

only of this country but other countries also in South-East Asia. So, I would like this whole question to be discussed. Let the House know where it stands. The Prime Minister said that if we want to take any firm action, this House will have to bear the burden. We are ready to bear the burden but let us know for what we are asked to bear it.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Hem Barua refers to the NEFA territory and the Kameng Frontier Division and the hoisting of the Chinese flag on the Indian side. Shri Goray included Subanseri and Kameng Division of Nepal adjoining Tibet. He also says:

"It would appear that the Chinese troops have undertaken a systematic probing of our frontiers in Ladakh and Nepal."

Shri Braj Raj Singh has included Ladakh and says:

"...unless checked might prove harmful to the country's safety."

Shri Vajpayee's motion reads:

"To discuss the explosive situation arising out of the reported exchange of fire between Chinese forces and Indian border pickets in NEFA area recently."

Then, there is another one. I did not even propose to read this but all the same it is connected with this.

Shri Kamble's motion read:

"Alleged extensive probing by Chinese forces of India's defences and the vacillating and indeterminate attitude of Union Government (Ministry of Defence) resulting in (i) complete absence of policy and (ii) not taking the Parliament into confidence."

So, they are all related to the alleged disturbances and incursions by the Chinese troops in many places in the NEFA area. In one or two motions, Ladakh and Nepal are also included. We had enough discussion

regarding Ladakh and Nepal. Now, the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): About the Nathu La Pass.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. After all, the hon. Member can depend only on newspaper reports. Let us hear the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Hem Barua: I just want to say a word. I am very happy the Prime Minister has contradicted this news, because we do not want this sort of awkward interventions. About the Nathu La Pass the Prime Minister said that it does not lie there. The newspaper also has not mentioned that the Nathu La Pass is lying there. The only thing that that newspaper has said is that it has to pass through the Nathu La Pass, and that is the Pass which was used by Dalai Lama while he entered into this country.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Hem Barua: That might be a mistake, but the paper has not said that it is lying there.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): Some mistake in geography.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I can very well understand the anxiety of the House to have information as fully as possible about this situation on our border areas. It is rather difficult for me to deal with these various adjournment motions as they are often based on wrong names, wrong areas, wrong locations. So, instead of my endeavouring to deal with each adjournment motion, I shall give some specific information.

Shri Hem Barua's motion is completely upside down—one name here, one place there—and has no connection with the events or anything. He has derived it from some paper (Interruption). Sir, may I continue?

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

In the course of the last two or three years, sometimes, not very frequently, there have been cases of some kind of petty intrusion on our border areas by some platoon or something of the Chinese troops, which was nothing very extraordinary, because there is no demarcation at all and parties sometimes may cross. We drew the attention of the Chinese Government in 1957-58 to this and they withdrew, there the matter ended.

One instance I have already quoted, which was a more serious one. In Ladakh last year, a small police party was apprehended by them, and that matter is still under dispute or under correspondence. Now, in June this year, the Chinese Government protested to us that Indian troops had shelled and intruded into Chinese territory by occupying a place on the border, Migyitun, and some other place along the frontier—this is Tibet-NEFA—and they accused us that our troops had entered into some kind of collusion with the Tibetan rebel forces or "bandits", as they call them, carrying on illegal activities against the People's Government of China. We replied that there is no truth in this allegation, and we expressed surprise that the Chinese Government should give credence to these wrong allegations. Ultimately, nothing happened there. We stayed where we were, and there was some dispute about the line.

Now, there are two matters that I would particularly like to mention, one, of course, is of very considerable importance and it is topical now. I shall come to it later. The first one is that on the 7th August an armed Chinese patrol, approximately 200 strong, violated our border at Khinze-mane north of Chuthangmu in the Kameng Frontier Division. When requested to withdraw, they pushed back, actually physically pushed back, our greatly out-numbered patrol to a bridge at Drokung Samba. Our people consisted of ten or a dozen police-

men and they were about 200, about ten times us. They actually physically pushed our men back. There was no firing. Later on, the Chinese detachment withdrew and our forces again established themselves. All this was over a question of about two miles. I might say, according to us, there is an international border. Two miles on this side is this bridge and two miles on that side is our picket or the small force. So, our patrol party was pushed back to the bridge and two miles away they stood facing each other. Then both retired. It is not quite clear to me why they did so, it is a mountain and perhaps during night time both the forces retired. Whatever it was later on the Chinese withdrew and our picket went back to the frontier and established a small picket there. The Chinese patrol arrived later and demanded immediate withdrawal of our picket and lowering of our flag there. This request was refused. Then there was some attempt by the Chinese forces to outflank our people, but so far as we know our people remained there and nothing further happened, that is, on the border itself. That is one instance which happened about two weeks ago.

The present incident I am talking about is a very recent one and, in fact, is a continuing one. On the 25th August, that is three days ago, a strong Chinese detachment crossed into our territory in the Subansiri Frontier Division at a place south of Migyitun and opened fire. Hon. Members will remember, I just mentioned Migyitun in connection with the Chinese protest that we have violated their territory and were in collusion with some Tibetan rebels. That was their protest made in June last, and there the matter ended. Now, round about that area, a little further away but not far from it, this Chinese detachment came and met, some distance away, our forward picket of about a dozen persons. It is said that they fired at our forward picket. They were much larger in numbers, it is

difficult to say in what numbers, but they were in some hundreds, 200, 300 or, may be, even more. They surrounded this forward picket which consisted of 12 men—1 N.C.O. and 11 Rifemen of the Assam Rifles. They apparently apprehended this lot. Later, apparently, 8 of these 11 Rifemen managed to escape. They came back to our outpost. The outpost is at a place called Longju. Longju is about 3 or 4 miles from our frontier between Tibet and India as we conceive it. Longju is five days' march from another post of ours in the interior, a little bigger post called Lumeiking. Lumeiking is about 12 days' march from the next place behind it. So, in a way, this Longju is about three weeks' march from a road-head. I merely mention this to give the House some idea of communications, transport, distance and time taken. I was saying, on the 25th they captured this forward picket of ours, but 8 of them, having been captured, apparently, escaped and came back on the 26th the next day. The Chinese again came and opened fire and practically encircled this picket and the post. In fact, they came forward and encircled this post, Longju, and although there was firing for a considerable time, we had no account of any casualties. Our people apparently fired back too. When those people were more or less surrounded at Longju they left that picket and withdrew under this overwhelming pressure. This has happened only the day before yesterday evening. So, we have not been able to get any exact particulars of what has happened.

The moment this information came we immediately protested to the Chinese Government about it and took certain other steps in that area to strengthen our various posts, Lumeiking and others, as we thought necessary and feasible. We have, in fact, placed all this border area of NEFA directly under our military authorities. That is to say, it was dealt with by the Assam Rifles under the

Assam Rifles Directorate which functioning under the Governor and the Governor was the agent of the Government of India in the External Affairs Ministry. The Assam Rifles will of course remain there and such other forces as will be necessary will be sent but they will function now under the army authorities and their headquarters.

All these have taken a little time. As I pointed out, it takes weeks. In this particular place, Longju, I imagine that this small picket of ours—it was probably altogether about 38—may have run short of ammunition because there was no supply coming in. We tried to send supplies by air. They were dropped but they missed them. It is a mountainous area; it is not easy. It is slightly risky to send para-troopers there, risky to the men in those mountainous areas. We do not think it was desirable or worthwhile to do so at that place,—dangerous. Anyhow, we have taken such steps as were feasible.

In fact, while I was sitting here, I have heard from our Ambassador from Peking. When he handed over this note to the Chinese authorities, the reply was that their information was different. The Director said that the information that the Chinese Government had received was contained in the note handed over to Kannampilly, one of our men there. Regarding the incident at Migyitun according to their report, it was the Indians who fired first, the Chinese frontier guards had opened fire only in self-defence. They had received no information yet of the clash at Longju on the 26th August. This is the Chinese answer. The Director said that the situation in this sector of the border was tense because Indian troops were continuously pushing forward. We see here the same kind of language, repetition of the reports we have, say, between India and Pakistan, that is, we make a statement and an exactly opposite, contrary statement is made by the other side as to who started firing.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I confess that in these matters I give credence to our own reports and I believe it is true because I would rather believe my own men who are there and who are trained men not used to exaggeration and also because the circumstantial evidence also supports their account. In fact, our Ambassador pointed this out to the Chinese people. So, that is the position. While I do not wish to take an alarmist view of the situation—in themselves these are minor incidents it is a little difficult to understand what lies behind these minor incidents. In any event, we have to be vigilant and protect our borders as best as we can.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad) I think we must have a two hour discussion for this subject.

Shri Goray: The point is this. It is not a question of taking any alarmist view of the position or anything like that. The real issue is about what is happening in Ladakh, Bhutan, Sikkim and in NEFA. The Prime Minister said that these localities are separated from each other by hundreds of miles. It is true, but it seems that the guiding hand behind them is the same. Therefore, the question is, what is our evaluation of the Chinese policy towards us. As I said, it is not a question of the effect it produces on us. If India fails to do its duty, I suppose the next will be Burma. After that, it will be Indonesia. It may then be Laos. All these South-east Asian countries look to us for guidance, and if we fail to protect our borders, do you mean to say that smaller countries will derive encouragement? Therefore, I want this House to discuss this matter thoroughly and the House should be taken into confidence.

Shri Khadiolkar (Ahmednagar) Are all these incidents an indication that there is a Chinese design to determine the border as shown in the map of theirs by saying that they have come under their occupation? If one studies all the incidents—I have tried

to study them—it is an indication that this is part of such a design. Their maps show that all these portions are theirs,—a transgression of the so-called MacMahon line. So, is it an indication of the Chinese design to occupy them and say "This is the border between India and China?"

Shri B. Das Gupta (Purulia). In view of the incidents off and on in Ladakh, etc., may I ask whether any proposal has been sent to the Chinese Government for any talks regarding this matter between the two Governments?

Dr Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram) Regarding the check post, the Prime Minister said that it is very difficult to drop paratroopers. May I know whether it is possible—I do not want to suggest that it should be done straightaway—to bomb that area in order to extricate it from Chinese hands?

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati) Ma, I know whether this incursion into NEFA which has been repeated in quick succession is due to the cartographic inaccuracy in the maps about which we have complained to the Chinese Government and the Chinese Government have told us that this is the handiwork of the Chiang Kai-shek regime?

Mr Speaker: That is the same as Shri Khadiolkar's point.

Pandit Govind Malaviya (Sultanpur) Our Prime Minister has clearly indicated the general attitude of the Government in this matter. We are in a delicate situation where, on the one hand, China is a friend of ours and we have a broad foreign policy which has the approval of every section of the House, and on the other we have got to safeguard our frontiers. I wonder whether this going into minute details will help anybody or the Opposition. Why should we raise questions about these details and small things here and there? The problem is a big one. Can we not at present leave matters to the Government in such big ques-

tions and can we not have one policy on such big matters? In internal matters, we may have different policies but on matters of national honour, let us maintain a unanimous stand

Mr. Speaker: The hon Member may kindly leave it to the hon Prime Minister

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: On the question of broad policies, well, broad policies are in our mind. We have to face here a particular situation. Any country which has to face that situation has to stand up to it. There can be no doubt about it. There is no alternative for us but to defend our country's borders and integrity having said that, at the same time, we must not, as often happens in such cases, become alarmist and panicky and thereby take wrong action

13 hrs.

Obviously apart from some past information, I have given the latest information to the House, including the telegram, which came to me while I was sitting here. In this telegram apart from other things our ambassador has said

"I pointed out that four persons—it is really three—were still missing as a result of the incident of the 25th August and that on the 26th August, Chinese troops had overrun Longju which the Chinese knew very well to be within Indian territory. I reiterated our Government's wish that the Chinese Government should take immediate steps to see that there was no assertion of supposed claims by force. Differences should be settled by negotiations."

We have taken the line that minor border incidents and border differences should be settled by negotiations. We must distinguish between this and that broad approach of the Chinese maps which have with

stroke of the brush coloured hundreds of miles of Indian territory. That is totally and manifestly unacceptable and we have made it clear. We stuck to the MacMahon line. But it is quite another thing that in this long line there may be minor arguments about a mile here or a mile there. Those arguments have been there before the Chinese came to Tibet. Even with the Tibetan authorities, these arguments about a mile of grazing ground here or there have been there. We admit that these are differences which exist and which should be settled. We think we are right but let us sit round a conference table and settle them. We are prepared to take up any matter like that, but when it comes to huge chunks of territory, it is not a matter for discussion.

The one or two instances that I have stated are, again, according to us, clearly intrusion into our territory. But suppose that there is some question of a Tibetan or Chinese case about a mile here or there well, we are prepared to discuss it. But from such information as we have received and which I have placed before the House, when their forces come, envelop our check-posts and capture them after firing, it is not the normal peaceful way of approaching these questions, even if there is a dispute. Therefore, this matter becomes a much more serious one than some incidental or accidental border affray.

I think Shri Khadilkar or someone else asked about what lies behind this. I cannot say. It is not fair for me to guess—it will be guess work, of course—but I cannot imagine that all this is a precursor to anything more serious. It seems to me so foolish for anybody, including the Chinese Government to function in that way and I do not give them the credit or rather the discredit for folly. Therefore, I do not think they will do it. But so far as we are concerned we should naturally be prepared for any eventuality and without fuss or shouting keep vigilant.



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru].

Some hon. Member, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, I think, gave me some advice and gave some advice to our military as to how they should act, where they should air-drop and where they should not. These are things for them to consider, not for us, as to where it is possible, where it is desirable or where it is not.

An hon. Member suggested a discussion on this. I am always in favour of a discussion in this House, but I do not see how a discussion in this case will serve anyone's purpose. When things are happening, I shall place the facts before the House as they take place and if any step is to be indicated, I shall place that also before the House.

Shri Vajpayee: May I suggest that the Government should issue a White Paper detailing all these developments, our border dispute with the Chinese and this cartographic aggression, so that world opinion may be well-informed?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am prepared to consider that. It will take a little time to issue such a paper.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the elaborate statement made by the hon. Prime Minister, I do not think it is desirable that I should give consent for discussion on these adjournment motions. Consent is refused.

#### BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajganj): On a point of order, Sir, I have given notice of an adjournment motion on the affairs of the Banaras Hindu University.

Mr. Speaker: I have disallowed it.

Shri S. L. Saksena: You have said that it relates to the affairs of an autonomous body. May I know if this House is not competent to discuss its affairs because it is an autonomous body?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member raised a point of order regarding his adjournment motion on what is happening in regard to disciplinary measures in the Banaras Hindu University. We passed a legislation the other day vesting the management in a particular committee or something like that. Regarding the day-to-day administration, I may at once state for the information of hon. Members that I am not going to allow it to be raised here. It will seriously interfere with the management of any institution and it is impossible for us to allow that kind of thing to happen. I do not think it is proper that this forum should be used to weaken the hands of the management there. Under those circumstances, I am not going to allow it.

Repeatedly questions are asked here, the moment a teacher is taken to task there. We do not sit here as an appellate body over disciplinary action taken against any individual or series of individuals. I am so sorry I would urge upon hon. Members not to give encouragement—not they intend to do so—but the very fact of bringing forward a motion for adjournment here might encourage an amount of indiscipline and it may be impossible for persons in charge of a big institution like that to manage their affairs properly because every day those people will be encouraged to look to Members of Parliament here to take up this matter. In such circumstances no autonomous body can work. We will have to scrap all autonomous bodies and ourselves manage here, distributing the various portfolios amongst the 500 Members of Parliament.

I may repeat that an adjournment motion shall not be brought up here once I disallow it. There is no purpose in bringing it up here. Even that has got a deleterious effect. In this case, I disallowed it. If I feel any doubt, I bring it up here; otherwise, I disallow it and inform the Member concerned. I have repeatedly said