

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall hear you after the Prime Ministers Statement.

श्री राजनारायण : यह न हा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर बयान करके चल जाये और हम लाग दावार का सुनाते रह ।

**STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER
RE THE AWARD OF INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL RE THE INDO-PAKISTAN BORDER IN THE GUJARAT-WEST PAKISTAN AREA**

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Chairman, the International Tribunal to determine the border between India and Pakistan in the Gujarat-West Pakistan area delivered its Award at Geneva yesterday. Government have not yet received this award. My statement is therefore based on the message received from our Consulate-General in Geneva.

The constitution of the Tribunal and the Award flows from the Indo-Pakistan Agreement on the Gujarat-West Pakistan border concluded on June 30, 1965. That Agreement was laid on the Table of the House by Prime Minister Shastri on August 16, 1965 along with his statement. The House discussed this statement on the Agreement and on August 24, 1965 adopted the following Resolution:—

"That the statement made by the Prime Minister in the Rajya Sabha on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965, relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House approves the policy of the Government in relation to the Agreement."

Sir, it is not necessary to take the time of the House to recapitulate the Agreement which now forms part of the records of the House.

In accordance with the terms of the Agreement, India nominated Ambassador Ales Bebler, Judge of the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia, Pakistan nominated Ambassador Nasrullah Entzam of Iran and the Secretary-General of the United Nations appointed Judge Gunnar Lagergen of the Stockholm Court of Appeals, Sweden.

I should like to recall what was stated in the Lok Sabha by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri explaining the function of the Tribunal, and I quote:—

" . . . I would like to state what is to be determined by negotiations or by the verdict of the Tribunal is not of any new boundary between India and Pakistan. That is not the claim of either of the two countries. What is to be determined is the boundary which came into being as a result of the partition of the country and the accession of the State of Kutch to India . . . "

Thus, the Award of the Tribunal was intended to settle the boundary between the former State of Kutch and the Province of Sind as it existed at the time of partition.

The preparation and presentation of India's case was entrusted to a team of eminent Counsel. The Attorney-General of India, Shri C. K. Daphtary, was the leading Counsel, the others being Shri N. C. Chatterji, M.P., and Shri M. A. Palkhiwala, Senior advocates of the Supreme Court, and Shri J. M. Thakore, Advocate-General of Gujarat. The Counsel had the assistance of a team of officers headed by Shri B. N. Lokur, Law Secretary to the Government of India. Hundreds of files, maps, books and reports were examined by our team which spared no effort in preparing and presenting our case before the Tribunal, which it did with great ability and thoroughness.

The claim of Pakistan was that the boundary lay roughly along the 24th parallel; in other words, Pakistan

laid claim to half the Great Rann of Kutch, with an area of some 3500 sq. miles. We had contended that the entire Rann was a part of India and the boundary lay roughly along the northern edge of the Rann. The Tribunal has unanimously rejected the Pakistani claim that the border lies along the 24th parallel. One member of the Tribunal has upheld our claim, while the other two members have upheld it with modifications in some sectors of the boundary. By a majority, the Tribunal has held that about 3200 sq. miles lies on our side of the boundary while about 300 sq. miles of the territory claimed by Pakistan lies on the Pakistan side of the boundary.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am conscious of the anxiety of the hon. Members and, indeed, of the country as a whole. I share this concern. This is a grave matter. Government are awaiting the full text which will be fully examined. Then, we shall be in a better position to make a fuller statement.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं बहुत ही दुःख के साथ आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को बताना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय जो अर्वाइड हुआ है यह हमारी मातृभूमि के हिस्से को पुनः हमसे अलग कर लिया है और यह शुद्ध राष्ट्र विरोधी है। मैं 5 मई, 1965 की लोक सभा की जो कार्यवाही है उससे कुछ-हिस्सा पढ़ना चाहूंगा :

“डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं प्रधान मंत्री से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि 15 अगस्त 1947 को जो भी नक्शा उनके पास है दिल्ली के दफ्तरों में, और किसी सरकार से मुझे मतलब नहीं, उन नक्शों को जो पुरानी चीजें बली गई हैं उनके बारे में मुझे इस समय कुछ नहीं कहना है, वह तो वक्त होगा तब कहूंगा लेकिन अब की कंजरकोट वगैरह अब से कोई भी चीज जाने पर प्रधान मंत्री साहब

यहां एजान करें कि वह किसी भी हालत में गोली बंदी नहीं करेंगे जब तक कि वह चीज वापस नहीं मिल जायें।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : यह तो मैं साफ कर चुका हूँ और कह चुका हूँ कि अपने देश की एन डी व भी भाग हम किसी भी हालत में छोड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, उसको अलग करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं और उसके लिये जो भी जरूरत होगी हम करने से पीछे नहीं रहेंगे।”

यह संवाद में ही लालबहादुर जी शास्त्री जिनकी मैं बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ, जिनका लालन पालन वाराणसी में हुआ है उनके मुखारविन्द से निकला हुआ है, उनके शब्द हैं कि कंजरकोट, छड़ बेट और दूसरी चौकियां हमारी हैं, हम उनका किसी भी हालत में छोड़ेंगे नहीं। क्या प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब हमको आज यह बताने के लिये तैयार हैं कि जो अर्वाइड हुआ है उससे कंजरकोट नहीं जाता है, छड़ बेट नहीं जाता है, दूसरी चौकियां नहीं जाती हैं। श्रीमन्, और भी मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि उस समय एक सवाल में श्री हुकमचन्द कठवाहा ने पूछा था :

सभापति महोदय, आज की सुबह सब संसद सदस्यों को पाकिस्तान द्वारा एक नक्शा दिया गया है जिसके अंदर डिग, कंजरकोट, सरदार पोस्ट, विस्कोट, बवारगेट, करीमशाही गुलू तालाब और चांड को पाकिस्तान का भाग बताया गया है इसके बारे में भी...

(Interruption)

यह डिपकशन है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जो ने तो हमको एक हिस्सा दी है, हम जानते हैं कोई नयी बात नहीं बतायी है। यह देखा जाय वह हमारे पास अग्रीमेंट है, अग्रीमेंट की कुछ धारारें पढ़ी जायें। अग्रीमेंट जो हुआ है उस अग्रीमेंट में कहीं नहीं लिखा हुआ, इसके तीन आर्टिकल्स हैं और तीनों आर्टिकल्स की सभी उपधाराएं हैं। इसको मैं आपके जरिये पढ़

[श्री राजनारायण]

देना चाहता हूँ। उसमें भी यही सीमा है कि हिन्दुस्तान की पुलिस कौन कौन जगह से हटाई जा रही है। पहला आर्टिकल है कि पहली जूलाई सन् 1965 से यह फैसला लागू होगा। दूसरा...

"All troops on both sides will immediately begin to withdraw".

दोनों तरफ की सेनाएँ तत्काल हटना शुरू कर देगी।

"This Process will be completed within seven days."

7 दिन के अन्दर तक यह सारी चीज पूरी हो जायेगी।

"The Indian Police may then re-occupy the posts at Chad Bet in strength no greater than that employed at the position 31st December 1964."

इसके बाद छाड़वेट जब हमारे पास आ गया था तो हिन्दुस्तान की पुलिस ने उसको पुनः ले लिया। यह लिखा हुआ है कि 31 दिसम्बर, 1964 तक पुलिस उतनी शक्ति में रहेगी। इससे यह सिद्ध होता है कि छाड़वेट हमारा था। आज जो समाचार आये हैं और रेडियो से जो न्यूज आई है, उससे यह मालूम होता है कि हम छाड़वेट को छोड़ रहे हैं और वह अब पाकिस्तान के पास जा रहा है।

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI): On a point of order. The Prime Minister just now said that this is a statement made for the moment because we have not received full information nor the full award. Therefore when that comes a fuller statement will be made and a proper discussion will be held. Why should this statement be made now by my hon. friend Shri Rajnarain? He can do it after the further statement is made by the Prime Minister.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान, वह कोई प्वाइन्ट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर नहीं है। मैं श्री मोरारजी भाई का बड़ा आदर करता हूँ। श्री मोरारजी भाई स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम के नये गबरू नहीं हैं।

(Interruption.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just wait. What the Deputy Prime Minister has stated is quite relevant because he has stated that the full particulars are not there and the Prime Minister is prepared to make a detailed statement and then they will give an opportunity to both the Houses to discuss the matter and therefore my feeling is that we will be wasting our time by going into matters on an insufficient basis.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं इस समय सदन को छोड़ने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं खड़ा हूँ और आपको मेरा प्वाइन्ट सुनना चाहिये। श्री मोरारजी भाई ने जो प्वाइन्ट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर उठाया है उसके द्वारा आप हमको बोलने नहीं देना चाहते हैं। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब यहां पर मैकमोहन रेखा के बारे में पूछा गया था कि हमारी सीमा कहां तक है, तो उस समय हम से कहा गया कि धीरज रखो। उसी तरह से जब काश्मीर में लड़ाई का सवाल उठा जिसमें हमारा 1411 हजार वर्ग मील का इलाका चला गया, उस समय भी कहा गया कि तुम धीरज रखो। वहां पर घास नहीं उगती है, दूब नहीं पैदा होता है। इसी तरह से आज कहा जा रहा है कि पूरी रपोर्ट आने दीजिये, चबराइये नहीं। जिस समय कच्छ का सवाल उठा था उस समय भी कहा गया था कि अभी तो ट्रम्बूनल बनाया जा रहा है और उसका एवार्ड आने दीजिये और बाद में देखा जाएगा। मैं श्री मोरारजी भाई से कहना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा का सवाल सिर्फ सरकार का ही कर्तव्य नहीं है क्योंकि यह सरकार इस राष्ट्र की रक्षा करने में असमर्थ हो चुका है। यह सरकार तो अपनी गद्दी की हिफाजत करना जानती है और उसी के लिए बचन दे सकती है आज यह सरकार जान बूझकर देश की

कमता को भुमराह कर रही है और हमारे मातृभूमि के हिस्से को काट रही है हमको श्री मोरार जो सरीखे लोग कहते हैं...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now you had your say. I will not allow you any more. Mr. Bhandari would like to put a question.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhandari. Sit down, I have explained the circumstances. You had your full clarification. Nothing more. You may do anything you like but I shall not allow.

श्री राजनारायण : आप मुझे निकाल दीजिये लेकिन मैं अपनी बात कहूँगा। आप दो मिनट और सुन लीजिये। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो मैंने एप्रोप्रीएट का पोर्शन पढ़ा है उसमें यह लिखा है . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We know of the agreement and the details of the agreement. Please sit down.

श्री राजनारायण : उसमें यह लिखा है कि . . .

"The decision of the Tribunal referred to in (iii) above shall be binding on both Governments and shall not be questioned on any ground whatsoever. Both Governments undertake to implement the finding of the Tribunal in full".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now sit down please. I have given you enough opportunity. Everybody is anxious. You are anxious, I am anxious and the two Houses are anxious about this matter.

श्री राजनारायण : यह जो सवाल है वह राष्ट्र का सवाल है . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I shall not allow you to proceed further. Mr. Bhandari.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : श्रीमान् पिछली बार जब कच्छ विवाद

1888 हुआ था कि इस विषय को ट्रिब्यूनल को दे दिया जाय तब इस संबंध में डम सदन में वाद-विवाद खड़ा हुआ और अनेक दल तथा अनेक मंगठनों की इच्छा के विरुद्ध यह सवाल वहाँ दिया गया। जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने अभी कहा कि यह केवल हमारे रिकार्ड के आधार पर कि जमीन किधर है और किधर नहीं है, इस सवाल पर ट्रिब्यूनल को फैसला देना था। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इतना जरूर स्वीकार किया है कि उनके पास अभी तक अधिकृत रिपोर्ट नहीं आई है और वे इस पर निर्णय नहीं कर पाये हैं। लेकिन जो समाचार प्राप्त हुए हैं उससे यह मालूम होता है कि ट्रिब्यूनल ने यह बतलाया है कि पाकिस्तान की भूमि क्या है और हिन्दुस्तान की भूमि क्या है। उसने इतना ही नहीं दिया बल्कि भविष्य में दोनों देशों के बीच शान्ति बनी रहे इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर कुछ कुछ इनलैट्स जो हिन्दुस्तान की भूमि में हैं उसके हिसाब से आ जाते हैं और यह जानते हुए कि वे हिन्दुस्तान के हैं, उसने पाकिस्तान को देने की सिफारिश की है। इस तरह से ट्रिब्यूनल ने अपने अधिकार सीमाओं का उल्लंघन किया है। जिस मतलब के लिए ट्रिब्यूनल कायम किया गया था उस दायरे में वह नहीं रहा।

दूसरी बात यह है कि उसकी जो भाषा है वह ट्रिब्यूनल की तरह नहीं है। उसने यह माना है कि पाकिस्तान एक अप्लीकेन्ट है और हम डिफेन्डेंट हैं तथा हम किसी अदालत में जाकर खड़े हुए हैं, इस आधार पर उसने रखा है। उसने दोनों बातों पर यह कहा है कि क्योंकि 40 प्रतिशत इलाके पर पाकिस्तान ने अपने आने-जाने की कोई बात साबित नहीं की है, इसलिए वह हिन्दुस्तान का हो गया और 10 परसेन्ट हिस्से पर क्योंकि पाकिस्तान अपने आने जाने का हिस्सा कायम कर सका इसलिये पाकिस्तान का

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

हो गया। तो ट्रिब्यूनल के दायरे में अगर आप में दोनों के रिजिस्ट्रेंटिज के आधार पर, दोनों के ट्रस्ट को ले कर जो एक साधारणतया ट्रिब्यूनल की परिभाषा और ऐग्रीज टू द प्राब्लम होना चाहिये उस ट्रिब्यूनल ने अपनी इस परिभाषा से इस शब्द के प्रयोग से अपना वह राइट जिस के आधार पर ट्रिब्यूनल के फैसले को मान्यता मिलनी चाहिये थी वह फारफोट कर दिया है और मेरा इसी कारण से यह निवेदन है कि सरकार इन दो बातों को ध्यान में रख कर अपने निश्चय को लें। अगर किसी भी प्रकार से अपने अधिकारों के सम्बन्ध में एक ऐसे तथाकथित ट्रिब्यूनल ने अपने अधिकारों का अतिरेक किया है एक ट्रिब्यूनल के नाते नहीं बल्कि केवल एक पार्टी को सुनने वाले इंस्टिट्यूशन के नाते विचार किया है, तो ट्रिब्यूनल की परिभाषा स्वयं उसने समाप्त कर ली। इसलिये ऐसे ट्रिब्यूनल के फैसले पर विचार करते समय वह इस आधार पर न चले इंटरनेशनल कंवेन्शंस की दुहाई दे कर क्योंकि ट्रिब्यूनल ने स्वयं अपने व्यवहार से, अपने ऐग्रीज से, अपने फैसले से "द बेरी कंसेन्ट आफ इट्स बीईंग ए ट्रिब्यूनल" इस सारी चीज को खत्म कर दिया है। इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर ही सरकार इस फैसले पर विचार करे।

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House adjourned for lunch at ten minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Patel, you wanted to say something.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Madam, I am surprised at the way in which business in this House is conducted. I pointed out to the Chairman that the Prime Minister was here on a specific matter and yet I was ignored and somebody else who shouted with a louder voice was allowed to ask questions. Then somebody else asked, and the thing prolonged until the House was adjourned for lunch. Madam, is having a loud voice only going to be the criterion because of which people are able to get up and speak? Certain questions were allowed to be asked. I should say, but then there were some other people also who would like to ask questions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is why I am permitting you now.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: But this should not become the practice that anyone who can shout with a loud voice can get away and continue to speak for fifteen and twenty minutes, till the time is up for adjournment, when the Chairman says that the House is adjourned, and goes away. Now, Madam, this is not the way to have a procedure for us. The Business Advisory Committee was called at 12.45. What happened to that? Is the business going to be regulated by a procedure by the Business Advisory Committee, and the traditions that we have evolved, or just by the loud voice that one or two people have? This is my first question. I would like to know this.

Madam, I saw that the Prime Minister was here. I wish she were here now. I would like to ask one or two questions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: She is coming. You please begin. I have sent for the Prime Minister.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, we would like to know whether the area that we are likely to lose under this Award, under this

dispensation, is at present under our control, or under the control of Pakistan. The award, on the face of it, does not look like a judicial award, it seems to be a political award.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): It is judicial also, they were judges.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is a political award; there is no doubt about it. Now the question certainly needs to be considered by the House and by Government, what our attitude towards it is going to be. But what the Government should really consider is that repeatedly our disputes with Pakistan are being settled on a piecemeal basis and always to our disadvantage because, wherever it suits the Pakistanis says: "Yes", and take the benefit of it, and whatever does not suit them they do not observe, right from the time of the withdrawal from Baramula. And yet we get a bad name in the world, as an aggressor. That is the situation that this Government has developed, or has allowed to be developed. May we know whether there is going to be any change in this, or this is the pattern that is going to continue in the matter of every dispute, or in every matter that is going to come up again as a dispute? Has the Government not thought of settling once and for all all matters of dispute with Pakistan? Unless a complete settlement is made, it is no use getting these little pieces settled. After all, whether it was a little dispute of a few posts in the Rann of Kutch is not the important thing to my mind. Psychologically, certainly it is important and it is going to be a very important matter with the people of Gujarat. When they are going to lose all this, they will ask why. People will ask questions whether our case was properly argued or not, and ask all sorts of things. I am not trying to raise those things, but I am raising the basic question, the policy of the Government in this matter. If we are to give up certain territories as

a result of this Award, for what reason? Is it because we are gentlemen or is it because we like to respect the award to which we have been parties? What about the other awards to which we have been parties but where the other side has chosen not to accept them and not to implement them? This is the large question which has to be decided once for all, and it cannot be allowed to be continued, to drag on. It is no good going on saying for ever that we are parties to the dispute, to settle which we must agree to the award given.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, the judgment of the international tribunal on the Rann of Kutch is based more on political considerations than on facts, than on evidence presented by the two parties. Now it is my opinion that, if this award is implemented, it will involve ceding a part of Indian territory to another nation, which I think the Government of India has no right to do. If the Government of India does so, it will be an act of betrayal of the nation itself. Again, this Award, as it has not been a unanimous one, I think it is not obligatory on the part of the Government of India to implement it, because there have also been other points of view expressed by another member of the tribunal. Therefore, India reserves the right to project her points of view in this case afresh.

Again, another point we have to note. If this award is implemented, it will create dangerous precedent, because the award has *inter alia* said this: "The consideration of promoting peace and stability in this region compels the recognition and confirmation that this territory", (awarded to Pakistan) "which is wholly surrounded by Pakistan territory also be regarded as such". If this is accepted, then this may also be raised in the question of Indian enclaves surrounded by Pakistan territory. Then that will also lead to ceding a further part of our country to Pakistan. That being the case, I would request the

[Shri Chitta Basu.]

Government of India to consider this tribunal's judgment on the basis of these observations of mine.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी
बीरझिया (मध्य प्रदेश) : उप-
सभापति महोदय, मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि
यह इतना महत्व का प्रश्न है कि इस पर
कुछ समय विचार करने के लिये रखा
जाय ।

अब मैं यह प्रश्न चाहूंगा कि जब यह
स्पष्ट है कि इसमें, पोलिटिकल एलीमेंट
आया है निर्णय में वैसे हमारे सपू साहब
कहते हैं कि जूडिशियल भी है उसमें और
पोलिटिकल भी है मगर जहां पोलिटिकल
शब्द को आप उसमें स्वीकार करते हैं कि
उसमें पोलिटिकल है तो . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam, . . .

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी
बीरझिया : तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि
जिस ट्रिब्यूनल में एक पोलिटिकल ऐंग्लोच
ले कर के एक निर्णय हुआ है उसको मानने
की हमारी सरकार क्यों बाध्य होती है ।

दूसरे क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि
सामरिक दृष्टि से वे स्थान महत्व के हैं और
सामरिक महत्व की दृष्टि से पाकिस्तान
ज्यादा सक्षम हो गया है ।

तीसरे मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि जैसे
माननीय डा. ह्याभाई जी ने कहा कि नेहरू-
लियाकत अली पैकट से ले कर ताशकन्द
समझौते तक न जाने कितने समझौते
पाकिस्तान के साथ किये लेकिन वह हमेशा
उनकी अवहेलना करता रहा और हम
उनका पालन करते रहे, तो क्या हमारी
सरकार इस बात का प्रयत्न नहीं करेगी कि
पुराने समझौते पर पूरी तरह पालन करवाने
के कारण इस पर विचार किया जाये । इन सब
बातों के सम्बन्ध में सरकार को क्या कहना
है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You
want to say something more on this?
We must put an end to this now.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Just two or
three words only. Every award has
a political and a legal aspect. He
who deal with these cases know that
we have to deal with facts and we
have to deal with the law which is
applicable to these facts. That has
been done in this case. What has to
be remembered by us is that where is
a definite commitment on our part to
abide by this Award. These three
persons, these High dignitaries, were
appointed at our instance and at the
instance of Pakistan.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That
has already been stated by the Prime
Minister.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: And there-
fore we have to abide by it whether
we like the Award or whether we do
not like the Award. I am not going
into that question. But we as a nation,
we as a nation which honours inter-
national treaties, which honours in-
ternational agreements, have to
abide by this Award.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: No, no.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That
will do.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: And it should
be accepted unanimously by us as the
representatives of the Indian people.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: It cannot
be accepted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That
will do. Now the Prime Minister is
here. Do you want to say anything
more You have made yourself
very clear.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: No,
I have nothing else to add.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now
we go on to the next item—Papers to
be laid on the Table.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
Madam, are we going to have a debate?

on this after the full details are received?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister has said that when the full text comes she will amplify her statement and all the rest will follow after that. Nothing more now.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, जो यह खबर है कि वहां पाकिस्तान की मेना जमा है

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Rajnarain.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ACTS MADE UNDER THE HARYANA STATE LEGISLATURE (DELEGATION OF POWERS) ACT, 1967

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Act made by the President, under sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Haryana State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Act, 1967:—

(i) The Indian Stamp (Haryana Amendment) Act, 1967 (Act No. 7 of 1967).

(ii) The Haryana Land Revenue (Additional Surcharge) Act, 1967 (Act No. 8 of 1967).

(iii) The Punjab Urban Immoveable Property Tax (Haryana Amendment) Act 1967 (Act No. 10 of 1967).

(iv) The Punjab Passengers and Goods Taxation (Haryana Second Amendment) Act, 1967 (Act No. 11 of 1967).

(v) The Punjab Entertainments Tax (Cinematograph Shows) Haryana Amendment Act, 1967 (Act No. 13 of 1967).

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-143/68 for (i) to (v)].

SIXTH VALUATION REPORT OF THE LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATION OF INDIA, 1967

SHRI K. C. PANT: I also lay on the Table, a copy of the Sixth Valuation Report of the Life Insurance Corporation of India, as at 31st March, 1967, under section 29 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-144/68].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962

SHRI K. C. PANT: I also lay on the Table copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance), under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:—

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 237, dated the 1st February, 1968.

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 277, dated the 6th February, 1968.

(iii) Notification G.S.R. No. 273, dated the 10th February, 1968.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT-112/68 for (i) to (iii).]

THE CUSTOMS AND CENTRAL EXCISE DUTIES EXPORT DRAWBACK (GENERAL) TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT RULES, 1968

SHRI K. C. PANT: I also lay on the Table, a copy of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) Notification G.S.R. No. 272, dated the 10th February, 1968, publishing the Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Twenty-first Amendment Rules, 1968, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 and section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act 1944. [Placed in the Library. See No. LT-111/68.]

NOTIFICATION OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE

SHRI K. C. PANT: I also lay on the Table, a copy of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) Notification G.S.R. No. 274, dated the 10th February, 1968, pub-