

Financial position of Delhi Transport Undertaking

3486. SHRI P. C. ADICHAN: Will the Minister of SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) whether as reported in the Indian Express of the 16th July, 1970, the Delhi Transport Undertaking is financially on the verge of collapse;

(b) if so, the circumstances leading to such a situation; and

(c) Government's reaction to help make it a worth-while and profitable undertaking?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI IQBAL SINGH): (a) It is a fact that the financial position of the Delhi Transport Undertaking is not satisfactory. The accumulated losses of the Undertaking as on 31-3-1970, are Rs. 859.49 lakhs. The liability (including liability on account of loan instalments and interest charges due to Central Government), on the same date, amounted to Rs. 751.36 lakhs.

(b) The reasons for the present financial position of the D. T. U. are given below:—

(i) Increased cost of operation over the years.

(ii) Non replacement of overaged buses; and

(iii) Uneconomic fare structure.

(c) The Government of India had given a loan of Rs. 130 lakhs to the Delhi Transport Undertaking on the 25th March, 1970, which was utilised by the Undertaking to acquire 50 single decker and 50 double decker buses. Deliveries are in progress and will be completed by December, 1970. A provision of Rs. 200 lakhs has been made in the Central Government's budget for 1970-71 for loan assistance to the said Undertaking for the purchase of buses. The Undertaking has, accordingly, placed orders for 130 buses (30 double decker and 100 single deckers) which are expected to come on the road by the end of February, 1971. A further loan of Rs. 1 crore is being given to the Undertaking immediately which will enable them to purchase an additional 100 buses.

Reservation of Posts for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Cochin Port Trust

3487. SHRI P. C. ADICHAN: Will the

Minister of SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) the number and category of posts reserved for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes at the Cochin Port Trust in the last two years;

(b) whether these posts have been filed up with candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI IQBAL SINGH): (a) to (c). A statement giving the requisite information is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-4488/70.*]

Setting up of an Organisation for Development of Sports and Physical Education

3488. SHRI MUHAMMAD SHERIFF: Will the Minister of EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have considered to set up a new organisation at the national level for the development of sports and physical education among the youth in the country; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the time by which it will start functioning?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES (SHRI BHAKT DARSAN): (a) The matter is under consideration.

(b) Does not arise.

12.03 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

SOVIET UNION'S REPORTED RESISTANCE TO CORRECT INDIAN MAPS

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. R. K. Amin—absent Mr. Nath Pai.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External

Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

“Soviet Union’s reported resistance to correct the Indian maps in the second volume of the Great Encyclopaedia and its having continued to show the rein NEFA as part of Communist China.”

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): The first volume of the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia which came out in April-May this year, showed in its political map of Asia, India’s northern boundaries with China with a firm line which implied that the boundaries were definite and delimited.

However, in the second volume of the same work which appeared later this year, about October 1970, boundaries between India and China in the western sector were clearly shown with broken or interrupted lines implying that the border was regarded as not settled.

The smaller edition of the Atlas Mira which appeared about the same time, also showed all the India-China boundaries with an interrupted or broken line.

To this extent there seemed to be an improvement in the Soviet position. (*Interruptions*). However, this is not still very satisfactory from our point of view and we have been pressing the Soviet authorities to take our views into account and effect further rectification of their maps.

As I have already told the House on the 9th of November during this Session, the Soviet Ambassador to New Delhi has assured us that the Soviet Union proposes to issue a new map of India.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Balrampur): When?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The Government hopes that the new map would take into account our views more fully.

SHRI NATH PAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister of External Affairs, speaking in the House on the 3rd September this year, had this to assure the House with regard to

this very grave matter which we are discussing presently. He said:

“The central thing that has emerged out of this discussion is the unanimous expression of view by this Parliament through its representatives belonging to different parties that all of us are united that this depiction of India-China border is something which is against our interest, and, therefore, all of us are unanimous in urging that it should be rectified.”

This is how the Minister of External Affairs, on the 3rd September, tried to allay the genuine apprehensions of this House.

In this Session, Sir, on the 9th of November, a question was asked and the Minister replied on this very subject. The question was:

“Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state (a) whether Russia has refused to carry out corrections in their maps in which the Northern frontiers of India have been shown as Chinese Territory?”

The Minister stated in reply:

“No, Sir.”

In part (b) of the same question, the Minister was asked about this:

“The reaction of Government of India on the outcome of their recent discussions with Russian Government on the subject.”

After having said ‘No, Sir’ to part (a) of the question, he had this to say:

“On the contrary, the Soviet Government had assured us that they would give due consideration to our representations and views in the matter.”

This reply might have been given unintentionally, but none-the-less, the Minister is guilty of misleading the House on a very grave issue. The Minister says in his statement:

“However, in the second volume of the same work which appeared later this year, about October, 1970, boundaries between India and China in the western sector were clearly shown with broken or interrupted lines implying that the border was regarded as not settled.”

[Shri Nath Pai]

Sir, in the first place the insinuation is that this dotted line has been shown as a result of the recent representations made by the Government of India. Sir, I have my own copy of the World Atlas published by the Soviet Union on the 50th Anniversary of the Great Soviet Revolution. The dotted line, Sir, is not an achievement of the External Affairs Minister. In this very map of 1967, the boundary between India and China has been shown by a dotted line also. The most important point is this. It is claimed that the 1970 map in October shows a dotted line and therefore this is an improvement.

Mr. Speaker, it was not an easy thing for me to bring this heavy map. At page 105 and 106 this is shown. If you, Mr. Speaker, want to be convinced of the veracity of what I am saying, I request, you may cast a glance at it. There also that border has been shown on a dotted line. If I am right, is it not that the House is being misled—perhaps unintentionally?

Much has been made of the dotted line, the contention being that straight line shows a settled boundary and the dotted line shows an unsettled boundary. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the graver issue has been deliberately avoided from the House. Even the dotted line in the Soviet maps shows the Chinese claim with regard to the boundary and not the Indian alignments of the boundary, *vis-a-vis* China. These dotted lines have been appearing in the Soviet official maps since 1955.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was in the year 1955 that the Soviet Union officially presented a copy of the Atlas to the then President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. It was in October, 1956 that the Government sent an *Aide Memoire* drawing the attention of the Soviet Union to the delineation of the Sino-Indian boundary favouring the Chinese position.

Between 1955 to this day,—if I am correct and if Government's statements are correct and accurate,—the Government have sent as many as 4 *Aide Memoires* and one protest note. I would only draw your attention to one such note. In this note, this is what the Government say:

"The Embassy of India requests that a reply may kindly be sent to these

representations about the depiction of India's northern frontier in Soviet maps and that instructions may be issued for the necessary correction to be made."

This was in 1958. Earlier, what did we say, after the map was presented to Dr. Rajendra Prasad? It was studied, and it took five months in the External Affairs Ministry to study it, and this was what very politely and very humbly and almost apologetically, the External Affairs Ministry wrote to the Soviet Union:

"On examination, it is discovered that certain major discrepancies existed in the boundaries of India as shown in the Soviet Atlas and as officially approved by the Government of India."

This was the most polite, not to say apologetic, manner of conveying our displeasure,

During these fifteen years, I would like to know from External Affairs Minister whether the Soviet Union has given a written reply on one single occasion? If so, we would like to get a copy of that reply. This is my first question.

Then, I would like Government to reply to my second question. Regarding the so-called dotted line, is my contention right that it is not between us and China that the dotted line is used by the Soviet Union, but it is with regard to many other international frontiers? Secondly, the dotted line is not an achievement of the Government of India. It is a dotted line which has been in practice in the Soviet maps since 1967. Thirdly, is the dotted line not showing the Chinese claims?

Then, I want to raise some very important issues arising out of these replies. May I know from the hon. Minister whether the Government of India have made a systematic study to find out which are the countries in the world which in their official maps accept the Indian delineation of the border? May I know whether a systematic study has been so far made, after all the trouble of of the past twenty years, *vis-a-vis* our frontiers, to find out which are the countries which accept the Indian alignment of our

frontier and which reject it? Will the hon. Minister today state exactly what the territory of India is? Will he agree with me that one indication of which are the friendly countries and which are not so friendly will be to find out which accept the totality of our territorial integrity in terms of the territory which we say is ours? Will he say which are the countries? Is it true that the UN maps accept Aksain Chin and NEFA and the McMahon line as the border between India and China? And does it not follow that the Soviet Union as a permanent member of the UN Security Council and as a friend of India should at least follow the UN maps? Does the Soviet refusal either to condescend to give a written reply or to alter the maps mean that the Soviet Union, contrary to all the assurances given in this House, does not either take our claims or our protests very seriously, and if so, how is this dangerous situation to be rectified? We were assured in these clarion words by the spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry. I am quoting from the press versions of that day:

"A spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry mentioned at his weekly press conference today that the recent Soviet maps shown to the Foreign Secretary during his recent visit to Moscow were the most favourable that we have got from Russia."

When the Government of India will take that extraordinary position that the Soviet maps showing Chinese claims only with a dotted line are the most favourable to India, is it not accepting that the Chinese claims are the genuine claims and we have been talking rubbish when we say that China has been guilty of aggression? May I know when those protests were lodged, because during the past few months, no less than the President of India, the Prime Minister of India and the External Affairs Secretary went to the Soviet Union, and then we were assured in their own words, which I have just quoted, that the Soviet Union has accepted and promised to correct it? Does it take fifteen long years to correct it? Is not the cartographic aggression on a country nothing but a total disregard of our territorial integrity? Is the hon. Minister serious? I think he was when in his reply he said that

Government were also equally concerned. If so, why this deviation in his reply which says that the Soviet Union's present position is an improvement? I hope he will take the submissions which I have made in the proper perspective and the seriousness with which I have submitted them, and try to enlighten this House on this matter.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: First of all, the hon. member has tried to create an impression as if I had either overstated the nature of our protest or the nature of the assurance. I have only one comment to make, that when he was reading the text of my reply which I gave on 9 November, he read out the first sentence but not the whole of it. . . .

SHRI NATH PAI: I could not read the whole of his speech.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: That is of September; I am talking of 9th November.

He read out the first sentence but did not complete that reply. To complete it, I would read my reply. This is on 9 November, about which he complained that I had made some statement which, according to his judgment, is not a correct statement of facts.

The question put to me was:

"(a) Whether Russia has refused to carry out corrections in their maps in which the northern frontiers of India have been shown as Chinese territory?"

My reply was:

"(a) No, Sir."

Then:

"(b) The reaction of the Government of India on the outcome of their recent discussions with the Russian Government on the subject."

My reply was:

"(b) On the Contrary, the Soviet Government had assured us that they would give due considera-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

tion to our representations and views in the matter. They have, through their Ambassador in Delhi, recently informed us that they are shortly going to publish a new map of India which will show the Sino-Indian border as an unsettled border."

This was the reply I gave on 9 November, and I stick to every word of what I said that day.

The present argument and the present long speech, very carefully worded and very nicely presented in the usual effective manner with which we are familiar so far as Shri Nath Pai is concerned, started on the premise as if this new map or the big volume he has produced was the map about which I made a reference in the last sentence of part (b) of my reply which I gave on 9 November.

SHRI NATH PAI: No, Sir.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I had said that through 'their Ambassador in Delhi they have informed us that they are shortly going to publish a new map of India which will show the Sino-Indian border as an unsettled border.' This is the main, substantive, part, and this assurance was given after these maps were published. So to contradict this assurance. . .

SHRI NATH PAI: No, I did not contradict. I said this is repeated in the last part of his reply. I did not contradict him on this issue.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I do not want to be interrupted.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ (New Delhi): Why not? This is an important issue.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: This is my prerogative also. Today I have decided not to be provoked even by Shri Sondhi. I will try and answer as calmly as I can. If he is interested, by all means let him listen; if not, he can go on with his interruptions—I do not care.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ: This is a weakness.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I know my weakness—and also my strength.

The main point is that on the 9 November I told the House that the 'Soviet Government through their Ambassador in Delhi have assured us that they will publish a new map', and there is no use in going into earlier maps which may have been published earlier to this assurance. He cannot contradict me on this assurance by relying on an earlier map. . .

SHRI NATH PAI: On a point of order. My submission was. . .

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Let me finish.

SHRI NATH PAI: Let me clarify; Otherwise, there will be confusion in the House.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: As a matter of fact, I should have raised a point of order when he was bringing in this earlier map which has nothing to do with my statement.

SHRI NATH PAI: I repeated very carefully that. . .

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I am in the hands of the House.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH (Khalilabad): What is the hon. Minister trying to do, Sir? Browbeat you?

SHRI NATH PAI: Once again, either it is a case of genuine misunderstanding or deliberate misrepresentation. I did not accuse him of misleading us—the tape record may be played back—in the statement he made in November. I just sought to link it up with today's statement. The main thing we are charging him with misleading us—it is a very serious charge—is this.

MR. SPEAKER: He has already noted it.

SHRI NATH PAI: No, Sir. There is misrepresentation. That is now the House will never get at the truth of the matter.

In his statement today he says:

"However, in the second volume of the same work which appeared later this year, about October 1970, boundaries between India and China in the western sector were clearly shown. . . ."

He says that the maps before October, 1970, were showing a straight line. I say this is not correct. I have got the Encyclopaedia with maps before 1970 also showing dotted line. To say that today the map is showing a dotted line is not a correct statement. This is my submission.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

SHRI NATH PAI: He has totally misled the House.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would only appeal to the hon. Members. If they are whipping up an agitation, I cannot help it.

SHRI M. L. SONDH: This is a very serious innuendo.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: You are talking to your other friends who are trying to help you, I do not know whether they are helping or hindering you.

SHRI NATH PAI: I do not want anybody's help.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The main point is that the hon. Member read out the reply which I give on 9th November. Now he is saying that what I have said today again is something which is not correct. What have I said today. In the second paragraph I have said today:

" . . . in the second volume of the same work which appeared later this year, about October 1970, boundaries between India and China in the western sector were clearly shown with broken or interrupted lines implying that the border was regarded as not settled."

And I stick to this statement. This is correct.

SHRI NATH PAI: I have a map showing the dotted line in 1967. Where is the improvement then?

MR. SPEAKER: Let him make the statement. Let us hear the whole statement. Why do you come in between?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The real thing is that they are not interested in understanding the facts, they are interested in trying to unearth something.

SHRI M. L. SONDH: Very serious insinuations are being made by the Minister.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi): This is a very serious allegation against the whole House, that we are not interested in understanding the facts. What do you mean by it?

SHRI RANJEET SINGH: We can tolerate his ignorance, but not his impudence.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: This kind of insinuation against all Members cannot be tolerated.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I know that hon. Members feel rather uncomfortable when certain home truths are uttered.

SHRI M. L. SONDH: What are the home truths?

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali): Because of the lack of truth.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Am I to answer the Jana Sangh queries or Mr. Nath Pai?

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): You are answering the House (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): We want replies to the questions put.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The replies to the questions are straight. I have quoted the reply I gave on 9th November. That statement is absolutely correct. What I have stated today is again correct, because in the second volume the boundaries are shown in the western sector with broken or interrupted lines.

SHRI NATH PAI: How is it an improvement?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I am stating a fact which is correct. Where have I used the word "improvement"?

SHRI NATH PAI: "To this extent there seemed to be an improvement." This is in the statement, in the fourth paragraph.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It is an improvement.

SHRI NATH PAI: You said: "Where have I used the word 'improvement'?"

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: If the hon. Members only want to go on interrupting, I cannot help it.

In all these maps, there are several pages, and there are different types of maps. If the hon. Member is interested in all the details, they cannot be gone into in this Question Hour.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is not Question Hour.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I will go on replying to questions as and when they are put.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी (पुना) : मंत्री महोदय कह रहे हैं कि इम्प्रूवमेंट हुआ है। उनको बताना चाहिए कि क्या इम्प्रूवमेंट हुआ है।

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: The House is interested in knowing this much from the Minister, how the dotted line is an improvement from the previous position. That is the point at issue. Let him clarify that.

SHRI PILOO MODY: What he should have said is that the deterioration has been rectified.

SHRI NATH PAI: There is not even rectification.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: If the hon. Members go harping upon. . . (Interruptions) It is a very interesting spectacle

that even on matters where the hon. Members themselves have devoted so much time and framed the questions, they are not hearing the other side but get up and pick up a word here or there and try to create a scene. . . (Interruptions) This matter was discussed in great detail. My statement in September when this matter was actually debated has been quoted and I had said there that the unanimous view that had been expressed would strengthen us in taking this matter up with the Soviet Union; we should then be able to press with them even more strongly that they should make corrections. This has yielded results because their Government, through their ambassador have assured us that they would issue a new map. That is a substantial achievement that we have got. These maps that are quoted are not maps which have been published after that assurance. I have made enquiries and I understand that the original material for these maps had gone to the Press sometime in April this year and the assurance was given to me on 8th November and I made a statement on 9th November. So, to say that these maps do not show that—obviously they will not show that because the material for those maps were sent to the press in April this year. Therefore, they cannot say that what I said was incorrect because these maps do not reflect what I said; it is something about which I cannot reply at all because my case is not that these maps reflect the correction. Is the House interested in getting the correction or only in heckling me? If so they can go on. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: In his reply he says that there is improvement. What is that improvement? That was the question put by Mr. Nath Pai? Are you satisfied that he has sufficiently explained the reasons why he took it as an improvement from the previous position? . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He says that the maps relate to the past. His assurance to the House was on 9 November and then he said that the maps would be corrected. These were printed before that date. What is the difficulty?

SHRI NATH PAI: May I request you to go through the statement which was read out by him today? I shall refer to it soon

again: "However, in the second volume of the same work which appeared later this year, about October 1970. . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: He has mentioned just now the same point.

SHRI NATH PAI: I want to know whether the Encyclopaedia which is in the E. A. Ministry Library shows this dotted line or not? My second contention is that the dotted line is not a new thing; it has always been so. As a proof, this is the original map, the Soviet map which you may see if you like. If he does not want to say anything I shall leave it at that but I want to ask again: what happened to the specific question I asked?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: If detailed questions are put about our interpretation of maps and I try to explain them in detail again, we shall be spending a good deal of the time of the House going into interesting details; may be some argument is built against me and I give a counter argument. That is not the substantive point. The basic or substantive point is this. . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Balrampur): There has been no improvement.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: On 8 November the Soviet Government through their Ambassador have assured us that they would issue a new map. I find that I have made a statement here on 9 November. If you go on saying that the earlier statement that has been made or the earlier maps that have been published do not carry out this assurance, they can go on. Because, this was given to me in very clear terms that they will issue a new map. If they had satisfied us, there was no point in taking up the matter strongly with them. (*Interruption*)

Now, a large number of questions are put, which map or on which page and so on. I have got here some atlases. There are about 100 or 200 maps in this. But if he asks me to do research work as to what is the dotted line here—

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: You are paid by the people of India. Is research work to be dismissed as of no importance? (*Interruption*)

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह: सौधी साहब, जरा आराम से सुनिए ।

I will refuse to be provoked even by the spring action which is on the seat of Shri Sondhi. The point is that he has got there a thicker volume. I have got here a slightly smaller volume. There are hundreds of maps. I am not interested in research work. I am interested in the substantive question. The substantive question is, the Soviet Union have assured us that they will issue a new map. I am not interested in going into the details as to what appears in this map or that map. That is the substantive point.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: Sir, on a point of order. Have you ruled out the other question put by Shri Nath Pai? It was a specific question. The Minister refused to answer that specific, relevant question. Of course, we are not satisfied with the reply that is given about the improvement. Perhaps he thinks that the assurance is also an improvement. But what about the other specific question?

SHRI NATH PAI: Has there been a written reply? On this issue, there have been four *aide memoires* and two protests so far as we know. Then, I will repeat the second question, a specific question. Have the Government ever received a written reply to all that we have conveyed by way of *aide memoires* and protest notes to the Soviet Union? What is the exact number of *aide memoires* and protest notes that we have sent? And has there been on any occasion a written reply from the Soviet Union? That is the first question.

The second question is—

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Let me answer one by one. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: My reply to this question is in the negative. (*Interruption*)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS rose—

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): The assurance given is an improvement!

MR. SPEAKER: Prof. Guha, Please sit down.

SHRI NATH PAI: Is it the dotted line which the Chinese claim on Indian territory? Does this dotted line reflect the Chinese alignment and not the Indian alignment?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The dotted line does not meet our requirements and that is why we are proposing to them to change it. I am not going to enter into the details as to what it represents or what it does not represent. We are expecting that the new map will meet our view point. That is the substantive point.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): On a point of order.

SHRI NATH PAI: He said that the dotted line does not represent our claim. Why does he not say that the dotted line represents the Chinese line? (*Interruption*)

SHRI RANGA: Is he not obliged to give us an answer to the question which you have allowed? Mr. Swaran Singh, please be patient. You told us not to lose temper but you go on losing it. Here was a specific question which the Speaker has allowed. That was, is the dotted line the same or is approximate to the claim made by China? That was the question that was put. To the question whether this is what was indicated by China, there was no reply.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: This is not something about which there should be this sort of feeling or suggestion. It is quite clear. I have said it clearly on the floor of the House when we discussed it in detail in September this year that there were Soviet maps which did show the Chinese line, that is, the Chinese line of claim was shown as a firm international boundary. The later improvement was, instead of showing it as a firm thing, they showed it as a dotted line indicating that it is in dispute.

SHRI RANGA: There was a deterioration and now that deterioration is removed.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: There is a deterioration from your angle because anything that improves the Soviet image from your point of view is deterioration.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Originally it was a dotted line. Two years later it turned into a solid line. This was no improvement. Six months later it became a dotted line. Can this be called improvement?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. You get up without my permission. There is no harm in asking for my permission as others do.

SHRI NATH PAI: Have the Government made a systematic study to find out which are the countries which have in their official maps shown the Indian position with regard to our frontiers and which are the countries which dispute it?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: On this issue, after this interest was shown, we have addressed all missions recently. The answers are coming in. I have not got a complete picture at the present moment.

SHRI NATH PAI: What, according to the Government of India, if it knows, is the exact territorial extension of India and which are the countries which accept this? I want to know the exact square miles of Indian territory. Which are the countries which have shown the Indian position. . .

MR. SPEAKER: He said he has asked for that information.

SHRI NATH PAI: The UN has published maps which accept our borders except Kashmir. Why does not the Soviet Union follow it?

MR. SPEAKER: This is what has been discussed all this time.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: On the question of the area of India, the House would no doubt recall there was a lengthy discussion and Mr. Chagla handled it. (*Interruption*). You are a heart case. Don't get excited.

SHRI NATH PAI: I plead guilty that where India's territorial integrity is concerned, I cannot be as indifferent as he is;

I am excited. Mr. Speaker, for 15 years, from 1957—you were not here then—we have been raising this issue. If you are not excited about India's frontiers, what will you be excited about?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: This question of the area of India and the correct mention of it in UN documents was once discussed here at great length. I have no further information to add to that. About the general question of alignment shown in the maps of other countries, the present calling attention has nothing to do with it, because it only says "Soviet Union's reported resistance to correct the Indian maps in the second volume of the Great Encyclopaedia". To connect it with maps published by countries all over the world may be a very interesting thing, but I am not having a memory test to give you all the the information from my brain. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: These are relevant questions and he should have come prepared with the answer.

श्री देवेन सेन (आसनसोल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत के फ्रांटियर को लेकर जो मुल्क चाहे जैसा मानचित्र खींच सकता है और उसमें हमारी टेरिटरी की हिफाजत करने में भारत सरकार असमर्थ मालूम होती है। आज जो स्टेटमेंट दिया गया मन्त्री महोदय की तरफ से यह बहुत अपोलोजेटिक है। इसमें कहा गया फर्स्ट पैराग्राफ में कि अप्रैल, मई में ग्रेट सोवियट इन्साइक्लोपीडिया में जो मानचित्र दिखाया गया

"... northern boundaries with China with a firm line which implied that the boundaries were definite and delimited."

Then, if you look at the second para, it says:

"However, in the second volume, of the same work which appeared later this year, about October, 1970; boundaries between India and China in the western sector were clearly shown with broken or interrupted lines."

The first edition was in April or May and the second in October.

अक्तूबर में कहा जाता है कि फिर वही बाउण्ड्री दिखलाई गई है—डाटेड लाइन्स दिखलाकर। इस बीच हमारे प्रेसिडेंट सोवियत रूस गये, हमारी प्रधान मंत्री गईं, उन लोगों के साथ इसके बारे में बातचीत हुई। इसका अर्थ है कि पहला मैप और दूसरा मैप निकालने के बीच प्रेसिडेंट और प्राइम मिनिस्टर के साथ बातचीत हुई, पार्लियामेंट की तरफ से भी इसके बारे में प्रस्ताव पास किया गया, लेकिन उस पर भी इन्होंने कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। इसलिये मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि जब भी हमारे मंत्री महोदय हमें आश्वासन देते हैं कि सोवियत रूस फिर एक नया मैप निकालेगा—हमें उस पर विश्वास नहीं होता है। सोवियत रूस ने इसके बारे में अपना मत निश्चित कर लिया है, हमारी बाउण्ड्रीज़ के खिलाफ वे चीन् की तत्परता करेंगे—ऐसी हमको आशंका है। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि वे एपोलोजेटिक हैं, इसी लिये डाटेड-लाइन फर्म-लाइन के मुकाबले इम्प्रूवमेंट है। नाथ पाई जी को उन्होंने कहा—डॉन्ट गेट एजीटेटेड—मैं उनसे पूछता हूँ कि फर्म-लाइन से डाटेड-लाइन इम्प्रूवमेंट है, यह उन्होंने कहाँ से सीखा, किस एलजेबरा, अर्थमेटिक या इतिहास में है—इसका जवाब उनको देना चाहिये। मैं आपको बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि मैप को लेकर यह जो इतना झगड़ा काल-एटेंशन में चल रहा है, वह असली मैप नहीं है, वह आनेवाला है, कब आयेगा मैं नहीं बतला सकता। 9 नवम्बर को जो मेरा प्रश्न था, उसमें मैंने मांग की थी कि सोवियत रूस की तरफ से यह मैप सभा-पटल पर रखा जाय या सोवियत रूस की तरफ से निश्चित एशोरेंस लाई जाय, लेकिन कुछ नहीं लाया गया। इसलिये आज मैं उनके कहने पर विश्वास नहीं कर सकता। हम चाहते हैं कि सोवियत रूस की तरफ से कोई निश्चित स्टेटमेंट लाकर सभा-पटल पर रखा जाय, वरना हम यह समझेंगे कि पार्लियामेंट को धोखा देने के लिये यह स्टेटमेंट रखा गया है।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I have heard the speech. He did not put any question. After carefully listening to what he has said, I find he has asked me only one question as to whether the dotted line is an improvement on the firm line. It is an improvement on the firm line because the dotted line shows that the boundary is not settled. Therefore, from that point of view it is definitely an improvement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Imagination.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It is not my imagination. It is international convention. It is also described in certain legends. If you do not want to accept it, you need not accept it.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: How did he get all this knowledge? He must have done some research.

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : सब बातें आप को नहीं बतला सकता हूँ, सौधी साहब, कुछ अपने पास भी रखनी है ।

He says that he does not believe that the assurances given by the Soviet Union would be adhered to by them. On that I can only say that I have sympathy with his suspicion. But while dealing with the government we have to accept the word of the government rather than proceed on suspicion. I cannot find remedies for suspicion.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली-सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी का आज का उत्तर सुनकर मेरा यह फर्म कनविकशन हो गया है कि यह सरकार 15 साल के बाद भी नक्शों को ठीक नहीं करा सकी, उनमें कोई इम्प्रूवमेंट भी नहीं करा सकी और पूरी तरह से फेल्योर हो चुकी है । मैं सरकार पर चार्ज लगाता हूँ कि इन्होंने जो उत्तर दिया है, उसमें फैक्ट्स को डेलीब्रेटली सप्रेस किया है और वे फैक्ट्स जो हिन्दुस्तान के विरोध में हैं उनको दबाने की कोशिश की गई है, रूस की चीज को, जो कि गलत है, उसको हाइलाइट करने की कोशिश की गई है, ठीक करने की कोशिश की गई है ।

मेरा पहला सवाल है कि जो डाटेड लाइन है, वह चाइनीज़ लाइन के हिसाब से है—ऐसा आपने अपने स्टेटमेन्ट में क्यों नहीं कहा ? एक एनसाइक्लोपीडिया अप्रैल-मई में निकला, जिसमें फर्म लाइन थी, उसके बाद अक्टूबर में निकला, जिसमें डाटेड लाइन है, लेकिन जो इन दोनों से पहले निकला था, जिसका हवाला नाथापाई जी ने दिया है, उसमें भी डाटेड लाइन थी तो पहले नकशे और इस अक्टूबर के नकशे में क्या अन्तर है, इसमें क्या इम्प्रूवमेंट है, कौन सी एचीवमेंट है—यह बात आपने अपने स्टेटमेन्ट में क्यों स्पष्ट नहीं की ? अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन्होंने नेशनल इन्टरेस्ट को सैक्रिफाइस किया है—
This Minister is acting as a Russian stooge. I charge him.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH: Quite correct. Very good word.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: The word "stooge" is unparliamentary. It should be expunged.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH: It is not unparliamentary. Here is another stooge speaking, Sir.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: I am a stooge of the nation, of India. I am not like you.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सरकार ने, जब कौल साहब यहां आये, तो कहा कि अब जो नक्शा उन्होंने देखा है उसके हिसाब से हम यह कह सकते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के लिए बहुत ज्यादा सैटिस्फैक्ट्री है । क्या वह नक्शा साथ लाये थे ? वह नक्शा साथ नहीं लाये थे, नकशे की कापी लिए बगैर ऐसी बात कह दी गई है, कम से कम कापी तो रखनी चाहिए थी, लेकिन उसके बगैर ही प्रोपेगेंडा कर दिया गया कि बिलकुल ठीक हो रहा है और हिन्दुस्तान की तसल्ली के मुताबिक हो रहा है । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो अधिकारी इस प्रकार की इर्रेस्पॉसिबल बात करे, उसके पास नक्शा भी नहीं है,

उसकी क्रापी भी नहीं है, उसके खिलाफ़ आपने क्या कार्यवाही की ?

तीसरा सवाल—आपने उनको प्रोटेस्ट नोट भेजा और जैसा नाथापाई जी ने कहा—एड-मैमायर्स भी चार भेजे—16 साल से यह कार्यवाही चल रही है, लेकिन रशियन गवर्नमेन्ट ने एक बार भी लिख कर नहीं दिया—क्या इसके पीछे कोई राज नहीं है ? मेरे ख्याल में यह डेलीबेट कांस्पिरेसी है, रशियन गवर्नमेन्ट कमिट नहीं करना चाहती है, हिन्दुस्तान की कास्ट पर चाइना को खुश करना चाहती है, आप को लारे-लपे में रखना चाहती है ।

एक जगह मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि अब हमारे लोगों को दूसरी गवर्नमेन्ट क्या कहती है, यह कहना बन्द कर देना चाहिए । लेकिन जो चीज़ 15 सालों से चल रही है, उसका जवाब लिखकर क्यों नहीं दिया जाता, क्या डिप्लोमेटिक एटीचूड है । मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि बहुत सी बातें एम्बेसेडर के जरिये कन्वे कराई जाती हैं, लेकिन इस मामले में तो 15 सालों से लगातार हमारे राष्ट्रपति, हमारी प्रधान मंत्री महोदया वहां जाती रही हैं, उन्होंने भी उनसे कहा, आपने भी उनको चिट्ठी लिखी, आप खुद भी वहां गये, लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी लिखित जवाब क्यों नहीं मिला ? इसका मतलब—कुछ दाल में काला है, वे जान-बूझ कर लिखना नहीं चाहते, 16 साल तक उन्होंने लिखकर आपको कोई लैटर क्यों नहीं दिया । इसीलिए, अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी यह मांग थी कि एक व्हाइट पेपर ईशू होना चाहिए, क्योंकि हम कमिट कराना चाहते हैं—हम जानना चाहते हैं कि रूस के मामले में हम कहां हैं, नकशों के बारे में, लड़ाई के सामान के बारे में, दूसरी चीज़ों के बारे में क्या स्थिति है ।

मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है—मैं इनके आखरी सेन्टेन्स को पढ़ना चाहता हूँ—

“The Government hopes that the new map would take into account our views more fully.”

What is this ‘more fully’?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mournfully.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : यह “मोर-फुली” क्या है ? इसका मतलब आप क्या लगाते हैं, आपकी कल्पना क्या है, यह आपकी मर्जी के मुताबिक होगा, कितना होगा, कितना नहीं होगा—इसका मतलब क्या है—यह बतलाइये । फुली क्यों नहीं कहा, मोर फुली क्यों कहा है ? इसका क्या मतलब है ?

मैं एक चीज़ और पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सही है कि रूस को देखते देखते और भी ईस्ट यूरोपियन कंट्रीज़ ने हमारे देश के नकशे को गलत बनाया तो उसके लिए सरकार ने क्या किया है ?

आखरी बात यह है कि रूस की एन्साईक्लोपीडिया जो आपने पहले बन्द कर दी थी लेकिन उसके बाद नवम्बर में जो इन्साईक्लोपीडिया इश्यु हुई है वह भी ठीक तरह से नहीं बताती है तो क्या उसके ऊपर भी आप बैन लगायेंगे और इस देश में उसको भी नहीं आने देंगे ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: First of all, I would like to appeal to the hon. Member who belongs to the profession to which I also belonged once to be a little more responsible. I would like him to ponder seriously when he used an expression like “stooge”. If I were to hit back and say, he is a stooge of somebody, I know, he will resent it. But I resist the temptation. . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am sorry that expression should not have been used.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: When he used it, all of you thumped. . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I didn't.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It is sickening to me to see Shri Vajpayee giving ovation to it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Nobody gave ovation.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: Nobody gave ovation.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We should not use such expressions in the House.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त: स्टूज शब्द ठीक नहीं होगा, मैं मानता हूँ लेकिन मेरी फीलिंग यह है कि आप देश के नेशनल इन्स्ट्रुमेंट को कुर्बान कर रहे हैं।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I request the hon. Member to be a little more sober and a little more responsible. It is extremely irresponsible to use such a filthy expression which should normally be avoided even if you do not agree. . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: It is on account of your filthy action.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I want India to have friendly relations with all countries and more so with super powers. . . .

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: But not at the cost of India.

श्री रणधीर सिंह: क्या ये हमसे ज्यादा हिन्दुस्तानी हैं? हम इनसे ज्यादा हिन्दुस्तानी हैं। . . . (व्यवधान) . . . ये दुनिया-भर की स्मर्गलिंग करते हैं और डंडी मारते हैं। उल्टी उल्टी बातें करते हैं। जो फौज में शामिल होते हैं और कटते हैं उनको ये स्टूज बोलते हैं। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आप बैठ जाइये। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त: स्मर्गलिंग में आपका हिस्सा होगा। . . . (व्यवधान) . . . ये इस देश की और इस देश की

घरती को कुर्बान कर रहे हैं, इनको शर्म आनी चाहिए। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I take it that he has withdrawn that word.

श्री रणधीर सिंह: यह मगरमच्छ के नकली आंसू हैं। इनके बाप दादों ने कभी फौज नहीं देखी और पंजाब और हरियाणा के जवानों से बात करते हैं। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री रणधीर सिंह: क्या काबुल में गदहे नहीं होते और हरियाणा में तुम्हारे जैसे नहीं होते? . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आप बैठ जाइये। इसमें हरियाणा, पंजाब और स्मर्गलिंग का कोई सवाल नहीं है। यह इर्रैलिबेन्ट है। आप बैठ जाइये। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री रणधीर सिंह: यह क्या बात हुई? मिनिस्टर स्टूज, हम स्टूज और ये बड़े देशभक्त हैं? बाकी सब स्टूज हैं? . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मेरी पार्टी के मेम्बर श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त ने ऐसे शब्द का प्रयोग किया जो यद्यपि अनपार्लमेन्ट्री नहीं था लेकिन हमने उसको पसन्द नहीं किया और इसीलिए मैं एकदम खड़ा हो गया और यह कहा कि यह शब्द इस्तेमाल में नहीं लाना चाहिए था लेकिन रणधीर सिंह क्यों बिगड़ रहे हैं? . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री रणधीर सिंह: ये मिनिस्टर को स्टूज बोलते हैं और मुझ को भी स्टूज बोलते हैं। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मंत्री महोदय जवाब देने के लिए काफी सशक्त हैं। इसमें आपकी मदद की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री रणधीर सिंह : आप हमको गाली दिलवाते हैं अपने मेम्बरों से ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हमें गाली दिलवाने की जरूरत नहीं है । जब गाली देनी होगी तो हम खुद देंगे । . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री रणधीर सिंह : हम गाली नहीं देने देंगे—मैं एक बार नहीं दस बार कहता हूँ ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अगर यह बात है तो इन्होंने जो स्टूज शब्द कहा है वह बिल्कुल ठीक कहा है । . . . (व्यवधान) . . . ये समझते हैं कि हरियाणा से आये हैं तो क्या सारे सदन को सिर पर उठा लेंगे ? . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये ।

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: There should be a limit to such things. (Interruptions)

SHRI RANJEET SINGH: The Speaker alone can rebuke Members. Not even the Minister has any right to rebuke Members. If "stooge" was a wrong word, you, Sir, were the only person from whom everything was acceptable to us, but not from him. (Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरी बदकिस्मती है कि जब मैं स्पीकर हूँ तो इतने गरम आदमी इस पार्लमेन्ट में आ गए हैं । यह क्या बात है ? बड़ी मुश्किल बात है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अगर हमारा कोई मेम्बर गलती करता है तो हम कहते हैं कि उसने गलती की है लेकिन ये बैठे हुए हैं मिनिस्टर फार पार्लमेन्ट्री अफेयर्स, क्या ये अपने सदस्यों को नहीं रोक सकते हैं ? . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री रणधीर सिंह : मैं इनकी धमकी में नहीं आऊँगा, कभी नहीं आऊँगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठिये . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: What is it that he is saying, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I would request you to sit down. Why don't you control your own Member?

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: What is this going on?

MR. SPEAKER: When Mr. Vajpayee has expressed his regret, what is the sense in all this provocation from the other side? When he regrets the whole expression, what is the sense in other members getting up from this side unnecessarily disturbing the whole House?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna): Is there no Leader of the House in this House, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: So far as I am concerned, Dada, it is very unfortunate.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: How is it that peace can be maintained in this House if there is no Leader of the House?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Sir, the first question that he asked was as to what was the reason for not saying this or saying that in that statement. You cannot ask about things which are not there but which he thought ought to be there. All the relevant information that I thought is essential has been given in the statement I have given. I am not answerable for what is not contained in that statement. That is a poor way of contradicting a person.

The second question he asked was: During this period why was no written reply given? I cannot answer that. I said that no reply was given. We are not happy. . . (Interruptions) Please wait. You can draw your own conclusion. But in international life—I will repeat what I said on an earlier occasion—both methods are well-known. Sometimes even the most important and most serious matters are conveyed through diplomatic channels not always in writing and the absence of anything in writing is not a matter upon which we should have any concern.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

He said, "What is meant by 'more fully'?" It is quite obvious that so far they had changed from the fixed boundary to a disputed boundary. Now we hope that our view-point which we have presented from time to time will be taken into consideration more fully. That is, partially it was taken into consideration before. Now it will be taken into consideration more fully. It is a simple English word. I do not know why Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta asked me a question about this. . . (Interruptions) Samar Guhaji, why do you join with the Jana Sangh in this? My English may be bad but Mr. Mody can very well correct my English. For me it is a foreign language. If he says it is bad English, I do not know. I can only plead that if Mr. Pilloo Mody thinks it is bad English, it must be bad English because his English is definitely better than mine.

About the last question that he asked as to why other East European countries also have followed the soviet stand in this respect, I would like to say that there is no question of following the Soviet stand in this respect. I clarified the whole position when this matter was discussed in September. This is a legacy of pre-Independence period when the Soviet Union accepted the Chinese stand as against the British stand on the extent of the Indian territory. This has continued thereafter and this was there when the type of government in China was different and when the geopolitical situation also was entirely different. It is not a question of the East European countries following the Soviet Line. From pre-independence period, a certain delineation of the then Chinese and the then British Indian territory was adopted by the Soviet Union and that has continued. Now we are making serious efforts to get this rectified.

13.00 hrs.

Towards the end, Sir, may I say, I am grateful to him for withdrawing that expression, but I do not want to be apologetic? It is our considered policy to have friendly relations with the United States of America, with the Soviet Union, and in fact, with all the countries of the world, more so, with the big powers and the super-powers, and we should not try to liquidate the goodwill and the friendship that has existed between these

countries just because of argument on a particular issue. On basic economic matters and defence matters and in several political matters like Jammu and Kashmir we have consistently received support from the Soviet Union and this should not be liquidated by these irresponsible expressions that arose from the other side. Thank you.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT AND CERTIFIED ACCOUNTS OF SHIPPING DEVELOPMENT FUND COMMITTEE

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-TARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report and Certified Accounts (Hindi and English versions) of the Shipping Development Fund Committee for the year 1968-69, together with the Audit Report thereon, under subsection (6) of section 16 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4480/70].

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC RELATIONS AND PUBLICITY IN PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH): On behalf of Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Committee on Public Relations and Publicity in Public Undertakings (Hindi and English versions). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4481/70].

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Taxation Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1970, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 17th