

Leader of the House and those powers were then delegated to me by the then Leader of the House. Now I am doing those things in my own right.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Leader of the House wants to have this business to himself we have no objection. Certainly he may do it. We do not want to take it away from him if he thinks that it is his job.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): May I submit, Sir, that in my own experience in this House—I have known the working of the Leader of the House for many years—and also my experience after having worked as Leader of the House, is that the function of announcing the business for next week has always been the function of the Leader of the House and there is no loss of dignity in announcing that statement.

An hon. Member: Same is the procedure in the United Kingdom.

12.57 hrs.

DELHI LAND REFORMS (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954."

The motion as adopted.

Shri Nanda: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

12.58 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: DELHI LAND REFORMS (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1966

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of

Defence (Shri Hathi): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the explanatory statement giving reasons for immediate legislation by the Delhi Land Reforms (Amendment) Ordinance 1966, as required under rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

12.59 hrs.

MOTION RE: TASHKENT DECLARATION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Sardar Swaran Singh on the 16th February, 1966, namely:—

"That the Tashkent Declaration be taken into consideration."

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Sir, may I ask whether we may assume the Minister will be called upon to reply on Monday?

Mr. Speaker: It is now 1.00. We have only 1½ hours before 2.30. Would the Minister like to reply on Monday?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): I have no objection.

13 hrs.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I earnestly make a two-folded request to you? Firstly, the House may sit till 6 o'clock today; that is to say, Private Members' Business may be taken up at 3.30 instead of at 2.30. Secondly, may I request you to ensure that the Defence Minister who was in Tashkent when the declaration was signed, is present in the House, because certain questions might be raised here which he alone may be able to answer? For instance, I understand that under an agreement which General Choudhuri and General Musa arrived at in Rawalpindi last week the Government of India has agreed to withdraw to the 1949 position. He can throw light

*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, section 2, dated 17-2-66.

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath].

on this. It is still a secret. It has not been given to the press.

Shri Bade (Khargone): It is a breach of privilege of the House. It was announced by Radio Pakistan. Though Parliament has been in session, no announcement has been made to the effect that our armies are going to the 1949 position.

Mr. Speaker: There is no breach of privilege of the House. He might resume his seat.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : मैंने प्राज रेडियो में समाचार सुना है अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह घोषणा करता है और हमें पता नहीं है। रावलपिंडी रेडियो चिल्लाता है...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बोलते चले ज.येंगे अपने आप जिसका जी चाहे ? क्या इसी तरह होगा ?

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): When is the Minister replying?.. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Because Shri Kamath has started it, therefore, it must be continued? I am sorry.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I only made a request that the Defence Minister should be present in the House.

Mr. Speaker: I would request Shri Kamath to give previous intimation if he wants to say anything—not in this manner obstructing the proceedings of the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I say that I have given a Calling Attention notice on this very subject?

Mr. Speaker: I hope he will allow me to continue with the business.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): What is the decision regarding the allotment of time?

Mr. Speaker: Nothing has been decided. We will continue till 2:30

today and the Minister would reply on Monday. Now Shri Bakar Ali Mirza will continue his speech.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was saying that the two countries of India and Pakistan have taken a new turning of the road and there has been a new approach, there has been the development of a new character in the functioning of the two countries. If the Tashkent Agreement is implemented honestly and with all sincerity by both the countries, I feel sure that very soon there will be a re-union of the two countries. By that I do not mean that there will be dissolution of frontiers. An atmosphere of friendship and goodwill will be created in the place of the present ill-will and hatred and the two countries will be able to march in the road of progress. And it might be quite possible, in the wake of the European Economic Community, to form an arrangement where by surrendering or merging a part of their sovereignty they can progress together.

13.04 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

For example, it is quite possible and quite feasible to have a common authority for Jute. This should be tried. There has been talk of sovereignty in the context of withdrawal from Haji Pir Pass, Kargil and Tithwal. It must be remembered that sovereignty also involves the 400 million people of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member should conclude now. His time is up.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: I have just started my speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to give time to the Members of the Opposition also.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: You might give me one more minute. Otherwise that is the point in my coming here today and making a speech?

In conclusion, I would say that the way in which the body of Shastriji was received by this country when it came from Tashkent, by millions and millions of people not only with rose petals but also with love and reverence that fact itself is not only an expression of devotion to Shastriji but also puts the seal on the final act of the great and good man of the Tashkent Agreement.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya (Serampore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, on behalf of our party in Parliament I heartily support the Tashkent Agreement. It is a matter of pride and gratification for our party that such an agreement has ultimately been reached between our country and our neighbour Pakistan. It was precisely for suggesting this type of settlement and a peaceful solution of all the outstanding issues with Pakistan that our party, specially the General Secretary of our Party, Shri E. M. S. Namboodiripad, was attacked and dubbed as a traitor and anti-national. Even Shri Nanda, the *sadachari* Home Minister, tried to be-fool the country by referring to a speech of Shri Namboodiripad in Bombay.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Here we are concerned with the Tashkent Agreement.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: I am limiting myself to the Tashkent Agreement. For making this suggestion, allegations were made against us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You may take some other opportunity to refer to this, not now.

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद (नारंदा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह इरैलिवेट बाते बोलने से क्या साम है ?

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: Our party was threatened with action. We were told that appropriate action will be taken at the proper time against our General Secretary for his speeches

and writings. Can anybody deny that our party and our General Secretary, Shri E. M. S. Namboodiripad, had the guts to make this suggestion at a time. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not concerned with your party.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: But I represent my party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should confine his speech to the Tashkent Agreement. He should not go beyond it. He can refer to other matters on other occasions.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: At a time when the two countries were confronting each other with war, the reactionary forces in the country tried to plunge the country into total war by creating war psychosis. Many people and countries were telling us to turn our economy into a war economy. Ultimately, however, good sense prevailed and thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Prime Minister and the boldness shown by our Prime Minister during the Tashkent Agreement, such a peaceful settlement has been possible. I hope that this Tashkent spirit will be taken seriously and every effort will be made to broaden the Tashkent spirit so as to settle all outstanding issues and disputes, including border disputes peacefully across the table. I congratulate our late Prime Minister for leading the country to such a situation in which peace and friendly relations can be brought about on the basis of the Tashkent Agreement.

There has been a voice of disagreement. I know that the voice expressed by certain forces here are not the voices of the people of our country. It is the voice and feeling of the imperialist reactionaries, under whose initiative our country was divided into two parts, with the intention that the two parts will always be at war and there will be no peace. In that way,

[Shri Dinen Bhattacharya].

opportunity was taken by the imperialists to carry on their brutal exploitation of our poor people in this sub-continent. So, I caution the Government not to surrender themselves to those reactionary forces who are trying to see that again the feelings and the relations between these two countries be brought to such a situation that our jawans will fight with the jawans of the other part of the same land. Sometimes, our Government leaders surrender themselves to these reactionary forces. I mention it especially because the western world is not very happy with this Agreement. They may speak sweet words but their aim is to see that we fight each other. (*Interruption*).

I do not want to be interrupted. In this connection, I may again refer to the matter which I had placed here when the very proposal for the Tashkent meeting was placed in this House by our late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. It is gratifying to note that before going to Tashkent, our late Prime Minister declared that we cannot conceive of any situation of perpetual enmity with our neighbour Pakistan. I say, the same should be the feeling in regard to China.

An hon. Member: No.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: Yes; I boldly say that. The people must know that. Unless and until we come to a peaceful settlement with China—she is also our neighbour—our economy and our position cannot improve . . . (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not concerned with that now.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: Sir, you are also interrupting me. Is it not in connection with our establishing friendly relations with our neighbours?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not concerned with China now.

श्री मधु लिम्बये (मुंबई): मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जब एक व्यापक प्रश्न पर चर्चा चल रही है, जिसके कि कई पहलू हैं, तो चीन का अग्र उल्लेख करते हैं तो इस में बुरा क्या है ? उस दिशा में हम लोग भी बोल सकते हैं, अपनी बात रख सकते हैं ।

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: Any student of history, basing on realities, will say that it is not very impossible for India to come to a settlement with our other neighbour China. (*Interruption*).

Shri Sidheshwar Prasad: Pro-China.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: Slanders are made against us that we want to sell out our country to our neighbour China. It is a slander. When we talk of peaceful settlement, we say that definitely with the intention that our national prestige and national integrity will be maintained. We have not surrendered anything to Pakistan while agreeing to the Tashkent Declaration. So, in this way alone we can settle our disputes. There are our friends. I remember, after coming from Burma, our late Prime Minister—I have read it in the newspaper, *the Statesman*—was asked a question by some correspondent as to whether such negotiations or such a meeting like Tashkent was possible with China. At that time, our Prime Minister remarked: Where is a Kosygin to arrange such a meeting? I say, there are our friends and there are non-aligned, neutral, nations who are friendly to us and to China and they can arrange it. Rumania has proposed such a thing; the UAR has also proposed it. There are proposals . . .

An hon. Member: The Colombo proposals.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: They are not sacrosanct. We met in Tashkent without any pre-condition, without any condition. In the same way, without any pre-condition, our disputes with China can be settled in

a friendly atmosphere under the initiative and invitation of any friendly nation. It is not only that my Party has said it. Even some eminent persons like Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan has suggested this. Is he a communist? Does he want to sell out any portion of our country to China when he suggests that a settlement may be made with China? The situation has changed. The Colombo powers must not be made sacrosanct. The relations of forces between Asia and the whole world have changed. At least, there must be an effort on the part of the Government of India to see whether it is possible to negotiate and settle our disputes with China without surrendering our sovereignty to any nation.

With these words, I fully support the motion and I hope in the spirit of Tashkent the peaceful settlement of all disputes with any neighbour of our country, including China, will be attempted and I hope the settlement will be arrived at. I hope the Government will not allow the reactionary forces to gain ground and to ruin our country by making it impossible to settle all our border disputes with our neighbours.

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit (Phulpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir at a moment when India stands at a turning point in her history the Declaration of Tashkent is a sign-post pointing out the direction towards the future. It is of tremendous importance to the participating countries. It has strengthened the United Nations, it has given mankind a new hope, for it has shown, as Walter Lipman said the other day, "that it is still possible for nations to get on top of the intractable violence of human affairs. The word is better for what happened at Tashkent."

Sometimes ago, Jawaharlal Nehru said that the reason why so many problems defy solution was because of the wrong approach to them and

because the violence of our minds dominated our actions. He said:

" . . . Unless the world recognises the need for a passionate involvement with civilised behaviour, tensions and conflicts would continue throughout the world."

I submit that what happened at Tashkent is an involvement with civilised behaviour. It is a right step at the right time in the right direction. The results that flow from it will be good and a new day of co-operation and friendship will dawn for the people of India and Pakistan.

Nothing in the world is ever entirely immune from criticism and the Tashkent Declaration is no exception. But may I remind hon. Members who are dissatisfied with the Declaration that the world consists of two kinds of people, those who curse the darkness and those who light a candle. Prime Minister Shastri lit a candle at Tashkent and I have no doubt that the flame will be strong and the light will guide us on to still bigger and braver efforts.

For the last two decades the world has talked a great deal about the necessity for settling disputes by peaceful means and for abandoning the use of force. For us in India this was no new idea, for it has been the guiding thread in our philosophy through the centuries. We too had spoken this language in world Forums and pledged our adherence to this concept. But now, by putting her signature to the Tashkent Declaration, India has shown that we can act as well as talk. India has risen in her own estimation, in the estimation of her people and in the estimation of the whole world. All nations have welcomed the Declaration with the single exception of China and maybe, even here, there is a lining to what looks like a dark cloud, for, perhaps the fact that China has not realised the importance of this Declaration may show Pakistan the realities of the

[Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit].

situation and help to tear aside the pointed veil which prevented her from seeing her neighbour clearly.

This is the first time that two nations have taken so bold a step, so pregnant with possibilities for new life and new hope for millions of people. It is the first initiative of its kind taken by a great power such as the Soviet Union for bringing together two of her Asian neighbours and helping them to resolve their differences through discussion, through consultation, in a peaceful manner. The Soviet initiative and its success should be welcomed by every one by all people who are involved in the search for peace and stability and justice in the world, specially those of Asia because this step has established, beyond any doubt, that the Soviet Union is not only interested in peace in Asia but is prepared to take the necessary initiative to achieve this objective and safeguard it. The Tashkent Declaration, therefore, establishes the Soviet presence in Asia as a strong factor in favour of peace.

The essence of this Agreement is obviously the spirit which inspired it—a spirit to which both sides wholeheartedly subscribed. India is determined to observe the Agreement and the spirit in which it was conceived and we believe that Pakistan will do likewise. To doubt the honesty and intention of either nation at this time is not only grossly unfair to both but amounts almost to an insult to the two Heads of States. It is a pity, it would be a thousand pities, if such an attitude were taken up.

It was only after assurances from Pakistan that the use of force would be abjured that Shastriji agreed to our withdrawals from Haji Pir, Kargil and Tithwal. This was the condition he had made earlier in his letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to Parliament. His willingness to withdraw shows that he

had the fullest confidence in India's strength and ability to defend and protect herself. Pakistan's withdrawal on the other hand from the Chhamb-Jaurian Sector is both politically and militarily of the highest importance to us.

I am sorry, some of the speakers who spoke yesterday, are not present in the House. Mr. Trivedi was among the most critical—he said that we cannot give up our own territory which we have recovered. The Tashkent Declaration is not an adjudication of the Kashmir question. We have made it clear time and again, in Tashkent and elsewhere, that Jammu and Kashmir is a part of India and our sovereignty in this area is not negotiable. This fact remains.

There was a further doubt in the mind of Mr. Trivedi to the effect that an Act of Parliament would be necessary to part with our own territory. We have not given up anything of our sovereignty. We had accepted the Cease-fire of 1949 but no Act of Parliament was then considered necessary. Our withdrawal from Haji Pir, Tithwal and Kargil is a mere re-affirmation of the Cease-fire line of 1949 and we accepted it in the larger interests of peace and the peaceful settlement of a difficult and vital issue.

Questions are asked as to what are the guarantees for the future. These lie in the terms of the Agreement, namely, that both sides will observe the Cease-fire terms and the Cease-fire line, that relations between the two countries shall be based on non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Equally important are Art. 4 which mentions the need to encourage propaganda which promotes the development of friendly relations between the two nations, and the first part of Art. 1, which speaks of neighbourly relations and the ending of tensions. I would like to draw the attention of this hon. House to the fact that it is these aspects and not

merely the disengagement of troops that are the long-term objectives envisaged in the Declaration.

This House bears a heavy responsibility because we are the representatives of the people. It is not Government alone who are responsible for the promotion of friendly relations between nations. If we raise false bogeys, the work of our Government is going to be made immeasurably more difficult and the purpose we seek to serve will be defeated.

On what do agreements and treaties rest? What guarantees do they offer? In the final analysis, as we all know, it is the will of the people that is the surest guarantee. In this case we also have the firm and friendly support of a mighty nation, the Soviet Union, and on the far side of the world, the other giant of our time and also our friend, the United States of America, has applauded our stand. Tashkent was the first step on a long road, probably a hard road, but we must not lose faith in ourselves and we must walk forward with firm unflinching steps until our goal is reached.

There has been no departure from any principle. As I said before, there has been a clear and firm declaration on more than one occasion though the fears of our basic position on Kashmir. This was repeated at Tashkent. Kashmir is and will remain a part of India and India's sovereignty in this area is not negotiable.

Why then should we be afraid of discussions and talks on any subject which helps to ease tension and lessen suspicious and pave the road to peace between ourselves and Pakistan?

Yesterday one other doubt was raised by Mr. Trivedi, who posed a question to the Government as to what happened on the 10th of January. I believe I am right in saying—I say this subject to correction by those who were present at the time—that a reaffirmation of the Agreement was made

on the 9th and only a few verbal changes were made later. These were minor changes such as 'should' in place of 'will'. There was no question of pressure on the Prime Minister by any party and I think it is a slur on the memory of a great patriot and a noble son of India to imply that what he did, was done under pressure either from his colleagues or others.

श्री हुकूम खान कछवाय : घापने घापने वक्तव्य में खुद कहा है कि दबाव में घा कर उन्होंने हस्ताक्षर किये हैं। उन पर दबाव डाला गया था।

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: In fact the whole delegation unanimously agreed to the small changes.

The question is also raised and it naturally comes to our minds whether the sacrifice we have made in terms of blood and treasure was not in vain. I say that it was not. It proved to ourselves that we are made of stern stuff, that if our sovereignty is threatened, if the values we cherish are attacked, we can defend both. We have proved to those who sought to belittle us by saying that our form of dress and our food habits were impediments in our path that when the defence of our country is in question, we can fight and we can protect our honour.

श्री किशन पटनायक (भद्रनगर) : इतना इनकारियारिटा कम्लैक्स क्यों घा गया है ?

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: We have also proved that it is not always the weapon that counts but as Field Marshal Montgomery says it is the man behind the weapon that ensures the ultimate victory. We have by the action at Tashkent also shown that we refuse to be treated any longer as pawns on the chequer-board of world politics.

श्री किशन पटनायक : खुदने कहा।

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: We can and shall come to our own decisions and plan our own destiny to suit ourselves. As I said earlier, the agreement may not be a perfect document, but it leads to a what may be a good end. For those who are fearful and critical I would like to paraphrase the Biblical injunction which says 'If thou shouldst err, let it be on the side of gentleness'. May I say—speaking politically—that if we err, let it be on the side of Peace. This is the spirit of India. This is the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration as I understand it.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I should imagine that the Tashkent Declaration has been acclaimed by the world except perhaps by China that seems to have a calculated and almost venomous interest in perpetuating trouble for India. I also believe that it would be correct to say that the Tashkent Declaration has been received by the Indian nation with mixed feelings. Because the Declaration was in a sense sealed with the death of a great and good man, there is a tendency for us to accept the Tashkent Declaration as an offering to his revered memory.

I am prepared to concede that there are groups in this country, fortunately still minority groups, that have a vested interest in tensions with Pakistan; every time Pakistan misbehaves it gives rise to their communal political mill. But I would ask the Government to recognise this that there are sober thinking people in this country who have received the Tashkent Declaration with considerable anxiety and with very grave doubts indeed.

First of all, I would ask the Government not to talk of the Tashkent Declaration as some kind of a diplomatic victory. Let us all recognise one thing. It is not any denigration of his memory, the memory of a man whom we loved. But let us recognise that the Prime Minister did give a

categorical assurance to this House. And what was that categorical assurance? It was that we would not vacate certain strategic areas and we would not vacate certain strategic passes unless there were certain pre-conditions, unless there were certain reasonable guarantees. What was the first pre-condition? It was that the withdrawal of armed personnel would comprehend and include first the withdrawal of Pakistan's infiltrators. Let us realise this that this was the pre-condition, and we wanted reasonable guarantees. The Tashkent Declaration reiterated that phrase 'armed personnel'. It meant that Pakistan had to agree to withdrawing her infiltrators first. Yet, what has happened? Pakistan has denied that she ever sent in infiltrators. She has, therefore, a fortiori, denied that there are any infiltrators to withdraw. And what have we done? I do not know, I see the Defence Minister talking to the Foreign Minister, 'would like to know whether we have already vacated Kargil, Tithwal and Haji Pir, which means that we have vacated these strategic passes through which alone we were able to plug this infiltration, without the pre-condition being fulfilled.

13.35 hrs.

[**SHRI SHAM LAL SARAF in the Chair**]
What does it mean? That is the first tremendous casualty of the Prime Minister's categorical assurance to this House. I am prepared to concede this; Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit is not here; I am prepared to concede that Pakistan's affirmation that she will not resort to force in order to settle disputes is to the good; I am also prepared to concede this that Ayub Khan having seemingly given up his original demand that there would have to be some kind of self-executing machinery in respect of the settlement of Kashmir before he subscribed to such a Declaration, is also to the good.

I do not, like the Minister of External Affairs, attach undue importance to this expression 'non-interference in internal affairs'. I was a

member of the Indo-Pakistan Conciliation Committee. Nobody desired more passionately than I did an understanding with Pakistan. But let us also understand Pakistan's policies. Pakistan will take the plea that Kashmir is not an internal affair of India, that Kashmir is in dispute and she will exercise her right to interfere, day in and day out, week in and week out, year in and year out, in Kashmir, taking the plea that it is not an internal affair. So, this phrase 'non-interference in internal affairs' has no meaning and no value at all, so far as Pakistan is concerned. But my greatest anxiety is this. What is there to prevent Pakistan almost immediately from perpetrating fresh infiltration?

My hon. friend said yesterday that there was the undertaking to observe the cease-fire line and there was the undertaking to observe the cease-fire conditions. They were all there before. Did they prevent Pakistan from infiltrating? Were your impotent UN Observers ever able to prevent infiltration? Let us face facts, however unpleasant they may be. And remember this, last time Pakistan had prefaced that infiltration with fanfares and trumpeting; she had brazenly and unashamedly said 'We are raising 150,000 mujahids and guerillas. She boasted of her Gibraltar force including regulars and guerillas with the stiffening of her regular forces. She did all that; she proclaimed this thing and then sent them in. But when Pakistan infiltrates again, as I am certain she will, who will identify her infiltrators? Will the UN Observers or the Security Council identify them? I do not want to say anything harsh about the Security Council. How did the Security Council behave on the last occasion? Who deliberately suppressed the Nimmo report which identified Pakistan's guilt? Why did the Security Council deliberately turn a blind eye to Nimmo's identifying Pakistan's guilt? Why did they evade naming Pakistan as an aggressor, probably largely under the

inspiration of the British? Who did all that? Who will identify them when they infiltrate again? Let us remember that last time, in spite of their proclamation that they were sending them, again, in spite of their saying that they would send their Gibraltar force to help the Kashmiris, in spite of Nimmo identifying them, blatantly they reasserted their false claim that they never sent any infiltrators. The next time they do send them in, without all this other material, what will they say? They have learnt well from the Chinese; they will emulate the Chinese techniques; they will emulate even the Chinese language and they will say 'Oh, this is a fabrication of imperialist Hindu country, these are not infiltrators; these are internal freedom-fighters . .

Shri Nath Pal (Rajpur): It is a people's war'.

Shri Frank Anthony: And who will say 'Nay' to them?

Mr. Chairman: His time is up.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am speaking on behalf of my Group. I was told I would get at least 15-20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Two minutes more.

Shri Frank Anthony: I cannot finish in two minutes.

Shri Nath Pal: 15-20 minutes.

Shri Frank Anthony: That was what I was told.

I am among those who, for what it is worth, accept the Tashkent Agreement. I accept it essentially because it was the last hostage of a great and good man, to his passionate desire for peace with Pakistan, in spite of Pakistan's record of repeated aggressions. Very secondarily, I accepted it because it was a hostage to our slender hope—the hope of some people like myself—that it may lead to improved relations with Pakistan, that it may lead to the leaders of Pakistan seeing some sense; because I am

[Shri Frank Anthony.]

among those who believe ardently that if we can achieve improved relations with Pakistan, then both countries, India and Pakistan, will be benefited immeasurably.

But having said that, I want Government to recognise certain hard and unpleasant facts, not to euphemise, not to explain them away, because my fear is that if the Government does that, sooner or later—perhaps sooner than later—it will be overtaken by these unpleasant facts. I do not want Government to become, as Ayub Khan, has become, the victim of its own false propaganda. I do not want that to happen.

What is the first hard, unpleasant fact? It is that this is not a diplomatic victory. Let us tell our people what the Tashkent Declaration is. It is for us, in our ardent desire for peace, a vast, a deliberate and a calculated risk of Pakistan attacking through Kashmir a third time. It is a deliberate and a calculated risk.

The next unpleasant fact is, while carrying this out, will the Defence Minister tell us that we must be completely vigilant. I was one of those who supported the Kutch Agreement, although there was a revulsion in the country against it. What did Shastriji tell us? He reminded us that the ink on the Kutch Agreement was hardly dry when Pakistan was preparing a careful, elaborate plan for yet another aggression. I do not want to say anything that may befoul the atmosphere. But let us remember that the ink on the Tashkent Declaration was hardly dry when Ayub Khan, having failed at Tashkent to get included, as he said he would get included, a precondition for a self-executing arrangement to settle the Kashmir problem, as soon as he got back to Pakistan, immediately tried to put a footnote to it. He let loose a barrage of propaganda through his leaders—after all, there is no public opinion in

Pakistan; it is the opinion of the Dictator channelled through his marionettes masquerading as public opinion—that Kashmir was in fact the dominant item in the Tashkent Declaration. Having failed to get his condition inscribed in the agreement, hardly was the ink on the Agreement dry when he introduced this footnote, that Kashmir was the dominant item.

Let us also recognise this. Let us hope and pray for peace with Pakistan. But do not let us delude ourselves into believing that there is going to be any let-up, for one minute, internally or externally, on the part of Pakistan with regard to agitating on Kashmir. Not for one minute will they let up. Let us realise this too, that for them, Kashmir is a symbol—a symbol of what? Of medieval, theocratic thinking, a symbol of the medieval two-nation theory, and worst of all, tragically a symbol of hatred for India. That is what Kashmir is to Pakistan. It is a symbol of all these terrible things for them. But for us, also, it is a symbol, but it is a symbol of an entirely different character. It is a symbol of our secularism. Two aggressions by Pakistan has further affirmed that symbolism. As I said as the leader of a recognised minority, Kashmir today has been sealed with the blood of all communities, in two aggressions, it has been sealed as an inseparable part of India. And any Government—any Government—that shows the slightest sign of betraying Kashmir will have to face a revolution in this country—I have no doubt about it.

Shri Nath Pal: They will not be allowed to do it.

Shri Frank Anthony: There is another hard and unpleasant fact, this double talk, this ambivalence, on the part of Government, people taking in official, quasi-official, semi-official, demi-official, semi-demi-homi-official, capacities, all purporting to speak on Kashmir, all purporting to propound their respective solutions of Kashmir.

I cannot understand this. I do not say —although I am a lawyer—indict them for treason, but I do say, kick them out of those positions of responsibility.

They do three things, I mean they damage India in three ways. They give the impression that there is a strong school of opinion over here in favour of handing Kashmir or a part of Kashmir over to Pakistan. They weaken us internationally. They give a handle to the enemies of India, to the friends of Pakistan, to beat us with. They deliberately encourage Pakistan to continue this agitation on Kashmir, to continue it as a symbol of hatred for India.

The other day, some people from Kashmir met me. This is their worst fear; they say, 'We want to proclaim our loyalty to India. But how do you expect us to say so? We do not know when a weak and dithering Central Government may betray Kashmir, may hand it over to the Pakistanis. Then what will happen to us? Even if we are not executed, we will at best be treated as infidels and as traitors'. This is another hard, unpleasant fact.

We are getting into some kind of euphoria. We are not only a naive people, we are impractical. I want to say this. While we say that we will accept the Declaration and will implement it in letter and in spirit, let us also leave Pakistan in no doubt that if there is a fresh infiltration, we will treat it as an act of war, and that despite what Mr. Harold Wilson or people of his ilk may say, we will take action to answer that act of war, not only in Kashmir but in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir or any other part of Pakistan.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Mr. Chairman, it becomes difficult to analyse the document that we are discussing today because the high dignitary who signed it on our behalf died at Tashkent in very tragic circumstances. But national duty has got to be performed.

Let us analyse the document, apart from its verbiage, apart from the expectations and hopes it foreshadows, apart from any prepossessions, what do we find as the essence of the document? We find that it is a rehash emphatically expressed of what was done by the Security Council. My hon. friend, Shri Anthony, said something about the Security Council and its attitude; I entirely agree with him. Russia spoke in favour of the Security Council Resolution. I cannot understand why we should have expected that Russia will take any other attitude than what it took at Tashkent. It was clear that in the present dispute, Russia was not with us but was neutral. It had abandoned its position that Kashmir belonged to India.

There are only two statements in the document that have any value at all. It is said that the Kashmir issue was stated by both the parties and they did not agree about its solution. We are told by the Foreign Minister that they were guided at Tashkent by a spirit of compromise. Both parties stuck to their position. Where is the question of compromise here? After returning to India and Pakistan, our spokesmen and Pakistani spokesmen have reiterated their respective positions, that Kashmir on our side is an integral part of India, and on their side it is said a plebiscite must be held in Kashmir.

The second statement that is of importance is that there will be no interference in the internal affairs of each country by the other. That has been absolutely repudiated and bluntly they have said that Kashmir is not an internal affair of India.

So, except for the platitudes that have been used that there shall be perpetual peace, that there shall be neighbourly relations, that the economic situation of the two countries impels them to act as friends, the two essential statements have been denied, one by both the parties and the other by Pakistan. There has

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

been no solution of the question which led to the last war.

But peace has been established for the time being. That is something good. That is what we welcome, and that is what the world has applauded. Nowadays wherever there is war, the other countries that are not involved in it put pressure upon those who are fighting to establish peace on any terms. It is only when the self-interest of a country is involved that it does not care whether there is war, whether there is atomic war, whether there is annihilation of the world. One can see this in Viet Nam. All countries excepting America and North Viet Nam are interested in peace, and they are pressing upon America to give up this war and work for peace.

Even when there is peace, when every country has welcomed this declaration at Tashkent, why are sections of our people dissatisfied? I would suggest that they are dissatisfied because of certain promises, very definite promises that were made in this Parliament and that were made before the people and that were made before the Members of the Opposition parties, that there would be no return of those territories in Kashmir which we have occupied beyond the cease-fire line. There have been given up. Also it was said that there would be no infiltrators left in Kashmir, that it would be the job of Pakistan to take them away. Both these conditions have not been fulfilled. Therefore, people are unhappy.

And people are unhappy because they do not understand politics. I did not expect that anything else would be done at Tashkent except to establish the status quo ante. It was inevitable because the world was against us, and our friends were neutral. And I do not see how this Government can take any revolutionary step. It is a Government wedded to status quo ante.

This has disappointed people. I never expected anything better than this, and I was not therefore disappointed. It is not I alone. I had talks with some Congress people who said the only possibility of all this was the restoration of the status quo ante.

People are disappointed because they do not know the meaning of the word "politician". A politician is not wedded to any idealism, not is he wedded to our private conception of morality. But we here, who have been brought up in the national struggle where we talked of equality, fraternity and liberty as they talked of in France and other dependent countries, believed that every politician would honour his word, but when politicians came to power they do not remember these things. People who are in power and people who aspire to be in power have got to do many things that are crooked, that are far removed from moral principles. This is what an English author says about the Prime Ministers of England. You will excuse me if I ask my neighbour to read it for me.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May, I, by your leave?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: "The British author says, 'cunning, ruthlessness and mendacity' are among the qualities of those who travelled the path to power in the years covered by the 16 Prime Ministers studied by him; it would be agreeable if it could be established he says, that the simple virtues of truth, sincerity, fairness, inflexible rectitude helped all men to reach the top; in actual fact, however, few of them embodied these qualities. Ramsay MacDonald, when hard pressed, was notoriously prone to seek refuge in prevarication. Those dealing with Lloyd George found he was a man who could 'never look on a belt without wishing to hit below it'. Highminded men have sometimes

reached positions of supreme power on the strength of the advocacy of a cause. But Prime Ministers have made no fetish of political consistency. To solve their difficulties in team making they have been prepared to enlist support without looking too carefully or conscientiously at credentials.

"They have been ready to accept as colleagues men they have previously denounced. Palmerston, it is said, did not care 'what dirt he had to eat so long as it was gilded dirt'. Gladstone, once the 'hope of the stern unbending Tories' grew even more radical as the years went by. Churchill deserted the Tories for the other side, and later deserted the Liberals to revert to true blue Tories. Nor is intellectual force a quality indispensable for men in power or men seeking power. The unassuming Attlee out-stayed more brilliant minds."

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I will conclude. We have been brought up under Gandhiji and in the struggle for freedom. Therefore, we needlessly expect from our politicians high standards of integrity, morality, and we expect them to keep their word. If we remember what politicians are made of, especially those who aspire for power . . .

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): From Gandhians when they become politicians.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I was saying that when they aspire for power, they have to do all the things that have been mentioned above.

12.59 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR]

There is another thing which was working at Tashkent. We know that there is a psychological process which brings about nervous exhaustion, by which the judgment of people is af-

fectured, and their will and determination are undermined. This you will find described in the book *Darkness at Noon*. This process is applied in two ways, first of all by cruel methods, but it can be applied also by non-cruel methods, by the exhausting methods, and I am afraid that, consciously or unconsciously, our Prime Minister was under the stress of very high tension brought about by the many receptions that were given to him, by the banquets that in Russia last for a few hours, by being taken into conferences up to 3 O'clock in the morning and so this tension worked upon him. He forgot the promise that he had made here. In order to get rid of the tension he signed the document and when he had signed it, as our foreign Minister said, he was very happy because this tension was past. That was a temporary happiness, a temporary exhilaration. But when he went to bed he realised that he had not acted as he had promised to act in India, as he had given his word to the people of India and therefore the tragedy took place. That is my point of view. That is all I have to say.

14 hrs.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): About the Tashkent spirit a number of speeches were made yesterday and today from both sides of the House and I shall not go into that immediately. Some discordant notes have been struck and I feel it my personal duty to speak about that first. A doubt was raised whether from the constitutional point of view we would be in a position to vacate the areas known as Haipir, etc. The hon. Minister of law may speak on this point. Since I am an Indian and I am also a resident of Kashmir I feel that we are not in a position to reconcile ourselves mentally to the Pakistani occupation of the portions on that side of the cease-fire line. Therefore when we take up this question simply by agreeing to hand over a few stones, it is not solved. It is a big question. By concentrating on these

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf.]

small slopes, I ask: are we not inadvertently giving up our claims, our affection and our sentiments towards the whole area under Pakistani occupation? From that point of view I feel that it will be wrong to say that by the handing over of one or two slopes to them which we had occupied, we will be doing something which will be very wrong to our interests. I do not agree with that.

In the context of the present agreement, Hajipir and a small stretch, or a small hillock in Kargil are supposed to be returned back; on the contrary we have to get back the whole Akhnoor tehsil. It is not only fertile land, plain land but more important still, it is the line of communication to all those areas that lie from Jammu right up to on the other side of Poonch, a distance of about 120 miles. Today, Pakistan has got Chhamb and Jaurian. There is the road, the life line of that area to the whole of Jammu and Kashmir State; that is, it is at the throat of it and it can be strangled. I would like my hon. friends from Jan Sang and Mr. Kamath to know this. The small stretches of land which will be handed over to them are nothing practically when compared to the area which they have to vacate in Jammu and Kashmir State; the whole of Karen, 3/4th of Akhnoor and the area in Jaurian. In case the road that is the lifeline goes into their hands, that State is gone once for all.

Shri Maurya (Aligarh): Did that go? Were they in possession of that road?

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: If my friend listens he will learn something. If we keep that in view, I think that we are the gainers.

Shri Maurya: We have gained nothing.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I respect the opinion of my friends even though they strike discordant notes. This is the material benefit that accrues to us

Secondly, for the last 17 or 19 years in that entire border line we have always faced trouble, turmoil, loot, plunder, killings and what not. I will certainly say that in Naushera, Akhnoor and Chhamb and Ranbir-singhpura tehsils, our people have suffered the most in a number of ways. I need not go into details. I think the Tashkent spirit will save us from all these things.

Shri Bado: What is the guarantee for the future?

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: You please be a little patient; I will tell you. Then again we have suffered in a number of ways. Government of India have spent large sums of money in the Jammu and Kashmir State and I must say to the credit of the administration there that they have been giving us very good results. What happened; every second year Pakistan does some sort of mischief with the result uncertainty again prevails and tourist traffic that had risen very high sometimes comes to the lowest ebb; business and commerce comes to a stand still . . . (Interruptions). So far as Tashkent Agreement is concerned, there are two aspects to it—national and international. I had occasion to talk to a number of foreign dignitaries; they have not always believed our words so much as they believed our friends from Pakistan. Let us at least this time show to the world that we believe in sound professions and also sound practices.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I have a few more things to say. Mr. Anthony has expressed some of his feelings with which I do not wholly agree. It is correct that nobody has taken the responsibility for these infiltrators. I can assure the hon. Ministers here that they could be dealt with any time. A few things have happened in the past. Politically questionable persons have found their way to the State of

Jammu and Kashmir in the last few years. I can name them. I will quote only one instance. Last August that is in 1964, I was coming from Srinagar to attend the monsoon session. One friend who happened to know me, a high dignitary in West Pakistan was flying in the same plane and we halted at Amritsar and stayed there for sometime. My friend knew me, and I knew him. I made a little probe, therefore, into his mind. Frankly, I may say that a statement came out in respect of it. He said, "Suppose, there is a dig on either side, from Naushera to Kargil, what would happen in Kashmir?" I asked him again to explain it to me. He told me plainly all that has happened today, and I perhaps reported about that to the hon. Minister also. Similarly, a number of people, who are politically questionable, have found their way to go there.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Is he a Pakistani official?

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: He is a dignitary. I know him in person.

An hon. Member: What is his name? (Interruption).

Shrimati Lakshminkathamma (Khammam): Give him more time, Sir. He is coming from that area, and we would like to hear him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I know that.

Mr. Sham Lal Saraf: Now, the cease-fire line has been talked about. May I remind my hon. friends as to what happened there in 1949, when I too happened to be somebody in that State? At that time, when the cease-fire line was acceded from the State Government was not consulted; our Central Government did not consult us. If we had been consulted, the Hajipur question would not have been there; the current things the current happenings, would not have been there. Certainly, this cease-fire line would have been drawn in a rational way. Now, similarly, Pakistan too might have one or two difficulties. But it was not done and therefore, we have to be careful about these matters hereafter also.

Now, the entire success of this Tashkent agreement and the spirit which lies behind it may not be known to very many. It shows one thing: that the Government at the Centre has to be a firm government. They must give the impression that what they say, they mean it and what they mean, they say. It is only a strong Government that can deliver the goods; similarly, a strong government which can deliver the goods in Jammu and Kashmir State should be set up there.

Regarding the infiltration, the present infiltration would not have happened at this scale and those men would not have dared to come near our boundary anywhere; but unfortunately it had happened. Let me tell you what happened. I got up one fine morning, much earlier in the morning, and I heard the firing going on only a furlong and a half from my house. The infiltrators had come near there, right inside the heart of Srinagar. Has such a thing happened in the past 17 or 18 years? These are a few things which I wanted to bring to the attention of the House. I have very little time to cover all my points. But I would submit to the Ministers of the Central Government here, and to the Government as a whole, that the Government here must be very firm, and they must take a very firm stand. Whatever they have agreed to in this Tashkent declaration, certainly we are one with them, but let them give the impression to our country-men here and to the world outside that what they mean, they say, and what they say, they mean.

In regard to what has happened on our borders, and what happened later, we could count on our finger-tips who really were the trouble-makers on the borders either on this side or on that side, and we know how to deal with them. What is the position today? I met some hon. Members this morning and I told them only with the idea of helping our people and the Government that this Tashkent agreement indicates success. I beg to

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

submit, let this agreement be made a success. But men let us not forget one thing. It has appeared in the papers also this morning. That is, the content of troops, the content of the forces, was a thing with which we did not agree in 1949. (Interruption). We must not forget one thing, and we are sincere about it: and this is a thing which, God forbid, should not happen; the point is,—and my hon. friends should not forget it—Pakistan can rush its military reinforcements to our borders within just two hours, while it will take days together for us to reach our borders. These facts also should be noted by our people and our Government.

Even with all this, I beg to submit that I am lending my full support to this agreement. Let everybody be vigilant, all the same, about the happenings—whether it is the Defence Minister, the Minister of External Affairs or the Prime Minister. I would conclude by saying that if only care has been taken, if only greater care had been taken earlier I am absolutely sure that all that has happened would have been avoided and much could have been saved. With these few words I support the Tashkent agreement and the motion before the House.

श्री मधु निमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ताशकंद करार पर विचार करते समय

श्री श्रीयं : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कम से कम हर एक पार्टी के एक सदस्य को तो समय दे दिया करे ।

At least one Member from every group must get a chance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has been discussed, and the Speaker has decided that we should close this at 2.30 (Interruption).

Shri Maurya: It is wrong.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : यह बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण विषय है । इस लिए समय बढ़ा दिया जाये ।

श्री मधु निमये : प्राप हमारा समय तो न काटिये । प्राप हम को बीस मिनट से कम न दें ।

ताशकंद करार पर विचार करते समय केवल इस करार की भाषा को नहीं देखना चाहिए, बल्कि इन दो राज्यों के निर्माण की जो पृष्ठभूमि है और भारत-पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्धों का जो पिछला इतिहास है, उसको भी मद्देनजर रखना चाहिए, वरना इस करार में जो सुन्दर भाव-युक्त किये गए हैं और जिन कर्प-मधुर शब्दों का प्रयोग किया गया है, उन से प्रभावित हो कर हम लोग बड़ी भूल कर बैठेंगे ।

पाकिस्तान के प्रश्न पर इस सरकार के पास न छठारह साल पहले कोई नीति थी, न बीच में कोई नीति रही है और न ही इस वकन कोई सफ़ नीति है। सरकार का दिमाग हमेशा दो शर्तों में बहता रहता है और इन्हीं से द्विधा की स्थिति पैदा होता है। श्रीमती विजय लक्ष्मी पंडित ने कहा है कि ताशकंद में शान्ति की दिव्य ज्योति जलाई गई। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले छठारह सालों में कितनी बार ऐसी दिव्य ज्योति जलाई गई और इन ज्योतियों का रूपान्तर कुछ ही घरों में पृष्ठ की ज्वालाओं में हुआ। इन छठारह सालों में एक-प्राधम हीने शान्ति की बातें होती रहीं, फिर एक-प्राधम हीने लड़ाई चलती रही और बाकी समय बराबर तनाव की स्थिति कायम रही। इस तनाव की स्थिति का प्रदब्दनी समस्याओं पर और जनता के प्रान्दोलनों पर भी बुरा असर होता है। कभी कभी ऐसा लगता है कि कहीं भारत की सरकार और पाकिस्तान की सरकार में कोई

समग्रीत तो नहीं है, जिस के अनुसार दोनों राज्यों की कोई पारस्परिक समस्या हल नहीं होगी, तनाव की स्थिति कायम रहेगी, बाव में छुटपुट लड़ाई भी होनी रहेगी और फिर दिव्य ज्योति की बात हमारे सामने आयेंगी। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस दुविधा वाले दिमाग को बदले।

1947 में जब हमारा मुक्त आजाद हुआ, तो उस वक्त भी वंगाल की ओर से जो प्रस्ताव पेश किया गया था, उस में भी यह दुविधा वाला बात थी। उस में एक ओर तो एक राष्ट्र के सिद्धान्त को मूल पर फुल चढ़ाए गये थे और दूसरी ओर उसी प्रस्ताव के द्वारा दो राष्ट्र के दो टुकड़े करने का सुझाव भी स्वीकार किया गया था। उस के बाद जिनेवा में समझौते किये गये हैं, उस में बाबर एक ओर तो एक की भावना है, अन्धे पड़ोसी की तरह रहने की भावना है, शांतिपूर्ण रिश्ते कायम करने की भावना है, मित्रता पैदा करने की भावना है और दूसरी ओर अलगाव और विभाजन को कायम रखने की प्रक्रिया भी बतारत जारी रखी गई है।

हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में जो एक करार 18 अप्रैल, 1948 में हुआ और फिर 14 दिसम्बर, 1948 में हुआ मैं उसका एक वाक्य पढ़ कर आप को बताना चाहता हूँ कि कैसे एक ओर तो एक की भावना और दूसरी ओर विभाजन और अलगाव को कायम रखने की भावना व्यक्त की क्यों बनी हुई है। इस में कहा गया है:

"Any propaganda for the amalgamation of Pakistan and India or of portions thereof including East Bengal on the one hand and West Bengal or Assam or Cooch-Bihar

or Tripura, on the other, shall be discouraged."

इस तरह की अलगाव वाली बात बरबत जारी रही है।

जहाँ तक अल्पसंख्यकों का सवाल है, एक ओर सरकार ने कहा है कि अल्पसंख्यक अपने अपने राज्यों में रहें, उनका निष्क्रमण न होने पाये। उनको समान अधिकार मिलें। साथ ही साथ यह भी कहा गया है कि उनके निष्क्रमण के लिये हर तरह की सुविधाय उपलब्ध की जानी चाहियें, उन को समान अधिकार देने चाहियें। इस को ले कर कई करार भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच में हुये हैं। नेहरू-नियोजित करार में इसी प्रकार की भावनाएँ व्यक्त की गई थी। लेकिन इस करार में यह भी दुविधा वाला दिमाग हम बतारत देखने आये है। अभी जिस करार का मैंने उल्लेख किया, उसमें कहा गया था कि शरणार्थियों का जो निष्क्रमण हो रहा है, उस पर रोक लाई जाये और अल्पसंख्यक अपने अपने राज्यों में रहें। इतना ही नहीं, इस करार में तो यह भी कहा गया था कि ऐसी स्थिति पैदा की जाये, जिस में शरणार्थी अपने अपने इनके में बस जा सकें बानी जो लोग पाकिस्तान से यहाँ आये हैं, वे पाकिस्तान चले जायें और जो लोग यहाँ से उतर गये हैं, वे लौट कर यहाँ वापस आ जायें। लेकिन इस के साथ ही साथ इस करारों में निष्क्रमण के लिये सुविधा देने के बात भी बतानी है। हमारी सारा में नहीं भूल कि सरकार के दिन ग में क्या है इस सरकार अल्पसंख्यकों को उन के राज्यों से हटाना चाहती है और निष्क्रमण की प्रक्रिया को जारी रखना चाहती है या वह दोनों राज्यों में ऐसी स्थिति पैदा करना चाहती है, जिस में अल्पसंख्यक विभाजन के साथ अपने अपने राज्यों में रह सकें?

उस तरह आप देखिये कि इन करार में कहा गया है कि अन्तर्गत मामलों में हस्तक्षेप

[श्री मधु सिन्घे]

नहीं करेंगे। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि छठारह साल पहले जो एक देश था, हम एक बतन के नागरिक थे, क्या हमारे लिये यह कभी सम्भव होगा और पाकिस्तानियों के लिए सम्भव होगा कि एक दूसरे के अन्दरूनी मामलों में हस्तक्षेप न करें या दिलचस्पी न लें। अभी इस ताशकंद करार के बारे में कहा गया है कि अन्तर्गत मामलों में हस्तक्षेप न करने का वादा किया गया है। लेकिन यह बिल्कुल झोटा वादा है। उस का कोई मतलब नहीं है क्योंकि श्री भुट्टो ने कहा है कि "काश्मीर में हम शराब दिवंगतों को ले रहे हैं और संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के चार्टर के आबजूद हमें पूरा अधिकार है कि आजादी की भी लड़ाई है उस में हम जरूर सहायता करें, उस में दिलचस्पी लें"। साथ साथ मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि एक वादा जो सरकार ने तोड़ दिया हाजीरों के सम्बन्ध में, टि।शाल, कारगिल, उड़ी-पूछ के सम्बन्ध में जो कि एक दूसरा वादा जो इस सरकार ने किया था इस सबन के सामने उस की ओर मैं ध्यान का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ और जिस का सीधा सम्बन्ध इस अन्तर्गत मामलों में दिलचस्पी लेने से है, इसमें हस्तक्षेप करने को है तथा इस को भी वह तैयारी? छठारह साल पहले एक बहादुर आजादी की तहरीक के नेता खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खाँ के साथ हम ने विश्वासघात किया था मगर एधर आजातवादी हुई थी सितम्बर, अक्टूबर में, फरवरी-महीने में और नवम्बर महीने में कि सरकार अपनी आज की आकारेगी और जो आप छठारह साल पहले किया था उस को धोने का काम सब की बात करेगी। 17 नवम्बर, 1965 के यानी पिछले साल सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह के भाषण से एक उद्धरण मैं देना चाहता हूँ और उन से मीठा सा सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने इस में जो साफ-साफ बात कही है क्या उस बात पर वह दृष्टा में चढ़े हुए हैं? या जैसे अन्य चीजों को ले कर सरकार ने वादा फरामोशी की है, इस को लेकर

भी की पाएगी? 18 नवम्बर को लोक सभा में बोलते हुए सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने यह कहा था :

"We have suggested to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan that he would be a most welcome visitor to India and we will, when he is here, afford him all opportunities to carry on whatever work he wants to carry on."

वह कोई रचनात्मक काम करने के लिए यहां नहीं आना चाहते थे, पश्तूनिस्तान की लड़ाई को प्रागे बढ़ाने के लिये यहां आना चाहते थे और उस के बारे में सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने कहा था कि यहां वह आ सकते हैं और अपना काम चला सकते हैं और हम हम काम में उन को सहायता करेंगे।

प्रागे सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने कहा था :

"We are fully aware that the fundamental freedoms and the natural aspirations of the brave Pathans have been consistently denied to them and their struggle has got our greatest sympathy. We will support the efforts that Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan might undertake in that direction."

मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि ये जो जम्मे आप ने कहे और जो वादा आप ने किया कि पश्तूनिस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई में हम साथ बंटाने के लिये तैयार हैं और उस के लिये प्रागे खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खाँ भारत में आना चाहें तो उन का हम स्वागत करने के लिये तैयार हैं, आप इस वादे पर दृष्टा के साथ प्रागे चलेंगे या जैसे हाजीरों के बारे में, उड़ी पूछ के बारे में आप ने किया है इस के बारे में भी आप करेंगे? क्या खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खाँ की पीठ में दूसरी बार छुरा घोंपने का पाप आप करने वाले हैं? मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान और भारत के रिश्ते ऐसे हैं कि एक दूसरों के मामले में दिलचस्पी लेना हमारे लिए स्वाभाविक है और यह कहना कि

घन्तगंत मामलों में हस्तक्षेप नहीं किया जाएगा बिल्कुल एक बेमतलब बात है। आप जिस रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं उस पर चल कर सफल इसलिए नहीं हो पा रहे हैं क्योंकि जो भाई-भाई थे, जो एक देश के नागरिक थे, हमवतनी थे, उन को आप ने पराया बना दिया, दुश्मन बना दिया और बाद में आप उन को सिखाने लगे कि अच्छे पड़ोसी बनो। यह चीज कभी नहीं होने वाली है। इसलिए जो असल और बुनियादी सवाल है वह यह है कि क्या सरकार सचमुच तनाव दूर करना चाहती है? इस तनाव के जो कारण हैं, उन कारणों को खोज कर सरकार उन को दूर करने के लिये तैयार है? जिस रास्ते से संस्कार चल पड़ी है उस रास्ते से जो तनाव है कभी कम नहीं होगा। इस में एक दो महीने शान्ति की ज्योति जलाने की बात होगी और फिर वही स्थिति पैदा होगी जो इधर घंटीरहें साल से बराबर चली आई है।

इस ताशकंद करार के घन्तर कहा जाता है कि बल प्रयोग न करने का वादा किया गया है। लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की घोषणा के आधार पर यह कहा गया है उसी संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की घोषणा में दूसरे भी वाक्य हैं, दूसरी भी धाराएँ हैं जिन के घन्तर पाकिस्तान दूसरा कुछ बखरवार कर सकता है। आप का ध्यान मैं शुरू में ही जो वाक्य है उस की और खींचना चाहता हूँ। यह धारा 1 का दूसरा हिस्सा है। इस में कहा गया है :

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of the people."

इस में जो आत्मनिर्णय की बात कही गई है उस का अर्थ अहिंसात्मक भी बना सकता है कि "काश्मीर में इन बातों को करने" और अगर आपसे करना है तो यद्वि स्था की मदद करने के लिए या पूर्ण बंगाल के लोग जो स्वतंत्रता चाहते हैं उन में उन का दाव बंगाल के लिए इस धारा की, जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की

घोषणा में से मैं ने पढ़ कर सुनाई है, हस्तक्षेप कर सकते हैं। आप भी उसी तरह से कर सकते हैं जैसे भुट्टो साहब ने कहा है कि बलप्रयोग न करने का वादा तो हम ने किया है लेकिन 51 वीं धारा के घन्तर हमें पूरा अधिकार प्राप्त है कि हमारे ऊपर कोई आक्रमण करेगा तो उस का हम बंद कर मुकाबला करेंगे जिस को आत्मरक्षा का अधिकार कहा जाता है। पाकिस्तान का यह बराबर कहना होता कि "काश्मीर पर आक्रमण हुआ है हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण हुआ है इसलिए हम 51 वीं धारा के घन्तर उस के खिलाफ हिंसात्मक कार्यवाई भी कर सकते हैं" यह जो बात मैं ने कही इस को वह बराबर कहते रहें हैं

श्री शिव नारायण (बामो) : उन की बकालत क्यों कर रहे हैं ?

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं उन की बकालत नहीं कर रहा हूँ। जब आप कोई करार करते हैं तो उसकी धारा की आप को अच्छी तरह से समझ लेना चाहिए, जनता में चलनफहमी पैदा करने की कोशिश नहीं करनी चाहिये।

श्री किशन पटनायक : वही तो नाक कटवा कर भा गए हैं और यहाँ बैठ कर बकवास करते हैं।

श्री शिव नारायण : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, वह बहुत आवश्यकीय बात है। आप बकवास करते हैं। आप को तर्क नहीं है।

श्री मधु लिमये : दूसरी बात यह कही गयी है कि तुर्काना देखा का पाला अच्छी तरह से लिया जाएगा। दूरी का तुर्काना देखा का पाला नहीं हो रहा है। दूरी मदन में कहा गया था कि काश्मीर के घन्तर पांच हजार से अधिक मुआहिद प्राप्त हैं। जब राज्य सभा में पूजा गया मुद्रा संशोधन कानून मुआहिद आप ने गिरफ्तार किये हैं या मार डाले हैं तो उन का धीकड़ा देने में मुद्रा संशोधन कानून किया। क्योंकि वह जानते हैं कि चीज भी काश्मीर में मुआहिद भी है और

[श्री मधु सिमये]

उन को बर्षा पिस लेने में पाकिस्तान ने साफ-साफ इन्कार किया है। पाकिस्तान ने कहा है कि वे हमारे मातहत नहीं हैं, उन का उत्तरदायित्व हमारा नहीं है और उन को हम वापिस लौटा ले सकते हैं। पांच और दस हजार के बीच ये सशस्त्र सैनिक पाकिस्तान के काश्मीर के अन्दर घुस आये थे। उन का क्या हुआ इस के बारे में सफाई होनी चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब प्राप समाप्त करें।

श्री मधु सिमये : मैं पांच मिनट में समाप्त कर दूंगा। पांच मिनट देने की कोई नुस्खाना नहीं होता है।

मवाल यह है कि क्या पाकिस्तान के बारे में कोई नैतिक है या केवल शब्द भाग्य का सा रहा है, कबिता रची आ रही है, साहित्य का निर्माण हो रहा है। हमेशा यह कहा गया है कि प्रभुता के बारे में हम जोदा नहीं करेंगे, सार्वभौमिकता का प्रांच नहीं माने देंगे, जो प्रादेशिक अश्वडता है उन में कोई कमी नहीं आने देंगे, काश्मीर भारत का अभिन्न अंग है। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह गारा अष्टम्बर है। अभिन्न अंग कौन है? प्रांच में / वा मोर का हिता पाकिस्तान के हाथ में है।

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बगहा) : जबदस्ता है।

श्री मधु सिमये : अभिन्न अंग की और कहा है? आप न तो उस की तंग दिया है और प्राप ने यह स्विकार भी किया है कि / हिता काश्मीर का उन के हाथ में रहेगा। और यह सत्तारह साल के / न के हाथ में बराबर रहा है। पृष्ठबन्दी करार का और क्या मतलब है? उन दसके में उन का विंगण रहेगा वहां की प्रांचता उन के मातहत रहेगी। उनो तरह प्राप ने उडे पृष्ठ, टिखराल कारगिल प्रादि दस्ता में / वापिस आने का निर्णय कर लिया है। और वृत्त के नागरिकों को जो कि

प्राप्त के नागरिक हैं, जबदस्ता प्राप ने पाकिस्तान के शासन में और पाकिस्तान के विंयंत्रण में धकेल दिया है। दम का साफ मतलब होता है कि यह सार्वभौमिकता की बात निस्तुल बेमानी बात है। जनता की प्राछों में धूल झोकने के लिये यह नाम हो रहा है। इसलिये मैं सरकार से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह दोस बातें किया करे। दो दिमाग वाला जो उन का काम चल रहा है उस को वह बदले। पिछले अट्टारह वर्षों में इतने करार हुए। सिंधु नदी के पानी के बटवारे का करार हुआ, कच्छ का करार हुआ, नेहरू-लियाकत करार हुआ, अभी ताशकन्द समझौता हुआ है। इस के बावजूब तनाव कम क्यों नहीं होता है उसकी अगर सरकार खोज करेगी तो इसी नर्ताजे पर पहुंचेगी कि तनाव का असली कारण देश का कृत्रिम विभाजन है। सरकार को सोचना चाहिये कि उसको समाप्त करने की दृष्टि से वह क्या कार्रवाई कर सकती है।

अन्त में मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार हमेशा धर्म निरपेक्षता की बात करती है। लेकिन हमारे देश में हिन्दू और मुसलमानों की बीच में, और जो दूसरे अल्पसंख्यक हैं उन के बीच में, एक किस्म की दीवार खड़ी करने का हमारे सत्तारूढ दल ने प्रयास किया है। चुनाव के समय वह एक और तो मुसलमानों से कहना चाहते हैं कि अगर हम नहीं रहेंगे तो प्राप का बचाव करने वाला कोई नहीं है और दूसरी और उन को धमकी भी देते हैं कि हमें वोट नहीं दोगे तो तुम यहां नहीं रह सकते हो। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दू और मुसलमानों के बीच में जो अलगाव है उस को खत्म करने के लिये कदम उठाना चाहिये। यहां के मुसलमान इस वक्त दुर्धी हैं। ये अल्पसंख्यक मुसलमान उत्तर प्रदेश, बम्बई और बिहार के एक जमाने में विभाजन के हथियार बनाये गये थे। उन मुसलमानों

का मन बदल रहा है, इसलिये उनको, यहाँ की जनता को, घोर पाकिस्तान में जो प्रजा-साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियाँ हैं उन को विभाजन समाप्त करने का हथियार बनया जा सकता है । लेकिन इस के लिये आवश्यक है कि सरकार दुविधा वाली बातों को छोड़ें और विभाजन को समाप्त करने के लिये ठोस कार्रवाई करे ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up non-official business.

Some hon. Members: We may extend the time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This matter was raised when the Speaker was here and he has decided that this will go only up to 2.30.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Now you are in the Chair and you can decide.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry I leave it to the Speaker. If he wants to extend the time, let him do so.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Please consult him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Unless the House is prepared to forego the Non-official Business.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why should we forego that? We can take it up at 3.30 and go up to 6.00.

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, we are entirely in the hands of the House. If they want to cut into non-official business we have no objection. I only want to point out that I will have to go to the other House at 3.00.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Defence Minister is there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. We will continue this discussion up to 3.00 and then take up non-official business.

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, on Monday there should be nothing on this except my reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes. We will close this at 3.00 P.M. and take up non-official business. The Minister will reply to the debate on Monday.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Sir, when the great Julius Caesar was murdered by Brutus and his friend Mark Anthony began to deliver his will distributing his lands and gardens Caesar became more triumphant after his death than when he was alive. So also, with regard to Shastriji, when he was alive he did his best and he died like a hero. This Tashkent Agreement is his last will and testament to the Indian nation. This agreement has made him more powerful, more potent, more influential, more respectable and more immortal after his death than when he was alive. He laid down his life for a noble cause. We cannot forget that the last breath of his life, the last drop of blood in his body, he sacrificed to bring the two countries, that formed Hindustan, together at Tashkent.

Sir, the Tashkent spirit is very extra-ordinary. When my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony was saying that we should do this and do that, I wondered whether he wanted us to go and occupy Pakistan. What is his objection? Does he want us to go and occupy Pakistan? Perhaps, Sir, through the Tashkent spirit we may arrive at a settlement on Kashmir. We have not closed the doors. We have kept the door open.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru for eighteen long years struggled with Pakistan asking for peace. But Pakistan banged the door on him. He proposed a no-war declaration which they rejected. But, finally, even through war and violence we have arrived at a settlement. We growled at each other. We looked at each other with dark fierce eyes. But today that bloody mood has vanished. The by-lanes and high-lanes between India

[Shri Joachim Alva.]

and Pakistan are open. We are ready to go there and they are ready to come here. Shri Hiren Mukerjee said yesterday that there should be more the spirit of such declarations and more of such cultural agreements behind.

Sir, you have to view history for the last twenty years. What did the British do? Before I touch upon the British, I should like to pay a tribute of praise to the defence forces of India. They have done a mighty job. Our airmen and jawans sacrificed their lives fighting on the front. They left their wills and children and went to the front when we were sitting comfortably on these benches. One can imagine what sacrifices they underwent. They were led by our gallant and patriotic Defence Minister. Also, our negotiations were carried on by a devoted and hard-working Foreign Minister led by an immortal, great Prime Minister unto victory, whose memorable words still ring in our ears:

“हथियार का जवाब हथियार है ।”

Mahatma Gandhi was the greatest liberator of India. Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose was our gallant fighter who planted our flag outside India. But for him we would not have been sitting here for so long as we have done. Sardar Patel was the greatest integrator in our history. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the greatest idealist and planner of India. But it was left to Shastriji to be the greatest leader both in peace and war. He had peace in his heart when he led us into war.

Now I come to the British. What happened? The British had played the game of divide and rule. So much blood has flowed down Punjab, so many thousands of people sacrificed their lives because the British rulers planned to divide us, just as they planned to divide Ireland, Iran, Cyprus and even America. North America and Canada would have been one but for the British. They still

want to play the game in the entire region of South-East Asia. They want to see that no one power in South-East Asia is paramount. That is why they put us one against the other. More British ships landed in the harbours of North Vietnam during the last few months giving them aid than of any other power. They played this game with us. The Communist leaders in Socialist Countries were right when they told our delegation that went there that a time bomb was delivered by the British in 1946 by cutting up this land and that bomb has exploded after 20 years resulting in rivers of blood.

Sir, the French had come into our country, the Dutch had come and the Portuguese had occupied our land. The British also invaded and occupied us. But it must be said to the credit of the Soviet Union, for being the only foreign power that has brought us together. It is Soviet Russia, the USSR, that has brought us together for the first time—praise beyond words unto Prime Minister, Mr. Kosygin. The British by their manoeuvres always tried to keep us apart. They drove King Amanullah out of his throne from Afghanistan and I remember, as a student before the thirties, how wildlv he was welcomed in Bombay. The Ranas of Nepal were impregnated with the reaction by the British so that the other side of India may never have anything to do with us across the Himalayas and an iron curtain was thrown between Russia, Afghanistan and India, and even China and ourselves. The hon. Member there referred to Abdul Gaffar Khan. I recall how when I met him at the end of the Gandhi-Irwin truce in Bombay in 1931, how that doleful, patriotic, great man was requested by me to address the Christians. For that he was sentenced for sedition and awarded two years' imprisonment by the then Chief Presidency Magistrate who was later knighted. So, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan was sentenced for

preaching non-violence and he got two years imprisonment. I wrote a letter to Mahatma Gandhi who, in his turn, wrote a letter to the Government. Shri Bhulabhai Desai also pleaded his case but in vain, because the Britishers were angry that he was preaching for independence. That same Ghaffar Khan is now in a friendly country, languishing there. We are not concerned with what happens in Pakistan; it is their business. According to the Tashkent Declaration we shall not interfere in the internal affairs of their country. But our hearts go out to Ghaffar Khan who is still suffering, even though we have become independent. His brother, Dr. Khan Saheb, one of the greatest Ministers in India or Pakistan, died at the hands of an assassin and was buried deep down. Jhastriji was to go to Kabul to meet Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and the King of Afghanistan nor call on Ghaffar Khan. Tashkent. But death came in his way. He was not able to meet the King of Afghanistan nor call on Ghaffar Khan. I remember his younger days when he was in Bombay. I remember, I was a student of the great Khadilkar then. The British put him into jail for two years. Shri Bhulabhai Desai defended him. I was present at the trial.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are discussing the Tashkent Agreement.

Shri Joachim Alva: This is the background in which we have to view the Tashkent Agreement. This is the background of the British policy—putting one community against another, one part of India against another. The Tashkent Agreement ushers in a new spirit. We are trying to forget the bitter past. We will proceed in a new direction.

We have also to remember the part played by China. They gave a green signal to Pakistan to invade our territory. She told Pakistan: creep and attack Kashmir, we shall close our eyes. This was the same China which had told us years ago that the Kashmir problem should be settled in a

peaceful manner. Marshal Chen Yi, the Foreign Minister of China was in Karachi on the 4th September, 1965. On the 5th September, Pakistan started the hostilities with the approval of Marshal Chen Yi. So, the Chinese danger is still not over.

After twenty years of bloodshed and war, the Tashkent spirit has come. Peace has settled on the region and there is an atmosphere of cordiality. It is not correct and proper for some of the Opposition parties to say at this stage that they do not agree to this. On the eve of his departure to Tashkent, Shastriji, the late Prime Minister, met the leaders of Opposition parties and this is what they told him: you do whatever you like, but deliver the goods; we shall support you.

श्री मधु लिखये : ऐसा नहीं कहा था ।

Shri Joachim Alva: He spent his last drop of blood to achieve peace. It is our bounden duty to complete his unfinished task.

There is one thing which I want to say about the Tashkent Agreement. Let us not forget that there are a large number of Muslims in this country. There are more Muslims in India than UAR, Turkey, Iraq or Iran put together. They are happy here and everything is going on smoothly. They have no complaints about the treatment meted out to them here. In fact, even in the recent conflict, Muslim warriors have sacrificed their lives for the cause of India. I should not forget to mention here the gallant deeds of Havildar Abdul Hameed. He also died in the conflict along with so many Rajus, Tarapores and Tyagis and others. We cannot forget them all.

There is one rainbow in the sky. I remember the rainbow which came in the sky on the 15th of August 1947 at 5 O' Clock in Delhi. That rainbow in the sky was a wonderful sign for us. But at 7 O' Clock we heard of mir problem should be settled in a

(Shri Joacim Alva.)

Declaration is another rainbow in the sky.

The Tashkent spirit has to be preserved by us at all costs. We have to work towards it. We have to see that both countries march on the road to progress. We must help Pakistan to be on the right path. We should not permit her to falter in her steps. If we succeed in that mission, peace will reign in this sub-continent against all external dangers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have mistakenly said earlier that the House will sit up to 6 O'Clock. It will sit only up to 5-30 p.m. We will take up Private Members' business at 3 O'Clock. Hon. Members should be brief and should not take more than ten minutes.

Shri Sheo Narain: This is a very important subject. It is more important than non-official business. So, we should get a chance to speak on this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry, I will have to close this discussion at 3 O'Clock.

Shri Seshiyani (Parambalur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, on behalf of the DMK Party I welcome the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration. It is a major step in the right direction of bringing in peace and friendship between these two countries. After a troubled history of 18 years, during which time there were strained relations between India and Pakistan, this joint declaration by the Prime Minister of India and President of Pakistan has come. It gives a ray of hope for abjuration of violence for settlement of disputed points between the two countries in the sub-continent. That declaration is a signal contribution to the cause of peace in this part of the world for which we have to be thankful and grateful to those who brought about this situation. It symbolises the aspirations of millions of people on either side of the line to live in peace and concord.

We cannot forget that it is a geographical fact that India and Pakistan are neighbours and that we have to live as neighbours. Therefore, whatever may be the disputes that may arise between them, we have to choose between the two paths—whether it has to be settled by violence or by methods of peace. Whatever may be the past history, whichever may be the way to bring in concord and a ray of hope towards civilized manner in which these differences can be settled, that should always be welcomed. Here for a moment we have to pause and imagine what would have happened if the Tashkent Declaration had not been made. If both the countries had not made such a declaration, the tension would have been kept up, probably it would have mounted to a war, probably a bigger and fiercer one. The Tashkent Declaration has eased the tension and paved the way, and I think the right way, for amity and concord between these two countries.

Yesterday and today many points were raised about the constitutional manner in which this agreement is to be implemented. I leave that problem to the Government. It is for them to consider whether it is constitutional or not, come to a decision and implement it. So many things have been said from this side and that side. They have got an able Law Minister who would be able to decide this issue. I am sure they will do it according to the Constitution. So, I leave that bugbear to them. While taking into consideration the opinions expressed by experts, I hope they will also take into consideration the opinion given by a constitutional expert, who has said:

“out of sheer necessity, on the grounds of our sovereignty, those areas should not be allowed to be vacated.”

This is his categorical statement. He is also a constitutional expert of many years standing. His worth was also recognised by this country

and the Prime Minister. I repeat his words:

"Out of sheer necessity, on the grounds of our sovereignty, those areas should not be allowed to be vacated."

This has been stated by Shri G. S. Pathak in the Rajya Sabha on 24th September, 1965, while speaking on the United Nations Security Council Resolution dated 20th September, 1965 regarding cease-fire between India and Pakistan. As this gentleman is the Law Minister of the Government today, I do not know how he is going to reconcile his own opinion with the view of the Government.

It does not mean that I am against the Tashkent Declaration. But whenever the Minister gives his opinion, I hope there will be some sort of uniformity with what he said previously and what he is about to say now.

With these words, I support the spirit of Tashkent which is to usher in an era of peace between these two countries. Let us preserve the spirit of Tashkent Declaration. Let us proceed on the difficult road of peace and strive to bring in an era of peace. Let us also take a pledge to remind ourselves that we are good brothers and good neighbours and that we have to remain so for a long time to come.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Barh): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for this opportunity that you have given me.

Sir, so much has been said about the Tashkent Declaration. From the course of the debate, I have come to understand that this Agreement has been judged from the contents of the Declaration, from the compulsions which brought the existence of this Agreement and also from the importance of this Agreement as a pointer

in the direction of peace. In order to have a proper judgement about this Agreement, we have to assimilate all its aspects, the contents of the Declaration, the compulsions which brought it about and its importance more as a pointer, as has been pointed out by the Foreign Minister, than as a conclusion.

There is no conclusion to Indo-Pakistan problems in the near future because the problems have been conditioned by historical perspective, historical antecedents, of not only today but, as Mr. Alva pointed out, of the time when the Britishers created the feeling of Hindus and Muslims and the Muslim League was born out of that kind of feeling. Since those days, this kind of misunderstanding has been generated and it is impossible for anybody to even presume or even to dream that a complete accord will occur with any such international agreement.

When I was a child, I had read the book *Alice in Wonderland* and I am reminded of a line mentioned in that book that Alice had to run very fast in order to be where she was originally. I did not realise the significance of those words at that time more than ever I realise today that either in the Indian economy or in any international relationship, we have to run fast even in order to be where we were. The Tashkent Agreement has achieved this very thing.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Relatively.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: The first and foremost achievement of the Tashkent Agreement is that it has brought us to a position where we were before this challenge of war, challenge of aggression, was cast on us. We had to meet all the obligations of this challenge. It is not a joke; it is not a small matter. The Defence Minister is sitting here and he realises the significance of war, the money, the men and the material that we were losing everyday. I do not know whether my figure is correct but I understand that everyday,

(Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.)

during all these days when we were meeting the counter-attack of Pakistan, the expenditure was to the tune of Rs. 25-crores. Certainly, if a situation demands, we shall forgo everything for maintaining our honour. But in a country like ours, how can we be blind to the situation that it demanded Rs. 25 crores everyday to meet our obligations? It required 11,000 people to die or to be injured or to be missing to meet our obligations. And yet what did we do? We did not defeat Pakistan. We made Pakistan humble. For the first time, Pakistan realised that war would not pay. The coin which was a bad coin was in circulation and it could never be put into circulation again. This is a lesson that we have given to Pakistan and, I think, that has been one of our great achievements.

The statesmanship demands that we could not go on spending the money, the men and the material for an indefinite period of uncertainty. What was the position? For example, as Mr. Sham Lal Saraf pointed out, in Chhamb sector, they were not moving in spite of all the efforts that we were putting. It was a vital life-line of this country. They were not moving and we could not make them move. There were many other places where we were stuck up and there were many other places where they were stuck up. This was the situation though, comparatively speaking, certainly, we were in a better position. But we cannot say—I again repeat it—that we defeated Pakistan. We made Pakistan humble. We made Pakistan to realise that war cannot be fought with India any longer and we made Pakistan to join us at the conference table. This is the achievement. As Mr. Menon pointed out, Tashkent was a venue where two parties met. The Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. Kosygin, came as only a person who was mediating between the two parties as to how they could be brought at the conference table. I

wish in the Vietnam war the two parties could come at the conference table. The Prime Minister pointed out today that it is very difficult to make two people to come at the conference table. It was not difficult for us. But it was most difficult for Pakistan to come at the conference table, to discuss the merits of the case and to accept the basic agreement of 'no-war'.

Most of the Members have raised the point of 'no-war' agreement. What is the sanctity of 'no-war' agreement with a party which does not have any sanctity for anything? We are presuming so today. Well, it is a fact. The past history of Pakistan has certainly made us feel suspicious. There are cogent reasons for that. Even today, this argument holds good. Even if we have a 'no-war' agreement with Pakistan, what is the guarantee that Pakistan will not violate that agreement in future? They are doing it right now and the apprehensions that have risen in the minds of the people are because of the interpretation that has been given by Mr. Bhutto, Mr. Ayub and Mr. Ahmed, the Foreign Secretary of the Pakistan Government to the fundamental concept of the United Nations Charter which has been incorporated in the Tashkent Agreement itself. That creates a doubt and suspicion in the minds of the people. But this is Pakistan. The Members would have been very happy if a 'no-war' agreement had been signed. But I say: What guarantee is there that Pakistan would not violate it? No agreement would have carried that amount of sanctity if a party wants to violate it. It can violate any agreement, whether it is a 'no-war' agreement or any such other agreement.

This Agreement has brought into existence the end of war. The machine guns, the heavy mortar guns, the tanks, etc. are not moving. This is what has happened under the Tashkent Agreement. The peace has

come into existence. It has checked the imbalance of power which was being generated very rapidly. After all, China is there. It was our problem and not so much their problem. Therefore, whatever we have achieved has set in motion bilateral discussions for creating a peaceful atmosphere.

Before I conclude, I would like to point out this morning's report and the broadcast which was made by the All India Radio about the news from Rawalpindi that we are going back to the position as was obtaining in 1949. I would like to point out to the Defence Minister—he is no longer sitting here; I am sure his colleagues who are sitting here will report to him—that reorientation of strategy has to take place. We have been meeting our obligations through the defence forces. We have been meeting our obligations on all fours. We have to assimilate our position in such a way that we can to any situation and meet our obligations fully in any situation. Take, for instance, the border of Azad Kashmir with Pakistan. They have surrendered 3000 sq. miles of Azad Kashmir territory to China. It has become a danger not only from Pakistan but it is more from China. The border of Azad Kashmir goes into the border of Sinkiang a part of China and there is a place called Khotan very near the border of Azad Kashmir from where the operations on Tibet were carried out. From there, not only a track has been made but a regular air service has been started between Khotan and Peshawar. If we go back to 1949 position, do we realise the implication of reducing our strength in that area which is on the border of China? I do not think it is proper for anybody to agree to this situation that we shall go back to 1949 position.

I am appealing to the Defence Minister through this House that he should not allow such a rapid withdrawal of Indian troops because that kind of withdrawal can always cause

danger. This is a danger which we must realise before it is too late.

15 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The discussion is over.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How many Members are standing at a time! They may kindly resume their seats.

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाब : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बड़े महत्व का विषय है। सभी कई माननीय सदस्यों ने इस पर बोलना है। हम चाहते हैं कि इस विषय पर और चर्चा होनी चाहिए। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस के लिए केवल साघ घंटे का समय प्रोबद्धार दिया जाये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shall we extend it upto 3.30 P.M.?

Several hon. Members: Yes.

Several Deputy-Speaker: All right; we shall go upto 3.30 P.M.

15:01 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT—
contd.

FOOD SITUATION IN WEST BENGAL—
contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Minister for Food & Agriculture got the information?

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri C. Subramaniam): Yes; I have got some information which I can supply to the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): In the morning when we were speaking...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. member got up without permission and goes on. He may kindly resume his seat.