

LOK SABHA DEBATES

6117

6118

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, March 16, 1960/Phalgun
26, 1881 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Violation of Air Space in NEFA and Assam

+

875. { Shri Ram Krishan Gupta:
Shri D. C. Sharma:
Shri A. M. Tariq:
Shri Hem Barua:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 779 on the 10th December, 1959 and state:

(a) whether Government have received any reply to the notes handed over to the Chinese Embassy regarding the violation of air space over NEFA and Assam; and

(b) if so, the nature of the reply?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Chinese Government denied that any of their planes ever violated Indian air space. The protest notes exchanged between the Governments of India and China in this connection have been incorporated in White Paper No. III (pages 100 to 104), which was placed on the Table of the House on 10th March, 1960.

Shri Ram Krishan Gupta: May I know whether any other such incident has been reported to have occurred since the handing over of the note to the Chinese Embassy?

Sardar Majithia: We have got no knowledge about that, Sir.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the emphatic denial of the Prime Minister on the 18th and 21st December, 1959 and the 22nd February, 1960 and of the Defence Minister on the 18th of December, 1959, that our air space was never violated by Chinese aircraft, may I know how Government reconcile this denial with the admission as embodied in White Paper III in which it is stated that this protest note was delivered to the Chinese Embassy here on the 5th December, 1959?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): I have no recollection of the exact terms of the replies made on that occasion either by the Prime Minister or myself. I should have notice for that. What we said was that there were a number of our own aircraft looking after this place. The Prime Minister said something of that kind. We had no evidence of any violation and the only people who could do anything of that kind would be those who go up to that height or have instruments for doing so. It is not possible to detect any aircraft at that height. We have said we had no evidence. When the report was received of suspected violation we lodged the protest.

Shri Hem Barua: May I draw the attention of the Defence Minister to the speeches made in this connection?

Mr. Speaker: What is the use of arguing this matter? The hon. Minister has said that our own planes were flying up and down and unless we go to such a height it is not possible to know it. Later on, when they received information, then they took up the matter. Therefore, there does not seem to be any inconsistency.

Shri Hem Barua: The denials were made on the 18th and 21st of December, 1959, and also on the 22nd of February, 1960, in the Prime Minister's reply to the debate on the President's Address. But, on the 5th December, this note was handed over to the Chinese Embassy, protesting against the violation of our air space by the Chinese planes. Obviously, they had evidence with them and that was why they protested. I say that this is an attempt on the part of Government to suppress facts. How can you dislodge this suspicion?

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary to have a preamble. The hon. Member can put a question straight. Even before the statement was made in this House the protest had been made. Is it not a fact that a protest had been launched with the Chinese Government; and, if so, how does it happen that a different version has been given here? That is all the simple question.

Shri Krishna Menon: While Government is one the Speaker is well aware that these protests and supervisions proceed from different parts of Government. I am not saying that there is no co-ordination. It is possible that when a country is under threat from outside situations may arise like this. So far as I am aware, there was no evidence of those violations. That is what the Prime Minister said.

Shri Tyagi: Has a protest been lodged with China without ascertaining whether there was a violation or not? If the Government had not ascertained about the violations, why did they mention that fact in their protest to China for this contradiction would make their position weaker?

Shri Krishna Menon: I was not here at that time. But I understand that the question related to the Ladakh area and the answers related to the eastern area. If there is any doubt on this matter we are prepared to clear it at any other time. I do not think there is any contradiction. When the question relates to Ladakh and

the answer relates to NEFA a new situation arises.

Shri Tyagi: May I know whether the violation was on the side of Leh or on the side of NEFA?

Shri Krishna Menon: The protest has been with regard to the Ladakh area.

Shri Hem Barua: I tabled a short notice question specifically about these incidents mentioned in the White Paper III. I wanted to know specifically about that. That short notice question was brushed aside and my name was clubbed with the Ladakh area. When my name had been clubbed with others and when my specific question was about the incidents of violation mentioned in the White Paper III, which relate to violations of air space in NEFA, possibly these supplementaries could be allowed. There is a contention that this relates to Ladakh. Does it not show that it is shelving the responsibility of Government?

Mr. Speaker: The Defence Minister is not responsible when questions are put like this and clubbed together. When more than one question relates to the same matter, the office suggests that all these questions may be put down into a comprehensive question. That does not prevent the hon. Member from asking—as he usually does—what has happened to Ladakh? What has happened to those matters that have been raised in the White Paper? It is not as if anything has been suppressed by the Defence Minister. The hon. Member could have put that question if he wanted to be sure.

Shri Hem Barua: There is a difference. My point is this. The Defence Minister puts up the plea that the question related only to Ladakh and the supplementaries were about violation of air space in NEFA. My contention is this. I tabled a short notice question with particular reference to air space violation in NEFA as mentioned in White Paper III. But I

was told that my name had been clubbed with others because there was a question of air space violation. Therefore, I think, I am entitled to put questions about air space violation relating to NEFA.

Mr. Speaker: I am not able to follow so that I may give a reply.

Shri Hem Barua: The point of order, Sir,

Mr. Speaker: I am not able to follow the point of order. How can I give a reply?

Sardar Hukam Singh: The hon. Member only desires that he may be allowed to put supplementaries here about the air space violation in the NEFA area. The hon. Minister perhaps said that the question related to air space violation so far as Ladakh was concerned and that he was not ready to answer this supplementary because this particular question related to air violation that took place in the NEFA area. The hon. Member says that his question related specifically to air violation in the NEFA area but his question was disallowed and his name was clubbed with others in this question. The information he received regarding this clubbing was that because there was another question relating to air space violation, therefore, his name has been clubbed there. He wants that because his question related to air space violation in NEFA he may be allowed to put a supplementary on that also. That is the point.

Mr. Speaker: Ultimately, when the question emerged as put down on the Order Paper was it in general terms of violation of air space?

Shri Hem Barua: The Defence Minister said.....

Mr. Speaker: Leave alone the Defence Minister. If the question was in general terms and if the hon. Minister had answered that there has been no violation, possibly, it may affect Ladakh also. If it referred only to Ladakh though the hon. Member had given it with respect to NEFA

and it was included in the question about Ladakh he must have put a question. It is not due to the mistake of the hon. Defence Minister.

Shri Tyagi: Are the Government in a position to assure the House that for future ample arrangements have been made to intercept any air violations on these borders? Is the hon. Minister in a position to give such an assurance to this House?

Shri Krishna Menon: Sir, if you wish me to answer this question I will do so. You will appreciate, Sir, that by giving an answer to this question I will certainly have to give to a certain extent information about operation of our aircraft. I do not want to withhold any information.

Shri Tyagi: I never wanted to have any detailed information. I only wanted him to assure this country that he has made all ample arrangements to intercept any air violations. It is not a secret information.

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, I rise to a point of order. The Question Hour cannot be used for seeking assurance from the Minister.

Shri Tyagi: The country wants to know whether there are ample arrangements of defence or not. There is no secrecy about it. I have heard the Prime Minister and other hon. Ministers all the time saying that they have got ample arrangements.

Shri Krishna Menon: The hon. Member may have different ideas about secrecy in this matter. I am suffering from some of it now.

Shri Tyagi: You will suffer for your life; nobody can help it. But the country wants an assurance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no exchange of words like this.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: In the note received from China dated 21st December, 1959, they have said that Indian aircraft intruded into Chinese air space over the Lake Pangong area and east of the Konga Pass and two

or three other places. When I looked at the map I found that these areas are within our territory. I want to know whether the Government of India has made it clear to the Chinese Government that these areas are Indian?

Shri Krishna Menon: Yes, Sir, we have. That is a political question, that is to say, what is Indian territory? We have said that the MacMahon line is our boundary in this area.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Pangong Lake and Konga Pass are in Ladakh.

Shri Krishna Menon: That is the question under dispute. That is the question now which has created all this position. We have said that it is our territory. We have said that we shall not yield any of these territories. We have not conceded any sovereignty to China or anyone else.

Shri A. C. Guha: Sir, may I have your ruling on the question put by Shri Tyagi? May I know whether this House is entitled to have some sort of an assurance that necessary precautions have been taken to maintain our air space and prevent any air raids? We would like to know whether this question is covered by the privilege of secrecy or this House is entitled to have an answer.

Shri Tyagi: We are suffering under dictatorship. There is no democracy in this country if even that assurance cannot be given.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has invited my opinion regarding this matter. I would request hon. Members not to ask for assurances. Shri Vajpayee himself pointed out that the Question Hour ought not to be used for that purpose, and therefore I kept quiet. Otherwise, the Ministers are pinned to their statements here, and later on it may not be possible for them to stick to them. There is no good then saying that they said one thing and they have not been able to carry them out. Therefore, hon. Members will themselves refrain from asking assurances.

But, later, on, Shri Tyagi put the question in another manner. He asked whether sufficient precautions had been taken to see that no more such violations take place. I do not think there is anything harmful in that. Once there has been an aggression questions have been asked as to whether we have taken steps to see that there is no more aggression. The hon. Prime Minister himself has answered such questions. Leaving alone the other portion that has been encroached upon in respect of which we are making negotiations, questions were asked about the steps taken to prevent further encroachment. Therefore, the hon. House would like to know if sufficient precautions have been taken. How it has been done, nobody wants to know the secrets.

Shri Krishna Menon: That has been answered. The question as I heard was, whether we are in a position to go up in the air and intercept any air violations on our borders.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Krishna Menon: If I am mistaken, I am sorry. But so far as our resources go, we have repeatedly said in the House, we have made all adjustments that are possible in order to meet any further incursions by land or in any other way.

Shri Tyagi: That is what I wanted to know.

Shri A. M. Tariq: May I know the number of violations that have come to the notice of the Government in the NEFA area in Assam?

Mr. Speaker: Is it not given in the White Paper?

Sardar Majithia: Yes, Sir.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, may I put one question. Sir, I am concerned with this and I thought you would possibly allow me three supplementaries.

Mr. Speaker: I have already allowed a sufficient number of supplementary questions.

Shri Hem Barua: Only one.

Mr. Speaker: That does not matter. I hope the hon. Member would bear with me. He will have enough opportunity on other occasions.

तीन वर्ष का डिप्री कोर्स

+

* ८७६. { श्री भक्त बशान :
श्री सरजू पाण्डेय :
श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :

क्या शिक्षा मंत्री २२ दिसम्बर, १९५६ के तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या ११५१ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) कुछ समय पूर्व उत्तर प्रदेश के आगरा, इलाहाबाद, गोरखपुर और लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालयों में तीन वर्ष का डिप्री कोर्स आरम्भ करने का जो निश्चय किया गया था उसे कार्यान्वित करने के लिये क्या कार्य-वाही की गई है ;

(ख) यह नया कोर्स आरम्भ करने से कितना अतिरिक्त व्यय होने की संभावना है ; और

(ग) भारत सरकार ने १९५६-६० के वित्तीय वर्ष में अब तक उत्तर प्रदेश के इन चार विश्वविद्यालयों में से प्रत्येक को और राज्य सरकार को इस कार्य के लिये कितना-कितना अनुदान दिया है और १९६०-६१ के वित्तीय वर्ष में कितना अनुदान देने का विचार है ?

शिक्षा मंत्री (डा० का० सा० श्रीमाली):

(क) और (ख) लोक-सभा पटल पर एक विवरण रख दिया गया है ।

विवरण

उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने सूचना दी है कि कालिजों की संख्या में वृद्धि होने के कारण पहले जो स्लॉट का अनुमान लगाया गया था

उस में संशोधन करना आवश्यक हो गया है, और राज्य के विश्वविद्यालयों में योजना को कार्यान्वित करने के लिये बड़े हुये अनावर्तों स्लॉट के लिये ही नहीं बल्कि आवर्तों स्लॉट के लिए भी राज्य सरकार को शत प्रतिशत केन्द्रीय सहायता की आवश्यकता पड़ेगी । राज्य सरकार के संशोधित प्रस्तावों के अनुसार केन्द्रीय सरकार को पूर्व अनुमानित २ करोड़ रुपये के बजाय ९ करोड़ रुपये का व्यय वहन करना पड़ेगा । ये प्रस्ताव विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान कमीशन को विचारार्थ भेजे जा रहे हैं ।

(ग) १९५६-६० में कुछ नहीं । विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान कमीशन के निर्णय के आधार पर १९६०-६१ में केन्द्रीय अनुदान देने के प्रश्न पर विचार किया जायेगा ।

[Dr. K. L. Shrivastava: (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.

STATEMENT

The Government of Uttar Pradesh have intimated that, in view of the increase in the number of colleges since the estimates of expenditure were last prepared by them, it has become necessary to revise those estimates and further that the State Government will require hundred per cent. central assistance not only for the enhanced non-recurring expenditure but also for the recurring expenditure involved in order to implement the scheme in the State Universities. The revised proposals of the State Government involve an expenditure of about Rs. 9 crores to the Central Government, as against the original estimates of about Rs. 2 crores, and are being referred to the University Grants Commission for the University Grants Commission].

(c) None in 1959-60. The release of central grant in 1960-61 would be considered in the light of decision of the University Grants Commission).

श्री भक्त बशान : श्रीमन्, इस प्रश्न पर काफी दिनों में लिखा-पढ़ी चल रही है । मैं