

[Shrimati Violet Alva.]

debate, solutions are not easy but one must bear in mind that when tempers fly in the heat of the debate, one must know that we have given unto ourselves a democratic set-up. Whether it be the other side or this side that sits in the Opposition, both have jointly to work to solve the many ills that this country suffers from and so one who sits in the Chair needs a lot of understanding and co-operation. Hon. Members have assured me and I feel sure that they will continue to give me this co-operation and understanding. On my side, I shall give to the fullest measure this understanding and co-operation within the framework of the healthy conventions we have laid in this House and the Rules of Procedure that we have given unto ourselves. Maybe that this side, the Opposition, does get sometimes uneasy and feels a little more alert but democracy must go through these stages. We are young but this august House had set itself a good model of the type of legislature that we should have in the different parts of the country, right down to the village level in our Panchayats and, therefore, while there are many new Members who have joined this House and there are those who have returned, I have returned once again too, I urge that we build up a democracy which we shall be proud of. A little laxity here and there from the Chair must not be mistaken because unless we relax and allow the Members to say what they like, the Members too in all seriousness, will not realise their own responsibilities and duties on this floor. Many battles will be fought outside in the lobby but when on this floor, we shall maintain the dignity and decorum that this House is known for. I do not wish to say anything more. I begin a fresh term. I will depend on the co-operation from every Member of this House, whether he be on this side or on that side.

Once again I am grateful to you, Sir, for the words and sentiments you have expressed, to the Leader of the House, Mr. Chagla, for having proposed my name, to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, whom I have known for many years, even from my childhood, and when I mention him, a great galaxy of great names stand before my eyes—his

great uncle, Vithalbhai Patel, Mavalankar, Ayyangar and you know, in our House, Dr. Radhakrishnan and you, Sir, with your gracious manner in which you conduct the House. Sir, to you, who have spoken, to those who have sponsored me and to those who have cheered me, I express my thanks.

STATEMENT RE STARRED QUESTION NO. 582 ANSWERED ON THE 17TH MARCH, 1966

LINKING OF BARSUA WITH TALCHER ON S. E. RAILWAY

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SHAM NATH): Sir, in my reply to a supplementary to Starred Question No. 582 on 17-3-66, put by Shri S. Supakar, I had stated that the target of export of iron ore from the Nayagarh area will be about 6 lakh tonnes per year. This figure, it is regretted, is not correct, and was due to a miscalculation. The target for export of iron ore from the Nayagarh area in the Fourth Plan period is about 3 million tonnes per annum.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

I. WITHDRAWAL OF INDIAN TROOPS FROM THE SIALKOT SECTOR

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
सभापति जी, मैं स्यालकोट क्षेत्र से भारतीय सैनिकों के हटाये जाने की ओर रक्षा मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ। मगर रक्षा मंत्री सदन में नहीं हैं।

श्री सभापति : विदेश मंत्री हैं।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the absence of the Defence Minister, who is away from headquarters, with your permission I will make a statement in reply to this Calling Attention Notice.

As the House will recall, under the Tashkent Agreement, the armed personnel of the two countries had to withdraw, not later than 25th February 1966, to the positions they held prior to 5th August 1965. These withdrawals were duly carried out. In fact, the U.N. Secretary-General announced the completion of these withdrawals on 26th February 1966.

According to the agreement between the Chief of the Army Staff, India and the C-in-C, Pakistan Army, any doubts about the ground positions, as they existed on 5th August 1965, were to be settled by mutual discussion between the local Commanders. On the international border between the Sialkot District of Pakistan and the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, a minor difference of opinion arose over three small areas, the total acreage of which was about 36. Accordingly as required under the agreement between the Chief of the Army Staff, India and the C-in-C, Pakistan Army, the matter was considered by the two local commanders and whatever adjustments in positions were necessary, were carried out in the light of mutually agreed conclusions.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Sir, I should like to know what actually has happened. Is it not a fact that our forces have withdrawn from the three points which we have been claiming as ours and, if so, on what grounds our forces have withdrawn? All along, also after the cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces, India has been claiming that this area in the Sialkot sector belongs to India and now, suddenly, a decision has been taken to withdraw our forces from that area. I should like to know on what grounds this decision has been taken.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I would like to clarify the position that, according to the Tashkent Declaration, and also more or less in accordance with the Security Council Resolution, the armed forces of both sides were to withdraw to positions which were occupied by the respective forces on the 5th of August. And on these points there was some doubt about the actual positions on ground, and as I have mentioned in the main statement, it was agreed between the two Army Chiefs that, if there is any dispute about the actual positions, that is a matter which

should be settled between the local Commanders. And the local Commanders met and have settled the position. I would like to give further information. This point was first raised when I and my colleagues, Mr. Manubhai Shah and Sanjiva Reddy, went to Rawalpindi for Ministerial talks, and when we landed there, questions were put to us suggesting that India had not complied with the Tashkent Declaration and that Indian forces were continuing to be in occupation of areas, or they were in positions, in which they were not on the 5th of August. And even at that time we had made the position quite clear that this was being mentioned to us for the first time and we would verify that position, and if there were any areas in which withdrawals in accordance with the Tashkent Declaration had not taken place, we would comply with this. So I do not think there is in this any dispute at all. It is a factual thing as to what were our positions on the 5th of August.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : If it is a factual thing, then why our forces did not withdraw after the 25th of February? Obviously there was some dispute, and may I remind the hon. Foreign Minister that this area is the same area which was attacked by Pakistan a few years ago. An encounter took place and one of our Captains and some soldiers were killed by Pakistan. And Pakistan, is it not in forcible possession of this area? Now, after our forces had liberated that area, had taken back that area from Pakistan, why the same area is being handed over again to Pakistan?

MR. CHAIRMAN : You say it was occupied by the Pakistani forces.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : On the 5th of August.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Before.

MR. CHAIRMAN : If it was in their possession before, then perhaps Pakistan may be justified in claiming it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Does it mean then that all the illegal possessions of Pakistan on the 5th of August are to be written off? Let the hon. Minister

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.]

refer to the old dispute and deny that there was any dispute at all. Regarding this area, are we to go strictly by technicalities? I understand that the Tashkent Declaration lays down that the respective forces should withdraw to the 5th August line, but is it not a fact that this area has been in the illegal occupation of Pakistan and that this area rightfully belongs to India but was captured by Pakistan and our forces, during the recent conflict, liberated this area? And now, under the pretext of the Tashkent Declaration Indian territory is being handed over to Pakistan.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I cannot understand this excitement. As you yourself rightly put the question to the hon. Member, we were not at the time of withdrawals deciding any disputes that might be there between the two countries about the actual *de jure* border or *de jure* boundary—that is something which must be understood. This was an agreement to undo or unwind the effects of the conflict, and it was agreed that we should withdraw, that either party should withdraw to positions which it occupied on the 5th of August. So this was the limited question with which we are concerned as follow-up action of the Tashkent Declaration. I would, with your permission, Sir, like to point out to the hon. Member that Pakistan is in illegal possession, according to our version, of 30,000 square miles in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
That is a different matter.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Merely because we have suspended an earlier decision, that does not mean that there is any admission, direct or implied, about the actual *de jure* position. This was an action which was taken in pursuance of an agreement and also, more or less, in accordance with the requirements which we were called upon to fulfil by the Security Council Resolution.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
My question has not been replied to.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think it has been

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : It has not been. Are there any old disputes in regard to this area or not? Is it not a fact that Pakistan has been in illegal pos-

session of this area for the last so many years? Let the hon. Minister reply.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I am not called upon at this stage to go into the disputes because that is a different matter, about which I would not like to take any definite position. Our position is quite simple; withdrawal to the positions occupied by either army on the 5th of August is something which has been agreed upon, and we should honour that. Whatever are the disputes, that is a separate issue altogether, and withdrawal or being in possession does not affect the actual *de jure* boundary at all points.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
(मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या श्रीमान्, यह बतलाएंगे कि जैसा यह तय था कि 5 अगस्त के पहले की स्थिति को पटुंच जायें और जो पहला झगड़े का कारण था जैसा कि आपने बताया कि तीन पोटन्ट पर था, तो वह पहले के झगड़े की वजह से था, पहले पाकिस्तान ने उसे अपने झगड़े में ले लिया था और चूँकि 5 अगस्त के पहले, आपके कहने के अनुसार, वह पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में था, उसको दिया जाना चाहिये था, तो क्या कारण था कि 25 फरवरी तक उनको वह जगह नहीं दे पाए जब कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के सेक्रेटरी ने भी उस पर सील लगा दी कि आपने जो कुछ पोजीशन ली, वह बहुत अच्छा है। तो ऐसी स्थिति में वह डिस्प्यूट की बातें 25 फरवरी के बाद तक क्यों रही ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, to expect that the local commanders will be so perfect that where hundreds of miles of country are involved, at each point there will be no dispute at all between the local commanders is, I think to expect too much. Disputes can arise. When the disputes arise then there is this agreement that the local commanders will meet and settle the point and then take their respective forces to either side, to the position occupied by them on either side. I would like because the hon. Member referred to the Security Council, to say that Pakistan raised this matter in a communication addressed to the Secretary-General also, and we have clarified the position

to the Security Council, that this was a very minor matter which had been settled between the local commanders and Pakistan was trying to take a propaganda advantage of this and trying to show as if India is not honouring its obligations under the Tashkent Declaration.

[Shri Rajnarain stood up]

श्री सभापति : मैं पहले उन लोगों के नाम पुकारूंगा राजनारायण जी, जिनके नाम पर यह सवाल है ।

SHRI D THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, an attempt is being made to minimise the gravity by saying that the acreage is only 36. Consequently may I ask whether apart from the 30,000 sq. miles of area in Jammu and Kashmir which is under illegal occupation, this episode of 36 acres is not a link in the chain so that Pakistan has not yet withdrawn from various areas from which it ought to have withdrawn according to the Tashkent Declaration? If that is so, may I know what is the total area from which it ought to have withdrawn and has not yet withdrawn ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, I am not minimising any gravity of it. I am making a factual statement. When it is 36 acres I cannot make it 360. You should read nothing more in it than what is stated.

The second question asked is whether Pakistan continues to be in illegal possession of areas from which Pakistan should have withdrawn according to the Tashkent Declaration. I would like to make the position categorically clear and say that there is no area in the possession of Pakistan from which Pakistan under the Tashkent Declaration, was required to vacate. All that has been vacated by the Pakistani forces

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि जिस प्रकार पाकिस्तान के इस दावे के आधार पर हमने सियालकोट में इस स्थान को खाली करने का निश्चय किया है, क्या इसी आधार पर राजस्थान से सम्बन्ध रखने वाले क्षेत्रों के बारे में भी पाकिस्तान की तरफ से कोई विवाद चल रहा है ? यह बात समझ में आ सकती है कि

पाकिस्तान न उस क्षेत्र को खाली कर दिया जो उसे करना चाहिये था लेकिन आज भी क्या राजस्थान के उस क्षेत्र में जिम पर आज हमारा अधिकार हो सकता है पाकिस्तान किसी क्षेत्र की माग कर रहा है और अगर कर रहा है तो इस सम्बन्ध में मागे विवरण प्रस्तुत किये जायें ।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह राजस्थान सेक्टर में कोई ऐसा इलाका हिन्दुस्तान का नहीं है जो पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में हो या जिममें पाकिस्तान का कोई फौजी या दूसरा 'पिकेट' हो । जब और अब वह क्या माग करना है, मेरी तो नोटिस में नहीं है । कोई ऐसी गलत माग हो तो उसे तुरन्त रद्द कर दिया जायेगा ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : जी हा, आप दे रहे हैं । रद्द क्या कर देंगे ।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी जैसलमेर के इलाके में इस प्रकार की माग की जा रही है ।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : जो नाजायज माग होगी उससे परेशानी नहीं होनी चाहिये, हम बिलकुल नहीं मान सकते, कभी नहीं मानेंगे ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सभापति जी, यह मामला बहुत गम्भीर है । मुझे अफसोस है कि विदेश मंत्री महोदय इसको जरूरत से ज्यादा सरग्न बनाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं । 5 अगस्त में पहले वहां भारत की एक सेना नहीं थी ऐसा मंत्री महोदय का कहना है । अगर यह बात सच है तो फिर फौजे वापस हटाने के बारे में तननी देर क्यों लगी । पष्ट है कि सरकार के दिमाग में भी यह बात थी कि यह क्षेत्र हमारा है और इसे पाकिस्तान को देने की जरूरत नहीं है । जब सिक्खूरिटी काउन्सिल में, जब यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में, पाकिस्तान गया तो सरकार की ओर से कहा गया कि पाकिस्तान का दावा गलत है, जब दोनों देशों के मंत्री पाकिस्तान में मिले तब भी जो वक्तव्य निकाला गया उसमें यह नहीं कहा गया कि कमान्डमें मीट कर रहे

है। अभी प्रेसीडेंट अयूब ने 2 अप्रैल को रेडियो पर जो भाषण दिया उसमें कहा कि यह जो चालीस एकड़ का इलाका है वह इलाका पाकिस्तान का है भारत इसको खाली नहीं करता। अगर दोनों देशों के मंत्रियों के बीच में यह समझौता हो गया होता कि कमान्डर्स इसके बारे में विचार करेंगे तो पाकिस्तान के प्रेसीडेंट को इस तरह का आरोप लगाने की जरूरत नहीं थी लेकिन जब से सरकार के ऊपर दबाव पड़ा है, सैनिक दबाव, कूटनीतिक दबाव, इस इलाके को खाली किया जा रहा है।

सभापति जी, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह इलाका 36 एकड़ है या 40 एकड़ है। मंत्री महोदय कह सकते हैं 36 एकड़ कोई बड़ा इलाका नहीं है। लेकिन इस सदन ने कसम खायी है कि एक-एक इंच भूमि की रक्षा की जायेगी। क्या 36 एकड़ एक इंच से कम होता है? मैं चाहूंगा, इस सवाल पर आप बहस का मौका दे, शाम को 4 बजे या साढ़े 4 बजे मंत्री महोदय को बुलाया जाये, हम इस सवाल पर बहस करना चाहते हैं। यह सवाल इतना सीधा नहीं है जितना मंत्री महोदय बना कर पेश कर रहे हैं।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : जी हां, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह सवाल उतना टेढ़ा भी नहीं है जिस कदर अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी टेढ़ा साबित कर रहे हैं। बहस तो उन्होंने कर ली, कोई सवाल तो पूछा नहीं। अब जो उन्होंने बात कही है उसके मुतालिक मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, एक तो उन्होंने अपने बयान में कहा कि हमने यह कदम किसी डिप्लोमेटिक प्रेशर या किसी फौजी दबाव की वजह से उठाया है। इस बात की मैं पुरजोर तरदीद करना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें न डिप्लोमेटिक प्रेशर, न मिलिटरी प्रेशर का कोई संबंध है। उन्होंने दो चीजों का अपने इस भाषण में जिक्र किया, उन्होंने अपने सवाल को भाषण में बदल दिया। तो दो चीजें उन्होंने कही कि सिक्कोरिटी काउन्सिल में और मिनिस्टीरियल मीटिंग में इसकी

चर्चा हुई, कानालाजिकल आर्डर में पहले मिनिस्टीरियल मीटिंग है जो कि मार्च के शुरू में हुई और मैंने अपने पहले बयान में साफ किया है कि जिम वक्त हम रावलपिंडी गये थे उस वक्त भी हमारी नोटिस में यह लाया गया कि हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ से कुछ इलाका, कुछ एकड़ ऐसा है जिसमें से ताशकंद समझौते के मुताबिक हिन्दुस्तानी फौजे वापस नहीं हुईं। तो मैंने बिल्कुल उसी वक्त कह दिया था कि ताशकंद समझौते के मुताबिक हम समझते हैं कि हम हर जगह से वापस हो गये हैं, अगर उसमें कोई ऐसी जगह है जहाँ कोई झगडा है या डिस्प्यूट है तो हम ताशकंद समझौते के मुताबिक पूरा अमलदरामद करेंगे। इसलिये यह कहना कि हम कोई गलत पोजीशन ले रहे हैं या जो पोजीशन पहले ली वह अब बदल रहे हैं यह सही नहीं है। फिर मिनिस्टीरियल मीटिंग हुई उसमें मिनिस्टीरियल लेवल पर नहीं आफिशियल लेवल पर चर्चा हुई। उस वक्त भी हमारी तरफ से कहा गया था कि आप यहां कुछ प्रोपेगेंडा इसका जो करते हैं, अगर वहां पर मौके पर ऐसा डिस्प्यूट होगा तो हम लोकल कमान्डर्स या दूसरे आफिसर्स जो हैं उनकी बात पर जाच करवा लेंगे। हमारी इस बात पर पोजीशन पहले से साफ रही है कि हम ताशकंद समझौते के मुतालिक पूरा अमल करेंगे।

अब सिक्कोरिटी काउन्सिल का अटल बिहारी जी ने जिक्र किया। सिक्कोरिटी काउन्सिल में तो यह अब की बात है, थोड़े असें की। उनको भी जो जवाब हमने दिया उसमें भी हमने इस पोजीशन को साफ किया। उसमें हमने यह कहा :

"Under the Tashkent Declaration the Armed Forces of India and Pakistan were required to withdraw to the positions they held prior to August 5, 1965. These withdrawals were carried out. According to the agreement between the Chief of Army Staff of India and the C.I.C. Pakistan Army, any doubts about the ground positions as they existed on August 5, 1965, were to be

settled by mutual discussion between the local commanders.

The area involved in the three pockets is only about 36 acres. Even so, the matter was taken up between the two local commanders and whatever adjustments in positions were necessary have already been carried out in the light of mutually agreed conclusions. I am surprised that for purposes of propaganda the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan has sought to exploit this relatively unimportant matter, contrary to the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration."

Now, Sir, one more thing is left in the speech of Mr. Vajpayee which requires a reply. He said that if we had not withdrawn from these areas to the positions which were occupied by the Indian Army on the 5th August then the Pakistan President would not have had the courage or the guts—or whatever is the Hindi word—to make the statement in his first-of-the-month broadcast. I think Mr. Vajpayee knows the Pakistani leaders perhaps even more than I do although I could claim to know them quite a bit and to expect that they will take up rational positions is absolutely groundless. They are bound to exploit the statements even of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and of his colleagues and they have done that in the past. Therefore let us not base our judgment merely because the Pakistani leaders act in a manner which we think is improper. We should not try to judge that we have been in the wrong merely because the Pakistani leaders make propaganda out of our position.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, जो मूल प्रश्न है, वह प्रश्न हमारे लिए 40 एकड़, 36 एकड़ या 30 एकड़ का नहीं है, हमारे लिए प्रश्न एक धूर जमीन का भी है। अगर वह जमीन हमारी है, हमारे भारतवर्ष की है चाहे एक धूर भी क्यों न हो क्योंकि हमने 14 नवम्बर 1962 को प्रतिज्ञा की है :

"This House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India

however long and hard the struggle may be."

तो मैं यह सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह भारतवर्ष की पवित्र भूमि है या नहीं। इस समय प्रश्न 30 एकड़, 36 एकड़ या 40 एकड़ का नहीं है। श्रीमन्, हमने सरकार को बहुत देखा है और आपकी इजाजत से मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि . . . (Interruption) आप बेचैन क्यों होते हैं जरा सुन लीजिये और अनावश्यक बेचैनी से कोई मसला हल नहीं होगा। इस सरकार को हमने देखा है और अगर ज्यादा बेचैनी होगी तो यह भी आपको आज जान लेना चाहिये कि इस मुल्क की आज़ादी हासिल करने के लिए हमने किसी से कम काम नहीं किया है।

श्री सभापति : आप सवाल कीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : सवाल यह है कि अब यह न कहा जाये कि हमारी क्या जमीन गई और क्या नहीं गई। हमने मैकमोहन रेखा के सम्बन्ध में सरकार को देखा है। हमने सरकार को यह देखा है कि जो हमारी जमीन थी उसे सरकार ने ऊसर, पथरीली और कंकर-वाली जमीन कह कर चीनियों को सड़क बनाने दी है वह उसने उसको दे दी। हमने अपने मन्सर गांव को देखा और सरकार ने वह भी दे दिया। हम यह जानना नहीं चाहते हैं कि सरकार श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी को क्या समझती है और श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी सरकार को क्या समझते हैं। यह तो देश की जनता का प्रश्न है और सरकार को इसका जवाब देना चाहिये। हमारी मातृ-भूमि क्या है, क्या इसका निर्णय फौजी कमान्डर करेंगे, उसका निर्णय क्या वहां का एक छोटा सा फौज का अफसर करेगा? हमारी जो मातृभूमि है उसका निर्णय हम करेंगे, देश की जनता करेगी, हमारे राष्ट्र की जनता करेगी जिसने कुर्बानी की है। इसलिए मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि 5 अगस्त के पहले वह जमीन हमारे कब्जे में थी या नहीं जहां से सरकार

[श्री राजनारायण]

अपनी सेना हटा रही है ? इस चीज का साफ साफ जवाब मंत्री जी से आना चाहिये ।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, he has put the question and I might answer it. Sir, I do not want to enter into polemics because I know that the hon Member has quite a bright record of polemics and he has come with a certain history. I think he will try to adjust himself by and by to the atmosphere of this august House. I wish him well and we will try to facilitate his transformation

Now the reply is simple. He has asked that I should clarify as to whether India has withdrawn its armed forces from any part which was in its possession on the 5th of August. My reply is that India has not withdrawn from an inch of territory from any point on which its armed forces or security forces were stationed on the 5th of August.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this question has two aspects. So far as I understood, the Foreign Minister's answer is that we have vacated these 36 acres in the Sialkot sector in terms of the Tashkent Agreement. Assuming that is the position may I know what he proposes to do about getting back these 36 acres of land which belongs to India? If he goes to the extent of saying that these 36 acres of land do not belong to India I have no question to put but if he accepts the position that these 36 acres of land belongs to India and that under the Tashkent Agreement we had to give it up, then my question is how he proposes to get back this territory.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I would like to say that we have not given up any area which was in our possession under the Tashkent Agreement. I want to make that position clear. The second thing is, the Tashkent Declaration itself provides the answer to his first query as to how we deal with matters between India and Pakistan about which there may be a dispute. We have agreed that we should try to resolve all our differences and disputes by peaceful means and will not have recourse to use of force.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I shall pass on; I have given ample time to this.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह जमीन भारतवर्ष की है या नहीं ?

श्री सभापति : अब मैं इस चीज को खत्म करता हूँ ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : एक सवाल जरूरी रह गया है । मैंने अभी सवाल पूछा था और माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि 36 एकड़ जमीन है जबकि पाकिस्तान यह दावा कर रहा है कि वह जमीन 40 एकड़ है जिसे भारत को खाली करना चाहिये । तो मंत्री जी को इस बारे में सोचकर जवाब देना चाहिये ।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : मैं सोचकर ही जवाब दूंगा और मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आपने भी सोचकर ही जवाब पूछा होगा । इस एरिया के मुताल्लिक पाकिस्तान की तरफ से सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल को जो चिट्ठी लिखी गई है उसमें कुछ एरियाज का जिक्र किया गया है और उसके मुताल्लिक उन्होंने 25 एकड़ एक जगह बतलाई है । 4 कनाल एक जगह बतलाई है ।

It is 25 acres and 4 kanals. Four kanals, I hope, everybody knows come to less than half an acre and then 100 kanals; that means a little over 9 acres. So 25 plus 9 plus $\frac{1}{2}$ comes to about 36 and not 40. This is what Pakistan said in their letter to the Security Council.

(Several hon Members stood up)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry; I cannot allow this to go on indefinitely. I pass on to the next item.

श्री राजनारायण : एक अर्ज सुन लीजिये ।

श्री सभापति : बिल्कुल नहीं सुनूंगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आपके सामने अपनी मुसीबत अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ ।

श्री सभापति : मैं इसके लिए बाद में मौका दूंगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप नहीं सुनेंगे तो मैं बैठ जाऊंगा ।

श्री सभापति: आप जो कुछ कहना चाहते हैं कहिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं निहायत अदब के साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जी इस बात का साफ जवाब दें कि वह जमीन हमारी है या नहीं अगर वे साफ जवाब नहीं देते हैं तो उन्हें दूसरे दिन इसका जवाब देना होगा ।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : क्या सवाल पूछा है ?

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सवाल यह है कि 15 अगस्त 1947 को यह भूमि भारत भूमि का अंग थी ? अगर थी तो फिर आज सरकार आकर कहती है कि 5 अगस्त को हमारी फौजें वहां पर नहीं थीं । तो यह सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है कि क्यों नहीं थीं ? यहां पर यह कहना कि वह भूमि 30 एकड़ है, 36 एकड़ है या 40 एकड़ है, इससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता है । सवाल तो यह है कि तुमने अपनी भूमि की रक्षा नहीं की तो क्यों नहीं की ?

श्री सभापति : गोडे मुराहरि साहब, अब आप मुझे आगे जाने दीजिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : इसका जवाब नहीं है ?

II. REPORTED SMUGGLING OF CHINESE ARMS INTO WEST BENGAL

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the reported recent smuggling of Chinese arms into West Bengal.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. S. NASKAR): Sir, the Government have no information confirming reports of foreign arms being smuggled into West Bengal.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : May I know whether the question was referred to the Government of West Bengal and their reaction got about this question?

SHRI P. S. NASKAR: Yes, Sir. We collected information from the West

Bengal Government and my answer is based on the report from West Bengal Government.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : May I know whether the report in "The Times of India" was brought to the notice of the Government of West Bengal and if that report was incorrect may I know whether any contradiction was issued because such items of news are apt to cause a lot of harm in the country if not contradicted.

SHRI P. S. NASKAR: I have seen the report in a newspaper in Delhi but I do not think any contradiction has been issued so far but I think the question that has been put by the hon. Member today might get full publicity.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): The matter is a little more serious than what is made out to be. Just on the eve of the general strike and hartal which passed off very peacefully and magnificently yesterday a canard was put across that the West Bengal people were getting arms from Pakistan and China and many things were said in this connection. In a number of papers this dirty lie appeared in order to malign our people and the movement. Now I should like to know why when this report appeared the Central Government did not hold investigations to find out how this report came to be published. Sir, I tell you even yesterday, as the strike was progressing peacefully and we were getting reports, some people were spreading it in the Central Hall and elsewhere that peace will not be maintained because some people had prepared them for violence, left Parties and so on . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): The Congress itself prepared them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Naturally. I am not saying it. I want an investigation because I can even name the person. For the last several days we have been subjected to the limit of our endurance to such canards and lies to defame our movement and our people. How is it that the West Bengal Government and the Central Government did not institute immediate enquiries? It is very serious.

SHRI SYED AHMAD (Madhya Pradesh): What is the question?