

We would like to know the constitutional position. Unless the matter was referred to Parliament and Parliament gave its sanction, there was no question of negotiating the line in Jammu and Kashmir particularly. The Simla Pact was only to delineate the line as on 17th December, 1971, the actual line of control. But actually Government have ceded some of the territory in return for Thako Chak I would like to know the constitutional position in this regard.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH There are one or two points which have arisen which I would like to clarify, lest there be any confusion. For one thing in Jammu and Kashmir, there is no international boundary or even a national boundary. So, any use of this expression from any quarter is against our national interest, and I would appeal to hon. Members not to use this expression.

About the second question, it is true that in Jammu and Kashmir, according to the Simla agreement, both sides had agreed that the new line of control had to be agreed to. Therefore, it had to be delineated, and agreed to before it was to be respected. The agreement is that it will be mutually respected. In that delineation, Thako Chak at the time of ceasefire was admittedly in the possession of Pakistan and we had to get this vacated. We delineated the line of actual control in the rest of the territory. There was some controversy which was raised in regard to this Thako Chak area. This is also in Jammu and Kashmir, and Pakistan was raising this controversy that they were entitled to stay put there. So, after several meetings to resolve the deadlock, we insisted that Thako Chak area should be vacated by them, because this was on the boundary between Jammu and Pakistan, which is an international boundary. Therefore, we insisted that they should vacate. Once this was accepted then in certain other regions, in regard to some small areas, the details of which I gave on the floor of the

House, we agreed that those should remain with Pakistan. So, this was a matter which was clearly stated on the floor of the House in a statement made by me, and there is no further controversy and there is nothing more to be said. All these matters have been stated on the floor of the House

+

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं दिया। मैंने पूछा था कि जो दो स्थान दिये गये हैं वे 17 दिसम्बर को हमारे हाथ में थे या नहीं ?

Some small pockets which were actually in our control on 17th December, 1971 were actually conceded to them. That is why I would like to know the constitutional position. He cannot create confusion in a matter like this.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH. I have already made a statement. I have made a detailed statement on the floor of the House earlier.

Plan to produce sophisticated battle tanks

47 **SHRI M RAM GOPAL REDDY:**
SHRI DHAN SHAH PRADHAN:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state

(a) whether Government plan to produce sophisticated main battle tanks in the near future and

(b) if so, the salient features of these tanks?

THE MINISTER OF STATE (DEFENCE PRODUCTION) IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The Defence R & D Organisation is working on the development of an improved battle tank based on the qualitative requirement furnished by the Army authorities. It would not

be in the public interest to disclose the details.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Are we self-sufficient in tank production and is it also true that we are going to export tanks to other countries?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: We are producing tanks according to the plans we have drawn up. As for the second part of the question, there is no such proposal.

Coal for Thermal Power Stations

*49. **SHRI SUKHDEO PRASAD VERMA:** Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state:

(a) the total requirements of coal for the existing Thermal Power Station; and

(b) the measures Government have taken to meet their coal requirements?

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI S. MOHAN KUMARA-MANGALAM): (a) The total coal requirements for the existing thermal power stations are estimated at about 21.8 million tonnes in 1972-73, which are expected to increase to about 29.6 million tonnes by 1978-79.

(b) Adequate production capacity is available and is also being planned in the various coalfields to meet the normal requirements of all the existing thermal power stations.

श्री सुखदेव प्रसाद वर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मावसीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि थर्मल पावर स्टेशन में जिस क्वालिटी के कोयले की आवश्यकता है उस क्वालिटी का कोयला दिया जाता है या नहीं ?

दूसरे क्या सरकार को जानकारी है कि पतरातू थर्मल पावर स्टेशन की स्थिति खराब कोयला देने की वजह से ऐसी बिगड़ गई कि

1972 में मार्च से लेकर दिसम्बर तक वह बन्द रहा जिसके चलते पटना, गया और शाहाबाद में रबी की फसल, धान की फसल और मकई की फसल मारी गई ? इस सम्बन्ध में मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह के कोयले की आवश्यकता है उस तरह का कोयला सरकार इस क्वालिटी थर्मल पावर स्टेशन को सप्लाई करने की स्थिति में है या नहीं ?

SHRI S. MOHAN KUMARA-MANGALAM: To my knowledge, the difficulty experienced by the Partratu power station was not due to any low or bad quality coal being supplied. If the hon. member tables a separate question about the details, I will give them to him.

श्री सुखदेव प्रसाद वर्मा : मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ क्या पतरातू थर्मल पावर स्टेशन के अधिकारियों ने लिखित रूप में माइन्स विभाग के अधिकारियों को सूचित किया है कि अच्छे किस्म का कोयला सप्लाई नहीं किया जा रहा है जिसका असर उस पावर स्टेशन पर पड़ रहा है लेकिन बावजूद इसके माइन्स विभाग ने पतरातू को अच्छे कोयले की सप्लाई नहीं की—इसकी जानकारी मंत्री जी को है या नहीं ? यदि है तो इसके सम्बन्ध में सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

SHRI S. MOHAN KUMARA-MANGALAM: I am not aware of any letter or memorandum from the officers who are in charge of the Partratu power station regarding the quality of coal. But there has been some discussion on this question between the State Electricity Board on the one side and the Department of Mines on the other. As I mentioned earlier, if the hon. Member wants details on this, may I request him to put a separate question?