

[Shri D. Sanjivayya]

the Note of Dissent, and hence this Bill is going to harm the workers.

I agree that certain portions of the Bill like payment of 4 per cent bonus may do good to some classes of workers.

Mr. Speaker: Merits cannot be gone into at this stage.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I oppose the Bill, and request the hon. Minister to withdraw it. I suggest that the Bill should be sent out for eliciting public opinion.

13 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Minister got anything to say?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the payment of bonus to persons employed in certain establishments and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

Shri D. Sanjivayya: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

13.01 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: PAYMENT OF BONUS ORDINANCE

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the explanatory statement giving reasons for immediate legislation by the Payment of Bonus Ordinance, 1965, as required under rule 71 (1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

13.02 hrs.

MOTION RE: INDO-PAKISTAN AGREEMENT ON GUJARAT—WEST PAKISTAN

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): On a point of order, . . .

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, . . .

Mr. Speaker: Even before the Prime Minister has moved the motion?

The Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, I beg to move . . .

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास)
मैं इसके बारे में एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो प्रपोज करना है उसी को मौका दिया जा सकता है ।

श्री मधु लियये (मुंगेर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस पर मेरा प्रश्न है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से बीच में बोलना ठीक नहीं है । जब मैंने उन्हें बुलाया है तो उन्हें सुनने दिया जाये ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Sir, I beg to move:

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

श्री मधु लियये : मैंने पहले ही कहा है कि मुझे एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से बीच में बोलना कौन सा कायदा है ?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: My point of order is this.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Hem Barua had earlier informed me and I promised him an opportunity. Let me hear him first.

श्री मधु लिमये : जब वह पढ़ रहे थे श्रीर मैंने बोलना चाहा था तो आपने कहा था कि बाद में बोलना इसलिए अब मैं अपनी बात सुनाना चाह रहा हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने कह दिया है कि आपकी बात मैं सुनूँगा लेकिन आपको सत्र नहीं है । श्रीर आप मेरी बात सुनने को तैयार नहीं हैं ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं सुन तो रहा हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कहां सुन रहे हैं ?
दखल तो आप दिये जा रहे हैं ।

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit that the cease-fire agreement had violated certain provisions of the Indian Constitution, has overridden the authority of Parliament and by-passed certain assurances given by Government on the floor of this House. May I draw your attention to article 3 of the Indian Constitution which gives the right to Parliament to increase or diminish the area of any state or alter the boundaries of any State. Article 3 gives this right to Parliament. Then, may I draw your attention to the first schedule of the Indian Constitution which lays down the boundary of the State of Gujarat. These are the two principal things to which I would draw your attention. I would first invite your attention to the Indo-Pakistan agreement on Gujarat-West Pakistan border that was circulated to us last evening by your office or, possibly, the Department of Parliamentary Affairs. Article 3(i)(b) of this agreement recognises Pakistan's claim to 3500 square miles of territory in the Rann of Kutch. Never were we told on the floor of this House about the exorbitant claim of Pakistan to 3500 sq. miles of territory. At the same time, Government, by being a party to this agreement, feel that if necessary Government are ready to surrender, maybe 3500 square miles or less of our territory to Pakistan. We were told on the floor of

this Parliament times without number, and the words that our Prime Minister used were, demarcation of the border. We never heard any other word except this phrase, demarcation of the border. May I draw your attention to the cease-fire agreement where the word 'determination' is used as many as four times, one time in the preamble and three times in the body of the text of the cease-fire agreement itself. My submission is that determination does not convey the idea of demarcation. Determination is much more comprehensive. It might mean realignment of the border, territorial adjustment; it might mean redrawing of the boundary. It means so many things.

Mr. Speaker: He should formulate the points of order.

Shri Hem Barua: I am doing it by stages. This is an instance where our Government has by-passed the assurances given on the floor of this House.

I would draw your attention then to the most potentially dangerous—I would say—sphere in the agreement. There is a proposal to constitute a Tribunal Article 3(iv) of the agreement provides that the decision of the tribunal referred to in article 3(iii) shall be binding on both Governments and shall not be questioned on any ground whatsoever. The ordinary procedure adopted by the international law commission in relation to international tribunals has been that the award of an international tribunal can be challenged if (a) it violates the terms of reference, (b) if any of the members of the tribunal can be accused of corruption and (c) if it fails to give reasons for the award and if it departs from certain fundamental procedures. But here is an agreement that binds the Government and Parliament also. When you have words like this, that the verdict shall not be questioned on any ground, whatsoever, I say that this Parliament also does not have the right to question the verdict of this tribunal—God forbid—if the verdict goes against. Where have you the right? Article 253

[Shri Hem Barua]

says that Parliament has the right to make laws. In this case except to put the rubber stamp of approval on the verdict of the tribunal, this Parliament is divested of all its powers to question the verdict of the tribunal. It is a very dangerous provision included in this cease-fire agreement. When this provision is read *pari passu* with the other provisions recognising the claim of Pakistan to 3500 square miles of our territory in the Rann of Kutch and the Parliament does not have the right to question it as the verdict is final and binding—they have used these words—where do we stand? This is over-riding the authority of Parliament by our Government by its being a party to this cease-fire agreement that contains these two provisions and as Mr. Kamath rightly says, the supremacy of Parliament is challenged.

Mr. Speaker: I request the hon. Member to confine himself to the points connected with his point of order. He is arguing certain things that can be discussed later on.

Shri Hem Barua: I am concluding in a minute. There is the *status quo ante* on which the cease-fire agreement is based. May I point out that the Government of India had lodged a protest on 20th February, 1965 and I would ask the External Affairs Minister to rake up his files and find out that protest note. There is the traditional boundary, not this truncated one.

Mr. Speaker: It is not the point of order; he is discussing the merits.

Shri Hem Barua: I have cited these instances. So, it is my contention that the cease-fire agreement has violated the authority of Parliament granted to it under the Indian Constitution, articles 2 and 3. And then, it over-rides the authority of Parliament. Then, it by-passes the assurance given by the Government to us in Parliament. This is my point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : संविधान के बारे में श्री हेम बरुआ ने जो कुछ कहा है, उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ और मेरा खयाल है कि उस पर इस सदन को फ़ैसला करना चाहिए। यह अदालत का मामला नहीं है—यह सदन के अधिकारों का मामला है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं भी यही समझता हूँ कि यह सदन ही इस बारे में फ़ैसला करेगा—मैं इससे इतिफ़ाक़ करता हूँ। माननीय सदस्य का प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर क्या है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : संविधान को लेकर उनका जो आक्षेप था, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

जो प्रस्ताव सामने आया है, उसमें कहा गया है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी का जो बयान है और कच्छ के सम्बन्ध में जो करार किया गया है, उन दोनों पर विचार किया जाये। यह जो बयान हमारे सामने आया है, इसमें ग़लतबयानी और असत्यभाषण है। मैं उसकी ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ और आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उसके कारण आप प्रधान मंत्री जी को इस प्रस्ताव को रखने की इजाजत न दें। इसमें ग़लतबयानी तो यह है कि

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं माननीय सदस्य को रोकना नहीं चाहता हूँ, लेकिन अगर इस बयान में असत्य भी सिखा हुआ है, तो भी यह मेरा अस्त्यार कहाँ है कि मैं उनको कहूँ कि वह इस प्रस्ताव को नहीं रख सकते। जब इस हाउस में इस बारे में बहस होगी, तो माननीय सदस्य कह सकते हैं कि यह ग़लत, झूठ और असत्य है।

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या असत्य प्रस्तावों को आप यहाँ पर रखने देंगे ? मैं आपको बताता हूँ कि कहाँ असत्य है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बहस के बाद यह हाउस देखेगा और फ़ैसला करेगा कि असत्य

है या नहीं। यह फ़ीसला मैंने नहीं करना है। यह नहीं हो सकता है कि माननीय सदस्य कहें कि इसमें असत्य है, तो मैं यह फ़ीसला दे दूँ कि यह असत्य है और इसलिए उनको यह प्रस्ताव रखने की इजाजत न दूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : 3 मार्च को इस सदन के सामने सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने और राज्य सभा में श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन ने एक बयान पेश किया था, जिसमें बताया गया था कि कच्छ में पहली बार पाकिस्तानी लोगों का आक्रमण 25 जनवरी को हुआ। इसी बयान के आधार पर इस सदन के कई सदस्यों की यह राय हो गई कि अगर 1 जनवरी, 1965 के पहले की स्थिति कायम हो गई, तो कच्छ का पूरा इलाका आक्रमण से खाली हो जायेगा लेकिन अब प्रधान मंत्री जी कह रहे हैं कि वहां पर कुछ इलाके में पाकिस्तानी लोग 1 जनवरी, 1965 से पहले भी आते थे। यह जो असत्य-भाषण और शलतबयानी सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह और श्रीमती मेनन ने लोक-सभा और राज्य सभा के सामने की है, उस के बारे में मैं प्राप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि विल्सन साहब ने, जिन्होंने इस बारे में मध्यस्थता का काम किया था, हाउस आफ कामन्स में कहा है कि कच्छ के पूरे रण में पाकिस्तानी पुलिस को गस्त लगाने का अधिकार मिलेगा इस की तुलना में यहां पर प्रधान मंत्री जी कह रहे हैं कि डींग-मुराही के बीच में जो मड़क है, पाकिस्तानी केवल उती पर गस्त लगा सकते हैं, क्योंकि 1 जनवरी, 1965 से पहले भी वहां पर गस्त लगाते थे। लेकिन जो करार हुआ है, उस में कहीं भी इस बात का जिक्र नहीं है कि केवल डींग-मुराही की मड़क पर पाकिस्तानी गस्त लगाने का काम कर सकेंगे। प्राख़िर हम लोगों को कैसे मालूम होगा कि किस पर हम बहम कर रहे हैं और अपनी राय दे रहे हैं।

इस करार के कुछ शब्दों को प्राप जरूर देख नाज़िए। मैं प्राप का ध्यान नम्बर 4 की धार दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उसमें यह कहा गया है कि 1 जनवरी, 1965 के पहले जहां गस्त लगती थी, वहीं पर गस्त लगेगी, लेकिन करार में कहीं नहीं बताया गया है कि कहां गस्त लगती थी, जब कि शास्त्री जी अपने बयान में कहते हैं कि डींग-मुराही का जो रास्ता है, जो सड़क है, केवल उसी पर गस्त लगाने का उन को अधिकार मिलेगा। जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, करार में यह बात बिल्कुल नहीं आई है। जैसे 25 जनवरी को एक झूठ, असत्य, यहां पर बताया गया, हो सकता है कि वैसे ही कल इस बात का भी पता चलेगा। खासकर मैं विल्सन साहब के हाउस आफ कामन्स में दिये गए बयान की रोशनी में प्राप के सामने यह बात रखना चाहता हूँ।

इसलिए प्राप की मार्फ़त शास्त्री जी से मेरा यह निवेदन है कि वे इस प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लें, इन बातों की सफ़ाई करें और फिर अपने प्रस्ताव को लायें और उमर के बाद उम पर यहां बहम हो।

श्री उ० मू० बिबेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन सिर्फ़ इतना ही है कि अगर यह प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया जाता है, तो क्या यह प्रस्ताव उपस्थित करने से हमारे प्रधान मंत्री, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, इस हाउस के प्रिविलेज का बांध करने हैं या नहीं, यह प्रश्न हमारे सामने आता है। जब मैंने यह प्रस्ताव उठाया और उम पुराने प्रस्ताव पर भी मैंने विचार किया, जो पहले इस सदन के सामने रखा गया था और जिस में यह कहा गया था कि हम अपनी जमीन का एक इंच या टुकड़ा भी नहीं देंगे, तो मुझे ऐसा मालूम पड़ा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने हम हाउस को नुचालता दिया है। अगर उन के दिव में "स्टेटस को एन्टी" का कोई काम प्रथ

[श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

या और वह अर्थ यह था कि हमारा रक्षा दल, हमारी धार्मी, हमारी फौज, हमारे क्षेत्र में नहीं जा सकेगी, वह वहाँ कभी नहीं गई थी और कभी जाने का उस का अधिकार नहीं था, तो यह बात उन को सदन के सामने कहनी चाहिये थी। उन को इस सदन को यह बताना चाहिए था कि "स्टेट्स को एन्टी" से मेरा मतलब यह है कि हमारा रक्षा दल, हमारी फौज, हमारे ही क्षेत्र की सीमा में कहीं भी घूमने का अधिकार नहीं रखती है। इस सदन में हम लोग "स्टेट्स को एन्टी" शब्द का मतलब यह समझ रहे थे कि हमारे देश को साविरेन्टी और सार्वभौमिकत्व के आधार पर हम अपने रक्षा दल को कहीं पर भी भेजने का अधिकार रखते हैं।

इतना होते हुए भी अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने "स्टेट्स को एन्टी" शब्द का अर्थ वह मंजूर कर लिया है, जो इस एग््रीमेंट में लिखा हुआ है, कि हमारी सेनाओं उस इलाके में नहीं जायगी, वहाँ पर सिर्फ हमारी सिविल फोर्स रहेंगी—जो क्षेत्र हमारा है, उस हमारी फौज नहीं जा सकेगी तो मेरा से यह निवेदन है कि इस सदन के साथ लिखा गया है, विश्वासघात किया गया है, उस को मुसालते में रखा गया है अगर इस सदन को मुसालते में रख कर यह कार्यवाही की गई है, तो मेरा आप से यह करबद्ध निवेदन है कि यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है और उससे हमारे सदन की मान-हानि ब... इस बारे में आपकी राय चाहूंगा, आपकी गाइडेंस चाहूंगा कि जो कुछ मैं कह रहा हूँ, वह सिद्धान्ततः सही है या नहीं और अगर वह सही है, तो उस पर योग्य विचार कर के बीच भाषा प्रिविलेज की कार्यवाही की जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या माननीय सदस्य ने जो बीच भाषा प्रिविलेज का नोटिस दिया है, जो वह इस पर धार्य कर रहे हैं ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : यह पढ़ कर मेरे ध्यान में आया है। अगर आप कहेंगे, तो मैं नोटिस दे दूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कैसे कह सकता हूँ कि आप नोटिस दें ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : मेरा दूसरा प्वायंट आप आर्डर यह है कि कांस्टीट्यूशन के आधार पर हमारी सीमा को परिवर्तित करने का अधिकार इस पार्लियामेंट के सिवाय किसी को नहीं है। जब बेशबाड़ी का सवाल पैदा हुआ था, तो उस केस की बहस के वक्त मैं भी एक वकील था। उस वक्त यह प्रश्न उठाया गया कि आया इस पार्लियामेंट के सिवाय दूसरी किसी भी शक्ति को यह अधिकार है कि वह हमारी एक इंच भूमि भी किसी दूसरे को दे सके। उसके निर्णय के आधार पर हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन के सम्बद्ध आर्टिकल में संशोधन किया गया। उस के बाद स्थिति यह है कि पार्लियामेंट को पूछे बिना पार्लियामेंट की राय के बिना, हमारी एक इंच भूमि भी किसी दूसरे देश को नहीं दी जा सकती है।

प्रश्न यह है कि यह जो एग््रीमेंट हुआ है, वह संविधान के अनुसार न होने की वजह से क्या उस पर इस सदन में विचार किया जा सकता है। प्रधान मंत्री ने पहले ही हमको बंधन में डाल दिया है कि हमने यह एग््रीमेंट मंजूर कर लिया है। उस एग््रीमेंट के आधार पर हमारी जमीन दूसरे देश के पास चली जायेगी। जब प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने पार्लियामेंट को सारी शक्ति को मंजूर कर लिया है, तो क्या इस सदन में उस एग््रीमेंट पर विचार किया जा सकता है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : एक सवाल तो त्रिवेदी साहब ने यह किया है कि यह एक बीच भाषा प्रिविलेज हुआ है, हाउस के जो विशेषाधिकार

हैं, उनका उल्लंघन किया गया है। मिनि-स्टर कोई स्टेटमेन्ट गलत भी करते हैं, भ्रगर गलत स्टेटमेन्ट भी हो तो भी बीच घाफ प्रिविलेज नहीं होता है जब तक साथ यह न हो कि उन्होंने जान बूझ कर हाउस को मिस-लीड करने की कोशिश की है। घ्राया ऐसी कोई स्थिति है, यह पता चलेगा जब हम डमको डिसकस कर लेंगे, उसके बाद।

दूसरा सवाल उन्होंने [किया है कि जबसे हमने यह इकरारनामा किया है, एग््रीमेन्ट किया है....

श्री बड़े (खारगोन) : स्टेटस को एंटी।

श्री अक्षर साल बरबा (कोटा) : एग््रीमेन्ट से पता चल जाता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यही डिसकसन में बात घ्रायेगी और इसको डुनेंगे तो पता चल जायगा।

श्री मधु लिमये : जान बूझकर किसे कहते हैं, इसी पर तो झगड़ा है।

श्री बालाड़ी (हिसार) : जान बूझकर ही झूठ बोले हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या मुझे इजाजत है कि मैं भी कुछ कह सकूँ ? मुझे हुकम दीजिये कि मैं बोल नहीं सकता हूँ और इससे बाहर नहीं जा सकता हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कौन हुकम देने वाला हूँ।

श्री रामसेबक बाबब (बाराबंकी) : यही कह रहे हैं कि जान बूझकर झूठ बताया है।

श्री मधु लिमये : 25 जनवरी के पहले ही वे धाक्रमण कर चुके थे। यहां पर झूठ बात बताई गई है। शर्म भी नहीं घ्रानी है। घ्रापको माफी मांगनी चाहिये।

श्री ब० ला० बीबरी (महुषा) : घ्राप गलत बोलते हैं, झूठ कहते हैं, घ्रापको शर्म घ्रानी चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दूसरी बात यह है कि...

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह..

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नेताओं को तो नहीं चाहिये कि ऐसी कोई कार्रवाई करें।

श्री रामसेबक बाबब : क्या नेता इस तरह से कोई बात कर सकते हैं ? देश को घोषा दे सकते हैं ? गलत बात कर सकते हैं ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : धब घ्राप खामोशी से सुनें।

श्री रामसेबक बाबब : खामोशी से क्यों सुनें ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसलिए कि मैं बोल रहा हूँ। भ्रगर मेरे बोलने पर भी घ्राप खामोशी धारण नहीं करते हैं तो क्या दूसरे भी न करें ?

Shri Sri Lakshmi Karthamam (Khammam): He is defying the Chair.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन्होंने एक यह सवाल उठाया है कि पार्लियामेन्ट के अध्यक्षतारत छीन लिये गये हैं। हेम बरुषा साहब ने भी यह साल उठाया है। यह भी डिसकसन में घ्रायेगा कि पार्लियामेन्ट के अधिकार छीने गये हैं या नहीं छीने...

श्री स० श्री० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : यह तो घ्रापको तय करना है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस बात को तय करना है पार्लियामेन्ट ने। गवर्नमेन्ट को अध्यक्षतार होता है कि वह किमी दूसरी गवर्नमेन्ट ने कोई एग््रीमेन्ट करे। भ्रगर वह पार्लियामेन्ट..

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : माग
देश इसके बारे . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप बैठ जायें ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : एक मिनट मुझे दे
दीजिए . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप पहले मेरी बात
सुन लीजिए ।

एग्जैक्टिव को अख्तियार है, जब उसने
कंट्री को एडमिनिस्टर करना है कि वह दूसरी
गवर्नमेंट से कोई समझौता करे . . .

श्री रामसेवक यादव : जमीन देने का
नहीं है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर पार्लियामेंट उसको
एप्रूब नहीं करती है और गवर्नमेंट पार्लियामेंट
को साथ नहीं ले जा सकती है तो गवर्नमेंट
को बाहर जाना होगा ।

श्री बागड़ी : पार्लियामेंट को पूछे वगैर
जमीन देना बिल्कुल गलत है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बात फंसला करने
वाली है कि पार्लियामेंट से पूछे वगैर यह हो
रहा है या नहीं । इसको हम डिस्कशन में
देखेंगे और हमें पता चल जाएगा कि क्या
कहानी है ।

श्री बागड़ी : कानून क्या है, विधान क्या
है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : प्राप भी तो देख सकते
हैं ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : 3500 वर्गमील
जमीन

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई ह्व होनी चाहिये ।
मैं खड़ा बोल रहा हूँ लेकिन बार बार रुकावट

डाली जा रही है । इस पार्लियामेंट के चार
साल बाद भी कम से कम इतना तो हो जाए
कि जब स्पीकर बोल रहा हो तो खामोशी से
उसको सुना जाए ।

इस वक्त मैं नहीं समझता हूँ और न ही
मैं यह समझता हूँ कि मुझे कोई अधिकार है कि
इस वक्त मैं कोई फंसला दे कर यह कहूँ कि
इस पर बहस नहीं हो सकती है । बहस इस पर
होगी । प्रधान मंत्री साहब शुरू करें ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would
refer to the points raised by some of
the hon. members.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय,
प्रापने मुझे कहा था और मैं बैठ गया था ।
अब तो प्राप मेरी बात सुन लें । अब भी प्राप
कहेंगे तो मैं बैठ जाऊंगा ।

सरकार को अधिकार होता है दूसरे देश
से समझौता करने का, माल मंगाने के लिए,
माल भेजने के लिए तथा इस तरह के दूसरे
मामलों के बारे में । लेकिन देश की भूमि को
कोई भी सरकार दूसरे देश को नहीं दे सकती
है । यदि इसी तरह से प्रधान मंत्री देते रहे
तो पहले पंडित नेहरू जी ने दे दी थी, अब शास्त्री
जी दे जायेंगे, फिर और कोई प्रधान मंत्री
प्रायेगा और वह दे जायेगा । इस तरह से तो
हमारा देश मियां जी की दाढ़ी रह जाएगा ।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : और नहीं ।

श्री बागड़ी : सिर्फ एक मिनट ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप बैठ जायेंगे ।

श्री बागड़ी : एक मिनट . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जी नहीं ।

श्री बागड़ी : सारा फंसला शांति के वाता-
वर के वास्ते किया गया है या दोनों मुक्तों

के बीच में जो तनाव है, उसको कम करने के लिए किया गया है। बीस वर्ग मील जमीन से अपनी फौजों को हटाना और उस में . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने सोचा था कि किसी साहब को मैं कुछ न कहूँ और कोई ऐसा बात न हो कि मुझे कोई एक्शन लेना पड़े। लेकिन मैं मजबूर हो गया हूँ। जब मेरी बात को सुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं है तो मुझे एक्शन लेना पड़ेगा। मैंने कहा था कि मैं नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। धाराम से काम धारम्भ होने लगा था। इतना संजीदा, इतना सीरियस मामला है, हाउस के सामने और कंट्री के सामने और इस पर धाराम से भी बहस हो सकती है। एक के बाद दूसरा, दूसरे के बाद तीसरा बोलता ही चला जा रहा है। यह जो सिलसिला है, इसका कहीं तो अन्त होना चाहिए।

श्री बागड़ी : एक बात धाप सुन लीजिये। सारे देश का यह मामला है। धाप प्रधान मंत्री को एक बात बता दें कि देश के साथ वे बेवफाई न करें। उनको धाप . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धाप नहीं बैठते तो मुझे कहना होगा . . .

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उनकी मातृभाषा हिन्दी या हिन्दुस्तानी है, उस में तो वह बोलें। क्यों वह विदेशी भाषा में बोलते हैं? यह बेवफाई तो वह देश के साथ न करें?

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं धब बागड़ी जी से कहूँगा कि वह सदन से बाहर चले जायें। मैंने धाप से कहा है कि धाप बाहर चले जायें।

श्री बागड़ी : मैं बाहर चला जाऊँगा। लेकिन मेरी बात को धाप . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बहस को मुनना नहीं चाहता हूँ।

श्री बागड़ी : बहस की बात नहीं है। जब हम धाप हैं इस सदन में तो हमें बात कहने का मौका तो मिलना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह बोले चले जा रहे हैं . . .

श्री बागड़ी : कितनी गोलियां चली है, कितने लोग जेलों में गये हैं, दो सौ धावमी धाप भी प्रधान मंत्री की कोठी पर प्रदर्शन कर रहे हैं, सारे देश के अन्दर एक बवंडर पैदा हो रहा है लेकिन इतना सब होने के बावजूद भी धाप एक बात कहने का मौका नहीं देना चाहते हैं, तो किस तरह से धाप इसको लोक-सभा कहते हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे वह मजबूर कर रहे हैं कि मैं अगला कदम भी उठाऊँ। उनका धब तकरीर करने दीजिए और धाप बैठ जाइये। मैंने बड़ी शांति रखी है, बहुत सन्न किया है। लेकिन एक हद तो होनी चाहिये।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धब धाप बैठ जाइये।

श्री बागड़ी : वह जरा हिन्दुस्तानी में तो बोलें और हम मुनें . . .

श्री क० ना० तिबारी (बगहा) : इम तरह से धगर चीज होगी और हम को धाप कहते हैं कि हम चुपचाप बैठे रहें तो कौसे मुकाबला करेंगे। धाप मरती से काम लीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धगर धाप . . .

श्री बागड़ी : हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन तो दे दी है और हमारे साथ देश में मुकाबला करने की बात कहते हैं। कोई अघिकार नहीं है धापको जमीन देने का . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यहाँ बहस के लिए तो मैं वक्त दे सकता हूँ लेकिन कुष्ती के लिए नहीं।

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

तीन चार बार मैं ने कहा है लेकिन प्राप बोले ही चले जाते हैं। प्राप बराबर स्कावट डाल रहे हैं और कार्रवाई को चलने नहीं देते हैं . . .

श्री रामसेवक यादव : स्कावट नहीं डाल रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : और क्या कर रहे हैं ?

श्री बागड़ी : ये देश के हित की बात नहीं कह रहे हैं, अहित की बात कह रहे हैं। जमीन को ये दे रहे हैं।

The Minister of Law and Social Security (Shri A. K. Sen): I beg to move:

"That Shri Bagri be suspended from the service of the House for the rest of the Session."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That Shri Bagri be suspended from the service of the House for the rest of the Session."

श्री रामसेवक यादव : नहीं, नहीं, नहीं।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : यह नहीं हो सकता है।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : यह नहीं हो सकता है। इस पर मत ले लिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बोट लेने के लिए तैयार हूँ।

Let the lobbies be cleared (*Interruption*). The Bell is being rung to clear the lobbies.

The question is.....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, before you put the motion to the House, although we all disapprove the attitude of the hon. Member, we feel that the sentence is too severe. If they could accept an

amendment, I suggest that it should be for a week.

Mr. Speaker: I must bring to the notice of Shri Dwivedy that there cannot be any amendment to this motion (*Interruption*). I am really very sorry that at this stage Shri Dwivedy has stood up to appeal to me. Was I not clamouring for any help from the Opposition that I should get. How long did I continue . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: None of the Opposition Members supported him; you must have observed that.

Mr. Speaker: I was all along asking the Opposition to exercise its influence. I was again and again saying that I did not want such an action to be taken. I gave so much of opportunity, showing so much of latitude and I was suffering all that humiliation and all that insult as well. I appealed to the House and particularly to the Opposition, but nothing could have any effect.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, we are with you in this respect and we do not want in any manner to lessen the decorum of the House. But at the same time we feel that this sentence for the whole term for the whole session, is rather very severe. Though the fault lies on the Member concerned, still we feel that it is a severe one. We do not want to support him in the least. We promise that we do not want to support him.

Mr. Speaker: Now, there cannot be any amendment as the hon. Member would be aware.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, I rise on a point of order.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं प्राप से सहमत हूँ, हम प्राप का सम्मान भी चाहते हैं, लेकिन इतना अत्याय तो नहीं चाहिये। इस को एक दिन के लिए कर दिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो साहब यह कह रहे हैं कि एक दिन का दंड दिया जाये, वह शायद यह भूल गये कि ऐसा तो मैंने ही चाहा था। लेकिन माननीय सदस्य ने बाहर जाने से इन्कार किया। अब वह ऐसा कैसे कह सकते हैं। मैं ने कई दफे कहा, लेकिन मेरी अपील को भी नहीं माना जा रहा है। जब मैं ने ही एक दिन के लिए कहा था तो अब वह कैसे एक दिन के लिये कह सकते हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : प्रच्छा, एक दिन के लिए नहीं तो दो दिन के लिए कर दिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मेरे लिये तो घाँट कोई चारा नहीं है।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I raised the issue last time also when there was a similar question before the House and you were pleased to observe that under the Rules there could be no amendment to the motion. But then I appealed to you that the rules might be suspended for the time being under rule 389. Therefore, you, Sir, on your own, *suo motu* could reduce the period. May I appeal to Shri Sen, the Law Minister, to reduce the period by bringing in an amending motion reducing the period to seven days? He can do it. I appeal to him. I appeal to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: I put it to hon. Members in the Opposition . . .

An Hon. Member: He can withdraw his motion and bring in a fresh motion.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask hon. Members in the Opposition, so far as the rules stand, is it possible for me at this stage to bring in an amendment? After a motion has been made, how can I do that? - It is for the House, after it has taken any decision, to change, modify or alter it whenever it wants.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Supposing I move a motion now that the Rules be suspended?

Mr. Speaker: There is no provision for it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He has a right to withdraw the motion and move a fresh one.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Sir, your purpose as well as the purpose of the Opposition is to see that the proceedings are conducted properly so that the points might be properly ventilated. None of us here like some kind of things which sometimes take place in this House. You have been pleased to say that the Opposition has not done its duty by helping you. You know the difficulty in which the Opposition groups function in this House. Your object as well as our object is to see that as quickly as possible in the difficult conditions of parliamentary life we conduct our deliberations. But would it be proper to punish a Member in a rather extreme fashion on the very first day of the session and thereby exacerbate emotion already obviously roused or would it be path of wisdom to see that something is done to see that it is brought down. The House can do whatever it likes. At any particular point it can, by suspending the rules, allow an amendment to be moved. This can be done and it ought to be done.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry the same thing is being repeated. Did not I say again and again, I ask Shri Mukerjee, that this is the first day and I do not want to take any action? How many times did I say that? Was any response given from the Member?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: What can we do belonging to different parties?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy. It is accepted by all that it is a case which needs punishment. What we ask is that it should not be too severe and it should not be for the rest of the session. If the rules stand in the way, my suggestion would be—as a request has already been made—that let this

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

motion be withdrawn and let the Law Minister make another motion suspending the Member for a week.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Daji (Indore): Sir, I rise to a point of order. I would like to know whether decorum is to be maintained only by the Opposition. When Opposition Members are shouted down, why is it that the Chair does not name one of them? They shout even at our leaders. How can we tolerate this? Mr. Mukerjee was shouted down; Mr. Dwivedy was shouted down and Mr. Kamath was shouted down. Has the majority Party, the ruling Party, got the privilege of shouting down the Opposition Members? Can you not ask them to leave the House? You should be fair. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: If the Members do not allow me to do that, what should I do?

श्री ज० ब० सिंह (धोसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय उन को सस्पेंड किया जाये, उनको भी कुछ शर्म घानी चाहिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या ला मिनिस्टर साहब कुछ कहना चाहते हैं ?

Shri A. K. Sen: If you are willing to allow the rule to be suspended, I am prepared, on behalf of the Government, to propose that the period be reduced to one week. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am doubtful whether at this stage the rule can be suspended.... (Interruptions) Would'nt they allow me to speak?

श्री रामसेवक साहब : अध्यक्ष महोदय, येरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप बैठ जाइये ।

When a motion has been made under one rule and it is about to be put to the House, I am doubtful whether at that stage it can be suspended. If the hon. Minister so desires, he might withdraw his first motion and make the second one.

Shri A. K. Sen: I can do that. I beg to move:

"That the leave be granted to withdraw the motion".

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the leave be granted to withdraw the motion".

Those in favour may kindly say 'Aye'.

Several Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against may kindly say 'No'.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The 'Ayes' have it

Some Hon. Members: The 'Noes' have it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Sir, I can very well understand the feelings of the hon. Members of this House, the views or the opinion of the Members of the Opposition and also of the Members of this side. It is highly regrettable that the proceedings of the House are not allowed to be carried on in a manner which would be in consonance with the dignity of this House. There is constant disturbance. Even when you, Sir, are standing, you are not allowed to speak. Whenever a Minister is speaking or replying, he is continuously interrupted. There should be some decorum in the House and if we do not observe that decorum, I am very sorry to say, we would be presenting an image which would go totally against us not only in India but outside also. I would, therefore, beg, through you, to the Hon. Members

that in future let us observe some rules and regulations.

As far as this particular matter is concerned, of course, it is not the first time that Bagruji has behaved in this manner. But I would request you that you may please agree to waive the rules and allow the Law Minister to move another motion. I have every hope that the whole House will agree with it.

Mr. Speaker: After this appeal of the Prime Minister, I hope the whole House would agree to the withdrawal of the first motion.

Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: So, the first motion is withdrawn.

Division No. 1]

Shri A. K. Sen: I move:

"That Shri Bagru be suspended from the service of the House for one week"

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That Shri Bagru be suspended from the service of the House for one week"

Lok Sabha divided.

Shri Sumat Prasad (Muzaffarnagar): I am for 'Aye'.

Shri Brij Basi Lal (Faizabad): My machine did not work. I am for 'Aye'.

श्री बसु लिये : मेरा बोट नहीं चलाया है ।

Mr. Speaker: All this will go in record.

[13:45 hrs.]

AYES

Akkamma Devi, Shrimati
Alva, Shri Joschim
Bakliwal, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Barman, Shri P.C.
Barua, Shri R.
Barupal, Shri P.L.
Basant Kunwari, Shrimati
Basappa, Shri
Basumatari, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B.R.
Bhagavati, Shri
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhargava, Shri M.B.
Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.
Birendra Bahadur Singh, Shri
Boroob, Shri P.C.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
Chandriki, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri S.N.
Chaudhry, Shri Chandramani Lal
Chaudhuri, Shri D.S.
Chaudhuri, Shri Sachindra
Cheva, Shri Y.B.
Choni Lal, Shri
Dandekar, Shri N.
Das, Shri B.K.
Das, Shri C.
Dighe, Shri
Dixit, Shri G.N.

Dwivedi, Shri M.L.
Elayaperumal, Shri
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Harvani, Shri Anant
Hazarika, Shri J.N.
Hem Raj, Shri
Himatsingka, Shri
Iubal Singh, Shri
Jyotlahi, Shri J.P.
Kabir, Shri Humayun
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kedaria, Shri C.M.
Khadilkar, Shri
Khan, Shri Osman Ali
Khan, Shri Shahnawaz
Kinder Lal, Shri
Kotaki, Shri Liladhar
Krishna, Shri M.R.
Krishnamachari, Shri T.T.
Krishnapal Singh, Shri
Kureel, Shri B.N.
Lalitan Chaudhry, Shri
Lalit Sen, Shri
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Mahtab, Shri
Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
Malmoora Sultan, Shrimati
Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra
Mandal, Shri J.
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
Maniyangadan, Shri
Mastri, Shri D.D.

Merandi, Shri
Meruthiah, Shri
Masani, Shri M.R.
Masuriya Din, Shri
Mathur, Shri Shiv Charan
Mehrotra, Shri Brij Bihari
Mehta, Shri Jaahvant
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri M.P.
Mishra, Shri Mahesh Dutta
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K.L.
Muhammad Ismail, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H.N.
Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharada
Murli Manohar, Shri
Muthiah, Shri
Nalk, Shri D.J.
Nanda, Shri
Nayak, Shri Mohan
Nayar, Dr. Sushila
Nigam, Shrimati Savitri
Oza, Shri
Pande, Shri K.N.
Pandey, Shri R.S.
Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
Pandit, Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi
Pant, Shri K.C.
Parmasivan, Shri
Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
Patel, Shri Rajeswar

Patil, Shri D.S.	Reddy, Shrimati Yashoda	Snetak, Shri Nardeo
Patil, Shri J.S.	Roy, Shri Bishwanath	Solanki, Shri
Patil, Shri M.B.	Sadhu Ram, Shri	Srinivasan, Dr. P.
Patil, Shri S.B.	Saigal, Shri A.S.	Subramanyam, Shri T.
Pillai, Shri Nataraja	Samanta, Shri S.C.	Sunder Lal, Shri
Prabhakar, Shri Naval	Samnani, Shri	Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Rai, Shrimati Sahodra Bai	Saraf, Shri Sham Lal	Swaran Singh, Shri
Raja, Shri C.R.	Sarma, Shri A.T.	Tahir, Shri Mohammad
Rajdeo Singh, Shri	Sen, Shri A.K.	Thengondar, Shri
Raju, Shri D.B.	Sen, Shri P.G.	Tiwary, Shri D.N.
Raju, Dr. D.S.	Shah, Shri Manabendra	Tiwary, Shri K.N.
Ram, Shri T.	Sham Nath, Shri	Tiwary, Shri R.S.
Ram Sewak, Shri	Sharma, Shri A.P.	Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo
Ram Swarup, Shri	Sharma, Shri D.C.	Tula Ram, Shri
Rananjai Singh, Shri	Shashi Ranjan, Shri	Uikey, Shri
Rane, Shri	Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur	Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
Ranga, Shri	Shastri, Shri Ramanand	Valvi, Shri
Ranga Rao, Shri	Sheo Narain, Shri	Varma, Shri M.L.
Rao, Shri Jagannatha	Shinde, Shri	Varma, Shri Ravindra
Rao, Shri Krishnamoorthy	Shinkre, Shri	Veerappa, Shri
Rao, Shri Rameshwar	Shree Narayan Das, Shri	Verma, Shri Balgovind
Rattan Lal, Shri	Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan	Vimla Devi, Shrimati
Raut, Shri Bhola	Singh, Shri K.K.	Vyas, Shri Radhela
Rawandale, Shri	Singh, Shri S.T.	Wadiwa, Shri
Ray, Shrimati Renuka]	Singha, Shri G.K.	Yadava, Shri B.P.
Reddy, Shri Narasimha	Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari	
Reddy, Shri Narayan	Sinhaan Singh, Shri	

NOES

Bagri, Shri	Murmu, Shri Sarkar	Singh, Shri J.B.*
Hanerjee, Shri S.M.†	Pattnayak, Shri Kishen	Sumat Prasad, Shri
Bhanja Deo, Shri L.N.	Pandey, Shri Saricoo	Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Bhattacharya, Shri Dhan	Rameshwaranand, Shri	Warior, Shri
Misra, Dr. U	Reddy, Shri Fswara	Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak

Mr. Speaker: The result of the Division is:

Ayes	174
Noes	15

The motion was adopted.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : जो राष्ट्र की भाषना है उस को श्री बागड़ी ने सदन के सामने रखा था, उन को निकाला जा रहा है, इसलिये मैं भी वाक ब्राउट करता हूँ।

Shri Kishen Pattnayak and some other Members then left the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us now hear the Prime Minister.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: As I told you in the beginning, I would refer to some of the points raised just now when I reply to the debate because it would be better to hear the full debate and then refer to those points.

The House will recall that the last session of the Lok Sabha devoted considerable time and attention, and rightly so, to the developing situation between India and Pakistan on the Kutch-Sind border culminating in the inroads committed by Pakis-

tani armed forces in the Rann of Kutch.

I had made a number of statements in the House. It would be recalled that, as a result of Pakistani armed intrusions into the Rann of Kutch and their aggressions committed against us, there was serious danger of a military conflict between India and Pakistan which, in the very nature of things, could not have been confined merely to the Kutch-Sind border. As I said in my statement in this august House on April 28, that was one of the most fateful moments of our times and both India and Pakistan stood poised at the crossroads of history. I made it quite clear then and afterwards that we are a nation, pledged to peace but that at the same time we are determined to defend our country.

Throughout those difficult days we were subjected to great provocations. Pakistan did everything to wash away the bridges of peace and to engulf the two countries in a military conflict, the consequences of which would have been grave for both. However, the firm steps that we took, including the despatch of troops to the frontiers to meet the threat posed by the concentration of troops on the other side made Pakistan realise that it should not hope to get away with aggression.

I cannot but make a reference to the present situation as it exists in Kashmir. It is a new situation, full of the most serious potentialities. A large number of raiders in civilian disguise, but heavily armed, have come across the ceasefire line and are indulging in serious acts of sabotage and destruction. These raiders are being spotted out and dealt with firmly and effectively. The number of those killed, wounded and captured is now fairly large. Our valiant security forces, both army and police, are acting with exemplary valour.

The two situations to which I have made a reference arose at different points of time and I have no doubt whatsoever that the manner in which Government dealt with them was the best possible in the circumstances. I would urge the House to consider the Gujarat-West Pakistan Border Agreement in the light of the stand that Government had taken while the Parliament was still in session and which was stated in this august House on more than one occasion.

May I now refer to the Gujarat-West Pakistan Border Agreement in some detail? As the House is aware, on April 28, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, wrote to me and to President Ayub Khan expressing great concern at the situation that had developed in regard to the Kutch-Sind border. He suggested a ceasefire to be followed by withdrawal of troops and restoration of the status quo as on 1st January, 1965 and thereafter talks between the two Governments. These proposals basically conformed to the stand consistently taken by the Indian Government in the fruitless exchange of notes which had taken place between the Governments of India and Pakistan in the months of March and April. I, therefore, replied to Mr. Wilson accepting these principles. Thereafter followed a long process of negotiations on details. Through the intermediary of U. K. High Commissioners in India and Pakistan and the United Kingdom Government eventually on the 30th June, 1965, an agreement was signed between India and Pakistan.

The main elements of this Agreement are: a ceasefire on both sides to be followed by withdrawal of forces and restoration of status quo as prevailing on the 1st January, 1965. Once these are accomplished, there has to be a meeting between the Ministers of India and Pakistan and if such a meeting is unable to resolve the boundary issue, a three-man impartial tribunal is to be constituted to give its findings on the subjects. A time-table is

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

set out in the Agreement for these various steps. The withdrawal of forces from the Rann of Kutch is to be completed within seven days of the ceasefire. Restoration of the *status quo* in its entirety, including resumption of normal police patrolling is to be completed within a month from the date of ceasefire. The Ministers' meeting is to conclude discussions within two months and the tribunal is to be set up within four months of the ceasefire.

The Agreement is in conformity with the Indo-Pakistan Border Agreements of 1959 and 1960. In connection with the latter, I would like to recall that those Agreements were placed before the House on the 16th November, 1959 and 9th February, 1960, respectively, and statements thereon had then been made by the late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the Minister for State, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.

Hon. Members will recall that, in my statement before the House in the last session, I had said that we would agree to talk, but only if Pakistan's aggression was vacated and the *status quo ante* was restored. I had also stated that Pakistan would have to vacate Kanjarkot. All this has been complied with. There is no Pakistani force now in Kanjarkot; Bihar Bet and other points which they had occupied have also been vacated.

As regards patrolling also, the position would be restored as on 1st January, 1965. The officials of the two Governments have met to sort out details.

I should like to say a few words with regard to the *status quo ante*. The Agreement restores the *status quo* as on 1st January, 1965. Generally speaking, implicit in the concept of *status quo* is adherence to the position

prevailing at a given time. In agreeing to the restoration of the *status quo ante*, we have not introduced any new principle.

The question as to what the actual position in regard to various matters on the 1st January, 1965, was one of fact and not of any sovereign rights. The restoration of that position was considered essential in order to get Pakistan's aggression vacated—the aggression which Pakistan had committed in April, 1965. The interim period, while the question of demarcation of the boundary is being pursued, would be of a short-term duration. As I have said already, there is a definite time schedule for the entire work to be completed even if it becomes necessary to refer the matter to the tribunal. It is perfectly clear that the boundary would be demarcated on the basis of documentary evidence and the *de facto* interim position would have no relevance whatsoever.

One matter about the Agreement which has caused some comment is that of patrolling. On this question also the actual position obtaining on the 1st January, 1965, had to be restored. The Pakistan Government put forward the claim before the United Kingdom Government, who were acting as intermediary, that it was patrolling on that day over a wide area in the Rann of Kutch.

This claim was found to be without foundation except with regard to a small track close to the international border, over which Pakistani patrols were said to have passed....

Shri Hem Barua: "said to have" passed!

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: While moving from Ding to Suraj, both of which lay in Pakistani territory. This position had to be accepted as part of the overall restoration of the *status quo ante*, on which from the very

beginning India had taken a firm stand. I should make it clear, however, that the use of this track does not, in any manner, confer any rights on Pakistan.

The authority of India is complete and extends to the whole of the Rann of Kutch.

14 hrs.

A few words more about Kashmir before I conclude. All my colleagues and I myself share fully the grave anxiety which I know fills the minds of all hon. Members. As the hon. Members are aware, the armed raiders have crossed the cease-fire line deceitfully in civilian disguise. According to information available, and as has just now been said by the Defence Minister, these people had been specially trained to indulge in acts of sabotage and destruction by the armed forces and officers of Pakistan. Our security forces are dealing with these raiders in the only manner appropriate to the situation. From the statements made by the prisoners, it would appear that the present operations have been planned and are being directed with the approval of the authorities in Pakistan.

The situation in Kashmir is fully under control. The raiders are being tracked down even with the help of the local population. It may take a little time to apprehend all the raiders, but the operations are proceeding satisfactorily. The Government and the people of Kashmir are prepared to face the challenge, and I would like to pay my tribute to the courage of the people and to the boldness and determination shown by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir under the distinguished leadership of G. M. Sadiq Sahib.

Hard days lie ahead, but we have to face the future with bold resolution. The price of freedom is paid not once but continuously. We have to be prepared as a country to pay that price.

So far as Government are concerned, we have dealt with the developing

situation, whether in relation to Kutch or in relation to Kashmir, in the best manner possible in our circumstances. Government will continue to do so in the days ahead, but their hands would be greatly strengthened by the mighty support they get from this House.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 18th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965, relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border be taken into consideration."

There are some substitute motions for this. The first one is in the name of Shri Yashpal Singh. Is he moving it?

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The second one is in the name of Shri Kishen Pattnayak. I think he is not there in his seat. The third one is in the name of Shri Madhu Limaye. He has gone out.

श्री किशन पटनायक : मैं मूव करना हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: Substitute motion No. 4 is in the name of Shri Surendranath Dwivedy and others.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am moving it.

Mr. Speaker: Then, the fifth one is in the name of Shri U. M. Trivedi and Shri Brij Raj Singh.

Shri Brij Raj Singh (Bareilly): I am moving it.

Mr. Speaker: Substitute motion No. 6 is also in the name of Shri U. M. Trivedi, Shri Brij Singh and others.

Shri Brij Raj Singh: I am moving substitute motion No. 6 also.

Mr. Speaker: Then, the seventh one is also from Shri U. M. Trivedi, Shri Brij Raj Singh and others...

Shri Brij Raj Singh: I am moving it.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the whole of that would be relevant.

Then there are two motions in the names of Shri Oza and Shri Vidya Charan Shukla respectively. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla is not present here.....

Shri Oza (Surendranagar): I move substitute motion No. 8.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): We have sought permission from you to move our amendment. Since we only came after 5 P.M. yesterday, we could not table our amendment. Ours is not a substitute motion but only an amendment, and I hope that you will kindly permit us to move our amendment.

Mr. Speaker: When will the hon. Member pass on the text of that amendment to me?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We have already sent it on to you. I had sent it at 10:30 A.M. today with a special letter to you.

Mr. Speaker: All right, I shall have that also circulated.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Before the House proceeds to discuss the motion, I would like to make a twofold request. Firstly, I would submit that in view of the importance of the motion, the House should have in my humble judgment, at least ten hours.

Mr. Speaker: The Business Advisory Committee is sitting today at 4 P.M. and this can be discussed there.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: My second request is this. The Prime Minister, if I have heard him aright, said that certain documents or proofs or evidence of Pakistan's pseudo-claim

were laid before the British Prime Minister. In order that the discussion here may be fruitful, useful and helpful, all those documents and proofs laid by the Pakistan Government before the British Prime Minister should be brought before this House, because the House was not apprised of those things during the last session on the question of the *status quo ante*.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Prakash Vir Shastri has also sent a substitute motion.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : (बिजनौर) मैं प्रस्तुत करता हूँ ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I had also sent in my substitute motion today at 10:30 A.M. I could not table it yesterday because I was not here.

Mr. Speaker: I shall take that also as moved.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is the Prime Minister not taking any action on what I had said?

Mr. Speaker: He has heard it, and it is now for him.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That means that they have no proofs?

Shri Yashpal Singh: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered 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, disapproves the Agreement as it barter away the honour and sovereignty of India."
(1).

श्री किशन पटनायक : मैं प्रस्ताव करता

हूँ :—

कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर निम्न-
लिखित रखा जाए, अर्थात् :—

“गुजरात-पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान सीमा के सम्बन्ध में जून, 1965 के भारत-पाकिस्तान करार के बारे में प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा 16 अगस्त, 1965 को सभा-पटल पर रखे गये यक्तव्य पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस सभा की यह राय है कि उक्त करार हमारे सार्वभौम अधिकार का उल्लंघन करता है, हमारी राष्ट्रीय प्रतिष्ठा के लिए अपमानजनक है और लोक सभा द्वारा किए गए निर्णय के विरुद्ध है इसलिए यह सभा सरकार को निर्देश देती है कि वह उस करार से अपनी स्वीकृति वापस ले ले।” (2)

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered 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, is of the opinion that the said Agreement is derogatory to national honour, detrimental to national interest, and is contrary to the spirit and letter of the resolution unanimously adopted by the House, disapproves the Agreement and calls upon the Government to annul the same.”

(4).

Shri Brij Raj Singh: I beg to move:

(i) That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered 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, disapproves the Agreement on the following grounds, namely:—

- (a) that it is a violation of Parliament's sacred resolve not to compromise with Pakistan until it vacated its aggression in Kutch;
- (b) that a case of wanton aggression has been wrongly acknowledged as a territorial dispute;
- (c) that it involves abdication of India's sovereign rights in Kutch inasmuch as Pakistan has been permitted to patrol in Indian territory;
- (d) that the Agreement acquiesces in an abridgement of India's sovereignty because India has agreed to withdraw Armed Forces from its own territory;

that the Agreement sets up a wrong and dangerous precedent because, contrary to India's stand to-date, it submits India's territorial integrity to international arbitration; and finally:

- (f) that it is an act of appeasement of the aggressor which by whetting the aggressor's appetite in the end result only serves to undermine the cause of peace—as the recent events in Kashmir have conclusively proved;

and therefore, directs the Government to revoke this Agreement.”

(5).

(ii) That for the original motion, the following be substituted namely:—

“This House, having considered 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

[Shri Brij Raj Singh]

Pakistan border, disapproves the Agreement and directs the Government to revoke it." (6).

(iii) That for the original motion the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered 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, is of the opinion that—

- (a) by launching an undeclared invasion on Kashmir, Pakistan has sabotaged the very basis of the pact, namely, the imperative need to maintain Indo-Pak peace and goodwill;
- (b) the Agreement was entered into on the ground that "it would result in lessening of tensions on the Indo-Pak border";
- (c) Pakistan has, by its own action, violated this basic postulate of the Agreement;
- (d) the pact in effect now stands annulled;

and, therefore, urges upon the Government to let it be known to Pakistan that India does not hold itself committed any longer to the Agreement, and further directs the Government to call off the proposed meeting of Indo-Pak Foreign Ministers and take no further steps in pursuance of the Agreement until Pakistan demonstrates in a convincing manner its *bona fides*." (7).

Shri Oza: That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered 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, approves of it." (8)

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered 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, is of the opinion that the clause for reference to arbitration be revoked, as it impinges upon our sovereign rights on the territory of Kutch and is fraught with grave dangers." (10)

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered 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, recommends to Government to scrap the said Agreement in view of the fresh aggression committed by Pakistan in Kashmir." (12).

Shri Maurya: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered 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, is of the opinion—

(a) that the said Agreement has deviated from the principles laid down by Parliament;

(b) that the Agreement is derogatory to national honour;

(c) that the Agreement gives a long rope to the aggressor; and

(d) that the recent aggression committed by Pakistan in Kashmir is the outcome of this Agreement;

and, therefore, recommends to Government that this Agreement should be scrapped." (13).

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ—

कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर निम्न-लिखित रखा जाए, अर्थात्:—

"यह सभा गुजरात-पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान सीमा के सम्बन्ध में जून, 1965 के भारत-पाक समझौते के बारे में प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा 16 अगस्त, 1965 को सदन में दिये गये वक्तव्य पर सिफारिश करती है कि समझौता भारतीय हितों के सर्वथा प्रतिफल है और पाकिस्तान को भारतीय सीमाओं पर आक्रमण करने के लिए और प्रोत्साहन देगा, जैसा कि काश्मीर और त्रिपुरा आदि में आक्रमण कर उसने सिद्ध भी कर दिया है, इसलिए इस अपमानजनक और दुर्बलता सूचक समझौते को अस्वीकार कर दिया जाए।" (11)

Mr. Speaker: All these substitute motions are now before the House.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): We are all very much exercised over what is happening in Kashmir across the cease-fire line and also inside the country, because of the incursions made by the infiltrators who are supposed to be coming from the so-called Azad Kashmir but who are feared by most people in this country to have been inspired by the Pakistan Government and to be coming very largely from Pakistan itself. There-

fore, we do not want to be misunderstood as being in any way less anxious than the Government and the other parties in our national anxiety and determination to throw out these infiltrators and to maintain the integrity of the cease-fire and see that in Kashmir there is peace, as the people would like to have it and as the people of the whole of India would like to have it.

14.06 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

At the same time, I would like to reiterate the stand taken by our party that if our country is to progress, we must certainly aim at a long-term programme for the achievement of peace and peaceful relations between India and Pakistan. It would not stand to reason nor would it be wise to settle ourselves down to an eternal posture of enmity between these two countries, because in that case, progress would become impossible for both of us. We want India and Pakistan to avoid a repetition of the miserable and disastrous experience that Germany and France had had over a period of eighty years, by going through two World Wars and bringing in suffering not only for themselves but for the rest of the world as well. Therefore, we would like our Government, and any Government in this country during the years to come, to try their best to keep the doors open for the achievement of peaceful relations, friendship and amity between these two countries.

But, here and now, we are face to face with this most unfortunate situation wherein the rulers of Pakistan seem to have taken it into their heads that they would be able to serve the interests of their country—that is entirely mistaken and disastrous also, but that seems to be their impression

[Shri Ranga]

that they would be able to serve the interests of the country—by creating this crisis again and again between their country and our country. We deplore it very much and that is the reason why when we found that on the Kutch border Pakistan defied the 1960 agreement and aggressed or sent her troops into our own territory and created that crisis, we were extremely sorry indeed, and we were prepared to support the Government, and we did support the Government in every possible manner in their efforts to drive away the Pakistani intruders on the Kutch border. But what did happen in that area? Would Pakistan have had the temerity to send her troops so close to our border for so many months and thereafter to cross the border also, if she had felt that we were sufficiently strong, if she had felt and realised that our security forces, our Army, our intelligence, our Defence Ministry and our External Affairs Ministry and our Home Ministry had been doing their duty? Even according to the 1960 agreement, there were certain important clauses such as clauses 6, 7, 9, 17, 18, 20 and 22 to deal with such situations. I need not take the House through all those things now. But I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in that agreement, both the Governments had agreed that notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs 6 and 8 above, in areas regarding which disputes of title were already pending with the respective Governments for a decision, the status quo inclusive of defence and security measures would be strictly maintained. If we had done that those troops would not have had the opportunity at all to come into our country and within our own borders.

Secondly, there was point No. 17, that the S.P.s. of border districts will also attend, where necessary, the monthly border meetings for the purpose of exchange of cattle and discussing border crimes. What were

our people doing during all these five years when Pakistani forces were trying to go against the provisions of this and gain control over our own territory.

Then again, the duties of the sub-centres, wing commanders, special police and lower commanders in their respective areas of responsibility had been laid down. There are points 1, 2, 3 and 4. Thereafter there is point 20 which says:

"It is felt that the tension on the borders will be greatly minimised if there is close personal touch between commanders of the two border security forces. . . ."

There should be close personal touch between them. Did they carry out their duties properly? If they had, if they had been in close touch with the other forces, with the representatives of the other Government on the other side, would it have been possible for the Pakistani forces to have made these incursions and gained this control and build up those brigades so that they are very close to our own borders? Did we not neglect, as my hon. friend, Shri Himmat-singhji had pointed out last session, the need for constructing border roads, bridges and causeways and also the necessary cantonments and other accoutrements needed by our army within Kutch?

Having neglected all this, it is no wonder that Pakistan was able to breach points Nos. 9, 17, 18, 20 and 22. According to point No. 6 neither side will have any permanent or temporary border security forces or any other armed personnel within 150 yards on either side of the *de facto* boundary and no picket/forward posts or observation posts will be established within this area. Why is it that we did not see that Pakistan implemented this, respected it and not

disregarded it? When they breached it what is it that we did over all that period of five years?

Then there is point No. 7.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 6 above, both sides may, (a) go right up to the *de facto* boundary in hot pursuit of an offender"—

did we do that?—

"(b) send patrols within the zone specified above upto the *de facto* boundary"—

Did we do it? We neglected all these rights that we had. When they neglected their duties in regard to our rights, we simply kept mum, we ignored it and did not do anything at all. We could have retained such pickets, forward posts and observation posts as are already established until the *de jure* boundary is finalised and return of territories under adverse possession takes place. A list of such posts on both sides would be exchanged by 1st February 1960. Did we have it? We would like to have information, as no information has been vouchsafed to this House.

Coming to points 18 and 20, here is 18:

"The duties of the Sub-centres; Wing Commanders/S.P.s. and lower commanders in their respective areas of responsibility shall be as under . . ."

These have been mentioned. But they neglected all these and suddenly in February-March, our Government came to realise that it had to do something. What happened during all these years between the Government of Gujarat and the Central Government? The Gujarat Government was supposed to be in charge of the special police. When the local legislators demanded of the Gujarat Government an explanation for the failure of the special police to keep

out the Pakistani intruders, they said they had already made many representations to the Union Government but the latter neglected it completely. We do not know the truth as between the two statements, the statement of the Government of India that it was primarily the duty of the Gujarat Government and they did not give any warning and of the Government of Gujarat that they had already sent so many reminders and warnings also to the Government of India but that the latter ignored all these things. Both Governments are cousin brothers belonging to the same political party. Both are equally guilty. Both of them are in the soup, both are in the dock, both neglected this national duty entrusted to them according to the 1960 agreement.

Having neglected all that, they now come to us with this agreement. Even when all this trouble was going on, they did not have sufficient information in regard to the possession of places that were on our side when they were asking for restoration of *status quo ante* as on 1st January. On 1 January, they did not know—and they tell us now—about the actual position, in regard to the ~~Surei-Ding track~~. They were under the impression that it was entirely on our side and that Pakistan had no control and no interest in it. On the other hand, when facts were placed before them in the presence of the British Prime Minister that Pakistan had some claim and their police were patrolling the track, the Government of India was obliged to wink and accept that fact and therefore include it in this agreement, as part of the area which would come within the mischief or *status quo ante* clause. This is how the Government of India has always been unprepared. It is Government that comes now and asks us to agree to this agreement.

It is my unfortunate duty to have to accede to this agreement. I can appreciate the feelings of my hon. friends in many of the Opposition

[Shri Ranga]

parties and also quite a number of our friends in the Congress Party, genuine feelings of anger, of disappointment and of unhappiness, because while on the one side we are being asked to accede to this agreement, on the other here is Pakistan creating troubles by intrusion in Kashmir. At the same time, what other choice have we got? Would it be in the interest of this country to give this opportunity to Pakistan to spread this war front or war zone over the whole gamut of our boundary between them and us? Or would it be in the national interest of India, in the interest of peace between these two countries from a long term point of view to have this agreement and allow peace to prevail at least on this Kutch border so that only the rest of the border will have to be defended and protected by our defence forces? It is from that point of view that our party has come to the conclusion that under the circumstances, given as we are this kind of Government and this Government, this kind of leadership and this leadership, it would be in the interest of the country to accede to this agreement. The main hope expressed in this agreement, that the tensions of the Indo-Pakistan border would be reduced as a result of it, has been frustrated, and that disappoints us, as it should disappoint all lovers of peace. The blame lies on Pakistan, the responsibility lies on Pakistan, and some responsibility, direct or indirect, you may call it vicarious, lies on all those countries also which are interested in seeing that peace is maintained as between these two great countries in this sub-continent, to see that Pakistan is brought to the road, to the realm, to the sphere of peace and decency and justice and fairplay in international relations.

Nevertheless, the hope that the tensions of the Indo-Pakistan border would be reduced has been frustrated, and the current Pakistani adven-

ture in Kashmir has queered the pitch for all those in this country as well as outside who are genuinely keen on Indo-Pakistan amity.

I have a strong feeling that under other auspices, that with a stronger and better Government, the situation that we were faced with in Kutch need not have arisen at all; it could have been avoided if only there had not been such a culpable neglect of duties in regard to safeguarding of our borders and territorial integrity. Under different auspices, with a different Government, with a stronger Government, I am sure that both the Union and Gujarat would not have neglected their duties as has actually happened. Pakistan would never have been tempted to contravene the 1959 and 1960 agreements, because she would have known that we were strong.

On the other hand, what is happening is that she has grown stronger and she thinks that she is stronger than India. Because she has behind her communist China, she thinks that she can do all this mischief against us, and she thinks that we are helpless. And because of our repeated statements of a non-alignment policy and our vaunted loyalty to some kind of deity that we have worshipped for so many years rightly or wrongly, Pakistan is assured that we would continue to be without powerful enough, good enough friends, reliable enough friends, to back us. Therefore, as we are standing by ourselves, Pakistan thinks that with all the strength that he has gathered, as our friends have put it this morning, in a stealthy fashion from the West and in a direct manner from Communist China, she can afford to play this mischief with us, create all these troubles, bait us, prevent us also from going ahead with our economic progress.

So, it is our weakness that is responsible for all this. Who is responsi-

(Shri Indrajit Gupta)

averted. There was, therefore, a general feeling of relief.

On a closer examination of the terms of the cease-fire agreement, as the Prime Minister has said, if one takes a formal view of things, a narrowly formal factual view of things, then there can be no doubt that the status quo ante as it prevailed on 1-1-1965 has been restored through the terms of the agreement. I suppose that, where we are dealing with matters of international relations and conventions between sovereign States, one has to go by formal facts, there is no other way for it. But when the detailed implications were known, the country realised that this status quo ante as it existed and which may have to be accepted, because it is the factual formal position, was nevertheless a very, very bitter pill for this country to swallow. That status quo ante was something which was the creation. I charge of the bungling by this Government, and not only of bungling but of suppression of facts from the people of this country. So that, a cease-fire in the abstract is something which I do not think any persons in their senses can oppose—of course, not cease-fire at any price—(4) a cessation of hostilities which restores a status quo ante prior to aggression is something which formally can never be opposed. But what do we find on an examination of the terms?

In the first place, the withdrawal which is to take place and which has taken place, or may not yet have been completed—I do not know whether it is still in the process of taking place—the nature of that withdrawal is such that it is not a withdrawal on an equitable basis. Our army, our regular armed forces have to withdraw for a considerable distance south of the international border. I do not know the exact depth of that withdrawal, because it is not stipulated anywhere in the text of the agreement. I presume we have to vacate our army has to vacate, the entire area which before 1-1-1965 was being pat-

rolled only by our State police and not by the regular army. But on the other side of the border, across the border, the regular Pakistan armed forces, having withdrawn from ~~Kanjarot and Ghad Bet and Diar Bet and Sardar post~~, can remain absolutely on their side of the border right up to the frontier. Is it an equitable withdrawal? On their side of the border they are right up against the border. On our side our armed forces have to withdraw a considerable distance. Now, if that was the position we have to accept it. But is it something to pat ourselves on the back about? How does this state of affairs come about?

Now, we find from official documents from 1959 and 1960 the existence of a dispute over that area, based on claims put forward by Pakistan for regions south of the 24th parallel. That dispute existed and was admitted, was recognised, by the Government of India. It is there in the terms of the agreement of 1960; it is admitted. And now, aggression takes place in the year 1965. It means that over a whole period of five years, where our Government was aware of the existence of a dispute, where our Government had admitted the existence of a dispute and had said "yes, both sides will have to collect documents and papers and what not, to see what the real position is"—that was done five years ago—in such an area which is a live area, which may become the object of aggression at any time, our armed forces for five years had not been moved up to the border and up to the forward positions. I want to know why. I am sorry the Defence Minister is not here but many assurances have been given to this House in the last two and a half years that in all the live border areas, our army is being posted right up at the forward posts so that we may not be taken by surprise again in the future. Was it because of the Gujarat State—I do not know, I want to be enlightened on this—was it because the State Government of Gujarat treated this or considered this

area to be some sort of private zamindari of its own and resented that the Central forces should intrude there over the heads of the State police? Was it that?

~~An hon. Member.~~ The contrary.

~~Shri Indrajit Gupta:~~ My hon. friend from behind, who comes from that State, says; the contrary. If that is so, then the responsibility has to be assumed by the Central Government itself. Every time an attack takes place we find that our State police is left to hold the baby at the border until the armed forces which are way back are brought up a considerable time later. Why was this done? And the result of it is now reflected in the terms of the status quo agreement, the cease-fire agreement, that our army cannot go up to the border and the Pakistan army can go up to the border on its side; but we cannot, we have to go back and say, "no, only our police will remain there" because that is the position as it was before 1st January, 1965. Who is responsible for this?

The State police behaved with the utmost gallantry. We know how they were faced and were attacked by overwhelming numbers; and the House appreciates very much the gallantry and the devotion that they displayed. The gallantry awards that were published are all for the personnel of the State police, many of them posthumous, to gallant constables and officers who died holding those forward positions.

Incidentally I am recalling a point, since the Home Minister is here, and I would like to point out that the gallantry awards for another gallant action which was fought, again by the State police, at Dahagram, the gallantry awards for that action have not been announced. I know it for a fact that from my State at least there were five recommendations for gallantry awards which are held up in the office of the Inspector-General of Police in West Bengal. I want to know why these gallantry awards are held up, and why they are not announced.

(5) Anyway, I say that first of all the fact that our army has to pull back is directly due to the callous indifference, complacency, neglect and negligence shown by this Government which knew five years ago that there was a dispute about that area, that Pakistan had claimed over 3,500 square miles and which yet refused to move our armed forces up to the forward posts and left it in the hands of the State police. And because formally we have to accept that position, our army has to come back.

Secondly, about this Ding-Surai track, I am reminded again of the plea that was put forward in the days of the Chinese aggression when we were told that we were not aware of the fact that this Aksai-Chin road was being built and was built; it was only after it was constructed that we came to know about it. The Pakistan Government claims that its police patrols were ranging far and wide over the Rann of Kutch, a claim which they were not able to substantiate except in the case of this eighteen-mile track, linking Ding with Surai. I want to know, did we know about it or not? At the time when this agreement was signed, a regular propaganda campaign, officially inspired, went on in the press day after day saying that Pakistan had produced irrefutable evidence that before 1st January, 1965 their police patrols had regularly been using the Ding-Surai track; and that is the reason why we have now to accept it. But the statement made by the Prime Minister here today, both his speech which we heard and the written statement, says that the Pakistan patrols were "said to have used" this track while moving from Ding to Surai, and this had to be accepted as part of the restoration of the status quo ante. I want to know what is the position. This kind of beating about the bush will not do. This House is not going to be hoodwinked any longer. Either they say that the Pakistan patrols were said to have used that track—and if they were said to have used the track and could not produce any

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

more conclusive evidence, why does it say in the next sentence that it "had to be accepted" as part of the restoration of the status quo ante—or, if that is not the position, the position was, as was earlier reported in the press, that there was irrefutable evidence. I want to know, if there was such irrefutable evidence, what were our intelligence services doing all this time.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Why was the House not told about it?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: And why was the House not told about it? Exactly, that is my question. Either they did not know, Government were ignorant about it, or they knew about it and these facts were being suppressed. And every time an incident like this takes place we come up again and again on this question of our intelligence. Every time, since 1962, we have been told that our intelligence services had suffered from some defects and lapses and that these are being removed and it is being given priority. General Bhagat, who was one of the officers appointed to hold that enquiry into the NEFA disaster has recently published a book in which also he has repeated this as to how our defence intelligence and other intelligence systems are being reorganised and are being very well equipped and so on. But how is it that they did not know about this track which was being used for a long, long time, and which Pakistan has now established and proved? I say that although a formal change has been made at the top of the intelligence system by removing Mr. B. Mullick from there, perhaps, in practice I believe that he continues to be a very important person, a sort of adviser on intelligence to the Government, to the Prime Minister. And this gentleman, whose whole organisation has proved over and over again that it is thoroughly incompetent, inadequate, on every occasion, is still here permitted to carry on in this fashion.

And now that is reflected in the terms of the agreement and we have to swallow this pill now.

I am surprised that yesterday, while speaking from the Red Fort, the Prime Minister said—of course I do not know whether he has been quoted correctly or not; but this is the Times of India report today, and it says—Mr. Shastri said that the Pakistani army and police—of course, as far as the army goes it is correct—the Pakistani army and police were no longer present in any part of Kutch. Are they not allowed to patrol the Ding-Surai tract which is south of the international border? How is it that this statement is made? Does it correspond with facts, is it accurate? Then it says: "Mr. Shastri also said that India was in full civil control of the Rann of Kutch." I submit it is not an accurate statement. You may say that this track is a very small area but I do not think that one's sovereignty is judged by the extent of square miles or feet involved. The point is that we have had to swallow this pill and the whole blame for it rests on this Government. Thirdly, there was also this question. Of course my hon. friend Mr. Ranga has quoted the ground rules which were drawn up between General Thapar on our side and Lt. Gen. Bakhtiar, Rana on the other side in 1960. In these ground rules I find that there was also an obligation undertaken by both sides when they send patrols within the zone specified upto the *de facto* boundary, to inform the other side about the actual patrol beat give full particulars regarding the number of patrols, when they will operate and so on. I am raising this point because I want to know whether ever, at any stage, Pakistan had informed our side that they were patrolling not only in the region of their side of the *de facto* boundary but across it. Naturally, they would not inform us. Being ignoramuses of these things always, we do not know anything about it. I want the Gov-

ernment to examine whether or not there had been any blatant, flagrant violation by Pakistan of these ground rules as far as the patrolling of that track was concerned and if so whether it was not a good ground for us to get out of some of the provisions of this agreement. Has it been examined? We are given this document today for the first time; we have hardly the time to go through it properly. But this point struck me here.

Then, as regards the restoration of the *status quo*, it has something to do with the past. It is bad enough as it is. But our main objection and our fundamental objection is to the provision for the future because it is one thing to argue: we have no option but to go back to the *status quo ante* however difficult it may be for us; we have to accept it unpleasant or unpalatable though it may be. That is one argument that is possible. But no such argument can be advanced for the future. The future arrangement which is laid down in this agreement regarding arbitration is the tribunal. There was no compulsion on us to accept this. Perhaps there were some indirect compulsions behind the indirect compulsions behind the scenes but we were not told about it. The people of this country and this sovereign Parliament was never taken into confidence. This Government preferred to indulge in secret diplomacy behind the scenes and that too under the protective umbrella of British mediation in the Whitehall. We were never told that as long ago as 1959-60 we had admitted to Pakistan; yes, you have also got a territorial dispute, not only a dispute concerning the demarcation of the already existing accepted border. This House was told in the month of April before it went into recess that there was no dispute except regarding the question of demarcation on the ground. We were told that demarcation pillars already existed on the western and eastern extremities of the border and due to certain difficulties it was not possible to plant

pillars along the remaining line and the only question was to demarcate on the ground; there could be no question of entertaining Pakistan's fantastic claims of 3,500 sq. miles which would push the whole line down several miles south of the 24th parallel which would mean, I presume, that the demarcation pillars which are already there will have to be uprooted. How else can Pakistan's claim be entertained? The existing pillars have to be uprooted. This is what we were led to believe. And now we find that somewhere in the recesses of the Whitehall, thanks to the good offices of Mr. Harold Wilson, we have signed an agreement in which we have clearly agreed that the terms of reference of this Tribunal will not be confined to the question of demarcation on the ground of an existing international border between Kutch and Sind but will also include the validity or not of the claims of Pakistan over a wide area of the Rann of Kutch itself. Thus our territorial sovereignty has been made justiciable; it has been made a matter for arbitration and award by a third party tribunal. Was this the impression given to this House before we went into a recess that such a thing would be permitted? There seems to be a pathetic reliance by this Government on what it calls the good offices of the British Government as though it is impartial and neutral. Is it not linked in a formal military pact with Pakistan? Is it not its military partner? We know over the years, while the Kashmir dispute was discussed at the U.N.O., what attitude the British Government's representative had taken in the U.N.O. and other places. They were the original creators of Pakistan and surely there was some motive behind the division of the country. We continue to have reliance on them rather than on this House and the people of this country. The seed which was planted by them has yielded its evil fruit. Now, at the present moment, something is taking place in Kashmir, the coming in of infiltrators. I believe it has got some connection

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

with this clause of arbitration. There is a motive behind it. The motive is to mount this attack and go on harassing us in Kashmir because, as we know, these infiltrators are much more difficult to deal with than regular armed forces in uniform and moving in conventional ways; the motive is to create such disorder, confusion and commotion in Kashmir and to keep it festering and ultimately perhaps in the guise of a mediator, some friend will appear in the west who will say: come on, let us try and have a peaceful settlement and once again on the analogy of Kutch we will have some sort of arbitration proposal tried to be thrust upon us in its application to Kashmir also. We have cut the ground from under our feet by accepting this proposal in the case of Kutch and Government has made justiciable before a tribunal and arbitrator areas over which our territorial sovereignty was unquestionable. I submit that before this House went into recess if the Prime Minister had taken the opinion of the House as to whether they were authorised to agree to such a thing, I am sure that this House would never have given them this authority. That is why this country and this House were bypassed and secret diplomacy was resorted to.

Now, Sir, we were not told also of a thing which is really the most alarming of all. I want to know what is going to happen if this three man tribunal cannot come to a unanimous decision. On October 23, 1959 an agreed decision was arrived at and the extract of it is given in this agreement. It says:

"It was agreed that all outstanding boundary disputes on the East Pakistan-India and West Pakistan-India border raised so far by either country should be referred to an impartial tribunal

consisting of three members, for settlement and implementation of that settlement by demarcation on the ground and by exchange of territorial jurisdiction, if any. . . It was also agreed that the decision of the tribunal shall be by majority and final and binding on both the parties."

In the tribunal which we have accepted for Kutch, we will have one nominee of Pakistan, and one will be our nominee and if both of them could not agree on a chairman, the U.N. Secretary General will appoint his nominee. I want to know whether the Government has in all seriousness considered this position that if a verdict is given by that tribunal by two to one, by the nominee of U.N. Secretary General and Pakistan's nominee against us, upholding the claim of Pakistan in part or in full south of the 24th parallel in the Rann of Kutch, we have bound ourselves beforehand to accept it whatever it may be. Yet while fighting was going in in Kanjarkot and while our policemen and soldiers were dying, we were told day in and day out that there was no question of anything happening excepting demarcation on the ground of the border that was already a settled fact. Is this not deception? What kind of irresponsibility is this, which has opened our position, doomed us to a state where by a majority of two to one, this tribunal can, if we take the formal position, even accept the whole of Pakistan's stand? There is nothing against it. It is no use saying that we can prove our case and so on and so forth. Pakistan may be equally confident. We do not know what all those papers and documents and things are, to which reference has been made in this agreement. The whole thing is going to be based on documents. Therefore, we say here, that what is being done for the future is something under which the Government was under no compulsion whatsoever; they could easily have

refused; they could have told the British Government and they could have told the Pakistan Government exactly what they told this House. Why did they lack the courage to tell them what they have the courage to tell this House—that we will not accept such a position? If it is a question about demarcation on the ground, there may be the question of half a mile here or two miles there or one mile here or there, where the demarcation line may be shifted this way or that way. That is a different matter. Everybody understands that. But why did they not tell the House before going to London that if necessary we will agree even to submission of Pakistan's claim to a tribunal? That way, the territorial sovereignty is being bartered away. And, therefore, my party has taken this stand: we took the stand on the 30th June, that because formal restoration of the *status quo ante* has taken place, although, as I said earlier, it contains some very, very unpalatable things which are the creation of this Government's own previous policy, even so, we said that cease-fire is a cease-fire; at least for the time being it stops the hostilities and it prevents further escalation of this war. It does restore the *status quo* but that does not mean that we can give any sort of unqualified support or any other support to the precise terms of this agreement, and particularly to the term regarding arbitration to which we are totally opposed. We have tabled an amendment to the motion in which we have tried to concentrate the attention of this Government to this point, and said that it is one thing to get a cease-fire agreement; a cease-fire agreement does not contain within itself any necessity of laying down a procedure for the future settlement. A cease-fire agreement is a restoration of the *status quo ante*. As far as that goes, the former position is there. You have to accept it but not hide it from the country. The responsibility of the Government for the future is there; Hiding it would be certain-

ly detrimental to our national dignity and self-respect.

But why was it inevitable that this agreement should visualise also this type of arbitration? Therefore, we are totally opposed to that. And when it comes to voting on this, our party will have to vote accordingly, because this thing cannot be seen—the way that the Prime Minister wants us to see it—that we must give our unqualified support to this whole agreement. That cannot be done.

Therefore, I submit that if this kind of practice continues in future, it will be bad. My hon. friend Shri Ranga—I do not know what he meant when he was talking about it just now—was mentioning the need for strengthening our defence preparations much more by getting powerful friends to help us.

An hon. Member: America.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I do not know to whom he was referring to.

But I do not see how America can help us because the Patton tanks which we found in the Rann of Kutch did not come from China or from anywhere else. The Patton tanks were manufactured in the same country which supplies us the PL 480 wheat. They did not come from anywhere else. I want to know from this statement which was made here by the Defence Minister, one thing. These arms, these weapons, this equipment, which have been found with the infiltrators in Kashmir—at least these which carry markings, and they may be markings only of the Pakistan army—are they all arms and equipment which were on'y manufactured indigenously in Pakistan? (*Interruption*). I do not think so. They were imported, for use, with foreign exchange. So, who are the friends who are going to help us? Of course, the Government has said that as far as procuring arms and equipment is concerned, the Soviet Union has said that they are prepared to sell or give us whatever we want. But who are the other friends? I do not understand

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

how the friends of the west, in this particular case, who are themselves involved—they are interested parties and they cannot be impartial because they are members of their own military bloc....

Shri Daji: They are inspirers of Pakistani aggression.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: ... can help us. How do we expect them to come to our help in this matter? They will not do it. And yet, our Government rushes to these people over and over again for mediation. Therefore, we have landed ourselves in a soup now, and my party demands that all possible ways and means should be explored by the Government, even at this hour, of seeing how it is possible to revoke our substantially modify at least those parts of the agreement which relate to the arbitration, the tribunal procedure. It is not laid down explicitly, I must say, in this agreement, in the body or the text of the agreement itself, that this future tribunal will be empowered to take the majority decision which will be binding. It is there in the 1959 agreement, which has been very conveniently circulated along with this, within the same cover. I suggest that this Government should see and make all efforts to see that if they are not capable of revoking this agreement—this is our demand—the minimum they can do is to see that the mischief created by the terms of reference which have been given here has got to be removed and the matters which have been left completely vague, namely, how the decision of the tribunal is to be taken, unanimously or by a majority or what—all these things have got to be made clear and all these loopholes have got to be plugged. Otherwise, tomorrow, —I say it here with all responsibility—we will have no way of getting out of accepting, in some form or the other, a tribunal or arbitration in Kashmir also. We have cut the ground from under our own feet now. This analogy will be rammed down our throats by our friends of the west time and

again: if you can accept it here why can't you accept it there. Of course, we will go on saying "No, we won't accept it; there is no question of any acceptance there." But we have said it here also; very brave words were said in April and May. But something different happened in Whitehall.

Therefore, this is the position, and it is a very, very serious position about which the people of this country should be told frankly now, and even at this late hour, I would request the Prime Minister not to go on prevaricating, not to hide part of the facts but to say it openly. If we have had to accept an unpalatable thing regarding the past, say it, and take the responsibility for it. Do not hide it now. And for the future, make it clear that we are not going to accept any kind of arbitration over our territorial sovereignty. It is never done by any country. Why should we do it now?

An analogy has been trotted out in some quarters of the press that the late Prime Minister had once made an offer which was not accepted, of course, by China, that the International Court of Justice might be approached to arbitrate on the question of Ladakh, but there is no border in Ladakh, defined like that, defined or demarcated or delimited or anything like that. Everybody knows that. That was the position then, and that was why Prime Minister Nehru had said at that time that on the basis of conventions, on the basis of all available records and documents and papers, etc., the border in Ladakh might be settled by arbitration by the International Court of Justice. Of course, China did not agree to that even, but then, that analogy does not apply here. Here in Kutch, there is a border, a definite, established, admitted, accepted international border, between Kutch and Sind and yet we have thrown it open to arbitration again.

Therefore, there are very, very serious implications within this agreement for the future of the country, and we are very much alarmed about

it and upset about it and misunderstandings throughout the country are spreading fast now. Therefore, we demand that this Government should, if it wants to consistently uphold our sovereign right and territorial integrity, revoke this clause which gives this power to the tribunal to arbitrate over our own territory. That is all I have got to say, and when it comes to the vote, we will have to vote accordingly.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri (Ghatal): Sir, we come to debate this motion under the shadow of happenings in Kashmir. There has been infiltration of a lot of people into this territory from the other side. It is an unhappy state of things and there is no question about that. But our neighbour, who has signed an agreement with us in regard to cessation of hostilities in Kutch is trying his best to create the difficulties in Kashmir so that we may renege from the agreement. In Kashmir, however, there are some silver linings to the cloud, and that is this. So far as our army and our police are concerned, they have done their duty. We congratulate them on throwing out or containing the infiltrators.

Infiltration is a thing which is not open aggression. And therefore, even if the army spreads itself out over all these 470 miles of the cease-fire line, it is not possible for the army to prevent infiltration, to prevent infiltrators who come in disguise as civilians and who, by all accounts, look the same as the people on our side of the border and talk the same language. The other silver lining is this. The people of Kashmir have shown that they are entirely with this Government and that they are loyal to this Government. Had it not been for their help, it would not have been possible to stem the progress of the infiltrators.

15 hrs.

On the one hand, I hear my friends on the other side saying that the Government of India has done nothing; they have been idle and they have not

created a proper defence force or police force and so on. On the other hand, they are—I agree with them—very consistent in congratulating and appreciating the efforts of our army and the police. There were certainly efforts behind the morale of the people and the discipline and loyalty that was built up through persistent efforts. What is that body which did it? Surely not my hon. friends opposite. That body is the Defence Ministry and the Government of India. Therefore, if we have got a force strong enough and capable enough to meet any aggression which is put forward and to meet any disturbance which is sought to be created in our country, is there any reason to be so alarmist, as my friend, Prof. Ranga was? Or, have we got to feel that we have at last had an opportunity of showing what our men can do and what training and discipline can do? I would not refer to Kashmir any more, except repeating that we work under that shadow.

The only question that might arise is, having regard to the perfidious nature of the Pakistani action, should we or should we not go on with this agreement? There is such a thing as international decency, which demands that if we have entered into a firm international commitment, whatever may be the odds against us, we on our side must carry through with it. That is exactly what we want to do. There is no question whatsoever of our turning away from what we have agreed, turning away from the obligations which we have undertaken. That brings us to the question as to what our obligations are.

Shri Shankre (Marmagao): We do not know; after all the agreement is only by the Government.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I take it that the Government is the people. That principle has been accepted throughout the ages.

Shri S. M. Bamerjee: We will see after 6 hours.

Shri Sachindra Ghaudhuri: Whether it is after 6 hours or 6 years or 60 years is another matter, which we shall see. At present this is the Government by law constituted and by election put into position and this Government does represent the country. This Government has accepted a particular agreement and any citizen proud of this country should not suggest that the Government should go against that agreement. But let us examine the agreement.

Is that agreement so very bad? I have heard very carping criticisms of this agreement by Mr. Indrajit Gupta. He seems to think, "Well, in the past we have been doing nothing and therefore when the matter came to a head, we had no alternative but to enter into this agreement." Both Mr. Gupta and Prof. Ranga have referred to the agreements of 1959 and 1960. If these references do anything, they show that we are conscious of the fact that the Rann dispute had been subjected to an agreement. As I said, international decency expects that the other party would abide by that agreement and do nothing which might in any way go against that agreement. If Pakistan has not done that, it will suffer for that. I ask my friends opposite, if you find that a thief has entered your house and has tried to steal, do you at once accuse the householder and do you say, you should be more vigilant; you should not have trusted anybody and you should have imprisoned yourself behind iron bars or stone walls, so that no thief could enter? Or do you have this feeling towards your neighbour that my neighbour cannot do anything like this? If in course of time, it is found that the neighbour has turned a thief, you can take action.

My friends opposite have said "We should not have made the agreement". But they have not suggested what we should have done. What was the alternative? The alternative was to start a war between ourselves and Pakistan. Our Government is democratic and Pakistan Gov-

ernment is not. Pakistan might have thrown its people into the morass of war without any thought. We were not prepared to do that without trying to see if there is any other way out of it. The horrors of war are well-known. We, as a peaceful nation, as a people wedded to non-aggression, have been telling the world to observe peace. Even in Vietnam, we have been saying that the dispute should be settled peacefully. Having preached that, when it came to our turn, were we to turn back and say, "No; we are going to fight"? I have no doubt in my mind that if war had been declared ultimately this country would have come out victorious. Our soldiers and citizens have shown that they are capable of sacrifice when necessary. I have no doubt about that. I have equally no doubt in my mind that we should adhere to the principles of peace. I feel we have a duty to the country, to the world and to ourselves to see that if peaceful means are available by which to avert war, we should adopt those means. That is what the Government has done.

The Prime Minister and his Government deserve our congratulations on having brought about this termination of a situation which looked very ugly. If we go back to March or April this year, the thought in the mind of everyone in this House must have been, are we going to have this peace continuing or are we going to have war? Are we going to have our people decimated and our economic progress retarded by war? At that time, every responsible citizen must have thought, is there no way of avoiding this? The question of sovereignty over the Rann of Kutch was there, but at the same time was there no way of saving that sovereignty without having recourse to war? If that has been found now, is it proper for the House, instead of accepting it, to start criticising what has been done?

It has been said, "You have agreed to a determination of the border and"

not to its demarcation." I ask, can there be demarcation without there being a determination? If I say that the border is along the 24th parallel and Pakistan says, "No; it is 300 miles within your border", how can there be any demarcation without determination of that border? My friend says that on the east and west, you had a certain number of pillars. Those pillars may remain; yet, there may be a bulge and that bulge may take 3500 square miles. So, if there was a dispute as to where the boundary is and even assuming that the dispute is nothing more—I say it is nothing more than a border dispute—still there is room for saying this. On the one side, the claim is this and on the other, the claim is different. In fact, Pakistan was demanding 3500 square miles. All that is done in this agreement is to recognise only the fact that Pakistan has been making this claim and nothing more than that. If, for the purpose of having a cease-fire and getting the Pakistani aggressors outside the country, we have given them only this recognition, can we say that it is unwise, foolish or timorous? My humble submission is it cannot be suggested that it is so.

Coming to the question of *status quo ante*, my friends have gone back to 1960 and said, "What else can we expect? You were sitting back doing nothing." Mr. Indrajit Gupta has time and again said that Ding-Surai is something in India. He may be better acquainted with the map of that place. But I do accept the statement made by the Prime Minister, referring to Ding-Surai that it is in Pakistan. If it is in Pakistan, there cannot be aggression because it is entitled to go there. They have said that they have got evidence to establish this fact. How could this evidence be known to us. If they have evidence, the evidence may be that there are orders given in Pakistan, to Pakistani military men or Pakistani police to go and patrol that particular area. They may have done that without our knowledge or consent for six months, a year or two

years. If they were doing that, how was it possible for us, with all the intelligence services we have at our command, to know what they were doing in their offices somewhere to the north of the Rann of Kutch. How are we to know that? My hon. friends accuse us for not having proper intelligence services because we could not anticipate that they were doing this in regard to this particular area. If they have produced that evidence tentatively for the purpose of establishing that they were patrolling this particular area of about 18 miles, I do not see that all is lost.

I have heard whispers about surrender of our sovereignty. Where is the surrender of sovereignty? It is assertion of our sovereignty. What we are saying is this. If properly interpreted the agreement means that we do not for one moment entertain the claim of Pakistan to any of our territory, not even an inch. But for the sake of peace, for good neighbourliness we are prepared to do this, that if they show that they have been patrolling certain areas, without our knowledge, without our consent, though it be certain small areas, we would allow them to do so till the question of the border is settled.

Shri Indrajit Gupta was saying that we have agreed to take away our patrols from an area which is our area. Those areas are ours. It is admitted by Pakistan by the same token as he raised, by allowing our patrols to be there. But in order to avoid any conflict between army and army if we take our army within our territory to a position a little behind where they were..... (Interruption). There was the question of the armies facing each other. If two armies face each other they do not sit quiet and smoke pipes of peace. There is the possibility of an armed conflict. Therefore, the wisest thing to do was to withdraw our army into our territory. They have withdrawn their army into their territory. They have withdrawn their army to a place where admittedly they can withdraw it. I say our sovereignty is recognised by the very fact that they allow our police patrols there. If we had not

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

asserted our sovereignty, our police patrols would not have been there. That is the position so far as the cease-fire is concerned. It is not something which has been rammed down our throats, as my hon. friend puts it; it is something wisdom dictated we should do and we have done it.

Speaking for myself, I am not ashamed we have done it. For the sake of peace it is necessary to do all that is possible for the purpose of avoiding conflict, and a conflict that might spark off certainly a country-wide war. That is why we have got our troops moved to a position behind where they had been. Nobody has suggested that our troops are not mobile. Nobody has suggested that when there is any conflict in that area again, whatever the reason it may be, our troops would not be available there. Where is the surrender of our sovereignty? I do not see any surrender of sovereignty at all.

The other argument is, they say we have given ourselves bound hand and foot to this tribunal which is being set up. They say they can conspire with Pakistan and if they do conspire with Pakistan we will be nowhere. I will be ashamed to think that we have agreed to a tribunal which will be so devoid of any sense of justice that they can render us, as he said, bound hand and foot to those who are not our friends. We are thinking in terms of men who are impartial. We are thinking in terms of persons who will go there with international reputation for justice and honesty. We are thinking in terms of people who are not subject to any pressure from any other group or country. If we are thinking of such a tribunal it would be really dishonourable for us to suggest that when we are thinking in terms of a tribunal like that we are afraid that that same tribunal would not act properly or honestly. If we have an honest tribunal, and I think we must have one like that, there is no question whatsoever that our plans, our

evidence, our documents and our actions throughout the years are such that this area of the Rann of Kutch has got to be declared as our territory and that our sovereignty will be upheld there. There is no question about it. Take, for arguments sake that that is not so. In that case, again, there is no rule of international law which prevents an agreement to arbitrate being made obligatory and binding even if there is palpable fraud, even if there is palpable dishonesty. If there is dishonesty, if there is fraud and we can establish that fraud before the world, in that case there is no question whatsoever that we can go back on any conclusion that they might come to. But, as I say, that occasion will never arise for the simple reason that a tribunal towards which the whole world is looking cannot possibly afford to do anything but honest, just and impartial.

The other safeguard which has been hinted at by Shri Indrajit Gupta is there, that we have bound ourselves to accept the decision of a tribunal and not a majority of the tribunal. Therefore, we hope that a tribunal of goodwill, with an understanding of the situation of our country and the country of Pakistan, with the knowledge which must be supplied to them by us as to what are the facts, is bound to come to a unanimous finding. There may be little differences here and there. That is why the Chairman is being selected, in case of the Chairman not being agreed to, by an outside authority, so that the Chairman may iron out the differences. So, with a tribunal constituted that way, I do not see any reason why we should have any fear, having regard to the fact that our case is just, that we shall be in any way the losers.

It seems we are confident of the strength of our army, that our army is such that we can win a battle, win a victory, win a war, and yet it seems that there is not enough confidence in the capabilities and intelli-

gence of our people to represent our case when there is another kind of battle in another battle field. It seems there is a feeling that where there is a question of evidence we will be so lagging behind that we would not be able to deliver the goods and that we will not be able to satisfy or convince a tribunal that our case is just our case is proper. I do not share that sense of diffidence that my friends have, namely, that where it is a question of negotiation, where it is a question of producing evidence, we lack the merit or intelligence, and therefore we must feel rather alarmed when there is an impartial body which is being set up or feel that there would be a body which is capable of being so influenced that it must decide against us although our case is just.

These things are to be reviewed when we are thinking in terms of international justice.

Throughout the 19th century and even in the beginning of the 20th century it was generally the pattern of things that any dispute between two countries would be settled by resort to arms. Now we have learnt, not only after the two wars but through the progression of atomic weapons, that war is too drastic a thing. More and more all countries are going towards arbitration, conciliation, negotiation and so on.

As I said earlier, what is the alternative. My friends suggested that we should refuse to arbitrate. Assuming that we can do so what would be the result? What happens after ceasefire? Are these two armies to sit quietly for years and years to come? If that happens, my friends would accuse us of doing exactly the same thing that is happening between China and ourselves. There nothing is moving, nothing is progressing and no settlement is there. Is that the thing to be contemplated? Are we going to have these irritations throughout our generation and in

the next generation or are we going to try and solve it. If an equitable solution is possible, then that solution must be found out.

Shri Indrajit Gupta said that pressure came from London and sitting under the umbrella of Harold Wilson we were lulled into a sense of stupor and therefore we did not consider what we were doing. It is hardly gracious to say that, where a friend without our asking for it comes forward to try and ease out our differences with a neighbour, we should think that they are somehow doing something against our interest. If for some reason or other they had been somewhat more partial to our neighbours than to ourselves, is that the proper approach? But surely that is not proper. When people from outside come to help and we do take that help, then they should not be told that they have done something with an oblique motive. Rather, they deserve our grateful appreciation.

We had no alternative but to enter into an agreement unless we wanted a war which we, being a peace-loving people, did not want. There is the admiration for the Army; there is the admiration for the Police. Our Defence Forces are strong. If that is so, we are not weak. All that is being shown in Kashmir today. Wherever there is any aggression, we are meeting it. We are quite prepared. It is not because of fear that we have entered into this agreement with Pakistan. It is because of our genuine desire to maintain peace which we love so much and for which we have struggled not only in our country but throughout the world. Wherever in the world there has been any menace to peace, we have offered our services to restore it. Having done that, when it comes to our turn and we say, "No, we are not going to do that", what will the world think of us? Was there any other alternative apart from war? My hon. friends have not said what else could have been done. There were

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

only two alternatives left. One was to have war with Pakistan with untold misery to the ordinary people of our country as well as their country and complete stagnation of our economic progress and the other was to try to find out a peaceful solution. When we found a peaceful solution, we went for it. It was not a question of abandoning anything. We wanted true *status quo ante* and because of that there was delay in bringing about a settlement. Where it was not a question of surrendering any sovereignty or question of *status quo ante* not being properly established, at least, *prima facie*, would it not be agreed that there should be an agreement? It is well known to everybody who have anything to do with disputes that when we agree to any temporary method of maintaining what was there before the dispute started, it is never a concession. If that is so, in what way have we offended anybody? We should try to resort to peaceful means. We should contain our Army in our own territory and we should allow Pakistan to take their army back into their own territory. How could we say that so far as their Army is concerned, we can dictate where it must be removed? How could we dictate to them? So far as we are concerned, the question of denying our sovereignty is not there. Our sovereignty is not being denied. Pakistan has admitted it. We have got our police forces there. They have also got some police patrols there and that is a self-inflicted position of ours in the desire for peace. Nobody has suggested that our army is so far removed from the scene of action that if any action is necessary, they will not be able to get there. That is not so.

I hope that this House would be unanimous in accepting the agreement that the Government of India has entered into with Pakistan. Despite the points put forward by Mr. Indrajit Gupta, I hope that after due

consideration of the matter, his Party will think it proper to vote for and not against this agreement.

श्री याज्ञिक (महमदाबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कच्छ के समझौते की बात चलती थी उस वक्त मैं कच्छ गया, खावड़ा तक पहुंचा, लश्करी सेनापति को भी मैं मिला। उस वक्त तक पानी का इन्तजाम हो गया था। रास्ते की सफाई भी ठीक हो गयी थी। हमारे हेलीकाप्टर, एयरोप्लेन, मिलिटरी इक्विपमेंट, गाड़ियां, सब कुछ साधन सामग्री वहां तैयार थी। मगर मुझे अफसोस हुआ कि जब हमारी सेना पूरी तैयारी में थी, और पाकिस्तानी दल को वापस हटा सकती थी, उसी वक्त दिल्ली से हुकम हुआ "रुक जाओ"। हो सकता है कि इन लपजों में न कहा गया हो, मगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने इधर सदन में कहा था कि हम ने डंडी से काम लेने को कहा है। हां कुछ नया हमला हुआ तो उसका सामना ठीक से किया जाएगा।

मेरी समझ में एक बात नहीं आयी। कंजरकोट पाकिस्तान के हाथ में था। कई और कैम्प पाकिस्तान के हाथ में थे। वह हमारा दुश्मन था उसने हमारी भूमि पर आक्रमण किया और वह आक्रमण कायम था। पर भारत सरकार कोई समझौते लिए लन्दन से बात कर रही थी। इस वजह से कोई समझौता होने के पहले बुपचाप सूचना दी गयी कि "रुक जाओ"। और उसका नतीजा क्या हुआ वह आप समझ सकते हैं। लश्कर के लोग अपना काम कर रहे थे। उनको पानी की बड़ी मूसीबत थी, पूरा पानी नहीं मिलता था सिख लोगों को अपनी दाढ़ी और बालों को साफ करने के लिए। इस मूसीबत में भी वे लोग कस कर काम कर रहे थे और लड़ रहे थे दिन रात।

जब मुझे ऐसा मालूम हुआ कि उनको यह हुकम मिला है, तो मेरे दिल में चोट लगी उस वक्त हम को मालूम नहीं था कि क्या

समझौता होने वाला है। कुछ खबर प्रायी थी। थोड़े दिन में सब बात पक्की हो गयी। प्रहमदाबाद में रहते हुए कच्छ का हमारा काफी परिचय होने की वजह से, हमने इस समझौते की शर्त पढ़ी। तब हमारे दिल में बहुत दर्द हुआ। मैं सचाई से घ्राप को कहना चाहता हूँ कि चीन ने तो हमारे सिर पर लाठी मारी थी। चीन तो एक बड़ा मुल्क है, एक बड़ी लश्करी ताकत है। मगर इस छोटे से पाकिस्तान ने भी हमारे लाठी मारी और बाद में हमको मूर्ख भी बना दिया। जब मैंने यह शर्त पढ़ी, तो मेरा सिर शर्म से झुकने लगा। क्या हमारी हुकूमत ने किया मेरी समझ में नहीं आया।

कंजरकोट खाली किया जाए यह शर्त है। कहा गया कि लश्कर एक दूसरे के नजदीक रहेंगे तो संघर्ष होने की धारणा रहेगी, कबूल है। लेकिन अगर हमारी सेना को सरदार पोस्ट और बिमारबेट खाली करना था तो पाकिस्तानी सेना को भी सरहद से दस बीस मील अन्दर चला जाना चाहिए था संघर्ष की सम्भावना को मिटाने के लिए। लेकिन पाकिस्तानी सेना पर सीमा से एक मील भी अन्दर जाने का कोई फर्ज नहीं है। हम हट जावें अपनी भूमि पर से यह शर्त है। क्यों हट जावें? क्योंकि पहली जनवरी 1965 में हमारा लश्कर वहाँ नहीं था। यह बात हमारे सामने रखी गयी।

यह बात सोचने के काबिल है कि हमारी हुकूमत सन् 1960 से जानती थी कि 3500 स्क्वायर मील का झगड़ा पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ कच्छ की भूमि के बारे में कर रहा है। हमने क्या किया। और 55 के साल में उसने छाड़बेट पर हमला भी किया था लेकिन 54, 55 और 56 के साल में हम नींद में रहे। अब सन् 60 के साल में पाकिस्तान ने यह 3500 बर्गमील रन औफ कच्छ के इनाक्रे के ऊपर घपना दावा पेश कर दिया है। हम ठंडी में

बैठे रहे और वहाँ पुलिस फोर्सोंज फिरती रही। जब पाकिस्तान का सचमुच इस साल में एक नया हमला हुआ तो हमारी हुकूमत जागृत हो गयी और फिर उसने घपनी सारी सीमा के रक्षण का काम सेना को दे दिया लेकिन यह पिछले पांच साल घपनात् सन् 60 से 65 तक हमारी सरकार ने कुछ काम नहीं किया। हम ने वहाँ घपना लश्कर नहीं बैठाया। पुलिस फोर्स को कोई ज्यादा मजबूत नहीं किया। रास्ते ठीक करने और बनाने सम्बन्धी कोई इंतजाम नहीं किया और वही पुराने जमाने से चले आ रहे रास्ते यह चलाते रहे। पानी का कोई इंतजाम नहीं हुआ। छाड़बेट में बड़ी मुश्किल से पानी मिलता था। जब हम लश्कर वहाँ घपना लेकर चले तो बड़ी मुसीबत के बीच हमारे सैनिकों को घपना काम करना पड़ता था।

15.31 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

फिर बड़ी चीज यह है कि वहाँ पर हमारा लश्कर नहीं था, नहीं था तो हम को क्यों कबूल करना था? ऐसी हालत में खामकबाह हमारी घपनी भूमि पर से हमारे लश्कर को हटाया जाय यह चीज मंजूर करने की जरूरत ही नहीं थी। चीन वालों ने कहा था कि हम इतने किलोमीटर पीछे वापिस हटते हैं घ्राप भी इतने किलोमीटर पीछे हट जाइयें तो वह ठीक बात थी और अरब की बात थी लेकिन यह क्या बात हुई कि हम ही केवल अपनी ही भूमि पर से अपने लश्कर को उतने किलोमीटर पीछे हटाते है।

एक अन्य बात यह है कि सुराई से डींग तक का रास्ता, सुराई और डींग दोनों पाकिस्तान में हैं, स्वीकार्य हैं, हमारा रास्ता जाता है, हिन्दुस्तान की पूर्वी सीमा और कच्छ की भूमि पर ये रास्ता जाता है। रास्ता देना हमने मंजूर कर लिया मगर मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से बड़े अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि घ्राप के दिन में तो इस के बारे में कोई निश्चय नहीं है। वह तो घ्राप के प्रस्ताव से मान्य होता है घ्राप के बयान से मान्य होता है, लेकिन क्या

[श्री याज्ञिक]

इस बारे में किसी ने भ्राप को सबूत दिया कि वाकई सधामुब यह सुराई से डींग तक पैट्रोलिंग भारत भूमि से चलती थी ? मैंने सुना है कि सिर्फ हैरोल्ड विल्सन ने पक्का कर लिया अपने दिमाग से, एक फोटोग्राफ़ देख कर हैरोल्ड विल्सन ने यह पक्का कर लिया और तय कर लिया कि हां यह बात सच्ची है और बस हम ने उसे मान लिया । मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी से ध्रदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पैट्रोलिंग का काम कौन करता था ? यह काम पांच साल से गुजरात की हुकूमत करती थी । क्या इस के लिए गुजरात की हुकूमत को पूछा गया ? उन्हें टेलीफोन वायरलैस या टेलीग्राम भेज कर पूछ सकते थे कि भाई यह पाकिस्तान वाले यह कैसे फोटो की बात बतलाते हैं और क्या भ्राप के पास कोई सबूत है ? लेकिन बँसा कुछ भी न किया, जा कर लन्दन में यह समझौता हो गया । यह भी कोई बात हुई कि हैरोल्ड विल्सन ने कहा और लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ने उसे मान लिया । शास्त्री जी बड़े सज्जन धादमी हैं लेकिन उन्हें उसे मानने से पहले सोचना ध्रयवा पूछताछ तो करनी चाहिए थी लेकिन इतनी जल्दी हैरोल्ड विल्सन की बात मान ली । क्या वह चाहते हैं कि हम भी उसी तरह से जल्दी से उसे मान लें ? मैं जानता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान ध्राने के बाद यह समझौता पक्का हो गया है । वह तो हमारे साथ था गुजरात के मुख्य मंत्री बलवन्त राय मेहता से शास्त्री जी पूछ सकते थे कि भाई क्या बात है ? प्रधान मंत्री, गृह मंत्री सब ध्रहमदाबाद में थे और उसको पूछ सकते थे । मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि गुजरात की हुकूमत को कोई पता नहीं है कि कोई पैट्रोलिंग पाकिस्तान की कच्छ के इलाक़े में चलती थी । पाकिस्तान की कोई भी पैट्रोलिंग कच्छ की सीमा में नहीं चलती थी । लेकिन इस के पक्ष में पाकिस्तान द्वारा गलत फोटोग्राफ़स बनाये गये और गलत फोटो लन्दन में ले जाये गये और गलत बात हैरोल्ड विल्सन को कही गई और मजे की बात तो यह है कि उस गलत

बात को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने मान लिया । यह चीज़ हमारे लिए बड़ी कमनसीबी की बात है ।

तीसरी बात जो हमारे कुछ भाइयों ने कही है, यह ट्रिब्युनल की बात, तो यह ट्रिब्युनल की बात हमारे दिल में बहुत खटकती है । पाकिस्तान 3500 मील का दावा करता है जो कि हमेशा हमारा रहा है । हमें तो उसका पाकिस्तानी इलाक़ा होने के बारे में कोई जानकारी नहीं थी । शायद कोई सरकारी किताब में लिखा हो मगर जब यह चर्चा चलती थी बजट सेशन में तो किसी ने यह बात बताई कि पाकिस्तान का 2500 मील का दावा है और उस के बारे में मेज़ारिटो से ट्रिब्युनल की बात हम ने सोची है । ट्रिब्युनल उस का फैसला कर सकता है । लेकिन कोई बात हम को बताई नहीं गई । डींग और सुराई की बात नहीं बताई गई है । यह सरदार पोस्ट और विगोकोट के बारे में भी हमें नहीं बताया गया । यह तीनों बातें हमारे दिल में बहुत खटकती हैं । कोई बात हमें नहीं बताई गई । बस ध्रासमान से पड़ती है हमारे सिर पर और हमारा सिर शर्म से झुक जाता है ।

जहां यह सब हो रहा था वहां पाकिस्तानी हमलावरों द्वारा कश्मीर पर ध्राक्रमण शुरू हो गया । सैबोटियस काफ़ी बड़ी तादाद में हथियारों से लैस होकर बाराभूला और श्रीनगर तक चले ध्राये हैं । यह देख कर हमारे दिल में खुशी होती है कि हमारी सेनाएं एक ध्रच्छे तर्र के से और ताकत के साथ शत्रु का मुकाबला कर रही है । कई बार मैंने यह सोचा कि ध्रब कच्छ का मामला बहुत पुराना हो गया है, एक नया ध्राक्रमण पाकिस्तान शुरू कर रहा है और प्रभी इस ध्राक्रमण का प्रतिकार हमारी हुकूमत करती है तो उसको हमें सहयोग व शक्ति देनी चाहिए, सारे देश की जनता को, सरकार को इस काम में ध्रपना सहयोग

व समर्थन देना चाहिये । इस समय सारे देश की जनता हुकूमत के पीछे खड़ी रहे और सारी दुनिया को कहे कि इस काश्मीर के झगड़े को लेकर सारा हिन्दुस्तान अपनी सरकार के पीछे एक होकर खड़ा हुआ है । 44-45 करोड़ की भारतीय जनता भारत सरकार के पीछे है । मैंने सोचा कि सरकार का, हुकूमत का इस समय विरोध न किया जाय । जो हो गया सो हो गया । फिर भी एक दूसरी बात जो उसमें से निकल आती है वह मेरे सामने खड़ी हो जाती है और वह यह है कि यह जो समझौता किया उस में हमारा मकसद क्या था ? हमारा मकसद यही था कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच में भ्रमन व शांति रहे । इसी कारण हमने सोचा कि चलो ठीक है, छोटी सी बात है और उस बारे में फैसला कर लिया । थोड़े मील इधर, उधर हो जायेंगे, कोई बात नहीं, हमने शांति के खातिर वह समझौता मान लिया मगर पाकिस्तान ने उसका उलटा अर्थ निकाला है और उसका अर्थ उलटा लगा कर धमकी उन्होंने नया आक्रमण हम पर शुरू किया है जिस से हमारी सब की धाँखें खुल जानी चाहियें थीं । हमने कुछ भी समझ कर यह समझौता कच्छ का उन से किया ताकि पड़ोसियों में शांति कायम रह सके लेकिन पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच में शांति का कोई मार्ग रहा नहीं है ऐसा साफ मालूम दे रहा है और बड़ी दिक्कत यह है जैसे कि हमारे कई भाइयों ने बताई है कि आज कच्छ के बारे में हम ट्रिब्युनल की, पंच की बात करते हैं । यह बात पाकिस्तान वालों ने बराबर पकड़ ली है । वे जानते हैं कि आज तक वे काश्मीर के बारे में जो कोई बात पहले रहे हैं, हिन्दुस्तान उसको नहीं मानता है, इसलिए उन्होंने सोचा है कि काश्मीर में थोड़ा हल्ला करो, वहाँ पर कुछ विप्लव जगाओ, कुछ तूफान मचाओ, तो फिर आखिर में—एक साल, दो साल, तीन

साल में—भारत सरकार काश्मीर के बारे में भी पंच-निर्णय के सिद्धान्त को मान्य कर लेगी । हमारे लिए यह एक बड़ा खतरा पैदा हुआ है, जिस से हम सब को सबक सीखना चाहिये ।

मैं साफ़ कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम ने पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता किया कच्छे खयाल से, शुभहेतु से, लेकिन वह हेतु सिद्ध नहीं हुआ और यह समझौता होने के फौरन बाद ही पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर पर एक नया हमला, बड़ा खतरनाक हमला किया है, जो सीधे लश्करी हमले से भी ज्यादा खतरनाक है । हम सब समझ सकते हैं कि इस हमले के पीछे उस की नीयत यह है कि किसी तरह से कच्छ की तरह काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में भी ट्रिब्युनल की बात भारत सरकार से मनवाई जाये और किसी तरह से उस पजबूर कर के इस बारे में उस की सम्मति ले ली जाये । यह हमारे लिये एक बड़ा खतरा पैदा हुआ है । जब इस समझौते से हमारा मकसद पूरा नहीं हुआ, तो भुट्टो साहब के यहाँ आने पर भारत सरकार को उन्हें साफ़ कहना चाहिए कि देखो भाई, हम ने शान्ति स्थापित करने के खयाल से आप के साथ समझौता किया, लेकिन आप उम पर पानी फेर रहे हो, उस को निष्फल कर रहे हो—शुकि आप ने काश्मीर में नया झगड़ा शुरू किया है, इसलिए समझौते के बारे में सारी कार्य-बाही एक जायेंगी और बिल्कुल धागे नहीं बढ़ेंगी ।

मैं जानता हूँ कि यह बड़ी मुश्किल बात है, लेकिन जब कोई गवर्नमेंट एक समझौता करे, तो क्या पार्लियामेंट से उस की मन्मति लेना आवश्यक है या नहीं ?

[श्री याज्ञक]

जब हिन्दुस्तान में पार्लियामेंट, संसद्, एक सर्वसत्ताधीन संस्था है, तो फिर इस समझौते के बारे में उस की सम्मति की जरूरत होती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हुकूमत जब भी कोई समझौता करे, तो उस में यह शर्त होनी चाहिए कि पार्लियामेंट की मंजूरी की प्रपेक्षा से इस समझौते पर दस्तखत किए गए हैं। इस से पहले कि पार्लियामेंट इस समझौते पर दस्तखत करे, पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर पर दूसरा नया हमला शुरू कर दिया है, जिस के बारे में हमारी हुकूमत को भी खयाल है कि यह जो हालां हुमा है, यह कोई आखिरी चीज नहीं है, इस के बाद और भी हमला होने वाला है, यह सम्भव है कि पाकिस्तान की सेनायें काश्मीर की भूमि पर हमला करेंगी—यह असम्भव नहीं है।

यह सब गोचरे हुए हम को इस समझौते की सब कार्यवाही की बन्द करना चाहिए और पाकिस्तान को कहना चाहिए कि हुकूमत और पार्लियामेंट काश्मीर परकी जाने वाली आप की कार्यवाही को देख रहे हैं, हम हमले का जबाब तलवार से देंगे। बन्दूक का जबाब बन्दूक से देंगे। कुछ समय पहले हमारे संरक्षण मंत्री, श्री चहलान, को रामलीला घाउंड में एक तलवार दी गई थी, जिसकी मूठ शायद सोने की थी। उस का बन्दोबस्त श्री प्रकाशचर शारत्री ने किया था। जब मैं ने कच्छ के समझौते की शर्तें देखीं, तो मैंने सोचा कि जो तलवार चहलान साहब को दी गई थी, वह है या टूट गई है या उस को क्या हो गया है। मेरे दिल में शुबहा है कि तलवार अच्छी तरह से नहीं चलाई गई है। मैं उम्मीद रखता हूँ कि काश्मीर में जो लड़ाई चल रही है, उस में यह तलवार और अच्छी तरह से चलेगी। लेकिन मैं

फिर यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान ने जो कार्यवाही की है, उस को देखते हुए अगर यह हुकूमत सारे समझौते को को रद्द न करे, तो कम से कम जैसे उस ने कच्छ में सेनाओं को कहा था कि रुक जाओ, वैसे ही पाकिस्तान की हुकूमत को कहना चाहिए कि इस करार के बारे में रुक जाओ, हम आगे नहीं बढ़ना चाहते।

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal):
Mr. Chairman, at the present moment, I confess that it is easier to attack this Kutch agreement than to defend it, not because of any merits or demerits of the agreement but because Pakistan has chosen this time to have an open armed intervention, in fact, invasion, of Kashmir and incursion also across the Assam border. The feeling is created that we are dealing with an unreliable party and any concession to it is really an act of surrender. That feeling is very strong, and at this moment, we have to make a special attempt to separate the issues properly.

As far as Kashmir is concerned, the Prime Minister has made the position quite clear that force will meet with force. I am in hundred per cent agreement with that. Therefore, if for a moment we free ourselves from this emotional involvement which is really disturbing us, everyone of us, because of this Kashmir issue, I am prepared to say that this particular agreement on Kutch is one of the best international agreements signed by this Government so far. It is not vague, it is not airy like a poet's dream; it is matter of fact, concise and precise. The objectives are clearly laid down, the time schedule is fixed, and it gives also room to hope that it will be successful and will open new vistas of international action.

My hon. friends opposite ask: can you have at one end a border agreement and a border aggression at the other? Therefore, why not scrap it? Some reasons were given by Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri why we should honour the agreement. There is another, Pakistan has got an advantage in publicity over us because of the help she gets from some of the big powers, their organisations and their news services. The world is not always well-informed about facts. Some fiction which emerges from Pakistan and supported by these agencies goes round and we may find ourselves in a position where the world might say that this country makes an agreement one day and dishonours it the next. They may be completely wrong but we have no time to waste over just trying to explain to the world what the real position is.

Further, there is a difference between this border dispute and the Kashmir dispute. They cannot be equated. Shri Yajnik and Shri Indrajit Gupta said that this was a device to bring the Kashmir dispute to arbitration. Kashmir is not a border dispute. Here it is a border dispute which we have inherited because of the lack of demarcation at the time of partition. Therefore, I think it would be in the interests of India that we honour this agreement and see that the border is properly demarcated.

You must have noticed that there has been a slight change in the propaganda from BBC. I think that has been noticeable change from the time the Labour Government came to office. But still the bureaucratic view and sympathy for Pakistan of the conservatives inside BBC and other organisations leak out. They give a twist which is sometimes very harmful. For example, in this infiltration into Kashmir they are trying to be fair in describing all that has happened: at the same time, BBC is the only agency which has used the word

"guerilla" for that warfare, saying that so many guerillas were killed etc. "Guerilla" today has got some political connotation; it conveys that there is a sort of rising from the people. By the use of that one single word they have changed the direction of propaganda. So, we have to be very careful.

I plead that, like Abraham Lincoln, we should always pursue the path of peace, but at the same time be prepared to go even to war, to take up arms, when the integrity or sovereignty of the country is threatened. Therefore, I think that this agreement is really a good one and that the country as a whole should stand together and see it through. It is no use making political advantage of a thing like this.

This Kutch Agreement should not be viewed in isolation because agreements have taken place in the past, commitments have been made, assurances given in this House; therefore, it is entirely the result of all that, and because this agreement satisfies all those conditions and fits in with all those previous commitments, the agreement is one that has to be honoured and adhered to, because previous commitments and previous events have really pre-conditioned, pre-determined, the form of this agreement.

It is said by Shri Indrajit Gupta and Shri Yajnik that our sovereignty has been compromised because we have agreed to a tribunal, that we have bartered away 3,500 square miles of our territory to Pakistan and things like that. About this tribunal, it is not a new idea. It was in the 1959 agreement. That is the policy we have pursued for a number of years as a nation, and therefore to say now that there should not be any tribunal is not keeping abreast with events.

Shri Yajnik said that we were not told that there was a provision for a tribunal in this agreement, we were

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

not told about this and that. The agreement of 1959-60 is there; it had been laid on the Table of the House. Should he have in every session a teaching class to give information about all that has taken place before that particular date? It is an impossible proposition. Even a man of the status of Morarjibhai said the other day, when he was told that he was a party to that agreement he said: I will not make the same mistake again. It is not an isolated agreement. The policy is laid down in our Constitution. We have repeatedly said that border disputes should be resolved by peaceful means and now at this late hour to say that it was a mistake is like the old nun saying that her life of virginity was a mistake and she would not commit the same mistake again. It is rather absurd. Much has been said about patrolling the Ding-Surai. I place the responsibility for this on the Opposition itself. When any matter of international conflict is under consideration before the Government would act, there is a hullabaloo; there is a demand: on what terms? what are you going to do? what is all this? No country in the world subjects itself to this sort of treatment. Because of this insistence from the part of the Opposition which unfortunately in a democracy cannot be ignored, the Prime Minister made that statement that *status quo ante* January 1965 should be restored before we had talks with Pakistan. Even acceptable condition becomes unacceptable if it is put in the form of an ultimatum. This was nothing less than an ultimatum and Pakistan accepted our ultimatum and removed her army from the Kutch area and gave up her claim about the inner lake and all that sort of thing. If after accepting that ultimatum of ours, Pakistan comes and says that a particular area had been patrolled by her police, we are in honour bound to accept it. Further, they said: why didn't you know about it before? You can say it was a mistake and that there was not sufficient vigilance and sufficient information; information services were not working properly

and all that. You cannot say that it is wrong to include that in the agreement. Further, Shri Sri Prakasa who was our High Commissioner in Pakistan for a number of years wrote recently that he found that many collectors, both in India and in Pakistan did not know where their jurisdiction ended and others' began because even after the Radcliffe Award, there were quite a number of pockets of indecision; the borders there had to be determined and demarcated. If what the Opposition says has to be accepted, there is no dispute at all. If you are to come to an agreement, you should examine the thing; you have to give some room to the other party. There was a lot of talk about the surrender of sovereignty. May I ask, especially my friends from the Jan Sangh who are the loudest in condemning the agreement: is sovereignty confined only to the soil of India? Does it not also cover the people and citizens of India? If it does, may I ask them: what is the position of our honour and sovereignty when that party says time and again in this House and outside that it is prepared to exchange as many as 60 million of our citizens from India for some foreigners from an alien land? Is that not a dishonour? Is that not an attack on our sovereignty? Therefore, to make political capital of this is a mistake, and as far as international affairs are concerned, the House and the country should act as one. That is the greatest need of the hour.

16 hrs.

Finally, I want to make an appeal to this House and to the Opposition. We have had 18 years of Independence. We have come of age. What was our position before Independence, and what is our position now? Earlier, we were slaves; now we are free and freedom is a precious thing. ~~But what else?~~ Then, we were one country; now, we are two. Then, we had the problem of one minority; now we have a problem of two minorities. Sir, if the gentlemen who are so vociferous about the claim for

sovereignty had shed one first drop of blood at that time, there would have been no need for them to be prepared to shed the last drop of blood now. There were rejoicing then. There is only one man in each country whose heart was in sadness; the rest rejoice.

Further, look at our economic position. Earlier, we were exporting raw materials; today, we are exporting the same raw materials at falling prices, and pleading before other countries not to reduce the price so that we can live and breath. Further, while the industrial countries are getting richer and richer, we are relatively poorer and becoming poorer and poorer, and the gap between the developed and the emerging nations has increased during the last 18 years, and not decreased. And that is true not only of India and Pakistan but of the entire Afro-Asian world. Is it wise to keep on simply giving lip-service to Afro-Asian solidarity and, at the same time, having feuds and conflicts everywhere and fights also with arms imported from outside?

Therefore, the need of the hour in this country and also for the whole of Asia and Africa is peace. Peace is the one thing that we should aim at, and through peace we can have salvation. Therefore, I support this agreement, because it is a serious attempt by Shastriji to take to the path of peace and to get away from the path of conflict. If Pakistan does not respond, it is a misfortune for Pakistan and also a misfortune to the world, but the time will come when it will realise that it cannot live all the time and depend for the stability of her Government on hatred of India. The time will soon be arriving when Pakistan also will realise that peace is a better and more useful thing for that country than this conflict for Kashmir and so on.

As far as Kashmir is concerned, I would plead with this House to give full support to the Government of India and not give pinpricks and try

to find out little pinholes here and there and mistakes here and there. Let the country and the world feel that when the Prime Minister of India, whoever he might be and at whatever time, makes a statement on international affairs and makes a commitment on international matters, he has got the backing of the whole country, the 450 millions of this country. It is only then that we will succeed. It is no use fighting about petty issues here and there. The strength of this country does not depend only on physical might. The strength of the country depends more on the confidence that you have in yourselves and also the spiritual values that you are after. There is physical strength, having one leg on the corpse of the adversary and holding the sword dripping with blood. There is another type of strength, the strength of the man who will not shed the blood of even the weakest of the adversaries and at the same time, will not bend before the mightiest empires. If you and I develop that feeling, that spirit and take the lesson from the Father of the Nation, this country will prosper and we need fear neither Pakistan nor China nor any other country in the world.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): Sir, if this cease-fire agreement on the Kutch-Sind border is considered properly and is not clouded by the issues which do not directly concern that, I am sure there would be much better appreciation and much less opposition to this cease-fire agreement. If the opposition considers the agreement purely as it is and not mix up the issue in a greater region, that is, the whole gamut of Indo-Pak relations, I am sure they will be able to appreciate the merits of this agreement in a much better manner than they have been able to do.

We are seeing the very unseemly spectacle of communal parties in this country trying to take a very undue and perverted advantage of our bad relations with Pakistan and particular-

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla.]

ly using this cease-fire agreement between the two countries for their own political and communal advantages.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about other parties?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I am coming to them. The communal parties in this country are trying to raise the basest instincts in the minds of our people to take advantage of this bad situation in which we find ourselves *vis-a-vis* Pakistan and we have been seeing all kinds of 'hings. At present, outside the Parliament House, a great demons'tration is being held with the obvious purpose of bringing the bad features of this agreement to the notice of the people. As a matter of fact, if you listen to their public statements and speeches before the masses, you will find that most of the things they say are incorrect and calculated only to mislead the people into believing things which are absolutely untrue.

May I now come to the other parties? Mr. Banerjee, of course, does not belong to any party and it is difficult to attack him. I have too much respect for him to attack him personally. But the way in which the infamous SSP are behaving in this respect is absolutely amazing. We are accustomed to their perverted attitude in political matter, but it is beyond our imagination that they can go to this extent of perversion and misleading public opinion in this matter. But we have to wait and see how they tackle the situation before the general masses of the country. I am sure as the general elections come nearer and nearer, they are going to get worse and worse.

If this cease-fire agreement is examined in a very unbiased manner, it would be clear that we have gained practically everything we wanted. We have not lost anything in this. The House was quite aware of what we were bargaining for. Mr. Banerjee

and other opposition leaders who are present here might remember that when the Prime Minister declared that we are going to ask for *status quo ante* as it existed on 1st January 1965 everybody supported this demand. None of the opposition leaders said that this demand is unjustified and we should demand something more than this. They all supported this demand for *status quo ante* as it existed on 1st January, 1965.

On 1st January, 1965, it was also well known that Pakistan was patrolling on the Ding-Surai track. Everybody knew that this track passed through India. It was known to the Opposition leaders that Pakistani police parties or Pakistani army patrols were patrolling this area. It was known, therefore, by implication, that if *status quo ante* as on 1st January, 1965 was accepted, as was being demanded, they would still have the right of patrolling the area. If they did not realise this, they cannot blame us or blame the Government for this. They should have realised this and debated this point. None of them raised his voice against this particular thing.

A lot of criticism is heard about the principle of arbitration by a tribunal. All these matters have been said, followed and settled in this House since 1959, that the Indo-Pakistan border issue will be settled by arbitration before a tribunal. This is known to all these leaders who now get up and criticise this agreement, which has been of a very limited order, that this consideration of our border issue by a tribunal is bartering our sovereignty. Nothing could be more amazing than this. These supposedly responsible leaders sit here, deliberate on these matters and they know what is happening. These are all matters of record. I do not have to say this, if you go through the records of this House you will find that this principle of arbitration by a tribunal as far as Indo-Pakistan border is concerned has been accepted

by this House, it has been debated here and it has been professed by the Government. None of these leaders belonging to major or minor parties, ever objected to this. Now just to take political advantage of a bad situation they are trying to play up this thing as if this idea was never professed or brought forward by the Government.

I am quite sure that the results we have achieved by this agreement, like the vacation of Kanjarkot and vacation of all our territories by either Pakistani police or army, if they had been achieved by an armed action nobody would have criticised these results, the same results that have been obtained for us by good diplomacy, persistent diplomacy. If we had fought the Pakistanis and driven them out of our territory we would have achieved precisely the same results and the same agreement. Then people would not have criticised us so much as they are doing now. Therefore, this is being made into a political gain. It has nothing to do with national gain or loss as they try to make it out.

The Prime Minister was very clear and he was very firm on this. I do not remember any party, either inside the House or outside, whoever disputed this basic stand of the Government that we shall accept this status quo ante. Now, if they are disputing this stand of the Government after it has been achieved, it gives us a doubt whether they really have any national interest in their heart about this matter or they are just playing a political game at the expense of the nation.

Having said all this I request the Government to do some re-thinking about our policy vis-a-vis Pakistan. The foreign policy that we have been following in relation to Pakistan, by all standards, is timid. We have never really indulged or we have never followed an aggressive foreign policy in relation to this particular

neighbour of ours who always has believed in this principle that ends justify the means. They are prepared to adopt any means to achieve the ends in view. I must say that I did not believe that force or power would really mean much in international diplomacy. But now I have come to the conclusion, looking to the events that have been going on in the world, that apart from the language of power and the language of strength based and supported by the strength at home, nobody really will take any nation seriously in world diplomacy or international diplomacy. So, it is for us to decide, think and reorient our foreign policy in a manner that instead of always being on the defensive in all matters, we should take a more aggressive attitude and put the enemy in the international diplomacy who is trying to harm us day in and day out in a defensive posture. We should see that they are not able to attack us all the time and we try to defend ourselves. We have seen this spectacle in Algeria. We have seen this kind of thing in other countries also. We are being attacked on absolutely false grounds. It has nothing to do with the reality of the situation. We have excellent case, as it is, on paper. But, unfortunately, that case is never presented properly. Recently, we read the report that this report about massive infiltration across the cease-fire line which was given by Gen. Nimmo to the United Nations has not been played up at all by the international news agencies. It has not been played up at all by other foreign correspondents who are based in Asia. Even our dispatches sent by our people are not properly played up in those countries. We should not stop at blaming all these things. I am quite sure that if we work up these things properly, we can see that our position is presented properly and squarely before the world opinion. I believe that world public opinion matters more today than ever it mattered and it is going to matter much more in future. We should not neglect that aspect of our foreign policy and we must see that

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

our case is properly presented to the world.

I conclude now and I would request the House to accept my substitute motion which I have moved.

16:18 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Dr. M. S. Aney: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, today we are discussing a motion which is of a very great importance to us and we must give as close attention as possible to the consequences that are likely to occur. Everybody wanted that there should be no dispute between India and Pakistan. That is the desire of everybody. But when Pakistan committed an act of aggression on Kutch-Sind border, naturally the situation arose that India and Pakistan had to bring in their army and there was the fight. It is said that this is a matter which is purely an act of aggression because at no time before this particular act of aggression was committed we received serious complaints from the Pakistan Government about any portion of Kutch being their territory or their property. But somehow or other, Pakistan thought that it was the proper time to commit this act of aggression and the army of Pakistan and the army of India were face to face with each other. Naturally there was anxiety among friends that Pakistan and India should not fight and that the dispute between them should be settled amicably. The Agreement that is before us is the result of mediation by certain statesman for bringing the two countries together. Sir, I am a man of peace and I do not like anything that aids war. Friendship and cordiality between two nations are always welcome but nonetheless the question is one of settlement between nation and nation; it is not an individual concern of a man. We have, therefore, to see that due attention has been paid to what may be called prestige and dignity of the nation concerned.

The matter was discussed in the House several times and on many occasions the Prime Minister and others made statements on this question. Assurances were also given that we shall not talk with Pakistan unless it was willing to vacate all the areas that it had occupied. When I read the Agreement first, I looked at it from that point of view and found that, so far as illegal occupation of Indian territory by Pakistan was concerned, care had been taken to see that the army of Pakistan was required to vacate. But ultimately they have sat down there. We have allowed one portion, which is a small portion and which was, to our understanding, a part of our own country, to remain in the occupation of Pakistan. What I want to say is this: We in India, the masters of the territory, did not know that a tiny part of India, which is our territory, was not in the occupation of India but of Pakistan for some time. I believe, it is due to our own lack of vigilance in looking after our territory. This will show that, even after seventeen years, we still are not precisely aware of the extent of our territory.

I am still more surprised to find that when this agreement was arrived at and this procedure was agreed to, the Government of Gujarat were not at all consulted. Already, my hon. friend Shri Yajnik who has spoken has made a very strong point of that, I can understand the Prime Minister of India doing it, but the Prime Minister of India must know that there is a Chief Minister of Gujarat who exercises jurisdiction over that part of it which is said to be under dispute. How is it that it did not occur to the Prime Minister to consult or get information from the Government of Gujarat about the particular part being ever in the possession of Pakistan as was agreed to by him? In Gujarat, I understand that there are allegations to the effect that the Chief Minister contends, and the Gujarat Government contend that in this matter, so

far as the negotiations were concerned, they were the last party who were ever consulted by the Government of India. I do agree that secrecy has to be observed. But with whom is secrecy to be observed? If you observe secrecy with your own officers and keep them altogether ignorant, and then agree to certain conditions, without getting first-hand knowledge from your own officers who are in charge of that area, then it is a serious matter. I do not know what the truth about this is, but this is the allegation which has been made by my hon. friend Shri Yajnik who spoke a little earlier. So, that is one point or one area where we have virtually agreed or allowed the Pakistan army to keep on patrolling, though there is a ceasefire agreement or pact with them.

Then, the most difficult position and the most debatable point is in regard to the question of reference to a tribunal. I have not read the agreement of 1960 at all, and I have just asked the office to supply me with a copy of the same so that I could read it again. But whatever that agreement may be, there is one point that we must remember in this connection. We have been quarrelling with China, and we have been quarrelling with Pakistan about Kashmir and various other little points in East Pakistan side also; but we have never thought it necessary to have recourse to this provision of the appointment of a tribunal for settlement of the disputes that exist. For, in my opinion, if we are sure, as we must be, that we have not occupied even an inch of foreign territory by keeping the Rann of Kutch area in our possession, then we are jeopardizing our sovereign right over it by agreeing to refer the dispute about that to some tribunal. The tribunal will first consist of two persons, and if they do not agree, a third man will come, and we do not know what he will do. In my opinion, no nation can afford to leave the question of sovereignty over its own territory to the sweet decision of an arbitrator who may or may not be inclined in its favour.

I do not say that he may not be inclined in your favour, but he may not be working in that true spirit of justice and settlement. I know that even in the United Nations Organisation there are many people who are more or less biased against India. I mention this for this reason. When the Goa question was there, the greatest opposition to and the greatest condemnation of, India came from one of the heads of the UN organisation at that time. He said 'we have ceased to have any faith in India'. I remember that word. These men who swear by peace said that we committed aggression on Portuguese territory instead of settling the matter by negotiation or arbitration.

Therefore, the prestige which India had at one time is no longer there. Those people follow an opportunist policy. Under these circumstances, the men who are in charge of Indian affairs have to look at every foreigner, amongst whom they have very few friends, with great care. We must look at the horse through the mouth before purchasing it. That is what we must do.

I am afraid that by agreeing to this clause concerning a tribunal we have created a doubt about our own sovereignty over our territory. What to do now? My point is that it is the right of this Parliament to have the final say on such matters. Any such agreement arrived at by Government has to be taken back to Parliament for ratification. Now the tribunal is going to be there. What is going to happen? The tribunal gives a decision, and as the agreement stands, it is going to be final. Thereby the right of this Parliament to have the final say is curtailed, the right of this Parliament to accept it or reject it is abridged. This is the effect of appointing the tribunal and giving to its decision the status that is given in the clause relating to its finality. By doing so, we are curtailing the jurisdiction of this Parliament. This Parliament has a just grievance against those in whose hands the destiny of the administration of India has been en-

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

trusted. It was their duty not only to protect democratic rights, but the right of this supreme Parliament. I believe in agreeing to this condition, in a way Government have encroached upon the right of Parliament itself to give the final verdict on this question.

Apart from this, there is one thing more. What is going to happen? Suppose they decide against us. The thing will go. But more than that, more than what you lose under this particular agreement, there is a greater danger. You will have allowed this as a precedent for the settlement of any other dispute between us and Pakistan. In fact, Pakistan is creating trouble in other sectors and trying to see that you are driven to the negotiating table and forced to bring about a settlement with this clause concerning arbitration.

I do not know why this clause was incorporated in the agreement. The External Affairs Minister may be able to throw some light on this. How did they make an agreement over the head of Parliament incorporating a provision for settlement of disputes by a tribunal? In the case of the tribunal, each party will nominate its member, and the chairman will be nominated by those members. Ultimately the decision will be that of the third man. He will decide your fate. Why did you make this agreement with this provision at all? if you could keep that agreement till this time without bringing into action that clause at all, why did you find it necessary to invoke that clause now and make it a condition of the present agreement? What was the pressure brought to bear on you? The agreement seems to have been arrived at under some kind of pressure, mental or moral, with a view to get over the present trouble and bring about some kind of settlement so that we shall be free from war. I am afraid that for this reason the people really feel that this agreement is not exactly what they wanted.

One word more, and I shall finish. My own impression is this, my own opinion is this. We are a new nation, no doubt, and we may not be properly prepared, we may take some time to prepare ourselves with proper strength, but you will not establish your prestige inside and outside India, in the world, unless it is found that Indians are standing up and fighting for their rights, not allowing their territory to be used for years and years by foreigners, as we have done in the case of China. You should stand up and fight, shed your blood, prepare your armies to fight with bravery and heroism. That is the real thing that will make nations stand by your side, not the righteousness of your cause. If you allow your sovereignty to be violated by foreigners, there is the danger of the position deteriorating into a very serious situation.

Shri Himatsingka (Godda): I support the agreement that has been entered into by the Government. The Prime Minister, in his statement, has made the position quite clear about the circumstances which preceded the agreement. The Opposition have been trying to assail the agreement on various grounds, that it is derogatory to national honour, detrimental to national interests, that it is contrary to the spirit of the resolution unanimously adopted by the House etc. etc.

But may I invite the attention of the House to certain facts? The Pakistanis had intruded into our territory. The first thing was to push them back, that is to say by means of armed conflict. But war has not solved any problems at any time, and, therefore, the best course was to find a way which would be consistent with our honour, our dignity.

So far as the boundary dispute is concerned, ours is almost a cast iron case. When the British were here, Kutch was under Indian rulers and Sind was a separate province under the British. So, the area is very well

demarcated. We have lots of pre-partition maps and other papers which will definitely show how far our area extends. So we need not have any fear if the case is referred to arbitration or an impartial tribunal. Of course the third person will be nominated by UNO and he will perhaps be the deciding factor but we have no reason to think that the tribunal will not be impartial or that it will be prepared to take sides.

The main condition that was made by the Prime Minister for coming to an agreement was that Pakistan must vacate aggression, and the first condition that has been agreed to is that Pakistan will vacate aggression. In fact, they have withdrawn their army and police from Indian territory. Therefore, there is nothing wrong that has been done by the Prime Minister in arriving at this agreement. The promise that was made in this House was that no agreement will be arrived at unless Pakistan agrees to vacate aggression. The first condition is that the armies will be withdrawn on that basis. The arrangement was arrived at. It was also honestly believed that with the arrival of this agreement, when we can come to an arrangement like this one, the tension between Pakistan and India will be very much lessened. Unfortunately, we missed the fact that the main thing which was in the mind of Pakistan was Kashmir and without the settlement of Kashmir dispute, Pakistanis are not going to change their attitude. That has been one weak thing, that we missed to take into consideration. So far as the agreement is concerned, in the circumstances in which we were, it has been one of the best that we could possibly enter into. I support the agreement and I say that in the circumstances it is in the interest of both countries, especially of India to have done so.

श्री उद्वा० प्र० ज्योत्सबी (मागर) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कच्छ के सम्बन्ध में हुए

समझौते पर चर्चा करते वक्त मुझे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि हमारा देश राजनीति के एक चौराहे पर खड़ा हुआ है। यह देश शांतिवादी है, यह देश युद्ध के द्वारा नहीं, प्रेम के द्वारा घोर समझौते के द्वारा झगड़ों का निपटारा करना चाहता है। इसी नीति पर यह देश आज तक चलता आया है और आगे भी चलता रहेगा। लेकिन कच्छ समझौते के पश्चात् पाकिस्तान ने जिस तरह का रवैया प्रकट किया है, काश्मीर में उसने जो जोरों की घुसपैठ जारी की है, वह इस देश की रियाया के लिए एक चुनौती बन गई है और इस देश के लिए ही नहीं इस संसार के सारे शांतिप्रिय देशों के लिए भी यह एक चुनौती है। शांतिप्रिय देशों के लिए यह वक्त है कि वे सोचें कि दो देशों के बीच में अगर किसी मुद्दे पर शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से समझौता करने का मुद्दाहिदा हुआ तो क्या यह लाजिमी नहीं है कि एग््रीडिंग पार्टीज जो हैं वे उस मुद्दाहिदे पर प्रमत्त करें? एक तरफ शांतिपूर्ण चर्चा करने के लिए बैठकें करने की तैयारियां की जाती हैं तो दूसरी तरफ से जो कोख में छूरी भोंकी जाती है तब उसके बारे में क्या हम सभी को यह सोचने के लिए मजबूर नहीं हो जाना पड़ता है कि भागें क्या होने वाला है? इंग्लैंड के कहने पर हमने यह समझौता किया था, इस बात को हमने भागें बढ़ाया था। कहा जाता है कि अमरीका के प्रेशर पर भी हमने यह बात भागें बढ़ाई। यों हम किसी प्रेशर के नीचे काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। लेकिन यह बात सच है कि अगर दुनिया के शांतिप्रिय देश, हमारे मित्र राष्ट्र, कोई बात हमारे सामने रखते हैं तो हर देश को और हर इंसान को जब दुनिया में रहना है, तो उसके लिए यह लाजिमी हो जाता है कि वह दुनिया के घादमियों की बात पर ध्यान दे, दुनिया के देशों की बात पर, शांतिप्रिय देशों की बात पर ध्यान दे और उस दिशा में कदम उठाये।

हमें दुख है कि काश्मीर में पाकिस्तान ने जो कदम उठाया है वह इस देश के लिए

[श्री ज्वा० प्र० ज्योतिषी]

एक चुनौती बन गया है और उस चुनौती की गर्मी में यह देश और इस देश का बहुसंख्यक समाज उत्तेजित हो उठा है और कच्छ के समझौते के विषय में तरह तरह की बातें करने लगा है और कहने लग गया है कि एक ऐसे राष्ट्र के साथ हमने यह समझौता किया है जिस राष्ट्र के हृदय में युद्ध और संघर्ष की बात कूट कूट कर भरी हुई है, जो कि हर क्षण हमका युद्ध की और विनाश की चुनौती देने को तत्पर रहता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस पर इस देश के नागरिकों को गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचने का वक्त है। एक जगह भ्रमर गर्मी रँदा की गई है तो इसके माने यह नहीं है कि हमारे देश के बुजुर्गों ने जो फैसले किये हैं उन फैसलों में जो प्रच्छादियाँ हैं, उन फैसलों में जो हमारे सिद्धांतों की गम्भीरता है, जिन सिद्धांतों पर कल तक हमने भ्रमल किया है, उन सबको हम भूल जायें। मेरा मन, मेरा मस्तिष्क यह कहता है कि कच्छ के मामले में जो हमने समझौता किया है उस समझौते में हमने कहीं कोई ऐसी बात नहीं की है जिससे यह पता चलता हो कि हम शांतिप्रिय देश नहीं हैं। हम शांतिप्रिय राष्ट्र हैं और हम चाहते हैं कि हमारा जो झगड़ा है वह शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से तय हो। इस सदन में यह बात कही गई थी कि भ्रमर पाकिस्तान कोई ऐसी शर्त नहीं रखता है जो शर्त कि हमारे सम्मान के अनुहूल न हो, जो हमारी राष्ट्रियता पर कोई टीका न लगाती हो जो हमारे राष्ट्रीय स्वतंत्रताओं पर कोई रोक न लगाती हो तो उस तरह का समझौता हम करने का तैयार रहेंगे।

हमारी पहली शर्त थी कि वह एग्शन हटाये। एग्शन हटाना उन्होंने मंजूर किया। कुछ खास स्थान थे, उन स्थानों को खाली किया। पाकिस्तान की फौजे वहाँ से हट गई। यह एक अलग बात है कि अपनी सीमा के भीतर शांति और व्यवस्था बनाये रखने के लिए हमने अपनी सिपाही वहाँ रखे और

इस गर्ज से कि पाकिस्तान और हमारे बीच में तनाव न हो, हमने अपनी फौजे भी वहाँ से हटा ली। हमारे पुलिस के सिपाही वहाँ रहेंगे। अब भ्रमर हमारे साथ दगाबाजी की जाती है, बईमानी की जाती है, मक्कारी की जाती है तो उसका जवाब देने के लिए हमारी पुलिस वहाँ मौजूद रहेगी और उसको ताकत देने के लिए हमारी फौज भी रहेगी। हमारे बुजुर्गों ने इस मामले में कोई गलती नहीं की है। हम सोये नहीं हैं। लेकिन हमने अपनी इज्जत को भी संरक्षित नहीं किया है। हमने मौका दिया था पाकिस्तान को कि वह हमारी शांतिप्रियता का विचार करे। प्रच्छा हो कि वह चेते और समझे और मिल कर चर्चा करके मामले को हल करे। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारे देधानतदारी के हाथ को, प्रेम की भावना के हाथ को सम्मानित नहीं किया है, हमारे प्रस्ताव को शब्दों में भले ही मंजूर किया है लेकिन उसकी भावना को मंजूर नहीं किया है और इधर प्रस्ताव की स्याही सूखने भी नहीं पाई थी कि उधर उसने एग्शन कर दिया, उपद्रव कर दिया।

यह एक बीज है जो हमको चोराहे पर ले जाकर खड़ी करती है। हमें सोचना होगा कि प्रेम का सिद्धांत, शांति और प्रेम की बात, युद्ध विहीनता की बात इस देश की राजनीति में कब तक चल सकेगी और खास तौर पर पाकिस्तान के साथ फैसला करते वक्त किस सीमा तक चल सकेगी। इस विषय में हमें बहुत गम्भीरता से विचार करना होगा। सारे देश में एक गर्मी फैली हुई है, एक तूफान देश में उमड़ रहा है और इस तरह का तूफान उमड़ना स्वाभाविक भी है। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि यह तूफान उठाने का वक्त नहीं है और शान्ति और गम्भीरता से विचार करने का वक्त है। जो इस देश के नागरिकों का हुजूम इकट्ठा कर के बहुसंख्या में एक स्थान पर धावाज कस कर और अपना विरोध प्रदर्शित

करके इतनी बड़ी समस्या को हल कर लेना चाहते हैं उन से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जरूरी है कि हम इस वक्त एक होकर, संगठित राष्ट्र बनकर जो कि वाकई में हम हैं, संसार के सामने हम यह नजीर पेश करें कि शान्तिवादी राष्ट्र सोचें कि पाकिस्तान का यह कदम कहां तक विश्व की शांति की रक्षा करने में योगदान कर सकता है, विश्व की दृष्टि से कहां तक हिनकारक हो सकता है।

मैं शान्ति को, प्रेम को, धर्मशास्त्र को व्यक्ति की जिनदगी में धीरे मानव समाज की जिनदगी में बहुत बहुत ऊंचा महत्व देता हूँ। लेकिन जब हम देखते हैं कि बारबार शान्ति की चीख को, प्रेम की चीख को, युद्ध न करने की नीति को कमजोरी समझा जाता है तब यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि देश के अन्दर सबलता धीरे मजबूती पैदा की जाए। मैं इस सदन के सामने यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि हमारा देश इस समय एक चौराहे पर खड़ा है, राजनीति के चौराहे पर। मेरी भावना आज भी विश्व शांति के सिद्धान्तों पर है, मेरी भावना आज भी एक युद्ध विरत राष्ट्र के निर्माण पर है। लेकिन मुझे लगता है, कि अगर शांतिप्रिय राष्ट्र, हमारे यूनाइटेड धरम रिपब्लिक के लोग, इंग्लैंड के लोग, रूस के लोग धीरे दूसरे लोग आज की स्थितियों पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार नहीं करते हैं धीरे इस तरीके पर किये गये हमलों के खिलाफ अपनी भावाज बुलन्द नहीं करते हैं धीरे हमारी इस शांतिप्रिय नीति को सक्रिय सहयोग नहीं देते हैं तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हमारे देश में शांति की नीति चल सकेगी या नहीं।

कल तक धमकीका हम से मित्रता की बात करता रहा धीरे आज भी करता है साथ ही वह पाकिस्तान से भी मित्रता की

बात करता है। लेकिन यह कहां तक चलेगा। यह बात कितने दिन तक चल सकेगी कि एक मित्र को शस्त्रास्त्र दिये जायें जो कि दूसरे मित्र की छाती पर उन का उपयोग करे। अगर हम संसार में शांति स्थापित करना चाहते हैं तो हमें देखनी पड़ेगा कि हमारी शक्ति किसी भी रूप में क्यों न हो, किसी भी क्षेत्र में, कहीं जा कर उस का दुरुपयोग शांतिप्रिय लोगों के खिलाफ न हो सके।

जो समझौता या मुघाहदा हुआ है उस में मैं किसी किस्म की असम्मानजनक चीज नहीं देखता हूँ। हमारी तरफ से तो यह संसार को धर्म धीरे युद्धविहिता की तरफ से जाने का एक कदम था। मैं इस को भारतवर्ष की एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विजय मानता हूँ। यह हमारे भारत की विजय है हम ने फिर से अपने धके हुए धीरे कमजोर दिनों में भी दुनिया के सामने अपनी उच्च धादशावादिता रक्खी। कमजोर में शक्ति धीरे शस्त्र की दृष्टि से नहीं कह रहा हूँ, कमजोर में कह रहा था मार्ल्स की दृष्टि से। चाहे संसार में इन सिद्धान्तों की धीरे राष्ट्रों का विश्वास कम होता रहा हो लेकिन भारतवर्ष ने इस वक्त भी पाकिस्तान के सामने एक नजीर रक्खी कि हम शांति के लिये, प्रेम के लिये, विश्व के रगड़े झगड़ों को दोस्त के नाते एक जगह पर बैठ कर शांतिपूर्ण तरीका से हल करने का एक रास्ता निकालें। धीरे इस दृष्टि से जो मुघाहदा हमारी सरकार ने किया, वह बहुत उचित था धीरे मार्ल्स की कसौटी पर बहुत उचित था। केवल इस बात से कि दूसरा पाटिसवेट जो है उस मुघाहदे को तोड़ कर हमारे साथ दगाबाजी कर रहा है, हम अपनी सन्तुलन खो कर अपने देश के बजुगों के निर्णय को प्रनुचित समझने लगे, यह इस देश की बड़ी राजनीतिक भूल होगी।

श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ (एटा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कच्छ समझौते के सम्बन्ध में काश्मीर की चर्चा प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने की। मुझे इसके सम्बन्ध में सब से पहले यह निवेदन करना है कि कोई भी राष्ट्र हो उसकी सरकार का यह नैतिक कर्तव्य होता है कि देश की मनोभावना को ठीक प्रकार से जांचे। परन्तु दुर्भाग्य देश का आज यह है कि जो शासन प्रणाली आज चल रही है उसमें ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि नौकरशाही और कांग्रेस-शाही यह दो अलग अलग वर्ग बन चुके हैं और देश की जनता एक तीसरा वर्ग बन गई है। देश के शासक और नौकरशाही आज देश की कोई भी भावना सुनने और उसके मुताबिक कार्य करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। यह कैसे दुर्भाग्य की बात है।

मैं अपने धावरणीय सरदार जी के सम्बन्ध में कहूंगा कि हमें अभी तक यह पता नहीं है कि कच्छ और काश्मीर सरदार जी के अन्तर्गत आते हैं या श्री नन्दा के अन्तर्गत आते हैं। यह बात अभी तक निश्चित नहीं है। फिल-हाल धाधा धाधा मान लेते हैं। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का एक कोटेशन देना चाहता हूँ जिसे कि उन्होंने अपने श्रीमुख से सन् 1953 या 1954 में इसी पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर कहा था।

“काश्मीर पर किसी प्रकार का हमला भारत के विरुद्ध पूर्णतया लड़ाई के रूप में समझा जायेगा।”

एक तरफ तो धाप गांधी जी और पंडित जी की दुहाई देते हैं तब मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरी तरफ पंडित जी ने जो इसी पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर कहा था कि किसी प्रकार का हमला अगर काश्मीर पर होगा तो उसे भारत के साथ पूरी लड़ाई समझा जायेगा, क्या धाप उसे पूरी तरह भूल गये।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र नाथुर (जालोर) : नहीं नहीं, भूल नहीं गये हैं।

श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ : बार बार सुरक्षा की बात कही जाती है। कोई भी मिनिस्टर महोदय पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर या बाहर बोलें, बराबर यह कहा जाता है कि हमारी सुरक्षा का पूरा प्रबन्ध है, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हजारों पाकिस्तानी हमारे पेट में घुस आये और घाप बँधे देखते रहे क्या यह घापकी सुरक्षा के पूरे प्रबन्ध का परिचायक है। अगर काश्मीर के अन्दर घाप बाई चांस भी एक चूक कर जाते तो क्या होता। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह देश का सौभाग्य है, घापकी और देश की लाज बचनी थी वरना अगर जरा भी देर हो गई होती तो काश्मीर पर पाकिस्तान का कब्जा हो गया होता। अब यह पास्ट टेन्स की बात हो गई है। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि मैं इसको घापका भाग्य न मान कर देश का भाग्य मानता हूँ, कांग्रेस का भाग्य नहीं मानता बल्कि किस्मत से देश की इज्जत बच गई।

इसी जगह पर मैं एक बात और कह देना चाहता हूँ। मुझे पक्की तौर से तो नहीं मालूम लेकिन बताया जाता है कि एक खास किस्म के पाकिस्तानी डी० धाई० जी० को बाइंड सिक्वोरिटी के लिये नियुक्त किया गया। जब उन्होंने कुछ इस तरीके की गड़-बड़ी की तो उनको गिरफ्तार किया गया हमारी सरकार के द्वारा। मैं इस बात की सराहना करता हूँ। कुछ देर से सही लेकिन सरकार ने धांधें तो खोलीं। वह सराहना की पात्र है, लेकिन प्रश्न यह है—मैं किसी खास आधार में नहीं जाना चाहता—मौलिक प्रश्न यह है कि घाप एक डाउटफुल एलीमेंट को ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण स्थानों पर भेजते क्यों हैं। मुस्लिम परस्ती के नाते घाप इस तरह के घादमियों को देश की सुरक्षा के कार्य में लगाना चाहते हैं। इससे ज्यादा दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण कृत्य और घापका कोई नहीं हो सकता। अगर घाप की सी० धाई० डी० घपवा किसी दूसरे

विभाग के जरिये पता लगता है कि कोई घादमी डाउटफुल कैरेक्टर का है तो उसी वक्त उसको भ्रमण करना चाहिये था। मैं श्री नन्दा जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि मैंने उनको खत भेजा था। इस वक्त उस पर कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता, प्रागे जब बोलूंगा तो कहूंगा उन्होंने उस पर कुछ नहीं किया।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : वह भी डाउटफुल रहा होगा।

श्री विशानचन्द्र सेठ : डाउटफुल नहीं, बिल्कुल ठीक लिखा था। नन्दाजी स्वयम् बैठे हैं। घ्राप कब तक इस बात का इन्तजार करेंगे, घ्राखिर इन्तजार की भी कोई सीमा होती है। कितना वक्त लगेगा। घ्राप ने जो समझा हो उस को बतलाईये, मैं तो कुछ समझ नहीं पा रहा हूँ।

श्री सरदार जी से मुझे बड़ी नाराजगी है। घ्राप तो सरदार जी हैं खुद लड़ाई छेड़ने वाले हैं। बजाय इसके घ्राप लड़ाई रोकना चाहते हैं। मैं सीख फायर लाईन के सम्बन्ध में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के स्टेटमेंटों को बार बार गौर से पढ़ता हूँ तो एक स्टेटमेंट से दूसरे स्टेटमेंट में कन्ट्रा-डिक्शन मिलता है। जो भी घ्राप को कहना हो घ्राप सीधे सीधे क्यों नहीं कहते जैसे कि पंडित जी ने बेरूबाड़ी के सम्बन्ध में कहा था। हम तो उसे समझते नहीं थे, उन्होंने इस मदन में कहा था कि उस की बड़ी इप्पाटेंट पोजीशन है लेकिन अब तो हम कह चुके। सब कर लिया देश ने कि पंडित जी ने सत्य बात कह दी। घ्राप को भी झुम कर कहना चाहिये था कि घ्राप ने अपनी टैरीटोरी में समझौता किया है और गर्दन झुका कर किया है। अगर घ्राप इस तरह से कहते तो मूमकिन है कि देश को इतनी शिकायत न होती लेकिन एक तरफ तो घ्राप कहते हैं कि हमने समझौता किया है अपनी इज्जत को को बचाकर और दूसरी तरफ सत्य यह है कि घ्राप ने अपनी टैरीटोरी में ही समझौता किया है जहां पाकिस्तानी घन्दर बैठे हुए हैं। घ्राप ने पीछे हट कर समझौता

किया है इस सत्य को छिपा कर घ्राप देश की प्रांशों में धूल नहीं झाँक सकते हैं। अगर घ्राप पद पर बैठे हुए हैं तो इस का मतलब यह नहीं कि घ्राप देश की भावना को कुचल सकेंगे।

हो सकता है कि हमारे चिल्लाने और चीखने का घ्रापके ऊपर कोई प्रसर न पड़े, लेकिन इसका भयं यह नहीं है कि घ्राप की बातों का हमारे दिलपर उल्टा प्रसर न पड़े। अगर घ्राप ईमान-दारी से मानबचरिख के अनुसार कार्य करें तो सीधी सी बात है कि घ्राप को घ्राज पाकिस्तान पर घ्रटक करना चाहिए और अब पाकिस्तान पर हमला होगा तो उसको पता चलेगा। हमने देखा कि एक छोटे से देश मित्र ने स्वीड कैनाल पर कब्जा कर लिया। रोड पाकिस्तान हमारे ऊपर हमले कर रहा है तो उसको किसने दुनिया ने निकाल दिया। घ्राप खुद डरे हुए हैं, इसलिए घ्राप पाकिस्तान पर हमला करने की हिम्मत नहीं करते। अगर घ्राप पाकिस्तान पर हमला नहीं करना चाहते, तो मेरी बरकबास्त है कि कम से कम हमारे जिस इलाके पर पाकिस्तान ने कब्जा किया हुआ है उस पर नो कम से कम घ्राप घ्रटक करिए। फिर घ्राप की पोजीशन यह होगी कि पाकिस्तान घुटने टेक कर घ्राप के साथ समझौता करेगा। घ्राज घ्राप अपनी घ्राप देश की इज्जत को बेच कर समझौता कर रहे हैं। और घ्राप अपनी घ्रादमियों से कहलवा रहे हैं कि घ्रापने जो किया वह घ्राच्छा किया। यह सुनते सुनते कान दुख गए। घ्राप भले ही चाहें कुछ कह लें। लेकिन घ्राज जो देहली में जनमंत्र द्वारा डिमांस्टेशन हो रहा है—ऐसा डिमांस्टेशन घ्राज तक नहीं हुआ—यह इस बात का सबूत है कि जनता की घ्रापके प्रति सच्चावना नहीं है। अगर उनकी घ्राप के प्रति सच्चावना होती तो क्या लोग इस तरह सैकड़ों और हजारों रुपया खर्च करके इतनी दूर और इतनी संख्या में घ्राते। कितनी बसें घ्रायी हुई हैं। इसका कारण यह है कि घ्राप के प्रति लोगों के दिल के घ्राण्ड घ्राविश्वास है। उनके दिल में यह क्या है

[श्री विशानचन्द्र सेठ]

कि पता नहीं हमारी सरकार देश की
 आबरू किस जगह जा कर बेच दे ।

17 hrs.

मैं आप के द्वारा सदन से निवेदन करूँगा
 कि वस्तुस्थिति को छिपाने से काम नहीं
 चलेगा । अगर हमारे अन्दर कमजोरी है तो
 हमें उसे साहस के साथ स्वीकार करना
 चाहिए ।

मैं अन्त में एक बात और कहना चाहता
 हूँ । मेरा यह कहना है कि आज आप जिस
 प्रकार की ममोबूति का सहारा ले रहे हैं,
 उसका सबसे बड़ा दुष्परिणाम देश में यह
 हो रहा है—लोगों के सब की बात को
 छोड़िये—उल्टे जमता में कायरता की भावना
 जाग्रत होती चली जा रही है—और उसका
 प्रभाव हमारी सेना पर पड़ने जा रहा है ।
 मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अगर आप
 अपनी सेना को मजबूत करना चाहते हैं तो
 उसको मजबूत करने का प्रयत्न दीजिए । सेना के लोग
 अक्सर हमसे रेलों और दूसरी जगह मिलते
 हैं । उनके दिम में यह भावना है कि अपने
 देश के लिए, उसकी रक्षा के लिए जो कुछ कर

सकते हैं करें । लेकिन उनको ऊपर से जैसे
 आईर मिलते हैं उनसे उनकी सारी भावना
 कुठित हो जाती है । ऐसा करके आप देश में
 किस तरह की स्थिति पैदा करना चाहते
 हैं ? अगर देश कमजोर हो गया तो आप किम
 पर दृकूमत करेंगे ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण
 समाप्त करता हूँ ।

BUSINESS ADVISORY
 COMMITTEE

THIRTY-SEVENTH REPORT

Shri Bano (Buldana): I beg to pre-
 sent the Thirty-seventh Report of
 the Business Advisory Committee.

17.04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
 Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday,
 August 17, 1965/Sharavana 26, 1887
 (Saka).