

5th June, 1980 containing Agreement between the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Government of the Republic of India on Cooperation in Shipping and providing for the avoidance of double taxation in respect of taxes on income derived from the freight earnings of Czechoslovak Vessels on the basis of reciprocity, issued under section 90 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 and section 24A of the Companies (Profits) Sur-Tax Act, 1964. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1185/80.]

(2) A copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:

- (i) G.S.R. 443(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 23rd July, 1980 together with an explanatory memorandum regarding exemption of parts of photographic cameras from basic customs duty in excess of 40 per cent *ad valorem*.
- (ii) G.S.R. 444(E) and 445(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 23rd July, 1980 together with an explanatory memorandum regarding exemption to tags or labels (whether made of paper, cloth or plastic) or printed polythene bags, when imported into India for fixing on articles for export or for packaging of such articles, from the whole of basic, auxiliary and additional duties of customs leviable thereon. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1186/80.]

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report the following message received from

the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha:

"In accordance with the provision of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1980, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 24th July, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha regard to the said Bill."

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

PRESS REPORTS ABOUT CHINA DISPUTING INDIA'S STAND ON McMOHAN LINE

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI (Pollachi): Sir, I want to make a submission or seek a clarification before you take up the Calling Attention. Though my name is not there, I want to make a submission on this Calling Attention. This has been admitted on the basis of a report in the press of a statement by Mr. Wang Bing-Na, Chairman of the Chinese Foreign Relations Committee, who has made some suggestions about the Mac Mohan Line. At the same time, the Vice-Premier of China has given out a different idea in another authoritative interview on the same border question. These two statements contradict each other. This is a matter that concerns the relationship between the two countries. Is it right for us to discuss this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Minister will clarify this.

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI: A similar question was raised in this vary

house on 12th September 1958 in regard to an agreement between India and Pakistan, when some hon. Members sought to raise the discussion on the proposed border adjustment between India and Pakistan, as the matter sought to be raised was subject to further negotiations between the two countries. That was disallowed. When a particular item that is, a matter reported in a particular paper, comes before the House, we do not know whether it is correct or not and the House should not discuss all these matters.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I know your view point and I hope the Minister will clarify.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the difficulty in the Government clarifying the whole thing?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (New Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you must have consulted the Minister for External Affairs before admitting this Call Attention motion. We would like to know if he has to say something on this. Before raising the question in the form of Call Attention, I am inclined to agree with the hon. Member that such delicate questions should not be raised in the House just on the basis of press reports. But I would like to hear the Minister for External Affairs....

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh): Once you have agreed, let the Minister say whether he has got any difficulty.

MR. SPEAKER: Let him clarify. He will clarify the whole position for what it is worth,

(Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Mr. Speaker, Sir, after 18 years or 20 years some initiative has been taken to normalise relations with the great neighbour with

1000 million population. And, Sir, at this moment there are a lot of people who are interested to throw a spanner into the wheel....

(Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Minister is intelligent enough not to let it happen. Now we take up the Call Attention. *(Interruptions)*. He will clarify everything. He is intelligent enough.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA (Bombay South): Sir, I have given a Call Attention.... *(Interruptions)*. I ask the Minister to clarify.

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I say. He will clarify. I am not clarifying anything.

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Pon-nani): Sir, you disallow the whole thing. Why do you ask the Minister to make a statement? We are responding to the people's diplomacy of China. They talk to us through press reports, Why not China talk to us through diplomatic channels?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He will clarify everything. Now, Mr. Kochack. *(Interruptions)*. I think he can treat them for what they are worth.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormugao): Sir, it is very improper that Parliament should get engaged itself on a statement made by foreign dignitaries, based on press reports. All the time....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, he will clarify and he will treat it for what it is worth.

(Interruptions)

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR (Gorakhpur): Sir, this is an important matter and this should be taken up in the House.

(Interruptions).

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: It is below the dignity of this House to respond to such press statements. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Speaker, Sir, you should disallow the whole thing.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot at this stage.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: Let the Minister make a statement. (*Interruptions*). Once it is on the agenda. (*Interruptions*). Let the Minister make a statement.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We have to take action against them for publishing press reports.

MR. SPEAKER: He will take appropriate action. He will do it

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur): We don't agree with you. Let the Minister reply. What is wrong with it? Let the Minister reply.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL KOCHAK (Anantnag): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"Press reports to the effect that Peking appears to be backsliding by disputing India's stand on McMahon Line as boundary between India and China and reaction of Government thereto."

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): According to press reports, the concerned Indian journalist has issued a clarification to the effect that his

interview with Mr. Wang Bingnan, President of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with other Countries, took place on 19 June 1980, two days before his interview with Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping at which Mr. Wang was also present.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the later and more authoritative interview with Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping has already been the subject of a calling attention notice in Lok Sabha on 2-7-80. According to the report of that interview carried by the official Chinese news agency, Zinhua, it was said "Ever since negotiations on boundary question began, China has never asked for the return of all the territory illegally incorporated into India by the old colonialists" This, by necessary implication, reiterates the well-known Chinese view about the legal status of the McMahon Line. Therefore, there is no essential difference in this regard between the two interviews. While dealing with this aspect, I had in my statement of 2-7-80, clearly stated that the Government of India has never accepted this premise.

Sir, I would like to submit to the House that my statement in response to the earlier calling attention notice thus covers both the interviews. Therefore, I have nothing more to add to that statement substantively, except to say that the Government, who keep abreast of all important research on the subject, are fully convinced that the alignment shown in our maps conforms to the true international border

Sir, the Government with the support of the Parliament is engaged in the task of seeking to improve our relations with China. While assuring the House once again that I would always be prepared to take the Parliament into confidence on any matter relating to this process, I would respectfully submit that a delicate question like the boundary question does not lend itself to examination, and

much less to solution through repeated recourse to the medium of newspaper interviews.

May I, in conclusion, note that even the interview of Mr. Wang Bingnan read as a whole does indicate Chinese desire to have friendly relations with India and this sentiment we fully reciprocate.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR (Ratnagiri): I am aware that the subject matter of the calling attention is a very delicate one, but the reason why it was given is that because of the publication of this news, a lot of misunderstanding has been created in the minds of the citizens of the country, and I am happy that this particular statement of the hon. Minister has cleared some of them. The statement mentions that the interview of Mr. Wang was on 19th while that of the Vice Premier was on the 21st and that was the latter. But while giving reports in the press, we were made to believe that this interview of Mr. Wang was subsequent to that of Mr. Ping and, therefore, there is a lot of misunderstanding. I very well appreciate your effort in getting this matter solved. But it seems from this that there is an agency working in our country who wants to put impediments in normalising our relations. I would request you to find out as to how, while making this particular report, these dates of 19th and 21st did not come to be mentioned in this particular news items.

The second and a very important point to which I would like to make a reference is, in all this matter, our hon. Minister for External Affairs has been involved. The report mentions that this McMahon Line was a fraud, fiction and imagination of Mr. McMahon and there was a document, which was found out by an Indian, to whom some political respectability was given by a member of Parliament of our country. This creates more misunderstanding in the minds of the citizens. The Report further

mentions that this Member of Parliament of our country met the hon. Minister and he showed the document and that some reply was given to him. We would like to know whether this is true. If it is not, we will have to take some action against this particular report. There was also a reference in this particular report that this McMahon Line cannot be the McMahon Line because China was not a signatory to the Simla Agreement of 1914, but only Tibet signed it. It is a fact. But it will have to be clarified that after Tibet was incorporated into China, China is presumed to have accepted that particular line. I would respectfully request the hon. Minister to make a statement with a reference to the admission of Chou-en-lai in 1956, wherein he has said that he accepts the McMahon Line. It is on this background that I would like to put two questions: the first is, whether the Government of India will bring to the notice of the Government of China, they need not to speak about border settlement through press interviews any more as our relations have been normalised enough to talk directly and the second, whether this particular MP has raised this issue before the Minister and if so, the name of the MP and whether any reply was given to the MP and whether any investigation would be made as to how these dates, 19th and 21st, were not mentioned and whether there is any lobby working behind this.

That would solve all the misunderstanding in the minds of the people.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: In regard to the actual publication of the interviews, it is very difficult for me to say, why the latter interview was published first and the earlier interview followed. It is very difficult because it is a matter for the newspapers to publish, it is a matter for the agencies to give. So it would be well-nigh impossible for me to comment on that. But, if, as the hon. member seems to suggest, this has something to do with some kind of

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

design behind it, well, all I can say is, I shall try to find out the design.

The next one is a matter which pertains to the merits of the case, about the McMahon line. I have already stated quite categorically that we are fully convinced that the alignment shown in our maps conforms to the true International border. This takes care of all the material that was gone into and all the material that has appeared since. So, I would not, at this stage, like to go into a full discussion of the merits of the case. I would respectfully submit that no further probing be allowed on that at this stage.

So far as my involvement is concerned in the first place, the interview does not name any Member of Parliament. First, it said that I had said it in Parliament. When there was another question, then it was said, "I did not say it publicly in Parliament, but I said it in my letter to a Member of Parliament. Since the Member of Parliament has not been named, it would not be proper for me..."

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I wrote a letter. I did not get a reply.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: The name of Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu has been reported.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It would not be proper on my part to make a roving survey of all the Members of Parliament to whom I have been writing letters and who have been writing letters to me. Because Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu has just stood up and said that he wrote a letter, I am prepared to say that he did write a letter and he is still complaining that I have not sent a detailed reply to him.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is true.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Bheekhabhai.

SHRI BHEEKABHAI (Banswara): No question.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri P. M. Sayeed.

SHRI P. M. SAYEED (Lakshadweep): No question.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri B. V. Desai.

SHRI B. V. DESAI (Raichur): No question.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have received numerous telephone calls and enquiries about it. I am trying to normalise relations between the two countries. I have been beseeching the Minister to apply his mind.

MR. SPEAKER: He will do his job.

12.21 hrs.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

INDIAN NURSING COUNCIL

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND HEALTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): Sir, I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of clause (o) of sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Indian Nursing Council Act, 1947, the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two members from among themselves to serve as members of the Indian Nursing Council."

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): Sir, before you put the motion to the House, I would like to make a few observations.

We have been told that there is a great scarcity in the number of nurses that we should have in our country and that not as many people as are