

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): अध्यक्ष महोदय, अब तो मुझे एक इतिहास दे देने दीजिए। मैंने कल यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के इतिहास केन्द्र से बात की। वहाँ श्री बेरी से मालूम पड़ा कि 1964 की किताब ग्राह्वीरी किताब है और वह फरवरी में आयी है। बारदवर्ष में जो इसकी अकेली दुकान है हमने उनसे पता लगाया, उनके यहाँ अप्रैल में आयी। फिर आपके पुस्तकालय में मैंने पता लगाया कि यहाँ कब आयी तो मुख्याध्यक्ष साहब ने बताया कि यह पुस्तक उनके पास 12 अप्रैल, सन् 1966 को आयी।

अब इसमें ज्यादा ताजा और क्या सवाल हो सकता है? इस के अलावा मैं आप को बतलाऊँ कि कल यहाँ पर सरकार ने खुद जो आंकड़े दिये हैं भारत के क्षेत्रफल के, जो उन्होंने संयुक्त राष्ट्र को भेजे 32 लाख कुछ हजार उस के मुकाबले में तो उस से तो अब मुझे और ज्यादा हैरत हो रही है। करीब 2 लाख 60,000 वर्ग किलोमीटर का फर्क पड़ जाता है इसलिए यह सब ताजा ताजा चीजें हैं जोकि कल उन्होंने बतलाई हैं। कल जब सरकार ने बतलाया तो पहले तो किसी को मालूम ही नहीं था कि भारत सरकार संयुक्त राष्ट्र को आंकड़े साल के साल भेजा करती है। भारत सरकार ने जो आंकड़े भेजे संयुक्त राष्ट्र को उसे मैं आप को खाली पढ़ कर छनाता हूँ। कल 16 मई को उन्होंने बतलाया कि 1963 में क्षेत्रफल था 32 लाख 76 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर और 1964 में 32 लाख 76 हजार और कुछ सौ वर्ग किलोमीटर होता है। उसी को जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र की ग्राह्वीरी किताब है उस ने छपा तो बताया है कि 1964 में 36 लाख 46 हजार और 32 लाख 76 हजार तो अब आप देखें कि कितना फर्क पड़ जाता है। 2 लाख 30 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर का फर्क पड़ जाता है। हम को मालूम है कि भारत सरकार ने...

अध्यक्ष महोदय: क्या एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर साहब इस बारे में स्टेटमेंट देने के लिए तैयार हैं?

12.40 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: AREA OF INDIA AS PUBLISHED BY U.N.O., AND THE SURVEY OF INDIA IN 1959 AND 1964

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): I am going to deal with both the survey of India publication and the UN Book.

Mr. Speaker: Is he ready with the information just now? If he is, he may give it just now, since the question has been raised.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Shall I read out the statement just now?

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): How is it that you have taken up that item now? It is out of order. You have gone beyond the List of Business today. This item figures as item No. 20 on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: We are now on the question about the adjournment motion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Are you not taking item by item?

श्री मधु लिवसे (मुंगेर): कामरोको प्रस्ताव को लेकर चर्चा हो रही है तो इस में आप का हेम बरुआजी क्या ऐतराज है? काम रोको प्रस्ताव को प्राथमिकता मिलती है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: सवाल एजोर्नमेंट मोशन का उठा है और उस का संबंध उस स्टेटमेंट से है जोकि मिनिस्टर साहब देने वाले हैं तो अगर वह स्टेटमेंट अभी कर दें और उससे जल्दी फेक्ट्स आ जायें तो इस में क्या हर्ज है?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Speaker, Sir, In his speech on 14th May 1966 in the Lok Sabha Dr. Ram Manohar

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

Lohia was presumably referring to the publication of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting entitled 'India, A Reference Annual, 1953' in which the area of India is mentioned as 12,69,640 sq. miles. It may be stated that this figure, which was based on rough estimates of the Survey of India, was subsequently revised to 12,62,158 sq. miles when more accurate information became available a little later and the boundaries were accordingly delineated on the maps. The figure for the area of the country in 1964, furnished by the Survey of India, is 12,61,597 sq. Miles. Both the figure of 12,62,158 sq. Miles in 1953 and the figure of 12,61,597 sq. Miles in 1964 give the area of the country excluding Sikkim and Bhutan.

2. Between the years 1953 and 1964, there is a net decrease in the area of 561 sq. miles, although the 1964 figure includes the area of 1,615 sq. miles resulting from the addition of the territories of Goa, Daman, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli. Excluding the area of these additional territories, the area in 1964 is less than that in 1953 by 2,176 sq. miles. This difference resulted from fresh calculations based on new and more accurate surveys. It may, however, be stated that no territory of India has been excluded from the figures which have been given in this statement for the area of the country in 1953 and 1964.

3. Survey are a continuous process. Variations in area in different years are likely to result from surveys carried out from time to time.

Regarding the discrepant figures of area of India given in the UN Year Books, to which reference was made by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, I would like to give the following information.

From 1947 to 1960, the UN Demographic Year Books and other statistical publications gave the area of India on the basis of the available published material. From 1952 to 1960, the UN Year Books gave the

area as over 32 lakhs sq. k.m., the figures for 1959 and 1960 being 32,63,373 sq.k.m. The footnotes indicated that this included Jammu and Kashmir with an area of 2,22,380 sq.k.m.

In 1961, the UN Statistical Year Book gave the figure as 30,40,220 (provisional) and since then the area of India is mentioned as over 30 lakhs sq.k.m. For 1961 and 1962 and for subsequent years, according to the footnotes, Jammu and Kashmir is excluded....

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Damn this UN. How could they excluded it?

Shri M. C. Chagla: ...and those of 1963 and 1964, however, include Goa, Daman and Diu.

Shri Tyagi: How could they exclude it?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I share the indignation of my hon. friend, and I shall state what we have done.

श्री मधु लिखदे : इसीलिए तो यह काम रोको प्रस्ताव बनता है ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am coming to that, and I shall state what we have done. My hon. friend may have a little patience.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): They never take notice of what we say to them.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Since 1961, the Central Statistical Organisation has been furnishing statistical information to the UN for its Demographic Year Book. However, the figures published by the United Nations in its Demographic Year Book have been different from those reported to them by our Central Statistical Organisation. In 1962, 1963 and 1964, the figures reported by the Central Statistical Organisation were over 32,76,000 sq. k.m. For 1961, the figure was less than this, namely,

29,49,275 sq. km., but as was explained by the Central Statistical Organisation to the United Nations, it excluded areas in respect of which the 1961 census figures of population were not available at the time it reported. It is, however, quite clear that from 1961, onwards, the United Nations have not accepted the figures reported by our Central Statistical Organisation.

Now comes the important point. The Government of India consider the exclusion of the area of Jammu and Kashmir from the area of India as completely unjustifiable. While up to 1960 the United Nations themselves have quite rightly, included in the area of India the area of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which is a constituent part of the Indian Union and an integral part of India, they seem to have arbitrarily excluded it from 1961. Nothing in our view had happened to warrant this change. The question of inaccuracy in U.N. statistics was taken up by our Permanent Representative with the UN Secretary-General in 1960-61, and we have continued to make representations since then. We are again asking our Permanent Representative to take it up with the Secretary-General with a view to securing the rectification of the U.N. figures.

Shri Tyagi: May I seek one clarification?.....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We should have a discussion on this.

Shri Tyagi: It is most shocking that the Jammu and Kashmir area has been excluded by the UNO. But will the hon. Minister also be pleased to say whether they have included this area in Pakistan, because Jammu and Kashmir as such does not appear in that list? They have, therefore, not only excluded it from India but they seem to have included it in Pakistan, because the area of Pakistan has also increased.

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend has raised a very pertinent and relevant question, but I am afraid I have

not got the information just now. I shall certainly look into it.

श्री मधु लिखते : हम लोगों का काम-
रोंका प्रस्ताव है पहले हम लोगों को सुनिये ।

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): It seems that what the Security Council of the UN was not permitted to do, the Central Statistical Bureau of the UN is trying in a way to do against India by excluding territories which are an integral part of India.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: May I know when this was brought to the notice of the Government first of all, when this matter was taken up with the UN in the first instance, why it was delayed, and whether Government did not consider it proper to lodge a very strong and vehement protest with the UN against this most unwarranted behaviour in international organisational terms?

Shri M. C. Chagla: If I may answer the last question first, we have lodged a strong and vehement protest with the UN.

An hon. Member: When?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have said that it is contrary to international practice, the UN should not have done it.

श्री प्रफुल्लचोदर शस्त्री (बिजनौर) :
सरकार ने विरोधपत्र कब भेजा ।

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: When was this first discovered and when was the protest sent?

श्री चारासूर (जिबपुरी) : सरकार को
बाहिए कि वह इस बारे में एक क्लाइमेट
तैयार कर के मेम्बर में सर्किलेट करे ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: We protested in 1961. We have continued doing that

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

and again protested. We have instructed our Permanent Representative in this regard.

An hon. Member: What is the reply?

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): When their attention had already been drawn to this in 1961 and the Government of India thought it fit to instruct their Permanent Representative to lodge a strong protest with the United Nations, why did it not occur to them that they should examine this figure given by the UN statistical section and see whether this particular area which had not been included in our but had been drawn from out of our territory has been added to the area of Pakistan? Has the area of Pakistan been increased in their figures? Why is it that they not examined this matter? My hon. friend now says that he has not got the information.

Mr. M. C. Chagla: I have said I have not got the information. I agree we should look into it from the point of view suggested by my hon. friend, Shri Tyagi and also by Dr. Singhvi. We will look into it and, if necessary, supply the information.

Shri Parasar: Why has this not been done till now?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): For several years now this discrepancy has continued. The United Nations has no business to interfere with the figures supplied by this country which is a sovereign member of that body. If any UN expert had, for technical reasons, any objection to our figures, he should have taken it up with our Survey of India and that sort of thing. But how is it that our country has swallowed this miserable insult hurled at us by the UN Security Council and its Secretariat? How is it that we have waited for this matter having to be brought up by private Members—I admire the enterprise—before Government could be

made to come out with this statement? How is it that this kind of thing has continued for so long since 1961?

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend is not right when he says that we have swallowed this. Far from swallowing the insult, we have indignantly protested.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: For four, five years.

Shri M. C. Chagla: From 1961, we have been protesting.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: For years you will go on doing it.

Shri Parasar: All the correspondence in this regard should be laid on the Table in the form of a white paper.

Shri J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): What is the reply received to our protest?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I entirely agree that the UN had no right to tamper with the boundaries of our country and to have excluded Jammu and Kashmir from this country. We share the resentment, and we have taken it up with them.

Shri Ranga: May I suggest that this should be the first subject which should be taken up at the beginning of the next session apart from the priority we would be giving to the Constitution Amendment Bill?

श्री मधु लिखपे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बारे में हमारा कामरोको प्रस्ताव है। सरकार की असफलता के बारे में डाक्टर राम मनोहर लोहिया बोलेंगे। मन्त्री महोदय ने यह कह कर सदन को गुमराह करने की कोशिश की है कि यह केवल जम्मू-काश्मीर का सवाल है। दो सौसिज से ये घांकड़े लिए गए हैं। मैं घाप को घांकड़े देकर बताता हूँ कि एक एक साल में इस देश के अक्षयफल में कितना फर्क पड़ा है।

यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की यीयर बुक्स में ये आंकड़े दिये गए हैं :

वर्ष	(क्षेत्रफल किलोमीटरों में)	वर्ध
1950	3,062,454	...
1951	3,047,952	14,502 (-)
1952	3,288,745	240,793 (+)
1953	3,288,251	494 (-)
1954	3,288,375	124 (+)
1955	3,288,375	कोई परिवर्तन नहीं
1956	3,288,375	कोई परिवर्तन नहीं
1957	3,288,876	501 (+)
1958	3,281,769	7,107 (-)
1959	3,270,480	11,289 (-)
1960	3,263,373	7,107 (-)
1961	3,040,220	223,153 (-)
1962	3,042,794	2,574 (+)
1963	3,046,232	3,438 (+)
1964	3,046,232	कोई परिवर्तन नहीं

जहां तक सरकार द्वारा प्रकाशित "इंडिया" में दिये गये आंकड़ों का सवाल है, 1957 में भारत का क्षेत्रफल 12,69,900 वर्ग मील बताया गया था और 1958 में यह 12,59,797 वर्ग मील बताया गया, जिस का अर्थ यह है कि एक साल में भारत का क्षेत्रफल 10,103 वर्गमील घट गया।

जैसा कि मैंने पहले कहा है, यह केवल जम्मू-काश्मीर का मामला नहीं है। इसमें जहां तक सरकार की असफलता का प्रश्न है, उसको बताने के लिए मैं आपका वक्त नहीं लूंगा। उसके बारे में डाक्टर साहब कहेंगे।

Shri Hem Barua: On a previous occasion, my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, raised this issue of the exclusion of the State of Jammu and Kashmir from UN maps and statistical books. He then suggested that Government should tell the UNO that if it continues like this, Government would refuse to pay India's dues to the UNO. In that light, since this has been a

deliberate tampering with our area, and this has become almost a pattern with the UNO and during these five years time, our Government have not rectified this and the UNO has also not rectified it, may I know whether our Government have told the UNO, and told it point-blank, that India is not going to pay her contributions if these things are not corrected and if these things continue?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have already told this House that we have protested strongly, vehemently and indignantly. Is it necessary to go to the length of giving an ultimatum to the UN.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार): यह मधु लिमये के सवाल का जवाब दिया जाये।

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have been a loyal and respected member of the UN ever since its formation. I agree that this particular action on the part of the UN is utterly unjustifiable, against which we have protested. But my hon. friend suggests something in the nature of an ultimatum which, I

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

do not think is right for a country like ours to give to the UN.

An hon. Member: Why?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): The House has expressed a justified indignation in a matter of such vital importance. Now the only thing which I would like to enquire of the hon. Minister is, what is the reaction of the UN, what do they say to our protest? He has said that Government have lodged a strong protest. But what have they to say? The least that we could do is not to permit these books to come here. It would be a most legitimate protest. Government may not stop the contribution. But would it not be a most legitimate protest to proscribe this sort of literature coming into India? That would be really a protest which would make itself felt. Why send important letters?

13 hrs.

Shri M. C. Chagla: The House knows the history of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute as far as the United Nations is concerned. In all United Nations publications, Jammu and Kashmir has been referred to as "the excluded area of Jammu and Kashmir, the status of which has not yet been determined", notwithstanding our protest. This is the attitude which the United Nations has maintained.

श्री चौध (अलोगढ़) : 1961 की रिपोर्ट पढ़िये, उसमें जम्मू-काश्मीर प्रांत के क्षेत्रफल में शामिल हैं। यू० एन० प्रो० की रिपोर्ट में जो मन्त्री महोदय कह रहे हैं, यह सब नहीं है।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Mr. Nath Pai rose two or three times. Why don't you call him, because he has taken more pains than any other Member on this subject? You are calling others. Why this attitude?

Mr. Speaker: I will call him. I can call only one after the other.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): I do not know what procedure you follow sometimes.

श्री प्रकाशचरित शास्त्री : मैं तो सिर्फ इतना चाहता हूँ कि प्राय छागला साहब से पूछ लीजिये कि जितना हिस्सा भारत का घटा है, क्या उतना हिस्सा पाकिस्तान में बढ़ा है, इस बारे में स्पष्ट बता दिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसका जवाब तो उन्होंने दिया है...

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): May I add the information that this area is not added to Pakistan at all. It used to be included in the area given against India, but after its exclusion from India, it has not been added to Pakistan.

One further informatoin I would like to give. Mr. Limaye read several figures. He has not read the footnotes which are given in those reports. I am not justifying it, but the variation can be judged from the footnotes that are added to the description of area given in each year of the Yearbook.

This is not a matter on which we are joining issue with the hon. Members who have raised doubts. It is a matter of statistics, and we would like to supply all possible information. So, if it is acceptable, I will produce a paper giving these areas, giving the footnotes and the various areas, statistical information, because it is figure work, and other people might give different figures and then it becomes difficult to discuss. I will certainly prepare the material which the hon. Members can study.

Shrimati Benu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): When he prepares this information, we would like to know whether the United Nations excludes all territory which is disputed in its calculations or is it only in the case of India?

Shri Nath Pal: The issue is being clouded. There are two kinds of mistakes which have been charged against the Government. One mistake has been committed over a long period by the United Nations showing territory, which under the Constitution of this country is part of India, as disputed territory. When this issue was again brought up by Dr. Lohia in this House, we had asked the Government, "If the United Nations persists in its folly, in utter contempt of what this country thinks, by showing this part of India as a disputed territory, why don't you retaliate?" A small country like Indonesia, when it concerned its interests, walked out. We do not say you should walk out, but what is the use of delivering these homilies saying we are a big power, a great power, we cannot behave like that? Because we are great, let anybody take away chunks of our territory—is that the sign of our greatness? And we will be sitting like petrified rabbits. (Interruptions).

This was pointed out that the whole of Jammu and Kashmir is shown not as part of India's territory, he knows it, this is what the United Nations has done, and the Government of India has palpably failed in exercising this duty, making no positive show of manliness and defiance, and that is why the United Nations go on treating us with contempt, and it does not lie in your mouth to come and say here that it does not befit India. What befits India?—submitting this kind of thing?

You know that cartographic aggression is a prelude to physical aggression. We have suffered it everywhere. So, we should ask them to stop. It was not in a peevish manner that I had suggested earlier that if the United Nations does not move, does not mend its ways, then we should not go on paying our subscription. It is on a reciprocal basis that we will accept the authority of the United Nations, and the United Nations is not

entitled to go on amputating like this. This is one failure.

The second failure is this. Mr. Chagla forgot there are two books which were mentioned. Mr. Limaye has referred to the India Year Book. This is published in India by a Ministry which is a part of the Government of India. In November, 1964 this is the total area given of India—12,69,000 square miles. In the same book published by the same department, India 1964, the area is 12,61,000 square miles. This has nothing to do with Kashmir. Eight thousand square miles of the territory disappears from the pages of the Government of India publication. How does this all happen?

The reason for this I am constrained to say, is that this constant vigilance about every inch of our territory is not exercised unless that inch is thrown in our face, is never exercised in practice as every department of the Government is called upon to do. That is why we had asked how many thousand square miles make one inch. It is not more rhetoric.

Is there any other country with whose territory and land such liberty is taken either by the United Nations or by its neighbours? Therefore, the Government should be far more serious than saying that this is a minor mistake. Government stands guilty, stands impeached, of culpable neglect on this very vital issue. It is not for the sake of saying we are saying it. Over a period of years we have seen this failure written large on the heads of all of them when they did not do anything except delivering homilies to us.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Why don't they place on the Table of the House the protest note and the replies that they have been received?

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest, if it is acceptable to all sides, that first of all that statement that has been

[Mr. Speaker]

referred to by the External Affairs Minister may be prepared and all information supplied, and the relevant protests etc., if the Government does not think that it is in the public interest not to disclose, may also be placed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: They never claimed.

Mr. Speaker: That is what I am saying. All this might be placed on the Table of the House. Then I am prepared to give it a special opportunity. As has been suggested by Mr. Ranga, after the Constitution Amendment Bill, as the next item we may take up the discussion of the statement that would be placed on the Table of House; it might be discussed threadbare and the Members might have the opportunity to say what they have to, and the Government might explain its position as it is.

Shri Swaran Singh: We will ourselves initiate the discussion.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): यह मामला इतना साफ नहीं है, जितना अभी तक कहा गया है, खाली जम्मू-काश्मीर का मामला नहीं है...

अध्यक्ष महोदय: इसको आप उस वक्त जे लीजियेगा।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: मैं इसमें बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह सारा मामला जम्मू-काश्मीर का हो सकता है, यह मामला अक्सार्ड-चीन का हो सकता है, यह मामला और कुछ पड़ोसियों का हो सकता है और मैंने इस असफलता को बिल्कुल साफ़ तीर पर आपके सामने रखा है। आप खुद देखिये कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र के अपने प्राकड़ों के मुताबिक करीब 2 लाख 45 हजार स्क्वेयर किलोमीटर या 2 लाख 50 हजार स्क्वेयर किलोमीटर जमीन अच्छे वक्त में थी और बुरे वक्त में सब खत्म हो गई। मैंने खुद संयुक्त राष्ट्र की किताब में जम्मू-काश्मीर का क्षेत्रफल

देखा है, वह केवल 2 लाख 13 हजार स्क्वेयर किलोमीटर होता है, जिसके मायने यह हुए कि करीब 27 या 30 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर और रह जाती है, जिसके बारे में सफाई देने की जरूरत पड़ती है। यह असफलता मामूली नहीं है। मुझे ऐसा डर लगता है कि जम्मू-काश्मीर के कुछ हिस्से को इसमें शामिल किया, कुछ अक्सार्ड-चीन छोड़ दिया, कुछ और पड़ोसियों का, जिनका मैं जिक्र नहीं करना चाहता, उनका छोड़ दिया। सरकार की जो अपनी छपी हुई किताब है, जिसके बारे में सबसे पहले छागला साहब ने सफ़ाई दी है, उसके बारे में मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ, बिल्कुल यहाँ आपकी आँखों के सामने, कानों के सामने क्या चीज हुई है। प्रसल में सर्वे प्राफ इण्डिया के मुताबिक 12 लाख 69 हजार 640 वर्ग मील जमीन हमारी थी अच्छे वक्त में, लेकिन अब 1964 के मुताबिक वह 12 लाख 61 हजार हो गई है। जिसके मायने हैं कि आठ हजार वर्गमील कम हो गई। आपके सामने मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि छागला साहब बहुत धीमे बोल रहे थे। मैं उनको चाहता हूँ कि वह बतायें कि कितने वर्ग मील उन्होंने बताया था? संयुक्त राष्ट्र को आप छोड़ दीजिये। आप अपने मुताबिक बनायें कि कितने वर्ग मील आपने बताया था।

Shri M. C. Chagla: 2,176 miles.

Shri D. C. Sharma: A question like this arose when Pandit Nehru was the Prime Minister.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: इन्होंने दो हजार के करीब बताया। मैं आपको यह बता रहा हूँ कि यह मामला ऐसा हो रहा है कि जिसके ऊपर हर एक भारतवासी का चिंतित होना स्वाभाविक है। हर एक भारतवासी को चिन्ता होने लगेगी। आठ हजार वर्ग मील कम नहीं है। दरअसल बात यह है कि 1961 में मोथा प्राय, इमर

घाया, दीब घाया, नागर हवेली घाया, जिनका जिफ़ किया लेकिन अभी भी मन्वी महोदय भारत के मामले में बेखबर हैं। इन्होंने पुद्दुचेरी नहीं गिनाया। पुद्दुचेरी इन्होंने छोड़ दिया वह भी वापिस घाया था। वह फ्रांस के मातहत था। कारेकल घाया। वह भी फ्रांस के मातहत था। सारे इलाके घाये थें। मतलब यह होता है कि कुछ इनका हिसाब किताब गलत है। हमारा ख्याल है कि बारह नेरह हजार बर्गमील की गलती यह कर रहे हैं। इसका मतलब होता है करीब 60-70 लाख एकड़ जमीन। उस दिन हम लोग 36 एकड़ जमीन के लिए रक्षा मन्त्री से लड़े थे। बिल्कुल वाजिब तौर पर हम लड़े। लेकिन यहां घ्राप देखें कि 60, 70 और 80 लाख एकड़ जमीन खत्म हो रही है। शक होता है कि यह सब क्यो हो रहा है। अगर हिसाब की गलती है तो भी सरकार की गलती है और इस बाम्ने सरकार को इस गद्दी पर रहने का एक सैकिड के लिए भी अधिकार नहीं रह गया है। साल साल में गलती अगर यह कर रही है तो इसको यहां बैठने का कोई कतई अधिकार नहीं है। अगर मान लीजिये, हिसाब की गलती नहीं और मामला कुछ और है और प्रक्सार्डिचिन, जम्मु काश्मीर के कुछ खास हिस्से बीच में घ्राते हैं... (ब्यबधान) सरदार साहब ने जुरत करके कह दिया कि फुट नोट 1964 में है। लेकिन घ्राप देखें कि कोई फुटनोट नहीं है। इसी तरह से ये बयान दिया करते हैं। लोक सभा को क्या समझा जाता है? जो मन में घ्राया कह देते हैं। घ्राप देखें कि कोई फुटनोट नहीं है। 1964 में नहीं है जहां हमारी जमीन कम बताई गई है। यह किताब है अध्यक्ष महोदय इसको देखें।

श्री प्रधु लिवये : सरदार साहब को बिष्वा दीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सरदार साहब को दिखाने से कोई लाभ नहीं है। उनका नो काम ही है यहां घ्रा कर गलत बयानी करना। इसलिए जहां पर इतनी ज्यादा गलत फहमी

रह जाती है कि कहीं मांलूम ही ब्रुहीं कि हमारी कितने बर्गमील जमीन...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब घ्राप समाप्त करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं प्रर्ज कर रहा हूँ कि इनकी यह असफलता बिल्कुल अच्छी तरह से साबित हो जाती है। इसलिए घ्राप इस काम रोको प्रस्ताव को ले लीजिये। इस काम रोको प्रस्ताव को भ्रगो के लिए डालना बहुत खतरनाक मामला हो जाएगा।

श्री त्यागी : बयान तो घ्राने दो।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कब दंगे, कहा दंगे। यह बयान तो घ्रा भी गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : घ्रापने अब कह लिया है। घ्राप चाहते हैं कि काम रोको प्रस्ताव को लिया जाए। मैंने घ्रापको काफी देर सुन लिया है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं घ्रापको सम्भावनायें बता रहा हूँ। क्या क्या सम्भावना-ये हो सकती हैं, यह मैं घ्रापको बता रहा हूँ। एक सम्भावना तो यह है कि भारत सरकार के मन में कुछ पेंच घ्रा गया है। कहीं कोई जमीन उसका छोड़ने का इरादा है। अब वह एकाएक घ्राखिर में जा कर फैसला तो बता नहीं मकेगी देश को कि यह होना चाहिये। इस बास्ते अभी से वह उसके लिए जमीन तैयार कर रही है। खुद घ्राप सर्वे घ्राफ इंडिया में अपनी जमीन कम बता रहे हैं...

Shri Tyagi: It is a very serious insinuation..... (Interruptions)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह कहना इसलिए जरूरी हो जाता है कि तेरह हजार बर्गमील खुद इनकी किताब सर्वे घ्राफ इंडिया के भूगणिक कम हो जाती है।

Shri Swaran Singh: I strongly repudiate it; it is absolutely incorrect.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आपको मैंने सुन लिया है। अब आप खत्म करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं दोहरा नहीं रहा हूँ। मैं आपके सामने नई बातें रख रहा हूँ और सम्भावनायें आपको बना रहा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कुछ लिमिट तो होनी चाहिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह एक सवाल है जिसके ऊपर लोक सभा आधारित है, देश आधारित है, संविधान की धारा। को इस सरकार ने बिल्कुल तोड़ दिया है। मालूम होता है कि जमीन जमीन नहीं है बल्कि मोम है जो पिघल जाया करती है। जब ऐसी स्थिति पहुँच जाए तो सिवाय इसके काम रोकने प्रस्ताव आए क्या हो सकता है। सरकार से पूछा जाए कि उसने हिसाब की यह भ्रष्टाचार गलती कैसे की है। सरकार इसकी अपराधी है। इसको खत्म करना चाहिये। उसने भारत के कुछ इलाकों को संयुक्त राष्ट्र के हिसाब से कम से कम सौप दिया है, क्या यह सही है या यह सही है कि उसकी नीयत कुछ प्रायः बढ़ कर है और वह कुछ और इलाकों को सौंपने का इर दा रखती है और उनके लिए वह जमीन तैयार कर रही है? इसलिए मैं अर्ज करूँगा कि स्थगन प्रस्ताव को लिया जाए।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I strongly repudiate the charge made by Dr. Lohia..

श्री बागड़ी : यह चार्ज नहीं है, नही बात है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कहते हैं तो क्या दूसरों को कहने का हक नहीं है कि चार्ज है।

Shri M. C. Chagla:... that in this discrepancy in the Survey of India, there was any ulterior motive. Dr. Lohia has the habit of making political capital of even the most.....

श्री बागड़ी : इस पर कोई सोचने की बात नहीं है। मंत्री महोदय अपने गुनाह को छिपाने की कोशिश करते हैं।

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I make a categorical statement for the record?

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): He need not refer to the habits of Dr. Lohia; he should state the facts..... (Interruptions.)

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have not used any expression which is unparliamentary.

श्री बागड़ी : इनको देश के साथ *करने का क्या हक है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मंत्री महोदय बोलना नहीं जानते हैं। मेरी धादत के बारे में बोल रहे हैं। मेरी धादत क्या होगी मैं यहाँ पर भारत के मामले में इतन बड़ा सवाल उठा रहा हूँ और इनकी जुरत होती है मेरी धादत के बारे में बोलने की?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जवाब तो सुनें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जुरत न करे ऐसी बात कहने की।

श्री बागड़ी : यह ** है, इनको बोलना भी नहीं आता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बहुत प्राब-
लेकज्ञानेबल वरं है। मैं.....

श्री मधु लिये : मंत्री महोदय ऐसे क्यों बोल रहे हैं? वे अपनी धादत को बदलें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन्होंने यह कहा है कि धादत है। उसका जब ब धगर बह आए जो उन्होंने दिया है तो ठीक नहीं है। यह बहुत बुरा लफ्ज है। कभी इसको बरदान नहीं कर सकता हूँ।

श्री बागड़ी : देश के हित की बात है। कहने वाली बात कहता हूँ।

*Engaged as ordered by the Chair.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वापिस लेते हैं या नहीं।

I take strong exception to that; that should be expunged.

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I make this categorical statement that no territory of India, no part of India has been excluded from the figures which have been given in the figures of the Survey of India in the area of the country in 1953 and 1964. As I pointed out this discrepancy of roughly 2,000 square miles is due to better methods of survey. We now have the aerial survey; we have the photographic survey. Therefore, there is bound to be.....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तेरह हजार वर्ग मील इनकी किताब के मुनाबिक।

Shri M. C. Chagla: Let not my hon. friend interrupt me.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जैसे मैंने कहा है मैं उसी फैसले पर कायम हूँ कि अगले सेशन में इसको प्रायोरिटी दी जाए।

श्री को० बे० मालवीय (बम्बई) : बि कुल मुनाबिक बात है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : स्टेटमेंट जो वह पूरी नफलील में एकमटर्नल एफयर्ड मिनिस्टर साहब.....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आप से अर्ज कर रहा हूँ कि तेरह हजार वर्गमील..

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उसी का फैसला दे रहा हूँ। इसकी डिसकशन को कास्टीट्यूशन एमेंडमेंट बिल के फौरन बाद स्थान दिया जायगा फौरन बाद इसको लिया जाएगा।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : काम रोकने प्रस्ताव के रूप में।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इसकी गवर्ने इनायत कभी कर दिया करे।

13.18 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

AUDIT REPORT (COMMERCIAL) 1966

The Minister of Finance (Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri): Sir, I lay on the Table a copy of the Audit Report (Commercial), 1966, under article 151(1) of the Constitution. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6359/66].

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): With regard to the paper laid on the Table by the Finance Minister, may I invite your attention to article 151 because there has been an instance recently in the State of Orissa where a similar report of the Auditor-General was delayed by the Governor; it was laid after two months or—I do not know—three months after it was submitted to the Governor. I want to know, on a point of guidance as to whether there is any time-limit fixed for the Government to lay on the Table of the House after the report had been submitted to the President. What was the timelag in this case? When was it submitted to the President? Is the Finance Minister in a position to tell the House?

Mr. Speaker: Can the Minister give these dates?—It has been signed by the Controller and Auditor-General on 10th May. There is no delay.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: My point was, when was it submitted to the President, under article 151 of the Constitution; today it was laid on the Table of the House. The article says, ".....the President shall cause them to be laid before each House of Parliament."

Mr. Speaker: On the 10th May, 1966, it was signed by the Comptroller and Auditor-General.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I wanted to know it, because in Orissa it has happened recently; deliberately they delayed it in Orissa.