

**Mr. Speaker:** That is exactly what was asked, and the Prime Minister has said nobody carries a badge on his forehead that he is a hostile.

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I put a supplementary?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have allowed a sufficient number. I have got a number of questions.

### Indian-Chinese Officials Talks

+

S.N.Q. 12. { **Shri Assar:**  
**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:**  
**Shri Khushwaqt Rai:**

Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the talks between the Indian and Chinese Official teams in regard to border records have concluded;

(b) whether Government have considered the report of the Indian Official Team; and

(c) what other steps Government propose to take in the light of this report in regard to border problem?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** (a) to (c). The talks between the Indian and Chinese official teams at Rangoon ended some days ago. Their report has been submitted to the two Governments and we have recently received it. It is a long report of about 570 pages. Together with it is a full record of the talks which takes up nearly 3,000 pages. We have yet to examine this report thoroughly before it can be decided what further steps should be taken in the matter.

**Shri Assar:** May I know if a copy of the report will be placed on the Table of the House; if not, the reasons therefor?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have just said that we are considering the report. Before we have considered it I am not in a position to go into these details. Some time or other, of

course, I take it, it will come before Parliament, but when this should be done I cannot say.

**Shri Vajpayee:** On a point of order. It has not been claimed by the Prime Minister that the report is a confidential document, nor has it been stated that it will not be in the public interest to place a copy of the report on the Table of the House. May I know why there should be any reluctance on the part of Government to place a copy?

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members read too much into the answer. The hon. Prime Minister has said that he is considering this. Certainly it will be placed on the Table of the House when the occasion arises.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have said clearly that some time or other it will be placed. Surely, it will be very extraordinary that the moment I receive 4,000 pages of a document I throw it on the Table of the House.

**Shri Vajpayee:** There is no question of throwing it on the Table of the House. The Prime Minister may be pleased to place it on the Table of the House.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am glad the distinction is made by the hon. Member. First of all, as I said, a thing of this kind, anyhow, has to be considered. I have not read it, I have not read ten lines of it yet. I just cannot face a document like this. It is being read in our Ministry, and I should read it, but apart from that, the question arises—it does not bind us—when they are supposed to be joint reports, whether there should be simultaneous publication or unilateral. May be it may be unilateral, I am not saying that it must be, but all these questions have to be considered. There is a certain decorum in such matters, apart from the political aspects.

**Acharya Kripalani:** May I know whether it will be published before we get information from Peking, or it will be published afterwards, because it is of great significance that

many times things concerning China and India have been talked of by the Peking papers and read, and we are put in an awkward position?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** How can I answer the hon. Member as to what the Chinese Government might do without our permission, or without reference to us?

**Acharya Kripalani:** You can publish it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Suppose suddenly they issue it or parts of it without reference to us,—but I do not think that is likely to happen, that is a different matter—if by any chance, deliberately or otherwise, some leakage takes place at the other end, I will not be responsible for it, but I do not think it is likely to happen.

**Mr. Speaker:** All that the hon. Member, I think, wants is that steps may be taken from this end to inform them that if they want to publish it, it may be published simultaneously.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Whatever we may do, we have to read it first.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I would want it to be done quickly.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Why should it be done quickly, may I ask?

**Acharya Kripalani:** Because there is a possibility of our getting information from Peking, and it may be coloured information, and the world may get a wrong idea.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** If by any chance something comes out from Peking, surely it will be followed immediately by the thing being placed here. That cannot affect it.

**Acharya Kripalani:** A lie that goes in advance has always an advantage.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the suggestion that we must publish it in advance now?

**Acharya Kripalani:** We will give our point of view.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Prime Minister is quite clear.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is not, obviously, in the nature of things, a report as to what should be done or what should not be done. The officials were not competent. It is an examination in a very lengthy way of the evidence produced by us and the evidence produced by the Chinese side. In fact, you cannot take a bit of it out. Either you consider the whole evidence, hundreds and hundreds of pages, or you don't, and considering the two, you may come to your opinion. Broadly, anybody who reads it will get the total effect of the case of India and the evidence on behalf of India and the case for China and the evidence on behalf of China. It cannot easily be extracted in bits here and there and a conclusion reported.

**Shri Nath Pai:** In spite of the fact that the report runs into 3,000 pages....

**An Hon. Member:** Not the report.

**Shri Nath Pai:** In spite of the fact that the report, including the evidence, runs into 3,000 pages, it is conceivable that a summary has been placed before the Prime Minister by the Indian expert team. Is it a fair assumption as reported in certain sections of the press that the evidence is so mutually contradictory that there is no point of agreement on the main issues; if so, may I know how Government intend to pursue the matter further?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member has started putting me the same question that was put to me originally which I answered. How can I possibly tell the House in regard to any matter which has not been fully considered, more especially in regard to an important international matter, as to what steps we are going to take and when?

**Shri Nath Pai:** May I clarify? I do know it had that appearance, but a summary must have been supplied.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the newspapers get some information, the hon. Prime Minister may have some information. These are all arguments.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Quite apart from the report, it is obvious that I have to keep in touch, and I have tried to keep in touch, with what was happening. After the first time our officials came back from the Peking talks, after the second time in Delhi, and now after the third time I have met those officials, I have had a talk with them, but the whole business of the officials was, apart from difficulties, minor difficulties, to place the evidence in a proper form, and explain it to the other people. I know the evidence, a great deal of it, I have seen it in the last year or two repeatedly. There is nothing very new for me except that it is put in an ordered form, and it is perhaps easier to understand than isolated bits of evidence. So, there was nothing new. They informed me of all this, and they informed me broadly of what the other party had placed or said.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Does it mean that the original difference still persists? The Prime Minister says there is nothing new in the report. Does it mean that the original difference still persists?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The report consists of the evidence—1, 2, 3, 4, 135, 346. There are some new items added on as and when they have come to our view, and the difference, that is, the different approach to the different cases not only persists, but was bound to persist because the officials on either side are not going to accept the evidence—minor things they may accept—as a whole, they cannot change the Government's case. That is not expected of officials on either side.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** May I know whether Government has received any documentary proof from China of the fact that Tibet had no right of its own to conclude treaties at the Simla Convention and any

other document repudiating the papers of Ranijt Singh's days regarding the western sector?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** How can I reply to the hon. Member's question? There are all kinds of documents. Some are accepted; some are not. How can there be documentary proof of that as if there is a clean, clear document saying that they have this right? They have not. Of course, there is no such document, but there are circumstances, circumstantial cases built up in that way. It has been the Chinese Government's case that the Tibetan Government had no right to come to an agreement, but it is really a very minor matter. The whole agreement is a minor matter, in our case; it is one matter to be mentioned here. Our case is based on much stronger grounds than that agreement of 1911.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Is it a fact that whereas our team was in a position to produce substantial evidence to establish the Indian position *vis-a-vis* Aksai-Chin, the Chinese team had not been able to produce any iota of evidence? May the Prime Minister enlighten us on this?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I think the hon. Member will have to exercise some patience in such matters.

#### **Financing Insurance Policies from General Provident Fund**

**S.N.Q. 13. Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to withdraw the permission to finance the Life Insurance Policies of Government employees from their General Provident Fund Account;

(b) if so, why and whether the discontinuance would commence only from a specified future date; and

(c) whether the persons who are already financing their policies, or