

**Shri Morarka:** Actually, one of the paras concerns Avro-748 and this Report deals extensively with that.

13.13 hrs.

**MOTION RE: TASHKENT DECLARATION—contd.**

**Mr. Speaker:** Further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Swaran Singh on the 16th February, 1966, namely:—

“That the Tashkent Declaration be taken into consideration” and amendments thereon.

**श्री हुकूम खन्ड कज़बाय (देवास):** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि ताशकंद वार्ता में स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री ने भाग लिया था और उन्हीं ने इस समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर किये थे। हम चाहते हैं और आशा भी यही करते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री इस बहस का जबाब दें। इस बहस का प्रारम्भ माननीय स्वर्ण सिंह जी ने किया था। हम चाहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जो स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री की उत्तराधिकारी हैं, इस बहस का जबाब दें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad):** She should be present at least.

**श्री रामसेवक घाब (बागबंकी):** अध्यक्ष महोदय, उचित यही होगा कि चूँकि ताशकंद समझौता बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है और स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री ने उस पर हस्ताक्षर किये थे, इस वास्ते प्रधान मंत्री ही स्वयं इस बहस का उत्तर दें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** हस्ताक्षर तो किये थे, यह ठीक है, लेकिन सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह वहाँ थे इस वास्ते....

**श्री हुकूम खन्ड कज़बाय:** सदन प्रधान मंत्री से ही उत्तर सुनना चाहता है।

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central):** Could it be conveyed to the Prime Minister that it is the desire of the House that on this very pre-eminently important matter, she should make a statement in the House? There is a qualitative character to a statement made by the Prime Minister in the House rather than in some meeting somewhere outside the House. It is very important that she makes a statement in regard to the Tashkent Declaration. We have all respect for our friend, Shri Swaran Singh, but we do desire that the Prime Minister should make a statement in the House on this question.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is for Government. This wish of the House should be conveyed to the Prime Minister.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर):** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि ताशकंद समझौता कोई कम महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है। अगर प्रधान मंत्री के उत्तराधिकारी ने इस बहस को शुरू नहीं किया तो उचित यह है कि वह या तो बहस का जबाब देती या बहस में इंटरवीन करतीं। अब जब कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी बहस का उत्तर दे रहे हैं तो वह हाउस में हाज़िर भी नहीं हैं। क्या उनकी दृष्टि में ताशकंद समझौते का किसी प्रकार कोई महत्व ही नहीं है? इस बारे में उनको अपना उत्तरदायित्व निभाने को कहा जाना चाहिये।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** आपने जो कहा है वह महत्वपूर्ण है। मैं आपके साथ इत्तिफाक करता हूँ। आप की बात उन तक पहुँचा दी जायेगी। लेकिन क्या मैं अब मिनिस्टर साहब को कह दूँ कि वह अपना जबाब नहीं दे सकते हैं?

**श्री हुकूम खन्ड कज़बाय:** आप कह सकते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जबाब दें हम उनसे जबाब सुनना चाहते हैं।

श्री राधसेवक यादव : आप सदन की यह इच्छा उन तक जवाब के बाद पहुंचायेंगे तो उसका कोई मतलब नहीं रह जायेगा। जवाब से पहले पहुंचा दें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

संसद्-कार्य तथा संचार मंत्री (श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह): उनकी गैरहाजिरी का सवाल उठाया गया है। आपको मालूम ही है कि वह यहां बैठी हुई थीं। साढ़े बारह बजे उनको स्टेटमेंट करना था। हंगरी के प्रधान मंत्री आये हुये हैं। उनके साथ लंच का समय उनका भिन्न हो चुका था। सोचा यह गया था कि साढ़े बारह बजे तक यहां का काम खत्म हो जायेगा। लेकिन कई बार हाउस अन-प्रिडिक्टबल हो जाता है और चलता रहता है। चलते चलते सभा बज गया और उन्होंने आप से भी इसके बारे में दर-स्वाम्त की है। इस लिये वह गैर हाजिर हैं।

श्री हुसैन चम्ह कझुबाय : एक बंटे के बाद जवाब दिल्वा दें। हम उनसे जवाब सुनना चाहते हैं। जब वह घर आयें तब जवाब दिल्वा दें।

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore):** When does the debate on the President's Address begin?

**Mr. Speaker:** Immediately after this.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** May we request that at least then the Prime Minister should be in 'the House'?

**Mr. Speaker:** By that time, she would come—I suppose.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Suppose!

**Mr. Speaker:** I can only suppose.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** You can direct the Leader.

**The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh):** Mr. Speaker,

Sir, I am grateful to hon. Members who, while participating in this debate, lent massive support to the Tashkent Declaration. I am very happy that this support came not only from hon. Members belonging to this side of the House but several hon. Members from the Opposition Benches also supported the Tashkent Declaration, and have given on many occasions more reasons and arguments in favour of acceptance of the Declaration by the country. This expresses the determination of our people to treat this as a non-party issue, as a national issue.

My task in replying has been greatly lightened. It is very much easier as several hon. Members who have already participated and have lent their support to the Tashkent Declaration have given various arguments and reasons to remove some of the doubts that had been raised by those hon. Members who criticised the Declaration. I will not, therefore, be long in my reply. I will try to confine myself to meeting some of the specific points that have been raised by hon. Members who criticised the Declaration.

At this stage, I would like to say that a desire has been expressed by hon. Members that the Prime Minister should also make some statement on the Tashkent Declaration in the House. I am sure that this request, this wish that has been expressed on the floor of the House, will be conveyed to the Prime Minister, and in her intervention in the debate on the President's Address, she can include her own statement on the Declaration.

श्री मधु लिवडे (मुंजर): प्रस्ताव पार पास होगा और वह बाद में बोलेंगी? क्या यह जयपुर वाली परंपरा आप यहां भी चलाना चाहते हैं? लोक सभा को क्या जयपुर बना रहे हैं?

श्री चन्द्रमणी लाल चौधरी (महुम्रा):  
जयपुर का स्टैंडर्ड आप से बहुत ऊंचा  
था।

श्री रामसेवक बाबू : अध्यक्ष  
महोदय, यह जो उन्होंने कहा है कि  
जयपुर का स्टैंडर्ड लोक सभा से बहुत  
ऊंचा था यह इस सदन का बोर अपमान  
है।

श्री चन्द्रमणी लाल चौधरी : लोक सभा  
से मैंने उसको कम्पेयर नहीं किया है।  
आपके स्टैंडर्ड से किया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अपनी अपनी जगह  
सभी ऊंचे होंगे। लेकिन हमारे लिये  
यह उस से ऊंचा है, सब से ऊंचा है।

Shri Swaran Singh: The question  
of withdrawals of armed personnel  
from Haji Pir, Tithwal and Kargil  
has come up for comments; it has also  
been criticised by certain hon. Mem-  
bers. The question of infiltrators has  
also been mentioned. As a matter of  
fact, these two points are inter-  
connected, and I would like to say  
something on these two points  
together. We have first to see the  
objective that we had before us when  
the Indian armed forces moved to  
Kargil, to Tithwal and to Haji Pir.  
It is very important, because we were  
facing aggression, and this massive  
aggression originated in the form of  
a large number of armed personnel  
crossing over to that part of Jammu  
and Kashmir which is in the actual  
possession and control, administrative  
and the rest, of the Government of  
India.

When we took up this matter with  
the Pakistan Government and point-  
ed out to them the serious situation  
created by these armed infiltrators  
coming across into Indian territory,  
the Government of Pakistan did not  
accept and responsibility. It then  
became necessary for us to take  
defensive measures to check infiltra-  
tion, because the responsibility in this

respect was not accepted by the Gov-  
ernment of Pakistan. It was in that  
context that the Indian armed forces  
moved into these two passes, Tithwal  
and Haji Pir; and we moved into  
Kargil because our line of communi-  
cation to the Ladakh area was under  
constant threat by the sniping and  
other provocative acts which were  
indulged in by the Pakistan forces.  
These were the objectives before us  
when we moved to these passes.

We have now to see whether, when  
we agreed to withdraw, our objective  
had not been realised, whether the  
reason for which we moved to these  
passes still persisted at the time we  
agreed to this withdrawal. We gave  
very careful consideration to the  
various aspects. This was a very  
serious matter, and we attached a  
very great deal of importance to it;  
it was necessary for us to give the  
most careful consideration to the  
implications of the step that we were  
taking in agreeing to the withdrawal  
from these areas.

As I said when I initiated this  
debate, three conditions were agreed  
to by Pakistan. Firstly, both coun-  
tries agreed that the use of force  
would be abjured in the settlement of  
any dispute; secondly, that cease-fire  
terms on the cease-fire line would be  
adhered to and respected by the two  
parties; and thirdly that there would  
be non-interference in each other's  
internal affairs. Even one of these  
considerations or conditions is enough  
to correct the mischief that can be  
created by the movement of infiltra-  
tors.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—  
Anglo-Indians): Question.

Shri Swaran Singh: Let me finish.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You  
need not finish. He can question.

Shri Swaran Singh: Sending armed  
infiltrators, for instance, is obviously  
use of force, and if both parties agree  
that force will not be used for the  
enforcement of any claim or the

[Shri Swaran Singh]

settlement of any dispute, obviously they cannot say that they will send these infiltrators in the exercise of their right to enforce a claim or to settle a dispute. It is quite another thing, a separate issue to which I will come, as to whether they will respect this or not, but my point is: is the sending of infiltrators protected or can it be resorted to by any loophole that is there in the agreement? My contention is that we should keep these two things separate, the interpretation of the agreements, and then other party's intentions or the question whether they will respect the terms of the agreement or not. At this stage, I am on this question whether the agreement itself covers armed infiltrators or whether, notwithstanding the terms of this agreement, and even if they are adhered to, they can make out a case that they can send infiltrators.

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** They have already made out a case.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** They have not.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Yes, they have.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I know what you mean to say. That is no new point, you know fully well. Pakistan has at no stage said that they have got the right to send infiltrators. All along they have denied having sent infiltrators, and even now they do not say that they have the right to send infiltrators. That is an important point.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Pakistan has not accepted the argument that Kashmir is an internal matter. President Ayub and Mr. Bhutto have made it clear.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** He has jumped on to the second issue. I am saying that one of the first conditions of the agreement is not to use force, and sending armed infiltrators is use of force. That is what I am trying to contend. It is quite clear that even

Pakistan has not said that they are entitled to send infiltrators or to use force even if Kashmir is not an internal matter of India. We do not accept Pakistan's contention that Jammu and Kashmir is not an integral part of India, and any interference by sending infiltrators, even by whipping up agitations there or trying to support those who are not accepting the writ of the local government there, is very much interference. We do not accept their interpretation of Jammu and Kashmir not being an internal problem or an internal responsibility of the Government of India.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Kashmir is an integral part of India. Then why did they discuss Kashmir at Tashkent.

**Shri Bada (Khargone):** We want your guidance. The hon. Minister is repeating the same argument which he advanced in the beginning. Mr. Anthony has pointed out that though Pakistan is not owning responsibility for the infiltrators, they are still there. So, what is the reply to that?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** If the hon. Member waits, he will get the reply.

**Mr. Speaker:** After hearing him, my guidance is that he will kindly resume his seat and for some time listen patiently.

**Shri Hem Barua:** My submission is this. We have been saying that Kashmir is an integral part of India, and we have been saying that very rightly. Then I do not understand why Kashmir was discussed at Tashkent. If it is an integral part, we do not discuss it with anybody, anywhere.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** That is a separate issue about which I will have to say something, but at the present stage . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** If the Minister does not yield, the hon. Members should exercise patience and listen to him.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** The important point that I was mentioning at this stage was that this question of infiltrators and their being sent is covered by this condition which has been agreed upon between the two sides. I need not repeat it.

The second point that has been mentioned is that they do not accept Jammu and Kashmir as the internal problem of India, and therefore there may be a loophole for sending infiltrators. My reply to this is two-fold. Firstly, it is our interpretation, it is our very firm stand, that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India, and that its sovereignty is not negotiable. In these circumstances, any unilateral interpretation . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : यह बात स्पष्ट हो जानी चाहिये । आप कच्छ के बारे में भी इसी तरह कहते रहे कि यह विवादग्रस्त नहीं है लेकिन आप ने उस को घात में कच्छ ट्राइब्यूनल के सामने भेजा ।

**Shri Swaran Singh:** We do not accept this interpretation that they have got the right to interfere in this. So far as the question of armed infiltrators is concerned, whatever may be their position with regard to Jammu and Kashmir, even if they are keeping up a dispute on that issue, which we do not accept—we clearly say that there is no dispute—even then I contend that the clause relating to non-use of force covers this completely and any step that they take to interfere with the established administration on our side of the cease fire line is a clear violation of the Tashkent declaration. It is therefore something about which we need not have any doubt in our minds. Prof. Hem Barua says: if it is an internal matter why was it discussed? It is very clear in the Tashkent declaration it is not left in doubt. I would recall that Prime Minister Shastri had on more than one occasion made the position clear in this House: 'I am not going to discuss Kashmir.'

**Shri Hem Barua:** He discussed it.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** He had also said: if the other party says that it wants to discuss Kashmir or they want to raise some point, all that I have to do is to state clearly that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India; that is the position to which he said India would steadfastly adhere. In this context, at the meetings in Tashkent between our late Prime Minister and President Ayub Khan, it is a fact that President Ayub did raise the question of Kashmir.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** What did he say? What did he claim?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Our late Prime Minister made a clear and categorical statement that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and that is the position to which he strongly adhered; we are not going to alter that position. As to what President Ayub said, or their Foreign Minister said, it is well-known; they say from time to time that the people of that area should be permitted to express their desire about their future. If in reply to that we categorically reject any such claims and reiterate our stand on Jammu and Kashmir, it is not discussing the question of Kashmir: it is only a reiteration of the position, and that fact, Mr. Speaker, is clearly enunciated in the declaration. The declaration says that the two sides reiterated their position. Prof. Hem Barua is hurling the declaration at us. We went through every word of it. Shri Dwivedy raised a point that the position and manners in which this sentence is used perhaps might cast some cloud on our assertion. That is not at all correct. Article I says that the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agree that both sides will exert all efforts to create good neighbourliness between India and Pakistan in accordance with UN charter. That is unexceptionable. They reaffirm their obligation under the charter

[Shri Swaran Singh]

not to have recourse to force but to settle their disputes through peaceful means. I would very strongly urge that this is a very clear and categorical reaffirmation of the obligation not to use force. This should not be lightly dismissed; it is a clear affirmation of their obligation. They considered that the interests of peace in the region, particularly in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent and indeed the interests of the people of India and Pakistan, were not served by the continuance of tension between the two countries. They also said that our attitude should be to develop good neighbourly relations, to discontinue tension. It was in this context and against this background that Jammu and Kashmir was discussed and each side set forth its respective position. I have already said what our position was: namely, that it is an integral part of India. The other party said that they have got their own claim. They agreed to disagree on this issue. To bring about good neighbourly relations, it was said there were other matters which should be attended to and the rest of the declaration proceeds to mention some of the other matters. The mention of this background against which Jammu and Kashmir was discussed is a point which brings out our clear statement and position on Jammu and Kashmir. I would also like to mention that in the course of my talks with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and his colleagues, talks during which on our side my colleague Shri Chavan and other members of the delegation were present, I reiterated our position and our stand on Jammu and Kashmir in unmistakable terms.

Some hon. Members here and some outside had mentioned that the country should be told as to what was talked between the two sides. I would like to clarify the position.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Tyagi was not told perhaps.

Shri Swaran Singh: There are a large number of others. The Indian position on Jammu and Kashmir was not whittled down in the slightest; we reiterated in clear and unmistakable terms our stand, and Pakistan is in no doubt about our stand.

Shri Tyagi: Very good.

Shri Swaran Singh: No newspaper, no critic or supporter of the Tashkent declaration from Pakistan has ever asserted that India has deviated from its stand on Jammu and Kashmir. On an issue on which even Pakistan does not claim that we have changed our stand on Jammu and Kashmir, it is not wise or in our national interest to continue to agitate these points and unnecessarily to create doubts even when the other party is in no doubt.

I do not want to go into the whole history of how this wave of infiltration started and how we took preventive action by moving into some of the passes and how vigorously our security forces took very stern and effective measures to deal with the infiltrators who were operating in Jammu and Kashmir territory. (Interruptions.)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Rather late.

श्री मधु लिख्ये : कितने पकड़े ?  
कितने मारे गए ?

Shri Swaran Singh: There cannot be a running commentary.

श्री मधु लिख्ये : चाप हमारी बंकाओं का समाधान कीजिए । हम जानना चाहते हैं कि जम्मू और काश्मीर में कितने घुसपैठियों को पकड़ा, कितनों को मारा ? हमारे प्रश्नों का वह उत्तर दें ।

श्रीमन्त शहीदय्य : कोई जरूरी नहीं है । चाप उनकी स्पीच सुनिए ।

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I cannot reply to all questions in one breath. If I attempt to answer one argument and the hon. Member feels it is inconvenient, then he goes to something else; that is not fair.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्नोत्री श्री ने कहा . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइए ।  
मंत्री जो ईश्वर नहीं कर रहे हैं । . .  
(अपवधान) . . . वह शब्द जवाब नहीं दे सकते ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अगर जवाब नहीं दे सकते तो मतलब क्या है उनके जवाब देने का ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय अब आप बैठ जाइए ।

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf** (Jammu and Kashmir): My submission is: let the hon. Minister speak and let us know what he says. Later on, we can put questions. This sort of heckling will not do.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not promising whether I would allow questions or not.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** The infiltrators who had crossed over were being dealt with and our security forces and our police made a very thorough job of it. If ultimately we were able to control the situation it was due to the effective steps that were taken by the security forces. I would also like to add that the government of Jammu and Kashmir and, if I may add, the people there, acted very strongly and they fully cooperated with these steps taken by the authorities in dealing with the infiltrators. It was this support given to us, the lack of the response which mistakenly Pakistan thought they would get from the people, which was mainly responsible for thwarting the designs of the infiltrators.

We are grateful to the people who gave information to the local authorities. We had a large number of non-officials who traced the movement of these people and supplied information to the authorities which ultimately led to the mopping up operations and in providing the necessary security to the areas and to the targets which unfortunately had been aimed at by the infiltrators.

I would also like to add that after the cease fire operations, although Pakistan did continue to keep this posture that they had never sent these infiltrators, and continued to disown their responsibility, we have definite information that they called upon these people, who had been sent across, to return to that area. We had definite information on that score, and a large bulk of the people actually crossed over into the other territory. (Interruption). Our security forces also have been stepping up their efforts, which continued after the cease fire, because our Prime Minister had made it absolutely clear that any cease fire agreement that is arrived at or any cease fire arrangement that is accepted does not mean that our efforts to deal with the infiltrators or to deal with them effectively would in anyway be influenced by the cease fire. We made the position clear that this is an internal, law and order matter, and we had to function effectively. It was the combined effect of these two things; the continuous drive by our security and armed forces, the civilians and the civilian government—all this combined effort put so much pressure on them and they found, particularly after the cease fire, that there was no point in their staying on. A large number were actually thrown out and pushed back into the other territory. We have definite information about the order which was available with us when they sent across these infiltrators, through a variety of sources, that after the cease fire, particularly—

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): Is it your case that there are no infiltrators inside Kashmir now?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I am coming to that. Out of the total number of infiltrators, who were in thousands, a good bulk has been thrown back. A large number of them were killed; some of them were also arrested. The number that might be left there might be very, very small. It is very difficult for me to give any number, but it cannot be more than a few odds and ends, say, half a dozen or 10 people in one remote area or the other. I have not got the census or the list. If we knew the exact number, we would get hold of them or kill them or shoot them, those who come here without any authority. But the point is, the Pakistan Government, naturally from the very beginning, had taken the attitude that they are not concerned with these, that they have not sent them; we have information that they had done so and they had sent across these people. We had information that they were receiving messages and we intercepted some of those messages, and it was on that basis that we kept the country and this House fully informed about their activity; that they were sent across and they were supported. We had also information—we had definite information—that they were withdrawn after the cease fire. So, this was a combined effect of the two-pronged operation, pressure by us, by our security forces, and also their attitude that they wanted to withdraw.

In a matter like this, we have to see the results and need not insist on a public statement that they have withdrawn. I am sure that even on this statement of mine they might say, "No; we never sent anyone; we have not withdrawn anyone." They may say, as in their earlier statement, that "We have not sent any man even in the initial stages." So, we have to look to the situation on the ground and view it realistically,

and realise that in future, these conditions are accepted: that non-use of force is accepted; non-interference in one's internal affairs is accepted; and that observance of the cease fire terms on the cease fire line is accepted. For after that sending in armed personnel across the cease fire line is a clear violation of the cease fire terms and the cease fire line. So, in actual fact also, based upon this agreement that they have entered upon, we were fully satisfied that the question of infiltrators is not likely to arise hereafter, and it is covered by the agreement. It was thereafter that we agreed in respect of Haji Pir and Tithwal the passage through which we had moved in order to check further infiltration.

**Shri Nath Pal** (Rajapur): Now that you have covered this point—I have been listening very patiently—may I put one question? How would you say that they disown, when they sent them? They now disown that they have issued orders to withdraw them. I ask you very simply; it has been annoying every Indian. Ultimately, again, they will send them and when the time has come to disown, they may say "we have not sent them"! What is your protection against this kind of perfidy?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** It is a separate issue and I will answer it. We are clear that if the terms of the agreement are adhered to, then, the question of sending infiltrators does not arise. It is a very pertinent question and a practical question, that if they do not adhere to the obligations that they have undertaken, then what is our guarantee? It is a very pertinent question. But the answer to this is the same as with all the other agreements that have been entered into between two countries. In a matter like this, if we start with this attitude that any agreement that is entered into is not likely to be adhered to that they will find some excuses to go back upon the agreement, then, the reply is that we know how to deal with the situation. Then a

new situation develops altogether. The agreement is clear. If they do not adhere to it, if they go behind the agreement and do not faithfully carry out their obligations under it but surreptitiously take resort to something else, then it is a clear violation of the agreement; then a situation arises, and we will take the sternest measure to meet the situation, and of that we have never made any secret. I would beg of this House to see that the agreement is very clear, and that the ultimate protection in this case is provided by the agreement and by their adherence to this agreement. If the agreement is not adhered to, what follows depends upon our capacity to deal with the situation. Many of our foreign friends, sympathetic friends, have many times mentioned to us that a country of 45 crores or 48 crores of people hardly needs to go to the international community to say that this is a nuisance by the infiltrators. But there should be some solemn agreement on their part that they will never send infiltrators. They have admitted their responsibility; though it is not in these clear words, if the terms are adhered to, it is covered. If they do not observe these terms then it is a situation where our strength and our capacity to deal with them will be the real guarantee. That is something which we have not to lose sight of.

13. 48 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

**Shri Hem Barua:** Clause III of the Tashkent Agreement says that "relations between India and Pakistan shall be based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Hem Barua:** My submission is Pakistan has not accepted this.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Bade:** He is bringing forward a point to the attention of the

Minister; it is a very important question.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister is not yielding. I cannot allow questions to go on like this.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I do not know why hon. Members are repeating the points again and again. I have attempted to clarify these points.

श्री मधु लिम्बे: पठानिस्तान के बारे में क्या स्थिति है ?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Bade:** Such intervention is right on the part of the hon. Member; he has the right to put a question. It is a pertinent question and it is for the Minister to reply to it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister is not yielding. Order, order.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Sending infiltrators is a clear interference in our internal affairs. Even if they unilaterally do not accept it, it cannot be an explanation of the declaration terms. Thirdly, this is a contravention of the cease fire terms. Sending in armed personnel across the cease fire line is contravention of the cease fire terms.

The other broad political issue which Mr. Nath Pai raised is vital. In fact, that is the most important issue which cuts across any words that might be used: What is the ultimate guarantee in these cases? For that the reply is, we have to depend upon our strength and we have to tell the world, as they have told us on many occasions, if the infiltrators come, notwithstanding this agreement, the answer is, shoot them; hang them in the passes. That will be the biggest deterrent. Even on this occasion, although they started in a surreptitious manner, although it caused some worry to us, the way we dealt with this problem effectively is the biggest guarantee that they will not try again. What have

[Shri Swaran Singh]

they gained by this, except that they have lost hundreds of people and they had to eat their words? When Pakistan embarked upon this misadventure, they had all types of flameboyant statements to make: "We are doing this with this object or that object". It is not for me to remind the Pakistani leaders, but without introducing any element of criticism of their earlier statements on this issue, I would certainly ask, whereas Pakistan had embarked upon this to realise certain objectives, viz., to get a solution of the Jammu and Kashmir problem which they thought fits in with their pattern, have they succeeded? No; they have not.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It was a dismal failure.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Regarding the sending of infiltrators, we dealt with that problem effectively.

**श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) :**  
राजस्थान में अब भी जानवर उठाए जा रहे हैं ।

**श्री मधु लिंगये :** क्या मंत्री महोदय वठानिस्तान के बारे में कुछ कहेंगे ?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** The terms of the agreement are such that any action of that nature will be covered. Will they do it again? If they adhere to the terms of the agreement, they would not do it. But if they do not adhere to the terms of the agreement, a new situation arises, which the country will have to deal with, with all determination. I am sure that the full support of this House and of the country will be with any steps that are taken to deal with that situation.

Furthermore, the date 5th August is important, because it was on 5th August that this infiltration started. Withdrawal of all armed personnel to positions which obtained prior to

5th August definitely covers the infiltrators also.

Another point which has been mentioned is that it appears as if some pressure was exercised on the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. I am very sorry that any such suggestion directly or indirectly was made.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :** श्री शास्त्री से ज्यादा आप दोनों—आप और श्री चव्हाण—इस स्थिति के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं ।

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Myself and Mr. Chavan were in constant touch with the late Prime Minister. It has become a fashion with Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri to make these statements in a very light-hearted manner.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :** सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह के लिए यह फैशन हो गया है कि राष्ट्रीय बाने में साम्प्रदायिकता को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाये ।

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I would appeal to him that he should take these things, a little more seriously. To say that anyone, either I or anybody else should be responsible for creating such a situation is a most unkind statement to be made by anyone who has the least sense of responsibility. (Interruptions). I do not give in. There should be an end to this sort of thing. That Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri, who all the time raises these highly controversial and communal issues, trying to give a communal tinge to all these matters, was the real protector of the conscience of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is something which we will not accept. It must be clearly understood. This is very unfair and wrong; this is hitting below the belt which we will never accept.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :** अगर कंजी महोदय अपनी रेखासोबिनिटी को निवाहें

श्री श्री शास्त्री कभी भी इस समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर न करते ।

श्री बड़े : इसमें कम्युनल का सवाल कहाँ है ?

श्री अखिलेश्वरी शास्त्री : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आप बुरी व्यक्तिगत स्पष्टीकरण का मौखिक इतिहास । विवेक मंत्रों (मतबयामी कर रहे हैं । आप उनको कहिए कि उन्होंने जो "कम्युनल" शब्द का प्रयोग किया है, वह उस को वापस लें ।

श्री अशु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय इसमें साम्प्रदायिकता की बात क्यों ला रहे हैं ? माननीय सदस्य ने श्री अखिलेश्वरी और मंत्री महोदय के बारे में कहा है ।

श्री हुकम शब्द कछवाय : मंत्री महोदय इस बात का जवाब क्यों नहीं देते कि दबाव डाल कर इस समझौते पर शास्त्री जी के हस्ताक्षर कराए गए ।

श्री बड़े : मंत्री महोदय "कम्युनल" शब्द को वापस लें ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I will not take back a single word, because I never lose temper, even if I speak at a high pitch. I will not give in. This is very unfair that any idea should be created in the mind of any citizen of India that our delegation, who were doing a very difficult task, trying to discharge the very onerous responsibility which this House and the country had cast on us, acted in any manner otherwise than in the best interests of the country. You may say our judgment was not correct; I can accept that and try to answer that. But I would humbly appeal to the hon. member in all earnestness that to insinuate things of the nature that have been insinuated is something which should not be attempted, because this really pains and annoys us very much. Some of us were so much attached to the late Prime Minister, attained per-

sonally, apart from his being the outstanding leader of the country. Any such remarks as have been made due really not fair and proper and I would very strongly urge and appeal that this effort should be given up once for all. This type of special solicitedness to one or the other members of the government, a pastime which the hon. member and others sometimes attempt, should be given up, because we are one in this respect and any attempt of this nature is absolutely uncalled for.

श्री अशु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय यह कहें कि वे सब एक दिल से काम कर रहे थे, लेकिन इसमें साम्प्रदायिकता का सवाल कहाँ है ?

Shri Swaran Singh: About the alleged pressure, those of us who were in touch with Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri can say that the actual volume of his work, the actual physical pressure, in those days was much less compared to the work he used to do in India where his responsibilities were so great, meeting a large number of persons from all sections of the House and leaders of various political parties, apart from his administrative work. But in Tashkent, we had gone for a special purpose. Myself, my colleagues and even the Press people who were there at Tashkent, everyone knows that, judged in terms of sheer volume of work, it was much less compared to his normal routine in Delhi.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Even you fell ill.

Shri Swaran Singh: Regarding the second point whether the functioning of the Soviet leaders and the Soviet delegation was such as to create the slightest feeling in our mind that they were trying to sell any particular idea, I would like to say categorically that the attitude of the Soviet leader in this respect was one of full understanding of our position. Even before going to Tashkent, I had paid a visit to Moscow and had long talks with the Chairman of the Council of Minis-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

ters, Mr. Kosygin and also with their Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko. I had explained in full detail our stand on the various issues that were likely to come up during the Tashkent talks. Our stand on all these issues was fully known to the Soviet leaders. There was a great deal of understanding and they were quite objective. It would be absolutely wrong to suggest that they exercised any pressure directly or indirectly. It would be wrong on our part to suggest anything of that nature.

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय यह कहें कि उन्होंने स्वेच्छा से देश-हित का सौदा किया है ।

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I would like to reiterate the expression of our gratitude to the Soviet leaders for all the understanding that they showed. If you look at the circumstances, what could be the pressure? I fail to understand. Mr. Shastri had gone to Tashkent as a great hero. He had the will and support of the entire country with him. Our army was standing on the outskirts of Sialkot and Lahore and we were occupying strategic passes. In the Security Council this matter has been agitated and we demonstrated very clearly that India will not brook any interference—we know what our case is and we will adhere to it steadfastly. So, what was the circumstantial pressure on him? Here was a person who was more or less in command of the situation. To suggest that there was any pressure either circumstantial or otherwise which impelled him to adopt this attitude is absolutely unjustified. There was only pressure on him in the sense that he saw what was in the best interests of the 800 million people of India and Pakistan. He, as a great leader, who could fight bravely the battles also knew that India's general attitude of peace is also something which re-

quires all possible support and nursing. Therefore, if he acted in the interest of peace, when he was in that strong position, when he had this support you cannot say there was any pressure of any kind, direct or indirect, on him. He acted in a very brave manner in reversing past unhappy trends by signing the agreement, in a sincere effort to reverse the trends without yielding on any essential matters. Therefore, I would like very categorically and clearly to reiterate that there is no question of any pressure either factual or circumstantial. He knew what he was doing, and he did it as a great gesture, with great strength, and it is for us really to honour that.

14 hrs.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Now that you have finished that point.....

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Let me finish, and then I will be prepared to answer one or two questions.

श्री मधु लिमये : पञ्चुनिस्तान के बारे में भी कुछ कहिए ।

**Shri Swaran Singh:** The Indian objective, when we had to face this armed conflict, was to repel aggression. That objective had been fully realised. We successfully met this aggression on the ground and also in signing this agreement.

Now, some test of this can be the reactions of other countries. This is one of those rare agreements which has been welcomed by all countries excepting one, our northern neighbour, China, or some critics on the other side. It is very interesting to see how the Chinese leaders look at it. Even their reaction was not very spontaneous to start with. They started building up their attitude and they took some weeks before they

actually gave out what was in their heart of hearts with regard to this. Apart from their hostility to India, about which we know, the House knows and the country knows—it is not that aspect that I want to put forward so much at this stage—unfortunately, China is one country which continues to hold that this doctrine of peaceful co-existence or the efficacy of peaceful means for resolving disputes is not good. All these are doctrines which, unfortunately, are not accepted by China. They saw in the Tashkent Declaration a clear vindication of these two very important principles of international behaviour, namely, the importance and the efficacy of peaceful co-existence and the determination to solve disputes by peaceful means. On both these grounds the official Chinese reaction is against this Declaration. They say the Soviet Union wants to demonstrate that, by bringing India and Pakistan together, and by asking them to abjure the use of force for the settlement of any dispute, notwithstanding differences they can co-exist and they can persevere in a patient manner to resolve their differences—the very doctrine which China is out to destroy. This is precisely their comment in their official newspapers. They say, by doing this the Soviet Union wanted to demonstrate that peaceful co-existence is possible and that settlement of disputes by peaceful means is also possible. As you know, the Chinese believe in the inevitability of war. They steadfastly hold this view that nothing can be resolved except through violence and resort to force. That is a doctrine which we have never accepted, which the rest of the world does not accept, and I would very humbly but very strongly place this aspect, not in any spirit of animosity against China because that relates to a matter which we can square—to have got our problem—but let us take it at a higher level:—their adherence to these doctrines of the inevitability of war—this Declaration is a clear blow to their doctrine. For that rea-

son also, this is a vindication of the general code of behaviour which the international community has embarked upon and is going assiduously to follow.

I would, before, ending, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, earnestly appeal, now that we have had the debate, now that we have had our full say on this issue, let us now hereafter bring about a general support for this in our country so that the unfortunate trends of deteriorating relations, continuous friction and continuous tension might be reversed (*interruption*). I know that the process is difficult. I know that there may be difficulties which may be created by statements from the other side, maybe that there may also be some difficulties on our side. But I would appeal that this Declaration is something worth working for; war and armed conflict is to be resorted to only if necessary in order to safeguard our security and integrity, but if peace can be restored by peaceful means and peaceful approaches, howsoever impracticable these efforts may appear to resolve all differences, it is something which is worth trying, and it is in that spirit that we should view this Tashkent Declaration.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry, I cannot allow any questions.

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, I would like to say that I oppose all amendments, but I accept the amendment which has been moved by Shri K. C. Pant.

Shri Nath Pal: Sir, he promised to answer my question after he had finished.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing any questions.

Some hon. Members: He had promised to answer our questions.

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र कडवाय : हम प्रधान  
मंत्री जी से जवाब चाहते हैं ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am sorry. We had a full-fledged debate. We have already exceeded the time by an hour.

**Shri Surendramath Dwivedy:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this is something unusual. When the Minister was speaking some hon. Members wanted to put questions. Because he did not yield he said he would answer the questions in the end.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He might have said. I am sorry I cannot allow that.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would suggest that one question from each party may be allowed.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then I will have to find time for eight questions.

**An hon. Member:** This is an important matter.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will allow the opposing parties to ask one question each.

**Shri Tyagi:** There cannot be any criticism now, they can only ask for some clarification.

**Shri Hart Vishva Kamath:** How can he put an embargo like that? He has resigned. Let him go back to the Treasury Benches.

श्री जयु लिखत : वह तो बोलना नहीं चाहते ।

**Shri Nath Pal:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I very much thank you and, particularly, the Leader of the House for agreeing not to curtail a well established right of the House to ask for clarifications. May I know of the Minister of External Affairs—he laboured the point and took great pains and efforts to dispel the doubts in some quarters that Shri Shastri acted under pressure, that his arm was twisted; we do not wish to say

who did it, we do not want to make any insinuation; so far as the Soviet Union is concerned it has genuine interest in peace which we also appreciate.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is your question?

**Shri Nath Pal:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is not good to go on pushing like that. With you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in particular, I want to make this plea that the observance of decorum is a universally accepted responsibility which applies to Members and those who occupy the Chair also. It is not that you can go on interrupting a Member who is seriously asking a question.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Please ask your question.

**Shri Nath Pal:** If you will allow me to complete, I will. You are not allowing me. You are interrupting in the middle of my sentence.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Please put your question now.

**Shri Nath Pal:** I want to ask the Minister of External Affairs because he has repeatedly said that there was no pressure. Will he please tell us how a man like Shri Shastri, who prided himself on his pledged word, who told us—Shri Frank Anthony, Shri Surendramath Dwivedy, Shri Karni Singhji and myself:

कलर दुनिया भी हमारे खिलाफ जाए तो हम हाथीपीर घोर स्थिरता नहीं छोड़ेंगे ।  
“Come what may, we shall not give in”—how did a man of that honesty, that integrity, that unimpeachable faith in his own pledged word, retract his promise given so solemnly on so vital a issue? If it was not on some pressure, what made him go back on this very solemn promise so repeatedly given to us? Would the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to

tell us this?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Other questions might also be asked. I will answer them together.

**Some hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** All right, I will answer this question first. The statements made by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri have been quoted by many hon. Members, including Shri Dwivedy. I did not want to take the time of the House by referring to it. The hon. Member has read out only the first paragraph of that statement. Perhaps, he did not think it necessary to read out his following words. This is what Shri Shastri has said after the portion read out by Shri Dwivedy:

"Once Pakistan generally embarks on the path of peace, the Government and the people of India will be ready to reciprocate."

Once Pakistan reverted to the path of peace, gave assurance of their acceptance of the obligation not to use force and agreed to other things, India reciprocated in a befitting manner and then withdrew those forces from the points up to which they had moved with a particular objective. Once that objective was realised, there was no point in sticking to the points they had occupied.

**Shri Bade:** Shri Dwivedy and so many other hon. Members read out extracts from the speeches of President Ayub Khan. Shri Bhutto and the Pakistan Foreign Secretary, Shri Aziz Ahmad after the signing of the Tashkent Agreement. On the very day after the Tashkent Agreement was concluded, the Pakistan Foreign Minister said that armed personnel did not include infiltrators. On the 13th and 14th Mr. Ayub Khan and Mr. Bhutto said that Kashmir is a disputed territory. Have our Government written to Pakistan that those speeches have created a cloud

of doubt and suspicions about their intentions?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** There is no question or doubt to dispel regarding infiltrators. I have dealt with that problem at great length. It is our clear case that the conditions which have been accepted by the two countries cover armed infiltrators and if they adhere to this agreement they cannot send armed infiltrators. That is the answer.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Next question. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

**Shri Bade:** On the 13th and 14th they have said that Kashmir is a disputed territory and it is not an integral part of India. Have we written to them about that?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has answered that question. Now Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

**Shri Bade:** Sir, how can we work in this House if opportunities are not given to ask questions?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has asked the question and the answer has also come. If he wants some more information, he can take some other opportunity. He cannot go on interrupting like this.

**Shri Bade:** What is the use of putting a question when the reply is not forthcoming?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has given the answer.

**Shri Bade:** Not about the armed infiltrators.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Have you written to Pakistan in the matter?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I do not know why the hon. Member is worried about this. I have said so many times that when President Ayub Khan raised this question about Kashmir, we made our position categorically clear. I have said it here on a number of times. What is the point in

[Shri Swaran Singh]

writing to them? They know our position and they are not in doubt. Unfortunately, Shri Bade alone is in doubt. I will ask him to shed that doubt.

**Shri Bade:** The public is also in doubt.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :** पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति जनरल अय्यूब ने ताशकन्द से लौटने के बाद ईद के दिन अपने भाषण में स्पष्ट भाषा में काश्मीरियों को सम्बोधित करते हुए कहा था कि काश्मीरी अपनी आजादी की लड़ाई को जारी रखें और पाकिस्तान जिस तरह से अब तक उन को मदद देता रहा है उसी तरह से बराबर मदद देता रहेगा। अभी तक पाकिस्तान के मदद देने के तीन ढंग थे, हथियार देना, बृसपैटिये भोजना और काश्मीर में आन्तरिक विद्रोह भड़काना, या साम्प्रदायिक भावना को भड़काना। अगर पाकिस्तान हमारे अन्दरूनी मामले में फिर हस्तक्षेप उसी प्रकार करता है और ताशकन्द समझौते का उल्लंघन होता है तो क्या श्री कोसिजिन या दुनिया की कोई शक्ति बीच में धा कर पाकिस्तान को विवश करेंगे ताकि इस समझौते का उल्लंघन न हो सके? और अगर उस का उल्लंघन होगा तो वह उसे किस प्रकार से रोकेंगे ?

दूसरी बात यह, और अपने भाषण में भी मैंने इस बात को पूछा था, कि आप ने जो यह निश्चय किया है कि जम्मू और काश्मीर में सन् 1949 में सेना की जो संख्या थी उस सीमा तक कम करेंगे, तो क्या ताशकन्द के एग््रीमेंट के अतिरिक्त भी कोई एग््रीमेंट वहाँ हुआ है जिस के सम्बन्ध में आपने लिखित रूप से कुछ प्रकट नहीं किया है और अन्दर अन्दर ही जम्मू काश्मीर के कुछ भाग को धीरे धीरे देना स्वीकार कर लिया है ?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I would very strongly refute any such insinuation. I do not know what he gains by making this suggestion. For ins-

tance, what he asks is, is it a fact that we have decided slowly to hand over Jammu and Kashmir. It is an amazing sort of attitude which grips the hon. Member which we cannot understand. I want to say very clearly that apart from this Declaration, a copy of which has been placed on the Table of the House, and the explanation that has been given on behalf of the Government, there is no secret arrangement, no secret agreement, of any type and any such insinuation is completely unjustified. The other question was . . .

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He need answer only one question.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I do not want that to remain unanswered. He asked whether the sending of arms, armed infiltrators or carrying on provocative acts in the area of Jammu and Kashmir is allowed under the agreement. I say very clearly that all this is prohibited by the agreement and any departure in any direction will be a clear violation of the agreement.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :** ऐसा हुआ तो क्या कोसिजिन बीच में हस्तक्षेप करेंगे ?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** We should depend on our own strength and not look to any outside help, whether from the Soviet Union or USA or any other power. That is the attitude which we want Shri Prakash Vir Shastri to develop.

**Shri Tyagi:** The interpretation of the word "armed personnel" as given by U Thant and agreed to by us . . .

**Shri Indrajit Gupta** (Calcutta South West): Which party does he represent? You said that only opposition parties will be permitted to ask questions.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Not opposition parties.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** You said that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He opposes this Resolution.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** He is a dissident.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has resigned from the Cabinet on this issue.

**Shri Warior (Trichur):** He can come to our side.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** You can persuade him; I have no objection.

**Shri Tyagi:** The interpretation of the word "armed personnel", as given by U Thant, and agreed to by us, was armed personnel, whether in uniform or otherwise. Now, within three hours of the signing of this agreement at Tashkent, a representative of Pakistan addressed a press conference and said that the withdrawal of armed personnel did not include infiltrators and that Kashmir was a disputed territory. Was it only after signing the agreement that this interpretation was given by the representatives of Pakistan or even before the signing of the agreement they had insisted that they would not take responsibility for the infiltrators that had crossed the border? Did they make it clear before signing the agreement and after that clarified that they were not owning the infiltrators, thousands of them, now in our country? Did they say that they have agreed to withdraw only armed personnel in uniform and for the future Pakistan has undertaken not to send armed personnel of any kind, including infiltrators? In other words, does it according to them apply only to future infiltrators? That is to say, the infiltrators will be those whom they recognise as such and non-Pakistani infiltrators might still come, as they have come in the past.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Non-Pakistani infiltrators?

**Shri Tyagi:** Yes. Thousands of infiltrators have come to our country whom Pakistan have not claimed to

be their own people. So, I would call them "non-Pakistani infiltrators". Such people will continue to come because you have agreed to it. I want a clarification on this issue. Did they make it clear before signing the agreement that they will not own responsibility for the withdrawal of infiltrators already in India and that the withdrawal of armed personnel will not include infiltrators? Did they make it clear before signing the agreement?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I would appeal to hon. Members not to base their attitudes merely on press reports of certain statements. I have got conflicting press reports of the statements of their representatives. Even the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan in one of his statements, which is reported in press, is reported to have said that according to his interpretation all armed personnel whether in uniform or not will be considered armed personnel under the agreement.

**Shri Tyagi:** That is right.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** I do not want to repeat this but we should understand their attitude. They have never said that they have got the right to send infiltrators. Having sent infiltrators they disowned all responsibility. That has got nothing to do with the agreement.

**Shri Tyagi:** This is contradictory to what you said just now.

**Shri Swaran Singh:** That is a broader political issue.

**Shri Tyagi:** He has said that Pakistan does not own these infiltrators. Did they disown them before signing it or afterwards?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** It was never the suggestion of any Pakistani spokesman or representative in the course of talks that they have the right to send armed infiltrators. They never said that they had any right or authority to do that. Which representative of any government can say

[Shri Swaran Singh]

that they have got the right to send infiltrators?

Shri Tyagi: I am talking of withdrawal of armed personnel.

श्री मधु लिमये : 17 नवम्बर, 1965 को इस सदन में, लोक सभा में, विदेश मंत्री ने धारणासन दिया था कि खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां को हमने बुलाया है, वह यहां पर घाय्ले और उनके आने के पश्चात् पञ्जुनिस्तान का जो स्वाधीनता का संग्राम है उसमें हम मदद करने को तयार हैं, तो इस ताशकन्द करार की रोशनी में मेरा सवाल है कि क्या यह अपने बचन की पूर्ति करेंगे या जैसे कि हाजापीर या उड़ीपूँठ के बारे में जो होने वाला है उसी तरह से इसमें भी होने वाला है ?

उपाध्यक्ष महीशय : यह प्रलग बात है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रलग कैसे है ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has nothing to do with this.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं बताता हूँ कि कैसे है ? आप प्रगर सम्बन्ध नहीं देखते हैं तो मैं देखता हूँ । ताशकन्द करार में एक बात है कि अब्दुल्नी मामलों में हस्तक्षेप न किया जाए ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing this.

श्री मधु लिमये : ताशकन्द करार में एक बात है . . . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is about Pakhtoonistan.

श्री मधु लिमये : ताशकन्द के बारे में ही है । आपने शायद ताशकन्द करार पढ़ा नहीं है . . . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing this question. Please sit down.

श्री मधु लिमये : आपने ताशकन्द करार शायद पढ़ा नहीं है . . . ताशकन्द करार में कहा गया है कि अब्दुल्नी मामलों में हस्तक्षेप नहीं किया जाएगा तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या पञ्जुनिस्तान की आजादी की सहाई को वह सहायता करेंगे, या नहीं ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not allow this question. Order, order: I have disallowed this question.

श्री हुकन खन्ड कछवाय : आपने ताशकन्द करार पढ़ा है क्या ? . . . (व्यवधान) . . हम पूछना चाहते हैं आपने पढ़ा है क्या ?

श्री मधु लिमये : यह तो ताशकन्द से सम्बन्धित है और इसका जवाब आना चाहिए । कुछ पता नहीं है आपको उसके बारे में । . . .

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): Sir, I rise on a point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह दूसरा बचन भंग हो रहा है । मैं सदन के नेता से आपके माफ्त प्रपोल करता हूँ कि मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब मिले । बादशाह खा पुराने साथी हैं . . . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, after a question is not allowed by the Chair, should an hon. Member insist that his question must be put? If we persist in this, I think, that will be an end of parliamentary debate.

श्री वृ लिमये : यह ताशकन्द से सम्बन्धित है, यह मैं प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ . . . . .

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): How is it possible for the Opposition to keep patience? I would not agree with what he says—that is another matter.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He asked a question about Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. That is a separate question; that is not about this.

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** My point of order is . . .

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Please sit down.

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** Is it permissible for any hon. Member to ask a question addressed to the Chair whether or not the Chair has read a particular document or not? Is it not a reflection on the behaviour and authority of the Chair?

**श्री हुकूम चन्द कट्टाय :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, उसमें लिखा हुआ है घरेलू मामलों के संबंध में . . . . .

**श्री मधु लिनये :** मैंने कहा शायद आपने नहीं पढ़ा है ।

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** Is it permissible for an hon. Member . . .

**श्री हुकूम चन्द कट्टाय :** कौन से कथ में प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर उठा रहे हैं ?

**श्री मधु लिनये :** नियम कौन सा है ? नियम बताइए ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Under what rule?

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** First let me make my point of order. The rule relates to parliamentary practice.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** You have to indicate the rule that has been infringed.

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** Will you not allow me to make my point of order?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** You have to quote the rule.

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** Rule 349.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That has to be observed as much by you as by anybody else. Please sit down. Shri Maurya.

**श्री मौर्य (प्रसिद्ध) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय . . .

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** Please read sub-clause (v) of rule 349.

**श्री मधु लिनये :** क्या एक के बाद एक बता सकते हैं ? उन्होंने गलत नियम बताया है। आप उनको बठाइए । . . . (व्यवधान) यह क्या मजाक चल रहा है कार्य प्रक्रिया के साथ ? . . . . .

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Please sit down.

**Shri Maurya:** "The Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the House of the People".

यह देश का संविधान कहता है । ताशकंद के समझौते के पीछे भी बहुत से समझौते हुए हैं जैसा कि रफ़ा मंत्री ने यहां पर कहा क्योंकि पूजनीय लाल बहादूर शास्त्री जी के निधन के बाद यही दो महापुरुष हैं जो तमाम बातें जानते हैं और यही सदन को बता सकते हैं, तो इस कैबिनेट का एक सदस्य जब प्राग्दे में यह कहता है कि काश्मीर की समस्या; भारत और पाकिस्तान के भाईचारे के संबंध स्थापित करने के लिए जरूरी है कि काश्मीर का बटवारा हो जाए । तो क्या यह कौंसिल ऑफ़ मिनिस्टर्स, जो मंत्रालय है वह भी इसी बिचार धारा का है ? और अगर नहीं है तो प्रधान मंत्री जी भी यहां पर हैं, आदरणीया प्रधान मंत्री जी से मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा, तब फिर अगर कौंसिल ऑफ़ मिनिस्टर्स का ऐसा कोई निर्णय नहीं है और कैबिनेट का मिनिस्टर जब इस तरह का बयान देता है तो वह गलत है या कौंसिल ऑफ़ मिनिस्टर्स गलत है ? और अगर गलत है तो क्या उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही की

[ श्री मौर्य ]

साथेगी श्रीर भ्रगर वह सही है तो क्या कौंसिल प्राक मिनस्टसं खुल करके अपने फ्रंसले क बतायेगी ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा प्रभु शक्ति मंत्री (श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी) : हमारे जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के विचार हैं वह आप लोग सब बहुत धन्यो तरह से जानते हैं कोई इसमें छपके श्रीर चुपके की कोई बात नहीं है ? काश्मीर के बारे में सरदार साहब भी कह चुके हैं, सब लोग कह चुके हैं, हमारा जो स्टैंड रहा है वही आज भी है ।

श्री मौर्य : मंत्रियों के बीच में जो मत-भेद है उसके बारे में . . . (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : महोदय, माननीय स्वयं चुप रहेंगे, तभी मैं राय . . . सकी . . . उनको भ्रगर बोलना है तो आप उनको बोलने दीजिए, जब बड़े चुप हों तब मैं उठूंगी भ्रगर आप मुझसे कुछ सुनना चाहते हैं तो मेहरबानी करके बातें करें ।

सवाल पूछा गया श्री जगजीवन राम जी के बारे में उन्होंने एक प्राणण प्रागरे में या कहीं दिया श्रीर उसमें कोई एक नम्बी सी कहानी सुनायी कि क्या क्या कब-कब बातें उठाई गई थीं श्रीर यह ठीक है कि एक वक्त में, वह मुझे ठीक तरह याद नहीं है कि कब लेकिन एक वक्त यह बात उठी थी । लेकिन जब यह बात पाकिस्तान की तरफ से नामजूर हो गई तो यह बिल्कुल छोड़ दी गई । हमनेभी कहा कि हम इसको नहीं उठायेगे श्रीर नहीं मानेंगे जो वह यही बात है ।

श्री मौर्य : मेरे प्रश्न का खुलकर उत्तर नहीं आया । . . . (व्यवधान) . . . श्रीमन्, मेरी बात सुन लीजिए । या तो प्रश्न पूछने मत दीजिए, नहीं तो प्रश्न का उत्तर खुल कर घाना चाहिये । यह बहुत गलत रवैया

Shrimati LakshmiKanthamma (Khammam): On a point of order Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more questions. We have spent half an hour over this.

There are 11 amendments . . .  
(Interruption).

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : प्रश्न का उत्तर घाना चाहिये ।

श्री मौर्य : मेरी बात का जवाब नहीं आया ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should take some other opportunity.

There are 11 substitute motions. Substitute motions Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8 and 11 are regarding its disapproval. You may choose anyone of them and other substitute motions will become barred.

Shri Bade: No. 6.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri, do you agree?

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put substitute motion No. 6 to the vote of the House. The question is:

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

This House, having considered the Tashkent Declaration, records its disapproval of the Declaration and calls upon the Government to halt immediately the steps being taken towards withdrawal of troops from Hajl Pir, Tithwal, Kargil and other liberated areas in Pak occupied Kashmir." (6)

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, substitute motions Nos. 1, 7, 8 and 11 are barred.

Then, there are motions Nos. 4, 5, 10, 12 and 13 making suggestions. Do you want all of them to be put to the House?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Yes. No. 4 is mine.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall put substitute motion No. 4 to the House.

The question is:

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

This House, having considered the Tashkent Declaration, while appreciating the efforts made by the late Prime Minister towards normalisation of relations between India and Pakistan, is of opinion that the decision embodied in the Tashkent Declaration to withdraw our armed personnel from the Kargil, Tithwal, Uri-Poonch and Haji Pir areas which are legally Indian territory is against our national interest and detrimental to our national security and directs the Government not to withdraw from these areas till such time as Pakistan agrees to a no-war pact with India." (4).

The motion was negatived.

श्री मधु क्लिये : घेरा 11 नवम्बर हे उसका क्या हुआ ;

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Substitute Motion No. 11 is barred. That is barred.

Then, I shall put substitute motions Nos. 5, 10, 12 and 13, to the House.

The substitute motions Nos. 5, 10, 12 and 13 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put substitute motion No. 9 of Shri K. C. Pant.

The question is:

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

That this House having taken into consideration the Tashkent Declaration, approves the stand of the Government of India thereon." (9).

The motion was adopted.

Shri Bade: With the passing of this motion, today will be considered as the saddest day in the history of Parliament. The withdrawal of our army from Haji Pir, Tithwal, Kargil and Uri-Poonch means exposing our country to serious danger from Pakistan and China. The Government will repent and the country will suffer. We walk out as we do not want to share in the passing of this Agreement.

Shri Bade and some other Members then left the House.

14.35 hrs.

#### MOTION ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): I beg to move:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:

That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 14th February, 1966."

Sir, while making this motion, I cannot escape thinking in terms of this being a valedictory Address because this is the last year of the present Parliament and, perhaps, we may not be here to hear the President at the commencement of the new Parliament—those feelings are understandable. But it is with a deep tinge of