

अन्दर आ जाता है जब कि दूसरे मंत्रियों को नहीं आता है।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sometimes, to avoid delay, the Minister asks his deputy or somebody to send an answer, and that is because he may be on tour or may be busy with some such other work. Normally speaking, the Minister or the Prime Minister himself desires to reply and does reply. Sometimes, when information is required, I tell my Principal Secretary, "Please get this information and convey it to the hon. Member". It is no disrespect at all to dispose of the matter as quickly as possible. But, as you have been pleased to say, we shall keep what you said, in mind.

Shri Nath Pai: Are they more busy than you? If you give replies, why can't they?

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

भारत-चीन सीमा विवाद

1

* ३७१. { श्री भक्त बर्शन :
श्री हेम बरूभा :

क्या प्रधान मंत्री दिनांक ७ अगस्त १९६१ के तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या ४४ और २३ अगस्त, १९६१ के अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या २१९७ के उत्तरों के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या भारत-चीन सीमा-विवाद के बारे में इस बीच चीन सरकार के साथ आगे भी पत्र-व्यवहार हुआ है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या दोनों सरकारों के बीच हुए पत्र-व्यवहार की प्रतिलिपियाँ सभा-पटल पर रखी जाएंगी ; और

(ग) क्या पिछले श्वेत-पत्र के बाद हुआ संपूर्ण पत्र-व्यवहार एक नए श्वेत-पत्र के रूप में प्रकाशित किया जाएगा ?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Laxmi Menon): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). Another White Paper containing the correspondence exchanged between the Governments of India and China will be placed on the table of the House today.

श्री भक्त बर्शन : श्रीमन्, क्या भारत सरकार ने इस तरह के कुछ आंकड़े तैयार किये हैं कि पिछले वर्षों के अन्दर कुल कितने पत्र भारत सरकार की ओर से चीन सरकार को भेजे गये हैं, कितने पत्र ऐसे हैं, जिन का जवाब ही नहीं दिया गया है, कितने पत्र ऐसे हैं, जिन के उत्तर संतोषजनक पाए गए और कितने ऐसे हैं, जिन के उत्तर असंतोषजनक थे, ताकि इस सम्बन्ध में आगे की नीति निर्धारित की जा सके ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा बंदेशिक कार्य मंत्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू) : करीब करीब वे सब पत्र, जो आए हैं और जिन का जवाब गया है, यहां पार्लियामेंट की मेज पर रखे गए हैं। आज एक और पोथी रखी जा रही है। गिनती कर लेना तो आसान है। अगर माननीय सदस्य चाहें, तो मैं दफ्तर में किसी और से कहूँ कि वह गितनी करे।

श्री भक्त बर्शन : श्रीमन्, मेरे प्रश्न का उद्देश्य यह था कि जब हमारे पत्रों के इतने असंतोषजनक उत्तर मिल रहे हैं, तो क्या भारत सरकार इस बात पर विचार करेगी कि ऐसी सरकार के साथ पत्र-व्यवहार भी जारी रखा जाये या नहीं ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : यह तो माननीय सदस्य खुद सोच लें कि दों गवर्न-मेंट्स के, जब उनमें मुखालिफत भी हो, क्या तर्क होते हैं। कबल इसके कि बिल्कुल कता-ताल्लुक हो जाये, खतो किताबत करनी पड़ती है। और कोई जरिया नहीं है। जब कता-ताल्लुक हो जाता है तब

भी किसी और हुकूमत के द्वारा खतो-कितावत करनी पड़ती है। हमारा और पार्टूगीज गवर्नमेंट का कोई संबंध नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी एक संबंध उससे रखा जाता है। हमारी तरफ से यू० ए० आर० को गवर्नमेंट नुमायंदगी करती है और उनकी तरफ से ब्राजीलियन एम्बेसी करती है। हमेशा कुछ न कुछ संबंध तो रहता है। यह तो वही हुआ कि हम बातचीत करना बन्द कर दें। बातचीत बन्द करने के बाद जो और जरिये होते हैं वे तो आम तौर से खुली लड़ाई के होते हैं। कुछ बीच का रास्ता तो मुझे मालूम नहीं है।

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, only last Monday, the Prime Minister told this House that there were cases of 11 incursions from the Chinese on the Himalayan border. The House received it with a shock, but an even more shocking statement was made within a few hours by a leading spokesman of the Government that this is not active hostility. May we know what act do you regard on the part of the Chinese as brotherly activity, friendly or good neighbourly activity in such matters? If it is not active hostility, what is it then?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think the hon. Member has understood it properly.

Shri Nath Pai: Many have not understood it. We plead ignorance!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know that. That is a misfortune.

Shri Nath Pai: For the nation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What was said was this. I am speaking from memory. When the Defence Minister was asked in the New York airport or in London—I forget—whether armies were ranged against each other—you must see it in the context and that was the implication of the question asked—he said, “No”. There are no armies there ranged against each other. There are no active hostilities in the sense of armies being ranged

against each other. That was the context, which is a completely correct context. There are no armies there as such; there are posts there—our posts with some forces, the Chinese posts at some distance away and so on, and they are not actively fighting each other in the sense of firing at each other. But the whole situation is one of hostility. That is obvious. It has not broken out into large scale warfare. That was the point, because hon. Members may remember that in the west what people think in terms of peace and war today is something very big on a big scale, even ultimately nuclear warfare, or leaving out nuclear warfare, huge armies marching against each other. The point was to clear up that the situation has not developed to that extent. In view of the terrain, etc., it cannot normally function in that way. The hostility is obviously there. I am going to place a little later all this correspondence, which is correspondence between two countries which are hostile to each other.

Shri Nath Pai: From the papers placed and the statements made by the Prime Minister it is clear that the Government received information as early as September. May I ask for a clarification as to how to understand the words of the Defence Minister at the same press conference, who said: “I am not aware of anything except what I read in the Press”? Are such vital secrets hidden from the Defence Minister or the Defence Ministry?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Again if I may refer to what was said by the Defence Minister—I have not got it here—he know as much as I did and as much as most of my colleagues did. We got to know about it in October. The first information came, I think, sometime in September. The Defence Ministry got it and we got it. About this, I am going to say something after the Question Hour. What the Defence Minister said was, “I do not know of any new development”. He had been away much of this time in

the United Nations. In fact, the reference was not to any new development. He said, "In case something new happened, I am not at present in possession of that fact". But he knew as much as I knew, because nothing new had happened. By 'new' I mean nothing new had happened in the last few weeks.

राजा महेंद्र प्रताप : मैं एक अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। मैं आपका बहुत बन्ववाद करता हूँ कि आपने कल ही मुझे अपने दस्तखतों से जवाब दिया। बड़ी सी मुहर लगा कर वह आया था और एक आदमी उसको लेकर आया था। इसके लिये मैं आपको बहुत ब-यवाद देता हूँ। चीन के साथ सरहद का सवाल दो साल से चल रहा है। मैं वहाँ पांच साल रहा हूँ। तिब्बत भी मैं गया हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस मसले को हल करूँ। आप मुझे यह जवाब दे देते हैं कि आपकी राय और है और मेरी राय और है। मेरी कुछ भी राय हो, मगर मैं इस मसले को हल करना चाहता हूँ। मेहरबानी करके आप मुझे यह समझा दीजिये कि आपको क्या एतराज है कि जो क़म आप नहीं कर पाते हैं, जिस मसले को आप हल नहीं कर पाये हैं, जिसका आप ठैसला नहीं कर पाये हैं, उसको मैं करूँ। मुझे आप इसको क्यों नहीं करने देते हैं ?

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that the Chinese officials produced a new map in 1960 which is a clear repudiation of the map which Mr. Chou En-lai had produced in 1956 and whether according to this map, the area is 18,000 square miles in that sector? If so, may I know what steps Government took to see that this cartographic aggression or claim is not followed by physical aggression as it has happened today?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Would it not be better, Sir, if I dealt with the hon. Member's question later, when I will speak about this matter?

Mr. Speaker: These matters will be taken up during the discussion. Hon. Members will raise it and he will reply.

Shri Hem Barua: My question was specific, whether or not the Chinese officials produced a map in 1960 which is a repudiation of the map produced by Mr. Chou-En-lai in 1956. A reply can be given to that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This argument about maps, etc. has been dealt with in the correspondence placed before this House previously. It is more dealt with in the White Paper that I will be placing today. Naturally, we think that the Chinese Government is not only utterly wrong, but has taken up a very aggressive and somewhat offensive attitude in such matters. That is admitted. As to the other question which the hon. Member asked about the steps we are taking to prevent the Chinese Government taking physical possession of that, that is a question to which I shall very briefly refer later in the course of my reply.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Referring to 'active hostility', the Prime Minister said that the armies of the two countries were not ranged against each other on the border. There have been reports in the Press that some 50,000 troops are there on the other side of our Northern border on behalf of the Chinese Government. May I know whether it has been ascertained by the Government of India if such a number of troops are there or if not 50,000, they are less or more?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What does the hon. Member mean by 'there'?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: On the northern border on the Chinese side.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is thinking of Tibet. I have no doubt that the Chinese have got very large forces there, for more than 50,000. But if he is referring to that part of our territory which is presumed to be in Chinese occupation, then

certainly they are not there; such large forces are not there.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I am referring to the border near Sikkim, Bhutan, etc.

Mr. Speaker: All these would be discussed in detail later. Next question. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hem Barua: May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to another part of the Defence Minister's statement? He said, "We need no armies there". Does it mean that the armies are entirely ruled out?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In the Ladakh area—there is the main area that is being referred to—there are no armies.

Shri Hem Barua: He said, "We need no armies there". That is what he said in Washington.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not a question of needing armies. Armies cannot function there, Chinese, Russian, American or Indian. Groups of armed people function in these areas. You do not put an arm on a mountain peak. You send an armed group well equipped. You may, if you like, take aerial action, but big armies cannot function there for various reasons—logistic reasons. The mere act of supplying them is a terrific act. No Government can easily supply a large army in those places. It is other type of military action that is taken there. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: If there had been no discussion fixed on this subject, seeing that the hon. Members are interested in this, I would fix a discussion.

Shri Nath Pai: The whole country is interested.

Mr. Speaker: Now that a discussion has been fixed, hon. Members will reserve all this. These matters will be discussed at length then and they will be explained.

Shri Ranga: The discussion would be fruitful if it can be based upon

useful information. Here is the hon. Prime Minister who simply makes a big point about a technical inaccuracy that we are obliged to mention just because of our ignorance. He says, armies cannot function there. Quite right, but what else is there? Can he not possibly say that? He says, groups of armed personnel are there. He does not give us information, but when we put a question to him, he makes a big point about a technical inaccuracy in what we say.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, you have been pleased to fix a date to discuss these matters. The present question, out of which supplementaries have arisen, as far as I remember, was about the trijunction in the Burmese border. That is the real question, but we are gradually spreading about to the whole policy range and military range in this matter.

First of all, there is going to be a full discussion. Secondly today within half an hour or so, I shall make a very brief statement in regard to the Ladakh position, just for the information of the House and place a fat book of correspondence on the Table of the House, so that when the discussion takes place four or five days later, hon. Members will be in possession of all these facts. Then, these matters can be discussed.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I rise to a point of order. When the Prime Minister was saying about armies functioning there he said positively that armed groups can function there and then he ruled out the possibility of armies functioning in that area. I am afraid, this might give a wrong impression to our people and to the Chinese. This might be taken to mean as a notice given to the Chinese that we are not going to introduce our army in that area in order to protect our borders (*Interruption*). The Prime Minister's statement has worsened the situation and has confounded all of us. Should he, Sir....

Shri Vajpayee: There is a clear contradiction in what the Prime Minister said. In one breath he says

that there are Chinese armies and in the other he says that no armies are there, there are only armed groups. Are we to understand that armed groups are not part of the Chinese Army? What is the use of saying this, that there are no armies simply because we do not want to send our armies there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, Sir, I cannot explain things to people who refuse to understand.

Shri Vajpayee: This is no reply. You have to explain the position to the people (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. All that will be explained in detail, not by a single sentence. There is no point of order. Hon. Member, Shri Hem Barua has got somehow a knack of introducing by way of a point of order whatever he wants to say. Unless I erase whatever he has said, when I come to the conclusion that there is no point of order, I think he won't stop this. I shall try to do it hereafter. When I do not find anything relating to a point of order, I will treat it as not in the records.

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, may I seek your protection, your guidance?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Sir, could the Question Hour be wasted like this?

Shri Vajpayee: There is no question of wasting it.

An Hon. Member: The country is anxious.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: What is the anxiety? Let us have a discussion.

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, the Prime Minister tried to make a fine distinction between Chinese armies and armed groups. Is there any distinction between armed groups and Chinese armies?

Mr. Speaker: All these distinctions will be explained during the discussion. Now let us proceed.

Shri Tyagi: Sir, may I make one request? I do not want to put any question (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: No, Sir.

An Hon. Member: Security of the border is very important.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have already allowed sufficient time on this.

Shri Tangamani: May I put one question? I have been trying to catch your eye.

Mr. Speaker: But I am not bound to call everybody.

Industrialisation of Rural Areas

+

*372. { **Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:**
Shri Pahadia:

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to set up an Autonomous Board or some other special agency for promoting industrialisation of rural areas; and

(b) what is the nature and scope of the proposal?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) and (b). It is proposed to set up a high-level Rural Industries Planning Committee with the object of reviewing the progress of industries in rural areas, studying problems of policy and planning relating to them and considering such issues as may arise from time to time in connection with rural industrial development.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: May I know what will be the true functions of this agency and what funds are likely to be placed at its disposal?

Shri Manubhai Shah: This is more or less a policy-making committee. It would not be in charge of direct execution. It would be broadly guiding the policies and implementation of different rural industrial programmes. The Committee is about to be formed and, therefore, I cannot say anything more on this point.