

[English]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, yesterday, after the shouting I have given a cake...

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : I will tell you as to what happened with me.

[Translation]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Why don't you allow ? I have given a Cake to Telegu Desam friends.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. Please, for God's sake, sit down.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Why is this cacophony; after the harmony ?

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER :

*Woh katl bhi karte hain to
charcha nahin hoti
Hum aah bhi bharte hain to
ho jate hain badnam.*

Shri Dharam Pal Singh Malik.

12.11 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

[Translation]

Chinese intrusion into Indian territory and construction of a Helipad in the Sumdorong Chu valley in Arunachal Pradesh.

SHRI DHARAM PAL SINGH MALIK (Sonepat) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I call the attention of the Hon. Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon :—

“Situations arising out of the Chinese intrusion into Indian territory and construction of a Helipad in the Sumdorong Chu valley area of Tawang District in Arunachal Pradesh.”

12.12 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

[English]

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER) : Hon'ble Members will recall that I had made a *Suo Moto* statement in this House on 18th July, 1986, on the Chinese intrusion in the Sumdorong Chu valley area of Tawang district of Arunachal Pradesh. I had also informed the Hon'ble Members that the 7th Round of Official level talks were due to begin from 21st July, 1986. During his visit to China, the Foreign Secretary who led the delegation was instructed to take up the question of the Chinese intrusion in the Sumdorong Chu valley area, both with the Acting Premier Wan Li as also the Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian.

2. During the meetings, both with the Acting Premier Wan Li and the Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian, the Foreign Secretary expressed our grave concern over the Chinese intrusion. They were informed that since both sides had agreed to maintain peace and tranquility on the border, such intrusions added tensions and vitiated the atmosphere for finding a satisfactory and just solution to the Boundary question. The issue of the Chinese intrusion in the Sumdorong Chu valley area was further discussed intensively in the Boundary Sub-group.

3. The Chinese, while expressing their desire for an early settlement of the boundary question did not respond to our concerns in a satisfactory manner.

4. As regards the matter of existence of a helipad said to have been built by the Chinese in the area, our information is that no such helipad exists as on today. However, Government are keeping a close watch on developments.

5. We shall continue to strive for a peaceful settlement of the Boundary question. We shall also persevere to resolve through peaceful negotiations the question of Chinese intrusions. We hope that peace and tranqui-

lity will prevail on the border and that pending a final solution, the *status quo* will be maintained.

[Translation]

SHRI DHARAM PAL SINGH MALIK (Sonepat) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, a very serious matter is being discussed in the House today. We are all aware that it is not the first instance of Chinese intrusion into our territory or of their attempt at illegally occupying some of it. I am implying that China has occupied a large portion of our land within a period of 30 years, i.e. from 1955 to 1986.

I want to raise a little objection to the statement made by the Hon. Minister in this regard. The Hon. Minister has just now affirmed in his statement that China has not given a satisfactory reply on the issue of her recent infiltration into Arunachal Pradesh during the course of her seventh round of talks with the Indian Foreign Secretary, which was held on the 21st of the last month. Therefore, it is essential to deliberate seriously on this matter.

Similarly, the Hon. Minister has stated that as on today, there is no helipad. The question arises as to whether a helipad was constructed or not and, if so, why? Again, as you are all aware that China is a vast country and is the largest in terms of population. However, India is also no less, for, it has the second largest population in the world. If every fourth person in the world is a Chinese at present, then every fifth person is an Indian.

You are all aware that we have made every effort to maintain cordial relationship with China since the very beginning—before and after independence—and it was only with this end in view that we handed over Tibet, which was a buffer State, to China on a platter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to say that the Tibet issue was not the only example of our desire to have amicable relationship with China. We had assisted them in every possible way in their struggle for freedom; we had also made every effort to make them

a member of the U. N. O. and we incurred the displeasure of certain nations in the process. But all our endeavours have been of no avail. China did not reciprocate to our attempts at amity and friendship.

Sir, this has been their old practice. It is not only with us, but with Russia also they behaved in a similar manner. Russia had always helped China but the latter soured this relationship also.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, China had begun the construction of a road in the Ladakh area in 1955 and had completed it in 1957. Several protest notes were sent from our side but it had little effect on them. We had also sent an official delegation in 1957 to hold talks with their counterparts in China. But when we received no message from them for seven days, then we suspected that perhaps they might have been arrested. When the matter was looked into, it was found that our apprehension was true. They had arrested our officials on the pretext that they were Indian spies.

Sir, the Hon. Members of this august House may be aware that the former Prime Minister of China Shri Chou-En-Lai had written a letter to the Indian Government in 1959, claiming 50,000 square miles of our territory and they also refused to recognise the Mc Mohon Line. Everyone knows what happened after that. China attacked India on the 20th October 1962, and occupied 'Dhaulta ki Chauki.' On the 22nd of the same month, the Chinese Troops reached Tawang and established their camp there. In the meantime, they also attacked NEFA and by the 25th of October, the whole of upper Ladakh was occupied by China. Then China made a unilateral peace treaty offer on three conditions. We had made no initiative in this regard. One of these three conditions was that both the sides should withdraw 20 km away from the line of actual control on both sides. When this proposal was offered by China that both the sides should withdraw 20 kms away from the line of actual control, it was clear that China had occupied the Indian territory.

Secondly, they said that no country would violate this line and thirdly, the

Chinese Prime Minister would hold talks in Delhi or in Peking. But our Government turned down this offer and said that if China was prepared to the position as on the 8th September, 1962 and to withdraw her forces to that line, we were ready to hold talks. China refused to accept this offer.

Once China declared cease-fire, but again launched another attack in NEFA on the 14th November, 1962. On the 18th November, they launched attack on Ladakh and occupied 2000 sq. miles of land. On the 20th November, they announced cease-fire. After this, talks were resumed with China to arrive at some treaty with that country.

Recently, seventh round of talks were held. But I would like to say that even today about an area of 9000 sq. miles of India is in the occupation of China. It is the practice with China to occupy some land and then start talks for some friendship treaty with a view to keep the matter pending. We should not believe the Chinese Government any more.

We recall the incidents of 1962 when Chou-En-Lai visited India and the people were raising Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai slogans and the Chinese forces were engaged in their aggressive design to grab the India territory. It is very difficult to rely on such a country. We will have to be very cautious in dealing with a country for which betrayal is a common practice.

Recently, talks were held with China. Earlier also talks were held with that country. The main thing that emerged, which was published in the newspapers also, was that fruitful talks were held between both the sides on the exchange of scientific and technical knowhow as well as cultural exchanges. I would like to say that we can hold talks with countries like Germany or Japan which are far ahead in these fields in regard to the scientific, cultural or technical exchanges but there is need to talk with China only on one point and that is that they should vacate the illegal occupation made on our territory.

In reply to the Calling Attention Motion on this subject, the Hon. Minister has admitted in his statement that there has been

intrusion into the Sumdorong Chu Valley of the Tawang district but it has come to our notice from the press reporters that about 150 intruders have occupied the territory illegally and they do not allow the tribals, who are residing in the upper area of Sumdorong Chu Valley, to graze their cattle in that territory. These people have no other means of livelihood. These adivasis eke out their living by selling the milk of these cattle. There are press reporters to the effect that the intruders from China have tried to establish contacts with the people of some villages in our area. They have told them that they are not enemies but good friends and if the adivasis wanted to graze their cattle in this areas, they must pay taxes to them.

The Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh, Shri Gegong Apang has given a suggestion to curb the activities of rebels in the Tirap district. His suggestion is that the International boundary with Burma should be sealed for some time and joint action should be taken by India and Burma to drive away the intruders from that territory. It seems that mule track to Tibet has also been repaired by the intruders so with a view to use it. The Hon. Minister has no doubt denied that the Chinese have started constructions of a one hundred feet long helipad to strengthen its position at a place where three borders of Tibet, Bhutan and Arunachal Pradesh meet in the Sumdorong Chu Valley of the Tawang district.

Besides, it has also come to notice that Chinese soldiers made overtures to the local people on 16th July to gain their confidence. I would like to know from the Hon. Minister whether any attempt has been made or not by the Arunachal Pradesh Government and the Central Government to establish contact with any citizen of that valley after this intrusion?

How far have the intruders entered into the Indian territory from the Mac Mahon line? In an earlier intrusion, they had entered seven miles inside our territory. When they intruded again the day before yesterday, they penetrated five kilometres inside our territory.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You are narrating many things which are not necessary now. Please put the relevant question.

[Translation]

SHRI DHARAM PAL SINGH MALIK : Recently talks of friendship are going on between China and India. In spite of it, why the Chinese forces have made intrusions into the Indian territory ? What action has been taken by the Government of India in this regard ?

May I know when the Chinese intruders were entering the Indian territory, what the Indian jawans on the borders were doing at that time ? What action they had taken at that time ? We have not received any report in this connection. I agree that only helicopters can go in that area from our side and on the other side of the International border, there is a road constructed by China where they can come without any difficulty. But our forces are deployed at the borders and the intruders are intruding into our side. What action has been taken by our forces in this regard ?

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have put three questions. Please wind up.

[Translation]

SHRI DHARAM PAL SINGH MALIK : Besides, I would also like to know from the Hon. Minister whether all the Chinese intruders are armymen or there are some civilians also among them ? On either side of the Mac Mahon line on the border of China and India, forces of both the countries are deployed hardly at a distance of 30 yards; how is it that the intrusion took place unchecked ? I want to know the role played by our Intelligence Agency in this regard and what report did it submit ? Did we not come to know in advance that such type of incursion will take place from China ? Is it because of our slackness that such a thing has happened ? May I know what steps are being taken to check such intrusion ?

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Nothing will go on record.

SHRI DHARAM PAL SINGH MALIK : **

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Chintamani Jena.

SHRI JAI PRAKASH AGARWAL (Chandni Chowk) : What he spoke should come on record. Sir, on a point of order... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Listen to me first. What we have decided is that he may take only ten minutes. That has to be strictly followed. That is what we have decided... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAI PRAKASH AGARWAL : It is not a matter of time. Whatever he has said is very important and it should be replied to by the Minister. It should be on record.

SHRI AZIZ QURESHI (Satna) : This is a Calling Attention on a very important matter concerning national security. It should be on record. It will be unfortunate if it is not recorded. It is very important...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Whatever it is important or not, it is for me to control the debate. He was given ten minutes and within those ten minutes he should have mentioned those important matters. He went on discussing other things unnecessarily.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT (Almora) : This is a very important subject and there should not be this time limit. (Interruptions)

SHRI JAI PRAKASH AGARWAL : Whatever he has said should be on record. You must say that it will go on record.

SHRI T. BASHEER (Chirayinkil) : You should have allowed a discussion under Rule 193. This was a very important subject.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : For that, you have to give a separate notice. When we are discussing this as a Calling Attention, we have to follow the rules and regulations

**Not recorded.

meant for it. If it is thought to be more important, a notice under Rule 193 is to be given.

SHRI JAI PRAKASH AGARWAL : Whatever he has spoken should be on record.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DHARAM PAL SINGH MALIK : The mention about the armed personnel of National Socialist Organisation of Nagaland and Pakistan must be allowed to go on record.

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Chintamani Jena. Only five minutes. Do not cover the same ground which has already been covered.

SHRI CHINTAMANI JENA (Balasore) : I will put some questions, Sir. I will not repeat.

In para 3 of his statement, the Hon. Minister has mentioned :

“The Chinese, while expressing their desire for an early settlement of the boundary question did not respond to our concerns in a satisfactory manner.”

In this connection may I know from the Hon. Minister what is the future course of action of the Government of India on this issue.

My second question would be seeking a clarification from the Minister as regards the matter of existence of a helipad said to have been built by the Chinese. In his statement, the Minister has stated that they have no information about its existence. May I know from the Hon. Minister when and who visited this site and reported the matter to the Government of India? Because the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh and also so many others have reported that Chinese have started constructing the helipad there. In case it has not been visited by a reliable agency of Government, may I ask the Hon. Minister

what action he would like to take to have the site visited by a reliable agency?

The Chinese aggression of 1962 into our territory is very fresh in our mind. At that time, you may recall, Sir, and the Hon. Minister may also recall, there was a slogan ‘ornaments for armaments’. At that time the poor people living in the rural areas contributed a lot of gold to save our motherland. In that context, may I know this from the Hon. Minister. Our Prime Minister has been trying his utmost to normalise our relationship with China. The last discussion on this issue was for the seventh time. In the past for six or seven times we could not succeed. How is the Government of India saying that we may have good relationship with China, even though our Prime Minister and the late Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi had started cordial relationship with China? In this connection may I know from the Hon. Minister whether the Prime Minister Mr. Deng has named us as an imperialistic legacy? If so, how the Government is thinking to have a settlement with that country?

Furthermore, I want to know from the Hon. Minister whether they are aware of the situation that China has three categories of border States with which they are going to have different relationship. Firstly with Pakistan—though judicially Pakistan is not a border country with China because the occupied Kashmir now in Pakistan is a part of India but they are thinking that it is Pakistan’s territory. So, they want to have separate relationship with Pakistan. They want to make Pakistan as a buffer State against the powerful country like India. Because whenever they like will utilise Pakistan against India to normalise Indian power. They would like to have balance of power in the sub continent in Asia.

We all know that through Karakoram Highways in occupied Kashmir they are going to have relationship with western countries, Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea from Karachi. Through Karakoram Highways they are going to negotiate with western countries. In that context how is our Government thinking to have a good relationship and to settle the border issue?

China is anxious to have an access to the modern technology of warfare from USA. But USA has denied the export of such technology and such help to China, though they are supplying it to Pakistan. So, through Pakistan they want to have good relationship with USA. In that context how is the Minister saying that we may have good relationship to settle the border issue amicably?

In case of Vietnam, another border country, they have "no peace, no war" relationship. But regarding India and Soviet Union they want to vitiate our negotiations and all our goodwill to settle the matter amicably.

China is supplying arms to Nagas. Is it a fact and is the Government aware of this situation? If so, what actions have been taken by the Government?

They have raised a new slogan. In October-November, 1985 when we had discussions here in Delhi they said that India has occupied 90000 sq. kms. of land of China in Arunachal Pradesh. Recently also they have raised it through their Vice Foreign Affairs Minister. He has said in the month of June this year that India has occupied 90 thousand sq. kms. of their territory. So to divert the attention at the international level they are highlighting these baseless issues and also they are trying to satisfy India by talking about cultural relationship, trade and commercial relationship, etc. In that context they do not like to settle the border issue. Will the Government take into account all these facts and categorically say what would be our relationship or our future course of action to counter these types of actions of the Chinese?

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not really feel inspired the manner in which the three or four kilometers of Indian territory was occupied and not a drop of blood was shed. I could have understood if we had resisted but could not succeed.

The Hon. Minister is assuring us that there will be *status quo*. I would like to know whether they have been assured of *status quo*

by the Chinese Government? Further unless *status quo* is maintained can there be dialogue or negotiation for settlement? You know, Sir, what Chinese had done in 1979 when Mr. Vajpayee visited the Chinese capital. Vietnam was attacked. When we are going to have the seventh round of negotiations where it was decided particularly that boundary dispute will be taken up they have encroached upon the Indian territory. So, is it not advisable that unless they withdraw and the real *status quo* is established there is no point for negotiation? That is why I do not feel inspired. So in any dialogue or bilateral talks if the *status quo* is not maintained there is no point in carrying on negotiations or dialogue.

In 1974 the Chinese took over Parcel island. In 1979 they attacked Vietnam but, I thought, we are handling a different China, a Socialist country experimenting on Capitalism. So, I had a lot of hope. They declared that they wanted to restore friendship of 1950s with India. So, I was hopeful. They invited the Prime Minister of India. Really it is quite encouraging. I thought there is some pragmatism inside China or at least in their area of foreign policy there are changes. But when the crucial negotiations are going on in the seventh round immediately they played this mischief. What does it indicate? You know what is the Chinese version as is reported in the Press? It says :

"It does not matter if no agreement is reached this time. You can talk about it next time you meet."

So, are we negotiating on equal basis or are they doing some mercy? That is why I do not feel encouraged. How do you assure us there will be *status quo*? Have you been assured by the Chinese government? They have encouraged upon three-four kilometers. Have they assured you that they will not encroach upon further? So, how are you assuring us here? Initially they wanted a package deal. We did not agree. We insisted upon sector-wise. That proposal was given by the then Foreign Minister or Premier Chou-En-Lai and now being called Zhau-En-Lai. Wherever it may be they have not been defined in concrete terms. Now they say this is only an idea. That is no where defined in concrete terms. Besides, since we did not

accept that package deal and are insisting on sector-wise approach, they have encroached upon our territory with an ulterior motive and the Mac Mahon line as the actual line of control has been disputed by them. We want Indio-China friendship to grow; long live Indio-China friendship was the slogan earlier and that is the slogan even now. But it must be appreciated that friendship cannot be generated unless the two friends treat each other on equal footing, but we are not being treated so.

There is another problem. They are talking of trade relations and improvement of cultural relations. But unless the basic issues are settled, how can that be done? Can we wait for the boundary question to be settled? We cannot wait, because the question of security of the country is concerned on this sector as also the Kashmir sector. In that background, we want speedier solution. They have violated the boundary line. What is the meaning of that? You have to read in between the lines. Perhaps they do not like our growing friendship with the Soviet Union, and as they have not been successful in that, they have desparately resorted to this.

So far as China is concerned, on one of the international issues they are with us, be it the new international economic order or any other international issue. In the opposition to the attempts made by the United States of America to weaken the United Nations, UNESCO etc., China is not with us. China is now playing the game of the imperialists and Reagan has categorically said that so far as Soviet Union and China are concerned, their friendship with the USSR cannot grow. They say, they have friendship with China because China is experimenting capitalism in a socialist country.

I would like to have specific answers by the Hon. Minister whether *status quo* has been assured by China or not. If not, what is your reaction?

Secondly, if any further violation takes place, will you resist it or not? Thirdly, I would like to know whether China are serious about the dialogue with us on equal basis. These are the matters which have been agitating the minds of the people.

[Translation]

SHRI JAGDISH AWASTHI (Bilhour) :
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, through this Calling Attention Motion, we are discussing the intrusion made by China. China has constructed a helipad in the Tawang district of Arunachal Pradesh. The Hon. Minister has denied it and said that he has no knowledge about it. This is not only a question of helipad but it is very important question. The House knows that some years back when China attacked Tibet, it occupied Tibet without resistance. At that time what we did is well known. We kept silent and China took full advantage of it. When China attacked India, what was our position at that time. The House knows this also. I would not like to go into that controversy. But keeping in view our relations with China to date and the sequence of events that took place, it is high time that we considered the matter seriously and the Government of India should come out with a firm policy in this regard. China has always taken undue advantage of our liberal stand. Whenever we extended our hand of friendship to improve relations with China and whenever it was opportune time to improve relations, China tried to vitiate the congenial atmosphere by intruding into the Indian territory. The Hon. Minister has himself admitted this fact. I would like to ask from the Hon. Minister after all for how long such a situation will continue and when the Government of India will take a positive stand?

You have denied any information regarding construction of a helipad by China. I would like to say that China had never recognised the Mac Mahon line since the British period. We shall have to stick to the Mac Mahon line and there should be no compromise on this point. We have discontinued military intelligence which used to be carried on during the British period. It is necessary that besides civil intelligence we should carry on military intelligence also. We must know in advance about the intentions of China. What happens at present is that we come to know about the incident after it has taken place and only after it is reported in the press. I will also ask the Hon. Minister to strengthen our military intelligence.

There are a number of hill districts in Uttar Pradesh on the Sino-Indian border and when we had cordial relations with China, the people living in these hill areas of Uttar Pradesh, used to cross over the border to China to carry out trade. But after the Chinese invasion, our relations deteriorated and trade with China was also discontinued. I want to know from the Hon. Minister whether this question of trade with China is raised during meetings with China? Alongwith it, I also want to say that whenever we hold talks with the Chinese leaders, they vitiate the atmosphere by resorting to such incidents and also do not respond in a satisfactory manner. Even the Hon. Minister has affirmed it. We should learn a lesson from these incidents about the intentions of China. The other situation is this that today China, Pakistan and U.S.A. have formed an axis in the political horizon of the world and whenever there are such questions, we find ourselves helpless. Whenever friendly nations face such a situation, we must adopt a positive attitude, as I have already mentioned. You should also make enquiries to find out how and under what circumstances a helipad was constructed six kms. inside the Mac Mahon line, about which you say you have no information.

Besides, I would also like to know from the Hon. Minister what arrangements have been made to check frequent intrusions from China, Bangladesh and Pakistan because this is not a question relating to China only which may be ignored easily. Therefore, I humbly submit that it is a national problem and we must take it seriously. If there is a minor intrusion, even that should not be taken lightly, because of wider political implications which may assume alarming proportion later on. I do not want to say much, I only want clarification from the Hon. Minister regarding the two or three points raised by me and hope that such incidents will not take place in future, necessitating another discussion in the House.

[English]

DR. CHINTA MOHAN (Tirupati) : Sir, because of the sensitiveness of the subject, I do not want to go into the details of the

subject; but whatever it is, the statement given by our Minister is very inaccurate, and very weak also. I would like to say that in his fifth point, he says :

“We shall continue to strive for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. We shall also resolve, through peaceful negotiations, the question of Chinese instructions. We hope that peace and tranquility will prevail on the border, and that pending final solution, *status quo* will be maintained.”

Instead of that, I should have greatly appreciated if he had said, “*status quo ante* will be maintained.” I will urge upon the Minister that he should change the words in the statement, “*status quo*” into “*status quo ante*”. We have lost so much of land. No doubt about it. But we should fight to get the land. There is no point in maintaining this Gandhian principle and all that. When they are slapping on our right cheek, we are not supposed to show our left. This goes to prove that we are very weak. The statement goes to prove that it is a very weak statement. The Chinese, on the other hand, are becoming stiffer and stiffer. This attitude should not be maintained by our Government.

My second question is : why did our intelligence fail to get a report of the helipad installation in Arunachal Pradesh? The Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh had come to Delhi, and he has reported that. Till that time, we were not aware of the fact. Though we say that it is not a fact, it is a fact known to everybody, and to the entire nation and to those outside also. Why is our intelligence failing in this? When we are not able to know even this small intrusion happening inside our territory, how can we know things happening outside? I would like to know this from our Minister.

My next question is this : Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee visited China in February 1979. At that time, the Chinese declared war on Vietnam; and our members from the Congress benches made a big cry in Lok Sabha saying that Atal Bihari Vajpayee went

to China, i.e. without knowing anything about that war he went there, and then he cancelled all his programmes and came back to India. Our Congress members said this about Mr. Vajpayee's visit. Then how did the present Government send its Secretary, Mr. Venkateswaran to China now on a peace delegation? What is this attitude? I am not able to appreciate it. Why should we have sent him, when they are slapping us on the right cheek? Why did we send our people? This itself goes to prove that we are giving a legitimate right for the Chinese to claim our land.

On the one side, Pakistan is sending terrorists.. (*Interruptions*). We know the fact. Pakistan is sending terrorists to destabilize our country. On the other hand, the Chinese have intruded into our territory in Arunachal Pradesh. Is there any important link between these two? If the Government is sensitive to this issue, I would like to know something from the Minister. With these words, I conclude.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir: Hon. Members have, in the Calling Attention Motion, brought to the notice of the House the historical background of the differences between China and India and also they have adverted themselves about the policy that China has been pursuing, Chinese relations with Pakistan, its repercussions on us. These details are the matters which are not connected with the calling attention motion, though, of course, they make a very good preface for the purpose of making all these points. I have categorically said in the statement, the situation that obtains on the ground. I have also said that there is no helipad, notwithstanding the fact that some of the members have gone to the extent of saying that Arunachal Pradesh Chief Minister said so on and so forth. We have got it verified through responsible sources. It is not possible for me to spell out which source it would be, but very responsible source and I find that there is no helipad there.

I will not like to quibble on the small points that have been raised by the Hon.

Members. I would like to bring to the notice of the House a little background of what happened at the seventh round of talks so as to meet the points that have been raised by the Hon. Members. The Foreign secretary, who had gone—in fact, I had said even in the earlier statement that I had read out on 18th July 1986—that Foreign Secretary was specifically instructed by us that when he met the acting Prime Minister and also Foreign Minister, he must take up this issue in the Plenary Session, in the discussions; and also in the meetings with the various authorities, this issue has been raised. As I said, on the last occasion, it is true that in the Sumdorong Chu valley, where the intrusion has taken place in Tawang District is, according to us, 2-3 kms as the crow flies from the Mac Mahon Line. (*Interruptions*) I am speaking with some authority. When I am saying I say it on the basis of ascertainment of the facts, and if there is anything wrong, I am prepared to correct myself (*Interruptions*) That is why I thought to make the position absolutely clear, even on 18th July I tried to allay the fear of the Hon. Members by putting across that as the crow flies, it is only 2-3 kms. Now, the whole point is this: that there is a lot of confusion about the Mac Mahon Line itself... (*Interruptions*). The point is either you listen to me what I would like to say or you stand up and I will sit down. The point is that boundary, so far as Mac Mahon Line is concerned, Chinese do not accept it. They also do not accept, water-shed principles; and there is a slight confusion because Mac Mahon had drawn the line; with a thick line originally in 1914; that thick line would be a few kms. when you go into it on one inch to 8 miles, whatever it is. This is a matter which we are trying to sort out. Chinese do not accept the Mac Mahon Line *per se*; they only say, they only talk of the line of actual control.

Even then, the line of actual control has got some shades, the details I would not like to go at this stage. Therefore, one of the points that we have raised was, as to what is the alignment of the line of actual control. This is one of the points that we discussed with them. Unless you know as to what is the line of actual control about which they say, to a large measure—I am saying to the large measure because there

are differences at some places—it can be similar to the Mac Mahon Line. But there—you know—they have not been giving the line of actual control. That has been the difficulty. We have been trying to pin them down, we have been trying to say that “you please now mark it so that we know what exactly is the line of actual control you refer to”. These are matters which you cannot short out unless you negotiate. To say, “How long will you negotiate?” “Why do you negotiate?” are questions which can easily be asked, but very difficult to answer. In international diplomacy, where you are committed to resolving the problems through peaceful means, you have got to discuss, negotiate and I would like to say that the policy of solving the problems through negotiations is a policy which is based on the Indian ethos and values.

Some gentleman was trying to say about Gandhiji. I would like to say that, well, Gandhiji himself had said, and very rightly perhaps, non-violence is not the weapon of the coward, but it is the weapon of the brave.

The concept of negotiations flows, in my submission, from the concept of non-violence. It does not mean that in the process of a negotiated settlement, we are totally surrendering ourselves. That is not the concept. We would not like to give an impression that just like a pack of children we are taking a decision and rushing through. We have got to decide matters with a little more—with a little—responsibility and the more powerful you are, the more restrained you should be, the more tolerant you should be. We are still hopeful. We are not saying that the matter sat the other end. Therefore, we would not like to close the chapter. We are saying, they are putting forth their points and what has been discussed at that stage on the Seventh Round of Talks is the intensive discussion and exchange of view.

Of course, they had been trying to stick to their guns saying that Wandung falls in their territory. That is their argument. But then, that has to be resolved and we are saying that this south is of the Mac Mahon Line. They do not accept this as Mac Mohan Line—these two to three kilometres of the

intrusions about which I have talked. Now this is a matter which has to be resolved and in fact very rightly, some of the Hon. Members have said that the Chinese claim that 90,000 kms are in our possession. That is their case. That does not mean that we are yielding to it. ...(*Interruptions*)

DR. CHINTA MOHAN : You have yourself said in your statement, what is *status quo* ?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER : Please understand a little bit of a better English. You will follow it.

What we are trying to say was that in the process when we were talking about the intrusions in 1984 at the Fourth Round of Talks, both the parties agreed that the *status quo* should be maintained; and peace and tranquility should prevail pending the talks. This was ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI AZIZ QURESHI : Tell him in Telugu.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER . No, no. He understands good English. He is a doctor. He understands better English. So, this is what had been agreed upon in 1984 between the parties. Now when the intrusions have taken place, our case has been that this is a violation of a gentleman's agreement that had taken place 1984. That is why we asked for delineation of the actual line of control. We have been pressing for it. The issues that we had discussed, as I was trying to say, were the discussion and exchange of views on intrusions, alignment of the line of actual control. We also discussed the need to maintain peace and tranquility. As a principle, that was mutually agreed upon in 1984 in the Fourth round of talks. There is, of course, now a case from November 1985, a variation of their previous package, what is called in their expression 'the remodeling of the package. They have been trying to say that variation of the previous package has been the concession on the East for corresponding concessions in the West. That is the concept which they have started adumbrating right from November 1985. Previously it was in the reverse gear. Since no progress on alignment had taken place,

discussions moved to the western sector. We gave our alignment. But the point is that when we asked for certain clarifications from them, they said that they were not in a position to give those clarifications. They could not give. It is possible that we might get them. Therefore, the matters stood at that stage where the discussions had taken place. I would only make the submission to the House that the matter is very delicate. Government of India is vigilant in the matter. We are vigilant on the borders. That is why I said I am not in a position to give the sources through which we are getting the information. But nonetheless, we would like to maintain peace in that area for the purpose of sorting out issue of the border itself and we are hopeful. When we are speaking of the *status quo* the *status quo* is as we had agreed in 1984 that there would not be any disturbance. It is that *status quo* which I have referred to and it is that *status quo* which we would like to maintain that there should be peace and harmony for the purpose of discussions. It is in this background that I would like to advert myself in a very brief manner to some of the questions which have been asked. Three or four Hon. Members were of the view that in the present state of affairs where do we go. What is the purpose of the discussions? I would like to submit that hope eternal springs in human breath. You just cannot become hopeless and pessimistic. We would like to explore every possibility. We would not like to give an impression that we are breaking talks. We would like to continue the discussions and see how far the fruitful results could come out of this discussion.

Now, many a question have been asked about intrusion as to how much it has been. I have said that. I would also like to say that well, there is no case of a failure of intelligence reports. Various organisations are cohesively working and I would like to bring to the notice of the Hon. Members that when it came in the papers also that helipad has been constructed, immediately we got back the information and it is on that basis that I have made it known to the House that no helipad as of today has been put up. In fact, even yesterday it was said. It came in some papers that there had been an intrusion in the Manigong area. We have been very active. We tried to find out

whether it is true and if it is so, why is it that we did not get information on 27th, the date on which the news came in and actually we find that there is no intrusion in the Manigong area, though of course some news had come. I would also like to bring to the notice of the Hon. Members that this particular Manigong area is an area where, as the Hon. Members were trying to put it, from their side it is easy to reach and from our side it is very difficult—the terrain from our side is very difficult. These are the grazing areas where our people also go to graze; their people also come. It is true that some of the people from that side have been talking.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI :
Bangla Desh border.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER : It is not that as though it is a case of surrender of our rights or the rights of our graziers.

Then I said in paragraph 3 that the Chinese, while expressing their desire for an early settlement of the boundary question did not respond to our concerns in a satisfactory manner. I did express in my submission about unhappiness, unsatisfactory nature of the talks. What is on the ground, I have to bring it to the notice of the House. I cannot merely say—notwithstanding that everything is satisfactory. That is why I said something of the background of discussions that our officials had during the Seventh round of talks and it is possible it might take some time for the purpose of resolving this issue because it is a very long border, where there is a clear dispute, where the principles are also diverse. But one has got to go into details, in every inch of the matter, in order to resolve it. Where actually the border is? And it is in this background we have been pressing the Chinese that they must give what they consider to be the actual line of control so that the discussions could take place. It is true that the Chinese authority had been saying that Mac Mahon Line is an imperialistic legacy, as the Hon. Member was trying to put it. But then the point is whether it is an imperialistic legacy or whether it is democratic legacy or whatever legacy it might be, one has to come to grass facts of the matter. One that matter one has to come forth with the delineation of LAC,

