

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid, it is for the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : The same point was posed to the House. It was decided that the discussion of the Plan will be over by 7 O'Clock today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time do you propose to take? When would you like to speak?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: I would be taking about forty minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As per calculation 20 minutes will be at the disposal of the House for discussion of the Plan. Quite a few speakers are there—Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, Shri Yadav, Shri Roy, are from the Opposition. There is a long list of speakers from the Congress side.

DR. KARAN SINGH: (Udhampur): We can have Half-an-Hour discussion now because the hon. Minister for External Affairs is also there. It will give a little change from planning. Then after that discussion on Planning can be resumed. The hon. Minister can perhaps extend his stay from 7 p.m. to 7.30 p.m. In this way it can be finished today.

... (व्यवधान) ... तो फिर कल कर लें।

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: In the Business Advisory Committee it was stated that the House would not sit beyond 7 p.m. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think let Dr. Karan Singh start with Half-an-Hour discussion.

Dr. Karan Singh, you should be very brief as it is Half-an-Hour discussion only.

17.33 hrs.

### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

EXCLUSION OF OCCUPIED AREAS OF JAMMU & KASHMIR FROM THE MAP PUBLISHED IN INDIAN GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENT.

DR. KARAN SINGH (Udhampur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have raised this Half-an-Hour discussion on the basis of certain replies given to Starred Question No. 174 relating to inaccurate maps published in the Government of India advertisement showing only part of Jammu and Kashmir as Indian territory. This betrays the continuing carelessness on behalf of the Government agencies. I recall, in fact, looking through some of the records as far back as 1970, I had to answer a similar question in the Rajya Sabha, because Air India at that time was responsible for the map which was inaccurate. Although at that time some directions were issued, it seems that they are not being really followed as forcefully as they should. There are lot of publications that show Kashmir either as a disputed area or as divided. I have with me Arabic, the Islamic World Review. I do not know whether the hon. Minister has seen it or not. It has very clearly shown Kashmir as separate from India as well as from Pakistan.

On this limited issue, with regard to the maps, I would suggest.

(a) fresh directions be issued from the Ministry of External Affairs to all Government Departments and agencies to ensure that there is no inaccuracy in the maps;

(b) where such maps come to their notice published by non-Government agencies Indian or foreign—they should immediately seek rectification.

But, Sir, this question of the maps does highlight an uncomfortable fact. For the last 35 years—1947 and then from 1962 vast areas of the State of

[Dr. Karan Singh]

Jammu and Kashmir which are legally and Constitutionally part of India are, in fact, under adverse occupation. I do not want to go into figures, but the original State of Jammu and Kashmir when it acceded was just over 84,000 sq. miles, my hunch is that almost 50 per cent of the territory today is not under our occupation. That speaks about the size of the problem. This is a stark fact and the countries concerned can only say that they are portraying the actual control. But we must be very clear. During her recent successful visit to the U.S.A. it was reported in the papers that the Prime Minister was asked at a dinner what she thought of the Kashmir problem, and she said that she did not see any problem. It was a good reply and there was lot of laughter and the questioner was duly confounded. But the fact of the matter is, surely there is a problem, because we have the legal and Constitutional right over the entire State. I do not have to go into the historical background. You are well aware of how the State was built up; how my ancestors built it and ruled it for over 100 years, my father signed the Instrument of Accession, I was Governor for 18 years in different capacities and have represented the State for 15 years here in the House. I know the historical backward probably as well if not better than anybody else. I do feel that this is a question which cannot simply be allowed to rest where it is. It is a question which does involve the national interest and I think, a stage has come when the matter should be taken up at the appropriate time and in the appropriate forum.

Now, President Zia of Pakistan passed through Delhi very recently. Some statements were made after his visit. It is a positive development. I welcome it because my own view is that an honourable settlement with Pakistan and with China is in the national interest and in the interest of the people of the State. We would also welcome that. There is not much de-

tails in the press, but it does appear that the basic issues and the basic differences were not really discussed—Jammu and Kashmir issue, for example. There were reports earlier that the President Zia having said that he had a solution up his sleeve. Probably, it is still up his sleeve. He is not in Indonesia. Now whether that solution came out of his sleeve or not? Probably, we would like to know something more about this.

There has been an announcement of the setting up of a Joint Commission, meeting of the officials and the second summit meeting in March. And this shows that the situation has become unfrozen and that a stage will now be reached when these substantive issues can be discussed. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether during the subsequent meetings, this Jammu and Kashmir issue will be raised and whether a genuine attempt will be made to solve it. I would like to know whether legal and Constitutional facts will be put forward in negotiation to establish our claim. Because, I must point out and I would ask the hon. Minister to bear with me here, it is not merely a theoretical problem.

In the present situation, we are getting the worst of all possible worlds. Firstly, thousands of sq. miles of territory which we consider to be ours, which became part of Indian territory when the instrument of accession was signed, are not, in fact, in our possession.

Secondly, we are not getting commensurate political advantage of a settlement. If you have some settlement and you get a very big advantage in terms of public opinion, in terms of international lessening of tension and so on, one might take it as all right. We are not getting any advantage. It is a *casus belli*, a cause of war which can be activated at any time by our opponents when it suits their fancy, because it is always there and whenever it suits them, they can turn up the pressure and we are constantly on the defensive. All the

time, we find ourselves in a position where we have got to react to the steps which are taken by other countries.

Thirdly, the people of Jammu and Kashmir are suffering. I will point out one thing. It is an interesting fact. The refugees from Pakistan occupied Kashmir have not to this day been treated on par with the refugees from partitioned Punjab because we say, "That is our territory. Therefore, we cannot treat you as refugees." So, in effect, what is happening is, because of our weakness or our inability to get those territories back, we are victimising lakhs of people who became refugees. You are aware that when the partition took place, in Punjab, lakhs of people came. Similarly, when the invasion was launched in Jammu and Kashmir, lakhs of people became refugees. They are today in Delhi and in other parts of the country. Their claims have not been registered and their compensation has not been paid on the same basis. It is a very curious situation. You cannot victimise refugees just because you are unable to fulfil establish your rightful claim. So, this is the situation where the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir are, in fact, suffering.

Another point which is very often overlooked is that the democratic rights of the people living in POK are totally trampled upon. The people in our part of the State have time and again had opportunities for elections to fulfil their democratic rights. But about the people in POK who according to our Constitution are supposed to be part of our territory, their rights are totally trampled upon. They never had a single election in POK. They never had an opportunity to express their views on any matter, even in regard to the form of Government. They are governed entirely from Islamabad.

So, the point that I am making is this. The question of maps is really just one aspect of it. The question of refugees is another. But the broader

question is that this unsatisfactory situation has now subsisted for 35 years and we have made vast sacrifices for Jammu and Kashmir. Not only the armed forces from all over the country, from every State, but the people living in the State have constantly made sacrifices.

May I remind the House that even in the great and historic victory of Bangladesh which goes down in history as the greatest victory India has ever achieved—it is said that Bahabharata took 18 days whereas Bangladesh took only 14 days; it was a great and grand victory—even in that victory, 20,000 people from the Chhamb area of the Jammu region were displaced and today they are living as refugees. Whether we win a war or lose a war, it seems that the people of Jammu and Kashmir are the ones who constantly suffer. Therefore, this is an important point that I am making.

Surely a stage has now come when the Government of India could take a comprehensive, a political, strategic and defence view of this whole matter and make a real effort to resolve this question through negotiations with Pakistan and with China while maintaining full defence preparedness because, as I said, it is a dangerous situation. Anyone of these countries can escalate tension at any time. But while maintaining full defence preparedness, I think, as a nation now we are strong and mature enough to move in an honourable way towards what the Simla Agreement called "a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir." Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to request the hon. Minister to make a comprehensive statement on this issue so that the national interest and the welfare of the people of Jammu and Kashmir are fully safeguarded.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, there is no more comprehensive statement that I would make which the Hon. Member has not made

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

himself. There are no two opinions on the matter. A large portion of India is under the occupation of Pakistan. The occupation is illegal. Flowing from this occupation are several complications and difficulties which we, the people of India and the people of Kashmir in particular, are facing.

Now, the question is, as Dr. Karan Singh pointed out, that we have to get this settlement in a particular framework. The framework is of the Simla Agreement, and no other. We have to choose the appropriate forum and the appropriate time, as he pointed out. The appropriate forum is bilateral and no other. The appropriate time, however, one could have one's opinions but, I am not sure that during the last several years there has been any time which could have been called an appropriate time.

We know that this matter has been raised incessantly on wrong forums by the Government of Pakistan. We have been telling them time and again that this does not help in the final settlement which we have to arrive at under the Simla Agreement. They have not stopped raising the issue. Nor have they created the necessary atmosphere for this matter to be taken up bilaterally and a final settlement being arrived at. This is what it is all about. We are coming back to the same point that we have to settle these matters under the Simla Agreement. On several fronts, there has been forward movement since the time of the Simla Agreement. This is well-known. We have been making constant efforts. There has been some response, halting on certain matters, less halting on certain other matters and no progress at all on certain matters like Kashmir. Now this is a mixed situation we have to live with and from this we have to find a way to move forward.

The recent visit of the President of Pakistan was very brief but it is significant in the sense that at the

highest level, on both sides, the desire to maintain contacts has been reiterated. This is how I look at it. It was not meant to clinch matters because no matter which under discussion has, as yet to reach the Summit level. They are under discussion at the level of the Foreign Secretaries.

The Joint Commission idea was adumbrated when Mr. Aga Sahi visited India in January and it was accepted in principle. Later, we sent a draft of the agreement on the Joint Commission. We were waiting for response from Pakistan accepting the draft. Naturally, it took some time for them to examine all the aspects. It so happened that when President Zia came here, we reminded him and there and then a decision was taken that the Joint Commission could go ahead, that we could go ahead with the modalities in regard to the Joint Commission. Now this is a forward step because not only Kashmir but there are other matters which are .....

DR. KARAN SINGH: Jammu and Kashmir.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I stand corrected. Jammu and Kashmir. There are other matters, several other matters....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): 'Jammu' must come first.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes; 'Jammu' must come first—Jammu & Kashmir.

As I said, there are many other matters on which it is desirable to have normalisation and also strengthening of ties. This has been happening intermittently, slowly and in a haphazard manner because there is no single agency to oversee what is happening in each of these fields. So we felt that the Joint Commission would be very useful in this. We have also decided the dates on which these discussions will be continued at the Foreign Secretaries' level; that will be some time

next month, in the third or fourth week of next month. So, considering the very short duration of the visit and the fact that there was no intention of clinching any of these issues on this visit, the House will agree that what has been agreed upon, what has been achieved, is really useful. And there will be another summit meeting at the time of the Non-Aligned Summit. It is not generally easy to find time when more than 90 Heads of Government/Heads of State are likely to be here. Even so, both the Heads of Government have decided that they will meet again during the Non-Aligned Summit.

I agree entirely, that this is not a theoretical problem, this is a human problem, this is a political problem. But the point is that we do not agree that there is any dispute. It is only a question of Pakistan sitting pretty illegally on territory which belongs to India. So, we do not call it a dispute. I am not splitting hairs. But this is the position which we have taken, and this is the right position to take. No one has the right, or had the right at any time, to cut Jammu & Kashmir into two. Jammu & Kashmir was Jammu & Kashmir. So it remained with India and it continues to remain in India. The mere fact that for the longest period—I know the period is unconscionably long for any other country to be allowed to be in illegal occupation of our territory but....

राम मनीषा मिश्र (सलेम पुर: भारत के साथ नहीं, भारत का अंग कहा जाया तो अच्छा होगा।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: So the facts are known, the background is known, what efforts have been made from time to time is also known. We have not been halting in getting the final settlement, but the point is that it requires two to come to a settlement; there cannot be a unilateral settlement. Therefore, while agreeing with the spirit of Dr. Karan Singh's statement, I would like to tell him and the House that we are on the right track, we hope. So far as preparedness is concerned, there is no ques-

tion of relenting on that; that is there and that will continue to be there. In this context we need not go into details. But I would like to assure the House that we are very consciously trying to prepare the ground for creating a situation wherein the final settlement according to the Simla Agreement becomes possible, we are able to take it up, we are able to discuss it, we are able to arrive at the final settlement. Otherwise, if the atmosphere is not congenial, any step could become counter-productive.

It is true that Gen. Zia, before coming here, gave the impression that he had something in view.

17.55 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair].

For various reasons which it is not possible for us to unravel at this moment, this did not come off. We need not be unduly disappointed about this. He might have his own reasons for not coming out with it when he came here. But if we are hopeful that there is something which he has in his mind, naturally at the proper time, at the appropriate time, it will have to be discussed. So we are preparing for that time, we are waiting and also preparing for that time and we hope that this visit will pave the way for creating an atmosphere when this question can be taken up between the two countries.

DR. KARAN SINGH: Meanwhile, on the refugees, what have you to say?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would like to say simply that we should not really call them refugees. By whatever name we may call them, we should not have called them refugees because that would not be a correct description. It is not treating them on par with the refugees from Punjab or from Sind or from other areas. I have no details with regard to the matter in which they need assistance. But I am prepared to have the details from Dr. Karan Singh. We will go into it and see what could be done but I repeat—let us not call them refugees.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now Shri R. L. P. Verma... This is half-an-hour discussion. Half an hour is already over... If you want I can close it and take up the Plan discussion.

श्री रीतलाल प्रसाद वर्मा (कोडरमा) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत संबधानिक सार्वभौमिकता को मद्देनजर रखते हुये सरकार द्वारा 35 सालों में की गई कार्यवाही को देखते हुए निराशा होती है। भारत और पाकिस्तान के साथ कई बार समझौते हुए हैं, बातचीत हुई है। लेकिन जिस तरह से मोकमोहन लाइन और पाकिस्तान के अधीन आजाद कश्मीर का सीमा विवाद अभी तक हल नहीं हुआ है उससे चिन्ता होती है। अभी तक विदेशी अतिक्रमण भारत पर ज्यों का त्यों बना हुआ है। कोई मैप छाप देता है किस तरह से, अभी 21 सितम्बर को जब प्रकाशन में आया तब हमें मालूम हुआ और तब हमारे लिए चिन्ता का विषय बना। लेकिन यह गम्भीर विषय है कि भारतीय अधिकृत क्षेत्र जो पाकिस्तान के हाथ में सालों में है और इस बार भारत और पाकिस्तान के साथ बहुत बार बातचीत हो चुकी है, फिर भी अभी तक इसका अन्तिम रूप नहीं दिया गया। तो यह संबधानिक सार्वभौमिकता का गम्भीर निषय है, हम अभी तक इस पर कोई निर्णय नहीं कर पा रहे हैं, और इतने ठीले रहते हैं तबता है कि अपने देश की भूमि जो चीन और पाकिस्तान के अधीन है . . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please stick to the subject. The subject is: 'Exclusion of occupied areas of Jammu and Kashmir from the map published in Indian Government advertisement.' This is not a general discussion; this is half-an-hour discussion. Everything you are going on repeating and you will not get any reply from the Minister. Please stick to the subject. Concentrate on that. Please come to the subject. No discussion on everything.

Every thing is not discussed.

श्री रीतलाल प्रसाद वर्मा: साइटीफिक अम-  
रौकम मंजीन जो अगस्त में प्रकाशित हुई  
उसमें भारत की गवर्नमेंट की सी एस आई  
आर द्वारा 16 पेज का एडवर्टाइजमेंट दिया

गया . . . उसमें हमारी प्रधान मंत्री का एक तरफ फांटा छपा है और दूसरी तरफ इण्डिया का मैप छपा है। क्या अमोरिका में स्थित हमारे भारतीय राजदूत का यह कर्तव्य नहीं था, वहां के अधिकारियों को यह नहीं देरना चाहिए था कि उस पत्रिका में जाँ गलत छपा है, उसके विरुद्ध कोई प्रोटैस्ट किया जाए। यदि उन्होंने कोई प्रोटैस्ट किया है तो मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि वह तिथि बताई जाए जब वह प्रोटैस्ट दर्ज कराया गया। दूसरे, जब उस पत्रिका के सम्पादक ने अपनी गलती मानी है, अपा-  
राजी मांगी है तो कब आपने बंद प्रकट किया, वह बताया जाए। साथ ही जो उस-  
की कार्रवायें छपी हैं, जिन पर आपने बंद प्रकट किया, क्या आपने उन कार्रवायों को जप्त किया, क्या उन्हें नष्ट किया गया। आप-  
ने उस सम्बन्ध में क्या कदम उठाये, वह भी बताया जाए।

18 hrs.

दूसरी बात, जब हमने उसके विरुद्ध विरोध प्रकट किया, भारत सरकार की ओर से प्रोटैस्ट किया गया, वह प्रोटैस्ट नोट भारत सरकार ने किस दिन भेजा, वह भी बताया जाए। तीसरे, वहां के लोगों को जिनको रिफ्यूजी, शरणार्थी कहा गया, जिनको मतदान के अधिकार से वंचित किया गया, जाँ रिफ्यूजी बनें, उनको मौलिक अधिकारों के साथ साथ मतदान का अधिकार भी प्राप्त हो सके, उस दिशा में आपने क्या कदम उठाये मंत्री जी कृपया इन प्वाइन्ट्स को उत्तर देने का कष्ट करें।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: This discussion has arisen out of an answer to a question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The other members will also put one question each and finally you will reply.

Mr. Shastri. You must put only one question.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): Please do not disturb me, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will be disturbing you if you do not follow the rules. But, I won't disturb you if you follow the rules.

श्री रामावतार झास्त्री (पटना) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, जम्मू कश्मीर हमारे देश का गौरव है जम्मू और कश्मीर हमारे देश का प्रभिन अंग भी है, पहल भी रहा है और आगे भी रहेगा । इस बारे में हमारी नीतियां स्पष्ट हैं । फिहाल तथा कथित आजाद कश्मीर का इलाका हमसे अलग जरूर है और इस वक्त पाकिस्तानियों के कब्जे में है, लेकिन वह भी कभी हमारे मां आयेगा । उसको वापस लाने का प्रयास होना चाहिये । वह हमारे देश का इस्लिये भी अंग है क्यों कि जम्मू और कश्मीर विधान सभा को 100 सीटों में से 24 सीटें उस इलाके की हैं और वे अभी तक खाली पड़ी हुई हैं । इसलिए इन तथ्यात बातों का ध्यान में रखते हुए और सामाज्यवादियों के प्रचार का दखते हुए, क्यों कि वे यह प्रचार करते हैं कि तथाकथित आजाद कश्मीर का क्षेत्र आजाद है और वह पाकिस्तान का है, उसी का कब्जा उस पर रहना चाहिए और इन्टरनेशनल कन्ट्रोल के बारे में न जाने क्या-क्या बातें करते हैं, लेकिन मैं केवल एक प्रश्न का जवाब चाहता हूँ अभी कुछ दिन पहले जम्मू और कश्मीर के मुख्य मंत्री डाक्टर फारूख अब्दुल्ला ने एक गपान दिया जिसमें उन्होंने नियंत्रण रेखा की बात कही, इन्टरनेशनल नियंत्रण रेखा की बात कही, जो कि अमेरिका या दूसरे सामाज्यवादी देश कहते रहते हैं लेकिन हम उसको नियंत्रण रेखा मानते हैं सरकार का उस बयान के बारे में कोई कन्ट्राडिक्शन में देखने में नहीं आया कि सरकार को उस सम्बन्ध में क्या प्रतिक्रिया रही। उसका कोई खलासा प्रकाशित नहीं हुआ । जिसके अभाव में हमारे मन में भ्रम पैदा हो रहा है कि जब वास्तव में वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नियंत्रण रेखा है तो फिर हम यू एन ओ में क्यों बैठे हुए हैं । हम यू एन ओ में इसलिए बैठे हुए हैं कि हमारा उस बारे में भगडा है । उसको हम फिहाल नियंत्रण रेखा ही मानते हैं, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रेखा उसको नहीं मानते हैं । इस बारे में आपकी प्रतिक्रिया हमारे देखने में नहीं आई । इसीलिए मैं इस सदन में आपकी प्रतिक्रिया जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारत

सरकार का डा. फारूख अब्दुल्ला के उस कथन के सम्बन्ध में क्या दृष्टिकोण है, वह हमें बताया जाए ।

SHRI P. NAMGYAL rose....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You will not be permitted. Please follow the rules. Your name is not here.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL: I have some points for clarification....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You write to the Minister if you have any point. I am not permitting you.

श्री सत्य नारायण जीटिया (उज्जैन) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने इस प्रश्न के उत्तर का पढ़ा है, इसमें कहा गया है कि जब आगे इसका प्रकाशन होगा तो उसमें भूल सुधार कर ली जाएगी । यह बात बड़ी सरलता से कह दी गई है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार के महत्वपूर्ण विज्ञान जब प्रकाशित होते हैं तो उनका जो प्रारूप होता है, मसौदा होता है क्या उनकी किसी में एप्रवल नहीं ली जाती है? उनको अपने आप ही कोई छाप देता है? यह बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण बात है और अपने देश के बारे में किसी प्रकार की आशंका उत्पन्न होकर विवाद का विषय बन सकती है । ऐसे नाजुक मसले को बड़ी गंभीरता से लेना चाहिए ।

यह पहला मौका नहीं है । काश्मीर का जो मुद्दा है, और जो पाक अधिकृत कश्मीर है इसके लिए हममें कर्बानयं दी है और उस वक्त जो इसके लिये लड़ें हैं, उन्होंने अपनी पर खेलकर हिन्दुस्तान की शान को बचाया है । इस बारे में श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह डोगरा, और श्री शेरवानी को याद किया जाना चाहिये ।

आज जो पाक-अधिकृत काश्मीर है उसको हम किसी के भरोसे छोड़कर बैठ रहे तो किसी समझौते पर हम नहीं पहुँच पाएंगे । शिमला समझौता हमने किया, मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि छम्ब एरिया का जो हिस्सा है, उसको शिमला समझौते के बावजूद आपने लौटाया और जब पाक अधिकृत इलाके लौटाने की बात हम करते हैं तो शिमला समझौता

## [श्री सत्य नारायण जटिया]

बीच में कैसे आया ? आपने उसकी बात कही तो मैंने कहा है, नहीं तो मैं यह नहीं कहता ।

मैंने साफ-साफ यह कहना है कि पाक अधिकृत काश्मीर हमारे देश का अभिन्न अंग है । जम्मू-काश्मीर की विधान सभा में जो कूल स्थान माने गये हैं, उनमें 76 स्थान भरे हुये हैं, 24 अभी रिक्त हैं । इसलिए ऐसा बहुत्वपूर्ण मुद्दा जो विवाद का विषय बन गया है, उसके ऊपर सरकार का स्पष्ट मत होना चाहिये इस प्रकार का जो विज्ञापन प्रकाशित हुआ है उसके बारे में हमारी सरकार को क्लेम करना चाहिये । यह सीधी बात गही है, चाहे चीन द्वारा अधिकृत हिस्सा मानसरोवर हो या नियंत्रण रेखा का मामला हो, ऐसे जो मूख हमारे देश की सीमाओं के बारे में विवाद बनकर रख दिए जाते हैं, उन पर बार बार विवाद न उठे, इस लिए हमारी सरकार को दृढ़ रुख अपनाना चाहिए ।

मैंने कहते हुए बड़ा अफसोस होता है, हर देश का निश्चित नाम होता है, हमारे देश का नाम भी भारत है । इसका नाम इंडिया भी है । क्या किसी नाम का भी कोई ट्रांस्लेशन होता है ? इंडिया इज भारत कहना गलत है । भारत प्राचीन है, यह हमारी मान्यता है चिन्तन इसे इंडिया भी कहते हैं ? सरकार की हरकत मामले में दो मान्यताएँ हैं । यह ठीक नहीं है । हिन्दी हमारी राजभाषा होनी चाहिये, लेकिन अंग्रेजी उसके साथ चलेगी ? हमें अपना निश्चय दृढ़ करना चाहिये । सरकार को इस मामले में संकल्पित होना चाहिये । उ ३

इसलिए मैं इस प्रश्न के माध्यम से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि ऐसे जो विज्ञापन प्रकाशित होते हैं, उनके बारे में सरकार की कोई निश्चित नीति है या नहीं ?

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR (Trivandrum): Sir, while taking part in this Half-an-Hour discussion and seeking some clarifications my memory goes to the great speech delivered by late Shri V. K. Krishna

Menon in the United Nations posing our problem most ably and may I express my homage to his memory. Sir, as we are all aware this question is one of vital importance as far as we are concerned. Today's discussion has arisen out of the answer given to question No. 174 regarding exclusion of occupied areas of Jammu and Kashmir from the map published in an Indian Government advertisement. I think this is not a new matter.

Sir, similar instances have taken place previously also. Even this Lok Sabha discussed this issue, I think, in March, 1968, through a Half-an-hour discussion regarding publication of a map excluding areas of Jammu and Kashmir from the map of India. At that time the then Home Minister Mr. Chavan told the Lok Sabha that anybody intentionally publishing any unauthorised map of India would be prosecuted. May I ask this question? Even though it may be relating to the Home Ministry, may I ask the External Affairs Minister, whether he is in the knowledge of things whether anybody has published any such map intentionally and whether such a person has been prosecuted or not? Eimilarly, Sir, as we all know, when Dr. Karan Singh was himself a Minister for Civil Aviation, a lapse had taken place Air India had published a map in which certain portions of Kashmir had been excluded from the map of India. That was a lapse. So, this is something which is being repeated almost. May I know whether the Government of India is having any concrete programme to avoid such lapses in future? While replying to the question on that day the Minister of State for External Affairs told the House that we have already sent our protest to those who have published the incorrect map. Now, what is the result of that protest? As far as the whole question is concerned, the Minister has told us: 'We see the bilateral discussion as a forum to settle the issue'. Even though he agreed that this issue has not been discussed day before yesterday while the heads of Governments of India and Pakistan the



President of Pakistan and Indian Prime Minister met for some time, yet he told us that it may be discussed during the coming non-aligned summit meeting. I ask him through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can he assure the House that the Kashmir question will be discussed during that Non-aligned summit between India and Pakistan? Can the Government of India assure the House that this question can be solved, and the problems of the people of India, who happen to be in occupied area of Kashmir will be solved and they will be able to perform all the rights of Indian citizens in future? Can this issue be solved by such bilateral discussion? If not what is the alternative before the Government of India? These are my question.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir let me first refer to the point raised in regard to the Map in the 'Scientific American'. In an issue of Scientific American of November, an apology has been published. I will not read it in detail. He has given the back ground, saying on such and such issue this had been done it does not tally with the official position, the map was not shown to the organisation that sponsored this and the whole thing was unintentional, this unintentional discrepancy is regretted. Now, that has been the practice always. This has been the pattern always. It is true that Mr. Chavan at one point of time said that if anybody intentionally publishes any incorrect map, the person responsible for that will be prosecuted.

Now, every time we have drawn the attention of any wrong map to the publishers, they have come back with an apology. This is significant, not just because it has been so, but the significance lies in the fact that those who are publishing these maps—whatever their motives, we need not go into that are coming back with an apology when we protest to them, which means that they agree that they have done something which they ought not to have done. This is the significance in this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The apology was like an apology given for breach of privilege.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is not an apology for breach of privilege. It is an apology which emanates from the fact that whatever the motivations in making these publications, when they are exposed, they cannot defend their action. This is the real significance of it and I would like the House to appreciate it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. T. KOSALRAM (Tiruchan-  
dur): When it came to your notice what action did you take? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am trying to place before the House an aspect which is very important; politically all kinds of maps are published by all kinds of people. (*Interruptions*). We as a sovereign nation know where our borders lie. We know where our territory is. The mere publication of a wrong map somewhere by whose even it may be, does not alter the position. We stick to our stand and we shall continue to stick to our stand. Wherever such wrong maps come—it is another matter—we bring them to their notice and see that they publish an apology.

On the line of control, the wording of the Simla Agreement is very clear.

"In Jammu and Kashmir, the line of control resulting from the cease fire of December 17, 1971, shall be respected by both sides without prejudice to the recognised position of either side."

Now, we have said that the line of control is not going to be the permanent border between the two countries. That is not our view at all. That is not our stand. As I have just stated no one has given anyone the right to cut the State of Jammu & Kashmir into two. The mere fact that someone is illegally in occupation of a portion of the State, a portion of Indian territory does not really give any justification or any title. So, we are quite clear on that. If the Chief Minister of

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

Jammu & Kashmir has made a statement, we have only to say that that is not our stand. It is at variance with our stand. From the other side, a contradiction has already come. Now, therefore, I would not like to add anything more to this. He has made a statement. We have noted it. We are quite clear on what we stand for and there the matter should rest.

18.19 hrs.

**MOTION RE. SIXTH FIVE YEARS PLAN—Contd.**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Now, we take up the discussion on the Sixth Five Year Plan. There are about 6 or 7 Members who want to participate in the discussion. I think we have got to complete this discussion today.

**SHRI D. P. YADAV:** No, Sir. We can continue this tomorrow.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** We had already postponed it yesterday till today. All the Members whose names are here with me will be given a chance to speak.

**SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI:** We have already decided that we should sit till 7 O'clock. So, we can postpone the discussion.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** There are very important discussions for tomorrow like the Reports of the Union Public Service Commission, etc. Therefore, now each speaker shall not take more than ten minutes. Now, I call upon Mr. Kosalram to take the floor. The Minister will reply to the debate afterwards.

**SHRI K. T. KOSALRAM (Tiruchendur):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by my friend, the Minister of Planning. A number of hon. Members from the opposition have taken part in this debate

and have made constructive criticism of the Sixth Plan. In fact, some of them gave very good suggestions which must be welcomed. My friend, Shri Satish Agarwal gave some very concrete suggestions and I congratulate him for that. But unfortunately, our friend, Chaudhary Charan Singh, the Lok Dal leader, spoke a few words and then left the House saying that there was no quorum. In fact there was quorum in the House at that time. A number of Members belonging to the ruling party and the opposition were there. It was very very wrong on his part; he could have walked out, but he should not have talked like that. He said that there was no quorum in the House. It was very wrong on the part of Chaudhary Charan Singh, a former Prime Minister of this country. He made a very irresponsible statement and walked out.

Then, an hon. Member belonging to CPM also criticised the Plan. I can quite understand his criticising the 6th Plan, but he categorially called the 6th Plan as the 'dead' Plan. This was an uncalled for accusation. You cannot call the 6th Plan as a 'dead' Plan. That was very wrong on his part to do that.

Even though I belong to the ruling party. I have certain points of criticism about the subject under discussion. The rate of industrial growth has been brought down in the annual plan to 4.5 per cent, though in the 6th Plan it has been pegged at 5.2 per cent. I demand that there should be no variation in the Annual Plans so far as the basic criteria of economic development are concerned.

Now, I would like to confine myself to a few relevant points concerning my State. I request the hon. Planning Minister that in the Annual Plan for 1983-84 more funds should be allotted for Karur-Dindigul-Tuticorin-Tirunelveli broadgauge line, which is vital for the economic development of this chronic