

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Twelfth Session)



(Vol. XLIV contains Nos. 1 - 10)

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

Price : Rs. 1.00

CONTENTS

COLUMNS

[Third Series, Vol. XLIV—Twelfth Session, 1965]

No. 1.—Monday, August 16, 1965/Sravana 25, 1887 (Saka)

Members Sworn	1-2
Obituary Reference	2-10
Oral Answers to Questions—	
*St Question Nos. 1 to 3	10-32
Written Answers to Questions—	
Unstarred Question Nos. 4 to 13, 13A, 14, 15 and 17 to 30	33-54
Starred Question Nos. 1 to 62	54-93
Re: Questions of Privilege	93
Re: Aspersions on P.A.C. in Bharat Jyoti and apology by the Editor	93-95
Re: Comments on report of P.A.C. by Director of Publicity, Khadi Commission in Times of India and Economic Times	95-96
Re: Motions for Adjournment, Calling Attention notices, etc. (Procedure)	97
Papers laid on the Table	97-114, 134-35
President's Assent to Bills	114
Parliamentary Committees—Summary of work	114
Amendments to rules of Library Committee	115
Re: President's Assent to Bills	115-22
Resignation of Member—(Shri Nityanand Kanungo)	122-23
Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill—	
(i) Report of Joint Committee ; and	123
(ii) Evidence before Joint Committee	123
Statement on situation along cease-fire line and elsewhere in Jammu and Kashmir as well as along Indo-Pakistan Borders (Shri Y.B. Chavan)	123-34
Motions of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers	135-40
Bills introduced—	
(1) Hindu Religious Endowments Bill	140-41
(2) Khuda Baksh Oriental Public Library Bill	141
(3) Aligarh Muslim University (Amendment) Bill	141
(4) Payment of Bonus Bill	141
Statement Re: Aligarh Muslim University (Amendment) Ordinance	142
Statement Re: Payment of Bonus Ordinance	143
Motion Re: Indo-Pakistan agreement on Gujarat-West Pakistan Border	144-252
Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri	164-74
Shri Ranga	181-90
Shri Indrajit Gupta	190-205
Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri	205-16
Shri Yajnik	216-24
Shri Bakar Ali Mirza	224-30
Shri Vidya Charan Shukla	230-35
Dr. M. S. Aney	235-40
Shri Himatsingka	240-41
Shri J.P. Jyotishi	241-46
Shri Bishanchander Seth	247-52
Business Advisory Committee—Thirty-Seventh Report	252

*The sign + marked above the name of a member indicates that the question was actually asked on the floor of the House by that Member.

LOK SABHA

Alphabetical List of Members

A

- Abdur Rashid, Bakshi (Jammu and Kashmir).
Abdul Wahid, Shri T. (Vellore).
Achal Singh, Shri (Agra).
Achuthan, Shri R. (Mavelikara).
Akkamma Devi, Shrimati (Nilgiris).
Alagesan, Shri O. V. (Chingleput).
Alva, Shri A. Shankar (Mangalore).
Alva, Shri Joachim (Kanara).
Alvares, Shri Peter Augustus (Panjim).
Aney, Dr. M. S. (Nagpur).
Anjanappa, Shri B. (Nellore).
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti (Gudivada).
Anthony, Shri Frank (Nominated—Anglo-Indians).
Arunachalam, Shri N. (Ramanathapuram).
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha (Bhagalpur).

B

- Babunath Singh, Shri (Surguja).
Bade, Shri Ramchandra Vithal (Khar-gone).
Badrudduja, Shri (Murshidabad).
Bagri, Shri Mani Ram (Hissar).
Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan (Wardha).
Bakliwal, Shri Mohanlal (Drug).
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri (Chandauli).
Balakrishnan, Shri S. C. (Koilpatti).
Balmiki, Shri K. L. (Khurja).
Banerjee, Shri S. M. (Kanpur).
Banerji, Dr. R. (Bankura).
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka Devi (Barpeta).
Barman, Shri P. C. (Cooch Behar).
:831 (A) LS—1.

B—contd.

- Barrow, Shri A. E. T. (Nominated—Anglo-Indians).
Barua, Shri Hem (Gauhati).
Barua, Shri Rajendranath (Jorhat).
Barupal, Shri Panna Lal (Ganganagar).
Basant Kunwari, Shrimati (Kaisarganj).
Basappa, Shri C. R. (Tiptur).
Basumatari, Shri D. (Goalpara).
Baswant, Shri Sonubhai Dagadu (Thana).
Bateshwar Singh, Shri (Giridih).
Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal (Kotah).
Besra, Shri Satyacharan (Dumka).
Bhagat, Shri Baliram (Shahabad).
Bhagavati, Shri Bijoy Chandra (Darrang).
Bhakt Darshan, Shri (Garhwal).
Bhanja Deo, Shri Laxminarayan (Keonjhar).
Bhanu Parkash Singh, Shri (Rajgarh).
Bhargava, Shri M. B. L. (Ajmer).
Bhatkar, Shri Laxmanrao Shrawanji (Khamgaon).
Bhattacharya, Shri Dinen (Serampur).
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K. (Raiganj).
Bheel, Shri P. H. (Dohad).
Biren Dutta, Shri (Tripura West).
Birendra Bahadur Singh, Shri (Raj-nandgaon).
Bist, Shri Jang Bahadur Singh (Almora).
Borooh, Shri Prafulla Chandra (Sibsagar).
Brahm Prakash, Shri (Outer Delhi).
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri (Gaya).

B—contd.

- Brij Basi Lal, Shri (Faizabad).
 Brij Raj Singh, Shri (Bareilly).
 Brij Raj Singh—Kotah, Shri (Jhalawar).
 Buta Singh, Shri (Moga).

C

- Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu (Barackpore).
 Chakraverti, Shri P. R. (Dhanbad).
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna (Cachar).
 Chandak, Shri B. L. (Chindwara).
 Chandrabhan Singh, Dr. (Bilaspur).
 Chandrasekhar, Shrimati M. (Mayuram).
 Chandriki, Shri Jagannathrao Venkatarao (Raichur).
 Chattar Singh, Shri (Chamba).
 Chatterjee, Shri H. P. (Nabadwip).
 Chatterjee, Shri N. C. (Burdwan).
 Chaturvedi, Shri S. N. (Firozabad).
 Chaudhry, Shri Chandramani Lal (Mahua).
 Chaudhry, Shri Digambar Singh (Mathura).
 Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamala (Hapur).
 Chaudhuri, Shri Sachindra (Ghatal).
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar (Berhampur).
 Chavan, Shri D. R. (Karad).
 Chavan, Shri Y. B. (Nasik).
 Chavda, Shrimati Johrabai (Banaskantha).
 Chuni Lal, Shri (Ambala).

D

- Daffe, Shri (Miraj).
 Daji, Shri Homi F. (Indore).
 Daljit Singh, Shri (Una).
 Dandekar, Shri N. (Gonda).
 Das, Dr. Mono Mohon (Ausgram).
 Das, Shri Basanta Kumar (Contai).
 Das, Shri Nayantara (Jamui).
 Das, Shri Sudhansu Bhushan (Diamond Harbour).
 Dasaratha Deb, Shri (Tripura East).

D—contd.

- Dass, Shri C. (Tirupathi).
 Deo, Shri P. K. (Kalahandi).
 Deo, Shri Vijaya Bhushan Singh (Raigarh).
 Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C. (Bhubaneswar).
 Desai, Shri Morarji (Surat).
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D. (Aurangabad).
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao Shankar Rao (Parbhani).
 Deshmukh, Shrimati Vimalabai Panjabrao (Amravati).
 Dey, Shri S. K. (Nagaur).
 Dhaon, Shri B. K. (Lucknow).
 Dharmalingam, Shri R. (Tiruvannamalai).
 Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri (Udaipur).
 Dighe, Shri Bhaskar Narayan (Kolaba).
 Dinesh Singh, Shri (Salon).
 Dixit, Shri G. N. (Etawah).
 Dorai, Shri Kasinatha (Aruppukottai).
 Dubey, Shri Rajaram Giridharilal (Bijapur North).
 Dwivedi, Shri Mannoo Lal (Hamirpur).
 Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath (Kendrapara).

E

- Elayaperumal, Shri L. (Tirukoilur).
 Elias, Shri Mohammad (Howrah).
 Ering, Shri D. (Nominated—North East Frontier Tract).

F

- Firodia, Shri Motilal Kundanmal (Ahmednagar).

G

- Gackwad, Shri Fatehsinhrao Pratahsinhrao (Baroda).
 Gahmari, Shri Vishwanath Singh (Ghazipur).
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri (Gurgaon).

G—contd.

- Ganapati Ram, Shri (Machhlishahr).
 Gandhi, Shri V. B. (Bombay City Central South).
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati (Mohanlal-ganj).
 Gayatri Devi, Shrimati (Jaipur).
 Ghosh, Shri Atulya (Asansol).
 Ghosh, Shri N. R. (Jalpaiguri).
 Ghosh, Shri P. K. (Ranchi East).
 Ghyasuddin Ahmad, Shri (Dhubri).
 Gokaran Prasad, Shri (Misrikh).
 Goni, Shri Abdul Ghani (Jammu and Kashmir).
 Gopalan, Shri A. K. (Kasergod).
 Gounder, Shri R. Muthu (Tiruppet-tur).
 Govind Das, Dr. (Jabalpur).
 Gowdh, Shri Veeranna (Bangalore).
 Guha, Shri Arun Chandra (Barasat).
 Gulshan, Shri Dhanna Singh (Bhatinda).
 Gupta, Shri Badshah (Manipur).
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit (Calcutta South West).
 Gupta, Shri Kashi Ram (Alwar).
 Gupta, Shri Priya (Katihar).
 Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan (Delhi Sadar).

H

- Hajarnavis, Shri R. M. (Bhandara).
 Hansda, Shri Subodh (Jhargram).
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri K. (Bangalore City).
 Haq, Shri M. M. (Akola).
 Harvani, Shri Ansar (Bisauli).
 Hazarika, Shri J. N. (Dibrugarh).
 Heda, Shri Harish Chandra (Nizama-bad).
 Hem Raj, Shri (Kangra).
 Himatsingka, Shri Prabhu Dayal (Godda).
 Himmatsinhji, Shri (Kutch).
 Hukam Singh, Sardar (Patiala).

I

- Imbichibava, Shri E. K. (Ponnani).
 Iqbal Singh, Shri (Ferozepore).

J

- Jadhav, Shri Madhavrao Laxmanrao (Malegaon).
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas (Nanded)
 Jagjivan Ram, Shri (Sasaram).
 Jaipal Singh, Shri (Ranchi West).
 Jamir, Shri S. C. (Nominated—Naga-land).
 Jamunadevi, Shrimati (Jhabua).
 Jayaraman, Shri A. (Wandiwash).
 Jedhe, Shri Gulabrao Keshavrao (Baramati).
 Jena, Shri Kanhu Charan (Bhadrak).
 Jha, Shri Yogendra (Madhubani).
 Joshi, Shri Anand Chandra (Sidhi).
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra (Balram-pur).
 Jyotishi, Shri Jwala Prasad (Sagar).

K

- Kabir, Shri Humayun (Basirhat).
 Kachhavaiya, Shri Hukam Chand (Dewas).
 Kadadi, Shri Madeppa Bandappa (Sholapur).
 Kajrolkar, Shri Narayan Sadoba (Bombay City Central North).
 Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shankar (Fateh-pur).
 Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu (Hoshanga-bad).
 Kamble, Shri T. D. (Latur).
 Kanakasabhai, Shri R. (Chidamba-ram).
 Kandappa, Shri S. (Tiruchengode).
 Kannamwar, Shrimati Tai (Chenda).
 Kappen, Shri Cherian J. (Muvattu-puzha).
 Kapur Singh, Sardar (Ludhiana).
 Kar, Shri Prabhat (Hooghly).
 Karni Singhji, Shri (Bikaner).

K—contd.

- Karuthiruman, Shri P. G. (Gobichetti-palayam).
 Kayal, Shri Paresh Nath (Joynagar).
 Kedaria, Shri C. M. (Mandvi).
 Keishing, Shri Rishang (Outer Manipur).
 Kesar Lal, Shri (Sawaj Madhopur).
 Khadilkar, Shri R. K. (Khed).
 Khan, Dr. Purnendu Narayan (Uluberia).
 Khan, Shri Osman Ali (Anantapur).
 Khan, Shri Shah Nawaz (Meerut).
 Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand (New Delhi).
 Khanna, Shri Prem Kishan (Kaimganj).
 Kindar Lal, Shri (Hardoi).
 Kisan Veer, Shri (Satara).
 Kohar, Dr. Rajendra (Phulbani).
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar (Nowgong).
 Koujalgi, Shri H. V. (Belgaum).
 Koya, Shri C. H. Mohammad (Kozhikode).
 Kirpa Shankar, Shri (Domariaganj).
 Kripalani, Shri J. B. (Amroha).
 Krishna, Shri M. R. (Paddapalli).
 Krishnamachari, Shri T. T. (Tiruchendur).
 Krishnapal Singh, Shri (Jalesar).
 Kumaran, Shri M. K. (Chirayinkil).
 Kunhan, Shri P. (Palghat).
 Kureel, Shri Baij Nath (Rae Bareilly).

L

- Lahri Singh, Shri (Rohtak).
 Lahtan Chaudhry, Shri (Saharsa).
 Laxman Dass, Shri (Shahjahanpur).
 Lakshmi Bhawani, Shri (Bastar).
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati (Khammam).
 Lalit Sen, Shri (Mandi).
 Laskar, Shri Nihar Ranjan (Karimganj).

L—contd.

- Laxmi Bai, Shrimati Sangem (Vicarabad).
 Laxmi Dass, Shri (Miryalguda).
 Limaye, Shri Madhu (Monghyr).
 Lohia, Dr. Ram Manohar (Farrukhabad).
 Lonikar, Shri R. N. Yadav (Jalna).

M

- Mahadeo Prasad, Shri (Bangsoon).
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr. (Maharajganj).
 Mahananda, Shri Hrushikesh (Bolangir).
 Mahatab, Shri Hare Krushna (Angul).
 Mahato, Shri Bhajahari (Purulia).
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh (Anand).
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini (Dharwar North).
 Maimoona Sultan, Shrimati (Bhopal).
 Majithia, Shri Surjit Singh (Taran Taran).
 Malaichami, Shri M. (Periyakulam).
 Malaviya, Shri Keshav Dev (Basti).
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J. (Jammu and Kashmir).
 Malj Mariyappa, Shri (Tumkur).
 Malliah, Shri U. Srinivasa (Udipi).
 Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra (Jaipur).
 Mansen, Shri T. (Darjeeling).
 Mandal, Dr. P. (Vishnupur).
 Mandal, Shri Jiyalal (Khagaria).
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad (Jainganagar).
 Maniyangadan, Shri Mathew (Kottayam).
 Manoharan, Shri K. (Madras South).
 Mantri, Shri Dwarkadas (Bhir).
 Marandi, Shri Iswar (Rajmahal).
 Maruthiah, Shri P. (Melur).
 Masani, Shri M. R. (Rajkot).
 Masuriya Din, Shri (Chail).
 Matcharaju, Shri M. (Narasipatnam).

M—contd.

Mate, Shri Kure (Tikumgarh).
 Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra (Jalore).
 Mathur, Shri Shiv Charan (Bhilwara).
 Maurya, Shri B. P. (Aligarh).
 Mehdi, Shri S. Ahmad (Rampur).
 Mehrotra, Shri Braj Behari (Bilhaur).
 Mehta, Shri Jaswantraj (Pali).
 Mehta, Shri Jashvantraj (Bhavnagar).
 Melkote, Dr. G. S. (Hyderabad).
 Mengi, Shri Gopal Datt (Jammu and Kashmir).
 Menon, Shri Panampilli Govinda (Mukundapuram).
 Menon, Shri V. K. Krishna (Bombay City North).
 Minimata, Shrimati Agamdas Guru (Baloda Bazar).
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali (Warrangal).
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti (Motihari).
 Mishra, Shri Bibudhendra (Puri).
 Mishra, Shri Mathura Prasad (Begusarai).
 Misra, Dr. Udaikar (Jamshedpur).
 Misra, Shri Mahesh Dutta (Khandwa).
 Misra, Shri Shyam Dhar (Mirzapur).
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri (Siwan).
 Mohan Swaroop, Shri (Pilibhit).
 Mohanty, Shri Gokulananda (Balsore).
 Mohiuddin, Shri Ahmed (Secunderabad).
 Mohsin, Shri F. H. (Dharwar South).
 Morarka, Shri Radheyshyam Ramkumar (Jhunjhunu).
 More, Shri Krishnaji Laxman (Hatkanangle).
 More, Shri Shankarao Shantaram (Poona).
 Muhammad Ismail, Shri (Manjeri).
 Mukane, Shri Yeshwantrao Martand-
 rao (Bhiwandi).
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N. (Calcutta Central).

M—contd.

Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda (Ratnagiri).
 Munzni, Shri David (Lohardaga).
 Murli Manohar, Shri (Balial).
 Murmu, Shri Sarkar (Balurghat).
 Murthy, Shri B. S. (Amalapuram).
 Murti, Shri M. S. (Anakapalle).
 Musafir, Shri Gurmukh Singh (Amritsar).
 Muthiah, Shri P. (Tirunelveli).
 Muzaffar Husain, Shri (Moradabad).

N

Naidu, Shri V. Govindasamy (Tiruvallur).
 Naik, Shri D. J. (Panchmahals).
 Naik, Shri Maheswar (Mayurbhanj).
 Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan (Quilon).
 Nair, Shri P. K. Vasudevan (Ambalapuruzha).
 Nambiar, Shri Ananda (Tiruchirappalli).
 Nanda, Shri Gulzarilal (Sabarkantha).
 Naskar, Shri P. S. (Mathurapur).
 Nath Pai, Shri (Rajapur).
 Nayak, Shri Mohan (Bhanjanagar).
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila (Jhansi).
 Nesamoni, Shri A. (Nagercoil).
 Nigam, Shrimati Savitri (Banda).
 Niranjana Lal, Shri (Nominated—Andaman and Nicobar Islands).

O

Omkar Singh, Shri (Budaun).
 Oza, Shri Ghanshyamlal (Surendranagar).

P

Paliwal, Shri Tika Ram (Hindaun).
 Pande, Shri Kashi Nath (Hata).
 Pandey, Shri R. S. (Guna).
 Pandey, Shri Sarjoo (Rasra).
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath (Salem-
 pur).

P—contd.

- Pandit, Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi (Phulpur).
 Panna Lal, Shri (Akbarpur).
 Pant, Shri Krishan Chandra (Nainital).
 Paradhi, Shri Bholaram (Balaghat).
 Paramasivan, Shri S. K. (Erode).
 Parashar, Shri V. C. (Shivpuri).
 Patel, Shri Chhotubhai M. (Broach).
 Patel, Shri Man Singh P. (Mehsana).
 Patel, Shri Nanubhai N. (Bulsar).
 Patel, Shri Purushottamdas R (Patan).
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar (Hajipur).
 Patil, Shri Deorao Sheoram (Yeotmal).
 Patil, Shri J. S. (Jalgaon).
 Patil, Shri Madhaorao Bhagwantrao (Ramtek).
 Patil, Shri S. B. (Bijapur South).
 Patil, Shri S. K. (Bombay City South).
 Patil, Shri T. A. (Osmanabad).
 Patil, Shri V. T. (Kolhapur).
 Patil, Shri Vasantao Lakhagounda (Chikodi).
 Patnaik, Shri Beishnab Charan (Dhenkanal).
 Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R. (Kumbakonam).
 Pattnayak, Shri Kishen (Sambalpur).
 Pillai, Shri P. S. Nataraja (Trivandrum).
 Pottekkatt, Shri S. K. (Tellicherry).
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval (Delhi—Karol Bagh).
 Pratap Singh, Shri (Sirmur).
 Prithvi Raj, Shri (Dausa).
 Puri, Shri D. D. (Kaithal).

R

- Raghavan, Shri A. V. (Badagara).
 Raghunath Singh, Shri (Varanasi).
 Raghuramaiah, Shri K. (Guntur).

R—contd.

- Rai, Shrimati Sahodra Bai (Damoh).
 Raj Bahadur, Shri (Bharatpur).
 Raja, Shri C. R. (Junagadh).
 Rajaram, Shri K. (Krishnagiri).
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri (Jaunpur).
 Raju, Shri D. Balarama (Narasapur).
 Raju, Dr. D. S. (Rajahmundry).
 Rajyalaxmi, Shrimati Lalita (Aurangabad).
 Ram, Shri T. (Sonbarsa).
 Ram Sewak, Shri (Jalaun).
 Ram Singh, Shri (Bahraich).
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr. (Bikramganj).
 Ram Swarup, Shri (Robertsganj).
 Ramabadrhan, Shri T. D. (Cuddalore).
 Ramakrishnan, Shri P. R. (Coimbatore).
 Ramanathan Chettiar, Shri R. (Karur).
 Ramaswamy, Shri S. V. (Salem).
 Ramaswamy, Shri V. K. (Namekkal).
 Ramdhani Das, Shri (Nawada).
 Rameshwaranand, Shri (Karnal).
 Rampure, Shri Mahadevappa (Gulbarga).
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri (Chapra).
 Rananjai Singh, Shri (Musafirkhana).
 Rane, Shri Shivram Rango (Buldana).
 Ranga, Shri N. G. (Chittoor).
 Ranga Rao, Shri R. V. G. K. (Cheepurupalli).
 Ranjit Singh, Shri (Sangrur).
 Rao, Shri Jaganatha (Nowrangpur).
 Rao, Dr. K. L. (Vijayawada).
 Rao, Shri J. B. Muthyal (Mahbubnagar).
 Rao, Shri J. Rameshwar (Gadwal).
 Rao, Shri M. Thirumala (Kakinada).
 Rao, Shri P. Hanumanth (Medak).
 Rao, Shri Rajagopala (Srikakulam).
 Rao, Shri Ramapathi (Karimnagar).
 Rao, Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy (Shimoga).

E—contd.

- Rattan Lal, Shri (Banswara).
 Raut, Shri Bhola (Bettiah).
 Rawandale, Shri Chudaman Ananda (Dhulia).
 Ray, Shrimati Renuka (Malda).
 Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala (Kavali).
 Reddi, Shri Ravi Narayan (Nalgonda).
 Reddiar, Shri R. V. (Tindivanam).
 Reddy, Shri C. L. Narasimha (Rajampet).
 Reddy, Shri G. Narayan (Adilabad).
 Reddy, Shri G. Yallamanda (Markapur).
 Reddy, Shri H. C. Linga (Chikballapur).
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Ramakrishna (Hindupur).
 Reddy, Shri R. Surender (Mehbubabad).
 Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara (Cuddapah).
 Reddy, Shrimati Yashoda (Kurnool).
 Roy, Dr. Saradish (Katwa).
 Roy, Shri Biswanath (Deoria).

S

- Sadhu Ram, Shri (Phillaur).
 Saha, Dr. Sisir Kumar (Birbhum).
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar (Rosera).
 Saigal, Shri Amar Singh (Janjgir).
 Samanta, Shri S. C. (Tamluk).
 Samnani, Shri Nazir Hussain (Jammu and Kashmir).
 Sanji Rupji, Shri (Nominated—Dadra and Nagar Haveli).
 Saraf, Shri Sham Lal (Jammu and Kashmir).
 Sarma, Shri A. T. (Chatrapur).
 Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati (Jahana-bad).
 Satyanarayana, Shri Biddika (Parvathipuram).
 Scindia, Shrimati Vijaya Raje (Gwalior).
 Sen, Dr. Ranen (Calcutta—East).

S—contd.

- Sen, Shri Asoke K. (Calcutta—North West).
 Sen, Shri Phani Gopal (Purnea).
 Seth, Shri Bishanchander (Etah).
 Sezhiyan, Shri Era (Perambalur).
 Shah, Shri Manabendra (Tehri Garhwal).
 Shah, Shri Manubhai (Jamnagar).
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben (Amreli).
 Shakuntala Devi, Shrimati (Banka).
 Sham Nath, Shri (Delhi—Chandni Chowk).
 Shankaraiya, Shri M. (Mysore).
 Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad (Buxar).
 Sharma, Shri Diwan Chand (Gurdaspur).
 Sharma, Shri K. C. (Sardhana).
 Shashank Manjari, Shrimati (Palamau).
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri (Pupri).
 Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur (Allahabad).
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir (Bijnor).
 Shastri, Shri Rama Nand (Rama-ganehighat).
 Sheo Narain, Shri (Bansi).
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb (Kopergaon).
 Shinkre, Shri M. P. (Marmagao).
 Shivananjappa, Shri M. K. (Mandya).
 Shree Narayan Das, Shri (Darbhanga).
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan (Mahasamund).
 Shyam Kumari Devi, Shrimati (Raipur).
 Siddananjappa, Shri H. (Hassan).
 Siddhanti, Shri Jagdev Singh (Jhajhar).
 Siddiah, Shri S. M. (Chamaraj-nagar).
 Sidheswar Prasad, Shri (Nalanda).
 Singh, Dr. Basant Narain (Hazari-bagh).
 Singh, Shri Ajit Pratap (Pratapgarh).

S—contd.

- Singh, Shri Digvijaya Narain (Muzaffarpur).
 Singh, Shri Jai Bahadur (Ghosi).
 Singh, Shri Krishna Kanta (Maharajganj).
 Singh, Shri S. T. (Inner Manipur).
 Singh, Shri Yuvraj Dutta (Shahabad).
 Singha, Shri Govinda Kumar (Midnapore).
 Singha, Shri Yagnya Narain (Sundergarh).
 Singhvi, Dr. L. M. (Jodhpur).
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari (Patna).
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan (Samastipur).
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari (Barh).
 Sinhasan Singh, Shri (Gorakhpur).
 Sivapraghassan, Shri Ku. (Pondicherry).
 Sivasankaran, Shri P. (Sriperumbudur).
 Snatak, Shri Nardeo (Hathras).
 Solanki, Shri Pravinsinh Natavarsinh (Kaira).
 Sonavane, Shri T. H. (Pandharpur).
 Soundaram Ramachandram, Shrimati T. S. (Dindigul).
 Soy, Shri Hari Charan (Singhbhum).
 Srinivasan, Dr. P. (Madras North).
 Subbaraman, Shri N. M. R. (Madurai).
 Subramaniam, Shri C. (Pollachi).
 Subramanyam, Shri Tekur (Bellary).
 Sumat Prasad, Shri (Muzaffarnagar).
 Sunder Lal, Shri (Saharanpur).
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri (Bulandshahr).
 Surya Prasad, Shri (Bhind).
 Swamy, Shri M. N. (Ongole).
 Swamy, Shri M. P. (Tenkasi).
 Swamy, Shri M. V. (Masulipatnam).
 Swamy, Shri Shivamurthy Siddappa (Koppal).
 Swaran Singh, Shri (Jullundur).

S—contd.

- Swell, Shri G. G. (Assam—Autonomous Districts).

T

- Tahir, Shri Mohammad (Kishanganj).
 Tan Singh, Shri (Barmer).
 Tantia, Shri Rameshwar (Sikar).
 Thengal, Shri K. Nallakoya (Nominated—Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands).
 Thengondar, Shri Gopaldasami (Nagapattinam).
 Thevar, Shri V. Vairava (Thanjavur).
 Thimmaiah, Shri Dodda (Kolar).
 Thomas, Shri A. M. (Ernakulam).
 Tiwary, Shri Dwarka Nath (Gopalganj).
 Tiwary, Shri Kamal Nath (Bagaha).
 Tiwary, Shri Ram Sahai (Khajuraho).
 Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo (Unnao).
 Trivedi, Shri U. M. (Mandsaur).
 Tula Ram, Shri (Ghatampur).
 Tyagi, Shri Mahavir (Dehra Dun).

U

- Uikey, Shri M. G. (Mandla).
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra ((Koraput).
 Umanath, Shri R. (Pudukkottai).
 Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt (Rewa).
 Uttiya, Shri Buddhu Singh (Shahdol).

V

- Vaishya, Shri Muldas Bhudardas (Sabarmati).
 Valvi, Shri Laxman Vedu (Nandurbar).
 Varma, Shri Manikyalal (Chittorgarh).
 Varma, Shri Ravindra (Thiruvella).
 Veerabasappa, Shri S. (Chitradurga).
 Veerappa, Shri Ramachander (Bidar).

V—contd.

W

Venkaiiah, Shri Kolla (Tenali).
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri Pendekanti
 (Adoni).
 Verma, Shri Balgovind (Kheri).
 Verma, Shri Kunwar Krishna (Sul-
 tanpur).
 Verma, Shri Suraj Lal (Sitapur).
 Vidyalkar, Shri Amar Nath
 (Hoshiarpur).
 Vijaya Ananda, Maharajkumar
 (Visakhapatnam).
 Vijaya Raje, Shrimati (Chatra).
 Vimla Devi, Shrimati V. (Eluru).
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri (Mahasu).
 Vishram Prasad, Shri (Lalganj).
 Vyas, Shri Radhelal (Ujjain).

Wadiwa, Shri N. M. (Seoni).
 Warrior, Shri K. K. (Trichur).
 Wasnik, Shri Balkrishna (Gondia).

Y

Yadav, Shri Nagendra Prasad (Sita-
 marhi).
 Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh (Azamgarh).
 Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak (Bara-
 Banki).
 Yadava, Shri Bhishma Prasad
 (Kesaria).
 Yajnik, Shri Indulal (Kanaiyalal
 (Ahmedabad).
 Yashpal Singh, Shri (Kairana).
 Yudhvir Singh, Shri (Mahendragarh).

LOK SABHA

The Speaker

Sardar Hukam Singh

The Deputy-Speaker

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao

Panel of Chairmen

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy

Shri Thirumala Rao

Shri R. K. Khadilkar

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi

Shri T. H. Sonavane

Secretary

Shri S. L. Shakhder

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Members of the Cabinet

- Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy—Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.
 Minister of Home Affairs—Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.
 Minister of Finance—Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.
 Minister of Information and Broadcasting—Shrimati Indira Gandhi.
 Minister of External Affairs—Shri Swaran Singh.
 Minister of Railways—Shri S. K. Patil.
 Minister of Law & Social Security—Shri Asoke Kumar Sen.
 Minister of Defence—Shri Y. B. Chavan.
 Minister of Steel & Mines—Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy.
 Minister of Food & Agriculture—Shri C. Subramaniam.
 Minister of Petroleum & Chemicals—Shri Humayun Kabir.
 Minister of Communications & Parliamentary Affairs—Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.
 Minister of Education—Shri M. C. Chagla.
 Minister of Labour & Employment—Shri D. Sanjivayya.
 Minister of Rehabilitation—Shri Mahavir Tyagi.

Ministers of State

- Minister of Works & Housing—Shri Mehr Chand Khanna.
 Minister of Commerce—Shri Manubhai Shah.
 Minister of Transport—Shri Raj Bahadur.
 Minister of Community Development and Cooperation—Shri S. K. Dey.
 Minister of Health—Dr. Sushila Nayar.
 Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs—Shri Jai Sukh Lal Hathi.
 Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs—Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon.
 Minister of Supply and Technical Development in the Ministry of Industry & Supply—Shri K. Raghu Ramaiah.
 Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals—Shri O. V. Alagesan.
 Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways—Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.
 Minister of Cultural Affairs in the Ministry of Education—Shri R. M. Hajarnavis.
 Minister of Irrigation & Power—Dr. K. L. Rao.
 Minister of Planning—Shri B. R. Bhagat.
 Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence—Shri A. M. Thomas.
 Minister of Heavy Engineering and Industry in the Ministry of Industry & Supply—Shri T. N. Singh.

Deputy Ministers

- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Rehabilitation—Dr. Mono Mohan Das.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food & Agriculture—Shri Shah Nawaz Khan.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Commerce—Shri S. V. Ramaswamy.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Transport—Shri Ahmed Mohiuddin.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Community Development & Co-operation—Shri B. S. Murthy.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs—Shri Lalit Narayan Mishra.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education—Shrimati Soundaram Ramachandran.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food & Agriculture—Shri D. R. Chavan.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting—Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman.
- Deputy Minister in the Department of Social Security—Shrimati Maragatham Chandrasekhar.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Law—Shri Jaganatha Rao.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Railways—Shri Sham Nath.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Defence—Dr. D. S. Raju.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs—Shri Dinesh Singh.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Industry & Supply—Shri Bibudhendra Mishra.
- Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications—Shri B. C. Bhagavati.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Irrigation & Power—Shri Shyam Dhar Misra.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Steel & Mines—Shri Prakash Chandra Sethi.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour & Employment—Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal Malviya.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance—Shri Rameshwar Sahu.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Health—Shri P. S. Naskar.
- Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education—Shri Bhakt Darshan.

Parliamentary Secretaries

- Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Community Development and Co-operation—Shri Annasahib Shinde.
- Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs—Shri D. Ering.
- Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Irrigation & Power—Shri S. A. Mehdi.
- Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister—Shri Lalit Sen.
- Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs—Shri S. C. Jamir.
- Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Steel & Mines—Shri Doda Thimmalah.

LOK SABHA DEBATES

1

LOK SABHA

Monday, August 16, 1965 (Sravana 25,
1887 (Saka))

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

MEMBERS SWORN

Mr. Speaker: Secretary may call out the names of the Members who have come to make and subscribe the oath or affirmation under the Constitution and then the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs may introduce the Members to the House.

Secretary: Shri R. Surender Reddy.

The Minister of Communications and Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Sir, I have great pleasure in introducing to you and through you to the House Shri R. Surender Reddy who has been returned to Lok Sabha from Mahbubabad constituency of Andhra Pradesh in the vacancy caused by the death of Shri E. Madhusudan Rao.

Shri R. Surender Reddy (Mahbubabad).

Secretary: Shri H. C. Linga Reddy.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, I have great pleasure in introducing to you and through you to the House Shri H. C. Linga Reddy who has been returned to Lok Sabha from Chikbalapur constituency of Mysore in the vacancy caused by Shri K. C. Reddy assuming the office of Governor of Madhya Pradesh.

Shri H. C. Linga Reddy (Chikbalapur).

2

Secretary: Shrimati Vimalabai Panjabrao Deshmukh.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, I have great pleasure in introducing to you and through you to the House Shrimati Vimalabai Panjabrao Deshmukh who has been returned to Lok Sabha from Amravati constituency of Maharashtra in the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. Panjabrao S. Deshmukh.

Shrimati Vimalabai Panjabrao Deshmukh (Amravati).

Secretary: Shri Mali Mariyappa.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, I have great pleasure in introducing to you and through you to the House Shri Mali Mariyappa who has been returned to Lok Sabha from Tumkur constituency of Mysore in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Ajit Prasad Jain.

Shri Mali Mariyappa (Tumkur).

11.04 hrs.

OBITUARY REFERENCES

[**Mr. Speaker:** I have to inform the House of the sad demise of six of our friends, namely Shri Mohanlal Saksena, Shri Duni Chand, Shri Venkatesh Narayan Tivary, Shri T. B. Vittal Rao, Shri B. Pocker Sahib and Shri Shamrao Vishnu Parulekar.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena was a Member of the Central Legislative Assembly, the Constituent Assembly of India, the Provisional Parliament and the First Lok Sabha during the years 1935 to 1957. He was also Minister of Rehabilitation during the years 1943 to 1950. He passed away at New Delhi on the 16th May, 1966 at the age of 69.

Shri Duni Chand was a Member of the Central Legislative Assembly during the years 1923 to 1926. He passed away at New Delhi on the 21st June, 1965 at the age of 97.

Shri Venkatesh Narayan Tivary was a Member of the Constituent Assembly of India during the years 1946 to 1950 and also of the First Lok Sabha during the years 1952 to 1957. He passed away at New Delhi on the 21st June, 1965 at the age of 75.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao was a Member of the First and the Second Lok Sabha during the years 1952 to 1962. He passed away at Kothagudem on the 25th June, 1965, at the age of 50.

Shri B. Pocker Sahib was a Member of the Constituent Assembly of India during the years 1946 to 1950 and also of the First and the Second Lok Sabha during the years 1952 to 1962. He passed away at Calicut on the 29th July 1965.

Shri Shamrao Vishnu Parulekar was a Member of the Second Lok Sabha during the years 1957 to 1962. He passed away at Bombay on the 3rd August 1965, at the age of 63.

[Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to have known Shri Mohanlal Saksena for the past thirty years. We both came together to this House in those days when the British commanded the majority, and we fought against that Government. We had also the privilege of going up the steps of this House and pulling down the Union Jack because it was raised there without the authority of this House and its Speaker.

We were both together also as Secretaries of the Congress Parliamentary Party for a number of years. He was a good patriot, a sincere social worker and he tried his best to concentrate the attention of the country upon the need for improving the housing conditions all over the country, in rural areas and urban areas. I am extremely sorry that he has passed away.

Shri Vittal Rao had distinguished himself by his ardent championship of the cause of industrial labour. The House was witness to the persistent and sincere manner in which he pleaded for labour.

The other friends also are known to us. We are all sorry that they passed away. We request you to convey our condolences to the bereaved families.]

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): Mr. Speaker, allow me to join you and the other colleagues in paying our respects to the Members who have died during this inter-session period.

Four of them were known to us, younger Members of the House. They were Shri Mohanlal Saksena, Shri Vittal Rao, Shri Parulekar and Shri Pocker Sahib. Two of them were members of our Group. Shri Vittal Rao was with us in the First Lok Sabha and the Second Lok Sabha. It is very sad that he died very suddenly and as a very young man, a comparatively young man. He distinguished himself by his hard work and by the persistent advice he offered on all trade union and mining matters. He was a perfect gentleman. I am sure I shall be reflecting the feelings of Members of this House when I pay my tribute to him who had suffered for the cause of trade unionism and that of the working class.

With regard to Shri S. V. Parulekar, in paying my tribute to him there is a poignancy which is added in the fact that he died in detention—he died in jail. I would point out: that even when Members are sick and ailing, they are kept in detention without trial. On such an occasion, I do not want to say much more, but I do feel that on this matter Government has got to be condemned for the way it treated Shri Parulekar in the last moments of his life.

Shri Pocker Sahib was an old Member of this House. I pay my tribute

to him and also to Shri Mohanlal Saksena who was here for only a very short time that I had been here. We younger Members never had the opportunity of meeting the other Members who have passed away.

May I request you on behalf of our party and this House to convey to the relatives of the departed our sincere regrets and our condolences?

Shri Muhammad Ismail (Manjeri): I associate myself with the condolence references made by the previous speakers. In particular, I want to say a few words regarding the late Mr. B. Pocker.

As an active and important Member of the Constituent Assembly, he made substantial contributions to the deliberations of that august Assembly. As a distinguished and illustrious Member of the Bar in Madras and Kerala, he was well known for his able advocacy, courage of conviction, frankness and forthrightness of expression.

As a member in public life, as a member of the Madras Legislature and also as a Member of this House for two terms, he took a very active part in the affairs of the country and in things which interested the life of the people.

In his activities, he always displayed an indomitable courage of conviction and unbending sense of integrity. For his many qualities of head and heart he was respected not only by his friends and by his party men, but also by the people of opposite parties.

I request you to convey the sincere regrets and condolences of the House to the members of the bereaved family.

श्री स० सो० बमर्षी (कानपुर): अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं घाज अद्दांजलि देना चाहता हूँ उन मित्रों को जो हमारे बीच नहीं हैं। श्री श्यामराव विष्णु पारुवेकर के बारे में, अद्दांजलि देने के बाद, मैं आपका ध्यान आकषिप्त करना चाहता

हूँ। उनकी मौत, जब वह अस्पताल से जाए जा रहे थे, उस वक्त हुई, और वह डी० घाई० पार० के मानहत डेटेन्सू थे। घाज मुझे ही नहीं बल्कि सारे देश के लोगों को शक है कि यह मोत नहीं था, बल्कि जबरदस्ती मोत लायी गयी थी, हत्या थी। और इसलिये मैं घाज के द्वारा गृह मंत्रां जो का ध्यान इन घोर आकषिप्त करना चाहता हूँ कि इस के बारे में वह बयान दें, ताकि हमारे दिल को तसल्ली हो कि जो हमारे बिच जेब में है, ऐसा न हो कि उनकी भी वही हालत हो जाए जो श्री श्यामराव विष्णु पारुवेकर की हुई थी।

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fully associate myself with the observations you have made on the sad demise of Shri Mohanlal Saksena, Shri Duni Chand, Shri Venkatesh Narayan Tivary, Shri T. B. Vittal Rao, Shri B. Pocker Sahib and Shri Shamrao Vishnu Parulekar.

They were Members of this House, and they had been associated with public life for quite a long time. I should especially like to refer to the activities of Shri Mohanlal Saksena. He was a Member of the Central Legislative Assembly for a number of years; then, he was a Member of this House, and later on a Member of the Rajya Sabha. His was a dedicated life, and he had served the cause of the country in a manner which would attract the admiration of every section of our people.

He was a Minister also during the most difficult times, Minister of Rehabilitation when millions of people were coming over from West Pakistan to India. Certainly, whatever he did, he did as a conscientious person and tried to discharge his duties in an efficient and effective manner. Shri Venkatesh Narayan Tivary was also one of our senior public men and he was a man who was prolific with

his pen. He was also a very active member in committees. He always used to make valuable contributions in discussions and, as I said, especially in the proceedings of committee meetings. Among the other Members I knew Shri T. B. Vittal Rao, and so long as he was here in this House, although he was in the Opposition, I must say that he was always very constructive, and though he was critical he tried to put up concrete suggestions for the consideration of the Government. He was a very active member indeed.

Lala Duni Chand was one of our veteran public men. We feel sorry on his sad demise. May I request you to convey our sincere condolences to the members of the bereaved family?

Mr. Speaker: I think all the Members will associate themselves with these sentiments. The House may stand in silence for a short while to express its sorrow.

The Members then stood in silence for a short while.

Mr. Speaker: I will convey these condolences to the bereaved families. I may say one thing. It would be my advice that on this occasion when we are making references like this, we should not take the opportunity to make any criticism or take up any controversial thing because that seriousness might be affected. That would be my advice.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-Central): Sir, you have thought it fit to make these observations. But if a member of this House or a former member of this House dies in detention, surely it becomes a matter of particular significance and reference to that becomes absolutely imperative, and therefore any suggestion from your lips that reference to matters which might be extraneous to mere expression of grief is unseemly is to my mind not particularly called for.

Mr. Speaker: I have given that advice. I am afraid that if this practice

is resorted to, at a time when we want to pay our tributes to our departed friends, there may be some remarks and there may be controversies raised. Thus we may do some disservice to those to whom we want to pay our respects. That is my fear. There are many opportunities and Government can be criticised. Other things can be said then. Though it has been said that my remarks were unseemly, in my opinion still I think that it is the only right thing to do.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Your remarks were unseemly. He said that you thought that my remarks were unseemly . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Daji: Should many die in detention, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Why should you put that question to me? Now, let us take up questions.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Sir, may I make one submission? I have only this submission to make that in our country today circumstances have arisen about Kutch and Kashmir where these are uppermost in the minds of the people and so even before the questions are being discussed, I suggest that this House do start discussion on this question of Kashmir invasion straightaway and that the Question Hour may be suspended today. That is my request . . . (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. First, I should like to tell the hon. leader of the Jan Sangh Party that this was not the proper way. He ought to have informed me beforehand that he wants to raise such a thing. He is the leader of a responsible party, and without giving notice—(Interruption). Order, order. Whatever is proper, I must say and others have to hear. So, he ought to have informed me beforehand. He did not do that. That was one thing.

The second point is, I have to proceed according to the list of business.

The Question Hour can be suspended only if the whole House agrees, and because there is no such thing, as I find, in this respect, I have to proceed with the business of the House.

Shri Bade (Khargone): The Kashmir question is there; it is important.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; that I will see. But that discussion cannot be taken up at this moment.

श्री बजरत्न सिंह (बरेली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक छोटा सा निवेदन है। अभी तक हम लोगों की यहाँ पर यह प्रैक्टिस रही है कि प्रोबोबुएरी रेफ्रैंज जितने होते हैं वे सब क्वेश्चन घावर के बाद आते हैं लेकिन आज चूँकि यह प्रोबोबुएरी रेफ्रैंज क्वेश्चन के पहले आ गये इससे यह स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि शायद आज का सिबुएशन में क्वेश्चन घावर इतना इम्पोर्टेंट नहीं था इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि हमारे नेता की मांग उचित व मानने योग्य हो जाती है क्योंकि हम स्वयं घोड़ा सा डीबैट कर गये हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप काफी गैरहाजिर रहें हैं इसलिये प्रापको यह पता नहीं है कि अगर पहले से बुलेटिन के द्वारा माननीय सदस्यों को इस बारे में सूचित कर दिया जाय तो ऐसा किया जा सकता है।

श्री हुकम चन्द लखवाय (देवास) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कश्मीर और कच्छ के सवाल अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण हैं और सारे देश में उन की चर्चा हो रही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : लॉडर के कहने पर जो बाद में माननीय सदस्य क्यों कहे जा रहे हैं ?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: In view of what you have said and what my party feels, we seek leave to withdraw from the House. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: No need for that Order, order.

831(Ai) L.S.—2.

(Shri U. M. Trivedi and some other Members then left the House.)

Mr. Speaker: We shall take up the Questions now. Shri Rameshwar Tantia.

Shri Rameshwar Tantia: Question No. 1. (Interruption).

Some hon. Members: We are not able to hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Members can hear only if they do not speak among themselves. There ought to be silence and then alone the Minister can be heard.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Pak. Build-up on Indo-Pak. Border

- *1. {
- Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 - Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 - Shri P. C. Borooah:
 - Shri D. C. Sharma:
 - Shri Yashpal Singh:
 - Shrimati Tarkeahwari Sinha:
 - Shri P. R. Chakraverti:
 - Shri Naval Prabhakar:
 - Shri Bagri:
 - Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
 - Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:
 - Shri R. S. Pandey:
 - Shri Gulshan:
 - Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
 - Shri S. M. Banerjee:
 - Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there has been a heavy build-up of Pakistan forces all along the Indo-Pakistan border recently;

(b) whether it is also a fact that fresh reinforcements are pouring into-East Pakistan by air and sea from West Pakistan; and

(c) if so, what steps have been taken by Government to meet this Pakistani threat?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Defence (Dr. D. S. Raju): (a) and (b). During the recent Pakistani aggression in Kutch, almost the entire Pakistani Army was deployed in addi-

tion to the other para-military forces on Indo-Pakistan borders both in the west and in the east. Some Army and Air Force re-inforcements were moved from West Pakistan to East Pakistan by air and sea.

Following the agreement on Rann of Kutch, the situation on all the borders except the cease-fire line had eased to some extent.

(c) All necessary steps to ensure security of our borders were taken and continue to be taken.

श्री रामेश्वर टाटिया : जम्मू कश्मीर राज्य में हजारों पाकिस्तानी हमलावर छिप कर चुन भायें हैं और वे श्रीनगर तक पहुंच गये हैं। जाहिर है कि उनकी यह कार्यवाही कई महीनों में हुई होगी तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज तक राज्य सरकार या केन्द्रिय गस्ती दस्ते व खुफिया पुलिस क्या कर रही थी कि उनका इस का पता नहीं चल सका।

Mr. Speaker: I wish to know the pleasure of the House. Should we not leave it to the discussion that is coming up instead of going on with these supplementaries at this moment?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The question and the answer are important.

Mr. Speaker: A regular discussion is coming up, and the whole thing has to be discussed.

Shri Daji: The question refers to the other part of the border also.

Mr. Speaker: If that is wanted, I have no objection.

श्री बागड़ी : अगर यह सवाल पूछने की जरूरत समझी गयी और उसका जबाब मंत्री

महोदय से दिनावादा गया है तो फिर उस पर प्रश्न पूछने देना ही चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: इस सवाल का नोटिस पहले था या हुआ था इसलिये उसे लिस्ट में रखा गया।

श्री रामेश्वर टाटिया: मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वहाँ की राज्य सरकार केन्द्रिय गस्ती दस्ते या खुफिया पुलिस को इस बात का पता नहीं चला कि पाकिस्तानी हमलावर इधर छिप छिप कर आते जा रहे हैं और अगर उन को पता नहीं चला तो प्रसम या बंगाल में भी उस की पुनरावृत्ति न हो इसके लिये भारत सरकार क्या कार्यवाही करने की सोच रही है ?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): Sir, I would like to assure the House that suddenly both the Central Government and the State Government had information about their intention to start the type of struggle that they have started. It is only because of certain steps that were taken in anticipation of that, that we could defeat the entire purposes that they wanted to achieve in the Valley of Kashmir. That itself is a proof of the preparations and the knowledge that both the State Government and the Central Government had.

श्री रामेश्वर टाटिया : क्या यह सच है कि श्रीनगर के कुछ स्थानों में जिन में एक, प्राथमिक स्थान भी है, पाकिस्तान के हमलावरों के गोला बारूद और कुछ पर्बे वहाँ पर मिले हैं यदि हाँ, तो उन स्थानों के संचालकों के विरुद्ध सरकार क्या कार्यवाही करने के बारे में सोचे रही है।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It is a fact that certain arms and ammunition were found in a masjid. Certainly the State Government and the Central

Government will take necessary action.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: After Government got information regarding the Pakistani build-up on our borders, may I know whether any particular steps were taken to tighten our security and to alert our intelligence? If the answer is in the affirmative, may I know on what date and time Government first got the information about the Pakistani infiltration in Kashmir?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: May I suggest that I am making a detailed statement about this whole matter immediately after the Question Hour and if hon. members still have any questions to ask, I will answer them later?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Is the Government aware of the fact that Pakistan had not only invaded some parts of India from outside, but also had been promoting internal subversion, not only in Kashmir but in other parts of India also? May I know what efforts Government is making to stop this kind of internal sabotage?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: As far as Kashmir is concerned, very strict measures are being taken. Wherever they are encountered, they are punished. Also, if they are not found, efforts are being made to comb them out, discover them and take necessary steps.

श्री यशपाल सिंह: महाराजा पृथ्वीराज चौहान ने 17 बार मुहम्मद गौरी को माफ किया था तो क्या हमारे चव्हाण साहब उनी राजपूनी परम्परा को कायम करने के लिये बार बार हमनावरों को माफ कर रहे हैं या घोर कोई उसका कारण है?

श्री यशबन्तराव चव्हाण: माफ करने का कोई सबाल ही नहीं उठता है।

Shri P. C. Borooah: With lakhs of Pakistani infiltrators in Assam and West Bengal and the massive military

build-up by the Pakistanis on the East-Pakistan border, may I know whether Government considers a similar attack as on Kashmir imminent in the East? If so, may I know whether Government is considering ordering Indian troops to make retaliatory attack in that sector?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The answer has already been given. Even on other borders, if there are possibilities of such things, necessary precautionary steps have already been taken.

Shri P. B. Chakraverti: May I know whether Government apprehends any aggressive activities on the eastern frontier because of the activities which have already been started in Kashmir?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: As far as Pakistan is concerned, it is difficult to take any encouraging view about it. We must presume that they might create trouble all over, wherever they can. That is our basic presumption.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर: पूर्वी सीमा के ऊपर पाकिस्तानी सेना ने कितन कितनी खानों पर जमाव किया है और उन की संख्या लगभग कितनी होगी?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I don't think I should give this information.

श्री बागड़ी: अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो सीमाओं पर पाकिस्तानी सेनाओं का जमाव है वह मंत्री महोदय के जयान के मुताबिक कच्छ मुद्राहिदे के बाद हुआ है तो क्या सरकार का ध्यान उस तरफ गया है कि पाकिस्तान द्वारा सरहदों पर भारी सैनिक जमाव और उसके द्वारा भारत की सीमाओं में घाकर गड़बड़ी करवाना यह उन घाफ कच्छ का फायला करने में भारत सरकार द्वारा ध्यान ही गई दुर्बल नीतियों का नतीजा है? आज जब पाकिस्तान उन मुद्राहिदे का नाक कर हिन्दुस्तान में गड़बड़ी कर रहा है ताकत सरकार अपनी सबल नीति का प्रमाण देने के लिये

रन श्री कच्छ के मुद्राहिदे को तोड़ने तर विचार कर रही है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: No, Sir; because we do not accept this analysis that whatever is happening is because of the Rann of Kutch decision—it is a very incorrect assessment of the situation.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : पाकिस्तानी हमला-भाबर काश्मीर की राजधानी, श्रीनगर, तक पहुंच कर न केवल नगर की सीमाओं पर, बल्कि नगर के घनदर भी आक्रमण कर रहे हैं। क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि काश्मीर में जो धार्मी इन्टेलीजेंस, सेंट्रल इन्टेलीजेंस और स्टेट इन्टेलीजेंस, ये तीन तीन गुप्तचर विभाग कार्य कर रहे हैं उन के होते हुए पाकिस्तानी हमला-भाबर हजारों की संख्या में काश्मीर में कैसे आ गये ? क्या अब इसी प्रकार का घटनाएं आसाम में तो नहीं हो रहों हैं ? क्या वहां पर स्थिति के प्रति सतर्कता बरती जा रही है और क्या वहां पर तो यह भूल नहीं बोहराई जायेगी ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Sir, as I have said already, certainly some infiltrators did reach Srinagar, but a large number of them were also stopped at the periphery.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Not "some" but "thousands".

Shri Y. B. Chavan: There are these three agencies—the Central Intelligence, the Army Intelligence and the State Intelligence. In different spheres they work but there is certainly coordination amongst all these three agencies. It was on that basis that a certain assessment of this possibility was made. But, naturally, we could not get—I think it is very difficult for anybody to get that information—information about the exact time and place where they can enter, because it was not, some sort of, concentrated interest at one place,

it was being done all over the cease-fire line. So we had anticipated this and despite the steps being taken there was a possibility and it was presumed that some infiltrators might come in. For that matter our Srinagar-protection-scheme or whatever steps were necessary to protect Srinagar and other important places there were already taken.

श्री जगदीश सिंह : सरकार का गुप्तचर विभाग बिल्कुल असफल रहा है, इस बारे में कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया है।

श्री जगदीश सिंह सिद्धाप्ती: क्या सरकार को यह पता है कि उस के जो तीन प्रकार के गुप्तचर विभाग हैं, उनमें और राज्य सरकार तथा केन्द्रीय सरकार के प्रशासनिक विभागों में ऐसे राष्ट्रद्रोही तत्व तो नहीं घुसे हुए हैं, जिन की गतिविधियों का नतीजा यह हो रहा है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It will be taking rather an exaggerated view of things. Certainly some spies were found out and wherever they were found they were proceeded against.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member says that there are some saboteurs in the Government administrative offices themselves.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Well, Sir, he has not pointed out any specific, particular case.

श्री जगदीश सिंह सिद्धाप्ती: पटिकुलर केस का क्या प्रश्न है ? मैंने तो सारे प्रशासन के बारे में पूछा है।

Shri R. S. Pandey: The impression created in the country is that we get late information about the aggression committed by Pakistan and the build-up of Pakistani forces all along the Indo-Pakistan border. May I know whether any agency or machinery is actively functioning on our borders to inform the Government

of the movements of Pakistani forces on our borders? Sir, I want a precise answer to this question.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: We certainly had information about the organisation they were making in Pakistan many many months before things started happening. I cannot go into all the details about the organisation and its functioning. (*Interruption*).

श्री मधु लिनये: सरकार आक्रमण-कारियों को रोक नहीं सकी है।

श्री सुलशन: क्या यह सच है कि काश्मीर वैली में जो पाकिस्तानी गुरिले घुस गये हैं, उन के पेशे-नजर सरकार ने हमारी सेना को यह हिदायत दी है कि जब तक हमारे सिपाही दुश्मन की गोली लगने से घायल न हो जाएं, तब तक वे किमी पर हाथ न उठावें ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: No, Sir; it is not the policy.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to know whether it is a fact that one year or even before that the Central Intelligence Bureau gave a report to the Government here that conditions were very bad in Kashmir and there was infiltration by Pakistani elements. If that report was correct, may I know whether any action was taken during that time or you have started taking action only now?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: There was this process of taking action against internal saboteurs for a long time now; it is a continuous process of taking action and not only now (*Interruption*).

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: May I know whether Pakistan Army has been carried by air from West Pakistan to East Pakistan with the permission of the Government of India and, if it is without permission, what steps have been taken by the Government to prevent this?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: There was no question of taking permission in this matter.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether the U.N. observers posted in Kashmir were made aware of these activities and whether the U.N. observer submitted any report to the Secretary General of the United Nations to be presented to the Security Council?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The U.N. observers were quite aware of what was happening. We presume that he may make a report on the facts.

चीन द्वारा वायु सीमा का उल्लंघन

- +
- * 2. { श्री प्रकाशचौर सास्त्री :
श्री जगदीश सिंह सिद्धाप्ती :
श्री बागड़ी :
श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या पिछले तीन महीनों में चीन द्वारा भारतीय वायु सीमा के उल्लंघन की घटनाओं में वृद्धि हुई है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उन्हें रोकने के लिये क्या कदम उठाये गये हैं ;

(ग) क्या चीन को कोई विरोध-पत्र भेजा गया है ; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो उसका क्या उत्तर प्राया है ?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Defence (Dr. D. S. Raju): (a) No, Sir. In fact no violation of Indian air-space by Chinese aircraft during the past three months has been reported.

(b) to (d). Do not arise.

श्री प्रकाशचौर सास्त्री: पीछे संरक्षण मंत्री ने इसी सदन में यह बक्तव्य दिया था कि यदि कभी कोई दूसरा देश-विशेष रूप

से चीन या पाकिस्तान—हमारी वायु-सीमा का प्रतिक्रमण करेगा, तो हम ने इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था कर दी है कि उन के वायुयानों को उसी समय मार गिराया जायेगा। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह व्यवस्था पूर्ण हो चुकी है और उस के अन्तर्गत सभी आवश्यक कदम उठाए जा चुके हैं।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I have already told the hon. House that certain steps are taken and further steps will have to be taken because I cannot say whether these things have reached or will ever reach a completely satisfactory stage. It has to be a continuous process. As far as the air violations in certain particular important sectors are concerned, steps have been taken.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या संरक्षण मंत्री को उन के गुप्तचर विभाग के द्वारा इस प्रकार की जानकारी मिली है कि भारतीय सीमाओं से लगते हुए तिब्बती भागों में चीन की ओर से लड़ाकू विमानों की संख्या बहुत बढ़ा दी गई है और हवाई झड़ों का बहुत विस्तार कर दिया गया है।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Yes; we have information about certain radar installations in those areas and at the same time about certain improvement in the air-field complexes. There is a certain improvement in the air force.

श्री जगबेब सिंह सिद्धास्ती : क्या सरकार को यह पता है कि जहाँ पर दोनों राज्यों की सीमाएँ मिलती हैं, वहाँ पर चीनी लोग निकट कर वायुयान से हमारे भेद ले जाते हैं ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That is exactly what I was trying to say. We have taken steps to prevent this.

श्री बागड़ी : क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि जैसे पहले चीन के प्रधान मंत्री, चाऊ-एन-लाई, हिन्दुस्तान की हवा

में से गुजरे, जिस के लिए देश को इजाजत नहीं थी, बल्कि बैन-प्रलकवामी इजाजत थी, क्या इन तीन महीनों में इस किस्म का कोई वाकया हुआ है और क्या हिन्दुस्तान की वायु में इस किस्म की कोई जबरी उड़ान हुई है या नहीं ?

श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण : नहीं।

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : क्या सरकार को मालूम है कि गत जुलाई मास में चीन के द्वारा हिन्दुस्तान के आसाम और त्रिपुरा में स्थित सामरिक स्थानों के चित्र लिये गए और चीन के अखबारों में उन का प्रकाशन किया गया ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: At least, as far as this particular field is concerned, no such activity was noticed.

Use of U.S. Arms by Pakistan

†

- †
- Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
 - Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 - Shri Hem Barua:
 - Shri H. N. Mukerjee:
 - Shri Yashpal Singh:
 - Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:
 - Shri B. S. Pandey:
 - Shri S. C. Samanta:
 - Shri P. C. Borooah:
 - Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
 - Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:
 - Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
 - Shri Subodh Hansda:
 - Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 - Shri S. M. Banerjee:
 - Shri Bade:
 - Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
 - Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:
 - Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavalya:
 - Shri D. D. Furi:
 - Shri Gokulananda Mohanty:
 - Shri Daljit Singh:
 - Shri Heda:
 - Shri P. L. Barupal:
 - Shri Kindar Lal:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1146 on the 3rd May, 1965 and state:

(a) whether the reaction or opinion of the United States Government on

the use of U.S. arms by Pakistani troops in Kutch has been received; and

(b) if so, the gist thereof?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). We were informed that the U.S. Government had taken up the matter with the Government of Pakistan and that this had had the desired effect.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Have the Government told the U.S. Government firmly, though gently, that the U.S. Government's silence on this question of perfidious misuse of American arms by Pakistan against India is tantamount to American connivance at Pakistan's crime and, therefore, is likely to be regarded by Indians as an unfriendly act towards India and, if so, what was their reaction to this?

Shri Swaran Singh: No, Sir, we did not put it in that form. We did point out to the use of American equipment by the Pakistani forces and we were assured that this matter would be taken up by the U.S. Government with the Pakistan authorities.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Minister earlier said that it had the desired effect. Is the House to understand that the 'desired effect' has been the misuse of American arms again by Pakistan against India in Kashmir?

Shri Swaran Singh: The House should not understand that at all.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What does he mean?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Member wants to know whether, in Kashmir also, the arms supplied by America have been used by Pakistan. This is the question.

Shri Swaran Singh: On that issue I would suggest that the Defence Minister may, at a later time, be able to give more information because the type of equipment that has been captured there is under examination by the Defence authorities.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: A point of order, Sir. I could not hear the answer completely. Did he pass the back to the Defence Minister.

Mr. Speaker: He says that the arms that have been captured are being examined and the result will be known later.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The papers are full of that!

Mr. Speaker: Well, this is the answer.

Shri Tantis.

श्री रामेश्वर दांडिया : कच्छ में पाकिस्तान ने हमारे विद्रोह जो घमरीकी लुियारों का उपयोग किया था क्या घमरीका को हमने उसके बारे में सूचना दी थी यदि दी थी तो उनका क्या जवाब आया ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह तो कहा है उन्होंने ।

Shri Hem Barua: Has the attention of Government been drawn to a statement made by President Ayub Khan to the effect that they have the arms and ammunitions and it is for them to decide as to against whom these should be used and, if so, may I know whether Government have brought this to the notice of U.S.A. and if they have brought this to the notice of U.S.A., have the U.S.A. lodged at least a paper protest against Pakistan?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have seen the Press report of President Ayub's statement. He did say something to this effect. (*Interruptions*). We have been taking the view from the very beginning that this type of assurance is not easy of implementation, but I am not aware if U.S. Government have made any protest to President Ayub.

Mr. Speaker: Precisely the question was whether we had brought this statement of President Ayub Khan to the notice of American authorities.

Shri Swaran Singh: That was a public statement. We have not made any formal . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Swaran Singh: We have not made any formal protest.

Shri Hem Barua: Do you make any difference whether he makes a statement like that in public or otherwise? He made that statement in a reception given to the American Ambassador at Karachi. Do not forget that it was an official reception and President Ayub Khan made the statement there; that has the weight of an official statement. It is a shame on your part . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua: I do not understand this. He wants to throw dust into our eyes. I hope you will not allow him to throw dust into our eyes by taking shelter under all sorts of pleas.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Hem Barua must realise that he knows it much better than anybody—at least myself. I can only ask him to answer the question and it is for the House to do the rest. If my eyes are also blurred by that, then I will certainly interfere.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: From the Minister's reply it is clear—if anything can be clear from what he says—that the United States Government did this dirty trick on us through Pakistan in Kutch and after the damage was done, is trying to fob us off with some idea of having spoken to Pakistan. May I know why this kind of thing is permitted? We highlight such things as our objections originally stated rather timidly by our Prime Minister about atrocious activities in Vietnam and elsewhere. We soft-pedal our criticisms of American atrocities in the hope of getting American generosity which finds shape in this kind of as-

sistance to those hostile to us. May I know why this kind of policy should continue?

Shri Swaran Singh: There are so many things mentioned in the question that it is not easy for me to reply to all that has been said . . .

Mr. Speaker: He might answer at least one of them.

Shri Swaran Singh: I have already said that we have protested to the United States Government about the use of American arms by the Pakistan authorities against India and there is no question of adopting any other attitude elsewhere and there is no question of timidity at all in this respect.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : मान लीजिये प्राप प्रोटेस्ट करते हैं और घमरीकी गवर्नमेंट भी इन्कार कर देती है। उसके इन्कार करने के बावजूद भी पाकिस्तान उन हथियारों का हमारे खिलाफ प्रयोग करता है तो फिर भारत सरकार क्या करेगी ?

Mr. Speaker: It is hypothetical.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: May I know whether Government have bothered to find out the nature of the desired effect that the American protestations or action had on Pakistan about the use of American arms against India by the Pakistan Army? May I also know the details of the desired effect, if Government have any knowledge about the desired effect?

Shri Swaran Singh: There are two things in this connection that I can mention. One is that the United States Government had conveyed to us that they had taken it up with the Pakistan Government and as a result of that they got further assurances from them that they will not be used. The second thing is that it is the United States Government's assessment that it was their pressure which

had some part to play in the stopping of the aggressive activities on that side by Pakistan.

Shri R. S. Pandey: Is it a fact that the United States Government have sent a high-powered military mission to Pakistan to verify the misuse of the arms given to them against India?

Shri Swaran Singh: The United States military observers are there all the time in Pakistan; I am not aware of any special high-powered military mission having been sent by the United States Government to Pakistan.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know the percentage of the U.S. arms and other arms that have been captured in the Kutch area and whether a report about this has been sent to America?

Shri Swaran Singh: The most obvious use of American arms in the Kutch area was the use of Patton tanks; and there was some other equipment also. There were two protests lodged with the United States Government about the use of American arms against India in the Kutch area.

Shri P. C. Borooah: May I know whether this American silence over the use of U.S. arms by Pakistan in Kutch has been considered by Government as an unfriendly act, as observed by our Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, and if so, whether this has been brought to the notice of the U.S. Government?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have already mentioned that we took it up with the U.S. Government and they did take this up with the Pakistan Government.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : हम दूसरे हथियारों का प्रयोग केवल कच्छ की सीमाओं पर ही नहीं हुआ है इससे पहले भी संरक्षण

मंत्री ने एक दो बार इस सदन में बताया है कि काश्मीर की सीमाओं पर भी घमरीकी हथियारों का प्रयोग पाकिस्तानी सैनिकों द्वारा किया गया है। ऐसी स्थिति में क्या विदेश मंत्री इस बात को सदन के द्वारा देश को बतायेंगे कि जब इस प्रकार की सूचना घमरीका को दी जाती है तो वह बहुत देर से खबर लेते हैं लेकिन पीछे जब कारगिल की चौकियाँ भारतीय सैनिकों ने ले लीं तो एक दम घमरीका एक्टिव हो गया है। भारत के इस असंतोष को क्या आप उन तक पहुंचाने की कृपा करेंगे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह एक सजेसन है।

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धा (श्री) : घमरीका को आप लिख कर भेजते हैं : घमरीका चाहे उसका उत्तर दे या न दे, परन्तु आप अपनी ओर से क्या कार्रवाई उसके विरोध में करते हैं ?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : उत्तर तो वह देते हैं। मैंने कहा है कि उन्होंने उत्तर दिया है।

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : माननीय मंत्री जी ने बताया है कि जो हथियार कच्छ के क्षेत्र में प्रयोग किये जा रहे थे उनकी जांच की जा रही है। जहां तक घाखबारों का सम्बन्ध है, घाखबारों में शिव छपे हैं जिन में पाकिस्तानी हथियारों का उल्लेख है और उन पर पाकिस्तान के मार्किंग भी हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ऐसे मार्किंग के भी कोई हथियार थे जिन को इरैज करके पाकिस्तान के मार्किंग डाले गये हैं? क्या इस प्रकार की भी कोई जानकारी सरकार का है और यदि है तो क्या वह इसके बारे में बनवाने की कृपा करेगी ?

Shri Swaran Singh: That is a separate question for which I will require notice.

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : अगर हमें हथियारों का पता चल सकता है . . .

प्रध्वज महोदय : किसी और सवाल पर पूछ लीजियेगा ।

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: In view of the assurance given by the Pakistan Government to the U.S. Government and the assurance given by the U.S. Government to us that U.S. arms will not be used against us, if U.S. arms are still being used by Pakistan against us, what particular action is Government proposing to take to stop this nonsense?

Mr. Speaker: In supplementaries unnecessary adjectives or insinuations should not be used.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: I want to know what action Government is proposing to take.

Mr. Speaker: That could be asked in a simple, straightforward manner. At least the lady Members should avoid the use of such words.

Shri Swaran Singh: I have already mentioned the action that was taken in two specific cases.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In reply to a previous question, the hon. Minister stated that to our protest they replied that they had issued instructions and would see that American arms were not used by Pakistan against us, and that it was partly due to their pressure and influence on Pakistan that they had this agreement. I would like to know whether it is implied that Pakistan always starts aggression because of their encouragement . . .

Shri Swaran Singh: No, I do not connect it.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey. Shri Mathur.

Shri Nath Pal: May I point out that it is the invariable practice in this House that when questions are admitted for answers you do exercise the privilege to call other Members also than those whose names appear

in the list? If we were to restrict ourselves only to those Members whose names are in the list, we would be converting the question into another call attention notice. I would like to know how you want to guide us in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: I do call other Members also. But when so much time has already been taken and the question has been exhaustively dealt with, there is no need to call other Members. But whenever I feel it necessary, I certainly call them.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: May I know what is our Government's assessment of the attitude and reaction of the U.S. Government, whether they accept that Pakistan has committed one of the greatest international frauds so far political and military pacts are concerned, having taken arms and ammunition for use against communist countries, and now, being in collusion with communist countries, using these against us? What is Government's assessment? Does the Government of U.S.A. realise that one of the biggest international frauds has been committed on them? Are they in a position to have any control over the arms which they have already supplied to Pakistan?

Shri Swaran Singh: I agree with the hon. Member when he says that there were arms secured under certain pacts for a certain purpose, and the use of these against India is certainly a very clear violation of or departure from, whatever was their undertaking. We are quite clear in our own assessment. As to whether the U.S. Government is equally clear or not, we should leave it to them to decide for themselves.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That was not my question. Of course, we are quite clear that it is the biggest political fraud; I am glad that the Minister says it. I am only asking him whether he has made any assessment—of course, he cannot say what reaction the U.S. Government should have; I do not say that; it is definitely

for the U.S. Government to have its own decisions and its own reactions—I am only asking whether you have been able . . .

Mr. Speaker: He should ask me.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am only asking through you whether the hon. Minister has been able to assess, that is, what is his assessment of U.S.A.'s attitude and reaction, whether they realise and recognise that this is one of the biggest political frauds committed on them. If they realise and understand it, the further question is only intended to stop Pakistan from using the arms against us. That question is whether the U.S. has any control now over the arms which they have supplied to Pakistan. What do we expect them to do? What is their control mechanism through which we expect the U.S.A. to control the use of arms already supplied to see that they are not used against us? I want a clear picture.

Shri Swaran Singh: I can understand the desire, but in a matter of this nature, no other Government would clearly share their own assessment with us, but there are signs that the U.S. Government are increasingly becoming aware of the Pakistani activities in various spheres and also their new-found friendship with many countries, but they have not made any public statement on that at all. So far as we are concerned, we are quite clear, but sometimes a matter which is quite clear to us may not be equally clear to other governments.

Shri Kapur Singh: May I know whether there is any truth in the story that at the time of Kutch hostilities U.S.A. warned us that American arms or no American arms, we must under no circumstances intrude, for retaliatory action into Pakistani territory?

Shri Swaran Singh: There was no such warning.

Shri Nath Pal: On a previous occasion when this matter of bringing to the U.S. Government the reaction of this country was mentioned in the

House, the Prime Minister volunteered to make this statement. In reply to my question the Prime Minister said that they had drawn the attention of the U.S. Government to the fact of use of American arms by Pakistan against this country, they were awaiting the American Government's reaction to this fact, that after that they would convey our real feeling about the use of American arms against this country's security. May I know how this assurance given by the Prime Minister on this very vital matter has been implemented by this Government?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have already ventured to point out that we took it up with the U.S. Government with the result that I have already mentioned.

Shri Nath Pal: My question was couched in the simplest possible language. There can be no scope for misunderstanding. I know they have drawn the attention of the U.S. Government to the fact of the abuse of arms given by them to fight communism, but then the Prime Minister assured us that after they had got the reaction of the U.S. Government, they would convey to the U.S. Government how strongly we feel that this is an unfriendly act by a friendly country.

Shri Swaran Singh: After this we have again taken it up with the U.S. Government, and we have conveyed the strong feelings of this House and the country on this matter.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asaf: What is their reply?

Shri Swaran Singh: Their reply is what I have stated. They say that they themselves have taken it up with the Pakistan Government, with the result that I have already mentioned.

Shri Nath Pal: On a point of order. An assurance was given. The questions can be looked into. I had asked for an assurance from the Prime Minister that this feeling would be

conveyed at the highest level, at his level, and his assurance was that he would be personally conveying it. That question is being evaded. I want a categorical answer.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: So far there is nothing. That is clear.

Shri Nath Pal: The assurance was given categorically by the Prime Minister that he would take up the matter. I want to know whether the usual channel of the External Affairs Ministry was used, or whether he, as Prime Minister of this country, conveyed to the U.S. Government what we feel.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): I am not aware of the assurance. I would like to consult the records. I do not think I said that I would take it up with the President or at the highest level, but I would be prepared to consult the proceedings.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Is the Government aware of a view held by a section of our people that whenever it is a question of Pakistani aggression or injustice, our American friends promise to consider the matter, but whenever it is a question of some strong action taken by India to vindicate its honour and is considered not so unfair by the American friends, they just force us to take some action as in Kargil? Is the Government aware that such things are having their own bad reaction on the people of the country?

Shri Swaran Singh: Kargil has been mentioned. I would like to mention that the United States had nothing to do with this. There was a report of the United Nations and not of the United States. We should be factually clear. (Interruptions.)

12.00 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: In this way we cannot proceed during the Question Hour. I have repeatedly requested this. I do admit that sometimes the answers are not precise, are not clear or are not direct. My difficulty is that

I cannot get answers in a direct manner because questions also have inferences, arguments and many insinuations and conclusions, and many other things. That is my difficulty. If the supplementary is direct, certainly I would compel the Government to give a direct answer. Sometimes I fail to understand, myself, the question. How can I compel an answer from the Minister?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: For the last fifteen minutes the supplementary questions are asked for a clear answer from the Government: what happened to the protests lodged by our Government about the military aid given to Pakistan? . . . (Interruptions). I am saying that no straight answer has come.

Mr. Speaker: The answer to that has come. Next question.

Shri Hem Barua: Question No. 4.

Mr. Speaker: What is the pleasure of the House? We started at 11.20 and should we take sixty minutes? Or should we stop at 12.00?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Whatever practice we adopt should be uniformly followed. Always there may be a loss of five or ten minutes every day. If we go beyond 12.00 today, we will have to go upto 12.05 or 12.10 on other days. So, the practice should be uniform.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: My point of order is . . .

Mr. Speaker: I am asking about the extension of question hour now. What is the pleasure of the House?

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Question Hour should continue . . . (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Of course today we took about twenty minutes. It will not be usually done in this manner on the other days. Therefore, I think that we stop with questions now and proceed with the other business.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Peace talks in Nagaland

Shri Hem Barua:
 Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shri A. N. Vidyalkar:
 Shri P. R. Chakraverti:
 Shri P. C. Borooah:
 Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 Shri Naval Prabhakar:
 Shri Hem Raj:
 Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
 Shri S. C. Samanta:
 Shri Subodh Hansda:
 Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
 Shri K. N. Tiwary:
 Shri N. P. Yadav:
 Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
 Shri Jagdev Singh
 Siddhanti:
 Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
 Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
 Shri D. D. Puri:
 *4. Shri Hukam Chand
 Kachhavalaya:
 Shri Brij Raj Singh:
 Shri Bade:
 Shri Bagri:
 Shri Mohammed Koya:
 Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:
 Shri Indrajit Gupta:
 Shri Ravindra Varma:
 Shri P. Venkatasubbiah:
 Shri V. B. Gandhi:
 Shri Basappa:
 Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:
 Shri S. N. Chaturvedi:
 Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:
 Shri Jedhe:
 Shri H. C. Soy:
 Maharajkumar Vijaya
 Ananda:
 Shri P. E. Patel:
 Shri Tan Singh:
 Shri E. Barua:
 Shri Himatsingka:
 Shri Kajrolkar:
 Shri Madhu Limaye:
 Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that peace talks in Nagaland have not made any significant progress so far due to the non-acceptance of the Peace Mission proposals by the underground Nagas;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the underground Nagas want to meet Mr. Phizo in London for consultation before finalising their attitude; and

(c) if so, whether any arrangements have been made for the purpose?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Peace talks are continuing. The progress has unfortunately been insignificant.

(b) and (c). The Naga underground expressed a desire to send one Shri Kevi Yallay to contact Mr. Phizo in London. Passport facilities were granted to Shri Kevi Yallay on his fulfilling all formalities as an Indian national.

Properties of Indians in Zanzibar

*5. { Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
 Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 Shri P. C. Borooah:
 Shri Solanki:
 Shri P. K. Deo:
 Shri Narasimha Reddy:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Zanzibar authorities have recently confiscated urban properties of Indian merchants on the island; and

(b) if so, the action taken by Government in the matter?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) Yes, Sir. This is in pursuance of their general policy and is not directed exclusively against people of Indian origin.

(b) Government has not been called upon to take any steps so far

Pakistan Assistant High Commissioner's Office in Shillong

*6. { Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri P. C. Borooah:
 Shri Yashpal Singh:

Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
 Shri S. C. Samanta:
 Shri Subodh Hansda:
 Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
 Shri Vishwanath Pandey:
 Shri P. R. Chakraverti:
 Shri Gokulananda Mohanty:
 Shri P. L. Barupal:
 Shri R. Barua:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have asked the Pakistan Government to close down its office of the Assistant High Commissioner in Shillong;

(b) if so, the circumstances which led the Government to this decision; and

(c) the reaction of Pakistan Government in this regard?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir. The Government, in a note dated the 11th May, 1965, requested the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi to close the Pakistani Mission in Shillong by the 15th June, 1965. The Mission ceased to exist from that date.

(b) Ever since Pakistan violated the principle of diplomatic reciprocity by closing down the Assistant High Commission of India in Rajshahi in December, 1963, this matter has been under the consideration of the Government of India. The Government of India repeatedly requested the Government of Pakistan to agree to the reopening of the Indian Mission in Rajshahi but the Government of Pakistan turned a deaf ear to this request. Besides this the Pakistani Mission in Shillong had been indulging in objectionable activities, contrary to all rules of diplomatic and consular behaviour.

(c) The Pakistan High Commission, New Delhi in a note dated the 26th May, 1965, protested against this decision.

Anglo-American Bases in Indian Ocean

Shri H. N. Mukerjee:
 Shri Indrajit Gupta:
 *7. { Shri D. C. Sharma:

Shri Shree Narayan Das:
 Shri Warior:
 Shri Vasudevan Nair:
 Shri Prabhat Kar:
 Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shri Bagri:
 Shri R. Barua:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the joint Anglo-American move to establish a chain of military bases around islands in Indian Ocean; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The Government of India are aware that the British Government wish to establish radio-communications and supporting facilities in the Chagos Archipelago, including an airstrip, the use of which may be shared with the U.S. Government.

(b) Government are opposed to the establishment or maintenance of foreign military bases and India has subscribed to the Declaration of the Second Non-Aligned Nations Conference which condemned the proposal for the establishment of such bases in the Indian Ocean.

Overflight of Pakistan Military Planes

Shri Shree Narayan Das:
 Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 Shri D. D. Puri:
 *8. { Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 Shri Gulshan:
 Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the present position with regard to the overflight of Pakistani military planes over the Indian territory;

(b) whether it is a fact that Pakistan did not allow an Indian plane to overfly Pakistan on its way to Tashkent; and

(c) if so, the circumstances in which this happened?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) The clearance for the weekly Pakistan Air Force flights across India expired on 30th June and the Pakistan authorities have not approached the Government of India for its extension.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) The Pakistan authorities unilaterally withdrew the permission, already granted. No reason was given.

Wage Board for Civilian Employees in Defence Establishments

*9. { Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Bagri:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2595 on the 26th April, 1965 and state:

(a) whether any final decision has since been taken to appoint a Wage Board for the civilian employees in the Defence Establishments;

(b) if not, the reason therefor; and

(c) when a final decision is likely to be taken in this regard?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) to (c). The question of pay scales was fully gone into by the Second Pay Commission. This matter affects all Central Government employees and Ministry of Defence cannot take any unilateral decision in regard to Defence civilians only. It is therefore not proposed to appoint a Wage Board for Defence civilians at present. However, if any specific anomalies in classification within the existing wage structure are brought to the notice of Defence Ministry, they will be considered by Government.

रुस से ट्रांसमिटर

{ श्री नवल प्रभाकर :
श्री हेमराज :
*10. { श्री स० चं० सामन्त :

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम :

श्री सुबोध हुंसवा :
श्री यशपाल सिंह :
श्री डी० चं० शर्मा :
श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय :
श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती :
डा० श्रीनिवासन :
श्री परमशिवन :
श्री हुकमचन्द्र कश्यप :
श्री बड़े :
श्री बृजराज सिंह :
श्री डे० इ० पुरी :
श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त :
श्री च० बा० गांधी :
श्रीमती रेणुका राय :
डा० महादेव प्रसाद :
श्री कर्णो सिंहजी :
श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :
श्री पु० र० पटेल :
श्री रा० बण्णा :
श्री नरेन्द्र सिंह महीड़ा :
श्री मधु लियये :
श्री राम सेवक यादव :

क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री 5 अप्रैल, 1965 के तारकित प्रश्न संख्या 741 के उत्तर के संबंध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) रुस से एक हजार किलोवाट का ट्रांसमीटर प्राप्त करने संबंधी बातों में अब तक क्या प्रगति हुई है; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो बातचीत के कब तक पूरा हो जाने की संभावना है ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी) : (क) और (ख). ट्रांसमीटर देने और लगाने के लिए भारत सरकार और सोवियन संघ की सरकार के बीच एक सेंटर थाक

इन्टेंट का विनिमय हुआ है। ट्रांसमीटर की डिजाइन का प्रारंभिक कार्य अब तक शुरू हो जाना चाहिए था। सोवियत संघ की सरकार के प्रतिनिधियों के बहुत शीघ्र ही यहां आने की उम्मीद है। उन से और बातचीत करने के बाद आवश्यक करार पर हस्ताक्षर किए जाएंगे।

Manufacture of Jets with U.A.R. Collaboration

- *11. { Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
 Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 Shri Hem Barua:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri P. C. Borooah:
 Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:
 Shri Indrajit Gupta:
 Shri Naval Prabhakar:
 Shri Hem Raj:
 Shri Bagri:
 Shri R. Barua:
 Shri Madhu Limaye:
 Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether any progress has been made in the manufacture of HF-24 supersonic jet aeroplanes in collaboration with the United Arab Republic; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Defence Production (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). Technical studies are still in progress. Discussions with U.A.R. authorities will be taken up after the technical studies have been completed.

Transmitters from Yugoslavia

- *12. { Shri S. C. Samanta:
 Shri Subodh Hanada:
 Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
 Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
 Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:

- Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaia:
 Shri Bade:
 Shri Brij Raj Singh:
 Shri V. B. Gandhi:
 Shri Karni Singhji:
 Shri R. Barua:

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1138 on the 3rd May, 1965 and state:

(a) the progress so far made in the negotiations with a Yugoslav firm for their offer to supply two 500 Kw medium-wave transmitters; and

(b) when the final decision is likely to be taken in the matter?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) and (b). The Director General, Supplies and Disposals who is negotiating the tender for the transmitters has not been able to get full clarifications on all the technical and contractual points relevant to the offer. The Yugoslav firm who have tendered, have cleared some of the points raised, but others are still to be cleared. The firm intended to fly out to India a Technical Expert. However, he was unable to come because of floods there. It is only when all points have been clarified that a final decision can be taken. Meanwhile the firm has been requested to keep the offer open till 31st August, 1965. The Director General, Supplies and Disposals are in constant touch with the firm.

Nuclear Tests

*13. Shri P. C. Borooah: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that India with 23 other nations has recently asked the Disarmament Commission to deplore the nuclear tests; and

(b) if so, with what response?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) India and 28 other countries co-sponsored a resolution in the Disarmament Com-

mission which in its preamble *inter alia* deplored the fact that nuclear weapons tests have taken place and that no agreement has been reached on discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests.

(b) The resolution was adopted by large majority.

Second Chinese Nuclear Explosion

*13-A. Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) what is the nature of the second Chinese nuclear explosion;

(b) what potential and development of technology is indicated; and

(c) the Government's reaction in the matter?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): (a) Analyses of the test debris carried out by our Atomic Energy Establishment shows that uranium 235 was used for the second explosion.

(b) This is difficult to assess as one has no firm indication whether the uranium 235 was obtained from outside or partially or wholly separated in a gaseous diffusion plant.

(c) The Government of India have deplored the conducting of atomic tests despite the partial Test Ban Treaty as an act indifferent to the welfare of mankind.

South Rhodesian Government

*14. { Shri Bagri:
Shri Madhu Limaye:
Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that he had said that Government of India was not going to recognise the South Rhodesian Government set up as a result of a unilateral declaration; and

(b) if so, the Government's reaction to such a statement?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The reactions of the Government of Rhodesia have naturally been critical.

Heavy Earth Moving Equipment Factory

*15. Shri Hanumanthaya: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that sanction had been accorded to start a Heavy Earth Moving Equipment Factory at Kolar Gold Fields, Mysore State;

(b) if so, the amount sanctioned for its preliminary civil works;

(c) what progress has been made in implementing this decision; and

(d) when the factory is likely to go into production?

The Minister of Defence Production (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir, on 16 July 1965, subject to finalisation of arrangements for foreign exchange allocations from economic credits.

(b) Rs. 7.43 lakhs.

(c) A project loan application has been drawn up and is being processed. For producing a phased programme of construction including water supply, designing of factory buildings and planning of township, consultants and architects have been appointed and Master Plans and sectorwise plans are under preparation. The work on laying of pipe line for industrial water supply is in progress. The scheme for supply of drinking water is being formulated in consultation with the State Government.

(d) During 1967-68.

Road Rollers and Air Compressors

*17. **Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) the progress so far made by the Garden Reach Workshop in the manufacture of Road Rollers and Portable Air Compressors required for building roads in the border areas;

(b) whether it would be enough to meet the demand; and

(c) if not, the steps taken to accelerate the manufacture?

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) The manufacture of components/parts of the Road Rollers was taken in hand from January 1965 and the assembly of the first batch of 4 Road Rollers is expected to be completed during this month. The assembly of 84 Road Rollers is proposed to be completed by the end of March 1966.

25 sets of imported components, for the first batch of 25 Air Compressors, have been ordered and the manufacture of indigenous components is expected to commence shortly. The first batch is expected to be placed on the market by January 1966.

(b) and (c). The requirement of Road Rollers and Air Compressors, for building roads in the border areas, is at present met by drawing supplies from the existing manufacturers of Road Rollers and Air Compressors. The production in Garden Reach Workshops will augment the total availability of Road Rollers and Air Compressors in the country.

Labour Unions

*18. **Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the recommendation of the Dhebar Committee of the Congress Working Committee that a referen-

dum by secret ballot ought to be taken in the Public Sector Industries in order to determine the representative character of Labour Unions before according recognition;

(b) if so, the Government's view thereon; and

(c) whether any steps are being taken to implement this recommendation?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) Yes.

(b) In Government's view the existing procedure for determining the representative character of trade unions, evolved through tripartite agreements, is more suited to our needs and circumstances than the secret ballot system and need not be disturbed.

(c) Does not arise.

बोनस का भुगतान

*19. { श्री मधु सिन्घे :
श्री रामलोक यादव :

क्या श्रम और रोजगार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) बोनस-भुगतान अध्यादेश, 1965 के अनुसार, सरकारी क्षेत्र के कितने उपक्रमों ने मजदूरों को बोनस दिया है ; और

(ख) इस उद्देश्य से सरकार क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है कि जिन उपक्रमों ने अभी तक बोनस नहीं दिया है, वे जल्द से जल्द दे दें ?

श्रम और रोजगार मंत्री (श्री संजीवध्या): (क) सूचना उपलब्ध नहीं है।

(ख) अध्यादेश के अनुसार कैलेंडर वर्ष 1964 में किसी भी दिन से शुरू होने वाले लेखा-वर्ष का बोनस सामान्यतः वित्त-वर्ष समाप्त होने के बाद छठ मास के अन्दर-अन्दर दिया जाता है। सरकारी क्षेत्र के उपक्रमों को अध्यादेश में निर्दिष्ट उपबन्धों की जानकारी

प्राप्त है और वे निःसन्देह सांविधिक मांगों का अनुपालन करने के लिए कार्यवाही करेंगे।

Occupation of Indian enclaves by Pakistan

- *20. {
 Shri Rameshwar Tanti:
 Shri S. M. Banerjee:
 Shri Kapur Singh:
 Shri Solanki:
 Shri Gulshan:
 Shri P. K. Deo:
 Shri Narasimha Reddy:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Pakistan has occupied all the Indian enclaves in East Pakistan while retaining control over its own in India;

(b) if so, whether the Indian team which visited East Pakistan in the second week of May had lodged a protest and has charged Pakistan for a violation of the India-Pakistan agreement on exchange of enclaves;

(c) if so, the reaction of the Pakistan Government thereto;

(d) the steps taken or being taken by Government to safeguard the enclaves;

(e) whether the Centre had also asked the State Government to set up administration units in these enclaves; and

(f) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) No, Sir. In April, 1965, Pakistanis infiltrated into the Indian enclave Daikhata, J. L. No. 38 in Dinajpur District and also constructed a road cutting through this enclave. Pakistanis vacated this area in early May, 1965.

(b) On the 24th May, 1965, the Government of West Bengal lodged a protest with the Government of East Pakistan on the above issue.

(c) The Government of East Pakistan while denying the charge have, however, admitted that a track passes through Daikhata and the right of

passage for people exists since pre-independence days.

(d) Action has been taken to send teams of officials for visiting Indian enclaves on a reciprocal basis.

(e) Yes, Sir.

(f) Instructions have been issued to the State Government to ask the East Pakistan Government for reciprocal facilities to post police parties in Indian enclaves for administrative purposes.

दिल्ली स्थित चीनी दूतावास और पाकिस्तानी उच्चायोग की गतिविधियां

- *21. {
 श्री प्रकाशचौर साहस्री :
 श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धाण्ठी :

क्या बंबेसिक्-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि दिल्ली स्थित चीनी दूतावास और पाकिस्तानी उच्चायुक्त के कार्यालय की गतिविधियां भारत के लिये कठिनाइयां उत्पन्न कर रही हैं और सरासर गलत प्रचार किया जा रहा है ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि उक्त दोनों देशों के भारत स्थित राजनयिक और व्यावसायिक प्रतिनिधि स्थान स्थान पर अपनी भारत विरोधी गतिविधियों में वृद्धि कर रहे हैं ; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो इन गतिविधियों को समाप्त करने के लिए सरकार ने क्या कदम उठाये हैं ?

बंबेसिक्-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) :

(क) यह तो सच है कि भारत सरकार पाकिस्तान के हाई कमिशन की और चीनी राजदूतावास की कतिपय गतिविधियां घापितजनक समझती है, पर सरकार इस बात का मुनिश्चित करने के लिए अभी आवश्यक कदम उठा रही है कि ये गतिविधियां भारत के लिए कठिनाइयां खड़ी न करें। पाकिस्तान

घोर चीन भारत के खिलाफ जो प्रचार कर रहे हैं वह सदा घोर बेहद गलत होता है।

(ख) कोई विशेष बढ़ती देखने में नहीं आई है।

(ग) चीनी राजदूतावास-चीनी राजदूतावास ने जब जब आपत्तिजनक प्रचार किया है, तब तब भारत सरकार ने चीनी राजदूतावास का ध्यान उतका घोर आक्रुष्ट किया है और उसे इस प्रकार का प्रचार जारी रखने के खिलाफ चेतावनी दी है।

पाकिस्तान हाई कमिशन-मई 1965 में विदेश मंत्रालय ने पाकिस्तान हाई कमिशन को एक नोट भेजा था और उसमें उससे कहा था कि वह इस बात का सुनिश्चित करे कि पाकिस्तान सरकार के 'पाकिस्तान न्यूज डाइजैस्ट' नामक प्रकाशन का वितरण तत्काल बन्द कर दे।

फरवरी 1965 से विदेश मंत्रालय पाकिस्तान हाई कमिशन को तीन नोट और भी भेज चुका है जिसमें उसने उससे प्रार्थना की है कि वह अपने हाई कमिशन द्वारा जारी की जाने वाले प्रेस-बंटनों के जरिए भारत-विरोधी प्रचार न करे।

Chinese Intrusions into Indian Territory

- *22. { Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
Shri Rameshwar Tanila:
Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
Shri P. C. Borooah:
Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:
Shri Hukam Chand
Kachhavaia:
Shri D. C. Sharma:
Shri Bagri:
Shri Heda:
Shri H. C. Soy:
Shri Daljit Singh:
Shri R. S. Pandey:
Shri Hem Barua:
Shri Jagdev Singh
Siddhanti:
Shri Bade:
Shri Brij Raj Singh:
Shri D. D. Puri:

{ Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:
Shri J. B. S. Blst:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Chinese armed forces have made further intrusions into Indian territory since the 11th May, 1965; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

India-China Dispute

{ Shri Hem Barua:
Shri Kajrolkar:
*23. { Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
Shri Indrajit Gupta:
Shri Vasudevan Nair:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the stage at which the Colombo proposals over the India-China dispute stand at present;

(b) whether any communication had been addressed to China in the matter directly or through any of the Colombo powers; and

(c) If so, the reaction of Chinese Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The Government of the People's Republic of China has obstinately refused to accept the Colombo Proposals, even though the Government of India has accepted these proposals. There has been no change in the position.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

Conversion of A.I.R. into Public Corporation

{ Shri Yashpal Singh:
Shri Hem Barua:
Shri R. S. Pandey:
Shri D. C. Sharma:
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:
Shri Subodh Hansda:
*24. { Shri S. C. Samanta:

Shri Daji:
 Shrimati Vimla Devi:
 Shri M. R. Krishna:
 Shri J. B. S. Bist:
 Shri R. Barua:

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government contemplate to convert the All-India Radio into a Public Corporation on the lines of the British Broadcasting Corporation; and

(b) if so, the main features of the proposal?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indra Gandhi):

(a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

IAF Firing Practice Accident

*25. { Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
 Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 Shri Bagri:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether the special inquiry instituted on the death of three persons in January last in the firing practice by I.A.F. planes in Jangpura village near Ludhiana has been completed; and

(b) if so, the findings thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). The Commissioner of the Jullundur Division was asked to conduct a Special Inquiry into this accident as well as two similar incidents which had taken place in April and May 1965. His report has been received last week and is under detailed examination. In so far as the incident of 2nd January 1965 is concerned, his findings are that three boys of village Golib Kalan killed at about 3 P.M. on 2nd January 1965 as a result of an explosion caused by one of them tampering with an unexploded rocket. After analysing the evidence produced before him, the Commissioner has come to the conclusion that this rocket was released, earlier that day at about 12 noon from

an Air Force plane engaged in firing practice over the Sidhwan Khas Range and accidentally dropped without exploding into the fields from which it was picked up. The rocket was picked up by one of the three boys: killed who tried to break the rocket head by throwing it on the metalled road nearby with fatal results to all the three.

Indians born in Zanzibar

*26. { Shri P. C. Boroach:
 Shri Raghunath Singh:
 Shri Kajrolkar:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Indians born in Zanzibar, but now living in East Africa have become Stateless persons since the independence of Zanzibar;

(b) if so, what is their political position there; and

(c) the action taken by Government in the matter?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) to (c). The Constitution adopted by the Zanzibar Government after independence had provided for automatic acquisition of citizenship by this category of residents. The constitution was, however, abrogated in January, 1964 by the Revolutionary Government. Subsequently the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar was announced and the position is somewhat fluid since the formation of the new State of Tanzania. Our representatives are in touch with the authorities in Dar-es-Salaam and London in the matter.

Expansion of T. V. Programme

{ Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri P. R. Chakraverti:
 Shri P. C. Boroach:
 Shri Bagri:
 Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
 Shri Hari Visham Kamath:
 Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
 *27. { Shri S. C. Samanta:

Shri Subodh Hansda:
 Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
 Shri Naval Prabhakar:
 Shri Kindar Lal:
 Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
 Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
 Shri Jashvanti Mehta:
 Shri P. R. Patel:
 Shri R. Barua:
 Shri Narendra Singh Mahida:

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(c) whether it is a fact that West ernment have taken a decision to develop further the television services in the country;

(b) if so, the broad outlines of the proposed programme;

(a) whether it is a fact that Gov- Germany has offered a gift of T.V. Studio; and

(d) if so, whether it has been ac- cepted and whether any foreign assis- tance is being sought in implementing the proposed programme?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The Cabinet have approved of the expan- sion of Television Service under the Fourth Five Year Plan period at an expenditure of Rs. 47 crores by setting up Television Centres at Bombay, Cal- cutta, Madras and Kanpur and by further expanding the Television Ser- vice at Delhi to the surrounding areas.

(c) and (d). Yes, Sir. The West German Government's offer to supply television equipment for one Studio at Delhi has been accepted. Whether any further assistance should be sought for implementing the proposed expan- sion of television is under considera- tion.

Submarine for Indian Navy

*28. { Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
 Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:
 Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
 Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
 Shri Brij Raj Singh:

Shri D. D. Puri:
 Shri M. N. Swamy:
 Shri P. R. Chakraverti:
 Shri Tan Singh:
 Shri Kapur Singh:
 Shri Solanki:
 Shri Narasimha Reddy:
 Shri P. G. Sen:
 Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:
 Shri Sidheshwar Prasad:
 Shri Bagri:
 Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shri Bade:
 Shri Hukam Chand
 Kachhavaia:
 Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Sinha:
 Shri P. C. Borooh:
 Sinha:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri Gulshan:
 Shri P. K. Deo:
 Shri Ram Sewak:
 Shri Madhu Limaye:
 Shri Mohan Swarup:
 Shri Basappa:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 722 on the 5th April, 1965 and state:

(a) whether the proposal for the acquisition of a modern submarine for the Indian Navy has been further considered; and

(b) if so, with what result?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b) The proposal for the acquisition of modern sub- marines is being pursued.

Explosion of Second Atom Bomb by China

*29. { Shri Hem Barua:
 Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
 Shri K. N. Tiwary:
 Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
 Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:
 Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri S. C. Samanta:
 Shri M. L. Dwivedi:

Shri S. M. Banerjee:
 Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
 Shri Hem Raj:
 Shri Naval Prabhakar:
 Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
 Shri D. D. Puri:
 Shri Maheswar Naik:
 Shri Hukam Chand
 Kachhavalaya:
 Shri Sezhlyan:
 Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda:
 Shri Bagri:
 Shri H. C. Soy:
 Shri Raghunath Singh:
 Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
 Shri R. Barua:
 Dr. L. M. Singhvi:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that China has exploded a second atom bomb and is preparing for full-fledged development of China as a nuclear power;

(b) if so, the Government's reaction thereto; and

(c) at what stage the proposal for joint nuclear protection, made by our Prime Minister last year, stands at present?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) to (c). China has conducted a second nuclear explosion as part of its plan to develop an independent nuclear weapons capability.

Government have condemned the Chinese nuclear tests and China's plans to develop its nuclear capability as a threat to international peace and security and as a serious setback to the cause of world disarmament.

The Prime Minister had proposed that the major nuclear powers might undertake responsibilities to mitigate the nuclear threat being faced by non-nuclear countries with a view to ensure that these countries do not seek to acquire independent nuclear capabilities and to reduce the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Prime Minister had merely posed the problem in a general way for consideration by the powers concerned.

This is a complicated matter having important strategic and political aspects and it is unlikely that assurances of security can be extended to non-nuclear powers until the powers concerned have had sufficient time to consider the matter in detail.

Indo-Ceylon Agreement

Shri P. C. Borooah:
 Shri Hem Barua:
 Shri P. R. Chakraverti:
 Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 Shri R. S. Pandey:
 Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
 *30. Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
 Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri Raghunath Singh:
 Shri Tan Singh:
 Shri R. Barua:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the disclosure made by Ceylon's Prime Minister in Parliament on April 23, 1965 of the "difficulties" in regard to the implementation of the India-Ceylon agreement of 1964;

(b) if so, whether our Government have ascertained these difficulties; and

(c) the steps taken to remove them?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) No, Sir. The Government have seen no mention of "difficulties" in regard to the implementation of the Indo-Ceylon Agreement of 1964 in the statement made in Parliament by the Prime Minister of Ceylon on 23rd April, 1965.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

P.M.G.'s Office, Nagpur

1. { Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
 Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the P.M.G.'s Office at Nagpur has been shifted to Bhopal;

(b) if so, whether 500 postal employees demonstrated against this move; and

(c) its reaction on the Government?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) There was demonstration by some employees.

(c) The decision to shift the P. M. G's office from Nagpur to Bhopal was taken some-time back in keeping with the policy of the Govt., to make the Regional P&T jurisdiction conform to state boundaries and to station the Postmaster General at the headquarters of the State Govt. This, however, could not be implemented for want of suitable accommodation at Bhopal. The office has been shifted to Bhopal on 1-7-65 after securing necessary accommodation there.

Flying Accident

2. { Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that two IAF officers died on the 27th May, 1965 in a flying accident in the Eastern sector;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether any enquiry has been instituted; and

(d) if so, the outcome thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) to (d). There was no flying accident on the 27th May, 1965. However, a flying accident involving an Air Force aircraft, while on training flight, occurred at a place about seven miles north of Jalpaiguri at about 0910 hours on 26th May, 1965. The pilot and the co-pilot were

the only two officers on board the aircraft and both were killed. The aircraft was damaged beyond economical repairs.

According to the findings of the Court of Enquiry, both the pilots were medically fit to carry out the flight. There was no technical failure or malfunctioning of the survival/escape equipment in the aircraft. The accident occurred due to the aircraft striking against a flock of birds, while flying at a height of about 500 ft. above the ground level. The pilots also appeared to have got injured after jettisoning the canopy to such an extent that they lost control over the aircraft which subsequently crashed killing them. No person is directly or indirectly to blame for the accident.

The findings of the Court of Inquiry have been accepted by the Chief of the Air Staff.

Commemoration Stamp

3. { Shri A. V. Raghavan:
Shri Pottekkatt:
Shri A. K. Gopalan:

Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether any final decision has been taken in the matter of issuing a commemoration stamp in honour of Shri Narayana Gurudev; and

(b) if so, when it will be issued?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) and (b). The matter is still under examination.

P. & T. Facilities in Kerala

4. Shri A. K. Gopalan: Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) the number of new Post Offices opened in Kerala in 1964;

(b) the number of Post Offices upgraded in Kerala in 1964;

(c) the number of new telephone connections given in Kerala in 1964; and

(d) the places where telegraphic facilities were extended in Kerala in 1964?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) 108.

(b) 68.

(c) 3465.

(d) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

1. Nadapuram.
2. Mattupatti.
3. Regional Engg. College (Calicut).
4. Kizhakkambalam.
5. Vithura.
6. Kallissery.
7. Chapparapadavu.
8. Mokkalam.
9. Nayarambalam.
10. Kaudiar.
11. Nellikkakuzhi.
12. Pulamen.
13. Puthucode.
14. Chalisseri.
15. Veliyanad.
16. Mullassery.
17. Kolaparamba.
18. Valancheri.
19. Muhamma.
20. Paripally.
21. Eriyad.
22. Kuthiadi.
23. Ranny Angadi.
24. Kavasseeri.
25. Pudunagaram.
26. Pallassana.
27. Chelembra.
28. Kollam.
29. Moongode.
30. Kalpakancheri.
31. Kalmandapam.

Payment of Bonus by Travancore Rubber and Tea Company

5. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any representation about the

non-payment of bonus by the Travancore Rubber and Tea Company, Mundalesyam (Kerala) for the year 1963-64 as recommended by the tripartite decision; and

(b) if so, the steps Government have taken to implement the decision?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) Yes.

(b) The Labour Commissioner, Kerala, has arranged for a Joint Conference of the parties for the settlement of the dispute.

Motor Transport Workers Act

6. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received complaints about the non-implementation of the Motor Transport Workers Act in Palghat, Cananoore and other districts of Kerala;

(b) whether Government have taken action against any employer for non-compliance with the provisions of the Act; and

(c) if so, the number of persons against whom action has been taken?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Action has been taken against 171 employers for non-compliance with the provisions of the Act. Prosecution was launched against 167 employers. Out of the 167 cases 141 cases ended in conviction and 26 cases are still pending.

Lock-out in National Rubber Works

7. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that lock-out was declared by the management of National Rubber Works Factory, Kottayam, Kerala;

(b) whether it is a fact that this lock-out was illegal;

(c) if so, the steps taken against the employer; and

(d) the number of workers affected by this lock-out?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya):

(a) Yes. The correct name of the concern is National Tyre and Rubber Company of India Ltd. Kottayam.

(b) and (c). The justifiability of the lock-out has been referred to adjudication.

(d) About 150.

Use of Hindi in Cantonment Boards

8. **Shri Vishram Prasad:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) the time by which arrangements are likely to be made to issue the agenda of the meetings of the Cantonment Boards in Northern India in Hindi;

(b) the steps taken so far in this connection; and

(c) the nature of arrangements likely to be made in future?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (c). It is not possible to indicate a time limit. Subject to any statutory provisions for the time being in force, the matter is within the competence of each of the Cantonment Boards.

(b) No Cantonment Board has commenced to issue agenda in Hindi.

Indian P.O.Ws. in Pakistan

9. {
- Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 - Shri D. C. Sharma:
 - Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:
 - Shri R. S. Pandey:
 - Shri P. C. Borooah:
 - Shri Yashpal Singh:
 - Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
 - Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
 - Shri Basumatari:

Will the Minister of Defence be

pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Indian soldiers captured by Pakistan in Kutch fighting are being subjected to mental and physical torture to elicit information;

(b) if so, whether it is also a fact that they are paraded in public;

(c) whether this kind of treatment to the prisoners is a breach of conventions adopted by the countries in this respect;

(d) the reaction of Government thereto; and

(e) the steps taken in the matter?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) to (e). The Government have no official information to establish the allegations made by the Honourable Members. The question of taking any steps in the matter, therefore, does not arise.

However, Article 13 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Prisoners of War, 1959, lays down *inter alia* that prisoners of war must at all times be protected against insults and public curiosity. Article 17 of the same Convention lays down *inter alia* that no physical or mental torture or any other form of coercion may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. In case the prisoners of war have been subject to any mental or physical torture or they have been paraded in public, as alleged by the Honourable Members, it will mean breach of the Convention.

I.L.O. Conference in Geneva

10. {
- Shri Rameshwar Tantia:
 - Shri P. E. Chakraverti:
 - Shri P. C. Borooah:

Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that India participated in the 49th Session of the

International Labour Organisation held in Geneva;

(b) if so, the subjects discussed thereat;

(c) whether India put forward any proposals in the Conference; and

(d) if so, the reaction of the Conference on these proposals?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) Yes.

(b) The following subjects were on the agenda:—

(i) Report of the Director-General.

(ii) Financial and budgetary questions.

(iii) Information and reports on the application of Conventions and Recommendations.

(iv) The employment of young persons in underground work in mines of all kinds (second discussion).

(v) The employment of women with family responsibilities (second discussion).

(vi) Agrarian reform, with particular reference to employment and social aspects (general discussion).

(vii) The role of co-operatives in the economic and social development of developing countries (first discussion).

(c) and (d). A report giving *inter alia* details about the work done by the Indian Government delegation will, as usual, be placed before Parliament.

Atomic Power Station in Kashmir

11. { Shri Yashpal Singh:
Shri Rameshwar Tantia:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Kashmir Government has asked the Centre to include Kashmir as one of the sites for setting up an atomic power station in the country; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Films on Chinese and Pak. Aggression

12. **Shrimati Savitri Nigam:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state whether some films regarding the Chinese aggression and Pakistani aggression have been made and exhibited in foreign countries to acquaint them with the actual position?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Yes, Sir, a number of films on these subjects were prepared and sent to our Missions to acquaint foreign audiences with the correct facts.

Bulletins circulated by Ministry of External Affairs

13. { Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state whether any bulletins are printed and circulated by the External Affairs Ministry to keep our representatives abroad well posted with the developments in the country?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Our representatives abroad are kept constantly informed of developments in India by various means. In the way of printed material, besides brochures and pamphlets on various issues, a fortnightly paper, the Indian & Foreign Review, which is circulated to a wide audience abroad, is also supplied to our representatives. This presents Indian thinking on political, economic and social

developments. A monthly publication, entitled "Foreign Affairs Record", is also supplied to our representatives abroad. This comprises important statements on matters of foreign policy made by our leaders. Daily newspapers and other periodicals from India are also supplied to our missions to keep them abreast of developments.

The printed material mentioned above is, in addition to news about India sent out twice a day by teleprinter to most of our missions, as well as telegrams, background notes and other directives sent to our missions regarding various happenings of importance to India.

Warning by China

14. **Shri Hem Barua:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that China has warned India that the "Indian Government will definitely come to no good end" if the conflict with Pakistan is widened; and

(b) if so, Government's reaction to this Chinese threat?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir. On May 4, 1965 the New China News Agency issued an "authorised statement" regarding Pakistan's unprovoked aggression on Kutch wherein it was stated that if Indian Government "insists on having its own way on playing with fire and widen the conflict, it will certainly come to no good end."

(b) On May 7, the spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs issued a statement pointing out that the Chinese Government was inciting Pakistan in its aggressive activities in the Ran of Kutch. The Indian *Charge d' Affairs* in Peking lodged a protest against the threat to India contained in the New China News Agency statement.

Demonstration before Indian Chancery in Dacca

15. { **Shrimati Savitri Nigam:**
Shri Hem Barua:
Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:

Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:
Shri S. N. Chaturvedi:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some Pakistanis demonstrated before our Chancery in Dacca on the 13th May, 1965 and caused heavy damage to our Deputy High Commission's office there;

(b) if so, the details of the incident; and

(c) the compensation, if any, sought from the Pakistani authorities for the damages caused?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). On May 13, 1965, at about 9.15 P.M. a violent crowd of about 250 persons assembled in front of the Office of the Deputy High Commissioner. They raised unseemly anti-Indian slogans and threw stones at the Chancery building and the building adjacent to it which is occupied by some members of the Mission. The demonstrators forcibly pulled out and took away the brass name plate of the Mission and an enamelled shield displaying the National emblem of India, removed a couple of electrical fixtures and broke a few window panes.

(c) On May 14, 1965, the Deputy High Commission lodged a protest with the Government of East Pakistan in the matter and demanded compensation for the losses and damages inflicted in the course of the demonstration. In reply, the Government of East Pakistan expressed deep regret over this incident. The Deputy High Commission is pursuing with the Government of East Pakistan the question of restoration of the Mission's brass name-plate and the enamelled shield. The other losses and damages have been made good by the landlords of the two affected premises.

Training of Foreigners in Employment Service

16. { Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
Shri Subodh Hansda:
Dr. P. N. Khan:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:

Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Central Institute for Research and Training in Employment Service has received any requests from foreign countries for training of their officers;

(b) if so, the names of such countries; and

(c) what kind of training they propose to take from this Institute?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) Yes.

(b) Malaysia, Burma and Thailand.

(c) Training is given in Employment procedures and organisation. This includes training in occupational information and research, vocational guidance and manpower information and planning.

Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

17. { Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
Shri Hem Barua:
Shri Heda:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that China's second nuclear explosion marks a significant technological advance towards sophistication;

(b) if so, whether any fresh efforts have been made by Government in the wake of these new developments to impress upon other nuclear powers of the world the dire need for checking this proliferation of nuclear arms in the interest of world peace; and

(c) if so, what has been the response of the concerned powers to India's appeal in this regard?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The second Chinese nuclear explosion has confirmed China's determination to acquire a nuclear weapons capability. China's capacity to achieve a nuclear strike capacity would, however, depend on a large number of factors including the development of an effective delivery system.

(b) India put forward an integrated proposal to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons during the recent meeting of the Disarmament Commission.

(c) There has been no specific response on the part of the nuclear powers to India's proposal though it is likely to come up for detailed consideration during the current session of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva.

तार के फार्म

18. { श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी :
श्रीमती सावित्री निगम :
श्री स० चं० सामन्त :
श्री सुबोध हंसदा :

क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि इस समय प्रयोग किये जा रहे तार के फार्मों में निखी बातें प्रसम्बद्ध व्यक्ति पढ़ सकते हैं ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो तार में निखी बातों के प्रकटीकरण को रोकने के लिए फार्मों के डिजाइन में परिवर्तन करने के लिए क्या कार्यवाही की जा रही है ?

संचार विभाग में उपमंत्रि (श्री अग्रवती) :

(क) इस समय तारों का दो भिन्न तरीकों से बांटा जाता है—एक तो यह कि तार फार्म को एक प्रयोग निष्काफे में रख कर बांटा जाता है और दूसरा यह कि नये किम्म के खुद एक तार फार्म को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय पत्रों की तरह मांडकर

दिया जाता है। दूधरे तरीके से तार में लिखी बातों के कुछ हिस्से को देखना संभव हो सकता है, किन्तु यह तभी हो सकता है जब कि मूड़े हुए फार्म की तरफ से जिवर प्लैन् नहीं होता जानबूझ कर ऐसी कोशिश की जाए। किन्तु वितरण से पहले किसी भी तार का कोई भी अनधिकृत व्यक्ति नहीं देख सकते।

(ख) अभी कुछ सोचा नहीं गया है।

तार शुल्क की वापसी

19. { श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी :
श्रीमती सावित्री निगम :
श्री स० चं० सामन्त :
श्री सुबोध हंसवा :

क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि जो तार डाक द्वारा भेजने के कारण विलम्ब से पहुंचते हैं उनका तार शुल्क उनके भेजने वालों को, बिना मांग किये ही वापस लौटाने के बारे में दिये गये प्राश्वासन को पूरा करने में अब तक क्या प्रगति हुई है ?

संचार विभाग में उपमंत्री (श्री भगवती) : डाक द्वारा भेजने के कारण अत्यधिक विलम्ब से पहुंचने वाले तारों के मूल्य से सेवा खर्च काटकर उसे डाक-तार विभाग द्वारा अपने प्राप ही लौटाने की प्रणाली 1 अप्रैल, 1965 से प्रारम्भ की गई है।

नौसेना के बिमान की दुर्घटना

- +20. { श्री उटिया :
श्री मरंडी :
श्री बागड़ी :

क्या प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री 8 मार्च, 1965 के प्रतारंकित प्रश्न संख्या 741 के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या गोघा के निकट समुद्र में हुई एक नौसेना बिमान की दुर्घटना की जांच करने के लिये बनाये गये जांच बोर्ड की

वारंवाई पर सरकार ने इस बीच विचार कर लिया है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो उसका ब्योरा क्या है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण) :

(क) बोर्ड प्राव इन्कवायरी की कार्यवाही सरकार के विचारारधीन है।

(ख) प्रश्न नहीं उठता।

रेडियो व्यय को तार व्यय के साथ मिलाना

21. { श्री उटिया :
श्री मरंडी :
श्री बागड़ी :

क्या संचार मंत्री रेडियो व्यय को तार व्यय के साथ मिलाने के बारे में 8 मार्च-1965 के प्रतारंकित प्रश्न-संख्या 736 के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि इस बीच इस मामले में कितनी प्रगति हुई है और अन्तिम निर्णय कब तक किये जाने की सम्भावना है ?

संचार विभाग में उपमंत्री (श्री भगवती) : रेडियो शाखा के लेखाओं को तार शाखा के लेखाओं में मिलाने का प्रश्न अभी विचारारधीन है और इस मामले में अन्तिम निर्णय लेने से पहले कुछ समय लग जाएगा।

Wage Board for Leather Industries

22. Shri S. M. Banerjee: Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that all the Unions working in Leather Industries have demanded the appointment of a Wage Board for the Leather Industries' Workers;

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto; and

(c) the steps taken so far in this regard?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) Demands have been received for the appointment of a Wage Board for the leather industry.

(b) and (c). The matter is being examined in consultation with State Governments.

भारतीय सीमा पर पाकिस्तानी सेना का जमाव

23. { श्री नवल प्रभाकर :
 श्री किन्दर लाल :
 श्री विद्यनाथ पाण्डेय :
 श्रीमती सावित्री निगम :
 श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल :
 श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय :

क्या बहिष्कृत-कार्य मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि सरकार ने सुरक्षा परिषद् को इस घाशय का एक विरोध-पत्र भेजा है कि भारत की सम्पूर्ण सीमा के साथ-साथ पाकिस्तानी सेना का आक्रामक ढंग से भारी जमाव है ;

(ख) क्या इस विरोध-पत्र की एक प्रति सभा-घटल पर रखी जायेगी ; और

(ग) इस पर सुरक्षा परिषद् की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

बहिष्कृत-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह):

(क) जी हाँ ।

(ख) सुरक्षा परिषद् के अध्यक्ष के नाम भेजे गए दिनांक 28 मई, 1965 के हमारे पत्र की एक प्रति मदन की मेज पर रख दी गई है [पुस्तकालय में रखी गई, देखिये संख्या एल टी—4465/65]

(ग) ऐसे पत्र सुरक्षा परिषद् के सदस्यों में प्रचारित कराने के लिए परिषद् के अध्यक्ष

के नाम भेजे जाते हैं । परिषद् में इस मामले पर कोई विचार-विमर्श नहीं हुआ है ।

Firing in Lathitilla Area

24. { श्री यशपाल सिंह:
 श्री D. C. Sharma:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Pakistan has handed over a note to the Indian High Commission in Rawalpindi on the 12th May, 1965 asking the Government of India to put an end to heavy firing in Lathitilla area; and

(b) if so, the nature of reply sent to Pakistan, if any?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Government have rejected the allegations as baseless.

Ministers' Absence from Delhi

25. Shri Yashpal Singh: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that none of the Ministers viz., Cabinet Minister, the Minister of State and the Deputy Minister, attached to his Ministry were present in the Capital for some time in the last week of May or the first week of June; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The three Ministers were away from the Capital only during the first week of June.

(b) The tours were undertaken for consultations with certain Governments in Asia and Africa in connection with the Afro-Asian Conference due to be held in the last week of June, 1965.

Visit Abroad of Deputy Minister, External Affairs

26. Shri P. C. Borooah: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Deputy Minister of External Affairs was sent round different Afro-Asian countries including Japan on the eve of the Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers to bring home to them the Indian view on various issues;

(b) if so, which countries he visited; and

(c) with what results?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The Deputy Minister of External Affairs visited a number of countries in East and South East Asia in June, 1965.

(b) The countries visited were Cambodia, Japan, Laos, Philippines and Thailand.

(c) The purpose of the Deputy Minister's visit was to exchange views with the Governments of these countries on international affairs and matters of mutual interest and to strengthen India's relations with them. The Afro-Asian Conference to be held in Algiers was also discussed. The response of these countries to the Deputy Ministers visit was very favourable and gives ground for hope of greater cooperation with them.

Heavy Water Plant

27. { Shri A. V. Raghavan:
Shri Pottekkatt:
Shri Kappen:
Shri D. C. Sharma:
Shri Surendra Pal Singh:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Department of Atomic Energy is now designing a heavy water plant to produce 200 tons of heavy water per year; and

(b) if so, where it will be located?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): (a) and (b). A proposal to set up a heavy water plant with a capacity of 200 metric tons per annum is under the consideration of

Government. The plant is being designed by the scientists and engineers of the Atomic Energy Establishment Trombay. The location of the plant will be decided after the proposal is approved.

उत्तर प्रदेश में डाकघरों को बड़े डाकघर बनाना

28. श्री विद्यनाथ पाण्डेय : क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या 1965-66 में उत्तर प्रदेश में कुछ उप-डाकघरों को मुख्य डाकघर तथा कुछ शाखा डाकघरों को उप-डाकघर बनाने का कोई प्रस्ताव है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इसका स्वीरा क्या है ?

संचार विभाग में उपमंत्री (श्री भगवती) : (क) जी हां ।

(ख) सभा पटल पर एक विवरण पत्र रखा जाता है । [युस्तकालय में रखा गया, डेलिबे संख्या LT-4466/65]

A.I.R. Station at Gorakhpur

29. { Shri Kindar Lal:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government is considering to set up an All-India Radio Station at Gorakhpur (U.P.);

(b) if so, when; and

(c) the total expenditure to be incurred thereon?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) During the Fourth Plan period.

(c) Estimated cost of the project is Rs. 48.6 lakhs.

Accommodation for P & T Employees at Calicut

30. Shri Mohammed Koya: Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the P & T employees at Calicut have not so far been provided with any housing accommodation;

(b) whether any site has been acquired for constructing a colony for the P & T employees there; and

(c) if so, the reasons for the delay in constructing the quarters there?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) No. Sixteen out of 751 P & T employees posted at Calicut have been provided with housing accommodation by the Department.

(b) Not yet.

(c) A suitable site for constructing P & T Colony has not yet been found. However, efforts are being made to find a suitable site for the purpose.

Bifurcation of Calicut-Trivandrum Station

31. Shri Mohammed Koya: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal to bifurcate the Calicut-Trivandrum Station of the All-India Radio into two independent stations;

(b) if so, when and the reasons therefor; and

(c) what are the other stations in India where this dual system followed?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) to (c). The Trivandrum and Calicut Stations of All India Radio are already functioning as independent centres, although they share some programmes as a measure of rational and economical programme planning. Therefore, the question of their bifurcation does not arise.

831 (Ai) LSD-4.

The other stations which have a similar arrangement are:

Lucknow-Allahabad, and
Bhopal-Indore.

Film Censors Board

**32. { Dr. F. Srinivasan:
Shri Paramasivan:**

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal to reorganise and re-appoint Central Board of Film Censors in the country; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Educated Unemployment in Kerala

33. Shri Mohammed Koya: Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state the steps taken by the Central Government to solve the problem of educated unemployment in Kerala so far?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): Development schemes under the Five Year Plans are designed to increase the employment opportunities for those in need of work including the educated.

A study in depth of the employment and unemployment situation in Kerala is being taken up with a view to evolving specific measures to deal with the problem of unemployment in the State:

The study has been designed to secure information about the educated unemployed in the State.

Sardar Patel-Nehru Correspondence

34. Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government is considering any proposal to publish corres-

pondence between the former Home Minister, Sardar Patel and former Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru as a booklet of considerable political and historical value;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) whether any such proposal was ever made to the Government either departmentally or otherwise?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) to (c). Government have not received any proposal for publishing the correspondence between Sardar Patel and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the form of a booklet.

Sikh Pilgrims to Lahore

35. Shri Daljit Singh: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some Sikh Pilgrims visited Lahore in June, 1965;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the Pilgrims were taken from the border by Pakistan authorities in closed lorries; and

(c) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

T.V. Sets

36. Shri Heda: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of Television sets in the different cities in India at present;

(b) the target of expansion in its number in immediate future; and

(c) the arrangements made to obtain these sets?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) Delhi/New Delhi 662
Bombay 4

686

(b) The number of T.V. sets and the rate of their increase will depend on the rate of expansion of TV service and also upon import and/or indigenous manufacture. The Draft Fourth Five Year Plan provides for an expenditure of 4.7 crores for setting up TV Stations in Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Kanpur besides the expansion of the Delhi Station. The demand for sets in these cities may be estimated at one lakh during the next five years.

(c) To begin with, it is proposed to import about 10,000 sets on rupee payment basis. The Ministry of Industry and Supply have been approached for investigating indigenous manufacture of T.V. sets.

Telephones in Malabar Hills (Bombay)

{ Shri Karni Singhji:
Shri Ram Sewak:
37. { Shri P. G. Sen:
Shri Madhu Limaye:
Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:

Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that immediately on the onset of monsoon, the telephones of Malabar Hills, Bombay have become ineffective in many sectors causing a great deal of dislocation; and

(b) if so, the steps being taken in the matter?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) Due to heavy rain the telephone services were dislocated to a certain extent in some parts of the metropolis.

(b) The dislocation was mainly due to failure of the underground cables, some of which have outlived their

normal life. A thorough overhaul of the cable system would be undertaken after the monsoons. Some arrangements for protecting the cables are also contemplated.

Public Sector Industries

38. { Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda:
Shri Basappa:

Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to set up a Committee to examine the working of labour laws in the Public Sector Industries; and

(b) if so, when?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) and (b). The suggestion for setting up a Committee to look into the working of labour laws in the public sector undertakings is under examination and along with related aspects of the matter, will be placed before the forthcoming meeting of the Indian—Labour Conference (September—October 1965) for consideration.

Labour Recruitment Depot, Gorakhpur

39. { Shri Bishwanath Roy:
Dr. Mahadeva Prasad:

Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to make some changes in the recruitment policy regarding the labour;

(b) if so, whether the question of abolition of the Labour Recruitment Depot at Gorakhpur is under consideration; and

(c) the steps taken in that direction?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) No decision has been taken yet about the necessity or otherwise of making changes in the recruitment policy regarding the labour. The working of

the organisation is still under examination.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

Indian Deputy High Commission at Dacca

40. { Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
Shrimati Laxmi Bai:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the staff of the Indian Deputy High Commission at Dacca is being harassed and threatened by the Pakistani plain clothes policemen; and

(b) if so, whether Government have lodged any protest with the Pakistan Government and with what result?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) No Sir. The facts are that in June, 1965, some persons claiming to be plain clothes policemen started accosting the local domestic servants employed by members of the Indian Deputy High Commission at Dacca. These plain clothes policemen reportedly asked obnoxious and objectionable personal question.

(b) The Deputy High Commissioner lodged a protest on June 16, 1965 with the Government of East Pakistan against such objectionable activities. The Ministry of External Affairs also brought this to the notice of the High Commission of Pakistan. On June 18, 1965, the Government of East Pakistan replied to the Indian Deputy High Commissioner saying that an enquiry was being initiated. The harassment of the local domestic servants ceased a few days later.

Pak visas to U.N. Experts

41. { Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
Shri Heda:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that Pakistan had refused visas to

the U.N. Food and Agriculture experts team from India which had been working at Kabul;

(b) if so, whether Government had tried to ascertain the reasons therefor; and

(c) whether Government have made any representation to the Pakistan Government in this regard?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). The Government of India requested the Pakistan Government to grant transit facilities to the Indian team but that Government declined to do so without giving any reasons.

सेना के कर्मचारियों की पदोन्नति

42. डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :
श्री किशन पटनायक :

क्या प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री यह बताने का कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि सेना में अगर किसी की अन्य योग्यताएं हैं और वह अंग्रेजी में उत्तीर्ण नहीं है तो उसकी पदोन्नति नहीं हो पाती ;

(ख) क्या यह सच है कि कुछ सेना कर्मचारियों को आपातकालीन कमीशन इस लिये नहीं दिया गया कि उनके पास अंग्रेजी की योग्यता नहीं थी; और

(ग) क्या यह भी सच है कि ऐसे उम्मीदवारों को पदोन्नति के लिये योग्य नहीं समझा गया था जिन्होंने इंटर की परीक्षा पास नहीं की हुई थी बल्कि विशारद की परीक्षा पास की हुई थी जो कि अंग्रेजी को छोड़ कर बी० ए० को उपाधि के समान मानी जाती है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री महाबत राव खन्ना) : (क) तथा (ख).

हवील्दार अथवा कनिष्ठ प्रायुक्त अफसर के पद के लिए, उन्नति के लिए, अंग्रेजी अर्हता के तोर आवश्यक नहीं है। तदपि, सेना में कमीशनों के लिए, सेना सेविवर्ग के लिए निम्न कम से कम, शिक्षा अर्हताएं निर्धारित की गई हैं :—

- (1) विशिष्ट सूची में स्थायी कमीशनों: मेट्रिकयूलेशन अथवा तुल्य परीक्षा ;
- (2) आपाती कमीशनों : इनका स्थान अल्पकालीन (नान-तकनीकी) कमीशन ने ले लिया है। आपाती कमीशन के रहते सेना सेविवर्ग के लिए कम से कम शिक्षा अर्हता थी मेट्रिकयूलेशन अथवा तुल्य जबकि अमेरिकियों के लिए थी इण्टरमिडिएट अथवा तुल्य परीक्षा ;
- (3) अल्पकालीन कमीशन (नान-तकनीकी) इण्टरमिडिएट अथवा तुल्य परीक्षा ;
- (4) सेवा के सेविवर्ग प्रविष्टि द्वारा स्थायी कमीशन मेट्रिकयूलेशन अथवा तुल्य। इन अर्हताओं में अंग्रेजी की जानकारी निहित है।

(ग) विशारद परीक्षा जिसमें अंग्रेजी पढ़ाए जाने वाले दिपयों में से एक नहीं है इण्टरमिडिएट परीक्षा के तुल्य नहीं मानी गई। तदपि मामला विचाराधीन है।

Unlicensed Radios

43. { Shri P. C. Borooah:
Shri P. E. Chakraverti:
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:

Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) the number of unlicensed radios detected by the anti-piracy staff of the P. & T. Department during 1963, 1964 and 1965 so far;

(b) the amount of surcharge collected thereon; and

(c) the steps contemplated to check this piracy effectively?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) and (b). The number of unlicensed radio sets detected during 1963, 1964 and the first quarter of 1965 and the amounts of surcharge collected thereon are as follows:—

	No. of un-licensed sets detected.	Surcharge collected.
1963	40,344	Rs. 5,69,861
1964	85,985	Rs. 7,16,036
1965 (1st. Quarter)	28,897	Rs. 2,21,132

(c) (i) An Assistant Director is placed in exclusive charge of the anti-piracy organisation in each Circle to make anti-piracy drives more intensive.

(ii) In order to help owners of unlicensed sets, who do not have documentary evidence of the date on which they came into possession of the set, they have been allowed to take a licence effective from the date as declared by them.

Indian Delegation to Algiers Conference

44. Shrimati Renuka Ray: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the total expenditure incurred on the delegation that went to Algiers for the Afro-Asian Conference which was postponed to a later date; and

(b) the total foreign exchange involved?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The total expenditure was approximately Rs. 1,19,050.

(b) The foreign exchange involved was Rs. 47,000.

Institution for Advanced Aeronautical Studies

45. { Shri A. S. Saigal:
Shri J. P. Jyotishi:
Shri Wadiwa:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether there was any proposal for the establishment of an Institution for advanced studies in Aeronautical matters at Indore;

(b) whether any offer of free land and building to the Ministry of Defence was made to house the Institution;

(c) if so, whether the offer was accepted; and

(d) the progress so far made in regard to the establishment of the Institution?

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) to (d). The proposal for the establishment of an Institution for the Advancement of Flight Sciences and Technology was examined by a Committee of Experts in 1963 and they advised that taking into consideration the difficulties in creating a completely new institution, as a better alternative, the existing facilities in the research and development establishments in the Ministries of Defence, Civil Aviation and Scientific Research should be more fully utilised by coordinating and co-relating their activities. Based on the advice of the Committee of Experts, the proposal to have a separate Institute was not pursued further.

Some land and buildings were offered on a long term lease for housing the Institute at Indore but as its establishment was not pursued, the offer was not accepted.

City Compensatory and House Rent Allowance for Defence Establishment Personnel

46. Shrimati Renu Chakravarty. Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that city compensatory and house rent allow-

ance is being given to all defence establishments situated in North Barrackpore Municipality, 24 Parganas, West Bengal including Ichapur;

(b) whether the same facilities are available to defence employees working in Barrackpur and Barrackpur Cantonment area;

(c) if not, the reasons therefor; and

(d) whether it is also a fact that the staff employees working in the Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd., situated in Barrackpur and Barrackpur Cantonment area are also being denied the city compensatory and house rent allowance?

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Both city compensatory and house rent allowances are available to the Defence employees at Barrackpur Cantonment. At Barrackpur only house rent allowance is admissible as it has been classified as a 'C' class city.

(c) Does not arise in view of (a) and (b) above.

(d) The Government of India have set up a Wage Board, which will consider this question. In the meantime, grant of accommodation compensatory allowance on an interim basis is the subject of negotiations with the representative Trade Union.

Fertilizer Factory, Gorakhpur

47. Dr. Mahadeva Prasad: Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that on the occasion of his visit to Gorakhpur in the last week of June, 1965, people complained to him about the injustice and unfair treatment to the labourers employed in the Fertilizer Factory there; and

(b) whether it is also a fact that the local people were dissatisfied with

the way in which appointments to different categories have been made?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) Yes.

(b) There were complaints about appointments.

Summer Drama Festival At Mussoorie

48. Dr. Mahadeva Prasad: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Song and Drama Division organised a drama festival at Mussoorie during the last summer; and

(b) if so, the expenditure incurred thereon?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) The Song & Drama Division did not organise a drama festival in Mussoorie but it participated in a festival organised by the local City Board.

(b) The performances were given by the Central Drama Troupe of the Song & Drama Division at the aforesaid festival as a part of a combined tour to Mussoorie, Dehra Dun and Roorkee. The total expenditure at all the three places amounted to about Rs. 3,750/-.

Bridge at Skardu

**49. } Shri Raghunath Singh:
 } Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:**

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Sino-Pak troops have constructed a bridge across the river Indus at Skardu, a strategic place in the Pakistan-held Karakoram mountainous range north of Kashmir; and

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). It will not be in the public interest to disclose the information available with Government.

Former Algerian President Ben Bella

50. { Shri J. B. S. Bist:
Shri Mohan Swarup:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that India like some other Afro-Asian countries has written to the new Algerian Government concerning the safety of the former President Ahmed Ben Bella; and

(b) if so, the response, if any, received to this move?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) India in association with the Afro-Asian Heads of States/Governments participating in the Commonwealth Conference at London on June 21st appealed to the Algerian Government to spare the life of Mr. Ben Bella.

(b) Though no reply was received, Government of India understand that Mr. Ben Bella is alive.

Handloom for Uganda

51. **Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have decided to give 20 handlooms to Uganda at an estimated cost of Rs. 20,000, under the Technical Cooperation Scheme;

(b) whether any other assistance is likely to be given to that country in the near future; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir. But the present estimated cost is Rs. 22,790.00.

(b) and (c). This depends upon the requests from Uganda received by the Government of India and our capacity to meet them. However, during the visit of the Prime Minister of Uganda the recommendations of the Indian Technical Team which visited Uganda to select sites for setting up sugar units have been discussed and there is now

a proposal in an advanced stage for a joint industrial venture for the establishment of a sugar factory with a capacity of 50,000 tons and farm of about 21,000 acres in the KINYALA area. Besides this, there is also the possibility of collaboration between the two countries with regard to the setting up of a power alcohol industry, a straw board plant, a solvent extraction unit and a pharmaceutical project. There is also a possibility of an industrial estate on the Indian pattern in Uganda.

Teleprinters

52. **Shri Raghunath Singh:** Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) the demand of teleprinters in India at present; and

(b) the number of applications for the supply of teleprinters pending at present for more than five, four and three years?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) As on the 1st August, 1965, the demand of Teleprinters pending against firm orders placed on the Hindustan Teleprinters Limited, Madras, was 3,100 units;

(b) No application for the supply of teleprinters is pending either with the Posts & Telegraphs Department or the Hindustan Teleprinters Limited for more than three years.

डाक तथा तार विभाग में हिन्दी

53. **श्री विद्याम प्रसाद :** क्या संचार मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि डाक तथा तार विभाग ने अपने कर्मचारियों को विभिन्न सरकारी विभागों तथा कार्यालयों के हिन्दी नामों से सम्बन्धित कारनामों के लिये क्या कार्य की है ?

संचार विभाग में उपमन्त्री (श्री जगन्नी) : निम्नलिखित कदम उठाये गये हैं —

(1) सभी डाक-तार परिमार्गों में श्री

प्रशासनिक कार्यालयों को सरकारी विभागों और कार्यालयों के नामों की शिक्षा मन्त्रालय के वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली बोर्ड द्वारा हिन्दी में प्रकाशित सूचियां भेज दी गई है।

- (2) केन्द्रीय सचिवालय हिन्दी परिषद् द्वारा प्रकाशित पुस्तिकाएं भी परिमंडल तथा प्रशासनिक कार्यालयों को भेज दी गई है जिनमें विभिन्न सरकारी कार्यालयों के नाम हिन्दी में दिए गए हैं।
- (3) डाक-तार विभाग द्वारा संकलित कार्यालयों आदि के हिन्दी नामों की इकट्ठी सूची भी सभी डाक-तार कार्यालयों को प्रसारित कर दी गई है।
- (4) सभी कार्यालयों को हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी नाम देने का निर्णय ले लिया गया है। इसी तरह सभी कार्यालयों के साइन बोर्ड, नोटिस बोर्ड और अफसरों के नामपट्ट भी हिन्दी, प्रादेशिक भाषा और अंग्रेजी में लिखे जा रहे हैं।

छावनी बोर्डों में हिन्दी का प्रयोग

54. श्री विश्वाम प्रसाद : क्या प्रति-रक्षा मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) उत्तर भारत के किन-किन छावनी बोर्डों के कर्मचारियों को हिन्दी में टिप्पणियां लिखने तथा पत्र-व्यवहार करने की अनुमति दे दी गई है ;

(ख) क्या इसके लिए उन्हें समुचित प्रोत्साहन दिया जा रहा है ; और

(ग) किन-किन छावनी बोर्डों को इस प्रकार का प्रोत्साहन नहीं दिया गया है और

इस कमी को कब तक दूर किये जाने की सम्भावना है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण) : (क) से (ग). आवश्यक सूचना और विवरण इकटित किए जा रहे हैं और सभा पटल पर रख दिए जाएंगे।

Experiments in International Living

55. Shri Tan Singh: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether India and U.S.A. have agreed to exchange 'experimenters' under the programme 'Experiment in international living';

(b) the number of men and women exchanged so far; and

(c) its impact on foreign exchange?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). The Indian branch of the 'Experiment' was started in 1953 but till 1960 it only received 'experimenters' from the U.S.A. and did not send any. The first batch of Indian 'experimenters' was sent to the U. S. A. in 1960 and the year-wise break-up of Indian 'experimenters' sent to the U. S. A. since 1960 is as under:—

1960	.	.	7
1961	.	.	7
1962	.	.	94
1963	.	.	116
1964	.	.	78
1965	.	.	80

The corresponding year-wise break-up of 'experimenters' received from the U.S.A. from 1953 to 1965 is as under:—

1953	.	11
1954	.	11
1955	.	11
1956	.	Nil
1957	.	11
1958	.	11
1959	.	11
1960	.	22
1961	.	36
1962	.	65
1963	.	44
1964	.	73
1965	.	77

(c) The exchange of 'experimenters' between the U. S. A. and India does not involve any foreign exchange. The organisation is subsidized mainly by the P.L. 480 funds and grants from the American foundations. The living expenses of the 'experimenters' going from India are looked after by their host families in the United States and the U.S. Counterpart of 'Experiment in International Living'. The Experimenters going from India pay in Indian Rupees to the Indian Organisation for their air-passage plus a small sum which is utilized to meet the administrative expenses of the organisation in India and the building of a fund for future activities of the Experiment. Thus, the 'Experiment in International Living' is a reciprocal arrangement which does not have any impact on 'Foreign Exchange'.

Sorting Section in South Bihar Express

56. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha: Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Postal articles for and from Jamshedpur are subjected to detention due to non-existence of a postal link from Patna to Tatanagar;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the Post-Master General, Bihar Circle has recommended for the opening of a sorting section in South Bihar Express from Patna to Tatanagar for expeditious delivery of mails; and

(c) if so, the decision taken in the matter?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) Only insured articles and parcels are subjected to detention and not other categories of articles.

(b) Yes.

(c) The case is under examination.

P & T. Regional Training Centre in Bihar

57. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha: Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal for opening a P & T Regional Training Centre in Bihar;

(b) whether it is a fact that Darbhanga has already been selected for locating the Regional P & T Training Centre; and

(c) if so, the reasons for delay in implementation of this scheme?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) Yes.

(b) No. Darbhanga is, however, one of the places that is being considered for the purpose.

(c) A final decision will only be taken after definite information is available on the expenditure that the P & T Department will have to incur in locating the Training Centre in the places under consideration.

Patna R.M.S. Building

58. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha: Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is an acute shortage of accommodation in R.M.S., Patna;

(b) whether it is also a fact that all assurances held out by the successive Ministers of Communications to construct a new building for R.M.S., Patna have not yet been implemented for over a decade; and

(c) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Communications (Shri Bhagavati): (a) Yes.

(b) Although Staff Unions had made representations to the Minister no assurance seems to have been given. The case has been under consideration of P & T and Railways for some time

past and the Railways have now agreed to construct a new building for Patna R. M. S. during the year 1966-67. Some relief has, however, been given by diverting the traffic and establishing a sorting office in the Patna G. P. O. building.

(c) Does not arise.

Export of Heavy Water

59. **Shri Himatsingka:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Heavy Water produced at Nangal is being exported; and

(b) if so, to which countries?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. 10 tonnes of heavy water produced at Nangal has recently been leased to Belgium for a period of 3 years.

Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd., Kanpur

60. { Shri R. Barua:
Shri D. D. Mantri:
Shri Basumatari:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the production of Aircrafts at the Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd., Kanpur is going on according to schedule; and

(b) if so, the number of Aircrafts which have so far been completed?

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) The production of aircraft at Kanpur is somewhat behind schedule during 1965 and the delay has been caused by non-receipt of components from abroad as well as to some extent by a smaller rate of build-up of technical personnel. For 1966, there is a better assurance regarding receipt of components etc. from abroad and it is expected that the production schedule for that year will be kept.

(b) Five aircraft have so far been manufactured.

Ex-I.N.A. Personnel

61. **Shri Narendra Singh Mahida:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the former Indian Army personnel who joined the Indian National Army and were discharged from service can now submit their claims upto 31st December, 1965;

(b) the number of claims by Ex-I.N.A. personnel which have been accepted and paid;

(c) the total amount paid so far;

(d) whether it is a fact that a considerable number of persons have not so far submitted their claims; and

(e) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Yes, Sir. The date for submission of claims has been extended upto the 31st December 1965.

(b) 12,167 claims were accepted and paid upto the 15th July 1965.

(c) A sum of Rs. 22,96,940 was paid upto the 15th July 1965.

(d) The number of persons who have not submitted their claims so far is about 1,000.

(e) The exact reasons are not known. In a number of cases, the persons concerned may not be Indian citizens or may have died without leaving any eligible claimants.

Laboratory at Veli near Thumba

62. **Shri Narendra Singh Mahida:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the construction of the Space Technology Laboratory at Veli near Thumba has been undertaken;

(b) whether the Kerala Government has acquired and handed over the land for the approach road to the laboratory site at Veli; and

(c) when the project is likely to be completed?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Sri Lal Bahadur Shastri): (a) No.

(b) The land for the approach road has not yet been handed over to us by the Government of Kerala.

(c) The project, when sanctioned, is expected to be completed in about 3 years.

12.04 hrs.

RE: QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: I have received some notices about questions of privilege—I need not read all of them—some about the arrest of Dr. Lohia and others that some Members of the socialist group were beaten outside the Home Minister's House.

Shri Kishen Pattanayak (Sambalpur): Yes, I was there.

Mr. Speaker: I fail to understand how these can be questions of privilege. Something has happened there. I cannot take that up in Parliament as a question of privilege. I have disallowed them. There are two more things about which I have to inform the House.

12.05 hrs.

RE. ASPERSIONS ON P.A.C. IN BHARAT JYOTI AND APOLOGY BY THE EDITOR

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that my attention was drawn to an article under the heading "Service or Slander?" published in *The Bharat Jyoti*, Bombay, in its issue dated the 16th May, 1965, which allegedly contained aspersions on the Public Accounts Committee of Lok Sabha. The article stated *inter alia*:

"The Reports of the P.A.C. are becoming increasingly audit re-

ports, similar to those of the Auditor-General, rather than review reports; and are thus becoming increasingly superfluous where they are not positively mischievous in their impact and incidence."

The article had also used in relation to the Public Accounts Committee the phrases "absence of understanding of the underlying social objectives to public undertakings" and "the P.A.C. does not appear to understand that loans in most commercial transactions. . . are in fact continuously repaid and equally continuously renewed. . . ."

2. Under my direction, a letter was addressed to the Editor of *The Bharat Jyoti*, Bombay, asking him to state what he had to say in the matter.

3. In his reply, the Editor has stated, *inter alia*:

" . . . It was not, therefore, meant even remotely to be disrespectful to the Parliamentary Committees.

I am sorry that any such impression should have been created as stated by you in your letter under reply. Let me assure you that the article could be interpreted in the manner stated by you had not even remotely occurred to me in publishing it.

I trust that this explanation will make the position clear and satisfy the Speaker that the purpose of this article was not, is not and never intended to cast aspersions or to show any disrespect to Parliamentary Committee.

Criticism of the Public Accounts Committee is made in good faith and in a constructive spirit and I hope it would be taken in the same spirits.

Needless to say that, if any disrespect to, or aspersions on, the Public Accounts Committee of the Lok Sabha is read into the article-

[Mr. Speaker]

in question, I am really very sorry."

4. In view of the explanation and the expression of regret made by the Editor of *The Bharat Jyoti*, the matter may be closed. I hope the House will agree.

Hon. Members: Yes.

12.06 hrs.

RE. COMMENTS ON REPORT OF P.A.C. BY DIRECTOR OF PUBLI-CITY, KHADI COMMISSION IN *TIMES OF INDIA AND ECONOMIC TIMES*

Mr. Speaker: I have also to inform the House that my attention was drawn to a letter to the editor under the caption "Khadi Commission" published in the *Times of India*, New Delhi, dated the 26th May, 1965, an article under the caption "Working of Khadi and Village Industries Commission" which appeared in the *Economic Times*, Bombay, dated the 21st May, 1965 and an article under the caption "Public Accounts Committee and the Commission" published in the *Jagriti*, Bombay, dated the 20th May, 1965. The letter to the editor and the articles, written by the Director of Publicity, Khadi and Village Industries Commission, Bombay, contained comments on the recommendations and observations made by the Public Accounts Committee of Lok Sabha in their 38th Report regarding the Khadi and Village Industries Commission.

2. The matter was taken up with the Department of Social Security for suitable action in the light of the ruling given by me on the 19th April, 1965 in the case of Bharat Sewak Samaj. It would be recalled that in that case I had stated that the findings and recommendations of a Parliamentary Committee should not be contested or commented upon in a public statement or in the Press by

any official or spokesman of a body whose working has been examined by the Committee.

3. In reply, the Department of Social Security forwarded a copy of the letter from the Chief Executive Officer of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission, which stated, *inter alia*:

"The Director of Publicity of the Commission issued a letter to the Press, which appeared in the *Times of India*, Bombay, in the *Economic Times*, Bombay, and also in the *Jagriti*. This letter was written solely as a reply to the comments and criticisms of the Press about the working of the Commission.

... there was neither the intention nor an effort to call into question publicly any of the observations of that august body. The Commission begs to assure the P.A.C. that neither the Director of Publicity nor the Commission did have, has or can have any intention or desire to disrespect the P.A.C.

The Commission as well as the Director of Publicity feel sorry that they have been responsible for creating a feeling of dissatisfaction in the mind of the P.A.C. If there is anything in the article, however, to which exception can be taken, both the Commission and the Director of Publicity feel sorry for it and apologize."

4. The explanation and apology tendered by the Chief Executive Officer of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission may be accepted and the matter closed. I hope the House agrees with me.

Hon. Members: Yes.

12.07½ hrs.

RE. MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT,
CALLING ATTENTION NOTICES,
ETC.

(PROCEDURE)

Mr. Speaker: Now, there are Adjournment Motions and Calling Attention Notices—not one but eight notices of no-confidence. I will just hold over those adjournment motions, unless I have rejected some of them. They will be kept pending until I have seen the fate of the motion of no-confidence, and then I will take them up if any one of them can be taken up.

An Hon. Member: What about the Calling Attention Notices?

Mr. Speaker: All of them will wait.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): They will be kept in abeyance.

Mr. Speaker: Kept in abeyance. Thank you very much.

12.08 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENT ON INDO-PAKISTAN AGREEMENT

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a Statement on Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965, relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4436/65].

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, I rise to a point of order. This cease-fire agreement on the Rann of Kutch violates certain provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker: We will see when we discuss it.

Shri Hem Barua: If you will give me a little patient hearing, the whole thing will be very clear, and if you uphold my point of order, . . .

Mr. Speaker: I will certainly listen to him and then give my decision. If the objection is that it cannot be laid on the Table of the House, then, he has no case. He should wait till we come to the discussion. It is only laid on the Table of the House, and if he has got any objection to its validity or if he says that it is ultra vires or anything, then we can hear about it when we take it up, and not now. It is only laid on the Table of the House. When we take it up for discussion, I will give him a chance to dispute its validity.

Shri Hem Barua: I shall point out how it is violating certain provisions of the Constitution. If you uphold my contention that it has violated certain provisions of the Constitution, the motion would not come up for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: That would be when it is taken up. When it comes up for discussion, he can say it cannot be taken up and he will be heard first before it is discussed. Here luckily both the hon. member and myself agree that he is not disputing the placing of the agreement on the Table. So, I cannot hear him now.

PRIME MINISTER'S RECENT VISITS
ABROAD

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: The statement runs to four or five pages.

Mr. Speaker: He may lay it on the Table.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Yes, Sir. I beg to lay on the Table a statement regarding my recent visits abroad. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4467/65].

REPORT ON THE WORKING OF THE DEPOSIT
INSURANCE CORPORATION ETC.

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Sir, I beg to re-lay on the Table:

(1) a copy of Report on the working of the Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended 31st December, 1964, along with Annual Accounts and Audit Report thereon, under sub-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

section (2) of section 32 of the Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1961. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4355/65].

(2) to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers:—

(i) a draft Notification to be issued under section 620(1) of the Companies Act, 1956, as required by sub-section (2) of section 820 of the said Act together with an explanatory memorandum. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4437/65].

(ii) statement indicating the results of Central Government Borrowing during 1965-66. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4438/65].

(iii) Finance Accounts of the Central Government for the year 1963-64. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4439/65].

NOTIFICATION UNDER THE MINES AND MINERALS (REGULATION AND DEVELOPMENT) ACT, 1957

The Minister of Steel and Mines (Shri Sanjiva Reddy): Sir, I beg to re-lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. S.O. 556 dated the 10th April, 1965, under sub-section (1) of section 28 of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4311/65].

ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE AND PAYMENT OF BONUS ORDINANCE.

The Minister of Communications and Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Ordinances under provisions of article 123(2)(a) of the Constitution:

(1) The Aligarh Muslim University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1965 (No. 2 of 1965) promulgated by the President on the 20th May, 1965. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4440/65].

(2) The Payment of Bonus Ordinance, 1965 (No. 3 of 1965) promulgated by the President on the 29th May, 1965. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4441/65].

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of a clarification, may I know whether the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs proposes to lay on the Table of the House a statement about his varied and interesting experiences during his recent travels abroad?

There is no answer.

Mr. Speaker: If there is no answer, the hon. member can sit with the Minister and share the pleasure with him.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The whole House should share, Sir.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES (CENTRAL) AMENDMENT RULES, ETC.

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers:—

- (1) The Industrial Disputes (Central) Amendment Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 488, dated the 27th March, 1965, under sub-section (4) of section 38 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4442/65].
- (2) The Payment of Bonus Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 884, dated the 14th June, 1965. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4443/65].
- (3) Government Resolution No. WB-6(5)/64 dated the 31st May, 1965, announcing acceptance of the recommendations of the Second Central Wage Board for Cement Industry for grant of interim wage increase. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4444/65].

- (4) Report of the Chief Inspector of Mines on the fatal accident in Kendwadiah Colliery, Dhanbad, on the 22nd April, 1965. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4445/65].

NOTIFICATION TO DELHI MOTOR VEHICLES RULES, 1940

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman): Sir, on behalf of Shri Raj Bahadur, I beg to re-lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. F. 12(95)/62-PR(T) published in Delhi Gazette dated the 28th January, 1965, making a certain amendment to the Delhi Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940, under sub-section (3) of section 133 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4280/65].

ALL INDIA SERVICES (DEATH-CUM-RETIREMENT BENEFITS) THIRD AMENDMENT RULES, ETC.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): Sir, on behalf of Shri Hathi, I beg to re-lay on the Table:

- (1) a copy of the All India Services (Death-cum-Retirement Benefits) Third Amendment Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 572 dated the 17th April, 1965, under sub-section (2) of section 3 of the All India Services Act, 1951. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4291/65].
- (2) to lay on the Table a copy of the Bombay Labour Welfare Board (Reconstitution) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 1893 dated the 19th June, 1965, under sub-section (5) of Section 4 of the Inter-State Corporations Act, 1957. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4446/65].

RAILWAY PROTECTION FORCE (AMENDMENT) RULES

रेलवे मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री० राम सुभग सिंह) : रेलवे सुरक्षा बल अधिनियम 1957 की धारा 21 की उपधारा (3) के अन्तर्गत रेलवे सुरक्षा बल (संगोपन) नियम, 1965 की एक प्रति सभा-घटन पर रखेंगे, जो दिनांक 1 मई, 1965 की अधिसूचना संख्या जी० ए०० धारा० 655 में प्रकाशित हुए थे। [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4447/65].

ANNUAL REPORT OF HINDUSTAN AERONAUTICS LIMITED, BOMBAY

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Annual Report of the Hindustan Aeronautics Limited, Bombay, for the period 16th August, 1963 to 31st March, 1964, along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4448/65].

NOTIFICATIONS REGARDING KERALA PANCHAYATS (RESTRICTIONS AND CONTROL ON POWERS OF ENTRY AND INSPECTION) RULES, 1963 ETC., ETC.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Community Development and Cooperation (Shri Shinde): Sir, on behalf of Shri B. S. Murthy, I beg to re-lay on the Table:—

- (1) a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (3) of section 130 of the Kerala Panchayats Act, 1960, read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 24th March, 1965, issued by the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President in relation to the State of Kerala:—
 - (i) S.R.O. 2/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 7th January, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats

[Shri Shinde]

- (Restrictions and Control on Powers of Entry and Inspection) Rules, 1963.
- (ii) S.R.O. 19/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 21st January, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Landing Places, Halting Places and Cart Stands) Rules, 1964.
- (iii) S.R.O. 18/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 21st January, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Nomination of Women by the Panchayat) Rules, 1964.
- (iv) S.R.O. 29/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 4th February, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Decision of Election Disputes) Rules, 1963.
- (v) S.R.O. 140/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 5th May, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Public and Private Markets) Rules, 1964.
- (vi) S.R.O. 139/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 5th May, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Slaughter Houses and Meat Stalls) Rules, 1964.
- (vii) S.R.O. 191/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 16th June, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Authorising of Expenditure) Rules, 1964.
- (viii) S.R.O. 185/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 16th June, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Trial of offences by Magistrates) Rules, 1964.
- (ix) S.R.O. 201/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 23rd June, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Construction and Maintenance of Public and Private Latrines and Removal of Waste and Rubbish from Private Premises) Rules, 1964.
- (x) S.R.O. 195/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 23rd June, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Contributions from persons having control over places of pilgrimage) Rules, 1964.
- (xi) S.R.O. 326/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 20th October, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Disposal of unclaimed dead bodies) Rules, 1964.
- (xii) S.R.O. 328/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 20th October, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Spread of Education) Rules, 1964.
- (xiii) S.R.O. 339/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 3rd November, 1964, containing the Kerala Panchayats (Duties of Village Officers) Rules, 1964.
- (xiv) S.R.O. 19/65, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 19th January, 1965, containing the Kerala Panchayats Removal of Encroachments and Inspection and Recovery of Penalties for Unauthorised Occupation) Rules, 1964.
- (xv) S.R.O. 5/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 7th January, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Proceedings of Panchayat Meetings and Committees) Rules, 1962.
- (xvi) S.R.O. 40/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 18th February, 1964, mak-

- ing certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Devolution and Delegation of President's Functions) Rules, 1962.
- (xvii) S.R.O. 46/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 25th February, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Procedure of Action on Illegal Resolutions) Rules, 1962.
- (xviii) S.R.O. 82/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 31st March, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Election of Members) Rules, 1962.
- (xix) S.R.O. 89/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 24th March, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Common Institutions Rules, 1963
- (xx) S.R.O. 81/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 31st March, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Custody of Records and Grant of Copies of Proceedings of Records) Rules, 1962.
- (xxi) S.R.O. 95/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 7th April, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Moving of Resolutions at Panchayat Meetings) Rules, 1962.
- (xxii) S.R.O. 94/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 7th April, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Fixing of Strength and Division of Wards) Rules, 1962.
- (xxiii) S.R.O. 93/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 7th April, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Taxation and Appeal) Rules, 1963.
- (xxiv) S.R.O. 170/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 2nd June, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Interpellation of President by members) Rules, 1962.
- (xxv) S.R.O. 184/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 16th June, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Disqualification of candidates and members) Rules, 1963.
- (xxvi) S.R.O. 211/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 7th July, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Invitation and disposal of tender for Public Works) Rules, 1963.
- (xxvii) S.R.O. 204/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 30th June, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Licensing of dogs and pigs and disposal of stray dogs and pigs) Rules, 1963.
- (xxviii) S.R.O. 261/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 1st September, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Licensing of Dangerous and Offensive Trades and Factories) Rules, 1963.
- (xxix) S.R.O. 292/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 22nd September, 1964, mak-

[Shri Shinde]

ing certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Powers of Officers authorised to hold Enquiries) Rules, 1962.

- (xxx) S.R.O. 289/64, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 15th September, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Manner of Execution of Public Works) Rules, 1963.
- (xxxii) S.R.O. 310/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 6th October, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Audit) Rules, 1963.
- (xxxiii) S.R.O. 318/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 13th October, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Constitution of Functional Committees) Rules, 1963.
- (xxxiii) S.R.O. 338/published in Kerala Gazette dated the 3rd November, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Building Tax) Rules, 1963.
- (xxxiv) S.R.O. 340/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 3rd November, 1964, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Show Tax) Rules, 1963.
- (xxxv) S.R.O. 360/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 1st December, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Budget) Rules, 1963.
- (xxxvi) S.R.O. 394/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 8th December, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Taxation and Appeal) Rules, 1963.
- (xxxvii) S.R.O. 395/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the

8th December, 1964, making certain amendments to the Kerala Panchayats (Licensing of Dangerous and Offensive Trades and Factories) Rules, 1963.

- (xxxviii) S.R.O. 11/65 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 12th January, 1965, making a certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Profession Tax) Rules, 1963. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4405/65].

- (2) a copy of Notification No. S.R.O. 33/65 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 26th January, 1965, containing the Kerala Village Courts Rules, 1964, under sub-section (3) of section 112 of the Kerala Village Courts Act, 1960, read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 24th March, 1965, issued by the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President, in relation to the State of Kerala. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4406/65].

RICE-MILLING INDUSTRY (REGULATION AND LICENSING) SECOND AMENDMENT RULES

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri C. Subramaniam): Sir, on behalf of Shri D. R. Chavan, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Act, 1959.

Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation and Licensing) Second Amendment Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1143 dated the 7th August, 1965, under sub-section (4) of section 22 of the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4449/65].

NAVY (DISCIPLINE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) REGULATIONS

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Defence (Dr. D. S. Raju): Sir, I beg to re-lay on the Table a copy of the Navy (Discipline and Miscel-

aneous Provisions) Regulations, 1965, published in Notification No. S.R.O. 2E dated the 6th February, 1965, as corrected by Notification No. S.R.O. 4E dated the 2nd April, 1965, under section 185 of the Navy Act, 1957. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4275/65].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE CUSTOMS ACT

The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Sir, on behalf of Shri Rameshwar Sahu, I beg to lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:—

- (i) G.S.R. 636 dated the 1st May, 1965.
- (ii) G.S.R. 666 dated the 30th April, 1965.
- (iii) G.S.R. 702 dated the 8th May, 1965, containing the Manufacture in Customs Bonds (General) Second Amendment Rules, 1965.
- (iv) G.S.R. 703 dated the 8th May, 1965.
- (v) G.S.R. 735 dated the 11th May, 1965.
- (vi) G.S.R. 736 dated the 11th May, 1965.
- (vii) G.S.R. 760 dated the 20th May, 1965.
- (viii) G.S.R. 764 dated the 29th May, 1965.
- (ix) G.S.R. 765 dated the 29th May, 1965.
- (x) G.S.R. 787 dated the 5th June, 1965.
- (xi) G.S.R. 816 dated the 12th June, 1965.
- (xii) G.S.R. 817 dated the 12th June, 1965.
- (xiii) G.S.R. 847 dated the 19th June, 1965.
- (xiv) G.S.R. 849 dated the 19th June, 1965.
- (xv) G.S.R. 850 dated the 19th June, 1965.

- (xvi) G.S.R. 886 dated the 26th June, 1965.
- (xvii) G.S.R. 887 dated the 26th June, 1965.
- (xviii) G.S.R. 888 dated the 26th June, 1965.
- (xix) G.S.R. 889 dated the 26th June, 1965.
- (xx) The Passengers (Non-Tourist) Baggage (Amendment) Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 892 dated the 23rd June, 1965.
- (xxi) G.S.R. 920 dated the 3rd July, 1965.
- (xxii) G.S.R. 937 dated the 10th July, 1965.
- (xxiii) G.S.R. 938 dated the 10th July, 1965.
- (xxiv) G.S.R. 987 dated the 17th July, 1965.
- (xxv) G.S.R. 988 dated the 17th July, 1965.
- (xxvi) G.S.R. 1038 dated the 24th July, 1965.
- (xxvii) G.S.R. 1039 dated the 24th July, 1965.
- (xxviii) G.S.R. 1040 dated the 24th July, 1965.
- (xxix) G.S.R. 1041 dated the 24th July, 1965.
- (xxx) G.S.R. 1042 dated the 24th July, 1965.
- (xxxi) G.S.R. 1043 dated the 24th July, 1965.
- (xxxii) G.S.R. 1044 dated the 24th July, 1965.
- (xxxiii) G.S.R. 1045 dated the 24th July, 1965.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4450/65].

(2) A copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 and section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, making certain further amendments to the Customs and Central Excise Duties Ex-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>port Drawback (General)
Rules, 1960:—</p> <p>(i) G.S.R. 701 dated the 8th
May, 1965.</p> <p>(ii) G.S.R. 818 dated the 12th
June, 1965.</p> <p>(iii) G.S.R. 819 dated the 12th
June, 1965.</p> <p>(iv) G.S.R. 851 dated the 19th
June, 1965.</p> <p>(v) G.S.R. 852 dated the 19th
June, 1965.</p> <p>(vi) G.S.R. 1013 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(vii) G.S.R. 1014 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(viii) G.S.R. 1015 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(ix) G.S.R. 1016 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(x) G.S.R. 1017 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xi) G.S.R. 1018 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xii) G.S.R. 1019 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xiii) G.S.R. 1020 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xiv) G.S.R. 1021 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xv) G.S.R. 1022 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xvi) G.S.R. 1023 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xvii) G.S.R. 1024 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xviii) G.S.R. 1025 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xix) G.S.R. 1026 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xx) G.S.R. 1027 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxi) G.S.R. 1028 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxii) G.S.R. 1029 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxiii) G.S.R. 1030 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> | <p>(xxiv) G.S.R. 1031 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxv) G.S.R. 1032 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxvi) G.S.R. 1033 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxvii) G.S.R. 1034 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxviii) G.S.R. 1035 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxix) G.S.R. 1036 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>(xxx) G.S.R. 1037 dated the 24th
July, 1965.</p> <p>[Placed in Library, see No. LT-
4451/65].</p> <p>(3) a copy each of the following
Notifications under section 38 of the
Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944:—</p> <p>(i) G.S.R. 421 dated the 13th
March, 1965.</p> <p>(ii) The Central Excise (Fourth
Amendment) Rules, 1965,
published in Notification No.
G.S.R. 700 dated the 8th
May, 1965.</p> <p>(iii) The Central Excise (Fifth
Amendment) Rules, 1965,
published in Notification No.
G.S.R. 792 dated the 6th
June, 1965.</p> <p>(iv) The Central Excise (Sixth
Amendment) Rules, 1965,
published in Notification No.
G.S.R. 990 dated the 17th
July, 1965.</p> <p>[Placed in Library, see No. LT-
4452/65].</p> <p>(4) a copy each of the following
Notifications under section 296 of
the Income-tax Act, 1961:—</p> <p>(i) The Income-tax (Fifth
Amendment) Rules, 1965,
published in Notification No.
S.O. 1886 dated the 10th
June, 1965.</p> <p>(ii) The Income-tax (Sixth
Amendment) Rules, 1965,</p> |
|--|---|

published in Notification No. S.O. 2153 dated the 5th July, 1965.

1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 2214 dated the 8th July, 1965.

- (iii) S.O. 2215 dated the 9th July, 1965.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4459/65].

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4453/65].

(5) A copy each of the following Notifications:—

- (i) G.S.R. 734 dated the 11th May, 1963, under sub-section (5) of section 77 of the Finance Act, 1965.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4454/65].

- (ii) G.S.R. 737 dated the 11th May, 1965, under sub-section (5) of section 81 of the Finance Act, 1965.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4455/65].

- (iii) The Estate Duty (Amendment) Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 742 dated the 14th May, 1965, under sub-section (3) of section 85 of the Estate Duty Act, 1953.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4456/65].

- (iv) G.S.R. 762 dated the 24th May, 1965, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 and sub-section (5) of section 77 of the Finance Act, 1965.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4457/65].

- (v) The Wealth-tax (Amendment) Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 832 dated the 10th June, 1965, under sub-section (4) of section 46 of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4458/65].

- (vi) The Income-tax (Determination of Export Profits) Rules,

12-13 hrs.

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table following three Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the last session and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the House on the 2nd April, 1965:—

- (1) The Finance Bill, 1965.
- (2) The Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1965.
- (3) The Kerala Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1965.

I also lay on the Table copies, duly authenticated by the Secretary of Rajya Sabha, of the following three Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the last Session and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the House on the 2nd April, 1965:—

- (1) The Armed Forces (Special Powers) Continuance Bill, 1965.
- (2) The Kerala State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1965.
- (3) The Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

12.13½ hrs.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

SUMMARY OF WORK

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table a copy of the 'Parliamentary Committees—Summary of Work' pertaining to the period 1st June, 1964 to 31st May, 1965.

12.13½ hrs.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Secretary: Sir, I also lay on the Table a copy of the amendments to rules 1 and 4 of the Rules of Library Committee made by the Speaker.

12.13½ hrs.

RE: PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshan-gabad): Sir, I seek a clarification with regard to the Bills laid on the Table which were assented to by the President during the interregnum. The bulletin dated the 14th May reached us containing the following information:

It says that the two Bills were returned by Rajya Sabha on the 13th and 14th of May, after the Lok Sabha had been prorogued or adjourned sine die. Of the two Bills, one was the Kerala Appropriation Bill and the other one was the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill. Both were returned by Rajya Sabha without amendments to this House.

Now, Sir, may I invite your attention to Rules 97 and 103. Rule 97 which deals with Bills other than Money Bills and Rule 103 which deals with Money Bills. May I read, by your leave, Rule 97? It says:

"If a Bill other than a Money Bill passed by the House and transmitted to the Council is passed by the Council without amendment, the message received from the Council to that effect shall be reported by the Secretary to the House."

Rule 103 is on similar lines, that the message received should be reported to the House by the Secretary.

Now, this House was not in session. The House had adjourned on the 11th May. The Bills received back from the Rajya Sabha on the 13th and 14th were submitted to the President for assent without having been duly passed finally by this House according to the Rules of Procedure which this House has made for itself, and because the lacuna is that the message received from the Rajya Sabha was not reported to this House in accordance with Rules 97 and 103 of the Rules of Procedure, I believe that the Bills that have been assented to by the President and become Acts are not in order, if I may use that expression, or have been passed into law *ultra vires* of the Constitution and the Rules adopted by the House.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि जितने भी बिल प्रादि राष्ट्रपति से स्वीकृत होकर आते हैं वे सभी अंग्रेजी में आते हैं तो मैं आप से यह जनना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कभी कोई दिन ऐसा भी आयेगा जब हिन्दी में भी बिल राष्ट्रपति से स्वीकृत होकर आयेंगे। हिन्दी में भी बिल स्वीकृत होकर आयें क्या इस के लिये भी कोई व्यवस्था होने वाली है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छा, ठीक है।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : जवाब तो दे दो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जवाब मेरे पास है नहीं।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अब आप जवाब नहीं देंगे तो फिर कौन जवाब देगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह दिन जरूर आयेगा अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : उसकी कोई तारीख भी है ? वह कांग्रेस के रहते आयेगा या जब यह बने जायेंगे तब आयेगा ?

Mr. Speaker: There are certain rules made by the President. Of course, when the House is in session that report is to be made to the House, but when the House is not in session, the procedure to be followed is shown in the rules made by the President.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Where are those rules?

Mr. Speaker: I am reading that. Rule 11(2) says:

"Whenever the House or the Council to which a message is sent is not in session, a copy of the message shall, as soon as it is received by the Secretary of the House or the Council, be forwarded by him to every Member of the House or the Council, as the case may be."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Can they supersede the rules of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Now, the other thing is that because it has not been reported to the House, Shri Kamath's contention is that the Bill has not been regularly passed. It will not be for me to hold that it has not been regularly passed. If really there is something that he doubts, that must be for the courts to decide. We have these rules and according to them we say that the House was not in session, it was put down in the bulletin, the information was conveyed to the Members and it is according to the rules made by the President. Therefore, there is nothing.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I submit that you have not answered

the point that I raised. Can the rules made by the President supersede the rules of the House?

Mr. Speaker: They do not supersede, but they can add, supplement and explain (*Interruption*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): The rules of the House are necessarily an expression of the autonomous sovereignty of the House in regard to that sphere. The President may be an exalted personality, but he has nothing to do with the House in the regulation of its conduct. Therefore, under the rules of our House, it is necessary for the report to come from the other House. The President had no business to intervene in the matter.

An hon. Member: He was ill-advised.

Mr. Speaker: The President is authorised, under the Constitution, to make rules so far as the communication between the two Houses is concerned. Under that provision of the Constitution, he has made certain rules. If the contention is that some rule is not according to the Constitution, then I am not here to give the decision.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Then our rule should be amended.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The communication to individual Members by some kind of process is no communication.

Mr. Speaker: If someone has doubts, he can get it cleared from the judiciary, not from me.

[Mr. Speaker]

I have to inform the House....

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): I have a submission to make... (Interruption).

Shri Nath Pal rose—

Mr. Speaker: This matter is closed. I have told the hon. Member that there is a rule made by the President. If the contention is that that is not according to the Constitution or that supersedes any rule of the House which the President is not empowered to do, that is not for me to decide or to give any decision.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I submit in all humility that other Members also want to make a submission. My colleague Shri Nath Pal is also standing up. Why are you shutting them?

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: If it is inconsistent with the rules of this House, certainly it impinges on our rights and powers. As such, it is our right to examine this matter and scrutinise it. We should find out whether the President's rules are in order. If they are not in order, we shall not be any party to any law being enacted. It is our right, as a matter of fact, to emphasise that a rule which has been made by the President under the constitutional power cannot be repugnant or inconsistent with the rules of this House. We must emphasise this point. It is a question of our own powers.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): My plea is limited to only this pronouncement made by you that the matter is closed. You will, rightly, concede that there are matters in the Constitution like that of ours which cannot easily be dealt with because all such eventualities are not foreseen by the fathers of the Constitution. I do not want to cast any aspersion or use any strong language for what the President has done—may be, he was

not properly advised—but for you to say that the matter is closed will not be helping us very much when we feel concerned about certain rights. I would say, therefore, that it is not enough for us to point it out to the High Court or to the Supreme Court and seek the remedy. In a matter like this, we will have to follow up the consultations with you and, perhaps, to see how a lapse like that does not take place. We should not say that the House is helpless and that the only remedy is to go to the court. I am afraid that is the impression at least I got from the ruling which you were pleased to give earlier.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): May I request you to refer this matter to the Law Minister?

An hon. Member: No, no.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): I would like to suggest that the matter may be referred to the Rules Committee for examination.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think there is any need to refer it to the Rules Committee at this moment. It has been said by more than one Member that they do not agree with me that we should express our helplessness. The only thing probably they want is that either I should at this present moment declare it... (Interruption). The point is that the Bills that were passed have been placed on the Table of the House. I have told the hon. Members that it is in accordance with the rules made by the President. It is contended that this rule, made by the President, is in conflict with the rules that are there. Now can I sit in judgement and declare that a particular rule, made by the President, is in conflict with the rules that are here or would it be for the courts to decide whether one part, one rule... (Interruptions).

Order, order.

My present reaction remains the same. I cannot sit in a judgement and say that this rule is repugnant to the rules that are already here.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We follow our rules and not the President's.

Mr. Speaker: I do not see any conflict. The President has made these rules in consultation with the Speaker and the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha. They must have been consulted at that moment. Therefore, their agreement is also there—maybe, I do not know; it was not I who was consulted; the consultation had taken place and all of them had agreed that this rule should be there. Now that rule is there. It is in accordance with the rule that this report has been made and information given to the members. The Bill has been laid in the House. Now if some one contends that that rule contravenes or is in conflict with any of the rules of the House, then I do not think—my predecessor has given his consent also—I can declare it as invalid.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: After hearing the words of wisdom that have fallen from your lips, Sir . . . (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: When he is contending my wisdom, he cannot say that. That rather looks awkward. Give me credit for wisdom and then . . . (Interruption).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Wisdom may not always be infallible. Now, may I request in all humility and in all earnestness that, whatever might have happened in the last three months or even earlier, the question should be taken up for the future. After all, the President is only a titular head of State, and it is the Parliament which is supreme. I need not impress this fact on you. Kindly

take up this matter with the President to ascertain as to why, how and when this conflicting rule, this repugnant rule, was made by the President. I think the rule will have to be amended.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mathur wanted to say something.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think we have been acting according to the rules which are at present in our hands and nobody is objecting that it should not be laid on the Table of the House as it has been laid down now. But a difficulty has arisen and there is no reason why we should not examine that. We clearly understand that the President has made rules in consultation with you and the Chairman, Rajya Sabha, but when a certain thing has been pointed out, namely, that the rules are in conflict with the rules that we have made, we must examine whether our rules should be amended or whether the President may be advised to change the rules to bring them in conformity with our rules rather than leaving the question in a vacuum and waiting for the matter to be taken up by somebody in the court of law. I do not think there is any difficulty in this. All that I request you is to examine the present difficulty and either in consultation with the Rules Committee we amend our rules or advise the President to examine the matter in consultation with you and the Chairman, Rajya Sabha, and change the rules.

Mr. Speaker: All right. I shall yield. I shall examine them.

12.30 hrs.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER
 (SHRI NITYANAND KANUNGO)

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that Shri Nityanand Kanungo.

[Mr. Speaker]

an elected Member of Lok Sabha from Cuttack constituency of Orissa has resigned his seat in Lok Sabha with effect from the afternoon of the 31st July, 1965.

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आप स्पीच नहीं कर सकते हैं।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री: मेरी बात आप सुन लें।

12.13½ hrs.

**BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY
(AMENDMENT) BILL**

(i) REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915.

अध्यक्ष महोदय: इस तरह से नहीं सुन सकता हूँ। जब कार्रवाई चल रही हो, पेपर रखे जा रहे हों, इस तरह से उठ कर खड़े हो कर कोई बोल नहीं सकता है।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री: मेरा निवेदन यह है कि राज्य के भंंदर उपद्रव चल रहे हैं। इस वास्ते यह वक्तव्य गृह मंत्री को देना चाहिये रक्षा मंत्री को नहीं देना चाहिये। रक्षा मंत्री की जिम्मेदारी केवल देश की सीमायों की रक्षा करना है। अब राज्य के भंंदर हजारों की संख्या में पाकिस्तानी प्रवेश कर चुके हैं, इस वास्ते यह वक्तव्य गृह मंत्री को देना चाहिये।

(ii) EVIDENCE GIVEN BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE

Shri Raghunath Singh: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the evidence given before the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act. 1915.

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आप इसको सुन लीजिये, फिर एतराज कीजिये।

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): Sir, I rise to make a statement . . .

12.31 hrs.

**STATEMENT ON SITUATION
ALONG CEASE-FIRE LINE AND
ELSEWHERE IN JAMMU AND
KASHMIR AS WELL AS ALONG
INDO-PAKISTAN BORDERS**

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Y. B. Chavan.

Mr. Speaker: How long is that statement?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It will take about 12 minutes or so . . .

Mr. Speaker: I shall get copies of the statement distributed to Members.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): It is an important statement and it should be read out.

Mr. Speaker: It is important really, but we have already spent so much time. I shall get copies of the statement distributed to Members. The copies will be distributed to them.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: But I shall have to make one amendment in the state-

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर): इसके पहले कि संग्रहण मंत्री वक्तव्य दें, मैं एक ब्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। पाकिस्तानी हमलावर घाज केवल काश्मीर की सीमाओं पर ही नहीं बल्कि काश्मीर राज्य के भंंदर और काश्मीर राज्य की राज्य-धानी तक प्रवेश करके हमला कर रहे हैं। जब उन्होंने घपने हाथियारों के भंडार..

ment, copies of which have been supplied already . . .

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): May I submit that this statement should be made on the floor of the House?

Mr. Speaker: When he is going to lay it on the Table of the House, he can make that amendment. He can amend that statement when he lays it on the Table.

श्री बड़े (खारगौन) : स्टेटमेंट घाना चाहिये। अगर वह पढ़ा नहीं जायेगा तो कैसे अभी पता चल सकता है कि उस में क्या है? इसको

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : यह जो सवाल है यह बड़े महत्व का है। इसके बारे में जो स्टेटमेंट है वह पढ़ा जाना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सारा प्रापके सामने आयेगा। प्राप उसको पढ़िये और देखिये उसमें क्या है . . .

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : हम उसको सुनना चाहते हैं हाउस में।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इतने लंबे लंबे स्टेटमेंट मैं पढ़ने की इजाजत नहीं दे सकता हूँ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : काश्मीर के जो प्रतिनिधि हैं, उनको प्राप पूछ लीजिये, उनकी राय इस मामले में ले लीजिये, वे क्या चाहते हैं इसको प्राप देख लीजिये।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I point out that according to the List of Business, the Defence Minister is supposed to make a statement and not lay a statement on the Table of the House, whereas the Prime Minister was to lay a statement on the Table of the House?

Mr. Speaker: That is no objection . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is an important statement.

Mr. Speaker: When he is going to make a statement, and I learn from him that it is a long statement, I can ask him to lay it on the Table of the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is an important issue.

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) : एक एमेंडमेंट भी वह करना चाहते हैं। अच्छा होगा अगर इसको हाउस में पढ़ दिया जाए।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : हाउस इसको सुनना चाहता है।

श्री सभनानी (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : हाउस सुनना चाहता है।

[شری سہنائی : ہاؤس سنا چاہتا ہے۔]

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : यह बहुत महत्व का विषय है। इसको पढ़ने में प्राधा बंटा भी लगे तो भी हाउस इसको सुनना चाहता है। दस बारह मिनट का कोई लम्बा समय नहीं है।

Some Hon. Members: Let the statement be read out.

Mr. Speaker: If that is the general desire, I have no objection.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I rise to make a statement on the situation along the Cease Fire Line and elsewhere in Jammu and Kashmir as well as along the Indo-Pakistan borders.

2. As hon. Members are aware, for the last 11 days we have had to face a new development posing a threat to the security of State of Jammu and Kashmir. This threat has taken the shape of an organised incursion of armed personnel disguised as civilians from across the Cease

[Shri Y. B. Chavan.]

Fire Line. It was on the 5th August that a large group of infiltrators appeared in the area South-West of Gulmarg. Prompt steps were taken to locate them and after an exchange of fire with our Security Forces, the infiltrators fled under cover of darkness. A quantity of ammunition left by the raiders was recovered. Since then reports of other groups infiltrating into different parts of Jammu and Kashmir have been received and steps have been taken to meet the situation. In the clashes from the initial encounters onwards, the infiltrators have suffered substantial casualties. In the process of retreat they have left behind large quantities of arms and ammunition, clothing, cooked food, medical supplies, compasses, maps, etc.

3. While some of the infiltrators encountered near the Cease Fire Line have retreated across it, some others have penetrated further towards our side and regrouped themselves. All these infiltrators have had as their aim the blowing up of strategic bridges, the raiding of supply dumps, the destruction of places of strategic importance, incendiaryism and the killing of VIPs. It also appears that their aim was to reach quickly the city of Srinagar and to create commotion there. They have operated during night to reduce chances of being seen and intercepted.

4. From the intelligence gathered by us and confirmed by the statements made by the infiltrators captured by us, it is quite clear that preparations for these incursions were made in Pakistan many months ago. The headquarters training these infiltrators was located near Murree and the Commander of the 12th Infantry Division of Pakistan was in charge of this training. The infiltrators were backed by a so-called Sada-e-Kashmir radio broadcasting from the town of Khari, six miles from Muzaffarabad, while they carried posters and proclamations of an alleged revolutionary council. The arms and ammunition taken by us show quite clearly

that they are of the type used by the Pakistan army. In some cases efforts have been made to erase the markings. In some other cases markings exist to indicate the Pakistan origin. On others there are no markings at all, which shows that they were specially manufactured for these operations, evidently by the Pakistan ordnance factories. Also, some of the weapons could only be obtained from abroad with the expenditure of foreign exchange obviously provided by Pakistan.

5. The infiltrators are by and large personnel of the so-called Azad Kashmir battalions of the Pakistan army which is a force Pakistan employs to man the Cease Fire Line. They are officered by Pakistani Army personnel and are supported by so-called mujahids and razakars, who apart from carrying arms are also given lesser jobs as porters etc. The infiltrators are equipped with rifles, sten guns, light machine guns, grenades, rocket launchers and explosives of which we have recovered large quantities. Wherever they have met our Security Forces they have not only suffered heavy casualties but have also either surrendered or abandoned large quantities of arms and equipment in their flight.

6. We are aware that mujahids, razakars and personnel of the Azad Kashmir forces were being trained in guerilla tactics but could not be aware of the exact type, time and place of the operations Pakistan intended to carry out. It will be appreciated that the aggressor always has an advantage as he aggresses at the time, place and ground of his own choosing. Consequently, they were able to make some advance into our territory at some points in the initial phase until such time as their pattern of operations became clearer to us. In this initial phase, they caused minor damage to some bridges but this damage was speedily repaired and all our road communications remained fully in use.

7. Perhaps the most important aim with which the infiltrators were charged was to enter the city of Srinagar, coinciding with an expected demonstration by some political parties on the 9th August in the hope that they could so disorganize the affairs as to give the resulting situation the complexion of an armed rebellion. The main aims of the infiltrators have not been realised. The Security Forces engaged them well outside Srinagar town and checked their progress. Their hope of important captures such as the Srinagar airfield was futile and, at this stage, I might say that Srinagar Airfield and other important military installations have always been carefully and well guarded.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is not the whole truth.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Of course it is.

8. The people of Kashmir by and large, whatever the differences between the political parties, have shown little sympathy towards the infiltrators and have, in fact, found them a nuisance to their daily existence. In many cases the information about the appearance of these infiltrators was supplied to the State Government and intelligence agencies by the local people. The city of Srinagar remains calm and the people go about their avocations as usual. Usual good neighbourliness between the communities exist and the town is full of tourists. The shops are open and transport plies as usual.

9. In the course of challenging some suspicious people, the police has had to resort to occasional firing on two nights in and around Srinagar but this has not disturbed the life of the people.

10. Although the infiltrators seem to remember the lessons of 1947, (when the brutalities and avarice of the raiders earned them the hatred of all they came in contact with they have not been able to refrain from indulging in acts of harassment. There has

been burning of schools, Panchayat Ghars and villages and firing upon people who tried to put out the fires. Places of worship have also been fired at by the infiltrators. Unarmed villagers have been killed by them and having soon exhausted or lost the rations they brought with them, instances of taking of rations, by force from villages have come to light. On the night of 14th August, a few Pakistani saboteurs set fire to a mohalla on the outskirts of Srinagar, resulting in the burning of 300 houses. Some Pakistani saboteurs with incendiary material in their possession have been captured. This appears to have been a desperate bid to terrorise people and thereby create a commotion.

11. As I have said before, we were aware that Pakistan was giving training to certain numbers of armed personnel in guerilla warfare but the exact time and place of the infiltration was not known to us. Our forces along the Cease Fire Line were mainly responsible for the stoppage of any major military attack across this Line but as Honourable Members will realise it is impossible to prevent infiltration of people in small groups across 470 miles of extensive and difficult terrain. The Cease Fire Line was as Honourable Members are aware fixed *ad hoc* and does not follow natural features providing easy defence against infiltration. The infiltrators came in small groups which then regrouped themselves later on. In view of the surprise tactics adopted by the infiltrators, and the type of the firearms that they carried, they were able to inflict some casualties on policemen guarding vital points. 21 of whom have died. Regarding these figures—this is the only change I am making in the statement as already prepared, and I am doing so only to give the up-to-date figures of casualties—the up-to-date information I have got is that in addition to 21 policemen killed, 5 officers and 41 ORs of the Indian Army have died fighting the infiltrators. We have killed 2 officers and 151 other infiltrators

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

and their bodies have been picked up. Another 300 are estimated to have been killed or wounded; 84 infiltrators including 2 officers have been captured by us so far. Amongst the arms and ammunition captured by us are substantial quantities of rifles, sten guns, LMGs, thousands of rounds of ammunition of various kinds, mortar bombs, rocket launchers and rockets and explosives. Wire cutters, binoculars, compasses, transistor radios and signal equipment have also been captured. Clothing, blankets, food and medicines, etc., has also been captured from the infiltrators in large quantities. Reports are continuing to come in of more losses suffered by the infiltrators. Apart from the valley, the infiltrators have been engaged all along the Cease Fire Line where the maximum engagements have taken place. It may, however, take some time before these Pakistan trained and inspired infiltrators are totally eliminated.

12. The complicity of Pakistan in this whole affair can be seen by the news coming from Pakistan radio and from that printed in her newspapers. In the beginning she said nothing but subsequently the claims made, have been so exaggerated and so fantastic that one is clearly led to believe it is what Pakistan had expected rather than what has actually happened that Pakistan has published.

13. Following assurances from the United Nations observers against repetition of Pakistani attacks on our vital supply route and the posting of the United Nations observers at Kargil and Skardu, our troops vacated the Pakistani posts in the hope that Pakistan would thereafter desist from its provocative activities. I am afraid these hopes have been belied and the United Nations observers let down. Apart from the large scale infiltration arranged by Pakistan and sabotage activities indulged in by the infiltrators, generally, the Kargil area has been a specific object of Pakistan

aggression, nullifying all assurances given by the UN to us.

14. I do not wish to minimise the serious situation that has been created for us once again in the State of Jammu and Kashmir which is a threat to the territorial integrity of our country. We feel deep concern for the suffering being caused to our brethren in J & K. We will meet this new threat created by Pakistan in an effective manner and I have no doubt that the security forces, with the help of the people of J & K will be able to meet the situation, even though it may take some time. We are also undertaking immediate measures to provide relief to those who have suffered at the hands of the infiltrators. We have apprised the Secretary General of the United Nations of these grave and blatant ceasefire violations by Pakistan. We have drawn the attention of all friendly Governments to this new phase of Pakistani aggression in Kashmir and hope that they will use their influence to make Pakistan desist from action which is against the Charter of the United Nations, against International Law and against the principle of good neighbourliness and which is fraught with grave consequences.

Shri Hanumanthalya (Bangalore):
City: You send more pamphlets.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: These are being done along with lodging protests.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह हमेशा मित्र देशों की बात कहते रहते हैं। यह क्या करते हैं। मैं इन से पूछता हूँ कि यह क्यों देश का नाश कर रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : देखिये, मैं बार बार कह रहा हूँ कि इस तरह से रूकावट डालना ठीक नहीं है।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I would like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the courage and resourcefulness displayed by the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Shri Sadiq, his colleagues and the State administration in meeting this - threat. I would also like to express my great appreciation about the gallant manner in which the Police forces deployed in Jammu and Kashmir have discharged their duties in meeting the infiltrators. Finally, I am sure you would join me in paying a warm tribute to our brave armed forces for the courage and skill with which they are dealing with the situation. I have not doubt that they will come out victorious.

16. As regards the Rann of Kutch the Prime Minister is making a statement. I place on the table of the House a statement regarding other incidents on the Indo-Pakistan borders.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4468/65].

Some hon. Members rose—

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): On a point of clarification.

Mr. Speaker: Not now. I am not allowing any questions because this is going to be discussed.

Shri Humayun Kabir to make a statement on the Oil Policy.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस पर तो प्रश्न पूछने का अवसर दिया जाये। बड़े महत्व का सवाल है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : घाडर, घाडर।

श्री मधु लिमये : जब पहला सवाल चल रहा था तब आप ने कहा था कि काश्मीर पर बयान था रहा है और उस पर सवाल पूछने की इजाजत दी जायेगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हम दो बार बहस नहीं कर सकते जब कि आपने बहस घा रही है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कब घायेगी?

श्री मधु लिमये : किस बहस में यह सवाल घायेगा?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बहस घायेगी, अब आप बैठ जाइये। अगर नहीं घायेगी..

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री : इस पर बहस होनी चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बहस मांगिये मैं इस की इजाजत दगा।

श्री बागड़ी (हिमर) : जिन लोगों ने कालिंग घटनेशन नहीं दिया है उन को इस लिये भोका नहीं दिया जायेगा कि काश्मीर पर मंत्री जी का बयान घा गया है। लेकिन जिन लोगों ने कालिंग घटनेशन दिया है उनको तो सवाल करने की इजाजत देनी चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। चूकि इस पर हाउस में बाकायदा बहस होगी इस लिये इस वक्त किसी कालिंग घटनेशन नोटिस पर सवाल की इजाजत नहीं दे सकता। दो बहसे नहीं हो सकती।

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा : सब से पहले इसी पर बहस होनी चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वन, अब यह वान बहस होनी चाहिये।

12.49 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE—
contd.

STATEMENT ON THE OIL POLICY

Mr. Speaker: Shri Humayun Kabir.

The Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Humayun Kabir): May I lay the statement on the Table?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Humayun Kabir: I beg to lay on the Table a statement on the Oil Policy. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4460/65].

STATEMENT RE: ACCIDENT IN DHORI COLLIERY

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): May I also lay the statement on the Table?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri D. Sanjivayya: I beg to lay on the Table a statement regarding the accident in Dhori Colliery in Hazaribagh District, Bihar, on the 28th May 1965. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-4461/65].

STATEMENT ON CERTAIN RECENT RAILWAY ACCIDENTS

रेलवे मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (डा० राम सुभग सिंह): मैं रेल दुर्घटनाओं के संबंध में अपना बयान सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ।
[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4462/65].

12-50 hrs.

MOTIONS OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Mr. Speaker: Now I will take up the motions of no confidence given notice of (Interruptions).

इस तरह तो ठीक नहीं है। यहां पर कुछ तो घाईली बंडकट होना चाहिये। जब मैं स्पीडर्स से कहता हूँ तो वे कहते हैं कि मुझ को इंडिविजुअल मेम्बर्स से डाइरेक्टली डील करना चाहिये। अगर मेम्बर्स चाहते हैं कि उनको प्रिंस के तौर पर मैं ट्रीट करूँ

तो उन को चाहिये कि वह उसी तरह से अपना व्यवहार रखें।

I have to inform the House that I have received eight notices of motions of no confidence in the Council of Ministers under rule 198.

The first is by Shri M. R. Masani and Shri Dandekar. It is a simple, straight motion, saying that this House has no confidence in the Council of Ministers.

The second is by Shri S. M. Banerjee. The reasons are:

- “(a) For not consulting Parliament on Kutch Agreement and for agreeing to have International Tribunal;
- (b) Failure of the Government to check rise in prices of all essential commodities;
- (c) For protecting the interests of employers in the matter of payment of bonus; and
- (d) Failure to revise dearness formula for Central Government employees as suggested by the Das Commission.”

The third is of Shri Madhu Limaye, reading:

यह सदन वर्तमान मंत्रिपरिषद् में विश्वास का अभाव प्रकट करता है

Then there is one by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, reading:

यह सभा मंत्रिपरिषद् में अविश्वास प्रकट करती है।

Then there is one by Shri U. M. Trivedi, reading:

“That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers.”

Then there is another motion by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy on the same lines.

Then there is a motion in the names of Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, Shri Daji, Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri Vasudevan Nair and Dr. U. Misra, giving the following reasons:

- (I) Its utter failure to hold the price line,
- (II) Its failure to keep the people's food out of the clutches of profiteers creating acute scarcity and famine conditions,
- (III) bringing about a widespread economic crisis and critical foreign exchange situation.
- (IV) Naked repression and use of D.I.R. on people's democratic movement and refusal to release thousands of detenus,
- (V) Bungling in foreign affairs and agreeing to arbitration of our sovereign territorial rights in Kutch, and
- (VI) Its grave irresponsibility in defence matters."

Then we have the motion of Shri Yajnik and Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhury, which reads:

"This House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers for

- (i) its utter failure to tackle the food and prices situation in the country ... and
- (ii) for its failure to ensure the security of the country's external frontiers."

I will take up the first, the motion of Shri Masani. I request the Members who want leave to be granted to stand in their places.

Some hon. Members rose—
831(Ai) LS—6.

Mr. Speaker: The number is more than 50. Leave is granted. Now, the time and the date would be settled in consultation with the Leader of the House, and I will inform the hon. Members.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): May I request that there may not be too much delay? Perhaps Monday next will be a suitable date.

Mr. Speaker: I will try. Can the hon. Prime Minister say anything?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Any time.

Mr. Speaker: Would next Monday be all right? It is being asked.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Then we start on next Monday.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): Debate on the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister regarding the Indo-Pakistan Agreement has been put down in the agenda. That will be taken up, I presume, today itself. May I request you that, this being one of the important points which is going to be raised in the no confidence motion by several parties, this debate may not be taken up now? This is exactly what happened to our no confidence motion last time. The specific food debate was taken up earlier.

Mr. Speaker: How can I do that? When Government brings forward a business, that has to be put before the House.

श्री मधु लिवये (मुंगेर) : मेने कण्ड के बारे में जो काम रोक प्रस्ताव दिया था उसको तो धापने नामंजूर कर दिया है। और उसके बारे में शास्त्री जी प्रस्ताव रख रहे हैं, इस लिए उसके बारे में मेरा धापन नहीं है। लेकिन बिहार में तथा अन्य सूबों में जो भ्रान्दोशन चालू हैं, जो गोलियां चली हैं,

[श्री मधु लिमये]

जो गिरफ्तारियां हुई हैं, लोगों को सूबा से निकाला गया है। उसके बारे में मैंने एक ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव की सूचना दी है। साथ साथ खाद्य नीति के बारे में सरकार की असफलता पर भी मैंने एक काम रोक प्रस्ताव दिया है। मेरा खयाल है कि उनको तो ले लिया जा सकता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बंद जाएं, आपने कह लिया। आपको यह कहना नहीं चाहिए था। अगर आपको शिकायत थी कि कोई प्रस्ताव लिया जाना चाहिए, जिसको मैंने नामंजूर कर दिया है, तो आप मुझे लिख कर दें या मुझसे मिलते, तो मैं उसका फैसला करता। यह तो आपने जो हाउस ने फैसला किया है उसका उल्लंघन कर रहे हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने कहा कि कण्ट्रोल आपने नहीं लिया तो ठीक है। लेकिन गोलियों के बारे में और गिरफ्तारियों के बारे में मैंने कहा कि . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो आप समझते हैं कि लिया जाना चाहिए उसके बारे में लिख कर भेज दें।

श्री मधु लिमये : आपने कहा था कि भविष्यवासी के प्रस्ताव पर वोट होने के बाद मैं उन मामलों को लूंगा। इसलिए मैंने यह मवाक उठाया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मुझे इजाजत नो दीजिए कि बाकी काम मैं देख लूँ। जब यह प्रस्ताव डिस्कस हो जाए तो मैं देखूंगा कि कौन सा लिया जा सकता है कौनसा नहीं लिया जा सकता।

श्री बागड़ी (हिमार) : जबाब नो दे दीजिए कि कौन सा लिया जाएगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ऐसे जबाब नहीं दे सकता। जब भविष्यवासी का प्रस्ताव लिया

जाएगा तो मैं देखूंगा कि कौनसा लिया जा सकता है और कौन सा नहीं लिया जा सकता।

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Do I understand that the particular issue of the Bihar situation will be considered by you and the result intimated to us?

Mr. Speaker: Some I have rejected already. I am not going to reopen them. Some I have kept pending. In view of this, I will examine all those that are pending with me, and then let the House know whether I will allow any one or not.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We have not received any intimation.

Mr. Speaker: Then, she will receive intimation.

श्री राम सेबक यादव (बाराबंकी) : आपने आज कहा कि कुछ ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव ऐसे हैं जिन के बारे में आप विचार करेंगे कि वह भविष्यवासी प्रस्ताव आपने के बाद लिए जाने चाहिए या नहीं। मैंने एक ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव की सूचना दी है, शायद वह प्रस्ताव भविष्यवासी प्रस्ताव के अन्तर्गत नहीं आ सकता। और वह यह है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं देख लूंगा।

श्री राम सेबक यादव : प्रधान मंत्री के घर के बाहर जो समाजवादियों को पकड़ा गया . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उसको इस ढंग से नहीं लाया जा सकता।

12.56 hrs.

HINDU RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS
BILL*

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

for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the better supervision and more effective administration of Hindu public religious endowments and for matters connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the better supervision and more effective administration of Hindu public religious endowments and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

Shri A. K. Sen: I introduce the Bill.

12.56½ hrs.

KHUDA BAKSH ORIENTAL PUBLIC LIBRARY BILL*

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to declare the Khuda Baksh Oriental Public Library at Patna to be an institution of national importance and to provide for its administration and certain other connected matters.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to declare the Khuda Baksh Oriental Public Library at Patna to be an institution of national importance and to provide for its administration and certain other connected matters."

The motion was adopted.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I introduce the Bill.

12.57 hrs.

ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): I beg to move for

leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Aligarh Muslim University Act, 1920.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Aligarh Muslim University Act, 1920".

The motion was adopted.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I introduce the Bill.

12.57½ hrs.

STATEMENT RE: ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the explanatory statement giving reasons for immediate legislation by the Aligarh Muslim University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1965, as required under rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

12.58 hrs.

PAYMENT OF BONUS BILL*

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the payment of bonus to persons employed in certain establishments and for matters connected therewith.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I oppose the Bill at the introduction stage itself. You will remember that the six members of the Bonus Commission who represent the entire working class of the country and the Government representatives made unanimous recommendations. Only one member, who represented the employers, gave a report of dissent. I am sorry that Government has taken note only of

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 2, dated 16-8-65.

[Shri D. Sanjivayya]

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

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

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

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

13 hrs.

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

Shri D. Sanjivayya: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

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

13.01 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: PAYMENT OF BONUS ORDINANCE

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

13.02 hrs.

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

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister

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

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

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

The Prime Minister.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं सुन तो रहा हूँ ।

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Hem Barua]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

श्री बड़े (खारगोन) : स्टेटस को एंटी।

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

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

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

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

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

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कौन हुकम देने वाला हूँ।

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

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

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

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दूसरी बात यह है कि...

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह..

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

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

एक माननीय सदस्य : धब घ्राप खामोशी से सुनें।

श्री रामसेबक बाबब : खामोशी से क्यों सुनें ?

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

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

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

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

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

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

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप बैठ जायें ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : एक मिनट मुझे दे
दीजिए . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप पहले मेरी बात
सुन लीजिए ।

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

श्री रामसेवक यादव : जमीन देने का
नहीं है ।

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

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

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

श्री बागड़ी : कानून क्या है, विधान क्या
है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : प्राप भी तो देख सकते
हैं ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : 3500 वर्गमील
जमीन

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

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

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

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

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

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

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : और नहीं ।

श्री बागड़ी : सिर्फ एक मिनट ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप बैठ जायेंगे ।

श्री बागड़ी : एक मिनट . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जी नहीं ।

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

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

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

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

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

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

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय . . .

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

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

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बहस को मुनना नहीं चाहता हूँ।

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

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

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

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

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धब धाप बैठ जाइये।

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

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

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धगर धाप . . .

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

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

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

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

श्री रामसेवक यादव : स्कावट नहीं डाल रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : और क्या कर रहे हैं ?

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

श्री रामसेवक यादव : नहीं, नहीं, नहीं।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : यह नहीं हो सकता है।

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

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बोट लेने के लिए तैयार हूँ।

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

The question is.....

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker: There is no provision for it.

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

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

Some hon. Members: No, no.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप बैठ जाइये ।

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

Those in favour may kindly say 'Aye'.

Several Hon. Members: Aye.

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

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The 'Ayes' have it

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

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

that in future let us observe some rules and regulations.

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

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

Hon. Members: Yes.

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

Division No. 1]

Shri A. K. Sen: I move:

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

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

Lok Sabha divided.

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

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

श्री बसु लिये : मेरा बोट नहीं चला
है ।

Mr. Speaker: All this will go in record.

[13:45 hrs.]

AYES

Akkamma Devi, Shrimati

Alva, Shri Joschim

Bakliwal, Shri

Balmiki, Shri

Barman, Shri P.C.

Barua, Shri R.

Barupal, Shri P.L.

Basant Kunwari, Shrimati

Basappa, Shri

Basumatari, Shri

Bhagat, Shri B.R.

Bhagavati, Shri

Bhakt Darshan, Shri

Bhargava, Shri M.B.

Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.

Birendra Bahadur Singh, Shri

Boroobah, Shri P.C.

Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri

Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri

Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna

Chandriki, Shri

Chaturvedi, Shri S.N.

Chaudhry, Shri Chandramani Lal

Chaudhuri, Shri D.S.

Chaudhuri, Shri Sachindra

Chavva, Shri Y.B.

Choni Lal, Shri

Dandekar, Shri N.

Das, Shri B.K.

Dass, Shri C.

Dighe, Shri

Dixit, Shri G.N.

Dwivedi, Shri M.L.

Elayaperumal, Shri

Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan

Harvani, Shri Anant

Hazarika, Shri J.N.

Hem Raj, Shri

Himatsingka, Shri

Iqbal Singh, Shri

Jyotlahi, Shri J.P.

Kabir, Shri Humayun

Kapur Singh, Shri

Kedaria, Shri C.M.

Khadilkar, Shri

Khan, Shri Osman Ali

Khan, Shri Shahnawaz

Kinder Lal, Shri

Kotaki, Shri Liladhar

Krishna, Shri M.R.

Krishnamachari, Shri T.T.

Krishnapal Singh, Shri

Kureel, Shri B.N.

Labtan Chaudhry, Shri

Lalit Sen, Shri

Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.

Mahtab, Shri

Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini

Maimoona Sultan, Shrimati

Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra

Mandal, Shri J.

Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad

Maniyangadan, Shri

Mantri, Shri D.D.

Merandi, Shri

Meruthiah, Shri

Masani, Shri M.R.

Maurya Din, Shri

Mathur, Shri Shiv Charan

Mehrotra, Shri Brij Bihari

Mehta, Shri Jaahvant

Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali

Mishra, Shri Bibhuti

Mishra, Shri M.P.

Misra, Shri Mahesh Dutta

Morarka, Shri

More, Shri K.L.

Muhammad Ismail, Shri

Mukerjee, Shri H.N.

Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharada

Murli Manohar, Shri

Muthiah, Shri

Naik, Shri D.J.

Nanda, Shri

Nayak, Shri Mohan

Nayar, Dr. Sushila

Nigam, Shrimati Savitri

Oza, Shri

Pande, Shri K.N.

Pandey, Shri R.S.

Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath

Pandit, Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi

Pant, Shri K.C.

Parnasivan, Shri

Patel, Shri Chhotubhai

Patel, Shri Rajeswar

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

NOES

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

Mr. Speaker: The result of the Division is:

Ayes	174
Noes	15

The motion was adopted.

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

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

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

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

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

tani armed forces in the Rann of Kutch.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Shri Hem Barua: "said to have" passed!

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

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

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

14 hrs.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

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

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

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): Yes.

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

श्री किशन पटनायक : मैं मूव करना हूँ।

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

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am moving it.

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

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

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

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

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

Shri Brij Raj Singh: I am moving it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Shri Yashpal Singh: I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border, disapproves the Agreement as it barter away the honour and sovereignty of India."
(1).

श्री किशन पटनायक : मैं प्रस्ताव करता

हूँ :—

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

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

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border, is of the opinion that the said Agreement is derogatory to national honour, detrimental to national interest, and is contrary to the spirit and letter of the resolution unanimously adopted by the House, disapproves the Agreement and calls upon the Government to annul the same.”

(4).

Shri Brij Raj Singh: I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table of

the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border, disapproves the Agreement on the following grounds, namely:—

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

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

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

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

(5).

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

“This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965, relating to Gujarat-West

[Shri Brij Raj Singh]

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

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

"This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border, is of the opinion that—

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

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

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

"This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June,

1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border, approves of it." (8)

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border, is of the opinion that the clause for reference to arbitration be revoked, as it impinges upon our sovereign rights on the territory of Kutch and is fraught with grave dangers." (10)

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

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

"This House, having considered the statement laid on the table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border, recommends to Government to scrap the said Agreement in view of the fresh aggression committed by Pakistan in Kashmir." (12).

Shri Maurya: I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border, is of the opinion—

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

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

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

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

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

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ—

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

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

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

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

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

14.06 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

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

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

[Shri Ranga]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then there is point No. 7.

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

did we do that?—

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

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

Coming to points 18 and 20, here is 18:

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Ranga]

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

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

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

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

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

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

bie for this weakness? It is this leadership. Given this leadership, it is no wonder that Pakistan is creating all these troubles.

We appreciate and take note of the brave and repeated declarations of this Government to throw out all the infiltrators, and we wish it all success, but would it be possible for it to do it? And how soon?

Can we forget what is happening in Viet Nam? Are not the tactics that are being pursued here almost the same that are pursued by the communists in Viet Nam? Whereas Viet Nam has been able to obtain its strength from the democratic West, what is the strength that we have?—the strength of this Government, this Government which presented such a weakness in Kutch, this Government which is not able to mobilise the whole nation. I do not think it is going to be such an easy matter to achieve all the success that we all desire in such a short time as we wish. We can achieve that success in the shortest possible time provided we give up our wrong international policies and try and make haste to gain friends for ourselves as against communist China as an ally for Pakistan.

The Prime Minister has asked for the co-operation of all parties in their fight against the infiltrators. We sympathise with them in their plight. But are we not to be assured of their competence and political adequacy—I underline the words "political adequacy"—before we commit ourselves to the wrong-headed political adventure of trying to fight the two foes of Pakistan and China all in isolation from all other powers in Asia, in our neighbourhood and the world as a whole?

By all counts, through their failure in NEFA, and recently in Kutch, this Government is politically incapable of providing the national leadership that is called for at this juncture to save us not only from these border disputes with Pakistan and China, but also from the economic, social, linguistic and political issues that face the country at this juncture.

Before I conclude, I would like to place on record our gratitude and admiration for the patriotic, loyal, disciplined service that has been rendered to this country by our armed forces on the Kutch border in the recent struggle and also for the heroic resistance that our defence forces as well as police are offering in Kashmir to the infiltrator. If there is one bright spot at all in this gloomy atmosphere that we find in this country, it is just that, the loyalty that our defence forces have shown to Mother India, the heroism that they have displayed, the sacrifices that they have made many a time at the altar of this country, but many a time because of the wrong policies of this Government and generally because they are Indians, because they love India and have gone into the defence forces in order to fight for us all and for the generations to come. All credit to them, and the homage of our party and, I am sure, the homage of all patriotic-minded people all over India, in this House as well as outside, goes to these friends, to these loyal citizens who have also accepted this additional responsibility of defending our country.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): When the news first spread throughout the country on 30th June that a cease-fire agreement had been reached in Kutch, before the details of all the implications and the precise terms of that cease-fire agreement were known, a great feeling of relief, I believe, swept through the country. That was quite natural because the *status quo ante*, which the Government announced had been achieved, meant to the people of this country one thing by and large, that all the posts and all the areas which had been forcibly occupied by Pakistani armed aggression would have to be vacated, and also that for the time being at least, the danger or the threat, which at one time seemed very real, of the Kutch conflict escalating into a much bigger conflict all along the border, seemed to have been

(Shri Indrajit Gupta)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

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

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

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

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

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

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

ly detrimental to our national dignity and self-respect.

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

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

An hon. Member: America.

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

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

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

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

Shri Daji: They are inspirers of Pakistani aggression.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15 hrs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15.31 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

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

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

[श्री याज्ञिक]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[श्री याज्ञक]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

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

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

16 hrs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

our case is properly presented to the world.

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

16:18 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

श्री उद्वा० प्र० ज्योत्सबी (मागर) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कच्छ के सम्बन्ध में हुए

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

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

[श्री ज्वा० प्र० ज्योतिषी]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[श्री विशानचन्द्र सेठ]

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

17 hrs.

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

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

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

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण
 समाप्त करता हूँ ।

BUSINESS ADVISORY
 COMMITTEE

THIRTY-SEVENTH REPORT

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

17.04 hrs.

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