

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]  
*The motion was negatived*

Amendment Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; 10, 13, 14 and 15 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall now put clause 2 to vote. The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill"

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 3 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Minister will move that the Bill be passed.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, we would not like to be associated with the passing of this Bill and in protest we walk out.

[At this stage, some hon. Member left the Chamber].

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, I move:  
"That the Bill be passed."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

#### CLARIFICATIONS ON THE STATEMENT REGARDING RECENT CHINESE INTRUSION INTO INDIAN TERRITORY

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members would seek clarifications on the Statement made in Rajya Sabha on the 18th July, 1986, by the Minister of External Affairs and Commerce regarding the recent Chinese intrusion into Indian territory.

Yes, Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, when the statement was made on the 18th July, voluntarily those on the side of the Treasury as also this side of the well had given up their right to seek clarification on a request from the Chair. It was then our under-

standing that rather than seeking clarifications on a statement which is now almost a month old, what would actually take place would be a more substantive and meaningful discussion on this whole question. It does not hold good for me to complain about that because we can take it up subsequently.

Now the fact remains that the circumstances of making that statement and coming forward to the House now to provide such clarifications as the Members may have, have so altered, so many additional events have taken place and so much additional input has been provided that necessarily one has to go slightly outside of what is contained in the text of the statement proper. The hon. Minister of External Affairs' statement of 18th of July, to start from there, providing skeletal essential and largely unavoidable information, shed little light on the real situation, precisely because it was not illuminated by a coherent and recognisable policy. Central to the difficulties that have recently cropped up on the Sino-Indian question and are manifesting themselves in this little trouble on the border, is precisely this—the absence of an overall—and mark my words, please—and a continuing policy. Of course this is on par with Government's approach on other important issues which are largely shadow and do not have much substance. Therefore, my first clarification is: What is Government of India's China policy? We have not had a substantial discussion on this. There is insufficient explanation of it. That is my first query.

There is then of course a logical corollary to it: What is Government of India's understanding of and appreciation about the People's Republic of China's attitude to issues which are currently bedevilling the situation.

Thirdly, on the question of border incursions, I have to regrettably say that this border incursion—what does it convey? All border incursions have essentially either a military message or a diplomatic message. Now therefore what is Government of India's assessment of the mili-

tary aspect of the incursion that has taken place in Sumdorong Chu? I would here take a minute of your time to elaborate my point by referring to an intriguing reference in the current year's report of the Ministry of Defence. The Ministry of Defence in its Annual Report has an assessment—I do not have the exact words—which says that following upon the possibilities of a Sino-Soviet rapprochement, it is likely that additional Chinese troops would be released from Mongolia and would therefore become a possible threat to India. Now this is at variance with the position and the pronouncements which the Ministry of External Affairs has come forward with in this House. Therefore, I would like a reconciliation of China policy between what the Ministry of Defence in its report says and what the Ministry of External Affairs comes across with as the Government's official viewpoint, because otherwise the resultant impression is that of a Government groping for a viable, enforceable and an intelligible policy.

Now I have to convey one more sad impression which is that as far as the Sumdorong Chu incident is concerned, it is commonly now being talked that a diplomatic finesse has been achieved by the Peoples Republic of China and the Government of India has been caught flat-footed in the execution of its responsibilities. The People's Republic of China had all along been recommending, suggesting, that the talks for normalisation should be comprehensive in nature. Government of India took a stand that it be sectoral in the sense that we approach the whole issue sector by sector. Following upon the Sumdorong Chu incident, press releases are issued that in the overall brief that our team is carrying to Beijing they have been asked to approach the whole question 'comprehensively sector by sector.' This is as classical an example as one can find of the Ministry of External Affairs, 'fudging issues.' Can one possibly find an answer to this? What is "comprehensively approaching sector by sector?" Therefore, I would like an elaboration of this particular aspect also.

Just another impression, Sir, and I would particularly value what the honourable Minister of State for External Affairs—who is himself not just an old China hand but a specialist in matters connected with the People's Republic of China—says. It appears as if within the Ministry of External Affairs, there are contending, almost rival, camps. One advocates moves for normalizing relations with the People's Republic of China and the other, whilst opposing it, almost sabotages any such effort. Such, at least, is the impression. And, sabotage, going to the extent of counter-press-statements—"There have been so many incursions that have taken place—No, there have not been incursions; helipads have been built—no helipads have not been built." So, the overall impression that is created is not just of confusion but it is also as if within the Ministry itself there are rival, contending, groups who are jeopardizing the creation and the putting across of an intelligible and aviable policy towards the People's Republic of China. It also appears—and I would like to voice it here; this was not just an empty coincidence—as if the shadow of Kapitsa looms over South Block, and I would like an elaboration of the coincidence of a very senior and a very important Deputy Minister of the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union being in India during those days—and his visit to India goes almost unannounced. Why did he come to India, what transpired in the discussions that took place between him and certainly officials of the Ministry of External Affairs if not all the Ministers, and why is it that a coincidence occurs that following upon his visit or coinciding with his visit there seem to be certain press releases about all these incidents that took place on the McMahon Line? I would be indeed benefited if the Minister would enlighten the House on this particular aspect.

Sir, there are three or four other smaller clarifications that I would seek from the Minister, and they flow directly out of the statement that was made on 18th of July. There is a reference in the statement to the 7th round of talks that was then due in Beijing. I would, therefore, like to know from the honourable Minister what ad-

[Shri Jawant Singh]

tually took place in the 7th round, because we have been assured in that statement of 18th July that when the conference actually takes place the whole matter would be taken up forcefully and it will be argued forcefully in the 7th round. Therefore, what actually transpired as far as the incursion on Sundorong Chu is concerned?

Secondly, Sir, the statement says that the incursion took place sometime in June. Now this vagueness is either intentional or, if it is not intentional, then it is to avoid giving Parliament the required information. If it is however, intentional, then to say that an incursion had taken place within India, into India, sometime in the middle of June, is so unsatisfactory from all aspects of national security that it is totally unacceptable to us.. (Interruption).. I have the statement with me, of 18th June. "In mid-June 1986, it was learnt" is the exact wording. Now, this is very unsatisfactory. How did you come to learn when in mid-June it actually took place? Then there is another one about graziers. It says graziers had been going peacefully. Is it your implication that with the arrival of the Chinese in the Sumdorong Chu such graziers they were asked to vacate? Were there any graziers there when this incursion took place?

And there is yet a more confusing sentence which goes on to say:

"After verification of the intrusion." How did the information first come to you? From whom did you verify? These three aspects of the whole incursion and the manner of its reporting to Parliament are wholly unsatisfactory.

There is here, Sir, a curious sentence. I do not know the drafters in the Ministry of External Affairs permitted such a sentence to be included in the statement in the first instance. It is in paragraph 2 for the benefit of the hon. Minister;

"With both sides having accepted this principle we on our part have continuously, consistently endeavoured to settle such problem through discussions".

This is a clear admission, Sir, that incursion have earlier taken place. Otherwise, why the need to enunciate a principle and why the need to clarify that we have consistently endeavoured to settle such problems' peacefully or through discussions or whatever the exact wording is? Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister how many incursions have earlier taken place in three blocks of periods. The first period which I referred to is 1977 to 1979. How many incursions from the Chinese side took place along the McMahon Line, in the central sector and in the western sector in the period 1977 to 1979. Secondly in the period 1980 to 1984. And finally in the period January, 1985 to the current year. This is an information which this House is entitled to know. Indeed, we would have extracted it from the Government had we been given an opportunity to have a more meaningful and more comprehensive debate on the subject. As, however, we have been denied that facility, I would, through you, request that the hon. Minister come forward with all the information that we have sought, all the clarifications we have sought, and not attempt to fudge

Just on final word of caution, Sir, I am concluding. After 1962 we witnessed a very unhappy manifestation of transferring governmental responsibility. The present manner of handling the incident in Sumdorong Chu does not inspire confidence in this Government's ability. In 1962 the Government transferred the responsibility on the armed forces and was absolved of its diplomatic, political failures. It was absolved of the responsibility which was squarely on their own head. I would, through you, Sir, appeal to the Minister not to fall into this possible trap. For having been caught flatfooted and for having been finessed by the People's Republic of China, please don't transfer the responsibility on to the armed forces.

Thank you.

**The Vice-Chairman Shri H. Hanumanthappa**, in the Chair.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU** (West Bengal):  
Sir, I have got the statement of the 18th July. In paragraph 2 it is stated:

"In our official level talks with the Chinese which commenced in 1981 both sides have accepted the principle that peace and tranquillity should be maintained along the border and that any problem that arose should be solved through friendly consultation."

On this point I want to seek this clarification. It is reported in the press that our Prime Minister had the occasion to meet the Chinese Prime Minister, Mr. Zhao Ziang in New York in October, 1985. It is further reported in the press that the Chinese Prime Minister suggested that in case border talks did not succeed, the dispute could be settled at a political level. I am also informed that the last round of discussions i.e. the sixth round of discussions did meet a rough weather. It is further reported that Mr. Shiv Shankar led a high-powered good will delegation to Beijing early this year.

Now, I seek clarifications.

Mr. Shiv Shankar's visit to Beijing must have had some political probe. May I know from him what actually emanated from that political probe that was undertaken by him. Was it known to the Government that there has been certain perceptible change in the attitude of the Chinese Government towards the resolution of the dispute? I want these two points to be clarified.

Now, on the 18th July the statement by the Minister stated:

"We are conscious of the concern of the hon. Members on this issue and shall take the House into confidence whenever such an occasion arises."

On this may I know whether the Government contemplates to upgrade the level of bilateral talks between India and China. to a political level and would the hon.

Minister take the House into confidence as to whether the differences between the Chinese Government's position and India's position have widened or narrowed down through the discussions held recently in Beijing. These are some of the questions I want to be clarified.

I repeat. I would like to know whether the dialogue would be upgraded to a higher political level whether the differences between the position of India and the position of China have widened further or have narrowed down. I am asking this because we are sure that the Minister will take the House into confidence.

**SHRI A. G. KULKARNI** (Maharashtra): The statement made by the hon. Minister on July 18 and the subsequent happenings particularly after the discussions of our delegation led by our Foreign Secretary without any fruitful results has raised certain questions on which I want certain clarifications.

My friend has stated the position taken by the Government of India was to have a sector-by-sector approach while the position taken by the Chinese is of a package deal. So, these two approaches have been adopted—one by the Government of India and the other by the Chinese Government. In short, what it means is that China desires to have concession on the western border while India desires not to give any concession on its Western border in order to have an alignment on the McMahan line on the Eastern sector. If it is so, I would like to know how the Government proposes—diplomatically or politically—to convince the Chinese leadership that the Western border is more sensitive to this country and the country's security and this cannot be accepted as against their claims on the Eastern border as is clear from their mischievous intrusions. I call it mischievous particularly because it has no military relevance as yet. I do not know whether it will escalate. I do not want to say anything more on that. Whether this is the position?  
4.00 Secondly, Sir, I am having a feeling and I want to share with the Minister and the Government that

[Shri Chitta Basu]

our country at present is faced politically with a problem and having a hostile neighbourhood. Take for example, Pakistan totally out because they knew that they cannot win over India militarily. So they are training terrorists and providing them with money and sending into our country clandestinely for creating political turmoil. With Sri Lanka the problem is same. I do not want to cast reflection on the Government, but it is there. Then, Sir, with Bangladesh the position is not very happy. Then again with Nepal the position is same. They are hobnobbing with China. It cannot be said in white and black, but little bit of what you call midway black and white relations with Nepal. Mr. Minister you may clarify whether my views and whether my apprehensions are correct that the entire perspective of Chinese intrusion is in league with Pakistan and U.S.A.? Whether you accept it or not, but they are in league with Pakistan and U.S.A. Sir, U.S.A. is applying pressure on U.S.S.R. to withdraw from Afghanistan. So we have become a scapegoat or a pan in the big power game. This Chinese intrusion is in a way to relieve pressure on the Pakistan front as well as on Afghanistan front. This might be a grand design of these big powers. I would request the hon. Minister to clarify on this aspect.

Finally, Sir, I request the Government to continue their diplomacy and political approach in spite of these provocations. Sir, any hostility will bring us trouble, because we believe in Panchsheel and it will be better for this country to have harped upon that principle enunciated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Thank you.

**SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE** (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the clarifications on this statement has been postponed, because everybody in the House agreed that it should not be discussed at a time when our official team was going for further round of talks to China. This raises the first point which I want to ask the hon. Minister, because it concerns really the

rights of the Members of Parliament. Now, as has been stated in the statement admittedly this intrusion was before or sometime in mid June, 1985. It was

learnt probably that it was much earlier. The Consultative Committee of Ministry of External Affairs met on the 11th July, 1986 and at that time we were not told of anything of this nature. I am not making a grievance of not being told to the Consultative Committee at this stage, because the Ministry of External Affairs was taking a view that it was a minor thing which happens every day and it should not be blown out of proportion. Therefore, what surprised me and little distressing was that on the eve of the meeting of Parliament within five days thereof, a senior spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs while giving a press interview said that the whole thing was blown up on the eve of our team going there for the talks. Now, both these things namely meeting on the eve of the commencement of the Session and on the eve of this official level talks which compelled all of us to defer the discussion on this point. Now, may I ask the first question to the hon. Minister as to in what light was this event seen and how this event has affected the subsequent talks? The second thing is this gives an opportunity to us for reappraisal of the bilateral talks that are going on between us and Chinese. The Chinese are known for their ingenuity and it seems that they are playing a game and tiring our patience. I agree with the sentiments which has been expressed here that the border issue should not be compromised but it is not an issue which really is susceptible to an easy or early solution. There are other areas where we can strengthen the ties between two countries despite our differences on the border issue like the cultural ties, the trade ties and various other thing. After all we are linked up together by a long tradition and history. But what is most important is that in my humble opinion, China alone holds the key to our policy towards our neighbours and China can practically solve many of the issues which we are facing today. They have been mentioned by the hon. Mem-

bers. In view of that, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he has thought of some positive policy towards China by process where by we cement our relations with the two countries and at the same time, avoid the risk of being left out in the cold.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, incursion was reported by the Chinese on the south of McMohan line. A lot of confusion has been created in the public mind. Now, Sir, on 15 th July, the spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs briefed the press about some Chinese incursion which happened sometime in mid June and the Government of India protested only on 26th of June as per the briefing made by the spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs on 15th July. On 16th July, Sir, in all the newspapers of the country, they reported that Chinese have entered upto six to seven kms inside the Indian territory and that is the deepest intrusion by the Chinese. Sir, in one newspaper which is published from Calcutta, it is owned by Congress Member of the Lok Sabha, it reported that Chinese actually intruded upto 17 kms inside the Indian territory. That was the news in the paper. Then, Sir, after a few days, the Government came out with the statement in this House that is on 18th July that the Chinese have entered only upto 2 to 3 kms inside the Indian territory as the crow flies. Now, again, the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh, who is a responsible person, reported and it is an alarming report that the Chinese have built their heli-pads south of McMahon line in Indian territory. Sir, these things are creating a lot of confusion in the minds of the people. Contrary reports are floating and these are given wide publicity through the media. We have the right to know what is what, and what is actually happening at the border. First of all, I would like to know whether the floating of these contradictory reports and wild goose stories about what is happening on the border, Just on the eve of the seventh round of talks—is a part of India Government's diplomacy, and if so, how that this would help us politically during the talks at

Beijing or it betrays utter ignorance of the External Affairs Ministry. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether they are aware of the real contour of the McMahon Line or what is happening at the border, whether they have at all any surveillance at the border, whether they are at all aware of the incidents taking place on the border. If it is ignorance of the External Affairs Ministry, then I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to who are responsible for this ignorance, whether they have fixed the responsibility.

Lastly, this Mc Mohan Line was drawn by Henry Mc Mahon as far back as 1914 and it is subject to diverse interpretations. Now for fruitful negotiations with the Chinese on the border dispute, it is necessary that the Government of India or the External Affairs Ministry should have a clear idea about the contour of the McMahon Line. So far as I remember, Mr. Shiv Shanker has said somewhere, perhaps in the other House, that it is too thick on the map. If the McMahon Line is too thick on the map, I would like to know whether the Ministry of External Affairs has been able to clearly delineate it so that we have a clear vision of the contour of the McMahon Line on the ground, on the Himalayas, so that we can have a fruitful dialogue with the Chinese. Otherwise we will always be placed in a situation from where it will be very difficult to extricate ourselves. That is why I would like the hon. Minister to clarify all these points before the House.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we did not seek clarifications on the 18th July when Shri P. Shiv Shanker made a statement in the House because we felt that we should not in any way embarrass the teams which were going for discussion on the border question. Sir, the statement seems to be vague and does not give clarity regarding the issues raised by Mr. Shiv Shanker in that very statement I do not want to go into the various reports published in the papers. This has been referred to by hon. Members. What I am concerned with is the positions taken

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

by our Government and the Government of China in regard to the area where we say that there has been intrusion by the Chinese. There is variation regarding the extent of intrusion. I go by the statement itself: I do not go by the press reports. The intrusion, according to the statement, is to the extent of two to three kilometres as the crow flies. That means even according to the statement the area is rather wide, because the statement refers to the area as 2-3 kms as the crow flies. We know what it is. The area is wide, it is larger. Can the Minister tell us in ordinary parlance the extent of the area occupied by the Chinese intruders? What does he mean by "as the crow flies" in real terms? I was told the Chinese took objection to the statement made by the Minister of External Affairs in Parliament when our team visited Beijing for negotiations. I want to know whether it was a fact that an objection was raised by them. The objection seems to have been raised on the ground that the Government of India raised a dispute on the eve of negotiations and the Government of China found fault with that. I would like to know whether this question was discussed at the time of talks. If so, what was the reaction of the Chinese? The Chinese have said that they have not crossed the border, they have not occupied our territory, they have claimed that the territory they have occupied belonged to them, this **piece of territory** lies on their side of the McMahon Line. If that is so, what is the truth about the statement? I would like to know whether there is any truth, veracity, in the claim made by the Chinese regarding their occupation.

Finally, why was there such a delay in taking Parliament into confidence? The statement was made of course. My friend had raised this issue as to why there was such a delay in taking Parliament into confidence. Incidentally, may I ask him whether any approach has been evolved to settle this border problem? We want this problem to be settled as quickly as possible, without delay. Can he throw some light whether any basis has been agreed upon to settle this question, any

basis agreed upon between India and China, whether any formulation has been made, any parameters fixed, any criteria evolved? What has been done? Should you go on with these negotiations at the official level for a long, long time to come? The more the delay, the greater will be the advantage for China, not for India. Therefore, I would like to know whether any basis has been evolved any approach has been decided upon, to settle this matter. What is the outcome of the seventh round negotiation talks with the Chinese?

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): The intrusion of the Chinese troops is not casual or incidental but a calculated, want on, attempt against India. Sir, the Chinese troops intruded into our country on the 14th June. But our Government protested against their intrusion only on the 26th June. I would like to know from the honourable Minister why there is a delay of twelve days and whether it is due to ignorance or an indifferent attitude on the part of our Government.

Sir, it is reported in the Press that in the sixth round of official-level talks, on behalf of the Chinese side, they have demanded more concessions in the eastern sector. We would like to know what those concessions are which are demanded by the Chinese Government. Sir, the Vice-Foreign Minister of China while he was having a talk with a group of our Press people, alleged that India was in possession of more than 90,000 sq. kms. of Chinese territory! It means that he is claiming the right over the entire Arunachal Pradesh and he wants to swallow the entire Arunachal Pradesh. In fact, in the middle sector, the Chinese are in possession of more than 35,000 sq. kms. of our land since 1962 and without even withdrawing from that area they are now claiming in the eastern sector land to the extent of 90,000 sq. kms. So, it is a clear indication of their aggressive attitude. So, we cannot underestimate their movements and their intrusions. Sir, the troops have been equipped with light weapons, it is reported in the Press. But I am to remind the House that there are five bases within

a radius of 80 kms. in the Tibetan sector with powerful weapons and vehicles. So, this must be a preparation for aggression. What are the effective steps that are going to be taken by our Government?

Sir, the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh is a responsible man and he has stated in a statement that a helipad is there and there has been intrusion into the territory and he has also said that tax collection is also done by the Chinese people and the people are being pressurized. (*Time belt rings*). At the same time, he has also given a memorandum or statement to the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Ministry. I would like to know whether the Minister would place that statement on the Table of the House.

Sir, the most important thing is the McMahon Line which is the accepted border between China and India. It has been repeatedly said by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on so many occasions in this House and also in the Lok Sabha that the McMahon Line is the boundary between India and China.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Between India and Tibet.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Between India and China only. Anyway, I will come to that a little later. He has said:

"Right from a few months of Independence, I repeatedly said in Parliament that the McMahon Line is the line by which I simply mean to define the frontier from their frontier. When I say something in Parliament, it is meant for the outside world and it may be so for the Government of China also."

Sir, to clarify the point further, on another occasion also, he has clearly stated the same thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Do not go on clarifying the past statements.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Sir, I would like to know from the honourable Minister whether our Government would stick to the policy of claiming the McMahon Line as the boundary line. That I want to know.

Normally, Sir, cattle prefer grazing lands. Unfortunately, the Chinese too prefer that and they do not allow the cattle to eat the grass. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Yes, Prof. C. Lakshman.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, a statement was given to the House on the 18th July 1986. However, the Members were not to seek clarifications in view of the seventh round of official-level talks that were going on then. What I would like to ask is this. When once the talks took place, was it not incumbent on the part of the Government to have come forward and told this House as to what has been the result of those discussions. On the other hand it is necessary on the part of the Government only to respond to Members from this side and that side who seek clarification? Therefore, in the first instance, I would like to ask the Minister as to why he did not think it fit to take this House and the Parliament into confidence as to what exactly had happened because this House showed the consideration for the Government in not seeking clarifications when the statement was made. Secondly, I am surprised at the surprise shown by the External Affairs Minister because we had many occasions of which two or three are outstanding when such surprise were thrown upon us by the Chinese. The first one was the shocking surprise which was expressed by the then Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, on the floor of the House when he said that the Chinese did something which he could not imagine. Therefore, to surprise us has been in the line of Chinese thinking. Secondly, in the year 1978, again there was a surprise. The then External Affairs Minister



[Prof. C. Lakshmanan]

who was in China was not kept informed of the dastardly action they were taking against a friendly nation. Therefore, I am really surprised that the Minister has shown surprise about this. Therefore, my point is this. How long this House or this Parliament has to be surprised by receiving surprising statements from the surprised Ministers about the surprising actions taken by the Chinese. (*Interruptions*) Therefore, I would like to know from the Minister whether there is something more surprising in store for us. If that is there then please give us all the surprises so that we will be knowing what the exact position is. May be there are some more surprises in the discussions which took place apart from the surprises which are known to us.

Thirdly, I would like to ask the Minister as to why the Government of India had to accept the Chinese stand of discussing a sector which they wanted us to discuss. My question is: Why did they not think what was to be discussed first in the interest of this country in their discussions with the Chinese? What was the necessity for acceding to the demand of the Chinese about discussion on a particular sector first and then on other sectors? We are realising the importance of integrated borders as a whole so that the integrity, unity, sovereignty and exactness of this country's borders are known about which our friends have always been talking. Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister as to why did the Government of India accede to discuss about a sector and not all the sectors which was the stand of the Government of India.

Finally, Sir, I would like to ask one more thing, namely, this intrusion or incursion took place some time in the middle of June. Subsequently, after the talks, there was a report on a particular date that there was an incursion. Subsequently, it was denied. Subsequently again, it has been stated that there has been a re-incursion or a new incursion to the Indian border. If that is the case, the Government of India taking another 15 or 20 days to come forward

and tell about the second incursion when the House is not in session. Therefore, what is the logic in the pattern of delay in not asking into confidence either the Consultative Committee of the Ministry of External Affairs or the House which is in session and thus causing a delay in bringing all such important issues to the notice of the House? Therefore, I hope the Minister will kindly consider these things and give answers in such a way that these speculations which we have been obviously often hearing, reading and talking about are laid to rest.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : (उत्तर प्रदेश)  
मान्यवर, यह बहुत ही गम्भीर और खतरनाक विषय है। 1962 में भी जब इस सिलसिले में लोगों को जानकारी हुई और संघ में इस प्रश्न को उठाया गया तो उस वक़्त भी हमारे तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था कि "A land where not a blade of grass ever grows".

यह ऐसी भूमि का प्रश्न है जहाँ पर कि घास का एक कतरा भी नहीं उगता है। और आज भी इस मामले को मान्यवर, बहुत गंभीरता से नहीं लिया जा रहा है। जो मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य है उसमें यह बतलाया गया है कि जून के मध्य में यह जानकारी हुई कि चीन की तरफ से 40 लोग थे और वहीं पहुँचे इन लोगों ने दो-तीन किलोमीटर भारत की भूमि में घुसपैठ कर ली थी और 26 जून को इस सिलसिले में भारत सरकार ने चीन के अधिकारियों से विरोध व्यक्त किया। तो मैं इस बात की जानकारी चाहता हूँ कि वह कौन सी निश्चित तारीख है जिस तारीख को चीन के लोगों ने यह घुसपैठ की? मंत्री महोदय को इस तारीख के बारे में स्पष्ट रूप से बताना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात यह है कि यह अच्छा होता कि 30 जुलाई, को जो सातवें चक्र की बातचीत हुई तो स्पष्टीकरण विषय को प्रारम्भ करने में पहले मंत्री जो स्वयं इस सिलसिले में वक्तव्य देंगे। तो अच्छा होता क्योंकि 18 जुलाई, को मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया उसका स्पष्टीकरण टालने का कारण केवल यह था कि 30 जुलाई, को वातावरण होने

वाली है। इसलिये मेरा यह आरोप है कि इस तरह से इस सदन का उपेक्षा सरकार की ओर से की जा रही है।

मन्थवर, मेरा सुझाव है क्योंकि आज सारा देश स्वाभाविक रूप से इस विषय पर चिन्तित है। सभा पक्षों के लोग, चाहे सत्ता पक्ष के हों या विरोधी पक्ष के हों उनमें और हमारे देश के 70 करोड़ लोग जो हैं वे सब इससे चिन्तित हैं। इस बारे में मंत्रों जो के वक्तव्य से जो छोट-पोट साफ्टोकरण हो रहा है या जो हमारे और माननीय सदस्य करेंगे, उससे इस चिन्ता में मामला साफ होने वाला नहीं है। इसलिये मन्थवर, मैं आपके मध्यम से सरकार से मांग करता हूँ कि कल या परसों किसी भी दिन, चहे रात को बैठकर और चाहे दिन को बैठकर भोजन के अवकाश को स्थगित करके इस विषय में विस्तृत और विस्तार से चर्चा होनी चाहिये क्योंकि चीन हमारा एक ऐसा पड़ोसी है जिसके लिये जितना भी कहा जाय वह कम होगा। उसकी जो धोखेबाजी की जाती रही है उससे सारा संसार परिचित है। हिन्दो चीनी भाई भाई, नेहरू चाचा चाऊ एन लाई चाचा के नारे लगाकर जो उन्होंने आज तक किया और जो आज भी कर रहे हैं, वह सर्व विदित है। इसलिये उनसे समझाना रहना चाहिये और उस पर विस्तार से चर्चा करनी चाहिये।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) :** उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अन्य माननीय सदस्यों की तरह मेरा भी खयाल है कि जब 18 जुलाई, के बयान में सरकार ने कहा था कि जो चीन की तरफ से घुसपैठ हुई, उस संबंध में सातवें दौर में जो बातचीत चलेगी, उस समय हमारे प्रतिनिधि इस सवाल को उठावेंगे। तो क्या उन्होंने वहां यह बात उठाई? वहां पर क्या हुआ यह तो सरकार को पढ़ने हो कड़ा देना चाहिये था। लेकिन अगर पढ़ने नहीं कहा तो कम से कम अब तो कह दें कि उनसे क्या बातचीत हुई ताकि हम लोग भी उसको जान सकें?

दूसरी बात जो हम जानना चाहेंगे वह यह है कि इस सुदरांग चु वेल में जहां चाइनीज का इन्ट्रजन हुआ है वह कहां है भारत और चीन दोनों इस बात पर सहमत हो गये थे कि कुछ क्षेत्र में पैट्रोलिंग न हो क्योंकि पैट्रोलिंग होने से क्लेश हो जाता है। यह दोनों देशों के प्रतिनिधियों ने मिलकर तय किया था। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह इन्ट्रजन जो हुआ है तो क्या वह उस क्षेत्र में हुआ है जिस क्षेत्र में किसी को नहीं जाना चाहिये था या यह हमारा माइड में अकर हुआ है? यह हम इस लिये जानना चाहते हैं क्योंकि नान-पैट्रोलिंग क्षेत्र मैकमोहन लाइन के साथ हूँ पड़ता है? बयान में सिर्फ सुदरांग चु वेल कहा गया है उसमें यह स्पष्ट होता नहीं है कि कहां यह हुआ?

तीसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि वह घसपैठियों चाइनीज जो थे क्या वे हथियारों से लेस थे? उनके पास कैसे हथियार थे इस संबंध में भी सरकार बताये?

चौथी बात मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि चाइनीज का कहना है कि गिव एण्ड टेक करके इस समस्या का निराकरण किया जाय। तो जब आप लोग बातचीत करते हैं तो वे सिर्फ टेक ही करते हैं या गिव भी करते हैं यह भी आप बताना दें। यह न हो कि केवल टेक ही हो गिव न हो इसको भी जरा आप समझा दें ताकि हमें अंदाजा लगे कि किधर गाड़ी जा रही है और कुछ स्पष्टीकरण हो जाय। अन्तिम सवाल यह होगा कि इतने दिनों के बाद बातचीत के बाद और अब तो शासक पार्टी के लोग भी चीन जाते हैं बिजिट करते हैं हमारे पत्रकार भी गये हैं और वहां बातचीत हुई है ट्रेड यूनियंस के लोग भी जाते हैं तो क्या अब यह स्टेज नहीं आई है कि राजनैतिक स्तर पर हस्तक्षेप किया जाए और कोई इसका निराकरण कर लिया जाए न कि सदा के लिए इसे छोड़ दिया जाए और इसी तरह बीच बीच में इंट्रजन हों और हम लोग चिंता प्रकट करें फिर चिंता समाप्त हो जाए फिर 6 महीने के बाद

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

चिन्ता जागे फिर एक साल बाद इंट्रूजन हो जाए और फिर हमारी चिन्ता जागे। यह चिन्ता और अचिन्ता का जो वातावरण है इसका हम लोग निराकरण कर सके तो क्या पोलिटिकल इंटरवेंशन की अभी स्टेज पैदा हुई है या नहीं, यह हमारी सरकार बताएँ ?

**SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA** (Punjab): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to mention that I happen to know this area as I was posted there from 1962. I would like to know where this Sumdorong Chu actually exists because as you remember in 1962 the battle started from Namaka Chu. At that time there was a dispute where the MacMahon Line was running, whether it was running south of Namaka Chu or north of Namaka Chu. This is one aspect which is important before we go into the intrusion part of it because if it is in that area then there is a triangle between Bhutan, China now, It used to be Tibet, and India. If it is that area it has repercussions both for India and for Bhutan. The second thing I would like to mention is that in 1962 also when the thing first started we were told that the Chinese did not mean business. They were not properly equipped and that sort of a thing. The fact remains that ground favours China and it is against us because we have to climb up to the Himalayas and they are on a plateau. It is, therefore, very necessary for us to be very vigilant because for us to reinforce is more difficult than it is for the Chinese to bring in their troops. This is another aspect why it should take us so long to react to a situation like this. The third thing that has already been brought out is that there are certain areas which we had accepted that we won't patrol, although we felt that they were south of the MacMahon Line but for keeping good neighbourly relations really, let us face the facts, we had agreed to do that. In 1962 the Chinese withdrew on their own and they decided that these are the areas they won't intrude into again and these are the areas on the MacMahon Line, we

should not patrol. We really had to accept at that time. What I want to know is that during all these discussions that have taken place, have we been able to pin down the Chinese to the MacMahon Line as the international boundary between China and ourselves? I have a feeling we have not been able to. I have a feeling that we have not been able to check because there is no doubt in my mind that originally at that time they claimed the NEFA, now known as Arunachal right up to the inner line was the territory that belonged to Tibet at that time and to China now. This is a very major point that we should really be clear about. We should know if the situation arises, if we have another problem with China where are we going to make certain that we do not permit any intrusion. Lastly, I think we must also remember. I think it has come out very recently when the Mizo National Front have surrendered their arms that a large number of those arms are of Chinese origin. Whatever the Bhai-Bhai relations might be or not be, the Chinese are continuing to arm such people who are carrying out insurgency against India in the Indian territory. Thank you, Sir.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS** (SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN): Sir, I am grateful to the House for this very enlightening discussion. Some very weighty issues of basic policies and approach to China have been advanced. I am not sure, in the context of this clarification, whether there would be enough time, or, if this is the proper occasion to talk about these basic policies, strategies and other issues. Not that I would not like to touch on them. But I would like to keep to the main thrust of the subject.

First of all, some questions about facts as to when this incursion, this intrusion, took place. We have said, mid-June but the actual date, as we know, is 16th June. Mid-June was put as the date because of the problems of communication, terrain etc. which has just been pointed out. Intrusion was first noticed by graziers. Then, we checked up with our other agencies in this area in order to be sure

that such intrusion did take place and this took some time. After that, we decided to lodge a protest with the Chinese on the 26th of June. This was the cause of the delay. Then, in coming to Parliament to inform Parliament about this, there has been some delay but not unreasonable delay. This is because, after lodging our protest with the Chinese, we wanted to know how they would react because the intrusion and the lodging of the protest took place at a very delicate period when negotiations were about to begin in Beijing. We protested here in Delhi and also in Beijing. We wanted to get some reaction from the Chinese in order to decide how exactly we should pursue the question of intrusion. Actually, it was due to these diplomatic reasons and reasons of political considerations of timing that we could not immediately come to Parliament and let know Parliament about this event. But then you might ask 'Why did the spokesman issued the statement on the 16th July?'. Having ascertained about the fact of intrusion and having also had some idea of the preliminary reaction of the Chinese, we were sure this intrusion was of a type which should be made known to Parliament. But the timing was such that it was on the eve, almost on the eve, of the departure of the delegation to Beijing. In a sense, there was a bit of a dilemma about the timing because we did not want to do anything that would create an unfavourable atmosphere for the official talks. At the same time, we had to take Parliament and the public into confidence on an issue like this. It is because of these circumstances that there has been some delay in informing Parliament immediately and I hope the House will understand and appreciate some of these diplomatic and political niceties involved in a situation like this. Sir, I have been asked about the intrusion because there is . . .

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** If the hon. Minister will excuse me for a minute. We are now speaking about the dates. Clarification is necessary as Parliament has been deferred to. On the 16th official spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs gives this fact to the press, issues

a press statement. The hon. Minister has been good enough to suggest that it was the eve of the departure of the delegation and, the Ministry could not wait overnight because on the 17th the Parliament was meeting. It is a bit laboured reason what you are trying to explain. (Interruptions). If the Parliament was meeting on the 17th, where was the necessity to issue a press statement on the 16th? . . .

**SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN:** The delegation was leaving on the 19th and if just one day before their leaving we had made it public, I think the impact would have been worse on the Chinese. I am just trying to point out the difficult timing in which we were involved and we were trying to lessen the impact of such a statement. So, we made it on the 16th, rather than on the 18th. The delegation actually left Delhi on the 19th. So, I want to assure the House that there was absolutely no intention on the part of the Government to refuse this information to Parliament. In spite of these talks taking place in Beijing we brought the matter before Parliament and made it known to the public. Parliament and made it known to the public.

Sir there have been other intrusions, minor intrusions earlier in various sectors. They were not big or important enough to protest publicly about, if the House wants, we can give a list of these things, but this was just across the line in all the three sectors, probably unintended transgressions we should think, but there have been a number of transgressions. It is because of this that in the talks that took place we tried to evolve this formula that peace and tranquillity should be maintained along the border and that any problem that arose should be solved through friendly consultations.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE** (Madhya Pradesh): That is the old formula.

**SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN:** One Member mentioned whether the announcement did not affect the outcome of the talks. As a matter of fact, the Government announcement was couched in such

[Shri K. R. Narayanan]

moderate, reasonable terms that, in our view, it had no adverse impact on the talks. Actually, we could not avoid it since the intrusion took place almost a few weeks before the talks were to take place. We had to say something. We had to let Parliament and the public know about it without exaggerating it and without making it an issue for not going into negotiations with the Chinese or for spoiling the atmosphere for the talks. As a matter of fact, the atmosphere of talks was cordial though I would not claim that the talks led to any substantive results or any progress in the solution of the border question.

Since it has been mentioned that the House has not been informed about talks in Beijing, I though I should take this opportunity to convey to the House what exactly took place at least very briefly, during the border talks in Beijing. Actually we instructed the leader of our delegation, our Foreign Secretary, to take up this matter of intrusion not only with the Sub-Commission which was dealing with the border question but also with the Foreign Minister of China and with the acting Premier of China directly when he would call on them. He called on the Foreign Minister and the Acting Premier and among other things he specially put emphasis on this particular intrusion in view of the understanding that we have with China that the peace and tranquillity along the border should be maintained, if there are any misunderstandings or any transgressions we should talk about them in a friendly manner. And he pointed out that the Chinese personnel in this area should be withdrawn. Now the Chinese argument was, as has been pointed out by some of the hon. Members, that there has been no transgression at all; they were on the northern side of the McMahon Line. I should say that what the Chinese have introduced in this area is something like a dispute within a dispute. As you know, there is this larger dispute, larger claim which China has made to the 10,000 sq. miles of Indian

territory—almost the whole of Arunachal Pradesh. That is their basic claim. But within that, even though they do not accept the McMahon Line, they had more or less accepted the McMahon Line as the line of actual control in the Eastern Sector and they had said that they would not cross this line of actual control. Their claim has been that this particular area is actually north of the McMahon Line. Therefore, they have introduced a dispute about the actual alignment of the McMahon Line. In our view this particular area—Sumdorong Chu Valley—and the other area where actually they came in, i.e. south of the river Sumdorong Chu to a place called Wandung, according to all the evidence we have is actually south of the McMahon Line. So this is more or less a dispute within a dispute and we have to straighten out the issue with the Chinese. We have no doubt about the location of this place. But we will have to convince the Chinese through negotiations, through argumentation that this area is actually south of the McMahon Line and their personnel should withdraw from that area. And it has been decided as a result of the talks in Beijing—even though the Chinese did not accept our viewpoint, did not concede that they have intruded—but they have said that we could talk about this matter further. Beyond that, I regret to say we could not get any positive response from the Chinese on this particular question.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Sir, one clarification I want to seek. The Minister was telling just now that this is a dispute within a dispute, that during our talks the Chinese have not accepted our point of view and they have at the same time said that they will talk further. In order to resolve this 'dispute within dispute'—of course that greater dispute is there and rounds of talks are going on—whether the Government of India have suggested to the Chinese to set up a committee or any date has been fixed to resolve this intrusion. Recently it has also

been reported that after this there was another intrusion and the Chinese are facing the local people to pay the taxes. Has this come to the notice of the Government of India? If so, what further action Government is taking in this regard?

**SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN:** As far as a committee is concerned, there is already the official delegation talking with each other and they have not decided to set up any special committee to go into this. The same delegation will continue the talks with the Chinese and we should, of course, take up the question through diplomatic channels.

**SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY:** Has any date been fixed?

**SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN:** No, we have not fixed the date. But normally these meetings have been taking place twice a year.

**SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH (Maharashtra):** Will the hon. Minister yield to me for a minute? The hon. Minister has just referred to the fact that the Chinese have said that this area is north of the McMahon Line and therefore within their control. Does that mean that the Chinese authorities have accepted the principle of the McMahon Line. I was given to understand that for a long time has been one of the major bones of contention.

**SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh):** He said they accepted it as the actual line of control.

**SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN:** Nevertheless, it is good that they are prepared to talk about where the McMahon Line actually is. In that sense I should think that it is slightly better for us. But they have not accepted, as has been pointed out, that the McMahon Line is the border, but it is only the line of actual control, by and large.

**SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA:** Excuse me, Sir, you didn't let us know where this area actually is—in relation to Namka Chu.

**SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN:** As you know, Namka Chu valley is there and there is the Namgyang Chu river running down. Namka Chu is on the west of the river and this area is on the east of the river. In a sense it could be said that this is a kind of extension of the same region, though not exactly next to each other. To my mind, you could explain it as an extension of the old Tagla Ridge dispute. But the important thing is that the Chinese had never in the past claimed this area as being north of the McMahon Line. They had come into the area but they have not so specifically claimed and they have not come so further south as they did this time.

Now, there has been a question about distance. If I may deal with that also, the distance as the crow flies—as I understand it—is the direct distance from the Chinese point north of the McMahon Line in Tibet. But if you take it as the track which winds to this place, then it would be longer; it would be probably six or seven kilometres if you take the road or the track, because it is a winding track. I think, as has been pointed out, this is a difficult area, rather inhospitable, and people do not normally live there. Our graziers go there in the grazing season and the Chinese also try to send their graziers, not as far down south as they have done this time.

I think I have dealt with questions like verification of intrusion. The first report is from the graziers, then we check it up through our agencies there and, after checking it up we take whatever action has to be taken—to protest or inform Parliament and the public.

Now, it has been asked whether there has been any decision as a

[Shri K. R. Narayanan]  
result of the meeting between our Prime Minister and the Chinese Prime Minister to elevate the dealings with the Chinese to a higher political level. As you know, Prime Minister Zhao Ziang of China had extended an invitation to our Prime Minister to visit China, an invitation which was accepted. But, naturally, there must be proper preparations and the right atmosphere for such a visit to take place. Actually, these rounds of border talks were intended to create some understanding between India and China on this basic border question, to improve the atmosphere of relations between the two countries so that we can elevate our negotiations with China to a higher level. I cannot really say what transpired during the visit of Shri Shiv Shanker, when he was a Member of Parliament, to China. I have had no occasion to know what exactly happened at that time. That was not an official thing.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:  
Has he not submitted any report to the Minister of External Affairs?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: He went at the instance of the Prime Minister. I have not seen anything about it.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: He might have reported to the Government.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: As I understand it, it has not been any sort of probing mission. He went to China on a goodwill mission rather than on a political, probing mission. This has been my understanding.

In regard to the question whether the differences between India and China have widened or narrowed down as a result of the seven round of talks, certainly we have been somewhat disappointed that the problem of this intrusion could not be dealt with satisfactorily at this round

of talks. But, as I said, we have negotiated with China even on much bigger differences in the past, in an atmosphere which was much more acrimonious in the past, and we have learnt that in dealing with this great neighbour of ours, we have to be patient and we have to take a long view and consider the whole question of reconciliation and solution of problems with China as something of a long haul. So, we cannot say that this particular incident or the experience of this particular round of talks has somehow widened the differences between India and China. We have discussed other things also, other things like the cultural relations, the relations in the field of science and technology and some of the issues in the international fields during this visit of our official delegation. On some of them we have had some constructive improvement in relations. We have to take this whole overall question and put this border question and the differences, misunderstandings and tensions which might crop up between India and China on the border issue in the larger context, in the context of what almost all the Members said, the necessity for living together as friends with China. This is really our objective. Our objective is to solve this border problem with China through peaceful, patient discussions, improve relations with this country and at the same time not be enchanted but look after our interests in a realistic, pragmatic way. This is really the policy of the Government of India with regard to China.

Some questions have been asked whether there is any grand design. Well, it is difficult to answer. This would be an exercise in the realm of political analysis or political speculation. China is a country which plans ahead. It has a long view of its interests and its objectives. But we do not believe that inspite of many events there is any kind of concerted activity against India by China and some other countries.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Why this sudden outburst by intrusion?

SHRIMATI OMEM MOYONG DEORI (Arunachal Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister says that this Sumdorong Chu Valley is in the west of the McMahon Line. Whether it is in the west, in the east or in the North, it is in one district of Arunachal Pradesh.

Sir, you remember, last year also I too participated in the discussion on the relations with China in this House, and I mentioned that we had a very bad time in 1962 when the Chinese had attacked us.

Now, Sir, 24 years have passed. Over these past 24 years the Chinese have been claiming us. During the 1982 Asiad when one of the Arunachal Pradesh dance troupes was brought, the Chinese protected, "They are our people." And we just kept quiet. During the last 24 years the Chinese people have been claiming..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): We are asking for clarifications, and the Minister is answering.

SHRIMATI OMEM MOYONG DEORI: Just one point, I want to tell. I come from Arunachal Pradesh. I know the background now. Now, on the 16th of June, when the Chinese came to the Sumdorong Chu Valley, our people were so much in tension and worry. We were keeping quiet thinking that the Government would do something. Now, you know Tawang is the headquarter of the district of the Sumdorong Chu Valley. Now, the families have been evacuated themselves from Tawang to Bomdilla. The people who had kept money with the bank have to withdraw it. We are everyday eagerly hoping that the Government would do something about the Chinese intrusion into our territory. The hon. Minister has said that China is claiming almost whole of Arunachal Pradesh. Now, I want to know if you are going to hand us over to China? I want to emphasise and say it again that we are Indians and we want to remain as Indians

and we would like to fight against the Chinese intrusions. I want to know from the Hon. Minister in this regard.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: Actually I can assure—and I am sure the whole House will assure the hon. Member—that there is no intention of this nature. In fact India is determined not to hand over this part of India to China or to any other country. It is true that China has claimed this vast area.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Please assure the people of the area also.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: It would be our effort to bring confidence to the people in the area. Whatever may happen, the effort of India since 1962 has been to ensure not only that this area which is an integral part of India will remain an integral part of India and the people there will prosper as Indians, but also an effort to regain the territory we have lost. Certainly this has to be an approach in a very, shall I say, intelligent manner practical manner, well thought-out manner coordinating not only military preparations, but economic and social, international and every aspect of Indian life. They will have to be co-ordinated in such a way that we can assert our own rights within our own borders.

Now, it has been mentioned that China is the key to our relations with out neighbours and it has been asked whether we have thought of a positive policy towards China. I know the importance of China in regard to our neighbourhood policy (and, in fact, in regard to our international policy. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was convinced that it was necessary for India and China to work together not only in our interest, but certainly in the interest of China also. If China has come round after the 1962 period to the view that they should talk with India, they should also live in peace



[Shri K. R. Narayanan]

with India and make friends with India, it is partly due to what we have done in this country to develop our country and also to pursue a policy which encompasses friendship with China as one of the main principles.

I have no doubt that better relations with China will certainly help in the pursuit of our neighbourly relations in South Asia and also in South East Asia. In the same way I have no doubt that from the point of China also, in the pursuit of its Asian and world policy, it requires friendship of India too. This is really the common point between our two countries and we will have to work on these common points as intelligently, as deftly and as imaginatively as we can.

A specific question has been asked about helipad. This point of fact I am quoting from what the External Affairs Minister told the other House. Sir, on the 1st August there was no helipad in the Sumdorong area. He said, I am quoting:

"Our information is that no such helipad exists as on today. However, Government are keeping a close watch on developments."

We have kept a close watch on developments and we have noticed a few days ago that actually some sort of a ramshackle helipad landing has been prepared by the Chinese and some of the helicopters have already landed there and have taken off from there. This is a later development after the External Affairs Minister made the statement.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Now, the hon. Minister for External Affairs makes a statement on the 1st of August and there are only five days between 1st of August and your making a statement today. On the 1st August he says that there is no helipad. The Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh earlier made such statements. There is implicit criticism of the

statement made by the Chief Minister Arunachal Pradesh. Today the Minister of State for External Affairs comes forward and says there is a ramshackle helipad. This is neither there nor here—"either there is a helipad or there is not a helipad" the Minister said a few days ago. On the 1st August the External Affairs Minister makes a statement "there is nothing". How can there be a ramshackle helipad? Because helipad is really a clearance. Sir, I take this opportunity because I do not want to constantly intervene. The hon. Member from Arunachal Pradesh made rather a disturbing statement that people are being asked to evacuate Tawang. If this is so, then this is highly disturbing and totally unacceptable. Certainly the Central Government must step in. There is no way for people to evacuate Tawang. There is no need for citizens of India to take their deposits from the banks that are operating in Tawang. Both asserfains about helipad and Tawang have been made by the hon. Member from Arunachal Pradesh.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: Sir, about helicopter we do not really need any major construction to prepare an area cut out of the bushes for the landing of helicopters. (Interruptions).

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: In spite of that, why this statement of August 1st?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: Sir, we had checked up and we found that no halicopter has landed there before that day.. (Interruptions)

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Why it has been said?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: In the statement you can see that no helipad exists as on 1st August.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: That means it was built just in four days.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: As a matter of fact, this is not a major con-

crete work or anything like that. It is a clearing of the bushes for enabling a helicopter to land. As you know any helicopter can land in a field.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): How did you discover that there is a helipad? How did you notice that helicopters were landing?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: It was a direct information we have.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: You say a helicopter did land. Therefore, you consider that it is a helipad. Since you did not see any cement concrete, therefore, you call it a ramshackle helipad.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: It is not just an inference. We have some evidence of the type of activities that are taking place.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: There was one helipad which was noticed by the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh and you said that there was a ramshackle helipad. Subsequently there has been a second helipad which has not come to the notice of the External Affairs Ministry..(Interruptions)..

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: We are absolutely sure that there was no other helipad at all there...(Interruptions).

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: What was the source for you to make a statement that there was a helipad?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: We have some evidence that helicopters are hovering in that area...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: The Minister has further confounded the matter. First he says that it is a ramshackle helipad by clearing some of the bushes. Some Member asked whether any helicopter landed? Then he says it is hovering or landing. Another

thing I would like to know from the Minister When did the helicopter land? We would like to know the date of landing of the helicopter.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, I think, there is a lot of confusion either in the mind of my friend, Mr. Minister or in his Ministry because we have given facts. Don't be confused. We would like to know the actual position there. In the first instance, there was a denial that there was any helipad. Later on, he admits that there was a sort of helipad and there was also a helicopter hovering around.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: Sir, about the helicopter hovering around. I was telling how did the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh think that there was a helipad and said the helicopter might have been seen hovering around, I was just hazarding a guess.

Sir, I was just guessing. As far as the helipad is concerned, we have discovered that there is a helicopter landing place there now. There was no helipad on the 1st of August, 1986.

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, if the hon. Minister for External Affairs is to be taken seriously, he said, that there was no helipad on the 1st August, 1986 but now the Minister says that there is a helipad. When was this discovered?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: Sir, I am answering it. According the information we have, we learnt about it or discovered it on the 4th of August.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Sir, I would like to know was there any communication from the Government of India to the Chief Minister inquiring whether the fact that he reported that there was a helipad was only on the basis of the hovering of helicopter or was there any communication? If there was a communication, if there any reply? If there is a reply what exactly has been stated by the Chief Minister about his apprehension or

[Prof. C. Lakshmanan] about his statement about a helipad being there in the place.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN : Sir, after we got this statement from the Chief Minister, we made an inquiry, we made investigation as to whether there is a helipad or not and the report we got was precisely that there was no helipad at that time.

AN. HON. MEMBER: But you have not inquired from the Chief Minister.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: We must have talked to the Chief Minister also, but our information is from our agency in that area who reported to us that there was no helipad at that time. Now, about hovering of helicopter, it was a guess. I was just guessing. He might have come to the conclusion because we also know that helicopters were there in that area but they were not able to land and we came to know on 4th August that they have been able to land and our people also sent some evidence of activities going on there.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What type of activities are going on there?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: They are building some huts and things like that.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Helipad has been constructed later on after the 1st of August.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: Yes.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: It was now being said that it was not a patrol but they have established a post there. That means, after the seventh round, it has assumed a new dimensions now because the promise made by the Chinese at the negotiating table is not being kept by them.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, this is two serious a matter to be dealt with in this forum in this fashion. When we are seeking clarifications, the Minister is giving infor-

mation bit by bit. The Chinese have not only intruded into our territory but they have built a helipad and they are carrying on certain activities. Obviously they are building a check-post.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Helicopters have landed there. Obviously the Government decided to convey to Parliament that a helipad is there only when helicopters actually landed there and our people were able to see them. It seems that the first information that appeared in the press through the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh was perfectly correct and Parliament was misled into believing that there was no helipad. Only when the helicopters actually landed there, the Government had no option but to come to the House on the 6th and say, "Yes, there is a helipad", as if the helipad was built between the 1st and the 4th. It is difficult to believe this.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: First of all, one should understand that when you say a helipad, it is a helicopter landing place. It is not difficult to clear an area for helicopter landing.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I understand that.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: Probably the Chinese had to transport something; they felt that the need and made it there and certainly...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Let us not minimise it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The House should be given an opportunity to discuss the entire matter. It is too disturbing a development. Mr. Narayanan, you will agree with me that a serious situation is developing. The Chinese never act without a purpose. And after talks, if they continue to build check-posts in our territory, in the territory which we claim to be ours, it is something which the House must consider.

SHRI VISHVJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: Mr. Minister, you must take

cognizance of what he has said. Mr. Vajpayee has personal experience of China.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He was there. What are you talking? He was there in the Ministry.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: We do take it as a serious matter, the original intrusion as well as what has gone on there later. We certainly take it as a very serious matter. There is absolutely no doubt about it.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, may I request him to make a comprehensive statement giving all the details so details so that we may have an opportunity to discuss it?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN : Yes, Sir.

SARDAR T SINGH AURORA. Mr. Minister, one point of clarification. Did the Chinese after 1962 clear out of the north bank of Namka Chu, or they are still there? If you remember, they had come to the north bank of Namka Chu. After the cease-fire, did they clear out from that area or not?

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: I think they had cleared out but... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please sit down. You have made your point.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: This post that they have established now it is not patrol; it is proper intrusion—ties up with the post that they already have on the north bank of Namka Chu. And they have also constructed a helipad there. This is to establish a permanent presence there. You have to take it as an attempt to establish their permanent presence there and then you have to decide what you are going to do about it.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: The Minister must say specifically whether people are being asked to evacuate or not.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: I am not aware. As far as I know, the Government has not asked anyone to evacuate, Sir (*In-*

*terruptions*) I am not aware of the sense of evacuation...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sense of insecurity.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: He has to be aware, instead of being unaware, whether they are being advised or not. The House has a right to know.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA) : He says, no they have not advised.

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: The Government has not advised. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): The Minister has given the information that he has. How can you force him?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Please get the matter enquired into because it is a serious matter. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN: You have spoken about calculated nature of the intrusion. Well, all intrusions are meditated. I don't think they are uncalculated actions. Then a question has been asked: What are the concessions demanded by the Chinese in the east? Actually we have tried in the last round of negotiations to find out from the Chinese, what their conception is of the alignment of the McMahon Line so that we can be sure what the area is that they consider to be north or south of the McMahon Line. They did not give us any clear answer on this and we did not succeed in getting information about the ment itself. This will be unfolded as the negotiations go. That means it is a subject-matter of further negotiations. It is our objective to get some specific information about the line of actual control. We also asked them that they should define what they considered to be the line of actual control. On this also in this round of talks it has not been possible for us to get any information from the Chinese. (*Interruption*)

I would like to conclude by one remark. Certainly we consider this intrusion as serious. But at the same time we are not prepared to be alarmed by it because we think it is possible to deal with the Chinese

[Shri K. R. Narayanan]

and it is possible to subject them to the persuasions and the reasoning of negotiations, and, as one Member pointed out whether it is a preparation for aggression, we do not take that view at all and we are willing and I think the Chinese are willing to continue talks and negotiations on the border. And all these individual disputes also will come in within the compass of a negotiated settlement with the Chinese. I want the House to note, while one understands the reaction and emotions generated by this, that we should be wise and careful in our approach towards the Chinese in regard to these individual intrusions and other questions as well as in regard to the larger question of the border itself. We have had bitter experience of history and, therefore, it is incumbent on us to approach the subject with earnestness, with patience, with determination and not to be swept away by emotions in dealing with a country like this.

#### THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CESS BILL, 1986

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Hon. Members, the Research and Development Cess Bill which has been listed at No. 3 of today's business paper is a Money Bill. The Bill at No. 2 is the Industrial Development Bank of India (Amendment) Bill, 1986. The fourteen days period for the Money Bill will expire on the 11th. In view of the Constitution Amendment Bill on 7th and South Africa Motion on 8th, and 9th and 10th being holidays, it is necessary that the Money Bill is gone through today itself. May we, therefore, take up the Research and Development Cess Bill, 1986 after which the Minister will reply to the IDBI Bill?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI): Sir, with your permission I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of a cess on all payments made for the import of technology for

the purposes of encouraging the commercial application of indigenously developed technology and for adopting imported technology to wider domestic application and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, as the honourable Members are aware, our policy on foreign investment and collaboration is selective. While the emphasis is on achieving technological self-reliance through the development of a sound indigenous technology base, the policy also recognises that in an era of fast changing technology Indian industry should take advantage of the advances taking place elsewhere in the world. Thus import of technology is allowed wherever it is in the national interest and generally in areas where the technology is not indigenously available or is not adequately developed. There are guidelines and parameters within which such a technology import is allowed. Such technology transfer arrangement may take the form of technical collaboration or it may be in the form of financial participation in addition to technical collaboration. Apart from this, import of technology can also take the form of import of designs and drawings and deputation of personnel. Import of technology in any of the above-mentioned forms requires the Government's approval. The number of technology transfer arrangements approved during the last three years is: in 1983—673, in 1984—752 and in 1985—1,024.

As regard the annual outgo of foreign exchange on account of the remittances on various forms of technology payments, it has been in the region of about three hundred crores of rupees. Although the relevance of import of technology cannot be minimised, there is critical need for the development and commercial application of indigenous technology. With this end in view, it was proposed in the Long-Term Fiscal Policy announced in December 1985 that in order to provide further incentives for the commercial application of indigenously developed technology, a Venture Capital Fund would be set up to provide financial support for pilot plants attempting