

[Shri Anand Chand.] Forces will be withdrawn from their positions occupied by them on the 5th August, 1965 but so far as the crucial question of Kashmir is concerned, it is very much in the body of the agreement itself. It was discussed and both sides put forward their respective points of view and so far as I have been, able to read the comments of the leaders and people of Pakistan, President Ayub Khan and others, I have no doubt in my mind that the Kashmir issue is one which would require settlement subsequent to the disengagement of the forces. I welcome this proposition that it should be settled and settled once and for all. Our position that Kashmir is an integral part of India is not in doubt, our position, that the whole State acceded to India in a manner which leaves no doubt juridically is there but the question of the dispute also exists, a dispute which Pakistan has now sought to put as the first item on the agenda of the ministerial conference that is envisaged between the two countries. In the circumstances, I feel that it would be in the fitness of things that after this disengagement of troops takes place and the troops of both the countries withdraw to the lines as they were on the 5th August, 1965, we come to a permanent settlement of the question of the State of Jammu and Kashmir thereby settling once and for all the apple of discord and re-establish greater amity and good relationship between India and Pakistan of which the Tashkent Agreement is a very nice beginning. I would not say more on this issue because the House has already debated it and I will pass on to China's continuing threat to India as well as the war in Vietnam.

Now, Sir, here again. I am one who has been greatly heartened by the pronouncement made in the Press Conference by our Prime Minister on the very day she was elected Leader

of the Party. There has been some criticism, I am sorry to say, about that statement from the Opposition Benches but I think basically it is a very sound statement and if I may be allowed to quote from it this is what she said about China. It is in "the Hindustan Times" of 19th January. She said;

"The Chinese threat on our frontiers still remains. If conditions are created in which we can talk of peace certainly we will do so but certain things will have to happen before that."

Now, Sir, I am glad that the Prime Minister designate has not harped on the Colombo proposals. The Colombo proposals were good as they were but they were made at a particular time in a particular context on a particular date, nearly three years ago and I for one have felt subsequently in the years that have elapsed since then that by going on harping on the Colombo proposals we are trying to rake up something which is unworkable. They are unworkable for the simple reason that China is a country which has said 'no' to them. She has not agreed to them though we accepted them. And now to go on saying that we shall have talks only on the basis of Colombo proposals and nothing else is like the ostrich which buries its head into the sand. We say here is something with which we agree and we do not care whether others agree with it or not. Sir, I personally feel that it was very nice on the part of the Prime Minister designate to have made this observation that if certain conditions are created we will talk with China. I do not see anything wrong in having talks with China.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE
(Uttar Pradesh): What condition?

SHRI ANAND CHAND: My friend asks, what condition? "Well, one of the conditions may be the withdrawal