

(SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statemi ni (in English and Hindi) regarding the introduction of Postal Index Number Code for delivery of letters. [Placed in Library. *See* No. I.T-3217/72],

. ---
**STATEMENT *RE* DELHI
UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT)
ORDINANCE, 1972**

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) explaining the circumstances which necessitated immediate legislation by the Delhi University (Amendment) Ordinance 1972. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-3279/72].

**THE DELHI UNIVERSITY
(AMENDMENT;) BILL. 1972**

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Delhi University Act, 1922.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

**MOTION *RE* AGREEMENT ON BILAT-
ERAL RELATIONS BETWEEN
INDIA AND PAKISTAN SIGNED AT
SIMLA— *contd.***

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir yesterday we heard the heated discussion on the Simla Agreement, which has emerged from the cool heights of the Himalayan hills. With

a new and fond hope, on behalf of our party, we welcome this Simla Agreement for the following reasons. Our Prime Minister has stated that it is a simple agreement marking a good beginning. Also our Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Swaran Singh, categorically stated that this agreement is only a beginning in the process of establishing peace, friendship and co-operation and also the agreement is a first step towards establishing durable peace on the sub-continent. This is only a new chapter in a big volume of peace between the two countries, that is between the border country Pakistan and our country. Of course, Sir, we are recording our welcome to this agreement. We want to submit certain points in this connection, Sir. The first of those important points would be this that there is no constitutional bar in ratifying an international agreement entered into between the two countries. As far as our Constitution is concerned there is no specific mention that this agreement should be discussed here in Parliament and get its sanction for ratification. But, Sir, this Simla Agreement has got the approval of most of the opposition parties, but it has been ratified by our President two days before Parliament started its present session. I regret to note that it is a hasty and hurried action on the part of this Government. The Government is fully aware that this agreement will be welcomed by all of the parties who are functioning here. Still the agreement has been already ratified. Whatever we say, whether the points are justified or not, that will not definitely affect the agreement. But this discussion will be a mirror to know to see how the people of this country view this agreement. Only for the purpose of knowing the mind of the people this discussion will be useful.

As far as the D.M.K. is concerned it welcomes the agreement since it is always for peace, international peace, and that

too peace between two countries which are very hostile to one another, which are already inimical for the past quarter of a century. Further, Sir, the agreement has been welcomed by all other countries in this world. They are looking at our country as the victor nation and Pakistan as the defeated nation in the military warfare. They expect that we should be generous, we should be magnanimous at the conference table. They expect that we should be very liberal in fixing the terms. So, this agreement has been concluded with magnanimity and at the same time with a good beginning. Therefore, we welcome it, Sir. Further, as the Minister of External Affairs has correctly put it, this Agreement is based on the principle of equality of sovereign nations and not in the spirit of the victor dictating his terms to the vanquished. Even though it appears that we have lost more and gained less, being the victor nation we must be generous and magnanimous. This Agreement has to be accepted by us because we are the victor nation in the recent struggle against Pakistan in connection with Bangladesh.

My approach to this Agreement is this. I am looking at this Agreement as a lawyer looks at an exhibit marked in a civil case. We know that the terms of this sort of agreements will be very vague and will not be specific; they will be elastic also at the same time, and because of this, this can be put under different interpretation by the International Court, by the international organisations and by different international legal luminaries. I also find that all the clauses are framed with words which can be interpreted in both ways. I am not accusing that they are dubious. They are not legally defective but they are liable to any sort of interpretation. Here I find clause 4. As I have stated earlier, as a lawyer, I find that the purpose of entering into this Agreement is only for the purpose

of clause 4. Sir, with your permission, I will read out this clause —

"In order to initiate the process of the establishment of durable peace, both the Governments agree that:

(i) Indian and Pakistani forces shall be withdrawn to their side of the international border.

(ii) In Jammu and Kashmir, the line of control resulting from the ceasefire of December 17, 1971 shall be respected by both sides without prejudice to the recognised position of either side. Neither side shall seek to alter it unilaterally, irrespective of mutual differences and legal interpretations. Both sides further undertake to refrain from the threat or the use of force in violation of this line.

(iii) The withdrawals shall commence upon entry into force of this agreement and shall be completed within a period of 30 days thereof."

This is the crux of the whole problem because the Jana Sangh has attached this Agreement mainly on this ground that we are going to lose a portion of the territory acquired by us. They say that according to the Agreement we have to part with 5139 sq. miles to Pakistan within one month and we will get 69 sq. miles of area in the Chamb area. But the problem of 53 sq. miles will be settled along with the Kashmir issue. According to these terms we have to give back 5,000 sq. miles roughly to Pakistan and we will get only 69 sq. miles. This must be considered carefully because in diplomatic action if you give something, you get something. But here the area is very large—the area which we are giving—and we are getting only a very small territory, a small portion of the land which has been conquered by Pakistan. As a lawyer I have already stated I find certain things are not mentioned in this

[Shri Thillai Villalan] Agreement. They are mainly three. One is that there is no mention about the repatriation of war prisoners because this Agreement has been arrived at Simla only after the military defeat of Pakistan. Now that they have come to table for agreement the first question will be the repatriation of the prisoners. That was not mentioned or that was not considered.

Another question, much discussed by the Jana Sangh and other parties here, is the Kashmir issue. Third thing is there is no talk about the revival of diplomatic relationship. So far as the Kashmir issue is concerned we are directly connected. We have categorically stated to the world that it is a closed book, and we would not open the book once again. It has been decided once and for all. But Mr. Bhutto claims that this is an issue which will have to be settled even after 25 years, even after our categorical statement that it has been an integrated part of India and it has been settled once and for all.

The next thing is repatriation of prisoners. Unless and until Bangla Desh joins in this discussion that question will not be decided. Therefore, we can leave it.

So far as the question of diplomatic relationship is concerned, Pakistan voluntarily severed all relationship with our country. Therefore, it is they who have to consider the restarting of relationship. These things are not mentioned.

Now I come to the terms and conditions of the Agreement. I find the following salient features of the Agreement. The main features can be catalogued like this :

1. No conflict and confrontation;
2. No hostility or enmity;
3. Only friendship and harmonious relationship.

4. Settlement of differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiation or agreed mutual means.

5. Conflict which has bedevilled the relations for the last 25 years should be resolved by peaceful means;

6. No hostile propaganda;

7. Officers should meet to implement, to resume communication in all ways;

8. Resume all trade relationship.

These are the main salient features that I find in the Agreement. The Legislature of Pakistan has also given its approval to the Simla Agreement. These things can be done only by proper implementation. The Minister of External Affairs has stated that the success of this Agreement will depend on its faithful implementation. We welcome this Agreement but we cannot hope that the faithful implementation will be done by this Government,

To conclude, I welcome the Agreement because it is only a beginning, but good beginning. Sir, good beginning will be considered as half done and also it will be construed as well done. Thank you.

SHRIMATI SUMITRA G. KULKARNI (Gujarat) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, since yesterday many speakers have examined the Simla Agreement and almost all points have covered. Therefore, I would not like to repeat them again. It will be almost an infliction on this House if I were to go over all those points. However, Sir, I would like to appraise the Simla Agreement from the perspective of taking a look at the future as history. Many of us here have been students of history, all kinds of history, political, geographical economic, social and cultural. And we as students of history would be able to appreciate the value of the lessons of history. The foremost lesson of history, of all history is that a good statesman actively

and consciously cultivates an ability to look into the future as if it were history and then accordingly plan his actions and policies, so that this future which he is trying to create, which he is planning himself, will conform to what he would like others to perceive as history. This ability to view the future as history is the ability to take a long range view of events that are taking place and also separate the events from the emotions and the heat of the moment. Unless we are able to take an objective view of any event that is taking place in our own times, we can never look into the merits of a case in the correct way. Therefore, I suggest, let us have a look at the Simla Agreement as if it were history.

With this criterion Sir, let us examine the Simla Agreement. What is the future of Indo-Pakistan relations? How would we like it to appear when viewed as history by posterity? Against this background, I would like to submit a few points for your consideration. All of us agree that if Pakistan prospers, India, too, will prosper. If Pakistan develops sound democratic institutions, Indian democracy will also flourish. If Pakistan enjoys durable peace and political stability, India, too, will have durable peace and political stability. If Pakistan remains poor—let me emphasise this point—it will exert pressures, and if not she, some other powers through her will exert pressures and India, too, would remain poor. Sir, none of us here would like to risk the prosperity of India. I am sure that all of us here are agreed that we want India to prosper, we want our democratic institutions to flourish, we want to perpetuate durable peace and political stability, and surely every Member of this House desires to eradicate poverty in India. If we want our country to make progress, we should be guided by the criteria which will ensure that Pakistan develops sound democratic institutions,

sound programmes of fighting against poverty and sound and stable democratic government. Sir, if we examine the Simla Agreement from these criteria, it appears that it satisfies all of them.

I am surprised that in this latter half of the 20th century, there are some Members in this House who are still thinking in terms of acquiring territory, in terms of solving issues at one stroke. India has never covered an inch of territory from any other country. In fact, the basic tenet of our political philosophy is that we respect the territorial integrity of other countries and we respect their sovereignty. Do we want to change our basic philosophies of life at this stage? Don't we respect our own philosophic values? Or do we want to make a *volte face* now and change over to some convenient principles at this stage? Let me tell you that no country, no matter how powerful it is, can in this latter half of the 20th century acquire any territory by merely marching its army into someone else's territory. This notion of acquiring territory or retaining territory is an outmoded style of solving international problems. History has shown us repeatedly that when a victor has tried to dominate the defeated nation, it has always been impossible to achieve durable peace. Peace gets shattered the moment there is an idea or a notion of domination. The ready example that occurs to my mind is that of Hitler and the Second World War. Both of them were the direct consequences of the Treaty of Versailles. If Britain and France had shown a little more consideration, a little more compassion and a little less of venom against Germany I am sure this world of ours could have been spared from the holocaust of the Second World War. If France had been less greedy, if it had resisted the temptation of possessing the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine and if they had resisted the temptation of exploiting the rich district of Saar,

[Shrimati Sumitra G. Kulkarni] Germany would never have felt this frustration, this humiliation, this oppression, so as to throw up a megalomaniac like Hitler. Do we want to have another Hitler in Pakistan ? Not that I am suggesting that Yahya Khan was a Hitler. Still I am suggesting that if we take a rigid attitude at this stage, we are likely to turn the face of Pakistan against India for all times to come. This is an opportunity which we have to grasp. Some of our friends in this House are worried about returning 5,000 square miles of territory back to Pakistan. I think the greater cause for worry would be how to tide over the avenging hatred that the retention of this territory would let loose in the hearts of the people of Pakistan. At least today the general public of Pakistan has no desire for waging war against India. At least today they are tired and they have done with war. They want peace and prosperity. Do we want to disappoint them at this stage ? Today President Bhutto is a symbol of democratic Government in Pakistan. And if we want that he should have an opportunity to establish a democratic Government in his country, establish democratic institutions in Pakistan, if we desire peace in our sub- ! continent, then we have to give him time ! and create an atmosphere so that he can persuade his countrymen, so that he can tell them to change this posture of hatred that Pakistan had adopted in the past 25 years. We should treat Pakistan with respect, with some consideration, in the hope that we might succeed in establishing durable peace in this sub-continent. If this principle of the victor treating the vanquished with courtesy and concern were not true, you will agree that the American people and their Government would never have launched the Marshal Plan for the regeneration of Germany and Europe. The Marshal Plan was started only to help Europe. They say—I

some people, I am not sure; it might be an exaggeration—that if the whole of Germany was filled up with so huge an amount of U.S. Dollars that it would have made a carpet of one inch thickness. When this is what they did after everything, they suffered after the holocaust of the Second World War, can we not show a fraction of that generosity to our neighbour also ? This is a lesson that the Allies learnt from the Second World War. After the First World War all of them were greedy. Even though the Congress of Peace at Paris was presided over by President Wilson and there were fourteen points of peace, yet nobody sincerely believed in them and everybody went out greedily to carve out his own portion out of Germany one way or other. And that is why within twenty years there was the Second World War. Do we want to repeat the same experience ? After the Second World War these allied nations learnt the lessons of history and they behaved quite differently with the vanquished Germany. Therefore, I ask my friends on the other side: Do we want to throw away all the accumulated wisdom of this past history ? The philosophy underlying this attitude of treating defeated nations is that the more we try to build other people in our own image, the lesser are the chances of distrust and estrangement. After all, if we have prosperity, if we have food to eat, if we have industries to produce things, then, let Pakistan also have these opportunities of having all the similar benefits. If they have these benefits, they will one day feel less hatred towards us; they will be more trustful, they will be less insecure at our hands. After the Second World War America went out to help Europe materially, financially, technically and socially and thereby helped to create sound democratic institutions and traditions in Europe. The same we will have to do to help Pakistan. But please do not imagine that I am advocating

any Marshal Plan for Pakistan. That will be a stupid thing to suggest. But I am certainly advocating peaceful and earnest implementation of Article 3 of this Agreement. This Article talks about the steps to be taken to restore and normalise the mutual relationship between the two countries. Four specific categories of steps are envisaged by Article 3. They are :

- (1) Reopening of all types of communications;
- (2) Promoting travel by mutual nationals;
- (3) Restoration of trade and cooperation in economic and other agreed fields; and lastly;
- (4) Exchange in the fields of science and culture.

We can call this Plan as Indira-Bhutto Plan for the Indian sub-continent just as the Marshal Plan was for Europe. If such a Plan can help restore normalcy in our relationship and can help Pakistan develop democratic institutions and create a stable government, it can achieve a lot. It will also help solve many problems of this country.

I wish to say that we should focus our attention on Article 3 and impress upon the Governments of both countries to ensure that the delegates of India and Pakistan do meet in actual practice and work out necessary details envisaged in this Article. Unless we get going with these details and our officers meet together and work out as to how to find out the ways and means of implementing Article 3, we will never make a start. If article 3 succeeds there will be fewer Indo-Pakistan problems. We will not have to incur heavy defence expenditure and naturally there will be some relaxation for both of us and we can look at our borders with ease because they will be more secure.

■ But we

will continue to be prepared. Still, that kind of tension or risk to which we have been used will not be there and as such we will be able to divert large finances from the defence budget towards industrial development of our country.

If Article 3 succeeds, then we will not be afraid of any foreign intervention. We will not be afraid of becoming a pawn in their international games. However, if article 3 is to succeed, India will have to show the initiative. We will have to give much more to Pakistan than we can take from them because India is a bigger and stronger nation. I am afraid some of our friends on the other side are not convinced that we are a bigger, better, stronger and greater nation than Pakistan. I think they have fallen a prey to the foreign propaganda that "Hindu India" and "Muslim Pakistan" are two equal groups and they should be considered on a one-to-one-basis. This falsehood started when Hindu majority and the Muslim minority were given equal weightage as a result of Pakistan which came into being. Afterwards, after independence, some foreign powers continuously carried on this refrain and some of the distinguished economists of America said that Pakistan's progress was far superior to India's and they continuously made unfavourable comparisons of India with Pakistan. They said that Pakistan was developing much faster and much better because it had adopted Western institutions for their economic development. I want to ask : Where is this accelerated growth? Where is this substantial growth rate of Pakistan ? Where is this better and faster progress that Pakistan has achieved in the past? The events of last December have amply proved that Pakistan has no real backbone to fight a war. It can import armaments; it can get aeroplanes and many things for its arsenal. Still to fight a war, background efforts were missing. Can any country fight a war without factories to

[Shrimati Sumitra G. Kulkarni] support and can any country fight a war without fields producing raw materials and foodgrains? Pakistan was ill-equipped to fight the war and it was admitted by themselves. You will remember that it was in Simla, I think, it was said that they were not producing even an ounce of iron and steel. There was not even one steel plant in their country. As against that, in this country we are producing 4 million tonnes of steel per year.

They do not manufacture from the scratch practically anything. They merely assemble products. They do not produce any drugs. For example, if somebody falls sick in Pakistan, they do not have drugs made in Pakistan. They merely pack these things in pretty covers. Beyond that they do not have any know-how. Can this be called better progress and better industrialisation? This sort of ill-equipped and this sort of industrially backward Pakistan of 55 million only, can it ever fight our country, with our economic background, with our industrial development, with our agricultural security? Though this year we are facing a drought situation, yet we have got our Food Corporation which has sufficient stocks to meet at least the shortfall of the *Kharif* crop. So, I am asking only this: Can we ever be in danger from such a Pakistan which has no industrial background to help it? At the same time, I would say that we need not be complacent also on this ground that we are 600 million strong in this country; but certainly, Pakistan with 55 million can never defeat us or go on with this confrontation.

(Time bell rings)

Sir, I may take only five minutes more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Members will remember, particularly the Congress Members, that I have got a long list of speakers and the time is limited.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Jammu & Kashmir Pradesh) : Sir, she is making a good speech and let her continue.

SHRIMATI SUMITRA G. KULKARNI : Anyhow, Sir, such a Pakistan can never constitute a danger to India and it is ridiculous to feel insecure. Our friends should never feel that there will be danger from Pakistan. But, at the same time, it is not as though we are not prepared. Such a weak Pakistan can, of course, become a pawn in the hands of other parties and other foreign powers and then, there is danger to India. So, it is not Pakistan which poses a danger to India, but it is the other powers who are playing politics through facade of that country and that is the reason why India is perpetually in a state of confrontation with it. If Pakistan is stabilised, if it is helped to progress, if we help Pakistan in eradicating poverty, I am sure, Pakistan will feel less insecure, will have greater faith in our sincerity and will look for help to India instead of looking to a distant horizon.

Sir, my only request is that it is in our enlightened self-interest to see that Pakistan prospers. It is again wrong to feel that we have got conflicting interests and not complementary ones. In fact, ours are complementary economies for each other and if we co-operate and collaborate on economic grounds, we will make progress, a steady progress. Therefore, Sir, I believe that the Simla Agreement has achieved this very important economic objective and, therefore, we must not allow any grass to grow under our feet and we should not get lost and waste our energy in this sort of controversy, in fact, as they call it in Hindi, over this Agreement. Instead of doing that, let us all support this so that the Government will ensure rapid implementation of Article 3.

I will take only one minute more, Sir. I would like to reply to the gentleman who

was speaking right before me. He said that it was only two days—personally I think it was three days—before Parliament was summoned that the Agreement was ratified. I would say that this is the executive power and whatever is within the powers of the Executive, they must be made to take the responsibility for the same. Why should Parliament take the responsibility for the actions of the Executive ? They have been entrusted with this job, they have been chosen for this and they have been selected for this work and it is their duty to take this responsibility rather than shirking this responsibility and placing it on Parliament.

Then, Sir, he also felt that we are going to give away 5,000 sq. miles of our territory and asked what we are getting in return. This is not something like one-to-one, a horse trading that you take away this and we take away that. There are some long-range views and just as I said earlier, let us view this from the standpoint of future history and then decide and judge. Are we doing anything or conducting ourselves in a way worthy of the generations which will in future be inhabiting this land of ours ? Do we want to live in a peaceful and prosperous country or do we want a war-ridden and poor country which will not have that prospect for the young children of today ? Therefore, it is for their sake that we must follow this policy. Let the Simla Agreement gain momentum and let us support our Government to implement it in right earnest. Thank you.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश): श्रीमन्,
लिखे हुए भाषणों को सभा पटल पर रखवा
लिया जाए तो समय की बड़ी बचत होगी।

संसदीय कार्य विभाग तथा नौबहन और परिवहन
मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री श्रीम मेहता): लिखा
हुआ नहीं है।

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL
(Gujarat) : I am one of those who welcome the Simla Agreement. But there are a few comments which necessarily one would like to make.

The manner in which the Agreement was concluded perhaps leaves something to be desired. When the conflict with Pakistan started, we had consultations. The Prime Minister called leaders of different parties for consultation—very often even at night—and everything was settled in a spirit of unanimity. Similarly, in this Agreement also perhaps the same spirit would have prevailed, and even the few dissenting voices that we have been hearing would not have been heard, if the Prime Minister had cared to take the leaders of other parties into confidence.

As far as my Party is concerned, we are not opposed to the Agreement. We are in favour of the Agreement. We welcome the Agreement. The only thing that we did not like the manner in which it was done. Perhaps, the consent of Parliament could have been obtained because there was time; a couple of days' delay would not have mattered.

i The other point that I would like to |
urge is that we have had 25 years of con-
frontation with Pakistan. I would like I to
see that this Agreement would put an end to
this confrontation once and for all and India
could behave generously 'as an elder
brother, be generous when the | time comes for
making permanent peace and set all points of
disputes at rest. I am not convinced that all
points of dispute have been settled. The
great point of dispute, Kashmir, remains
unsettled. Besides that, there may be many
other problems—smaller perhaps. Has
any solution for them been found ? Or has
any method by which these would be solved,
been evolved in this Agreement / I
would like to see it. I would like to see it

t Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel] spelt out in such a manner that there is no room for future dispute.

On the matter of Kashmir, there may be many opinions. I am one of those who feel that the defence of Kashmir has cost this country so much. Perhaps instead of defending it, it would have been better to say: Take it,—our friends; we are friends; we were brothers till yesterday; we are brothers today; we cannot be parted. How much money has been spent on the defence of Kashmir ? If you take it in rupees, annas and pies, perhaps this country could have built five Kashmirs on the Himalayan range, if you take into account the crores of money that we have spent. I am not asking the Government to do it just now in that way. But in a generous way, if you look at it, that would be one of the angles from which it can be examined. I am glad that this Agreement does show a generosity on the part of the Government to come to a solution which would be permanent. Let us put an end to these 20 years of useless conflicts, which have done no good and only spread bitterness. And it should be least done by a country owing allegiance to Gandhiji, claiming to be following the Gandhian way. We should have been generous. We could be generous. We should do so even now. Let us correct these mistakes of the past and try to follow this Agreement in this spirit. While saying so, may I suggest that Government and its officers may also look to its implementation and see that there are no irritation points anywhere. There have been many matters of conflict and dispute during the dispute several times. There are matters of evacuee property, of properties seized during the conflicts and so on. All these matters are hanging still.

Property has been seized on both sides—at some places it is more and at some places it is less. Some people have been suffering because of this. Some people have been

suffering more than they can afford to suffer. If it is due to the action of two individuals, one can understand—the Government can wait. But where the individuals suffer through actions taken by the Governments, the Government should take a generous view and try to help these people find a way out because, as long as these points of irritation remain bitterness and reaction will remain. With these few words I support the Agreement.

पंडित भवान्नी प्रसाद तिवारी (मध्य प्रदेश):

सभापति जी, जमला समझौते पर विचार हो रहा है। मेरा अपना दृष्टिकोण इस संबंध में एक सीमित विषय को उठाने का है। राजनीति में संधि और विग्रह यह दो शब्द आते हैं और इन दोनों का एक दूसरे से संबंध होता है। कभी यह एक दूसरे का परिणाम होते हैं और बहुधा ही विग्रह के बाद संधि होती है। जो पहले दो विग्रह पाकिस्तान से हुए उनके बाद भी संधि हुई और एक का परिणाम युद्ध विराम का बनना और दूसरे के परिणाम क्या स्थिति पर लौटना हुआ और ताशकन्द का समझौता सामने आया। परन्तु, यह तो मैंने प्रसंगवश कहा है, मैं विस्तार से संधि और विग्रह को उन परिस्थितियों को सामने लाना चाहता हूँ जो कि 1971 को संधि और विग्रह की स्थितियों में पैदा हुईं। और सबसे पहली भूमिका जो मेरे सामने इसकी है, वह यह कि ताशकन्द समझौता एक प्रकार से क्षमफल हुआ या उसको कार्यान्वित नहीं किया जा सका। उसी समय से यह दिवाई दे रहा था कि अब विग्रह यागे होने वाला है और उसकी तैयारी पाकिस्तान ने भी की थी और भारतवर्ष ने भी की थी और जिनको हमने बार-बार सामने उपस्थित किया और 1965 के बाद यह जो 1970-71 का भारत है उसकी तैयारी, 65 से अलग और ज्यादा थी। परन्तु जो विग्रह है धारम्भ हुआ वह पहले विग्रह से बिल्कुल भिन्न था। हम जानते थे कि पाकिस्तान से विग्रह होगा, परन्तु यह कि वह पहले पाकिस्तान की अपनी भूमि पर ही शुरू था, वहाँ की तानाशाही हुकुमत ने अपने ही लोगों पर ज़ुल्म डाले, निःशस्त्र लोगों पर सेना छोड़ी और जिस तरह के अत्याचार उन पर किये उसका

परिणाम हुआ कि इतने शरणार्थी हमारे यहाँ भाग कर आये कि जिनका इंतजाम करना मुश्किल हो गया और जो सरकार वहाँ चुनी गयी थी वह भी यहाँ वहाँ हो गयी। सारी दुनिया ने यह अत्याचार देखा। पहले तो उस पर परदा डाला जा रहा था, लेकिन भारतवर्ष ने अपना यह कर्तव्य समझा कि वह मजलूमों के साथ खड़ा हो जाय और उनकी मदद की जाए और सारी दुनिया के सामने उनका यह अत्याचार उजाड़ दिया जाय जो कि वहाँ की तानाशाही सरकार ने अपने ही लोगों पर किया था। इस प्रकार का विग्रह वहाँ पैदा हुआ।

हम धीरे-धीरे मजलूमों के साथ जाकर खड़े हुए, परन्तु इसी स्थिति में एक बात देखने की है कि यद्यपि हम ने जब प्रस्ताव पार्लियामेंट में पेश किया तो यहाँ सभी लोग उससे अपनी आवाज मिलाने के लिए खड़े हो गये, लेकिन कुछ लोग जो उस समय हमारे साथ थे। आज इस समझौते के विरोध में बोल रहे हैं। उस समय उनकी स्थिति देखने योग्य थी। वह हमारे साथ तो खड़े हो गये थे, परन्तु बाहर जाकर उन्होंने कहा कि बंगला देश को मान्यता क्यों नहीं देते। सरकार को बंगला देश को एक दम मान्यता दे देनी चाहिए। यहाँ तक हुआ कि इस मान्यता के सवाल पर सत्याग्रह होना शुरू हो गया, यद्यपि कहा जा रहा था भारत सरकार की तरफ से, नेताओं की तरफ से कि जब ठीक समय आयेगा तो बंगला देश को मान्यता दी जाएगी। उसका भी समय होता है। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि संधि और विग्रह में, किसी एक चाल की चूक में किसी भी राष्ट्र का उत्थान और पतन निहित होता है, अगर चूक हो जाय तो राष्ट्र गिर जाएगा और नेतृत्व भी गिर जाएगा, उसके साथ और अगर चूक नहीं होगी तो राष्ट्र उठ जाएगा, उसका माथा उठ जाएगा और उसके साथ उसका नेतृत्व उठ जाएगा। जो हमने देखा वह यह देखा कि मान्यता के लिए सत्याग्रह करने वाले लोग हार कर बैठ गये और जो सामने आया वह यह कि आन्दोलन के जवाब में आन्दोलन सामने आया और 9 अगस्त को लोग यह सोच रहे थे कि शायद इंदिरा गांधी जो तमाम भारतवर्ष के लोग इकट्ठा हुए हैं उनके सामने ध्वज दबाव में आकर के प्राज्ञ मान्यता प्रदान

कर देने वाली हैं, परन्तु सब ने यह चमत्कार देखा और आश्चर्यपूर्वक देखा कि उस दिन रूस और भारत की संधि की घोषणा सामने आई। मैं इस संधि के महत्व को भी कम नहीं समझता। इस संधि ने, भारत और रूस की संधि ने हमारे विग्रह को मजबूत किया, मजलूमों को सहायता करने का हमारा बल बढ़ाया, न केवल युद्ध के मैदान में बल्कि कूटनीतिक मैदान में भी। तीन दफा रूस का वोटो का उपयोग करना, मतदान का उपयोग करना जबकि कि दुनिया में सारे राष्ट्र क्रांति में खड़े हुए थे यह देखने लायक बात थी। इस संधि का महत्व इस बात में है कि आगे चल कर आपकी विजय हुई, कूटनीतिक के राजनीतिक के मैदान में भी और युद्ध के मैदान में भी और आत्मसमर्पण हुआ उस तानाशाही सैनिकों का जो कि तरह-तरह के अत्याचार कर रहे थे।

इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ कि इस सारे प्रश्न को इस नज़र से देखता हूँ। नेतृत्व की कुशलता जो संधि-विग्रह में होती है, वही राष्ट्र का महत्व ऊँचा करती है और उसे विजय की ओर ले जाती है। आगे चल कर हमने देखा कि विग्रह के बाद, विजय के बाद जय जयकार के बाद यह समझौता हुआ। समझौता तो होना ही था। युद्ध कब तक चलेगा? 14 दिन तक चला था पहला 1965 ई० का युद्ध। यह इतना भी नहीं चला। बड़े से बड़ा युद्ध जो हमारे यहाँ चला है महाभारत का वह 18 दिन चला है। लड़ते लड़ते लोग थकते हैं। एक दूसरे की कुर्बानी जब हो जाती है तो लोग शान्ति चाहते हैं। एक जगह रवीन्द्रनाथ ठाकुर ने लिखा है : यों क्रांति शान्ति के ही विरुद्ध अपना मिर ऊँचा करती है पर आखिर अपना अन्तिम लय शान्ति के निलय में करती है। क्रांति तो होती है उसका लाभ होता है। संधि होता है, युद्ध होते हैं। उस समय इन्दिरा जी ने एलान किया था कि यह संधि जो है वह शान्ति के लिए, शान्ति की स्थापना के लिए है। उस आवाज को सबने सुना था। वह तो होना ही था युद्ध के बाद संधि जब समाप्त हुआ और जब युद्ध-विराम हुआ, तो एक समझौता होना ही था।

[पंडित भवानी प्रसाद तिवारी]

अब इस समझौते को आप देखिए तरह-तरह की आलोचनाएँ की जा रही हैं। जो आलोचना करने वाले हैं, जैसा मैंने कहा, एक उदाहरण उनका दिया, वह फिर अत्याग्रह करने लगे, फिर तमाशा किया। क्योंकि इसलिए कि उनको लगता है कि जिस संकीर्ण साम्प्रदायिकता के आधार पर वे अपना राजनीतिक उल्लू सीधा किया चाहते थे वह जमीन ही खिसक गयी है और इस समझौते की वजह से ही वह जमीन खिसक गई है। आज जो श्रीमती विजयराजे सिधिया इतनी बोखलाई फिर रही हैं उसका कारण क्या है? वही तो रियासत थी जहाँ गांधी जी के खून करने का पडयंत्र पला था, वही तो रियासत थी जहाँ का पिस्तौल पकड़ा गया गांधी जी के हत्यारे के पास। आज उन संस्कारों को यदि वह कहती फिरती हैं, उनको बुरा लगता है कि यह समझौता हो गया, बोखलाई फिर रही हैं, इसीलिए कि वह संकीर्ण साम्प्रदायिकता की जमीन ही खिसक गई, जो कि उनका आधार था। इसीलिए — अब देखिए—कहा जाता है, पैकेज डील क्यों नहीं हुआ? अरे, आप सोचें, अगर पैकेज डील नहीं सोचेंगे तो आपसे फिर झूल हो जाएगी, जैसे कश्मीर के मामले में आप कहते हैं कि सवाल खुल गया। मगर सोचिए कि बंद क्या हो गया? काश्मीर के सवाल पर बंद यह हो गया कि जो चीन और अमरीका यह कहते थे कि हम आते हैं महायत्ना देने के लिए, यह बंद हो गया। यह पैकेज डील है कि नहीं है—यह बंद हो गया कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में सवाल ले जाएंगे, ऐसा करेंगे वैसा करेंगे। सवाल यह पैदा हो गया कि वहाँ ले जाकर क्या करेंगे? तब तो यह हुआ कि हम दोनों मिल कर तय करेंगे। फिर यह बंद हो गया। जब यह बंद हो गया तो आप बताइए, झूल क्या गया? झूल यह गया कि जो जमीन उनके पास है, अनधिकृत कब्जे में, उसकी बात उठाएं और वार्ता में लायें। यह झूल गया। तो बंद और झुला दोनों चला और जितनी भी शर्तें हैं वे परस्पर सम्बन्धित हैं। मैं एक नजर से और देखता हूँ कि जो समझौते में लिखा नहीं है, वह भी काम का है, जैसा उसमें नकरबंदियों के बारे में कुछ नहीं है और कहा है कि क्यों नहीं है। क्योंकि बंगला देश और हमारी जौहन्ट

कमांड के अंदर उनका आत्मसमर्पण हुआ। अगर यह लिखा भी नहीं है, तब भी मैं कहता हूँ, इस समझौते में यह न लिखा रहने के कारण ही यह नतीजा सामने आने वाला है कि कुछ ही दिनों में पाकिस्तान को बंगला देश को मान्यता देने के लिए बाध्य होना पड़ेगा। और कोई रास्ता नहीं, अभी कहा राष्ट्रपति भुट्टो ने कि अब मैं अपनी पार्टी के सामने यह सावल रखूंगा कि जो आगे असेम्बली का अधिवेशन होने वाला है 14 अगस्त को, उसमें बंगला देश को मान्यता देने का सवाल रखा जाए या नहीं। अतएव यह समझौता भविष्य की ओर हमें ले चलता है, आगे करता है और इसलिए हमें इसका स्वरूप देखना चाहिए, यह हमारे कल्याण के लिए, अपने हित के लिए है कि उसे लागू करें।

इससे हमारा हित और फैलता और विस्तृत होता है और जो निष्ठांत हमने कभी कहे हैं पंचशील के, जो गौतम बुद्ध के जमाने से कहे गए, उनका विस्तार होता है और जैसा गांधी जी ने कहा, अगर उनका विस्तार होता है और संकीर्ण साम्प्रदायवाद का नाश होता है, तो इसका स्वागत करना चाहिए। मैं तो यहां तक कहता हूँ कि यह चूकने का अवसर नहीं था। अगर यह समय इस वक्त हम चूक जाते, न जाने कितने दिनों बाद, कब यह अवसर आता? क्योंकि निहित स्वार्थी को मौका मिल जाता कि यह संधि न हो पाए, यह शांति संधि न हो जाए, भारत और पाकिस्तान एक साथ न जाएं; क्योंकि यही तो पडयंत्र था जो ब्रिटिशर्स यहां छोड़ गए हैं, फिर वे उसका प्रयत्न करते। इसलिए जब हमने इस मौके को पकड़ा, ठीक डिसीजन ले लिया, आप जो पहले जयजयकार में दुबा करते थे, कहते थे इन्दिरा जी बहुत ठीक डिसीजन लेती हैं और जब शांति का वक्त आया तो देख नहीं रहे हैं कि कैसा ठीक डिसीजन और ठीक वक्त पर लिया गया और जो मौका था वह चूका नहीं गया? मैं समझता हूँ, इस समझौते ने एक मानव कल्याण का रास्ता, एक उसका मार्ग दर्शन का रास्ता भारत के लिए खोल दिया है और आज हमें यह गौरान्वित

करने की बात है कि इस नेतृत्व ने जहाँ एक बड़ा विग्रह
जीता वहाँ संधि भी जीती और हमारे राष्ट्र का माया
दुनिया के बीच में इतना उंचा किया कि इतिहास सदा
के लिए उसे याद करेगा ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Hamid Ali
Schamnad will speak at 2 O'clock. The
House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House then adjourned for
lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at
two of the Clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in
the Chair.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD
(KERALA) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I
support the motion moved by Sardar Swaran
Singh on the 2nd of August. I am really
happy to note that the Simla Agreement has
got some salient features. One salient feature
is that the Agreement has been arrived at by
the head of our Government, by our Prime
Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and the
head of the Pakistan Government, Mr.
Bhutto, without the intervention of any third
party, without any cajoling or threat from
any corner of the world. These two heads of
Governments independently thought about
the best interests of their respective countries
and they arrived at this Agreement. This is a
salient feature that I find in this Agreement.
This is really remarkable and a turning point
not only in the history of India and Pakistan,
but in the history of the entire continent. This
will go a long way in maintaining peace
between these two countries for years to
come. This Agreement is more significant
than the previous agreements, namely the
Nehru-Liaquat Pact and the Tashkent
agreement. When we consider the previous
agreements we find that the present
Agreement has got more significance because
it comes out

of the experiences of the past. Mr. Bhutto
and other Pakistani leaders for the last
twenty-five years were thinking only in
terms of war with India. They were
speaking only in terms of war with India
and confrontation. Nothing more than that.
Now, he has realised from his own ex-
perience, because experience makes a man
wiser, from his own experience and from the
experience of the leaders of his country he
has realised that the only way to achieve
peace and prosperity for Pakistan is to have
bilateral talks with the Government of India
and their leaders. I find it is a remarkable
thing. I am of the view that India has
achieved something by this Agreement. We
all know that for the last so many years Mr.
Bhutto was speaking of a thousand-year war
with India. He was declaring Jihad to take
Kashmir. He had insulted our Minister of
External Affairs in the UNO in the past.
Such a man has been brought-down to India,
to Simla, and he has come to an agreement
with our Government, with our Prime
Minister and with our Minister of External
Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh. Is it not an
achievement on our part ? Definitely it is an
achievement and it is of significance to the
people at large. No doubt, some of the world
leaders may not be happy about this, because
they feel that India would stand on its own
legs. India can stand on its own legs and
India can decide what view she should
adopt hereafter. It is because of this that
some of the power blocks may not be happy
over this agreement. But at the same time
the image of India has gone high, also the
name and fame of our Prime Minister and
our Foreign Minister, Mr. Swaran Singh.
Our Foreign Minister, very sober, very
passive in spite of all difficulties and hurdles
and in spite of the insult that has been meted
out to him by Mr. Bhutto, did stand very
firm and brought round Mr. Bhutto and he
has made him see reason. For what he has
done definitely credit should go to Mr.
Swaran

[Shri Hamid Aji SchamnaJ]

Singh and also to the Prime Minister of India for this great achievement.

The Prime Minister has made it very clear yesterday that our intention is to be peaceful with other countries of the world, and that was the foreign policy of India. Our great leader and great Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, was declaring that our foreign policy was a policy of neutrality. Whatever differences we may have with other countries, and there could be differences, those could be narrowed down by mutual discussion and mutual dialogue. That has been kept up by the present Prime Minister.

Another thing. Yesterday the Prime Minister very categorically said, and I perfectly agree with that, that our biggest enemy is poverty in this country. To wipe out poverty from this land, to build up a new India, to reconstruct our country, to build up the economic backwardness of this country to the level of the other, forward economically developed countries, it is definitely necessary that we should have peace in this country. For that it is absolutely necessary that we have a dialogue negotiations with other countries. When once we drive out poverty from our country, we can make use of all our resources that are at our command to strengthen our country, so that we may meet all our enemies with confidence and maintain peace in this country for ever.

With regard to Kashmir also, I should like to say one point. As far as Kashmir is concerned, no doubt Kashmir has been declared as an integral part of India, but at the same time there is criticism that at Kashmir has been one of the topics at the Simla talks. There also you will find that Mr. Bhutto has come down even with regard to Kashmir. All these years Mr. Bhutto was saying that he would send an

army to Kashmir. He was saying that a Jihad would be declared in Kashmir. Such a person has said the other day that as far as self-determination is concerned that is for the people of Kashmir to decide, not for the people of Pakistan. He has categorically said so the other day. Is it not a change of mind which is being reflected from that talk? Another important speech of Mr. Bhutto would show how he has changed. He has told in his National Assembly at Islamabad, "Yes, if you want war with India or if you want confrontation with India, you should look for another leader, not me." That definitely would show that he has changed. Anyhow, Sir, even if he does not change himself, if at any time he thinks of anything other than peace, we could also change our mind. Under the present circumstances the best thing is the agreement that has been arrived at by our Prime Minister and by our Foreign Minister. All credit should go to them. Not only the Members of Parliament belonging to all shades of opinion but the entire people of this land are with them and behind them in defending our country. Definitely India's position and prestige and image have been pushed to the top in the world.

With these words I conclude, Sir,

SHRI HIMMAT SINH (Gujarat) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, yesterday when I sat through the debate, I was watching very carefully the utterances which came from the opposite side particularly from the friends belonging to the Syndicate or the Jan Sangh or the Swatantra Party. One could see and almost feel an under current of unity in their thought and in their outlook and in the mobilisation of their arguments which are as hollow as their utterances. I am sorry to say—when Mr. Dahyabhai Patel spoke this morning, he said that a huge amount of money has been incurred in order to keep Kashmir within India and

therefore he would go to the length of giving away Kashmir to Pakistan and building up a new Kashmir on the Himalayas. Unfortunately, he does not have to go and live in that Kashmir in the Himalayas and therefore in that fashion he put forward that argument which only means that territories and human beings can be transferred like chattels. This is the attitude which these people have toward human beings, towards territories, which we in this country regard as very sacred.

Mr. Shyam Dhar Misra talked about what he had discussed in countries like Taiwan or Formosa. These people are the recipients of warm hospitality from there and that is the reason why these people refer only to those countries. To these people, only those countries are very important. I would never wish that this country should be reduced to the size of those countries either in politics or in stature. This country has a big role to play. This country's future will also be determined by the geopolitical importance which this country enjoys in world affairs.

Sir, when, Dr. Bhai Mahavir spoke, he completely ignored the realities of the sub-continent as they have emerged as a result of Bangla Desh liberation. Not one word did I find about it in the speeches of these gentlemen. Do they realise that during the last one year we have witnessed situations which perhaps will remain unprecedented in the history of the world. Seven hundred and fifty million people have been liberated within the shortest possible time in a 14-day war, it will be recorded in human history as a glorious war of human liberation, and I say that was a glorious chapter which India wrote into the annals of world history when an army of the size which Pakistan sent to Bangla Desh had capitulated and surrendered to a joint command as a result of the 14-day war, the like of which I do not think we have seen anywhere

else in the world except in this sub-continent.

The other event which showed the self-confidence of our country's people and the self-confidence of the leadership in the ultimate objective of this country was the fact that while the war was going on, it was our Prime Minister who had the daring to call a public meeting which she addressed wherein—with what confidence—she said that our objectives are clear, we have not gone to fight this war in order to acquire anyone else's territory, we have gone into this war because of the high ideals to which we have been wedded, the ideas which are enshrined in the foreign policy of this country, a foreign policy which has been evolved by the great leaders of the country, which was not something which was dropped from the sky, but for which our people have sacrificed. I belong to that generation, Sir, which has witnessed two World Wars. We have seen economic crises in Europe, America and in other parts of the world, we have seen the fascist crisis in Ethiopia, we have seen the fascist crisis in Europe and we have seen fascist aggression in Republican Spain. And we know what happened in Europe, and what happened in Africa and also what happened in other parts of the world. Therefore, our objectives have been declared very clearly, very unambiguously and in a most forth-right manner that we went into this war for the cause of democracy, for the cause of liberation of people who were subjugated by foreign elements. Pakistan's part in the east may have been determined by the support to Pakistan by the British. But it was against all canons of geography and politics and national considerations and other reasonable factors which have to determine the character of a people. That was the most heinous crime that the British committed in this sub-continent. They created two chunks of Pakistan separated by a thousand miles of foreign territory and with that part of Pakistan

[Shri Himmat Singh] which could never be integrated with Pakistan and demanded self-determination. We went to the aid of that part of Pakistan and we saw the liberation of that people in 14 days. These are historical facts of which the Indian people should be proud. We on this side of the House have more reason to feel proud because it was under that leadership that these achievements were made.

Sir, coming to the main question of the Simla Agreement, I would like to state that an agreement is slightly different from a treaty. A treaty is more specific while an agreement is something which is based on higher ideals. I refer here to the Agreements at Yalta and Potsdam. What was it that brought the Allies together and made them sign the Agreement ? The importance of these Declarations, in my opinion, is as important as the declaration that was made at Simla on the 3rd July. This Agreement is not just a mere treaty. In this Agreement we have declared to the whole world to listen that hereafter in this sub-continent we shall not allow any foreign intrigues to take place. We shall not allow any foreign powers to inter-fere or middle in our affairs, that whatever the difficulties, whatever the problems they will be solved by us on this earth by bilateral discussions, by mutual adjustments, etc. etc. This Declaration, in my opinion, is even more important than the Potsdam or the Yalta Agreements. And, therefore, every person in this country realises the historic achievement between India and Pakistan. While these friends opposite, particularly those who belong to the Syndicate and the Swatantra and the Jan Sangh.

SHRIBANARSI DAS (Uttar Pradesh): Can he say where his Congress was ? He should be asked to correct himself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : This is irrelevant.

SHRI HIMMAT SINH : This is your illusion and if you want to live in your illusion you are welcome to do so. Your individual illusion is not going to make any difference to the people of this country. The people of this country know which is the Congress. History is on record to show which Congress can claim that heritage for which the Congress stands. I know what you have in mind and what you stand for. By projecting your image you cannot delude the people. Let your illusion ever remain illusion for you.

Therefore, the highest traditions of this country, the highest historical records of this country...

SHRI BANARSI DAS : He is talking nonsense.

SHRI HIMMAT SINH : ... has given the lofty ideal that it will [never have an eye on any one else's territory or what belongs to others...

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa) : Sir, he has never been in the swatantra Party. He was all along in the Congress.

SHRI BANARSI DAS : Sir, this Member has no business to call us by the name which does not belong to us. We are a recognised party. He has been a turn-coat and a defector with no scruples and conscience, a man who was loyal to the British, a defector who went over to the Swatantra Party.

SHRI HIMMAT SINH : On a point of information, if the honourable gentleman is interested in knowing my *bona fides* he can meet me after the Rajya Sabha is over and I will tell him.

Coming to the question of the Agreement, the Agreement has been in the highest traditions of this country, as a result of this

shortest war ever imaginable as a result of the biggest surrender that we could claim to have achieved under the joint command of ourselves and the army of Bangla Desh, the Mukti Bahini, we said that :

Has any country ever proclaimed before the world when its armies are marching forward victoriously that here we snail stop and here we shall declare that our intentions being clear, our objectives having been achieved, we shall now fight for peace in this sub-continent ? And that is exactly what we did. The conception of the Simla Agreement was implied in that very historical and momentous decision about cease-fire which we declared to the world. Let those who want to support this Agreement say so categorically without any reservations as friends on the opposite side have done. After all, you cannot adopt the attitude of "ready to strike but afraid to wound". To-da> you have no place, no position, to go to the country and say that this Agreement is something which you will not support. Therefore, if this Agreement is to be supported, it has to be supported categorically and unequivocally and in a forthright manner, because there was no other course left open to any sector of this sub-continent excepting this, namely, to negotiate in a peaceful atmosphere so that instead of fighting to share in each other's poverty, we can share, for a change, in each others' prosperity.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, when our friends ignore completely the reality of the situation of Bangladesh, it is a deliberate attempt to misguide people. Then they try to rivet their entire attention on Kashmir. Who says that Kashmir is not Kashmir has been a problem 25 years. But whose creation 8 R.S.S./72—6

was the problem of Kashmir? The Kashmir problem was never a creation of this country. Rather Kashmir was created as a problem by those very elements, those very interests, those very powers, which divided this sub-continent into three sectors, two politically and three geographically. Therefore, when we have to solve every problem on the basis of the realities of the situation, I have no doubt in my mind that the Kashmir problem, too, will only be solved on the basis of the realities of that problem and in no other way. At the United Nations the representatives of Pakistan fretted and fumed. They brought in observers and they are still supporting the observers. But they know that the reality says that the observers have no *locus standi*. Therefore, in the eyes of the world, in the opinion of those who look at things in a realistic manner, the Kashmir problem cannot be solved in the United Nations, either through the intervention of foreign powers or through the mediation of anyone. The Kashmir problem can only be solved on the basis of mutual understanding, on the basis of bilateral discussions, and in no other fashion. Therefore, in order to divert the attention of the people from realities, from facts, these gentlemen want to rivet their attention on Kashmir which is a problem to be solved as a direct consequence of this historical Agreement, the Simla Agreement.

Lastly, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to remind this House that this country has always practised what it has preached. This country has always preached about universality of brotherhood and fraternity of man. Therefore, it is enshrined in our scriptures as much as in the utterances of our saints. We say :

सर्वे भवन्तु मुनिना सर्वे सन्तु निरामया ।
भद्राणि पश्यन्तु मा कश्चित् दुःखं भाग्यभवेत् ॥

[Shri Himmat Singh.] It means, let everyone be happy, let everyone be without fear, let no one be under any sufferance; and that is the aim and objective of this country. This is what we have preached for thousands of years. This is what we have practised. And this is what we shall go on with, no matter what my friends on the other side may say. I would also like to remind the House of what the great saint of Dakshinewar, blessed by the great Paramhansa Dev said. He said : "The reason that we Indians are still living in spite of much misery, distress, poverty and oppression from within and without is because India has her own quota yet to give to the general store of the world's civilisation", and if I lay add, "to the world's wisdom." Thank you.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Sir, I rise to participate in this debate not because the Simla Pact is a live issue any more. The Simla Pact has been signed, sealed and delivered and, however much we may argue here and however much we may chop logic here, not even a comma of that Pact is going to be altered. So it becomes like flogging a dead horse. But I thought of speaking because during the debate some very important issues were raised and some very important formulations were put forth before the House. I would like to say something about those issues and those formulations. But before saying that I would plead with the House to bear with me because I found that the general mood seems to be that these who differ, those who do not accept the Pact as it stands today, are being denounced, cursed, called names. I do not understand this mood at all, this position at all, the attitude at all. Yesterday I found that the Jan Sangh was criticised not only by my Communist friend, Mr. Sardesai, but even my distinguished friend, the cartoonist; he also lampooned them. Why should it happen ? Why should it happen that any dissent on matters like

this, very important from the point of history of the country, the future of the country, should be sort of ridiculed as anti-progressive or as an expression of Chauvinism ? I do not understand. And therefore, at the very beginning I would like to make it very clear that though I am one of those who have pleaded not only for peace between Pakistan and India, but have pleaded orally and in writing that the sooner Bangla Desh, India and Pakistan become part of a confederation, a democratic confederation, the better still I have to express certain differences so far as this Pact is concerned. I was grateful to one of our distinguished speakers here, Dr. Dutt, who told us about the new decade of *detente*—*detente* between the USSR and the USA, between the USA and China, between South Korea and North Korea, so on and so forth. He also said you must try to understand the historical trends which are working in the direction of more and more cooperation. True. But I would only remind the learned Doctor that this is a very strange decade. It is not only a decade of *detente*. It is a decade of *detente* and also ambivalence. On the one hand they meet as friends; on the other hand, they prepare for war. Only the other day you must have read in the newspapers that in spite of the fact that the USA and the USSR have come together and entered into a period of *detente*, the Soviet Navy Chief has declared in very clear terms that the Soviet Navy is so strong that it can destroy any ship anywhere on the seas of it belongs to the enemy. He has also said that the building programme of nuclear submarines will continue unabated. For whom are these submarines being built ? For what purpose the Soviet Navy is becoming stronger and stronger ? Therefore I am saying that there is *detente* because there are deterrents with both the USSR and the USA and this means that if there is a war both the countries will be destroyed. That is

why there is *detente*. But at the same time there is a parallel development of nuclear forces, nuclear submarines and nuclear war-heads.

So far as India is concerned, I think everybody will agree that right from the day of independence, India has always tried to be friendly with her neighbours. Is it any new policy that we are following? Is it that we have been belicose and have been pursuing an aggressive policy and it is for the first time at Simla that we have pursued some other policy? It is not like that. Therefore, if people like me or my friends or other people criticise the pact, it is not as if we are—to quote the words of D. Dutt—making war as a basic principle of our policy. It is not like that. But we have the right to point out the defects and we have the right to point out the lacunae in the pact. We have a right to point out that the pact as it is drafted today is not satisfactory. Have we not exercised that right before? We have done it and for this sin we have been misunderstood also. Right from the days of Jawaharlal Nehru our policy has been one of mutual understanding and one of resolving all conflicts across the table. And that why this period of 'Chini bhai-bhai' was there. That is why we entered into one pact, the second pact and the third pact with Pakistan. But at the same time is it not a fact that every time there was a surprise for us from them? Is it not a fact that in spite of Pandit Nehru's high philosophy and ideology and his concern for human welfare and maintenance of peace, when the Chinese invaded this country, did not that great man say—was he not forced to say—that "I was living in a dream world of my own"? When that great man was there, we small people tried to point out that taking into consideration the philosophy which guided every step of the Chinese, Communists, it was not proper on our part to trust them. I do not want to take

the credit myself. But I would only tell you this that no less a person than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself in the other House—I was then a Member of the other House—said on that occasion that the party to which Mr. Goray belongs has vested interest in keeping the enmity between China and India. That was two years before the Chinese Attack. Why did we say that? Not because we failed to understand the history, but because we understood it well. Yesterday I was surprised when Sardesai made fun of Jan Sangh. He said the Hindu Muslim was a creation of the British. But, Sir, who was fighting the British? It was the Congress, Sir, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I am very sorry to remind the House that this has happened. I would not have done it. But, because he raised this question, I am doing it. What was their characterisation of the Congress? Sir, this is the "Action Programme" published in the Pravda in 1930. What is their characterisation of people like Jawaharlal Nehru and Gandhiji and Bose? This is the characterisation :—

"The most harmful and dangerous obstacle to the victory of the Indian revolution is the agitation carried on by the left elements of the National Congress led by Jawaharlal Nehru, Bose, Jinnah and others."

This attitude continued till the 50's when Mao-Tse-tung, in reply to the letter of congratulation sent by Shri Ranadive, who was at that time the General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, said, "I hope that the Indian people will succeed in emancipating themselves from the yoke of the imperialists and their collaborators". By that he meant Nehru. Therefore, Sir, I am not accusing the Communist Party any more, because these are the facts of history, and they cannot be changed. But as they have a right to change, why

[Shri N. G. Goray.] cannot the Jan Sangh also change ? They can change. If you can change, they can also change.

Therefore, what I am saying

simply because somebody says that he does not agree with this Agreement, don't run him down as a chauvinist and don't run him down as somebody who is

1 create some sort of enmity between communities. The communists look at the pact keeping in mind the impact that

to be there on the Muslims in India. Perhaps this pact might not have come at all. Does it mean that if the pact had

me, the Muslims in India are going to rise in revolt ? Is that the proof of their loyalty that our talks with Mr. Bhutto must yield some positive results ? It is Therefore, I am saying that you should not raise these questions. You should only look at the pact as it is •

in the realities in the midst of this pact was born.

Sir, yesterday, the Prime Minister said that those who are opposing the pact seem to have lost much of their enthusiasm. Quite true. Here there were not such demonstrations as they took place there. But, Sir, may I say that you also seem to have a good deal of the euphoria ? You also said...

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) : We were never in a state of euphoria.

I N.G. GORAY : Yes, you were it. On the walls in the streets. Right, everywhere, this pact is hailed as something mighty. Therefore, you yourself

are in a state of euphoria in favour of the those who were opposed to it were maligning it from their own point of view. I have no brief for them. I

good debate is impossible when charges and counter-charges are thrown about. I have been bandied about like that. I am in a good debate. // I am wrong. I

want to be convinced that I am wrong. But, you must also have an open mind and you must also say, "All right. If the Opposition is putting forward some points of view, we shall also accept them if we are convinced."

That is the way in which a good Parliament should function and that is what we wanted to say when you were very much in a hurry to ratify the pact. Nothing would have been lost if you had discussed it here. You were bound to win and you were bound to carry the House with you because you are having a majority. You have to establish a good convention. I know that under the Constitution we cannot challenge you, because the Constitution has given you the right to ratify treaties. Yes. But, there are equally good democratic countries in the world where the Senates can discuss and even throw out such pacts that are arrived at between their governments and the other governments. USA is one such country and it is not a small country. It is a mighty democratic country and even the League of Nations which Wilson brought into force, that concept was thrown out and Wilson had to go, because the ratification clause was there. You have to establish good conventions. I was sorry you did not. I am not saying that you went beyond the Constitution. Not at all. But a good convention could have been established. If you had ratified the pact two months before the Parliament met, I would have nothing to say. But here one day or two days before the Parliament met you ratified it. Legally your position is correct. But from the point of view of establishing a good parliamentary practice it is improper. The President can promulgate an ordinance. He does it. But supposing one or two days before he promulgates an ordinance, that is not a good exercise. ..

SHRI LAI. K. AOVANI (Delhi) : That is what they have been doing

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Therefore, I am saying, I am pleading with you that you should have a good democratic functioning in this country, no matter how small the Opposition. If the Opposition is saying something which is worth while...

(Time bell rings)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Allow him to continue...

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Sir, a point was raised here by many : Why is it that you are quoting Bhutto? In fact, Sir, I wish that all the Members of Parliament were provided with copies of what Bhutto said in the National Assembly. Why ? This is because in that speech which came on the morrow of the Simla pact you find the interpretation that Mr. Bhutto puts on the pact. That's why it is important; not because Bhutto is an erudite man, not because he is a philosopher. But his speech has to be studied, has to be understood because he holds the key to the pact, so far as the pact is concerned, as our Prime Minister does. I would ask : Why should we not also try to understand what his interpretation of the pact is ? Therefore, Sir, I think that you would have done a great service to the House if you had provided every Member of the House with a copy of his speech in the original. I am saying 'in the original' because, Sir, I am sorry to say that the copies or the versions that were given by the Pakistan Government to you and the original version of his speech differ in material respects. They have deliberately deleted some of the portions. A strange thing, Sir ! Unbelievable ! When there is a pact between two nations, a copy of the speech of the President, explaining the pact, is given in a garbled form. The most important points were deleted. I am not going to quote him again because some people may ask : why are you quoting Bhutto ? I shall not

quote him now. I read his speech three, four, five times to understand what he means. Supposing, Sir, immediately after the pact the man goes back and says : Give me time for mobilization, and when we are properly mobilized, we come to the next stage. If the man says, "Well, it is for the Kashmiri people to rise in revolt ; it* they rise in revolt, no matter what happens our commitments under the pact we shall stand behind the Kashmiris when they are in revolt", then, Sir, what do you make out of this pact ? There are many other instances like this. Many other like this are there where Bhutto has told in so many words, "If the Kashmiri people were to rise in revolt we are here to -them". And he has named persons also. He has said that if Abdullah does it, if Farooqui does it, " we shall be I do not know whether these brave people will do it but you see. the intention is very clear. Therefore, Sir, I am saying that it is very difficult to understand the intentions of the man. I have said that you must talk with Mr. Bhutto but when you talk it, does not mean that you must come to an understanding or a pact or a treaty with him because he is having parallel lines of thinking a double think. He would like to take revenge but then he says that we are not in a position to take it. That is what he said and he has revealed certain things. He said that in 1965 there was an occasion, in 1962 there was an occasion and then he quotes from the autobiography of Maxwell Tailor. He says that Maxwell Tailor has written in his autobiography that he was waiting in Bangkok because he thought that within a couple of days the armoured divisions of Pakistan would be in Delhi. He further says : if we have had the proper type of people to lead us, we have had a! (the material but unfortunately we could not seize the opportunity. This is one way of doing it. The other way is that he tells them : You have been divided. If you

[Shri N.G. Go ray:]

want to fight with India immediately I am not the leader to lead you, you will have to find some other man. You see how the man's mind is working and, therefore, I say that while you are having talks while, you are saying that we must have a pact, an understanding with Pakistan etc. etc.

Everytime you say that the conquered territories must be returned. I have no objection to that because they were conquered territories and I am not a fool to say that all the conquered territories should have been absorbed in India. We never wanted that. Nobody does it unless it has an expansionist idea. Therefore, you return them, it is all right, but, so far as the Kashmir issue is concerned, could you not have said to Mr. Bhutto that since we want to have friendly relations with you, you want to end this chapter of conflict, confrontation, war and destruction and hatred and since you are handing over to him the territories that you have taken in war, he also will have to give back the territories that he has occupied? I would like to know what wrong would have been there. What wrong would it have been on our part to say that? Mr. Bhutto, while addressing the members of the National Assembly, said that he had no card in his hand. Indiraji had all the trump cards. What happened then? Sir, I was reminded of the chess match which is going on between the existing world champion, Boaris Spassky and the aspirant Bobby Fischer. Bonis is very solid, very steady, very sobber and the other man is losing I his temper, comes late, removes cameras, shouts at people and people say that under those circumstances Boris Spassky does not understand what to play and that is why he is losing. I sometimes feel that it is the result of a similar hyponosis produced by Mr. Bhutto. He was

shouting, twisting, saying this and that

thing and our sober Swaran Singhji was compelled to yield ground. Now in order to save Mr. Bhutto he had to be given something. Sir. I suspect that we have acquired some vested interest in Bhutto, we think, that we must save Bhutto, otherwise somebody worst will come. He knows it and this is why he wants to play this card.

Sir, I would like to say that nothing would have happened, nothing would have been lost if in the first meeting you had not come to a pact. Go on talking with them, go on exchanging ideas, go on meeting it does not matter at all. Nobody had told you that at the first meeting you must come to a pact that you must not come to Delhi without a pact. Nobody had said that. The conversation could have continued. You could have met him once, twice and thrice. You could have done it but you ought to have taken this position that once for all this problem which has bedevilled the relations between India and Pakistan will be solved. Therefore, Sir, we are not taken in. Nothing can be done about it now. I only wish and pray that your good intentions should succeed. I only wish and pray that between the two trends that Bhutto is following the trend for peace and friendship with India will dominate the other trend which is for confrontation with India.

شری سید حسین (جموں و کشمیر):

مسٹر ڈپٹی چیئرمین - ابھی جو آنریبل
ممبر شعلہ اکورٹ کے بارے میں فرما
رہے تھے ان کو جواب نہیں دینا چاہتا
اور نہ اپوزیشن کو جواب دینا چاہتا
ہوں - میں تو اپنے ویو پوئنٹ کو
سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں -

انگریزوں سے ہندوستان کو آزاد
کرنے کے لئے جب ہم آزادی کی لڑائی

لڑتے تھے تو ایک ہندوستان تھا اور جمہوریت اور آزادی ایک بچہ کو جب ملی تب اس قوم میں جس اسکول میں بچے کھیلتے تھے اس اسکول میں استاد بھی تھے لیڈر بھی تھے - بچے کبھی چھری اٹھاتے ہیں تو اپنی آنکھ نکال سکتے ہیں اور اس آزادی کے بچہ نے اپنے پتا کو بھی مار دیا - گاندھی جی مارے گئے - اس آزادی کے بچہ نے اپنی ماما کو بھی زخمی کر دیا - ۲۵ سال ہو گئے اور یہ آزادی کا بچہ اور اس قوم کے اندر بالغ ہوا ہے - میچورٹی اس میں آئی ہے - اس وقت کے ہمارے نیتا یہ کہتے تھے کہ سامراج اس ملک کو تباہ کر کے چھوڑینگے - پالیٹیکل فریڈم کے بعد ہم کو اکانامک فریڈم نہیں ملیگی ایکسپلائیشن رہے گا اور ہم نہیں سمجھتے تھے - سامراجیوں نے کافی سازشیں کیں اس چھوٹے سے براعظم کو تباہ کرنے کے لئے - بار بار حملہ کرایا لڑائی کرائی - مجھے یاد ہے اپنی ۳ سال کی سیاسی زندگی میں ایک آزادی کے دن ہماری اس ناہختہ قوم میں آزادی کے چھوٹے بچوں نے بچوں کے سر کلٹ کر ٹوکرے میں بھیجے - ایک دوسرے کو بھیج دیا - وہ حادثہ ان کے سامنے ہے - کیا انہوں نے کیا تھا ؟ اگر استاد اور سیاسی رہبر سامنے نہ آتے تو وہ سرکلٹے کا سلسلہ نا معلوم کب تک جاری رہتا - بیچ میں گاندھی جی آئے بیچ میں جواہر لال نہرو آئے بیچ میں پاکستان کے کچھ لوگ آئے اور یہ معاملہ قتل و غارت کا رکھ پڑا - کشمیر چار دفعہ ان لڑائیوں کا شکار ہو گیا - کس نے لڑائی

کی - میں وثوق سے کہوں گا کہ یہ جو چھوٹی چھوٹی مثالیں ہماری پرچا سوسلسٹ کے ممبر فرما رہے تھے یہ واقعات ہیں - مجھے اس سے انکار نہیں ہے لیکن یہ ایک مکتب میں ایک اسکول میں چھوٹے بچے کرتے تھے کوئی بڑا آدمی نہیں کرتا تھا کوئی میچورٹ پولیٹکل آئیڈیا لوجی والا نہیں کرتا تھا وہ نہیں کرتا تھا اور نہ کراتا تھا - سامراجیوں کی سازشوں کو ان کی ڈیزائنس کو ریسنٹی بڑا سیٹ بیک ملا ہے جب کہ روس اور ہندوستان کی دوستی سامنے آئی اور آپ دیکھتے ہیں کہ ان کے ڈیزائنس کو جب سیٹ بیک ملا تو کس طرح سے سیونٹھ فلیٹ کی تیاری ہوئی کب سے ہو رہی ہے اور اس وقت بھی ہوئی میں سمجھتا ہوں کچھ لوگ مطمئن نہیں تھے ان میں شانتی نہیں تھی اور وہ رکنیشن کی باتیں کرتے تھے - اور شاید ان لوگوں کو اپنی فورسز پر بھروسہ نہیں تھا لیکن ہماری قوم نے اور ہمارے جوانوں نے آرمڈ فورسز نے جوئٹ کمانڈ کے لوگوں نے ان لوگوں کی مدد کی جو آزادی چاہتے تھے اس سازش سے نکل کر جو ایک تھیو کریٹک اسٹیٹ بنانے کی سازش تھی - میں ۵ جنوری کو جیسور گیا تھا اور میں نے ہزاروں سرکٹی لائیں دیکھیں عورتوں کے بالوں کا انبار وہاں پڑا تھا - جس نے کرایا وہ بھیجی خاں کہاں ہے - آج صدر بھٹو اس حقیقت کو پاکستان کے لوگوں سے کہ رہا ہے اگر جنگ چاہتے ہو تو میری ضرورت نہیں ہے اگر پاکستان کو رکھنا چاہتے ہو تو میں کہوں گا کہ جنگ پر نہیں جائیں گے -

[شری سید حسین]

جو باتیں ہم کہا کرتے تھے آج پاکستان کے عوام وہ باتیں تسلیم کر رہے ہیں کہ جنگ سے قتل و غارتگری سے لوگوں کی حالت ٹھیک نہیں ہو سکتی ہے۔ آج جس عزم سے سامراجی فورسز کو اور ان کی طرف نظر لگانے والے آدمیوں کو ایک پریشانی سی ہے۔ یہ پریشانی صرف ہندوستان میں نہیں ہے ان لوگوں کی طرح کے لوگوں کو بلکہ پاکستان میں بھی ہے اور ہو سکتا ہے واشنگٹن والوں کو بھی ہوگی۔ یہ ایک ہسٹری ہے کہ روس اور ہندوستان کی دوستی اور ہندوستان قوم کی سوچ سمجھ سے جو یہ بچہ آج بالغ ہو گیا ہے اس میں میچورٹی آگئی ہے آدمیت ہو گئی ہے۔ انٹرنیشنل

Everything is subject to variation—

جو کل نکتہ چینی کرتے تھے بنگلہ دیش نہیں ہو گا انہوں نے دیکھا کہ ہو گیا بنگلہ دیش۔ جو کل نکتہ چینی کرتے تھے کہ رکنیشن نہیں ملیگا وہ دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ مسلم کنٹریز رکنیشن دے رہی ہیں۔ یہ میں رسوخ سے کہوں گا کہ یہ شملہ اکورٹ جو ہے حالانکہ ایک بگنینگ ہے لیکن حکومت کی ایک فارسائٹینس ہے۔ بڑی طاقتیں جنہوں نے اس چھوٹے سے براعظم کو ترقی کرنے کے راستہ میں ہمیشہ رکاوٹیں ڈالیں وہ بڑی طاقتیں اندر سے پریشان ہیں مگر ساتھ ساتھ یہ سمجھ رہی ہیں کہ ہندوستان کی قوم بیدار ہو چکی ہے۔ سماج وادی نظام کے ممالک اس کی مدد کرتے ہیں اس لئے

نہیں کہ وہ کوئی قبضہ جما کر بیٹھا ہے۔ مصر پر قبضہ کر کے کوئی روس نہیں بیٹھا ہے بنگلہ دیش پر قبضہ کر کے ہم وہاں نہیں بیٹھے ہیں ہم کسی کی کوئی ٹیریٹری نہیں لینا چاہتے ہیں۔ یہ ہماری وزڈم ہے پولیٹیکل میچورٹی ہے۔ ہم کشمیر میں ۱۹۴۷ سے لے کر اب تک چار ملزائیاں دیکھ چکے ہیں۔ چاروں لڑائیوں میں میں خود مصیبت کا شکار رہا۔ میں نے گول بھی کھائی ہے۔ سینکڑوں لوگ ہمارے مارے گئے۔ ہمارے بہادروں میں شہید شیروانی بریگیڈیئر عثمان ماسٹر عبدالعزیز شہید ہوئے جن کے نام پر بارہولہ میں میموریل بنا ہے۔ اس وقت کے لیڈران جن کو ہم ٹیسٹ بیٹریٹ سمجھتے ہیں اگرچہ آج وہ فرسٹیریٹیڈ ہیں لیکن انہوں نے دو قوموں کے نظریہ کو نہیں مانا۔

They have rejected the two-nation theory. The designs of imperial powers and their conspiracy have been frustrated.

آج وہ فرسٹیریٹیڈ ہیں۔ ان کو فرسٹریشن ہو سکتا ہے۔ ہماری کانگریس کے اندر سے وہ لوگ نکل گئے۔ پاور نہ ہونے کی وجہ سے لوگ کبھی کبھی فرسٹیریٹیڈ ہو جایا کرتے ہیں لیکن۔

We must not be led by mobocracy. We must lead the masses. We must lead all.

جہاں تک شملہ اکورٹ کا تعلق ہے جیسے روس ہند دوستی کا معاملہ جیسے بنگلہ دیش تھیو کریٹیک اسٹیٹ سے نکل کر ایک فری اسٹیٹ ہونے کا ایک تاریخی معاملہ ہے اس سنچوری میں ویسے ہی ایک تاریخی معاملہ ہے یہ شملہ

اکورٹ میں - یہ تاریخی واقعہ میں کیا ہونا ہے - ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے بیچ سبھی مسائل بات چیت سے حل ہونگے لڑائی سے نہیں - اس میں ایک بات تو ہوئی ہے کہ بھٹو صاحب نے کہا ہے۔ . . .

. . . کہیں تو وہ نیچے آئے ہیں۔ کہ ہم پارٹی نہیں ہیں کشمیر کے بارے میں - یہ کشمیریوں کا اپنا معاملہ ہے - کن کشمیریوں کا - ؟ کیا پتا ہے ان کو کہ ہمارے بھائی ہمارے رشتہ دار ہماری بہنیں ہمارے سارے بھائی بند وہاں ہیں سامراجیوں نے ہم کو بانٹا ہے۔ . . .

3P.M. لیکن جب انہوں نے کوشش کی اس صورت کو بدلنے کی تو ہم نے مارلی پولیٹیکلی اور ملٹری اسٹینڈ لیا اور اس میں کامیاب رہے - آج کونسی گھبراہٹ ہے جموں و کشمیر کی سچویشن کے بارے میں - جموں و کشمیر کی جو موجودہ صورت حال ہے اس میں کوئی تبدیلی نہیں ہے اور نہ ہو گی - کہاں سے گھبراہٹ آتی ہے - ایک بات ضرور ہے کہ جیسے مچھلی پانی کے بغیر زندہ نہیں رہ سکتی ویسے ہی یہاں کے غریب کاروباری یہاں کے ہندوستان کے شہری اور پاکستان کے غریب اور وہاں کے شہری کبھی ترقی نہیں کر سکتے جب تک پیس نہیں ہوگی - پیس اتنی ہی ضروری ہے جتنی مچھلی کے لئے پانی اور تب تک مچھلی زندہ نہیں رہ سکتی جب تک پانی نہ ہو - اس طرح سے ہمارے اس براعظم میں بھی کوئی ترقی نہیں ہوگی جب تک پیس نہیں

ہوگی - یہ ایک ہسٹریکل قدم ہے جو شریعتی گاندھی جی کے اشارے پر اور ان کی سوچ پر اٹھایا گیا ہے - اس بات کے لئے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ ساری قوم کی کوشش اور عقل سے یہ قدم اٹھایا گیا اور سب لوگ ٹھنڈے دماغ سے اس بات کو سوچ رہے ہیں اور ری ایکٹریز دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ یہ پیس کی طرف ایک قدم اور ہندوستان نے امن کے لئے دنیا کو دوس دیا ہے - کیوں کہ گاندھی جی نے دنیا کو نان وائلنس سکھایا تھا اور آج اس چیز کو ہم نے ثابت کر کے دکھا دیا ہے -

میں تین باتوں کے لئے پچھلے دو سالوں کو ہسٹریکل واقعہ مانتا ہوں - ایک تو روس انڈو فرینڈ شپ بنگلہ دیش کا صحیح لائن پر آنا اور شملہ اکورٹ -

All these historical acts are a challenge to imperialists and imperialism and their design has got a setback.

میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان کے لوگ پاکستان کے لوگ اور جتنے بھی سماج وادی نظام والے ممالک ہیں وہ آج تعریف کر رہے ہیں ہماری سوچ پر - یہ صرف اندراجی کی سوچ نہیں ہے اکیلے اندراجی کی سوچ نہیں ہے - مجھے یقین ہے کہ جہاں ڈیموکریسی ہوتی ہے وہاں بہت سے سوچنے والے ہوتے ہیں وہاں سب پاڈا کرتے ہیں اور باتوں کو آگے بڑھاتے ہیں - یہ بھٹو کے اکیلے سوچ کی بات نہیں ہے یہ تو سچویشن ہے پاکستان کی سچویشن ہے اور ہندوستان کی سچویشن ہے تبھی تو کشمیر کے بارے میں وہ شیخ عبداللہ جس میں ایک نقص ہے جو ٹاپ مومنٹم میں بلیو کرتا

[شری سید حسین]

ہے وہ بھی کہتا ہے کہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ کشمیر کا الحاق ہو گیا ہے اور ہم پاکستان کو اس میں پارٹی نہیں مانتے ہیں یہ دوسری بات ہے کہ کیسے معاملہ طے کرینگے کس طرح سے بات کرینگے ہم نے کوئی اسٹامپ لکھ کر نہیں دیا ہے۔ ہم نے کوئی تحریر لکھ کر نہیں دی ہے۔ ہم نے کسی کو ٹھیکہ پر پولیٹیکس نہیں دی ہے۔ اتنی ساری جدوجہد اور قربانی کرنے کے بعد کشمیر میں اتنی مصیبت برداشت کرنے کے بعد وہاں کے لوگوں نے جو صحیح قربانی دی اس کے بعد اگر آج ہم کمیونل فسادات کا شکار ہو جائیں۔ دو کمیونل کے شکار ہو جائیں تو میرا خیال ہے کہ ہم آپ سے سہیہ چاہینگے۔ ہم تمام ایوزیشن سے سہایتا لیں گے۔ ہم کانگریس پارٹی سے سہایتا لیں گے۔ اور سماج وادی ممالک سے مدد لینگے۔ یہ اکیلے راجیہ کا معاملہ نہیں ہے یہ اکیلے کشمیر کے کسی لیڈر کا معاملہ نہیں ہے۔ اور نہ ہی بھٹو کا معاملہ ہے ہم تو امن کی طرف ایڈوائس کر رہے ہیں۔ کہاں گیا بغداد پیکٹ کہاں گیا سیٹو اور نیٹو پیکٹ آخر یہ سب پیکٹ کس کے خلاف تھے اور یہ سازش کس کے خلاف تھی اس لئے جتنے غریب ہیں جو ایکسپلائڈ ہیں جن لوگوں کا استحصال ۲۵ سالوں سے کیا ہے وہ آج ابھر رہے ہیں سوشل فورسز آگے بڑھ رہی ہیں اور محنت کش آگے بڑھ رہے ہیں۔ بڑلا۔ ٹاٹا اور ڈالیا یہ سب پریشان ہیں اور واشنگٹن میں بھی پریشان ہے۔

I am sure that victory is for socialist forces and for the forces which are for peace and not for the forces which are for war.

† [श्री संयद हुसैन (जम्मू व काश्मीर) :

मिस्टर डिप्टी चैयरमैन, अभी जो आनरेबल मेम्बर मिमला एकाईड के बारे में फरमा रहे थे उनको जवाब नहीं देना चाहता और न अपोजिशन को जवाब देना चाहता हूँ। मैं तो अपने ब्यू प्वाइंट को सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

अंग्रेजों से हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद कराने के लिये जब हम आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ते थे तो एक हिन्दुस्तान था और जम्हूरियत और आजादी एक बच्चा को जब मिली तब इस कौम में जिस स्कूल में बच्चे खेलते थे, उस स्कूल में उस्ताद भी थे, लीडर भी थे। बच्चे कभी छुरी उठाते हैं तो अपनी आंख निकाल सकते हैं और इस आजादी के बच्चे ने अपने पिता को भी मार दिया। गांधी जी मारे गये। इस आजादी के बच्चे ने अपनी माता को भी जखमी कर दिया। 25 साल हुए और यह आजादी का बच्चा और इस कौम के अन्दर बालिग हुआ है मेच्युरिटी इसमें आई है। उस वक्त के हमारे नेता यह कहते थे कि साम्राज्यी इस मुक्त को तबाह करके छोड़ेंगे। पालिटिकल फ्रीडम के बाद हम को इकानोमिक फ्रीडम नहीं मिलेगी, एक्सप्लाइडेशन रहेगा और हम नहीं समझते थे। साम्राजियों ने काफी साजिशें कीं इस छोटे से बर्रे-आजम को तबाह करने के लिए, बारबार हमला कराया लड़ाई कराई। मुझे याद है अपनी 30 साल की सियासी जिवंदगी में एक आजादी के दिन हमारी इस नापुख्ता कौम में आजादी के छोटे बच्चों ने बच्चों के सिर काट कर टोकरे में भेजे। एक दूसरे को भेज दिया। वह हादसा उनके सामने है। क्या उन्होंने किया था? अन्तर उस्ताद और सियासी रहबर सामने न आते तो वह सर कटने का सिलसिला ना मालूम कब तक जारी रहता। बीच में गांधी जी आये, बीच में जवाहरलाल नेहरू आये, बीच में पाकिस्तान के कुछ लोग आये और यह मामला कतल व सारत का एक पड़ा। काश्मीर चार दफा इन लड़ाइयों का शिकार हो गया। किसी ने लड़ाई की, मैं

† Hindi transliteration.

Pakistan

वक्कू से कहूंगा कि यह जो छोटी-छोटी मिसालें हमारी प्रजा सोशलिस्ट के मेम्बर फरमा रहे थे, यह वाक्यात है। मुझे उनसे इंकार नहीं है लेकिन यह एक मकतब में, एक स्कूल में छोटे बच्चे करते थे कोई बड़ा आदमी नहीं करता था कोई मेम्बोर्ड पोलिटिकल आइडियालोजी वाला नहीं करता था। वह नहीं करता था और न कराता था। साम्राजियों की साजिशों को उनकी डिजाइन्स को रिसेन्टली बड़ा सेटबैक मिला है, जब कि रूस और हिन्दुस्तान की दोस्ती सामने आई और आप देखते हैं कि उनके डिजाइन्स को जब सेटबैक मिला तो किस तरह से सेवन्थ प्लोट की तैयारी हुई, कब से हो रही है और उस वक्त भी हुई, मैं समझता हूं कि कुछ लोग मुस्लीम नहीं थे उनमें शांति नहीं थी और वे रिकोगनीशन की बातें करते थे। और शायद उन लोगों को अपनी फोर्सेज पर भरोसा नहीं था। लेकिन हमारी कौम ने और हमारे जवानों ने, आम्ड फोर्सेज ने, ज्वाइंट कमांड के लोगों ने उन लोगों की मदद की जो आजादी चाहते थे। इस साजिश से निकल कर जो एक थ्यो क्रेटिक स्टेट बनाने की साजिश थी। मैं 5 जनवरी को जैसोर गया था और मैंने हजारों सर कटी लाशें देखीं, औरतों के बालों का अम्बार वहां पड़ा था जिसने कराया वह याह्या खां कहां है। आज सदर भुट्टो इस हकीकत को पाकिस्तान के लोगों से कह रहा है, अगर जंग चाहते हो तो मेरी जरूरत नहीं है, अगर पाकिस्तान को रखना चाहते हो तो मैं कहूंगा कि जंग पर नहीं जायेंगे। जो बातें हम किया करते थे आज पाकिस्तान के अबाम वह बातें तसलीम कर रहे हैं कि जंग से कल्ल व शारतगरी से लोगों की हालत ठीक नहीं हो सकती है। आज जिस अज्रम से साम्राज्यी फोर्सेज को और उन की तरफ नजर लगाने वाले आदमियों को एक परेशानी सी है, यह परेशानी सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं है उन लोगों की तरह के लोगों को, बल्कि पाकिस्तान में भी है और हो सकता है वाशिंगटन वालों को भी होगी। यह एक हिस्ट्री है कि रूस और हिन्दुस्तान की दोस्ती और हिन्दुस्तानी कौम की सोच समझ से जो यह बच्चा आज वालिग हो गया है उसमें मेम्बोरिटी आ गई है आदमियत हो गई है, इन्टरनेशनल— Every thing

is subject to variation. जो कल नुकता चीनी करते थे बंगला देश नहीं होगा उन्होंने देखा कि हो गया बंगला देश। जो कल नुकता चीनी करते थे कि रिकोगनीशन नहीं मिलेगी वह देख रहे हैं कि मुस्लिम कन्ट्रीज रिकोगनीशन दे रही है, यह मैं रसूख से कहूंगा कि यह शिमला एकोर्ड जो है, हालांकि एक बिगनिंग है, लेकिन हकूमत की एक फारसाइटेडनेस है। बड़ी ताकत जिन्होंने इस छोटे से बर्टेअजम को तरक्की करने के रास्ते में हमेशा रुकावटें डालीं, वह बड़ी ताकतें अन्दर से परेशान हैं, मगर साथ-साथ यह समझ रही है कि हिन्दुस्तान की कौम बैदार हो चुकी है। समाजवादी निजाम के मुमालिक इसकी मदद करते हैं, इसलिये नहीं कि वह कोई कब्जा जमा कर बैठा है। मिस्ट पर कब्जा करके कोई रुम नहीं बैठा है, बंगला देश पर कब्जा करके हम वहां नहीं बैठे हैं, हम किसी की कोई टेरीटरी नहीं लेना चाहते हैं। यह हमारी विज्डम है, पोलिटिकल मेम्बोरिटी है। हम काश्मीर में 1947 से ले कर अब तक चार लड़ाइयां देख चुके हैं। चारों लड़ाइयों में मैं खुद मुसीबत का शिकार रहा। मैंने गोली भी खाई है। सैकड़ों लोग हमारे मारे गये, हमारे बहादुरों में शहीद शेरवानी भिगेडियर उस्मान, मास्टर अब्दुल अजीज शहीद हुए जिनके नाम पर बाराभूला में मेमोरियल बना है। इस वक्त के लीडरान जिनको हम टेस्ट पेडियेट समझते हैं अगरचे आज वे फस्ट्रेटड हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने दो कौमी के नजरीये को नहीं माना।

They have rejected the two-nation theory. The designs of imperial powers and their conspiracy have been frustrated. आज वे फस्ट्रेटेड हैं, उनको फस्ट्रेशन हो सकता है, हमारी कांग्रेस के अंदर से वे लोग निकल गये। पावर न होने की वजह से लोग कभी-कभी फस्ट्रेटेड हो जाया करते हैं, लेकिन We mustnot be led by mobocracy. We must lead the masses. We must lead all. जहां तक शिमला एकोर्ड का ताल्लुक है, जैसे रुसहिद दोस्ती का मामला जैसे बंगला देश प्योनेटिक

[श्री सैयद हुसैन]

स्टेट से निकल कर एक फ्री स्टेट होने का एक तारीखी मामला है इस संचुरी में, वैसे ही एक तारीखी मामला है यह ज़िमला एकोर्ड में, यह तारीखी वाक्या में क्या होना है, हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच सभी मसाले बातचीत से हल होंगे, तड़ाई से नहीं। इसमें एक बात तो हुई है कि भूटो साहब ने कहा है—कहीं तो वे नीचे आये हैं—कि हम पार्टी नहीं हैं काश्मीर के बारे में। यह काश्मीरियों का अपना मामला है किन काश्मीरियों का? क्या पता है उनकी कि हमारे भाई हमारे रिश्तेदार हमारी बहनें हमारे सारे भाई बंध बहाने हैं साक्षात्कारों ने हम को बांटा है। लेकिन जब उन्होंने कोशिश की उस मूलतः को बदलने की तो हम ने मोरली पालिटिकली और मिनिटरी स्टैंड लिया और इसमें कामयाब रहे। आज कौन सी अवस्था है जम्मू व काश्मीर की सिन्धुएनन के बारे में जम्मू व काश्मीर को जो मौजूदा मूलतः हाल है उसमें कोई बदलाव नहीं है और न होगा। कहा से अवस्था है एक बात जरूर है कि जैसे मछली जल के बिना जिंदा नहीं रह सकती वैसे ही यहां के गरीब कारोबारी यहां के हिन्दुस्तान के शहरी और पाकिस्तान के गरीब और यहां के शहरी सभी तरफकी नहीं कर सकते, जब तक पीस नहीं होगी। पीस इतनी ही जरूरी है जितनी मछली के लिये पानी और जब तक मछली जिंदा नहीं रह सकती, जब तक पानी न हो। इसी तरह से हमारे इस बर्रे-आजम में भी कोई तरफकी नहीं होगी, जब तक पीस नहीं होगी। यह एक हिस्टोरिकल कदम है जो श्रीमती गांधी जी के इशारे पर और उनकी मूल पर उठाया गया है। इस बात के लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सारी कोष की कोशिश और प्रयत्न में यह कदम उठाया गया और सब लोग ठंडे दिमाग में इस बात को सोच रहे हैं और रिपणशन देख रहे हैं कि यह पीस की तरफ एक कदम और हिन्दुस्तान ने धमन के लिये दुनिया को दरस दिया है; क्योंकि गांधी जी ने दुनिया को नान-वायलेंस सिखाया था और आज इस चीज को हमने साबित करके दिखा दिया है।

मैं तीन बातों के लिये पिछले दो सप्ताहों को हिस्टोरिकल वाक्या मानता हूँ। एक तो रूस-इंडो

फेंडशिप, बंगला देश का सही लाइन पर प्रता और ज़िमला एकोर्ड।

All these historical acts are a challenge to imperialists and imperialism and their design has got a setback.

मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोग पाकिस्तान के लोग और जितने भी समाजवादी निज़ाम बाने मुसलिक हैं, वे आज तारीफ कर रहे हैं हमारी मूल पर। यह सिर्फ इंदिरा जी की मूल नहीं है, ब्रकेले इंदिरा जी की मूल नहीं है। मुझे पकीन है, कि जहाँ हैमोनेसी होती है वहाँ बहुत से सोचने वाले होते हैं, वहाँ सब पाइलट करने हैं और बातों को आये बताते हैं। यह भूटो के ब्रकेले सोच को बात नहीं है यह तो सिन्धुएनन है पाकिस्तान की सिन्धुएनन है और हिन्दुस्तान की सिन्धुएनन है, तब तो काश्मीर के बारे में वह श्रेष्ठ प्रवृत्ति जिस में एक मुक्त है जो टाय मोनट्रियम में बिलोव करता है वह भी कहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ काश्मीर का अवस्था है गया है और हम पाकिस्तान को इस पार्टी में नहीं मानते हैं, यह दूसरी बात है कि कैसे मामले लय करने, किस तरह से बात करेंगे, हमने कोई स्टाम्प लिख कर नहीं दिया है। हमने कोई तहरीर लिख कर नहीं दी है, हमने किसी को टेक पर पासिटिक्स नहीं दी है, इतनी सारी जवाबदारी और कुर्बानी करने के बाद काश्मीर में इतनी मुसीबत बरदाश्त करने के बाद वहाँ के लोगों ने जो सही कुर्बानी दी, उसके बाद अगर आज हम कम्युनियल फ़ेसदात का शिकार हो जायें तो कम्युनल के शिकार हो जायें तो मेरा खयाल है कि हम आपसे सहायता चाहेंगे। हम उसाम अपोजीशन से सहायता चाहेंगे, हम काश्मिरी पार्टी से सहायता लेंगे और समाजवादी मुसलिक से मदद लेंगे। यह ब्रकेले राज्य का मामला नहीं है, यह ब्रकेले काश्मीर के किसी मोडर का मामला नहीं है और न ही भूटो का मामला है। हम तो अपने की तरफ एडवांस कर रहे हैं। कहाँ गया बरदाद पैक्ट, कहाँ गया सीटो और नीटो पैक्ट, आधिर ये सब पैक्ट किसके खिलाफ थे और यह माहिफ किसके खिलाफ थी, इसलिये जितने गरीब हैं जो एक्सप्लोइटेड हैं, जिन लोगों का

Pakistan

इससे माल 25 सालों से किया गया है वह आज उभर रहे हैं। सोशलिफोसिस आगे बढ़ रही है और मोहननकन आगे बढ़ रहे हैं, बिडला, टाटा और डालगियां से सब परेशान हैं और वाशिंगटन में भी परेशानी है।

I am sure that iciory is for socialist forces and for the forces which are for peace and not for the forces which are for war.

श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभापति महोदय, शिमला समझौते के विषय में आज चार दिनों से बहस चल रही है और दोनों सदनों को मिला कर इन समझौते की हर बात पर काफी बहस हो चुकी है। लेकिन फिर भी कुछ बातें हैं जो आपके माध्यम से मैं भी कहना चाहती हूँ। शिमला समझौते के पीछे हमारे उद्देश्य क्या हैं? हमारे दो उद्देश्य हैं। स्पष्ट तौर से अपने रास्ते में उन रोड़ों को हटाना जो हमारी जनता के आर्थिक विकास, औद्योगिक विकास और वैज्ञानिक विकास में अटकाव डालते हैं और युद्ध की शंका को शांति और सहयोग के वातावरण में बदलना। दूसरी बात है कि हम अपने देश को और एशिया के देशों को उन परिस्थितियों से अलग करें जो बाहरी दबाव का कारण बन जाते हैं। इन दोनों उद्देश्यों को सामने रख कर अगर हम पहले के समझौते को देखें तो उनमें वह परिस्थितियाँ मौजूद नहीं थीं जो शिमला के समझौते में मौजूद थीं। इनसे पहले जो भी समझौते हुए उनमें बाहरी दबाव मौजूद था। ताशकन्द के समझौते के समय हम दो लड़ने वाले देश तीसरी जगह मिले थे और जब तीसरी जगह पर मिलते हैं तो बहुत सी एक्स-टर्नल फोर्सों और बहुत से कारण उनमें आ जाते हैं, जिनके दबाव में हम पड़ जाते हैं। पहली दफा दो लड़ने वाले देश शिमला में आपस में मिले और उन्होंने फैसला किया कि जो कुछ भी बातें हैं वे हम आपस में मिल कर तय करेंगे।

बहुत से लोगों ने यह आवाज उठाई कि शिमला में बाहरी दबाव था। मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि अगर बाहरी दबाव पड़ा तो बाहरी दबाव हम खुल कर क्यों नहीं लेते, उसमें छिपाने की क्या बात है; क्योंकि खुल कर लेते तो अगर मान लीजिए

शिमला समझौता न हो पाता तो इसका दोष थर्ड पार्टी को होता, हम अपने सिर उसका दोष क्यों लें या श्री भुट्टो ही उसका दोष क्यों लें। इसलिए उपसभापति महोदय, इस प्रकार का शक लोगों के दिमाग में पैदा करना यह पोलिटिकल स्टण्ड है। कुछ लोग इस बात को एक्सप्लाइट करना चाहते हैं, एक उम्दा नई चीज लाए तो उस चीज को किसी और कारण के ऊपर डाल दें, यह बता दें कि यह इतनी सीधी और सरल और अच्छी बात नहीं है, इसके पीछे जरूर कोई राज है।

सही बात तो यह है कि दोनों देशों के नेता शिमले में मिले। हमारे सामने दो रास्ते थे। विरोधी दल के कई माननीय सदस्यों ने यह बात कही है कि शिमले के समझौते में सारी बात एक साथ नहीं हुई, तो हमने क्यों कोई भी समझौता किया, हम सिर्फ बातचीत करके टल जाते। सही बात यह है कि हमारे सामने दो रास्ते थे—या तो हम लकीर के फकीर बनते, अपनी-अपनी डफली बजा कर अलग हो जाते, उसमें न हमारा काम बनता न पाकिस्तान का और न उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति होती जिन उद्देश्यों के लिए दोनों देशों के नेता मिले थे। पाकिस्तान में भी श्री भुट्टो चुनाव के द्वारा आये हुए नेता हैं, उन्होंने अपनी जनता के सामने वादे किये हैं और उन वादों को पूरा करना उनका धर्म हो जाता है। दूसरा रास्ता दोनों नेताओं के सामने था कि वे ऐसा कदम उठाते जिससे दोनों लड़ने वाले देशों के बीच सद्भावना और नए विश्वास की नींव डाली जाय। 25 वर्ष से पाकिस्तान में फौजी शासकों ने वहाँ की जनता में भारत की जनता के प्रति नफरत पैदा की। उसी देश के नेता और जनता के मन में भारत के प्रति नया विश्वास और नई सद्भावना पैदा करना कोई आसान काम नहीं था। यह नई दिशा हमारी प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने दी और बड़े साहस के साथ दी। ऐसे उद्देश्य की पूर्ति न तो नगराज पर सामान तौल कर और न जमीन को गड से नाप कर की जा सकती है। यह होगी तो कुछ उमूलों के बल पर। प्रधान मंत्री और हमारी पार्टी ने बार-बार कहा है कि हम दूसरे की जमीन पर कब्जा करने का इरादा नहीं रखते,

Pakistan

[श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह]

इस लड़ाई के सिलसिले में यूनीलेटरल सीज फायर के समय भी कहा था, उसके पहले भी हमारी पार्टी के जितने मैनीफेस्टो हैं, उनमें हमने बार-बार कहा है, आजादी से पहले भी कहा है कि दूसरे की जमीन पर कब्जा करने का हमारा इरादा नहीं है। और सबूत इसका यह है कि हमारा देश बंगला देश में लड़ा, बंगला देश को आजाद किया, लेकिन बंगला देश पर कब्जा नहीं किया। आज की दुनिया में कोई भी देश दूसरे देश की जमीन पर अधिकार नहीं रखता है। लड़ाई के वक्त की बात और है। लड़ाई के वक्त के नियम और हैं। लड़ाई के वक्त सेंटीमेंट्स और हैं। लड़ाई के बाद शांति के समय के नियम और हैं। उसके तरीके हैं। उसमें लेन देन करना पड़ता है, कुछ आगे कदम बढ़ाना पड़ता है, कुछ देना पड़ता है, कुछ उनकी बातों को भी समझना पड़ता है; क्योंकि जब तक हम तनाव की स्थिति, स्पीयर आफ टेंशन्स, को दूर न करें, तब तक कुछ बनता नहीं। प्रधान मंत्री जी को श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने काट दिया है कि 14 मई को प्रधान मंत्री जी ने किसी इंटरव्यू में कहा था।

Indo-Pakistan problem could not be looked upon piecemeal."

इस बात को श्री वाजपेयी जी और उनके समर्थकों ने तिल का ताड़ बनाया है। पीसमील की बात तब उठानी थी जब किन्हीं समस्याओं को बातचीत में छोड़ दिया होता। हाँ, यह बात और है कि समस्याएँ एक-एक बार संभाली जायगी, कदम बढ़ते हैं तो पहले एक पांव आप बढ़ाते हैं और फिर दूसरा पांव आप बढ़ाते हैं। दोनों पांव एक साथ आप बढ़ायें तो या तो आप चित्त चिरेंगे या पट चिरेंगे। यही कारण है कि आप एक साथ दोनों कदम नहीं बढ़ाते हैं। इसलिए अगर आप समझौते को सही रूप में पढ़ें, नॉट ऐज ए पालिटीशियन बट ऐज ए स्टेड्समैन, तो आप पायेंगे कि इस समझौते में हर बात के लिए गुंजाइश रखी गई है। आप आर्टिकल 6 को उठाइये और आर्टिकल 6 को सही रूप में पढ़ कर देखिये ऐज ए स्टेड्समैन, नॉट ऐज ए पालिटीशियन, तो आप इसकी महत्ता को समझेंगे। पालिटीशियन आज की बात, अभी की

बात, इस वक्त की बात देखता है और स्टेड्समैन देखता है कल की बात, परसों की बात, आने वाले जमाने की बात, नई दुनिया की बात और नौजवानों की बात। आर्टिकल 6 में लिखा है:

"... the two sides will meet to discuss further the modalities and arrangements for the establishment of durable peace and normalisation of relations, including the questions of repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees, a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir and the resumption of diplomatic relations."

इसमें तो कोई बात छोड़ी नहीं है। यह सही है कि सारी बातों को एक साथ ही करना संभव नहीं है, लेकिन हर बात के लिये रास्ते खुले हुये हैं। हर बात की गुंजाइश रखी हुई है।

जम्मू व काश्मीर की बात 25 साल से यू० एन० ओ० में लटकी है। क्या वहीं लटकी रहे? यू० एन० ओ० में काश्मीर के सवाल को भारत ले गया। इस बार शिमला समझौते में दोनों दल पहली बार राजी हुए हैं और इसीलिए जम्मू काश्मीर की स्थिति पर प्रकाश डालने के लिये आर्टिकल 4 का भाग दो है जिसके अनुसार 1971 की 17 दिसम्बर की जगह पर हम स्थित रहते हैं। इसके मुताबिक इससे पहले के समझौते में और इस समझौते में भिन्न स्टेटस आ गया है। इसके मुताबिक इस समझौते के अनुसार इस के पहले के जितने भी समझौते थे उनमें जो सीज फायर लाइन थी वह नहीं मानी जायगी और अब 1971 की सीज फायर लाइन मान्य होगी। सवाल यह उठ सकता है कि सारे जम्मू काश्मीर के मामले शिमला में समाप्त क्यों नहीं हुए। अगर वहाँ के मामले शिमला में समाप्त नहीं करने थे तो उनको एक्टिवाइज क्यों किया गया। जवाब साफ और सीधा है। हल निकालना आवश्यक था और इसलिये मामले को उठाना जरूरी था। मामले को न उठाने से काम नहीं चलता और वहाँ का मामला लटका कर छोड़ दिया जाय और वहाँ के लोगों को सस्पेंस में हर दम के लिए छोड़ दिया जाता, यह ठीक बात नहीं होती। उस को हल करने का तरीका आर्टिकल 6 में मौजूद है।

Pakistan

जो आर्टिकल एक के भाग दो के साथ पढ़ने पर आपस में बातचीत द्वारा हल होंगे और किसी तीसरे की दस्तदाजी की जरूरत उनमें नहीं पड़ेगी। दूसरी बात जम्मू काश्मीर भारत का अविच्छिन्न अंग है। वहां के चुने हुए सदस्य हमारे दोनों सदनों में हैं। वहां के कानून के फैसले भारत के सुप्रीम कोर्ट से किये जाते हैं। वहां का इलेक्शन कमीशन भारत का इलेक्शन कमीशन है। और फिर जो भी कुछ हुआ है बंगला देश में उसने क्या वहां की जनता की आंखें नहीं खोल दीं? वहां की जनता क्या नहीं समझती कि केवल धर्म की नींव पर राज्य नहीं टिक सकता? क्या वहां की जनता आर्थिक विकास और वैज्ञानिक विकास नहीं चाहती है? शिमला समझौते में एक बड़ी बात यह हुई है कि तीसरी शक्ति जो काश्मीर में बैठ कर दंगल कराती थी उससे दोनों देशों को छुटकारा मिलेगा; क्योंकि 17 दिसम्बर, 1971 की स्थिति के स्वीकार होने से ही यू०एन०ओ० के लोगों को जम्मू काश्मीर में कोई लोकस स्टेडार्ड नहीं रह जाती। वहां के रिजोल्यूशन में 1949 के सीच फायर लाइन को एक्सेप्ट किया गया है और इसलिये मैं जनसंघ दल के साथियों से कहूंगी कि वे सोचें कि जमीन की एक्वीजिशन वाली ध्यौरी कितनी घातक होती है। आप एक्वीजिशन का सवाल उठाते हैं तो यह सवाल दूसरे भी उठा सकते हैं। अभी शिमले में कम से कम आपके उसूल को उन्होंने तसलीम किया है। आपने उनको लगभग 5,000 वर्ग मील जमीन दी तो उन्होंने भी कमोबेश 50 वर्ग मील जमीन आप को लौटाना स्वीकार किया है। सवाल माप तोल का नहीं है, उपसभापति महोदय, सवाल है उसूल के तसलीम होने का। शिमला समझौते के आर्टिकल 3 के अनुसार रास्ते खुल गये हैं। कुछ लोगों का खयाल है कि यह ठीक नहीं हुआ। किन्तु रास्ते बंद थे तो उस पार के लोग भारत के विषय में गलतफहमियों का शिकार बनते थे। अब रास्ता खुलने से उनको कम से कम सच्चाई तो दिखानी पड़ेगी। भारत में क्या स्थिति है, यहां हिन्दु मुसलमानों का कैसा मेल है और वे कैसी आजादी से रहते हैं, क्योंकि हमारे गहर के भी कुछ लोग, जिन के भाई बंधु पाकिस्तान में हैं, उनसे अभी इस

लड़ाई के बाद बात हुई थी। उन्होंने कहा कि हम वहां गये थे तो 15 दिनों के अन्दर ही हमें लगा कि हमारा दम घुट जाया। हम वहां बोल नहीं सकते थे, अपने वक्कों से भी खुल कर बात नहीं कर सकते थे, क्योंकि वहां फौजी शासन है।

उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से एक बात और कहना चाहती हूं। श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी कहते हैं कि मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि श्री भुट्टो के साथ पन्द्रह मिनट की मुलाकात में क्या हुआ? यह श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहते हैं कि 15 मिनट की मुलाकात में क्या हुआ?

श्री नगेश्वर प्रसाद शाही: 15 मिनट में बहुत कुछ हो सकता है।

श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह: जी, मैं जवाब दे रही हूं, जरा शांति से सुनिये। आप जब घंटों बोलते हैं तो मैं सुनती हूं शान्ति से।

श्री ओम् मेहता: शान्त हो जायें तो क्या बात है।

श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह: आपके अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी आगे कहते हैं कि “जो कुछ हुआ उस पर रहस्य का परदा पड़ा हुआ है। समझौता भंग होते-होते कैसे सफल हो गया? यह बात उन्होंने व्यंग में कही है, लेकिन सच्चाई उनके मुंह से ही निकल आयी और सचमुच में उस पन्द्रह मिनट में समझौता भंग होते-होते सफल हो गया, हुआ क्या? (Time bell rings) आप श्रीमन्, मुझे थोड़ा समय और देने की कृपा करें। मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहती हूं कि उस 15 मिनट में इस उपमहाद्वीप का नक्शा बदल गया। श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने श्री भुट्टो के साथ उसी प्रकार का व्यवहार किया जिस प्रकार से इतिहास में सिकन्दर ने पुरु से किया था। प्रधान मंत्री इन्दिरा और श्री भुट्टो की वार्ता उस 15 मिनट में उसी प्रकार हुई जैसी इतिहास में चाणक्य और मुद्राराक्षस के बीच हुई थी। इन्दिरा गांधी के सामने लक्ष्य क्या था? एशिया जो सदियों से बड़े-बड़े राष्ट्रों के खेल का स्थान रहा है और बड़े-बड़े राष्ट्रों के हथियारों

[श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह]

नया सोला बरूद की ताकत आजमाइश का अखाड़ा रहा है, उसे इन राष्ट्रों के हाथों से अलग करना। कभी यह राष्ट्र हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में युद्ध कराने हैं, कहीं इन्होंने वियतनाम को अखाड़ा बना रखा है तो कहीं कोरिया इनके खेल का मैदान बना रहा। न एशिया में शान्ति होगी और न इन देशों में विज्ञान, व्यापार और कृषि आदि का विकास हो सकेगा। अतः, इन्दिरा जी ने देखा कि यह उपयुक्त समय है जब कि अगर हम उदारता से, बरणपन से हाथ बढ़ावें तो युद्ध की विभिन्निका को दूर कर सकते हैं और शान्ति की ओर कदम बढ़ा सकते हैं।

उधर श्री भुट्टो के सामने श्री पीछे के इतिहास की सच्चाई थी, पीछे का इतिहास सच्चाई लिये हुए खड़ा था। उसके सामने बंगला देश का उसके न चाहने पर भी निर्माण हुआ था। उसके सामने धर्म पर आधारित राज्य की दीवार गिर चुकी थी। उसने यह स्पष्ट देखा कि आर्थिक उन्नति वैज्ञानिक उन्नति, इतिहास, भूगोल भाषा, कितनी ही ऐसी बातें हैं जिनकी सच्चाई और अहमियत का समझ कर के देश को चलाना पड़ता है। श्री भुट्टो बंगला देश के मसले पर घंटों मिकयोरिटो कौमल में धांसू बड़ा चुके थे, रो चुके थे। श्री भुट्टो अपमानित हो चुके थे। बाहरी लोगों की बांह पकड़ कर खाई में गिरना होता है, यह श्री भुट्टो अनुभव कर चुके थे। इसका पूरी तौर पर अनुभव कर चुके थे। श्री भुट्टो ने देखा कि धनी राष्ट्रों के हथियारों से ही सिर्फ लड़ाई नहीं जीती जाती है, देश के रहने वालों की ताकत से देश जीतता है और आगे बढ़ता है। शिमला आकर श्री भुट्टो ने यह भी अनुभव किया कि यहाँ की जनता, यहाँ के नेता उनके साथ हारे देश के नेता के समान तो व्यवहार नहीं करते हैं, बल्कि सभी यहाँ समानता का और आदर का व्यवहार करने हैं। ऐसी अनेक छोटी बड़ी घटनाओं का अगर उन पर तीन दिनों में पड़ रहा था और इसलिये 15 मिनट की मुलाकात में प्रधान मंत्री इन्दिरा गांधी ने मिकयोरिटो से इस उपमहाद्वीप में शान्ति की बात कही तो श्री भुट्टो इंकार न कर सके। जहाँ हुआ।

यह सवाल सही है कि क्या श्री भुट्टो बदल सकते हैं ? (Time bell rings) उपसभापति महोदय, मैं तीन मिनट और लूंगी। उस सवाल का जवाब तो भारत के इतिहास में मौजूद है। सम्राट अशोक कितने युद्धों का विजेता उड़ीसा (कलिंग) युद्ध के बाद एक घड़ी में बदल गया। यदि श्री भुट्टो पाकिस्तान के सही मायनों में नेता बनना चाहते हैं तो पिछले चन्द महीने के अनुभव उनको अपने आपको बदलने से रोक नहीं सकते हैं। उनकी महत्वाकांक्षाएँ ही उनको प्रेरित करेंगी कि वे शिमला समझौते का पालन करें। क्या पिछली लड़ाई ने इनको स्पष्ट नहीं कर दिया है कि देश से गरीबी मिटाने के लिये शान्ति और सहयोग का ही रास्ता है ? सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने अपने एक वक्तव्य में कहा है कि श्री भुट्टो उनको बदले दिखाई दे रहे हैं। तो इस पर कहा जाता है कि उनका चक्का ही बदल गया है। असल बात तो यह है कि जनसंघ का चक्का मटमैला हो गया है जो एशिया के नौजवानों में नई आशा, नई प्रेरणा, नई कल्पना जगी है, जो सीमाओं को पार कर जाना चाहती है, उस नई हवा को नहीं पहचान पा रहे हैं। इन नौजवानों ने ही बंगला देश का निर्माण पुरानी रीत को तोड़ कर किया है। इन नौजवानों ने ही नेपाल में एक दिन राजतंत्र को तोड़ कर प्रजातंत्र की स्थापना की थी और ये ही नौजवान पाकिस्तान को भी एक नया रूप देंगे जिसकी नींव आर्थिक प्रगति, वैज्ञानिक प्रगति पर आधारित होगी। इसी परिस्थिति ने भुट्टो साहब की आँखें भी खोल दी और बात बिगड़ने-बिगड़ते बन गई।

(Time bell rings)

उपसभापति महोदय, जो आपसी बातचीत की, बाइलैटरेज्म की मिसाल हमारे देश की प्रधान मंत्री ने दुनिया के सामने रखी है उसका अनुकरण भी होने लगा है। क्या यही इस रास्ते के सही होने की सच्ची कसौटी नहीं है ? सच बात तो यह है कि यह युग ही आपसी बात से समस्याओं के निपटारे का है। वहाँ निकसन और चाऊ एन लाई में बातें कैसे होती ? निक्सन और ब्रैजनेव में बातें कैसे होती ? कोरिया वाले आपस में बात करना चाहते हैं। योसू के देशों में बातें होने की

बात है। अतः इस नये रास्ते, इस नये कदम के लिये प्रधान मंत्री जी को बधाई है। शान्ति और सहयोग दबाव से नहीं, भाव से होते हैं। समझौता तभी सफल होगा जब दोनों पक्ष बातों को बाइजजत सुलझाने की चेष्टा करते हैं।

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA (West Bengal). • Mi. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have moved an amendment which I do not want to repeat. But on the question of my amendment, I have with me a copy of the *Hindustan Standard*, Calcutta, dated August 2, 1972. The last four lines of its editorial say:

"After all the Prime Minister is not obliged to consult the Opposition Parties on important national issues. Yet, she does it to build up a healthy democratic convention. This convention would have been strengthened if the Simla Agreement was ratified by the President after a debate in Parliament."

This is also the substance of my amendment. Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I fully endorse the view expressed by the External Affairs Minister when in a written note circulated he says,

"The experience of the past 25 years shows that outside agencies and third party involvement have made the solution of problems between India and Pakistan extremely difficult."

True. It was the foreign powers that tried to play with Pakistan and we have as many as four wars with Pakistan. But I cannot understand Mr. Swaran Singh, our External Affairs Minister, when he says in the last page, "As far as India is concerned, we are prepared to treat the new Pakistan as a friend". What is the meaning of this "new Pakistan"? Does he want to convey that old Pakistan was something different from new Pakistan?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That is, without Bangla Desh.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA:

I know. Our stand has always been we want friendly relations with all neighbouring countries. Old Pakistan, undivided Pakistan, was also a neighbouring country and our relations with old Pakistan from our side were always good. Now we have given handle to those who want to use it against us that we only want the new and truncated Pakistan to be our friend and we never wanted the old, undivided, Pakistan as our friend.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh):

No, no.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA:

Anyway, I do not want either 'yes*' or 'no' by way of running commentary. I have now before me the printed Agreement on bilateral relations between India and Pakistan signed by our Prime Minister India Gandhi and signed by Islamic Republic of Pakistan's President Zulfikkar Ali Bhutto. If it was not signed by our Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, if it was a draft given by Great Britain or America or China or even Russia, we would have ourselves said that these foreign powers want India to be bracketed with Pakistan or put the aggressor at par with India. What have you said here?—

"The Government of India and the Government of Pakistan are resolved that the two countries put an end to the conflict and confrontation that have hitherto marred their relations and work for the promotion of a friendly and harmonious relations...."

Now, we never declared war against Pakistan. We could categorically say that we reciprocate the ideas expressed by Mr. Bhutto and could give him thanks for his belated wisdom. I say there should not have been a bilateral agreement in this language. This line only indicates as if we say, let us forget and forgive, let us now

[Shri Dwijendralal Sen Gupta]

open a new channel. This is the significance of this line. In all the pages you will find as if India and Pakistan are a counterpart of each other doing the same good or the same bad and they have, now come to a sense of urgency "well, in future we should not do like that". Now, on the question of this Agreement, I have very little to say because it is *ajait accompli*. We have signed this Agreement and President has ratified it without knowing the views of the Parliament. Internal problems exist in Pakistan and that is against Bhutto. Bhutto is the leader of the Peoples' Party there and has the strength of the Punjabis behind him. Most of the prisoners of war are Punjabis. Bhutto was being questioned by his people as to when these POWs will be released. He could not guarantee it. He was in hot water. Now we have given him a handle to say, 'well, something will be done now. | Wait a few days'. We have helped Bhutto to save his face definitely. The people of Sind are fighting for autonomy. The people of Baluchistan are fighting for autonomy. The people of North-West Frontier Province are fighting for autonomy. Bhutto is being troubled like that. And our sympathy, I should say, my sympathy goes with those people, with those exploited people, of Sind, the exploited people of North-West Frontier Province, and the exploited people of Baluchistan but our action is positively against their interest. Exploitation was there in East Pakistan earlier, they rose in revolt and we played our part. Now you have strengthened the hands of Bhutto by signing this Agreement and have put cold water to the movement for autonomy of the different units of Pakistan. What was the urgency on our side? No urgency. We could have waited and seen. Again, Mr. Deputy Chairman, how can we forget that this Bhutto is not the leader of Pakistan with any dignity and honour, as it stands today. He was

the leader who honoured the hijackers of Indian plane. When the hijackers went to Pakistan, it was Bhutto who garlanded them. It was that Bhutto who called our very respected External Affairs Minister the 'Indian dog'. It is that Bhutto who decried Tashkent pact and ultimately was thrown out of Pakistan Cabinet. It is that Bhutto who after the 17th December, 1971, after the war, consulted America and China as to what should be done. Possibly—why possibly, in all likelihood—it was under Chinese and American advice that Bhutto signed this pact at Simla because America and China knew that they could not do anything now for their friends in Pakistan. If anybody from the Congress side or this side of the opposition feels that Bhutto is changed and he has no link with China and America, he is living in a fool's paradise. America is now with thorn in his flesh on Vietnam issue. They cannot help him. The internal leadership conflict in China does not permit China to be involved in any war with India at this time. It was thus a very favourable time for India to see how Bhutto shapes himself and how he comes to his senses. But we have gone out of our way to strengthen him and instal him as the true leader of Pakistan. How can we forget that it was this Bhutto who on the 25th March 1971—the day when the army crack down took place in East Bengal—said at the West Pakistan airport when he landed there by plane that "Pakistan is now saved". He said that in support of mass killing. He directly supported the Yahya Khan regime. Bhutto is a man who is capable of changing sides every moment and Bhutto is thus not a dependable friend. I have every confidence in the people of Pakistan. I have every confidence in the leadership of those progressive elements in Pakistan. But Bhutto does not belong to those progressive elements, nor is he a true leader. He has now established himself by giving false hopes. He was in the confidence of China

and that was the reason why he was acceptable as leader by a section for reasons of convenience and not because of any faith. His patriotism is very much in doubt. He can sell Pakistan and he can tell our Prime Minister any nonsense. But we have tried to strengthen that man's hands. Again when we look to the question of strengthening, I have had no hesitation in saying that we have to leave this acquired territory to Pakistan. Why we did not do it earlier, as we have not bargained over that even now. Our Government, however, said that so far as this acquired land is concerned, it will never be given back. Now, I am quoting our Defence Minister, Shri Jagjivan Ram. Not once, but on various occasions he had said it. If he says that just to keep up the morale of our Army, and our people, I say, Sir, that is not what the top man in the Defence Ministry should say. Such things create complications. But, day in and day out they make such statements. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, our Prime Minister said something, our Defence Minister said something and our Defence Minister said something. So, there is no Government in that sense. Everybody "speaks either on his own behalf or on behalf of nobody. Our Defence Minister said that, If he says today, 'No, I did not say that', then I can give him the cuttings, press cuttings, wherein he has said that; Sir, his speech was never contradicted by himself or even by the Government.

When in the war so much of money and so many precious lives were lost, were they lost for nothing? That is a big question and that has to be answered. Sir, we can sign anything, we can also agree to whatever we honestly feel, we can give something to Pakistan also, because we have certain idealism, we have certain traditions, we have certain history and we are a matured nation, as some speakers have spoken.

But, will they serve the cause of security of India? Then, why spend so much on defence? Then why don't you spend that amount for our culture and tradition and history by giving it to the Universities? Will our Army and our people believe us tomorrow if the Prime Minister or the Defence Minister says that we shall not give any land acquired by us, if we go to war. It is because of this they will say, 'Well, this is the fashion with the Government. You do not talk what you mean or you do not mean what you talk.' Government may say that they have got something to settle the problem of 25 years in this Agreement. Sir, the Kashmir problem was in the cold storage so far. Now we have allowed it to be revived and it is one of the basic problems—that is the language used—according to us, according to Pakistan. What does the Government mean by 'basic problem.' All these twenty-five years we have had only one basic problem with Pakistan and that was Kashmir's false claim by them. And, regarding that problem, you have not advanced anything and you have only said that the basic problem will be settled by mutual negotiations. Very good. When we talk of mutual negotiations, we ultimately say that I take this part and I give you that part. So, I want to know are you going to negotiate with Pakistan in respect of Kashmir which is declared as an integral part of India? Let us know whether Kashmir is negotiable. If we are going to negotiate on Kashmir in the second or third summit, it becomes something negotiable? Do you say that it is negotiable? Then, you go out of the Constitution. I know, Sir, Government have a huge majority and by a two-third majority they may get constitution amended even on this issue, or on any issue they like. But, is it fair enough? Is it a democratic process?

[Shri Durjendralal Sen Gupta] Sir, lastly, I would like to give a warning to this Government that war is not over and there might be a repetition when Mr. Bhutto will feel encouraged by the foreign powers. He is just taking time, he is biding his time and he will be lying low for some time only. Our External Affairs Minister said that Mr. Bhutto's speech was for home consumption, and that you should not take, Mr. Bhutto on his words. When Mr. Bhutto told our Foreign Minister 'Indian dog', that was for world consumption, that was not for home consumption?

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I know you have given me time. The last thing is this. Some of us have criticized the Government. The Government should understand the criticism objectively, not subjectively.

Pakistan lost the war because of a united India. But the whole credit is being monopolised by the Congress Party. It is unfair... (Interruptions). Yes, yes. You won the election of 1972 on the slogan: 'We have won this war'. The election of 1971 was won on the slogan "*Garibi Hatao*", which was a big hoax. The election of 1972 was won by another hoax that "Congress Party has won this war and made Bangla Desh free". But supposing tomorrow there is another national crisis and you go to the nation, the people and the parties will think thrice before responding to the national emergency. Such bad precedents are pregnant with grave consequences. With these words, I thank you.

MR. D3PUTV CHAIRMAN: Mr. Panda.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: Sir, to relieve the monotony of repetitions, I shall begin with a story of Swami Ramakrishna Paramhansa. Two young fisher women selling their fare in the villages one day about sun down they came to a village three or four miles away from their J

own village. Not to risk the journey in darkness, they took shelter in the house of a florist, an old lady. The good old lady made some space for them in the room where she had kept a variety of scented flowers. Their fish baskets were thrown in the inner court. At about mid-night the old lady found them wide awake and talking to each other. She asked them what the matter was. They replied, "mother, we feel suffocated by the scent of your flowers. If you can get us our fish baskets then we can go to sleep". Similarly, there are certain elements in this country who cannot rest or sleep with the mere mention of 'peace'

or 'amity'___ (Interruptions). I need not name them. They stand exposed before the people today. And if some people relish the smell of blood and burnt earth, I cannot help; neither the people of India can help. I cannot forget the bullet that stilled the frail frame of the Mahatma. The people of India will also not forget that little Muslim boy who died alongside Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi to uphold communal unity and harmony in the country.

Sir, I was very much surprised that my hon. friend, Shri Goray, was trying to shield the Jan Sangh, saying that they have a right to correct themselves. But when the question of ideology comes, we will have to expose them, and their politics behind it. If I am harsh towards them, well, I am not at fault. I am not one of the persons like Shri Goray who are prisoners of history. Throughout the world today, great changes have been taking place. We must strive to write the history of the future. A great change is sweeping the world today. Resistance to change is a disease, and a diseased mind cannot plan for the health of the future ... (Interruption) I am not a prisoner of history or the past. Our Prime Minister many a time has

said that the real enemy of the sub-continent, the real enemy No. 1 in the sub-continent today is poverty. So, India, Pakistan and Bangla Desh with their 800 million people who constitute one-fifth of the population of the globe can never remain silent. They are going to have a role to play in world politics and that role can be played only through peace. If there is no peace we cannot build up that either; we cannot make ourselves felt in the comity of nations; nor can we develop our country to take our people to a high pedestal. A weak neighbour can neither be a steadfast friend nor a formidable foe. He is a mere headache creating tensions. As the Prime Minister said yesterday, even rational people, when injected with a little religion, become irrational. But India is a country with ancient wisdom. I am reminded of that great man of ours, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, when he said "Wars have become out of date, offence negotiations, negotiations—hundred times". So, when we say that the Simla Summit is something out of that theory, it is wrong. The Simla Summit is only a stage in the process of our search for peace. And we must understand the mind of the people of Pakistan also.

In India for the last twenty-five years we have a democratic Government. In Pakistan, for the last twenty-five years they have been fed with jihadism only under military dictatorship. When Mr. Bhutto is now striving to change those people gradually to create a different atmosphere in that country, shall we not bear with them and help them and help him?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) in the Chair]

My friend, Dr. Bhai Mahavir—he is not here—was mischievously selective

while quoting Mr. Bhutto. He forgot I that the same Mr. Bhutto is now the President of Pakistan and who has said "If we have to fight with India you must select another President. If you want to fight, it may not be possible for another ten or fifteen years. The basic thing is, what relationship you want to have with India. Decide yourself." Shall we not see a change through this? That Mr. Bhutto who had said in the UNO "We shall wage a thousand-year war against India—the same Bhutto—also can talk about a thousand year peace because the entire nature of the world, the political pattern in the world is changing. And if anybody in this subcontinent feels that we remain in the past, then history will show that we are not forgiven. This is a fear complex which, I think, my people will not suffer, my party will not suffer from.

My friend there has said—I think he has left...

AN HON. MEMBER: He is there.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: I am very sorry; he is there. He said *gcribi hatao* is a hoax. For him it is just a slogan or a voice. But, for me it is an article of faith because we know that the real enemy of the sub-continent is poverty, poverty, and poverty alone.

I will quote another saint, Thiruvalluvar, of the South. Five hundred years ago he said: "If you lose a battle, you remain an enemy. If you win a battle, you leave an enemy. Therefore, avoid confrontation." So, it is not merely a policy of friendship and amity among nations or peace with neighbours. It is not merely a policy that reflected the Congress Party's Resolutions. It is the ancient Wisdom of his country. As a sub-continent we have a special role not in this area of Asia or in Africa alone but we have a role to play in

[Shri Brahmananda Panda] the whole world. And that will be clear when you read history objectively and try to write history for the future instead of being prisoners of history. I must say that Mr. Goray, by asking the Jarta Sangh people to change with his very intellectual speech, only wanted to shield them for the time. I repeat again, when ideological differences come, we must thrash them out. You can have a clear exposure then; then only can you know what we stand for and what they stand for.

Sir, now much is being talked of the conquered territory that it is being given away. I would again remind our critics that battles are always fought on the battle fronts but the problems of war and peace are always settled at the diplomatic table and through negotiations alone. What is happening in Vietnam? They are bombarding there; B-52 bombers are now smashing all their massive bases and even dykes, but in Paris they are also having peace talks. Even if the battle is won things are not settled at the theatre of war; the question of war and peace has to be decided by negotiations. If you take things in that perspective then the Simla summit is relevant and if you come to some agreement there is nothing wrong. *(Time bell rings)* Sir, please don't be harsh on me; probably I will take two or three minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): There are quite a number of speakers yet in the list.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: Some Member referred to some Vijay Raja Scindia; I cannot even pronounce it properly and it has been said that Vijay Raje Scindia is unhappy about this Agreement. Sir, the less we talk of the Scindia House the better. History will show that in 1957 but for this House, this notorious Scindia House, which played a traitorous role the history of India would have been different.

SHRI N.G. GORAY: The Scindias have a very glorious history and also a history of treachery, both.

SHRI OM MEHTA: What was their role in 1857?

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: But for them I can tell you that the great Rani of Jhansi would not have been killed.

SHRI N.G. GORAY: But they have also a glorious history.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: If you look to the brighter side of the moon I do not forget the darker side. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA (Uttar Pradesh): You always see the darker side; that is the difficulty.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V.B. RAJU): Mr. Panda, your time is up.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: Therefore I say that a psychological change has started in Pakistan. People are now beginning to think whether they should be friendly to India or should be inimical of India. If Mr. Bhutto can play his role and bring about this change then I think it would be better to deal with him rather than with Tikka Khans and Yahya Khans. He is the civilian President, democratically elected President with the masses behind him and if you want to deal with them any day he is a better man to deal with than the trigger-happy army Generals who always talk in terms of bombs and bullets. We have seen Yahya Khan; we have seen Ayub Khan. There are so many already doing their best for sabotaging what has been achieved at the Simla meeting and what may be achieved in future. To say that Mr. Bhutto will not change is not correct. With the charge

that is sweeping the whole world is bound to change. After all he has political sagacity; he is a clever man and he would not abolish himself politically.

I won't take much of your time because I always feel that the greatest danger to society is the intellectual bore. The House has had it to a great extent and I would not like to add to it.

AN HON. MEMBER : You have already added.

SHRI N.G. GORAY: A good way of complimenting yourself.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: I seldom indulge in that luxury. Well, Sir, the Jana Sangh people have said that the Simla summit is a sell out but if I cite the real sell out they will be unhappy. Sell out of what? It is not a sell out of our national honour or dignity; it is not a sell out of our national sovereignty. It is a sell out of the Jana Sangh cult.

श्री भोला पासवान शास्त्री (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी का जो प्रस्ताव इस सभा के सामने विचार के लिए प्रस्तुत है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। इस संबंध में विदेश मंत्री का बयान और शिमला इकरारनामे को मैंने पढ़ा है और पढ़ने के बाद मैं इस निश्चय पर पहुँचा हूँ कि शिमला इकरारनामे से हमारे देश के राष्ट्रीय सम्मान को जरा भी बट्टा नहीं पहुँचा है बल्कि दुनिया में उसका सम्मान बढ़ा है। दूसरी बात यह है कि इससे हमारे देश की एक ईज जमीन पाकिस्तान के हाथ लगी है, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। क्या कारण हुआ जिससे दोनों देशों को शिमला में मिलने के लिए बाध्य होना पड़ा? मैं यह भी सोचता हूँ कि आज यदि बंगला देश में पाकिस्तान की सेना सफल हो जाती तो शिमला में समझौता वार्ता होती कि नहीं होती? मेरा क्या

है कि वह वार्ता नहीं होती अगर पाकिस्तान थोड़ा ऊँचा उठ कर सोचता तो हो भी सकता था। मैं इस पर एकदम अविश्वास नहीं करता कि वह जीत कर भी शांति की स्थापना के लिए प्रयास नहीं करता। पिछले 25 वर्षों का जो रवैया रहा है उसे देखते हुए मैंने कभी विश्वास नहीं किया था कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में कभी दोस्ती होगी। जिस ढंग से, जिस तरीके से, जिस अविश्वास, घृणा लड़ाई और एक दूसरे के साथ दुश्मनी के खयाल से व्यवहार होता था, मैंने कभी नहीं सोचा था कि हमारे जीवन काल में, हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में कभी इस तरह का समझौता करने का मौका आयेगा। ऐसा तो मान कर मैं नहीं चला था। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि वह हो गया। क्यों हुआ? क्या पाकिस्तान बहुत बड़ा सत्यवादी, बहुत बड़ा शांतिप्रिय है जिसकी वजह से ऐसा हुआ? नहीं। उसकी परिस्थिति ने ऐसा कराया। मिस्टर भट्टो ने पाकिस्तान राष्ट्रीय असेम्बली में कहा, आधा पाकिस्तान तो चला गया, हिन्दुस्तान और रूस का समझौता हुआ। हम कहाँ हैं, इस वास्तविकता को समझिए और इस पर फैसला कीजिए। तब रैटिफिकेशन का प्रस्ताव वहाँ स्वीकृत हुआ। आज वह लाचार है, परिस्थिति ने पाकिस्तान को लाचार कर दिया शिमला आने के लिए।

श्री मान सिंह बर्मा : हाँ, यह कहिए—वाई फौस आफ सर्कमस्टान्सेज। आज तो आप यह मानते हैं।

श्री भोला पासवान शास्त्री : हम विश्वास नहीं करते थे। उनको आना पड़ा क्योंकि परिस्थिति ने उनको लाचार किया। हमारी नान एलाइन्मेंट की पालिसी है। पहले लोग इसकी खिल्ली उड़ाते थे, कहते थे कि ऐसी पालिसी बेकार है, यह चलने वाली नहीं है। अब हम देखते हैं कि उस पर सारे संसार का ध्यान गया है। इसलिए मैं मानता

[श्री भोला पासवान शास्त्री]

हूँ कि शिमला में जो कुछ किया गया है, वह न केवल हिन्दुस्तान के लिए बल्कि दुनिया के लिए ऐतिहासिक चीज है। हमारा विश्वास है कि शांति की स्थापना के लिये कोई दिन मुकर्रर नहीं है, ऐसा कोई फार्मूला नहीं है कि दुनिया का कोई बड़ा से बड़ा आदमी इसे मनवा ले। जिस चीज को हम क्रीड मानते हैं अगर उसको पाकिस्तान भी मान ले तो न अपने देश को और न पाकिस्तान को धार्मिक आवश्यकता होगी। यह जाहिर है कि हम शांति को अपनी नीति मान कर चलते हैं। जिस वक्त पीस को क्रीड मान लिया जायेगा उस वक्त डिफेंस एक्सपेंडीचर कम कर देना चाहिए। कोई भी देश इस चीज को मानने का दावा नहीं करता है, लेकिन जहाँ तक हमारा संबंध है, पीस हमारी शुरु से ही नीति रही है। हम इस बात की तारीफ करेंगे कि हमारे नेता, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी, हमारे बुजुर्ग नेता पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू जिस जमाने में हम पढ़ते थे उस जमाने में नान एलाइनमेंट और शान्ति की बात कहते थे। उस समय दुनिया उनकी इन बातों पर हंसी थी और खिल्ली उड़ाती थी और आज सारी दुनिया का ध्यान उनी बात की तरफ जा रहा है। कोई ऐसा दुनिया में है जो पीस न चाहता हो। इसमें विरोध करने की बात नहीं है। अगर पीस न हो तो आदमी पागल हो जायेगा, वह लड़ाई करेगा और लड़ने रहेगा। क्या इस तरह से दुनिया में समनचैन हो सकता है, एक अच्छा समाज बन सकता है? इस चीज को सबने माना है कि शांति एक अच्छी चीज है।

मैं व्यक्तिगत रूप से युद्ध का बड़ा विरोधी आदमी हूँ। हमारे विरोध करने के बाद भी दुनिया में लड़ाई चलेगी, हम इसको रोक नहीं सकते हैं और कोई भी रोक नहीं सकता है। लेकिन आज एक प्रयास किया गया है और शिमला में जो पैक्ट हुआ है वह एक छोटा सा प्रयास हुआ है और यह

एक अच्छी शुरुआत है। हो सकता है कि यह प्रयास भी असफल हो जाय क्योंकि इसके बारे में कोई भी गारन्टी नहीं कर सकता है।

माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी का जो भाषण हुआ उसको हमने गौर से पढ़ा है। उसमें दिया गया है कि अगर इसको ईमानदारी के साथ अमल में लाया जायेगा तो सफल हो सकता है। अगर, अगर, इसमें है। तो इसलिये सब कोई सावधानी से कदम उठा रहे हैं। इसके लिये इतना तूफान मचाने की क्या जरूरत है, इसमें तो हमें कंधे से कंधा मिलाकर काम करने की जरूरत है।

श्री मानसिंह बर्मा : एक छोटी सी बात के लिए इतना प्रयोगन्डा करने की क्या आवश्यकता है? यह कहना कि हमने यह किया, वह किया, यह ऐतिहासिक हो गया है, इतिहास में आ जायेगा। इस तरह की बातें कहने की क्या आवश्यकता थी?

(Interruption)

श्री भोला पासवान शास्त्री : यह बात हमने तो नहीं कही। जिसने कही उससे आप पूछिए मैं तो अपनी बात के बारे में कह सकता हूँ। अगर मेरी बात के सम्बन्ध में आप को कुछ कहना है तो मैं उसका जवाब दे सकता हूँ। अगर किसी दूसरे ने कोई बात कही है तो आप उससे पूछ सकते हैं। हमारा यह पहिला भाषण है और आप को इस तरह से बीच में नहीं बोलना चाहिये।

हमें पहले विश्वास नहीं होता था कि इस तरह की कोई बात दोनों देशों के बीच होगी। लेकिन आज मुझे विश्वास हो गया है कि जो शिमला समझौता हुआ है, उसको कामयाब बनाने के लिये, उसको अच्छा बनाने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान का बच्चा बच्चा और सब पोलिटिकल पार्टीज का यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि वह इस चीज को कामयाब बनाने में साथ दें और टांग पकड़कर पीछे न खींचे। इसलिये मेरा विश्वास है कि इस प्रस्ताव का हमें समर्थन करना चाहिये और मैं आपके द्वारा विदेश

मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना हूँ कि उन्होंने इस तरह का प्रस्ताव लाकर सदन में सदस्यों को अपनी भावना प्रकट करने और समर्थन देने का अवसर प्रदान किया।

लेकिन हमको यहाँ एक बात खटकती है। वह यह कि शिमला समझौता का कार्यान्वयन खूबसूरत बन जाती अगर पार्लियामेंट में बहस होने के बाद इसको रेटीफाई किया जाता। अगर पहले सदन में यह चीज आ जाती तो और भी खूबसूरत हो जाती। बस मुझे इतना ही निवेदन करना है।

श्री महावीर प्रसाद शर्मा : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब मैं शिमला समझौते पर विचार करता हूँ तो मेरे मानसपटल पर हमारे देश के इतिहास की पिछली 50 वर्ष की घटनायें चलचित्र की तरह घूम जाती हैं। जब शिमला में समझौते की बात हो रही थी, उसकी खबरें आ रही थी और जिस समय दूसरी तारीख की शाम को रेडियों से यह सुनने को मिला कि शिमला समझौते में सफलता की आशा नजर नहीं आ रही है तो मेरा हृदय—जिसके जीवन के 50-55 वर्ष अपने देश की आजादी के जदीजहद में बीते हैं—जिसने भारत के भविष्य की एक भव्य कल्पना कर रखी थी वह दबने लगा, बैठने लगा और मैं सोच में पड़ गया कि इतिहास ने जो मौका हमारे देश को, इस महाद्वीप को दिया था इतिहास की दिशा बदलने का क्या वह आज हाथ से निकल जायगा, किन्तु दूसरे दिन सुबह जब मैंने प्रखबार में खबर पढ़ी कि समझौता हो गया तो मेरा हृदय बाग-बाग हो गया। मैंने तीसरी तारीख को ही जो हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय की सलाहकार समिति है उसमें अपने विचार व्यक्त किये थे। अगर यह सफलता न मिलती तो मुझे बड़ा दुख हुआ होता और मैं सोचता कि मेरे जीवन में वह अपना साकार होने वाला नहीं है जिस सपने को लेकर हमने इस देश की आजादी की लड़ाई में कदम रखा था और जिस सपने को आज तक हम अपना आदर्श समझते हैं। भारत का 5 हजार वर्षों का इतिहास आप देखिए। इस देश में कभी भी एक केन्द्रीय शासन नहीं रहा है जिस शासन के अधीन मारा देश रहा हो। इसलिए जब एक केन्द्रीय शासन अंग्रेजों के जमाने में आया और राष्ट्रीयता का उदय

हुआ तो हमारी कल्पना हुई कि हमारा देश एक केन्द्रीय शासन में रह कर सफल होगा और संसार में अपना एक महत्वपूर्ण अस्तित्व रखेगा। किन्तु आजादी की लड़ाई के उन दिनों में हमारे बीच में एक तीसरी शक्ति थी जो विभाजन के द्वारा हमारे ऊपर शासन करते रहना चाहती थी। उसने हमारे हृदयों को मिलने नहीं दिया, धर्म के नाम पर, जाति के नाम पर आपस में झगड़े कराए। उन झगड़ों के इतिहास में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन दुःख के साथ जब हम स्मरण करते हैं कि सन 1947 में जो आगरे में ए० आइ० सी० सी० की बैठक हुई तो उसमें हमारे राष्ट्रपिता बापू की धन्य-वेदना का स्मरण आता है। मुझे इस बात की जरूर खुशी होती है कि जो उनकी कल्पना थी कि भले इस देश का विभाजन हो रहा हो लेकिन इस देश की जनता का हृदय और मस्तिष्क मिलेगा और कोई नेता ऐसा होगा जो दोनों को मिला कर सही दिशा में ले जाएगा। मुझे इस बात से खुशी होती है कि दिसम्बर सन 1970 के पाकिस्तान के चुनावों के बाद और 71 में मार्च में हिन्दुस्तान के चुनावों के बाद इस महाद्वीप की नई पीढ़ी ने इस देश को और इस जगत को एक नई दिशा की तरफ जाने का झुकाव दिखाया। लेकिन उसको हमने समझा नहीं। पहले पाकिस्तान के उन नेताओं ने नहीं समझा, भूटो और फौजी तानाशाहों ने नहीं समझा जिसका नतीजा हुआ एक नए डेमोक्रेटिक सेक्युलर राष्ट्र का उदय। बंगला देश का अभ्युदय। उसी का नतीजा अब दूसरा होने वाला है कि धर्म के सिद्धान्त पर चलने वाला पाकिस्तान जो आज इस्लामी रिपब्लिक है, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे इस सदन में कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह भी कल एक डेमोक्रेटिक सेक्युलर रिपब्लिक होने जा रहा है। आज के इस कदम ने, शिमला समझौते ने उस दिशा की तरफ संकेत किया है। पाकिस्तान की नई पीढ़ी, हिन्दुस्तान की नई पीढ़ी और बंगला देश की नई पीढ़ी ने साबित कर दिया कि वे बेताब हैं हिन्दुस्तान को समृद्धिशाली और शक्तिमान देखने के लिए, गरीबी को मिटाने के लिए, जल्म को मिटाने के लिए, शोषण को मिटाने के लिए, अज्ञानता के अन्धकार को मिटाने के लिए, विज्ञान के चमत्कार से अपने जीवन को सुखी बनाने के लिए। इस वक्त इस उपमहाद्वीप के जनजीवन में यह भावना है कि यहाँ शांति रहे और ऐसी शांति रहे कि हमारे इस उप-महाद्वीप में बसने वाले जनजीवन के हृदय और मस्तिष्क

[श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल]

एक हो जाये उस शत्रु से लड़ने के लिए जिसका प्रधान मंत्री ने संकेत किया है।

यदि यह शिमला समझौता न होता तो क्या स्थिति होती। यह, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। हम दोनों खाली हाथ लौट जाते। उस समय हिन्दुस्तान ही नहीं, पाकिस्तान ही नहीं, सारे जगत की निगाह लगी हुई थी शिमला पर, निगाह लगी हुई थी इन्दिरा गांधी पर, निगाह लगी हुई थी भूटो पर और लोग सोच रहे थे कि क्या इस युग में इस बीसवीं शताब्दी के सातवें दशक में सर्वशक्तिमान होते हुए भी, फौजी शक्ति, आर्थिक शक्ति रखते हुए भी, जब अपना स्वाभिमान खोकर, अपने को वियतनाम के युद्ध से निकालने के लिए, वहाँ से अपने सैनिक बन्दियों को वापस लाने के लिए अपने अभिमान को चर करके निम्नतम पीकिंग की यात्रा कर सकता है, समझौते कर सकता है, मास्को में जाकर मिलकर समझौते कर सकता है तो हिन्दुस्तान के और पाकिस्तान के नेता जब मिलते हैं, जिनके पूर्वज आज से 25 वर्ष पहले एक थे, जिनके रक्त एक थे, जिन्होंने मिल कर आजादी की लड़ाई एक साथ लड़ी, साथ-साथ जेल खाने में रहे और एक साथ गोलियाँ खाईं। खुदाई खिदमतगारों ने और बंगाल के क्रांतिकारियों ने अपने रक्त को एक साथ मिलाया। वे आपस में नहीं मिल सकते? हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बटवारे में कोई पहाड़ नहीं बीच में खड़े हुये हैं। पाकिस्तान और हमारे हृदयों के बीच जो पहाड़ है उन्हें हमको दहाना है। हमारे हृदयों के बीच में जो शंकाएं धर्म को ले कर, जाति को लेकर उठी उनको कौन दहा सकता है। इस देश का नेतृत्व दहा सकता है जो बलवान है, शक्तिवान है, जो बड़ा है। पाकिस्तान आज पराजित हो चुका है और यदि उसको यह मौका न मिला कि हिन्दुस्तान के नेतृत्व में यह उदारता है, यह मानता है कि वह हम को अपने साथ ले चलना चाहता है, तो उससे किसी को लाभ होने वाला नहीं है। साढ़े सात करोड़ का बंगला देश उससे अलग हो गया है। पांच करोड़ का शेष पाकिस्तान अब न उतनी फौज रख सकता है और न उसमें वह शक्ति आ सकती है और न गरीबी में अब वह अपनी जनता को रख सकता है। उसकी परिस्थितियाँ उसको मजबूर कर रही हैं और हमारी परिस्थितियाँ हमको मजबूर कर रही हैं। हमारा

इतिहास भी हमको मजबूर कर रहा है साथ चलने के लिए। आज हमारे नेतृत्व ने अगर यह मौका खोया होता तो आने वाले पीढ़ियों और इतिहासकार हमको कोसते और कहते कि जैसा पिछले 50 वर्षों में पाकिशन के पहले हम मौका खोते चले गये और जिसके कारण बटवारा हुआ, वैसे ही आज जब यह मौका हमारे हाथ में आया तो इसको भी यदि हम खो देते तो युगों तक हमको ऐसा मौका नहीं मिलता।

महोदय, मैं इस ऐग्रीमेंट की भाषा पर विचार नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मैं इसकी भावना और इससे उत्पन्न होने वाला जो फल है उस पर विचार करना चाहता हूँ। पीपल के वृक्ष का बीज जो होता है वह अत्यन्त छोटा होता है। लेकिन जब चट्टान को चीर कर उसकी जड़ें नीचे जाती हैं तो वही महान वृक्ष हो जाता है, बड़ा विशाल वृक्ष हो जाता है और फल देता है। यह छोटा सा शिमला समझौता एक छोटा सा पीपल का बीज है। बड़ी कठिनाइयाँ हैं इसके जमने और उगने में। जैसा हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने और प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि दूसरी तरफ के लोग कहते हैं कि कठिनाइयाँ हो सकती हैं, लेकिन जो चट्टानें हैं उन चट्टानों को चीर कर जब वह नीचे जायेगा तो हिन्दुस्तान के इस महाद्वीप का भविष्य उज्ज्वल होगा, समृद्धशाली होगा और जगत में हमारा एक स्थान होगा। क्या हम चाहते हैं कि हमेशा हिन्दुस्तान की जनता उस करभार से दबी रहे जो उसकी सेवा के ऊपर खर्च करने में लगता है और वह द्रव्य अन्य समृद्धि के कामों में न लगे। क्या हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे नौजवान हमेशा बन्दूक और टैंक लिये हुये पूर्व और पश्चिम की तरफ खड़े रहें। क्या हम चाहते हैं कि इस देश को शांति कभी न मिले। क्या हम चाहते हैं कि हम पाकिस्तान को ऐसी दशा में रखें कि जैसे पहले जगत की साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियाँ हमें लड़ाती रहीं वैसे ही आज भी जो आर्थिक साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियाँ पूर्व और पश्चिम की हैं और जो इस देश की शत्रु हैं वे इससे खेल खेलती रहें और हमें लड़ाती रहें। इस समझौते का सबसे बड़ा परिणाम यह हुआ है कि तीसरी शक्तियाँ जो अब तक हमको लड़ाती रहीं वह अब हम से अलग हो चुकी हैं। आज हमने मौका दिया है पाकिस्तान की नयी पीढ़ी को हिन्दुस्तान की नयी पीढ़ी के साथ हृदय लगा कर, सामने आकर, खुलकर मिलने का, कुछ करने का, साथ चलने का, हंसने का। खेलने

का, कूदने का मौका दिया है। हम लोगों के बीच पिछले 50 वर्षों से जिस साम्राज्यशाही शक्ति ने अलगाव पैदा किया था, उसको हमने इस शिमला समझौते से समाप्त किया है। हमें खुशी है कि हमारी इन्दिरा जी, जिनके परिवार ने पिछली तीन पीढ़ियों से देश का नेतृत्व किया है, उनको आज श्रेय मिला है देश को आगे ले चलने का और उन्होंने ही इस काम को पूरा किया है। हमारे जनसंघों साधियों की मांग अखंड भारत की है। वह कैसा अखंड भारत चाहते हैं? क्या यह समझते हैं कि हम पाकिस्तान को मिटा कर ही अखंड भारत बना सकते हैं या वह क्या यह समझते हैं कि बंगला देश को मिटा कर अखंड भारत का निर्माण किया जा सकता है? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह तभी हो सकता है कि जब इन देशों की जनता के हृदय मिल कर एक हो जाय और वह एक दिशा में देखे, एक रास्ते पर चले एक कदम उठाये और यह संभव है, संभव है, और संभव इस समझौते से है। महोदय, इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इन समझौते का समर्थन करता हूँ और आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री बी० जी० राजू) : नवल किशोर जी, आपके लिए दस मिनट हैं। इसी में समाप्त करने की कोशिश कीजिए।

श्री नवल किशोर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं कोशिश करूंगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं शिमला समझौते का स्वागत करता हूँ और उसका समर्थन करता हूँ और मुझे खुशी है कि इस समझौते का समर्थन और स्वागत इस देश के बहुत बड़े बहुमत ने और सभी राजनीतिक पार्टियों ने एक दो को छोड़ कर, किया है और देश के बाहर तो शायद विश्व का कोई ऐसा देश होगा जिसने उसका समर्थन और स्वागत न किया हो। मैं श्रीमन्, इस समझौते को न तो श्री हिम्मत सिंह जी की दृष्टि से देखना चाहता हूँ और न डा० भाई महावीर की दृष्टि से ही देखना चाहता हूँ, मैं तो एक अदना कांग्रेसी और उससे ज्यादा एक भारतीय की दृष्टि से इस समझौते को देखने की कोशिश कर रहा हूँ। श्रीमन्, मंत्री जी ने अपना जो भाषण दिया उससे पड़ देना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने शुरू में कहा है :

"The agreement is the first step towards establishing durable peace in the sub-continent. It provides a framework which, if faithfully worked out, can bring about an altogether new relation between India and Pakistan." Then it says :

"The Agreement is based on the principle of equality of sovereign nations and not in the spirit of a victor dictating his terms to the vanquished."

श्रीमन्, अगर इन दो बातों को समझ लिया जाय तो जो बहुत सी शंकाएँ यहां उठायी गयी हैं वह समाप्त हो जायेंगी। यह सही है कि यह जंग हिन्दुस्तान ने जीत ली है और पहले जमाने के हिसाब से अगर हम शिमले समझौते में आने सामने बैठते तो जैसे एक जीता हुआ देश एक पराजित देश पर अपनी शर्तें थोपता है, अगर उस दृष्टि से देखा जाय तो इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि शिमला एग्जिमेंट में लोगों को मायूसी दिखायी देगी, लेकिन अगर इस दृष्टि से देखा जाय कि यह जंग क्यों हुई और इसका मकसद क्या था, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उसका दृष्टिकोण, परस्फेक्टिव बदल जाता है। सबसे बड़ा जो एतराज हमारे कुछ साधियों की है वह आर्टिकल 4 पर है जिसमें लिखा हुआ है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की फौजें इंटरनेशनल बाउंड्री को वापस हो जायेंगी। लोगों का कहना यह है कि 5100 वर्ग-मील जमीन हमको देनी पड़ रही है और बदले में 59 वर्ग मील हमारे पास आ रही है और उनको तकलीफ इस बात की है कि यह जो जमीन हमारे पास थी वह क्यों दी जा रही है। श्रीमन्, मैं यह बतलाऊँ कि पहली बात तो यह है कि यह जंग हमने शुरू नहीं की। बंगला देश की जनता ने अपनी आजादी की जंग छेड़ी और उस जंग के सिलसिले में लाखों की लादाद में, करीब 90 लाख, शरणार्थी हिन्दुस्तान में आये। एक विषम समस्या हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हुई है। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार और प्रधान मंत्री ने इन बात की कोशिश की कि शरणार्थी इज्जत और शान्ति के साथ बंगला देश को वापस जायें और यह तभी हो सकता था जब कि बंगला देश की सरकार स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्त कर सकती और वह एक आजाद देश बन जाता। हम क्या करते यह कोई नहीं जानता लेकिन इतिहास की बात है कि पाकिस्तान ने 3 दिसम्बर को हम पर हमला कर दिया।

[श्री नवल किशोर]

श्रीमन्, उसके बाद जंग हुई, 14 दिन की जंग के बाद बंगला देश आजाद हुआ और 93 हजार पाकिस्तानी फौजों ने आत्मसमर्पण किया। उस समय जो हमारा पश्चिमी फंट था उस पर इन्स्टिट्यूट हिन्दुस्तान की आर्मी के हाथ में था और वह आगे बढ़ रही थी, लेकिन चूंकि हिन्दुस्तान की गवर्नमेंट, हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधान मंत्री, हिन्दुस्तान के विदेश मंत्री इस बात का वायदा कर चुके थे कि हमें पाकिस्तान की जमीन एक इंच भी नहीं चाहिये, हमारा तो केवल एक सीमित दायरा है या मकसद है उसके वास्ते जंग लड़ी है इसलिये हमने एक तरफा सीज-फायर किया जिसको कि दुनिया के सभी देशों ने कहा कि मास्टर-स्टोक आफ डिप्लोमेसी है। श्रीमन्, अगर उभी स्प्रिट में देखा जाये तो मैं कह सकता हूं कि गिमला एप्रोमेंट भी कुछ हद तक यूनि-लेटरल एप्रोमेंट है। यूनिलेटरल इस माने में है कि यह हमारी मैगनातिमिटी है, सरेंडर और चीज है और मैगनातिमिटी दूसरी चीज है, मैं यह महसूस करता हूं कि हमारी यह एक ऐतिहासिक परम्परा रही है, मैं कोई सिकन्दर की बात नहीं करता, बाणभ्य की बात नहीं करता, लेकिन यह हिन्दुस्तान की एक उदारता है, हिन्दुस्तान जैसा बड़ा और शक्तिशाली देश जिसको अपने ऊपर विश्वास है, जिसको अपनी जनता पर विश्वास है, अपने भविष्य के ऊपर विश्वास है, वह उदारता दिखा सकता है और वह दिखाई। कोई दूसरा नहीं दिखा सकता। तो यह उदारता की बात हम मान सकते हैं। जो कहते हैं कि सरेंडर किया गया, समर्पण किया गया, तो कहीं समर्पण नहीं किया गया। आज के जमाने में किसी देश की जीती हुई भूमि को कोई देश रख नहीं सकता बहुत ज्यादा समय तक। जापान की हिस्ट्री मुझे याद है। जापान पर अमेरिका ने दो ऐटम-बम्ब गिराये और जापान का सरेंडर हो गया लेकिन आज जापान एक सावरेन इंडिपेंडेंट कंट्री है, अमेरिका उसको अपने कब्जे में रख नहीं पाया।

श्रीमन्, एक बात और है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में हिन्दुस्तान के विदेश मंत्री का यह कमिटमेंट है कि जो पैलेस्टाइन में इजरायल की फौजें हैं उनको वापस किया जाये। यह आपका कमिटमेंट है, यह आपका स्टैंड है कि इजरायल को अपनी फौजें वापस करना चाहिये।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन् मैं बता दूं कि हिन्दुस्तान की भूमि चीन और पाकिस्तान ने अपने कब्जे में रखी हुई है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री बी० बी० राजू) आप अभी मत बीच में बोलिये। उनको कहने दें।

श्री नवल किशोर : श्रीमन्, मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि अगर यह मसल यूनाइटेड नेशंस में जाता है हिन्दुस्तान को इस बात पर अपने को डिफेंड करना मुश्किल पड़ जाता कि इजरायल की फौज तो पैलेस्टाइन से वापस हो और हिन्दुस्तान की फौजें उस जमीन से वापस न हों जिसको कि उसने जीता है।

श्रीमन्, दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इसके साथ-साथ यह भी कहा गया कि भूमि वापस करने से पहले कांस्टिट्यूशन का अमंडमेंट किया जाय। मैं समझता हूं कि यह हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन नहीं थी, एक्वायर्ड जमीन नहीं थी। श्रीमन्, आप वकील हैं, अच्छे वकील हैं, आप जानते हैं कि एक्वायर्ड जमीन कौन सी बनती है वह आर्टिकल 2 में दिया हुआ है। इसलिये कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है कि कांस्टिट्यूशन में कोई तब्दीली करने की बात हो।

श्रीमन्, अब आप देखें कि आर्टिकल 4 में जो दूसरी बात है वह जम्मू-काश्मीर के बारे में है। इसके बारे में एक डाउट पैदा हुआ। जो आखिरी पैराग्राफ है उसमें यह है :

"including the questions of repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees, a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir and the resumption of diplomatic relations."

श्रीमन्, जहां तक मैं इसका मतलब समझा, इसमें शक नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान का स्टैंड था और आज भी है कि काश्मीर एक इंट्रानल पार्ट हिन्दुस्तान का है और यह स्टैंड हमारा आखिर तक रहेगा लेकिन इसके माने सिर्फ यह है कि यह हमारा स्टैंड था लेकिन पाकिस्तान का स्टैंड यह नहीं था, पाकिस्तान का स्टैंड यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान—सही या गलत—एग्ग्रेसर है और यूनाइटेड नेशंस के अन्दर से यह मामला न हिन्दुस्तान

Pakistan

ने विद्वत् किया है और न पाकिस्तान ने विद्वत् किया है, तो फाइनल सेटिलमेंट के मायने मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जो हमारा झगड़ा है वह बजाय इसके कि कोई हम जंग करें या किसी थर्ड पावर को बीच में लायें हम इसको आपस में बैठ कर के शान्तिमय ढंग से तय करें। यह जो आर्टिकल 4 का सब-क्लाज 2 है उसमें यह है :

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

यह इस बात को और भी साफ कर देता है कि जो हमारे दोनों के स्टैंड हैं उस पर हमने कोई काम्प्रोमाइज नहीं किया है। और श्रीमन्, इसी सिलसिले में मैं आपकी आज्ञा से, श्री बी० के० कृष्णामेनन साहब, जिन्होंने काश्मीर के मामले को एक बार नहीं कई बार संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में रखा है, उन्होंने जो स्पीच दी थी लोक सभा में उसको कोट करता हूँ। मैं वर्बेटिम उसका उल्लेख करता हूँ और मुझे उम्मीद है कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री उसकी ताईद करेंगे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): No, no. It cannot be quoted.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE : All right, I will give the gist if it cannot be quoted.

उन्होंने यह कहा है स्पेसिफिकली कि काश्मीर इन्डिया का इन्टीग्रल पार्ट है और काश्मीर पर इंडिया की जो सावरेनिटी और सुजरेनिटी है वह उस तमाम हिस्से पर है जिस पर महाराजा काश्मीर का कब्जा था, वह उस हिस्से को शामिल करता है जो आज पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है, और जिसका 2,000 वर्ग मील का इलाका पाकिस्तान ने चीन को दे दिया है...

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to know one thing. Since it is a question of procedure I would like to know this : What is it that cannot be quoted ? What after all did the honourable Member want to quote which you said cannot be quoted ?

I can understand that the proceedings of the other House cannot be discussed. But a running speech made in the other House can always be quoted because it is a public document.

AN HON. MEMBER : He is talking about the UN proceedings. .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal)

: Don't be too rigid about it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): The practice is what is actually said in the other House cannot be quoted here excepting a Minister's statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know, if he just reads out what was said in the other House without mentioning that it was said in the Lok Sabha, it would be perfectly valid. These are just parliamentary niceties. How long must we follow May's Parliamentary Practice ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Anyhow, he is giving gist of it.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: I have asked it so that it may not become precedent for future.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think we had better forget it. It is a minor thing.

श्री नवल किशोर : श्रीमन्, मैं यह कह रहा था कि यह जो काश्मीर का मामला है इसके बारे में मेरा आज भी मत यह है और मैं समझता हूँ विदेश मंत्री भी इसकी ताईद करेंगे कि काश्मीर में जो हमारा स्टैंड अब तक रहा है, न कोई इसमें तब्दीली आई है और न कोई तब्दीली होगी क्योंकि श्रीमन्, उस तब्दीली को हिन्दु-स्तान की जनता बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है क्योंकि इन्टीग्रिटी आफ दी कान्ट्री जनता में इतनी डीप-रूटेड है कि उसके अगेन्स्ट कोई भी बात जनता मुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं है और न कोई सरकार ही इसके खिलाफ जाने की हिम्मत कर सकती है। इसलिए, इस पर शंका होना कोई मुनासिब बात नहीं है।

[श्री नवल किशोर]

श्रीमन्, इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि भुट्टो साहब अजीब प्रंदाज के आदमी हैं जिनको सरदार साहब ही समझ सकते हैं और उनसे झील कर सकते हैं। वे कभी गरम हो जाते हैं कभी ठंडे हो जाते हैं और एक संस में कई बातें कह जाते हैं। एक तरफ जहाँ वे कहते हैं काश्मीर में खून बहाएंगे वहाँ यह भी कहते हैं कि पिछले 25 साल में यूनाइटेड नेशन्स काश्मीर के मामले को तय नहीं कर पाया, कोई बाहरी देश हमारी इमदाद नहीं कर पाया, लिहाजा हमने यह तय किया है कि पच्चीस साल बाद हिन्दुस्तान और हम एक साथ बैठ कर बाई-लेटरली इस मामले को तय करें। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ समझौता न हमारी जीत है न हिन्दुस्तान की जीत है। तो श्रीमन्, उनकी किस-किस बात को कहाँ तक कहा जाए। यह सही है कि लोगों को पाकिस्तान का पिछला अनुभव इतना कटु रहा है कि उसके आधार पर यदि कुछ लोगों के अन्दर शंकाएँ हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ उन शंकाओं के समाधान की कोशिश होनी चाहिए। उनकी शंकाओं का समाधान इस तरह से नहीं होगा कि हम उनको इधर-उधर की बातें कहें या हम उनको तरह-तरह के नाम दें। मैं भाई महावीर जी से भी कहूँगा कि वे यह मान कर न चलें कि भुट्टो साहब को कभी अक्ल नहीं आएगी। अक्ल श्रीमन्, हर इन्सान को आती है और कब घाएगी, यह कोई नहीं जानता। 25 साल में काफी ठोकरें खाने के बाद भुट्टो साहब को अक्ल आ गई है और शायद वह अपनी तमाम बातों में जो कलाबाजियाँ खाते हैं, उनकी कलाबाजी अब सम्भवतः अपनी जगह पर ठीक बैठे। मैं इस चीज में जाना नहीं चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने क्या-क्या कहा। श्रीमन्, पैकेज डील की बात कही गई है और कहा गया है कि इसके अन्दर पैकेज डील नहीं हुआ। यह बात सही है कि इस बात का वादा किया गया था कि पैकेज डील होगा। मगर जब हम टेबल में आमने-सामने बैठते हैं और अगर पैकेज डील न हो सिर्फ कुछ ही हो सके तब क्या इतना भी न किया जाये, और जितना इस समय हो गया है यह भी एक कदम आगे के लिए है और शान्ति की तरफ है इस उम्मीद में हमें यह फैसला देखना होगा कि अगला सम्मिट जब होगा तो हो सकता है उसमें कुछ ज्यादा पैकेज डील की तरफ बढ़ा जा सके।

श्रीमन्, मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि जो यह समझौता हुआ है उसके पीछे किसी तीसरी ताकत का हाथ

नहीं था और मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी किसी के दबाव में काम करने की आदी नहीं हैं। लेकिन श्रीमन्, यहाँ पर सी०पी०आई० बैठकर जिस तरह का बिहेवियर करती है उससे ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि सब कुछ कर्त्ताधर्ता ये ही लोग हैं और स्वर्ण सिंह जी और इन्दिरा गांधी जी बिल्कुल बेकार हैं। सिर्फ इनके इशारे पर चलते हैं। इसलिए धोखा होता है। ये हाउस में कूद फांद कर न जाने क्या-क्या करते रहते हैं और फिर दिखाना चाहते हैं as if any are the dictors and masters of the whole show इस चीज से शक पैदा होता है कुछ भाइयों के हमारे दिमाग में बरना कोई शिकायत नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, यह एक अजीब बात है कि अगो कल ही सरदेसाई जी ने यह बात फरमाई थी कि एंग्लो अमेरिकन साम्राज्यवादियों की साजिश की वजह से देश का पार्टिशन हुआ था, जब कि वे स्वयं पार्टिशन के फेब्र में थे और 1942 में उनकी पार्टी ने एंग्लो अमेरिकन्स का साथ दिया था और उनकी साजिशों में शामिल थे।

श्रीमन्, मैं हैरान हूँ कि हमारे भाई हिम्मत सिंह जी ने हमें सिंडिकेट कह कर पुकारा। हम इन्दिरा जी को दुआ देते हैं कि एवरीबडी हैज बिकम समाजवादी। जो लोग कल तक स्वतन्त्र पार्टी में थे, जो कल तक अंग्रेजों के खैरखाह थे वे आज हम लोगों को जिनकी जिनदगी 40 साल से हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के लिए निछावर हो गई है, वे हमें सिंडिकेट कहने की हिम्मत करते हैं। वाह, इन्दिरा जी, आप जिसके ऊपर हाथ रख देती हैं वह समाजवादी हो जाता है।

श्रीमन्, मैं आखिरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी होशियार आदमी हैं मगर उन्होंने कल एक अजीब सी बात कह दी। उन्होंने यह मिसाल दी कि जब हमारी रूस के साथ संधि हुई थी तो उस वक्त पार्लियामेंट चल रही थी तब भी हम उस ट्रीटी को पार्लियामेंट के सामने नहीं लाये रेकॉर्ड-फिकेशन के लिए। दूसरी बात उन्होंने यह कही कि हम कांस्टीट्यूशनली बाउन्ड नहीं हैं कि पार्लियामेंट के सामने इसको लाकर रेकॉर्डफाइ करावें। इसमें सबाल कांस्टीट्यूशन बाइंडिंग का नहीं है, यहाँ पर तो परम्परा का सबाल आता है, कन्वेन्शन का सबाल आता है। हमारे डी० पी० सिंह साहब एक काबिल बकील

हैं और उन्होंने एक आधिकारिक पद दिया। यहाँ सबाल यह नहीं है, जैसा कि अभी गोरे साहब ने कहा कि अगर यह समझौता दो हफ्ते पहले हो जाता तो हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं थी। आज जो प्रस्ताव आया है उसमें रैटिफिकेशन करने के लिए नहीं कहा गया है बल्कि वह कंसिडरेशन के लिए आया है। अगर आप इस चीज को रैटिफिकेशन के पहले ले आते तो इसमें आपकी शान ही बढ़ती, आपका स्टैचर बढ़ जाता।

धोमनू, अपोजिशन पार्टी के और पार्लियामेंट की मर्यादा और उसका सम्मान बना रहता। नेताओं को भी विश्वास में नहीं लिया गया। उनके बारे में जो शिकायत की गई है उसके बारे में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री ने जितनी उदारता मैगनैनिमिटी भुट्टो को दिखाई है, अगर उससे थोड़ी भी कम या आधी भी अपोजिशन पार्टी के नेताओं के साथ दिखावाई जाती तो इस बारे में हमें कोई शिकायत नहीं होती।

(Time bell rings)

एक बात कंसिडरेशन की आई है। कंसिडरेशन की बात तब ही कामयाब हो सकती है जब हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान नजदीक आ जायें। मैं शुक्ला जी की बात से इतिहास करता हूँ कि शायद वह दिन आ जाय जब हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान एक संघ में हो जाएं तथा बंगला देश भी शामिल हो जाय। लेकिन अभी यह बात कहना मुनासिब नहीं है। अन्त में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो यह समझौता हुआ है वह एक सही कदम है और जनता का यह फर्ज है कि वह इस कदम को मजबूत बनाये। अगर भुट्टो साहब अपने बच्चों से वापस जाते हैं तो हमें इस तरह की स्थिति पैदा कर देनी चाहिये हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में कि वे अपने बच्चों से वापस न जाने पायें। अगर वे अपने बच्चों से वापस जाते ही हैं तो मैं विदेश मंत्री जी और प्रधान मंत्री जी से यही कहूँगा कि हमें अपनी सतर्कता में किसी तरह की ढील नहीं आने देनी चाहिये और मित्रता का हाथ

SHRI M.S. ABDUL KHADER (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to speak with the wholehearted intention of supporting the Simla Pact. The whole of India—

Muslims in particular—is hailing the Simla agreement as a very salient achievement for stabilising and normalising the relationship between India and Pakistan. And I congratulate our hon. Prime Minister and the President of Pakistan for their wise farsightedness and statesmanship. The leaders of the two countries have shown vision, understanding and courage. As specifically mentioned by our honourable Minister for External Affairs, this Agreement is the first step for establishing durable peace in the sub-continent. It is not the final one by any means or any manner in the bilateral relations of the two countries and we have to go a long way. In fact, we had to wait patiently for a long time, for more than two decades and a half, to see the budding of this beginning. It is said that India and Pakistan would now settle their disputes and differences by peaceful means without any third party intervention. By saying "third party" it is also meant that the paramount powers of the British and American imperialism, which have been causing division between the two nations for a long time and enjoying the benefit thereby.

Sir, it is foolish on the part of any country, I say, to have a policy of utter dependence on foreign imperialist powers, both economic and military dependence, and I am glad that Pakistan has realised this after 25 years. The very same idea of getting away from the clutches of the imperialist countries is prevailing in almost all the nations which are presently going through turmoil including the countries like Philippines, the Government of South Vietnam and the Government of Islamabad. As far as Pakistan is concerned, her military dependence on the US and China and her diplomatic dependence on the UN, are still existing and this may, of course, be reflected in the Kashmir issue. Although we are vitally

[Shri M. S. Abdul Khader] interested in the peaceful co-existence of the three components of the sub-continent, namely India, Pakistan and Bangla Desh, I fear, Sir, that there is still the possibility of third party intervention. Obviously, external forces like China and America will raise the Kashmir issue in the UN seeking to turn against us by means of the majority resolutions. No doubt, we have our friends there who, on similar occasions defeated the resolution by the use of the veto. May I hope, Sir, on this occasion that this Simla Agreement would put an end to the fear of confrontation and would open up new vista on the basis of bilateralism.

Sir, the term 'bilateralism' is very specific, as enunciated by our Minister for External Affairs. We could not find this word in the Tashkent Agreement which talks of peaceful measures, peaceful consultation and peaceful means. The term 'bilateralism' means bilateral negotiations, peaceful means which are to be mutually agreed upon, so that no country can unilaterally take the help of some mediator or conciliator or any UN agency or anybody else unless the other party has agreed to it. As far as India is concerned, Sir, as stated by our honourable Prime Minister we are not at all afraid of any country. Our people are one and strong and loyal and we have confidence in ourselves and can stand on our own strength.

Sir, I conclude now with my expression of heartfelt gratitude and I once again reiterate what I have been telling from the beginning that the Muslims of India do welcome this Agreement cordially and I, on my behalf, congratulate the honourable Prime Minister and her associates for bringing about such an Agreement and I call upon the people to stand by the Government and strive for the proper implementation of this Agreement. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Nominated) : Sir, I would at the outset like to refer to the 700th anniversary of British Parliament. It was about the month of June in 1965. General Ayub Khan came out of the hall at the end of the proceedings and was followed a little later by his then Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto. I had known him in India and at the United Nations. I asked Mr. Bhutto as to how many children he had. He told me that he had five children and his eldest daughter ' was thirteen years old. I laughingly told him, "You will have to clear up the borders before she is married," meaning thereby that Muslim boys in India or Muslim girls in India could marry Muslim girls and boys respectively in Pakistan. Now the borders are open and we are very happy about it. We were also happy to welcome Miss Bhutto who made a very graceful gesture by wearing the saree above her back. Her father, she declared, had advised to do it always.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : What about the knees ?

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : You are not interested in this problem as I have been. I had moved a resolution twice, giving notice for a resolution, in Parliament, demanding ban on foreign films, which did not come off. We want this to be stopped. We want to stop the import of all foreign indecent films which make our young boys and girls forget the culture of their great land and they show their backs. We want to stop the whole thing.

My second point is this. The Jan Sangh wants India to be brought to the level of Ireland where man tears man to pieces and bombing takes place every day even now, and even if Vinoba Bhave were to go there to restore peace between the parties, even he could have the fear of being killed there.

I remember the late Major General Bhandari, Superintendent of Nasik Jail, wherein my friend Mr. Goray and I were jail companions,—Mr. Bhandari being a Punjabi—having told us later after the partition how the Hindus and Muslims and the Sikhs would fill each other's houses on the occasions of marriages and what fun there was by such gatherings. All that has been shattered by the British partition of India. But for the British, we should have been all together. Now the British are watching the fun far away, though, they have been liquidated.

I recently heard Pakistan Radio and landed on the Multan station. How lovely was the music. It thrilled me. It sounded like Indian music. The music of Afghanistan, India and Pakistan is so much alike. We are of the same flesh and blood. I heard Afghan music in Kabul. All this will come back.

I must mention another incident. At the Simla conference of All India leaders summoned by Lord Wavell, the then Viceroy, Mahatma Gandhi and other leaders were present. The late Mr. Dev-das Gandhi, son of Mahatma Gandhi, asked me to go and see Mohammed Ali Jinnah. Jinnah asked me as to who had sent me there. When I told him that Shri Devdas Gandhi had sent me there, he began to talk cordially and we talked on six days. He wanted a letter from Mahatma Gandhi, asking him to go and see him. Then I told that I had seen with my own eyes Mahatma Gandhi going to his house in Bombay for 18 long days to talk about communal unity, though he had lost his beloved wife, Kasturba a little before that, and that Shri Jinnah had never condoled with him. He felt guilty and embarrassed. But the point remains that he was not invited and thereafter the Simla talks broke 8 R.S.S./72—

8

down and we had no reconciliation thereafter. Lord Wavell and his ICS Secretaries had sabotaged all efforts to bring the two communities together. Now the Prime Minister has shown some remarkable talent when she said that this was a great occasion in the history of a nation which has happened after 25 long years.

I have seen the first riots in Bombay in 1928 on killing a dog and the British encouraged it and made it dangerous for the national unity. I was in Calcutta after the Bhubaneswar Congress Committee when riots were on in 1964. We cannot be more politicians. We have to be at places where riots take place and find out the causes and suggest remedies.

When Indiraji said that this was a great occasion in the history of a nation, we should let go and go by. She did it in a determined way and so how can you find fault with her ?

Then there are the Americans and the Chinese who are working behind the scene. The Americans and the Chinese are not our friends at present. The history shows that they have vested interests. Then why do you talk about Russians ? About 20 million Russians died in the last war and about 7,000 villages were destroyed but not one American was killed or a village destroyed by fire from the sky by aeroplanes in the USA as described by Marshal Zuksv, the Soviet Army Commander of world war II in his memories. Yet people here say that the Americans are the greatest folks and they run after the Americans. You can see what the Russians have done on the issue of Goa and Kashmir, in the field of steel and oil, how they helped us in the last two wars. Not one substantial thing has been done by the Americans or the British in the matter of war or on most vital issues. This is what the Russians have done. Why

[Shri Joachim Alva] do you mix Russia with China and America? When the British walked away, these two countries, America and China, came in. The Chinese *Hindi Chiti bhai bhai* came in and the result was that this sub-continent has never been allowed to live in peace.

The Jana Sangh is indulging in the most malicious and unkind propaganda that could have ever been done. There could not have been better politicians. In Mahatma Gandhi's *Young India* he has said that the Hindus and the Muslims drank and smoked from the same pipe but those days are gone. We are trying to build up a new nation. When you look at the history of India, Russians have been trying to bring the two countries together. The Americans sent espionage planes from Pakistan into Russia. You should also not forget the kind of arrangements that were made by Shrimati Indira for the stay of Mr. Bhutto. Please do not forget that. Mr. Bhutto had uttered very unkind words about Indiraji much before he came to India; yet she went herself, forgetting it most graciously, and saw the arrangements that were made for Mr. Bhutto. That was the great magnanimity she showed.

We have still confidence in our Army. Our defence forces are ready. We were recently taken to Visakhapatnam. That is the most interesting tour. There what you will find is the young men of the ages of 30 to 35 years going down the submarines as leaders of submarines. They stay there down below. They say that they cannot eat tinned food after three days and that they are getting tired of each other. They are prepared to take care of our borders. The two Commanders took the M.Ps to the submarines. There are less than five submarines and we will have to build up at least 50 submarines if we have to protect our long borders.

We shall not allow monopolists to interfere with the construction in self-defence. Whatever the sources may be, we will have to build up this submarine fleet.

While I talk of Jana Sangh, I have had the happiness of knowing Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee whom I hailed the other day in the Aligarh Muslim University debate here as the greatest orator of the Indian Parliament. But he was always suffering under the mighty grievance of the sufferings of the Bengalis by the partition of India. They were different days. His followers have taken a different line from him altogether. I am sure Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, had he been alive, would not have adopted the present lines as the Jana Sangh. "He died in very unhappy circumstances in Kashmir and my wife and I met him two days before he was arrested. He never gave us a hint that he was entering Kashmir and would be arrested. Before Liaqat Ali Khan came to India in 1950, there was a terrible turmoil going on in India. We had then a stormy Congress Party meeting presided over by Pandit Nehru. Everyone advocated strong steps but I as a new member said that it was not easy—we cannot run away from here—now the bombs will fall above the hall just as we had a fear of the bombs on the 3rd December, 1971 right outside this hall. I was shouted down by Acharya Kripalani and others. They asked me to shut up ! He is the one who is now presiding over Jana Sangh meeting. But Pandit Nehru asked them all to keep quiet and he wanted to hear me. This is what is happening in this country. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee would never have tolerated this malicious and rotten ideas that they are now bringing up of one community hating each other.

Now I come to the role of Maharani of Gwalior. The Maharani never opened

her mouth in Parliament. She was absent even during the Budget debates, though present in Delhi. That is the sort of interest she had in the affairs of the country. Now she leads a procession in the border, and it is played up. The *Statesman* which is run by the wealthy people of India writes in a box that the Maharani walked in great nobility, silence and dignity. She did not even stir; she strode like a leader. I ask, where were these people all those years during the days of the British when people were being butchered and shot down? They were busy looking after race horses.

Sir, I would like to talk about the Birlas just as my friend there talks about Kashmir. They would like to see Kashmir being thrown open to everybody and do you know what will happen when Kashmir is thrown open? We in Mysore have been fed up because of the entry of Birlas into our State. Birlas are holding hundreds of acres of land there and now the Jains have come too. We did wonderful things in Mysore and Mysore as a strong State under late Visweswaraya. Mr. Veerendra Patil was there as Chief Minister but slowly the Birlas came in and entrenched themselves there under Nijalingappa and Indira Patil Ministries. How? Lots of money has passed by. Into whose corrupt hands has it gone? Similarly Goa is being exploited and sought to be destroyed by the Birlas. In my own State Mr. Thapar is now coming up and buying up all the land in my old constituency of Karwar. I say such people should be asked to go to hell because he is going to damage the land and pollute the fish. These are the sort of people whom you want to get into Kashmir. Let the Kashmiris remain where they are untainted by these monopolists who have representation here and political friends amongst corrupt Chief Ministers. I do not want to say anything more on this.

Sir, the last thing I want to say is this. The Prime Minister has done a wonderful thing in the history of the world. In the history of the world you cannot find such an example when 5,000 miles of territory have been returned. She has shown a great example to Mrs. Golda Meir; she has shown a great example to the Jews who are setting up Israel. She has shown that it is immoral and unjust to hold on to other people's land. I was at the United Nations I remember on the 18th November 1967 or so when that Resolution on Egypt-Israel was passed. I had a hearty laugh when I was told that there would be no peace for years. So, Sir, our prestige has gone up very high. Shrimati Indira Gandhi has done something magnificent, something unprecedented in the history of the world by giving away 5,000 miles of territory. She has shown to the Arabs and above all to the Israelis what real morality is that should govern relations between two countries.

SHRI S.D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, we request that the whole of his speech should be circulated because we have not understood his pronunciation. His high flown English we have not followed and it should be circulated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I suggest that you should go to his house tonight and live with him and get him explain the whole thing.

SHRI S.D. MISRA : In that case I would send Mr. Bhupesh Gupta because he is nearer to him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Professor Rasheeduddin Khan.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated) : Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, let me first recite two couplets in Urdu, for reason which will be evident presently.

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

उठायें कुछ बर्क लाले ने गुल ने और नरगिस ने
चमन में हर तरफ बिखरी हुई है दास्तां मेरी
इसलिये मारुजा है कि :
मैं भी मुह में जबान रखता हूँ
काश पूछो कि मुद्दमा क्या है ?

Sir, poetry in Urdu comes in handy when a man feels frustrated, and for the last two days I have been feeling frustrated because all that I wanted to say had been said rather well. I have been robbed of the newness of my thoughts ! Anyhow, Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to say what I have to.

Sir, there are occasions in the life of people when they should take some satisfaction, indeed even a modest pride in having done a job well. One such occasion, I submit, has now come, when we have not only conducted a just and righteous war successfully, in repulsing a needless aggression on our land, but in the process we have also helped an oppressed neighbour, the struggling people of Bangla Desh, to assert their democratic right to liberty and freedom. And what is more, we have also been able to negotiate an Agreement with dignity, honour and goodwill, the first of what can well be called a series of 'just' Agreements which, if all goes well, will establish the age of lasting pax and prosperity in this sub-continent. This occasion, however, should neither lead us to a state of Euphoria and complacency, nor to a listless state of unconcern, much less to a position of shortsighted, partisan opposition for a small group interest. This is an occasion, Sir, which calls for a national consensus. It calls for transcending the narrow party considerations. It calls for transcending the sentimentalist style of passion-politics. It calls for transcending the habitual suspicion and mistrust.

Sir, what is the criterion for judging the recently ratified Simla Agreement between India and Pakistan ? Let us apply our mind to this fundamental consideration in a constructive manner. Should there be some objective and rational basis of judgement, or merely a subjective and partisan basis of evaluation? Should we judge it by remembering the times when the successive regimes in Pakistan have gone back on their assurances of peace-towards India ? Should we judge it by recapitulating the habitual animosities generated among both the people by interested parties ? Should we judge it by making a balance-sheet of gains and losses in each sector of war by measuring the areas captured and lost ? Should we judge it by the exhibition of nostalgia for the Pakistan territories of Sind which had come under our occupation during the war ? Should we judge it by probing into the motives of Pakistani elite and of the ruling party ? Should it be by indulging in a sort of pseudo psycho-analysis of the irregularities in the behaviour pattern and the conduct of the flamboyant and self-contradictory President of Pakistan ? Or should it be that we dismiss all these as unworthy of our consideration at this great hour of triumph, at this great hour of responsibility when India has been able to vindicate the majesty of its democratic system ? Should we not judge the Agreement and the negotiations that led to it on the stable basis not only of the realities of the situation but also in the context—and this I submit is more important—of the *ends* and *purposes* for which India has stood for the last twenty-five years ? Should we not judge the Agreement on the basis of the operative policy of our own national life and international conduct ? Should we only *react* to what Mr Bhutto says, or should we *act* in a more positive manner ?

I will submit that among the important aspects to be kept in mind are not only the

international context but also the national context. Three important things in the international framework need some emphasis. One has already been mentioned in this House by my good friend, Professor Dutt, that there is an around atmosphere of *detente*, the atmosphere of *detente* not only between the super-powers, but an atmosphere of *detente* between all regional powers. This has resulted in the collapse of bipolarity and Super-power dominated politics.

5 P.M.

The second is the fact that the UN has declined in its political role in solving disputes, reducing tensions and avoiding conflict between neighbours. This is a consequence of the shift from multilateral approach to the settlements of disputes, to bilateral negotiations between the concerned parties, outside the UN forum. The third is the generation of regional consciousness and an attempt to promote direct talks and negotiations for regional peace and cooperation. This is a consequence of the creation of, what may be called, 'viable security communities' in different parts of the world, which has increased trade, cooperation and transactions of goods and services resulting in regional economic collaboration. The EEC is a good case in point. Therefore the spirit of *detente*, of *bilateralism*, and *regional cooperation* has also a direct relevance and a lesson for India and Pakistan.

All these things impinge on us, but what is more important is the context of the internal situation and the colossal problem of socio-economic growth. I am happy that our Prime Minister, even in this hour of triumph, has said that our enemy is neither China nor Pakistan nor any other power. Our main enemy is the rampant poverty of our people. Therefore, the first national problem is the problem

of stabilising the foundations of our economy by eradication of poverty, rapid industrialisation and overall development. The second important national problem. I submit, as a consequence of this war, is that we have emerged as a big regional power in South Asia. And since we are a big regional power in South Asia we must also accept the responsibilities which flow from this position. Now, what do you mean by being a big regional power? Is it in terms of military force? Is it in terms of the capacity of India to strike against her neighbour? Or, is it in terms of India's capacity to stabilise the whole region as an area of peace and prosperity? This responsibility has to be taken into consideration by us. It is the responsibility of promoting goodwill, of constructive mutuality, of building bridges between people as part of Asian solidarity. Therefore, in pursuance of this responsibility one important compulsion is that we should do everything to strengthen and help the progressive forces within Pakistan as indeed we must do everything to help and strengthen the progressive forces within India.

Now who are the enemies of the Agreement? If we examine that we will find that both in India and Pakistan the enemies of the Agreement, the enemies of bilateralism and the enemies of negotiation are precisely those people who stand to gain by conflicts, tensions and disputes between neighbours. Hence, I would say that we must not look to the passing phase of any leader in Pakistan or the self-contradiction in the statement of any leader, but to the larger purposes for which the people of Pakistan have also been struggling.

Now, Sir, we must look at the Agreement in its totality. It is futile to look at its *letter* only without examining its *spirit* as well. What is the spirit of the

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khun] Agreement ? I would say that it is the spirit of political wisdom which has brushed aside the animosities of the past and rejected the recriminative style of conduct of foreign policy. It is the spirit of Asian solidarity, it is the spirit of regional fraternity. It is the spirit of international responsibility for peace and above all it is the spirit that would help the radical transformation of political relationship between India and Pakistan to establish, instead of hatred and suspicion, an enduring basis for peace. It is in this larger context that the spirit and not the letter of the Agreement has to be considered.

I would say that the Agreement can be broadly divided into three parts. The first part contains agreements on certain principles for conducting mutual relations. The second part contains agreement on certain specific issues of immediate concern. The third deals with certain unresolved issues. In the first set, three important principles have been agreed to. Firstly, that both countries renounce the use of force and the policy of confrontation and conflict. Secondly, that the two countries shall work on the basis of bilateral nations. At this point I may mention that the Charter of the UN lists in Chapter VI seven ways of solving a problem by peaceful means. The first is *negotiation* followed by *enquiry*, *mediation*, *conciliation*, *arbitration*, *judicial settlement* and *resort to regional agencies or arrangements*. It is, therefore, evident that even the UN Charter emphasizes negotiations, which are bilaterally conducted between the parties concerned, as the first method of solving disputes and conflicts. Today the stage has come where the first instrument of peaceful settlement that is negotiations has acquired greater importance. When we speak of bilateralism, we mean to extricate ourselves from third party interference. Third party intervention within the framework of our regional politics means the

intervention of super-powers, particularly the United States. And we are aware that United States has been a continuous supplier of arms to Pakistan, and is a power responsible for unsettling the conditions in the sub-continent.

Hence the emphasis on mutuality between the two countries, the emphasis on bilateralism ultimately for the extrication of the problems of the sub-continent from the direct and indirect influence of other powers.

In the second set the agreement speaks about progressive normalisation of relations, resumption of communication, trade, economic co-operation, and so on. What is significant is that when the agreement speaks of withdrawal of troops to their respective sides of the international border, it also speaks of maintenance of the line of actual control in Kashmir as on 17th of December, 1971. I submit that the significance of India's emphasis on the maintenance of the line of actual control as on 17th December, 1971, should be read with much more care, because this is a step forward in which we have said that we do not recognise the boundary created by the ceasefire in 1948. We recognise Kashmir to be an integral part of India. Therefore, we shall neither go back to the old line of 1948 nor do we accept any necessity of UN observation team in Kashmir. This is a distinct change with far reaching repercussions. I would not like to emphasise this point too much either in this House or outside because we are at the moment engaged in a process of approachment with Pakistan and anything said by us will be repeated there and might be given a construction which might almost appear as if India is dictating terms.

The third set of Agreement speaks of the question of repatriation of the prisoners of war, final settlement of Jammu and

Kashmir and the resumption of diplomatic relations.

Most of the objections to the Agreement relate to this part, and are based on a rather sentimentalist approach. But two objections have to be nevertheless answered carefully. One objection is that withdrawal of our army from occupied territory without a *quid pro quo* by making Pakistan vacate occupied Kashmir amounts to a sell-out to Pakistan. The second objection is that the phrase "final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir" gives rise to the impression as if we are reopening the whole issue of the State's accession once again.

Regarding the first objection, four valid answers come to my mind : One that withdrawal from territories occupied by us as a consequence of the war has been stated as our goal and purpose from the beginning: both by the Prime Minister on the floor of both the Houses of Parliament and by the Foreign Minister in his speech in the Security Council of the United Nations in December 1971. But quite apart from this we had not gone to war with Pakistan to annex territories. We had gone to repulse aggression. Our objective was limited and specific. As the world's largest democracy I submit, Sir, it is incumbent on us to uphold the principles of democracy which involves scrupulous regard for the territorial integrity of other countries and our concern not to annex, conquer or appropriate regions for a shorter or a longer period of time. We refuse to be conquered as we refuse to conquer. Further we have enough of problems on our hands, then why should we even temporarily retain areas involving tremendous administrative responsibilities.

The second argument is more important. I submit for the consideration of the House

that as long as the prisoners of war are with us, from a strictly bargaining angle the added occupation of Pakistani territory does not make a difference. But, however, their continued occupation on the contrary would make a difference, in so far as it would impede the generation of a more cordial atmosphere between India and the people of Pakistan. Our withdrawal will help in still in the minds of these progressive sections of the people in Pakistan a confidence about India that India has no claim on any part of Pakistan either by right, reprisal or conquest.

And thereby, we would strengthen the democratic forces in Pakistan whose strengthening indeed should be an enlightened policy of a big neighbour like India. Indeed, we should not look to any President of Pakistan but on the other hand we should look to the people of Pakistan in the hope that they would first put their house in order and in that process would also feel the necessity and desirability of peace with India.

Finally, a word about occupied Kashmir. The question of occupied Kashmir should not be confused with the question of the solution of issues of immediate concern resulting from the recent war. It will only add to more mistrust, suspicion, tension and a basis for conflict. We must take a political rather than a juristic and restrictive view. We must keep in mind the larger problem of building up a friendly and viable sub-continent. Therefore, I would say that the inclusion of the phrase "final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir" in the Agreement is to be looked at from a larger angle. In terms of our constitutional law, after the due accession of the State, Jammu and Kashmir has become an integral part of our sovereign nation. The last 25 years have also shown, notwithstanding some voices of dissent, that

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

the people of Kashmir have endorsed through many elections and even otherwise that they have ratified the accession as final and complete. But let us not lose sight of the fact that since we and *not* Pakistan had gone to the United Nations under the articles of the Charter invoking the authority and help of the United Nations to get Pakistan vacate its aggression and withdraw from the occupied area, therefore what is known as the Kashmir question in the lobby of the United Nations remains on the agenda of the Security Council. Further as long as Pakistan remains in occupation of parts of Kashmir and continue to lay claim to them sometimes directly and at other times indirectly by proclaiming the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir, we cannot shut our eyes to the necessity of doing everything through peaceful means to come to an understanding with Pakistan. By the inclusion of this item in the Agreement, far from compromising, what we have done is to take the first realistic step which through bilateral talks and negotiations will yet pave the way for durable peace.

In conclusion, I would say, let us look at the real nature of the conflict. What is the real nature of the conflict? Looked more carefully Sir, the real conflict between India and Pakistan over the years has been the *conflict of the system*, the *conflict of values* of political life and political culture. It is a conflict between secular popular democracy and autocratic elite rule, depending on a non-secular and non-democratic base. This was the reason why even the leaders and people of Pakistan are saying and rightly so that their defeat is essentially the defeat of their system.

Let us remember ultimately that we cannot fight hate with hate, but hate with compassion and understanding; we cannot fight bigotry with bigotry, but bigotry

with enlightenment and reason; we talk not fight obscurantism with obscurantism but obscurantism with rationalism and wisdom. What we have done in the Simla Agreement is hopefully to make an attempt, to take the first step to initiate an era of sanity, of good neighbourliness and constructive mutuality of relations. It is not the be-all and end-all of Indo-Pakistan relations. It is the first step but an important step. Therefore, while rejoicing in the majesty of our democratic system which has been upheld both in war and in peace, let us hope that wisdom will dawn on the democratically elected leaders of Pakistan — indeed elected by adult franchise for the first time in their history. Let us not, therefore, look at this Agreement from a narrow perspective but from a broad vision for the stability and peace and prosperity in this sub-continent.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर (बिहार) : उपसभापति जी, शिमला समझौते पर पिछले दो दिनों से बात चल रही है। एक से एक बड़े लोग और यहाँ तक कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी उस पर अपना मत व्यक्त दिया है। मैं नहीं समझता कि मेरे जैसा साधारण व्यक्ति इस संबंध में क्या कह सकता है, लेकिन मुझे एक बात के लिए खड़ा होना पड़ा है। आज इस सदन में यह प्रस्ताव सर्वसम्मति से होना चाहिए था, लेकिन जनसंघ के भाइयों ने इस को नहीं माना। गोरे साहब ने कहा कि उन में भी सुबुद्धि आयी है और उन को भी सुधरने का मौका दीजिये, तो उसके लिए अभी भी समय था और उस के लिए उनको अगर सुबुद्धि आ जाती तो इस सदन में इसका प्रस्ताव सर्वसम्मति से पास हो जाता और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो एतिहासिक काम किया है उस काम के लिए उन को बधाई दी जाती। लेकिन वैसा कुछ नहीं हुआ। आज सदन में जनसंघ के थोड़े से लोग हैं और इस संबंध में मुझे बहुत कहना नहीं है, लेकिन पूरे देश में, समूचे राष्ट्र में और सारी दुनिया में कुछ ऐसे तत्वों को छोड़ कर जो खामखाह इंटररेस्टेड थे,

उन को छोड़ कर किसी ने इस का विरोध नहीं किया है, और ऐसे लोग भी खुल कर नहीं चुपके चुपके इसके विरोध में रहे। अमरीकन और चाइनीज, जिनका अपना निजी स्वार्थ था, उन्होंने भी चुपके चुपके छिप कर इस समझौते का स्वागत नहीं किया, नहीं तो दुनिया की हर शक्ति ने, हर शान्ति-प्रिय देश ने, हर प्रगतिशील देश ने इस का स्वागत किया है और इस लिये स्वागत किया कि शान्ति और यूद्ध दोनों ही स्थितियों में श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने एक शानदार ढंग से इस देश का सही नेतृत्व किया है और आज मैं समझता हूँ कि ये आने वाले समय में एशिया का और दुनिया का नेतृत्व करेंगी। स्वाभाविक रूप से इस का स्वागत होना चाहिए था, लेकिन जनसंघ के लिए मुझे दया आती है। मुझे उन पर दया इस लिए आती है कि जनसंघ के लोग अब समझ रहे हैं कि उनका अस्तित्व अब खत्म हो रहा है। जनसंघ का अस्तित्व और पाकिस्तान का कंस्ट्रेंशन, दोनों चीजें एक साथ जुटी हुई थीं। माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बात को कहा और जनसंघ के लोग शायद इस बात को भूल गये कि जब शिमला में समझौते की बात चल रही थी तो सारी दुनिया के लोग इस बात को महसूस कर रहे थे कि यह समझौता सफल नहीं होगा। भूटो और इन्दिरा जी में कोई एप्रीमेंट होने वाला नहीं है, भारत और पाकिस्तान का कोई एप्रीमेंट होने वाला नहीं है, उस समय ग्रैंड विहारी वाजपेयी जी ने कहा था कि प्रधान मंत्री हिम्मत के साथ आगे बढ़ें, सारा देश उन के साथ है। हम जानते हैं और हम ने देखा है, जनसंघ के उस चुनाव को भी हम ने देखा है जब बंगला देश के सवाल पर, जब यहाँ मान्यता देने का प्रश्न उठ रहा था और प्रधान मंत्री कह रही थीं कि समय आने पर हम उस को मान्यता देंगे तो यही लोग उस को मान्यता दिलाने के लिए अपने मत्स्याग्रही जेलों में भेज रहे थे, यहाँ तक कि कुछ ऐसे लोग भी थे कि जो भारत और पाक महासंघ की बात भी करते थे, कहीं कहीं के मुख्य मंत्री अपनी फीजों को वहाँ भेज रहे थे इस लिए कि बंगला देश का निर्माण किया जाए, लेकिन जब बंगला देश को आजादी मिली तो वही तत्व पाकिस्तानी एजेंटों को लेकर चुनाव में काम कर रहे थे और मजदूरों के बीच प्रचार कर रहे थे यह कि इन्दिरा जी ने एक डायनमिक देश को खत्म किया है इस लिए उन को वोट न दिया जाय। इस तरह का विरोध केवल विरोध करने के लिए है। जब वह किसी काम को

करने का कहते हैं कि इस को सरकार पूरा करे तो उस के लिए वह सरकार को गाली देंगे और जब वह काम पूरा कर दिया गया तो उस के लिए रिपब्लिकनियों के साथ मिल कर गाली देंगे, इस तरह की राजनीति कब तक चलने वाली है, मैं समझ नहीं पा रहा हूँ। आज जनसंघी रामायण की बहुत चर्चा करते हैं, महाभारत की बहुत चर्चा करते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि धाखिर रामायण का सार क्या है। अगर राम चन्द्र जी के नाम पर इतना मोटा ग्रंथ लिखा जा सकता है और उस की घर घर पूजा हो सकती है तो आप को यह भी जानना चाहिए कि रामचन्द्र जी ने स्वार्थ के वशीभूत हो कर ही रावण का वध किया था। जब उन की पत्नी सीता हरी गयी थी तभी वह लंका का दहन करने गये थे। लेकिन दुनिया में ऐसा कोई उदाहरण नहीं मिला कि किसी ने बिना अपने किसी स्वार्थ के, केवल परोपकार के नाम पर करोड़ों इंसानों को आजादी दिला कर, रोटी दिला कर उन की समस्या को हल कर दिया हो। ऐसा कोई दूसरा उदाहरण नहीं मिलता। जनसंघ को चाहिये कि इन्दिरा जी के संबंध में वह उससे मोटी रामायण लिखे। लेकिन उन का तो रास्ता दूसरा ही है, तुम कुछ भी करो, हम तो गाली ही देंगे और है वे एक से एक रिपब्लिकनरी, जो अपने को रिपब्लिकनरी कहते हैं आज उस में है। आज देश ने बता दिया है कि वे क्या हैं और कितने लोग हैं आज इस के विरोध में सारे देश में। तो जनसंघ के भाइयों का यह हाल है। दूसरे आचार्य कृपलानी हैं। आगे नाथ न पीछे पगडा। और तीसरे हैं राजनारायण। इन के अलावा सारे देश में कोई भी विरोध में नहीं। सब से बड़ी खुशी की बात तो यह है कि हमारे सेंडीकेट के भाई भी इस के समर्थन में हैं, और वे इसका स्वागत करते हैं। स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के लोग भी इस के समर्थन में हैं और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की बात तो छोड़िये। तो सारे देश में यह तीन लोग हैं इसके विरोध में। तो हम समझते हैं कि इतना बड़ा समर्थन आज तक किसी सवाल पर इस देश में किसी को नहीं मिला है।

फिर कहते क्या हैं कि इन्दिरा गांधी ने कैसे यकायक यह कर दिया? रुस के इशारे पर कर दिया? शायद इतने दिनों की राजनीति में आपने श्रीमती गांधी को परखने की कोशिश नहीं की। हमें याद है कि लोक सभा

[श्री गुरुगानन्द ठाकुर]

मैं तमाम विरोधी दल के लोग कहते थे कि प्रिवी पर्स के बाद चलो चुनाव लड़ो। जनसंघ यह कहता है कि रैफरेंडम करो। कहते हैं कि पार्लियामेंट से पूछा क्यों नहीं? अरे, पार्लियामेंट के सामने प्रस्ताव रखा हुआ है, हिम्मत है उसको रिजेक्ट कर दीजिये, एग्जीमैट फेल हो जायेगा, पार्लियामेंट को भंग करो, चलो चुनाव के मैदान में। जब पार्लियामेंट भंग हुई थी तो एक एक नेता राष्ट्रपति के यहाँ पहुँच गये थे कि इन्दिरा गांधी ने अवैधानिक काम किया है। जब कि इनकी विरोध की प्रवृत्ति ही बन गई हो, विरोध की एक आदत बन गई हो तो फिर इसका तो कोई इलाज नहीं है। कुछ लोग इसमें ही बड़ी ज्ञान समझते हैं कि हम एक सिम्बल आफ अपोजीशन हैं। सिम्बल है तो ठीक है सिम्बल आप रहिये लेकिन भुट्टो के वकील न बनिये, उनकी वकालत न कीजिये, भुट्टो साहब भी आपको वकील नहीं बनायेंगे।

कहते हैं कि देश को "सेल आउट" कर दिया। हंसी आती है, क्या सेल आउट पर दिया? आपने क्या ला कर के रखा था कि उसको सेल आउट कर दिया गया है। तो इस दृष्टिकोण से बातें करते हैं। उप-नभापति जी, खैर इसको जाने दीजिये। मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि जिमला समझौते में तीन-चार बातोंका बड़ा विश्वास दिलाया गया है। छोटे छोटे पड़ोसी मुल्कों में, चाहे वह नेपाल हो, या बर्मा हो, या लंका हो, या इंडोनेशिया हों, जो छोटे छोटे राष्ट्र हैं उन देशों में चीन के लोग, अमेरिका के लोग इस बात का बड़े जोरों से प्रचार करते थे कि हिन्दुस्तान छोटे मुल्कों को, अपने पड़ोसियों को अशान्तिपूर्वक नहीं रहने देना चाहता है। आज जिमला समझौते के बाद यह बात और स्पष्ट हो गई कि हिन्दुस्तान इस बात में विश्वास करता आया है और करता रहेगा कि लिब एंड लेट लिब, जीयो और जीने दो। इसलिये आज ऐसे तत्वों की कुछ भी हरकत चल नहीं पा रही है। जितने छोटे छोटे राष्ट्र हैं तमाम राष्ट्रों ने जिमला समझौते से पहले और समझौते के समय इस बात की कामना की थी कि जिमला में प्रधान मंत्री इन्दिरा गांधी की और श्री भुट्टो की बातें सफल हो और जब समझौता हुआ, एग्जीमैट हुआ, तो तमाम राष्ट्रों ने इसका स्वागत किया सिवाय एक दो को छोड़ कर के। तो आज इन

लोगों की बातों से कुछ होने जाने को नहीं है। देश के सामने इस संबंध में जनसंघ का सर्टीफिकेट लेकर के श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी चले और कांग्रेस पार्टी चले यह कोई अच्छा नहीं लगता है, जनसंघ अपना सर्टीफिकेट अपने पास ही रखे और जनता को इस बात को कहे, जनता खुद इनकी दवा कर देगी।

श्रीमन्, असली बात यह है कि आज काश्मीर का सवाल है। काश्मीर के संबंध में यह लोग कहते हैं कि साहब पैकेज डील क्यों नहीं किया, पैकेज डील करते और सब सवाल हल कर लेते। क्या कहा जाय। भुट्टो बेचारा हार कर आया था, उसके दिमाग में इतना बड़ा परिवर्तन हुआ—विदेश मंत्री जी यहाँ बैठे हुये हैं उनको राष्ट्रसंघ में उसने कुत्ता कहा था, डाग कहा था, जो कि आकाश पर धूम रहा था, राकेट पर धूम रहा था, जो भुट्टो दिल्ली पर शासन करने का सपना देख रहा था, वह भुट्टो इन्दिरा गांधी को कहता है—आई एम इंडायरली इन योर हैंड, तो और क्या चाहते हैं, क्या और कहलाना चाहते थे भुट्टो से यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है। आज काश्मीर के संबंध में कहते हैं कि काश्मीर पर बहुत पैसा खर्च कर के यह कर लो, आप अरबों करोड़ों सब कुछ खर्च कर सकते हैं लेकिन काश्मीर जो है वह है, काश्मीर कुछ और है और जो काश्मीर है वह काश्मीर आपका है, आपने देख लिया, यू० एन० ओ० को भी देखा, आपने दूसरों को भी देखा। तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अच्छा कदम उठाया है। आज काश्मीर के मामले में भी वह रास्ता साफ करने जा रही है। बार बार मैं नहीं दोहराना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन जनसंघ के लोगों ने बीच में हस्तक्षेप करके कहा कि आप बड़ा टाल बलेम कर रही है। आज तक किसी कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्य ने, यहाँ तक कि प्रधान मंत्री ने, कभी नहीं कहा कि हमने बहुत बड़ा बाध मारा है, हमको इनाम मिलना चाहिए। दिस इज अ बिगनिंग।

एक बात मैं अंत में कहना चाहता हूँ। इस देश ने श्रीमती गांधी पर पूर्ण भरोसा किया है। उनमें 2 बड़ी खूबियाँ हैं—उन्हें न कोई डरा सकता है, उन्हें न कोई ठग सकता है। अगर भुट्टो साहब में बड़ी चालाकी हो, हाँशियारी का दावा हो, तो इस देश की जनता को भी अपने प्रधान मंत्री पर बड़ा विश्वास है कि उन्हें भी कोई ठग नहीं सकता, न कोई धमका सकता है, डरा सकता

है, उसका भी अंजाम देखा लिया है और शायद दुनिया में पहली मिसाल है जब कोई देश युद्ध में फँसा हो तो उसका प्रधान मंत्री खुले आकाश में, खुले मैदान में, लाखों लाख जनता के बीच आह्वान करता है और जनता को अपने जो प्रतिज्ञा की हो, उसको पूरा किया हो। इसलिए यहाँ पर जमीन देने देने की मामूली सी बात है। मैं चुनौती के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कभी श्रीमती गांधी ने कहा था कि हम पाकिस्तान को खत्म कर देंगे। गोरे साहब बड़े बुजुर्ग हैं, उन्होंने कहा पार्लियामेंट से रेडिफिकेशन होना चाहिए। हम पूछते हैं, पार्लियामेंट से रेडिफिकेशन का सवाल कहाँ आता है? संविधान में सरकार के पास एक्जीक्यूटिव पावर है और फिर पार्लियामेंट के सामने यह प्रस्ताव आया है। सारी दुनिया ने इसका स्वागत किया है, सारे देश ने स्वागत किया है, हर तबके के लोगों ने स्वागत किया है आज भी मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा—रूपरानी जी न यहाँ हैं न वहाँ हैं—लेकिन जनता के भाइयों से कहूँगा कि आप जा रहे हैं, आप आज की परिस्थिति में, इस बीसवीं शताब्दी में, आज के समय में टिक नहीं पाओगे, आपकी बात को सुनने वाला कोई नहीं है। आप भी इसका स्वागत करके एक बड़ी राष्ट्र भक्ति का परिचय दें। इससे दूसरा अच्छा मौका नहीं मिलेगा।

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated): Sir, I do not often take the time of the House. But on this occasion I think it will not be proper for me to be silent. I want to make no debating points on this occasion. I want to place before the House certain fundamental considerations which should guide our attitude with regard to the Simla Agreement. It is not correct and it is not doing justice to the Agreement, it is not doing justice to ourselves and the country, if we considered the Simla Agreement as an isolated event, as an isolated document, to be separately considered. The Simla Agreement must be viewed in a larger perspective. The Simla Agreement has arisen out of the cease-fire, ordered unilaterally. The cease-fire has flowed from a combat between Indian and Pakistani forces. That combat arose out of

in Bangla Desh. And one of the major consequences of that development was the outflow of a crore of men into our country, and we were faced with a certain difficult situation. I am not one of those who held that our army intervened for the liberation of Bangla Desh. I hold the view that our army was forced to intervene to remove the cause which resulted in the outflow of a crore of foreigners or people belonging to another country into our country raising many vital issues and raising many burdens on our country. That was the reason why we intervened. This had led to the combat and this had led to the ceasefire and them to the Simla Agreement. We must view this matter, therefore, in a larger perspective and while I am addressing the House I am largely addressing the Opposition and when I am addressing the Opposition, I am not appealing to them or talking to them as members of certain Parties. I want to talk to them as fellow Indians and fellow Members of Parliament—Parliament which has to take charge of the country's fortunes in the coming future. As fellow Indians and responsible for the governance of the country, let us see what is before our eyes. I do not see Pakistan or Pakistani Army before my eyes. I see something else before my eyes. I saw that just before Pakistani Army invaded Bangla Desh. What I saw was that as a result of elections to the Lok Sabha, the masses rose to a new awakening and the masses spoke and the masses acted and this awakening of the masses gave rise to certain problems for the Government. Twenty-five years have passed after we got Swaraj. I am one of the creatures of the Gandhian movement. Gandhiji told us repeatedly and he wrote repeatedly that "I am talking of Swaraj in terms of the masses." "In terms of the masses" means in terms of the welfare of the masses. At the end of 25 years the awakened masses find that it has become a swaraj not for the welfare of the masses largely, but it has resulted

[Shri Jauamdas Daulatram] largely in the welfare of the masses. The masses today are awake. They were awakened by the Gandhian mass movement. They are not only awake, but they are conscious of their poverty, backwardness and their urge to satisfy some basic needs. They started using more and more radios, newspapers and other media. These masses have got the political power of the vote and they can exercise that political power and make and if necessary, unmake governments. These masses, as a result of Gandhian movement and subsequent developments, have got the power of action. In the big industrial towns they can bring life to a standstill, if they want to. And in rural areas, by refusing to produce food-grains in the fields, they can strangle the whole country. There are many other actions they can take. This is the position to which we have to attend to, as Parliament and as Indians. This mass awakening swung the Prime Minister into power. But it is not only that the Prime Minister who was swung into power, but these awakened masses desire certain things to be done for them. We have to deal with their power to act. Can we now discharge those responsibilities if we have a relationship of continuous tension with our neighbours? That is the issue before us. It is this issue which has to guide not only this simple Simla Agreement which is a mere beginning, of the coming talk, that we are joining to have hereafter. We are facing a time when many discussions may have to take place. We may be able to solve the disputes, or we may not be able to solve the disputes. Are we going to be driven into a running race for arms either by diversion of our energy and money and manpower for production of arms or by being dependent upon foreign powers for our defence. There is no doubt that we have to be self-sufficient for defence. But, are we going to increase our difficulties? We have to be aware of the failure of talks

and we have to be prepared for the consequences also. But, we must make a genuine effort to create conditions when the Government and this Parliament which is governing the Government is able to do something for these awakened masses who today are prepared to take action for their rights. That is the challenge which we have got to face and I am, therefore, appealing to the Members of the opposition parties not as parties, but I am appealing to the Indian within them and asking the Indian within them whether the situation which faces us and them does not require a change in the attitude with regard to the relations with the neighbouring countries in our own interest, in our own national interest.

I issued a public statement recently. You are talking about Tharparkar border areas in Sind. It was a mishap not to have secured that area in 1947 when partition took place. It is not correct, as some people hold that the Tharparkar district, as a whole, was a Hindu majority, district, the 1941 census was the basis of partition. In the district there was a small Muslim majority. It could not be treated as a Hindu majority district. But the border tehsils were a Hindu-majority area where the Muslims were a small minority. The Census of 1941 may be consulted and it will show this. I had suggested that the border Hindu areas at that time might be attached to Rajasthan just as Sylhet was added to East Bengal. But that was not finally agreed to. There was resistance and it could not be done. So in 1947, that area became a part of Pakistan. Now, this war was not fought for the purpose of conquering Pakistan. Our Army entered there because it had to go there in view of the developments when the fight was going on in Bangla Desh. Therefore, what I was saying was this that the Prime Minister, in spite of my wish that this area

should have been with us, had acted wisely in handling over this area earlier, some six months earlier than otherwise, because the return of this area was inevitable, just as the return of the area taken over in Punjab by Pakistan was inevitable. It is a question of a few months here or there, the area had to be returned, because it was not a part of our country in 1947. Now, why was it done now ? What was Mr. Bhutto otherwise taking to Pakistan ? What kind of an agreement was he to sell to his people in Pakistan ? All that he had to say was that there would be no war between India and Pakistan, that Pakistan will not fight India. That is Clause 1, Clause 2 is that Pakistan will only talk with India and settle dispute with India and through nobody else. We returned the occupied area earlier because, it was our idea to work for a settlement with Pakistan for durable and enduring peace, in our own interest, peace in our own national interest and the return of the occupied area earlier would enable Bhutto to commit Pakistan to the Simla Agreement. And, when I am talking of enduring peace, I am looking forward to the kind of peace between the USA and Canada, between Norway and Sweden, or between Switzerland and the rest of the world. I am not talking of peace which is only transitory and uncertain, but dependable and durable peace. Therefore, we should view this matter as Indians and not as Jana Sangh Party members or members of any other party. As a matter of fact, if my friends do not mind my saying so and I am saying it with all humility— that the Jana Sangh has not raised its stature before the world. You see the manner in which they have acted. They are all my friends and some of them are my relations also. Mr. Lai K. Advani is my relation, many Members may not know that and I call them as my friends. Now, can I imagine tomorrow a situation in which the Leader of the Opposition in the British

Parliament goes to Northern Ireland and sit in 'dharna' there because the British Government may want to transfer Northern Ireland to Iceland ? What would the world think of it ? Can I imagine the Leader of the Opposition in the American Congress going to Korea or elsewhere and sit in 'dharna' ? You cannot stay in the occupied area because the moment the Pakistan army comes there you have to come back. So, this is not the way in which any party should function. Minority has to be a minority and may fight constitutionally. Minority has to accept the democratic ways. The majority decides and the minority, for the time being, submits to it. It may cultivate opinion and become the majority. But, this kind of demonstration, this kind of leading processions, dharnas etc. are not, in my opinion, dignified for them. The world is looking at us today. The world is looking at India and the Indian Parliament...*(Time bell rings)* My appeal to you is: Kindly act as Indians first and as Indians last. We have got a challenge to face today which we must face and deal with...*(Interruptions)*

I know that Bhutto is, as I call him, one of the most mercurial politicians in his country, in the sub-continent, and possibly in Asia. He is mercurial. You cannot fix him up anywhere. And I have mentioned this to the Prime Minister that he is one of the most mercurial politicians. But we have to deal with him, because today there is nobody else in Pakistan, with whom to deal. He has to some extent been able to hold the five units together, Baluchistan, Frontier Province, Punjab, Sindh and Azad Kashmir. He is trying somehow to control the situation. If we have to deal with Pakistan, we have to deal with him and deal with him with open eyes, being aware that what he says may not actually happen. In my opinion, it is the people of Pakistan who have to decide to be at peace with the people of

[Shri Jairamdas Daulatram] India. It is not the Government, the Government there must be influenced by the people...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must wind up.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM : I am not taking more time. It is my appeal to the Members of the Opposition not to carry on this agitation for months together. After all, the talks have yet to take place and they are as much responsible as anybody else for India's future. Let us face the internal challenge as Indians.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Chinai.

SHRIBABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me five minutes to express my views on this very important matter. I have been listening to the debate in this House for the last two days. I have found an overwhelming support of this Agreement.

We must not lose sight of the fact that this war with Pakistan was not at our pleasure. It was forced on us in order to, liberate the people who were attached by Pakistan. We liberated them. Those who fled to our country were about a crore of people. At least I was one of them who believed that they will never go back to Bangla Dosh. But I heard the Prime Minister say in this House and on every other platform that she would see that these people go back to Bangla Dosh. This is her victory. This was her achievement. And I am glad she could do it.

The second part of it was that she has always been saying that we will square up with Pakistan, we do not want any third party in it. She stuck to it. United

Nations and other Big Powers wanted to interfere with it. She said: Nothing doing. Even China and the United States wanted to do it: She said: Nothing doing. The United States used gunboat diplomacy. She said: Nothing doing. And ultimately it was between India and Pakistan, and we arrived at this settlement.

Much has been made about giving away a part of the land of West Pakistan which we kept. I do not understand why we are doing this, because, to my mind our attack on the west was just to see that we get more chance to do what we were planning on the eastern side and see that Bangla Dosh can be freed.

But coming to the main point of my observations, Sir, I would say that we want peace for ourselves, we want peace for Pakistan and we want peace for Bangla Dosh. I do not want to say what they should do. I want to say something to our own Government, to our own people: why we want peace, We want to establish peace for the uplift of the millions of the people of this country who are downtrodden even though we have independence for the last twenty-five years. Unless we have peace we cannot direct all our energies to the uplift of our people. Therefore, I much more welcome this Agreement so that all our energies can be spent for the good of the people of this country. I wish the younger generation also who will be coming up now will take this hint and cooperate with the Government so that those who are coming up will also be benefited and those who are there will also be benefited. Sir, I am thankful to you, I have made my point.

Much has been said—and it is not my desire to repeat—and, therefore, I am winding up my speech with only one thing and it is this: Whatever has been done is good but I also hope that it would have been

far better if this House was taken into confidence first and then the President's assent taken. Why ? That would not have made any difference to the Government which has such a massive mandate, the majority of their own party and also the overwhelming support in this House. There would not have been any difficulty for the Government to get this Agreement through both the Houses. I wish in future at least Parliament will be taken into confidence first and then the President's assent taken. That would be dignified and in keeping with the practice of all the Parliaments in the world. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Papi Reddi, two minutes

SHRI PAPI REDDI (Andhra Pradesh): Standing itself takes two minutes.

Sir, having heard the debate yesterday and today, I feel that the Agreement has the aspects of both a triumph and a tragedy. Tragedy in the sense that some of the pessimists amongst ourselves...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please come to the mike.

SHRI PAPI REDDI :...have magnified the tragedy portion of it and minimised the triumph portion of it. But fortunately I am glad to say I whole heartedly support the Agreement and accept the success at Simla. But then it is high time the Prime Minister also dealt with the other problems of the nation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please come; to the front because the Reporters will not be able to hear.

SHRI PAPI REDDI : As in Simla I wish our Prime Minister deals with the other smaller problems of the nation like the Burma refugees and Ceylon repatriates by bilateral talks with those Governments.

For the success of this summit I would like to congratulate the advisers who advised the Prime Minister, Mr. Piloo Mody who has been keeping Mr. Bhutto in good spirits all the time and, finally giving the devil its due, Mr. Bhutto also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why Mr. Piloo Mody ?

SHRI PAPI REDDY : He was responsible for keeping Mr. Bhutto in good spirits.

AN HON. MEMBER : Indian or imported.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think that will do.

SHRI PAPI REDDY : Then, Sir...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up now.

SHRI PAPI REDDI : Sir, you have given me only two minutes. I would say only one thing.

Now we should be careful about our so-called friends who are getting closer to the Prime Minister because a new era has started in the world, that is, what is called the Sadat Era.

It is high time because all these years we have been hearing about the cartographic errors by our friends the Russians. This has become a chronic disease and so far they have been trying to sell our land in this way. Yesterday, one of our friends...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do.

SHRI PAPI REDDY : Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The Minister.

श्री नरेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यह तो बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण विषय है, इस पर हम लोगों को भी मौका मिलना चाहिये।

श्री उपसभापति : आपकी पार्टी के बोल चुके हैं।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : वह तो ठीक है लेकिन इसमें पार्टी का कोई प्रश्न नहीं है। ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। और बिजनेस कमेटी ने भी तय किया है कि 6 बजे के बाद सदन बैठेगा।

श्री सभापति : ठीक है, आपकी पार्टी के बोल चुके हैं।

श्री एन० एच० कुम्भारे (महाराष्ट्र) : डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहब, मैं एक ही बात कहूंगा, एक मिनट ही लूंगा।

मैं शिमला समझौते का स्वागत करता हूँ, मैं रिपब्लिकन पार्टी की ओर से इस समझौते का स्वागत करता हूँ, मैं देश के नंगे, भूखे, दरिद्र लोगों की ओर से इस समझौते का स्वागत करता हूँ। इससे सबसे ज्यादा खुशी इन्हीं लोगों को हुई है, इन बेचारों की हालत आज पच्चीस साल के बाद भी वैसी ही है जैसी कि पहले थी, उन लोगों के दिलों में एक नई उम्मीद पैदा हो गई है, जिन कारणों से हमारी प्रगति में रोकथाम आ गई है तथा जिस कारण-वश हमारी आज यह हालत बनी है, वह कारण हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में होने वाली लड़ाई थी। लड़ाई के बीच में कौन पीसा जाता है? लड़ाई के बीच में सबसे नीचे का गरीब आदमी पीसा जाता है और इसलिये आज हम बड़ी उम्मीद के साथ यह कहते हैं कि शान्ति की दृष्टि से यह जो कदम बढ़ाया गया है, आवश्यक कदम है। शान्ति की दृष्टि से आगे जो बात-लाप होगा हमारे लीडरशिप, डिप्लोमेसी और स्टेटमैनशिप कसौटी पर उतरेगी। मुझे विश्वास है कि हमारा क्रदम शान्ति की दृष्टि से बढ़ता रहेगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Sardar Swaran Singh.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : उपसभापति महोदय, हमें मौका दें। यह बहुत अनुचित बात है। आप समय एलाट करने में पक्षपात करते हैं, ईसाफ नहीं करते।

श्री उपसभापति : बैठ जाइये आप।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : आप समय एलाट करने में पक्षपात करते हैं, ईसाफ नहीं करते, अनुचित बात है।

श्री उपसभापति : कोई पक्षपात नहीं है, आप बैठिये।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : बिल्कुल पक्षपात है मैं इसको बर्दाश्त करना नहीं चाहता।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप चले जाइये।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मुझे जाने की बात मत कहो। मैं दलालों के कहने पर सदन से जाता नहीं। मैं जानता हूँ अपनी बात कहना। कह दिया कि जाओ।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am extremely grateful to the lion. Members who have participated in this debate. It is a unique occasion in the sense that as many as 34 Members have participated in this debate. The quorum is only 24; so it is much more than the normal quorum. Then again there was massive support to the Simla Agreement by as many as six parties which sit in opposition to us. Their spokesmen have supported the Simla Agreement, the strength behind it and the objectives that are sought to be achieved. I would not like on such an occasion to introduce any heat in my reply and I will try to be as brief as possible. There are several reasons why it is possible for me to be brief. For one thing the opposition from certain hon. Members has been, if I may say so, more subdued and then the points that were raised by sonic hon. Members who criticised the Simla Agreement and put forward their own viewpoints have been very amply replied to by several hon. Members from this side as well as from the opposition benches. Prime Minister's intervention raised the level of the debate, and in all humility I would like to pay a tribute to this august House for fielding some of the important Members. And generally the level of the debate, if I may say, has been very high, and I am grateful to the hon. Members. If I may say, this gives us greater strength to be able to take further step for implementing this Agreement. The support of Parliament—we are at the final stage now—will go a long way in telling the whole world that the entire country

is behind the Agreement. And this will enhance our ability and our capacity to take follow-up action in a purposeful manner, and will further enhance the prestige of our country. I have no hesitation in saying that this Agreement has been universally hailed throughout the world, and by all parties in the world. It is not only the Governments of those countries, but even those who are opposed to Governments in other countries, they have also hailed this Agreement.

I would like also to take a somewhat charitable view of the critics who have put forward their viewpoint in this House. I have carefully tried to understand as to what is the real thing that appears to be bothering them and what are the essentials of this Agreement about which they feel worried. After very carefully listening to the arguments and suggestions, I have no hesitation in saying that we don't adopt this attitude that no one has got the right to criticise us or criticise the Agreement. This is part of democracy and we welcome it, and I would like to assure Mr. Goray that that is not the spirit in which we approach this problem. In a democratic setup it is our duty to listen to the Opposition point of view and also try to benefit if there is any benefit that we can derive. If some of the hon. Members on this side used rather strong words, they were rather feeble as compared to the exhibitionist attitude that was adopted by a certain party, not only in this House but in the other House also. It was not that we were not prepared to listen to any points that might be urged. But this type of attitude which the entire House would agree is not consistent with the smooth functioning of democracy, is something which did enrage some of the hon. Members. In spite of that, the counterattack has been comparatively mild, and therefore there can be no reasonable grouse on this score. 8 R.S.S./72—9

Sir, after a careful consideration of the various points put forward by way of criticism, I can say that anything that is contained in this Agreement is not objected to, and I would like to repeat that all the clauses in the Agreement and the essentials of the Agreement are not being objected to. That does not appear to be the central point in the criticism. The criticism is only this that they have fears that what has been agreed upon may not be implemented.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi): Not only that.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Kashmir.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Now I will come to that. Be a little patient. I will try to enunciate as to what are the points about which there is agreement. Can there be any disagreement that all differences should be settled by peaceful means? None whatsoever. Can there be any disagreement that this peaceful settlement should be through bilateral negotiations? No dissent. Now, can there be any disagreement on the point that neither

side shall unilaterally alter the 6 p.

M. situation? There is no dissent.

Both sides shall prevent the organisation, assistance or encouragement of any acts detrimental to the maintenance of peaceful and harmonious relations. No dissent. Both sides agree that they have a commitment to peaceful coexistence, respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, no one can object and no one has objected. Then, the basic issues and causes of conflict which have bedevilled the relations between the two countries for the last 25 years shall be resolved by peaceful means. There is no dissent. They shall always respect each other's national unity, territorial integrity,

[Sardar Swaran Singh] politic concerned with the earlier history of Mr. independence and sovereign equality. How Bhutto. In fact, if you ask me, perhaps I no can there be any objection? There is none. other Indian knows Mr. Bhutto more¹ than I do. I have dealt with him on numerous occasions, in bilateral talks, international talks, talks in other capitals, in New York, in London, in Dacca, in Karachi, in Islamabad, in Delhi and Calcutta. There are so many places where we have discussed several matters.

What is then objected to and what is the essence of their argument is that although the Pakistan President has said that there should be settlement by peaceful means or there should be bilateral and mutual agreement in order to arrive at a settlement, is he likely to stick to it? This is the argument. Now, if the Head of the Government of a country enters into an agreement, signs that agreement and then also gets it ratified by his own Parliament by an overwhelming majority, by near-unanimity, then it is not an individual act. It is an act which binds the country, binds the people of that country. The moral approval of the people of Pakistan has been obtained by President Bhutto. I am mentioning this because some remarks unfortunately were made by an hon. Member sitting over there. Mr. Sen Gupta, in which he tried to ask: who is this Mr. Bhutto? What did he do in 1965? What did he do at the time of the Tashkent declaration? He may have done many things. [I am not an apologist for him. It is for him to defend himself in his own country and if there are critics then it is for him to answer those criticisms, but here he has entered into this Agreement as the President of Pakistan. As President he has been inducted into that office because he commands an overwhelming majority in the Pakistan National Assembly. The elections were conducted not by Mr. Bhutto, but by the military regime against whom every day President Bhutto is making statements which are not very flattering to the erstwhile military regime, including to the ex-President General Yahya Khan. So, we are dealing with Mr. Bhutto who represents the majority opinion in Pakistan, who is the President of Pakistan and who has got this Agreement approved by his Parliament, a democratically elected Parliament.

^rise do you want? I am not at all

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not necessary to go into that subject.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I know your views on this, but there are people sitting behind you who are doubters and also on your side, Mr. Sen Gupta. In fact, I was amazed when he used this type of language.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Do you remember what he said some time back in the UN?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am grateful to Dr. Bhai Mahavir, but I do not require his protection for that.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: It is a waste of protection.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I thought "Bhai" was a soft word, but he has become unnecessarily militant. I am saying (that we are dealing with the Head of a Government who has got this Agreement approved by Parliament. Should we proceed on the basis that person who signed the Agreement, notwithstanding the approval of the Pakistan Parliament, and his own personal history should be the guiding factor for us for judging the possibility or lack of possibility of implementation of this agreement? I would plead with the hon. Members that this is not the way to have an approach to an international agreement. International agreements have a certain sanctity and the hon. Members must be aware that even when Governments have

changed, not even by constitutional means, the first declaration that is made by any new Government who style themselves as a revolutionary Government, perhaps the first announcement on the radio, is that "we will abide by the international agreements entered into by the earlier Government." This is something which does not depend on individuals, does not depend on the case history of any individual who may be signing the Agreement. It binds the country, it binds the people. Therefore, we should view it in that context.

Then again, is there anything in this agreement which, having been approved...

SHRI N. G. GORAY: May I put you a question?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: You note down your questions. You may also have this practice. Is there anything which would be repugnant to the normal thinking of the people of Pakistan? Is there anything in this Agreement which would not be liked by the people of India? That is a certain guarantee to which we look. If the agreement gives an impression to the people of Pakistan that it is something which is unjust to them or if it gives an impression to our people that it is unjust to India, then also there is an inherent weakness in it, and history is replete with such instances where countries who were in a dominant position dictated treaties, i What was the fate of those treaties? The world knows that at that time they might have been satisfied with obtaining the signature on a piece of paper or on a document which they thought served their interests! and that perhaps it would serve their interests for all time to come. But what is the judgment of history in such cases? They have not proved to be durable. In fact they lay the basis for eruption of fresh trouble, fresh conflict and fresh misunderstanding which ultimately again develop

into conflicts. Therefore, the important thing in this connection is, as was pointed out by my friend, Shri Nawal Kishore, opposite that we did not sit in this summit as conquerors or as those who had obtained a decisive military gain or military victory. Of course that fact is there and even if you do not mention or announce it, everybody knows that. But what should be the approach? Some people say, "You were in a position to dictate terms, why did you not dictate terms?" We did not want to dictate terms, I want to be quite clear. We were in search of not only durable peace but a just peace, and where just peace is involved there is always an element which we have to take into consideration the reactions of what we decide upon the people of the other country and our own people. Our predominant consideration was the effect of this agreement on our own people because it is our basic duty to see that our own interests, our country's own interests are safeguarded. At the same time if while adhering to this basic consideration we can also arrive at an agreement which gives satisfaction to the people in the neighbouring country, that is worth pursuing and trying. And this is what we have to try to achieve in this agreement.

Then, Sir, what has been the thrust of the Criticism? It is not that anybody is opposed to the Agreement in principle but that there is little likelihood of it being implemented. This was the main point that was urged. And it was a very interesting spectacle that a great deal of research was done in culling out sentences from President Bhutto's speech, and they were quoted in a very selected manner. And I have no intention to quote other paragraphs because I presume that the hon. Member who has taken such pains to select three or four sentences and omitted completely what followed or what preceded those few sentences, when he goes back and studies them again and again as Shri Gorey has

[Sardar Swaran Singh] done—I am sure—he will be convinced that the basic agreement which was signed by President Bhutto has not been departed from in his speech, if you take the speech as a whole. If you point out this sentence or that sentence, other sentences can be pointed out, but I have no intention to do that because that will be a public document. And when the records of the discussion appear in print, then certainly people can judge as to what he has said or what he did not say. It is not for me to defend President Bhutto's position. I do not accept that everything that he has said is even entirely consistent with the Agreement. There are parts in his statement which cannot be fully understood in terms of this Agreement. But if you take the speech as a whole, I find that basically he has tried to stick to the basic elements of the Agreement, although being a great speaker an electric speaker, he has on many occasions used language of overstating the case or understating the case but the essential thing, I think, has not been departed from in his speech.

Then the main point that was said was about Jammu and Kashmir. Now, what is there in this Agreement which, to the slightest degree, compromises our stand that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India? I claim that there is not a single word in this Agreement which to the slightest degree compromises our stand on that.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : The words 'final agreement'.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Now, a great deal of research appears to have been done by the hon. Member on this. *(Interruptions)* Listen, do not be in a hurry now. What have we said in this Agreement? The words are 'final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir.' Now, for one thing, we have not used the word 'dispute'. Then, I put it in all earnestness to all those who are

critics because no one else has got this doubt in his mind—I put it to the critics—Is there nothing to be settled about Jammu and Kashmir? Many things have to be settled. *(Interruptions)* Please. Then, is that outside Kashmir?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Pakistan's occupation...

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Therefore, there is something to be settled. Why do you say that nothing is to be settled'?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Say that. I did not mean that.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Why do you say you do not mean that?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Say, that we welcome it.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I do not want your welcome. I would start...

(Interruptions)

The main point is, why is this *tamasha* being carried on by means of these demonstrations in the House, and those demonstrators—these great conquerors going into that territory, some one going to Gadr and..

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He is going.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : .. the Maharani Saheba has gone. And what was most amusing is that Mr. Joshi from Maharashtra has gone to Punjab across Gurdaspur as if we do not know what is happening in Gurdaspur and Shakargarh. You see, even after losing this debate this is the respect for democracy which this party has. They carried on a big debate here. Then Mr. Joshi goes to Amritsar, addresses some of his followers who are greatly worried because most of them are commercial people. They are looking forward to a

period of relaxation of tension. They want to have trade with the Lahore people. But Mr. Joshi goes there, makes a speech that Sardar Swaran Singh and the Prime Minister should resign because they have indulged in a sell-out of India. I am amazed that they are so isolated from the people that they cannot understand even what is in the interests of the people. When the guns are pointed, when the border areas are bombed and when people die, it is not Joshis or Atal Beharis who go there, it is the great Punjabis who face all that. At that time they come to Delhi and want to live here. Now they go to Shakargarh. What is Mr. Joshi doing in Shakargarh? It is amazing that now he is leading the brave Jana Sangh volunteers to Shakargarh. I bow before their bravery if this is bravery.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: What a standard of speech from the Foreign Minister?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : यह आप की समझ में नहीं आयेगा ।

DR. BHAI MAHABIR : You are raising the level of the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You have not referred to the Joan of Arc from Gwalior.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I wanted to be a little chivalrous.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I presume that the hon'ble Minister is sincere about explaining things. I want to know only one thing. In this Agreement we have talked about the settlement of the Kashmir problem. I admit there is some problem, but that problem is about one-third portion of Kashmir which is being illegally left by them in their possession. Can you raise that issue now when the Settlement mentions that no fresh issues can be raised? The Government of India so far has never taken the stand that one-third portion of

Kashmir should be vacated. Can you raise that issue now in view of the clause that no fresh issues can be raised?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Where is the clause that no fresh issue can be raised? There is none. Where is the clause, Mr. Pitamber Das, where we have said that no fresh issue can be raised? In fact, the clause is that all issues, all differences between the two countries will be resolved by two means : (1) peaceful, and (2) bilateral. So whatever may be the differences which may be raised or which may arise at any time, present or future, this is the agreement, I am amazed that all this misrepresentation is being made. So I would appeal to the hon'ble Members that in a matter where such vital national issues are involved, where there is not much objective served just by heightening tension by making strong speeches, by criticising heads of Governments of other countries, even when you may not like, I would strongly urge that we should resist that temptation. It may be very tempting to use that strategy. But while dealing with people who are democratically elected—I do not like all the people who have been elected on the Jana Sangh ticket because they oppose me always but still I listen to them with the greatest care and I show all possible respect and regard to them—we should be more careful, no matter what we do internally, since we say harsh things, sometimes unjustified things about those who are elected by their people. He is the head of a government. We have to deal with a country which geography has placed next door to us. We have got a long border, roughly about 1,800 miles or so. And all along the border, we have to create a situation where there may be trade between the two countries. Their followers, the commercial people, settled in the major cities are looking forward to an era where there may be trade between the two countries. It is a tragedy that

[Sardar Swaran Singh] sometimes the leaders do not know what their own followers, even Jan Sangh followers, want. So, this is the type of agreement that we have arrived at.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : A person who does not know his own mind !

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Then the speech of Mr. Bhutto has been very copiously quoted here. I am glad, I think he is paying me a compliment because I started the game in the other House. But I am not going to quote those speeches here, because if anybody wants to study them he can study them. Some of them are very good pieces. If, for instance, something had been quoted here which is also consistent with his support for a peaceful settlement, his support for bilateralism, his support for settling all the differences by peaceful means, I would have said that perhaps he is making a fair presentation. But It was not even a fair presentation of the speech from which he quoted so copiously. Now, I have been thinking what he was trying to prove by quoting certain portions. Was he trying to prove that what he has said there is correct ? Now, if what he says in his speech is correct, then all other parts also should be taken as correct. Or does he want to say that what he quotes is the correct position and all the rest of it is in correct ?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Shall I ...

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : No, because everybody knows your position was absolutely untenable.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : I was saying that it militates against what you are saying. You are trying to put meanings which are not there.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : He has not got much experience of what I say. What I say cannot be contradicted by another person's speech. That may be his interpretation.

Therefore, I submit that the Agreement that has been arrived at is in the best interest of peace and it should be given a trial. We are determined that it should be given a trial.

There are one or two points which I would like to mention. I would appeal to the hon. Members who perhaps in a fit of ideological refinement continue to talk about a confederation, that nothing can cause a cloud on the friendly relations between us and our neighbours more than the talk of a confederation. I will be quite frank because the country has been divided. They are sovereign independent countries and any suggestion that there should be a confederation, whatever may be the intentions, means that you want that their sovereignty may partially be compromised. I would strongly appeal to the hon. Members that we should desist from this because this does not show India in any good light. Bangladesh has emerged as a sovereign independent country, and we respect their sovereignty. We have accepted them as a sovereign independent country. Even to friends we should not talk of a confederation because this is something which is not good and we should be quite clear that by doing so, we are not advancing either our reputation or our prestige amongst our neighbours.

Several hon. friends had said that with Pakistan we should have relations as between good neighbours and the case of Canada and America, Norway and Sweden, etc., was cited. I would like hon. Members to come nearer home. We have established such fine relationship, for instance, with Nepal. Between Nepal and India, as you

know, there are *no* passports, there is no restriction on travel and there is no restriction on movement of goods, etc. So, we need not look to Europe or other countries for building good neighbourly relations. We have built the best of relations with our neighbours, Burma, for instance, and now with Bangla Desh. So, in this region a new picture is emerging, a picture of sovereign equality irrespective of the size of a country, where we respect their sovereignty, we respect their independence. And if this process could result in the creation of that type of relationship that we have with our eastern neighbours and with some of our neighbours in the mountains like Bhutan and Nepal and Bangla Desh, this is something of which I think we should be happy. We should see as to what we are doing to create an atmosphere of equality, of acceptance of the sovereign rights, of friendship, of understanding, because we always point out that India's strength will never be used to the detriment of any of our neighbours, and that all our neighbours have everything to gain if India is strong and no one should have any fear. Unless we succeed in creating this feeling, we will always be committing a mistake. And I can claim in all humility that this atmosphere, by and large, has already been created with regard to a fairly large number of neighbours in our neighbourhood and this is the process towards which we should move. And any sarcastic remarks, any doubts, and always trying to say, "Well, because I have some doubt as to whether the other party would be genuinely interested in peace or not, therefore, I will always be hostile to him, I will always create a situation where the other side, even if they want to revert to peace, should not proceed in that direction, will not be wise in our own interest. Therefore, I would appeal to the honourable Members that perhaps it was a try on by Jan Saigh to boost up some of their sagging morale; they have seen the reaction

in Parliament, they have seen the reaction amongst the people, amongst the other political parties, and they will be well advised to revert to the path and fall in line...

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Receive consolation.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : No, I need not be consoled. I won't mind if you go on in this way because you will console yourself more.

Another thing was mentioned by an honourable Member here and I would like to repudiate that.* After the signing of this Agreement, to talk of unrest in Sind, to talk of unrest in the Frontier Province, to talk of unrest in Baluchistan, is totally inconsistent with the spirit of this Agreement. Those are their internal matters and it is absolutely wrong for anyone in India now to say anything which is purely internal. Let us be quite clear about our obligation. Whatever the matters between the people of Sind and the Central Government of Pakistan, or the people of Baluchistan and the people of Northern Frontier Province with their Central Government, they are their internal matters. We will not interfere in their internal affairs and we would not like them, by any means, to interfere in our internal affairs. . .

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Their President himself speaks about Kashmir. Would you allow it ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I think Mr. Bhutto is a Sindhi and so is he. There appears to be some old rivalry between the two. I would, therefore, appeal to the honourable Members from all sections of the House that this is a futile thing to do, we will not get anything except making speeches. You create suspicion, without achieving anything. I would ask my brave friends of the Jan Sangh: What will they do in Baluchistan ? What will they

[Sardar Swaran Singh] do in the Frontier Province or even in Sind ? What is the use of adopting this type of an attitude ? There is a certain code of international conduct. We as a mature country should adhere to it and should not be swept off our feet because you feel what somebody else is doing is not palatable to us. Even if it is not palatable to us, even then, we should set an example, and I am sure that there will be response. We are in a strong position. We should set that example by correct international behaviour, a good neighbourly behaviour. And I am sure that this will not be go unheeded because it is also in the interests of the people of Pakistan to achieve peace. We have lived with this problem for 25 years. Now, personally, on many occasions, I feel greatly worried because I was a party to partition, and after that our expectations were not realised. We did not get peace. I want to pay a tribute on behalf of the entire House to our young men, our Army, Air Force, Navy, for their bravery, for their valour, for their great devotion and the great sacrifices that they have done. I pay them my homage. I want to pay them homage. We owe it to them also. Do you want to keep them perched on the mountain tops which are 25,000 ft. high and 27,000 ft. high ? Do you want to keep them all the time in the fields, in marshy lands and water, or do you want them also to feel that the two countries have, by political means, taken some steps where they can come back to their families ? It is easy to talk about the thinking of the Armed Forces. I have been a Defence Minister for four years and many of my relations are in the Navy and Armed Forces and I know their thinking. We know that the soldiers do not want just to be in that condition of no peace and no war. They want either to fight or to settle down and do their training and other important things because we have to keep ourselves in trim

even to fight. It is not best for the morale of the Army that they should all be scattered in the fields where there are not even tents on many occasions. These brave Jan Sanghis who lead these jathas to Shakargarh and other places from air-conditioned rooms and cars do not know what is the thinking of the members of the Armed Forces. We know it. To the next generation at least, we should give durable peace so that people of India and Pakistan....

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Those who sacrifice ...

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : He is talking of sacrifices. He does not know what sacrifices are. To achieve peace we should be prepared to make sacrifices...

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : We have done more sacrifices than you.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : In the long run this sacrifice is much less than the sacrifices that war demands and for which we have been willingly giving sacrifices. If we have sacrificed many things for the sake of war, we should be equally prepared to sacrifice for peace and it is in that spirit that we have signed this agreement.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Will you permit me to ask one or two clarifications ? He said that we may take down notes and ask questions at the end of his speech.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I am putting this question because he made a reference to me. Otherwise I would not have asked. He talked about research and I would like to assure him that not much research was necessary at all .. .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I did not refer to you. I was referring to Dr. Bhai Mahavir.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : That is all right. Then he said that while evaluating Bhutto, we should not think of his past. I agree with him completely. But should I not feel disturbed when a man in his position as the President of a country with whom we signed this pact goes straight from Simla back to Islamabad and says as follows while addressing the members of the National Assembly ? In this there is no question of any misunderstanding at all. He says :

"If the people of Jammu and Kashmir want their independence^ if they want to be liberated from the Hindu yoke, if they want to be a free people in the fraternity and friendship and comradeship with Pakistan, they will have to give the lead and we will be with them. Even if the Simla Agreement is broken, even if it jeopardises all our relations with-India, I tell you, Sir, on the floor of this House, with solemn commitment to the people of Pakistan that if tomorrow the people of Kashmir start a freedom movement, if tomorrow Sheikh Abdullah and Moulvi Farook start a freedom movement, we will be with them, no matter what the consequence is."

Now, I would like to ask you one thing.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : You have already asked.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Just now you told us that what is happening in Sind, in Baluchistan, etc. should not have been mentioned. I agree with you. Now, supposing the Prime Minister were to come back from Simla and say that if the Sind people rose in revolt, our Army in Naya Chor will back them, will it be consistent with the spirit of the Simla Agreement? It will not be. Therefore, I am saying that just as she is important so far as the

Simla Agreement is concerned, he is also equally important, because he happens to be the President of Pakistan. Now, the President of Pakistan goes there and makes this speech. What do you want us to understand ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : First of all, Sir, it is a little unfair to me that I should be called upon to explain President Bhutto's speech. It is for him to do that. ..

(interruptions).

SHRI N.G. GORAY : No, no. No explanation. Why do you mistake me ?

(interruption)

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :
iJT ipff cTff, JT] 5fRFT eft ^H 'J5T],

Now, Sir, regarding this speech, if I may take the House into confidence, some of the remarks which were originally reported in the Press and which appeared to be rather extreme, do not occur in the speech that we have officially got. Now, I cannot vouchsafe for the correctness of even the version that has come to me, because it does not bear anybody's signature. Perhaps it might have happened as it happens on many occasions that one makes a speech in gusto and when the record comes, one makes changes in that. I myself sometimes, try to soften it and make changes when the script comes to me. So, if he has made changes, we should encourage him to make such changes rather than saying that this has been reported in the Press and therefore, you are bound by this. Therefore, I can say broadly only from the version I have

got*(Interruptions)*..... Mr. Goray, if you are interested I can explain it to you outside. I do not want to say anything more on this.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I will certainly seek an explanation outside. I am open to correction

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : It is correct that part of the speech.. *(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : An intelligent lawyer never argues the.. *(Interruptions)* ...weak points.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Pardon?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I said that an intelligent lawyer never argues the weak points.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : You probably ask your followers not to do that. They pick up some points for which they later on repent. .. *(Interruptions)* .. Now I want to share another information. Now, about the well-known speech, about which there is so much feeling in India—it is the well-known Security Council speech—wherein at one stage he was reported to have said "Indian dogs", I looked up the UN records and it is not there, because as soon as the script came it eliminated that part. ..

(Interruptions).

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : कृपा करके यह तो बताइए कि जो उन्होंने कहा...

(Interruptions)

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : आपको समझ आया, उन्होंने क्या पूछा ? आप रिपीट करे उन्होंने क्या पूछा ?

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : मैं आपकी समझ से काम नहीं लेता, अपनी समझ से काम लेता हूँ।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : आपको मुबारक हो आपकी समझ। अगर आपकी समझ हम पर आ गई तो हम मारे जायेंगे...

(Interruptions)

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : दूसरा बयान बताइए यहाँ पर।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The point is that some of the parts in his speech which were prominently displayed in the

Indian Press and which, on the face of it, appeared to be totally inconsistent with the terms of the Agreement, it appears that when the speech went for correction, either the Press had *wrongly* reported or in the authorised version that we have got, a good part of that does not appear. I do not want to explain it further. Thank you.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Sir, I want to ask one question.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : *mf ^Wtx, snr*

because if the honourable Members had listened to me yesterday, I had dealt with this point perhaps a little indirectly. I have read both the unauthorised version and the authorised version also. I have also read the remarks which were read out here, which appeared in our newspapers. But when you read the whole speech, even of the unauthorised version, the original speech as it came to us, the impression is not the same as one gets by reading extracts.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Don't be unjust to us. We do not want to be misinterpreted.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am not unjust.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : It is a copy of the monitored speech of your own All-India Radio.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am not saying that it is not. I have not read the All-India Radio version of the speech. I have got a printed one which, I was told, was uncorrected. When you isolate a sentence, it may give one meaning. After the initial remarks on Kashmir,

President Bhutto goes on to talk about the struggles in Vietnam, and in Algeria. I am not saying that the remark quoted was not made nor am I trying to justify President Bhutto. I am merely saying that when you read the whole speech, you get one impression but when you take these passages out of their context you get another. As Bhai Mahavir has pointed out, when I was asked this question at the Press Conference I did say that President Bhutto's remark was not entirely in the Simla spirit. At that time, I also had seen these passages torn out from their context. What is important is, as I said yesterday, that we are prepared for any situation...

(Interruptions)

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : May I just, for the sake of information, because Mr. Goray read out that part of the speech, mention to him that this part which he referred about the freedom struggle in Jammu & Kashmir, does not occur in the official version that has come to us ? I must make a statement that I cannot swear even by the authorised version that has come to us, because it has come to me without signature or anything. This part does not occur in this; I quote: "We will be with them even if the Simla Agreement is broken, even if we jeopardize all our relations with India". This does not occur in the correction. "No matter what the consequences ..." these words do not occur.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You ask Members of Parliament: How many of them would like their uncorrected speech to be circulated ?

(Interruptions)

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : There is a well-known practice in parliamentary system, and we should not discourage that, that on mature thinking some of the things are correct. I will command this to

Dr. Bhai Mahavir. He may think of correcting some of his speeches probably to make them more consistent with what is happening in the country today, and we should encourage people to return to a more just position rather than bind them with the position they might have taken up.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Thank for your advice which I return to you, with due regards. Now, Sir... *(Interruptions)*.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no. ...

(Interruptions)

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Why not ? I am asking a clarification. How is Mr. Alva worried about it ? We have been anxiously expecting the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister to satisfy us about the situation whether during the course of the talks we raised the question of liberation of the part of Kashmir occupied by Pakistan. In this connection, I would like our heroic Foreign Minister to tell us if it is not a fact that there are indications that the Government of India has been expressing its willingness to consider internationalising the cease-fire line. Now this is the thing which we want a specific assurance about. Let us have it.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : These are hypothetical questions and I am not going to enter into any discussion.. *(Interruptions)*.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Was this question raised at all ? He can say either 'yes' or 'no'.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : The question of internationalising the ceasefire line or the line of control was never discussed in Simla.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : What about the question of liberation of Pak occupied Kashmir ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : You heard the Prime Minister yesterday. If you heard her carefully, she said that this has always been our position that the entire area of Jammu and Kashmir including POK is part of India.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : May I make [a point? The 'Statesman' newspaper has written—I have not read the report, I do not know what they say in the report—but I have seen the headline which is absolutely false. They have attributed something to me which I have not said in the House.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : I want to have one clarification. The last paragraph of the Agreement is also welcome to me in which it is mentioned: "for the establishment of durable peace and normalisation of relations" etc. These things will be done. It is all welcome. There is also a passage saying that a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir may also be a subject—to that too I have no objection. But then I want a clarification from the Government whether we have not shifted from our old policy and commitment to the fact that the whole of Jammu and Kashmir State is an integral part of India. That is our claim. So, we have now shifted from the position. So long as we have not shifted from the position, I do not mind even if Kashmir is discussed and becomes a question of decision.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : There has been no shift from our well-known stand on this issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will now put Dr. Bhai Mahavir's amendment to vote:

The question is:

1. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same and noting that:

(a) the Agreement fails to assure "durable peace" which the Prime Minister had solemnly promised to obtain through a "package deal" with Pakistan;

(b) "bilateral negotiations" and "causes of conflict which have bedevilled the relations between the two countries for the last 25 years shall be resolved by peaceful means" mentioned in the Agreement have lost all meaning after President Bhutto's declaration in the National Assembly of Pakistan that he was free to raise the Kashmir issue in the U.N.O., and that Pakistan would "shed its blood", "whatever the consequences" to support any "Liberation War" launched by Kashmiris to free themselves from the "Indian Yoke"

(c) about 5000 sq. miles of territory now under control of Indian Army is being restored back to Pakistan without requiring the Pakistani Army to vacate the 30,000 sq. miles of territory in Kashmir which is legally and constitutionally part of India;'

this House disapproves the Agreements,"

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will now put Mr. Jagdambi Prasad Yadav's amendment to vote.

The question is:

2. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:

'and having considered the same, this House disapproves the Agreement,' "

The motion was negatived.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Sir, I would like to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment (No. 3) was, by leave withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. advani do you want to press your amendment ?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Yes, Sir.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : I hope my friend, after the assurance given by the Foreign Minister, will not press his amendment. It will be against the interest of the country if the amendment is defeated. Therefore, I am suggesting that you may better withdraw it. It does not look good. If it is defeated, it will tell on us.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Sir, I press my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now I will put Mr. Advani's amendment to vote:

The question is:

4. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:

'and having considered the same and noting the reference to "a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir" in the last paragraph of the Agreement, this House urges upon the Government to keep in view during the proposed discussion the fact that the whole of Jammu and Kashmir State is an integral part of India.' "

The motion was negatived.

SHRI DWDENDRALAL SEN GUPTA : Sir, I would like to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment (No. 5) was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will now put Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's amendment to vote:

The question is:

6. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House welcomes the Agreement as a significant constructive step in the direction of achieving amity and good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan and a durable peace in the sub-continent and with this hope and confidence the House calls upon our people to mobilise with determination their united will and effort for the implementation of the Agreement,' "

Those who are in favour may please say 'Aye'.

HON. MEMBERS : 'Aye.'

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Those who are against may please say 'No.'

AN HON. MEMBER : 'No.'

(Interruptions)

SHRI SITARAM KESRI (Bihar) : Sir, I want division.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, those who are in favour of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's amendment will please say 'Aye'.

HON. MEMBERS : 'Aye'.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Those against will please say 'No.'

(No lion. Member dissented)

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : When you called for those who were against there was not a single voice of 'No.' There is no dissenting voice at all. There is no one who is opposing it and if there is no one opposing it why should there be a Division?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In that case, Sir, you should say that the amendment is unanimously adopted.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : No, no. I would like to point out something in that connection.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You asked for a Division. I did not ask for a Division.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : You may say that the amendment is carried unanimously. Why unnecessarily delay ?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : The situation is like this. You wanted Ayes and Noes to be expressed in the beginning. You heard one voice as 'No' and you said that "Ayes have it." meaning thereby that it was being carried by a majority, not unanimously. This was in the very beginning. Otherwise, how did the question of Division come in ? The question of Division came only when there was at least one voice of 'No.' Later on, when the question of Division came and when again you wanted us to say 'Aye' or 'No', nobody said 'No'. That means that the Division is not needed, and that your previous decision is correct.

It was by a majority. That is what you had previously declared.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All right. I will demand a Division. This running with the hare and hunting with the hound will not do. Either run with the hare or hunt with the hound. I can understand if you say, 'unanimously'. Otherwise, let the country know how many opposed it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Are you demanding a Division ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I want a Division.

The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Ayes—120; Noes—Nil.

Abdul Khader, Shri M. S.
Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.
Abid, Shri Qasim Ali
Alva, Shri Joachim
Amjad Ali, Sardar
Amla, Shri Tirath Ram
Anandam, Shri M.
Arif, Shri Mohammed Usman
Basar, Shri Todak
Bhagwati, Shri B. C.
Bhardwaj, Shri Jagan Naih
Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore
Bisi, Shri P. N.
Bobdey, Shri S. B.
Buragohain, Shri N. C.
Chakrabarti, Dr. R. K.
Chandra Shekhar, Shri
Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprasad
Chaudhary, Shri N. P.
Chettri, Shri K. B.
Chinai, Shri Babubhai M.
Choudhury, Shri M.M.
Choudhury, Shri N. R.
Das, Shri Balrani
Das, Shri Bipinpal
Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
Dutt, Dr. Vidya Prakash
Gowda, Shri U. K. Lakshmana
Gujral, Shri I. K.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh
Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal
Himmat Singh, Shri
Hussain, Shri Syed
Jain, Shri A.P.
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri
Joseph, Shri N.
Joshi, Shri Umashanker
Kalanika, Shri I. K.
Kalyan Chand, Shri
Kaul, Shri B.K.
Kempuraj, Shri B. T.
Kesri, Shri Sitaram
Khan, Shri Maqsood Ali
Khan, Prof. Rasheeduddin
Kollur, Shri M. L.
Krishan Kant, Shri

Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
 Kumbhare, Shri N. H.
 Madani, Shri M. Asad
 Mahida, Shri U. N.
 Mujhi, Shri C. P. Mali,
 Shri Ganesh Lai
 Maragatham Chandrasekhar, Shrimaii
 Mehta, Shri Om
 Menon, Shri Balachandra
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja
 Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar
 Mulla, Shri A. N.
 Munda, Shri B. R.
 Musafir, Shri Gurumukh Singh
 Narasiah, Shri H. S.
 Narayanappa, Shri Sanda
 Narayani Devi Manaklal Varraa, Shrirati
 Nawal Kishore, Shri
 Nurul Hasan, Prof. S.
 Pai, Shri T.A.
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda
 Parashar, Shri V.R.
 Patil, Shri G.R.
 Patil, Shri P.S.
 Patil, Shri Veerendra
 Prasad, Shri K.L.N.
 Pratibha Singh, Shrimaii
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota
 Purabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati
 Raha, Shri Sanat Kumar
 Raju, Shri B.V. Ramaswamy,
 Shri K.S. Rao, Shri Katragadda
 Srinivas Reddi, Shri Papi

 Reddy, Shri Janardhana
 Reddy, Shri K.V. Raghunatha
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa
 Roshan Lai, Shri
 Sangma, Shri E.M. Saraswati
 Pradhan, Shrimati
 Saroj Purushottam Khaparde, Miss.
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati Savita Behen,
 Shrimati
 Schamnad, Shri Hamid Ali
 Sen, Dr. Triguna
 Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal

Shah, Shri Manubhai
 Shashtri, Shri Bhola Paswan
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani
 Shukla, Shri M.P.
 Shyamkumnri Devi, Shrimati
 Singh, Shri Bindeshwari Prasad
 Singh, Shri D.P.
 Singh, Shri Inder
 Singh, Shri Mohan
 Singh, Shri Ranbir
 Singh, Shri i'riloki
 Singh, Dr. V.B.
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh
 Sita Devi, Shrimati
 Sivaprakasam, Shri S.
 Sumitra G. Kulkarni, Shrimati
 Suraj Prasad, Shri
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand
 Tiwari, Shri Shankarlal
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad
 Venigalla Satyanarayana, Shri
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati
 Villalan, Shri Thillai
 Vyas, Dr. M.R.
 Wajd, Shri Sikandar Ali

NOES—Nil

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The other amendment by Mr. Kumbhare is identical. So I am not putting it to vote.

7 p. M. The question is :

"That the statement made in the Rajya Sabha on the 31st July, 1972, regarding the Agreement on bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, signed at Simla on the 2nd July, 1972 be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House welcomes the Agreement as a significant constructive step in the direction of achieving amity and good-neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan and a durable

peace in the sub-continent and with this hope and confidence the House calls upon our people to mobilise with determination their united will and effort for the implementation of the Agreement."

The motion, as amended, as adopted.

**STATEMENT RE
CLARIFICATIONS ON THE
SETTING UP OF THE COLLEGE
COUNCILS UNDER THE DELHI
UNIVERSITY ACT**

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HUSAN) : Sir, the President had on June, 22, 1972, promulgated an Ordinance amending certain sections of the Delhi University Act. Although the Vice-Chancellor, Delhi University, gave a categorical assurance in the meeting of the Academic Council held on July 4, 1972, that the Ordinance maintains *status quo* in respect of (a) the existing relationship between the Colleges and the University; and (b) parity of service conditions and pay scales of the teachers of the colleges and the teachers appointed by the University, some misunderstanding has

been created in certain sections of the teaching community that the setting up of the College Councils is a move towards delinking of the colleges from Delhi University. I should like to take this opportunity to clarify that the Government of India do not have under their consideration any proposal to delink the colleges from the University. In fact, the Government would consider such a proposal to be a retrograde step.

According to the definition of "Teachers" incorporated in the Delhi University Act, "Teachers" includes Professors, Readers, Lecturers and other persons imparting instruction in the University or in any college or Hall. Further, "Teachers of the University" means persons appointed or recognised by the University for the purpose of imparting instruction in the University or in any college. I should like to state that the Government has no intention of changing these definitions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A. M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at four minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 4th August, 1972.