speech?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Just one sentence. The hon. Minister, in his wisdom, says that he considers this as a realistic approach, to have bilateral talks with Pakistan to the exclusion of Bangladesh. I want to know from the Government whether they will also consider it a realistic approach, namely, the exchange of prisoners of India and Pakistan to the exclusion of Bangladesh, the soldiers of India and Pakistan who have been captured in the western front.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: There is no difficulty about the exchange of prisoners that are with us and who have been arrested on the western front. In fact, we had made the proposal, but President Bhutto for his own reasons thought that he would like to deal with the entire question of prisoners of war together. We made the position clear that Bangladesh is a necessary party; they have to be associated with any discussion; their agreement has to be there. That position is absolutely clear.

18.32 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, September 4, 1972/Bhadra 13, 1894 (Saka).*