

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

घौर सब पार्टीज मिल कर लेती हैं तो बड़ी मुश्किल हो जाती है अगर हर एक पर एमैंड-मेंट्स लानी पड़े . . .

श्री हरि बिष्णु कामत : हाउस बढ़ा सकता है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हाउस को प्रखत्यार है ।
ऐसी जरूरत है तो हाउस देख ले ।

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 16th August, 1965."

The motion was adopted.

13-00 hrs.

MOTION RE: INDO-PAKISTAN AGREEMENT ON GUJARAT-WEST PAKISTAN BORDER—
Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri on the 16th August, 1965, namely:—

"That the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border be taken into consideration."

श्री उ० भू० त्रिबेदी (मंदसौर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कच्छ का जो अनुबन्ध हमारे साथ हुआ है, इससे सारे भारत वर्ष में एक दुःख की लहर दौड़ गयी है। किसी कारणवश कई धादमी, जो अपने को चतुर गिनते हैं, वह यह समझते हैं कि इस में भी चतुराई हुई है। बनिया दूसरे को धोखा देने के बतल जब तराजू से तोलता है और एक डंडी मार देता

है, तो वह बोलता है, मैं ने कौसी चतुराई की कि उसे कमती तोल दिया। ऐसी ही कुछ भावना उन धादमियों की होती है जो नैकनीयती से, प्रामाणिकता से, सचाई से किसी चीज का सामना नहीं कर सकते।

हम इस अनुबन्ध को देखें और हम अपने दिलों को टटोर्नें तो यह वास्तविकता हमारे सामने धायेगी कि हमें शर्म से अपनी आँखें नीची कर लेनी पड़ेंगी। इस सदन में हम सब सदस्यों ने मिल कर यह प्रस्ताव रखा था कि हम अपनी जमीन का एक इंच भी किसी हालत में नहीं देंगे। इतना ही नहीं, परन्तु जब तक स्टेटस को एंटी (Status quo ante) कायम न हो जाये किसी प्रकार का वार्तालाप नहीं करेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, दुःख की बात यह है कि कच्छ का और सिन्ध का जो सीमा प्रदेश है वह फुदरती ऐसा बना हुआ है कि उस में किसी प्रकार की भूल होने का कारण पैदा नहीं होता। जहां कच्छ की सीमा का भ्रन्त होता है, जहां से सिन्ध की सीमा शुरू होती है, वहां जमीन ऊंची है और हमारी कच्छ की भूमि नीची है। फुदरत ने ही उसको ऐसा बनाया है कि उस में कहीं शंका को स्थान नहीं हो सकता। इतना होते हुए भी वहां पर हम ने स्तम्भ गाड़ रखे हैं और बराबर नाप से स्तम्भ गाड़े हुए हैं।

ऐसी भूमि पर आक्रमण कर पाकिस्तान ने यह बता दिया कि झगड़ा करना हो तो किसी प्रकार से भी झगड़ा किया जा सकता है। पानी ऊपर से नीचे को बह के घाता हो, सब भी भेड़िया यह कह सकता है कि पानी नीचे से बह के ऊपर घा रहा है, और पानी गदसा हो रहा है। पाकिस्तान ने जहां चाहा वहां हमारे साथ झगड़ा पैदा करने के वास्ते कोई नई समस्या खड़ी कर दी, और उस के बाद में हम ऐसे झुकते चले जाते हैं कि मानों वह समस्या किसी एक विषाद के कारण है, और उस

विवाद का निर्णय हम को किसी न्यायालय द्वारा करा लेना चाहिए। जब विवाद के वास्ते स्थान नहीं, जिसे धंधेजी में कहते हैं "काज धाफ ऐक्शन", तो उस काज धाफ ऐक्शन को किसी न्यायालय को सुनने का अधिकार नहीं। विवादास्पद कोई बात ही नहीं है। धीर अगर हम इस पर उठे रहते कि कोई विवादास्पद बात नहीं है धीर पाकिस्तान हमला करता तब भी हमें उसको वहां से धकेल कर निकालने का अधिकार था क्योंकि वह हमारे गृह में प्रवेश करना चाहता था। गृह प्रवेश के मामले में एक साधारण मनुष्य को अधिकार है कि अपनी जमीन की रक्षा करने के वास्ते, अपनी स्त्री धीर अपनी सन्तान की रक्षा करने के वास्ते, अपनी जाति की रक्षा करने के वास्ते वह किसी धादमी को जान से भी मार सकता है। धीर हम तो एक बड़े अधिकार वाले संबंद्धता सम्पन्न राष्ट्र हैं, हमारे पास सत्ता थी, हमारे पास यंत्र थे, साधन थे। यह स्थिति होती हुए भी हम ने पाकिस्तान को मार के नहीं निकाला यह हमारी एक गम्भीर भूल हुई है। हम ने क्यों उससे वार्तालाप करना शुरू किया। क्या हम स्पष्ट रूप से नहीं कह सकते थे कि पहले धाफ चले जाइये धीर फिर हम बातचीत करेंगे।

एक मानवीय सबस्य : कहा तो था।

धी ३० मू० त्रिबेदी : कहा तो था पर किया नहीं धीर यही तो दुःख है कि जो कहते हैं उसके अनुसार करते नहीं।

धाज हम ने देखा कि यह समझौता हुआ, बड़ी स्थानी स्थानी बातें हुईं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री भले बन कर धंधेजों के प्राइम मिनिस्टर के चक्कर में घा गये। उन्होंने पीठ थपथपायी, उन्होंने मान देकर इज्जत बढ़ा दी, कह दिया कि धाफ बहुत बड़े धादमी हैं, यह छोटी बात क्या करते हैं। धाइए, बैठिए, हम मसले को मुलझाते हैं, धीर इस चक्कर में ला कर हेरोल्ड बिस्सन साहब ने सब बातें उनके सामने रखीं धीर उन्होंने अपना सिर हिला दिया।

एक मानवीय सबस्य : वहां बैठ कर चक्कर में घा गये।

धी ३० मू० त्रिबेदी : पालियामेंट से पूछने तक का समय उनके पास नहीं रहा। उन्होंने सोचा तक नहीं कि पालियामेंट को पूछना है। वहां बैठ कर उन्होंने एक समझौते पर दस्तखत करने के वास्ते हां भर ली धीर यहां साले बहनोई पास-पास बैठ गये फट-फट दस्तखत कर विये। धीर हमारे देश के वास्ते एक विघातक समस्या पैदा कर दी। इसका गम्भीर परिणाम होगा। हमें सोचना होगा कि क्या जहां-जहां पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ झगड़ा पैदा करेगा, क्या हम वे सारे मसले ट्राइबुनल को तै करने के वास्ते दे देंगे। अगर कल पाकिस्तान धमूतसर पर दाबा करे तो धमूतसर का मसला भी दे दो हल करने के वास्ते। अगर पाकिस्तान जैसेलमेर पर हमला करे तो उसका मसला भी दे दो हल करने के वास्ते। कल को पाकिस्तान कलकत्ते पर हमला करे तो कलकत्ते का मसला भी दे दो हल करने के वास्ते। इस 34 हजार बर्गमील जमीन के मामले को हल करने का अधिकार ट्राइबुनल के हाथ में दे कर हम ने भारी भूल की है। हो सकता है कि इस गम्भीर भूल का परिणाम धाज की प्रजा को न भोगना पड़े। लेकिन दो साल बाद या दस साल के बाद उसके बहुत बुरे परिणाम हो सकते हैं।

किसी भी सार्वभौम सत्ता को अपनी सत्ता का प्रयोग करने का अधिकार मात्र नहीं होता, उसको उसका प्रयोग करना ही चाहिए, यह उसका फर्ज होता है। कोई हमारे घर में धुस धावे, धीर हम उसे जानते हैं कि यह चोर है, नामी चोर है, दस नम्बरी है, इसका नाम मिखा है पुलिस थाने में, उसको भी हमें थपथप मारने में संकोच होता है। इसके लिए किसी के सरटिफिकेट की जरूरत नहीं है। उसका सरटिफिकेट तो टंगा है पुलिस थाने में। सारी दुनिया पाकिस्तान को जानती है। पाकिस्तान के वाम्ने कुछ लोगों को हर्मदर्वी है। मैं भी दूसरे देश के धादमियों से मिलता हूँ। वह भी कई दफे पाकिस्तान के वाम्ने

[श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी]

हमदर्दी बतलाते हैं। वही तो हमारे दुर्भाग्य का एक कारण है कि हम पाकिस्तान का प्राज जो प्रपंच और जान फौला हुआ है उस को किसी तरीके से हटाने के वास्ते उतना प्रयत्न नहीं करते जितना प्रयत्न कि हम को करना चाहिए।

13.11 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

कई हमारे राजदूत ऐसे हैं कि वह उस को मजाक समझते हैं। अभी मैं एक राजदूत का एक लेख पढ़ रहा था। उस को पढ़ कर उन की मनोवृत्ति जो मुझ पर प्रकट हुई उससे मुझे दुःख हुआ। किसी भी भारतवासी के दिल में और खासकर हमारे एक राजदूत के दिल में भारतवर्ष के प्रेम की एक भाग की लपट होनी चाहिए। वह शान्त नहीं हो सकता। भारत के भलावा दूसरा और कोई मुल्क उस के लिए नहीं है। उसी का वह दूत है उसी के वास्ते उसे कार्य करना चाहिए और उसी की इज्जत बढ़ानी चाहिए। उस का मजाक करने का या उस का मजाक सहने का उसे कोई अधिकार नहीं है। लेकिन दुर्भाग्यवश ऐसे भ्रादमी राजदूत बन कर चले जाते हैं, व्यक्तिगत बात मैं न कहूँ, लेकिन सुनने में ऐसी बात धाती है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री तक को एक मजाक का साधन मान कर बात करते हैं। जाहिर है कि ऐसे भ्रादमियों के द्वारा हम अपने देश की इज्जत नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं। हम भारतवासी होकर अपने देश का मजाक अगर सह लें तो नतीजा वही होता है जो आज पाकिस्तान सारी दुनिया में यह फौलाव कर चुका है, यह बात फौला चुका है कि हम बहुत छोटे हैं और यह हमें मार रहा है। यह तो वही बात हुई कि चोर चोरी करे और कोतवाल का नाम देवे। ऐसी स्थिति हमारी आज हो रही है। जब से पाकिस्तान का निर्माण हुआ है तब से लेकर आज तक पाकिस्तान ने हम पर कितने हार के दिये हैं और उन हमलों पर हम ने क्या प्रकाश डाला है? वह हमले किस प्रकार के हैं यह हम किसी के सामने रख नहीं सकते।

भलबत्ता अपने घर में बैठ कर बातें करना हम शुरू कर सकते हैं। हमारी सहिष्णुता का भी कहीं अंत होना चाहिए। आज हमारे देश पर हमला हो रहा है। आज हमारे देश पर शत्रु द्वारा बम के गोले बरसाये जा रहे हैं। 80, 80 पौंड की तोपों से हमारे ऊपर हमला हो रहा है। हम ने विश्वमंच से ऐलान किया हुआ है कि हम एक शांतिप्रिय देश हैं। हम शांति के लिए वचनबद्ध हैं और चूँकि हम एक बड़े मुल्क हैं इसलिए सारी दुनिया हमारी ओर देख रही है। हमें लड़ाई का मार्ग नहीं अपनाना है शांति की नीति पर कायम रहना है। ऐसा हमारा विश्व प्रेम है, जगत प्रेम है और शांति प्रेम है। इस वास्ते हम इन सब बातों को मान लेने को तैयार हैं। इसी का नतीजा आज हम यह देख रहे हैं कि श्री स्वर्ण सिंह भूट्टो साहब को यहां भ्राने और बातचीत करने का निमंत्रण दे रहे हैं। यह हमारे वास्ते बड़ा शर्म की बात है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब मैं इस अनुबन्ध को पढ़ता हूँ तो एक वाक्य हमारे सामने धाता है और वह वाक्य हमने यह लिखा है :—

"In the confidence that this will also contribute to a reduction of the present tension along the entire Indo-Pakistan border."

यह प्रीएम्बल है। इस के आधार पर हम ने इस एपीमेंट पर दस्तखत किये हैं। क्या इतने हम सब भ्रादमी भंघे हैं जो इस चीज को नहीं देखना चाहते कि वह हमारे ऊपर हमला करने की ताकत रखता है? किसी भी भ्रादमी का एंटीसिडेंट, प्रीसिडेंट और सन्सिक्च्यूट कंडक्ट यह बतलाता है कि वह किस प्रकार का भ्रादमी है। उसके प्रागे पीछे की दोनों बातें हमें सोचनी पड़ेंगी। आखिर कौन सी ऐसी बात है जिस से हमने सोच लिया कि पाकिस्तान अपने वचन

पर कायम रहेगा ? कौन सी ऐसी बात थी इन पिछले 18 साल के दरमियान ऐसी कौन सी बात हुई जिस से हम यह कह सकते हैं कि पाकिस्तान का हमेशा ऐसा आचरण रहा है, जिस के कि कारण हम उस पर विश्वास करने को बाध्य हो सकते हैं ? एक, एक बात उस की ऐसी रही जो हम को धोखा देने वाली थी । उसने हमें हर वक्त धोखा दिया । वह हर वक्त हम से लड़ाई करने पर भ्रमादा रहा है और हमेशा हमारी तरफ उसका हेटफुल कंटवट रहा है । हमारा बड़े से बड़ा भ्रादमी हो लेकिन पाकिस्तान में जा कर एक शब्द भी वह भारतवर्ष के पक्ष में बोलने की जुरंत नहीं कर सकता है । हमारे बड़े से बड़े भ्रादमी की वहां पर बेइज्जती हो सकती है । आज हम वहां पर चले जावें तो हमें सदा एक डर और फिकर लगी रहती है और हालत यह है कि हम वहां पर बतौर एक भारतवासी के क्रुदम नहीं रख सकते और भ्राजादी के साथ नहीं चल फिर सकते लेकिन इस के विपरीत जब कोई पाकिस्तानी यहां पर आता है तो वह पूरी भ्राजादी के साथ बतौर एक पाकिस्तानी के इधर, उधर घूमता फिरता है और मस्जिदों में जाता है । गांवों में मजे से घूमता है और डाके डालता है फिर भी वह चलता रहता है और हम लोग उसकी परवाह नहीं करते लेकिन हमारे किसी भी भारतवर्ष के नागरिक को यह हिम्मत नहीं हो सकती कि वहां पाकिस्तान में जा कर किसी गली, कूचे में भ्राजादी के साथ घूम फिर सके । पाकिस्तान जो कि हमारी जान का दुश्मन है उन हमारे जानी दुश्मनों के साथ ऐसा व्यवहार करने का अधिकार किस भ्राधार पर आपको प्राप्त होता है जो आपने यह लिख दिया :—

"It will contribute to a reduction of the present tension along the entire Indo-Pakistan border."

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बड़ी मुशानता भ्रामेज

चीज है । ऐसी बात उस प्रीऐम्बल में नहीं रखनी चाहिए थी । आपको इस बात को सोचना चाहिये था । आपने स्टेटस को ऐंटी कच्छ के बारे में कहा था तो क्या आप को यह मालूम था कि यह डीव और सुराई की पंटीलिंग के वास्ते पाकिस्तान भारतवर्ष की भूमि का उपयोग करता है । अगर उस रास्ते का उपयोग पाकिस्तान नहीं करता है तो उसको इस में शामिल करने की क्या जरूरत थी ? उन के कहने भर से क्या हमें यह मान लेना चाहिए था कि हमारे अफसर सब बेईमान हैं और झूठे हैं और हमारे कागजात व दस्तावेजात सब झूठे हैं और दस्तावेज अगर सच्चे हैं तो पाकिस्तान के सच्चे हैं ? पाकिस्तान की यह बात मान लेने का हमें क्या अधिकार था ? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह हमारे वास्ते एक बड़ी तौहीन की बात है कि हम अपनी बात को नहीं मानते और दुश्मन की बात को सही मानते हैं और दुश्मन की बात को हम तरजीह देते हैं । उसका कुपरिणाम आज हमें भोगना पड़ रहा है ।

समय का तकाजा है कि सरकार अब अपनी डरपोक व दब्बू नीति का परित्याग करे । डरने के दिन चले गये । हम वैसे शांति प्रेमी जरूर हैं लेकिन देश की इज्जत और आत्मसम्मान को खोकर नहीं । अपने देश की मान, मर्यादा व इज्जत की रक्षा करने के लिए अगर लड़ाई करनी पड़ती है तो हमें उस से डरना नहीं है क्योंकि अगर लड़ाई हुई और वह बड़ी तो सारी दुनिया को नुकसान होगा सिर्फ भारतवर्ष का ही नुकसान नहीं होगा । स्वेज केनाल के मामले में हम ने देखा कि नासिर ने उस पार ब्रिटिश सरकार से टक्कर मी, मि० ईडन बहुत कुछ चिल्लाये लेकिन कुछ उसका बना न सके, उन्हें गडी छोड़ कर जाना पड़ा और

[श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी]

स्वैज केनाल नासिर के पास रही । परशियन गल्फ के सारे मामले के ऊपर नजर डालिये । क्या कोई डरता है ? आज इजराईल एक छोटा सा मुल्क है लेकिन कदम बढ़ा कर चल रहा है । कोई ताकत नहीं है जो कि उसे दबा सके । वह मरने और मारने के वास्ते तैयार होकर बैठा है । वह बीस लाख की प्रजा आज सात करोड़ के सामने अपनी हिम्मत के बल पर खड़ी हुई है तो क्या हम 45 करोड़ भादमी इन सात करोड़ भादमियों के सामने खड़े नहीं हो सकते ? इजराईल ने सीरिया की नाक में दम कर रक्खा है । आज धाखिर हमारे शासकों को डर किस का लगता है ? उन के पीछे देश की 45 करोड़ जनता है । आपको किसका सर्टिफिकेट चाहिए ? जब 45 करोड़ इस देश की जनता आपके पीछे है तो फिर आपको किसी अन्य से सर्टिफिकेट लेने की जरूरत नहीं है । जब 45 करोड़ देश की जनता आपके पीछे हो और आपको सहयोग व समर्थन दे रही हो तो आपको किसी बात की चिन्ता न करनी चाहिये और उस हालत में दुनिया की कोई भी ताकत, पाकिस्तान का तो कहना ही क्या, आपके प्रागे टिक नहीं सकती है । हम को किसी का सर्टिफिकेट नहीं चाहिए । आज भारतवर्ष की जो धावाज है उसे आपको सुनना पड़ेगा । यह ठीक है कि आपके हाथ में राज्य सत्ता है लेकिन आप भारतवासी हैं इसको आप एक क्षण के लिए भी नहीं भूल सकते हैं । आपको देश का प्रेम है और मुझे भी देश का प्रेम है इस लिए आप मुझ पर यह इल्जाम नहीं लगा सकते कि मैं व्यर्थ में युद्ध की बात करता हूँ । मैं यह प्रवचन कहता हूँ कि हम में दुर्भाग्यवश यह जो दुर्बलता की नीति धा गई है उसको हटाया जाय । उससे आज खबराने की आवश्यकता नहीं है । देश आपके पीछे है । उस दिन भी

मैंने कहा था कि जिसके पीछे देश की जनता हो उसे किसी की भी फिर नहीं करनी चाहिये । अमरीका आप के साथ है और रहेगा । इंग्लैंड भी आपके साथ है और रहेगा । उन के साथ में सारी प्रजा है । रूस से भी आप को खबराने की जरूरत नहीं है । रूस एक ईमानदार राज्य के अनुसार आप के पीछे रहेगा । अलबत्ता अगर डर है तो उन बदमाशों का डर है, चीन और पाकिस्तान का डर है जोकि हम से हमेशा लड़ने के वास्ते तैयार हैं । यह बड़े दुःख की बात है कि रन ऑफ कच्छ में हमने बिलकुल हथियार डाल दिये । बड़े दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि कैसे हम लोगों ने माम लिया कि जहाँ हमारी फौजें जा सकती थीं उस भूमि पर से हम अपनी फौजें हटा लें और महज इस से हम संतुष्ट हो गये कि वह कंजरकोट से हट गये । कंजरकोट में हमारी फौज को जाने का अधिकार है । सरकार ने उस को किस प्रकार से संकुचित किया ? उस ने उस में क्यों रुकावट डाली ? मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता कि ऐसा करने का क्या कारण था । अगर मैं किसी दूसरे के दबाव के आधार पर यह मान जाऊँ कि जहाँ मैं अपनी फौज रखता था, वहाँ नहीं रखूँगा, जहाँ मैं अपनी पुलिस रखता था, वहाँ नहीं रखूँगा, तो क्या इस को उचित कहा जा सकता है ? यह मेरी मर्जी है कि मैं अपनी जगह में फौज रखूँ पुलिस रखूँ, या उस को खाली रखूँ । कौन बाहर वाला मुझे इस बारे में कहने की ताकत रखता है ? सरकार ने अपने देश की सार्वभौमिकता का अधिकार खो दिया है । मैं समझता हूँ कि उस को अपने दिल में डर नहीं रखना चाहिए । जिस जगह को हम अपनी समझते हैं, उस पर हमें अपनी फौज भेजने का अधिकार होना चाहिए । इसलिए जब

हैं इस समझौते को पढ़ता हूँ, तो मुझे बड़ा दुःख होता है ।

फिर इस समझौते में धन्याय यह हुआ है कि सरकार ने सब कुछ ट्रिब्यूनल पर छोड़ दिया है । हमारे एक्सटर्नल एफ़ेयर्स मिनिस्टर तो भ्रष्ट वकील रहे हैं । वह इस बात को खूब भ्रष्टी तरह से समझते हैं कि मुकदमे बाजी में कोई नहीं कह सकता है कि जंट कौन सी करवट बैठेगा । भगर वह कहीं ऐसी करवट बैठ गया कि हमारी 3400 वर्गमील भूमि चली गई, तो खाली सरकार की नहीं, हम सब की नाक कट जायेगी ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : उनकी नाक है ही नहीं ।

श्री उ० मु० त्रिबेदी : नाक उनकी है । भगर उन की नाक न होती तो हम से लड़ने को क्यों आते, हमें जेलों में क्यों बन्द करते ? नाक कटने का डर है, इसीलिये वे डी. धार्ड. धार. का उपयोग कर रहे हैं ।

यह जो समझौता हुआ है, यह देश के लिए घातक ही नहीं है, बल्कि यह देश को नीचा दिखाने वाला है । इस के कारण हम को घपना सिर लज्जा से नीचे करना पड़ता है । कल भारतवर्ष के कोने कोने से यहां पर धादमी आए । क्यों आए थे ? क्या उन गरीबों के पास पैसा उछल रहा था ? उन के मन में एक भावना थी, उन के मन में एक जोश था कि इतने लोगों को देख कर शायद सरकार झुक जायेगी और हमारी बात मान लेगी । वे लोग सरकार के पास प्रार्थना करने आए थे । धर्मजी ला, रोमन ला का सिद्धांत है कि सरकार मां-बाप होती है और मां-बाप को कहने का अधिकार बच्चों का होता है—प्रजा को अधिकार होता है कि वह सरकार ने अपनी

बात कहे । इस आधार पर 230 हजार धादमी सरकार के पास प्रार्थनापत्र पेश करने के लिए आए थे । सरकार उस पर विचार करे और उस भावना को देखे और फिर अपने मन में दूढ़ निश्चय कर ले कि भ्रष्टों से बात करने की जरूरत नहीं है ? सरकार ने जो समझौता किया है, उस को वह फाड़ कर फेंक दे, उसको रद्दी की टोकरी में डाल दे—उस की कोई जरूरत नहीं है ।

इस का जो भी परिणाम होगा, मारा भारतवर्ष उस के लिए तैयार है । भगर बदनामी होगी, तो सारे देश की होगी—खाली सरकार या किसी मंत्री की नहीं होगी । हो जाए सारे देश की बदनामी । इस की कोई फिक्र नहीं है । हमारे देश का सम्मान रहे, यही हमारे लिए सब से बड़ी इज्जत है । हमारे देश के सम्मान और गौरव के मुकाबले में एक व्यक्ति का सम्मान या गौरव कोई महत्व नहीं रखता है ।

भगर हम सब तरफ यही नीति अपनाते चले गए, तो हम को अपने पूरे बाईर पर जमीन खोनी होगी, क्योंकि हमारे सब बाईर पर झगड़ा है । कौन सी ऐसी जगह है, जहां पर पाकिस्तान से हमारा झगड़ा नहीं है ? इधर वे लोग घूमनसर की तरफ घुसने की कोशिश करते हैं, बाइमेड़, जैसनमेर और पुंछ की तरफ घुसने की कोशिश करते हैं और उधर जलपाईगुड़ी, मिलीगुड़ी और त्रिपुरा की तरफ घुसने की कोशिश करते हैं । उन्होंने पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में सब माइनारिटीज को मार-मार उन का कब्र मर निकाल दिया, उनका खरम कर दिया । फिर भी हमारे मन में दर्द पैदा नहीं होता है कि इतने बंगाली मारे गए । वहां पर 140 लाख हिन्दुओं में से लगभग 70 लाख रह गये हैं । बाकी कहां चले गये वहां पर जैनोमाइड हो गया, लेकिन हम उस सवाल को भी नहीं उठा रहे हैं । हम सब जगह शांति, शांति की बात कहते हैं । यह कैसी शांति है ? यह शांति तो द्रोपदी बन्धन-हरण जैसी चीज हो रही है ।

[श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी]

आज देश प्रधान मंत्री श्रीर सरकार की तरफ देख रहा है। आज देश उन के वचन की तरफ देख रहा है, जो कि उन्होंने इस सदन को दिया था। देश को आशा है कि प्रधान मंत्री श्रीर यह सरकार उस वचन पर कटिबद्ध रहेंगे और उन से पीछे नहीं हटेंगे।

सरकार को यह बात अच्छी तरह से सोच लेनी चाहिए कि एक दफा चोरी हो गई, उस का इतना दुख नहीं होता है—यह हो जाती है, लेकिन चोर ने घर देख लिया, इस का दुख होता है। दुख इस बात का है कि चोर ने इस सरकार की यह कमजोरी देख ली कि इस देश पर हमला कर दिया, तब सीज फायर आयेगा, उस के बाद आपसी समझौता होगा और फिर इस देश को अपनी जमीन छोड़नी पड़ेगी। मैं कल चांग-काई-शेक की जीवनी पढ़ रहा था। उस में एक ही बात चली आ रही है—लड़ाई, सीज फायर, भागे बड़ना, फिर लड़ाई, सीज फायर, भागे बड़ना। आपस में अनुबन्ध और फिर भागे बड़ना। यही हमारे साथ होता चला आ रहा है। आखिर कब तक हम अपनी जमीन छोड़ते चले जायेंगे। पाकिस्तान पहले ही काश्मीर में हमारी चौदह हजार वर्ग मील जमीन दबाए बैठा है। वहां पर हम सीज फायर के भागे नहीं जा सकते हैं, लेकिन वे बमबारी कर रहे हैं। अब पाकिस्तान हम से कच्छ में 3400 वर्ग मील भूमि मांग रहा है। उस को वहां पर आने का अधिकार नहीं था, लेकिन वह आ गया।

सरकार की तरफ से कई किस्म के एक्सप्लेनेशन दिये जाने शुरू हुए। कहा गया कि पाकिस्तान टैंक ले कर आ गया और हम टैंक नहीं ले जा सकते, हमारे यहां पानी है, जब कि उन के यहां पानी नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि वहां पर जो झड़ने उन के लिए हैं, वही झड़ने हमारे लिए हैं—दोनों के लिए

एक सी ही झड़ने हैं। फिर हमारे सोलजर्ब ने, हमारे बहादुर सिपाहियों ने बता दिया है कि हम उन लोगों को मार सकते हैं और खदेड़ सकते हैं। क्या हम को अपनी आर्मी पर विश्वास नहीं है कि वह उन को खदेड़ सकती है। कहा जाता है कि हमारे पास अच्छे हथियार नहीं हैं। सवाल यह है कि यह सरकार सत्रह साल तक क्या करती रही थी कि उस ने अच्छे हथियार हासिल नहीं किये।

अब सरकार की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि डींग-मुराई तक के रास्ते पर पाकिस्तानी आते जाते थे। सरकार की पुलिस कैसी है कि उस को इस बात का पता ही नहीं चला? यहां की पुलिस श्री जे. बी. कृगलानी के पीछे तो लग जाती है और 110 नम्बर का तार भेजा जाता है कि वह फलां जगह जा रहे हैं। जब मैं अजमेर रवाना होता हूँ, तो सी० आई० डी० वाला दरवाजे पर खड़ा होता है कि आप आ गए साहब। इन बातों में तो सरकार बहुत तत्परता दिखाती है, लेकिन जो घादमी हमारे देश में घुसपैठ कर गए, जो हम को सता रहे हैं, जिन्होंने हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा कर लिया है, सरकार को उन के बारे में कुछ भी पता नहीं होता है। यह हमारे लिए शर्म की बात है। दिस गवर्नमेंट इज ए मोस्ट इनएफिशेंट गवर्नमेंट इन दिस रेस्पेक्ट। (This Government is most inefficient in this respect). यह ऐसी गवर्नमेंट है, जिस को पता नहीं चलता कि हमारे देश में क्या हो रहा है। हमारे घर में चोर घुस आए, लेकिन इस को मावूम नहीं होता है। सरकार ऐसे घादमियों पर विश्वास कर लेती है, जो कि विश्वास-योग्य नहीं होते।

आखिर में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो मोशनज मैंने भूव किये हैं, यह सदन उन पर ध्यान दे और मैं विरोधी दल के दूसरे मित्रों से आग्रह करूंगा कि वे इन सब प्रस्तावों

का समर्थन करें और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, उस को ठुकरा दिया जाये।

Shri K. C. Pant (Nainital): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when the Kutch agreement was signed on 30th June, 1965, many men of goodwill had expressed the wish that this would lead to a lessening of tensions and ultimately to a meaningful dialogue to solve the other outstanding problems between the two countries. Sir, I am afraid that this hope has been brutally shattered by Pakistan's insidious attack on Kashmir. And this has taken place within five weeks of the signing of that agreement. I am sure that all sections of the House will share and reflect the sense of outrage and indignation with which the country received this further proof of Pakistan's perfidy in its dealings with India.

I do not want at this stage to deal with the developments in Kashmir except to draw the attention of the House to one of its implications.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : जब तक काप्रेस में रहोगे, ऐसा ही होता रहेगा।

श्री कृ० चं० पन्त : स्वामी जी सब को शान्ति का पाठ पढ़ाते हैं—वह तो शान्त रह सकते हैं।

There is a great deal of hullabaloo over this agreement both in the House and outside. An attempt has been made to create an impression that aided and abetted by Mr. Wilson, Pakistan has somehow succeeded in either tricking or pressurising India into an unfavourable agreement. Does this charge bear the scrutiny of the House? If this was really the case and if the Kutch agreement gave Pakistan a great one-sided advantage as some friends opposite seem to think, then does it not strike them as rather odd that Pakistan chose this very moment to jeopardise the whole agreement by its incursions into Kashmir? If the territory

or other interests involved in this agreement were of such vital importance to Pakistan, would it not be reasonable to expect that they would have waited for another three months before creating trouble in Kashmir? Pakistan's apparent indifference to the settlement and implementation of the Kutch agreement can mean only one of two things. Either they do not attach importance to the territory which our friends suppose they do or they are not confident of winning their case under the procedure laid down under the Kutch agreement. No other interpretation is possible. In either case, it is obviously wrong to project the agreement as a great diplomatic victory for Pakistan.

The fact of the matter is that Pakistan's attack on Kutch was motivated not so much by territorial ambition as by political considerations and this fact has got to be understood clearly. Otherwise, there is a danger of getting over-involved in the details of the agreement and losing sight of its substance. As Mr. Trivedi said, we should not approach this problem from the point of view of a bania, who is out for a little gain here and there. That should not be the attitude. If we look at the agreement, what ultimately has Pakistan achieved by the agreement? It had to vacate the entire area which it had occupied. It had to give up its fruits of aggression and in withdrawing from this area—this is an important point—it had to confess to and swallow the charge of aggression, which it has so strenuously denied all along. What did it gain in return? The dubious satisfaction of bringing to life a dispute that had remained dormant for 17 years. Shorn of technicalities, this is really what the agreement amounts to. I ask our friends, was Pakistan's gain commensurate with the price it paid for it? I do not think anyone will say so.

Another question arises: If this were so, why did Pakistan sign the agreement? We get a clue to this

[Shri K. C. Pant]

puzzle from the pronouncements of some of Pakistan's leaders. According to Mr. Amjad Ali, Permanent Representative of Pakistan at the UN,

"...a just and equitable settlement of the Kashmir dispute lies at the root of the present trouble—(i.e. the Kutch trouble)—and tension in relations between my country and India."

Equally significant is what Mr. Bhutto said in London:

"The Rann of Kutch is blown out of proportion. It is not a dispute *per se*. It forms a part of a much bigger issue. The heart of the Indo-Pak dispute lies in the Srinagar Valley."

Thus, it is obvious that Pakistan is mainly interested in linking Kutch and Kashmir.

As against this, India's attitude has always been that each dispute stands on its own and it should be treated as a separate matter. Whether it is the Canal Waters Agreement or the Sheikh-Swaran Singh Agreement, India has always maintained that the solution of the other Indo-Pak problems should not be linked with that of Kashmir. I wonder if my friends opposite, who strongly and vigorously suggest that the Kutch agreement should be given up, should be disowned because of Pakistan's aggression in Kashmir, have considered these implications. If we insist on linking Kutch with Kashmir, we will be only falling into a trap. I would not like to say anything more, but I would like them to consider this aspect of the question.

I should now like to say a few words about the fighting in Kutch. Mr. Trivedi, I am sorry, found it necessary to say,

"रत राफ कच्छ में बिल्कुल हथियार डाल दिये"

What are the facts? One can state those facts a little more clearly today. I have attempted to piece together the story. The House will recall that Pakistan went out of its way to create an image of an Indian soldier who runs away from battle. What are the facts? One whole brigade of Pakistan's army—the 51st Infantry Brigade—attacked Sardar Post, which was defended by a single police company. An amazing thing happened then. This single company beat back the entire brigade. They knew that they were outnumbered. Still they beat back the entire brigade and only the next day in broad day light they withdrew from this post. It was only then that Pakistan occupied this post. If proof were needed for this, it is supplied by the fact that Pakistan has found it necessary to sack the Brigadier who was in charge of that particular engagement. What more proof do you want?

Then there was the question of Point 84 and Biarbet. Here again, one whole Pakistani brigade, supported by the latest Patton tanks attacked these posts. Our troops were there, but they were not meant for fighting. They were there as look-outs. These infantry men, armed with normal infantry weapons, knocked down three Pakistani tanks and brought the whole brigade to a standstill. Then they withdrew and Pakistan occupied those posts. Is this anything to be ashamed of? If you go into the facts we have every reason to be proud of the valour of our gallant soldiers in this area.

The main criticism against the agreement from the speeches which I heard yesterday and today is that the agreement subjects India's sovereignty to international arbitration. As far as that question goes, let us take firstly the UN, which is the world organisation. Though the UN is based on respect for the sovereignty of the State, even the UN Charter does not exclude national sovereignty from the scope of international arbitration, be-

cause obviously in the case of each dispute, the alternative would be war. Neither does our Constitution bar such agreements or transfers of territory. Article 51 (d) of the Constitution lays down that "the State shall endeavour to encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration." Whether Kutch is a territorial dispute or a border dispute, it is obviously an international dispute. So, its settlement by a tribunal or arbitration cannot be said to be repugnant to the Constitution. Historically speaking, both the Radcliffe Tribunal and the Bagge Tribunal were based on the principle of arbitration. So far as the present Kutch agreement goes, it was directly based on the procedure laid down in the joint communique following the 1959 talks at ministerial level. So, the provision of a tribunal is fully in consonance with customary international practice as well as our own and I do not think it is anything new or anything that can be objected to.

Again, it is feared that this agreement may become a precedent for other disputes, particularly the Kashmir issue, being referred to similar tribunals. There is certainly no obligation or commitment on the part of India to accept such a position. Apart from this, India has always maintained that each dispute is separate. Kashmir is neither a boundary dispute nor is it a territorial dispute. There is no similarity between the two disputes. Apart from the fact that the fate of 4 million Kashmiris can never be made the subject of arbitration or adjudication, Pakistan has not even advanced a legal claim to the territory of Jammu and Kashmir. Their claim is something different. So, I do not understand how the question of arbitration can arise in the case of Kashmir.

I do not want to take too much time of the House in referring to Press comments. But I think the Press comments on the Kutch agreement are very significant. I was

amazed to find that all shades of opinion in the country—not all, perhaps, but a very large section of it as reflected by our Press, and I hope the House will agree that our Press is neither accustomed to tow the Government line nor can it be accused of being unpatriotic—responded to the agreement. In the *Hindu* of July 5, Shri Rangaswami writes:

"For a variety of sound reasons, it was wisdom to conclude the cease-fire agreement with Pakistan."

The Tribune of 1st July says:

"The agreement is to be welcomed..... Failure to agree on a carefully worked out formula would have created a host of intractable problems for both (countries). In any case, the price of war would have been far greater than the price of peace and the ultimate beneficiary would have been neither India nor Pakistan but China."

This is something we ought, all, to remember. Then, in the *Patriot* it is said:

"It will be extremely unrealistic to see surrender or uncritical concession in the cease-fire agreement that was signed on Wednesday. On the main issue..... the agreement upholds the Indian position unreservedly..... In 1960 we admitted that this boundary has to be negotiated insofar as it had not been demarcated on the ground. To agree to negotiate it now is no concession."

The Indian Express said:

"The cease-fire in Kutch will be welcomed for many sound reasons. . . . Mr. Shastri has accepted the procedure after honouring his pledge to Parliament that he was prepared to settle the matter peacefully provided the *status quo ante* was restored..... In the firm, far-sighted and courageous stand he has now taken he is entitled to the

[Shri K. C. Pant]

unwavering support of his countrymen."

The National Herald said:

"The overwhelming majority of the people would support the agreement on Kutch."

This is not all. *The Times of India*, *The Statesman*, *The Hindustan Times*, *The Indian Nation*, all of them—I have quotations here, but I do not want to go into all of them because that will take a lot of time—have spoken on the same lines. Not only our papers, but papers abroad have also hailed this agreement. I will not tire the House with more quotations except a couple of very brief ones.

The Time of Ceylon dated 5th July: wrote:

"There has been no better news from the hemisphere for months and years."

The Utusan Zaman of Malaysia dated 4th July said:

"Malaysia is happy about the agreement."

In *The Tehran Journal* dated 8th July they said:

"The statesmanship displayed a few days ago by the leading political figures of India and Pakistan is heartening in these times."

The Sydney Morning Herald of 14th July said:

"Both Mr. Shastri and President Ayub deserve great credit for these agreements. . . . But it is Mr. Shastri who has really displayed the greatest courage and who emerges with his stature much enhanced."

These are foreign papers and some of them are not very friendly to us. Still you find these things in these papers. This is enough to give a good

idea of the widespread favourable reception of the agreement both within the country and outside.

So far as we are concerned, at this moment the question before the House is a simple one: whether to agree, whether to accept this particular agreement or to reject it. I have given various reasons to support the plea that the Kutch Agreement should be accepted, not because it is perfect, not because it is exactly what we want—by its very nature it is in part a compromise, and it has got to be so—but because in the balance it offers us a reasonable solution to a problem which would otherwise have to be resolved by force. Let us not forget that in case we had preferred to use force to push out Pakistan from the positions it had occupied, it would not only have cost us a good deal in terms of men, money and material but at the end of it all the dispute would still have been on our hands and, as like as not, the procedure for its solution would not have been very different from that laid down in the Kutch agreement. What have we lost? We have gained a good deal and lost nothing. Besides, as my hon. friend, Shri Chaudhuri said yesterday, the dictates of international decency press upon us to honour our international commitments. I do not deny that there is room for expediency in international affairs provided we stick to our principles on matters of importance.

Now, I turn to Kashmir, where the situation is fraught with danger. Pakistan's intentions are clear. It is a great pity that Pakistan is spoiling for a fight. All along Pakistan has provoked this country and India has all along dealt with these provocations with great patience and restraint. But there is a limit to everything and the continued aggression on Kashmir is fast becoming intolerable. If this continues, if Pakistan does not refrain from its dangerous activities, its dangerous experiments, then it must bear

the full responsibility for the consequences that will follow as night follows day.

In contemplating this grim possibility—I admit that it is a grim one—three matters deserve careful consideration. First is the matter of intelligence and security. Both in Kutch and in Jammu and Kashmir Pakistan proposed talks and while we were preparing for these talks, talks at the border level, they attacked, they moved their troops and caught us by surprise. Now, it is not a question of blaming anybody. The situation is far too serious for that. But the need to improve both civil and military intelligence and bring about better co-ordination between the two is urgent. They cannot afford to run on parallel courses.

The second point is that we must devise ways and means to deal with the guerillas. Our army is built on conventional lines. It should not be made to jump around the periphery or to be deployed disproportionately. It is a sledge hammer and it should not be used to kill a fly. Guerilla warfare will have to be dealt with in a different way and it will require careful handling both at the political as well as at the military level. I hope this aspect of the matter will receive careful consideration.

Thirdly, we should be ready to take a military initiative at short notice. In our scrupulousness, we have always refused to strike except in self-defence and that too within our own territory. Kargil was an exception. But Kargil also was in self-defence in the sense that our road was affected, our vital communications were affected and it is by no means an offensive. But the time has come to be prepared to retaliate against aggression and retaliate at a time of our choosing and at a place of our choosing by the method we want to choose.

Now, Sir, in the end, may I say, there is a great deal of resentment against Pakistan throughout the coun-

try today in all sections of the people. We all share that resentment. But the point is, what should we do with this resentment? It is a kind of latent energy. We have to harness this latent energy for strengthening the fibre of the country. If this energy is wasted, what use is it to the country? Those who promote civil strife fritter away this valuable energy in anti-social and anti-national activities. Those who foment communal trouble, again, fritter away this energy. They are playing with an explosive factor, they are playing with fire. In either case they are playing into the hands of Pakistan, wittingly or otherwise, because nothing suits Pakistan better today than to have civil strife and communal disturbances in this country. No words are strong enough to condemn this activity in the face of the grave external danger to the country. When the survival of the nation is at stake, all petty differences must be put aside. That is the paramount need of the hour. It is in this context that I am very sorry that all Members of the Opposition completely disregarded the seriousness of the situation, the seriousness of the external danger and voted yesterday en bloc for the No-confidence Motion.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :

उपाध्यक्ष जी, जो कच्छ के रन के समझौते पर यहां चर्चा चल रही है, तो यह न विरोधियों का सवाल है और न यह सरकार का सवाल है। यह पूरे देश का सवाल है और सारे सदन का सवाल है, और मैं चाहूंगा कि सभी माननीय सदस्य इस देश की रक्षा के बारे में ठंडे दिमाग से सोचें।

भारत मां क्या है, हमारा एक मानचित्र है, नक्शा है, और उस नक्शे के अन्दर रहने वाले 48 करोड़ लोग हैं। गत 17 मासों की गतिविधियों को देखने में पता चलता है कि बराबर भारत मां के मानचित्र के साथ खिलवाड़ होता रहा है। जब चीनियों का प्रति-

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

क्रमण हुआ तब हमारी जमीन गयी, और जब फिर कच्छ के रण में पाकिस्तान ने आक्रमण किया तो उसने भी हमारी जमीन दबोच ली, और अब कच्छ के रण का समझौता हुआ है। हम उस के परिणामों पर विचार करें तो मालूम होगा कि इससे देश के बटवारे का सिलसिला चल सकता है।

जहां तक इस देश के 48 करोड़ नागरिकों का सवाल है, उनको सरकार ने अपनी नीति से भूख और महंगी के मुंह में झोंक दिया है। दोनों स्थितियां आज आपके सामने हैं।

फरवरी, 1962 में चीन का आक्रमण हुआ तो कहा गया कि वह आक्रमण अचानक हुआ और हम उसके लिए तैयार नहीं थे। इसलिए हम को उससे मात खानी पड़ी और चीन ने हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा कर लिया। और तब से तैयारी हुई। सदन ने फौज का खर्च बढ़ाया। रक्षा मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री दोनों ने बार-बार घोषणा की कि चीन और पाकिस्तान का जो दोस्ताना बड़ रहा है और उस से उन की जो शक्ति बढ़ेगी उन दोनों का मुकाबला करने के लिए हम तैयार हैं। हम में इतनी पर्याप्त शक्ति है कि हम पाकिस्तान और चीन दोनों ताकतों का मुकाबला कर सकें लेकिन दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि 1962 के बाद सन् 65 में, तीन साल की तैयारी के बाद, प्रधान मंत्री और रक्षा मंत्री की घोषणाओं के बाद हमने वांछित परिणाम नहीं दिखाया। इस करोड़ की आबादी वाला पाकिस्तान जब हमारे रब और कच्छ के इलाके में घुस कर हम पर आक्रमण करता है तो वहां हमें भी मार खानी पड़ती है और शायद स्थिति और भी भयंकर होती। चीन जोकि हमारी हैसियत का ही था उसके द्वारा हमारी जमीन हड़पी गई और हमारा सम्मान भी घटा लेकिन अब तो हद ही हो गई जब पाकिस्तान ने हमारी सीमाओं का प्रतिक्रमण किया और रन और कच्छ के इलाके में और कंजरकोट प्राय

इलाकों में उसने कब्जा कर लिया। इस बात से हमारे देश के मान, मर्यादा और आत्मसम्मान को सारी दुनिया की निगाहों में धक्का लगा और हमारी जनता के सामने भी धक्का लगा। जनता के मन में भी एक शंका पैदा हो गई कि क्या हम इतने कमजोर हैं? क्या हम इतने गये गुजरे हो गए हैं कि हम पाकिस्तान के धक्के को भी सह नहीं पाते? इस संदर्भ में अगर हम सोचें तो हमें सोचने की जरूरत पड़ जाती है।

श्रीमान्, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने रन और कच्छ के समझौते को संज्ञा दी है शांति की। उन्होंने इसे शांति की संज्ञा दी है और सम्मान की संज्ञा दी है लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कच्छ और रन का समझौता न शांति का है न सम्मान का है बल्कि वह युद्ध और अपमान का है। वह शांति का नहीं है, सम्मान का नहीं है बल्कि अपमान का है और युद्ध का है क्योंकि शांति है कहां? आज कच्छ और रन में आपने समझौता कर लिया लेकिन उस के बाद काश्मीर समस्या पैदा हो गई। काश्मीर की समस्या भी हल हो जाए तो भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी असम की सरहदों पर झगड़ा पैदा होगा और राजस्थान की सरहदों पर झगड़ा पैदा हो जाएगा। हमको यह समझ लेना चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान की बुनियादी ही नफरत पर है और पाकिस्तान की जिन्दगी ही इस पर निर्भर करती है कि वह हिन्दुस्तान से किसी न किसी बात पर झगड़ा बनाए रखे। अगर हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच मौजूद सारे झगड़े तय भी हो जायें तो फिर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान और पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान को एक साथ मिलाने के लिए कोई एक रास्ता चाहिए इसका लेकर झगड़ा खड़ा किया जाने वाला है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि यह झगड़ेवादी उस के द्वारा जारी रखे जाने वाली है। इसलिए यह खबाब

करना कि यह कच्छ प्रीफरन्स का मामला तय हो जाये तो फिर शांति घा जायेगी और कोई झगड़े नहीं होंगे, गलत है। जैसा कि प्रीएम्बल में कहा गया है शांति कायम करने के हेतु प्रधान मंत्री ने समझौता किया है वह उद्देश्य पूरा होने वाला नहीं है क्योंकि कच्छ समझौते के बाद यह पाकिस्तानियों द्वारा काश्मीर पर आक्रमण वाद की बात है। कल रक्षा मंत्री ने एक बयान दिया था जो कि अखबारों में भी निकला है जिस में बतलाया गया है कि बिलकुल नियमित ढंग से उन के फौजी सिपाही यहां उनके अंदर शामिल हो गये हैं जिस से कि साफ नतीजा निकलता है कि शांति स्थापित होने वाली नहीं है। यह युद्ध का रास्ता है शांति का रास्ता है नहीं।

अभी हमारे पन्त जी ने 1959-60 की संधि की बात कही थी जिस में यह ट्रिब्यूनल की बात साफ़ दी है हालांकि दोनों में भेद है क्योंकि 1959-60 में जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ है उस में हमारे देश का एक जज होगा और पाकिस्तान का एक जज होगा, हालांकि उस में स्थिति बिलकुल विपरीत है लेकिन उस में एक नतीजा निकलाना चाहते हैं। 1959-60 के करार की हमारे पास एक प्रतिलिपि भी है। इसी कच्छ-सिंध सीमा के बारे में झगड़ा पैदा हुआ था तब वह संधि हुई थी सन् 59 और 60 में और जब 65 में यह आक्रमण हुआ। 60 से 65 तक पांच वर्ष हम सोते रहे। यह बात कहना दुःख नहीं है कि हमारे सिपाही और जवान शत्रु का मुकाबला करने को तैयार नहीं हैं और अगर शासक दल हम विरोधी लोगों के लिए यह नतीजा निकालते हैं कि हमारे कहने का मतलब यह है कि हमारी फौज मुकाबला करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है तो शासक वर्ग अम में है। हम समझते हैं और हमें पूरा

विश्वास है कि हमारे सिपाही तैयार हैं, लेकिन कठिनाई तो यह है कि हमारी कोई नीति नहीं है, हमारा कोई संकल्प नहीं है, हमारा कोई इरादा नहीं है। अब प्रसल चीख तो रही है, क्योंकि बिना नीति के बिना संकल्प के और बिना इरादे के कोई हाने जाने वाला नहीं है। जैसा मैं ने कहा यह कच्छ सम्बन्धी हमारा समझौता शांति का नहीं युद्ध का है, मान-सम्मान का नहीं अपितु अपमान का है और अपमान का इसे मैं इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह तो ठीक है कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारी सीमा पर से अपनी फौज हटाई है लेकिन उसी के साथ हम ने भी अपनी फौज अपने ही इलाके में पीछे हटाई है। कोई बदमाश व शरारती भ्रामकी किसी व्यक्ति के मकान पर जाकर कब्जा कर ले और जब उस के बारे में पंच लोग फैसला करने आयें और यह कहें कि जिसका वह मकान है वह भी उसे खाली कर दे और जिसका कि मकान नहीं है और जिस ने कि घा कर कब्जा कर लिया है वह भी उसे खाली कर दे। कच्छ समझौते में ठीक वही बात हुई है। शास्त्री जी अगर इसे सम्मानपूर्ण समझौता समझते हैं तो यह उन्हीं को मुबारक हो यह क्या सम्मानपूर्ण समझौता हुआ कि हम अपनी जमीन से हटने वाले हैं हमें कंजरकोट पर पुलिस रखने का अधिकार नहीं है, बियार बेट पर, सरदारपोस्ट पर हमारी पुलिस नहीं रहेगी और 84 नम्बर पर भी हमारी पुलिस पोस्ट नहीं रहे?

शास्त्री जी कहते हैं कि सुराई-डींग में मिली जुली गन्त होगी लेकिन इंग्लैंड के प्रधान मंत्री जिनका कि इस समझौता कराने के अन्दर जबरदस्त हाथ है उनका बयान अगर वहां की पार्लियामेंट में दिया हुआ पढ़ा जाये तो उन में उन्होंने साफ़ कहा है कि डींग और सुराई में ही नहीं

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

अपितु पूरे कच्छ झीरन के इलाके में पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों को मिलजुल कर गश्त करने का अधिकार होगा। मैं चाहूंगा कि जब प्रधानमंत्री जी जवाब दें तो वह इसे साफ़ करें कि इसमें कौन सी बात ठीक है? इस के साथ मैं यह भी चाहूंगा कि वह जो करार हुआ है उनके सारे डिटेल्स को और तमाम करार के कागजात को इस सदन के सामने रखें क्योंकि इस बारे में अभी तक सफ़ाई नहीं हो पाई है और इसे लेकर पूरे देश में भ्रम है और इस चीज़ को इस सदन में साफ़ होना चाहिए।

शास्त्री जी यह भी कहते हैं कि यह केवल सीमांकन का प्रश्न है लेकिन इस करार के मुताबिक हमने इस सीमांकन के नाम पर 3,500 वर्गमील भूमि को बिदेसी पंच के सामने रख दिया है। आर्टिकल तीन को मैं आप के सामने पढ़ कर सुनना चाहता हूँ।

"Article—3

(1) In view of the fact that:

(a) India claims that there is no territorial dispute as there is a well-established boundary running roughly along the northern edge of the Rann of Kutch as shown in the pre-Partition maps which needs to be demarcated on the ground;

(b) Pakistan claims that the border between India and Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch runs roughly along the 24th parallel as is clear from several pre-Partition and post-Partition documents and, therefore, the dispute involves some 3500 sq. miles of territory;"

इस 3,500 वर्गमील भूमि के सवाल को प्रधानमंत्री जी ने एक विदेशी पंच के सुपुर्द कर दिया। मान लो शास्त्री जी के मुताबिक फैसला हमारे हक में न हो और इस 3,500 वर्गमील में से 1,000 वर्गमील जमीन उबर चली जाये या 2,000 वर्गमील भूमि इधर चली जाये तब क्या हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को या इस देश के प्रधानमंत्री को यह अधिकार है कि वह उस फैसले को नहीं मानें क्योंकि उस फैसले के, उस करार के मुताबिक हमने कह दिया है कि जो भी पंच प्रदालत का निर्णय होगा दोनों सरकारों को उन निर्णय को मानना होगा, किसी तरीके की उस में चुं चरा नहीं हो सकती, उस में कोई ऐतराज नहीं हो सकता है? जो हमारे भारत का मान चित्र है जिस की हम रात-दिन शपथ लेते हैं जिसका कि हमारे ही संविधान में वर्णन है, क्या हम को किसी को भी यह अधिकार है कि हम उस नक्शे को किसी विदेशी पंचायत के सुपुर्द कर दें? यह चीज पहली बार की जा रही है लेकिन इसका असर बहुत खराब पड़ने वाला है। नैपाल से आज हमारे बड़े अच्छे पड़ोसी के सम्बन्ध हैं लेकिन कल को हो सकता है कि उन से हमारे सम्बन्ध बिगड़ जाय, वह किसी के बहकावे में आ जाय और हमारे ऊपर हमला कर के हमारी कुछ जमीन छीन ले। बाद में वह उस से हट जाये और उन के बाद झगड़े का निबटारा करने के लिए पंचायत प्रदालत और वह जो भी फैसला देवे हमारे हक में न हो कर नैपाल के हक में हो तो भी हमें उस पंच निर्णय को मानने को बाध्य होना पड़ेगा। हम विदेशी पंच निर्णय को मान कर इस सरकार ने एक ऐसा रास्ता खोल दिया है जिस से हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदें हमेशा कतरी जातीं

रहेंगी, वह हमेशा टूटती रहेंगी और हमारे मानचित्र के साथ बराबर खिलवाड़ होता रहेगा ।

अभी जब पंत जी बोल रहे थे तो उन्होंने कहा था कि इस समझौते से हमारी जमीन जाने वाली नहीं है बल्कि उस में हमको जमीन मिलने वाली है । पाकिस्तान कुछ अधिपतन की जमीन चाहता है और अगर यह फैसला उस के हक में होने वाला होता तो वह कश्मीर पर हमला नहीं करता । अब पाकिस्तान के क्या इरादे हैं मैं चाहूंगा कि माननीय सदस्य उन इरादों में न जायें बल्कि पाकिस्तान का जो आक्रमण है उसका नतीजा क्या है उसे वह देखें । वह कुछ की जमीन चाहता है या नहीं ? अगर इस तरीके से तर्क दिये जायें तो चीन ने भी हमारे ऊपर हमला किया था और हमला करने के बाद जो हमारी जमीन ली थी तो कुछ जमीन वह छोड़ कर चला गया और कुछ पर वह अभी भी कब्जा किये हुए है मगर उससे हम कोई इरादे का नतीजा निकालें उस के बाद हम फिर कहें कि उसका क्या मकसद था तो वह ठीक बात नहीं होगी । प्रसल चीज तो देखने की यह है कि उसका नतीजा क्या होता है ? नतीजें मेहम देखेंगे कि हम हमेशा हारते रहते हैं, जमीन खोते रहते हैं । इसीलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कुछ सम्बन्धी समझौता शांति व सम्मान का समझौता न हो कर युद्ध व अपमान का समझौता है । हम बेकार में युद्ध नहीं चाहते । हम नहीं चाहते कि पाकिस्तान का हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण हो जाय लेकिन उसी के साथ साथ मैं यह चीज बिल्कुल साफ़ देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा दल और दल ही क्यों, इस देश की समस्त

जनता यह चाहेगी कि अगर कोई हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण करे तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को और सरकार को अपनी एक, एक इंच भूमि की रक्षा के लिए तत्पर व तैयार होना चाहिए । हम हमला करने नहीं गये थे । लेकिन इस डर से कि कहीं युद्ध न हो जाये, कहीं संसार में कोई बड़ी जंग न हो जाये, हम अपनी जमीन छोड़ते चले जायें, अगर आत्म-समर्पण का यह रास्ता अपनाया गया, तो युद्ध जल्दी होगा और हम युद्ध से नहीं बच सकेंगे । अगर यह सरकार जम कर लड़ने का रास्ता अपनाती है और संसार पर अपना यह दृढ़ निश्चय प्रकट कर देती है कि हम अपनी जमीन नहीं खोयेंगे, चाहे हमें घमरीका जैसी बड़ी ताकत का ही सामना क्यों न करना पड़े, तो हम अपने को युद्ध से बचा सकते हैं और साथ ही अपनी सीमाओं को भी बचा सकते हैं ।

14 hrs.

आज देश के सामने जो संकट आया है, उस का मुकाबला करने के लिए देश के लोग तैयार हैं, लेकिन इस सरकार के सामने कोई संकल्प नहीं है, कोई इरादा नहीं है । अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने विरोधी नेताओं की एक बैठक बुलाई थी । मैं नहीं समझता कि इस बैठक का क्या मतलब था । क्या फैसला करने वाले हैं प्रधान मंत्री जी ? वह क्या चाहते हैं ? मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश के सभी विरोधी दल और इस देश की जनता यह चाहती है कि कुछ-रण के प्रसम्मानजनक और देश को तबाही की तरफ़ ले जाने वाले समझौते को रद्द कर दिया जाये ।

पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में हमारे सामने दो ही रास्ते हैं—या तो युद्ध और या महासंध, और कोई रास्ता नहीं है । या तो हम पाकिस्तान के साथ एक महासंध बनायें, दोनों देशों का पुनः एकीकरण हो, जिस के लिए इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि इस देश में

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

सरकार की नीति और दिशा बदले, समाजवाद और जनतंत्र की तरफ हमारे कदम बढ़ें और हम दोनों देशों को एक करें, या हम यह निश्चय करें कि हम अपनी एक इंच जमीन भी नहीं खोयेंगे, चाहे उस के लिए लड़ाई लड़नी पड़े ।

प्राज हमारे देश में लाखों लोग भूखों मरते हैं। क्या मैं भ्रशा कर्क कि जिस देश में लाखों लोग भूखों मरते हैं, उस देश के लोगों को अपनी मानु-भूमि की रक्षा के लिए, अपने देश की आजादी की रक्षा के लिए मरना सिखाया जायेगा ? अगर उन को ऐसा करना सिखाया जाना है, तो मैं शास्त्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि पिछले छठारह सालों से समाजवाद का जो कीर्तन चला आ रहा है, उस को समाप्त किया जाये । मैं समझता हूँ कि श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी की शकल देख कर ही समाजवाद बहुत दूर भाग जायेगा ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : क्या वह बदसूरत है ?

श्री रामसेवक यादव : इसलिए कि आज समाजवाद के नाम पर करोड़पन्थ आ रहा है । यदि यह सरकार इस देश में कुछ करना चाहती है, तो मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि वह देश में सादगी, समाजवाद और समता लाये और देश को महंगाई और गरीबी के बंगुल से छुटकारा दिलाये । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि गांधी का युग सच्चाई, गादगी और ईमानदारी का था, लेकिन नेहरू जी से ले कर शास्त्री जी का युग भोग, विलासिता और क्रिजूलखर्ची का युग है । चालीस चालीस हजार रुपया सालाना मंत्रियों के बंगलों पर खर्च हो, इस रास्ते पर चल कर यह सरकार पाकिस्तान जैसी सरकार, या किसी भी पड़ोसी सरकार, से लड़ने का संकल्प नहीं ले सकती है । इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि यह सरकार दृढ़ संकल्प करे कि हम कच्छ-रण के समझौते को खत्म करेंगे, जो कि देश को लड़ाई में शीकेगा, देश को

बेइज्जत करेगा, और एक संकल्प का रास्ता अपनायेंगे ।

सरकार यह काम नहीं करना चाहती है । अगर उस ने यह काम करना होता, तो डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया जैसे निश्छल राष्ट्रप्रेमी और देशभक्त व्यक्ति को भारत रक्षा कानून के अन्तर्गत जेल में बन्द न किया गया होता । अगर उन को कोई कानून तोड़ने पर बन्द किया जाता, तो मैं समझ सकता, लेकिन जो व्यक्ति चाहता है कि हम चीन से लड़ें, जो चाहता है कि पाकिस्तान को अपनी जमीन न दी जाये, ऐसे धादमी को भारत रक्षा कानून के अन्दर बन्द किया गया है, यह कितने दुर्भाग्य की बात है ।

मैं कुछ विरोधी लोगों के बारे में भी कहूँ । रंगा साहब ने कच्छ-रण समझौते का समर्थन किया । अलग अलग इरादे हो सकते हैं । शायद उन का यह इरादा हो कि अगर पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता हो जायेगा, तो हम चीन के साथ निपट लेंगे । लेकिन उनको समझना चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान और चीन दोनों में दोस्ती है और वे अलग अलग नहीं हो सकते, इसलिए उन दोनों के साथ निपटना पड़ेगा ।

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this Agreement on Kutch, I can admit, is not an ideal solution of the problem. I can also admit that this does not satisfy all the expectations of the country. But, Sir, an international agreement can be considered only in the background of the international situation, as also the national situation; it cannot be considered and it should not be considered as an abstract document bereft of all environmental incidents and circumstances.

Sir, it has been stated that the sovereignty of the nation has been surrendered by this Agreement. It has

also been stated that the sovereignty of the House has been denied. There is nobody who can deny the sovereignty of the House. Even the Government, which is the creation of the House, cannot deprive this House of the sovereign rights. Sovereign rights of this Parliament find expression in the motion moved by my friends on that side—a motion of no-confidence against Government, which is an indication of the sovereign authority of this House. If the Government has done anything wrong, anything which is detrimental to the national interest or is derogatory to the honour of the nation it is open for the House to remove that Government and that right is inherent just in this House and so that motion has been moved. So it cannot be said that the sovereign rights of this Parliament have been denied by this Agreement.

The question of sovereignty of the nation has been raised. We should realise that no nation today is sovereign in the sense that a nation was sovereign in the 19th Century. In the 19th century, the Government in India thought that Burma should be captured; they created some pleas and conquered it; then they went to Afghanistan, Nepal and Tibet, but to day it is not possible. Every country has got a limitation on certain rights. When there was the League of Nations and, today, when there is the United Nations, we have agreed to surrender a portion of the sovereign rights; each nation has agreed to that. So, we have to conduct our affairs in the comity of the nations according to the civilised codes of the present world. If China does not behave according to the civilised code of conduct, then China would be considered as something unworthy of being a civilised nation. If Pakistan has behaved in a wrong way, has not honoured the civilised code of conduct, then Pakistan will be condemned in the court of history. So, we have to conduct our affairs under the present international set-up. We should also realise that today not even in commercial matters is each nation

supreme. There is the GATT Agreement, under which we have to surrender some of our commercial rights to some international organisation or international convention. Then in Europe there is the European Common Market or the Free Trade area where each nation has surrendered some of its commercial and fiscal powers to a common organisation. In India also, a few years ago the Indus River Water Dispute was referred to the World Bank. If it had happened in the 19th Century, we could have diverted the water somewhere through the channel which runs through the Indian territory. But this cannot be done today; we have to go to the International Bank and agree to abide by its decision. That is the civilised code of conduct. We should also realise that the behaviour of a nation depends to a large extent on the political connections that the nation can command in the international world. We should realise that in our conflict with Pakistan, we have practically no friend to help us. Pakistan is the creation of the Anglo-American Powers, and according to the wrong assessment of the international strategy they have created Pakistan, simply perhaps with the motive that India may not become too strong. So, the *raison d'être* of Pakistan is to create trouble for India, and the creators of Pakistan to a very great extent somehow condone all these misdeeds of Pakistan. I am sure even the USSR will not come forward . . .

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत महत्व का विषय है जिस पर चर्चा चल रही है। लेकिन हाउस में इस समय गणपूर्ति नहीं है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may kindly resume his seat. There is no quorum. The bell is being rung—

Now, there is quorum. Shri A. C. Guha may now resume his speech.

Shri A. C. Guha: I am sure that even the USSR will not come forward openly help us in this matter of our struggle with Pakistan.

[Shri A. C. Guha]

I was referring to our position in the international world *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. In this struggle against Pakistan, as I was saying, we have no friends in the world. Some nations may show us some lip-sympathy, but we would not get any material or substantial help from any nation, including the USSR. No nation will even say that Pakistan is an aggressor. We should realise that position, and in the context of that position we should frame our own policy. So, we in India cannot afford to defy world opinion, however much we may like to. We should also realise that our military strength has its limitation. I know that there has been much improvement since October, 1962, and that has been demonstrated in several spheres such as twice in Kargil and also in Kutch and elsewhere, but still it has certain limitations. From the military point of view, we cannot claim that we are a powerful or strong nation. We are building up our military forces. It will require some years yet for India to be called a militarily powerful nation.

My hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta yesterday made a bitter criticism about this pact. At the very outset, I should say that he has made a confusion between arbitration and tribunal, and it looks as if he has equated the two or identified the one with the other. Here, the word used has always been tribunal and not arbitration. As I have said already, on previous occasions also, international disputes have been referred to some tribunal, and in the 1959 agreement with Pakistan also, there has been mention about referring disputes to a tribunal, but somehow that has not come about because of the intransigent attitude of Pakistan.

Only about two days ago, on the 15th August, 1965, my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta had contributed an article to *The Statesman* in which he had advocated the settlement of even acute territorial disputes by peaceful

means' which he thinks 'is not only indispensable but feasible, although it requires restraint, patience and time.' For the Sino-Indian dispute, he has suggested:

"to consider concrete methods of settling the issue which can be voluntarily applied with the aim of establishing friendly and equal relations."

He has further suggested:

"Many such methods are known in history—exchange of territories on a basis of mutual benefit, cession of some area to restore justice, lease of territory on equitable terms, joint exploitation of disputed areas, demilitarisation, neutralisation, freezing of claims and so on."

Incidentally he has also suggested that the Aksai Chin Road may be given to China either on lease or on some agreement so that China may use that road. When all these things are admissible in our dispute with China, I cannot understand why these should not be advisable in our dispute with Pakistan. My hon. friend has urged in that article that:

"This is a plea for Indian initiative".

And this is what he has suggested in regard to the Sino-Indian dispute. But here when the Government of India have taken the initiative, my hon. friend has come out against this agreement, basically ignoring the argument which he had put forward only two days ago in regard to the dispute between India and China.

Some of my hon. friends in the Opposition, particularly, from the PSP have moved an amendment seeking to discard this agreement on the ground that it is contrary to the spirit and letter of the resolution passed on the 18th April, 1965. I do not see how this agreement can be contrary to the spirit or letter of the resolution passed by this House. The resolution simply stated that we shall have nothing to do with Pakistan unless we

drove them out of our territory. There, the words were 'drive out', but here, the case is of a voluntary vacation'. That is the only difference.

I do not think that any party or any individual in the House will advocate that India should recklessly go on with war preparations against Pakistan. We have been hearing of the horrors of the war in Viet Nam. That is a very limited war. But if there were to be any war between India and Pakistan, it will not be a limited war, but it will be on two fronts, and that will mean hardship to millions of people besides destruction of properties running to hundreds of crores of rupees. So, we should think hundred times before we can think of anything on the lines of preparing for a war against Pakistan. We have always been exercising restraint and that is according to the civilised code, according to our own convention and according to the ideology of our country. This House had advocated not once but repeatedly and has expressed its desire and its wish for the peaceful settlement of all boundary disputes. This is one of those examples which India has set for the peaceful settlement of boundary disputes.

When there is a boundary dispute, there is always the risk of either party losing some of its points. My hon. friend who had preceded me had said that out of these 3500 square miles, if India were to lose 1000 square miles or even 20 square miles, then that would be a loss to India. Similarly Pakistan may also argue that if out of their claim for 3500 square miles they do not get the whole of it or . . .

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is a bogus claim. So, let not my hon. friend put forward that proposition.

Shri A. C. Guha: That is true. We say that it is a bogus claim.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We ought to have driven them out.

Shri A. C. Guha: When in a law court, the two parties . . .

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Why should we go to the law court itself?

Shri A. C. Guha: Each party may think that its claim is justified, and that the claim of the other party is not justified . . .

Shri U. M. Trivedi: There is no justification for going to court. We are sure of our own claim.

Shri A. C. Guha: Similarly, Pakistan may also be sure of her claim...

Shri U. M. Trivedi: She can have no claim.

Shri A. C. Guha: Moreover, this is not the first time that a dispute has been referred to a tribunal. Under the previous agreement of 1969 also, there was a reference to a tribunal of a border dispute. But it did not come about because of some intransigent attitude on the part of Pakistan.

Having said this, I should like to say a few words to Government about their attitude towards Pakistan. We have all along been indulgent....

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Over-indulgent.

Shri A. C. Guha: ...to Pakistan. I think, to some extent, it was reasonable, and expected also. Pakistan, after all, was just a part of our country and our nation only 16 or 17 years ago. It requires some time to adjust our mind to think that the citizens of Pakistan are hostile and alien people. There are even now many families on this side and on that side who are relatives.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Then why did they separate?

Shri A. C. Guha: All right. He need not interrupt me.

I should say that Government should now think how long they will go on with this indulgent attitude. All our record of relationship with Pakistan has been a record of broken pledges

[Shri A. C. Guha]

and disrespected agreements; they have not redeemed or respected any agreement. Even before the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, there was the Nehru-Noon Pact regarding the Indus waters. Later on, they said that the agreement was signed under duress. They came the Nehru-Liaquat Pact and other subsequent pacts. They have not observed any pact either in spirit or in letter. They have been creating problems and border disputes year after year.

The Kutch dispute was created only in 1959. Then they started many border disputes in West Bengal and Assam side. I think the real remedy here is to be not always on the defensive but to act just as our Indian forces have in taking possession of two posts in Kargil which we had to hand over on the persuasion and assurances of the UNO. We should adopt this attitude. Wherever there is a border dispute, we should run into their territory and attack their operation bases and posts.

Moreover, we have justifiable grounds to make our own border claims also. Under one interpretation of the Radcliffe Award, about 12 police stations in the district of Sylhet (which was originally in Assam) should have come to India. Why should we not raise that border dispute and imitate some of the methods adopted by Pakistan as regards Kutch, Kashmir or even Assam and West Bengal? Then the Chittagong Hill Tracts area was not within the competence of the Radcliffe Commission for giving any award. There was only 3 per cent Muslim population there, the rest 97 per cent of the population being Hindu. Yet the Chittagong Hill Tract was handed over to Pakistan. This is a suitable case for a border dispute. This will give us immense communication facilities, if we can raise this claim there and assert it. It was not an administered area; it was something like a native state, something like the Kathiawar States, small

States. So it was not within the competence of the Radcliffe Commission to give any award over this territory.

As I said, now our attitude should not always be on the defensive. We should also take an aggressive attitude to Pakistan in pursuance of some of the disputes.

Lastly, I would like the External Affairs Minister to look into the working of his own Ministry. I think the whole House will agree that the Ministry requires a rude shake-up. This date, 1 January 1965, was fixed on wrong information. The External Affairs Ministry officials misled the Minister and the Prime Minister to accept that date. When the Berubari agreement was signed, it was alleged that the Chief Secretary of West Bengal was kept waiting outside the closed room in which the officials of the Ministry were discussing the matter with their counterparts in Pakistan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are now discussing the Kutch agreement.

Shri A. C. Guha: Similarly in regard to the Kutch affair, it is alleged that the Gujarat Government has not been properly consulted. This state of affairs should not be allowed to continue.

With these words, I support the agreement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Dinesh Bhattacharya. Hon. Members will take only ten minutes each.

Shri Dinesh Bhattacharya (Serampore): In spite of the grave situation in Kashmir at the present moment, our Party does not consider the Kutch agreement inimical to the national interest. We lend our support to the decision of the Government leaders to settle the dispute across the table rather than through military action.

At the same time, I must say that it is most unfortunate that a dangerous precedent has been set by the

leaders of our Government by not coming to an agreement on their own initiative or with the good offices of some respected Afro-Asian leaders who are really interested in building up friendship between Asian and African countries. The method that has been adopted is a most dangerous one, namely, to bring about a settlement under the umbrella of the commonwealth which is now there in the form of a neo-colonialism to carry on the exploitation of Asia and Africa by the Britishers. Our leaders have not yet taken a lesson from the happenings in Kashmir. Even the present situation gives a true picture of how the nefarious game is played behind the back by these imperialist powers. The infiltrators who are there at present carrying on sabotage activities in Kashmir are there at the instance of the Pakistan ruling class which is always provoked by these imperialist powers. There is every justification to apprehend that Kutch will become another plague spot where the imperialists conspiracy can thrive at the cost of our people.

The most objectionable and dangerous feature of the agreement is the provision for setting up a tribunal. Here reliance has been placed on the imperialists. In case of disagreement as to the selection of a chairman, the UN Secretary General will appoint his nominee. We are now having the bitter experience of the functioning of the UN observers in Kashmir. Even the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, had to express her great concern at the behaviour, so conspicuous, of the UN observers.

If at all a tribunal becomes unavoidable, we must see that it is composed of three non-aligned nations' representatives. We must not rely on any imperialist power for the settlement of any dispute. There has been some misunderstanding in some sections in the country to the effect that India has surrendered and lost some-

thing by this agreement. It has been created by the failure of Government to create confidence in the people by giving to them honest and straightforward information about the dispute. It has been mentioned by some speakers that the real happenings and the true picture were not placed before the people at the time the situation was getting worse. Lack of vigilance on the part of Government also created doubts in the people about this agreement. In spite of all the weakness in the agreement, we would urge on our Government leaders to make an all-out and sincere effort to create an atmosphere for a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

If despite all attempts any threat comes from any quarter, we pledge our full support for the defence of our sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

Now, in this connection I will mention one thing. A start has been made for a peaceful settlement with Pakistan which is more so our neighbour. Our party wants that the same procedure should be followed for settling our problems with China. The urgency of this was emphatically stressed by no less a person than our most respected President very recently in the course of a speech in Mettur. I will quote what our President said in the course of his speech. He said:

"It is essential for us to come to terms with our neighbours, China and Pakistan, terms with honour and dignity. We are now spending a great deal of money on military expenditure, nearly Rs. 900 crores. This is at a time when the eternal needs of our country demand so much attention. If we are able to settle with our neighbours, it will be possible for us to divert these funds for the purpose of internal development."

[Shri Dinen Bhattacharya]

Sir, it reflects the real aspirations of the whole mass of the people of India, because a peaceful settlement with our neighbours will help in a great way in solving the crisis that our country is now facing in respect of our economy.

With these words, Sir, I support the motion that has been moved here by our hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Oza (Surendranagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, today a Member from the left has replied to a certain extent to a Member of the right communist party, and I think the latter will reconcile himself to certain observations made by his erstwhile friend who is now sitting to his left.

We heard today Shri Trivedi. If friends like Shri Trivedi had their way in this country, no settlement could be had through peaceful negotiations. Every dispute must be resolved, according to him, through a show of strength. We are fortunate that they can only demonstrate before Parliament House but have not got enough strength anywhere in any part of the country. It is good to have a giant's strength . . .

श्री सुकम चन्द कच्छबाय : हमने अपनी शक्ति दिखा दी है ।

श्री घोला: देख लेंगे। 1967 is not far away.

It is good to have a giant's strength but unwise to use it like a giant. Let him take a lesson from that.

My hon. friend Shri Yadav, while speaking on this motion, condemned this agreement, but in the same breath pleaded for a confederation between Pakistan and India. He wants to go to war with Pakistan on the smallest issue and he has condemned the present agreement, which according to me and as has been pointed out rightly by several friends on this side

is absolutely consistent with our ideal of self-respect. He wants us to go to war with Pakistan on this issue, but at the same time, like his leader, is always pleading for a confederation with the people of Pakistan. How far that is consistent, we can very well judge.

It has been pointed out by several friends from the opposition that this agreement is not consistent with our self-respect. I wonder how it is not. I am also not in agreement with some clauses of this agreement and on some occasion I have ventilated my viewpoint rather strongly on some of the clauses. But we should always understand that certain things flow from our acceptance of referring this matter to a tribunal. In 1959 we agreed with Pakistan that if it is not possible for us to resolve these disputes through peaceful negotiations across the table we will ultimately refer this matter to a tribunal. We cannot go back on our word. Having agreed to refer the matter to tribunal, certain things flow from it, for example *status quo ante*. When the parties go to a tribunal we must agree to preserve the conditions on both sides as they were on a particular date to be agreed upon between the parties. Otherwise there is no point in going to a tribunal. So when we have agreed that we will withdraw our armed forces from the border, that does not mean that we are swallowing a bitter pill, as was pointed out by my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta. We have got our army in Bhuj which is not far away, it is within striking distance. In Chad Bet we had only our armed police on the 1st of January, and that we will be able to maintain. Then our armed police was patrolling right up to Kanjarkot. That we are entitled to do. Pakistan had to vacate Kanjarkot and it will not be possible for them to come below the international line. They will come only for the limited purpose of patrolling the Ding Sural area, that tract, about which it seems they have given *prima facie* evidence to Mr. Harold Wilson and

some other friends. About this I want to say something. We are in possession of incontrovertible proof that Pakistan was never patrolling this area on the 1st of January. As Shri Guha has rightly pointed out that in the case of East Pakistan and West Bengal the Government of West Bengal was not taken into confidence with the result that we had to undergo certain handicaps and we were not able to negotiate as much in the interest of the country as was possible, in the same way if in this case also the Government of Gujarat had been taken into confidence and if all the proofs that are available with that Government were placed before the proper authorities I am sure that we would not have conceded this right of patrolling the Ding-Sprai area to Pakistan. But that is a small matter. After all, it loses its relevance, because soon the matter will be going before the tribunal. Within four months the matter has got to go before the tribunal, and before the tribunal, we have a very strong case, and I have no doubt about the ultimate findings of the tribunal.

Pakistan is laying a very big claim on this area. But history is very well known. This area is known as the Rann of Kutch. Kutch was a Part C State. It has acceded to the Indian Union, and along with it this part of the land also has acceded to India. This is a fact which cannot be controverted, and I am sure the Tribunal which will consist of international jurists will come to the right conclusion. But even Pakistan, while laying its claim on this area, has conceded that this area is known as the Rann of Kutch. In Article 3(i) (B) we say—and these words are written at the instance of Pakistan—"Pakistan claims that the border between India and Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch runs roughly along the 24th Parallel etc." That is, in the Rann of Kutch—not in the Rann of Sind. This whole area is known as the Rann of Kutch, right up to the international boundary. When Kutch has acceded to and has

become an integral part of the Indian Union, how can Pakistan have any claim over this area? It is by itself self-contradictory, and I am sure the international jurists will look into this and ultimately the tribunal will give its right verdict in favour of India.

As was rightly pointed out by certain friends who spoke before me, the spirit behind coming to an agreement with Pakistan has been laid down in the preamble. It reads:

"WHEREAS both the Governments of India and Pakistan have agreed to a cease-fire and to restoration of the status quo as at 1 January 1965, in the area of the Gujarat/West Pakistan border, in the confidence that this will also contribute to a reduction of the present tension along the entire Indo-Pakistan border;"

It is really a paradox, it is a pity, that exactly when these words were being written, or the documents were being signed, Pakistan was preparing itself to carry out the recent incursions or invasions which it has made along the cease-fire line.

To call this an infiltration is also wrong. Friends in Kashmir are feeling hurt when we say that this is infiltration by some people across the cease-fire line. They say this is a naked invasion made by Pakistan on Indian territory, and we must take it as such. It is not necessary for people to come in uniforms to invade a country. They may don any dress and come and invade our country. Simply because they are coming in civilian dress, disguising themselves sometimes even in female clothes, it does not mean that it is only infiltration. Persons trained by Chinese officers and some of the army officers of Pakistan are coming across the border, and they came right up to Srinagar. They wanted to capture the air field, to take over the All India Radio station, they have killed one guard. This is not a small thing. This is not an act

[Shri Oza]

of infiltration, but naked invasion. I think it is high time that this House and the country took up the matter very seriously.

When we say that we want to honour this agreement, it does not mean that it will be done in all eventualities, that we will swallow whatever humiliation is hurled at us. As was correctly pointed out by Shri K. C. Pant, the time has come when we should sink our differences. Merely because we are wedded to peace, to resolving all our differences through peaceful negotiations, it does not mean that we are going to compromise with our self-respect. I am sure that Pakistan will also realise that it cannot in this manner trifle with our integrity and honour.

The people of Kashmir have stood up like men. It is no use saying that the people of Kashmir have on a large scale collaborated with those who have invaded that part of the country. On the contrary, the invaders got no co-operation from the local population. The local population is co-operating with our army, with the authorities there, and by and large the invaders have failed to get the co-operation which they anticipated they would be able to get. Let us not let down the people of Kashmir who have stood by us and who expect that India will also stand by them and protect the integrity that is ours.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत सरकार और प्रधान मंत्री, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, ने देश के लिए यह एक अपमानजनक और दुर्बल समझौता किया है। इसके अनुसार अपनी 3500 बर्ग मील घरती को विवादास्पद स्वीकार कर के हम अपने घर में अपनी सेनायें नहीं रख सकेंगे, जब कि पाकिस्तानी सेनायें अपने स्थान पर ज्यों की त्यों बटी रहेंगी। इस के अतिरिक्त इस समझौते के अनुसार हमारी घरती पर डींग और सुराई

के बीच में 23 मील के हिस्से में पाकिस्तान की पुलिस गश्त कर सकेगी। दो चौकियों को भी हमने खाली किया है।

इस प्रकार का समझौता पहले कर के और बाद में अपने बहुमत के गर्व के आधार पर संसद की स्वीकृति लेने का प्रधान मंत्री और सरकार का यह प्रयास पहली बार नहीं है। इससे पहले भी भारतीय प्रधान मंत्री श्रीलंका के साथ इसी प्रकार का एक अपमानजनक समझौता कर के संसद से उस की स्वीकृति ले चुके हैं। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि सरकार के काम करने के इस ढंग में भ्रष्ट परिवर्तन लाना चाहिए। न केवल वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री, अपितु पहले प्रधान मंत्री भी इसी प्रकार के निर्णय दो बार पहले ले चुके थे। एक बेरवाड़ी के सम्बन्ध में और दूसरा पंजाब के सीमा-निर्धारण के सम्बन्ध में—कि पंजाब का कितना हिस्सा पाकिस्तान को दिया जाय।

जब भारतीय संविधान में यह स्पष्ट है कि इतना घरती का भाग हमारा है, तो उस का कितना भाग किसी दूसरे को वैसे दिया जाय, इस प्रकार के महत्वपूर्ण निर्णय लेने समय सरकार के लिए कोई एक आचार-संहिता का निर्माण अवश्य होना चाहिये। यह सरकार हमारी घरती दूसरे देशों को देते समय इतनी आसानी से निर्णय ले ले और बाद में अपने बहुमत के आधार पर, संसद से उस की स्वीकृति प्राप्त करे, इस परम्परा में भ्रष्ट अवश्य कुछ न कुछ संशोधन होना चाहिए।

इस समझौते की पृष्ठभूमि में इंग्लैंड और उस के प्रधान मंत्री, श्री विल्सन, का प्रमुख हाथ है। ब्रिटेन के सम्बन्ध में मैं स्वयं अपने मुंह से कुछ न कह कर एक विदेशी विद्वान के ही शब्दों में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि इंग्लैंड इस समय दुनिया के पर्व से हट जाय, तो दुनिया की बहुत बड़ी शरारत

बन्द हो सकती है। अगर संसार से ब्रिटेन को हटा दिया जाये, तो शांति स्थापित हो सकती है। वे शब्द ये हैं—“वर्ल्ड माइनस ब्रिटेन इज इक्वल टु पीस।” इंग्लैंड का व्यवहार हमारे साथ क्या रहा, अगर हम पीने दों सौ सालों के पराधीनता के काले इतिहास को छोड़ भी दें, तो भी हम यह नहीं भूल सकते कि 1947 में किस तरह मुस्लिम लीग की पीठ धपथपा कर इंग्लैंड ने देश का विभाजन करवाया। किस तरह से 1947 में ही काश्मीर पर जब हमला हुआ तो ब्रिटिश जनरल ने पाकिस्तानी सेनाओं की कमान अपने हाथ में ली। किस तरह काश्मीर का युद्ध बीच में ही रोक कर हमारा केस सुरक्षा परिषद को भिजवाने में ब्रिटेन ने मदद की। किस तरह से सुरक्षा परिषद में हमारा केस जाने के बाद उसने हमारा विरोध किया और किस तरह से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में इंग्लैंड हमेशा पाकिस्तान का समर्थन करता है। अब कच्छ के इस प्रस्ताव के पीछे ब्रिटेन का जो चालभरा हाथ रहा है और समझौते का जो ड्राफ्ट कामनवेल्थ सेक्रेटेरियट में बैठ कर लिखा गया है, इन सारी बातों को देखने के बाद हम सरकार से यह चाहते हैं कि अब कम से कम प्रायः के लिए वह धाँख खोल कर चले, ब्रिटेन को पहचाने और देखे कि भारत के प्रति ब्रिटेन का किम प्रकार का चालभरा रुख रहा है।

जहाँ तक ट्रिब्यूनल का सम्बन्ध है, 1959 और 1960 के समझौते में यह स्थिति थी कि ट्रिब्यूनल का एक व्यक्ति भारत का होगा और दूसरा पाकिस्तान का होगा। वे दोनों मिल कर अगर किसी बेयर-मेन पर सहमत हो गए, तो सभापति की नियुक्ति होगी और अगर वे सहमत न हो पाए तो वह प्रश्न खटार्ई में रह सकता था। लेकिन अब इस की स्थिति बिल्कुल भिन्न हो गई है। पाकिस्तान अपना एक प्रतिनिधि रखेगा जो पाकिस्तानी नागरिक नहीं होगा।

एक प्रतिनिधि भारत रखेगा, जो भारतीय नागरिक नहीं होगा। वे दोनों मिलकर सभापति का चुनाव करेंगे। लेकिन अगर वे इस सम्बन्ध में एकमत न हो पाए, तो यू० एन० प्रो० सेक्रेटरी जनरल को अधिकार होगा कि वह सभापति का चुनाव करे। केवल इसी एक बात से अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है कि इस ट्रिब्यूनल का हमारे बारे में जो निर्णय होगा, वह भारत के पक्ष में कितना जायगा। मैं सेक्रेटरी जनरल की नीयत पर कोई लांछन नहीं लगाना चाहता, लेकिन यू०एन० प्रो० में हमारा काश्मीर केस पिछले सत्रह सालों से पड़ा हुआ है और उस का जो परिणाम है उसी से हम शंकित हैं। वह जो सभापति होगा उनका झुकाव हमारी ओर होगा या पाकिस्तान की ओर होगा।

भारत सरकार का कहना है कि हमारे प्रमाण, हमारी दलीलें और हमारी दस्तावेजें बड़ी पुष्ट हैं। गाँवों में एक कहानी प्रचलित है कि किसी गौदड़ को कहीं से एक कागज मिल गया। वह अपनी पत्नी पर रौब जमाने के लिये कहने लगा कि यह यमराज का सर्टिफिकेट है और अब मुझे कोई नहीं मार सकता। बाद में वह किसी के खेत में चला गया। किसान जब डंश लेकर उस के पीछे चला तो गौदड़ की पत्नी ने कहा कि सर्टिफिकेट दिखाओ न। तब उस गौदड़ ने कहा कि दिखाऊँ किम को, यह तो पढ़ा-लिखा ही नहीं है। भारत सरकार के प्रमाण पुष्ट अवश्य हैं, लेकिन जिस ट्रिब्यूनल के सामने वह प्रमाणों को ले कर जायगा उन की नीयत और बुद्धि भी तो पुष्ट होनी चाहिये।

सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि हम इस ट्रिब्यूनल के निर्णय को कहीं चुनौती नहीं दे सकते। इस लिये आरबिट्रेशन की कहीं अपील नहीं हो सकती है। आम तौर पर आरबिट्रेशन का काम यह होता है कि उस ने अपना निर्णय

[श्री प्रकाशबोर शास्त्री]

दिया और उस का काम समाप्त हो गया । लेकिन इस ट्रिब्युनल के सम्बन्ध में सब से बड़ी कठिनाई यह है कि निर्णय भी वही देगा, उस को कार्यान्वित भी वही करेगा, उस को चैलेंज भी कहीं नहीं किया जा सकता । उस के बाद अगर कोई कठिनाई आये, तो वह ट्रिब्युनल स्वयं धा कर कार्यान्वित भी करायेगा । इस से बड़ी दुर्बलता इस समझौते की कोई नहीं हो सकती है । पता नहीं, सरकार ने किस प्रकार इन का स्वीकार कर लिया है ।

मैं भारत सरकार पर यह आरोप लगाना चाहता हूँ कि उसने कच्छ के सम्बन्ध में शुरू से ही उपेक्षा से काम लिया है । गुजरात की सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत पहले ही भारत सरकार को सावधान किया था और कहा था कि हम को इस दिशा में थोड़ा सा सतर्क रहना चाहिये । अगर मेरी जानकारी शलत नहीं है तो गुजरात गवर्नमेंट ने 1960 में भारत सरकार के पास प्रस्ताव भेजा कि सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से यह धावश्यक है वहां पर छः सड़कें बनाई जायें । 1960 के उस प्रोपोजल पर 1962 में यह निर्णय लिया गया कि केवल एक सड़क की जो खावदा से छाड़बेट जाती है, स्वीकृति दी जाती है, लेकिन इस स्वीकृति के लिये भी यह शर्त रखी गई कि इस का प्लान हम बनायेंगे, इस के बजट एस्टीमेट हम देखेंगे । उस के बाद भी चीफ इंजीनियर, गुजरात, यहां पर आया, लेकिन 1965 तक उन टैंडरों की स्वीकृति नहीं दी गई । यह सब इस बात के प्रमाण है कि भारत सरकार कच्छ की सीमा के प्रति कितनी सतर्क थी ? गुजरात सरकार जहां तक मेरी अपनी जानकारी है केन्द्रीय सरकार को बराबर सतर्क करती रही है और कहती रही है कि चीन और पाकिस्तान के एबीमेंट के बाद कच्छ की सीमा पर खतरा बहुत बढ़ गया है । धाप इस दिशा में भी

सावधान हो जायें लेकिन भारत सरकार इस दिशा में भी सावधान नहीं हुई ।

एक सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि जिस डींग और मुराई की सड़क के बीच में भारत के प्रधान मंत्री और भारत सरकार ने पाक पुलिस की गश्त की बात मान ली है, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं नन्दा जी से पूछता हूँ जरा वह प्रधान मंत्री को और विदेश मंत्री को कहें तो कि जिस समय उन्होंने डींग और मुराई के बीच गश्त की बात स्वीकार की उस समय क्या उनको पता नहीं था कि एस०भार०पी० एक रजिस्टर में टैन करती है । किस किस तारीख की गश्त लगाने के लिये वह गये क्या वे सब प्रमाण उनके सामने नहीं थे ? वे प्रमाण मैं धापको पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ । ये प्रमाण एस०भार०पी० के रजिस्टर में लिखे हुए हैं । 1961 में मई और जून में तीन बार उसने गश्त की । 1962 में पानी और दलदल होने के कारण हम नहीं जा सके । 1963 के जनवरी, मार्च और अप्रैल के महीनों में चार बार हम गए । 1964 में मार्च के महीने में पांच बार हम गए । अप्रैल, 1964 में पांच बार गए । मई 1964 में नौ बार गए । जून 1964 में पांच बार गए । सितम्बर, 1964 में एक बार गए । नवम्बर, 1964 में एक बार और 28 दिसम्बर, 1964 को फिर एक बार गए । 25 जनवरी, 1965 से पहले जब कि पहली बार ऊंट गाड़ी के निशान देखे गए उसके बाद भी तीन बार उस क्षेत्र में हम गए जो कंजरकोट के दक्षिण में पड़ता है और जिसके बारे में पाकिस्तान कहता है कि हमारी ऊंट गाड़ियां और दूसरी गाड़ियां वहां चलती थी । जनवरी के महीने में पहली बार ऊंटगाड़ियों के निशान देखे गए । उससे पहले भी प्रसिस्टेंट कमांडेंट एस भार०पी० छाड़बेट गैरीजन 1-1-1965 से पहले सात बार कंजरकोट गए और धाखिरी बार 7 जनवरी 1965 को गए पर कंजर

कोट के दक्षिण में तब तक कोई सड़क नहीं थी ।

प्रश्न यह है कि जब इतने प्रमाण मौजूद थे तो उन प्रमाणों के होते हुए भी प्रधानमंत्री श्री लाल बहादूर शास्त्री ने कैसे यह स्वीकार कर लिया कि 1 जनवरी, 1965 को कंजरकोट के बगल में एक ऐसी सड़क थी जिस पर पाकिस्तान की जंटगाड़ियाँ या दूसरी गाड़ियाँ चलती थी ? या तो सच्चाई यह है कि प्रधानमंत्री को उनके अधिकारियों ने, आफिस के कार्यकर्ताओं ने धोखे में रखा । जिस आधार पर प्रधानमंत्री ने यह बात स्वीकार की । अगर उन्होंने प्रधानमंत्री को जानकारी नहीं दी तो आज यह सदन और देश मांग करता है कि प्रधानमंत्री के कार्यालय के उन अधिकारियों को दंडित किया जाये जिन्होंने प्रधानमंत्री को धोखे में रखा ।

दूसरी सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि अगर प्रधानमंत्री को यह जानकारी थी तो फिर मेरा प्रधानमंत्री पर आरोप है कि प्रधानमंत्री ने देश को धोखे में रखा और संसद को धोखे में रखा । जब वह एक जनवरी, 1965 के पहले की बात कहते थे उस समय हमारे दिल सहलते थे । हमने संसद में भी कहा था कि पाकिस्तान के साथ एपीमेंट करते समय 1 जनवरी 1965 की बात न कहो, 15 अगस्त, 1947 की बात कहो । लेकिन प्रधानमंत्री जब इतनी हिम्मत के साथ कहते थे तो हम समझते थे कि कोई न कोई मजबूत बात इनके पीछे अवश्य होगी ।

प्रधानमंत्री जो व्यक्तिगत चर्चाओं में और दूसरे स्थानों पर भी यह कहते हैं कि यह तो इंटरनेशनल एपीमेंट है, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समझौता है । अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समझौता करने के बाद कोई भी बड़ा देश उससे मुकर कैसे सकता है या पीछे उससे कैसे मुड़ सकता है ? इसी के सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समझौता उस के साथ किया जाय जो व्यक्ति या देश समझौता करने के मूड में हो । एक व्यक्ति तो सम-

झौते के मूड में है और दूसरा युद्ध के उन्माद में पागल है ऐसी अवस्था में उसके साथ समझौता कैसे हो सकता है ?

पाकिस्तान के साथ हमने एक समझौता 1959 और 1960 में किया था । पाकिस्तान ने उसके बाद 1965 में धा कर कच्छ की धरती पर आक्रमण किया । जब कच्छ की धरती पर आक्रमण हुआ तो 1960 का समझौता टूट गया । 1960 के समझौते की कोई कीमत नहीं रही ।

दूसरा समझौता हमने किया था जब विलसन साहब के चक्कर में धोखे से हम फंम गए और हमने इस समझौते को स्वीकार कर लिया । लेकिन यह समझौता भी खरम हो गया उस दिन जिस दिन पाकिस्तान ने कश्मीर में आक्रमण किया । जब पाकिस्तान समझौते के मूड में नहीं है युद्ध के मूड में है और उसके साथ हम समझौते, समझौते, शांति, शांति, सद्भावना, सद्भावना की बात करते चले जायें तो शांति और सद्भावना कैसे हो सकती है जब दूसरा पक्ष भी शांति और सद्भावना प्रदर्शित करे वह तो तब होगी । जब पाकिस्तान लड़ने के मूड में हो तो उसके साथ शांति और समझौते की बात का क्या लाभ ?

एक निवेदन मैं यह यह भी कर देना चाहता हूँ कि — भूटो साहब जो परसों यहाँ आए हैं, उनके बारे में विदेश मंत्री को स्पष्ट भाषा में कहना चाहिये और पाकिस्तान को खबर भेज दी जानी चाहिये कि भूटो साहब के घाने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है । दिल्ली में बैठकर स्वर्ण सिंह और भूटो की बानबानत प्रब नहीं होगी, प्रब तो लड़ाई के मैदान में जनरल चौधरी और जनरल प्रभुब की बाँटें होंगी । भूटो और स्वर्ण सिंह की बात नहीं होनी चाहिये । यह तो भारतीय स्वाभिमान की मांग है ।

एक अंतिम बात मैं कांग्रेसी मित्रों से कह कर अपना स्थान छोड़ कर लेना चाहता हूँ । यह बात मैं उनसे इस नाते से कहना चाहता हूँ कि कच्छ एपीमेंट का विरोध

[श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री]

कोई विरोधी दलों की ही जिम्मेवारी नहीं है। देश जितना हमारा है उतना ही आपका भी है। देश से जितना प्रेम हम करते हैं उतना ही देश से प्रेम शायद आप भी करते हैं। आपके प्रेम का तो शायद यह नमूना था कि बंगलौर के कांग्रेस महा समिति के अधिवेशन में जब कच्छ समझौते के बारे में प्रस्ताव आने वाला था तो कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी ने ही उस प्रस्ताव के आने की अनुमति नहीं दी। मैं कांग्रेस के साधियों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश के इतिहास को उज्ज्वल बनाने के लिये, राष्ट्र की अखंडता और एकता सुरक्षित रखने के लिये जो साहस उन्होंने बंगलौर में दिखाया था उसी साहस का वे इस सदन में भी इस प्रस्ताव को जब यह स्वीकृति के लिये आये उसे गिरा कर परिचय दें।

Shri Jashvant Mehta (Bhavnagar):
 Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the situation created by the Pakistani action in Kutch had caused great resentment all over the country. After this aggression people all over the country have taken this problem very seriously. At that time when Kutch aggression came people were in a mood to fight out to the finish. But then a situation developed, negotiations started and then came the agreement. This agreement was signed in the hope that Pakistan will come to an understanding and will create the goodwill for the settlement of the other disputes. But after this agreement the Pakistani foreign minister issued a statement and they started to play on the chessboard and hobnob with China. They wanted to conspire against India. As we know China is in the background. The policy of China is also to upset the economy of our country, to fight on the diplomatic and military fronts and to defeat the goodwill which India has created. After the Kutch agreement Pakistan started another move on the Kashmir cease-fire line. When Pakis-

tan started this move, we had to re-think and fight this issue again on another front. The situation created by Pakistan requires reconsideration. The whole nation wants strong policy and action from this Government. When the Prime Minister declared on the 15th of August from the Red Fort that force will be met with force, our people took it seriously. We have to tackle this problem on the Kashmir front. On the one side we have come to an agreement on the Kutch issue. The morale of the people of Kutch was very high even in those days. When we went to Kutch border, people were not afraid in spite of all the difficulties and bombardments on the frontier that were going on. Our young military jawans were confident. After this Kutch agreement, there is an international conspiracy of China to upset our economic planning and damage Indian prestige in the international world. An impression is created that China and Pakistan have taken an offensive and aggressive attitude in the international chessboard. If they want to fight, the nation should be prepared and the nation is not in a mood today to hear anything else, when I was travelling in the train, I met a lot of soldiers, military officers. At the time of the Kutch aggression they were in this spirit: that we want to fight to the finish. In no circumstances India should be insulted. Now the situation has changed when the intruders have entered our Kashmir territory. At this time, we have to enquire how the intruders have been able to enter Srinagar city. What are the factors? We wonder whether military intelligence and Home Ministry's intelligence was active. Now, the situation has deteriorated to such an extent that immediate action needs to be taken.

15 hrs.

It is good that today's front-line news in the press is encouraging; we

have been able to take our posts back and we must congratulate our officers on that performance. They have been able to create confidence in the people. Otherwise the situation would have deteriorated to such an extent that people would have lost faith. When Shastriji gave us confidence on the 15th August, the people were thinking that the Government should face the situation squarely. Even if the worst comes to the worst, we must tell Pakistan clearly that "unless you are ready to change your attitude, we will have to reconsider *de novo* the Kutch agreement."

Some people argue that it is not logical. But what is the logic when the enemy is indulging in naked aggression? On the other side, we want peace. How to resolve this dilemma? The other party is not coming to its senses. During the last 15 years, one way or the other, they have been conspiring against our country. The people of this country are in no mood to hear anything else, and the people want a strong government and strong action against the enemies.

The time has now come to reconsider this whole situation, *de novo*, and take a positive stand on Pakistan affairs. I hope the House is also in that mood, and the country's mood is also reflected everywhere, namely, that the country today wants strong action and a strong Government to face this emergency.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hosangabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at a time when the enemy is knocking at the gates of Kashmir, when the enemy is trying to batter down the gates of Kashmir, when the enemy is partly inside the gates with the connivance if not the active assistance of some treacherous anti-national elements in that region, it is not an easy or pleasant task for me to remind patriots on both sides of the House of that cold, bleak wintry day in November, 1962, when a victorious albeit perfidious Chinese army inflicted a national humiliation on our country. The President, on the 23rd

November, 1962, referring to this military debacle in NEFA said, "The Indian reverses in NEFA should be regarded as a matter of sorrow, shame and humiliation. We have to retrieve our lost prestige." Here was an opportunity, a golden opportunity, in Kutch, to retrieve that lost prestige. But I am sorry to say that what happened in the winter of 1962 was repeated by way of national humiliation in the summer of 1965, not by a victorious enemy, not by a victorious foreign government, foreign power, but by the pusillanimity of our own Government.

My mind goes back to those torrid, scorching days in early June when I and two of my colleagues in the Opposition, Shri Himmatsinhji and Shri Narendra Singh Mahida, toured the forward areas in the Rann of Kutch in helicopter, in jeeps and on foot. I learnt at that time that neither the Defence Minister nor the Home Minister—of course the Prime Minister was too busy, perhaps—had been as far as the point that we had gone to. I am not finding fault with them. They were probably too busy with other matters here. But I wish that they had gone and seen the fine, fighting fettle of our troops, our army, right from the General to the jawan. Each one of them was, so to say, straining at the leash, everyone of them in his own language told me so. It was a heartening picture of national integration that I saw there—there were jawans and officers, from Jammu to Kerala and from Gujarat to Assam in the Rann of Kutch. But the pusillanimity of our Government had reduced it to a phoney war in the desert. I wish the Government had shown that firmness, that courage, that strength, which they displayed in 1966; when Pakistan had occupied Chaad Bet in the Rann, without any fuss, without much ado, the army moved in to Chaad Bet and pushed out the Pakistani intruders, invaders, in less than 48 hours. But since, because of the States' reorganisation, the part 'C' State of Kutch became part of the Gujarat State, and

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

the Gujarat State police were entrusted with the responsibility of patrolling the border area, I do not know whether the Gujarat State police have discharged their duty well. If the Prime Minister is to be believed that Pakistani patrolling had been going on even before 1st January, 1965, then evidently—because, no statement was made in Parliament in the last session, neither by the Prime Minister nor by the Foreign Minister nor by the Home Minister or the Defence Minister that Pakistani patrols had been seen in the Rann of Kutch even before 1st January, 1965—I take it that either the Gujarat State Government, or the State police, did not report this matter, if the Prime Minister's statement is to be taken at its face value—or the Central Government paid no heed to the reports of the Gujarat State Government. In either case both the Governments are to blame.

The President, in the case of China, had said that two blunders had brought the country to that sorry pass—credulity and negligence. Here in the matter of Kutch, it was negligence in the past and pusillanimity in the present. The army was fully prepared in 1947. Let us remember Mahatma Gandhi, the apostle of Ahimsa. His Ahimsa was not a synonym for cowardice; his was an active Ahimsa, resistance to the point of final sacrifice, the supreme sacrifice. It was Mahatma Gandhi who, in 1947, when an offensive was launched by the Pakistani tribals in October, 1947, summoned the Prime Minister, Nehru,—a hesitant Prime Minister—and told him, "Send your Air Force, send your Army to Srinagar to save Kashmir." But now, in the Rann of Kutch, when Pakistan committed aggression, Government put up a brave face, a brave show, in Parliament; unfortunately, there was no Mahatma Gandhi with us to give them advice. The Prime Minister, on the 28th April last, in the last budget session, when this Kutch issue was being discussed, said: "I want to

state clearly and emphatically that we reject and repudiate the claims in their entirety"—the Pakistani territorial claims in the Rann of Kutch. He went on to say that what was involved was only a boundary demarcation.

India's permanent representative in the United Nations, Mr. Chakravarty, wrote a letter to the Security Council very briefly, but very pointedly, as follows:

"It is clear that Pakistan's claims do not have a shred of legitimacy or any basis in historical evidence. They only reflect Pakistan's greed for territorial expansion which it seeks to satisfy by military force."

That is exactly what the Publications Divisions pamphlet brought out on 11th May also says—this is a Government publication, not mine:

"The attack for effecting illegal military occupation of Indian territory is a violation of the Indo-Pakistan Border Agreement of 1960 and a breach of international law and of the United Nations Charter. The invasion of Indian territory of the Rann of Kutch is an act of naked aggression against India."

Is the government lost to all sense of manliness that when Pakistan violated that agreement, according to their own state by marching their troops into Kutch, effected illegal occupation and committed naked aggression, the government did not have the courage to say then that "we repudiate the agreement, the agreement no longer binds us"? It was their bounden duty, they were honour-bound, to march their troops into Kutch at that time, as soon as they came to know about this aggression against India and to see to it that the invader was expelled from India, as they did in 1956. It is nothing new.

What is all this preaching of Ahimsa, peace and non-violence? Are we so committed to this uncondition-

al peace and ahimsa? Mahatma Gandhi was not so committed or bound. Who are these epigones of Mahatma Gandhi to commit a nation like this? Why are these hundreds of crores of rupees being spent on the army if they cannot stand up and fight for once? If they had stood up in February, March, April or even in May, in the Rann of Kutch, the country would not have been brought to this sorry pass. This is the impression which I and my colleagues got when we toured the forward areas in the Rann of Kutch. Even in late May or early June, it was not impossible.

But when our Prime Minister went to London and met President Ayub—I don't know whether he shook hands or hugged him, but he had a very cordial meeting with Ayub. We saw the pictures, but from the pictures it was not quite clear, because the final act was not photographed. After that, a strange metamorphosis seems to have come over the Prime Minister. He had readily accepted the resolution which the party to which I have the honour to belong—the PSP—moved in this House on the 28th April. The Prime Minister accepted it spontaneously and the House adopted it unanimously, namely,—

“...with hopes and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India.”

After having accepted this, in London a sea-change seems to have come over the Prime Minister. The pathetic dependence, the pathetic faith of the Prime Minister's advisers, if not the Prime Minister himself on Whitehall and 10, Downing Street overcame the faith which as the democratic Prime Minister of free India, he should have reposed in the people and Parliament of India. Otherwise, how and why this agreement? It is not an agreement of peace or truce either; it is not an agreement of peace with honour and justice. It is a pact for abject appeasement of the aggressor, where the aggressor and the aggressed, the victim, are

equated, put on a par with each other. History has borne witness times without number that such appeasement ultimately culminates in war—God forbid! The appetite grows by what it feeds on.

In the very first sentence of the preamble, what is said is this. I do not know who was the Prime Minister's adviser—the semantic adviser on the English language in London. I suppose he has competent advisers and I hope he did not depend on Whitehall entirely. After having said in Parliament that what is involved is only demarcation, here it is said:

“Arrangement should be made for determination and demarcation of the border of that area.”

In international law, the distinction between demarcation and determination is clearly understood. Demarcation is a simple administrative act. But determination gives the power to draw a new international boundary. Sardar Swaran Singh must have been there in London at that time. Demarcation is a simple process and when it was said in Parliament, we had no objection to it. But determination is pregnant with grave danger, because it gives power to the tribunal to draw an entirely new boundary, while we have all the time said that the Rann of Kutch was part of Kutch and not of the province of Sind. This should be the ultimate issue. To whom did the Rann of Kutch belong at that time—to the Maharao of Kutch or the Government of Sind? But nothing like that seems to emerge out of this agreement. It is quite different here. Determination of the boundary and then demarcation is pregnant with dangerous consequences for the country.

By signing this document, the Prime Minister has betrayed, violated, the pledge solemnly given to Parliament. After agreeing to determination and then demarcation, the Government went a step further. At the tail end, the Tribunal comes in. Yesterday the Prime Minister glossed over this part of the agreement. He referred to it casually and said, if there is any

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]
 difference between the two Governments, it will be referred to a tribunal for their findings. The agreement says that the tribunal's findings cannot be questioned on any ground whatsoever. Even the International Law Commission's convention gives the parties the right to question the tribunal's award on any one of three grounds, to which my colleague, Shri Hem Barua, referred yesterday. We have voluntarily divested ourselves even of that right. After having done this, does it lie in the mouth of the Prime Minister or Foreign Minister to come and say that we have been true to the pledge given to Parliament? I must learn semantics anew if this is being true to the pledge.

Much is made of the *status quo ante*. What should have been done is to restore *status quo ante*. But what has been done is *status quo anti-India*, that is against India. I am not going to refer to the brave speeches of the Prime Minister about not surrendering an inch, because that has a familiar ring. We have learnt to our cost in the case of China that many many miles make an inch. I do not believe that the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, can say today with regard to Pakistan what his predecessor, Prime Minister Nehru, said with regard to China. He, Pandit Nehru, ultimately confessed in Parliament, but late for the nation, too late for the country, that he had lived in a world of illusion, out of touch with reality. I do not think Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri can claim that privilege. Pandit Nehru went on to say: "I had hoped, perhaps studidly, that China would never attack India." Prime Minister Shastri cannot say that. Pakistan's intentions have been clear right from 1947 when they invaded Kashmir. Today they have again invaded Kashmir along with the so-called Azad Kashmir forces (*Inter-ruption*). Sir, before you ring the bell I might say that I will close in one or two minutes.

Sir, I am glad that the heartening news has come that we have re-taken Kargil. Could we, could our Government not have shown similar guts, similar courage when Pakistan invaded Kutch?

The Gujarat State Government was never consulted before the agreement was signed. The Gujarat Government was never asked whether their police knew anything of Pakistani patrolling the area before January 1965. The draft agreement, I say with information in my possession, was never referred to the Law Minister before it was signed—after it was signed it might have been referred. The Draft agreement was not referred to the Attorney-General who was then in Moscow. The Law Minister was absent from Delhi, but the Cabinet meeting took place, considered the agreement and finalised it—all because of the pathetic faith in the British Prime Minister and Whitehall experts. Our Indian experts or advisers of the Prime Minister played into the hands of the Whitehall experts; otherwise, if they had given, if Sardar Swaran Singh, with all his legal knowledge, had given some thought to these matters, I challenge him today, could he have agreed to the word "determination" with regard to the boundary? He is sitting tongue-tied, but I am sure he will speak later on. Therefore, is it not high time that today after having committed these blunders they do something about it. Even today they would not confess the blunder. But who is to pay the price for these blunders? We are paying too high a price for peace. They may say it is the price for peace. Is it not too high a price to pay for peace, that Pakistan should enter the Rann of Kutch, commit aggression, then we should give them voluntarily the right to patrol the area, we should withdraw our forces from the area and allow them to maintain their posts, keep their forces on their side of the international boundary while we withdraw our forces deep inside our territory and we refer their case,

their claim to 3500 square miles to the tribunal?

This booklet, again of the Publications Division, says that Pakistan claims that it is an "inland sea" and therefore half of it belongs to them. Tomorrow Pakistan might claim that Sunderbans in Calcutta is an inland sea, it is a marshy place and therefore they should get half of it. Will we refer their claim to Sunderbans to a tribunal again? I would say a thousand times 'no'. The Prime Minister said that this is not a precedent for the future. But one precedent is bad enough, one precedent is bad enough to humiliate the entire nation. The nation's heart is sound today. Today the people's heart is sound. They want dedicated, determined, honest, efficient, courageous leadership. That is what is lacking today. If that is given I am sure the army with the 45 crores of people at the back will still march as they have marched before.

We want to recapture, if the Treasury Benches will help us, the spirit of Shivaji, the spirit of Mahatmaji, the spirit of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose. That spirit is lacking today. The Government ask us to sacrifice, sacrifice and sacrifice at the time of crisis, and once the crisis has passed the Government sinks once again into comatose complacency and wallows in the quagmire of corruption. That is why the people have lost confidence in the Government. If they can still overhaul themselves, the Government first, the people will render greater sacrifices. I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind about it. What did Mahatma Gandhi say many years ago—the apostle of ahimsa—parrot-like our friends repeat that they are the disciples of Mahatma Gandhi? Let them take this to heart. This was what Mahatma Gandhi said many years ago. He said:

"I would risk violence a thousand times rather than emascula-

tion of a whole race. I do not say, eschew violence in your dealings with robbers or with nations that may invade India."

One word more, Sir, and I have done. I referred to Shivaji. Our Defence Minister has been described in the Marathi Press as Shivaji II. I do not know whether he will emulate the example of Shivaji I. If he wants to remain true to the title of Shivaji II he will have to emulate the style, the courage and bravery of Shivaji I. Let him remember that Shivaji I inspired his soldiers to march with the war cry on their lips:

“शरण नहीं रण, भारीत भारीत मरण”

That means: "No surrender but fight" and not "no fight, but surrender". Let him inspire the soldiers the people. What did Netaji say? Netaji inspired the Azad Hind Fauj also in a similar way. We want to recapture that fire, that incandescent spirit, that zeal, that patriotism to suffer and sacrifice for the nation. What was their war cry?

“तु जे हिन्द आगे बढ,
मरने से भी तु न डर,
आकाश तक उठा के मर,
जंगलवन बाधे जा ।
शिमन जेरी यही रा,
खा जेरो गुनना रहे,
जा सामने जेरे मरे,
तु युद्ध में मियाय जा ।”

That, Sir, is the spirit that is lacking today in the country. Can the Prime Minister, the External Affairs Minister, the Defence Minister and the Home Minister all of them together, if not singly, inspire that spirit in the nation? If they cannot then the nation is lost; if they can then everything can be saved. We pledge, myself and my party, to stand by the side of the Government to undertake this task. We pledge to fight the forces of chaos and subversion in the country, to fight the forces of disruption in the country, provided they

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath] will stand firm, determined and dedicated to this task, and not repeat another Kutch in Kashmir.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in the face of Pakistan's latest acts of adventurism and treacherous aggression, it is almost impossible to speak with any degree of objectivity. As we know, Sir, Pakistan's calculated, planned aggression in Kutch produced a wave of indignation throughout the country and, indeed, in this House. I recall I made one of the angriest speeches during the debate on Pakistan's aggression in Kutch. I am glad that my hon. friend, Shri Kamath has paid a tribute to our forces in Kutch. I do not think the story of Kutch, so far as our troops are concerned, has been adequately told. I know something because I got it first-hand from people who ought to know it. That story shows that in spite of Pakistan's massive attack supported by American supplied tanks, artillery and superior equipment, our troops fighting under the most unfavourable circumstances, not only of terrain but also tremendously out numbered and with inferior weapons, with no tanks, had so mauled the Pakistanis that they abandoned their obvious plan to achieve the blitzkrieg down to the 24th Parallel. Today, because of Pakistan's persistent, treacherous, aggression—I can understand Mr. Kamath's feelings; it expresses emotional and psychological revulsions in the country—there is no point in talking with Pakistan in respect of Kutch or indeed in respect of any other matter. If today the Government said to Pakistan, "We have reached the end of our patience; we entered into the Kutch Agreement as a gesture to the hope that you would abandon your policies of obsessive hate or persistent aggression against India but today your persistence in this kind of aggression makes it pointless and that if you persist in this kind of aggression, it will mean war whatever the consequences that

may follow", that kind of appeal by Government would be emotionally powerful to the country, to everyone of us. But I appreciate that, fortunately or unfortunately, Governments cannot function on emotion. Fortunately or unfortunately, a Government has to try to be statesmanlike and has to try and assess its policies according to certain international conduct.

Sir, I know that what I am going to say about Kutch will not be emotionally liked—I do not like it myself very much emotionally—but I would try to approach it objectively. I asked myself, "Can this Kutch settlement be separated from Pakistan's latest acts of aggression in Kashmir?" When I looked at it—I should not look at it—I asked myself a question, "What was the assurance that the Prime Minister gave to this House?" I have analysed it as a lawyer from a brief. The assurance was that we would accept or agree to some terms only if the *status quo ante* as on the 1st of January, 1965 was restored. What did those terms spelt out mean? I know my legalistic arguments will not appeal to my friend—it does not appeal even to me—but what do they mean? It meant that Kanjarkot, Biar Bet and Point 84 would have to be vacated, it meant that Chad Bet would be re-occupied by our police force; it meant that there will be unrestricted patrolling by our police—we did not have our military there. Well it may be said, you have allowed Pakistan to patrol in the Ding-Surai area which is a customs track of about 8000 yards. But the official reason was that there was some evidence that Pakistan had been patrolling there. If we look at it in terms of the assurance, legally there has been a complete restoration of the *status quo ante*. Perhaps we can make a case, emotionally, to abuse the Government. I could do it better than my friend Mr. Kamath. When the Prime Minister invited some of us to a discussion, when this whole Kutch

aggression was taking place—I do not know what was his reaction but, I think, he was surprised as I was—I was utterly shocked to find that we had already committed ourselves, almost categorically, in respect of Kutch. As a lawyer, I like to see what my brief is. I had read in some of the British papers that we had already committed ourselves, almost categorically, in respect of Kutch. At that meeting, I asked the Prime Minister, "Please see the Agreement of 1959"—I was utterly shocked—but the Prime Minister was not to be blamed. We now talk about the tribunal and about its mandatory character. Mr. Kamath said that Sardar Swaran Singh would not have accepted it. But he had already accepted it. We might resurrect and castigate the ghost of the late Prime Minister but this is what the present Prime Minister and his Government inherited. In 1959-60 Agreement there was a reference to the boundary dispute. If you accept that it is a boundary dispute, you refer it to a tribunal and the decision of the tribunal has to be mandatory unless, by mutual consent, you withdraw it. We accepted that in 1959. We spelt out categorically the acceptance of the fact that there was a dispute in respect of Kutch. We did not recognise it but there was the claim of Pakistan to 3500 sq. miles. It was all there duly signed and what I never understand is.....

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): No; that came later.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have read the whole agreement. You have read the extracts but I have read the whole Agreement. I was shocked and I asked the Prime Minister, "What is this? What have we done? If you like, you may get hold of the late Prime Minister's ghost and abuse him and abuse, in a lesser degree, Sardar Swaran Singh. But we have inherited this. What are you going to do?" We might have said, whatever the late Prime Minister, Shri

Jawaharlal Nehru, may have done, we will repudiate it. That may have been one course of action. But I say this that in the light of the tremendous emotional revulsion in this country, few people would have had the moral courage to have accepted this Agreement. I say this that, if nothing else, the Prime Minister showed great moral courage. It is much easier for some Members of the erstwhile Cabinet—I will not name them—to be more fire-eating and more super-patriotic than some Members of the Opposition. What were they doing as senior Members of the Cabinet when the late Prime Minister entered into these agreements about boundary disputes and in respect of Kutch? What were they doing then? It is all very well to indulge in fire-eating now. What were they doing in 1959?

You may say, that international opinion does not matter. But I do not agree with this. Internationally, this Agreement has done a great deal of good to India's image. I have it on very good authority that both the President of America and the President of the U.S.S.R. have congratulated our Prime Minister. If it were only the American President, even if it were Britain, I would not have said that it was a matter of congratulation because we know that they have invariably leaned towards Pakistan and because of their membership of the SEATO and CENTO, they continue to turn a blind eye to Pakistan's lapses, Pakistan's acts of aggression. But when the U.S.S.R. which has consistently supported us on Kashmir feels that we did a good thing by accepting the Kutch Agreement, I will say, it means a great deal internationally and in the immediate future, when we do not know what may happen *vis-a-vis* Pakistan, it may mean a great deal more.

If today we repudiate the Kutch Agreement, we will be playing into Pakistan's hands. I feel that one of the reasons that has entered into the

[Shri Frank Anthony]

perverted complex of Pakistani thinking is that in a mood of psychological revulsion we will repudiate this Kutch Agreement so that they can say, "We know how blatantly mendacious their line of propaganda is", that India cannot be trusted to honour her international undertakings.

I do not think, for one moment, that Pakistan was happy about the Kutch Agreement. We have isolated the Kutch Agreement; we have made it abundantly clear that it has nothing to do with other border disputes and it has certainly nothing to do with Kashmir. I am saying this because I feel that it is necessary for us to separate Kutch from the latest position—a critical issue posed by Pakistan.

Pakistan today, apparently under Chinese tutelage, has adopted the latest style of communist Chinese invasion by guerillas masquerading as local people. I am glad that the papers have underlined the response of our people in Kashmir. I was talking to some foreign correspondents—I do not know why some seem to have a kind of blind spot in these matters. But so far as we are now concerned they say that this Pakistani invasion through guerillas has been as abject a failure as the American-backed invasion of the Bay of Pigs. They say that, because by and large and specially our rural Muslim population have refused to give aid and comfort to the Pakistani guerillas. I feel that the pattern is very similar. Pakistan's invasion is reminiscent of her invasion through tribals in 1947, backed by members of the regular Pakistani army; it is reminiscent, above all, of Pakistan's blatant lying, her blatant denial of complicity, which was later on proved to the hilt.

What is really unfortunate is that it is also reminiscent of the fact that the U.N. Agency is dragging its feet. On that occasion it was the Security

Council; on this occasion it is the U.N. Observers. How can they pretend to be ignorant of what has happened in the whole background? Pakistan proclaimed from the rooftops that she was training Mujahids and guerillas—little dictators seek to emulate big dictators with disastrous consequences to themselves. President Ayub blatantly advertised the fact that he was training guerillas precisely for this purpose.

The crucial question now, in the face of Pakistan's invasion through guerillas, blatant violation of the Ceasefire Agreement, blatant violation of the Ceasefire Line, and with your U.N. Observers unwilling or—let us give them the benefit of their motives—unable to ensure the integrity of the Ceasefire Line, is what do we do? I pose this question to our Communist friends. What do we do? Do we do what the South Vietnam people are doing? The harsh realities on our door-step will make us realise that the only answer to the Chinese communist style of invasion through guerillas is attacking their bases, bombing their bases and liquidating their bases. That is the answer. If Pakistan persists in this invasion through guerillas there can only be one answer and that is this. We have wanted peace; we wanted it passionately because we realise that we have our major preoccupations—economic and others. We have given hostage after hostage to this ardent desire for peace, and the latest hostage, if you like, was going to the utmost limits on Kutch.

Today, the Prime Minister and his Government face this position. And it is a crucial question to which there can be only one answer. If Pakistan persists in this, then what are we to do? I believe that whatever the cost, we shall have to pay it. Let us have no illusions about it; whatever fire-eating politicians and Members of the Opposition may think, let us have no illusions; whatever the cost—the cost will be ghastly; it will be terrible; the cost of any war—we

have not fought a war on our soil for 200 years—will be ghastly, but we will have to pay it, and the people will insist on our paying it because they will insist that if Pakistan persists in this, no longer can we have a peace of appeasement and no longer can we have peace with dishonour.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Before I say a word about the Kutch agreement, I do wish to pay my most warm tributes to our fighting forces in Kashmir for occupying Kargil. The great valour and bravery and determination which they have shown are really such that they deserve the warmest congratulations and appreciation from this House.

When my hon. friend Shri Kamath was referring to this happy incident, I think he forgot that behind this courageous step of our forces was the decision of this Government. They could not have gone across the cease-fire line and occupied those high peaks had it not been in pursuance of a decision of this Government. That shows what the thinking and the determination of this Government is.

Let us examine the whole thing in that context. I am reminded of the words of our great leader Jawaharlalji who said that even mountains bowed before the determination of man. Here is an example where our men have gone to those heights at altitudes of over 13,000 feet and have occupied these most vital and basic posts on the other side of the cease-fire line.

When the question of Kutch was before us and was being discussed in this House in various ways through questions and interpellations, I think the Prime Minister made the position perfectly clear.

15.49 hrs.

[**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI** in the Chair]

I do not view this matter or this agreement regarding Kutch from any

party point of view. It is not a Congress affair. It is a national agreement and has got to be viewed from that angle. I do not want that any party angle should be imparted to it. In spite of the fact that the forthcoming elections sometimes do blur our visions, yet, I think that in a matter so vital as this, there are hon. Members on both sides of the House who will rise above that easy temptation and try to see clearly what the issues are.

Whenever I have spoken in this House regarding our relationship with Pakistan, I have always said, and with all the force at my command, that we have been rather over-generous to Pakistan in all our dealings. Pakistan does not understand that generosity and that sympathy, and we have been spoiling Pakistan by being over-generous to Pakistan. Let us speak the language which Pakistan understands. Even when the Kutch question was being discussed and questions were being asked, I told the same thing to the Prime Minister. When we had our party meetings, I told the hon. Prime Minister 'Why can't you throw two or three brigades and drive out the people who have occupied our territory in Kutch?'

Shri Frank Anthony: They had three divisions.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I got a glimpse of the Prime Minister's mind when we discussed this matter. He was quite clear in his mind even when he said that we love peace, peace is our life-breath, peace for our progress, peace for our prosperity, peace for our development, that we will never hesitate to go to war if we cannot, through peaceful negotiations, achieve what is necessary. The only two questions before us at that time were whether we should go straight-way to war or we should try negotiations: negotiations and then war, if necessary, or no negotiations, no

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

talk or discussion, we straightway go to war. Even there, the Prime Minister was quite clear in his mind, and he stated it categorically on the floor of this House, that we would not go and have any talk with them until and unless they vacated the aggression. He made three things quite clear. First the aggression must be vacated. An hon. Member of this House, I think Shri Himmat-sinhji, was rather very sceptical. He asked 'Even Kanjarkot, you mean?'. The Prime Minister said here, 'Yes, Kanjarkot will have to be vacated if talks are to proceed'. Then he said that the *status quo ante* as on 1 January must be restored. He also made it clear—and there were strong comments all over—when he said that we would not restrict ourselves to Kutch if Pakistan did not vacate the aggression; we would go and attack at a place of our own choice. He said that we would go to war if they did not vacate.

What is the position? It was not as some of our friends think. It was not as if somewhere in London between Mr. Wilson and Prime Minister Shastri some decision had been taken. I do not know how hon. Members forget that from day to day here, Cabinet meetings were taking place to consider every little step, every little development that was taking place. It was not by a talk between Prime Minister Shastri and Prime Minister Wilson in London that things had been settled. What were the Cabinet meetings here for? What were they discussing? They were discussing each and every development from day to day, from step to step. The Cabinet was meeting and it was reported all over the papers.

My hon. friend, Shri Indulaj Yajnik, for whom I have great respect, who spoke so sweetly, said that it was Mr. Wilson who told Shri Shastri that this Ding-Surai track was being patrolled and, therefore, he accepted it, that he showed some photographs

and nobody knows; he never consulted anybody.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Prime Minister said so at a press conference in Nagpur. I know that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I have got two ears. I have got here the members who had a discussion with the hon. Prime Minister before he left for London. He mentioned this very fact before the Executive Council—I particularly raised my voice in horror, 'Is it really so?..... (Interruptions).

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You know what happens in the Cabinet. But we are not in the know.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am not saying that, I am only saying that it is not in London in a private talk between Mr. Wilson and Shri Shastri that the thing was settled. The Cabinet was meeting here from day to day taking note of every development. I further say that it was not Mr. Wilson who told Shri Shastri about it, but much before Shri Shastri's departure for London, this particular situation had been talked over.

Shri Maurya (Aligarh): You want to say that the whole Cabinet was wrong?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am not saying whether the Cabinet was right or wrong. I am only answering my hon. friend . . . (Interruptions.). I am prepared to listen to my hon. friends and answer them.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : यह प्रधान मंत्री शास्त्री का नहीं घपितु पूरे मंत्रिमंडल का सवाल है जिसके कि वह प्रधान मंत्री है इसनिए किसी प्रधान मंत्री के ऊपर तो धाओप है नहीं ।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: My hon. friend was possibly absent when Shri Yajnik made a speech and gave out certain facts. I am answering those facts.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Not facts, allegations.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: What he considered to be facts. My hon. friend is ignorant of what was happening in the House, and that is why he is raising his voice.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: May we know what was happening in the Cabinet?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: These were the decisions taken that way.

Certain friends say that we are prisoners of indecision. Was Shri Shastri a prisoner of indecision or a prisoner of decisions? I would not like to go into that fray between two great ladies in this House. Another equally distinguished lady Member, from a public platform, has clearly stated that she does not understand what is "prisoners of indecision", one can be a prisoner of decisions.

Here, in this particular case, as Shri Anthony has very eloquently pointed out, we agreed that there should be negotiations, that we should consider it peacefully if a peaceful settlement was possible. Nobody in this House ever said that we should not have any talks, that we should not think of peace, that we should straightaway go to war. Did Shri Kamath say at that time. "Why are you talking, whatever the talk may be? Why are you having any proposals from Mr. Wilson? Why are you considering any proposals?"

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Read the debate of the 28th.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Was this the voice of the House, of Parliament, of anybody? It was not. If there had been a resolution to the effect that this House does not want any talk for peace, that this House

does not want vacation of aggression by Pakistan without a war, I would understand that. Nobody said it, ever. Now it is all convenient and easy for somebody to come and talk like that. It is clearly taking a political advantage.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: A baseless statement you are making.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Shri Indrajit Gupta from the Communist benches made a very eloquent speech. He supports the agreement, he has got to support the agreement, but there were certain legal quibblings all the time. One does not understand why these legal quibblings were there, why he could not give a clear and categorical support to it. He could not say that they rejected it outright because he is going to the extent of asking us to take the initiative and have a settlement with China. For his love for China and his wanting us to take the initiative for having a settlement with China, he has got to support it. The Communist Party supports this settlement, and supports it very well, but now because of their professional fire-eating tactics, they must find some excuse to run down the Government.

I am glad Shri Ranga gave the fullest support to this agreement. Let us not forget that after this settlement was reached, Rajaji was the first to say that it was good. The Swatantra Party should have given absolutely unqualified support.

Even the Communists, let us remember, in their first flush, gave unqualified support. It was only after some time when they met here and considered their further strategy, they thought that they should somehow qualify it, take some political advantage out of it. It was only a second thought.

The Communists, extreme left and left, support it. Shri Ranga's party supports it. Of course, the Jana Sangh have their own view. I do not have very much quarrel with them.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

They have been persistent, they have their own views. I do not want to go into that, but I can understand that. And I can understand the SSP which is not understandable by anybody.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Except you.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: They are out for nothing but trouble. What I understand is that their whole programme, as announced by their own leaders, is to create confusion in this country, to create chaos in this country. It is their pronounced policy; it is no secret; it is all in the Press. Their only one programme, one idea is to create chaos. They say: let us create confusion; something will come out of this chaos and confusion.....

16 hrs.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: There is already chaos and confusion.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That is the only contribution which we can expect from them and which they have promised to this country. There is no worthwhile alternative one can expect from them. Dr. Lohia has times without number said, from place to place, all the time he says: we want nothing but chaos and confusion; something good will come out of it; we know we are helpless. What is their slogan? By such and such time either this Government will not be there or he will not be there. I do not see any prospect of this Government not being there. I do not know whether he is also going to indulge in self-immolation or what he wants to do to see that he is not there. We wish him well. I wish Dr. Lohia well; I only wish that some better sense prevails upon him.

What has been the world reaction to this Kutch agreement—the world reaction from all the quarters, not only from the USSR or USA? There is no one quarter or one country or one place which has not acclaimed this agreement.

श्री राससेवक यादव : अगल इन की जमीन जाती, तो पता चलता कि क्या एएकशन है ।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र मथुर : सारी दुनिया पागल है और निक एक माहव समझदार है । हम जानते है कि किम तरह मे जमीन रखी चाहिये और किम तरह मे जमीन रखी जाती है । So, that has been the general reaction from all over the world, from the entire Press. I do not think that the entire Press of the world, all the statesmen of the world have gone mad. What is behind it? I am not going into details. There may be some clauses to which exception could be taken. If it was only a dictation from us of our own charter of demands, it is another thing. But it is an agreement between two hard bargaining people; there will always be certain clauses to which objection could be taken. What is the sense of this agreement? It is not only that we wanted to be generous. The whole trouble with this world today is that we say one thing and do another thing. Our professions are one, our performance another. Everyone is talking about peace. This country has taken a leading part in talking always about a peaceful approach. It is to give a positive meaning to that word peaceful approach that this has been done. That is moral. This agreement is perfectly legal; it is informed by vision and wisdom; this agreement is militarily and strategically wise. We knew very well that Pakistan was itching for trouble and we will have to deal with Pakistan in the proper place. What is the emotional side? The emotional side cannot be ignored in spite of the fact that we do not want our visions to be blurred. Nations cannot ignore emotions. What is the emotion now? I wish the Government understands it and the Prime Minister, I hope, reflects fully the emotion of the nation. It is this: that we have no right to breathe

the free air of this country until and unless we make the full determination not only to drive out the infiltrators but to make it understandable to Pakistan for all times to come and to see that this trouble between India and Pakistan is knocked down for all times and there would be no repetition not only here, but that there would be no repetition of any act of aggression. Pakistan will forget to think of committing any aggression against India and I do hope that that will be the attitude which will inform us and our future action will be guided by that. Pakistan itself has walked into that parlour and it is for this country to pay back and let Pakistan understand that we mean business.

Shri Himmatsinhji (Kutch): If the other hon. Members had found it difficult to look at this question without emotion, I think it would be most effective for me to look at it not from that point of view but from a different point of view. My hon. friend Shri K. C. Pant, speaking some time ago, described this agreement as a compromise, and that is what it is. I do not want to go into the merits or the demerits of this question, but I would like to say that we will have to change our way of looking at things. We will have to be ready with our policies and not grope in the dark. As I said last time when I spoke on the Home Ministry's demands, the Minister of External Affairs said one thing, the Home Minister had another thing to say, and when the hon. Prime Minister came before this House he had something quite different to say. He had said that no conditions were laid for talks with Pakistan. If that is how we go about our policies, and particularly those policies which concern the territorial integrity of the country, then I have no doubt in my mind that any aggressor, be it Pakistan, China or anybody else, will be forced to do such things.

Then, in the course of this debate, I have heard many hon. Members re-

ferring to the army loosely. They have said that our army has suffered losses there, that our armed forces have had to vacate certain points, etc., but they do not realise the difficulties which those brave jawans had to undergo. I have been there. My hon. friends Shri Kamath and Shri Mahida were there with me. If one can imagine standing in that arid land in the trench with sand blowing into your mouth, eyes, throats, all the 24 hours, one will realise what difficulties those people must have undergone there. Water was scarce; it had to be carried from long distances. If we saw the morale of those boys there we would certainly feel proud about them. They were known to do something. That is the spirit which will ultimately save this country. To say that they were driven out is not right. Under very difficult circumstances, they put up a very good show for which the whole country should be proud.

Talking about the military, as I was saying earlier, our country should have a balance between political thinking and military action. It is all right for hon. Members from the Congress party to talk of peace and peaceful approach. It was the same peaceful approach that brought about the trouble on the Tibetan border; it was the same peaceful approach which has landed us in this Kashmir problem. It is the same peaceful approach and hesitation which has caused this country and its economy great stresses and strains all these years. That is why I am emphasising: Let us be prepared for all eventualities.

As I said, had we acted in January or February or latest March, we would not have had to face all these difficulties. I am quite sure of that. In 1956, when the Pakistani intrusion was noticed in Chhadbet, we moved in there and I am proud to say that one of the units there was one in which I have had great interest, because

[Shri Himmatsinhji]

the old State forces were there. They moved in and Pakistanis withdrew. Of course, they have no place in that area. Dharabani, as it is known, of which Chhadbet is one portion, was grazed by the Maldharis. Cattle herds from Sind were going to the erstwhile State of Kutch and these Maldharis used to graze there. They used to pay grazing dues to the State of Kutch. This right was inherited by the Union Government when Kutch became a Part C State. I am sure Government has got those records in the revenue department. Apart from that, when murder cases and cases of loot took place on this side of the established border, the Sind Government handed over the cases to the Kutch State. Of course, this is for the Government to see and put forward the arguments. These are some of the basic facts from which we cannot get away.

I do not want to take up the time of the House by repeating what has already been said in this context. But I will say one thing that if by any chance we lose 3,500 square miles of our territory, the people of India are not going to forgive this government. Particularly, the people of Kutch will not take this lying down.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Sir, it is no pleasant task to criticise what the government has done in its wisdom. If we criticise it, they can throw it in our face that they and not we represent the country. So, they have a divine right to rule and also an equally divine right to misrule.

Let us see the history of this dispute. I happen to have been born in the province of Sind and I know what this area is. It was always called the *Run* of Kutch. It is not 'Rann' as some people say, but 'Run' which means desert. It was always called the *Run* of Kutch and not the *Run* of Sind. My friend, the Maharao of Kutch, has made it very clear.

Whatever his title may be, now he is a member of Parliament.

Shri Himmatsinhji: The Maharao is my brother; not me.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He has descended down or risen up, shall I say, to be a common man. So, it is all right whether I mention his title correctly or wrongly.

He has made it clear that when there were criminal cases in the area the Sind Government—it used to be the Bombay Government and Sind was only a Commissioner's Division of Bombay Presidency handed them over to the Kutch Government. It was an area that belonged to the Kutch Government. The British Government could not have possibly handed over what did not belong to them. This is an undisputed fact.

The only quarrel that could have arisen was the demarcation of the boundary. The Prime Minister also many times said here that there is no question of Kutch territory. If that is so, how does the word "determination" with regard to the boundary come in? Demarcation of the boundary is understandable. It means that those who signed this document committed a very great political blunder and, I think, a legal blunder, by putting in the word "determination".

Then, much has been made by Mr. Anthony about our commitments in 1959 and in 1960. Let us analyse these commitments. What are they? The 1959 agreement says that there would be peaceful settlement of border disputes—not of territory but of border disputes—and if there could be no peaceful settlement by negotiation then there will be a tribunal. The tribunal may be mandatory, but what your terms of reference to that tribunal are, is the essence of the thing. If you give them wrong terms, then it is not that you repudiate negotia-

tions but that you put yourself in a wrong position and that you are politically wrong. It is not that there is objection to the tribunal deciding border cases. It is not our contention that there should not be peaceful negotiations. Everybody, even the aggressor says that he believes in peaceful negotiations. There is nothing wrong in this. In having a tribunal for border disputes there is nothing wrong. But when you give to that tribunal the determination of what is your territory and what is your enemy's territory, then I say you have bungled and it is not in accordance with the 1959 agreement.

Our Prime Minister also said that certain commitments were made during the last regime, in the regime before him, as if he wanted to say that he was bound by those agreements. First of all, he is not bound by those agreements. Historical events are changing every day now. He has bound himself by saying that he will follow, in internal and international affairs, the policies that were laid down by his predecessor. So he cannot take refuge in that. It was open to him, if he considered that there were handicaps in the 1959 agreement, to say that we are not bound by this agreement.

Let us now see what the agreement of 1960 is. What does it say? It says that there are five disputes, and the Kutch dispute comes the last. It says that data shall be collected. While data is being collected, Pakistan comes and attacks us. "Data being collected" means that the two parties would meet, compare that data and on that data will be decided what is to be done, what is right and what is wrong. Nothing in the 1959 and 60 Agreement made us come to the conclusion that we were bound to appoint a tribunal after aggression. If there was aggression, that meant that the Agreements were repudiated. The 1959 and 60 Agreements had been

repudiated by Pakistan. And yet we say, we are bound by these Agreements. This is a very strange thing. I do not know how Mr. Frank Anthony could, with his legal knowledge and legal quibbling, justify it. It has political significance and not legal significance. This is a political affair and not a legal affair. Let us not forget it.

Again, it is said that this Agreement is commended by all quarters in the world. Let me tell you that today, excepting those who suffer from tyranny, nobody wants war. Even if the cause is just, the people are so much afraid of war, and its spreading, lest the world should be destroyed by nuclear weapons. There is an outcry from every quarter that people must stop war at any cost. But if it had been a portion of his empire, I am sure, the worthy Prime Minister of England would not have talked in the terms in which he talked to our Prime Minister. I can understand the anxiety of every nation to avoid war anywhere, excepting where their own interests are involved. Wherever their own rights are concerned, they are prepared to risk world conflagration, they are prepared to risk nuclear war and they are prepared to risk the destruction of the world. But we are in a different category. We have always considered *sanyasa* as the highest state in life. So, this nation has become a *sanyasi*. How does a *sanyasi* live? He lives by begging. We are the greatest beggars in the world. The *sanyasi* does not care for his family. But he says, "The whole world is my family— वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्". He does not see whether his people are defended or not. But he must defend the world. He is more concerned with the opinion of the world, as Mr. Mathur, said today.

I remember, in 1932, when Gandhiji, returned from the Round Table Conference, the country after having given a great fight to the

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

British Government was also exhausted, many wise people told him that the country was exhausted. He said, "Remember, the challenge has not been thrown by us. But if anybody refuses a challenge that is thrown by the opponents, he must go down! Whether we are prepared or not, we must accept this challenge." Then, in 1942, in the Congress Working Committee there were some wise men. Do you know what those wise men said there? They said, as Mr. Mathur said today, as Mr. Anthony said today, that you must think about the international opinion. Gandhiji said, "I am not going to think about international opinion in a thing which I consider to be right. International opinion is affected and is guided by its own interest and not by our interest." He said that international opinion would veer round us if we give the battle to the British Government. So, it is not the international opinion that counts. I am sure every country, including Soviet Russia, will bless us for having come to this agreement. The Agreements of 1959 and 1960 did not prevent us from making correct references. Our Prime Minister has said several times—If I mistake not—that there is no question whether Rann of Kutch belongs to us or not; there was only the boundary question; there was only the question of demarcation. If we cut our hands and give them to the foreigners and the foreigners make us say what they want, I am afraid we are in a bad way.

There is another thing which is more important than anything else. Did our Government know that there was a portion of our territory that was being patrolled by Pakistan? This is the crux of the question. If they did not know, then I say that they were culpably negligent. Culpable negligence is also immoral; it is not only legally punishable but is also morally wrong. I remember

that one day Mahatma Gandhi signed a document and he brought it to the Working Committee. We told him that he had signed this under misapprehension but he said that a man of common-sense should not have signed it. What is culpable negligence? It is that which a man of common-sense would not do. A man of common-sense would not have carried on this negotiation unless he had the facts before him. This Government did not know that a portion of our territory was being patrolled by Pakistan. And to whom was it proved that it was so? They had no talks with the Pakistan's representative; it was proved to the Prime Minister of England. He was convinced that this portion was being patrolled and we accepted it. We accepted it because we had no knowledge.

I was talking about Mahatma Gandhi's example. When we pointed out to him his mistake, he said:

हम बदमाश हैं ।

हमने कहा बापू घ्राप ऐसा क्यों कहते हैं
कि हम बदमाश हैं ।

He said that he was not fit to lead the country if he could commit a mistake involving the lives of millions of people. When people make such culpable mistakes, they must be taken to task.

Shri Hanumanthaya: Did you take Gandhiji to task and remove him from the leadership?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He had removed himself, but all the people went to him for advice. When he decided about Quit India Movement, more than half the Working Committee was against his decision and he said that he would go all alone. Then, what have we done? We have allowed them to patrol a portion of our territory. All right. But they say that in this area in which they were patrolling there was a track which

was traversed by their camels, and there was no trace left of this. After that they began to bring their jeeps and their wheeled vehicles and all that. We say that that area is not in their possession. What is the definition of possession? We cannot patrol that area. But they can patrol that area.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: We can patrol that area.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: It is semantic confusion to say that it is not in their possession, since we cannot go there but they can go there. I do not know what the meaning of possession is. Does possession mean that there should be in that area of Rann of Kutch, in that desert area, some people living who are Pakistanis? There is no such thing like that. People are not living there; it is a desert land. But they have control of it, and we cannot go there. So, when it is said that it was quite right to say that the conditions regarding the *status quo ante* of January, 1965 were fulfilled, it actually means that those conditions were fulfilled according to the defective knowledge that our Prime Minister and his Cabinet had. That is all.

16-32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then, there is another thing. When Jawaharlalji talked of a tribunal, I am sure he had in mind only one kind of tribunal, and it was that there should be a representative of India, an Indian national, and a representative of Pakistan, a Pakistani national, and a neutral person selected by common consent. He did not want an international tribunal. But we have consented to an international tribunal. We have allowed this border question to become an international question. It was a question between Pakistan and ourselves and it was not an international question. Let us leave this aside. The Pakistanis are treacherous people, and we knew their treachery from the days of the Muslim League. Even Gandhiji could not convert the heart of Jinnah.

But, now, there are here in India, people who think that by giving concessions to Pakistan they can change the heart of Pakistan. Among them is the distinguished and the learned leader of the Swatantra Party. It is very strange that the Congress should stand in need of the support of the Swatantra Party! This is a very good alliance. Then our Government have the support of a saintly person who sometimes makes his incursions in politics. I do not know whether he knew that our Government did not know that some portion of this territory was being patrolled by Pakistan. Then, there is the man of good-will called Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan who wants peace at any price. And with all these distinguished supporters, the Government need not be afraid. They have also their majority in this House. But I say today that we have been subject to many *dhokas* many deceits and betrayals by Pakistan, the latest being in Kashmir. Do they not even now say that in spite of what has happened in Kashmir, our agreement stands, and we are there on the burning deck when all have fled, and alone we stand? Are we going to say to the world that, 'Whatever Pakistan might do, we stand by this agreement because it is an international agreement?' I say there can be no greater nonsense than this. When we have clearly been shown that their words cannot be trusted, when the Prime Minister has said that their words cannot be trusted, can we then sit with them round the negotiation table? With what face will the representatives of our Government sit with the representatives of Pakistan when Pakistan has infiltrated into our territory in Kashmir? I say this is absurd. How can you face each other? How can you face a person who has betrayed you time after time?

The only thing is, you scrap this agreement. This agreement was sinful as it was made. It is sinful to carry out at this time of the year when we are fighting Pakistan with

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

the skin of our teeth in Kashmir. I say it is time enough for Government to retrace its steps if it wants to be considered a powerful, good and honourable government, a government that does represent the people, not only with the vote of the people but the will of the people. Go into the market place, go into the bazar, go into the *kucheries*, you will find that the people think that this is a wrong agreement and the people think it will be wrong, at this time, to talk with Pakistan. There can be no talk with Pakistan except at the point of the sword because it has unsheathed the sword. Those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword.

श्री श्रीर्य : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कच्छ सीमा को ले कर भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच 30 जून, 1965 का समझौता लोक-तंत्रीय परम्परा के विपरीत है। 28 अप्रैल 1965 की शाम को सर्वसम्मति से लोब-गभा ने एक ऐतिहासिक प्रस्ताव पारित किया था। मैं समझता हूँ कि उस निश्चय के वे शब्द और उनके पीछे जो भावना थी वह भावना इस 30 जून के समझौते से पूरी नहीं हुई है। उस 28 अप्रैल वाले प्रस्ताव में यह कहा गया था :—

“... with hopes and faith this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India.”

यह तीस जून 1965 का भारत, पाकिस्तान का सीमा सम्बन्धी समझौता, भारत पाकिस्तान के पूर्व के सीमा सम्बन्धी समझौते जोकि 1958, 1959 और 1960 में हुए, उन की शर्तों से कोई लगाव नहीं खाता। उनसे कुछ हद तक यह डीविएट (Deviate) करता है। वहाँ एक ट्रिब्यूनल (Tribunal) बनाने की व्यवस्था रखी गई थी। 1959-60 में जो ट्रिब्यूनल (Tribunal) को शक्ति दी गई थी और उसके निर्माण का भी निश्चय किया गया था आज के इस

समझौते में जोकि 30 जून का समझौता है उनमें आपस में बहुत बड़ा टकराव होता है। मैं इस मौके पर उन तमाम व्यवस्थाओं में नहीं जाना चाहता। मैं तो आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के खुद उनके अपने शब्दों को ही इस सदन के सामने रखते हुए उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस सदन में कहे गये उनके वे शब्द उस समय भी उनके सामने थे जब उन्होंने यह समझौता स्वीकार किया था और उस पर हस्ताक्षर किये थे? प्रधान मंत्री जी ने 11 मई को इसी सदन में यह कहा था :

“... by a reference to an 'impartial tribunal' as contemplated in the earlier agreements on the subject.”

जहाँ तक अरलियर (Earlier) एग्जिमेंट्स का सवाल है, 1959-60 के जो समझौते की बात थी और जैसा कि भाई प्रकाशवीर जी शास्त्री व अन्य इस सदन के सदस्यों ने कहा है वहाँ पर ऐसा ट्रिब्यूनल बनाना चाहिए था जिसमें भारत की ओर से भारतीय व्यक्ति होता, एक पाकिस्तान की ओर से होता और तीसरा वह होता जिसको कि यह दोनों देश एक राय से माँ लेफिन आज का जो ट्रिब्यूनल बनेगा उसमें ऐसी व्यवस्था नहीं रखी गई है। यह तीनों ही विदेशी होंगे। तीनों ही विदेशी होने के कारण एक तरीके से यह मसला यू० एन० प्रो० में जाकर उलझ जायेगा। मैं आज इस सदन में यू० एन० प्रो० की कोई टीका नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन यह सही बात है कि यू० एन० प्रो० में जितने भी मसले इस देश के, या बाहर के देशों के जितने भी मसले गये हैं वह वहाँ पर उलझ कर रह गये हैं। यू० एन० प्रो० एक ऐसे डाक्टर की तरह है जो न बीमारी का इलाज करता है न बीमारी को समाप्त करता है बल्कि मुह्त तक उसको चलाये रखने की व्यवस्था करता है। मैं आज के दिन सिर्फ यह प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि हम अपने देश से सम्बंधित

जो पड़ोसी मुल्कों से हमारे झगड़े हैं उनको निश्चय करने की हमारी अपनी शक्ति होनी चाहिए। अगर हम अपनी उस निश्चय करने की शक्ति को कमजोर करते हैं तो हम अपनी भारतीय सीमाओं की रक्षा नहीं कर पायेंगे।

एक शब्द में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ लाल चीन ने कुछ समय पूर्व भारतवर्ष की पगड़ी उछानी थी तब पाकिस्तान के इस रन प्रॉफ कच्छ के हमले ने भारत के हृदय को चीर डाला है और भारत सरकार यह जो समझौता करने चली है वह उस चिन्ते हुए हृदय पर नमक छिड़कने का काम कर रहा है।

अभी पन्त जी ने अखबारों का हवाला दिया और कहा कि अखबारों की रिपोर्ट्स से जाहिर होता है कि उन्होंने इस का बड़ा स्वागत किया है। उन्होंने कहा कि उन्होंने बहुत सी अखबारों की रिपोर्टें देखीं। मैं नहीं जानता कि उन्होंने किस रूप से देखीं। कुछ अखबारों के कमेंट्स मेरे हाथ में हैं। उन्होंने नाना प्रकार से इसका खंडन किया है।

अमृत बाजार पत्रिका ने लिखा है :

"What will be objected to is that Pakistan's claim that a territorial dispute involving 3,500 square miles of territory exists has been virtually recognized."

यही नहीं, इस अखबार ने फिर लिखा :

"New Delhi is set on a course of appeasement whose ultimate outcome is fearful to contemplate."

एक और अखबार ने लिखा :

"The Rann of Kutch is a prestige issue. There should be no ambiguities about it. If India fails here, she will fail everywhere else."

इसी तरह से और भी बहुत से अखबारों के कमेंट्स हैं, जिनमें इस देश के अखबार भी हैं

और देश के बाहर के भी हैं, जिन्होंने इस समझौते का कोई ज्यादा शक्ति के साथ स्वागत नहीं किया है।

मैं इन बातों में नहीं जाना चाहता। मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी समझौता हो, उस समझौते का असर क्या हुआ ? रन कच्छ का समझौता कर के हम चाहते थे कि पाकिस्तान से हमारे अच्छे सम्बन्ध हों। यही नहीं, हमारा लक्ष्य हमेशा यही रहता है कि हमारा देश और पूरा संसार शांति पूर्वक रहे। कांग्रेस के लोग भी यही चाहते हैं और विरोधी दल, यह राष्ट्र और सारा संसार भी यही चाहता है। लेकिन मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिस देश से यह समझौता किया गया, क्या वह भी ऐसा चाहता है, क्या पाकिस्तान का ऐसा इरादा था या है।

श्री एन्वनी साहब ने यह कहा कि पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर पर जान-बूझ कर हमला इस दृष्टि से किया है कि कच्छ के रण का समझौता नाकामयाब हो जाये और हिन्दुस्तान का अपमान हो। मैं एन्वनी साहब से कहूँगा कि ऐसी बात नहीं है। पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर पर इस क्ल्याम से हमला किया है कि हिन्दुस्तान अपने कैसले से वापस नहीं जायेगा। उसने सोचा कि हम काश्मीर पर हमला करें या न करें, लेकिन कच्छ रण के समझौते में कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ेगा, क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान जो भी फैसला करता है, उस में इंग्लैंड और अमरीका की सरकार का बहुत कुछ हाथ होता है।

आज मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह समझौता जित दिन हुआ, उस के एक महीने बाद ही क्या हुआ ? क्या इस समझौते में शान्ति हुई ? उसके ठीक एक महीने के बाद काश्मीर पर हमला हुआ, खुला हमला हुआ। वहाँ पर हिन्दुस्तान के लोग मारे गये, हिन्दुस्तान के मिगही मारे

[श्री मौयं]

गये। पाकिस्तान के भी विनाही मारे गये। क्या आज यह बात संसार के सामने नहीं है? मैं तो इस समझौते को वैसे ही समझता हूँ कि जैसे एक शादी हो और उस के बाद पति-पत्नी में जुडिशल सेपेरेशन (Judicial separation) हो जाये, लेकिन फिर भी पति यह कहे कि हमारी शादी हुई है और हम बहुत प्रेमपूर्वक रह रहे हैं और हमारा शादी का मुआहिदा टूटा नहीं है। आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह कहना ठीक उसी प्रकार है कि यह इन्टरनेशनल एग्रीमेंट है और हम उस से पीछे नहीं जा सकते हैं। मैं उन से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या संसार की तबारीख उन के सामने नहीं है। संसार में ऐसे बहुत से समझौते हुए और बाद में टूटे। वे समझौते आज उन के सामने आने चाहिए। अगर वह चाहें, तो मैं उन को रेकॉर्ड दे सकता हूँ। इस तरह की बातों से देश बच नहीं सकता है। आज हम को यह निश्चय लेना होगा कि हम किस तरह से अपने देश को बचा सकते हैं।

चीन के हमले के समय मैंने जो बात कही थी, यहाँ बात मैं आज भी कहना चाहता हूँ। माना कि हम 45 करोड़ लोग कनडोर हैं, हमारे यहाँ बहुत भी समस्याएँ हैं, हम पिछड़े हुए मुल्क के लोग हैं, लेकिन अगर 45 करोड़ भूश्वे-नंगे लोग किसी भी ताकत धूकना भी शुरू कर दें, तो वह दुश्मन बूक में बह सकते हैं। 45 करोड़ लोगों में बड़ी ताकत होती है, बशर्ते कि उन का नेतृत्व करने वाला सत्ता भी कुछ ताकत रखती हो। आज कांग्रेस सरकार इस तरह की व्यवस्था में फंस गई है कि वह इस तरह के निश्चयों को नहीं ले सकती है, जिन से देश को रक्षा हो सके। आज हम को फ़ैसले लेना साखना चाहिये।

काश्मीर के मामले पर अभी आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने विरोधी दलों का एक बैठक बुलाई थी। विरोधी दलों के नेता उस में गये

थे। मैं भी गया था। आप जानते हैं कि काश्मीर के मामले पर रिपब्लिकन पार्टी या बाबा साहिब डा० भम्बेदकर की क्या विचार-धारा थी। बाबा साहेब डा० भम्बेदकर ने इसी सदन में प्रधान मंत्री, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को काश्मीर की सलत नीति के विरोध में इस्तोफ़ा दिया था। उन्होंने उस वक्त कुछ मशवरे भी दिये थे, लेकिन उन को नहीं माना गया। आज करोड़ों रुपये काश्मीर में खर्च हो चुके हैं। वहाँ पर हजारों हिन्दुस्तानी मारे जा चुके हैं। आज यह देश और इस देश के बाहर भी एक बहुत बड़ी तादाद में विश्व के लोग यह मानते हैं कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का अंग है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को एक ऐसे चोराहं पर ला कर खड़ा कर दिया गया है, जहाँ से वह वापस नहीं जा सकती है। आज कांग्रेस पार्टी के नेता पब्लिक प्रोपोनियन, विश्व की प्रोपोनियन की बात कहते हैं। आज वे परराष्ट्रों की राय की बात करते हैं। हमें परराष्ट्रों का मशवरा नहीं लेना है। अगर उन का मशवरा लेना था, तो पिछले छठारह बरसों से सरकार क्या करती रहती? इस अवधि में उस ने क्या निश्चय लिया था? आज वह इन बातों को ले कर देश को गुमराह नहीं कर सकते हैं। अगर वह इस तरह से देश को गुमराह करेंगे, तो वह कुछ ऐसी परम्परायें डालेंगे, जिन के परिणाम देश के लिए अच्छे नहीं होंगे।

आज यह सरकार इस सदन में बैठ कर कुछ ऐसे फैसले ले रही है, जिन का असर कल की सरकार पर ही नहीं, बल्कि सैकड़ों वर्षों तक हिन्दुस्तान की पीढ़ियों पर पड़ेगा। हमारा आज का निश्चय हमारे चरित्र का बखान करेगा कि हम किस तरह का चरित्र रखते हैं। कांग्रेस पार्टी ने आज तक जो फैसले लिये हैं, उन से देश का कल्याण नहीं हो सका है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस ने कच्छ-रण का जो फैसला लिया है, उस की देन है काश्मीर पर हमला और उसकी देन पाकिस्तान का

श्रीर भी खुला हुआ प्राक्रमण होगा। चाहे सरकार शान्ति में विश्वास करे, चाहे हम शान्ति में विश्वास करें, चाहे पूरा देश शान्ति में विश्वास करे और चाहे पूरी दुनिया शान्ति में विश्वास करे, लेकिन पाकिस्तान अपनी घादत से बाज नहीं आ सकता है।

पाकिस्तान का जन्म नफरत, कद्रूरत, घृणा और जातीयता के विष में हुआ है। जिसका जन्म ही इस तरह के दूषित वातावरण में हुआ हो, वह राष्ट्र कभी भी शान्ति और मानवता में विश्वास नहीं कर सकता है। इस तरह के मुल्क जो फौनेटिक होते हैं, वे सिर्फ सत्ता और ताकत को माना करते हैं। अगर आज यह सरकार अपनी ताकत नहीं दिखा सकती, तो वह पाकिस्तान को हमला करने से नहीं रोक सकती। अगर पाकिस्तान को हमले से रोकना है, तो सरकार को इस देश की शक्ति का प्रदर्शन करना होगा। मुझे खुशी है कि कारगिल की चौकी आज हमारे कब्जे में है, जो हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा के लिए बहुत जरूरी है, जहां बैठ कर पाकिस्तान के लोग बहुत सी शरारतें करते रहे, बेगुनाहों को लूटते रहे, मारते रहे, भारतीय सड़कों को काटते रहे। यह बड़ी अच्छी बात है।

मैं चाहूंगा कि कुछ दिन के लिए यहां के फौसले रोक दिये जायें, बल्कि फौज को यह फौसला लेने का अधिकार दे दिया जाये। मेरा विश्वास है कि हिन्दुस्तान की फौज और हिन्दुस्तान के सिपाही संसार के किसी भी सिपाही से किसी भी माने में कमजोर नहीं है बशर्ते कि उन को लड़ने का पूरा पूरा मौका दिया जाये। आज उन पर हमला वहां होता है, गोली उन पर वहां चलती है, जान उन की वहां पर ली जाती है, फौसला यहां पर लाल बहादुर जी—जिन को वहां पर हाने वाली लड़ाई का कोई विशेष ज्ञान नहीं है, जिन्होंने कभी कोई निश्चय इस प्रकार के नहीं लिये हैं—लेते हैं कि वहां पर हमला न किया जाये, वहां पर अपने बचाव के लिए गोली न चलाई जाये। इस तरह के फौसले दिल्ली में लिए जा सकते हैं, लेकिन उन से भारत की सीमायें

नहीं बचाई जा सकती हैं। फौज को पूरा मौका देना चाहिए कि वह देश की सीमाओं की रक्षा कर सके।

कच्छ-रण का जो समझौता पाकिस्तान के साथ हुआ है, वह केवल भ्रवैधानिक ही नहीं है, बल्कि इस समझौते ने भारत की परम्परा, सम्मान और मर्यादा को समाप्त कर दिया है। यही नहीं, इस समझौते की वजह से मुझे इस देश की 3500 वर्ग मील जमीन जाती हुई नजर आती है। मुझे यह कहते हुए प्रफसोस होता कि आज तक हम कह रहे थे कि यह बाउंडरी का झगड़ा है, लेकिन आज हम ने 3500 वर्ग मील जमीन को विवादप्रस्त इलाका मान लिया है। इस तरह की बात को मान कर हम ने पाकिस्तान को उकसाया है, उस को मौका दिया है कि वह और भी ज्यादा फितनाप्रगेंजी करें, और भी ज्यादा शरारतें करे।

मैं आप का ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूं। आप ने मुझे समय दिया, उस के लिए बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद। अन्त में मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यदि सरकार चाहती है कि देश बचे, भारतीय सभ्यता बचे, तो उसे हम समझौते को रद्द कर देना चाहिये। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि कांग्रेस कही अपने डूबने के साथ मुल्क को भी न डुबो दे। आज सरकार को और कांग्रेस दल को दलबन्दी से ऊपर उठ कर, कांग्रेस में ऊपर उठ कर फौसले लेने होंगे। कांग्रेस दल के सदस्यों से आज मेरी प्रार्थना है कि विूप की चिन्ता न करने हुए, अंकुश की चिन्ता न करते हुए, पार्टी विशेष की चिन्ता न करते हुए, भारतीय सभ्यता, भारतीय सम्मान और भारत की जनता की चिन्ता करते हुए, पार्टी से ऊपर उठ कर, देश के मान और मर्यादा के लिए, अविष्य के निर्माण के लिए, इस देश की प्राजादी के लिए वे वांट करें और कच्छ-रण के समझौते के बारे में जो मांगन धाया है, उस को गिरायें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आप को फिर धन्यवाद देता हूं।

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I support the Kutch agreement. Our nominee in the proposed tribunal should be a Russian statesman of the stature of Mr. Mikoyan, Mr. Brezhnev or Mr. Kosygin. On the lines of the Russo-German Pact of 1939, an Indo-Russian pact should be forged with the subject of solving the problem of Indo-Pakistani conflict. Pakistan has attacked Kashmir with the object of pressurising India to agree to the setting up of another tribunal. The answer to the question whether or not we should endorse the Kutch agreement depends upon an answer to the question whether or not a war between India and Pakistan is possible or desirable. We are living in the bipolar world and not in the international system of the balance of power. The balance of power has got relevancy in relation to Russia and America only. The international system of the balance of power was dissolved the day the bipolar world and the thermo-nuclear stalemate were established, Europe in general and Germany in particular were divided into two spheres of influence—Russian and American, the atom bomb was dropped over Hiroshima, and Russia became a thermo-nuclear power of the stature of America. The thermo-nuclear stalemate binds Russia and America in a bond of unbreakable unity. Russia can use force against eastern Europe only. America can use force against Latin American only. No other State can wage war against another without the consent or connivance of either Russia or America. North Korea invaded South Korea with the connivance of Russia. The United States of America is throwing bombs over North Vietnam with the connivance of Russia.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is coming to that.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: China invaded India with the consent of Mr. Khrushchev. A war between India and Pakistan is neither possible nor desirable till the bipolar world and the thermo-nuclear stalemate last. Neither Russia nor America nor China would have joined hands with either India or Pakistan if the Indian troops had attacked the Pakistani troops at Kanjarkot. India would have become another Congo if it had attacked Pakistan at any other place. The Russian troops are standing in Soviet Central Asia on the borders of West Pakistan. The American Seventh Fleet is patrolling the Indian Ocean. Both India and Pakistan are sandwiched between Russia and America. Airborne Russian troops will occupy West Pakistan and the peninsular regions of India will be subjected to heavy bombardment by the Seventh Fleet if India attacks or is attacked by Pakistan. When the British, the French and the Israeli troops reached the outskirts of Cairo, they were prevented not only from entering Cairo but from marching one step further and were ordered to withdraw from Egypt within a specified period of time determined by the American Government. If the United States of America had no hesitation in preventing England and France, its allies, from conquering Egypt, a non-aligned country, will it have any hesitation in preventing India, a non-aligned country, from attacking Pakistan which is a member of the SEATO and the CENTO? The Sino-Pakistan pact has strengthened the bargaining power of the United States of America vis-a-vis Russia, because China is on hostile terms with both Russia and America. If China is asked to choose between India and America, it will choose the later. If it is asked to choose between Russia and Ame-

श्री ब्रजेश्वर प्रसाद काठियाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उन से कहिये कि विषय पर बोलें ।

rica, it will choose the latter. If America is asked to choose between India and China, it will choose the latter, because China, and not India is the balancer between Russia and America. If there is any country in the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands which the USA loves most, it is China. China will choose America and not Russia because Siberia is the only place where China can expand profitably. The pro-Chinese elements are stronger in Washington than in Moscow. China has laid claims over nine lakhs square miles of Russian territory in the Heartland. It has not laid claim over any portion of American territory. China is a greater threat to Russia than to America.

The United States of America will either be neutral or join hands with either India or Pakistan if a war breaks out between India and Pakistan. Russia will be neutral if the United States of America adopts the policy of neutrality. Either Chinese hegemony will be established over the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands in general and over the Indian sub-continent in particular or the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands in general and India in particular will be divided into two spheres of influence—Chinese and Pan-Islamic, if both Russia and America adopt the policy of neutrality in the event of the outbreak of a war between India and Pakistan. All the Muslim States will rally round the banner of Pakistan if both Russia and America adopt the policy of neutrality in the event of the outbreak of a war between India and Pakistan. Russia will join hands with India if the United States of America joins hands with Pakistan.

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या किसी माननीय सदस्य को घपना भाषण पढ़ने की अनुमति है ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (बागलपुरी) : पढ़ नहीं रहे हैं, नोट्स को कंसल्ट कर रहे हैं।

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छवाय : भाषण पढ़ा जा रहा है।

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): The hon. member is making a useful contribution and he should not be interrupted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He rarely speaks.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Russia will join hands....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are concerned with the Kutch agreement. Why bring in Russia and America?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am dealing with Kutch. I am saying that war cannot break out and what will be the consequences if war breaks out. The whole question hinges upon this.

Russia will join hands with Pakistan if the United States of America joins hands with India. China may either be neutral or join hands with either Russia or America if a limited war breaks out between Russia and America in the Indian sub-continent. If China adopts the policy of neutrality, either Russia or America may win or the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands in general and the Indian sub-continent in particular will be divided into two spheres of influence—Russian and American. If Russia wins, Russian hegemony and if the USA wins, American hegemony, will be established over the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands in general and the Indian sub-continent in particular.

The Sino-Soviet Pact will be resurrected if China joins hands with Russia. The Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands in general and the Indian sub-continent in particular will be divided into two spheres of influence—Chinese and Russian if the USA is driven out of the Indian sub-continent, or into three spheres of influence—Chinese, Russian and American—if a political settlement is arrived at between Russia and China on the one side and the USA on the other as the result of the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet Pact in the event of the outbreak of a limited war between

Russia and America in the India sub-continent. The Chinese volunteers drove out the American troops from North Korea. Can the American forces withstand the combined onslaught of the Chinese and the Russian forces both in South-East Asia and the Indian sub-continent? The Delhi-Peking-Moscow Axis will be forged if the USA joins hands with Pakistan. India will have to recognise Chinese sovereignty over the Aksai Chin area if the Delhi-Peking-Moscow Axis is forged. The Karachi-Peking-Moscow Axis will be forged if the USA joins hands with India. All the members of the NATO, the SEATO and CENTO will rally round the banner of Russia if the USA, as an ally of India, throws tactical weapons over Pakistan. (Interruptions). I will resign from this House if anybody says that whatever I am saying is irrelevant.

17-00 hrs.

Shri D. C. Sharma: (Gurdaspur): If you resign you will not get a ticket next time.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: As long as Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is there I will get the ticket.

Sir, the forging of the Delhi-Peking-Moscow Axis or the Karachi-Peking-Moscow Axis connotes the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet Pact. Russia cannot remain neutral as it is today on the question of Vietnam while the USA is throwing bombs over North Vietnam if Russia and America start throwing tactical weapons over each other in the Indian sub-continent.

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav (Nanded): The hon. Member may speak a bit slowly.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: He may read my speech. He cannot understand what I am speaking.

The Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands in general and the Indian sub-continent in particular will be divided

either into two spheres of influence—Chinese and American—if the USSR is driven out of the Indian sub-continent or into three spheres of influence—Chinese, American and Russian—if a political settlement is arrived at between China and America on the one side and the USSR on the other as the result of the forging of the Sino-American alliance in the event of the outbreak of a limited war between Russia and America in the Indian sub-continent.

The whole world will be destroyed if the war between Russia and America in the Indian sub-continent and South-East Asia escalates into a thermo-nuclear world war.

India, Russia and America are geopolitical friends of one another. China, the Asian States on the borders of the heartland and the western European States are geopolitical friends of one another and the geopolitical foes of India, Russia and America.

India, Russia and America stand for the transformation of the bipolar world into one world, i.e., for the achievement of the goal of world disarmament. China, the Asian States on the borders of the Heartland and the Western European States stand for the transformation of bipolar world into a multipolar world. Eastern Europe, the USSR, Africa Western Asia, the Asian States on the borders of the Heart land. Tibet, Sinkiang, Mongolia, Manchuria and North China will be integrated into one political unit and the rest will be integrated into another political unit if the bipolar world is transformed into one world.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. We will take it as read.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Sir, I will read only two more sentences.

The transformation of the loose bipolar world into a tight bipolar

world is the condition precedent to the transformation of the UNO into the World Government. The Heartland and the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands in general and India in particular will be divided into two spheres of influence—Chinese and Pan-Islamic; the New World in general and the USA in particular will be divided into two spheres of influence—Chinese and Western European and Western European hegemony will be established over Russia within the framework of the United States of Europe encompassing within its bosom all the States extending from Great Britain to the Ural mountain if the bipolar world is transformed into a multipolar world. The alternative to the establishment of Russian hegemony over Pakistan and to the division of China into two spheres of influence—Russian and American—is the division of

India into two spheres of influence—Chinese and Pan-Islamic and the establishment of Pan-Islamic hegemony over the Caucasus and Soviet Central Asia and of Chinese hegemony over Siberia. India has to play the same part vis-a-vis China and Pakistan that China played vis-a-vis Japan from the time of the Japanese conquest of Manchuria till the atom bombs were dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Prime Minister will reply to the debate tomorrow immediately after the Question Hour.

17.04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, August 18, 1965/Sravana 27, 1887 (Saka).