

Sayed Muzafar Ali Shah.

**PRESIDENT BHUTTO'S
ADDRESS TO
SIND & BALUCHISTAN
HIGH COURT
BAR ASSOCIATION**

Syed Muzafar Ali Shah

1/0 Rashid Wagon

Dist: Larkana.

Karachi, August 31, 1972

Syed Muzafar Ali Shah
P.O. Rashid Wagan
Distt Larkana.

سید مظفر علی شاہ
پست رشید وگن ضلع لارکانہ

Samekonomiye = Gov
Hobbies

Syed Muzafar Ali Shah. L
and
Ahmed Hussain Abbasi.

Following is the transcribed version of President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's extempore speech at the annual dinner of the Sind and Baluchistan High Court Bar Association on August 31, 1972.

Mr. President, my lord Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pakistan, my lord Chief Justice of the High Court of Sind and Baluchistan, my lawyer brother advocates, friends, ladies and gentlemen:

I am delighted to be with you tonight. I have come especially to meet you and take the advantage of your kind hospitality. I am returning day after tomorrow to Islamabad. I have put aside all other work and come here especially to be with you as I think it extremely important that we establish regular contacts with one another. Unless we have these contacts, unless we meet one another often, unless we understand each other's problems, I am afraid, differences will arise. It is never a good thing for differences to grow between the people and the Government, especially between the Government and those individuals who influence public thought. Therefore, we attach the highest importance to the judiciary and the institution, to the judges who man this institution and to the advocates, the barristers, the lawyers who assist the judiciary in the dispensation of justice. We intend to maintain these links even if some differences arise. We will always seek to remove them. I do not see why there should be differences between the judiciary and the executive or between the executive and the people.

Inherent in the concept of good Government and inherent in the concept of a popular Government is the desire, nay the urge, to do right. I feel sanguine and confident about the future. The past has been a chequered one and a dislocated one. I dare say that when things settle down, and I believe to some extent things are settling down, we will be moving forward and setting new initiatives into motion. We seek a better understanding of each other's problem in this larger interest.

More careful
displaced

We want normal conditions. The Government wants normal conditions more than anyone else would like to have normal conditions. We want normal conditions for a variety of self-evident reasons. Unfortunately, we inherited a state of affairs which was, to use an understatement, simply extraordinary. As I said in my speech in the National

Dearful
dreams in which
one is unable to
speak or speak
at thousand
years

Assembly, when I look back on those dark December days I truly believe that we have gone through a nightmare, literally a nightmare. We have seen how harmful and painful, how unsettling, abnormal conditions can be for the State and for those charged with the responsibility of running it.

My friends, I am not ignorant of history. We all know that nobody can run a Government or rule for a millennium. Nobody has come to rule for a millennium. We are convinced more than our predecessor, that all we see or hold is a passing phase and that a time will come when others will replace the present Government. We would, therefore, like to do whatever we can for the people so that those who come after us do not have the same kind of legacy, same kind of problems, same nightmares we have faced. We would like to create or try to create normal conditions as soon as possible. These normal conditions cannot be created in a vacuum. We know that Government by itself and on its own, without the support of the overwhelming majority of the people, cannot muster and mobilise the necessary strength to overcome fundamental problems. We know too well that these normal conditions cannot be restored without your cooperation, without the cooperation of thinking people, without the cooperation of people everywhere in Pakistan.

I have immediately gone into serious matters. I did not intend to start on such a solemn note. I have so many friends here. I have so many well-wishers amongst you and I am happy to see them here. They have grown a little older. But it is nice to be with them again. When you say that I am one of you, and I feel I am one of you, it is difficult to be very formal. You cannot but be natural among friends and I do not think even the Judges of the Supreme Court and High Court suffer from the disability of a Head of State in this respect. I feel that it is a great burden to be formal all the time and not to be able to shout across the table to a friend and remind him of some moments we had together.

I returned from England in October 1953. In 1954 we had a great *tamasha* over the One Unit and we all got very worked up. I sought an interview with Mr. Abdus Sattar Pirzada. He was the Chief Minister of Sind. Musa, an East Pakistani, was his Private Secretary who later became the Chairman of the PIDC. Musa asked me to come rightaway. So I went to the Chief Minister's office. Mr. Pirzada must have been very busy. I sat there for 15 minutes, half an hour, and after forty-five minutes I told Mr. Musa that I had been given an appointment and that I would not wait any longer. Having recently come back from a silly place called Oxford I took punctuality and all such things rather seriously. Musa pacified me and I agreed to wait a little longer. An hour passed, one and half hour passed, and then I just stormed out. The office of the Chief Minister was in the Napier Barracks. I came back to my chambers. My good friend Abbasi, I do not know whether he is here tonight, well, my good friend Abbasi was in the chambers when I came back furious, and in a rage. We had a typist called Ali and I dictated a letter to Mr. Pirzada in which I wrote that when I will take charge of the destiny of this country I will not behave with you (Mr. Pirzada) like you have behaved with me. This letter must still be with Mr. Pirzada. I have a copy of it.

This was in 1954 and many things have happened since. Actually, if you are unhappy with this Government; if you do not like the way this Government is working, the real villain is Mr. Dingomal, because when I came back I was his junior. Mr. Abbasi and I used to sit in adjoining rooms. I was supposed to learn the Civil Procedure Code, the Criminal Procedure Code, the Law of Evidence as adapted to our conditions. Mr. Dingomal was a very busy lawyer. He had a great deal of practice both on the civil side and the criminal side. He had no time for me and whenever I went to his room he appeared so busy that I did not have the heart to burden him further. I would be back to my room and do precious little sitting and chatting with Mr. Abbasi and Mr. Tikam Das. After some months, I hit upon a case in the Small Causes Court. I was very excited. My case was in the Small Causes Court but by the time I crossed the Bank of India building and reached the Small Causes Court, I felt a large cause never to go again to Small Causes Court. But, nevertheless, I won that case. People came and went to Dingomal's room. Nobody came to Abbasi's room or to my room. Then, as luck would have it, I got another case. I think it was from Sukkur. It was an encumbered estate matter. It was a second appeal, and Abbasi got the case but we shared it. It was a very difficult case. However, we took it and we went to the Court and that was my first appearance in the High Court. It was then the Chief Court and Justice Constantine was the Chief Judge. Being a very difficult case I thought the appeal would not be allowed. I felt a little disappointed that my first case in the Chief Court might be rejected. I thought the best thing to do would be to quote all the laws and I went on quoting one legal authority after another. I went on and on and I discovered that it worked. Justice Constantine allowed the appeal on the ground of equity.

To
Amberal,
to
embassies

Then there was another case, of a young friend who had written a pamphlet on the Hurs. A full bench was constituted and we won that case also. And then there was another succession case from Larkana of a big jagirdar and we won that case as well. But then I was taken away from you. Legal problems were there but the political problems became more challenging. Many things began to happen and somehow or the other I could not keep away from them. I got involved, more involved. Mr. Hafeez Lakho is sitting here. I remember the time when he and I went to get some donations from prosperous lawyers for our Sind Youth Front. We went to a Minister. He gave us a cheque. Of course, the words he used I have not forgotten, and I think Mr. Lakho remembers them also. After signing the cheque he said 'darling' here it is, take it. That celebrated lawyer is so fond of using the word 'darling', 'dear', and he kisses you on both cheeks whenever he meets you. I do not think he is here tonight.

However, I am among you and I am talking as a friend, not as President, as a brother lawyer, not like the occasion when General Yahya came here as President of Pakistan. When General Yahya Khan came here as President of Pakistan, he had an altercation with Mr. Pirzada, something about who was sober and who was not sober. The next day Mr. Pirzada was summoned by General Riaz.

There were many functions of the Bar attended by me when the Presidents or Prime Ministers were the chief guests. There was a time when Mr. Mohammad Ali Bogra, as Prime Minister, attended a function of the Bar. Mr. Nasiruddin was

active in those days. He introduced all of us to Mr. Bogra. After him we heard Mr. Suhrawardy making an eloquent speech in the Metropole Hotel on the right of self-determination of Jammu and Kashmir. And later we heard Iskander Mirza in the Beach Luxury Hotel. Justice Farooqi was then the President of the High Court Bar Association. Justice Farooqi gave a very learned speech on land reforms. In reply, Iskander Mirza talked of Pak-Afghan relations. I think the best speech we heard when I was a lawyer was the one delivered by Mr. Ghulam Mohammad. He spoke on solemn occasion and none of us could follow him!

Times have changed. I am not being nostalgic. I remember those days and I remember them well. I remember all my friends. I shall always have time for them. They know that. I want not only to maintain those relations but strengthen them.

Now I come to some of the points you have raised, Mr. President. They are important points and I can assure you that we will give our consideration to each of them. But let me touch upon some of the ones I can readily deal with.

There is one question which has been engaging your attention for a long time. I had heard it when I was with you. It relates to new chamber buildings for lawyers at close proximity to the High Court. This is a reasonable demand. I do not see why it has not been met. There is plenty of land available quite close to the High Court. The Central Government is now in Islamabad. If there are Central Government offices here, there might be need for them. But certainly we can find other places for the remaining Central Government departments functioning in Karachi. The Provincial Government has in any case to build a great deal for its own requirements. I do not see why we cannot meet your demand. As a matter of fact, if it cannot be done, I will do it by invoking Article 216. Please send me a representation. I will remove the bottlenecks as quickly as possible. This is a matter we can easily dispense with.

Then there is the question of the Headquarters of the Supreme Court of Pakistan. This is another old demand. It has long story. I remember when Justice Munir was the Chief Justice, determined efforts were made to bring the Supreme Court to Karachi as in those days Karachi was the capital. One reason or another was given for not shifting to the capital. It was partly, if not mainly, due to the reluctance of the Chief Justice to shift from Lahore. He liked Gulberg and the greenery of the Ravi so much that he felt reluctant to shift to Karachi. Now that is not the problem. The Supreme Court should be in Islamabad. The climate of Islamabad is good and if the Chief Justice is not averse to Islamabad or Rawalpindi, we will do everything within our power to accommodate him. I must, however, warn him that in the beginning it will not be very comfortable. We have to build a new place. I have already given instructions to the Capital Development Authority that the most imposing buildings for the Government of Pakistan, for the State of Pakistan, should be the Legislative Assembly and the Supreme Court. We intend to build the Supreme Court commensurate with our status and our standards. At this stage, however, it cannot be done. It will take time. We will try and find a temporary place. Even now the Chief Justice and his learned brothers are not very comfortable at Lahore. I believe that the library is not properly housed. Books are

not kept in a permanent place. We will welcome the Supreme Court to Islamabad. Let them be closer to us. The Supreme Court must be in a separate building of its own. We will attend to it.

Salary fees, advantages

Regarding the emoluments or the salaries, or whatever you like to call them, for the Judges, we accept the principle that you have enunciated. As a matter of fact, soon after I took over the responsibility of the country, I gave certain directives in this connection. It is but natural and normal to improve the conditions of the judiciary. I am also looking to the future—to the role the judiciary has to play in the consolidation of institutions. I can assure you that this is another logical and reasonable demand. It embarrasses me to find that such reasonable demands should not have been met. These demands should have been settled many years ago. I really feel embarrassed when you put forward such demands as proper emoluments, adequate standards for the judiciary, a permanent place for the Supreme Court and chambers for lawyers. We should have attended to these elementary matters many years ago.

I am glad you have set up a benevolent fund. I cannot speak on behalf of the Finance Ministry. I have to consult the Ministry of Finance on why the Ministry has not agreed to grant tax exemptions to your benevolent fund. At the moment you have spoken both about the benevolent fund and the free legal aid and the research work. I was able to squeeze fifty thousand rupees out of the Finance Ministry before I came here. I have placed it at your disposal. You can use the whole of it for the benevolent fund or you can use it for the research work or the legal work. I leave it to you. But do not quarrel over it. I leave it to you as you deem fit depending on your priorities. The other question pertaining to tax exemption cannot be answered now. I will find out whether you can be put at par with the salaried persons. I am afraid, at the moment I am not prepared sufficiently to give an answer. Financial questions are such that I cannot straightaway state whether I can agree or not. I will take up your question with the Ministry of Finance and will let you know whether we can agree.

Now, Sir, you have referred to the role we played in the restoration of democracy. The struggle against dictatorship of the former military Presidents was not an easy struggle. It was a difficult struggle. Nevertheless, for a variety of patriotic reasons we launched that struggle and of course one of the primary considerations was to restore democracy. When you say we feel stifled, we feel a sense of suffocation, I know what you exactly mean. I have gone through a terrible suffocation. I have gone through a black period of privation and despair. It is not just words which are being uttered. A person who has not gone through similar experience will never be able to understand precisely the meaning of these words. Individuals suddenly thrust into a position of the highest responsibility but coming from an entirely different background or profession and unaware of the conditions in the general run of things, will not be able to comprehend your words. I say this with the full knowledge of my long experience in Government. A Government which is not political cannot be sensitive to political factors. And yet, basically, life is political. It is a question of relationship; a question of equation with individuals; how you get on with the person next door and how you get on with your other neighbours and citizens. This relationship goes on expanding

*to feel
suffocation*

to the State. Unless you have that experience, unless you have gone through the sufferings of people in common with them, you cannot understand the full implications and meaning of such matters. For instance, take the legal profession. You have much more experience in the legal profession. I have much less than you. Nevertheless, I have a legal background and legal training. Many individuals talk about the rule of law; but when you talk about the institution of the judiciary, when you talk about the separation of the judiciary from the executive, these are not abstract words for you. They have a clear meaning. They have a content. I know exactly what you mean and I know the message you are trying to convey. This is a message we feel in common and it is our effort to spread it as Pakistan marches forward in its endeavours to stabilise and rebuild herself. I understand you perfectly well in these matters. Let me, therefore, be frank with you.

There is also a concept to better the lot of the people. This idea goes hand in hand with the concept of restoration of democracy; conditions must change radically for the better. There must be a fundamental change in the economic and social structure. This is where we have to harmonise the requirements of freedom with the requirements of improving the lot of the people. In this quest we have to find a new equation. Freedom by itself, unlicensed and unrestricted freedom does not exist anywhere. It is a myth. That kind of freedom does not exist in any part of the world, neither in Britain nor in the democracies of Western Europe. We know Parliamentary democracies of the Western Europe. In making comparisons we must take into account the social conditions of those countries in a given moment of time and also the different phases which those countries have passed through. In order to reach the pristine heights of democratic development all those nations have had to wage many struggles. But the point to determine is whether their struggle was similar to ours. I have great respect for Lord Acton and I agree in moral terms to the words of Lord Acton. No civilised person can disagree with what Lord Acton had to say. But when Acton uttered those words his nation was sucking the blood of two-thirds of mankind. They could say that they preferred to be poor in order to be free because Englishmen were not poor. The British had to have an Imperialist Empire including Ireland not for the love of freedom but for the need to keep their people prosperous by exploiting the resources of Africa, of Asia and even of America at one stage. With their wealth and our resources they could afford to talk in those words. They built themselves, they looted the resources of Europe, of Asia and of Africa and had the largest empire in the world to benefit economically and not to develop freedom. And there were relatively normal conditions, comparatively stable conditions in Britain. Whilst exploiting the empire the British manipulated the countries of Europe to remain involved in the internal conflicts of Europe. Britain was, therefore, in a position to enunciate the philosophy of Acton for those within the shores of England, inside the White Cliffs of Dover. If such were the standards of Britain within the White Cliffs of Dover, may I ask what were the standards of Britain for countries across the White Cliffs of Dover? Why did Britain indulge in double standards; one for the English and the other for those whom they ruled? Was freedom a commodity that could be divided between the English and the non-English? Was it an absolute principle only for Britain and the British or was it a universal principle? If it was a universal principle then why did Britain deny freedom to her empire? We must understand not only the words we use but also the context in which they are used. We are trying to struggle here to establish

democracy and I can assure you that there are no two questions and no misgivings on this objective. Now the point is that we must get together and work out how we can establish democracy, we must reach agreement on the given principles, taking into account the conditions of the country, the way it has been lacerated, the way it has been given such a mighty jolt. These are the factors which we cannot ignore in the best of circumstances. We cannot overlook the various forces that are at play in Pakistan and our past experience. You must see the other side of the coin because there is other side of the coin. As I said to you earlier, this Government has come into power with the strength of the people and naturally it would not like to become unpopular or get alienated from the people. It does not make sense that we should enjoy putting people into jail; some of them might have voted for us and some of them might have been arrested in the past for us. But here we come face to face with conflicting equities, to use a legal expression. There are conflicting equities in the situation and these conflicting equities have to be balanced, if the paramount considerations of the State have to be protected. Why should we not feel happy when people are free? What grievances or vendetta do we have against the people? None whatsoever. We proceed strictly on the basis of certain actions of individuals. When we are convinced that some people are deliberately doing harm to the State we are duty-bound to act. I give you the case of a young man who was given a bail and is now sitting in Rajasthan. We had a similar case of a young man who crossed the border during the war and made speeches and wrote a pamphlet in India. When we arrested him we were told that freedom of expression was being put in danger. The point is that you cannot go across the border and join your enemy and yet expect to remain free. Another young lad recently released on bail is sitting on the other side of the border. These things are happening. You cannot take a light view of them. These are the factors at work and I beg you to understand because we are not confronting each other. There is no confrontation between us and there is no need for a confrontation between us. I do not want to plead for emergency. India won the war. India was victorious. India has had stable institutions for 25 years. India has built her institutions. Yet the Prime Minister of India has declared that she cannot contemplate withdrawing the emergency in India. And we are a smaller country, much smaller than India. We have 5000 sq. miles of our territory in the hands of India and over 90,000 of our citizens as her prisoners. Yet, there is demand here to withdraw the emergency and not in India. Is this not very strange? Even if we want to send spies to India or spend millions of rupees on espionage it would not be a material factor. India is a very big country. It will be a drop in the ocean, but not so for a smaller country. See how free the diplomats move about in Pakistan, visiting universities and hostels and meeting all manner of people. This kind of activity does not take place in other countries. We are imposing international conditions on their movements very soon. We should have done it on the 20th of December when we assumed charge, but we did not do it then. At that time we were not in a position to enforce them. Now we are in a position to do it.

In the application of wrong processes we have lost half the country. It is not that East Pakistan alone was the apple of our opponent's eye and that only East Pakistan was sought. Those who did not believe in Pakistan, those who believed Pakistan to be a vivisection of Bharat, they had evil designs not only on East Pakistan but also on West Pakistan. If you look at the conditions dispassionately, you will agree that things are in

To East into
irregular segments

To Transfer

blood feud

the melting pot. Therefore, as I said on the first day I came into office, one man can destroy the country but one man cannot build it. Unless there is understanding, unless there is appreciation and unless there is modicum of trust we will not overcome our difficulties. If we cannot move forward collectively it will not be possible to move. I am fully confident that the people will appreciate these difficulties. I have spoken frankly. There is a multitude of harrowing problems that we have to face from morning to night. Sometimes there are problems for the sake of problems. Sometimes attitudes are completely negative. This uncertainty will go as time passes. After all, we do not speak like dictators, because we are not dictators. We have a constitution, an interim constitution. You may not like some of its features but we can always amend it. We are framing a new constitution. We stand at the cross-roads. I tell you solemnly and sincerely that the times are so difficult that if I were in the Opposition, I would have told my party that there comes a time to hit below the belt and there comes a time not to hit below the belt. This is not the time to hit below the belt. Eight months have passed. They have just gone. As you have said, man goes and institutions remain. Man must go. How can man remain? Man goes, ages move on. Man decays. Thus, governments have to go. How many governments we have had in 25 years of Pakistan? Governments are transitory. But then there is a state. There are certain state responsibilities. There are certain state duties. These are of a permanent nature.

We talk about rights. I believe in rights; I believe in fighting for people's right. But, also, when you quote Islam, Islam enjoins duties; gives primary importance to duties. Islam attaches primary importance to duties and says that along with rights there are duties. You want fundamental rights. Who does not want fundamental rights? As a matter of fact, you want divine rights. I do not know how you got this concept. How can there be divine rights? I have not heard of a preamble becoming justiciable. Of course, there will be fundamental rights. Of course, the emergency will be lifted. Of course, the constitution must come into being along with the fulfilment of social justice and economic justice. Essentially, there should be a parliamentary form of Government. There should be a democratic form of Government. There should be autonomy. You have said that we should negotiate a constitution. Of course, we believe in a negotiated settlement and that is why we have a Committee of the House on the Constitution. We have a Committee of the House on the Constitution comprising of other parties. For the first time in the history of Pakistan we have given to the provinces governments with not only their Chief Ministers in coalition with others but also with their own Governors, a matter which was subjected to a great deal of criticism. We, nevertheless, decided to trust them. Those individuals who were perpetually in jail in Pakistan one day suddenly found the ban on their party lifted. Their governments constitute a fragile, tenuous coalition majority but they are running it in two provinces. Was this done only to dissipate our energies? Was it done for the sake of an adventurous experiment? It was done for a purpose. The purpose was to trust, to assume that with responsibility of office a national outlook will emerge. We naturally want to maintain this same spirit of accommodation for the constitutions.

This was my point of view after the 1970 elections. There were five federating provinces. But more than the five provinces there were two wings of the country. Six Points

was a confederal scheme. In a confederal arrangement it is not only the existence of provinces which is at stake but of two distinct entities separated by a thousand miles of territory. In such a situation the majority of both entities must have a say and not a majority of one entity along with a minority of the other entity. The point is not only of provinces but of two entities separated from one another with different economic objectives and with different economic levels of development. At that time, when we said the question relates not only to provincial autonomy of the five provinces but also the interests of the two separate entities, in a confederal arrangement, we were deliberately attacked by vested interests and anti-people forces. It is a fundamental requirement of a confederation to give equal recognition to the confederating units. On the other hand, we also made it clear that if Six Points were modified then we would gladly sit in the Opposition in a true federation. We are prepared for this even now. When I insist that we should meet the leader of East Pakistan to have final negotiations, the object is to once again re-stress these relevant considerations in the light of our experiences, in the light of new factors. This is our just position. We are prepared to say again that we are ready to accept any basis of contact and association, from one end to the other, from one point to the other. If they say the point of contact should be up to certain degree, we will accept that quantum, any quantum, whatever the degree of that contact. Finally, if they say "No, we want no association", then we will report to our people faithfully their outlook towards us. We have made the final effort to come to a negotiated settlement. We have not taken an unreasonable stand in this matter. We believe it is necessary to be flexible. The question of false pride does not come in the way of national destiny, or national purpose. The problem is that we are prepared to take flexible position within accepted principles. We cannot jump out of principles. Once we meet we can have a logical, meaningful dialogue to determine our future state of relations. Now on this, unfortunately and regrettably, the authorities in Dacca say that recognition must come first, recognition must precede any discussions. We want discussions to discuss our past relations, our present relations, our future relationship and come to a settlement determined by their wishes. We cannot go beyond that; we are prepared to respect their wishes in a face-to-face talk, across the table, in a civilised method. This is the only method for the determination of such complex issues. They say we must meet on the basis of equality. Who says equality does not exist? The People's Republic of China has been holding negotiations with the United States. They are two separate countries. Did China contend that equality was not met? The President of the United States went to China recently. Did the Chinese Government invoke the conditions of recognition? This is not the basis of equality. China and America were not one country separated by an international intrigue and aggression. Nevertheless, that position was not taken. Equality is in the mind of the beholder.

One of their leaders is in Cairo. Has Cairo recognised East Pakistan? Cairo has not recognised East Pakistan. I could understand his going to Indonesia because Indonesia has recognised East Pakistan. I could understand his going to Malaysia for the same reason. If he can visit Cairo without the condition of recognition having been met, he can easily meet us. We cannot allow these things to linger on. The cancer will spread further and further. Let us begin a new page. Both looking to the future let us start again and write a new page. We have to live in the same subcontinent. Who knows

wiser counsel might prevail in the years to come and there might again be closer understanding.

We have had the Simla Agreement with India. When we signed the Simla Agreement we signed it to honour it. We believe that Simla Agreement is in the higher interests of the people of Pakistan. Our conscience is clear and we believe that nothing has been done in this Agreement which is harmful or detrimental to the interests of Pakistan. We believe that 5000 square miles of territory which belongs to us, if returned to us, is not a deleterious development. And in this fashion, step by step, we can move forward to utter the words of Lord Acton within the context of Asian conditions. That can only come when a *modus vivendi* is established. It is a happy augury for me to see that your Government has, in this short period, moved with convictions and with principles in such a way that we could have a delegation, strong and important delegation from the People's Republic of China visiting Pakistan and at the same time our representatives could be in Delhi discussing our future relationship. This has been possible because we have based our foreign policy on principles. This is so because our foreign policy is not subject to expediency and on this basis, we believe that we can move forward, move ahead with a firm resolution to solve our problems.

I can assure you, Mr. President, that we shall consult all our friends in the National Assembly to arrive at a consensus. This is inherent in the concept of federalism but at the same time we have again to decide that ultimately if there is no agreement, then what should we do? Have no constitution? Compromise means adjustments from both sides. We are prepared to make our fullest measure of adjustment within a genuine concept of a national framework; within the context of national requirements in this period of stress and strain, upheaval and dislocation; within the concept of autonomy to the maximum extent possible but inside a national framework. On this question of the constitution a moral issue is involved; not merely political or constitutional. A moral issue is involved because people are saying that my predecessor should have invoked his Legal Framework Order much earlier to save Pakistan. The main point relates to maximum provincial autonomy. This has been the bane of the problem since elections and before the elections. If we had framed a constitution in 1954 we would have had less problems. There was a constitution in 1956. Well, that was also a constitution. But then it was punctured and thrown out. Since that day we have been going from day-to-day, from minute-to-minute. This minute-to-minute existence will not do. It is most harmful to the people of Pakistan and to their future. It would not be fair to live without the umbrella of decency, that is without a constitution. Therefore, the country must have a constitution on the basis of maximum autonomy. If we call for maximum autonomy and in fact have a unitary constitution then you can protest because the conditions of the country are federal. The country's conditions are federal and a non-federal arrangement would amount to the imposition of dictatorship. There is no subjective criterion. The criterion is objective. The objective criterion is that we believe in maximum autonomy. Once you have accepted the objective criteria then comes the question of degree and quantum of that autonomy and that quantum can always be modified in the future with stabilization and progress. Those people who want more autonomy today might a few years later ask for less autonomy and those who today ask for less autonomy might

want more autonomy in the future. Once the basic principle of the autonomy is conceded to, then the matter boils down to finding nuances. I believe nuances can be found. We are going with an open mind to find the nuances. If we do not have a prejudiced outlook, if we are not suspicious, and to allay suspicion we have given governments in the provinces to other parties, we will *Insha Allah* succeed. Let us proceed on that basis in the National Assembly and frame a constitution. I would like to see it framed by the 23rd of March. If it is not framed by the 23rd of March, let it finally come into being on the 21st of April. But I genuinely believe that if we dilly-dally and continue to harp on the old theme and go on from one crisis to another then we would have lost our last opportunity for Pakistan. I would not like to consciously contribute to that fatality.

Mr. President, I have tried to cover all your points. I think I have not left over any. If I have left out any of them, we will meet again to cover them. Thank you.

Sayeed Muzaffar Ali
Bukhari.

...the basic principle of the autonomy is conceded
...to them the matter goes down to finding names. I believe names can be found. We
...are going with an open mind to find the names. If we do not have a particular
...book, I will not be surprised, and to ally suspicion we have given governments
...to other parties, we will have them succeed. Let us proceed on that
...and frame a constitution. I would like to see it framed
...by the 13th of March for a final decision.
...we believe that it will be daily and coming to
...to rather than we would have had
...to consistently contribute to that

...I have not left over
...Thank you

Syed Muzafar Ali Shah

11 O Kashiq Wagan

Distt Larkana.

Combr

90 hoo

Produced by
The Department of Films and Publications,
Government of Pakistan,
Karachi.

Syed Muzofar Ali Shah

(U) Rashid Wagan
Distt Larkana.

SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON CURRENT EVENTS IN PAKISTAN

Flowering of a New Society

President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's first address to the Nation on December 20, 1971.

New Deal of Labour

President Bhutto's speech on Labour Policy; also the text of the Labour Minister's press conference.

Land for the Landless

President Bhutto's address to the Nation on the sweeping Land Reforms introduced by the Government.

Education for the Masses

President Bhutto's speech on Education Reforms, with the Education Minister's press conference.

President to People

President Bhutto's address at a public meeting at Lahore on March 19, 1972.

Unite to Rebuild Pakistan

Text of President Bhutto's speech at Sanghar on March 31, 1972.

Police Reforms

President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's address to the Nation on Police Reforms on April 12, 1972.

Law Reforms

President Bhutto's speech on Law Reforms on April 13, 1972.

President Bhutto's Address to National Assembly

Text of speech by Mr. Bhutto as President of the National Assembly on April 14, 1972.

A New Beginning

An account of the Reforms introduced by President Bhutto till April 20, 1972.

President Ushers in People's Rule

President Bhutto's speech at the oath-taking ceremony in Rawalpindi on April 21, 1972.

New Charter of Rights for Workers

An interpretative analysis of the new Labour Policy by the Minister for Labour, Mr. Mohammad Hanif.

People's Works Programme

Details about the People's Works Programme which will ensure development on a vast scale in the country.

The Language Accord

Texts of President Bhutto's speeches on July 8 and 15 regarding the language controversy in Sind; also the texts of Language Bill and the Language Ordinance.

President Bhutto on Simla Agreement

Text of the President's speech at PIIA, Karachi, on July 31, 1972.

Meaning of Press Freedom

Text of speech by Maulana Kauser Niazi, Minister for Information and Broadcasting, on August 11, 1972.

President Bhutto on National Issues

The President's address to the National Assembly on August 14, 1972.

More Benefits to Workers

Text of speech by Mr. Mohammad Hanif, Minister for Labour, broadcast on August 23, 1972.

Department of Films & Publications
Block No. 3-B, Pak. Secretariat
Karachi.

Handwritten signatures and stamps at the bottom of the page.