बचाना हो ना चाहिये और इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस संबंध में एक सर्वदलीय सम्मेलन बुलाया जाना चाहिये और उनकी इस बारे में सहायता मांगी जानी चाहिये। हम लोग इस सम्बन्ध में एक सप्ताह मनावें जिसमें सभी पार्टी के लोग बैठकर उसका कार्यक्रम तैयार करें। इसमें जनता को समझाया जाये कि यह दलगत का मामला नहीं है। इसमें तो सब का सहयोग लेना और करना आवश्यक है क्योंकि इससे जनता को ही फायदा पहुंचने वाला है। मैं मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि केन्द्र के मंत्री बिहार में जगह जगह पर जायें। मैं इस बारे में कई लोगों से मिल चुका हूं। यह बात सत्य है कि मुंगेर, भागलपुर, सहर्सा और सन्थाल परगना में जहाँ भी गया हूं वहां के विधायक और लोगों से मिला और उन लोगों ने बताया है कि वहाँ पर काफी लोग मरे हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि वहां पर केन्द्रीय और राज्य मंत्री जायें। मैं डा० कर्णसिंह से भी प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे कम से कम एक जिले के हैडक्वाटर में जायें और वहां पर लोगों तथा अधिकारियों को बुलाकर एक बैठक करें। इससे जनता में उत्साह आवेगा और इस बीमारी तथा कलंक को हमेशा के लिए हम मिलकर ही मिटा सकते हैं।

डा० कर्ण सिंह : उप-सभापति जी, माननीय सदस्य ने कोई विशेष स्पष्टीकरण नहीं पूछा है बल्कि उन्होंने कछ सुझाव दिये हैं जिन पर विचार किया जा सकता है। उन्होंने अपने प्रश्न में जिस कम्युनिटी का जिक्र किया है, उसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे कोई जानकारी नहीं है, लेकिन हमारा जनरल एप्रोच यह रहता है कि जो आदिवासी क्षेत्र है, उसमें वहां के लोगों को अधिक से अधिक संख्या में टीका लगाया जाय। मैं समझता हूं कि इस चीज से वहां के लोगों को ज्यादा फायदा हो सकता है। इसी प्रकार हम चाहते हैं कि सभी कम्युनिटी के लोग इसमें आयें।

जहां तक राउन्ड टेबल कांफ्रेंस की बात है, हम इस बात को महसूस करते हैं कि इस में सब दल सहायता करें, सारे कर्मचारी, स्कूल टीचर, प्राईमरी हैल्थ सेन्टर के जो कर्मचारी हैं और सब सेन्टरों के जो कर्मचारी है, तथा जो और कर्मचारी हैं, वे सब इस तरह से मदद करे कि यह अभियान सफल हो सके। इस सम्बन्ध में केन्द्रीय सरकार के उच्च अधिकारी तथा विशेषज्ञ उन क्षेत्रों में गये हैं जहां पर यह बीमारी फैली हुई है और इस तरह का प्रबन्ध कर रहें हैं ताकि यह बीमारी बढ़ने न पाये। मैं सदन को और मेंम्बरों को विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूं कि इस सम्बन्ध में केन्द्रीय सरकार की ओर से कोई भी कसर उठा नहीं रखी जायेगी और जो भी सहायता, जो भी विशेषज्ञ इस कार्य के लिये आवश्यक होंगें, वह दी जायेंगी और हम इस काम के लिए दे भी रहे हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि यह कार्य राष्ट्रीयस्तर पर किया जाय ताकि जो धब्बा हमारे देश के ऊपर है वह मिट जाय और सारे संसार से चेचक समाप्त हो जाय। मेरी यही आशा है कि हम इस धब्बे को धोने में अन्त में सफल हो जायेंगे।

OBJECTION TO GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON INDIA-SRI LANKA AGREEMENT ON BOUNDARY IN HISTORIC WATERS BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Surendra Pal Singh will now make a statement.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): On a point of order.

SHRI RABI RAY (Orissa): There is a point of order.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu): On a point of order.

SHRI B. S. SHEKHAWAT (Madhya Pradesh): On a point of order. *(Interruptions).*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, where is the point of order. Please take your seats.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: You hear the point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him make the statement.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: You hear the point of order first. The point of order is this. Was it proper for the Government of India, without consulting the Government of Tamil Nadu, who are so much emotionally involved in it, to enter into an agreement with the Government of Sri Lanka?

{Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have asked Mr. Shekhawat to make his point of order. Please take your seat. now. If you persist, it will go out of record.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever you say. You please take your seat now.

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत : पोइन्ट आफ आर्डर। राज्य सभा की कार्यसूची में यह लिखा हुआ है "मंत्री द्वारा वक्तव्य-श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : भारत और श्रीलंका के बीच दोनों देशों के मध्यवर्ती ऐतिहासिक समुद्र में सीमा और उससे संबद्ध मामलों के विषय में हुए करार के संबंध में एक वक्तव्य देंगे।" इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा पोइन्ट आफ आर्डर यह है कि जिस प्रकार का वक्तव्य दिया जा रहा है उस वक्तव्य से संविधान का उल्लंघन हो रहा है संसद की अवहेलना की जा रही है, सार्वभौमिकता से समझौता किया जा रहा है और जो हमारे संविधान का संघात्मक भाव है उसका अतिक्रमण किया जा रहा है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि माननीय मंत्री महोदय को वक्तव्य देने की इजाजत नहीं दी जानी चाहिए और इसलिए मैंने पोइन्ट आफ आर्डर रेज किया है। मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा हूं कि कच्चातिवु के सम्बन्ध में समझौता जो भारत सरकार ने 28 जून को श्रीलंका से किया उस समझौते के अनुसार कच्चातिवु की 200 एकड़ भूमि, जिस पर आज हमारा अधिकार था, जिस दिन संविधान बना था उस दिन से हमारा अधिकार था...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall I tell you something? Now you are talking about the merits of Kachchativu.

SHRI B. S. SHEKHAWAT: Not the merits of the case. I am only putting the constitutional position of this agreement.

मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि जिस समय संविधान लागू हुआ उस समय इस क्षेत्र के ऊपर हमारा अधिकार था। इस बात को स्वयं प्रधान-मंत्री महोदया ने स्वीकार किया है, हमारे विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने स्वीकार किया है। उस क्षेत्र के ऊपर हमारा निरन्तर अधिकार रहा है। उसके विपरीत, उपसभापति जी, लंका का कभी उस पर टाइटिल नहीं रहा और लंका का 54 का जो सर्वे मैप है उसमें भी वहां की सरकार ने कच्चातिवु को अपने अधिकार-क्षेत्र में नहीं बताया।

दूसरा प्रश्न यह आता है कि हमारी सरकार जो देश की टैरीटोरियल इन्टेग्रिटी है...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is not a point of order. You can take obje:-tion. You cannot give a speech on the relative merits or demerits.

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत : यह सैसेशन का क्वेश्चन है। इसलिए मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूं...

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT (Nominated): On a point of order.

(Interruptions).

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत : मैं केवल संविधान के प्रश्न को डिस्कस करना चाहता हूं, इस समझौते की मैरिटस् और डिमैरिटस् में नहीं जाना चाहता।

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: I should like to know from you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, wheiher there can be a point of order for such a long time.

श्री उपसभापति : आप केवल यह बताइए कि यह स्टैटमेन्ट यहां देने पर आप क्यों एतराज कर रहे हैं।

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत : मैं मैरिटस् और डिमैरिटस् में नहीं जा रहा हूं, मैं केवल संविधान की पोजीशन समझा रहा हूं।

कांस्टीट्यूशनल पोइन्ट यह है कि संविधान के आर्टिकल 3 के अनुसार किसी भी राज्य की सीमा में किसी प्रकार का परिवर्तन किया जाये तो उसके लिये काम्पीटेन्ट लैजिस्लेशन आना चाहिए और उस लैजिस्लेशन के पहले उस राज्य की असैम्बली से सलाह ली जानी चाहिए जिस प्रदेश की सीमा घटती है । मद्रास के मुख्य मंत्री ने 6 जनवरी, 74 को प्रधान मंत्री को एक पत्र लिखा जिसका आज तक कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया गया । यह प्रधान मंत्री और मुख्य मंत्री के बीच का ही प्रश्न नहीं है, वहां की राज्य विधान सभा से अनुमति ली जानी चाहिए थी । वह नहीं ली गई । इसलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि जो हमारी संघात्मक व्यवस्था है उस व्यवस्था का भी उल्लंघन किया गया है । उपसभापति जी, संक्षेप में मैं इतना निवेदन कर दूं कि जब हमारी टैरीटोरियल इन्टैग्रेटी का प्रश्न आता है, हमारी सीमाओं के संकोच का प्रश्न आता है, चाहे आक्साईचिन का मामला हो, चाहे काश्मीर का मामला हो, चाहे कच्छ का मामला हो, चाहे बेरुबारी का मामला हो, मेरा इस सरकार पर स्पष्ट आरोप है कि सरकार ने टैरीटोरियल इन्टैग्रेटी के प्रश्न पर हमेशा सरेन्डर की पोलिसी अपनाई है, हमारी टैरीटोरी का भू-दान किया है । और इसलिए ऐसा आप कैसे समझते हैं कि जो भारत की भूमि का भू-दान करता है उस का हम विरोध नहीं करेंगे । और इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि . . .

1 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mariswamy.

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर : आज तक सरकार ने जो भी इस तरह का समझौता किया है उस पर संसद् की मुहर लगी है, विधान सभाओं की मुहर लगी है और संसद् उसके लिए कम्पिटेंट है. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thakur, this is not the way. Please take your seat.

(Shri Gunanad Thakur continued to speak).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This would go off the record. Now, Mr. Mari-swamy.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu): In the early 50s in connection with Aksai Chin the same arguments were used. The late Panditji came out with a statement that not evan a blade of grass grew in that area. I remember our hon. colleague Mr. Mahavir Tyagi got up and showed his head. He said: Nothing grows on my head; does that mean that you wou'd chop off my head, put it on a platter and hand it over to China? At that time China was a friendly nation but now we are not on friendly terms. But the arguments advanced by the Government are the same. Sri Lanka is a friendly country; we have given it away and this is uninhabited and so on. These were the very words of the late Panditji when the transfer of Aksai Chin took place. Sir, this is transfer of territory from one country to another. As my hon. friend said, Madras is close by to Kachchativu. It is about 12 miles from Rameswaram border. The Ramnad Zamindar was having control over it; it was in his zamin. When the zamin was abolished it became part of Madras State. Now I would request the House to realise the position. The Madras Government was not even taken into consultation in spite of the fact that our Chief Minister wrote a letter saying that it is a matter which affects the sentiments of our people and we would like to know what the position is. But no reply was given to that. Again, Parliament was to meet on 22nd and in the beginning of this month Madam took a decision. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mari-swamy, I do not think. . .

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Sir, I am coming to the point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to listen to me.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: All the time Parliament is presented with a *fait accompli* and it is. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am objecting to the use of the word 'Madam*,

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: All right, I will say Prime Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must use proper words.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Prime Minister or Madam, it means the same thing. I accept your ruling.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must have the patience to listen to what 1 say.

श्री राजनारायण : क्या श्रीमन्, मैडम, प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं कहा जा सकता ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot use 'Madam' like that; you must know the proper usage in English.

SHRl S. S. MARISWAMY: When Parliament was about to meet, the Government had no business to enter into an agreement with Sri Lanka. The matter should have been placed before Parliament. For example when Diego Garcia was taken over by Britain the matter was put before the House of Commons and they took the premission of the House of Commons. It was a part of Madagascar earlier. Now when they want to set up an American base there the American Government has gone to the Senate and it has raised an objection whether America could participate in the arrangements made in Diego Garcia. In the same manner when a matter concerning a territory is settled outside Parliament I say it is disrespect to Parliament and repugnant to democratic principles. We strongly protest against this and I would like to know whether we will have a discussion on this subject.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): There are two points involved in this matter. One is making a statement in this House with regard to an international agreement which has been arrived at and the other is whether the agreement that has been arrived at is constitutionally or legally valid. At the moment, however, we are concerned not with the constitutional or legal part of it; at the moment we are concerned with the agreement which had been arrived at being communicated to the House in a formal manner by making the I statement. As far as we are concerned it is well known that we have publicly welcomed the Agreement.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Who? CPI?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We means CPI. I have not included you (here. I hope it will not happen that way. Therefore, Sir, I am not going into it. Now, the statement can be laid on the Table of House, irrespective of what you might feel about the merit of the case. This is what I say. Therefore, nothing is wrong on the part of the Government in coming expeditiously to this House within two days to tell us what agreement has been arrived at. Otherwise, what will the House take cognisance of? Suppose he does not make the statement on what will you argue as to whether it is legal or illegal? You have no case before you. Let him put his case before you. Then you apply your legal mind and constitutional mind to find out loopholes or other things and say whether it is constitutional or not. We do not know what the statement contains. We may have read it outside, but that is a different matter. Insofar as the House is concerned legally and in this House we have not been yet told what the agreement is. Therefore, Mr. Surendra Pal Singh is perfectly in order. On the contrary it will be a breach of privilege of the House on his part if he does not make the statement.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Here is a copy of the statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may have got it from somewhere. It will be a breach of privilege on his part and disrespect shown to the House if, having arrived at an agreement outside, he does not take the earliest opportunity to communicate to the House what agreement has been arrived at. You would not like it. Hon. Members being very experienced and noble parliamentarians will not create a situation in which we barter away certain established norms and privileges of the House for taking some political advantage or for giving our opinion in anticipation

on a matter which is constitutionally legal but which is not yet before us till the statement is made. Therefore, 1 think the statement should be allowed to be made. After that, let us get up and express our reactions. After we get the statement surely Members can express their reactions as they like. Personally from whatever I have heard it is an act of statesmanship on the part of the Government of India to have entered into the agreement with the Government of Sri Lanka. As far as the other merits of the agreement are concerned, 1 reserve my opinion.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): We cannot prevent him from laying it on the Table of the House. The point of order is this. The whole question is, should the Government of India be allowed *to* proceed in this way when an entire people, the Tamil people, are emotionally involved in this issue? They did not care to consult their Assembly and to consult the Tamil people. After all India is a multi-national country. These nationalities are involved. You are raking up things and you are proceeding in a manner which is injuring the feelings of various nationalities. The agreement may be good or bad. I stand for friendly and peaceful relations with Sri Lanka. I do not want any relations of enmity, but the way you proceed about it you estrange sections of people and the peoples of India. It is extremely improper on the part of the Government and this is not the procedure that they should adopt in this matter.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं मंत्री महोदय जी का वक्तव्य इस सदन में रखा जाए, इसका विरोध करता हूं और सख्त विरोध करता हूं ।

श्री उपसभापति : कभी कम विरोध भी करते हैं?

श्री राजनारायण : कभी कभी कम भी करता हूं और दिल से करता हूं, दिमाग से करता हूं ।

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द पंडा : दिल है ?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं अपने मित्र, तमिलनाडु की जिन्होंने बात की, उनके समर्थन में खड़ा हुआ हूं ।

जब तिब्बत का मसला उठा था तो श्रीमन् आपको अच्छी तरह से मालूम है बाराहोती के बारे में । उत्तर प्रदेश की सीमा के अन्तर्गत बाराहोती आती थी । उस समय हमारे लोगों के जानवर उठा कर ले जाये गए थे और भारत सरकार ने चुप्पी साध रखी थी । मुझे खुशी है कि उस समय श्री श्रीमन्नारायण, जो एक राष्ट्र भक्त थे, जिन्हें अपने देश की सीमाओं के प्रति चिन्ता थी उन्होंने बहुत हिम्मत के साथ कहा कि यह प्रश्न हमारे राज्य से सम्बन्धित है और हमारे राज्य की जो पुलिस है वह वहां जाएगी और जो भी विदेशी ताकत होगी उसका मुकाबला करेगी । चाहे भारत सरकार करे या न करे ।

मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जो तमिलनाडु राज्य सीमा है उस सीमा के अन्तर्गत यह कच्चा तीवू आता है । तमिलनाडु सरकार से भारत सरकार ने इस संबंध में कोई सलाह नहीं ली । तमिलनाडु के मुख्यमंत्री ने प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा को इस बारे में लिखा भी, परन्तु उसका उत्तर कोई दिया नहीं गया । मैं समझता हूं सदन के माननीय सदस्यों को इस बात की जानकारी होगी कि इसके पहले प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा कह चुकी हैं कि कच्चा तीवू हमारा है । यह बात उन्होंने पब्लिकली कही है । फिर भी प्रधान मंत्री जी, जो अपने देश की जमीन है उस देश की जमीन को बिना संसद में लाए, बिना संसद से पास कराए दूसरों को दे दे तो यह संसद का अपमान है, संविधान की अवहेलना है ।

श्रीमन्, सबसे बड़ी तकलीफ मुझे तब हुई जब प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा ने यह बात कह दी कि 200, 250 एकड़ जमीन क्या है । यह बिल्कुल कंकर है, पत्थर है, वहां कोई रहता नहीं है ।

मुझे याद आया है कि जब चीन का लद्दाख के इलाके पर कब्जा हुआ था और डा० लोहिया ने कहा था कि हमारी 14 हजार वर्ग मील की जमीन चली जाएगी तो जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कहा था कि वह तो ऐसी जमीन है जो ऊसर है, बंजर है, कंकर है, पत्थर है और वहां तो चिड़िया भी जिन्दा नहीं रह सकती, आदमी वहां नहीं रहता

[श्री राजनारायण]

और वही सब श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी दोहरा रही है। उन्होंने कहा है कि हम इस जमीन का क्या करें यह तो बहुत रद्दी जमीन है। जब सरकार अपनी मातृ भूमि के किसी अंग को कंकर पत्थर, ऊसर, बंजर कह कर विदेशियों के हाथों में जाने दें तो वह सरकार राष्ट्र द्रोही है, देश द्रोही है। जो स्टैटमेंट दिया गया है वह मैं असंवैधानिक स्टेटमैन्ट मानता हूं और वह स्टैटमेंट इस सदन में नहीं हो सकता।

श्री उपसभापति : आप खत्म कीजिए।

श्री राजनारायण : दो मिनट आपने कहा था, मैं अभी समाप्त करता हूं।

रामनाथ स्टेट का जो राजा था उससे पूछा जाए, उससे कागजात लिए जाएं। रामनाथ स्टेट का सारा का सारा नक्शा मैंने देखा है उसके तहत यह द्वीप है। वहां आदमी वास करता है, वहां इन्सान मिलते हैं। इन तमाम बातों को मद्देनजर रखते हुए जिस ढंग से भारत सरकार ने कच्चा तीवु दिया है उसका मैं विरोध करता हूं और एक अराष्ट्रीय कदम मानता हूं।

क्या सरकार को, इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को इस बात की जानकारी है कि कच्चा तीवु देने के वक्त श्रीमती भंडारनायके के पुत्र यहां आए थे और उन्होंने भारत के प्रधान मंत्री के पुत्र राजीव और संजय को लंका आने का निमन्त्रण दिया। क्या इसी के इवज में कच्चा तीवू दिया गया ? उनको यह लौटाया गया। यहां वे व्यापार चलाना चाहते हैं। क्या वहां की प्रधानमंत्री अपने परिवार वालों के लिए ले रही हैं। मेरा कहना है कि यह पारिवारिक मामला नहीं होना चाहिए।

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to get a clarification in this regard from the hon. Minister. Just now I heard the views expressed by my hon'ble friend, Mr. S. S. Mariswamy, D.M.K., that on the agreement reached between the Government of India and the Sri Lanka Government the Government of Tamil Nadu was not properly informed. He quoted various authorities from the Western countries. Sir, not only my hon'ble friend, Mr. Mari-swamy, preferred this kind of argument in this august House today, for the past more than twenty days in Tamil Nadu ihe Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, the hon'ble Mr. Karunanidhi, was reported saying that the derision by the Centre on Kachchativu is unilateral. Further, he met the Press on the 27th and the 29lh June, 1974 . . .

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN (Tamil Nadu): On a point of order. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. There is no point of order.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: I am making a point of order. . .

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY: That is their usual tactics. They want to deviate me from the main point.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Sir, he is going into details and that is why I am raising a point of order. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: If somebody rises on a point of order he should be heard. He is a stranger to the House... *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record.

(Shri G. Lakshmanan and Shri K. A. Krishnaswamy continued speaking).

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY: He says I am a stranger. He should not be allowed to speak. He should withdraw th-u word. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lakshmanan, please sit down.

SHRI G LAKSHMANAN: He is a raw man.

SHR! KA. KRISHNASWAMY: He is an anti-social element. I have got every right to defend my right, my property.***

***Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Please control him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 1 cannot control him unless you control Mr. Lakshmanan. . .

SHRI C. D. NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu). Mr. Deputy Chairman, that expression which he used is highly defamatory. It should be expunged and he should apologise for it.

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY: They are afraid of truth. They want to prevent me from telling some unpleasant truth in this august House. They are afraid of my truth. They are afraid of Anna-D.M.K. and, therefore, they are not prepared to hear my speech. The same is happening in Tamil Nadu. I am prepared for any amount of argument.

I am relying on arguments, not on abuses. *{Interruptions).* I have got sufficient material. I have been brought up by our reverred leader Anna and revolutionary leader M.G.R., not by such vandalism.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You come to the subject now.

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY: I have come to express a few things and they have no guts to listen. Is it manly? *(Interruptions).*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You come to the subject. Otherwise I will ask you to sit down.

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY: There are two news items which appeared in the *Hindu.* I will just take two minutes and finish. One was on June 27.

> "When pressmen asked the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister Mr. Karunanidhi, for his reaction to the agreement on Kachchativu, he said he would prefer to wait until after the details had been announced.

Mr. Karunanidhi said the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Kewal Singh, had met him last week during his visit to Madras and apprised him on the situation. Mr. Kewal Singh had told him that a favourable condition existed for agreement on Kachchativu."

This was the reaction of the hon. Chief Minister on the 27th. On the 29th June, the State Chief Minister told the press people:

> "It was regrettable that before signing the agreement, the Centre had not invited him or any representative of the State Government for consultation. The Prime Minister had not even chosen to ascertain the views of the leaders of Parliament on this vital question."

I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the agreement was reached without the knowledge of the Chief Minister. Further, Sir, I have come to understand from reliable sources that Mr. Karunanidhi is suppressing the information made available to him by the Centre about I his accord.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the merits of the case. I think I will call the next speaker.

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY: I would like to get a clarification whether the Centre had consulted the Chief Minister and what was the dialogue that took place between Mr. Kewal Singh and the Chief Minister when he met him at Madras? This is a crucial and vital information that I would like to get from the hon. Minister. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. V. P. Dutt.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Sir, I have to make a submission. Now the issue before the House is Kachchativu. It is not a question of the profession of Mr. Karunanidhi or vandalism or this or that. *(Interruptions).* I am on my legs.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We know it for a fact that the State was consulted. *(interruptions).*

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY: I am not saying anything without sufficient basis.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Krishnaswamy.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: The issue, as I said, is Kachchativu. Unnecessarily the name of the Chief Minister of Madras, Mr. Karunanidhi, has been dragged in, and

[Shri S. S. Mariswamy] aspersions have been cast and motives have been attributed. Is it fair that all that should go into the record?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall see the record, and if there are any unparliamentary words, I will remove them.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, 1 think it would be a very wrong impression, if such an impression is given, that this entire House is exercised against the Kachchativu agreement.

(Interruptions).

SHRI RABI RAY: We are.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: All these territorial disputes lie in the area of murky, shadowy history and, therefore, for anyone to take a sanctimonious attitude about such agreements and such problems would be totally wrong. On the one hand, we say that we must have close relations with all our neighbours. *(Interruptions).* Why can't you listen with patience? 1 have been listening to you with great patience. I have my point of view.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: Sir, I remember that Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia used to be emphatic on this point that we were neglecting the establishment of close relations with our neighbours. But now. . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia also said the last Viceroy of British imperialism was Jawaharlal Nehru. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajnarain, please take your seat.

(Interruptions).

श्री राजनारायण : मैं समझता हूं कि डिपुटी-चैयरमैन प्रोफैसर से ज्यादा डा० लोहिया को समझते हैं । डा० लोहिया ने कहा था कि अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद का आखिरी वाइसराय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू चीनी साम्राज्यवाद का प्रथम वाइसराय हो सकता है ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Rajnarain.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: 1 do not accept the view that only one or two people have the right to say what Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia said or meant 1 have my own right to interpret what he said. I know that Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia was anxious about the development of close friendly relations with all our neighbouring countries. If it is the submission of the Members of the House that every territorial dispute must be settled fully to the satisfaction of India, fully in favour of India, then why have any negotiations? Then negotiations have no meaning at all. I should like to submit that in all such things, especially when small neighbours are concerned, to inflate or inflame and exaggerate things or issues is not in the vital interests of our country. I would suggest finally that every big country should be large-hearted, magnanimous, generous, with regard to small neighbours, because we have to breed confidence in the small neighbours to win the minds and hearts of the small neighbours is far more important than the discussion, the barren discussion, about small territorial claims. Therefore, I would suggest that taking into account all these things, if a substantive discussion is to take place on this issue, then all other Members of the House, all other shades of opinion, should also have the right to express their opinion.

श्री राजनारायण : पोइन्ट आफ इनफार-मैशन में जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या प्रोफेसर साहब देश की आजादी में एक बार भी जेल गए ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no point of information. There is nothing like point of information. Please take your seat. I am calling Mr. Abdul Samad.

श्री राजनारायण : एक बार भी जेल नहीं गए, खाली प्रोफैसरी की ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Rajnarain, please take your seat. Whatever you say will not be on record.

(Shri Rajnarain continued speaking).

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: I object to this kind of personal attacks by Shri Rajnarain. I do not have to prove my credentials before him.

(Shri Rajnarain continued speaking).

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: I object to such personal remarks. I never said a word against Mr. Rajnarain. Mr. Rajnarain has no right to make personal remarks against anybody.

(Shri Rajnarain continued speaking).

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I seek your protection.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajnarain, please take your seat.

SHRI RAINARAIN: Why?

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: Sir, Mr. Rajnarain has no business to make any personal remarks against his colleagues.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I have got every business. सरकार की चापलूसी करके नामिनेशन पाए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 1 have to say again whatever Mr. Rajnarain says will not go on record.

(Shri Rajnarain continued speaking).

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: Sir, I am proud to belong to a family which has sacrificed and sufferred for the independence of the country.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: On a point of order. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order? Nothing. Please take your seat. Whatever you say is not going on record. You take yours seat. I will not allow you. You are disturbing the proceedings.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: What is he doing?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Take your seat. Otherwise, I will name you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has made a statement. He is an esteemed member. His *bona fides* should not be questioned . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Who is doing that? L/B(N)17RSS—7

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may or may not agree with him. . . *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now shall I tell you something? Nobody can claim the monopoly of patriotism here. . . *(Interruptions)* This is all very wrong. Whatever you said will go out of the record. Now, Mr. Samad.

SHRI A. K. A. ABDUL SAMAD (Tamil Nadu): We are not here to prevent the Minister from making the statement. In fact we expected the statement on the first day of the session itself. I am not questioning the authority of the Government of India also in concluding a treaty with the neighbouring State. But I only want to echo the feelings of the people of Tamil Nadu and some patriotic people on this issue.

[here is a lot of confusion and commotion in Tamil Nadu ove this issue. Leave alone the political issues involved in this. But what about the economic issues involved in this? We have been agitating for the Sethusamudram project. That project was laudable. Even Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar once told the Government that it was not only feasible and possible, but also profitable and was in the interests of the country. Now we are afraid that Sethusamudram project will be shelved once and for all. Now Kachchtivu was handed over. There was never any dispute about it, there was only a doubt. Now our Government is handing over this very precious piece of land. You may say that not even a blade of grass grows there. But immediately after handing it over to Sri Lanka the next day they started oil exploration. We are losing a very precious piece of land, which was very small indeed. But you must understand the feelings of people of Tamil Nadu. This is my submission.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you may lay the statement on the Table . . . *(Interruptions)*

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: As a protest we are walking out . . . *(Interruptions). (At this stage some hon. Members left the House).*