

[श्री शिव नारायण]

वह मिनिस्टर बने, तो उन्होंने रिजाइन किया और फिर कांग्रेस के टिकट पर इलेक्शन लड़ कर आए।

लोग नेशनल इन्ट्रिग्रेशन का नमूना हमारे यहां देखें। हम ने अपने यहां उत्तर प्रदेश में बंगाली, मद्रासी, पंजाबी, सब को बसा रखा है और बिना भेद-भाव के हम उन को बेलकम करते हैं। पिछली बार दादा भी हमारे यहां से एम० पी० हों कर आए थे। श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी ने भी हमारे यहां इलेक्शन लड़ा और हम ने उन को चीफ मिनिस्टर बनाया। यह हमारी उदारता है। उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रीय एकता का नमूना देखा जा सकता है।

वहां पर हमारे लीडरों ने कहा, "We are not in a hurry to topple down this Government." लेकिन चरण सिंह और उन के साथी आपस में लड़ पड़े।

मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह होम मिनिस्ट्री को टाइटन करें, देश की रक्षा करें और हरिजनों की रक्षा करें, क्योंकि हम उन के सहारे पर हैं, हम इस देश को छोड़ कर कोई पाकिस्तान बनाने वाले नहीं हैं।

सरकार को बोर्डर पर भी सचेत और सजग रहना चाहिए। हम नेपाल बार्डर से आते हैं। सरकार के अफसर स्मगलड माल इधर मंगाते हैं। इसको चेक करना चाहिए। व्यरोकेसी अग्रेंज की ज्यादा लायल है, सरकार की कम।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं होम मिनिस्ट्री की डिमांडज का समर्थन करता हूँ। चव्हाण साहब ने अभी हाल में बम्बई में नमना दिखा दिया है। हम वहां पर 66 सीट्स जीते हैं। उस के बाद शिव सेना है। एम० एस० पी० वाले तो "जय सियाराम" हो गये, साफ हो

गये। यह चव्हाण साहब का नमूना है। जिस का जो चाहे वह देख ले।

श्री नधु लिनबें : पाटिल का।

श्री शिव नारायण : पाटिल का भी है। पाटिल ने इन को दिखा दिया है।

श्री मधु लिनबें : हम ने पाटिल को दिखा दिया है।

श्री शिव नारायण : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि : Coming events casts their shadows before

अब जितने भी इलेक्शन होंगे उन में हम जोतकर आयेंगे, इस का हमें पूरा विश्वास है।

18.25 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

*MAP OF KASHMIR PUBLISHED
IN "INDIAN EXPRESS"

MR. SPEAKER: This is a very good ending after a tiresome day. We shall begin the half an hour discussion now.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Basti): Mr. Speaker, Thank you very much for calling me to initiate this discussion.

I had given notice for the half an hour discussion on the problem of the Indian map. I was going through some of the records available in Parliament Library and was surprised to find that this problem has not only not been tackled so far but has been allowed to percolate in a way which has gone completely against this country, whenever the occasion has come.

This morning you were yourself very much concerned about the reply given by Government. You yourself felt that it could not satisfy the

House, much less the country. What was the answer?

"All matters relating to our border are subjected to constant scrutiny in the appropriate Ministries and departments of the Government of India, and where necessary, inter-ministerial meetings take place. Hon. Members will appreciate that it is not in public interest to disclose the details of such meetings and discussions."

Hon. Members should be denied information! I do not know, why? But others take advantage of the archives of the Government of India and make use of our maps for all kinds of concessions that they would like to have for nibbling at our territory.

This Parliament is the Parliament of this nation. Everybody in Parliament is concerned about the national interest. Everyone in Parliament has a patriotic feeling. I do not therefore understand how public interest could be pleaded for not taking this Parliament into confidence, for not taking the nation into confidence, as to what exactly should be done about this. I am surprised at the way the living archives of the Government of India have not been aware of the damage that has been done to the interests of this country.

I would only like to mention one instance of a document of the Survey of India. This is the general report of 1953. It was published by order of Brig. I. H. R. Wilson, Surveyor General of India. This is the official document of the Government of India still available in Parliament Library. I would like to show this map to you locating the red lines. This map shows some red lines. Outside the red lines are included foreign possessions in India and Andaman and Nicobar Islands. The red lines exclude Darjeeling; they exclude Jammu and Kashmir entirely; they exclude some areas of Kutch! Thank God, Calcutta

has been included within the red line. It is, I think, a great sense of relief that the red line was not drawn excluding Calcutta and probably Delhi.

This map and this report is lying in the Library. The officer who was in charge then was, I have come to know, doing this; and after the documents got accumulated, somebody, perhaps the Regional Labour Commissioner of the Central Government at that time—his name was Shri Hari Singh—informed the Government of India that he was indulging in this...

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobbili): May I seek a clarification on that report?

MR. SPEAKER: No, it will lead us nowhere.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: This is the Survey of India Report 1953. It is an authentic book available in Parliament Library. It has not been taken out of circulation. It is available in Parliament Library, the only place where one can be sure of the authenticity of books and reports.

His activities were noticed by Shri Hari Singh who was Regional Labour Commissioner. He informed the Government of India. Later on, it was known that his brother was occupying the same position in Pakistan. I do not have details of what happened. But the map indicates that definitely the work was being done not from the point of view of national interest and nobody had till then noticed it. Nobody noticed it. Later he was retired prematurely but the damage he did had never been rectified later on. I am not concerned with the fact that the officer was retired prematurely but what followed. Nothing has been done. Recently, also what happened on the Kutch border? We all know we lost our territory because our records could not be kept straight. It was our territory but we could not maintain re-

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

gular records. What is being done about border demarcation? I do not want to mention the name of a particular officer because his interests will be jeopardised. A very responsible officer told me about the way the border demarcation take place. Somebody comes somewhere and says he has seen some stone lying somewhere; note is taken. The officer decides: let the stone be removed from this place to that place. That becomes the border of India. This has happened in one of the important regions of this country. If the Home Minister wants, I can give the name of the officer. He was telling me that because the concern was expressed in an unusual manner, it usually damages the cause; otherwise quietly many things could be done. This is not a matter on which we can feel proud. We have been allowing our territory to be nibbled. Australia did not want to keep some islands and they want to the U.N. and said: we are surrendering these islands they do not belong to us. Next year when they submitted a report to the U.N. they deliberately said that they would no longer include those islands in the territory of Australia. But what is happening here? A very pertinent point was raised by Dr. Lohia when he participated in a similar debate sometime ago. This is the only unfortunate country where year we had been submitting reports to the United Nations giving varying figures. Our areas had been made to appear like rubber, to expand and contract at will. Dr. Lohia pointed out that from 1952 to 1960, our borders changed so many times. It was shown as 32 lakhs sq. kms. in one year, 32.60 lakhs in another year and in the third year, 32.40 lakhs. Then again, the Government of India once submitted a report—Dr. Lohia pointed this out—with a note that the counting of population could not take place and so the area could not be registered; the measurements were still going on and therefore a full report could not be sent and that they

would send a fuller report later on. No such report was sent later on or at least I do not know whether a fuller note was sent to the UN.

At a meeting held under the auspices of the Indian Parliamentary Group on 22nd March, 1968, Mr. Limaye had asked Dr. Bebler one question: "May I ask you a question, Dr. Bebler? You had very rightly stated in your dissenting opinion that the job of the Commission was to discover where the boundary lies in the Rann of Kutch area and not to invent a new boundary. But the Chairman in his judgment on the last but one page says that the two inlets in the Naganparkar area must be given to Pakistan and the jagged boundary straightened out in order to establish peace and stability in the region. Don't you think therefore that the Tribunal majority has gone beyond the terms of reference? "To which Dr. Babler replied: "Yes, it can well be argued that they have exceeded their jurisdiction. In fact I wish there were an Appellate authority and instead of being your nominee on the Tribunal, I had an opportunity of being your advocate before this Appellate Authority." Dr. Bebler is a great lawyer and a jurist of world renown. He does feel that the tribunal went beyond their terms of reference. Was it not noticed by our lawyers who argued our case? Was it not pointed out at that time? When the Kutch decision was not before us as a categorical decision, we could have said, "We would like to have some information about that, to give a further clarification." If Dr. Bebler's opinion is this, we were caught napping when the tribunal exceeded their terms of reference.

We have been completely taken by surprised because we had to accept it as an award. We have respected international conventions and I do not blame the Government of India for respecting it. It should be done by

any civilised Government. But the records, as they are kept, are highly unsatisfactory. About Kachchativ, even today there is a controversy in this country whether it belonged to us originally or not. The Prime Minister this morning said—in reply to earlier questions that these islands were always in dispute. If so, there are friendly countries around India with whom we could have discussed these issues. We took 20 years to come to a border agreement with Burma. I do not know whether the whole thing has been confirmed by Burma and India. We could have discussed this issue with Ceylon and taken a decision without a controversy being raised.

Not only are we very much concerned about these maps, but I suggest that a very high-powered committee should be appointed under the supervision of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister to demarcate our borders and decide this matter once and for all. It is not at all an unimportant matter. The area and population are two basic things of this nation and that must be given top priority.

Another example of a blatant kind of air violation is being done by B.O.A.C. They have the cheek to put that kind of categorical air violation as part of their manual. This was probably laid on the Table of the House, but I would again quote it. We know that we have no trade with South Africa and we do not allow any goods to go there through India by air, land or sea. The manual of the B.O.A.C. says:

“Officially, goods destined to or from South Africa are not permitted to transit India. However, consignments of negligible value can be carried provided they are stored out of sight in inner-most part of aircraft holds. If the value of a consignment is suffi-

ent to make risk of confiscation a serious matter, the sender must be informed and must give a written indemnity to the carrier against any action the Government of India may take.”

This is a blatant violation. They say they would carry goods to and from South Africa through India by taking an indemnity bond from South Africa. We are a sovereign nation and yet this kind of thing goes on.

There is some misunderstanding about our border demarcation. Goa and Pondicherry were not part of India originally and their area could not be counted as India's territory. Then, after that, if Goa and Pondicherry came over to India, the demarcation of area should have increased automatically, the square miles should have increased automatically. Why did it not happen? Where has all that area gone away? How is it that our demarcation of areas, square mile area remained at 32,60,000 k.m.? How did it happen? I would like to know that from the hon. Home Minister.

Then I find that on the 31st July, 1957 the Government of India made a statement in which there was no mention of Azad Kashmir when the Government were giving a statement of the area of India. Azad Kashmir is still part of India and will remain part of India. That is our stand.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): Occupied Kashmir.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Yes, occupied Kashmir. I am very happy that he corrected me. How did this omission take place and what has the Government done to rectify this mistake which occurred earlier?

MR. SPEAKER: By ballot four names were selected. Shri Limaye

[Mr. Speaker]

and Shri Rabi Ray are there. I hope one of them will ask question. Similarly, the names of Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta and Shri Ranjit Singh are there. Among them also I suppose one will ask question. Instead of too many people asking questions, I am suggesting that two Members may make important points.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय सब से पहले मैं श्रीमती तारा-केशवरी सिन्हा को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस विषय पर चर्चा उठा कर एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण मामले की ओर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाया है। अभी उन्होंने सर्वे आफ इंडिया के 1953 के नक्शे का उल्लेख किया और कहा कि उस में पूर्वतः भारत का कुछ इलाका रेस्ट्रिक्टेड बतला दिया गया है। हो सकता है कि गृह-मंत्री जी उस का यह जबाब दें कि फौजी दृष्टि से उस को हम ने रेस्ट्रिक्टेड रखा है। लेकिन इस बात में तथ्य नहीं है, क्योंकि मेरे पास 1952 की रिपोर्ट है जिस में यह लिखा हुआ है कि :

"Maps outside the red line and which include any portion of foreign possessions in India and Andaman and Nicobar Islands are restricted."

यह तो 1952 में हुआ, लेकिन मैं ने जो नई रिपोर्ट देखी है 1961 की उस में यह लिखा हुआ है कि :

"Maps outside the red line, maps which include any portion of Assam, Tripura, Manipur, Nagaland, Jammu and Kashmir or Andaman and Nicobar Islands and such other maps which the Ministry of Defence may notify from time to time are restricted."

मतलब यह कि हमारा जो सुरक्षा मंत्रालय है वह 1961 में सामने आता

है। उस के पहले जो मैप्स रेस्ट्रिक्टेड थे उन के और जो मैं ने अभी पढ़ा उस के मतलब में फर्क है। इसलिये गृह मंत्री जी हम से यह न कहें कि फौजी कारणों से यह किया गया था। इस में असली कारण यह है कि सर्वे आफ इण्डिया के जो सर्वेअर जनरल आजादी के प्रथम वर्षों में रहे हैं वह अंग्रेज रहे हैं। मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार एक हेनी साहब थे जो कि करीब पांच साल तक 1946 से 1951 तक रहे, और उस के बाद विल्सन साहब रहे हैं। जो भी अंग्रेज अफसर थे, फौजी अफसर या आई सी एस, उन की सहानुभूति हमेशा पाकिस्तान के साथ रही है। देश के विभाजन के यही लोग जिम्मेदार रहे हैं और उन लोगों ने जानबूझ कर दस्तावेजों में और नक्शों में इस तरह की बातें लिखी हैं कि हमारा मारा सीमावर्ती इलाका स्पष्ट नहीं है, और इसके लिये उस को रेस्ट्रिक्टेड एरिया रखा था कि उस के अन्दर जो भी घाँघलियां उन को करनी हों वह वे कर सकें।

इस सिलसिले में मैंने अंडमान निकोबार का उल्लेख किया था। अंडमान और निकोबार के बारे में कभी भी विवाद का सवाल ही उत्पन्न नहीं हुआ, और न कोई मानता था कि विवाद हो सकता है। लेकिन क्या बजह है कि कच्छ का निर्णय होने के तत्काल पश्चात पाकिस्तान का प्रचार शुरू हुआ कि अंडमान और निकोबार का बटवारा किया जाये। और उसके बाद यह भी खबर आती है कि पाकिस्तान जिन राष्ट्रों में उन का बटवारा करना चाहता था, आज उन में से एक राष्ट्र बर्मा ने नरकुण्डम द्वीप पर अपना कब्जा जमाने की कोशिश की। यही कच्छ-तिबू के बारे में हुआ।

क्या सरकार इस बात पर विचार करेगी कि जब कभी एक मुलक और उसका सरकार कमजोर हो जाते हैं तब जो पड़ोसी मित्र होते हैं वह भी प्रलोभन और लालच में आकर दुश्मन बन जाते हैं ? मैं इसके सम्बंध में रूस का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। जब से रूस ताकतवर बना जब से जिन राष्ट्रों का मैं के इलाके पर दावा था, जैसे कि तुर्की की बात है जो कि उस के दो प्रान्त अभी भी मांग रहा है वह पड़ोसी देश दोस्त होने लगे। आज आप लोगों की संधि नेपाल से है चीन के साथ आप ने 1954 में संधि की, बर्मा के साथ किया, और सीलोन के साथ भी जो भारतीय नस्ल के लोग हैं उन के बारे में संधि की। जब चार राज्यों के साथ आप ने संधि की तो क्या आप का यह कर्तव्य नहीं था, दायित्व नहीं था, कि जब आप उन के साथ संधि करते हैं तब सीमा के बारे में भी कुछ सोचें ? आप दूसरों के साथ संधि करते समय जिनमें बारगेनिंग काउंटर्स होते हैं उन्हें फँक देते हैं और बाद में दूसरे लोग हमारी कमजोरी के कारण विवाद उत्पन्न कर देते हैं और जो शुरू में एक आसान मामला था उसको उलझा देते हैं। क्या इन सारी बातों पर विचार करके आप हमेशा के लिये कोई पक्की नीति बनायेंगे? इसमें कोई दल का मामला नहीं है, कॅमिंस पार्टी की सदस्या जो इस बहस को उठा रही हैं मैं उसका समर्थन कर रहा हूँ, इस लिये यह कोई दल का सवाल नहीं है, यह राष्ट्रीयता का सवाल है, हमारी प्रभुसत्ता का मामला है। कमजोरियों के कारण पड़ोसी दुश्मन हो जाते हैं, क्या इसके ऊपर भी गृह-मंत्री ध्यान देंगे ?

MR. SPEAKER: I may inform Shri Bhogendra Jha that it is not on party basis but lots are drawn of those who want to speak. One party has got two names. Those are the

lucky people. If I allow outside that, Shri Randhir Singh and others, who gave notice and lost in the lots, will ask me to call them.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur): I always give my name.

MR. SPEAKER: I know.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): I always lose in the lots.

MR. SPEAKER: If only two or three people take part, they may be able to make some points. That is my point.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यहाँ कोई एक या दो नक्शे ऐसे नहीं हैं जिनमें हमारे देश की सीमाओं को गलत बतलाया गया है। अगर सब जगहों का सर्वे किया जाय और हमारे देश की जो बड़ी बड़ी लाइब्रेरीज हैं उनमें भी और जो सरकार की लाइब्रेरीज हैं उनमें भी, और जो दूसरी जगह के ऐटलस बने हैं, वह देखे जायें, तो एक नहीं कई उदाहरण ऐसे मिलेंगे जिनमें बहुत बड़ी गलतियाँ की हुई हैं, पेटेंट गलतियाँ की हुई हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके दो ही कारण हैं। एक तो, जैसा श्री मधु लिमये ने बतलाया, यह है कि हम कमजोर होते जा रहे हैं, और दूसरा सबसे बड़ा कारण यह है कि हम बहुत केन्द्रलेस हैं। इस समस्या के बारे में हमने कभी ध्यान ही नहीं दिया। इसके बारे में हमने कभी सोचा ही नहीं।

मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनियाँ में एक हमारा ही देश है, हमारी सरकार ही एक ऐसी सरकार है, जिसने अभी तक हमारे देश का सही नक्शा क्या है, हमारी सीमायें क्या हैं, इसका पता नहीं लगाया है।

मुझे याद है कि दिल्ली में कई राय साहब और राय बहादुर हैं, जो कि हरिद्वार की कई धर्मशालाओं की प्रापर्टी के ट्रस्ट बनाये हुये हैं। वह उनको यहाँ से ही कंट्रोल करते हैं, वह वहाँ कभी जाते नहीं हैं। नतीजा यह है कि कई कई एकड़ जमीन पर ट्रस्ट-पासर्स बैठ जाते हैं, उसी प्रकार कुछ मान-

[श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त /

में इस चीज के बारे में हमारा रवैया रहा है। कभी कहा जाता है कि यहाँ घास नहीं उगती है, कभी कहा जाता है कि यहाँ कोई आबादी नहीं है, कभी कहा जाता है कि यहाँ कुछ भी नहीं उगता है। मैं चाहूँगा कि हम इस तरह का नक्शा बनायें जिसमें हमारी बाउंडरी ठीक तरह से दिखाई गई हो और उसमें जो आईलैण्ड्स हैं छोटे छोटे वहाँ पर डाट आप लगा सकते हैं और अगर नहीं लगाना चाहते हैं तो नीचे नोट दें कि यह हिस्सा भारत का है। एक तर्फसील से हमारा भ्रम होना चाहिये और जिस नक्शे में सरकार द्वारा बेरीफिकेशन न हो उसको किसी भी कालेज में, स्कूल में या लाइब्रेरी में नहीं रखा जाना चाहिये। अगर अनधिकृत नक्शा बनता है और वह सरकार से प्रेप्रूव नहीं होता है तो कानूनी कार्यवाही सरकार द्वारा की जानी चाहिये और अगर इसके बारे में कानून नहीं है और इसको जुर्म नहीं समझा जाता है ...

श्री रणधोर सिंह : 467 आ० पी० सी० है तो।

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त : अगर है तो उसका इस्तेमाल होना चाहिये। दुःख की बात तो यह है कि अभी एक केस में भी इसका इस्तेमाल नहीं किया गया है और इस्तेमाल हो भी नहीं सकता था क्योंकि इसकी तरफ कभी सरकार का ध्यान ही नहीं गया है।

सरकार का बहुत ही कैलस एटीट्यूड रहा है। मुझे दुःख है कि भारत सरकार इस तरह में फंक्शन करती है जिससे ऐसा मान्य होता है कि यह भारत की सरकार ही नहीं है। यही कारण है कि कभी इसका जगड़ा होता है और कभी उसका होता है।

मैं चहता हूँ कि अधिकृत रूप में नक्शा बनाया जाना चाहिये। जिसमें हमारे आईलैण्ड्स कौन कौन से हैं वे सब तपसील में बताये जाने चाहिये। अनधिकृत नक्शा कोई छापता है तो उसके खिलाफ ऐक्शन होना

चाहिये, उसको सजा मिलनी चाहिये। अभी जो नक्शे हमारी लाइब्रेरीज में हैं उनकी छानबीन होनी चाहिये अगर आप छानबीन करेंगे तो आपको सकड़ों नक्शे इस किस्म के मिलेंगे जो कि आपत्तिजनक हैं। हमारी अपनी आफिसियल लाइब्रेरी में भी ऐसे नक्शे हैं जो गलत हैं।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि एक्सपर्ट्स की एक कमेटी आप बिठायें और वह कमेटी सर्वे करे। वह हर चीज देखें और अपनी रिपोर्ट एक निश्चित समय में दे और वह रिपोर्ट पार्लियामेंट के सामने आये और उस पर यहाँ चर्चा हो। जब पार्लियामेंट उसको प्रूव कर दे उसके बाद वह अधिकृत चीज बनें।

बीच में जो चीज हो रही है जैसे निकोबार के बारे में झगड़ा हो गया कुछ और के बारे में झगड़ा हो गया, इसको सरकार दबाने की कोशिश न करे। जो भी इस तरह की चीज हो उसके बारे में सरकार को स्वयं स्टेटमेंट देना चाहिये और बताना चाहिये कि यह यह हिस्सा हमारा है और यह डिस्प्यूटिड है। पिछले डेढ़ साल से हम देख रहे हैं कि जब कुछ और मच जाता है तभी सरकार कुछ बताती है, अपने आप आगे आकर कुछ नहीं बताती है। जब कोई इशू नहीं आता है तो सरकार सोती रहती है। कुछ आपको नीति निर्धारित करनी चाहिये और उस नीति के तहत काम करना चाहिये, तभी मामला ठीक होगा।

जो मैंने मुताब दिये हैं ये राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से दिये हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि आप इनको स्वीकार करेंगे।

SHRI RANJIT SINGH (Khalilabad): Disasters have already visited our land for want of vigilance on our borders, on the ground as well as on the map. The armed forces are there for vigilance on our borders but there is no vigilance exercised against cartographical aggression and errors. The tragedy is that the border on the ground defended by the

blood of our jawans is lost by lapses of the Survey of India. The purely technical personnel in the Survey of India do not realise the implications of the marginal and other remarks they put on the maps. Would the Government, therefore, consider the creation of a cell, in the Survey of India, of officers who go through the maps from the political angle also and that, only after they have passed the maps, the maps should be published? There are hundreds of small islands spread all over the ocean, about some of which, unfortunately, we do not have even information, like Kachhathivu, as to whom it belongs to. The Government did not have the information; the Government today is not in a position to take a strong stand . . .

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur): The records with the Madras Government indicate that Kachhathivu belongs to us. I want to put the records straight.

MR. SPEAKER: Government had no information. That is what he is saying.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: Would the Government consider this? In those islands which are not occupied, i.e., where our population is not there but the islands belong to us, either settle some of the refugees that are coming or if those islands are uninhabitable like Kachhathivu where, it was said, there was no water or something like that, at least erect some strong edifices pointing out that they belong to India.

Lastly, I regret to say that there is a lot of ignorance on the geography of our own country among the Ministers and in the Government. I will point out a classic example. This is not a laughing matter. This happened with a Minister. Looking at the operational map in the Army Headquarters, he asked the officer-in-charge where Aksai Chin was, and after Aksai Chin was pointed out to 3856 (Ai) LSD—1.

him, he asked, "Where is Ho-Chi-Minh in this map?" This is the depth of ignorance that the Ministers and the Government have . . . (*Interruptions*). You were not there. This is a classic example . . . (*Interruptions*). Would the Government consider giving lectures, giving education, to the Ministers on the map of India?

श्री रवि राय (पूरी) : एक ही सवाल में पूछा . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Alright.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA rose—

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: How are you calling him, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Rabi Ray's is the first name in the lot. The other names are: Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha, Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta and Shri Ranjit Singh. These were the names that came in the lot. Yours and Mr. Narayana Rao's were also there, but unfortunately you did not get it . . . (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: We abide by your wishes. We do not grudge it.

19 hrs.

श्री रवि राय : देश के किसी भी हिस्से को विवादास्पद जब सरकार कहती है तो वह बिना सोचे विचारे कह देती है। उत्तर प्रदेश का बाड़ाहोती का इलाका आप जानते हैं कि भारत का इलाका है और उत्तर प्रदेश का वह एक भाग है। उत्तर प्रदेश के उस समय डा० सम्पूर्णानन्द मुख्य मंत्री थे और उन्होंने कहा था कि यह भारत का अंग है, उत्तर प्रदेश का एक भाग है। प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू जी ने फेरमाया था कि यह विवादास्पद है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसके बारे में स्थिति क्या है इसको स्पष्ट सरकार को करना चाहिये।

[श्री रवि राय]

इस सवाल को भी पिछले साल डा० लोहिया ने उठाया था कि कुछ वर्ष पहले नेहरू जी के द्वारा कुछ गांव मनीपुर के शांति बनाये रखने की खातिर बर्मा को दे दिये गये थे जब कि बर्मा में थाकेन नू प्रधान मंत्री थे। क्या यह सही है और अगर सही है तो यह कैसे हुआ ?

तीसरा सवाल मेरा यह है कि कूच विहार का कुछ इलाका है कुछ एनक्लेब्ज हैं। हमारी भी एनक्लेब्ज है और पाकिस्तान की भी हैं। पाकिस्तान की जो एनक्लेब्ज हैं वहां पर तो पाकिस्तान के अफसर लोग आते जाते हैं। और हमारी जो हैं वहां हमारे अफसर लोग नहीं जा पाते हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सही है ? क्या कोई करारनामा या कोई सन्धि इस तरह की वार्ता द्वारा पाकिस्तान के साथ आपने की है जिसके अनुसार हमारी जो एनक्लेब्ज हैं उनमें हमारे अफसर और हमारे लोग जा पायें और उनकी जो एनक्लेब्ज हैं वहां उनके अफसर जायें उनके लोग जायें। उनके लोग तो अभी भी वहां आते जाते हैं लेकिन हमारी एनक्लेब्ज में हमारे अफसर नहीं जा पाते हैं। इस स्थिति को बदलने के लिये और ऐसी व्यवस्था करने के लिये जिसमें हम अपनी एक इंच भूमि भी पाकिस्तान को न दें और हमारी एनक्लेब्ज पर हमारा कब्जा रहे सरकार क्या कार्य-वाही कर रही है ?

श्री रणधीर सिंह : सब नाम आपोजीशन के मेम्बरों के निकले हैं और किसी भी कांग्रेसी सदस्य का नाम नहीं निकला है। यह बड़ी आबजेकशनेबल बात है।

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. Member kindly resume his seat. The lots are drawn. So, how can I help it?

श्री मधु लिख्ये : यह तो बैलट-बाक्स का दोष है।

MR. SPEAKER: I do not want anybody to reply. When lots are

drawn I do not know how I can help it, if the Members on one side do not secure the lots? (Interruption).

I do not want anybody to help me. I can help myself. When lots are drawn it happens like that. Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha has taken about 15 minutes. But Shri Randhir Singh thinks that unless he is called, it means that no Congress Member has been called, he thinks that there is no Congress other than himself. That is the pity. Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha has been there for about fifteen years and the Home Minister has also been there in Parliament. Yet, Shri Randhir Singh thinks that except himself there is no Congress. That is the pity of it. That is unfortunate.

Now, the hon. Home Minister.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): Hon. Members have certainly raised very important issues. There is no doubt about it. But I thought that this question was considered in a restricted manner in relation to the question which was answered here the other day.

I do not wish to say anything about this book and the map in it because I do not want to make any wrong statement which might go against our national interest. So, I do not want to make any statement about it. It may be that the criticism that is made there is also valid, but I do not know about it.

The only point which I would like to make is this. The authoritative map of India is the one which was published in 1962 by the Survey of India (40 miles to one inch). That is the basic on which we have to go about it. That is the final authoritative map.

The question that has been raised in this discussion is what we are doing about the wrong maps that are

published. Either they are published as maps or they are published as part of some textbooks etc. There are a large number of foreign publications also which go on publishing wrong maps. Now, the question is: What is the in-built arrangement in our administration and in our statutory provisions so that we can prohibit these maps.

In 1961, the Criminal Law Amendment Act was passed, and if you would kindly see sections 2 and 4 of that Act you will see that notice was taken of this particular matter. Section 2 reads thus:

"Whoever by words either spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representation or otherwise, questions the territorial integrity or frontiers of India in a manner which is, or is likely to be, prejudicial to the interests of the safety or security of India, shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both."

This section is about the punishment to be given.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Why should he not prosecute?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: There is another section, namely section 4 which authorises the prescribing of the material which is published. This is the legal arrangement. Under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act also, by definition, such a thing can be considered to be a penal offence under the Act. This is the legal position about it.

Even as regards the book mentioned by Shri George Fernandes, the publication of the London Times Organisation, I find that it was proscribed in 1965. Unfortunately though the

book was published in 1959, it was brought to the notice of the Government of India in 1965 and timely action was taken and the publication was proscribed. Of course, some number of copies must have already been imported during that period.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: It is still lying in our library.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I accept it. It may be there in several libraries as it was there in our own library. So, I am now pursuing this matter and trying to reach the libraries to find out which are the proscribed publications which should be removed from the libraries. This is one step.

The other point that Shri George Fernandes made was that the book contained a long list of acknowledgments in which they had mentioned even the Survey of India. This might create a wrong impression as if the Survey of India has collaborated with this organisation to prepare that map. I made enquiries from the survey of India and they have said that they have in no manner collaborated with this organisation for preparation of these particular maps.

Some other eminent academicians also are mentioned there. I think it will be necessary to take up this matter with them to find out. It is quite possible that this publication is a continuous process. Possibly they might have consulted the Survey of India published before 1947 and the acknowledgement may have been continued as such.

I have got a list of nearly 51 publications proscribed under this Act. Now in order to facilitate correct publication of these maps in the country, the Survey of India has published three different maps on three different scales which might be helpful to those who want to publish the correct maps. All

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

State Governments have been written to bring this facility to be made known to all publishers etc. so that if they want to publish correct maps, they should have this facility with them.

These are the steps that have been taken in the last two years to see that correct maps are published in India and wrong maps are not circulated in the country. This is on the general question.

About the *Indian Express* publication, I find the Express organisation published the wrong map unintentionally. Three times the matter has been taken up with them through the State Governments because their editions are published in different States. This particular map was published in Andhra Pradesh. We have already taken up the matter with the Andhra Pradesh Government. At the same time, we have taken it up with their central organisation in Delhi. So this is about the *Indian Express*.

There is one thing which remains by way of difficulty. These sections of the Act provide for action in the case of intentional publication. But sometimes some publications are made negligently or unknowingly. What do we do about that? That matter will have to be legally examined. We have taken up this matter with the concerned authority...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Ignorance is no excuse.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I quite agree. This matter needs to be examined. I am only pointing out one difficulty. This is another aspect of the problem. If administrative action is thought of in the sense that any publication of any person should have some sort of previous sanction of some administrative authority, if we do that, it will create a large

number of difficulties. I am not expressing a view; I am only pointing out certain difficulties. Suppose a large number of geography books are published for schools, primary and secondary, and if we make this sort of compulsion, it will create a number of difficulties.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): There will be no difficulty about reproduction. Authorised maps are there.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I know. I am pursuing this matter further. Authorised maps are there. But sometimes they have to use small drawings of maps in the textbooks. If we make this compulsory for them to take previous sanction for publication, possibly—I am not giving my final view about it—it might create a feeling of harassment. This is a matter that will have to be looked into. I am pursuing it further.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: What about prosecuting those responsible for tampering with the authentic record in this particular case?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: This was published in 1953.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: Let him locate the persons responsible.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I will find out.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I think there was a fire in 1961 or 1962. Then Shri Humayun Kabir was the Minister in charge. A question was raised about the fire. It was said that a lot of documents were destroyed. We would like to know what is the position, whether valuable documents were destroyed or not. If the Home Minister has no information about it today, he might give it later.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Certainly. In this matter, I would not stand on formality as to whether it is pertaining to my Ministry or not, because I know this is a matter of national interest and national importance.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : मैंने सुना है कि सर्वे आफ इंडिया ने एक मैप निकाला है जिसमें हमारे आईलैण्ड्स का कहीं भी जिक्र नहीं है ।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I will not be able to answer all the detailed questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Members may pass on information to him.

श्री मधु लिमये : एक काम तो यह कर सकते हैं । यहां इस वहम में जितने मुद्दे उठाये गये हैं इन पर बाद में सोच समझ कर जानकारी इकट्ठी करके बयान दे दें, चाहे नरकुंडम का मामला हो या कच्चा तीवु का मामला हो, क्योंकि हम लोग बहुत परेशान हैं इन मामलों को लेकर ।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: My attitude is not to refuse any information. I am not taking a technical view of these matters that these matters are dealt with in two or three ministries. Ultimately, we are all responsible for this. Therefore, the point you have raised will have to be gone into. At the present moment, I cannot answer all the questions.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi): May I suggest that a note and an authorised map may be circulated among the Members.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: All these suggestions are for our consideration.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA: Has any person been prosecuted for publishing an unauthenticated map?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Under the Act anybody who publishes an unauthorised map will be prosecuted because we have a legal provision for it.

श्री शशि भूषण वाजपेयी (खारगोन) : विदेश में जो जाली नोट और जाली नक्शे बन कर आते हैं उनकी भी जांच करते हैं ?

श्री यशवन्त राव चव्हाण : बाहर से छप कर जो आता है उसके लिये मैंने कहा कि ऐक्शन लिया गया है ।

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: He said that certain authenticated maps are on the scale of one inch to forty miles. Under that scale, small islands could not be shown even by a dot. So far as the islands are concerned, the authenticated map should be of the scale of one inch to one mile and not forty miles.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I can only say that these are suggestions in regard to details and we shall certainly consider them but I am not in a position to answer all these things now.

19.15 hrs,

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, March 28, 1968/Chaitra 8, 1890 (Saka).