

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

So, the first point that the hon. Minister should clarify is whether this committee that is going to be constituted is really a parliamentary committee. I would like to know whether he still stands by what he said yesterday, namely that this would be a parliamentary committee. If he says it is not a parliamentary committee, then it is well and good, but if it is a parliamentary committee, then he is wholly wrong and he is only bamboozling the House.

Coming to the amendments which I have moved, I am anxious because the Kerala State, which has been called one of our problem states, a beautiful State, highly literate State, a politically conscious State, has been in a summary fashion, in a cavalier fashion, deprived of the constitutional and parliamentary privilege of having a legislature for the conduct of its affairs and this has been done in a manner which was described in various ways, in various words, yesterday by Members on that side and by Members of the Opposition on this side of the House. So, I need not go into that matter again. I need not reiterate what was said yesterday. The manner in which it has been done has been wholly unconstitutional, wholly illegitimate, wholly high-handed and I might say, even atrocious.

Therefore, to make amends,—or may I use the word *prayaschitta*—for the sin or the crime or the major, if not monumental, blunder which they have committed with regard to Kerala, I appeal to Government and to the hon. Minister to accept these amendments of mine, because the duty of this House is now more than twofold, and in fact it is manifold, with regard to Kerala. It is rather unhappy and unfortunate that we have given only one day or a little more than a day for the discussion of the affair of Kerala. It should have been much more.

My amendment suggests or proposes that the President shall, on every oc-

casión before he proceeds to legislate for Kerala, consult the committee which will be constituted of Members of both Houses of Parliament.

The idea underlying this amendment is that the President, busy as he is, a busy dignitary as he is, may not . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Will the hon. Member take more time?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I think so, because there are two amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then he will continue on Monday. We have to take up non-official business now.

14.31 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SIXTY-SIXTH REPORT

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Sixty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th May, 1965."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Sixty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th May 1965."

The motion was adopted.

14.32 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: DEFENCE OF INDIAN BORDERS—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further discussion of the following Resolution mov-

ed by Shri Krishnapal Singh on the 23rd April, 1965:—

"This House is of opinion that the arrangements for defence of Indian borders (with Pakistan, China and Burma) should be further improved and their protection should be under the overall supervision of the Defence Forces."

Shri Krishnapal Singh had just begun his speech on that day. He may continue.

An hour and a half has been allotted for this.

Shri Krishnapal Singh (Jalesar): It is not my object, Sir, to create an impression in this House that I am trying to indulge in war-mongering or that I want unnecessarily to create panic. My whole object in moving this resolution is that I want the country to become strong, so strong that no aggressor or no would-be aggressor would ever try to think of coming across our borders.

I am glad, Sir, that a few amendments have been moved, or are going to be moved, and I would like to make it clear that I would be prepared to accept the amendment which stands in the names of Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh and Shri Deorao S. Patil which makes the position still more clear.

I am glad that the Prime Minister has made it clear this morning that in the talks or in the negotiations for cease-fire he would only accept an honourable settlement. None of us on this side would be opposed to any kind of honourable settlement about any dispute.

I am glad that the Prime Minister's appeal for a guarantee from the nuclear powers has met with some response.

Now, before I say something about the relative strength of the different forces, I would like briefly to draw the attention of the House to the existing situation on our borders. Our

border, as hon. Members know, our land border stretches to about 10,000 miles, and we have a sea coast of about 3,000 miles. We have three countries with whom we have our borders: Burma, Pakistan and China. In order to determine what should be our strength, what should be our preparedness, we should see how strong they are and what sort of equipment and what sort of forces they possess.

As regards Burma, with whom fortunately we have had no quarrel yet, and I hope that we shall always live peacefully with our Burmese neighbour, but we have to take into account what is the size of their forces and what type of forces they have got. According to the information which I have been able to collect, they have an army strength of about one hundred thousand men. They have a small air force, and quite a small navy consisting of frigates and other small boats.

Pakistan, as we know, is much stronger. They have a standing army of about two and a half lakhs. They have a bigger air force about there to four squadrons of aeroplanes. They have a navy with destroyers and other ships; not a very big navy, smaller than ours, but one bigger than that of Burma. What is important is that they have trained a large force of guerillas and irregular troops, and they are making good use of them.

As regards China, we know that it has made massive preparations for war in the past few years. They have a standing army of over two million men. Their air force consists of over two thousand front-line airships, most of which are jets. And they have a navy fairly large compared to what all the other nations in Asia have got at present.

I would only restrict my remarks to the army. There is not much time, and we don't have to worry about the navy at present, as the Chinese navy is not likely to come and worry us for some time.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Don't be so complacent.

Shri Krishnapal Singh: They have some submarines with torpedo bombs which may be of a nuisance value, which may interest our merchant shipping. But we cannot expect, in the face of the American and other naval forces in the seas that lie between China and India, they would think of bringing their naval forces near our coast. They are always preoccupied with the American naval forces which are so near to them, and so I do not think that they will ever do that. Besides, they have a very long border too. And although they have a large standing army, they have also many commitments to meet. Therefore it is not possible for them to bring a very large portion of their army to the Indian border.

According to the information given by our Defence Minister, they have already massed twelve to sixteen divisions on our border. Pakistan is said to have eight or nine divisions, besides its air force. They too have other commitments than the Indian border, and it is not possible for them to concentrate their entire force against us. But we should not forget that the combined strength of Pakistan and China is formidable—China alone is formidable—and therefore, what we have to prepare for is to meet the threat, the combined threat of China and Pakistan. And if I may be permitted to say so, if we are anxious to maintain peace and do not want to precipitate a war with anybody, we must forget the old Roman saying which says "If you want peace, prepare for war". That is the only way to keep an aggressor or people who want to be aggressors, in check—deter them from taking the initiative.

In the last two or three years, we have increased the strength of our armed forces. We have certainly improved the defence of our borders. But what we have to see is whether we have sufficient forces to deter any aggressor from intruding into our

territory. There is no room for complacency. As I said, we have made some improvements. Possibly our present forces are quite sufficient, as has been announced by the Defence Minister several times, to take care of our borders and to meet any eventuality. But are we prepared to deter any would-be aggressor, any aggressor who intends to create trouble in future? There I may say that we are not prepared to that extent. We have to make greater preparations. I cannot praise the wisdom of those who brought about the cease-fire in Kashmir or the withdrawal from Tibet. Those are the two great mistakes we made in the past and they are responsible for creating the situation which we have to face today.

I must make it clear that unless we are strong enough to launch an offensive against any country which tries to give us trouble, we shall not be able to live in peace, as things are today. I cannot say about the future, but as things are today, we must be prepared not only to defend ourselves but to ensure that if any country tries to give us trouble we will be able to hit back.

Lately, quite a number of our people have published very good articles. I would not refer to all of them, but I would like to read out an extract from one at least. There Rear-Admiral Karmarkar, one of our retired soldiers, says in one of the letters published in the *Indian Express* of 22 April:

"Why have we landed ourselves in the present state of border strife? Have we not learnt our lesson from the debacle of 1962 as a result of the Chinese aggression? First of all, there were Chinese incursions into our territory. We talked but took no action. Then our leaders made statements that 'only a few thousand square miles' of 'useless' land was occupied by the Chinese".

Further on, he says:

"Now our sabre-rattling neighbour occupies our territory and

refuses to be dislodged, except by fighting. Why were they allowed to encroach, in the first instance? Have we no border patrols? Have we no military intelligence system which could warn us? So now we have suddenly decided to take action. We have approached the UN naming the aggressor. What is the use? Let us smack him down and let him go to the UN and complain saying that he walked into our territory and was kicked out bag and baggage and that he feels very hurt and painful in the hind quarters".

This is soldier's language. But the purpose of my moving this Resolution is to impress upon the Government that we should be strong enough to take the offensive if any country tries to give us trouble.

As regards the strength of our armed forces, I have already said there is a good deal of improvement but a lot more remains to be done. We have to recall what happened in the beginning of the last war. The Indian Army was only 175,000 strong. Within three years, its strength rose to over 2 million men, it was equipped fully and whenever and wherever it went into battle, it fought and won laurels. What is more, India was not a debtor; India had, I think, Rs. 1,100 crores of sterling balances in London after the Second World War.

So this kind of anxiety on our part that we should be able to build a strong army and build up our defences properly. One of the reasons why we have not been able to do it and why we are hesitating is that we are trying to do too many things at a time. It is time that Defence received the highest priority at the hands of our Government and this Parliament.

There are two ways of calculating the strength of our armed forces. One is by measuring the strength of our neighbours. Capt. Liddel Hart, an authority on military matters has es-

timated that for defence alone one should have two-thirds of the strength of one's enemy. The same authority says that another way of calculating the strength of our armed forces is by measuring the ratio of the length of the border with the men we require. If we want to defend, as I have said already, we need two-thirds the strength of our neighbour, but since we have to prepare for taking the offensive, we need an overall strength of three times the strength of our neighbour. That alone can enable us to ensure a safe defence. The other method by which we can calculate the required strength of our forces is by measuring the ratio of men to mile. We have a land frontier of 10,000 miles. There was a time when they used to have 10,000 to 15,000 men to a mile in good old days. That has been gradually reduced. It came down to 7,000 or 6,000 in the Boer War and other wars. Then in the last war, it was reduced, with improved weapons and greater mobility, to 700 or 600 men to one mile. Nowadays, provided they have good weapons, even 250 or 200 men to a mile would be enough to defend the borders safely, but if we have less than that, we cannot ensure the security of our borders. We need that manpower on the border itself.

Then we need reserves, and the strength of the reserve, which is more important, should be at least 50 per cent of the troops on the borders. In addition to that, we have to have recruits for replacement of casualties and for relief to our troops on the frontier. Therefore, when we calculate the strength of our armed forces we have to build a strength which would enable us to protect our frontiers effectively.

Another point which we have to remember is that we have to have mobile reserves. I do not know what the present arrangement is, but Russia, which has a tremendous and huge army, of over 300 divisions has ten air-borne divisions in its armed forces. I do not know what the present

[Shri Krishnapal Singh]

strength of our air-borne forces is, but I would like the Government to increase it as much as they can. Russia has over 7,000 transport planes. We cannot afford to compete with her, yet we should have a sufficiently strong air-borne force. That is extremely important.

As regards our equipment, I think we are still deficient in equipment for night fighting. I do not think we have yet been able to evolve or invent very effective infra red equipment which is used in nights. In addition to that, other countries have artificial moonlight and other methods of illuminating the battle field at night. Night, of course, is the time when most of the important operations are conducted. Therefore, I would like to emphasize that Government should have sufficient equipment for fighting at night.

Another important matter is the mechanised and armoured carriers for our patrols on the border, besides amphibious vehicles. In Kutch we were told the other day that the weather was so bad that no ordinary vehicle could move there. I believe that other countries possess not only amphibious vehicles but also hopping vehicles which can go to any type of terrain. So, when we are faced with such unfriendly neighbours, we must have sufficiently good equipment.

Another very important point is the training of our guerilla forces. Pakistan and China have very efficient guerilla forces. Fortunately we have on our borders a large number of ex-servicemen living, people who can be trained easily in guerilla warfare. Guerillas have limited liability. For a poor country, a sufficiently large guerilla force is the only solution. We must start training centres for guerillas and increase the strength of the guerilla forces. We all know what the guerillas have been doing in Vietnam, in Malaysia, what they have done even in our own country. The Nagas have been using this hit and

run tactics. It is a very cheap force. They get a small amount, and whenever there is need, they only operate near their homes, but they can be very effective both in offence and in defence. I think I drew the attention of the Defence Minister to this point about a year back, but I do not think much has been done so far. Therefore, I would like to emphasize now that we should have a strong guerilla force at our command, and not only on our borders. But we should train some of our people in the interior also so that they are available when they are required.

The next important point is about the police. When they are serving on the borders, they should be placed under the command of the local military commander. Secondly, since their duties entail a lot of risk, they should be better equipped. In one of the articles that has appeared in the papers it is said that there are men in the border police who are over 50 years of age. They will be quite useful here, but on the border probably they would not prove very useful. Therefore, we should improve our police, have younger men, and place them under the military commander.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has taken 27 minutes. Two minutes more.

Shri Krishnapal Singh: All planning in the army is done on the basis of intelligence which is acquired from across the border about our unfriendly neighbours. That is a very important point. There can be no sound military planning unless we have good information about our unfriendly neighbours. As against China our army was placed at a disadvantage because we failed to get timely and accurate information. This I am sorry to say, has again happened in Kutch, as pointed out in a letter published in a paper recently.

In the letter one of the commanding officers has given out that there were only two companies fighting

against two brigades of Pakistani forces assisted by tanks. That was a very unequal fight. No army in the world would be able to fight with that ratio, against such overwhelming numbers.

Since there is no time, I shall reserve my other remarks for another occasion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that the arrangements for defence of Indian borders (with Pakistan, China and Burma) should be further improved and their protection should be under the overall supervision of the Defence Forces."

Shri Rananjai Singh: Musafir-khana): I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—

(i) for 'Burma' substitute—

"wherever disturbance or intrusion by enemies or rebels is apprehended".

(ii) after "further improved" insert "vigorously". (1)

Shri Yashpa! Singh (Kairana): I beg to move:

That in the resolution,

for "under the overall supervision" substitute — "in the hands". (2).

Shri Deorao S. Patil (Yeotmal): I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—

add at the end—

"This House is further of opinion that detailed survey of all the strategic border roads connecting border installations with inland military centres and bases should immediately be undertaken and its completion entrusted to the Border Road Development Organisation with adequate independent Budget provision for a

definite positive target of achievements by end of Fourth Five Year Plan." (4).

15 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendments and the Resolution are before the House. The time allotted is an hour and a half.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): It may be increased; it is a very important subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will extend it by half an hour.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri (Bijnor): One hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right, one hour. But just one minute should be there for Mr. Chakraverti to move his Resolution. Members should not take more than 6-7 minutes.

Shri A. C. Guha: At least ten minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have not got 100 minutes; there are more than ten Members who want to speak.

Shri A. C. Guha: Sir, I congratulate the Mover of this Resolution on bringing this motion before the House so that the Government may become alert to the seriousness of the problem and may also take the advice of the different sections of this House. It has been a sort of a misfortune for India that ever from the emergence of our Independence, we have got unsettled boundaries with Pakistan. I think the creators of Pakistan created that State so that certain problems may linger on with India and the development programmes of India may be hampered due to our pre-occupations with the border problems; It was a deliberate move on the part of the creators of Pakistan and Pakistan has been justly playing the role for which it has been created.

China is another neighbour. I should not say that our Government was wise enough in dealing with China as a potential source of danger. In spite of

[Shri A. C. Guha]

everything that we may say against the British imperialism of the 18-19 centuries, we should realise one point about the strategic question of defence. Simply for the sake of India they had their posts from Aden up to Singapore or even beyond Aden, from Suez to Malta and Gibraltar. They knew the border of India on the North also cannot be just on the foot of the Himalayas. It should extend beyond Himalayas. Therefore, they tried to extend the borders of India beyond the Himalayas by creating a sort of a buffer State in Tibet. But in our desire for getting the friendship of China we allowed that State to be liquidated and created problems for ourselves. We did not then envisage that China might be a source of potential danger for India. I think that judgment should have been exercised on that point. Now, our frontiers with China are very difficult and also most of these areas are uninhabited or uninhabitable. In spite of our claim that MacMahon line is our border, that line has not been properly demarcated. So, there were some disputes as to where exactly the line would lie. The Government while at least allowing Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, should have been alert about the clear definition of the MacMahon line and the defence of the line according to our reading of that line. We have not done that but we have created serious problems on the northern side of the country.

Even when the British ruled Burma, certain territories in the north-western part of Burma were considered unadministered areas. They were not under the actual administration of the Burma Government. Now, the difficulty is that there is a constant exchange of population between certain types of Nagas on this side of the border and on that side of the border and the Naga tribals are in a hostile condition. In spite of everything, our friendly relations with Burma and all that, we should realise that the northwestern border of Burma is almost in an un-

settled condition and the writ of the Burma Government may not very much extend to certain parts of that place and it is doubtful whether the writ of the Burmese Government would extend upto the borders on their side. They have also their own problems with the hostile and rebel Chins and Kachins and other tribes on the Burmese side and if the Naga hostiles can have some combination with the hostile tribals on the Burmese border, that will create further troubles for us.

Due to all these things, the border problem of India could not be left to the different States, as has been done so long. A small State like Assam with very little financial resources has to face the borders with three countries: the border of Burma, the Chinese border and the Pakistan border. In all these three places Assam is having troubles. Similarly, Tripura, a tiny territory, has to defend our borders with Pakistan. West Bengal also is a truncated and a small State and it has to face the borders of two States, the Chinese side near Kalimpong and also the Pakistan border. The Pakistan border on the West Bengal side is about 1350 miles and even now it is not properly demarcated in many places. Particularly in places where it is not properly demarcated, Government should have taken sufficient steps to protect the borders so that any part of the border may not be in an adverse possession of a hostile Nagaland. Our Government have failed in taking those precautions about the borders of West Bengal and Pakistan. Assam and Pakistan. I should not say much about the western side as there will be other Members who may speak about that but I should mention at least the present problem on the Kutch border. Kutch border territory is uninhabited and uninhabitable. But knowing that Pakistan has been making certain claims over the territory or over certain portions of the territory, Government should have taken sufficient precautions to prevent any

incursion of the Pakistani forces into the Rann of Kutch.

Having mentioned the failures of the Government, I should also mention the difficulties of guarding so wide a border all the time. It is taxing greatly the resources of the Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You should try to conclude now; you have taken eight minutes. If hon. Members take more time, I cannot accommodate many Members who have expressed a desire to speak.

Shri A. C. Guha: I will require two or three minutes more. Apart from the financial difficulties, the House will have a general feeling that there had not been sufficient consciousness of the problems of border defence.

On the East Pakistan side, the Pakistan Government had vacated the border upto about 3-5 miles by the minority communities population. We cannot do that; we do not want to do that. There was the proposal in Assam of evicting the population upto two or three miles of the border. That is a human problem and I do not think it would be ever possible. But we should take care of one point. We should take care of one point and that is that these borders both in Assam and in West Bengal are generally populated by minority populations of India. That would help infiltration of saboteurs and fifth columnists from the other side. That is a point of which we have not been so much conscious and we have not taken precautions. Apart from the question of the Centre taking over the defence of the entire border, I would also suggest that there should be some local militia. On the Pakistan side, apart from the army, they have got the Ansars and the Mujahids and the East Pakistan Rifles. We also should have a local militia so that the local people can be entrusted to some extent to defend the borders. The entire charge of defending the border should be on the Centre and not be left to

the States at all. If the border police is to be there, I support the view that it should be a special cadre of police to be under the supervision of the Centre and under the guidance and control of the Defence Ministry. It should not be left to the ordinary State police to protect the border.

श्री रणजय सिंह : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, श्री कृष्णपाल सिंह, ने जो संकल्प यहां पर प्रस्तुत किया है, वह बहुत सामयिक है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। यदि आज देश की परिस्थिति पर विचार किया जाये, तो मैं समझता हूं कि देश की सीमाओं की सुरक्षा के लिए बहुत अधिक प्रबंध करने की आवश्यकता है।

इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा संशोधन यह है कि माननीय सदस्य ने अपने संकल्प में जो ये शब्द रखे हैं, "पाकिस्तान, चाइना एंड बर्मा", उन में से "बर्मा" शब्द को निकाल दिया जाये। यद्यपि इस बात की बहुत आवश्यकता है कि हम अपनी सभी सीमाओं पर सचेत रहें, क्योंकि पता नहीं कि कब हमारे बैरी या उपद्रवकर्ता नियमों का भंग कर के किस ओर से हमारी सीमा में प्रवेश कर जाते हैं, लेकिन हो सकता है कि इस संकल्प में "बर्मा" शब्द के रहने से हमारे एक मित्र-राष्ट्र के मन में ऐसी बात आए कि पाकिस्तान और चीन के साथ उस की भी गणना हो रहा है। इसलिए मैंने यह संशोधन रखा है कि "बर्मा" शब्द को निकाल कर उस के स्थान पर ये शब्द रख दिये जायें, व्हेयरएवर डिस्ट्रेंस थार इन्ड्रजन वाई एनिमीज आर रेबलज इज एप्रिहेंडिड", अर्थात् चाहे हमारी सीमा पर कहीं भी इस बात की सम्भावना हो कि हमारे बैरी या उपद्रवकारी अतंक पैदा करने के लिए या उपद्रव मचाने के लिए हमारे देश में प्रवेश करेंगे, हम को उन सभी स्थानों पर सचेत रहना है। इस संकल्प में "बर्मा" शब्द के रखे जाने से बर्मा में यह आशंका उत्पन्न हो सकती है कि हम को भी पाकिस्तान और

[श्री राजेंद्र सिंह]

चीन के साथ जाड़ा जा रहा है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि नीति यही कहती है कि "बर्मा" शब्द इस संकल्प में रखना उचित नहीं है। मग निवेदन है कि इस संकल्प में से "बर्मा" शब्द निकाल कर इस को पास कर दिया जाये।

जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, हम को सभी जगह भवेन रहना है। आज-कल जो समाचार सुनने में आ रहे हैं और यहां पर नित्य प्रति जो विचार प्रकट किये जाते हैं, उन से हमको यह चिन्ता हांता है कि हमारा यह पड़ोसी देश हमें क्या समझ रहा है। क्या वह समझता है कि हम लोग सो रहे हैं? आज हम लोग यह सोचते नहीं हैं, यह बात नहीं जानते हैं कि हमारे बैरी यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं। पाकिस्तान का जन्म केवल इसलिए हुआ कि स्वतंत्रता से पहले देश में जो साम्प्रदायिक वैमनस्य उत्पन्न किया जा रहा था, वह दूर हो और पाकिस्तान की भारत के साथ मित्रता रहे। लेकिन पाकिस्तान अपने जन्म के बाद से ही नित्य प्रति उपद्रव करता आ रहा है। उसका कारण क्या है? मैं समझता हूँ कि इसका मुख्य कारण यह है कि वह हम को निर्बल और दुर्बल समझता है। वह चाहता है कि वह हम पर आक्रमण कर के, हम को धक्का मार कर, हम को अपमानित कर दे और इससे दुनिया में यह समझा जाये कि पाकिस्तान भी हम से शक्तिशाली, बलशाली और बীর है, यद्यपि इस प्रकार दूसरे की सीमा का अतिक्रमण करने में कोई वीरता नहीं है।

आज पाकिस्तान हमारी सीमा पर उपद्रव और झगड़े कर रहा है, हमारे देश पर आक्रमण कर रहा है, हमारी पवित्र मातृ-भूमि की सीमा में प्रवेश कर के भारत माता के एक भाग पर अपना अधिकार जमाना चाहता है और ऐसे नक्शे बना रहा है, जिससे संसार के लोगों में भ्रम उत्पन्न हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि इय स्थिति में हमें हट का जवाब पंथर

से देना चाहिए। हमें इस बात का संतोष है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी बराबर इस बात की घोषणा कर रहे हैं कि हम अपने देश की रक्षा के लिये बिल्कुल तैयार हैं और हम पाकिस्तान से तब तक समझौता नहीं करेंगे, जब तक कि भारतवर्ष की एक इंच भूमि भी पाकिस्तान के पास रहती है और वह हमारे क्षेत्र में हट नहीं जाता है।

प्रश्न यह है कि हम कब तक पाकिस्तान की इस प्रकार की कार्यवाहियों को सहन करते रहेंगे। शिशुपाल ने भी बहुत उपद्रव किये थे, लेकिन भगवान कृष्ण ने यह सोमा निर्धारित कर दी थी कि जब उस की ओर से सी उपद्रव हो जायेंगे, तब उसको क्षमा नहीं किया जायेगा। लेकिन हम इस बात को नहीं समझते हैं। यदि गिना जाये, तो अब तक हमारी तरफ से पाकिस्तान को सी विरोधपत्र तो भेज दिए गए होंगे। जब कभी वह कोई उपद्रव करता है या झगड़ा पैदा करता है, तो हमारे यहां से विरोधपत्र भेजा जाता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के लिए यह पर्याप्त नहीं जान पड़ता है। जैसा कि माननीय संकल्पकर्ता महोदय ने कहा है, हमें इस बारे में अधिक दृढ़ता और सावधानी से काम लेना चाहिए और अपने देश की रक्षा करने में तनिक भी संकोच नहीं करना चाहिए।

आज पाकिस्तान के हवाई जहाज हमारी सीमा में किस तरह घुस जाते हैं? क्या हमारे पास उनको रोकने या गिराने के लिए शास्त्रास्त्र नहीं हैं? क्या हम उनको गिरा नहीं सकते हैं? पाकिस्तान तो हमारे हवाई जहाजों को गिरा देता है। तो फिर उस के हवाई जहाज हमारी सीमा में कैसे चले आते हैं? इस संबंध में हमें तनिक भी सावधान नहीं होना है। हमें समझ लेना है कि "रिपु पर दया परम कदराई" हम को पाकिस्तान पर दया नहीं करनी चाहिए।

हम इस बात की आशंका भी नहीं करनी चाहिए कि हमारी ओर से कोई कदम उठाए जाने पर विश्व-युद्ध छिड़ जायेगा। वास्तव में यह उद्देश्य अच्छा है कि संसार में युद्धाग्नि न भड़कने पाए। लेकिन युद्धाग्नि भड़काने के लिए जिम्मेदार कौन है? अगर हम डीले, दुर्बल और असावधान रहेंगे, तो संसार में युद्ध की आग भड़क सकती है। इसलिए हम को पूरी शक्ति के साथ अपनी सीमाओं की रक्षा करनी चाहिए और पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण का मुकाबला करना चाहिए।

जहां तक चीन का सम्बन्ध है, अगर वह जनसंख्या की दृष्टि से बड़ा है, तो क्या हुआ? हाथी भी तो बहुत बड़ा होता है लेकिन सिंह उस को मार गिराता है। हम भारतवासियों में शक्ति है, इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है, लेकिन हमें सावधान रहने की आवश्यकता है। हमारे शत्रु-देशों के जो चेले-चांटे घूमते हैं, चीन से पैसा लेने वाले जो कम्यूनिस्ट हैं, पाकिस्तान से पैसा लेने वाले जो कम्यूनिस्ट हैं, इन दोनों से हम को सावधान होना चाहिए। हमें ऐसे लोगों को साफ़ कह देना है कि जो भी देश-द्रोह करेगा, उसके लिए इस देश में कोई दया नहीं है, कोई रियायत नहीं है, हम उनके साथ कड़े से कड़ा व्यवहार करेंगे, जैसी कि हमारी दंड-नीति रही है। हमें यह स्पष्ट कर देना चाहिए कि हम उन को उखाड़ फेंकेंगे और हम उनको एक क्षण भी देश में रहने नहीं देंगे, वे देश-द्रोही हैं और उनको एक क्षण के लिए भी देश में रहने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है।

मैं माननीय संकल्पकर्ता महोदय से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह मेरे संशोधन को स्वीकार करें और सरकार भी इस संशोधन के साथ इस संकल्प को स्वीकार करे। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि पाकिस्तान और चीन को उचित जवाब दिया जाय। भारत में शक्ति है। भारत विद्या और बल

में किसी से पीछे नहीं है। लेकिन आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम अपने बल को पहचानें और उन देशों को बता दें कि हम में क्या शक्ति है। अगर हम ईट का जबाब पत्थर से दें, तो फिर किसी भी देश में यह हिम्मत नहीं है कि वह हमारी तरफ़ झांख उठाने का दुस्साहस करे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने संशोधन को प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

श्री गौरी शंकर कश्यप : (फ़तेहपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे माननीय मित्र जो प्रस्ताव लाए हैं, उसके लिए मैं उनको बधाई देता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि अब तो हमारी सरकार को इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करने में किसी प्रकार को कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए क्योंकि यह तो एक नीति का प्रश्न है। सरकार भी यह चाहती है और मारा राष्ट्र भी यह चाहता है कि हमारी सीमायें सुरक्षित रहें।

हमारी सरकार की अब तक जो नीति रही है, उससे एक बात तो हमारे देश में सिद्ध हो चुकी है और वह यह है कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद जहां जहां भी हमारी सीमाओं पर बाहर से आक्रमण हुआ और जहां भी दूसरे देशों ने हमारी धरती पर अपना आधिपत्य जमाया, वहां हम इस बात में सफल नहीं हुए कि हम अपनी धरती को दोबारा उनसे वापस ले सकें। यही बात काश्मीर के बारे में हुई और यही बात चीन के बारे में हुई।

मैंने बड़े ध्यान से प्रधान मंत्री जी का भाषण सुना, जब उन्होंने यह कहा कि हाल ही में पाकिस्तान द्वारा हम पर जो आक्रमण हुआ और हमारी कच्छ की सीमा के इस पार हमारी धरती पर जो आधिपत्य जमा लिया है, हम उस को शीघ्र ही दूर करेंगे, परन्तु इस पर विश्वास नहीं होता है, क्योंकि अभी तक तो सरकार का कोई भी कदम कभी भी इस ओर नहीं उठा है। मैं यह भी कहने के लिए तैयार

[श्री गौरी शंकर कक्कड़]

हूँ कि हमारे राष्ट्र में यह बात सिद्ध हुई मानी जा रही है कि एक बार जब आक्रमणकर्ता इस बात में सफल हुआ कि वह हमारी सीमा को पार करके हमारी जमीन पर अपना आधिपत्य जमा ले, तो वह आधिपत्य जमा ही रहा और उस जमीन को वापस लेने की क्षमता हम में नहीं हुई है।

इस दृष्टिकोण को सामने रखते हुए हमारी पूर्वी, पश्चिमी और उत्तरी सीमाओं को सुरक्षित रखने का उत्तरदायित्व हम पर है। बहुधा कहा जाता है कि चीन तो बड़ा मुल्क है और जब से चीन ने अणु विस्फोट किया है, तब से उसका स्थान विश्व के बड़े देशों में हो गया है परन्तु यह तो एक बहुत बड़ी लज्जा की बात है कि हम पाकिस्तान का भी मुकाबला न कर सकें और पाकिस्तान में भी यह साहस हो कि जहाँ पर वह चाहे, वहाँ पर अपना आधिपत्य जमा ले, धरती के जिस भाग पर वह चाहे, अपना आधिपत्य जमा ले।

इस प्रस्ताव के मैं समझता हूँ दो अंग हैं। एक तो यह है कि हमने यह देख लिया है कि जो आक्रमण होने हैं वे सीमाओं के द्वारा ही होते हैं। हमारी जो सीमाएँ हैं वे पाकिस्तान, चीन और बर्मा के साथ लगती हैं। वे टेढ़ी मढ़ी नहीं हैं और आसानी से उन को पार कर के आया जाया जा सकता है। ऐसी स्थिति में पहला हमारा कर्तव्य यह हो जाता है कि हम अपनी सीमाओं की सुरक्षा के लिए, वहाँ तक पहुँचने के लिए, जिन सड़कों की आवश्यकता है, उनकी व्यवस्था उचित ढंग से करें। आज भी हमारे सामने कष्ट का प्रश्न आया था। हमारी सरकार की तरफ से एक कर्तव्य में हमें बनाया गया था कि पाकिस्तान के मुकाबले में हमारी दशा बर्मा की नहीं थी, पाकिस्तानी एडवांटेजियस पोजिशन में थे। इस तरह के शब्दों का जब प्रयोग किया जाता

है तो इनको मुन कर मुझे बड़ी लज्जा आती है। जब चीनी आक्रमण हम पर हुआ था तब भी यही बात कही गई थी और अब पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण के समय भी इसी बात को दोहराया गया है। मुझे यह कहने में कोई संकोच नहीं है कि इस प्रकार के शब्दों को दोहराने से किमी प्रकार भी हमारे देश की इज्जत नहीं बढ़ती है। हमको पहले से अपनी सीमाओं की, जा भी वे हैं और जहाँ भी हैं, आक्रमणकर्ताओं से रक्षा का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये था। जहाँ जहाँ हमको आक्रमण होने का भय था वहाँ वहाँ पर बहुत अच्छी और उचित ढंग से सुरक्षा का प्रबन्ध कर लेना चाहिये था और इस प्रकार की सड़कें उन सीमाओं तक जाने को बना लेनी चाहियें थीं जो सभी मांसमों में काम आ सकती हों, गर्मी, बरसात, जाड़े आदि में बराबर यातायात के लिए सुनी रह सकती हों ताकि उन सड़कों से हमें खाने पीने की सामग्री और हथियार आदि अपने जवानों को पहुँचाने रहते।

दूसरी बात यह है कि अभी तक जो व्यवस्था हमारी सीमाओं की रही है और जो स्थिति रही है वह यह रही है कि हम ने इनकी सुरक्षा का भार प्रान्तों पर छोड़े रखा है। इतने सालों तक परिधान के प्रयोग के बाद आज हम दुर्बल के साथ यह कहने की स्थिति में हैं कि जहाँ तक प्रान्तों के शासन का सम्बन्ध है, वह दुर्बल ही सिद्ध हुआ है और के कंधों पर अगर यह भार उन सीमाओं की रक्षा का छोड़ा गया तो इसमें हमको सफलता नहीं मिल सकती है जैसे आज तक नहीं मिली है।

हमारी सीमाओं के द्वारा ही आक्रमणकर्ता हमारे देश में आते हैं और यह प्रश्न एक दो दिन या एक दो साल का नहीं है

बल्कि यह प्रश्न तो जो हमारी सरकार द्वारा देश के सामने प्रस्तुत किया गया है, बहुत ही सालों का है और आगे आने वाली हमारी पीढ़ियों को इसको झेलना पड़ेगा, इसलिए इसका एकदम निर्णय हो जाना चाहिये कि हमारी सीमाओं की सुरक्षा का भार किम पर रहे और उपयुक्त यही होगा, देश हित में यही होगा कि डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री, सुरक्षा मंत्रालय के कंधों पर इसका भार होना चाहिये, उसके अन्तर्गत इसको लाया जाना चाहिये, उसको सीमाओं की सुरक्षा का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये। यह एक बड़ी उचित मांग है। अब तक यही देखा गया है कि जब भी आक्रमण हुआ है वह सीमाओं के द्वारा ही हुआ है और कोई बाहर से आक्रमण होने की बात नहीं है। जो नई एक परिस्थिति पाकिस्तान ने हमारे सामने उपस्थित कर दी है और चीन के द्वारा हमारा जो अपमान हुआ उनका हमें मुकाबला करना है। चीन द्वारा किये गये अपमान का जखम अभी भरा भी नहीं था कि एक नया आघात हमें लगा है। इस से हमारी सरकार को सबक लेना चाहिये।

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो प्रस्ताव हमारे मित्र ने सदन के सामने पेश किया है, इसको सरकार को पूरे तौर से मान लेना चाहिये। और यदि ऐसा किया गया तो राष्ट्र को यह प्रतीत होगा कि सरकार ने दृढ़ता के साथ सीमाओं की रक्षा का कदम बढ़ाया है और वह सीमाओं की रक्षा करने में सफल होगी।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का स्वागत और समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Liladhar Kotoki (Nowgong):
Sir, I welcome this resolution. It needs no proof that the defence of our borders, whether western, northern or eastern needs to be improved. It has been admitted in this House that often there have been intrusions into our borders and more often than not, the

intruders do occupy certain areas and they do not go away from there. Our defence arrangements are such that we cannot throw them out. It is no good denying this fact. So, the conclusion one has to arrive at is that the defence authorities should take steps to ensure the security of our borders.

So far as the north-eastern region is concerned, comprising NEFA, Nagaland, Tripura, Manipur and Assam, all the three countries mentioned in this resolution—China, Pakistan and Burma—surround the borders of this region. Although Burma is not unfriendly as China or Pakistan are, the hostile Nagas, as Arun Chandra Guha has mentioned, have been going to Pakistan and coming back with arms and ammunition, after getting training and they commit hostilities against India. It is through the territories of Burma that the hostile Nagas are coming to and fro Pakistan with impunity. So, that border also has to be protected effectively.

The peculiar geographical position of this region has to be kept in mind and our defence preparation of that entire region has to be examined from that point of view. While I do not undermine the equal urgency of protecting the western and northern borders, in this region, because of the narrow corridor and the very meagre transport system there, it is highly essential that there should be enough defence potential created within that region with a view to enable our defence forces there to stand against the aggression till reinforcements through this meagre transport system can reach them. It is obvious that reinforcements in this region will be quite difficult. So, it is necessary that supplies of men and material for defence purposes should be built up there.

I do not know the details of the defence arrangements, but my hunch is that this aspect has not been given as much attention as it deserves.

To protect this border, there should be quick mobility for our forces. So,

[Shri Laladhar Gotoki]

I will urge the Ministry of Defence to construct border roads along the entire border. I am afraid nothing has been done and no decision has been taken that the border roads along the Assam-East Pakistan border would be taken up immediately.

Therefore, these matters which are vital for ensuring effective guarding of our borders in this very vulnerable area should receive the urgent and serious attention of the Government. I am sorry to say that we, who belong to these areas, do not see any signs of such seriousness being attached to this matter.

Therefore, whether Government accept this resolution in this form or not, it cannot be denied that this resolution focusses the attention of the Government on the urgency of safeguarding our borders, which today are not adequately guarded. That has been proved in the Kutch border, Lathitilla-Dumabari area in Cachar district where firing is going on and so also in Dawki in Khasi-Jaintia Hills. That is happening in Jalpaiguri, Cooch-Behar and other areas of West Bengal border also. Wherever there is a chance they strike us, they commit incursions and intrusion, do whatever mischief they like on our territory and go back or stay with impunity.

So, we should have our defence arrangements so effective and so efficient that we can strike them back immediately when our enemies commit any intrusion or aggression on our Territory and teach them such a lesson that they do not dare to strike us again.

In concluding, Sir, I request the Government to consider the suggestions that at I have made.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, देश की रक्षा के बारे में मैं कुछ बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं अभी राजस्थान की तरफ से

आया हूँ। मैंने देखा है कि वहाँ पर छोटे छोटे बच्चे खेल रहे थे। उन में से एक बच्चा कहता था कि पहली बुझाता हूँ, उस का जवाब वज्रताप्यो मैं वह कहता था :

“लाल है पर रंग नहीं,
बहादुर है पर वीरता नहीं।
शाली है पर विद्वत्ता नहीं,
बोलो बच्चो कौन ॥”

सब मिल कर कहते थे “लाल बहादुर शाली”। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम रक्षा की बात कहते हैं तो हम को एक बात साफ तौर से सोच लेना चाहिये। पहली जनवरी, 1965 से पहले भारत की जो जमीन चीन और पाकिस्तान ने इस देश से हटा ली है उस की बात मैं नहीं कहता, उसको हम तो क्या अगर हमारे बेटे भी वापस ले सकें तो हमारी धुश-किस्मती होगी। लेकिन पहली जनवरी, 1965 के बाद की गई हुई जमीन के बारे में हमें कम से कम यह निर्णय कर लेना चाहिये कि अगर कोई भारत की एक इंच जमीन पर भी कब्जा करेगा, चाहे वह चीन हो या पाकिस्तान हो, जब तक वह वहाँ से हटेगा नहीं तब तक कोई संधि या सीज-फायर नहीं होगा या किसी किस्म का वार्तालाप नहीं चलेगा। हमें मन में ऐसा निश्चय कर लेना चाहिये।

15.32 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI in the Chair]

दूसरी बात मैं अर्ज करूँगा सेना के बारे में। सेना की बात करते हुए हमारे नेता डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने अपने भाषणों में कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान की सेना के बड़े बड़े अफसर आज हीरे और जवाहरात के तस्कर व्यापार के घादी बन चुके हैं। अगर इस देश के अन्दर शैतान सिंह, होशियार सिंह और उस्मान की नीति को अपनाया है, या उनकी तरह के लोगों की फौज बनाना है तो सबसे पहला काम देश के अन्दर इस किस्म के फौजी अफसरों को साफ करना होना चाहिये। इन तस्कारी

लोगों को हटाना होगा। इससे कोई खतरा नहीं आना चाहिये क्योंकि और मुल्कों के अन्दर जब जंग छिड़ी हुई थी तो उस के दौरान ऐसे गलत आदमियों को ठीक किया गया था, उन को हटाया गया था।

तीसरी बात मैं नीति के बारे में कहूंगा। हमारे देश की बड़ी उदार नीति है। आप ने चीन के साथ दस साल तक दोस्ती का दम भरा, लेकिन चीन ने दोस्त के मुंह पर थपड़ मारा। एक ऐसा वक्त भी आया था जब पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति अयूब ने यह बात कही थी कि हमें मुश्तर्क फौजी मुआहदा बनाना चाहिये, सार्वा हितफाजत करने के लिये। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने उस से इन्कार किया और उस की जगह यह दशा बनाई। जरा इस में अन्तर देखिये। पाकिस्तान हमसे लड़ रहा है लेकिन अयूब खां आज भी हमारा भाई है। हम उस का गला काटते हैं, वह हमारा गला काटता है, चीन इतने दिनों बाद भी हमारा भाई बन सकता है लेकिन पाकिस्तान की जनता नहीं बन सकती। हमारी लड़ाई कोई पाकिस्तान की जनता से नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता और पाकिस्तान की जनता का आपस में कोई द्वेष नहीं है। यह ठीक है कि पाकिस्तान सरकार ने पाकिस्तान की जनता के साथ जिस तरीके से अन्याय किया है उसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने भी किया है हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के साथ, बल्कि उससे भी बुरा किया है। दोनों मुल्कों को उनकी सरकारों आपस में नजदीक नहीं आने देनी।

चौथी बात मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले दो तीन दिनों से हम ख़ास तौर से देख रहे हैं कि हमारे नेता डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया और मेरे बारे में तरह तरह की बातें चल रही हैं कि हम युद्ध चाहने वाले हैं। लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं है। मगर पाकिस्तान से कैसे मेल हो सकता है। महासंघ के आधार पर, और दुनिया में शांति हो सकती है विश्व

सरकार के नाते से। अगर विश्व लोक सभा बने तो संसार में शांति हो सकती है, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में अगर शांति आ सकती है तो केवल महासंघ के आधार पर।

मैं एक और बात कह कर खत्म करूंगा। आज जिस उदार वैदेशिक नीति का कोई आधार ही नहीं है अगर उस को छोड़ कर हम मजबूत वैदेशिक नीति अपनायें और उस पर दृढ़ता से चलें तब तो हिन्दुस्तान बच सकेगा, वरना इस देश का अस्तित्व ही खत्म हो जायेगा।

श्री प्रकाश बीर शास्त्री: सभापति महाशय, कुछ भी कहने से पहले मैं अपने हृदय का एक दुःख प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ। राव कृष्ण पाल सिंह ने जितना महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव देश की सुरक्षा से सम्बन्धित आज उपस्थित किया है और इस सदन की यह उपस्थिति, इन दोनों में परस्पर विरोधाभास है। मुझे इस बात को कहते हुए बड़ा कष्ट है कि आज जब यहां प्रत्येक सदस्य को उपस्थित होना चाहिये था और सरकार के प्रमुख नेताओं को भी उपस्थित होना चाहिये था, सत्तारूढ दल के सदस्य आज सेंट्रल हाल में अपनी पार्टी के चुनावों के संबंध में गोष्ठियां कर रहे हैं। उन्हें देश की परवाह ही नहीं है।

दूसरी बात जो मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि राव कृष्ण पाल सिंह के प्रस्ताव का एक लक्ष्य है और वह यह कि सेना का इतिहास हमारे देश में जो गौरवपूर्ण रहा है उस को ध्यान में रखते हुए प्रस्तावक महोदय यह चाहते हैं कि देश की सीमाओं की रक्षा का भार सेनाओं को सौंप दिया जाय। जहां पुलिस हमारी सीमाओं की रक्षा कर रही है उस में कुछ कठिनाइयां आई हैं। उन कठिनाइयों की अभी कुछ दिन पहले चर्चा हुई थी, जिस में कहा गया था कि अरमम राज्य में एक इन्स्पेक्टर जनरल पुलिस थे जिन के कारण पाकिस्तानी लाखों की संख्या में अरमम में आ गये और वह अरमम को दूसरा काश्मीर बनाना चाहते थे। वहां के मंत्रिमंडल के एक सदस्य, जो दूसरे

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

गेख अब्दुल्ला वन कर असम की स्थिति को बिगाड़ना चाहते थे, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने विवश हो कर उम आर्टी० जी० को गुजरात भेजा । नन्दा जी को जब यह कहा गया कि एक ऐसे व्यक्ति को, जो असम में दांषी पाया गया, गुजरात जैसे महत्वपूर्ण सीमावर्ती राज्य में क्यों भेजा गया ? तो गृह मंत्री ने बतलाया कि उन का रेकार्ड बहुत अच्छा है । अगर उन का रेकार्ड अच्छा है तो गृह मंत्रालय उन को फिर वहां से स्थानांतरित करने की बात क्यों सोच रहा है । अगर रेकार्ड अच्छा होता तो उन को वहां से स्थानांतरित करने की बात सोची ही न जाती । इसी से प्रकट होता है कि पुलिस से धीरे धीरे हमारा विश्वास उठता जा रहा है और सेना के कार्यों की ओर, सेना की देश भक्ति की ओर, देश का ध्यान आकर्षित हो रहा है ।

भारत के पिछले इतिहास में भी और म्यतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद अब तक भी भारतीय सेनाओं ने जो साहसिक कार्य किये हैं, उन में अगर कहीं कोई चोट लगी है तो वह हमारे नेताओं की अदूरदर्शिता के कारण, उनकी गलत नीतियों के कारण । लेकिन सेना ने कहीं किसी प्रकार की दुर्बलता दिखाई है। इस प्रकार का इतिहास देखने का नहीं मिलता । स्वतंत्र होने के पश्चात् सब से पहले काश्मीर में हमारी सेनाओं का परीक्षण हुआ जब कि इस देश में स्वतंत्रता ने प्रारम्भिक सांस ली ही थी । हमारी सेना ने अद्भुत साहस और वीरता का परिचय काश्मीर की पहाड़ियों में दिया । यदि दुर्भाग्य से भारत के तत्कालीन नेताओं ने लड़ाई बन्द न कर दी होती तो काश्मीर की जो हड्डी आज गले में अटकी हुई है वह स्थिति न होती । दूसरी बात हमने वीरता का परिचय दिया नेफा और लद्दाख में । नेफा में चूंकि सेनायें पहले से तैयार नहीं की गई थी इस लिये कुछ चोट लगी, लेकिन चीन के साथ

लद्दाख की पहाड़ियों में भारतीय सेनाओं ने जम कर मोर्चे लिये हैं । इसका सब से बड़ा प्रमाण यह है कि चण्डूल की हवाई पट्टी पर चीनी सेनाओं को कदम नहीं रखने दिया गया । यह हमारी सेना के गौरवपूर्ण इतिहास की अमर कहानी है । इसी प्रकार गोआ और दूसरे स्थानों पर भी हमारी सेना ने बड़ी बहादुरी का परिचय दिया है ।

मैं ने अभी पीछे यह शब्द कहे कि हमारे नेताओं की अदूरदर्शिता से सेनाओं को नीचा जरूर देखना पड़ा । मुझे अच्छी तरह याद है कि नागालैंड में जो हमारी सेनायें हैं उन में हमारे पिछले प्रधानमंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू को सेना के एक बड़े व्यक्ति ने एक पत्र भेजा था कि पंडित जी या तो हमें आप यहाँ से वापस बुला लीजिये और अपनी पुलिस भेज दीजिये । सेना को नागालैंड में पड़े पड़े इतने दिन हो गये और अभी तक हम शांति नहीं स्थापित कर पाये यह हम पर एक बड़ा धब्बा लग रहा है, । या फिर सेना को जब आपने भेजा है तो हाथ खोल कर काम करने का मौका भी उसे दीजिये । एक और आप सेना के द्वारा शांति स्थापित करना चाहते हैं और दूसरी ओर आदेश भेज रहे हैं कि हम किसी पर हाथ न उठायें । आप सेना को इस तरह क्यों रोक रहे हैं । मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यहाँ यह है कि सेना की प्रतिष्ठा को जब जब चोट लगी है या जब जब नीचा देखना पड़ता है तब नेताओं की ही अदूरदर्शिता के कारण । हमारी सेना में साहस और बहादुरी का अभाव कभी नहीं रहा । जम्मू और काश्मीर में या दूसरे स्थानों में हमारी सेनाओं ने जो अपने शौर्य का परिचय दिया जहाँ वह हमारे लिये गौरव की बात रही है । मैं सेना के सम्बन्ध में एक दो सुझाव भी यहाँ देना चाहता हूँ कुछ पर कुछ कहने से पहले ।

एक तो बात यह कि हमारी सेनाओं से प्रति वर्ष दस हजार के लगभग व्यक्ति सेवा निवृत्त होते हैं। करनल राजू जो स्वयं सैनिक रहे हैं और जिन्होंने नेता जी सुभाष बोस के साथ रह कर देश की स्वतंत्रता के आन्दोलन में प्रमुख भाग लिया था, मैं चाहूंगा कि उनके माध्यम से रक्षा मंत्री तक यह विचार जाये किये दस हजार व्यक्ति जो हमारी सेनाओं से प्रति वर्ष सेवा निवृत्त होते हैं उनको हमारे देश की सीमाओं के निकट बसाया जाए और जो उनको पेंशन मिलती है उसके प्रतिरिक्त उनको आर्थिक और दूसरी सुविधाएं भी दी जाएं। इससे सीमाओं पर जो छटपुट घटनाएं होती हैं उनमें हम अपने देश को बचा सकेंगे।

दूसरी बात आपने देखी होगी कि पाकिस्तान या चीन ने हमारे उसी प्रदेश पर आक्रमण किया है जहां हमारे देश के निवासियों में कुछ दुर्बलता है। आज कच्छ में ही पाकिस्तान का आक्रमण क्यों हुआ? बंगाल में ही क्यों उसका आक्रमण होता है इस पर विचार करना चाहिए। राजस्थान की सीमा पर या पंजाब की सीमा पर कोई आक्रमण क्यों नहीं होता इस पर भी हमको विचार करना पड़ेगा।

कच्छ में हमारी सेनाओं ने साधनों के अभाव में, मड़कों के अभाव में, पानी के अभाव में भी अपनी बहादुरी का परिचय दिया है। मैं आज इस सदन में विश्वासपूर्वक कह सकता हूँ कि जहां तक मरने वालों की संख्या का प्रश्न है, या जहां तक घायलों की संख्या का प्रश्न है, उसमें पाकिस्तान की संख्या अधिक है। लेकिन आज हमारी सेनाओं में इतने पर भी एक तिलमिलाहट है, एक क्षोभ है, और वह यह है कि ब्रिटेन की चाल में आकर हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री और देश की सरकार हमारी सेनाओं के हाथ क्यों रोक रही है? इससे हमारी सेनाओं पर कमजोरी का आरोप लग रहा है। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार को कहना चाहता हूँ

कि यदि डिफेंस मिनिस्टर किसी देश का गलती करता है, जैसी कि श्री कृष्ण मेनन ने की थी, तो उसको बदला जा सकता है, अगर किसी देश की सरकार गलती करती है तो उस सरकार को भी जनता बदल सकती है लेकिन सेना को नहीं बदला जा सकता। अगर सेनाओं का साहम मर जाएगा तो देश की सुरक्षा सदा सदा के लिये संकट में पड़ जाएगी। इसलिए, सेना का मनो बल न गिरने पावे इसके लिए अत्यंत आवश्यक है कि सैनिक निर्णयों में राजनैतिक हस्तक्षेप नहीं होना चाहिए।

आज जो चोट इस देश को लगी है उसका एक बहुत बड़ा कारण यह है कि ब्रिटेन की चाल में आकर हमने सैनिक निर्णयों पर राजनैतिक निर्णय लाद दिया। मनु 1947 के बाद से, जब से हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान पर ब्रिटेन का वर्चस्व समाप्त हो गया उसकी यह इच्छा बनी गयी है कि इन देशों पर उसका प्रभाव किसी न किसी प्रकार फिर बना है। स्वतंत्र होने के बाद दोनों देश दुनिया के अन्य देशों से मित्रता बढ़ा रहे थे, पाकिस्तान अमरीका से मित्रता कर रहा है और हम अपनी तटस्थता की नीति पर चलते रहे। लेकिन ब्रिटेन पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण की आड़ में पाकिस्तान में और हिन्दुस्तान में अपना वर्चस्व फिर से स्थापित करना चाहता है। हमको देखना चाहिए कि ब्रिटेन के इस वर्चस्व से हमको देश के प्रतिरिक्त अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में भी कहीं नुकसान न उठाना पड़े? इस पर भी हमें सावधानी से विचार करना चाहिए।

अन्त में अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए, जैसा मैंने आज प्रश्नोत्तर काल के बाद प्रधान मंत्री से कहा था उसे मैं फिर दोहराता हूँ कि इस सरकार का पिछले 17 साल का इतिहास इस बात का गवाह है कि वह हमारी सीमाओं की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती। देश की प्रतिरिठा सेजी से गिरती चली जा रही है। इसी कारण राव कृष्ण पाल

[श्री प्रकाशवारशास्त्री]

सह जी को यह प्रस्ताव भी लाना पड़ा। आज नैतिकता और जनतंत्र की प्रतिष्ठा का यही तकाजा है कि इस सरकार को अपने स्थान से हट जाना चाहिए और देश में नेशनल गर्वणमेंट का निर्माण होने देना चाहिए।

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Rai-ganj): Madam Chairman, the frontiers of India, particularly in the West, have always been vulnerable. That has been proved in history. But after partition and the creation of Pakistan, it has become more and more vulnerable now. Therefore, we ought to make arrangements for the defence of this frontier much more effectively than the British Government used to do to protect the western and north-western frontiers of India. The eastern frontiers were known to be safe, but after the Chinese invasion last time we came to realise that the north-eastern frontier, which was regarded as non-vulnerable, was not so. In fact, when China brought heavy tanks 14,000 ft. in that winter, it was something like a miracle or something unexpected happening and was regarded as such. So, that makes the protection of our frontiers all around much more necessary and much more difficult than what it was before.

Within last 17 years of our independence, it is our misfortune that in spite of our standing for peace within and outside India, we are faced with four cease fires—cease-fire in Kashmir, cease-fire in India-China border, a so-called cease-fire in Nagaland, which goes on prolonging from month to month, and God knows what is coming in the Kutch border, for talks of cease-fire is already there. We should pause and scrutinise what is the reason for India, after getting her independence, within the last 17 years in spite of our policy of non-alignment and professions of peace at home and abroad, being surrounded by cease-fire all around the border.

Why is this so? It is something difficult to explain, difficult even to comprehend. What is there in us, in our policy and in our administration which is inviting these things. This requires to be considered, scrutinised, analysed and judged.

What I feel is that the agency which has dealt with our external affairs has not done its work effectively and in the way which it should have done it. Otherwise, the difficulties with which we are now faced would have been less than what they are now. I will mention only two instances. We gave recognition to the occupation of Tibet by China. But, at the same time, we did not demand that China should give a corresponding recognition to the MacMahon line. If we had done so at that time, this difficulty about the MacMahon line would not have been there. When Shri Chou-En-lai secured our recognition of Chinese occupation of Tibet, we ought to have secured Chinese recognition of the MacMahon line. It was of vital interest to us to do so because Tibet and India were divided by the MacMahon line. But we did not do so.

There is another instance. We recognized the Durand Line which separates Pakistan from Afghanistan. But we did not demand, at the same time, that Pakistan should give recognition to the MacMahon line, which is the border between Tibet and India. I do not understand why this was not done. Any person with commonsense would have done it. I believe there is some element in the management of external affairs, who are people acting, not as diplomatic agents, people who are not manipulating at the diplomatic and political level, but some elements who think of being Messiah in themselves. They did not do even small things which are very urgent and very necessary to protect the interests of India herself?

The most difficult part would be the protection of the eastern boundary, to which Shri Guha also made a reference. There also, while I concede that local people might be used to defend the border by supplying them with arms, the difficulty is that the local people on all the borders are not as dependable as the local people in the borders of other countries. Here in this House, Shri Khuda Baksh, coming from Murshidabad, the same constituency which is represented by my hon. friend, Shri Badrudduja, told the Prime Minister, and it is on record, "my constituency is being subverted by Pakistan; please save my constituency". That constituency was not preserved and he lost the elections. That is the difficulty with the local people.

There is another instance. On one occasion, the late Shri H. C. Mukerjee, who was the Governor of Bengal, had to run to the borders and warn the people there that he was getting information that the border people were harbouring people coming from Pakistan. He warned them that if this continued he will be forced to take severe steps in the border. That is the difficulty on our border with Pakistan, and that should be taken into consideration.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : अधिष्ठात्री महोदया, श्री कृष्णपाल सिंह भारतीय सीमाओं की रक्षा सम्बन्धी जो संकल्प सदन के सामने लाये हैं वह आज की स्थिति में बहुत ही आवश्यक व महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव है। मैं श्री कृष्णपाल सिंह को इस सुन्दर तथा अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव लाने के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ और सरकार से भी यह निवेदन करता हूँ कि यह प्रस्ताव इतना जरूरी है कि उसे बिना किसी तरहीय के मान लेना चाहिए।

आज देश की सब से बड़ी जरूरत है कि यहां का हर एक देशवासी अपनी जननी की रक्षा करने के लिए कसर कस कर खड़ा हो

जाय। समय का तकाजा है कि अब भारतवासियों को युद्धवादी मनोवृत्ति अपनानी चाहिए। जब लोग खड़े होकर कहते हैं कि हम वारमौगर नहीं हैं, हम युद्धवादी नहीं हैं। तो मुझे बड़ी मुश्किल पैदा हो जाती है। आज हमारे देश की 38,000 वर्गमील भूमि के ऊपर दुश्मन ने अपना कब्जा कर लिया है जो देश अपमानित किया जा रहा है और जिस देश के अपमान की पराकाष्ठा हो गई हो और जिस देश का 17 साल का इतिहास पराजय का इतिहास हो उस देश के लोग यह कहें कि हम वारमौगर नहीं हैं, युद्धवादी नहीं हैं तो समझें बड़ी शर्म की बात है और कोई नहीं हो सकती है। मैं परमेश्वर को साक्षी कर के इस पवित्र सदन के अन्दर घोषणा करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम लोग युद्धवादी नहीं हैं, हम लोग उंडे का जवाब उंडे से नहीं देते हैं, ब्लड फोर ब्लड नहीं डिमांड करते हैं और ईट का जवाब पत्थर से नहीं देते हैं तो उसका मतलब यह है कि हमारा जन्म निरर्थक है और हम अपनी इज्जत की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते।

एक छोटी सी सरकार ने 15 करोड़ इंसानों को बांध कर डाल रक्खा है क्योंकि उनकी डिफिटिज्म की मेट्रिलिटी है। देश प्रागे बढ़ना चाहता है, फौजें प्रागे बढ़ना चाहती हैं और वह मोर्चा सांभाल सकती है लेकिन सरकार उन्हें रोकती है और प्रागे नहीं बढ़ने देती है। अगर यह फैसला हो जाता कि मिलिटरी जनरल्स इस काम को करने तो हिन्दुस्तान को इस बेइज्जती का सामना नहीं करना पड़ता। आज जो भारत को शिकस्त हुई है वह हमारी अपनी सरकार की कमजोरी के कारण हुई है। न हमारी सेना की कोई कमजोरी है और न जनता का मॉरैल गिरा हुआ है अगर मॉरैल किमी का गिरा हुआ है या देशभक्ति किमी की गिरी हुई है तो वह सरकार की गिरी हुई है। जो मामले तलवार से हल होने थे उनको इन्होंने पंचशील से हल करना चाहा। जब पंचशील पर दमनचक्र इनके

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

द्वारा हो रहे थे तब मैं ने उस की मुखालफत की थी और सरकार को चेतावनी दी थी कि यह पंचशील हमारे लिए अस्वीकृत का सांप्रति होगा ।

हमारी सेनाओं को जब भी अवसर मिला उन्होंने अपना जीहर दिखलाया । हमारे भाई भतीजों ने देश की खातिर अपने को कुर्बान कर दिया । हमारी सेना ने काश्मीर में घुसे हुए चोर को पकड़ा और उसकी मुश्कें कस कर दहलीज में लाकर पटक दिया लेकिन मकान के मालिक ने यह कहा : इस गवर्नमेंट के प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने यह कहा कि चोर को छोड़ दिया जाय, चोर की मुश्कें खोल दी जाय और उसको इस वक्त मारा न जाय । इस गवर्नमेंट के देन प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने उस चोर का मामला पुलिस के सुपुर्द करने का निर्णय किया । पुलिस उसका निर्णय करेगी कि वह चोर है या नहीं ? इस मसले को लेकर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री वहां यु० एन० ओ० में गये थे । भारत सरकार वहां यु० एन० ओ० में इसका फैसला कराने गई थी लेकिन क्या वह इस बारे में कोई उचित या न्यायसंगत फैसला दे सकती थी ? जिन लोगों ने पाकिस्तान को बना कर खड़ा किया था उन्हीं के दरबार में जाकर इस की अपील की गई । यह तो वही हुआ :-

“वही मुंसिफ हैं वही जान के कातिल हैं मेरे ।
अक्रबा मेरे करे और खून का दावा किस पर ।”

अब ऐसे लोगों से जो शुरू से ही हमसे प्री-जुडिस रहे हों और जो पाकिस्तान को बनाने वाले हों उनसे हम अगर इसाफ की आशा करें तो यह हमारी भयंकर भूल ही होगी ।

दरअसल यू० एन० ओ० में पिटे हुए लोग जाते हैं । वहां पर वह जाता है कि जिस का बल वीर्य खत्म हो जाता है । यू० एन० ओ० में वह जाता है जिसकी फौजी शक्ति टूट जाती है जिसका कि सैल्फ रिस्पेक्ट गिर

जाता है । यह मसला तलवार से हल होगा, टिट फौर टेट से हल होगा । ब्लड फौर ब्लड से यह मसला हल होगा । अपने जमाने के सबसे बड़े आदमी प्रिंस बिस्मार्क ने यह लिखा था :—

“Not by parliamentary speeches or majority votes are the mighty questions of State solved but it is through a policy of blood and iron.”

सरकार को आगे बढ़ कर डिसेशन लेना पड़ेगा । इतिहास गवाह है कि किसी ने इतनी कमजोरी नहीं दिखाई जितनी कि यह सरकार दिखा रही है । दुश्मन ने कंजर-कोट को अपने कब्जे में लिया, बियारबेट को कब्जे में लिया, दुश्मन ने एक बड़ा इलाका कब्जे में ले लिया यह भारत सरकार की कमजोरी नहीं तो और क्या है ? देश की जनता व फौज को आर्डर नहीं दिया गया कि वह डट जाय और हमलावरों को देश की सीमाओं से निकाल कर बाहर कर दे । सरकार ने किस की बात मानी ? सरकार ने ब्रिटिश प्राइम मिनिस्टर की बात मानी और गान्धा-बंदी कर ली । उस ब्रिटिश प्राइम मिनिस्टर की बात मान ली जिसने कि हमेशा हमें जलील किया और जिन्होंने कि पाकिस्तान बना कर खड़ा किया । प्राइम मिनिस्टर हमारे सम्मान के साथ खिलवाड़ कर रहे हैं । मैं अपनी सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह उनकी बात में न आये और हमलावर को निकाल कर ही दम ले । यह देश अब और बेइज्जती बर्दाश्त करने को तैयार नहीं है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार चेते और गीता माता के इस उपदेश को अपने सामने रख कर व्यवहार करे :—

“सम्भावितस्य चा कीर्ति मरणादतिरिच्यते

गीता माता के सिद्धान्त के अनुसार मैं कहता हूँ कि हमें हर कीमत पर और जान की भी

पर्वाह न करके अपना यश बनाये रखना चाहिये। गीता माता कहती है कि जिसका यश खत्म हो जाता है वह मृत से भी बदतर हो जाता है। मरा हुआ आदमी उस मनुष्य की अपेक्षा अच्छा होता है जो जिंदा तो है लेकिन जिसका यश नष्ट हो गया है। यशहीन आदमी जिंदा रहने का अधिकार नहीं रखता। आज हमें गीता माता का यह सिद्धान्त मान कर आचरण करना चाहिए :—

“सुखिना क्षत्रिया पार्थ लभन्ते युद्धं मीदृशम्”

हमें ईंट का जवाब पत्थर से देना पड़ेगा। अगर हम इसी तरह पिटते गये और अपना इलाका खोते गये तो हमारी आने वाली संतानें क्या कहेंगी। यही कहा जायगा कि शेर की माँत गीदड़ के हाथ से हो गई। अजगर का बच्चा मेंढक के हाथ मारा गया। मेंढक ने अजगर के बच्चों को खत्म कर दिया। अगर सरकार यह काम नहीं कर सकती है तो वह यह काम छोड़ दे और हम इस काम को कर के दिखला देंगे। अगर हम इस काम को न कर सके तो हम को गोली से उड़ा दीजियेगा। हमारा नाम सदा के लिए इतिहास में कलंकित रहने वाला है। जरूरत इस बात की थी कि आज सरकार दुश्मन का चैलेंज स्वीकार करती और उसे हटा कर ही दम लेती लेकिन ऐसा न होकर समझौता वार्ता चल रही है। इस तरह से यहां पर लम्बी लम्बी स्पीच देते से राज्य नहीं चला करता है। राज्य चलेगा राइफल से, राज्य चलेगा ऐटम बम से, हाइड्रोजन बम से। अपने को हर तरह से मजबूत करके ही हम अपने देश की रक्षा कर सकेंगे। सरकार के हुकम भर की देर है यहां से आक्रमणकारियों को भारतवामी निकाल कर ही चैन लेंगे। आप राजपूताने के राजपूतों को हुकम दे दीजिये वे चार दिन में शत्रु को चटनी बना कर रख देंगे। फीरोज़पुर के सिक्खों को हुकम दे दीजिये वह पांच घंटे के अन्दर इनकी चटनी बना देंगे। सरकार की अपनी कमजोरी है जिसको कि उसे समय रहते दूर करना चाहिए

और श्री कृष्णपाल सिंह को मैं यह रेजोल्यूशन लाने के लिए मुबारकबाद देता हूँ और सरकार से उसे स्वीकार करने की अपील करता हूँ।

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Aney.

Shri Basumatari (Goalpara): I come from the border areas; I may be given a chance.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Madam, I will not take much time. The Resolution before us is one on which I believe there cannot by any difference of opinion in this House. The only cause for tension is the serious position that is created by the Pakistani aggression on the Kutch-Sind border. In my opinion, one of the main reasons for this difficult situation in which we find ourselves was the absence of a sense of responsibility in the minds of those who pursued the reins of government in their hands after partition and independence was won. They did not understand what partition really meant. They had no idea that partition created new borders and that the old borders which existed there were no longer our border lines. New borders were created but the creation of new borders never appeared to them as a serious matter. In fact, if anybody insisted on or stressed this point, there was a suspicion in their minds that those persons were trying to create a kind of a regional or communal feeling, or something like that, because they proceeded under an idea for many years that India had no enemies. This was the gospel on which we fought the entire non-cooperation struggle. This was the gospel which required us to accept *khilafat* as a point for fight when the Mohammedans outside India were themselves giving it up. This was the gospel on which we proceeded a long time. Though we succeeded in getting independence, no doubt, the effect of some of these ideas which we had accepted in those days remained there. The effect was that

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

some of the most important problems which ought to have been the subject of great considerations, very minute decisions and careful revision were altogether neglected by us. The border question was one of those questions.

How were our borders changed? On account of this partition new border lines were created. The old border that was there, considerable advantage of that was had by Pakistan. The Durand Line was there and they knew their border. The whole thing was done. The MacMahon Line was there but on account of this thing China came forward and occupied the whole of Tibet. Yet, we refused to believe that a change like this was coming in and that we should be prepared for it. The change has come in this way.

Secondly, we have yet to learn as to how the border territories are to be administered and what kind of arrangements are to be made there with a view to see that our borders are unchallenged and properly guarded. We must keep them in proper order. We must have proper boundary lines. A large number of cases occur because of the negligence of one's own border lines. They are bent upon creating mischiefs. Under these circumstances, we must see that our borders are properly safeguarded.

16 hrs.

It is not only the Army that can do it alone—the Army can fight all right and can show its valour—but the Army can do it only if there is the whole nation standing behind the Army, if they take pride in what they do and give them all the help. Therefore, we must fill the people with the idea that our country is in danger and that we must be on a war-footing. If we are really serious about our position, we must be

on a war-footing. We should also feel that we are on a war-footing and that the questions of default do not loom large. As to how to add to our military strength should be the only problem before us.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Just last sentence and I conclude. How to make our Army strong should be the one consideration before us in order to make the Army sufficiently strong to defend our borders and drive out the aggressors from our sacred soil.

Shri S. Kandappan (Tiruchengode): Madam Chairman, we are discussing a Resolution of a very serious nature and I hope that though this is a Private Members' Resolution, the impact of the suggestions made during the discussion should not be lost on the Government.

It is most unfortunate that our next-door neighbour, Pakistan, should have fallen into the trap of China and should behave most inimically towards us. It is rather the unanimous opinion of all the Members in this House and all the responsible people in this country and anywhere else in the world that war is an evil—it is not only an evil, it is a sin. But nor is it a virtue to enter into negotiations and order cease-fire when the enemy is on our soil. This is a serious thing and we should take note of it. We read reports in the foreign press that our talk of peace is not genuine and that we are talking of it because we are not prepared for war. It may be that they are wrong but I honestly feel how can we escape such a feeling on the face of our achievements that we have shown in the past. During 1962, when we were attacked by China, there was a humiliating defeat for us. In spite of our best efforts, the territory that we have lost has not

been recovered. Now we hear of these Pakistani intrusions. It may be true that they may have some built-in advantage at some place where we are not able to withstand the onslaught of the Pakistani Army. But are we not justified in making them realise the danger of attacking India by demonstrating, by selecting our own vantage point and attacking them? If the Government does not do it, the inescapable feeling will be that we are not strong enough to defend the territorial integrity of our country. I am sure the Government would not expect war to be some kind of a wedding where both parties can sit and fix the date. You will not be given any advance notice of that. It is expected that the standing Army on which one-third of our revenue is being spent would do its duty well and that whenever there is any intrusion or some kind of an attack, they will retaliate and safeguard every inch of our territory.

In this connection, I would like to make one or two concrete suggestions. It is not that our border is an isolated thing. We cannot just post our men like poles to defend the border. It is only by our demonstrable strength of defence power that we will be able to defend our land. In fact, I feel, if we had taken any steps during 1962, Pakistan would not have ventured to attack us. Now, I am afraid, this humiliating set-back and reversal from a small country like Pakistan will tempt even other countries to attack us. There is no guarantee that we will always remain friendly with other countries. For example, on the southern tip of our land, there is Ceylon. Of course, the present Prime Minister is quite friendly to us. But about the previous Prime Minister there was no guarantee and she had, I feel, some leanings towards China and there is no surety that she may not come back again to power. Hence, I would urge upon the Government to pay their attention to the Navy also. We cannot ignore any one aspect of the defence. I feel strongly

that we should make every effort to strengthen our Navy.

Sir, so many suggestions were made by the hon. Members who preceded me. I would like to add one more suggestion. We should see that, if possible, even compulsory military training is given in schools and colleges. It is rather high time that we should do it. We cannot ignore that any more. In this connection, I have to say a little about language though it is a delicate matter. In my State, I receive complaints that though the students are willing to attend to the training of the N.C.C. and all that, they rather feel resentment over the fact that they are compelled to learn it in Hindi. What is important is that we should know the modern techniques and all the knowledge of the modern warfare. It is not all that important through which medium it is being learnt. So, the Government should not be very adamant on that and every effort should be made to avoid such a thing.

I would like to conclude by saying that the time would not be far off when we proclaim to the whole world in the words of one Seventh century Tamil poet: "We are slaves of nobody, we fear not death".

Shri Basumatari: Madam Chairman, this Resolution is quite befitting to the gravity of the present situation. Although I could not support it but I support the spirit of it. As to whether it should be accepted or not, it is upto the Government.

Now, the question is how to strengthen the border areas. We should be careful about the borders of the States which are surrounded by the various foreign countries. My hon. friend Mr. Kotoki just now mentioned how Assam is surrounded on all sides by various foreign countries. There have been a number of instances in which the Chinese and Pakistanis have attacked our State on the northern side. But we have done nothing to strengthen our border

[Shri Basumatari]

security. I feel that Government have not taken up this question in regard to the security of the border areas of Assam very seriously. For, if we go to the details, we find that whatever we wanted in order to strengthen the border area has not yet been done. For instance we have been insisting that the number of security posts or border posts should be increased and the number of the CRP also should be increased, but that has not been done. We wanted the construction of a road all along the border to check infiltration. But that also has not been done. Therefore, a doubt arises in the minds of the people whether Government have taken it very seriously at all.

You might have been seeing in *The Assam Tribune* and other local papers over there how every day there has been intermittent firing going on in the Latitilla-Dumabari area. You know also that firing has been going on on the Cooch-Bihar side as well. You know very well how Cooch-Bihar and Assam are linked. My hon. friend had given a very beautiful simile when he said that Assam, was just like the head of a body, and the other parts of the body were represented by the rest of India; and the small strip of 40 miles or so the corridor in between Pakistan and Bhutan was just like the neck. So, you can easily imagine in what a vulnerable position Assam is. Its position is such that Pakistan can do it any harm at any time that she likes. The collusion between the two neighbouring countries, namely China and Pakistan, is very dangerous to the whole nation, and more so to Assam.

Of course, it might be asked 'Why do you not stand on your own legs? And why are you afraid of them?' I may tell you that Assam when it was ruled by native kings was able to defeat the Moghals seventeen times and they could not win even an inch of our territory. History would tell

you how Assam had been bold enough in the past. So, it is not as if Assam does not have the strength. But there are elements today of whom we are afraid, and we have suggested, therefore, that Assam border should be strengthened to defend itself.

The question of personnel has been referred to already, but I would not like to go into that matter in detail. As a member of the ruling party, I want our Government to be very careful in regard to the appointment of persons and also in regard to recruitment of personnel. They should not always be going in an one-track way thinking that what policy we are following is always the correct policy. The policy may be all right, but at the same time we must be careful. In the name of secularism, if they do all sorts of things which are not at all good for the security of the country, then I do not think that that kind of policy can save us. Therefore, I would request Government not to depend always on the reports coming from the State. There must be some sort of vetoing by the Centre also at their level to find out whether the information coming from the State is correct or not. Here, in the House itself, on many occasions we have referred to many points where there has been difference, and where the reports coming from the State have been quite different from the report given by the Home Minister here. So, I do not know which reports are quite correct. I would submit that Government should not rule the country merely through paper-work in this time of emergency. I would request Government to be very careful, and more so in the case of Assam which is in a vulnerable position and which is in a strategic position.

In conclusion, I would stress this aspect about the personnel. My hon. friend Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya has already said that the personnel every-

where are not dependable. While determining the meaning of the term 'dependable' and then deciding who is dependable and who is not dependable, Government must be very careful in regard to the policy that they are pursuing.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Since there is a very short time at my disposal, I would only refer to the Indo-Pak border. I know that except the Punjab border and North-west-of-Ganganagar border, the rest of our border is not safe. Only those parts are safe. I do not think Pakistan will ever dare to enter our territory through those borders.

If you look at the content of the population near the border all over, what do we see? They do not reflect the entire community as such. There are certain communities, minorities, in greater numbers in these border areas: may be they are our Indian Muslim brethren, may be they are our Indian tribal brothers. Whoever they may be, I do not want to doubt their loyalty. If any such doubts are cast, they become angry. At the same time, we have to be vigilant and see that they are not used for sabotage or fifth column activity.

The second point is this. There is great need to raise the morale of these areas. A practical way has been shown by one of our friends, Shri Manikyalal Varma. In a small area, he has been doing very good work. A team of 27 MPs recently toured the Jaisalmer area and saw the good work he has been doing. I have no doubt that if a score of Members of Parliament who come from the border states follow his example, the entire picture would be changed.

The third point. The Rajasthan Government has done a very good job by appointing a Border Commissioner. His job is more psychological than administrative or defensive. From that angle, he has done a good job. For over 350 miles of area, one Border Commissioner is there. I feel that the

area per Border Commissioner should not exceed 100 miles. In that case, he will be more effective. I do not mean that a lesser person should be there as Border Commissioner. The Border Commissioner should be a high-calibre man who can control, and can exercise his superiority over the Collectors. Therefore, men of that stature should be appointed for every hundred miles. I am sure that if in the Kutch Border, such a Commissioner was there, probably what has happened now would not have happened.

The fourth point is that in these border regions, we must give military training, particularly to young boys. This is a must; without that, morale would not be raised as we want it to be.

The fifth point is this. Roughly speaking, the border area people can be divided into two classes. One is those who are very much suppressed, the weaker sections of our people. It is time that we create leadership amongst themselves by a long-range programme. I think a very good job has been done in Jaisalmer by helping them to cultivate leadership among themselves and by giving them land and other facilities, by uplifting them through education and other beneficial activities. I think this is very necessary. If we take all these steps, the entire look of the border regions would change.

Lastly, I would make the point that recruitment to the army must reflect the country. When I visited Assam in 1962, I found that the whole population there was agitated; an area which was peace-loving, which had not seen a war for a number of centuries was so much agitated. I could see the same glow in their eyes as one could see in the eyes of the Punjabis, Rajputs or Mahrattas.

Therefore, it is time we broadbased our recruitment. Mere change of rules is not enough, because we have experience of that. Take the case of the Madras Brigade or any such brigade. You must make the recruit-

[Shri Heda]

ment entirely on a different footing and see that people from different areas have a chance. If this is done, in course of time, the army will really be an integrated army and every village, every house will feel that it has contributed something or other to any fight that takes place in a border of the country. If these steps are taken, we can see a marked change for the better in our border defence set-up.

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): The subject matter of the Resolution is of topical interest, especially in the context of the recent developments on our borders. I am very happy that Shri Krishnapal Singh has been lucky in the ballot and this Resolution of such great importance has come up for discussion.

We had a very useful debate, and I am happy that so many valuable suggestions have also been put forward in the course of the debate. In fact, Members from States like Assam, West Bengal, Punjab.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Nobody spoke from Punjab.

Shri A. M. Thomas: . . . and Gujarat have taken considerable interest in the security of our borders and in streamlining the arrangements that have been made on the borders.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri stated that he had his own doubts whether the Government realised the importance of the subject matter of this resolution. I may inform the hon. House that the Government is quite conscious of the great importance of this subject. I shall presently indicate to this hon. House the broad aspects of these problems and how we have tried to tackle the various aspects.

I am also glad that the Members who participated in this debate have general faith and confidence in the army and the way in which the army

can deal with the situation. In fact, the gallantry and bravery of our army have never been in question, in spite of some reverses because of the Chinese invasion. The glory and prestige of our armed forces is a matter of which we can certainly take legitimate pride.

At the same time, we should not lose sight of the tremendous role that has been played by the border police which has made great sacrifices guarding our frontiers. In fact, the whole country has nothing but praise for the police men who have fought so valiantly the Pakistani army units at Sardar post on 9th April. It constitutes a glorious chapter in the annals of the history of the border police. The way in which the border police has not only been able to deal with the situation on the Gujarat border when they were confronted by the Pakistan armies at places like Sardar post, but also the way in which the police men have stood the firing and incursions at places like Latitilla, Dahagram and other areas on the eastern border, deserve, according to me, the commendation of this hon. House.

One main thing that we have to bear in mind when we approach this question is the nature of our defences in recent years. Dr. Aney mentioned that we were for sometime after attaining independence, under the honest belief that we had no enemies. To a great extent Dr. Aney is correct. In fact, we were following a policy of peace and friendship. In international affairs our policy was of friendship and amity towards all nations. We also took things for granted to some extent, and to start with, we treated every country as our friend and not an enemy. But the invasion of China in 1962 came as a great, rude shock, and ever since we have tried and we have taken several steps to improve the defences of the country after the massive aggression in October-November, 1962.

If our defence forces are strong, if we have been able to strengthen our defence forces, the hon. House would agree that that will be in the direction of safeguarding the integrity of our borders. That is one primary factor. Whether these forces are deployed all along the frontier or not, if we have a strong defence force, that is certainly a guarantee for the integrity of our borders. A number of new divisions, as has been mentioned on previous occasions, have been raised, equipped and trained for fighting at high altitudes under extreme climatic conditions. The Army had been equipped with modern equipment and generally speaking our defence capability has improved manifold during the last two or three years. A well-thought out plan for improving communications in border areas is being rapidly implemented. The House knows the wonderful work that has been done on the borders by the border roads organisation and it will certainly improve our capabilities to guard our own frontiers . . .

Shri Heda: We have still a long way to go.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Even then, the steps that we have taken in recent years, Mr. Heda would admit, had been in the right direction and those who had gone to the border and seen the roads would certainly join with me in saying that we have done a wonderful job there in the matter of the border roads.

Defence production also is steadily increasing and in the course of the debate on the defence grants, it has been made clear how our defence potential has increased and how the defence production has also increased manifold and an increasing proportion of our total requirements of arms and equipment is now being met from indigenous sources and we are, if I may say so, on the road to self-sufficiency in the matter of arms and ammunitions. The House is also aware of the Five Year Defence Plan—it is not co-terminus with the other Five Year

Plan—but there is a defence plan and that covers the period 1964-69. All this will certainly help us in defending the borders of our country with our neighbours. It may also be borne in mind that in spite of all these, it would not be possible to prevent hostile neighbours from creating incidents in our borders and even organise minor incursions on our territory which has a frontier of several thousands of miles. Of course a border incident or even if it is a minor incursion into our territory, it does not really threaten the security of the country; it is irritating no doubt; it is demoralising, as the hon. Member here says. When we consider the overall plan, we have to take the realities into consideration. While it would not be possible to guard every inch on the thousands of miles of our frontiers, there are certain points at which we must maintain the closest guard and naturally the hon. Members would not expect me to disclose the points which we consider to be very important from the strategic point of view and in those areas we are certainly having the necessary precautions and we are guarding those areas although I would not be in a position to disclose to the House which areas are they where we have deployed our forces. If we react to every incident by sending large forces to deal with it, we shall be strong nowhere and, I would say, weak everywhere. There is probably no country which could guarantee the integrity of every inch of its political borders. Some countries even at the risk of losing certain parts of their borders would concentrate in certain other areas which are more vital according to them. These strategic considerations should govern our policy rather than an attempt to guard each and every part of a long drawn out frontier.

Now, I will attempt to place before this hon. House the various sections of our frontiers and the problems which we confront within these various sections. The frontiers of India lie along those of four other countries we have

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

Nepal as our neighbour, Burma, China and Pakistan. I will take country by country and then I will also deal with each country sector-wise also. Our relations with Nepal, as the hon. House is aware, are quite cordial and the border between that country and ours poses no problem at all. What about Burma? Some Members have referred to our border with Burma? In fact, our frontier with Burma has also always been peaceful in the sense that as far as the relationship between that country and our country is concerned, it is extremely cordial and peaceful and friendly. The relations with the Government of Burma have throughout been friendly. The only problem that has arisen in regard to that country is that hostile and disgruntled elements have taken advantage of the terrain on both sides of the border for access to Pakistan where they can get arms, ammunition and equipment and training in their use. The case of the hostile Nagas is most relevant in this connection. To prevent such movements, army and police units under the operational control of the army are deployed on this border. So, that part of the objective of this Resolution is already met so far as that border is concerned. It has not, however, been possible to completely stop the movement to and fro of hostile persons between India and Pakistan via Burma. The reasons for our inability to control such movement have been disclosed at length on previous occasions, too, on the floor of this hon. House. All that I would emphasise at this moment is that there is no border defence problem as such in this area, though the army is in operational control of this sector of the border for the specific purpose mentioned earlier, that is to say, the hostile elements within our country should not take advantage of the border as well as the hostile elements in Burma also should not take advantage of that border.

Having dealt with Nepal and Burma, I shall now come to China. The res-

ponsibility for the protection of our border with Tibet and Sinkiang already vests in the army. All security forces deployed for the protection of these borders are under the army's operational control.

16.33 hrs.

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]

But here again, a dispersion of the armed forces to guard every point would not only be unwise but would be dangerous. Therefore, some points are held more lightly than others. When I say that some points are held more lightly than others, hon. Members should not be under the impression that we are not alive to the gravity of the situation and that the Government is not anxious to guard our borders.

Then I will come to Pakistan. In fact, the entire House is rather disturbed about the positions vis a vis the borders with Pakistan. Regarding our borders with Pakistan also, I will divide the areas under three heads. The first head is the international border between Jammu and Kashmir State and West Pakistan, and the cease-fire line in the Jammu and Kashmir State. That is the first sector. What is the position as far as this border is concerned? This border and the cease-fire line have, since 1949, continually been the scene of repeated violations by our neighbour who evidently believes it to be in her interest that there should be a state of perpetual small-scale warfare in this area. In fact, the tactics of Pakistan amounted to keeping the tension all along these borders and now these tactics have also been adapted to other areas. As the hon. House is aware, the army is responsible both for this stretch of the border and the cease-fire line. So, as far as this sector is concerned, it is taken care of by the army and what has been envisaged in this Resolution is also met. All possible measures are taken to protect our territories and our citizens from arm-

ed incursions by Pakistani troops or armed irregulars. There have been several cease-fire violations and because of the steps that we have taken, the loss of life and property that we have been able to inflict on Pakistan is much more than what Pakistan has been able to inflict on us.

I will come to the next sector, the border with West Pakistan. This border between the States of Punjab and Rajasthan on the Indian side and West Pakistan has, for some time, been free of incidents involving the armed forces. It is noteworthy that this border has been surveyed and demarcated on the ground. So, there had not been any possibility of Pakistan coming in under some pretext or other on the basis that the border has not been demarcated.

Some portions of the border between Gujarat and West Pakistan have yet to be demarcated. The House is aware of the recent occurrences on the Kutch-Sind border. The border with West Pakistan had so far been normally looked after by the State Governments concerned, with the help of Special Armed Police units. Now we have placed the responsibility for the protection of the Kutch-Sind border on the army. It is a very live border and the army as in complete control of it.

श्री बागड़ी : कंजरकोट तो डिस्प्यूटेड नहीं है ।

Shri A. M. Thomas: As far as we are concerned, there is absolutely no dispute about Kanjarkot. It is our territory and it is within the boundaries of our country.

The other sector is the border with East Pakistan. Generally speaking, this border is also the responsibility of the State Governments, except the Assam-East Pakistan border, which is under the operational control of the army, which provides the necessary support and supervision over the special border police employed for border protection duties. I may assure the House that the army has

been eminently successful in this task and that the casualties inflicted upon the intruders are far larger than any we have suffered.

As the House is aware, there have been a number of incidents on the East Pakistan border, particularly in the Lathitilla-Dumabari area and Gobindpur village in Assam, the Dahagram area in West Bengal and the Karrangicherra area in Tripura. While these incidents are deplorable and have caused unnecessary suffering to our people, the solution is not to involve the army in the task of protection of this border. The Special Police here have given a very good account of themselves and Pakistan has not been allowed to benefit by her aggressive and violent tactics.

Some hon. members have referred to the reorganisation of the border police. I may inform the House that the question whether the constitution of a Central Police Force would be better under the circumstances is engaging the attention of the Government. At the same time, I may assure the House that even in cases where the borders are being manned by armed police units mainly under the control of State Governments, the Central Government take a great deal of interest in their organisation and equipment and arrangements are in hand for improving their training and supervision so that they can discharge their duties with greater efficiency.

These facts pointed out by me make it clear that whenever it is necessary to do so, the responsibility for the protection of a particular stretch of the border is assigned to the army.

The House will appreciate, however, that it will be against the overall interest of the security of the country to string the Army out in small units all along the frontiers. The army of any country has to be conceived as a striking force and must, therefore, be in a position to deploy itself in such a manner that it can inflict substantial damage on an aggressor at a point of

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

its own choosing. If the army is saddled with the responsibility of looking after every inch of our extensive frontiers, it would have to be of a very large size. The maintenance of such an army would strain our resources unnecessarily. In fact, this strategy has to a certain extent been appreciated by hon. Members of this House. In the course of the short discussions that have taken place off and on after this Pakistan intrusion in the Kutch border, the question has been posed by some hon. Members why, if that terrain is unfavourable to us, we should not take advantage of other areas. That itself shows the consciousness among the hon. Members themselves that as far as the defence of the border is concerned we will not be in a position to stretch our army all along these borders with Pakistan and China.

Even when a border is peaceful, it has to be policed for the purpose of enforcing customs and immigration laws and to prevent the escape of offenders. Such enforcement of the laws is essentially the task of the Police and cannot be performed by the army which is raised and trained with an entirely different objective. When the country across the border is hostile, unpleasant incidents are bound to occur particularly when that country feels that such incidents help its national policy, as perhaps Pakistan feels. Unlike many international borders in other parts of the world, our border with Pakistan has to be policed by armed police units who can meet force by force. As I have already indicated, at the very outset, our armed police in the borders have given a glorious account of themselves.

Mr. Chairman, some hon. Members have raised the question of strengthening of our intelligence machinery. In fact, I may inform the hon. House that our intelligence machinery has been expanded considerably especially in the recent years. In fact, the method of collation and assessment of the information that we receive from

several sources has been improved. We have also a joint intelligence machinery, a committee which consist of representatives of the External Affairs Ministry, of the Defence Ministry and the Ministry of Home Affairs. There are also representatives of the army intelligence, naval intelligence and air force intelligence. This joint intelligence machinery is to collate and assess the information that they get from various sources, so that the improvement and strengthening of the intelligence machinery is ever in the attention of the Central Government.

Apart from these economic and tactical arguments, it would be necessary to invite the attention of the House to the possible undesirable consequences of opposing armies facing each other across the border, for it must be remembered that if in any sector we substitute the police by the army, the other side will follow suit and when two opposing armies face each other across the border, there is always a danger that minor incidents may escalate into a major battle. This is a matter of general policy and I hope the House would appreciate it. There appears, therefore, no reason, as envisaged in the Resolution, to hand over the protection of the entire frontier of India at one stroke to the army. As has already been stated by me, wherever we find that our neighbour is employing the army in the borders, we will call upon the army to support the police. In this manner the army can devote its attention on training so as to improve progressively its potential as a striking force against an enemy who casts covetous eyes on any part of our territory.

Although I am in sympathy, and certainly the House is also in sympathy, with the spirit of what the resolution elucidates—in fact, it is a resolution of a general character and the amendments are also of that nature—it would not be possible for the Government to accept this Resolution. But, at the same time, as I have al-

ready assured this hon. House, the various suggestions that have been made in the course of the debate would certainly engage the attention of the Government. As I have stated already, wherever it has become necessary, the army has taken control of the situation.

In the light of what I have stated and the assurance that I have given, I trust that the hon. Member, Shri Krishnapal Singh would find his way to withdraw the Resolution, because the Resolution that he has tabled and moved has certainly served a very useful purpose.

Shri Krishnapal Singh: I had certainly thought that the Government would gladly accept the innocent type of a Resolution that I had moved, especially the Defence Ministry, whom it would have helped in building up their strength. The reply of the Defence Minister is in effect a confession of weakness. He says that we cannot station our troops in every inch of the borders. That is quite true. I said the same thing. Wherever we cannot have the army, we must have the police. But if we have a sufficiently strong army on the border and reserve, the enemy or the aggressor will think twice before he comes and occupies our territory.

Now, according to the Defence Minister, everything seems to be all right. I ask him: if everything is all right, if other people come and occupy part of our territory, why are we not in a position to go and occupy part of their territory? The very fact that we have failed to do so, we have not been able effectively to retaliate proves that we have not got sufficient strength.

I am prepared to concede that we are better off than we were two or three years back. But I must say that we are not sufficiently strong to meet the combined strength of the two allies opposing us, and that is why I say that if we want to defend our borders effectively, we must be serious, we

must give the top-most priority to the Defence, which the Government has not given it.

I should have thought that the Defence Minister would come here and blame his colleagues who are not helping him, by saying that his Ministry is not getting top-most priority. We must give it top-most priority. We must concentrate on a few things like defence, food etc. instead of trying to run after everything. Once our borders are secure, we can devote our attention to other matters also. What is the use of having big factories, oil refineries and multi-storey buildings if our borders are not safe? When our borders are not secure, what is the use of doing this, that and the other?

We seem to have too many fingers in the pie and my sole object is to ask the Government to give defence of the borders the top-most priority.

I was hoping that Government would accept this Resolution which was couched in very modest language and which, I am glad to say, has been supported by every section of the House. I would again like to emphasize that the Government should accept the suggestions which have been placed before them by every section of the House and accept this very innocent Resolution. We only want that our borders should be secure. They should build up strength. You cannot possibly place men at every inch of the soil; everybody knows it, even a child knows it. But if you are strong, the aggressor will think twice before he tries to cross the border. We are not sufficiently strong. I ask: Where is the need to stop recruiting? What was the need? Had our opponents receded?

Shri A. M. Thomas: Who said that recruitment has been stopped?

Shri Krishnapal Singh: The pace had been slowed down. It has practically been stopped.

Another point that I would like to emphasize and which is just as important as any other is the tighten-

[Shri Krishnapal Singh]

ing up of security. For want of time I could not lay stress on it. I think, the Government documents themselves are responsible for breach of security. Everywhere when we start a new factory, we tell the world where our ordnance factory is going to be located. These days it is a very dangerous proposition.

Other secret information somehow leaks from our offices. We must tighten up security. During the last war there were instances which led to serious losses. Careless words of a mother at a grocer's shop led to one of the troopships being torpedoed in the Indian Ocean by the Japanese. That is a very dangerous thing. There was a time when the families of Generals used to live in Simla and they used to write to their wives on military matters and two or three Generals were taken to task during the last war. Therefore we must prevent leakage of information. If intelligence is important in securing information about military matters of our enemies, security is important in denying the leakage of information to the enemy. So, sufficient stress should be laid on that subject.

I would like to emphasize once again that I hope the Government will accept this suggestion that now onwards they are going to give the topmost priority to defence and will concentrate only on a few of the things and not try to do too many things. At this time we cannot successfully do it. Defence, which has been neglected for so many years, cannot be built up in a day.

I would also like to suggest that before we are strong enough, we better be in search of a really good ally, a good friend, who will stand by us in time of need. Whoever that are, that is for the Government to decide; but we must have it. That is the only way to put our defence right so long as we have not been able to build up our defences satisfactorily.

Before I close I would like to pay my tribute, as also on behalf of the House, to our jawans who laid their lives on our borders and to those who are serving the country under very difficult conditions. I hope, the House will support me and that we should be able to carry this Resolution. I press this Resolution to a division.

Mr. Chairman: There are three amendments to this Resolution. Amendment No. 1 is by Shri Rananjai Singh. Is he pressing for it? He is not here. So I will take another one.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): The amendment is before the House. If it is not withdrawn, it is to be put to the vote of the House.

Mr. Chairman: All right. I now put the amendment of Shri Rananjai Singh to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put Amendment No. 2 by Shri Yashpal Singh.

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived

Mr. Chairman: Then, Amendment No. 4 is by Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh Shri D. S. Patil and others. Are they pressing for it?

Shri D. S. Patil: I withdraw it.

Amendment No. 4 was, by leave withdrawn

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that the arrangements for defence of Indian borders (With Pakistan, China and Burma) should be further improved and their protection should be under the overall supervision of the Defence Forces."

Let the lobbies be cleared.

17.00 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 23]

AYES

[16.57 hrs.

Aney, Dr. M.S.
 Badrudduja, Shri
 Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
 Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shankar

Krishnapal Singh, Shri
 Minimata, Shrimati]
 Ranga, Shri

Shinkre, Shri
 Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
 Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Alva, Shri A.S.
 Bhagat, Shri B.R.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.
 Boroosh, Shri P.C.
 Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
 Chakraverti, Shri P.R.
 Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
 Chaudhry, Shri Chandramani Lal
 Chavan, Shri D.R.
 Daffe, Shri
 Daljit Singh, Shri
 Das, Shri N.T.
 Dighe, Shri
 Dorai, Shri Kasinatha
 Dwivedi, Shri M.L.
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Gowdh, Shri
 Hansda, Shri Subodh
 Hazarika, Shri J.N.
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri M.L.
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
 Kamble, Shri
 Kandappan, Shri S.
 Kedarai, Shri C.M.
 Khadilkar, Shri
 Kotaki, Shri Liladhar
 Kripa Shankar, Shri
 Krishna, Shri M.R.

Krishnamachari, Shri T.T.
 Kureel, Shri B.N.
 Lahtan Chaudhry, Shri
 Lakshminanthamma, Shrimati
 Laakar, Shri N.R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Mahtab, Shri
 Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra
 Maniyangadan, Shri
 Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K.L.
 Mukane, Shri
 Musafir, Shri G.S.
 Muthiah, Shri
 Niranjani Lal, Shri
 Oza, Shri
 Pande, Shri K. N.
 Pant, Shri K.C.
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Patil, Shri D.S.
 Patil, Shri T.A.
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Raju, Shri D.B.
 Raju, Dr. D.S.
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rananjai Singh, Shri

Rane, Shri
 Rao, Shri Rampathi
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Reddy, Shrimati Yashoda
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Sadnu Kam, Shri
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Samanta, Shri S.C.
 Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Shakuntala Devi, Shrimati
 Sharma, Shri A.P.
 Sharma, Shri D.C.
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Sonavane, Shri
 Subbaraman, Shri
 Subramanyam, Shri T.
 Thomas, Shri A.M.
 Tiwary, Shri D.N.
 Tiwary, Shri K.N.
 Tiwary, Shri R.S.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Ukey, Shri
 Upadhaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
 Vaishya, Shri M.B.
 Yadav, Shri N.P.

The Minister of Communications and Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): My vote has not been recorded even though I had pressed the button.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of the division is as follows:

Ayes: 10; Noes: 87.

The Resolution was negatived.

17.02 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: CEILING ON URBAN PROPERTY

Shri P. R. Chakraverti (Dhanbad): I beg to move:

This House is of opinion that suitable measures should be taken

*Half-an-hour discussion.

to introduce ceiling on urban property, commensurate with the policy adopted with regard to rural areas."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member can commence his speech on the next day.

Shri D. S. Patil (Yeotmal): I also move my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not now. He can move it on the next day.

17.03 hrs.

*SUPPLY OF SHOES TO MINERS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, we shall take up the half-an-hour discussion to