

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now the question is that leave be granted to Shri S. M. Banerjee to move his adjournment motion on price rise. Those in favour may please rise in their seats.... I find that the number is more than 50. Leave is granted.

At what time you would like to take it up for discussion?

**SOME MEMBERS:** After Lunch.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Do you want to take it up today?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Yes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the House agrees, instead of 4.00 P.M., we can take it up immediately after Lunch. The Minister's statement can be circulated. He can lay it on the Table of the House (*Interruptions*) or he can make it after discussion.

एक बात की मतिवला आ गई है आज के लिए। श्री फाउंडन अली इहमद की बेंटी की शादी रात के पांच बजे है।

**श्री हुकम चन्द कछबाय :** इन्से क्या मतलब है ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** बल की आपके भी होगी। आप को भी करना पड़ेगा।

I think, we can take it up tomorrow. (*Interruptions*). Let us accommodate him. It can be taken up as the first item tomorrow.

12.35 hrs.

#### RE. SITUATION IN ASSAM

**श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (स्टन) :** आपने सी० आई० ए० वाली बात के बारे में कहा था कि आप वाद में बताएंगे। आपने कुछ नहीं बताया है। संविधान के प्रति एनीजियंस की इन्होंने शपथ ले रखी है। जो आपने आपको सी० आई० ए० एजेंट कहते हैं उनको हाउस से डिबार किया जाना चाहिए।

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai):** I have a submission to make to you. In the last meeting that you conveyed of the leaders of Opposition Parties, we raised the language riots in Assam and it is agreed that the Government will make a statement on the law and order situation in Assam and on the basis of that, there will be a discussion. But, in to-day's business paper, I do not find there is any such item.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour):** What is happening in Assam is a shame to this country. It is a shame to any civilisation and this Government and this Party is at the root of all this trouble and it is a silent spectator. This is not the first time it is happening....

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am allowing a calling attention on it for tomorrow.

Mr. Piloo Mody, whatever be their objections regarding whether it is a question of Parties opposite to you or otherwise, so far as the dignity and decorum of this House is concerned, inside this House I do not think it is proper that people should come with signs and symbols. You can do any thing outside, but it is very improper in this House.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: (Begusarai):** His dog is also wearing it.

12.37 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE  
PAKISTAN'S CONTINUED INTRANSIGENCE IN RESPECT OF DELINEATION OF LINE OF ACTUAL CONTROL IN JAMMU AND KASHMIR.

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (वाराणसी) :**

मैं अत्रिलम्बनीय लोक मन्त्र के निम्न निम्न विषय की ओर विदेश मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इन बारे में एक बक्तव्य दें :

“...म्हूँ और कश्मीर में वास्तविक नियंत्रण रेखा के रेखांकन के सम्बन्ध में पाकिस्तान का निरन्तर दुराग्रह”

**THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH):** Mr. Speaker Sir, Hon'ble Members would recall my statement in the House on August 30, at the conclusion of the meeting between the representatives of India and Pakistan, wherein I had conveyed the agreement of both sides to the delineation of the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir along its entire length. I had also stated that maps showing this agreed line would be exchanged by both sides and that delineation of the line would be completed by the 4th September, 1972 and withdrawals to the international border would be completed by the 15th September. In accordance with the Simla Agreement the line of control had to be mutually respected, therefore its delineation has to be agreed so that its inviolability may be ensured by both sides.

The Senior Military Commanders of India and Pakistan, who were entrusted with the task of delineating the line of control on maps, have so far held 9 rounds of discussions. By the 7th round which was completed on 18th October, an agreement was reached on 19 maps delineating the entire length of the line of control from the Chamb area on the international border to Partapur sector in the North. These maps were to be signed in the 8th round. On that occasion, however Pakistan's Senior Military Commander raised a fresh controversy over a pocket approximately 1½ square miles in area which is in Pakistan's occupation but separate from the line of control. Several messages have been exchanged between the Chiefs of the Army Staff of India and Pakistan on this issue and as a result further meetings took place between the Senior Military Commanders on November 7 and 9. However, these discussions failed to iron out the differences. It is now being considered whether the stage has been reached for a meeting at another level to resolve this question.

Honourable Members would appreciate that as the talks are still in progress, it would not be in our national interest to discuss this matter in greater detail. The major task of delineation of the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir, in terms of the Simla and Delhi Agreements has been completed on maps. It is hoped that the remaining problem will also be resolved by further bilateral discussions. After the delineation of the line of control is approved by the two Governments the withdrawal of troops to the international border will be completed in the shortest possible time. We hope that Pakistan Government will view this matter in a realistic and constructive manner.

**श्री छटल बिहारी बाजपेयी :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस उद्देश्य से यह ध्यानाकर्षण सूचना दी गई थी, विदेश मंत्री ने अपने वक्तव्य में उसे पूरा नहीं होने दिया। सूचना का उद्देश्य यह था कि इस सदन को, श्रीर देश को, यह पता लगे कि शिमला समझौता की गाड़ी किस पट्टाड़ी पर या मैदान में जम कर रुक गई है और दोनों देशों के बीच में कौन सा विवाद खड़ा हो गया है। विदेश मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि, राष्ट्रीय हितों में इस सम्बन्ध में ज्यादा बताना ठीक नहीं होगा। मैं "राष्ट्रीय हितों" की उन की परिभाषा से सहमत नहीं हूँ। पाकिस्तान से वार्ता चले, लेकिन इस सदन को, श्रीर देश को, भी त्रिभुवन में लेना होगा कि वार्ता किस मूढ़ पर अटक गई है। राष्ट्रीय हितों का तकाजा है कि हमें बताया जाये कि सीमा के अंकन का काम क्यों रुक गया।

हम ने अखबारों में पढ़ा है कि इंसानों पर प्रश्न मंत्री श्रीर पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्रपति के बीच में पत्रव्यवहार हुआ है। संसदीय मर्यादा का तकाजा यह था कि उस पत्रव्यवहार को सदन की मेज पर रखा जात, हमें त्रिभुवन में लिया जाता, हमें पत्रव्यवहार से पता लगता है कि किस बात पर विवाद है।

धीर उस को हल करने के लिए क्या किया जा रहा है। दोनों देशों के सेनापतियों के बीच में भी पत्रव्यवहार हुआ है। उस को भी प्रकाश में नहीं आने दिया गया। मेरे, लिये धीर सदन के किसी भी सदस्य के लिए, यह तय करना मुश्किल है कि पर्दे के पीछे क्या हो रहा है।

मुझे 31 जुलाई की तारीख याद है। तब तो हम सदन में भकेले थे। अब तो प्रधान मंत्री भी कहती हैं कि पाकिस्तान का रबैया कठोर हो गया है।

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra):  
Great similarities.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : वह कब से कठोर हो गया है? क्यों कठोर हो गया है? यह ध्यानाकर्षण सूचना तो एक सीमित विषय पर है। लेकिन मैं चाहूंगा कि भारत और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्धों पर सदन में बहस करने का मौका दिया जाये।

विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने इस वक्तव्य में स्वीकार किया है कि शिमला समझौते को बचाने के लिए जो दिल्ली समझौता हुआ था—समझौते पर जो समझौता हुआ था, उस में यह व्यवस्था भी कि जम्मू और काश्मीर में नियंत्रण की रेखा का अंकन किया जायेगा। इस वक्तव्य में भी उन्होंने वही बात कही है। मैं उसको दोहराना चाहता हूँ :

.....wherein I had conveyed the agreement of both sides to the deliniation of the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir along its entire length.

पूरी सीमा के अंकन का सवाल था। कमांडरों में बातचीत हुई। कहते हैं कि 19 नवम्बर पर सहमति हो गई और दस्तखत करने के लिए तारीख तय हो गई, लेकिन पाकिस्तान मंफ़र गया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब पाकिस्तान मंफ़र गया, तो हमारे कमांडर-इन-चीफ़ ने पाकिस्तान को यह आकर क्यों दिया कि भले ही हमारी राय में

डेढ़ मील के इलाके पर इतिफ़ाक नहीं हुआ है, उस को छोड़ दो, हम अपनी सेनायें वापिस करने के लिये तैयार हैं? यह जो विवाद का विषय है, क्या यह सीमा के अंकन के अन्तर्गत नहीं आता? जब हम ने पूरी सीमा का अंकन करने का निश्चय किया था, तो फिर उस स्टैंड से पीछे हटने का सवाल कहां पैदा होता है? लेकिन सरकार ने पाकिस्तान से कह दिया कि इस विवाद पर चर्चा चलती रहेगी और हम अपनी फ़ौजें हटा लेते हैं।

पाकिस्तान ने इस बात को नहीं माना। पाकिस्तान हम पर यह आरोप लगा रहा है कि हम शिमला समझौते को दोबारा लिखना चाहते हैं। पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति दावा कर रहे हैं कि उन के लिए सिद्धान्त का सवाल है। तो क्या हमारे लिए सिद्धान्त का सवाल नहीं है? आखिर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा पर दोनों देशों की फ़ौजें वापिस जानी हैं। ठाठू चक या टाकुरचौक हमारा क्षेत्र है। वह हमें वापिस मिलना चाहिए और पाकिस्तान की सेना वहां से हटनी चाहिए। लेकिन हम उस विवाद को बनाये रख कर सीमा पर से अपनी फ़ौजे हटाने के लिए तैयार हैं। क्या यह भारत सरकार के स्टैंड में परिवर्तन नहीं है? इस परिवर्तन का कारण क्या है? जब तक पाकिस्तान उस इलाके को खाली नहीं करता, तब तक सीमा के अंकन का काम पूरा नहीं होता और जब तक सीमा के अंकन का काम पूरा नहीं होता तब तक हम अपनी फ़ौजें कैसे वापिस हटा सकते हैं?

यह भी रहस्य की बात है कि पाकिस्तान ने इस इलाके के बारे में कोई समझौता माना था या नहीं माना था। पहले सरकार की ओर से कहा गया कि पाकिस्तान के कमांडर ने बात मान ली है, केवल दस्तखत करना बाकी है। पाकिस्तान को भी यह सूचना दी गई कि हम इसके बारे में बहस नहीं करेंगे, अगर दस्तखत करने के लिए मिनता हो, तो आओ। इस स्टैंड से भी सरकार मंफ़र गई

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी] है। अब कहा जा रहा है कि हम बात करने के लिए तैयार हैं। इस से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमारी स्थिति हास्यास्पद हुई है। ये आरोप लगाये जा रहे हैं कि तथ्यों के बारे में मतभेद पैदा हो गया है। आखिर जब कमांडर मिलते हैं, तो उन की बातचीत लिखी जाती है, उस का कोई रिकार्ड होता है। वह रिकार्ड क्या बताता है? पाकिस्तान ने माना था या नहीं माना था? अगर एक बार पाकिस्तान मान गया, तो हम इस स्टैंड पर क्यों नहीं अड़े रहे कि केवल दस्तखत करना बाकी है, अब आगे बातचीत नहीं होगी? अगर पाकिस्तान समझौते का सम्मान नहीं करना चाहता है, तो फ़ौजें नहीं हटेंगी, क्योंकि सीमा का अंकन नहीं हुआ है।

अगर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा पर फ़ौजों के वापिस जाने का सवाल है, तो केवल ठाठू चक से नहीं, जिसे ठाकुरचौक भी कहा जाता है, पाकिस्तान की सेना छम्ब के क्षेत्र से भी वापिस जानी चाहिए। छम्ब का क्षेत्र अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा से लगा हुआ है। पाकिस्तान की सेना अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा का उल्लंघन कर के छम्ब के क्षेत्र में प्रविष्ट हुई थी। लीपा वैली की चौकियां हमारी थीं, जिन पर पाकिस्तान ने 17 दिसम्बर के बाद कब्जा किया। उन को वापिस लेने के लिए हम ने चकनोट दे दिया। हम ने अपनी भूमि को पाकिस्तान को समर्पित कर दिया। हमने जमीन का सौदा किया। हमने भूमि की रक्षा नहीं की।

आज हमें दर्द है कि पाकिस्तान के जो दस लाख लोग विस्थापित हो गये हैं, उन का क्या होगा। वे रबी की फ़सल बो सकें, उस को काट सकें, इस के बारे में भारत सरकार चिन्तित है। लेकिन छम्ब के जो लोग विस्थापित हो गये हैं, बेघरबार हो कर उजड़े हैं, उन का क्या होगा? भारत सरकार वह मांग कर सकती है कि पाकिस्तान छम्ब के क्षेत्र को भी खाली करे, क्योंकि शिमला

समझौते के अन्तर्गत अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा पर जहां भी फ़ौजें आगे बढ़ी हैं, उन को वापिस जाना चाहिए।

मैं चाहूंगा कि विदेश मंत्री महोदय इन प्रश्नों के स्पष्ट उत्तर दें। सरकार के मंत्री भ्रमण भ्रमण भाषा में बोल रहे हैं। इस से जनता में बड़ा भ्रम पैदा हो रहा है। कभी कहा जाता है पाकिस्तान का हमला होने वाला है, कभी कहा जाता है कि हमला होने का कोई खतरा नहीं है। हम विदेश मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहते हैं कि जिस भावना से भारत सरकार ने शिमला समझौता किया था क्या पाकिस्तान उसी भावना से उस का पालन कर रहा है और अगर नहीं कर रहा है तो पाकिस्तान की भावना बदलने का क्या कारण है? अगर पाकिस्तान की भावना बदल गई तो क्या भारत एक तरफ़ा शांति की साधना करेगा? क्या एकतरफ़ा शांति की साधना फल देगी?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I will confine myself to the specific points he has asked me either to clarify or give further information. I would like to say that the statement of the hon. member that there is any different projection by different Ministers is not correct.

He asked whether our Commander made an offer to Pakistan to withdraw troops from the main Punjab-Rajasthan-Gujarat-Pakistan border, keeping this issue apart. Yes, an offer was made, as has appeared in the newspapers. It was a good offer....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI SWARN SINGH:....and the fact that Pakistan did not accept it is perhaps of some consolation to the hon. Member opposite. That should be the criterion as to whether we looked after our interest or not; he would agree with me there.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:**  
Had Pakistan agreed then?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** There was absolutely no change in Government's stand. All along we had taken the view that the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir has to be delineated first, because there is the agreement that it has to be mutually respected. Both sides should know what it is before it can be respected. Hence the inevitability of agreement on the delineation of the line of control as it existed on 17 December 1971 in Jammu and Kashmir. As that has not yet been finalised, if there are any outstanding matters, we cannot raise a public debate about the substance of that because bilateral agreement means that both sides, although having different approaches, different stands, will sit down and try to straighten out matters, try to come to a mutually acceptable arrangement. It should be appreciated that in any negotiations of that importance and delicacy, no side should take a public stand. That does not help the negotiators in carrying on their negotiations. It was for this reason that I had mentioned that point in my statement.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:**  
Then why has Pakistan taken a public stand?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** Pakistan has not taken any public stand. There may be some public statement by certain people; we do not regard that as a public stand at all, unless there is a formal communication to us or a statement by any of their Ministers or officials.

As for the progress that has been made, I have mentioned that 19 maps have already been initialled—agreement has been arrived at. If there is a difference of opinion, we should, according to the Simla Agreement, try to resolve it bilaterally. If the military commanders at that level cannot

resolve it, then perhaps military commanders at another level can. If even then that is not resolved, there can be a meeting at some other level, at civilian officials level or even at government level. Because let us not forget that the essence of the Simla Agreement is that there should be peaceful settlement of disputes and it should be arrived at bilaterally. When there is this bilateralism, there can be different of opinion. If by bilateralism, we feel that there is no difference of opinion or difference of approach, then there is no need for negotiation.

So this should be viewed in this perspective, and we should not run to the conclusion and make statements to this effect that we should get out of the Simla Agreement because Pakistan have not accepted a particular point. Then we should repudiate the whole agreement; that is not a correct attitude. We do not accept the validity of this stand. We have taken a deliberate decision to resolve all differences between India and Pakistan bilaterally and by mutual agreement. There may be difficulties; there will be difficulties. The Prime Minister has rightly said that we get this impression that Pakistan's stand has hardened, but that does not mean that by that hardening of attitude we should give up the basic point, namely, that the two sides should settle the issues by mutual agreement and bilaterally. We adhere to that, and we hope that Pakistan also, in accordance with the statement made by President Bhutto and by other Government spokesmen, would adhere to the letter and spirit of the Simla agreement. We do hope that the outstanding dispute between the two, or the question that still remains unresolved, would be resolved by mutual discussion.

**SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE:**  
What about the Chhamb area?

श्री राममोक्ष प्रसाद सिंह (छपरा) :  
माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा दृष्टिकोण इस

[श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह]

प्रश्न के संबंध में ऐसा नहीं है जैसा कि पिछले वक्ता ने कहा है और न मेरी परिभाषा ही ऐसी है। मैं उस परिभाषा को मानता हूँ जो मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि देश के हित में इस पर ज्यादा बहस नहीं करनी चाहिए। इसको मानता हूँ। इसको मानते हुए इस अवसर पर मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ। अगर उसका उत्तर न भी मिले तो भी मैं सरकार को बता देना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रतिनिधि और पाकिस्तान के भी प्रतिनिधि जो यहाँ दिल्ली में पांच दिन तक वार्ता करते रहे और वार्ता के बाद प्रगति संतोषजनक कही गई और जिस दिक्कत की वजह से वह पांच दिनों तक किसी असली राय पर नहीं पहुँच सके उसका हल होना चाहिए। उसका हल करने के लिए अगर अफसरों के लेवल पर उसका समाधान नहीं हो पाता है तो मेरी राय में सरकार को ऊपर के लेवल से उसको तय करना चाहिए। यों जो आपने बताया है वार्ता की प्रगति संतोषजनक है और दोनों देशों के अन्दर बात चल रही है, तो कुछ समय लगना आवश्यक है। लेकिन देश के अन्दर यहाँ और पाकिस्तान में भी जो प्रसन्नता शिमला समझौता होने के बाद हुई थी उतनी प्रसन्नता नहीं है। इसमें देर होती है लेकिन इस दिक्कत का भी समाधान होना चाहिए। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय के उत्तर से सह्यति प्रकट करता हूँ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would like only to say that I have already accepted this position, that the stage has arrived when serious consideration can be given as to whether discussion at another level may or may not be undertaken.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Sir, it was the intention and hope and aspiration of the whole of the Indian people, after liberation of Bangladesh, that will be restored in the Indian sub-continent, and perhaps with that hope, although prematurely, and without, I should say, study,—our Government have been steadily deluding themselves—the Government have relied too much on a person who is known as politically mercurial and who is known as an unreliable person.

13 hrs.

We entered into the Simla Pact with the hope that it will be possible for us to have peace in the Indian sub-continent. Certainly I agree with our hon. Minister that peace is our objective and we should not try to do anything which will harm the cause of peace. The objective of Simla pact was peace. But where is peace? Is the spirit of peace anywhere clinging to the Simla pact? If it is not, why should we, why India should cling to it? What national interest will it serve if India clinged to the dead ghost of Simla pact? The hon. Minister says that in our national interest we should not discuss the matter in greater detail. What is that national interest? The day before yesterday, the Prime Minister in an address to the Congress Party said something; she said: despite our best efforts, "it seems peace will continue to elude us": "Pakistan's attitude has hardened". She has also accused big Powers and said: "there is not going to be peace because some big Powers do not like it."

Look at the two diverging viewpoints: one put forward by the Prime Minister herself that the attitude of Pakistan is hardening and some big powers are not allowing restoration of peace in this continent. She categorically says so. It is not a technical question of demarcation of lines; it is something more; the Prime Minister says so; but our hon. Minister says that it is a technical question and only delimitation of border, is

there; he does not want to go into greater details. In the national interest, the Prime Minister has given a warning to the whole nation while the hon. Foreign Minister says it is a technical thing. It is not so. What does it mean? This has been aptly described by Mr. Bhutto himself on 3rd October. He said that "India was resiling from the Simla pact": further he says that 1.77 sq. miles might be a tiny piece of land and this piece of land is not the most important thing; but it is the "principle" that is involved. It is not a question of small piece of land; it is a question of principle. Our Prime Minister looks at the whole problem from the point of view of greater perspective. Even from the point of view of the principle as has been rightly said by Mr. Bhutto himself, the question of principle is involved; not a tiny piece of land; otherwise he will not be foolish enough as he would not have endangered the future of 5,000 sq. miles of Pakistani territory, nor the future of 93,000 prisoners of war. During these 4½ months after the signing of the Simla Pact, something has happened and the attitude of Pakistan has changed. In the course of the discussion on the Simla pact, we tried to draw the attention of the Government; I was not allowed to conclude my speech. We have relied on Mr. Bhutto too much. I said: "you are hyperbolically hailing the pact". I said that the Government missed the most opportune moment to restore peace in the Indian sub-continent by their premature haste in having a bilateral pact with Pakistan, in exclusion of Bangla Desh. Now Pakistan is bringing in many issues like the issue of prisoners of war, recognition of Bangladesh, issue of Pakistani citizens now in Bangladesh and so on. You know that the UN is going to discuss the Yugoslav resolution on the issue of recognition of Bangladesh. Therefore, it will be absolutely wrong and against the national interests if we look at the question only from the point of view of this piece of land or that piece of land. I re-

peat that we have made a mistake in having talked with Pakistan excluding Bangladesh. Peace in the sub-continent is indivisible. Without an understanding between India, Bangladesh and Pakistan together, there is not going to be peace in the sub-continent.

I want to know why the Prime Minister has made a statement the day before that Pakistan's attitude has hardened, that peace is eluding us and that some big powers are not allowing us to have peace in the sub-continent. After the failure of two deadlines for completing the delineation of the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir, I want to know whether the Government of India has the right to say that as soon as delineation is completed, the army will withdraw, without having another round of official talks between India and Pakistan. I also want to know whether it is a fact that within one year after the war, Pakistan has amassed huge arms and ammunitions from China, USA and other parts of the world and whether it is a fact that by quitting SEATO, Pakistan has reactivated CENTO with a view to develop its war potential. The news has also appeared in the press that Pakistan has mobilised some of the armaments in the border....

MR. SPEAKER: You are going much beyond the scope of the calling attention motion.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I want to know whether the Government will have a fresh thinking on the issue of the Simla Pact and whether before the recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan, we will refuse to withdraw from the occupied territory.

MR. SPEAKER: Only one question is allowed under the rules, but so many questions are being asked.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I will try to answer the highly philosophical part of his questions....

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** Not philosophical at all; it is as realistic as you and I are.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** He has also put some questions. He asked, why should the Prime Minister make the statement which has been published in the press? Of course, this was an assessment of the situation and the Prime Minister made a correct and very timely statement. There is nothing further to be said about that statement. Then he said, two deadlines were fixed for completing the delineation and because they could not be adhered to, therefore we should not talk of withdrawal.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** The Prime Minister has alarmed the whole nation.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** This is not a correct approach. In fact, we want the delineation to be completed and the time frame has been agreed upon that withdrawals will take place after delineation of the line of control is mutually agreed upon. Our effort should be to find mutually acceptable agreement and as soon as that agreement is arrived at, we adhere to our undertaking that the troops will be withdrawn.

The third question that he asked is that Pakistan is collecting arms and we should take note of it. Of course, we have taken note of it. We are not sitting idle. But just to make this type of statement of an alarmist character does not help anyone. My colleague, the Defence Minister....

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** It is not correct to say...

**MR. SPEAKER:** I would request the Minister not to give a reply if he interrupts like this at every stage.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** I think it is a good step that Pakistan has left SEATO, because we have been totally opposed to any defence pact. If she leaves CENTO also and joins the group of non-aligned countries, it will be a

good development. So, they have gone half way and I do not see why you should object to that.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** I do not object to that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Why don't you have a little patience to listen to the reply?

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** The question of reactivation of CENTO has a new meaning.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** The CENTO has always been there. We know that Pakistan is a member of the CENTO. We are fully aware of the goings on in the CENTO context and any planning that we have either in the external relations or in the matter of the security of the country will certainly take note of all these factors.

He has raised a rather interesting point that we should not talk to Pakistan on any matter unless they recognise Bangladesh. I think the objective is that there should be normalisation of relations in the sub-continent. So, we should not allow anything to stand in the way of the realisation of that objective, and we should continue to sort any differences that might be there. Anything mutually agreed upon between India and Pakistan in fact helps the situation in the entire sub-continent, including Bangladesh, and I would request the hon. Member to view it in that light.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I pose a few specific questions to the hon. Minister, I would like to say a word to clarify the perpective of these questions. As a seen pasist I believe that any heightening of tension between Pakistan and India always strengthens the growth of communal reaction in both the countries and, therefore, if any efforts for durable peace fail it is a matter

re.

of deepest regret to me. Therefore, if I pose a few questions to the hon. Minister, I do so more in anguish than in anger. The question of happiness does not arise at all.

In the context of the stagnated talks on delineation, President Bhutto remarked that efforts are being made by India to redraft the entire Simla Pact, and that too at a new level of Army commanders' meeting. If this is the position, does not the hon. Minister feel that this statement of President Bhutto is an indication of the tremendous troubles that President Bhutto is facing at home?

Secondly, though the Simla Agreement was characterised as a new break-through, is it not a fact that new difficulties that are being created on the question of delineation are really the hang-overs of the past Indo-Pak relations, particularly on the question of Kashmir?

Thirdly, though President Bhutto took over the reins from the military regime there are again hang-overs of the past and still there is a substantial hold of the army rule and army personnel and the influence which the military personnel still wield is creating new and fresh difficulties in the problem of delineation.

My next question is...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Mr. Dandavate, the rules are very definite. According to rules, only one question is allowed. You can ask one question, inter-linking all its parts. Please don't make my position awkward. It is very embarrassing for me to allow you question after question.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** I always try to be brief and precise. I will take less time than what others have taken.

Is it not a fact that there is a conflict of interests between President Bhutto and prominent personnel of the Army? Is it not a fact that Mr. Tikka Khan who had a very notorious record in Bangladesh is realising the

fact that interest of President Bhutto lies in going to the people of Pakistan, telling them, "I have a new feather in my cap. I am prepared to swallow the bitter pill of Simla Agreement because that will give me an opportunity of getting back the occupied territory of Pakistan from the hands of India and also, at a later stage, bring about the release of Pakistani prisoners of war."? That is the interest of President Bhutto.

The conflict of interest of the Army is that senior Army officers realise today that the moment delineation is completed, the deadlock is solved and the withdrawal of troops begins, they will come face to face with reality of Bangladesh and, since the Bangladesh Government has already decided to go in for the trial of war criminals, they will have to face the situation. They feel, if senior military officers are returned back, this will be the difficulty that will be created. As a result of that, the Army people are trying to put military pressure and trying to create difficulties on the problem of delineation.

As far as the involvement of foreign powers is concerned, I would like the hon. Minister to make a categorical statement as to what are the foreign powers which, according to the Government, are involved and what is the political situation, specially, in the Asian sub-continent which is responsible for the intervention of foreign powers. As a political reality as well as a political strategy, would the Government like to declare very categorically that we are all out for peace, that we will make genuine and sincere efforts to honour the Simla Agreement, but, if consistently new difficulties are created by Pakistan, we cannot take it for granted that this option of the Simla Agreement remains open indefinitely? Are we not going to put some condition and give an indication that if they consistently go on creating new difficulties and putting new pressures, the option of the Simla Agreement

[PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE]

is not going to be indefinitely open to them?

On the same background, I would like to know whether with a new situation developing in talk with Pakistan, that has in effect almost nullified the Simla Agreement, there is the need to face, the problem of delineation and other problems in a new way? Since, in effect, they are almost nullifying the spirit of the Simla Agreement, even as a strategy as well as a political reality, shall we not take a new stand now and go to the extent of bringing Bangladesh into the picture? You can say, "if you continue these nefarious activities and obstructionist methods, we have to insist that recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan will have to be one of the conditions."

With this attitude, I would like to get a clarification from the hon. Minister about it.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: If I may say so, in regard to some of the queries that the hon. Member has raised, some of the doubts that he has expressed, he has also tried answer them in the latter part of his formulations. I would not like to go into them.

I would like to say one thing. I would like to resist the temptation of going into the background of what is happening in Pakistan, what are the internal relations between the Army and the political wing. We have to deal with a Government, with a spokesman of the Government. What are the internal processes that go on is a matter of interest and we keep ourselves informed. But it is not customary to make comments on what is happening inside Pakistan, as to what are the compulsions, what are the brakes, what are the obstructions, to the smooth discharge of the responsibilities that have been undertaken under the Simla Agreement by the

Government of Pakistan. Now there can be a temptation of adopting this attitude that you should speed up, say, the implementation of the process of Agreement and if you do not, then, as he said, we will say that we close the Simla Agreement or add a new condition to it. That is not our attitude; I may say this frankly. Simla Agreement is a self-contained document and it has also laid down the basis on which differences between India and Pakistan can be resolved. I have mentioned it a number of times and I will repeat it. There are two essential points: one is that there will be bilateral discussions and agreements and the second, there will not be any resort to use of force, i.e., by peaceful discussion. Both are excellent principles and to give an impression that we are trying to find some excuse for getting out of this arrangement is neither proper, nor is it in our interest. It is not in the interest of peace either. This is the best way also to keep the interest of other countries in this region or outside agencies to the minimum. You cannot think in isolation. Some countries will continue to have interest; this can be a friendly interest or this can also be an unfriendly interest. The best way to keep this interest out is to stick to the basic ideals and the basic principles of the Simla Agreement, namely, not to resort to use of force and to settle differences bilaterally. We are all-out for peace and it is a good thing to be all out for peace. We should do everything to ensure that there is peace in this sub-continent. That helps everybody; it helps India, it helps Pakistan, it helps Bangladesh...

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: But Mr. Bhutto thinks otherwise.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: We should try to ensure that he gives up that thinking rather than that you also fall a victim to that line of thinking.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: If you permit me, I will ask for a clarification.

My specific question is this—I had asked this question, but he has given a reply—I would not say anything about the question of scrapping the Simla Pact. But would you give an impression that, indefinitely, this option is open?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** I think that there is no question of option. There is a positive element that the two sides will resolve all their differences bilaterally and peacefully. I would stick to this. What is the point in getting out? What is the point in enabling Pakistan to get out of it? It is a good arrangement and it should continue.

13.24 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

PAYMENT OF BONUS (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE; SICK TEXTILE UNDERTAKINGS (TAKING OVER OF MANAGEMENT) ORDINANCE AND ANNUAL ACCOUNTS OF BOMBAY PORT TRUST, 1970-71

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR):

I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy each of the following Ordinances (Hindi and English versions) under provisions of article 123(2)(a) of the Constitution:—

(i) The Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Ordinance, 1972 (No. 9 of 1972) promulgated by the President on the 23rd September, 1972. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-362/72].

(ii) The Sick Textile Undertakings (Taking over of Management) Ordinance, 1972 (No. 9 of 1972) promulgated by the President on the 31st October, 1972. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3621/72].

- (2) A copy of the Annual Accounts (Hindi and English

versions) of the Bombay Port Trust for the year, 1970-71 and the Audit Report thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3622/72].

NOTIFICATION UNDER BANKING COMPANIES (ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF UNDERTAKINGS) ACT, AND THE THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF THE THIRD PAY COMMISSION RE. FURTHER INTERIM RELIEF

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. K. GANESH):

I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy each of the following Notification (Hindi and English versions) under subsection (5) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970:—

(i) The Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Second Amendment) Scheme, 1972, published in Notification No. S.O. 575 (E) in Gazette of India dated the 4th September, 1972. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3623/72].

(ii) The Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Third Amendment) Scheme, 1972, published in Notification No. S.O. 661 (E) in Gazette of India dated the 28th September, 1972. [Placed in Library. See LT-3624/72].

- (2) A copy of the Third Interim Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Third Pay Commission on Further Interim Relief to Central Government Employees. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3625/72].