

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The Government refuse to be persuaded.

Mr. Speaker: I would certainly advise the persons in charge not to carry on this kind of movement. There are other methods open. I cannot give my consent to this motion.

12.24 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF THE INDIAN AND CHINESE PRIME MINISTERS

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I beg to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the joint communique issued last night as a result of the conversations that I have been having with Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China. [*Placed in Library, See No. LT-2123/60*].

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): In view of the joint communique which has already appeared in the press, may we know from the Prime Minister what immediate steps he proposes to take now to get the territory which is already occupied by the Chinese vacated?

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I would like to know the trend of the discussions that the two Prime Ministers had, because the whole country is anxious to know about it, and the newspapers are not capable of giving the information. The Chinese Prime Minister has already held a press conference.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): I want to say the House should be given an opportunity to discuss the whole situation.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): The joint communique has already appeared in the press. Therefore, there is practically nothing very significant in laying that document on the Table of the House. What we would like to

know, and what we expect from the Prime Minister, is clarification about the six points which have been mentioned by the Chinese Premier. In fact, we find there enunciation of the principle of a plebiscite in the border areas.

Mr. Speaker: We are not having a discussion. What does he want? If there is a statement, let him read it properly.

Shri Mahanty: We want that there should be a full-fledged discussion of this.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Before Parliament adjourns.

Shri Mahanty: Many crucial issues have been raised.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Last night, soon after the issue of the joint communique, Premier Chou En-lai held a press conference. It was a very prolonged press conference which, I believe, lasted for about two hours and a half. There is some reference to it in this morning's papers, but they have been unable to give a full report, which possibly may appear tomorrow. I myself have not seen the full report of that, but such things as I have seen indicate that he had naturally stated and given expression to his point of view, which, very often, is not our point of view, of the Government of India. It is possible some misapprehension might arise occasionally.

The hon. Member refers to the six points.

Shri Mahanty: But what are our reactions to these six points?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We do not agree to them. The points were—I am reading from the script which he gave to the press:

"1. There exist disputes on the boundary between the two sides."

Of course, there exist disputes. That is the first point.

"2. There exists between the two countries a line of actual control up to which each side exercises administrative jurisdiction."

Shri Mahanty: This is very important.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): Because that is what the Defence Minister said.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It may be very important, it is very obvious too. It is obvious, I do not know where the importance of it is.

Shri Mahanty: I may be pardoned for interrupting, but does the Prime Minister draw a line of distinction between the area under administrative control and the geographical area? That we would like to know. We have our sovereignty.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of administrative control or any control. What it says is, not very happily, not correctly, but broadly, that there is a line of actual control broadly meaning military control.

Shri Hem Barua: That would mean that Long Ju and part of Ladakh would be in their hands, and the *status quo* should be maintained.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Long Ju is in their hands, that is under military control. It is military control, it means military control.

"3. While determining the boundary between the two countries, certain geographical principles such as watershed, river valley and mountain passes could be applicable equally to all sectors of the boundary."

It is a principle laid down that watersheds are applicable, and we naturally agree that watersheds are very important factors; it is the most important factor in mountainous regions, river valleys etc. It does not carry us anywhere.

"4. A settlement of the boundary question between the two countries should take into account the national feelings of the two peoples for the Himalayas and the Karakorum mountains."

I take it as a response to the fact that the Himalayas are an intimate part of India and Indian culture and all that.

Shri Vajpayee: What about Karakorum?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the Chinese feel strongly about the Karakorum, they are welcome to do so, I have no objection to it.

Shri Hem Barua: Do they mean a plebiscite there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no reference to a plebiscite anywhere. I do not know where the hon. Member got hold of the plebiscite. We cannot have a plebiscite of the mountain peaks in the Himalayas.

Shri Hem Barua: Of the mountain people, I mean.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Then,

"5. Pending settlement of the boundary question through discussions, both sides should keep to the line of actual control and should not put forward territorial claims as preconditions, but individual adjustments may be made."

Whatever the explanation of that may be, it is rather an odd way of putting it. Presumably it means that they will not discuss anything unless the territorial claim is accepted. It may be that; it is not quite clear.

"6. In order to ensure tranquility on the border so as to facilitate the discussions, both sides should continue to refrain from patrolling along all sectors of the boundary."

An Hon. Member: Which boundary?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This is what he has said. This is not something that I agreed to. In fact, he said before stating this, that:

“On the boundary question, it is not impossible for the two sides to find common points or points of proximity, which in my view may be summarised as follows:”

and then he has summarised them. He has given his view; it has not been clear, but there it is. Anyhow, I am not agreeable to this particular approach, but I should like to make one or two things clear.

I believe he was asked something like ‘Were you asked to vacate?’. In what form, I do not remember. He said, ‘No’ or something to that effect. I think his answer was

Shri Vajpayee: He is reported to have said that the issue of Chinese aggression was not raised by India.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He said that he was not asked to vacate or something like that.

The Prime Minister of the Chinese People’s Republic presumably came here because something important had happened, the important thing being that according to us, they had entered our territory, over a large area of our territory, which we considered aggression. That was the whole basis of his coming here. And if hon. Members may remember, in one or two public statements I made at the airport and at the banquet, I had repeatedly referred to something having been done which should be undone.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Which we all appreciated.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The whole argument was based, our argument was based, on the Chinese forces having come into our territory. Their argument was based on the fact that they have always been there, that is

to say, not those particular forces, but that the Chinese authorities either of Sinkiang in the north or of Tibet have been in constructive or actual possession of those areas, not now, but for two hundred years. That was such a variance, such a tremendous variance in the factual state that there was no meeting-ground, when, according to us, and we repeat that now too after all these talks, that their forces came into this area within quite recent times; naturally, they did not enter a broad area on one date, but in the main, they had come to this area in the course of the last year and a half or so. That is our position. Some may be even less than a year, some may be a little more than a year, and some may be a little more than that. I am talking about the western sector. That is our case, to which we hold.

Their reply to that was that they have been in constructive and actual possession or actual possession of this for two hundred years. Now, there is some difference, factual difference between the two statements, a very considerable difference, and there it is. And naturally, in the course of our long talks, we considered various things they had to say and I had to say. We listened to each other. May I remind the House that in talking with interpreters having to interpret Chinese into the English language, it is a very laborious process? Broadly, it takes three times the amount of time that a normal talk takes, that is to say, an hour’s talk will become a three hour talk with interpretation into Chinese, not double but three times. And so, very prolonged talks took place. And this basic disagreement about historical and actual facts came up again and again.

Now, we are quite clear in our minds about our facts, and we are prepared to, and we did state them, and we are prepared to establish them with such material as we have got. The Chinese position was, as I said, basically different facts; historically,

actually, practically, they are quite different.

Also, the attempt was made, it was frequently stated, to equate the eastern sector with the western sector. That is, according to the Chinese, although in the eastern sector, we had no right to be there, we had nevertheless advanced gradually in the course of the last few years, last six or seven or eight or ten years, to the present boundary line which we call the MacMahon Line. They equated it to the western sector, although the conditions are quite different and the facts are quite different.

So, the position emerged that apart from friendly sentiments and all that, the actual discussion came against a rock of an entirely different, set of facts. If facts differ, inferences differ, arguments differ; after all, every argument, every inference, depends on a certain set of facts. If the basic facts are different, then, there is no meeting-ground at all, unless some slight clarification takes place about certain basic facts.

Therefore, it was suggested and ultimately agreed to, that these facts should be explored from the material available with us and with the Chinese Government. I had suggested that it might be done here and now, but, to that, while we were prepared to do it, they said they did not have most of their material here, so that we could not advance much on that line.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: To gain time.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Thereafter, it was suggested that this pure examination, factual examination might be done on an official basis later, that is, after our talks, and this was agreed to.

It is obvious that the officials who might do it have no authority or competence to deal with this problem in the sense of suggesting anything, in the sense of dealing with the political aspect of the problem or suggesting any solution or recommending any-

thing; they cannot do it. It is not their function. All they can do is to examine such facts, and as is stated in the communique, to more or less list the facts that are agreed to, the facts on which there is a difference of opinion or such on which perhaps some further inquiry may be necessary. Anyhow, I do not imagine that this process will clarify the situation and make it easy of solution. I do not think so, but it might somewhat make some basic facts clear or at any rate, we would know exactly on what evidence their case stands. For the moment, we do not know that except what they state. They know to some extent our evidence, not all of it, because when they could not produce all their evidence, there was no reason why we should produce all of it. Anyhow, that is the position in this communique that a committee or a set of officials,—to call it is committee was not correct—some of our officials are going to meet some of their officials with our set of facts, material, documents etc. and to examine their set of material, maps, documents, and all these—there are such things as revenue reports, revenue records, collection of taxes and all kinds of things. They will give an objective report which, presumably, would not be a report in which both agree. But anyhow they will draw up a list.

That is as far as we have gone at present—to present that report. Then presumably that report will be considered by the two Governments and they will decide what other steps might be taken.

There are two things which I would like to clear up. As I said, I have not seen the full report of Premier Chou En-Lai's Press Conference.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Is there a time-limit fixed for the discussion and submission of the report?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, the hon. Member will find that mentioned in the Joint Communique.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): The earlier discussion took more than a year!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In the Communique itself, a period of four months has been fixed for this process, for the meetings which are going to take place in Peking and New Delhi—two centres—for examining these papers. Probably the first meeting will take place right at the beginning of June, the first week of June. No exact date has been fixed.

Broadly speaking, the position, therefore, is that after these prolonged talks, which consisted of our stating fully whatever we thought about our respective stands and positions, we were unable to convince each other and we—both parties—remained unconvinced at the end of it—we standing for what the House knows we stand for, and they standing for something entirely opposite and based on an entirely different set of facts. We thought that in the circumstances it was desirable from many points of view to pursue this line of inquiry at the official level, without any authority to the officials to come to any decisions, and then take this up. Meanwhile, obviously when this is being done—and otherwise too—we have to avoid clashes on these border areas, because these clashes do not help anybody.

That is the position. I would gladly have answered any further question that is asked of me but for the fact that we are very much short of time for discussing these various things.

Shri Vajpayee: We want a discussion on the question.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Apart from these claims and counter-claims based on either historical data or actual possession, as the Prime Minister suggested in his speech of welcome, namely, that the primary issue was the restoration of the atmosphere of peace which had absolutely disappeared, was there any reciprocation of that sentiment from

the other side during the course of the talks?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How am I to answer that? As far as I remember, I said 'good faith'. Obviously when there is a conflict, one of the elements which helps in removing it is good faith and, of course, peace. We were always coming against this hard rock of an entirely different set of facts. This House accepts a certain set of facts which we have ventured to place before it with some confidence that they are correct and which we have believed. Now they produce an entirely different set of facts relating to what had happened for 200 or 300 years plus what has happened in recent years.

So it becomes a little difficult to discuss. If one is fairly clear about some basic facts, one can draw inferences and discuss. But when the basic facts are so completely different, some kind of an attempt should be made to find out what the basis is for those facts.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: In view of what has been said by the Prime Minister about our attitude—he also said that both have remained unconvinced on these matters—I want to know whether he is convinced that these meetings of the officials at Peking and New Delhi, our officials and the Chinese officials, will bring in any fruit? Or will it be some sort of a roving commission which will not bring about any result? Does he not propose to take some immediate steps?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can I say? I just said that they may—I hope they will—throw some light on the factual situation. But by themselves they cannot take us very far. That is all they can do. But in a state of affairs of this kind, one naturally tries every method which might prove helpful.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I wonder if it would be possible at any stage during these negotiations to make the

people of India aware of their facts and their claims.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Neither their facts nor our facts are secret. Our facts are well-known; so are theirs except in minor matters. In two or three sentences, I will place it before the House now.

Their case is that from immemorial times, you might say, or at any rate, for hundreds of years, their border has been the Karakoram Range upto the Kanakla pass. Unless you have maps, you will not be able to understand it. If you accept that border, a large area of Ladakh is cut off. They say that of this area, the northern part pertained to Sinkiang, not to Tibet at all, and the little lower part to Tibet. That is, broadly, their case. They say that they came there—not the present Government but the previous Chinese Government—previously. They referred to something that I had said in Parliament here which some hon. Members perhaps did not like. They took advantage of that from their own point of view. They said, 'How is possession there in an area which is an arid area where nobody lives?'

Shri Hem Barua: We pointed it out.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They said that most of this area is like the Gobi desert. You do not have normal administrative apparatus in such areas. You have constructive control; in addition, sometimes an administrative officer goes there, occasionally some tax collector goes there. They do not sit, there. It is because it is so deserted. During winter periods, nobody can go there at all; nobody can move about there. They said, 'But we have been in constructive and actual possession of this all along, long before the present People's Government came, before that too'. That is their case, and they gave this boundary.

But one thing which is worth noticing is that throughout our correspondence or talks, the boundaries have never been given precisely by them, as we have latitude, longitude, mountain peaks, this and that hon. Members will see how even in the White Paper we have given very precise boundaries. But in spite of our efforts to get a precise boundary we did not succeed except these broad ranges.

An Hon. Member: Did Chou En-lai invite you to Peking? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Vajpayee: I may be allowed to put a question.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Let us fix some time. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): There is one important point about Dalai Lama. (*Interruption*).

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): What is the distance between our territory which has been occupied by China and our administered area in the remaining part of Ladakh? As it has been agreed, and as our Prime Minister has also said that we have agreed to avoid clashes, does it mean that our patrol personnel will not go to patrol our territory?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not understand the questions of hon. Members. But I will try to answer them to the extent I understood. There was a question—I think somebody asked about Premier Chou En-lai's invitation to me. My answer to that was that it is not time when I can give an answer. In fact, I said that we must await developments, await the report of this official committee, then we can consider that.

The hon. Member asked me, as far as I understood, about patrolling.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. Members will see, in this communique it is said that every effort should be made by the parties to avoid friction and clashes in the border areas. That is a general direction which we take and which we give. We found that it is very difficult and partly undesirable to be precise about it. I think we cannot immobilise people so that they can go and sit and not go to the right or left. I think it was right anyhow to tell them that they should not take any step which obviously brings them into conflict.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: That is not my point. My point is this. There is a long distance between the Chinese occupied area of Ladakh and our actually administered area in the terms of what the Government of India has been saying. Therefore, I want to know, if that is possible, what will be the situation, if our patrol personnel are not allowed to go to patrol the territory because whenever they went to patrol our territory they were arrested by the Chinese.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Our people will be completely free to move about these areas without coming into conflict.

Shri Vajpayee: Does it mean that Government has committed itself that pending factual investigation, no steps will be taken to eject the Chinese from Indian soil?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should think that it was absolutely clear. Is there any doubt about it in the hon. Member's mind?

Shri Vajpayee: Yes, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very sorry. If there is one point that should be clear even to an average mind—and the hon. Member is not average; he is a super-average mind—it is this that you either have war or you have some kind of, call it talks or steps; you cannot have something in between the two. We cannot declare war on the frontier and, at the

same time, talk about discussions or sending official teams. The two cannot go together.

Shri Vajpayee: That does not mean war.

Shri Kalika Singh: The Chinese Premier talked about Dalai Lama. *(Interruptions).*

Mr. Speaker: I find that a number of hon. Members are interested. This is a very important matter. We have fixed up some No-Day-Yet-named motions for these days. I will avoid one of those and fix up a discussion on this matter for a couple of hours.

Some Hon. Members: One full day, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Either tomorrow or on the 29th as is found convenient to the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am in your hands, Sir. But I think it is quite impossible for me to come tomorrow or the day after. On the 29th I am in your hands and it is the last day. There is a tremendous deal to be done here and elsewhere. But if you say so I shall present myself on the 29th.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. Papers to be laid on the Table.

Shri Ranga: Has any date been fixed?

Mr. Speaker: 29th.

ANNUAL ACCOUNTS OF THE ALL-INDIA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malaviya): Sir, on behalf of Shri Karmarkar, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Accounts of the All India Institute of Medical sciences for the years 1956-57 and 1957-58 along with the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (4) of Section 18 of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences Act, 1956. *[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2124/60].*