

March to Parliament. Not only so, it is given that the Police Officers have told them that the authorities are opposed to this People's March to Parliament and if anything is done by them and if their vehicles are destroyed, they will not be responsible for that.

I want to know from the Government whether it is a fact that the State Transport Authority has not only withdrawn the permits but they have also threatened the bus-owners and vehicle-owners to desist from transporting people to the capital. They are creating all kinds of trouble in the Railways also.

I want that the Government should make a statement.

SHRI NOORUL HUDA (Cachar): Sir, in the State of Tripura there was a peaceful mass satyagraha.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How does it come here?

SHRI NOORUL HUDA: Sir, the tribal population which was agitating for constitution of a tribal autonomous Council, recognition of their language and restoration of the land which had been alienated in 1960 were fired at by the police. They were peaceful demonstrators. The firing resulted in the killing of one person and injuring several persons. What has come over to the Government? We condemn the firing most vehemently and I ask the Home Minister to find out from the Tripura Government the reasons for this unjustified firing and inform this House.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Huda, please sit down. Please take your seat now.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Sir, I want to raise a matter which is purely under the purview of the Central Government. There are fourteen nationalised banks and one of them is Grindlays Bank. The employees of the Grindlays Bank throughout the country are on stay-in strike for three to four hours daily and they have decided to observe a day's strike on 14th March. Sir, the employees have been victimised and I would like the Finance Minister and the Labour Minister to intervene immediately.

14.40 hrs.

MOTION RE: STATEMENT IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It has been conveyed to me that yesterday it was agreed to extend the time of this debate by two hours and calculated on that we would expect the Prime Minister to reply round-about 4 O'clock or may be a few minutes after that.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Sir, there was no such agreement to extend the time by two hours, but if it is required we can agree to it. That is a different thing.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE (Rajapur): We welcome the Kashmir agreement as well as this agreement.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This was conveyed to me. If it has not been an agreement, it does not matter. This is a suggestion made. I would request the hon. Members to keep that in mind and to limit their observations within the time schedule.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: Only on Kashmir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, of course, Mr. Dandavate.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there are occasions in the life of a nation when the Members of Parliament must raise above the political parties and I believe that this is one of the occasions where we must look at the problem from a national perspective

Sir, socialists have always believed that if the problems of reconstruction are to be solved, the various types of tensions that exist must be completely eliminated. We have always stood for the creation of conditions where the threat to socialism will be completely banished, where an atmosphere of Hindu-Muslim unity will be preserved and time will come when to solve various problems in this region, we will be able to establish a broad confederation in which India, Pakistan and Bangladesh will play their legitimate roles. So, all of us who had dreamt that way, would be very happy to welcome the accord that is being presented to us in the form of Agreed Conclusions.

Sir, as far as the problems of Kashmir are concerned, any tension that exists in this area of Kashmir becomes a threat to the forces of integration and forces of secularism. Therefore, any effort to normalise the situation in Kashmir would always be a welcome step. Sir, it is all right to say demagogically that today there are normal conditions and we have a popular Government. But, any one who has visited Kashmir in the course of the last few years would have found a large number of army men and policemen stationed in Srinagar and elsewhere. In such an atmosphere, under these conditions, it is not possible to have the problems of reconstruction solved. Therefore, Sir, after this agreement, I have not the least doubt that the tension in Kashmir will be completely resolved and there will be

no necessity for us to spend such a large amount on the Army and the Police. Probably, with the will of the people, with the consent of the people and with the cooperation of the people we will be able to build a better atmosphere in Kashmir. Sir, those who have been criticising this agreement which has been arrived at lose sight of the fact that the most pivotal problem of accession to India has become irrevocable and this has already been established in the agreement which has been arrived at. I think the greatest merit of this agreement and the accord which has been arrived at is that the problems are sought to be tackled and solved within the broader framework of India's unity and within the broader framework of India's Constitution. That is the greatest merit of the conclusions that have been arrived at.

Sir reference is made by certain sections to Article 370. I do not want to attribute motives even to the Members of the Jan Sangh with whom I differ on this problem. Probably, due to patriotic considerations they feel that Kashmir must be like any other part and since there is no Article 370 for any other State, this Article must not remain on the statute. But, Sir, they must try to understand that if you try to remove Article 370, it will generate forces and generate a climate that will be contrary to the climate that even Jan Sangh wants to build up for the integration of this country. If art 370 remains in the Constitution and the people of Kashmir feel satisfied that their legitimate claims can be fulfilled within the framework of that article, we should not feel frightened about that article at all. Of course, if even without that article, that atmosphere could have been created, I would have been extremely happy. But I would like to weight the issue like this. By making an effort to remove 370 from the Constitution, will more tensions be created? Or by retaining 370 can a better climate of integration be created? My assess-

ment is that if you try to remove article 370, probably more tensions will be created and the effect will be contrary to what the members of the Jan Sangh are expecting. Therefore, I would earnestly request them: let them not rub this article the wrong way.

There is another problem. There is so much talk about Sheikh Abdullah, whether you can rely on his promises. Here I would like to sound a note of warning. One may agree with Sheikh Abdullah, one may agree with his perspective, one may disagree with it. But it is a fact that if you want to deliver the goods in Kashmir, if we have to carry the majority of the Muslim population with us, if an atmosphere of integration is to be built up there, we must try to find out, with all our allergies to certain individuals, who are the men in Kashmir who can deliver the goods. Without casting aspersions on any national leader, I would like to say that if any person in Kashmir can deliver the goods in Kashmir on behalf of the people of Kashmir, whether one likes it or not, it is Sheikh Abdullah's personality. Therefore, there is nothing wrong in entering into an agreement with Sheikh Abdullah. That is the point.

Ultimately, we have to carry all sections of the people of Kashmir with us. They have to have a sense of participation in the affairs of the country and if a man like Sheikh Abdullah who commands the confidence of large sections of the population in Kashmir is brought round and he comes into the mainstream of Indian national politics, I think he will act as a catalytic agent of the people of Kashmir, of the various sections of Kashmir and they can actually be brought into the mainstream of national politics.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: A catalytic agent does not itself change; it brings about change.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have a feeling that Sheikh Abdullah

will not change. Therefore, I have deliberately used the words 'catalytic agent'. As a student of physics and chemistry, I know that a catalytic agent is one which does not participate in the process but at the same time accelerates it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That was what I meant.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You agree with me. Therefore, I feel that is the correct approach in bringing about these changes.

As for the agreed conclusions that have been arrived at, first, all the changes sought to be brought about by common agreement will be brought about within the broader framework of India's Constitution; second, there were a number of tensions created by the slogan of plebiscite. Here I welcome Mirza Afzal Beg's statement of Feb. 6, 1975, in which he has said that in view of the changed circumstances, plebiscite has become irrelevant. It is the greatest achievement for India that those who doggedly stood for the slogan of plebiscite have come forward in the new and changed atmosphere with a new declaration that in the changed circumstances the slogan of plebiscite has become irrelevant and outmoded. I think this is also a great achievement, the climate created by the efforts of arriving at an agreement. Third, there were certain voices of discord insisting that various affairs of Kashmir must not be brought within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of India. I am glad that in the talks that have taken place and in the agreed formulations and conclusions that have been arrived at, the basic sovereign position of the Supreme Court of India has not been surrendered. I think this is the greatest achievement of those who carried on the talks and I am happy about it, because without undermining democratic institutions like the Supreme Court, without curtailing their powers and jurisdiction, the new formulations have been arrived at and agreed upon.

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

There is one more aspect. If Kashmir continued to be turmoil territory and if tensions of various types are there, we know that there are international forces which are willing to jump into the fray and make it a pawn in international power politics. If we are successful in ending tensions in Kashmir, we will succeed in preventing international powers from using this beautiful territory of Kashmir as the hotbed of international rivalries.

As far as Kashmir is concerned, our attitude should be this. While we should make Kashmir an integral part of India, we must try to maintain certain characteristic features of Kashmir and in the context of this agreement my attitude is that it should always be like a daughter in her mother's house but a mistress in her own. That is the attitude which we should maintain, in the context of the overall unity of India. If there are peculiar characteristics and distinctive cultural features, we must give them an assurance that they would be maintained. If the agreement is arrived at in that context, I have not the least doubt that it will be possible for us to tackle the problem.

I am saying this in a lighter vein and nobody should take it that I am casting any aspersions. While arriving at an agreement with Sheikh Abdullah, he has said that he retains his right to maintain his own views to various national problems. He has maintained his individual point of view on problems affecting the mainstream of national life. I am glad that he also accepted the fact that JP stands for democratic values. I only hope and trust that because of his attitude to JP he will not meet the fate of Mohan Dharia.

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu): I am happy to find that the un-

derstanding reached between the Prime Minister and the Sheikh Sahab had been widely welcomed, not only in this House but also all over the country. It is a fact that in the past there were political tensions in Jammu and Kashmir and one of the factors responsible for that was some misunderstanding and the creation of unpleasant situations which prevailed in the past in that State. Due to those situations differences cropped up between Sheikh Sahab and the Central leadership for which the people of that State had to pay the price. Only a microscopic political element in Jammu and Kashmir, the Jan Sangh, has chosen to oppose this understanding. I want to post certain questions to the Jan Sangh leaders. What do they want in Jammu and Kashmir? Do they want political tensions to continue?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (मुरैना)

धारा 370 समाप्त हो।

श्री रामरतन शर्मा (बादा) : त.मिल-नाडु और जम्मू काश्मीर में क्या अन्तर है, इतको स्पेशल स्टड्स क्यों दिया जाय ?

श्री इन्द्रजीत मल्होत्रा : जो बात मैं कह रहा हूँ, वह प्राहिस्ता प्राहिस्ता आपक जहन में आएगी।

श्री रामरतन शर्मा : हम आपके प्रश्न का उत्तर दे रहे हैं, आप चेयर को कहिये, आप हमसे क्या सवाल पूछते हैं ?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : हमसे पूछेंगे तो ऐसा ही हाजिर जवाब मिलेगा।

श्री इन्द्रजीत मल्होत्रा : पहले सवाल सुन लीजिये, उसके बाद जवाब दीजिये।

By these interruptions the hon. Members have further proved the point which I was going to submit. I would like to revive their memory of the unpleasant situation in 1953. What were the main factors respon-

sible for it? It was the unwise agitation by the Praja Parishad at that time, and now by the Jan Sangh, in the Jammu region for various reasons. Again this is a very important and significant point. They are having apprehensions in their mind, but they forget that is not 1953, this is 1975. The whole complexion of the political situation has changed not only in the State of Jammu and Kashmir but also all over the country and in the world. Therefore, my only fear is that this element of danger should not be introduced into the perfect mutual understanding and the good atmosphere which has now started taking shape. In my view this accord or understanding is just a beginning to improve the political atmosphere in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. For what purpose? To strengthen the democratic, secular and progressive forces so that the programme of socialism which has been undertaken in our country can be implemented with greater speed in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

I would also like to pose another question to my Jan Sangh friends because it is high time that they realised the practical situation not only in the State of Jammu and Kashmir but also in the country and in the world. In the past we had to face the hostile and unpleasant attitude of Sheikh Abdullah on various matters which had a direct impact on the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It is also a fact that Kashmir has been talked about, discussed in the international forum at various times. Every time India was faced with this question why Sheikh Abdullah had changed his position.

श्री राम रतन शर्मा : उनकी जो पुरानी बात थी, वही रही। आप बेन्ज हुये हैं, मोख अब्दुल्ला बेन्ज नहीं हुये हैं।

श्री इन्द्रजीत मल्होत्रा : आप के साथ मुसीबत यह है कि आप अपने जहन के तारों को बन्द रखते हैं, बात को सुनने के कोशिश नहीं करते हैं।

This is another important factor that this understanding was not reached overnight. But it took at least 2½ years and in reaching it not only the Prime Minister and Sheikh Abdullah but also other State and Central leaders were involved. Then Sheikh Sahib undertook an extensive tour of the three regions of the State. He spent a good deal of time in the Jammu region. He went everywhere in the Jammu region, he had talks and discussions with various people in all walks of life, with political leaders, non-party leaders and prominent citizens to know their reactions and aspirations regarding the future political set-up. After knowing the attitude of the people he came to this conclusion that the time had come when all misunderstanding should be removed and understanding should be reached with the centre so that all political tensions could be removed for all time to come. Today we have a cooperative and responsive Sheikh Abdullah, not only individually but who has along with him his other colleagues and other political elements, who were hitherto wasting their energies on various political controversies. Their energies can now be utilised to build up the State economically with greater speed. I ask, what harm does the Jan Sangh find in a situation like this.

15 hrs.

श्री सुकम चन्द कछवाय : 370 समाप्त करो, केन्द्र के नियम लागू करो।

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA: It is unfortunate that the Jan Sangh especially in the Jammu region, has always been trying to thrive on slogans only. I am sure my hon. friend

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

Mr. Kachwai does not understand the real constitutional meaning of article 370.

श्री [कस चन्द्र कछवाय : 10 साल तक जल में रखा गद्दार को, तब क्या हो गया था ?

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA: I take strong objection to the language he is using for a very tall and highly patriotic political personality of this country.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar) This should be expunged. Everybody is known by the words that he uses. That shows the quality of the member.

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA: I am not at all worried because, as I said, this is just a microscopic political element. I would advise my Jan Sangh friends that when they come to Jammu, they should not spend all their time around the city chowk or Cantt. Mandi area. They should try to go to other parts of Jammu region to find out the reactions of the Jammu people. I am very happy to find that under the consolidated leadership of the Congress—Dr. Karan Singh is sitting here—the Jammu people have always responded well as far as the integration of the State is concerned and as far as the integration of the three distinct regions of the State is concerned. I am happy to say this that only recently Sheikh Abdullah also indicated that he will make all efforts to keep the three regions together. He is aware of the economic and political problems which are being faced by the Jammu region, Kashmir valley and Ladakh. Therefore, I have no doubt that the administration under his leadership would make all efforts to further strengthen the links between these three regions and also further strengthen the link existing between Jammu and Kashmir and the rest of the country.

When Mr. Bhutto takes objection to this accord, my Jan Sangh friends follow the same line. This raises various questions in my mind: Are they taking their political advice and orders as far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned from the Pakistani leadership or are they using their own mind?

In the end, I would only like to say this. This is how Sheikh Abdullah has summed up his reaction to this accord, his reaction to this understanding. In the last paragraph of the letter which he wrote to the hon. Prime Minister, Sheikh Abdullah says:

"The country is passing through a critical period and it is all the more necessary for all of us who cherish the ideals of democracy, secularism and socialism to strengthen your hands as the leader of the nation, and it is in this spirit that I am offering my whole hearted cooperation."

I ask again those friends who still have apprehensions in their minds, what more than this could a person say, or a person could offer, for he has offered his whole-hearted cooperation to join hands with the leader of the nation to solve the national problem?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: (Begusarai) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as I had stated earlier in the House, we are generally in agreement with the accord that has been reached between Sheikh Abdullah and the Government of India and I am here to express my satisfaction that the darkness and misunderstanding and distrust which clouded the relationship between Sheikh Abdullah and the Government of India has dissipated. We are sorry this unfortunate chapter was allowed to remain for over two decades. However, if this consummation has been brought about, it must be a matter of satisfaction for everybody in the country. What we

And today is that there is unanimity, complete unanimity, in the hope that this accord must succeed and fructify in the well-being and prosperity of the people of Kashmir and of the people of the whole of India.

After having said that, I must also say that we do not know the various intimate processes through which this agreement had passed, nor do we know the stages through which it has emerged. So, we cannot say whether both sides have taken care to see that this chapter, this unfortunate chapter, is not repeated again in the future. Only the Prime Minister can assure the country, or the ruling party spokesmen can assure the country, or my hon. friend, Shri Shamim, can assure the country that they have taken the utmost care to see that again the same unfortunate chapter of misunderstanding and distrust is not repeated.

But, so far as we are concerned, this House has been completely kept in the dark even about the broad framework within which this dialogue was resumed. Now I ask you, Sir, and I ask the hon. Members on the other side of the House, whether it is proper for the Government to treat the House in the manner in which they thought it fit to treat it. We are reminded of what Mr. Churchill did. During the period of grave national emergency he took the House of Commons into complete confidence even about the secrets of war and thereby Mr. Churchill was able to turn the Parliament into an ally. But, our hon. Prime Minister thinks the Parliament to be a hostile organisation and she gives the impression to the Parliament and the people that, so far as Parliament is concerned, her attitude is one of "I don't care". Can't we ask the Government with all humility that even within the broad framework within which the dialogue was being conducted, should it not have been indicated to Parliament right from the beginning? That is a thing to which we had taken strong objection even earlier.

We do not support this agreement because of certain reasons that have been adduced by my hon. friend, Professor Hiren Mukherjee. I must say that I value his kind words about me immensely, as I consider him to be a person of sterling qualities; in fact, he is one of the gems of Parliament. But I must say that I am not supporting, my party would not support, this agreement for the reasons that he has chosen fit to adduce in support of it. Professor Mukherjee said, I might remind the hon. House, that India was a multi-national configuration. That sounds very well, so far as the rhetoric of it is concerned. But one has to go behind the rhetoric. We, for one, would not be a party to this kind of concept of a multi-national configuration: we do think that India is a nation. If we support this agreement, we do not do so because we consider that India is multi-national. India has many divergences and many nuances, but they make for the richness of our culture for the richness of our nation; they do not detract from the solidarity of the nation. So, I do not agree with him, so far as that argument is concerned.

May I also say that I do not welcome the return of Sheikh Abdullah to the scene because he happens to be the leader of the minority community. I respect Sheikh Abdullah as a leader of that community also. He belongs to the minority community and therefore, we have to have a special feeling about that community and about that leader; that is something else. But it would be deminishing, it would be truncating the stature of Sheikh Abdullah to say that he is only the leader of the minority community.

Sheikh Abdullah was called the Shar-a-Kashmir because he had a remarkable part to play in the freedom struggle. We have to look upon him as a national leader. So, it is not also from that point of view that we would like to support this agreement between Sheikh Abdullah and the Government of India.

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

Here I would like to remind the House of what our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, said soon before his death in 1964 about Sheikh Abdullah. These are the words which must ring through the corridors of history. Before he died, he had spoken to the AICC, not to the present AICC, which is only a toy for you to play with, but to the AICC of the good old days. Pandit Nehru said in the AICC meeting.

"Sheikh Abdullah is wedded to the principles of secularism and does not wish anything to be done to vitiate this in any way. He does not believe in the two-nation theory, which was the basis of the formation of Pakistan."

I think these are the words which must govern our assessment of Sheikh Abdullah.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Was the assessment of Nehru of people correct?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Had he been alive, his assessment of Pilo Mody would have been similarly correct as it was about Sheikh Abdullah. He would have made no discrimination against my hon friend, Shri Pilo Mody; about that I am quite sure.

Sheikh Abdullah has been the principal architect of modern Kashmir and his contribution to the emergence of modern Kashmir cannot be erased by anything that had happened during the past few years. That being so, we think that he is going to play a great role in deal in the changed circumstances of the country and in the changed circumstances of the sub-continent. The whole scenario has changed in the sub-continent and the world situation has also changed a great deal.

Now we are particularly very glad to note some of the recent utterances of Sheikh Abdullah. They have heartened the people all over the country. Sheikh Abdullah has said that he is very keen to see that the administration is cleansed; that he would try to eradicate corruption from administration; that he would try to re-build society on the basis of socialism, secularism and democracy and that he would work for the re-enthronement of the Gandhian values. When he was speaking to the Kashmir people the other day, he said, "What we find today is complete disappearance of the Gandhian values" and he said that he would try to re-enthron the Gandhian values.

It is also a matter of great satisfaction to us that Sheikh Abdullah has said that he does not believe in the use of force and would try to persuade his opponents to change their ways by methods of love and affection. He has told the police not to arrest his opponents if that is possible. He was, therefore, speaking the language of J.P.

Would my hon friends disagree with me when I say that he was laying stress on the same values as those of J.P.? Would my hon friends disagree with me when I say that he was pledging himself to the programme of national re-generation to which J.P. had pledged himself? Would my hon. friends disagree with me when I say that he is also a believer and upholder of the Gandhian values as J.P. is and has been acclaimed universally to be? So, Sheikh Abdullah's heart has been beating in unison with the heart of J.P.

In fact, he has gone there, if you analyse it properly, as a Janta Chief Minister. He has not gone as the leader of your party. He has not even gone as a member of the Legislative Assembly. Although J.P. has made it clear and those of us who are engaged in this movement have made it clear that we are not work-

ing for a partyless democracy through this movement, yet my hon. friends on the other side go on harping on this thing. What have you brought about exactly in Jammu and Kashmir? You have brought about the consummation of the ideal of a partyless democracy. Although we have never said that we are working through this movement for the achievement of a partyless democracy, that is what you have brought about in Jammu and Kashmir.

Sheikh Abdullah has gone there as a partyless leader, as a partyless Chief Minister, as a Janta Chief Minister, as J.P.—Chief Minister. I ask my hon. friend, Sardar Swaran Singh who is a student of constitutional affairs quite unlike the Prime Minister: Does not the Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly stand as good as dissolved? What is the meaning of the Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly in the present context? None of the Ministers of Sheikh Abdullah happens to belong to the Legislative Assembly.

It would proably please my hon. friends on the other side that I agree with the Prime Minister that this agreement should not be judged on the basis of legal niceties. To repeat, I agree that in judging this agreement, one should not go into legal niceties. I completely agree with the Prime Minister, for this basic trust and understanding cannot be brought about by legal or constitutional niceties.

I do not find my hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, here; I wanted to recommend this to him, although with a degree of hesitation because he happens to be a bachelor; generally when I am speaking, he is sitting at my back. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I wanted to recommend to Mr. Vajpayee in this context a few lines from one of the great English poets, W. H. Auden, who died only last year. This is one of the newest poems of W. H. Auden. I am saying this to request Mr. Vajpayee not to have a very close look at it.

Now, what does W. H. Auden say? He says:

"It is very rude to take close-ups and, except when enraged, we don't:"

That is, we take close-ups only when we are enraged; otherwise, we do not. Then what does he say?

"Lovers, approaching to kiss, instinctively shut their eyes before their faces"...

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not provoke Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: A bachelor is not expected to be a husband, but he is certainly expected to be a lover. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, since you have been a student of English literature, I would like to draw your attention to this:

"lovers, approaching to kiss, instinctively shut their eyes before their faces can be reduced to anatomical data."

In our view, some of the remarks or the pronouncements of our great leaders have to be borne in mind while considering the Kashmir situation, and the first that I would commend to the attention of the House is what Sardar Patel said in October, 1949 Sardar Patel said:

"In view of the special problem with which..." I lay stress on the words "special problem".

"In view of the special problem with which the Jammu and Kashmir Government is faced, we had made special provision for the continuance of the relationship of the State with the Union on the existing basis."

Later, Pandit Nehru, while participating in the debate, to which my esteemed friend, Shri H. N. Mukherjee made a reference and in which I also had the honour of participating, in 1952, had said:

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

"The strongest bonds that bind will not be of your armies or even of your Constitution to which some reference has been made, but bonds which are stronger than the Constitution or of laws and armies—bonds that bind through love and affection and understanding."

This also, the hon. House must always bear in mind.

Then I have to say a few words about the Constitutional aspects of it in my own humble way. Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar, father of one of the principal architects of this Agreement, Mr. Parthasarathy, while placing article 370 of the Constitution before the Constituent Assembly had expressed the hope on behalf of.

"everybody here that in due course even Jammu and Kashmir will become ripe for the same sort of integration as has taken place in the case of other States."

Now, I would like to refer to certain remarks made by the hon. Prime Minister so far as article 370 is concerned. I must say that I do not agree with the views of Mr. Vajpayee that article 370 is a complete block to progress there, it is a blot on our Constitution. I do not subscribe to that view. In fact, much of the integration that has taken place has been through the instrumentality of article 370, and that is not being realised by many hon. members. That does not require any elaborate process of delay to bring about this integration. In fact, I am foreseeing, in not-too-distant future, that the demand will be clamant from the people of Kashmir for withdrawal of article 370; the demand would come from them. After all, erosion of article 370 has taken place, and it has taken place a great deal on the basis of the demand from the people of Jammu and Kashmir and not on the basis of the demand that has been made in this hon. House. Article 370 has played a really constructive and helpful role. But, at the same time, I would like to submit

with all humility to the hon. Prime Minister that had she not treaded on this constitutional ground, it would have been much better. The hon. Prime Minister made a definitive statement that, after the dissolution of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly, Article 370 has become permanent. It may be that the Prime Minister said it in a different way and it had a hidden dimension to it, I do not know. But the point is that, though, in the proviso to sub-clause (3) to Article 370 there is the mention of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly, after the dissolution of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly, that has become otiose, as it is known in constitutional parlance. You have also got a mention of the Maharaja of Kashmir in Article 370. Does it mean that the Maharaja of Kashmir is there and there is no other ruler in his place? There cannot be a vacuum. The president himself acts when the Constituent Assembly is no more there. So, I do not think that the views of the hon. Prime Minister would bear a scrutiny, any close scrutiny, in this respect.

With these words, since you have been .

SHRI PILOO MODY: . . . really impatient.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA. . . . ringing the bell, may I say that we express our satisfaction over this agreement. We also express our hope that this agreement would prove to be enduring and no blasts of mis-understanding would and should come in the way and disfigure the scene. We would also like to assure our co-operation and support in bringing about an atmosphere in which this agreement might succeed.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur): Much as I had enjoyed the speech made by my friend, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, it is my humble duty to point out to him certain distortions in which he has indulged, the first one being that the Government of India have kept the opposition in the

dark while the talks were going on whereas Mr. Winston Churchill, during the days of the Great World War, constantly took the Opposition into confidence. May I remind Mr. Mishra that Mr. Churchill was leading a national government of which Mr. Attlee was the Deputy Prime Minister and the situation was not parallel

May I also ask Mr. Mishra something that I have not understood nor does my logic permit me to digest. He seems to say that in Kashmir we have spoken the language of JP. Would he enlighten me and tell me in what language are the great admirers of JP, the Jana Sangh is, speaking, when it comes to Kashmir? It bewilders me when I see that people who are actively campaigning for the dissolution of a properly elected legislative assembly.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: But you have brought it about in effect.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH: It surprises me that the people who are campaigning day in and day out for the dissolution of an elected legislative assembly are so worried about the fact that a person who does not happen to be a member of the Assembly has been sworn in as the Chief Minister. Does Mr. Mishra forget that this experiment though not successful, was tried very hard by his Party when they put Mr. T. N. Singh as the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh... (Interruptions) only to be rejected by the people within the stipulated period?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Does he belong to a Party? He does not belong to any party in the legislature. You cannot make a distinction between Mr. T. N. Singh and Sheikh Abdullah? He belonged to a party.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: That would have been defamatory.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH: I am merely pointing out to you your love of legislative assemblies and your love

of only those people being Chief Ministers who have been elected to the assemblies. My point is very simple and it does not require any hair-splitting. Some of my friends talked about Kashmir being put in the same condition as other States. I wonder whether they have forgotten the Indian spirit. I am reminded of something that Abdul Fazal wrote about Akbar. He said:

'The remarkable quality of His Majesty's mind is that it sees unity in diversity and diversity in unity.'

Unity in Diversity.—This has been the Indian spirit throughout the ages,—a country of diverse religions, many languages and many cultures. We in this country have never believed in the monolithic unity. We in this country have never believed in steam-rolling things. That is something that Pakistan has tried to do, that is, to produce a sort of monolithic unity, but see what has happened in Bangladesh and see what is happening in Baluchistan and God forbid what comes about in Pakistan. This is not the kind of unity or uniformity which this country has ever subscribed to.

I would like to remind this House of one thing. It was commented that between 1967 and 1969, if one travelled from Amritsar to Calcutta one would never come across a congress Government. It was through the understanding and acceptance of the Prime Minister that India was kept together. It is this kind of tolerance which we require in this country.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee quoted Jawaharlal Nehru from B. N. Mullik's book. I would like to say that when the spirit of Jawaharlal Nehru is invoked, it should be properly understood. Speaking of Jawaharlal Nehru, Winston Churchill has said:

'Here was a man who had helped overcome bitterness and malice'

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]

I recommend that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee follows the same spirit in relation to Sheikh Abdullah in Kashmir. In page 172 of the book of Mr. B. N. Mullik (which Shri Vajpayee has referred to), Mr. Mullik records Pandit Nehru's views. I quote:

"The Prime Minister felt that Sheikh Abdullah still had a strong hold on the people of Kashmir and in the changed circumstances no political settlement in the valley could be thought of without bringing him in."

Our Prime Minister has certainly not departed from the stand taken by the Prime Minister then. This is what Jawaharlal Nehru himself felt in 1964.

Much has been talked about the Sheikh being called 'Wazir-e-Azam'. I ask, what is there in a name? As Dr. Karan Singh himself pointed out, he was known by 4 distinct names: Regent, Yuvaraj, Sadar-i-riyast, and then Governor. And Dr. Karan Singh will bear me out when I say that the Yuvarajs of Kashmir were known as Mian Sahebs.

SHRI PILOO MODY: And after that he has gone as a Minister. And, what happens after that?

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH: The Working Committee of the Jan Sangh said that while the agreement talks about secularism, socialism and democracy it does not talk about patriotism. 'If you talk about patriotism', I tell them, 'you must get over chauvinism and jingoism; you must get over your narrow, then only you can understand patriotism.'

Sir, this is an understanding which is an understanding of foresight. It is an understanding of vision and courage. A Sheikh un-reconciled was a handy tool to invoke for political intrigues. A sheikh on the side of all the forces that are battling for secularism and communal harmony in Kashmir and in the country is a great

force for good. Let us remember that Sheikh has been a freedom fighter and may I also for the information of those who are trying to say unworthy things about Sheikh say that when Sheikh was outside this country he never chose to stay outside this country. He much rather suffered in this country and fought for his principles and very rightly today is leading his people.

What has happened with this understanding? The very first thing that has happened is we have put Pakistan's democratic proclamations to test, and, only two days ago 'the Motherland' reported that wherever in Pakistan—occupied Kashmir Bhutto and Abdul Qayyum went there were slogans of 'Indira Zindabad' and 'Sheikh Zindabad'. We have put a challenge to Pakistan and we have also to tell them that they will have to come to terms on the basis of Simla Agreement.

I will conclude by quoting the statement that the Sheikh made in 1968. He said: "Give me a little trust and freedom, I shall never endanger India's honour, for India's honour is my honour"

श्री एस० ए० शमीम (श्रीनगर) :

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, आज की बहम और आज का मौका मेरे लिये खास अहमियत रखता है। चार साल पहले जब मैं इस एजान में आया था तो मैं कह रहा था कि काश्मीर के साथ नाइन्साफी हो रही है, काश्मीर को इन्साफ दीजिये और काश्मीर को इन्साफ देने का एक तरीका यह है कि काश्मीर के सबसे अजीम लीडर के साथ इन्साफ कीजिये। इस दर-खवास्त को प्राप्त करने में चार साल का वक़्त जरूर लगा लेकिन तारीख में, इतिहास में चार साल का वक़्त बहुत तबील नहीं है। इस प्रोसेस को आगे बढ़ाने में मुझे फ़क़ है कि एन उस वक़्त जब कुछ लोग नहीं बचा

कर रहे थे, मैं यहाँ हुआ कर रहा था कि यह कम पाया-ए-तकमील तक पहुंचे, और मेरी दुआ कामयाब हुई है ।

कल से मैंने जो तकरीरें सुनी है उनको अपनी जगह ग्रहमियत है, और मैं समझना हूँ कि इस एकाई को जिस तरीके से बलकम किया गया है वह इस बात की गहादत है, इस बात की अलामत है कि पूरे मुल्क ने इसको सहमति दी है, इसका खैर-मकदम किया है । लेकिन एक बात मुझे जरूर खलती आ रही है कि काश्मीर का मसला क्या है, यह क्यों पैदा हुआ, इसको सही तौर पर नहीं समझा गया है ।

अगर श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी इसको अच्छी तरह से नहीं समझे तो मुझे एतराज नहीं । लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि इस तरफ के कुछ लोगों ने भी इस मसले के असल पहलुआ को नहीं समझा ।

अगर काश्मीर का मसला सिर्फ यह है तो कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा इसलिए बना कि महाराज को इम्पूमेंट आफ एक्मंशन पर दस्तखत करने का हक था, तो फिर वह मसला तो खत्म हो गया । उस के बाद शेख अब्दुला से बात करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी । अगर काश्मीर का मसला यह होता कि काश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा बने रहना चाहिये, तो काश्मीर को किसी ने हिन्दुस्तान से छीना नहीं था । हम तीन लडाइया लड चुके हैं । हिन्दुस्तानी नौजवानों ने खून बहाया है । यह मसला नहीं था ।

फिर क्या जरूरत पेश आयी कि एक ऐसे आदमी के साथ बात की जाये, जो किसी पार्टी का लीडर नहीं है, जो किसी नेजिस्नेचर का मेम्बर नहीं है ? इस मसले की ग्रहमियत यह है कि काश्मीर का हिन्दुस्तान के साथ इलहाक सिर्फ किसी इलाके का इलहाक नहीं था । मुझे माफ करें श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी भी, और डा० कर्ण सिंह भी,

कि अगर यह सिर्फ महाराजा हरिसिंह के दस्तखतो से हुआ होता, तब इस मामले की कोई ग्रहमियत नहीं थी ।

यह मुस्लिम लोग का दावा था कि स्टेट्स के इलहाक का फैसला वहाँ के नवाब, राजे और महार जे करेगे । कांग्रेस ने इस बात को कभी तस्मीम नहीं किया । कांग्रेस ने कहा कि वहाँ के लोग जो फैसला करेगे, वह हमें मजूर है । यही बजह है कि नवाब जूनागढ के पाकिस्तान के मथ इलहाक करने के बाद भी, जूनागढ हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है । यही बजह है कि निजाम हैदराबाद की स्वाहिशात के बाद भी हैदराबाद हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा रहा है । काश्मीर के मसले की ग्रहमियत यह है कि जब आप ने मद्रास का मजदब के नाम तकसिम किया, उस वकत एक मन्निम-मंजारिट, स्टेट ने यह फैसला किया कि हम हिन्दू-मंजारिट कन्टी का हिस्सा बनेगे । शेख अब्दुल्ला ने हमारे मुल्क के मैकुलरिज्म को प्राइडियानाजिकल करटेन्ट दिया है । यह शेख अब्दुल्ला की ग्रहमियत है ।

इसलिये बुनियादी तौर पर बात यह नहीं है कि किसने क्या किया । बुनियादी तौर पर बात यह है कि काश्मीर के मुल्लिक बहम करने का अधिकार हमको किसने दिया है । श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी ने हिन्दुस्तान के नौजवानों की जवाबदारी की बात कही है । उन्होंने मुना होगा, मैंने अपनी आखो से देखा है । अगर वह यहाँ मौजूद होते, तो मैं उनसे कहता कि काश्मीर क इन्टेग्रेट करने के लिये आप का खून खीन रहा है, उसके लिये आप बेकरार और बँचेन है । लेकिन काश्मीर के मुताल्लिक बात करने का हक आपको उस आदमी ने दिया है, जिसका नाम शेख अब्दुल्ला है । क्यों ?

27 अक्तूबर से 29 अक्तूबर तक हिन्दुस्तानी फौजों ने नहीं, शेख अब्दुल्ला और उसके निहत्थे सिपाहियों ने काश्मीर का दिफा किया । हिन्दुस्तानी मिपाही का

[श्री ए० ए० शमीम]

खून गिरने से पहले मुजपद्धरावाद में मास्टर अब्दुल अजीज का खून गिरा था और बाराभूना में शही-शेरवानी के सोने में गोलियां पेवस्त हो गयी थी। उम खून ने आपको हक दिया है कि आप काश्मीर को अपना लख्ने-जिगर बनाये। लेकिन जिसने आपको यह हक दिया है उसे आप गाली देने हैं, यह अच्छा नहीं करते हैं। काश्मीर का मसला क्या है काश्मीर का मसला यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान एक जम्हूरियत है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान एक डेमोक्रेसी, एक लोकतंत्र, न होता, तो, तब काश्मीर का कोई मसला नहीं था। अगर बीस, पच्चीस तीस लाख लोग चिल्लाते हैं, तो चिल्लाने रहे, डिक्टेटर इस बात की परवाह नहीं करते हैं। जिन मुल्क में डिक्टेटरशिप हो, वह यह परवाह नहीं करता है कि बीस, पच्चीस लाख लोग क्या कहते हैं। काश्मीर का मसला यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान एक डेमोक्रेसी है, और डेमोक्रेसी में अगर दस हजार लोग भी नाराज है दस आदमी भी नाराज है तो उनको अपनी तरफ करने के लिये तरीके उतारना खरोदने के लिए मुहैया किये गये हैं, डायलाग का प्रोसेस मुहैया किया गया है।

श्री इयासनुबन मिश्र : इम हाउम में भी यही होना चाहिए।

श्री ए० ए० शमीम : होना यही चाहिए लेकिन जहा-जहा यह हुआ है उसका खैर मकदम कीजिए और अपनी बड़ाई का सबूत दीजिए। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि बड़े-बड़े मन्सूबों पर बैठ कर भी आप छोटपन का मुजाहिरा करे।

मेरी गुजारिश यह है कि पाकिस्तान के लिए काश्मीर का कोई मसला नहीं है। भुट्टो साहब आईन बनाने हैं और आजाद काश्मीर पर लागू करते हैं—कोई मसला नहीं है। लेकिन हमारे लिए यह मसला जरूर था। 1953 में जो हुआ वह एक भयानक डबाब है। उसको जितनी जल्दी भूल जायें

उतना बेहतर है। लेकिन 1953 में एक बात हुई। 1953 में हिन्दुस्तान के जमीर में एक काटा चुभ गया। 22 साल तक हमारा जमीर में यह काटा हमें बेकरार करता रहा। हम दुनिया के बड़े-बड़े ऐवानों में जाकर इस सवाल का कोई जबाब नहीं दे सकते थे कि क्या वजह है कि जिस आदमी ने पाकिस्तान का मुकाबला किया, तलवार की धार का मुकाबला किया और काश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा बनाया वह आज जेलों की रोक बना हुआ है क्या वजह है कि काश्मीर में हर बार इन्तखाबात कराने के लिए पहले उसे जेल में रखना पड़ता है और उसे एक्सटन करना पड़ता है। आप यहाँ कुछ भी कहते लेकिन हमारा जमीर इस बारे में शरमिन्दा था। मुझे खुशी है कि आज 22 साल के बाद हिन्दुस्तान के जमीर से वह काटा निकल गया है। यह बात वे लोग नहीं समझ सकते हैं जिन का कोई जमीर नहीं है जिन की निगाह सिर्फ जमीन पर है जिन को जमीन चाहिए। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान के 55 करोड़ अरबों आज अपने आप को हल्का महसूस कर रहे हैं। आज हमारी आंखें रोशन हैं हमारी गर्दन बुलन्द हो गई है हम बकाए के साथ कह सकते हैं कि जिस आदमी ने गांधी और जवाहरलाल नेहरू के शाना-व-शाना काम किया था आज वह हमारा साथी है।

भुट्टो साहब की परेशानी बंजा नहीं है। भुट्टो साहब अगर खुदकामी भी करे तो मुझे ताज्जुब नहीं होगा। उसका सबसे बड़ा हथियार आज हमने उसके हाथ से छीन लिया है और उसके लिए सारे मुल्क को खून होना चाहिए। जो लोग खुश नहीं हैं उनमें दो किस्म के लोग हैं। एक तो वे हैं जो जानते नहीं हैं कि किस्सा क्या है। उनको माफ कर दो।

श्री पीलू मोदी : पूरी सरकार को माफ कर दो।

श्री ए० ए० शमीम : मसलन आप को माफ कर दो।

दूसरे लोग वे हैं जो जानते हैं कि क्या दुष्प्रा है इसमें मुल्क को क्या फायदा है, लेकिन जिनका जहन साफ नहीं है जो यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि यहाँ के लोगों के साथ इन्साफ होना चाहिए, जिनका विशाल भारत का ख्वाब यह है कि यहाँ की हिन्दू-मैजारीटी को इस बात पर कि परवाह किये बगैर कि जनता की क्या राय है उसके साथ गोली की जुबान से बात करनी चाहिए। उन लोगों को हमें समझना होगा।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी को यह नहीं मूलना चाहिए कि जब मुल्क तकसीम हुआ था, तो चार दिल खून हो गये थे, जिन्होंने इस तकसीम को कभी कुबूल नहीं किया। उनमें से एक का नाम गांधी है दूसरे का नाम अब्दुल कलाम आज़ाद है तीसरे का नाम अब्दुल गफ्फार ख़ाँ है और चौथे का नाम शेख़ अब्दुल्ला है। इस तारीख़ी हकीकत को नज़र-अन्दाज़ नहीं किया जा सकता है। जिस भारत को अखण्ड बनाने के लिए आज वे बेचैन हैं, उस भारत की अखण्डता के ख्वाब इन चार अदमियों ने देखे थे। और भी बहुत से लोगों ने देखे होंगे। लेकिन जब इनके ख्वाब नितर-बितर हो गये, तो उनका खून उन की आँखों में टपक पड़ा था। वह दर्द जानने के लिए श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी, जनमंथ के बाहिद पढ़े-लिखे मेम्बर, को यह सोचना चाहिए।

इस एग्जिमेंट से और कुछ दुष्प्रा हो या न दुष्प्रा हो, हमारी अख़लाकी, नैतिक, हैसियत मजबूत में मजबूततर हो गई है। हमारे पास काश्मीर का मकम्मल कब्ज़ा था। पोलिटिकली और फ़िज़िकली हम वहाँ थे। लेकिन हमारी अख़लाकी हैसियत कमजोर थी। इस एग्जिमेंट से जानी तौर पर मैं खुश हूँ या नहीं, उसकी बात नहीं है। लेकिन एक मुहबे-बतन हिन्दुस्तानी थी हैसियत से मैं यह दावा कर सकता हूँ कि हमारी अख़लाकी हैसियत भी आज मुस्तहकम हो गई है और इस एग्जिमेंट को इसी नुक़ता-ए-नजर से देखना चाहिए।

मैं श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी से नाराज़ नहीं हूँ। अगर वह यहाँ मौजूद होते, तो मैं उनका शुक्रिया अदा करता। मुझे मितेज़ गांधी से शिकायत है कि उन्होंने यहाँ एग्जिमेंट पेश करने बकत इस बात का ख्याल नहीं रखा कि शेख़ मुहम्मद अब्दुल्ला जब काश्मीर में लोगों के सामने जायेंगे, तो वह क्या कहेंगे कि मैं क्या लेकर आया हूँ। मितेज़ गांधी परेशान थी कि ये 520—शुक्र है खुदा का को 420 नहीं—मेम्बर क्या कहते हैं नतीजा यह दुष्प्रा कि सिर्फ़ उसके नैगेटिव एक्स्पेक्टस पेश किये गये—यह मांगा था, यह भी नहीं दिया, यह मांगा था, यह भी नहीं दिया। श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी का शुक्रिया और उनकी जमाअत का शुक्रिया कि इस एग्जिमेंट में शेख़ अब्दुल्ला के लिए जो पाज़िटिव फ़ीचर हो सके थे, उनको जाहिर किया और हमारे लिए यह आसान बना दिया कि हम काश्मीर के लोगों को बताये कि देखो, हम लोग क्या लेकर आये हैं। अगर हम आपका भरोसा करते, तो हम किसी को मुँह दिखाने के लायक भी नहीं होते।

एग्जिमेंट के सिलसिले में एक बात नामेन-क्लेचर की कही गई है। अगर आप जाती तौर पर मुझ से पूछें, तो मैं कहूँगा कि नाम में क्या रखा है। लेकिन शेख़ मुहम्मद अब्दुल्ला के लिए, और काश्मीरी अराम के लिए इस की हैमियत साइकालोजिकल ज्यादा है और अमली कम है। जो लोग यह चिन्ताते हैं कि कैसे हो सकता है कि इस मुल्कमें दो वज़ीरे आज़म हो, वे नहीं जानते कि 1904 तक इस मुल्क में दो वज़ीरे आज़म थे। काश्मीरी सोमायटी का एक बहुत ही इनसिमीक्रिट किरदार, कैरेक्टर, नान-एन्टीटी—शमसुद्दीन—भी वज़ीरे आज़म था। उस बकत जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कभी यह नहीं कहा कि मैं तो नहीं मानूँगा कि इस मुल्क में मेरे अनावा भी कोई वज़ीरे आज़म रहे। जवाहरलाल नेहरू अगर शमसुद्दीन के भूताल्लिक यह सोच सकते थे, तो श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी क्या शेख़ अब्दुल्ला

के मुतालिक यह नहीं बर्दाश्त कर सकती है ? यह शकत है। और फ्रक क्या पडेगा ? हमने यहां मामूली से अपने सेक्रेटरी को सेक्रेटरी जेनरल बना दिया है। तनब्बाह वही रही है। कौनसा घास्मान टूट पड़ा ? इसके कुछ साइको-लोजिकल बैल्यूज होते हैं।

डा० कर्ण सिंह सदरे रियासत थे। इनकी दौलत मे उससे कोई इजाफ़ा नहीं हुआ, कमी हुई, कुछ लोगों को खिलाना पिलाना पडता था। लेकिन एक साइको-लाजिकल बैंकप्राउन्ड, एक साइकोलाजिकल प्रभील काश्मीरी धावाम के लिए है और मैं इस सिलसिले मे अपनी राय वाजह तौर पर मिसेज इंदिरा गांधी तक पहुंचाना चाहता हू कि मुझे इन की इस राय से इत्फाक नहीं है कि शेख अब्दुल्ला अपने आपको वजीरे भाजम लिखें। ये उन्हें चीफ मिनिस्टर कहती रहें। शेख अब्दुल्ला ने भी इस राय का इजहार किया है।

He does not accept this interpretation; I do not accept this interpretation. I do not want that this minor issue should be a source of irritation and Mrs Gandhi must make it clear that whatever the State Constitution amendment provides will be accepted No heavens will fall because no heavens fell till 1954.

मुझे अफसोस है कि मेरे बुजुर्ग दोस्त हनुमन्तैया जी यहा नहीं हैं। एक भावाज यहा कल आई। उन्होंने पुरानी वह बाते दोहराने की कोशिश की जो कम से कम एक त्रीनियर कांग्रेस मेम्बर का जेब नहीं देतीं। मुझे शिकायत उनसे यह है कि उन्होंने चार्ज लगाया, एक ऐसा चार्ज लगाया जो पिछले 22 सालो से यहा कभी प्रूव नहीं हुआ। शेख अब्दुल्ला के हक मे मैं एक ही गवाह पेश कर सकता हूं जिन का नाम जवाहरलाल नेहरू है। जब शेख अब्दुल्ला गिरफ्तार हुए तो जवाहरलाल नेहरू गमगीन थे। शेख अब्दुल्ला

के खिलाफ मुकदमा चला। जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने सारे कवानीन पीछे कर के कहा कि मुझे इस पर यकीन नहीं है, शेख अब्दुल्ला को रिहा कर दो। शेख अब्दुल्ला जेल से रिहा होकर आते है और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के मेहमान बनते हैं। यह मामूली वाकया नहीं है। यह इस बात की दलील है कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कभी उनकी दुब्बल वतनी पर शक नहीं किया।

मेरे दोस्त अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने मलिक की किताब का हवाला दिया। मैं एक हिस्ट्री के स्टूडेंट की हैसियत से हमेशा यह जानने की कोशिश करता रहा हू कि आखिर 1953 मे शेख अब्दुल्ला को हुआ क्या ? जिस प्रादमी ने उस वक्त पाकिस्तान का मुकाबला किया जब दुनिया की कोई ताकत पाकिस्तान को रोक नहीं सकती थी काश्मीर में पेशकदमी करने से, उस वक्त तो हिन्दुस्तान का साथ दिया लेकिन 1953 मे जब दुनिया की कोई ताकत हिन्दुस्तान को काश्मीर से बाहर नहीं निकाल सकती थी उस वक्त मे वह हिन्दुस्तान से क्यों बिखर गया ? मैंने तलाश किया, इम के असबाब जानने की कोशिश की। आखिर मे मुझे मलिक साहब की किताब मिली और वह मलिक साहब की किताब ऐसी है कि तमाम काश्मीर की सियासत मे दिलचस्पी रखने वाले और मुल्क की रियासत मे दिलचस्पी रखने वाले लोगो को पढनी चाहिए। मलिक साहब कहते हैं कि 1947 मे जब पाकिस्तान ने शेख अब्दुल्ला के मिग की दस हजार रुपये की कीमत लगा रखी थी कि जो शेख अब्दुल्ला का सिर लाएगा उमे दस हजार रुपये दिए जाएंगे, उस वक्त मलिक साहब कहते हैं कि सरदार पटेल ने कहा था कि तुम इसकी जासूसी करना, तुम हर खतने से खबरदार रहना। इस पर एतवार नहीं किया जा सकता। जब अमल यह है कि दुश्मन मुल्क उसका सिर मांगे अपना मुल्क उसके खिलाफ जासूसी मांगे तो और क्या

क्या होना है उस बद्दलतमादी और बद्दगुमानी की फिजा में । मलिक साहब जवाहरलाल नेहरू के मुंह में झलकाव देते हैं कि उन्होंने मुझे प्राइवेटली कहा कि शेख अब्दुल्ला कम्प्युनिस्ट है । माफ कीजिए, यह जवाहरलाल नेहरू के साथ इत्साफ है ? जवाहरलाल नेहरू पब्लिक में एक स्टेटमेंट देते हैं, पार्लियामेंट में एक स्टेटमेंट देते हैं और मलिक साहब को प्राइवेटली दूसरा स्टेटमेंट देते हैं ? अगर इस मुल्क में कानून का एहताराम होता, अगर इस मुल्क में वाकई इत्साफ का तकाजा होता तो मलिक जैसे नापाक लोगों के खिलाफ अदालती कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए जिन्होंने मुल्क में एक नफरत की फिजा बन। दी, जिन्होंने यह साबित कर दिया कि शाख अब्दुल्ला जैसे मुहब्ब वतन पर भी हिन्दुस्तान की सो आई डी और हिन्दुस्तान का होम मिनिस्टर निगाह रखने की स्थिति में होता है ।

मैंने आपका बहुत सा वक्त लिया । अब मैं केवल दो बुनियादी बातों की तरफ आपकी तबज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ । एक तो यह कि यह एग्रीमेंट इल्जदा है, आगाज है । यह एक बिगिनिंग है ।

तरीق ایس اے شہوم (سریلنگر)

ہفتی سہ ہیکر صلحہ آج کی بھت اور آج کا موقع مہرے لئے خاص اہمیت رکھتا ہے - چار سال پہلے جب میں اس ایوان میں آیا تھا تو میں وہی پیغام بھی درخواست لے کر آیا تھا کہ کشمیر کے ساتھ ناانصافی ہو رہی ہے ، کشمیر کو

انصاف دیجئے اور کشمیر کو انصاف دینے کا ایک طریقہ یہ ہے کہ کشمیر کے سب سے اعظم لیڈر کے ساتھ انصاف کیجئے - اس درخواست کو آپکے کانوں تک پہنچانے میں اس پر عمل کرنے میں چار سال کا وقفہ ضرور لگا لیکن تاریخ میں، انہوں میں چار سال کا وقفہ بہت طویل نہیں ہے - اس پر - جس کو آگے بڑھانے میں مجھے نظر ہے کہ نہ میں اس وقت جب کچھ لوگ وہاں دعا کر رہے تھے ، میں وہاں دعا کر رہا تھا کہ وہ کام پایڈہ کمپنوں تک پہنچے اور مہری دعا کامیاب ہوئی ہے -

کل سے میں نے جو تقریریں سنی ہیں انکی اپنی جگہ اہمیت ہے ، اور میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس دہکرتے کو جس طرح سے وہل کم کہا گیا ہے وہ اس بات کی شہادت ہے اس بات کی علامت ہے کہ پورے ملک نے اس کو سمجھتی دی ہے اس کا خیر مقدم کیا ہے - لیکن ایک بات مجھے ضرور کہنی ہے کہ کشمیر کا مسئلہ کیا ہے ، یہ کہیں بھدا ہوا ، اسکو صحیح طور پر نہیں سمجھا گیا ہے

[شری ایس - اے - شمیم]

اگر شری اتل بہاری واجہٹی
اسکو اچھی طرح سے نہیں سمجھے
تو مجھے اعتراض نہیں - لیکن مجھے
افسوس ہے کہ اس طرف کچھ لوگوں
نے بھی اس مسئلے کے اصل پہلوؤں
کو نہیں سمجھا -

اگر کشمیر کا مسئلہ صرف یہ
ہوتا کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا حصہ
اس لئے بنا کہ مہاراجہ کو انسٹرو
مینٹ آف ایکسیشن پر دستخط
کرنے کا حق تھا تو پھر وہ مسئلہ
تو ختم ہو گیا - اس کے بعد شہج
عبداللہ سے بات کرنے کی کوئی
ضرورت نہیں تھی - اگر کشمیر کا
مسئلہ یہ ہوتا کہ کشمیر کو ہندوستان
کا حصہ بنے رہنا چاہئے تو کشمیر
کو کسی نے ہندوستان سے چھوڑنا
نہیں تھا - ہم تو ن لڑائیاں لڑ چکے
ہیں - ہندوستانی نوجوانوں نے
خون بہا رہا ہے - یہ مسئلہ نہیں تھا -

پھر کیا ضرورت پھی آئی کہ
ایک ایسے آدمی کے ساتھ بات کی
جائے جو کسی ہارتی کا لیڈر نہیں
ہے لہذا کسی لہجسٹریٹر کا منبر
نہیں ہے؟ اس مسئلے کی اہمیت
یہ ہے کہ کشمیر کا ہندوستان کے
ساتھ الحاق صرف کسی علاقے کا الحاق
نہیں تھا - مجھے معاف کرینگے مری
اتل بہاری باجہٹی بھی اور آکٹر

کرن سنگھ بھی کہ اگر یہ صرف
مہاراجہ ہی سنگھ کے دستخطوں سے
ہوا ہوتا تب اس معاملے کی کوئی
اہمیت نہیں تھی -

یہ مسام لیگ کا دعویٰ تھا کہ
سٹیٹس کے الحاق کا فیصلہ وہاں
کے نواب راجے اور مہاراجے کریں گے -
کانگریس نے اس بات کو کبھی تسلیم
نہیں کیا - کانگریس نے کہا کہ
وہاں کے لوگ جو فیصلہ کریں گے وہ
ہمیں منظور ہے - یہی وجہ ہے
کہ نواب چونانڈہ کے پاکستان کے ساتھ
الحاق کرنے کے بعد بھی چونانڈہ
ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے - یہی وجہ
ہے کہ نظام حیدرآباد کی خواہشات
کے بعد بھی حیدرآباد ہندوستان کا
حصہ رہا ہے - کشمیر کے مسئلے کی
اہمیت یہ ہے کہ جب آپ نے
ملک کو مذہب کے نام پر تقسیم
کیا اسوقت ایک مسلم میچوریٹی
اسٹیٹ نے یہ فیصلہ کیا کہ ہم
ہندو میچوریٹی کلتری کا حصہ بنیں
گے - شیخ عبداللہ نے ہمارے ملک
کے سپیکلوریٹم کو انڈیولوپمنٹل کلتیولٹ
دیا ہے - وہ شیخ عبداللہ کی اہمیت
ہے -

اسلئے بنیادی طور پر یہ بات
نہیں ہے کہ کسی نے کیا کیا -
بنیادی طور پر بات یہ ہے کہ کشمیر
کے متعلق بحث کرنے کا ذہنکار

ہمگو کس نے دیا ہے - شری اٹل
 بہاری باجھٹی نے ہندوستان کے
 نوجوانوں کی جوانمردی کی بات کہی
 ہے - انہوں نے سنا ہوا ' میں نے
 اپنی آنکھوں سے دیکھا ہے - اگر وہ
 وہاں موجود ہوتے تو میں ان سے
 کہتا کہ کشمیر کو انگریزیت کرنے
 کے لئے آپکا خون کھول رہا ہے لیکن
 کشمیر کے متعلق بات کرنے کا حق
 آپکو آس آدمی نے دیا ہے جسکا
 نام شیخ عبداللہ ہے - کیوں ؟

27 اکتوبر سے 29 اکتوبر تک
 ہندوستانی فوجوں نے نہیں شیخ
 عبداللہ اور اسکے بہتے سپاہیوں نے
 کشمیر کا دفاع کیا - ہندوستانی سپاہی
 کا خون کرنے سے پہلے مظفر آباد میں
 مسٹر عبدالعزیز کا خون گرا تھا اور
 بارہ مولا میں شہید شہروانی کے سپاہی
 میں گولیاں پھوست ہو گئی تھیں -
 اس خون نے آپکو حق دیا کہ آپ
 کشمیر کو اپنا نصرت جگر بنائیں -
 جس نے آپکو یہ حق دیا
 ہے آسے آپ کالی دیتے ہیں یہ اچھا
 نہیں کرتے ہیں -

کشمیر کا مسئلہ کیا ہے ؟ کشمیر
 کا مسئلہ یہ ہے کہ ہندوستان ایک
 جمہوریت ہے - اگر ہندوستان ایک
 ڈیموکریسی ، ایک لوک تانترا نہ ہوتا
 تب کشمیر کا کوئی مسئلہ نہیں
 تھا - اگر بیس پچیس ، بیس لاکھ
 لوگ چلاتے ہیں تو چلاتے رہیں ،

ڈکٹیٹر اس بات کی پروا نہیں
 کرتے ہیں - جس میں ملک ڈکٹیٹر
 شب ہو وہ یہ پروا نہیں کرتا ہے
 کہ بیس پچیس لاکھ لوگ کیا کہتے
 ہیں کشمیر کا مسئلہ یہ ہے کہ
 ہندوستان ایک ڈیموکریسی ہے ، اور
 ڈیموکریسی میں اگر دس ہزار لوگ
 بھی ناراض ہیں ، دس آدمی بھی
 ناراض ' میں تو انکو اپنی طرف
 کرنے کے لئے ، انکے دل خریدنے کے
 لئے طریقے مہیا کئے گئے ہیں ،
 ڈائلاگ کا پراسیس مہیا کیا گیا
 ہے -

شری شیام نندن مصر - اس
 ہاوس میں بھی یہی ہونا چاہئے -
 شری ایس اے شمیم - ہونا یہی

چاہئے ، لیکن جہاں جہاں یہ ہوا
 ہے ، اسکا خیبر مقدم کھینچے اور اپنی
 برائی کا ثبوت دیکھئے - یہ ضروری
 نہیں ہے کہ بڑے بڑے منسجوں پر
 بیٹھ کر بھی آپ وتے پن کا مظاہرہ
 کریں -

میری گزارش یہ ہے کہ پاکستان
 کے لئے کشمیر کا کوئی مسئلہ نہیں
 ہے - بہتو صاحب انہوں بلاتے ہیں
 اور آزاد کشمیر پر لاگو کرتے ہیں -
 کوئی مسئلہ نہیں ہے - لیکن ہمارے
 لئے یہ مسئلہ ضرور تھا - 1953 میں
 جو ہوا ، وہ ایک ابھینک خواب ہے -

[شری ایس۔ اے۔ - شمیم]

اسکو جتنی جلدی بھول جاتیں اتنا بہتر ہے۔ لیکن 1953 میں ایک بات ہوئی۔ 1953 میں ہندوستان کے فہرہ میں ایک کانٹا چبھ گیا۔ 22 سال تک ہمارے فہرہ میں یہ کانٹا ہمیں بہتر کرنا رہا۔ ہم دنیا کے بڑے بڑے ایوانوں میں جا کر اس سوال کا کوئی جواب نہیں دے سکتے تھے کہ کیا وجہ ہے کہ جس آدسی نے پاکستان کا مقابلہ کیا، تلوار کی دھار کا مقابلہ کریں اور کشمیر کو ہندوستان کا حصہ بنا دیا وہ آج جہلوں کی رونق بنا ہوا ہے، کیا وجہ ہے کہ کشمیر میں ہر بار انتخابات کرائے کے لئے پہلے اسے جہلوں میں رکھنا پڑتا ہے اور اسے الیکشن کرنا پڑتا ہے۔ آپ یہاں کچھ بھی کہتے لیکن ہمارا فہرہ اس بارے میں شرمندہ تھا۔ مجھے خوشی ہے کہ آج 22 سال کے بعد ہندوستان کے فہرہ سے وہ کانٹا نکل گیا ہے یہ بات وہ لوگ نہیں سمجھ سکتے ہیں، جن کا کوئی فہرہ نہیں ہے، جن کی نگاہ صرف زمین پر ہے، جن کو زمین چاسگئے۔ لیکن ہندوستان کے 55 کروڑ عوام آج ایسے آہنکو ہلاک محسوس کر رہے ہیں۔ آج ہماری آنکھیں روشن ہیں، ہماری گردن بلند ہو گئی ہے۔ ہم وقار کے ساتھ کہہ سکتے ہیں کہ جس

کے شانہ بھانہ کام کیا تھا آج وہ [ہمارا ساتھی ہے۔

بہتر صاحب کی پریشانی بے جا نہیں ہے۔ بہتر صاحب اگر خودکشی ہی کریں تو مجھے تعجب نہیں ہوگا۔ اسکا سب سے بڑا ہتھیار آج ہم نے اس کے ہاتھ سے چھین لیا ہے۔ اور اس کے لئے سارے ملک کو خوش ہونا چاہئے۔ جو لوگ خوش نہیں ہیں ان میں دو قسم کے لوگ ہیں۔ ایک تو وہ لوگ ہیں جو جانتے نہیں ہیں کہ قصہ کیا ہے۔ ان کو معاف کر دو۔

شری پدلو موڈی - پوری سرکار کو معاف کر دو۔

شری ایس اے شمیم - مثلاً آپکو معاف کر دو۔

دوسرے لوگ وہ ہیں جو جانتے ہیں کہ کیا ہوا ہے، اس سے ملک کو کیا فائدہ ہے، لیکن جن کا فہرہ صاف نہیں ہے، جو یہ نہیں چاہتے ہیں کہ یہاں کے لوگوں کے ساتھ انصاف ہونا چاہئے، جن کا وشال بھارت کا خواب یہ ہے۔ یہاں کی ہندو مہاجوریگی کو اس بات پر کہ پروا کئے بغیر کہ چلتا کی کیا رائے ہے، اس کے ساتھ گولی کی زبان سے بات کرنی چاہئے، ان کو ہمیں سمجھنا ہوگا۔

اتل بہاری راجپوتی کو یہ نہیں
 بھولنا چاہئے کہ جب ملک تقسیم
 ہوا تھا تو چار دل خون ہو گئے
 تھے، جنہوں نے اس تقسیم کو
 کبھی قبول نہیں کیا۔ ان میں سے
 ایک کا نام گندھی ہے، دوسرے کا
 ابوالکلام آزاد ہے، دوسرے کا نام
 عبدالغفار خان ہے اور چوتھے کا نام
 شہخ عبداللہ ہے۔ اس تاریخوی
 حقیقت کو نظر انداز نہیں کیا جا
 سکتا ہے۔ جس بہارت کو اکہلتا بلانے
 کے لئے آج وہ بے چین ہیں، اس
 بہارت کی اکہلتا کے خواب ان چار
 آدمیوں نے دیکھے تھے۔ اور یہی
 بہت سے لوگوں نے دیکھے ہونگے۔
 لیکن جب ان کے خواب تتر بتر
 ہو گئے تو ان کا خون انکی
 آنکھوں سے ٹپک پڑا تھا۔ وہ درد
 جاننے کے لئے شری اتل بہاری راجپوتی
 جس سنگھ کے واحد پڑھے لکھے ممبر
 کو یہ سوچنا چاہئے۔

اس ایگریمنٹ سے ارز کچھ ہوا
 ہو یا نہ ہوا ہو، ہماری اخلاقی
 نیتک حیثیت مطبوط سے مطبوط
 تر ہو گئی ہے۔ ہمارے پاس
 کشمیر کا مکمل قبضہ تھا۔ لیکن
 ہماری اخلاقی حیثیت کمزور تھی۔
 اس ایگریمنٹ سے ذاتی طور پر
 میں خوش ہوں یا نہیں اُسکی
 بات نہیں ہے۔ لیکن ایک صاحب
 وطن ہندوستانی کی حیثیت سے
 میں یہ دعویٰ کر سکتا ہوں کہ
 ہماری اخلاقی حیثیت بھی آج
 مستحکم ہو گئی ہے اور اس
 ایگریمنٹ کو اسی نقطہ نظر سے دیکھنا
 چاہئے۔

میں شری اتل بہاری راجپوتی
 سے ناراض نہیں ہوں۔ اگر وہ یہاں
 موجود ہوتے تو میں انکا شکریہ ادا
 کرتا۔ مجھے مسز گاندھی سے شکایت
 ہے کہ انہوں نے یہاں ایگریمنٹ
 پھس کرتے وقت اس بات کا خیال
 نہیں رکھا کہ شہخ محمد عبداللہ جب
 کشمیر میں لوگوں کے سامنے جاٹھلکے
 تر وہ کہا کہیں گے کہ میں کہا
 لے کر آیا ہوں، مسز گاندھی پریشان
 تھیں کہ یہ 520، شکر ہے خدا کا
 کہ 420 نہیں، ممبر کہا کہتے
 ہیں۔ نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ صرف
 اس کے نیکٹو اسپیکٹس پھر گئے
 گئے۔ یہ مانکا تھا یہ بھی نہیں
 دیا یہ مانکا تھا یہ بھی نہیں دیا۔
 شری اتل بہاری راجپوتی کا شکریہ
 اور انکی جماعت کا شکریہ کہ ایگریمنٹ
 میں شہخ عبداللہ کے لئے جر پارٹیو
 فہرچر ہو سکتے تھے انکو ظاہر کیا اور عارے
 لئے یہ اسان بنا دیا کہ ہم کشمیر
 کے لوگوں کو بتائیں کہ دیکھو کہ
 ہم لوگ کیا لے کر آئے ہیں۔ اگر
 ہم آپکا بہرومہ کرتے تو ہم کسی
 کو مہلت دکھانے کے لائق بھی نہیں
 ہوتے۔

ایگریمنٹ کے سلسلے میں ایک
 بات نامعلومچر کی کہی گئی ہے۔
 اگر آپ ذاتی طور پر مجھ سے
 پوچھیں تو میں کہوں گا کہ نام
 میں کیا رکھا ہے۔ لیکن شہخ
 محمد عبداللہ کے لئے اور کشمیری
 عوام کے لئے اس کی حیثیت
 سائیکولوجیکل ذہادہ ہے اور عملی
 کم ہے۔ جو لوگ یہ چلاتے ہیں
 کہ کہسے ہو سکتا ہے کہ اس

[شر ایس - اے - شہم]

ملک میں دو وزیراعظم ہوں وہ
 نہیں جانتے کہ 1964 تک اس
 ملک میں دو وزیراعظم تھے - کشمیری
 سوانحی کا ایک بہت ہی انسکلی
 فیکٹس کوارٹر، کیریگٹر، نان اینڈ
 شمس الدین بھی وزیراعظم تھا - اس
 وقت جواہر لال نہرو نے کہی یہ
 نہیں کہا کہ میں تو نہیں مانوٹکا
 کہ اس ملک میں صہرے علاقہ
 بھی کوئی وزیراعظم رہے - جواہر لال
 نہرو اگر شمس الدین کے متعلق
 یہ سچ سکتے تھے، تو ہریمتی
 اندرا گاندھی کہا شہخ عبداللہ کے
 متعلق یہ نہیں برداشت کر سکتی
 ہوں گ یہ غلط ہے - اور فرق کہا
 پوینما؟ ہم نے یہاں معمولی سے اپنے
 سنٹری کو سنٹری چمرل بنا دیا
 ہے - تلخوواہ وہی ہی ہے - کون
 صا آسان توت پرا؟ اس کے کچھ
 سائیکولوجیکل رپورٹ ہوتے ہوں -
 ڈاکٹر کرن سنگھ صدر ریاست تھے -
 ان کی دولت میں اس سے کوئی
 اضافہ نہیں ہوا، کمی ہوئی، کچھ
 لوگوں کو کہلانا یلانا پوتا تھا -
 لیکن ایک سائیکولوجیکل ہیکٹرونیڈ
 ایک ٹیکولوجیکل اہل کشمیری
 عوام کے لئے ہے اور میں اس سلسلے
 میں ایلی رائے واضع طور پر مسز
 گاندھی تک پہنچانا چاہتا ہوں کہ
 مجھے انکی اس رائے سے اتفاق نہیں
 ہے کہ شہخ عبداللہ اپنے آپ کو
 وزیراعظم لکھوں - یہ انہیں چھک
 مسٹر کہتی رہیں - شہخ عبداللہ
 نے بھی اس رائے کا اظہار کیا ہے

He does not accept this interpretation; I do not accept this interpretation. I do not want that this minor issue should be a source of irritation

and Mrs. Gandhi must make it clear that whatever the State Constitution amendment provides will be accepted. No heavens will fall because no heavens fell till 1954.

مجھے افسوس ہے کہ صہرے
 بزرگ دوست ملوستانہیا جی یہاں
 نہیں ہوں - ایک آواز یہاں
 کل آئی - انہوں نے پرانی باتوں
 دوہرانے کی کوشش کی جو کم سے
 کم ایک سہتر کانگریس ممبر کو
 زہم نہیں دیتیں - مجھے شگایت
 ان سے یہ ہے کہ انہوں نے چارج
 لگایا، ایک ایسا چارج لگایا جو
 پہلے 22 سالوں میں یہاں کسی
 پروو نہیں ہوا - شہخ عبداللہ کے
 حق میں میں ایک ہی گواہ
 پیش کر سکتا ہوں جملکا نام جواہر
 لال نہرو ہے - جب شہخ عبداللہ
 گرفتار ہوئے تو جواہر لال نہرو شکون
 تھے - شہخ عبداللہ کے خلاف مقدمہ
 چلا - جواہر لال نہرو نے سارے
 قوانین پھینچ کر کے کہا کہ مجھے
 اس پر پتلی نہیں ہے، شہخ
 عبداللہ کو رہا کر دو، شہخ عبداللہ
 چول سے رہا ہو کر آئے ہوں اور
 یلقت جواہر لال نہرو کے مہمان بننے
 ہوں - یہ معمولی واقعہ نہیں ہے -
 یہ اس بات کی دلیل ہے کہ
 جواہر لال نہرو نے کہی ان کی
 حسب الوطی پر شک نہیں کیا -

صہرے دوست اتل بہاری باجھٹی
 نے ملک کی لغاب کا حوالہ دیا -
 میں ایک دستوری کے سٹوڈینٹ
 کی حالت سے ہمیشہ یہ جانتے
 کی کوشش کرتا رہا ہوں کہ آخر
 1953 میں شہخ عبداللہ کو کہا
 ہوا؟ جس آدمی نے اس وقت
 پاکستان کا مقابلہ کیا جب دنیا

کی کوئی طاقت پاکستان کو روک نہیں سکتی تھی کشمیر میں پھس قدسی کرنے سے اسوقت تو ہندوستان کا سانہ دیا لیکن 1953 میں جب دنہا کی کوئی طاقت ہندوستان کو شہر سے باہر نہیں نکال سکتی تھی اسوقت میں وہ ہندوستان سے کیوں بکھر گیا؟ میں نے تلاش کیا، اس کے اسباب جاننے کی کوشش کی۔ آخر میں مجھے ملک صاحب کی کتاب ملی اور وہ ملک صاحب کی کتاب صدمہ ہے کہ تمام کشمیر کی سہاست میں دلچسپی رکھنے والے اور ملک کی سہاست میں دلچسپی رکھنے والے لوگوں کو پڑھنی چاہئے۔ ملک صاحب کہتے ہیں کہ 1947 میں جب پاکستان نے شیخ عبداللہ کے سر کی دس ہزار روپے کی قیمت لگا رکھی تھی کہ دو شیخ عبداللہ کا سر لائے گا اُسے دس ہزار روپے دئے جائیں گے، اسوقت ملک صاحب کہتے ہیں کہ سردار پٹیل نے کہا تھا کہ تم اس کی جاسوسی کرنا تم ہر خطرے سے خیردار رہنا۔ اس پر اعتبار نہیں کیا جتا سکتا۔ جب عمل یہ ہے کہ دشمن ملک اسکا سر مانگے ابنا ملک اُس کے خلاف جاسوسی مانگے تو اور کیا ہونا ہے اُس معاہدے کی اور ہدگمانی کی فضا میں۔ ملک صاحب جواہر لال نہرو کے مہذبہ میں الفاظ دیتے ہیں کہ انہوں نے مجھے پرائیویٹلی کہا کہ شیخ عبداللہ کمزور ت ہے۔ معاف کہجئے، یہ جواہر لال نہرو کے سانہ انصاف ہے؟ جواہر لال نہرو پ ک میں ایک سٹیٹمنٹ

دیتے ہیں پارلیمنٹ میں ایک سٹیٹمنٹ دیتے ہیں اور ملک صاحب کو پرائیویٹلی دوسرا سٹیٹمنٹ دیتے ہیں؟ اگر اس ملک میں قانون کا احترام ہوتا، اگر اس ملک میں واقعی انصاف کا تقاضا ہوتا تو ملک جو سے ناپاک لوگوں کے خلاف عدالتی کارروائی ہونی چاہئے جنہوں نے ملک میں ایک نفرت کی فضا بنا دی، جنہوں نے یہ ثابت کر دیا کہ شیخ عبداللہ جو سے مستحب وطن پر بھی ہندوستان کی سی۔ اُنی۔ تی۔ اور ہندوستان کا ہوم منسٹر نکال رکھنے کی سزا ہی میں ہوتا ہے۔

میں نے اپنا بہت سا وقت لیا۔ اب میں کدول دو بلدیوں ہاوں کی طرف آپ کی توجہ دلانا چاہتا ہوں۔ ایک تو یہ کہ یہ ایگریمنٹ انڈیا ہے، تازہ ہے۔ یہ ایک بگلاگ ہے۔

Sheikh Abdullah's task is extremely difficult. Do not be deluded. People think that the Sheikh is in power and all the problems of Kashmir are solved. Do not for a second think that the Pakistan lobby had disappeared and do not believe that Pakistan will lose its interest in Kashmir and will not interfere in our internal affairs. The Sheikh's task is extremely difficult and he must be supported by all the right thinking people in the country. I would beg Atal Bihari Vajpayee; he is not here and I do not know whether the rest of the members of his party will understand what I am saying. I would plead with him in national interest. The experiment of inducting him back to the mainstream of national life is a very valuable, historical experiment. This experiment must succeed. It must succeed notwithstanding Sheikh Abdullah, in

[Shri S. A. Kader] spite of Sheikh Abdullah. The Sheikh today has become a symbol of our democracy. It is the dynamism of our democracy that even if there are sharp differences, the path of dialogue is never closed. What applies to Sheikh Abdullah will also apply to JP, whatever you may say today, because there is no way out except through dialogue. The logic of the situation will convince you. The understanding with Sheikh has only one meaning and that is that dialogue is the only way to resolve differences. The other way means destruction of the system. Therefore, each one of us, rising above party levels, will have to see that Sheikh Abdullah succeeds. Sheikh Saheb is a very proud man, a very sensitive man, and by the way his age is 70, though he says it is only 69. That is not important, what is important is that all these three factors combined make his position very vulnerable. He is sensitive, he is easily provoked, in spite of my telling him not to get provoked, because he has not been a Member of this Parliament where people, if they are provoked, will run mad. Therefore, he does not know anything of the new trends in Indian Parliamentary democracy. We do not expect him to learn. Therefore, I would caution everybody, I would request all the Members of the Opposition in particular, not to bracket Sheikh Abdullah with Mrs. Gandhi.

Mishraji tried to bring in Jayaprakash Narayan into Sheikh Abdullah's politics. I took him rather humorously. I do not think he himself was very serious. If JP is interested in that way, he is welcome, but Sheikh Saheb's coming to power has a deeper meaning. Therefore, my special appeal to the Jan Sangh Members is: mistrust begets mistrust, you must learn to trust, and if you trust, you will be pleased to see that Sheikh Saheb is a very lovable human being.

उस के लिए यह जरूरी है कि जिस तरह मेरे दोस्त इंद्रजीत जी ने कहा कि 1953 की

असल बुनियाद जो है वह प्रजा परिषद् की एजीटेशन थी, डा० कर्णसिंह भी उससे इत्तफाक करेंगे और जब डा० कर्णसिंह, इंद्रजीत जी और शमीम अहमद शमीम तीनों इस बात से इत्तफाक करेंगे तब जनसंघ के बचने की कोई सूरत नहीं है। इसलिए हमारा फैसला यह है कि 1953 की जिम्मेदारी शेख अब्दुल्ला की जिम्मेदारी नहीं है, 1953 की जिम्मेदारी बलराज मधोक की है, अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी की है और अडवानी की है, मिस्टर कछवाय की बिल्कुल नहीं है, इनको क्या मालूम कि क्या हो रहा है ?

[اُس کے لئے یہ ضروری ہے کہ جس طرح میرے دوست اندرجیت جی نے کہا کہ 1953 کی اصل بلحاظ جو یہ ہے پرچا پریشد کی ایجنڈیشن تھی؟ ڈاکٹر کون سنگھ جی اس سے اتفاق کریں گے اور جب ڈاکٹر کون سنگھ اندرجیت جی اور شمیم احمد شمیم تیلوں اس بات سے اتفاق کریں گے تب جن سنگھ کے بچنے کی کوئی صورت نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے ہمارا فیصلہ یہ ہے کہ 1953 کی ذمہ داری شیخ عبداللہ کی ذمہ داری نہیں ہے۔ 1953 کی ذمہ داری ہراج ممدوہا کی ہے، اٹل بھاری واجپئی کی ہے اور ایڈوانزی کی ہے، مسٹر کچھواہا کی بالکل نہیں ہے، ان کو کیا معلوم کہ کیا ہو رہا ہے؟]

श्री कृष्णक बाबुलाल (नदाख) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कुछ बातें इस अवसर पर कहना चाहता हूँ। उस के लिए मुझे दस पन्ने

मिनट वक्त चाहिए। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि शेख मुहम्मद अब्दुल्ला कितने बड़े लीडर हैं और कितना उन्होंने अपने काश्मीर की आजादी के लिए कुर्बानी दी है, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ और उनका आदर करता हूँ। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि लद्दाख की तरफ उतना ध्यान उन्होंने नहीं दिया है। पहले शेख मुहम्मद अब्दुल्ला लद्दाख आए थे तो हमने उनका स्वागत किया था और उसी तरह आने पर फिर भी कर सकते हैं। लेकिन इस समय मैं न उन का स्वागत कर सकता हूँ न उनकी मुखालिफत कर सकता हूँ। हमारा लद्दाख, हिस्सा जो है उस लद्दाख में रहने वाली जनता की कुछ मांग अलग है। हमारी नेता श्रीमती गांधी पर हमें पूरा भरोसा है। लद्दाख के बारे में क्या हो, यह हमने पूरा उनके ऊपर छोड़ दिया है। इसलिए इस समय मैं शेख अब्दुल्ला की न प्रशंसा कर सकता हूँ न उनकी मुखालिफत कर सकता हूँ। चाहे एक साल के बाद कुछ कहना पड़े लेकिन इस समय हम कुछ नहीं कह सकते हैं। यहाँ उनकी बहुत प्रशंसा की गई। लेकिन मैं इस समय कुछ नहीं कर सकता हूँ। हो सकता है कि शेख साहब जम्मू, काश्मीर और लद्दाख तीनों को बराबर हिस्सा दे दें और तीनों का बराबर विकास करते रहे, लेकिन इस समय तो हमें कोई गारन्टी नहीं मिली है। हमारे लद्दाख की जनता पिछले डेढ़ माल से केन्द्रीय शासन की मांग करती रही आ रही है और हम यह मांग करते रहेगे जब तक प्रधान मंत्री जी और शेख साहब हम से बात नहीं करेंगे।

16.00 hrs.

श्रीमती साहब ने यहाँ बहुत सी बातें कही, लेकिन लद्दाख के लिये कुछ नहीं कहा, लद्दाख को वे भूल गये। हमारे शेख साहब भी लद्दाख को भूल गये। वह इस बात को भी भूल गये कि 1947-48 में हमारे लद्दाखी नौजवानों ने कितनी कुरबानी की थी, लद्दाखी मलेगिया और लद्दाखी स्काड के नाम पर उन्होंने दुश्मनों का मुकाबला किया था,

आज उन्हें कोई नहीं पूछता। हमारे लद्दाख के लोग केन्द्रीय शासन की मांग क्यों कर रहे हैं, उका कारण क्या है—इसके बारे में आपको सोचना चाहिए। आप कहते हैं कि लद्दाख में कुछ लोग केन्द्रीय शासन नहीं चाहते हैं—क्यों नहीं चाहते हैं, आपको उनमें पूछना चाहिए। लेकिन सच्चाई यह है कि वहाँ की अधिकांश जनता केन्द्रीय शासन चाहती है। इसलिए कि पिछले 22-25 सालों में लद्दाख की कोई खास तरक्की नहीं हुई, त्रितीय तरक्की होनी चाहिए थी, उतनी तरक्की नहीं हुई। वहाँ न कोई दो मील लम्बी पक्की सड़क है और न कोई पक्का पुल है। प्रधान मंत्री जी खुद वहाँ गई थी उन्होंने देखा है कि वहाँ क्या हालत है। वहाँ समूह मदम्य भी वहाँ गये थे। इसीलिये मैंने ये सारी बातें प्रधान मंत्री जी पर छोड़ दी हैं। पहले हम ने नेफा पैटर्न की मांग की थी, लेकिन उस वक्त हमें प्रधान मंत्री जी ने रोका और कहा कि गजेन्द्र गडकर समीक्षण बैठे हुआ है, उसमें बातचीत करो। हमने उनमें बात की और उन्होंने बहुत अच्छे अच्छे मुझाव दिये, लेकिन उन सुझावों पर कोई अमल नहीं हुआ। इसी लिये आज केन्द्रीय शासन की मांग हो रही है। वहाँ का बहुमत उसके साथ है—उस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी हो सके तो इस मांग को मान लें, अन्यथा हम को बुला कर बात करें। इस समय हम न तो शेख अब्दुल्ला का विरोध करने हैं और न उनकी प्रशंसा करने हैं, हम चाहते हैं कि हमारी मांग पर गौर किया जाय, हमारी समस्या को हल किया जाय। हम 3 मार्च में केन्द्रीय शासन की मांग के समर्थन में आन्दोलन शुरू करने वाले थे, लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी के कहने पर अभी हम ने उसको रोक दिया है, डॉ० कर्ण सिंह के कहने पर आन्दोलन को अभी रोक दिया है और हम ने अपनी जनता से कहा है कि अभी 15 मार्च तक ठहर जायें। अब यदि प्रधान मंत्री जी हम से बात करेगी और शेख साहब हमारी समस्याओं की तरफ ध्यान

[श्री कुमोत वाकल।]

द्वेष और लड़ाख की तरफ भी दूसरे हिस्से की तरह से देखेंगे तो हम उन की प्रशंसा करेंगे शक्यता नहीं करेंगे ।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि संविधान के अनुच्छेद 370 से लड़ाख के लोग खुश नहीं हैं । मैं इसकी क्या वजह बतलाऊँ—समय नहीं है । लेकिन मैं इतना जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ—जैसा शेख साहब हमेशा अपने भाषणों में कहते हैं कि मैं काश्मीर के मुसलमानों को किस तरह से खुश रखूँ, किस तरह मे उनकी रक्षा करूँ, आज उनको यह भी कहना चाहिए कि मैं लड़ाख के लोगों को किस तरह से खुश रखूँ—लेकिन उन्होंने ऐसा कभी नहीं कहा । लड़ाख में बौद्धों का बहुमत है, लेकिन मैंने कभी बौद्धों के लिये कोई सबाल नहीं उठाया, बहा की तमाम जनता के हित का सबाल उठाया । मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज शेख साहब की तरफ से लड़ाख के लोगों की उन्नति की गारंटी मिलनी चाहिए, बौद्धों के लिये गारंटी मिलनी चाहिए, उनकी तरक्की के लिये कोशिश की जानी चाहिए । आज तक झूठ बोल बोल कर हम में कहा गया कि हम यह करेंगे, हम वह करेंगे, लेकिन कुछ नहीं किया गया । गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की सिफारिशों को लागू करेंगे, लेकिन वह भी नहीं हुआ ।

अब यह कहा जाता है कि आप के एक बड़े प्रतिनिधि को मिनिस्टर लिया गया है । जो व्यक्ति मिनिस्टर बने हैं, वे हमारे प्रतिनिधि नहीं हैं, लड़ाख की जनता के प्रतिनिधि नहीं हैं । यह ठीक है कि वे एक बार लड़ाख की सिथिसत में आये थे, लेकिन सफल नहीं हुए, उसके बाद चले गये । अब वे राजदूत थे, बहा से आये गये हैं । मैं उनकी भी नुकताचीनी नहीं करता हूँ, वह काम करेंगे तो हम जरूर देखेंगे कि वे कैसा काम करते हैं । हम को यह भी देखना होगा कि वे जनता के सामने आते हैं या हमेशा ही इसी तरह से मंत्री बनते रहेंगे ।

16 05 hrs.

[SHRI VASANT SATHI in the Chair.]

अभी तक जम्मू-काश्मीर की संवै-परिषद् में हमारा कोई प्रतिनिधि नहीं और न प्रदेश को एंक्जोस्यूटिव में हमारी कोई राय ली गई । फिर मैं ही एक ऐसा आदमी था जो बड़ा पर मोजूद था, लेकिन मुझ से भी नहीं पूछा गया, केवल जम्मू-काश्मीर के लोगों को रान ली गई । जो जम्मू के एम० पी० थे या काश्मीर के एम० पी० थे, वे तो इतकी प्रशंसा करते हो, क्योंकि उनको तो सब कुछ मिन चुना है उाहें चार मिनिस्टर हो गये, उनको और क्या चाहिए । तरक्की के लिए जितना पैसा चाहिए, वह उनको मिन गया, इन लिये वे दासों प्रशंसा करते हैं । आज कहे कि मैं काश्मिर का ही कर ऐसी बात कहना है—मैं अभी भी काश्मिर में हूँ, दूसरी किसी पार्टी के साथ नहीं हूँ, लेकिन मुझे भी जनता के सामने जाना है, उनका हित करना है, उनसे बात लेना है । मैं अपने चुनाव में आने वाला नहीं हूँ, लेकिन मैं लड़ाख के लोगों को इस तरह से नहीं छोड़ सकता हूँ । उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान के लिये जो कुर्बानी दी है, उनको किनो ने नहीं देखा । आज प्रधान मंत्री भुट्टो चाहे जो कहना हो, लेकिन जम्मू-काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है, उसको हिन्दुस्तान में कोई अलग नहीं कर सकता । मैं तो यह कहूँगा कि भुट्टो साहब शिमला समझौते के अनर्गत भारत के साथ दोस्ती कर, इस तरह की बातें करने से उनको कोई फायदा नहीं होगा । और इसी तरह की बातें करने रते तो जिस तरह से उन्होंने बंगला देश को खोया, पाकिस्तान के और हिस्से भी उसी तरह से उनके हाथ से निकल जायेंगे । लड़ाख और जम्मू के लोग कुछ भी कहें, वह उनका अन्दरूनी मामला है, हम अपने आप ही उन मामलों को निबटारेंगे, उनको हस्तक्षेप करने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

*SHRI S. D. SOMASUNDARAM (Thanjavur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I welcome the recent accord that has been arrived at between the Kashmir leader, Sheikh Abdullah, and the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Sir, we have ushered in a new political era in Jammu and Kashmir with Sheikh Abdullah assuming the office of Chief Ministership.

Many hon. Members who preceded me referred to Article 370 of the Constitution under which the State of Jammu and Kashmir enjoys a special status. I am of the view that Article 370 of the Constitution is necessary and the State of Jammu and Kashmir should continue to enjoy special facilities. I have the least objection to this constitutional provision. Some Members also apprehended that other States also might start demanding such special facilities. At the time when our Constitution was formulated, the Constitution-makers were guided more by the defence of the country when it became free than by certain exigencies that might arise in future. Immediately after India became free, the country was partitioned. Our constitution-makers in those circumstances, had certain guide-lines before them. At that time they had to conceive of the Central Government as the foremost organ in ensuring the security of the country.

Our hon. Defence Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, might remember the atmosphere prevailing then in the country. If he is now asked who he is, he will say that he is a Punjabi. Similarly, if we ask our friend Shri H N Mukherjee, he will say that he is a Bengali. Sheikh Abdullah himself will say that he is a Kashmiri. Our Minister of External Affairs, Shri Chavan, will say that he is a Maharashtrian. I will say that I am a Dravidian. At the same time when our Constitution was formulated, the diverse cultures and different languages of the country were not in the minds of our con-

stitution-makers. They were not determined to ensure full protection to the different languages and cultures in our country.

They thought of giving constitutional protection to the State of Jammu and Kashmir by incorporating article 370, in view of the then prevalent political climate there. Having said this, I would like to state that, when other States ask for more powers from the Centre, it should not become a question of political parties. If the Congress Party is in power throughout the country and if it so happens that one of the constituent units ruled by the Congress Party, it may be euphemistically termed as legitimate demand. But if it so happens that a State ruled by an Opposition Party asks for more powers, it may be termed as demand for extra-constitutional rights. I am unable to appreciate this kind of contradiction in political thinking. It is strange that the demands of a daughter are treated as necessities by her parents, but if she claims something after she has become a daughter-in-law, it is treated as demand for certain rights for which she is not eligible.

Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to say that the entire climate—political, economic and social—in our country has changed. I would only be voicing the feelings of all the young people in our country if I say that the present time is ripe for convening a new Constituent Assembly comprised of the elected representatives of the people to formulate a new Constitution which will truly represent and reflect the aspirations and ambitions of the new generation in whose hands lies the security and prosperity of our country. I am sure that the new Constituent Assembly will naturally give adequate protection to the interests of the constituent units of the country.

In conclusion, while thanking you for giving me an opportunity to participate in this Debate, I would again

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

[Shri S. D. Somasundaram]

repeat the imperative necessity for giving a new Constitution to the country.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Khozhiokode): Sir, the status of Jammu and Kashmir and the process of integration of the State with our country has been a very delicate and ticklish issue for decades. This thorny problem has defied solution ever since independence, though several attempts have been made at different junctures. Now, after long this deadlock has been broken, a positive step forward has been taken and an accord has been reached between our Prime Minister and Sheikh Abdullah. I am, therefore, happy that this accord has been arrived at between the Prime Minister and Sheikh Abdullah.

The Prime Minister has spelt out the objectives of this accord with Sheikh Abdullah very clearly. She said at Banswara in Rajasthan on the 6th of last month:

"The basic question in Kashmir was not handing over power to any individual, but averting confrontation."

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Later on, she denied that. She said that she did not use the word "confrontation".

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: She said very clearly that the objective of this accord was to avoid confrontation. Therefore, I have every hope that this objective will be achieved and this will be a step forward in that direction and that we will be able to normalise the situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

I must say here, to avoid any misunderstanding that Kashmir accord has only vindicated the stand of my party, the Indian Union Muslim League which from the very beginning consistently held that accession of Jammu and Kashmir was complete. Together with this, we had advocated always that all promises made

at the time of accession must be fulfilled. I mean that we always desired to have special treatment meted out to the State of Jammu and Kashmir because of historical reasons.

Today, when it is said that article 370 of the Constitution will be maintained and acted upon, I say, our stand which has been a consistent stand, has only been endorsed. The Prime Minister herself has said recently that article 370 will now become a permanent article in our Constitution. This has been done in spite of maintaining the supremacy of the Supreme Court over Jammu and Kashmir and also maintaining the supremacy of the Election Commission. Therefore, I feel, this is a happy blending of realities. But I would like to add a word of caution and say that we have to proceed very carefully.

It has to be seen how far confrontation will end. I say this because, as far as Sheikh Saheb is concerned, though his is a great personality, though he has made sacrifices for the cause of Jammu and Kashmir all these years, he has been a bundle of contradictions. This has to be taken into account and we have to proceed very carefully. No doubt, he has given up his demand for self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir, he also does not say now that Pakistan is a party to the dispute. It is not his desire also now to go back to 1953 position. He does not demand new elections and a fresh Assembly. No doubt all these things have been given up and he has climbed down considerably. I know, that because of his contradictions, there is a section that does not agree with his position and he has been recently losing ground as far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. Now, when there has been climbing down on his part and, I hope, his climbing down has not been to achieve power and his climbing down has been with sincerity to see that all matters in Jammu and Kashmir are

'settled' and a new era of normalisation of relations starts. Only time can judge what future is going to be.

I would also desire that the Government must take note of the situation that now exists in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and that we must not over-simplify matters, as the Minister of Health, Dr. Karan Singh, pointed out. What I mean is that once an accord has been reached with Sheigh Sanheb, we must not take everything for granted. There are some powerful elements in the State of Jammu and Kashmir like Moulvi Farook and Maulana Maswoodi who do not very much agree with this accord that has been reached. Therefore, keeping up the principles of democracy, we must try to see that we open a dialogue with them also and try to carry with us those elements in Jammu and Kashmir who are not with us at the present juncture so that the accord may be much wider-based and much more complete. This has to be done by discussion and persuasions and not by suppression and oppression.

I say this because recently a call for hartal was given for 28th of last month against the accord. Our papers no doubt said that hartal was a complete failure. But I have got here papers from Srinagar itself, Aftab and Azan, the local daily urdu papers, which say that hartal was to great extent successful. Even Sheikh Abdullah has not hidden this fact. He has very clearly accepted the fact and said recently on 2nd of this month at Srinagar—I quote from Times of India:

'Sheikh Abdullah criticised All India Radio and Delhi Television for not giving a correct picture of the response Srinagar gave to the hartal call.

He said, "The media should not have hesitated to broadcast that some shops remained closed and some groups of young men indulged in violence. No harm would have been done by admitting this. India should have confidence in herself

and should not build a structure on untruths."

Therefore, it shows that there is an element which is opposed to this accord. What I would desire is that there should be a dialogue with them and they should also be taken with us, so that this accord will be complete and lasting. We desire that confrontation with the State of Jammu and Kashmir should be avoided for all times to come. Therefore, I earnestly hope that the Prime Minister, together with Shri Sheikh Abdullah, will act in this direction and see that, while they go forward, they carry not only the people of our country but also all the people of Jammu and Kashmir, along with them :

میں آکھتا ہوں کہ جہاں جا جائیں وہاں
مگر لوگ آتے رہتے آتے رہتے آتے رہتے
میں ॥

میں آکھتا ہوں کہ جہاں جا جائیں
مگر لوگ آتے رہتے آتے رہتے
میں :-

I hope this accord will succeed and will become a caravan with which we can go ahead. That will be in the interest of the people in India and also the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

SHRI S. A. KADER (Bombay—Central-South): Mr. Chairman.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: You never visited Kashmir during the last 20 years.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Then what has he to say?

SHRI S. A. KADER: If my hon. friends will allow me to say something, I will finish it as early as possible. I would request specially Mr. Pilloo Mody to be a little quiet and not indulge in loose gimmicks.

The accord has to be looked from three angles: Constitutionally; the background of Kashmir, and the implication of the accord to Kashmir as well as to India Constitutionally, enough has been said, and I do not want to go into this matter.

[Shri S. A. Kader]

About the background, we have to go into that. I fully agree with my hon. friend, Shri Shamim, that Sheikh Abdullah was not only a fighter but he was also against the partition of India. In Jammu and Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah's leadership started from 1930 and it was there he galvanised the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Although the Muslim League succeeded under the *nara* of the two-nation theory, Islamic Nation and all that, they could not succeed in Jammu and Kashmir because of the leadership of Sheikh Abdullah. Sheikh Abdullah has been secular in outlook right from the beginning, even during the time of the attack on Kashmir. Why was Kashmir attacked? It was clearly seen by Jinnah who had to run away from Kashmir cutting short his programme to one day—just before Partition he had gone to Kashmir and the Programme was for three days but it was cut short to one day and he had to leave Srinagar hurriedly—and so the Pakistanis thought that, as long as Sheikh Abdulla was there, Kashmir would not accede to Pakistan. Hence, there was the attack

SHRI PILOO MODY: Why is he going into the historical background? (Interruptions)

SHRI S. A. KADER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask you one question? Does an over-developed body mean a developed mind?

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: In this case, 'yes'.

SHRI S. A. KADER: This is the background which we have to take into consideration. As far as Sheikh Abdullah was concerned, he was a nationalist right from the beginning. He was a nationalist even during the time of confrontation or whatever it is with the Central Government; even then, he did not deviate from his nationalism. He wanted solution of Kashmir in a different way. The most charitable aspect is that he thought that, since Kashmir was under dispute between India and Pakistan, and if

the Kashmir dispute could be settled, then there could be an amicable settlement between India and Pakistan. Possibly, under some misapprehension he must have taken that line, from which, however, he has now come back. Today it is a happy occasion that he accepts that Kashmir is a part of India.

I was listening to my friend, Shri Kushok Bakula who said something about development. I would only say that Jammu and Kashmir is a State including Ladakh and if any part of the State is not developed, then it is not a development of the State at all. It is only a paralytic development. Some way, if any area of India is left out either on regional grounds or on communal grounds and other parts progress, that will not be a healthy progress. It will be a paralytic progress. Therefore, it is in the interests of Jammu and Kashmir itself that the Ladakh area is well looked after and developed properly. I am sure that a person like Sheikh Abdullah as we all know him, will never tolerate that certain parts should be developed and other parts should languish. Therefore, I would only request my friend to please leave aside this suspicion because it is said:

सद्यारामा विष्णवति

If you give place to suspicions, then you will lose your soul. This is the meaning of this Sanskrit verse.

The same request I would also make to my friend over there, Shri Vajpayee. I was listening to my friend, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait. He spoke about everything except one thing....

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: That will hurt his electorate.

SHRI S. A. KADER: This accord should have hurt two people. One is Mr Bhutto in Pakistan and another is Mr. Vajpayee in India....

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: How about Sulaiman Saheb?

SHRI S. A. KADER: Those of us who were in Indian politics would remember how the Hindu Maha Sabha and the Muslim League had both abused each other and they both abused the Congress but in the central and provincial legislatures both voted for the British Government. So also, Mr. Vajpayee on the one side and Mr. Bhutto on the other side are both hurt because of this accord. Therefore, I would say that this type of opposition either here in this House or in Kashmir will always be there and it is for this House to demonstrate that as far as Kashmir is concerned...

SHRI PILOO MODY: March 6.

SHRI S. A. KADER: Kashmir and India are one and they will always be one and there cannot be any difference or discord between Kashmir and India.

My friend, Mr. Mukherjee, spoke about India being a multi-national country. I do not know what is the basis of multi-nationalism. Multi-nationalism may be on the ground of religion. Multi-nationalism may be on the ground of language. Multi-nationalism may be on the ground of geography. But, as far as India is concerned, although it has so many communities and so many languages, there is only one nation and that is called the Indian nation and there is no other nation. This is possibly a totally different concept to which we do not subscribe.

I am quite sure that this accord will be welcomed by all well-wishers of this country as well as Jammu and Kashmir and I am quite sure that Sheikh Abdullah will prove that he means what he has spoken and if you want Sheikh Abdullah to succeed, it will be our duty to strengthen his hands and not to cast suspicion so that he may take Kashmir along with Jammu, Ladakh and India on the path of progress.

3774 LS—12.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): I warmly welcome this accord, for I consider it as a triumph of an attitude of pragmatism and of a sense of realism in our politics and politicians. It requires a certain amount of courage, confidence and magnanimity on both sides to come to such an accord, and I must say that the people of this country, by and large, will express their sense of not only satisfaction and gratitude, but if I may say so, a certain sense of relief that the still waters in Kashmir particularly have been again flowing in the right direction. Sir, some of my esteemed friends from the Opposition have been complaining as to why they were not taken into confidence at the time of the negotiations.

I must say, Sir, I feel amazed and rather amused. Because, after all, these are very delicate negotiations. So, when there are delicate negotiations which are going on in an atmosphere of greater and greater understanding, how does one expect the Government and the leaders on behalf of the Government to go on briefing the opposition and taking their advice?

After all, Sir, either Parliament says 'Yes' or 'No'; we say it is 'good' or 'bad'; but to say that they should have been consulted beforehand is rather expecting too much. I do not think that any Government in any democratic country would do that to any opposition.

Now, Sir, I do not view this Accord at all from any narrow or formal legalistic angles, nor even from any formal or constitutional aspects—not that they are unimportant—but, Sir, after all, Constitutions are not Constitutions because they are the product of a fine brain of a legal pundit. Constitutions are Constitutions, and Constitutions become workable because they reflect the aspirations of the people. They respect the political will of the people and reflect what the people will not tolerate in their particular polity.

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

After all, the Constitution is made by the people, and if the Constitution falls short of certain aspirations and certain expectations of the people, the very people have got a right to make amends to go forward in the direction of the ideals so beautifully enshrined in the Preamble of our Constitution.

Having said that, may I say, I must particularly underline two or three lines of the Prime Minister's statement of the 24th February, where she said about Sheikh Abdullah. I quote:

"His commitment to basic national ideals and objectives had remained unchanged. He reaffirmed that the accession of the State to the Indian Union was final and irrevocable."

But, Sir, more than the Prime Minister's comments, what touches me and I am sure what touches the hearts of millions and millions of our countrymen is what Sheikh Abdullah says in his letter to the Prime Minister. I quote.

"The accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India is not a matter in issue."

And, Sir, the sentence which particularly touches me comes a little further, when he says: why he has come down from a particular position, from what he said in 1953. He says, as it were, 'I am prepared to step down not one step, but several steps'. Why? Because, it is, as he says, for the well-being of the people of the State, which I have always considered as my sacred trust'. So, this is the fine motivation behind Sheikh Abdullah's stepping down and agreeing to certain points when the Prime Minister of the Government of India rightly said that although certain concessions and a certain compromise have to be there in the agreement, the clock cannot be put back; and Sheikh Saheb agreed to that, because,—let us not forget that,—Sheikh Saheb considered the Chief Ministership as only a means to an

end, the end being the discharge of duty for meeting this sacred trust, and that is why he has got into this position, for the well-being of the people of Kashmir.

Now, Sir, I feel very happy, I feel very relieved and I feel very hopeful about this accord. I feel happy because an old sore is removed, happy again because the weight of a queer status quo has at long last been lifted, happy, moreover, because the political stream in Kashmir has started flowing again. A sense of relief is there, because, Sheikh Abdullah is back again on the stage. If I may say so, it is futile to go ahead without him and it would be foolish to ignore him. Can you ever imagine the Play Hamlet, without the Prince Hamlet? Likewise, can you have a Kashmir, without the acknowledged leader of Kashmir, very much in the forefront and very much on the stage?

Now, Sir, our hope is that forces of secularism will be strengthened and unity of the nation will be fostered. But, there are certain misgivings in some quarters that this accord may lead to what is termed Balkanisation. If I may say so, the fears may be genuine, but the fears are definitely ill-founded.

When we look at the whole background, when we look at the ideological philosophy behind the whole thing, I do not think we are going in for "Balkanisation". Indeed, this is a step in the direction of strengthening the nation.

Sir, some of the friends have rightly said that some critics who spoke today have not mentioned Bhutto and some others who mentioned Bhutto only mentioned Bhutto and Jan Sangh. I view this accord a little differently. I say, this accord has to be viewed from the international angle as well. Only this morning we read a small news-item that Peking also considers this accord as very wrong and bad. Therefore, we know now the obvious international leanings on this

point. If Pakistan and China do not want it, it is not because they are really interested in the people of Kashmir but because they are jealous of the kind of democratic polity that we have established on the Indian sub-continent, and they are not able to see the progress of democracy, socialism and secularism in India.

Sir, if it is an accord born out of our strength and not of our weakness, born out of our confidence and not of diffidence, then I ask these questions to the critics of this accord: Are we afraid of Sheikh Abdullah or the people of Kashmir? Do we fear that they will one day go out of the Union? Do we apprehend that they will perhaps dominate over us? If we have these fears we do not deserve to be a Union; we do not deserve to be a free nation. We do not deserve to be a democratic nation. But far from having these apprehensions, I believe, this accord starts a wonderful and welcome experiment in the direction of socialism, secularism and democracy. As my friend, Mr. Shamim said, Sheikh Abdullah is really a living symbol of this force. But even after Sheikh Abdullah is not on the scene, I am quite sure, on the foundations laid by Sheikh Sahib and the Government of India and the people of India through the consent of this House today, the near future generations will be able to go ahead on these lines and strengthen this accord in the directions we wanted it to go.

Sir, much is made of Article 370 because it is said a separate and special status is given to Kashmir. But let me tell you, it is not the Constitution of India which has given Kashmir its special status. Indeed, it is the very special and peculiar circumstances of Kashmir that were incorporated into the Indian Constitution through Article 370 and as long as those peculiar and special circumstances remain this Article will have to remain in the Constitution. I am one of those who believe and say that let this Article remain on the Constitutional book until by course of events we create a

climate of confidence so that as the time passes the need for Article 370 automatically gets evaporated.

Finally, I would say if we have started this dialogue with Sheikh Abdullah—and I say it with all sincerity and without bringing in any political overtures—who as the Prime Minister herself has admitted, has had a feeling of bitterness, then we should show similar magnanimity and generosity so that history should not tell 20 years later that the powers that we did not start a dialogue with other national leaders who are fighting perhaps against Government today but also fighting for certain values which they hold very dear to their hearts.

My conclusion is this Kashmir is a beautiful land but a land consisting of so many poor people. When I was only eight years old I had an opportunity of visiting Kashmir. That was back in 1936. But since Independence I have not yet had the privilege of going to Kashmir. But, it is very much in my heart not only because it has a beautiful land-scape but also because of the ties of friendship and the ties of secularism and democracy with which the people of that area have bound the people of this country.

Sir, before I sit, coming as I do from Ahmedabad and Gujarat, I must remember with a certain sense of anguish and sorrow the late Bahen Mridula Sarabhai. I only wish she was alive to see this happy end of a very fine accord which the Government of India have made with Kashmir leaders. Mridula Bahen would have been rejoicing at the way things are moving. With these words I welcome once again this accord.

SHRI RANABAHADUR SINGH (Sidhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I welcome this accord whole heartedly. I think Mr. Shamim would be kind enough to allow me...

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: I am all for the accord.

SHRI RANABAHADUR SINGH:

I know that Mr. Shamim has been extremely voluble, about it and what I am going to say is a part of what he has said and I will just add one more line to it. In this accord, I personally feel that our country, apart from solving a very old international problem, that was so close to us, has also blazed a historic trail, if I may put it that way, inasmuch as that for the future, we have shown a way, wherein, people from different regions can reach an accord and exist together. Article 370, has all along been in our Constitution, but has remained more or less a pious hope and it is only today, after this accord has been reached, that Article 370 has come into its own. The limitations of Article 370 that it would apply only to Kashmir would, I hope, some day in the future, prove that this particular approach might help to form a better comity of people in South East Asia. That is my hope and that is why, I welcome this accord. Thank you.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF ELECTRONICS, MINISTER OF SPACE, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we had a fairly lengthy debate and the various points raised—legal, constitutional, political—have been dealt with by most speakers on both sides of the House, for a change. The hope that I had expressed earlier that the Jan Sangh would show an understanding of the background, the spirit and the benefits of the accord has been belied. This is evidence of their chauvinistic policies and authoritarian outlook. They cannot understand that bitterness can be overcome by seeing things in the larger perspective and by moving forward in trust.

16.42 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The understanding that has been reached is within the framework of the Indian Constitution which, while ensuring that the Union functions effectively, is sufficiently broad-based and flexible to accommodate special requirements and situations and to provide ample scope for the socio-economic development of constituent States.

Some Members spoke of autonomy. This seems to have become a catch word. Our Constitution provides for a strong Centre, yet it gives considerable autonomy to the States. It is wholly wrong to think that constitutional arrangements stifle the States in any way.

None of us can claim to be as great as Mahatma Gandhi but I can assure Hanumanthaiyali who is not here just now, that we are not subjective when we talk of Centre-State relations. Without a strong Centre, how can the States hold together? If each State looks only to its own interests, how will the weaker States be helped? All our States are inter-dependent and each needs something from the other. The Centre is the thread which binds them together. At present, most States, in fact, I would say all States, find it useful to have someone on whom they can lay the blame for whatever they are unable to do, for their shortcomings.

I believe in diversity and decentralisation. Individuals, groups and States should be able to develop their personalities and their resources. Local initiative and talent should be encouraged. But I believe equally in unity. Without a strong Centre there would be no united country. What freedom would the States then share? State autonomy should be inseparable from national strength. Any demands

in the name of autonomy which are incompatible with national strength will not be acceptable to the people of our country.

I can assure the hon. Member opposite, from the DMK, that we have never called him or anyone names. Nor shall we do so. But, if anybody works for or propagates a policy which weakens the nation, we must say so.

Shri Hanumanthaiya was in great form yesterday, but he indulged in a flight of fancy when he compared Chief Ministers to ants. One of the books which made an impression on me when I was a child was *Macterlinck's Life of the Ant*. Ants may be small, but they are industrious creatures and their communities are very disciplined and highly organised. I do not know to which of these qualities Shri Hanumanthaiya was referring.

Many members have spoken about art. 370, either in criticism or in explanation or in support. As has been said, this is a specific provision made for Jammu and Kashmir in our Constitution taking into account the historical and political factors which prevail in the State. It lays down a procedure for the progressive extension to the State of the remaining provisions of the Constitution with the concurrence of its Government. This has been working satisfactorily all these years, and several important and necessary provisions have been applied to the State in this manner. There is no reason to assume that further extension of provisions to the State is ruled out. Given mutual trust and confidence, there is bound to be mutual appreciation of the needs of the State and the Centre (*Interruptions*).

Shri Vajpayee made much of a particular sentence I used the other day. It is characteristic of the Opposition to try to find a word on which to trip us—ignoring the spirit and the substance.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Why Opposition?

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: From now on, do not use words; use gestures!

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: My observations on the present status of art. 370, to which Shri S. N. Mishra took exception, are based upon the Supreme Court's decision of 1970.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What? Please quote.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I had quoted it earlier. I had said so the other day also.

What I said was that because the State's Constituent Assembly, which completed its work in 1956, did not suggest deletion or modification of art. 370, it therefore became a part of our Constitution, and this position was confirmed by the Supreme Court in 1970. The agreement has not brought about any new situation as regards art. 370.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Now there is no Constituent Assembly in India, so the Constitution of India cannot be changed or amended? That is no argument.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not saying it cannot be changed ..

SHRI PILOO MODY: She is saying it can be changed. I am saying it cannot be changed.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE: It is as permanent as any other article.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: This is what I said earlier also. From what I have said about this article, it is clear that there is no question of any surrender, as alleged in some quarters, nor is there any loosening of the ties that bind the Centre and Jammu and Kashmir State. This is clear from the very

[Smt. Indira Gandhi]

fact that no such consequences flowed during all these years since art. 370 was incorporated. It is not correct to allege that this will create a precedent for other States. A distinctive constitutional features in respect of Jammu and Kashmir is that it has its own Constitution supplementing the Union Constitution and the specific provision in art. 370.

There is some talk of mysterious, secret, clauses. I said the other day—and I should like to repeat—that there are no such secret clauses.

SHRI PILOO MODY: What a shame! What a shame!

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I first saw Sheikh Saheb in 1934 leading a procession. He was sitting on a pony so small—I do not know whether the pony was small or it merely looked small in comparison—that his feet were hardly off the ground. Even so, he managed to look dignified and every inch a leader. He was attracted to the message of national freedom, civil liberties and religious equalities which our national movement propagated and this became the guideline of his own National Conference which mobilised the people of Kashmir. If he remained with India and enabled the people of the State to cast their lot with India, it was because of our party's ideals and policies. If we had followed the policy of the Jana Sangh I do not think the people of Kashmir would have chosen to accede to India.

Hon. Member Shri Shamim has already spoken on this subject with emotion... (Interruptions).

A reference has been made and is being made to subsequent events. here is no point in harking back to past misunderstandings and past mistakes. There were some internal

developments which necessitated certain action. When we found that there was a change in the approach we did not hesitate to open the door to reconciliation and cooperation. I should like to draw the attention of hon. members who talk about any other dialogue to this last sentence. The opportunity was provided by Sheikh Abdullah with his readiness to join the main stream of national life and to bring his experience and idealism into the task of strengthening the democratic and secular fabric of our country.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: It is your party members who are asking for dialogue.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Sheikh Abdullah has categorically stated that he always believed that the well being and the future of Kashmir lie with the Indian Union. His reiteration that accession is not an issue and that plebiscite has become irrelevant has had beneficial consequences. Even those who had expressed reservation on the fact of accession have now come to accept its finality. The decision of the Plebiscite Front to change its objectives and its name sets doubts at rest. The existence of the Plebiscite Front had encouraged hostile elements outside the country. This should now end. But it is true that this does not mean that there will be no hostility. We have to take it in our stride and meet it. I have no doubt that Sheikh Sahib will do so.

SHRI PILOO MODY: ... With Shamim's help.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I certainly hope Shamim will help. Why not? I should like the House to show its appreciation of Sheikh Abdullah's vision. This latest example of his statesmanship is worthy of his record as a veteran of our freedom struggle. We should not underestimate his difficulties and he should not

underestimate the difficulties we face here. Perhaps that was why it took us long, so that we could create an atmosphere in which an agreement and understanding of this kind would be welcomed by almost all the people. We have succeeded in this. It is up to us to see that this atmosphere is not changed or damaged in Kashmir and it is also up to us to see how we can help Sheikh Sahib in every way in overcoming the difficulties which he will face.

I should also like to refer to the constructive part played by Mirza Afzal Beg during the discussions. His deep knowledge of the law, his sound political judgement were invaluable in reaching a satisfactory and realistic accord. Syed Mir Qasim played a notable part in negotiations through his self-effacing devotion to the larger interest. Shri Parthasarathi showed great patience and was ably assisted by Shri Balakrishnan. Sardar Swaran Singh's knowledge of the political scene and his vast experience with negotiations stood him in good stead in dealing with this delicate task.

I am glad that our hon. friend Shri Mavalankar referred to Mridula Sarabhai. I should like to inform him that before her illness, we had discussed these matters and she was aware that an understanding was being reached. So it was not as if she were in the dark regarding what was happening. I know that she was very happy at the outcome.

We are all deeply concerned with the development of the two regions of Jammu and Ladakh. Dr. Karan Singh gave an account of the work undertaken in Jammu. Kushak Bakula who spoke just now felt that nothing has been done for Ladakh. This is not wholly correct. There has been development, but it is true that it is nowhere near adequate. I have taken special interest in these areas and have been visiting these regions regularly, even the most outlying areas. During the discussions with Sheikh Abdullah I made it a point to mention

the anxieties and difficulties of these regions and of certain sections of the people even in the valley. In recent months Sheikh Sahib himself has toured these regions and he assured me of his own awareness and his desire to treat all regions equitably. The composition of his Cabinet reflects this concern for Jammu and Ladakh.

There is a special situation in Jammu and Kashmir not only because of its own Constitution or of its Muslim majority but, as Dr. Karan Singh rightly pointed out, it has been the main battle field during repeated aggressions against us. All the three regions of the State have borne the brunt of the attack. All sections of the State population have fought valiantly for the national cause. I should like particularly to mention the brave Gujjars, Bakarwals and Gaddis. These are communities which have suffered much poverty and hardship. They deserve all the help we can give them by way of education and employment. I hope adequate attention will be given to their problems.

I do not think I need dwell on the other points raised in the debate. As I said, most of them have been answered. I should like to revert to the point I have already made, that the understanding has to be viewed in the larger context of the need for adopting a conciliatory approach in resolving problems facing the country. A problem that has been with us for a generation should be solved when we have the ability and opportunity to do so.

Although the Opposition loses no occasion to attribute motives to us and our Party, it has always been our endeavour to solve problems in the larger national interest. It is obvious that in this case also our party unit in Kashmir and our party at the national level has not thought of its own interest but only how to consolidate the unity and strength of our country.

[Smt. Indira Gandhi]

Let us not expect miracles and an immediate total ending of tension. Much as we all desire this, life is a series of problems. And solutions give rise to new difficulties of one kind or another. But an achievement based on understanding and confidence strengthens us to face challenges. It is in this spirit that we should look at this understanding. Once again I should like to thank all the hon. Members who have given it such warm support and shown appreciation of it. A few have not but the vast majority in the House and outside have shown appreciation and support and I thank them all. On behalf of you all I should like to send our good wishes to Shiekh Abdu'lrah in the tasks ahead.

17 hrs.

SHRI PILOO MODY. I would like to add our good wishes to Mr. Shamim also.

MR. SPEAKER: There are some substitute motions, one by Shri Vajpayee. He conveys his regret at his absence. He does not mean any disrespect, he is attending the rally of his party.

The question is:

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

"This House, having considered the Statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 24th February, 1975 in relation to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, resolves that the process of integration of Jammu and Kashmir with the rest of India going on during last more than two decades be carried further and the State be brought at par with the other States of India."(2)

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 5]

[7.04 hrs.

AYES

Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
Chaudhry, Shri Ishwar
Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh
Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
*Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
Pandeya, Dr Laxminarain
Sharma, Shri R. R.
Verma, Shri Phool Chand

NOES

Achal Singh, Shri
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Ambesh, Shri
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
Arund Netam, Shri
Austin, Dr Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerjee, Shrimati Mukul
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Barupal, Shri Panna Lal
Basumatari, Shri D.
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhargava, Shri Basheswar Nath
Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen
Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu

- Bhavarahan, Shri G.
 Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
 Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
 Chavan, Shrimati Premalabai
 Chellachami, Shri A. M.
 Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque
 Daga, Shri M. C.
 Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Dalip Singh, Shri
 Darbara Singh, Shri
 Das, Shri Anadi Charan
 Das, Shri Dharnidhar
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Desai, Shri D. D.
 Deshpande, Shrimati Roza
 Dhandapani, Shri C. T.
 Dharia, Shri Mohan
 Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
 Engti, Shri Biren
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Gangadeb, Shri P.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Gavit, Shri T. H.
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Godara, Shri Mani Ram
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun
 Gokhale, Shri H. R.
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar
 Gopal, Shri K.
 Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
 Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
 Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Hansda, Shri Subodh
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.
 Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
 Huda, Shri Noorul
 Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
 Jadeja, Shri D. P.
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
 Jagjivan Ram, Shri
 Jamilurrahman, Shri, Md.
 Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
 Jha, Shri Chiranjib
 Jitendra Prasad, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
 Kadam, Shri J. G.
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
 Kader, Shri S. A.
 Kailas, Dr.
 Kakoti, Shri Robin
 Kamble, Shri T. D.
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kisku, Shri A. K.
 Kotoki, Shri Laddhar
 Kotrashettu, Shri A. K.
 Krishnan, Shri M. K.
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
 Mallanna, Shri K.
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
 Maurya, Shri B. P.
 Mirzha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Modi, Shri Shrikishan
 Mohapatra, Shri Shyam Sunder
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Mukherjee Shri Samar
 Muzmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Naik, Shri B. V.
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
 Nimbalkar, Shri

- Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
 Pandey, Shri R. S.
 Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Krishnarao
 Patnaik, Shri Banamali
 Patnaik, Shri J. B.
 Quresi, Shri Mohd Shaif
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri
 Raju, Shri P. V. G.
 Ram Dayal, Shri
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Ch.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
 Rao, Shri P. Ankincedu Prasada
 Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
 Rao, Dr V. K. R. Varadaraja
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ray, Shrimati Maya
 Reddy, Shri M Ram Gopal
 Reddy, Shri P Narasimha
 Richhariya, Dr Govind Das
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Rudra Pratap Singh, Shri
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saha, Shri Gadadhar
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaque
 Sangliana, Shri
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Satpathy, Shri Devendra
 Savant, Shri Shankerrao
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sethi, Shri Arjun
 Sezhiyan, Shri Era
 Shailani, Shri Chandra
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
 Shankar Dev, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Sharma, Dr Shanker Dayal
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
 Shastri, Shri Raja Ram
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Shetty, Shri K. K.
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Shivnath Singh, Shri
 Shukla Shri B. R.
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Prof.
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.
 Sokhi, Sardar Swaran Singh
 Subramamam, Shri C.
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Swarup Singh Shri
 Tavayab Hussam, Shri
 Tewari, Shri Shankar
 Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani
 Tiwari, Shri R. G.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Vekaria, Shri
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh

Yadav, Shri N. P.
Zulfquar Ali Khan, Shri

MR. SPEAKER: The result* of the division is:

17.05 hrs.

Ayes 8; Noes 191.

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, there is another Substitute Motion moved by Shri Surendra Mohanty.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY. I press it.

MR. SPEAKER: I put the Substitute Motion moved by Shri Surendra Mohanty to the vote of the House.

Substitute Motion No. 4 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, there is the Substitute Motion No. 1 moved by Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami. I put it to the vote of the House.

The question is

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

"This House, having considered the Statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 24th February, 1975, in relation to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, approves of it." (1)

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 6] [17.03 hrs.

AYES

Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Abirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Alagesan, Shri O V.

Ambesh, Shri
Ansari, Shri Zaur Rahman
Arvind Netam, Shri
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
Banerjee, Shrimati Mukul
Barua, Shri Bedabrat
Barupal, Shri Panna Lal
Basumatari, Shri D.
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
Bhuvarahan, Shri G.
Bisr, Shri Narendra Singh
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrika Prasad, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
Chavan, Shrimati Premalabai
Chellachami, Shri A. M.
Choudhury, Shri Moul Haque
Daga, Shri M. C.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Dalip Singh, Shri
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Darbara Singh, Shri
Das, Shri Anadi Charan
Das, Shri Dharnidhar
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
Desai, Shri D. D.
Deshpande, Shrimati Roza
Dhandapani, Shri C. T.
Dharia, Shri Mohan
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Engti, Shri Biren
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Gangadeb, Shri P.
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Davit, Shri T. H.

*The following Members also recorded their votes for NOES:
Sarvshri Tarkeshwar Pandey, Genda Singh and Jagannath Pahadia.

- Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Godara, Shri Mani Ram
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun
 Gokhale, Shri H. R.
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar
 Gopal, Shri K.
 Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
 Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
 Hansda, Shri Subodh
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.
 Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
 Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
 Jadeja, Shri D. P.
 Jaifer Sharief, Shri C. K.
 Jamilurrahman, Shri Md
 Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
 Jha, Shri Chiranjib
 Jitendra Prasad, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Poptial M.
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhedra
 Kadam, Shri J. G.
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
 Kader, Shri S. A.
 Kailas, Dr.
 Kakoti, Shri Robin
 Kamble, Shri T. D.
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kaul, Shrimati Slesha
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kisku, Shri A. K.
 Kotaki, Shri Liladhar
 Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Malhotra, Shri Indar J.
 Mallanna, Shri K.
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
 Maurya, Shri B. P.
 Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mishra, Shri Shyamnandan
 Modi, Shri Shrikishan
 Mody, Shri Filoo
 Mohapatra, Shri Shyam Sunder
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra
 Nahata, Shri Anrit
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
 Nimbalkar, Shri
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Painuli, Shri Paripoomanand
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
 Pandey, Shri R. S.
 Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
 Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
 Parmar, Shri Bhagyibhai
 Patil, Shri E. V. V. khe
 Patil, Shri Krisnnerao
 Patnaik, Shri Banamali
 Patnaik, Shri J. B.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaif
 Raghu Ramaiab, Shri K.
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri
 Raju, Shri P. V. G.
 Ram Dayal, Shri
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Ch.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramshekhhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Ranabhadur Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
 Rao, Shri P. Ankinedu Prasada
 Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. Varadaraja
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ray, Shrimati Maya
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha

Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Rudra Pratap Singh, Shri
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambhali, Shri Isbaque
 Sangliana, Shri
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Satpathy, Shri Devendra
 Savant, Shri Shankarrao
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sethi, Shri Arjun
 Sezhiyan, Shri Era
 Shailani, Shri Chandra
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shamim, Shri S. A.
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
 Shankar Dev, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Madharam
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Sharma, Dr. Shanker Dayal
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
 Shastri, Shri Raja Ram
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Shetty, Shri K. K.
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.

Shivappa, Shri N.
 Shrivnath Singh, Shri
 Shukla, Shri B. R.
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Prof.
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.
 Sokhi, Sardar Swaran Singh
 Subramaniam, Shri C.
 Suryanarayan, Shri K
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewari, Shri Shankar
 Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani
 Tiwari, Shri R. G.
 Tiwari, Shri D. N.
 Vekaria, Shri
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Vidyalandai, Shri Amornath
 Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
 Yadav, Shri N. P.
 Zulfiquar Ali Khan, Shri

NOES

Berwa, Shri Onkarlal
 Chaudhry, Shri Ishwar
 Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh
 *Jaggiwan Ram, Shri
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain
 Sharma, Shri R. R.
 Verma, Shri Phool Chand

MR. SPEAKER. The result of the division is: Ayes 189, Noes 8

The motion was adopted.

*Wrongly voted for Noes.

†The following Members also recorded their votes for AYES

Sarvshri Banamali Babu, Genda Singh and Jagjiwan Ram