श्री मनी राम बागड़ी (हिसार) : अध्यक्ष जी, आप ने एक बात कही है कि घर मंत्री जी जब तहकीकात करने गये हैं तो उन को रपट सदन में देनी है लेकिन. . . .

(व्यवधान)**

MR. SPEAKER: Not allowed: nothing has been said, he will make a full statement here.... This is not the way. You have agreed to co-operate; but you are not helping for the smooth proceeding of hte House. Why can't you cooperate with each other? I am ready to accommodate every point of view, but still you go on persisting. This is not the way.

Now, Calling Attention.

12.05 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED CHINESE OFFER TO SETTLE THE BORDER PROBLEM ON THE BASIS OF PRESENT LINE OF ACTUAL CONTROL

श्री राम विलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) : मैं अविलम्बनीय लोक महत्व के निम्नलिखित विषय की ओर विदेश मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूं और प्रार्थना करता हूं कि वह इस बारे में एक वक्तव्य दें :

> "वास्तविक नियंत्रण की वर्तमान रेखा के आधार पर सीमा की समस्या को हल करने की चीन की कथित पेशकश तथा उस के सम्बन्ध में सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Vice Premier Deng-Xiaoping of the People's Republic of China met an Indian journalist on June 21, 1980. According to the official Chinese News Agency Xinhua, on the settlement of the border prolem. The following is an extract of his statement:

"So long as both sides are sincere, respect the present state of the border, and are tolerant towards each other, the Sino-Indian boundry question can be solved through peaceful negotiations. As a matter of fact ever since negotiations on boundry question began, China has never asked for the return of all the territory illegally incorporated into India by the old colonialists Instead, China suggested that both countries should make concessions, China in the East Sector and India in the West Sector, on the basis of the actually controlled border line so as to solve the Sino-Indian boundary question in a package plan, thus fully demonstrating the spirit of mutual understanding and concessions".

Similar suggestions have been made to us earlier occasions by the Chinese Government. This time it is somewhat more precise. The Government of India has never accepted the premise on which it is based, namely, that the Chinese side are making a concession in the Eastern sector by the giving up of territory which they allege is illegally incorporated into India. Nevertheless we welcome the prospect of the Eastern Sector being settled without any particular difficulty.

As the House is aware, the India-China boundry question is long-standing and complex. After a considerable lapse of time, our two Governments have only just begun to come to grips with it once more. This itself is a positive step. It may be that ways other than the package solution suggested by the Chinese Government could prove more effective. In any event, I am sure the House will agree that we should proceed forward meaningfully, while also keeping our best interests in mind.

It is our hope that we can settle the border question in the spirit of Five Principles of peacefull co-existence consistent with the national

**Not recorded.

honour and interest on both sides and on a basis of equality.

In the course of the same interview Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping had also indicated a strong desire for the improvement and extension of relations between India and China as this would undoubtedly exercise positive influence in world affairs and Asian affairs in particular. We fully reciprocate these sentiments.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : भारत और चीन के बीच जो यह जो बोर्डर डिस्प्यूट है यह बहुत ही गम्भीर मामला है और इसके साथ किसी एक पार्टी या दल की सरकार का नही बल्कि पूरे देश का सम्बन्ध है । इसका फल पूरे देश को भुगतना पड़ता है ।

जहां तक चीन का सम्बन्ध है चीन से पहली झडप 1954 में हुई थी । उस के पहले हमारे चीन के साथ बहुत ही पुराने सम्बन्ध थे और मधुर सम्बन्ध थे । 1947 में भारत आजाद हुआ था । 1948 मे जब चीन मे साम्यवादी सरकार बनी और उसको मान्यता देने का प्रश्न आया तो मै समझता हूं कि गैर-कम्युनिस्ट राष्ट्रो मे सब से पहले भारत ही एक ऐसा राष्ट्र था जिस न उस को मान्यता प्रदान की । संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में भी जब उस की मदस्यता का प्रश्न उठा, तो सबसे ज्यादा भारत ने उसकी वकालत की, कोरिया का युद्ध हुआ तो उस में भी भारत ने उस का साथ दिया । यह सारा रिश्ता उस के साथ शुरु से हमारा रहा है लेकिन जब 1959 मे तिब्बत पर हमला किया गया और जब वहा से दलाई लामा हिन्दुस्तान आये और उसके बाद भारी सख्या मे तिब्बती शरणार्थी हिन्दुस्तान में पहुचन लगे तो वहा से विवाद शुरू हो गया और 1959 के पहले जब कभी भी बैठक हुई, तो जहा तक मुझे मालूम है, उस के अनुसार मै कह सकता हू कि कभी भी चीन ने भारत के साथ सीमा का प्रश्न नही उठाया था । जब तिब्बत का मामला आया, मै अभी भी इस बात को मानता हू और बडे अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि आज भी हम लोगो को इस बात को कबूल करना चाहिये कि हमारी यह सब से पहली गलती हुई थी जो कि तिब्बत के मामले पर हुई थी कि तिब्बत को हमने छोडा था ।

अब जो सीमा विवाद है, जो कट्रोल लाइन है, यह कहा जाता है कि मैकमोहन लाइन है । यह मैकमोहन लाइन क्या है ? सन् 1914 ईस्वी में तिब्बत के प्रधान मत्री, चीन सरकार के प्रतिनिधि और भारत की ब्रिटिश सरकार के समय मे सर हैनरी मैकमोहन ने, इन तीनों ने हस्ताक्षर किये और उस हस्ताक्षर के द्वारा तिब्बत को 2 भागों में बांटा गया, एक आन्तरिक तिब्बत और दूसरा वाह्य तिब्बत । उस वाह्य तिब्बत और भारत के बीच करार के अनुसार नक्शे में लाल रेखा खीची गई और जो कैलाईक, मानसरोवर और ब्रह्मपुत्र हैं, इसको मान लिया गया कि यह हमारी मैकमोहन लाइन है । आज हमको अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज जो मानसरोवर और कैलाश है, जो भारत का प्रतीक माना जाता था, आज वह महादेव जी का स्थान है । हमने वही गलती की थी ।

उसके बाद आज यह आपकी मंशा है । मुझे बहुत खुशी होगी अगर भारत और चीन का सम्बन्ध फिर से सुधर जाये और फिर दोनों राष्ट्र, हम जो नारा लगाते थे "भारत-चीन भाई भाई" उससे बन्ध जायें, लेकिन उसके बाद भी हमको देखना होगा ।

हमारे बाजपेयी जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं, ये भी चीन गये थे । जब यह चीन गये हुए थे उसी समय चीन के द्वारा वियतनाम पर हमला किया गया , नतीजा यह हुआ कि इन को अपनी यात्रा बीच में ही बिना पूरी किये, वापिस आना पड़ा । मै यह कहूंगा कि यह जो सारे पेशकश हो रहे हैं, यह हमारा विदेश का मामला है, 1962 के पहले भी आप देखें तो चीन के साथ भारत का जो वार्तालाप हो रहा था, उस में कही यह मालूम नही पड रहा था कि इसमे कही कटुता है । मै एक बात और कहना चाहूगा कि जो हमारी विदेश नीति है, इसको अगर देखे तो जो बडे-बडे राष्ट्र हैं, उन का किसी नीति या सिद्धान्त से कोई मतलब नही है । उनका एक ही मतलब है कि उनके हथियार कैसे बिके ? जब कभी आप का पाकिस्तान के साथ झगडा होगा तो एक राष्ट्र आप का साथ दे देगा, अगर हिन्दुस्तान और चाइना का युद्ध होगा तो दूसरा जो बड़ा राष्ट्र है, वह साथ देगा । इसलिये जो बडे-बडे राष्ट्र हैं, इनके दिमाग में एक ही बात है कि युद्ध चले, तो युद्ध के समय किस प्रकार उन के हथियार बिके और उनको मुनाफा मिले ।

मंत्री महोदय को कहना चाहूंगा कि जो नक्शे के ऊपर भाग में दिखाया हुआ है, एक तरफ आप के उत्तर मे जहा अक्साई चीन है, जो अभी तक चाइना के कंट्रोल मे है, जो कराकोरम है, जिससे हो कर उसकी सड़क है, स्काईलैड होकर सडक है, वह सीधी अभी इस पोजीशन में है कि वह सीधे अफगानिस्तान से हो कर हिन्दुस्तान के बगल से होते हुए पाकिस्तान वगैरा वह कही भी जा सकता है ।

1962 के बाद इस संसद् में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया गया था, और सब सदस्यों ने --सरकारी पक्ष और विपक्ष ने—खडे हो कर यह प्रतिज्ञा ली थी कि जब तक हम हिन्दुस्तान की भूमि पर से--उसकी एक एक इंच जमीन पर से--विदेशियों को नही हटा देंगे, चीन को नही हटा देंगे, तब तक हम चैन की सास नहीं लेंगे । यह जो आफर आया है, यह एक तरफ से वार्ता का दरवाजा है, मैं यह मानता हूं, लेकिन बुनियादी बातो को तय किये बिना यह बचवार्ता सफल नहीं हो सकेगी। परसों हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में श्री एम० पी० गुप्ता का एक लेख निकला था, जिस में उन्होंने कहा था कि जब तक कोराकोरम के इलाके और मैकमोहन लाइन के बगल में कैलाश, मानसरोवर और ब्रह्मपुत्र के क्षेत्र को डीमिलिटराइज नही किया जाता है, जब तक उस

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

सड़क पर से पाकिस्तान और दूसरे देशों को जाने वाली फौज को रोका नहीं जा सकता है, तब तक इन समझौतों का कोई रिजल्ट निकलने वाला नहीं है।

मैं आप के माध्यम से मंत्री महोदय से बड़े अदब के साथ आग्रह करूंगा कि यह कोई साधारण सी बात नहीं है। आज हमारे आस पास के देशों में जो स्थिति है, अफगानिस्तान में रूस की उपस्थिति का प्रश्न है, दूसरे देशों में भी कई घटनायें हो रही हैं—विदेश मंत्री को इन बातों की जानकारी है—,इन परिस्थितियों में क्या फिर से हमारे साथ मिल कर कोई नई योजना चलाने की बात तो नहीं सोची जा रही है कि हिन्दुस्तान अब पुराना हिन्दुस्तान नहीं रहा है। हमें खुशी है कि 1962 के बाद हमारे उत्तरी क्षेत्र और दूसरे सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों में चप्पे चप्पे पर हमारे सैनिक तैयार हैं और पूरी तरह से लैस हैं। आज सरकार इस सदन को यह आश्वासन दे कि यदि कोई बड़ी से बड़ी शक्ति भी हम पर आक्रमण करेगी, तो हिन्दुस्तान उस का मुकाबला करेगा और विजय हासिल करेगा।

इस स्थिति में यह जो पेशकश हुई है, मैं मंत्री महोदय से आग्रह करूंगा कि वह इसको बहुत गम्भीरता से लें। जहां तक बातचीत और भाषणों का सम्बन्ध है, वह सब होता रहे, लेकिन जब तक सरकार ऐसी रण-नीति नहीं बनायेगी, जिस से बुनियादी समस्या हल हो सके, तब तक चीन के साथ चाहे कितने भी मित्रतापूर्ण सम्बन्ध हो हमारी कठिनाइयां दूर नहीं हो सकेंगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, : अगर आप कोई सवाल पूछना चाहते हैं, तो पूछ लें।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैं मंत्री महोदय को दो तीन सुझाव देना चाहता हूं। मंत्री महोदय जो भी निर्णय लें, उससे पहले देश का जनमत जरूर जानना चाहिए। संसद् सर्वोपरि है, इसलिए उस को विश्वास में लेकर चलें। 1962 के युद्ध के बाद इस संसद में जो प्रतिज्ञा ली गई थी, उसको हमेशा मद्देनजर रखें। डीमिलिटराइजेशन का जो सुझाव आया है, उस पर भी वह विचार करें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य ने कोई प्रश्न नहीं पूछा है। श्री कोचक।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने पूछा है कि क्या मंत्री महोदय इन बातों पर विचार करेंगे। आप मेरे इतनी देर के भाषण को ऐसे ही खत्म कर रहे हैं।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : माननीय सदस्य ने जो सुझाव दिये हैं, उनके लिए मैं उन का आभारी हूं। हम यह कभी सोच ही नहीं सकते कि जो इतना पेचीदा मसला है, उसके बारे में जनमत जाने बिना, या संसद् के मत को जाने बिना, या यहां पूरी तफसील से उस पर चर्चा किये बिना कुछ हो सकता है। ऐसा कभी नहीं हो सकता है।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मेरे दो डेफिनिट सवाल थे, आप ने उन को सुझाव में बदल दिया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : राम विलास जी, वह सारे आ गए उसी में।

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL KOCHAK (Anantnag): Sir, the way statement has been put before this House, I may be excused if I say that it is dangerously worded and it is diplomatically dangerous, because this question is one of great national importance and the House should have been taken into confidence fully and completely by letting the House know as to what is the package deal going on with China and the offer that has been made. From what I read out of the statement, almost the package deal has been accepted by the Government of India without letting this House know what was the basis for accepting the package deal. I shall read only one sentence from the statement made before this House:

> "We welcome the prospect of the Eastern Sector being settled without any particular difficulty."

In other words, the Government has accepted the McMahon line to be the line of settlement. The Govern-

ment appears to have accepted the offer. I would, with all respect to the Foreign Minister, point out that from what he has stated before this House, we have started travelling on a hazardous journey to have a settlement with China once again and the journey is full of risk and pitfalls. If we are not cautious in driving, we may fall down once again the same way as we have done in the past. It means that a lot of understanding, caution and a lot of knowledge is required, so that we do not fall a prey in their hands once again.

The basic question now is not one of border dispute. That has lost its sigificance by the process of years. Now a new map has come, that is the map of India. I would like the hon. members to know that it is not the borders that count now, but it is the deep infiltration into the territory of India through roads, which are becoming dangerous to the safety and intergrity of India. Aksaichin was occupied by China in 1962, which was a part of the territory of Jammu and Kashmir State. From Aksaichin have emerged two factors. One is that Aksaichin links with Sinkiang, one of the Tibetan territories occupied by China. Another is that by Aksaichin, road has been constructed by China which is known as the Karakoram Road, Thousands and thousands of miles of road have been constructed whereby they have been able to touch not the borders, but rather the base of Kashmir. So, I have two swords hanging on my head now. From Aksaichin side, there is the easiest access to Ladakh and from Ladakh to Kashmir. Another direct link is from Aksaichin to Muzzafarabad, Pakistan occupied territory of Kashmir, which has been linked by Karakoram Road. So, we have made the passage very clear for the invaders to come any time without touching the border. That is the situation on the Western side also. That made the invasion possible in the past also.

According to the Constitution of the Jammu & Kashmir State, no territory can be ceded to any power without consulting the Government and the State of Jammu & Kashmir. Has the hon. Minister taken into confidence my Government on this question because here the question of territorial sovereignty is involved? Has the Government thought that the invasion can never stop if steps are not taken to de-militarise the Karakoram Road and Sinkiang Road? There is no border danger in the light of the changed circumstances except that a new threat is posed to India to have an invasion through roads newly built by China on either side of the frontiers.

I would refer to my friend's last answer where he said: "I am going to deal with this problem in a businessman like manner.". The real business is this. If those issues that created abnormal relations with China, are solved, that would bring normalisation of relations.

MR SPEAKER: You please put the question.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL KOCHAK: As my learned friend said, a categorical declaration had come from this House in 1962 that they should vacate our territory. There is no issue except vacating the territory and accept the sovereign and territorial character of the areas which belong to India but have been illegally occupied by China. That alone would bring normalisation of relations, as we would be free from constant threat of invasions.

We have not to depend on the emotional slogans as have been given in the Statement like panch sheel. Our great leader, Panditji, trusted China but they had belied that trust. Now, we have to take a realistic approach.

May I ask categorically whether this offer which has come in the form of a statement by the Vice-Premier of China is acceptable to the Government of India? If this is the basis, would this not have repercussions on the border problem between India and Pakistan? Is it not a fact that a similar offer was made during Panditji's time but was rejected by the House when it demanded unconditional immediate withdrawal of forces from all those territories which were forcibly occupied by China?

May I know what steps Government propose to take to restore this territorial sovereignty of Kashmir?

The recently built Karakoram Road and the Aksaichin Road are a danger to the safety and security of Kashmir. So, may I know whether, before agreeing to a settlement on the border dispute, stopping of military movement through them would be made a condition precedent?

MR. SPEAKER: You do not want an answer. You only want to speak. That is all. I am going to disallow this. Shri Bheekabhai.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has to reply.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow it.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL KOCHAK: I want a reply.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR (Gwalior): After all, it is the property of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I have not allowed it. I have disallowed this question. (*Interruptions*). You are trying to defend him. You cannot take the House for a ride. The House has to do some business.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): What is the reply?

MR. SPEAKER: How do you expect a reply to a non-existent question? Mr. Rao, can you reply to this question?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): There are two or three questions. He may reply.

MR. SPEAKER: They must realise their responsibilities. They are wasting the time of the House. I cannot allow that.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: On the matter mentioned in the calling attention, there has been no specific question raised by the hon. Member. We are going to have a full debate on the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. That will be the proper occasion for hon. Members to give us the benefit of their views, and that will be the proper occasion for me to respond on behalf of the Government. All I can say is that the statement made by me is by no stretch of the imagination dangerously worded, it is delicately worded I would say, because we had to touch upon certain aspects of this package deal. We are still at the beginning, we have not made any commitment. Actually, stated positions have been restated in this. So, there is no occasion now to make any categorical statement. As I have just submitted, naturally the Parliament of India will have its say, there will be a long national debate on this question. All this is to be expected. So, there is nothing for me to add to what I have said in the statement.

श्री भीखा भाई (बांसवाडा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कहना है, मुझे केवल इतना ही कहना है कि जो भी समझौता हो, वह सम्मान के साथ होना चाहिये और राष्ट्रीय परिप्रेक्ष्य से होना चाहिए ।

विदेश मंत्री जी ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है और जो कदम चीन की तरफ से सामान्य संबंध बनाने के लिए लिया जा रहा है, उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूं । लेकिन मैं यह जरूर निवेदन करूंगा और वह यह है कि हमारे यहां अतीत में जो कुछ चीन ने किया, उसको तो हमें भूलना पड़ेगा, अगर समझौता करते हैं । इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह निवेदन जरूर करना चाहता हूं कि जब तक

सतर्कता (कांशन) नहीं बरती जाएगी, तब तक काम नहीं चलेगा। इस मामले में केवल भावनात्मक चीजों को लेकर हम नहीं चल सकते, हमें यथार्थवादी बनना पड़ेगा। अगर हमें यथार्थवादी बनना है तो दूसरे छोटे-मोटे झगड़ों के बजाय हमें यह भी देखना होगा कि हमारे नार्थ-ईस्ट रिजन के अन्दर क्या हो रहा है। वहां भी विदेशी लोगों का हाथ है, चाइना के लोगों का हाथ है, चाइना ने वहां हथियार दिये हैं, उन को प्रशिक्षण दिया है, इसलिये हम को बातचीत की शुरुआत वहीं से करनी होगी और जो बाउण्ड्री डिस्प्यूट का मामला है, उस का फैसला बाद में करना होगा।

एक बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूं—हम को यह बात नहीं भूलनी चाहिये कि सीमा-विवाद से इस देश को बहुत बड़ी क्षति उठानी पड़ी है। हम इस बात को कभी नहीं भूल सकते हैं कि हम ने अपने पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू और श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री को इसी लिये खोया कि उन के दिमाग पर मेन्टल टेन्शन था और वह सीमा विवाद के कारण था, चाहे वह चीन का आक्रमण हो या ताशकन्द का समझौता हो। इस सीमा विवाद ने पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू के स्वास्थ्य को इतना गिरा दिया था कि उन को लड़खड़ाते हुए नहीं देखा जा सकता था। इस समय हमारी जो प्रधान मंत्री है, वे लोकप्रिय प्रधान मंत्री हैं, उन के दिमाग पर ऐसा टेन्शन न पैदा हो, इस बारे में हम को बराबर ध्यान रखना चाहिये। जो भी समझौता हो वह देश के सम्मान के अनुकूल हो, उसके द्वारा भारत की धरती और आसमान की सुरक्षा होनी चाहिए—केवल इतना ही मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आपने ठीक कहा है।

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East): First I would like to say I am quite satisfied with the manner in which the Minister of External Affairs is handling the relations with China. I am quite confident that no national interest would be sacrificed in whatever steps he will take.

The key question is whether there is a willingness on the part of both the countries to have a negotiated settlement. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, from what he has, whether he thinks Chinese have expressed a desire for a negotiated settlement. I have seen what he has stated. But I would like him to specifically answer this question.

Now, my own knowledge is—I have been to China twice, first in September, 1978, when the Deputy Premier Deng Xiaoping did tell me many things and I also came away convinced that China is willing for a negotiated settlement. I want to know whether the Government of India's understanding is the same.

Again, about the proposals or what Mr. Deng Xiaoping has told an Indian journalist, I would like to know from him whether he has looked at the proposal originally made in 1963 by Premier Chou En-Lai, the 6-point proposal whether he has compared the two, whether he sees any materials difference between the two, whether he thinks that Mr. Deng Xiaoping's propoposals are a step forward or a more concrete version of the same or a more specific version of the same. If they so, if the hon. Minister feels that there is a possibility of a negotiated settlement and the Chinese have after a long time expressed a desire for a negotiated settlement and they have made a proposal, then I would like to know from him whether the Government—obviously, the proposal made by the Chinese cannot be accepted· he is quite right; it is a preliminary thing—itself is clarified in its mind about the situation and willing to make a counter proposal for a negotiated settlement. Is he prepared for a negotiated settlement and, if he is prepared for a negotiated settlement, is he willing to make a counter proposal?

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that counter-proposal?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Of course, I do not know whether he is in a position to say what that counter-proposal is at the moment. But I would like to know whether he is mentally prepared for that.

Then, I would also like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has fixed a time for the Foreign Minister of China who has been invited once again by the External Affairs Minister—an invitation has been handed over to Mr. Huang Hua to visit India—whether he has fixed any kind of rough schedule,

not exact dates, a rough idea, when he expects him to come and whether any agenda is going to be drawn up for such a meeting. I am particularly interested because there are two parts of our relations with China. One is the border issue and the other is the general political understanding on international affairs..

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Global issues.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Don't worry. Soviet Union is also included in that understanding. I know, he is worried about the loss of leverage of the Soviet Union; that the Soviet Union will suffer if India and China have a negotiated settlement.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Please reply to this.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I did not ask the Minister. I told him that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Why is he telling me?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I do not want an answer on that. I would like to know from the hon. Minister how he places these two, a political understanding which the two countries have and the border question. What priority does he assign, which comes first or do they go together or one comes after the other. Therefore, in that context, I would like to know whether he would satisfy himself about perhaps a broader package or perhaps he could ask the Chinese about north-east frontier. I fully share their anxiety. The Chinese themselves have unilaterally stated that in the past they did. But that is the thing of the past. They are not going to do it again. So I would like to know whether this is something which he would consider. The economic aspects of it, of course, are not his domain, but he should tell the House something about that too.

Sir, I have only asked question; I have made no speech.

MR. SPEAKER: And you also care for your neighbour!

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, there is a saying in English 'Speak, that I may see thee'. The only way of judging the intention of a person or a State is to start with their statements. From that point of view, we think that the Chinese Government wants the process of normalisation to be taken up again, and we are responding to that. On our part also, as part of our general policy of normalising relations and strengthening relations with neighbours, we are proceeding on those lines. So, on that I could say nothing beyond what our judgment is on the basis of statements coming from the other side.

So far as the visit of the Chinese Foreign Minister is concerned, the visit has been slated for some time later this year because it would depend on the special and general sessions of the United Nations. Only after those sessions are out of the way we could think of this visit. I have sent an invitation; the invitation has been accepted. But the exact date, the agenda, etc. remain to be finalised.

What is your other question in your questionnaire?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Have you compared Chou-En-Lai's proposals?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would say that similar suggestions have been made to us on earlier occasions also. (*Interruptions*).

The statement contains an answer to that particular query. Similar suggestions have been made to us on earlier occasions by the Chinese Government. This time it is somewhat more precise.