Second Series, Vol. XXXIV, No.31

Saturday, September 12, 1959
Bhadra 21, 1881

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Second Series)

VOLUME XXXIV 1959

[August 31 to September 12, 1959/Bhadra 9 to 21, 1881 (Saka)]

EIGHTH SESSION, 1959/1881 (Saka)

(Vol. XXXIV contains Nos. 21—31)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

CONTENTS

[Second Series, Vol. XXXIV—August 31 to September 12, 1959 Bhadra 9 to 21, 1881 (Saka)]

No. 21.—*Monday, August* 31, 1959/*Bhadra* 9, 1881 (*Saka*)

	COLUMNS
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred questions Nos. 962 to 970, 972, 974 to 976, 979, 980, 982, 984 and 985	5223—59
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 961, 971, 973, 977, 978, 981, 983, and 986 to 1010	5260—79
Unstarred questions No. 1809 to 1900	5279—5332
Papers laid on the Table	5332—34
President's assent to Bills	5334
Message from Rajya Sabha	5334-35
Petition *re.* renewal of broadcast receiver licences for villages	5335
Re: Withdrawal of a Member from the House	5335—37
Bills introduced	
(1) Geneva Conventions Bill	5338
(2) Kerala Appropriation Bill	5338
Government Savings Banks (Amendment) Bill	5339—70
Motion to consider	5339—70
Clauses 2 to 9 and 1	5370
Motion to pass	5370
Government Savings Certificates Bill	5371—80
Motion to consider	5371—78
Clauses 2 to 13 and 1	5378
Motion to pass	5378
Public Debt (Amendment) Bill	5381—87
Motion to consider	5381—87
Clauses 2, 3 and 1	5387
Motion to pass	5387
Motion *Re* . Fourteenth Report of the Law Commission	5387—5470
Business of the House	5461-62
Half an hour discussion *re* Scholarships to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Classes	5471—84
Daily Digest	5485—94

No. 22.—*Tuesday, September* 1, 1959 *Bhadra* 10, 1881 (*Saka*)

Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred questions Nos. 1011, 1012, 1037, 1014 to 1021 and 1023	5495—5531
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1013, 1022, 1024 to 1036 and 1038 to 1052	5531—46
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1901 to 1972	5546—86
Short Notice Question No. 8	5586
Motion for Adjournment—	
(i) Reported resignation of Chief of Army Staff	5587—5600
(ii) Food situation	5600-01
Re. Procedure for Disposal of Motions for Adjournment	5601—07

	COLUMNS
Statement *re.* Breach in D.V.C Canal	5607—10
Bill Passed—	
Kerala Appropriation Bill	5610-11
Motion *re.* Fourteenth Report of the Law Commission	5611—40
Demands for Excess Grant (Delhi)	5640—57
Demands for Excess Grants (Himachal Pradesh)	5658—62
Arms Bill—	
Motion to conside., as reported by Joint Committee	5662—70
Motion *re.* Annual Report of Hindustan Shipyard (Private) Limited	5670—5718
Daily Digest	5719—26

No. 23.—*Wednesday, September* 2, 1959/*Bhadra* 11, 1881 (*Saka*)

Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred questions No 1054 to 1056, 1058 to 1061, 1063 to 1066, 1069 to 1071 1073 to 1075, 1077 and 1078	5728—68
Written answers to questions—	
Starred questions Nos. 1053, 1057, 1062, 1067, 1068, 1072, 1076 and 1079 to 1094	5768—84
Unstarred questions Nos 1973 to 2071	5784—5851
Motions for Adjournment—	
Resignation of Chief of Staff of the Army	5851—74
Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance—	
Food situation in West Bengal	5874—90
Papers laid on the Table	5890-91, 589 6
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Forty-ninth Report	5891
Statement *Re.* Accident in Bhakra Dam	5891—95
Bills introduced	
(1) Travancore Cochin Vehicles Taxation (Amendment and Validation) Bill	5895-96
(2) Appropriation (No 7) Bill, 1959	5896-97
Motion *Re* Report of Committee of Parliament on Official Language	5897—6012
Daily Digest	6013—20

No. 24 —*Thursday, September* 3, 1959 *Bhadra* 12, 1881 (*Saka*)

Oral Answers to Questions	
Starred questions Nos 1095 to 1102, 1104, to 1107, 1109, 1111 and 1113	6021—55
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos 1103, 1108, 1110, 1112 and 1114 to 1131	6056—67
Unstarred Questions Nos. 2702 to 2744	6067—6105
Re . Motions for Adjournment—	
Situation in Calcutta	6105—12
Papers laid on the Table	6112-13
Messages from Rajya Sabha	6113-14
Calling Attention to a Matter of Urgent Public Importance—	
Army help in floods in Ambala	6114 —16
Point of Information—	
Absence of Defence Minister on U.N.O. work	6116-17
Bill passed—	
Appropriation (No. 7) Bill	6117-18
Motion *re* : Report of Committee of Parliament on Official Language	6118—6294
Daily Digest	6295—6302

COLUMNS

No. 25.—Friday, September 4, 1959/Bhadra 13, 1881 (Saka)

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred questions Nos. 1132, to 1136, 1138, 1139, 1144, 1140 to 1143, 1146, 1149 to 1151 and 1153 to 1156 . . . . . 6301—40

Short notice questions Nos. 9 to 11 . . . . . 6340—49

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred questions Nos. 1137, 1145, 1147, 1148, 1152 and 1157 to 1178 . 6349—63

Unstarred questions Nos. 2145 to 2217 . . . . . 6363—6402

Motions for Adjournment—

Situation in West Bengal . . . . . 6402—23

Papers laid on the Table 6423

Messages from Rajya Sabha 6424-25

Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill—

Laid on the Table as passed by the Rajya Sabha 6425

Committee on Privileges—

Tenth Report 6425

Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance—

Talks between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India . 6425—28

Business of the House 6429-30

Election to Committee—

Committee on Public Accounts 6430-31

Mines (Amendment) Bill—introduced 6431

Motion *re.* Report of Committee of Parliament on Official Language . . 6432—92

Re. Business of the House 6492-93

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—

Forty-ninth Report 6493

Resolution *re.* Reference of the Tibet Issue to the U.N.O. . . . . 6493—6560

Resolution *re.* Session of Lok Sabha at Hyderabad or Bangalore . . . 6560—62

Daily Digest . . . . . 6563—70

No. 26.—Monday, September 7, 1959/Bhadra 16, 1881 (Saka)

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1179 to 1184, 1186 to 1196 and 1198 to 1201. . . 6571—6611

Short Notice Questions Nos. 12 and 13 . . . . . 6612—17

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1185, 1197, 1202 to 1213 and 1215 . . . 6618—26

Unstarred Questions Nos. 2218, to 2308 and 2310 to 2325 . . . 6626—92

Re: Motions for Adjournment 6692-93

Papers laid on the Table . . . . . 6693—99

Messages from Rajya Sabha . . . . . 6699—6700

Statement *re:* Accident to Hoist Chamber in Nangal . . . . . 6700—09

Committee of Privileges—

Tenth Report 6709-10

Motion *re:* Vivian Bose Board of Inquiry's Report of Life Insurance Corporation Inquiry . . . . . 6710—6826

Daily Digest . . . . . 6827—34

Columns

No. 27.—Tuesday, September 8, 1959/Bhadra 17, 1881 (Saka)

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred questions Nos. 1216 to 1218, 1220 to 1226 and 1228 to 1232 . . 6835—71
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred questions Nos. 1219, 1227, and 1233 to 1252 . 6871—83
Unstarred question Nos. 2326 to 2393 . . . 6883—6918
Papers laid on the Table . . . . . 6917—18
Committee on Absence of Members—
Sixteenth Report. 6918
Statement *re :* Accident to a Tug in River Hooghly . . . 6919—21
Motion *re :* Vivian Bose Board of Inquiry's Report of Life Insurance Corporation Inquiry . . . . . 6921—80
Motion *re :* Report of Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities . 6981—7036
Business Advisory Committee—
Forty-third Report 7036
Daily Digest . 7037—42

No. 28.—Wednesday, September 9, 1959/Bhadra 18, 1881 (Saka)

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 1253 to 1258, 1260 to 1267 , 1269, 1270 and 1300 7043—82
Short Notice Questions Nos. 14 and 15 7082—90
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 1259, 1268, 1270A, 1271 to 1274, 1274A, 1275 to 1299, 1301 to 1303, 1303A, 1304 to 1309, 1309A and 1310 7090—7119
Unstarred Question Nos. 1394 to 2437, 2439 to 2485, 2487 to 2505, 2505-A, 2505-B 2505-C. 7116—82
Paper laid on the Table 7182
Messages from Rajya Sabha 7182-83
Committee on Petitions—
Minutes 7184
Committee on Subordinate Legislation—
Sixth Report . . . 7184
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—
Fifteeth Report . . 7184
Committee on Petitions—
Seventh Report . 7184
Correction of Reply to Starred Question No. 1978 7184—86
Business Advisory Committee—
Forty-third Report . 7186—90
Travancore-Cochin Vehicles Taxation (Amendment and Validation) Bill—
Motion to consider . . 7191—7224
Clauses 1 to 4 . 7224
Motion to pass . . . 7225-26
Motion *re :* Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities 7227—66
Motion *re:* Annual Report of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation 7266—7330
Half-an-Hour Discussion *re :*—
(i) Manufacture of Avro 748. . 7330—60
(ii) Replacement of Dakotas . . . . . 7330—60
Daily Digest . . . . . 7361—70

Contents

No. 29.—Thursday, September 10, 1959/Bhadra 19, 1881 (Saka)

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1311 to 1321 and 1323 to 1325 . . . . 7371—7408

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1322, 1326 to 1334, 1334-A, 1335 to 1352, 1352-A and 1353 to 1362 . . . . . 7408—31

Unstarred Questions Nos. 2506 to 2626, 2626-A, 2626-B, 2626-C and 2626-D 7431—7502

Statement Correcting reply to S.Q. No. 1826 7502

Motions for Adjournment—

Alleged attack on procession . . . . . 7502—05

Papers laid on the Table . . . . . 7507—11

Message from Rajya Sabha 7512

Miscellaneous Personal (Laws) Extension Bill—

Laid on the Table as passed by Rajya Sabha 7512

Correction of Answer to Starred Question No. 219 . . . . . 7512—12

Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill—

Motion to consider . . . . . 7512—38

Clauses 2 and 1 . . . . . 7538—39

Motion to pass 7539

Motion *re:* Report of Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities . . . 7539—88

Motion *re :* Accident to the Hoist Chamber of a Tunnel at the Bhakra Dam . 7589—7666

Half-an-Hour Discussion *re* Tungabhadra High Level Canal . . 7666—78

Daily Digest 7679—90

No. 30.—Friday, September 11, 1959/Bhadra 20, 1881 (Saka)

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1363 to 1365, 1367 to 1370, 1373 to 1375 and 1378 to 1381 . 7691—7726

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1366, 1371, 1372, 1376, and 1377, 1382 to 1390, 1390-A, 1390-B, 1391 to 1402, 1402-A, 1403 to 1409 . . . . 7726—7746

Unstarred Questions Nos. 2627 to 2711, 2713 to 2727, 2730 and 2731 7746—7808

Correction of Answers to Unstarred Question No. 1873 7808

Re : Motions for Adjournment. 7809-10

Papers laid on the Table— . . . . . 7810—12

Amendment to Direction issued by Speaker under Rules of Procedure . . 7812

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—

Minutes 7812

Committee on Absence of Members

Minutes 7812

Message from Rajya Sabha 7813

Leave of Absence 7813-14

Correction of Answer to Starred Question No. 1099 7814-15

Statement *re :* P. & T. Board . . . . . 7815—18

Motion *re :* Report of the State Trading Corporation of India Limited . . 7818—73

Committee on Private Member's Bills and Resolutions—

Fiftieth Report 7873-74

Mirzapur Stone Mahal (Amendment) Bill—(*Amendment of section* 3) by *Shri Raghunath Singh*—Withdrawan

Motion to consider 7874

COLUMNS

Orphanages and other Charitable Homes (Supervision and Control) Bill *by Shri Kailash Bihari Lall*—

Motion for concurrence to refer to Joint Committee . . . . . 7880—7931

Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill (*Amendment of section 198*) *by Shrimati Subdhra Joshi*—

Motion to consider . . . . . 7931—37

Half-an-Hour Discussion :

(i) Co-operative Sugar Factories in Madras . . . . . 7937—50

(ii) Fertiliser Factory in Andhra Pradesh . . . . . 7950—64

Daily Digest . . . . . 7965—74

No. 31.—*Saturday, September* 12, 1959/*Bhadra* 21, 1881(*Saka*)

Oral Answers to Questions—

Short Notice Question Nos. 16 to 18 . . . . . 7975—84

Motion for Adjournment—

Re: Talks between the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan. . . . . 7984—85

Papers laid on the Table . . . 7986

Committee on Government Assurances—

Minutes . . . 7986

Message from Rajya Sabha . 7986—87

President's assent to Bills 7987

Calling Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance—

(1) Pak protest to Security Council . 7987—88

(2) Purchase of Sea *Hawk* Jets . 7988—89

Statement *re* : Bhakra Dam . . 7989

Motion *re*: White Paper on Indo-Chinese Relations . . . . . 7990—8130

Half-an-hour discussion *re* : Gorakhpur Labour Organisation 8130—48

Daily Digest . . 8149—52

Resume of the Eighth Session . . 8153-54

Consolidated Contents [August 31 to September 12, 1959/Bhadra 9 to 21, 1881 (Saka) . (i)—(vi)

N.B.The Sign + marked above a name of a Member on Questions, which were orally answered, indicated that the Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by that Member.

LOK SABHA

Saturday, September 12, 1959/Bhadra 21, 1881 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

News Agencies

S.N.Q No 16 Shri C. D. Pande: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No 1257 on the 9th September, 1959 and state·

(a) whether any criteria for the News Agencies has been finalised, and

(b) if so, what are the broad outlines thereof?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr Keskar): (a) and (b) Government receive requests from time to time for the provision of special facilities for the purveyance of news to the public and have been considering what requirements Indian news agencies should be capable of fulfilling to serve adequately the needs of newspapers and other suppliers of information to the public consistently with the general principle of free availability of correct and unbiassed information

The special communication facilities at concession rates consist of leasing of teleprinter circuits, reception of multi-address news service on wireless and hiring of transmitters for transmission of Press messages. Ordinary postal means of communication like letters, book post or press telegrams do not come within these facilities and are open to all persons or bodies who are authorised to use such channels

In view of the numerous requests coming from time to time and the limited number of channels that Government have at their disposal, they have recently examined the question closely.

In this connection, they broadly accept the definition proposed by the UNESCO that a news agency is "an undertaking of which the principal objective, whatever its legal form, is to gather news and news material, of which the sole purpose is to express or present facts and to distribute it to a group of news enterprises and, in exceptional circumstances, to private individuals with a view to providing them with as complete and as impartial a news service as possible against payment and under conditions compatible with business laws and usage"

The Indian Press Commission while drawing attention to the UNESCO definition had further observed that news agencies should not merely keep themselves free from bias and follow the principles of integrity, objectivity and comprehensiveness, but should also appear to newspapers and to the public that they are following such a course

Keeping the above in view, in considering the request of any news agency, the following factors will be taken into consideration:—

(1) that it has as its principal aim and objective the dissemination of news on the principles of objectivity, integrity and, as far as possible, comprehensiveness, and conforms to the accepted standards of

journalistic ethics in the coverage and dissemination of news;

(2) that it is managed as a public trust or a registered society, or a public limited company and is not ancillary to a commercial enterprise, or a newspaper, or connected with a political party; and

(3) that its services are available to the whole body of the Press, the radio and information services on payment or, where appropriate, on terms of reciprocity amounting to payment.

The financial stability and solvency of any agency will naturally have to be taken into consideration also in order to see that it is able to pay its dues regularly. Though fulfilment of these general conditions might make any agency eligible, it is not possible to guarantee facilities. The provision of such facilities will have to depend on availability of channels and equipment. These facilities are liable to be withdrawn whenever in the opinion of Government the agency has ceased to function in accordance with the aforesaid general principles.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think there is any necessity for any supplementaries. He has read one statement.

Shri Bhakt Darshan: Then why was the statement not given to us?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As it is a long one, it could have been laid on the Table so that hon. Members could study it and then put supplementaries.

Shri C. D. Pande: At present there is a stipulation that any foreign news agency which comes to this country has to be sponsored by a member here. Since the press has got certain political bias, has it not been brought to the notice of Government that such dictation from one press which sponsors the foreign news agency impairs the freedom of the press and dissemination of news from foreign countries?

Dr. Keskar: The import of the question is not clear to me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is rather suggestive and some information is given. The question should be brief and to the point.

Shri C. D. Pande: At present there is a stipulation that any foreign news agency which disseminates news here has to be sponsored by one newspaper in this country. Since the newspaper which sponsors dictates the terms, the incoming agency suffers from that dictation.

Dr. Keskar: There is no question of sponsoring. The rule is that foreign news agencies are not allowed to distribute news internally in this country excepting through an Indian news agency. Now, simply because there is only one news agency here, we are allowing, as an *ad hoc* measure, foreign news agencies to function by arrangement with one newspaper. It is not a question of sponsoring.

Shri Hem Barua: Besides enunciating the general principles, may I know what steps Government have so far taken to ensure objectivity in presentation of news by national news services as well as international news services functioning in this country.

Dr. Keskar: I do not know what Government can do except to impress on the news agencies the desirability of such a course.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Since the criteria for the news agencies have now been finalized, may I know whether, in addition to the PTI, any other news agencies in India have been given recognition and these facilities.

Dr. Keskar: It is, in fact, on account of the applications of one or two

news agencies that we felt that we should lay down certain general rules. At present we have not got any other all-India agencies There are small agencies. But, as far as my recollection goes, we have only received applications, we have not got anything functioning.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let hon Members study the statement first and then put supplementaries Next question

Bengal-Nagpur Cotton Textile Mill, Rajnandgaon

S.N.Q No 17. **Shri Vajpayee:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Employment** be pleased to state

(a) whether the Bengal-Nagpur Cotton Textile Mill at Rajnandgaon, Madhya Pradesh, has closed down from the 5th September, 1959,

(b) if so, the reasons thereof and the number of workers rendered idle as a result of the closure of the mill, and

(c) the steps taken or proposed to be taken to get the mill restarted?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) Yes From 6th September, 1959

(b) Some of the reasons given by the management for closure are uneconomic working and financial difficulties About 3 000 workers are affected

(c) The State Government being the appropriate Government tried to persuade the employer to postpone the closure for another 3 months pending an enquiry but the employer wanted to affect a wage-cut of 22½ per cent to be treated as a deferred payment to be made good when the mills make profit A survey party was appointed to investigate into the technical and financial position of the mills Government of India have since issued a notification appointing a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri G. D Somani, M P., to investigate into the affairs of the mills

Shri Vajpayee: Has Government received from the workers any proposal to work the mill on a co-operative basis and, if so, what is the reaction of Government to that proposal?

Shri Abid Ali: No such proposal has been received, so far as I know

Shri Vajpayee: May I know whether the proprietors gave notice of their intention to close down the mills before they actually closed it down and, if so, what action Government took before the mill was closed down?

Shri Abid Ali: I have already stated as to what action was taken

Shri Vajpayee: The first part of my question has not been answered I wanted to know whether the proprietors gave previous notice

Mr Deputy-Speaker: He wants to know whether notice was given of the intended closure

Shri Abid Ali: Yes, Sir They did give notice

Shri S. M Banerjee: Since the Government of India has appointed a committee, may I know whether the closure notice has been withdrawn till the Committee submits its report?

Shri Abid Ali: The mill has been closed with effect from the 6th instant.

Shri T B. Vittal Rao: According to the decisions of the Naini Tal 16th Labour Conference, the millowners have to give a notice of two to three months before they close down. Was such a notice given by the owners of this mill?

Shri Abid Ali: Yes, Sir Notice was given

Shri Anthony Pillai: Has any action been taken by the Government

by way of revenue recovery proceedings to ensure that the workers get the retrenchment compensation which is their due and are paid the last month's wages?

Shri Abid Ali: Yes, Sir About Rs 14½ lakhs are due to the workers The property, I think, has already been attached and the proprietors have been asked to pay the amount within 48 hours, I think Action is being taken for the recovery of the amount as arrears of land revenue

Shri T. B Vittal Rao: In view of the fact that the millowners had given the notice of closure two months ago, may I know the reasons for the delay in appointing the committee of enquiry?

Shri Abid Ali As I said first of all a survey party was appointed to find out the technical side of the matter and then another committee has been appointed

Membership of Central Trade Union Organisations

S.N Q No. 18 Shri K. N Pandey Will the Minister of **Labour and Employment** be pleased to state the total membership claimed by and the actual membership of (1) Indian National Trade Union Congress (2) All India Trade Union Congress (3) Hind Mazdoor Sabha, and (4) United Trade Union Congress upto the 31st March, 1959?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): The claimed membership figures from the INTUC, AITUC and the HMS as on 31st March, 1959, which were due on 31st August, 1959, have been received These are:—

S.No	Name of the Organisation	No of Unions	Membership
(1)	I.N T U.C.	1,269	15,03,605
(2)	A.I T U.C	1,238	10,82,572
(3)	H.M.S.	324	4,80,200

The UTUC had asked for time upto 15th September, 1959 which has been allowed

The verification, which is being done in accordance with the procedure decided upon in consultation with the representatives of the Central Trade Union Organisations, will take several months to complete

Shri K N Pandey: What was their claim last year, that is, in 1958 and what was the actual membership found out?

Shri Abid Ali: Whose claims?

Shri K. N. Pandey: Of the four organisations

Shri Abid Ali: Last year INTUC claimed a membership of 13 lakhs and the verified number was about 9 lakhs The AITUC claimed it to be 14 lakhs and the verified number was about 5 lakhs The UTUC claimed a membership of about 1,96 000 and the verified number was 80,000 The HMS claimed it to be 3,57 000 and the verified number was 1,84 000

Shri S M Banerjee What are the comparative figures of AITUC and INTUC in West Bengal, Andhra Kerala, Tamilnad, Delhi, Punjab and Karnataka after the recent verification?

Shri Abid Ali For that notice will be necessary

Mr Deputy-Speaker: Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri

Shri S. M Banerjee: I want to know

Mr Deputy-Speaker: I have called Shri Chaudhuri Shri Banerjee has asked a question and the hon Minister has said that he wants notice for it I have already called another hon Member

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I only want to know. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called Shri Chaudhuri.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: I understand that all the Central Trade Union Organisations were asked to file objections May I know whether those objections have been considered up till now?

Shri Abid Ali: Yes, Sir Objections with regard to the membership for the period 1957-58 were invited These have been received and considered already

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to know whether the membership of AITUC in West Bengal, Andhra, Kerala, Tamilnad, Delhi, Punjab and Karanataka is more than that of INTUC and if so, whether it is true

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he wants notice for his first question how can he answer this? Shri Vittal Rao

Shri S. M Banerjee: I will ask another question

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: According to the decision of the 16th Labour Conference when there is a dispute about the actual membership of different unions, a committee of the representatives of the four Central Trade Union Organisations was to go into it Why was this procedure not adopted during the last year's verification procedure?

Shri Abid Ali: The occasion did not arise because the representatives had to be called after the verification work was completed Our provisional figures were sent to these four organisations, their objections have been received and, as I have already submitted, now the occasion will come to invite the representatives and have further discussion with them

Shri Panigrahi: What are the industry-wise figures of INTUC and AITUC?

Shri Abid Ali: This question, it may be appreciated, pertains to the period as on the 31st March, 1959 and hon. Members want information for the previous years Naturally, I will need notice Then I will place the information here

Shri Panigrahi: I wanted to know the industry-wise figures

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Information is not available just at present Hon. Members should seek another opportunity to get that information

---

11.16 hrs

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

ALLEGED INACCURATE PRESS REPORT *re.* TALKS BETWEEN THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA AND THE PRESIDENT OF PAKISTAN.

Mr Deputy-Speaker. I have received notice of an adjournment motion saying—

> 'The news appearing in the Pakistani Press under the title 'What Ayub Khan told Nehru' purporting to be verbatim extracts of General Ayub Khan's talk with our Prime Minister when recently General Ayub Khan and Shri Nehru met at Palam airport" etc

This is by Shri Goray So far as its admissibility is concerned I am very clear about it in my mind But I thought that perhaps the Government might like to make some statement on this point If it is to be made, I might request the hon Prime Minister to do so

Shri Goray (Poona) Sir, may I say something?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The report referred to here is quite incorrect in so far as what was said to me is concerned This was not said to me About 70 per cent or 75 per cent of what is said here was not said to me One or two sentences might have been said I can hardly go into the detailed conversation But this is an incorrect report so far as I am concerned.

Shri Goray: I would like to have one or two clarifications made because this gentleman who has written this article, namely, Shri Qudratullah Shahab, is the Secretary to General Ayub Khan and he has in his article apparently quoted General Ayub Khan. There he says, "We cannot believe Indian intentions so long as India has three times the army that we have" Then he said, "Many times, at least twice, India had concentrated troops when there was no reason to concentrate troops on our border" In Pakistan there is no Parliament Here there is a Parliament There General Ayub Khan's words are quoted and are broadcast throughout the country Here we do not know as to what happened between the hon Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan. So, shall we not know what the hon Prime Minister said?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have said so The Secretary was not present

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is clear It is correct that from what the Secretary has quoted it appears as if he is quoting General Ayub Khan But whatever General Ayub Khan might say or whether it is correct quotation or not by the Secretary, how is our Government responsible for it? How can we ask them to contradict each and everything? Now this statement has been made that by and large 75 per cent of it is incorrect, in so far as it refers to what our hon Prime Minister said at that time

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Was the Secretary, who has written the article, present there?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He was not present. That has been stated I withhold my consent to this

11.19 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Annual Report of All India Institute of Medical Sciences

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): Sir, on behalf of Shri Karmarkar, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of corrigendum to the Annual Report of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences for the year 1958-59 laid on the Table on the 2nd September, 1959. [*Placed in Library, See* No LT-1630/59]

Imports into and exports from Rajasthan of foodgrains

Shri A. M. Thomas: Sir, I beg to lay on the Table copy of a statement showing imports into and exports from Rajasthan of principal foodgrains by rail and river [*Placed in Library, See* No LT-1631/59]

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

Minutes

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Hissar): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the Minutes of the sittings (Fourteenth and Fifteenth) of the Committee on Government Assurances held during the Eighth Session

---

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 182 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Travancore-Cochin Vehicles Taxation (Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1959, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 9th September, 1959, and transmitted to the

Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table following four Bills, passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current Session and assented to by the President, since a report was last made to the House on the 31st August, 1959:—

1. The Appropriation (No 4) Bill, 1959.

2. The Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1959

3 The Appropriation (No 6) Bill, 1959

4. The Central Excises and Salt (Amendment) Bill. 1959

11.20 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

PAK PROTEST TO SECURITY COUNCIL

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur) Sir, under rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

"The reported Pakistani protest to U.N. Security Council over the contemplated extension of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the Election Commission of India to Jammu and Kashmir State."

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I do not know, Sir, what I am supposed to say about normal routine protests that Pakistan makes from time to time. There is no virtue in these protests. There is no basis for them, as the House very well knows.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I only submit for your information what the papers say on this, from which it will be clear. I shall just read this:

"Action of this nature on the part of India, said a letter from Pakistan's deputy resident representative to the President of the Council, 'constitutes a contravention of the basic principles of the decisions of the Security Council, particularly those contained in its resolutions of March 30, 1951, and January 24, 1957, which lay down that the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir shall be made through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite'."

So my submission is this I wanted to know whether it is correct that they have protested and whether we have made it clear to the United Nations that the paramountcy of the Constitution will be maintained, whether we have categorically stated that, and that no interference by any foreign agency will be tolerated.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This has been repeatedly referred to in the United Nations and Pakistan has repeatedly raised such objections in a routine manner. This has been the history of a few years past. There is nothing new in it And we attach no importance to it We carry on as we think we should

PURCHASE OF SEA HAWK JETS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is another Calling Attention Notice by Shri Uma Charan Patnaik. Under Rule 197(3) not more than one Calling Attention Notice can be admitted for the same sitting. But today being the last day of this session, a second notice has been put down. The statement in respect of that may be laid on the Table in accordance with Direction No. 47A. The statement will be laid on the Table by the Honourable Deputy Minister of Defence.

That statement will be laid on the Table.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Will it be laid now, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, the Member can get it as soon as he wants.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): Under Rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Defence to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

> "The reported purchase of two squadrons of Sea Hawk jet fighter aircraft from Hawker Siddley Group of U.K."

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Raghuramaiah): I beg to lay on the Table a statement in regard to the reported purchase of two squadrons of Sea Hawk jet fighter aircraft from Hawker Siddley Group of U.K. [*Placed in Library, See* No. LT-1633/59].

STATEMENT *RE*: BHAKRA DAM

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim): Sir, I am glad to inform the House that, according to a telephonic message received from Nangal, a gate was successfully dropped in the cable gallery at 8·15 hours this morning. Except for a small leakage the gate has practically stopped the flow of water into the power house through the cable gallery. The flow from the cable gallery has now been diverted into the spillway through the two side openings made earlier. The water level in the power house is reported to be below the generator floor. The diverted water passing through the two holes made in the wall of the cable gallery is going to the river downstream the dam.

The project authorities can now go ahead with the erection operations along with salvaging of equipment in the power house.

11.24 hrs.

MOTION *RE*: WHITE PAPER ON INDO-CHINESE RELATIONS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri P. K. Deo might now make his motion. I must make it clear that the time we have got at our disposal is five hours. That has to be taken by all the parties, and a large number of Members are very anxious to speak on this motion. I would therefore request hon. Members to condense their remarks in as little a time as possible. I will give the sponsor twenty minutes, I suppose.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Thirty minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That would be too much.

Shri P. K. Deo: That is the usual practice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then I will have to disappoint many Members on this side as well as on the other side. He might have twenty-five minutes.

Shri P. K. Deo: Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959 and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Sir, while initiating this motion, at the outset I congratulate the Prime Minister for his statesmanship and for his firmness and at the same time for the extraordinary patience which he has shown in conducting these prolonged negotiations, Sir, the situation is very delicate and at the same time it is potentially dangerous. It would have been much better if the Prime Minister would have taken this House into confidence. He should have

apprised this august House of all the developments from time to time At long last the Prime Minister comes forward with the White Paper.

This White Paper comes as a very big surprise to the country We find that it would have been much better if the Prime Minister would have acquainted us with all the various facts from time to time

In this connection I beg to submit that the Chinese are in occupation of a part of Kashmir since the last two years They have built there highways, they have constructed their military establishments and they have been hitting below the belt of India since so long

This White Paper is a very sad and bewildering document of these protracted negotiations

Since the dawn of history we have been finding that China and India are traditional friends Though they had years and years of cultural contacts, trade relationships and religious association, we find in the pages of history that they have never crossed swords Each country had enriched the other's culture by its contact and association It is only for the first time on the 25th and the 26th of last month that bullets were exchanged And, Sir, it was all possible only when the Communists came to power in China and when they forcibly occupied Tibet

This White Paper is conspicuous by the regular reference to the principles of *Panchsheel*. At the end of the last paragraph of every communication that has passed between India and China, stress has invariably been laid on the principles of territorial integrity and peaceful co-existence Sir, I am not sure if there is any sincerity on the part of China in those principles or it is only in words and not in action. Now *Panchsheel* is in the acid test, and that too between the two countries who have first initiated this great doctrine. Mr. Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China has invariably endorsed the principles of *Panchsheel* in the Bandung Conference and similar conferences, but he has thrown the principles of *Panchsheel* to the winds in dealing with China's great neighbour, India

We find that the first agreement was signed in 1954 between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China It dealt with all sorts of things It started from trade agencies, market places, to places of pilgrimage, various trade routes and procedure for visa and travel papers But it was conspicuously silent regarding the definition of our common border In 1954 we were in a much better bargaining position and we could have made it clear by defining our border at that time Anyway, the basis of the 1954 agreement is stated to be 'mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty" I fail to understand how territorial integrity could be guaranteed when there has not been a properly demarcated border The Government of India should have taken the earliest opportunity to define our border categorically and it should have found a place in our first international agreement with China

Tibet under the peace-loving Lamas never created any problem for India because the natural and geographical features coincided with tradition and the various international agreements confirm our well established border. The great Himalayas which so long protected our northern frontiers are not in a position to do so due to scientific advancement Things are different when the Tibetan administration has been under the direct control of Communist China

The lapse on the part of the Government of India in not bringing in a definition of our border line in our first agreement with China is due to lack of foresight. The Government of India were completely disillusioned. If the Government of India could have

[Shri P. K. Deo]

anticipated beforehand these things that are to come, then, their representative the Jam Saheb of Nawanagar would not have expressed his pious hopes in the U.N.O. in 1950 that every Tibetan problem would be settled by peaceful means and would not have moved for the adjournment of the Tibetan question in the General Assembly of the U.N.O. in 1950.

We find that the Chinese brutal occupation of Tibet has brought the Communist menace to the door of India and has threatened not only India, but the whole of the democratic world. First of all, we saw the cartographic aggression of China on India. We saw the various publications of maps in 1956. Later, in 1958, in the July edition of *Pictorial China,* we saw the Chinese territorial aggression claiming N.E.F.A., Bara Hoti, large portions of Ladakh, Sikkim and Bhutan. They claim those areas as fingers of the great palm of Tibet. First, the plea was taken by China that these maps were reproductions of the old pre-liberation maps of the Kuomintang days, and as no survey was conducted and the concerned parties were not consulted, they were not going to take any initiative of their own to change the boundary line. But, in the latest communication of Mr. Chou En-lai of the 8th of this month, he has categorically stated that these Chinese maps are true reflections of the actual situation of the traditional boundary. You can very well understand how they have been changing their arguments. We have experienced the venom of the Chinese anti-Indian propaganda branding us as expansionists and imperialists. We belong to the great country of Mahatma Gandhi. We belong to the great country of Buddha. We never had any such design to aggress or to expand our territory at the cost of our neighbours.

Let us take the questions one by one. So far as Bara Hoti or Wu-Je is concerned, from the correspondence, it seems that the Chinese authorities have absolutely no clear idea where this Wu-Je lies. Sometimes, they say it lies to the north of the Tunjun La pass, the traditional and firm border of India and China. Sometimes, they say, it lies to the south of the pass. Counsellor Kang has clearly stated that Wu Je or Bara Hoti portion which is in dispute lies 12 kilometres to the north of Tunjun La pass. But, Bara Hoti lies to the south of the Tunjun La pass. This unnecessarily created tension. As soon as we pointed out this fact to the Chinese authorities, the Foreign office at Peking contradicted it saying that Counsellor Kang was not clear about the geographical position of Wu Je. But, still they claimed Wu Je as part of Chinese territory.

We find that the administration in that part of China is very primitive. They have not got the latest maps. No survey operation has been done in that area. They have not got any record. They only rely on hearsay evidence and the old maps of the Kuomintang Government. Now, Mr. Chou En-lai calls the posting of our troops at Bara Hoti as an invasion of Wu Je. It is a regular feature of our troop manoeuvres at the borders that every year, we post our frontier guards at Bara Hoti. There is nothing new about it. Up till now, the Chinese Government have reconciled themselves to this position. It is only today that they come forward and say that there has been an attack on Wu Je area of Chinese land.

Coming to Ladakh, the Chinese provocative mood has been apparent by the latest stand they have taken by constructing the Sinkiang-Tibet highway and by capturing the Khurnak fort and by occupying the great salt lakes in the Ladakh area. We find further that they have captured our reconnaissance party within the limits of our territory. The Chinese repudiate the 1842 Peace Treaty concluded by the local authorities of Tibet and Kashmir on the ground

that the Chinese Government did not send anybody to participate in the conclusion of the treaty. It was not India's fault if the so-called Chinese Central authority did not send their representatives at the time of the negotiation of the treaty. Why should India be taken to task? As a matter of fact, five years later, in the Chinese Government's publication of China's maps, in 1847, we find they have considered this territory as part of India and they have shown them in their maps.

Regarding the MacMahon Line, Mr. Chou En-lai, during his visit in 1956, has accepted the MacMahon line as the Sino-Indian border But, in his latest letter, he has completely repudiated it This line lies along the crest of the Himalayas and is the water dividing line and so a natural boundary between the two countries. This line has been accepted by the Simla treaty Our Prime Minister has rightly said that this line is firm by usage, firm by tradition and firm by geography and that we stand by it. Mr Chou En-lai says it is a product of the British policy of aggression and claims 90,000 sq Kilometres of territory, which according to him is equivalent to Chekiang province which cannot be sold to the disgrace of China. We are surprised to find this statement of Mr Chou En-lai. It is a fantastic claim of the Chinese Prime Minister, . . .

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi) Are you surprised?

Shri P. K. Deo:.....not befitting the high position he holds. The Chinese never exercised any administrative authority in that part of the world.

Ever since the Communists came to power, for all these ten years, they were reconciled to the fact that the N.E.F.A. belongs to India. Only the other day, on the 31st of March last, the Government-controlled Peking Radio announced to the world that the Dalai Lama has entered India, when he crossed the MacMahon line. Today, most surprisingly they say that India should part with 90,000 sq. Kilometres of land to the South of that line.

So far as the N E.F.A is concerned, it is an integral part of India. In this august House, there are representatives of that area,—Shri Chow-Khamoon Gohain, is one—who sit in this House and participate in the debates, N E F A has been paying tribute to this country and for all purposes it is part of India. The Chinese aggressive mood culminated lately when they forcefully occupied Longju and other frontier outposts of Kameng and Subanasiri divisions by inflicting fatal casualties on our frontier guards

Regarding the Chinese border with Sikkim and Bhutan, we are more surprised to find the latest stand taken by the Chinese Prime Minister. Sikkim for all purposes is a part of India, and so far as Bhutan is concerned, we have guaranteed its territorial integrity, and very rightly our Prime Minister has said that any aggression on Bhutan will be considered as aggression on India.

These incidents have clearly unfolded the Chinese mind. The statement of the Chinese Ambassador to our Foreign Ministry dated the 10th May, 1959, is most discourteous and provocative. I think before any negotiations start, the Chinese authorities should withdraw that piece of document, and then only can any respectable negotiation or any settlement follow

This clearly shows that they ask for negotiations, but they are in no mood to negotiate. Talks across the conference table, I do not think, will serve any useful purpose at this stage.

China has committed aggression on this country. Let China leave its forcible occupation by a certain date,

[Shri P. K. Deo]

and withdraw its troops from Indian soil, and let an atmosphere of goodwill be created between these two countries, and then negotiations could easily proceed We have always taken that stand in the case of Pakistani aggression in Kashmir We have made it clear that Pakistani troops should first withdraw from Azad Kashmir, and then only we will start negotiations Similarly, we should take the same stand in the case of China also With nerves highly strung on both sides, there could not be any negotiation at this stage

It is a good thing that our borders are being left to the care of our gallant soldiers, but at this time when the integrity and sovereignty of this country is being threatened by foreign aggression, it would be most proper if the Prime Minister takes up the Defence *portfolio*

Shri C D Pande (Naini Tal) He has already taken it

Shri P K Deo: Whatever little damage has been done by the resignation and subsequent withdrawal of the Chief of the Army Staff could be repaired if the Prime Minister takes up the Defence *portfolio*

Lastly I submit the Chinese should be categorically told that this aggression will be resisted with all our resources, to the last man India has tremendous goodwill throughout the world, has influential friends who are all anxious to protect the sovereignty and integrity of the biggest democracy of the world So, I most respectfully submit that our Prime Minister who has so long successfully guided the destiny of this country in days of trouble, should rise to the occasion and give a strong lead so that India's integrity would be safe for all time to come I sincerely hope that he will shed his policy of appeasement and resort to a policy of firmness and determination befitting this great country in dealing with the Chinese. I am sure every patriotic Indian will give his loyal support especially at this hour of need I am sure and I would like to make it known to everybody in the world that so long as one Indian is living, he will not allow one inch of Indian soil to be conceded

The Prime Minister has all along played the historic role of the mediator, and it is through his good offices that various big clashes have been obviated, and I sincerely hope that similarly the Prime Minister would use his good offices and will negotiate this question peacefully for a permanent solution of our border trouble, so that not only India-China friendship will be a permanent feature but it will also contribute to a great extent to world peace

Mr Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved

> "That the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China during 1954-1959 laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959 and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September 1959, be taken into consideration"

There are certain substitute motions tabled by Members

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug) I beg to move

That for the original motion the following be substituted, namely —

> "This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959, and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, regrets that the Government of China have been making persistent

encroachments on the Indian territory since 1954 and have unlawfully occupied regions in the States of NEFA, Utter Pradesh and Kashmir in total disregard of the principles of Panch-Sheel and Sino-Indian friendship and as this constitutes a grave threat to the integrity and the solidarity of India and the Indian nation, this House is of opinion that the Government of India do take immediate and effective steps to make the Chinese withdraw from the regions forcibly occupied by them."(1)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Substitute Motion No. 2 by Shri Braj Raj Singh. I would not object to its admissibility.....

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Thank you very much.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: .....but my only point is that if we enter into these grounds, perhaps the main issue may be left aside, and the time might be spent in deciding whether the Government was right in saying this or whether the party should defend its position just now.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I have to protest against such a sort of note.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That he can do. He has got another substitute motion also, but more emphasis should not be laid on this, because today we have got really the Chinese incursions on our territory, and that should be the point that should be discussed and not the side issues that might have arisen consequent to that.

(1) **Shri Braj Raj Singh:** I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959, and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, disapproves the manner in which paragraph 5 of the note of Government of India dated 30th April, 1959, was written and protests against the expressions used therein and asks the Government of India to publicly apologise to the Socialist Party for the injury that the said note has done to it and directs the Government not to repeat such mistakes in future." (2)

(2) That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959, and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, reaffirms its complete faith in the principles of peaceful co-existence and assures all concerned that it will not depart from them but declares unequivocally that India will not tolerate any aggression on its territory and will under any threats not surrender any of its territories,

that India holds firmly to the MacMahon Line which henceforth shall be renamed as Gandhi Line or if China so agrees, Panch-Sheel Line,

that China should withdraw its forces or personnel stationed in any part of India's territory all along our North-Eastern borders, failing which this House directs the Government to push back the said forces and personnel from our territory and calls upon every citizen of the country to be prepared for any eventuality that may happen, and directs the Government to initiate negotiations for settlement of our border problems with China, if China so agrees." (3)

Shri Naldurgkar (Osmanabad): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959, and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, agrees with the policy of the Government adopted with regard to the frontier problem existing between the Governments of India and China and endorses the view and stand taken by them in connection with this problem." (4)

Shri Vajpayee (Nalrampur) I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959, and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, is of opinion that—

(a) more effective steps should be taken to meet Chinese in roads into Indian territory, than hitherto, adopted, and to this end—

(i) China be asked to vacate aggression by a particular date-line,

(ii) China be informed that negotiations in respect of any border adjustments can be held only subsequent to such vacation, and that too only on the basis of the MacMahon Line, and

(iii) circulation of Chinese maps which have falsely depicted parts of India as Chinese territory, and of Chinese magazines, or other literature, which have been publishing such maps, be banned in India, and

(b) immediate steps be taken to reinforce our northern defences and develop transport and communication facilities in border regions for better protection of the area."(5)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Yadav.

श्री यादव (बारावकी) : इस सम्बन्ध में एक निवेदन है कि मैं ने जो मोशन दिया था उस में दो शब्द थे "deliberate" and "irresponsible" जिन को मैं इस मोशन में नहीं पाता हूं । न मालूम किस तरह से वे इस में से निकाल दिये गये हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आप इसे मूव तो कर रहे हैं ।

श्री यादव मैं इसे मूव तो कर रहा हूं लेकिन ये शब्द भी इस में जोड़ दिये जायें ।

Shri Yadav: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959, and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, condemns the policy of the Government of India in keeping the House in the dark about the facts and developments concerning territorial violations on the Northern border, reminds the Government of India of the warning given by the Socialist Party of India in its Himalayan Policy,

as early as 1947, and directs the Government of India to make suitable amendments in its foreign policy in conformity with the policy followed by the Socialist Party of India." (6)

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajganj): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959 and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, is of the opinion that in order to maintain cordial relations with China, the Prime Minister of India and his Government have shown the utmost patience and forbearance in spite of the gravest provocations from time to time, so much so that they did not even inform, as was their duty, the Indian Parliament of even the gravest of these Chinese aggressions against the Indian border, out of sheer anxiety not to give them a publicity, which would have done grave injury to Sino-Indian friendship, and in the hope that the Chinese Government would settle these border disputes through friendly negotiations, and while the House appreciates this anxiety of the Prime Minister and his Government to maintain and strengthen Sino-Indian friendship, it is of opinion, that, while attempts should continue to be made for settling these border disputes by friendly negotiations, Government must take adequate steps to defend and safeguard its Himalayan border right from the MacMahon Line to the traditional border in Ladakh." (7).

Shri Liladhar Kotoki (Nowgong): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely.—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954-1959, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959, and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959, takes serious view of the situation arising out of the Indo-Chinese border disputes and approves of the firm stand taken by the Government of India in this regard." (8)

Mr Deputy-Speaker: The substitute motions and the original motion are before the House for discussion. When I said that hon. Members should condense their remarks within about 25 minutes, I heard voices from the left that that was impossible I have no objection if the hon. Members want to take more time, but then now there are eight substitute motions to the original motion. Members who move their amendments desire to speak, and then there are eight groups at least, and every group, however small it might be, wants to place its views before the House Then, in this discussion at least the Congress Members also demand that they must have equal opportunity This is not a discussion in which only the Opposition is interested So, I hope that it would be appreciated that the time would be divided equally, at least equally, between the Congress and the Opposition So, they have two hours at the most I am being rather indulgent in giving them two hours, and when they have two hours, they can see how many can be accommodated, and how long each individual Member can speak.

Shri Dange.

Acharya Kripalani: Shri Dange wants to criticise me, therefore he will speak after me. Let him have the last chance.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): The Chair called upon Shri Dange to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called upon Shri Dange to speak.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: Then, why does Acharya Kripalani rise?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps Shri Dange does not want to speak

Shri Dange (Bombay City-Central): I am prepared to speak at any time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But I had called him Then, he might speak.

Shri Dange: He is on his legs Let him speak

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. Acharya Kripalani.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): On a point of order He should not be called later on because we are not called again once we refuse to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My difficulty is this Ordinarily if a Member is called to speak and he refuses to speak, he cannot have a second chance, but now Shri Dange is not refusing to speak He says he has no objection if Acharya Kripalani wants preference and wants to speak in the first instance. That was my trouble; otherwise, I would have warned him that he would not be allowed another opportunity.

Shri Dange: If you want me to speak first, I am ready

Shri C. K Bhattacharya: Sir, we should go by your choice. We want your choice should stand. Shri Dange should speak first.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Acharya Kripalani.

Acharya Kripalani: It is a very serious matter we are discussing here today. You will not therefore, mind, if I make constant reference to my notes.

I have been speaking upon this topic inside and outside the House since 1950 In connection with Tibet, in 1950, I said:

> "Our Government's attitude is understandable on the assumption that Tibet is a far off country, and none of our business. But supposing what has happened in Tibet happens to Nepal, supposing the Chinese liberation forces come to Nepal, then, I am sure, we will fight, whether we are ready or not"

Again, in 1954, after signing of the Indo-Chinese agreement, I said that the destruction of a buffer state was an unfriendly act, and was dangerous for the security and safety of India. Many nations have gone to war on that issue I am not saying this to remind the House that I said so We have more serious business than that

Why did I say all these things? It was because I had taken note of the serious nature of the revolution that had taken place in China. Our Prime Minister while speaking in the Rajya Sabha said that "the revolution was a major factor in history, and any appraisal of the situation neglecting the fact of the revolution would be utterly wrong; and many of the troubles in the international world were due to the fact that a deliberate attempt was made not to recognise the major events in human history"

I entirely agree with the Prime Minister I may submit that if some countries in the West have failed to recognise the significance of the Chinese Revolution, I am afraid we have done no better. This Revolution, by whatever name we may call it, has established in China a totalitarian government. Such a regime can only be a military regime It is based upon power and force. Its appeal is to authority and not to rea-

son. It does not believe in co-operation but strict obedience and regimentation. All education is turned into propaganda. Truth is subject to party loyalty Such a regime is fanatical It pays no regard to the purity of means. It is controlled either by a dictator or by a self-perpetuating janta of politicians Whatever such a regime may do at home may not be the concern of neighbouring countries But it is a concern of every peaceful neighbour to see what its international policy is

The foreign policy of a totalitarian government cannot but be expansionist. It is natural Power, if not increased, will fade away Therefore, if we are really to take note of the tremendous revolution that has taken place in China, we must not forget its aggressive nature

History has also proved that whatever effect a revolution may have in internal politics, it does not change the foreign policy of a nation. The French Revolution did not change the foreign policy of France initiated by Louis XIV The Fascist revolution in Italy and Germany did not change the foreign policy of these countries Bolshevik Russia follows the foreign policy of Peter the Great and the Czars of nibbling at its neighbours We see today China is following the expansionist policy of its predecessor imperial regimes There is nothing to wonder at that

I submit that if some Western nations have over-emphasised the totalitarian and militarist and expansionist character of the Chinese revolution, we in India have minimised it. May I submit that if there is a choice in international affairs, it is better to over-emphasise danger than to under-emphas se it? If we do the latter, we shall be caught unaware and unprepared and our people will also be caught so

So, we had the taste of this new totalitarian regime in China Immediately after the Communists had established their rule on the mainland, the old imperial policy was followed in Tibet, a helpless an a disarmed country While the former imperial regimes in China were content and were satisfied with the exercise of suzerainty, the new regime wanted complete control of Tibet. They would have nothing less than that

Again, we had other md cations of the character of this regime. In October, 1949, in reply to a telegram of congratulations from the Indian Communist Party on the success of the Communists in China, Mr. Mao Tse-tung sent the following telegram:

> "I firmly believe that relying on the brave Communist Party of India and the unity of all patriots, India will not certainly remain long under the yoke of imperialism and its collaborators Like China, India will one day merge in the socialist democratic family."

It is family indeed, for there is one and the same family for communists all over the world, wherever they may be born

Further, in Chinese eyes, and unfortunately in the Communists' eyes here, we were not free even in 1949, and our Government was a collaborator Our Government was collaborating with Western imperialisms. I suppose in the eyes of China and in the eyes of some of our own countrymen, we do not seem to have achieved our freedom yet, liberation is yet to come, and, therefore, we see the march of Chinese armies on our borders, and they are liberation forces. The idea that we were stooges of Western imperialism was again made clear to us when instinctively, our Prime Minister protested against Chinese excursion in Tibet He said, "it was not quite clear from whom the Chinese were liberating Tibet." History has given the answer Every fanatical creed, whether it be religious or political, undertakes to make people free from themselves, and make them happy against their will through fire and sword. This is, there-

[Acharya Kripalani]

fore, no new phenomenon in the world. We are familiar with it. This apart, we got a prompt answer to our protest; we were told that we had made our protest because we were stooges of western imperial Powers. In fact, the language was more vulgar. This vulgarity has continued all through the years. Our Prime Minister has politely called it the language of the cold war. Instead of resenting these insults, we merely submitted to them and recognised Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. This proved to the Chinese that we would submit to their bullying tactics. I am afraid we have been doing so throughout these years.

12 hrs.

Some people have asked: What could India have done? Could it have gone to war on the issue of Tibet? It need not have But while recognising the *de facto* sovereignty of China on the mainland, India should have refused to recognise Chinese rule in Tibet It would have put us morally in the right We do not recognise the right of France over Algeria. Are we, therefore, at war with that country? Do we not have diplomatic and friendly relations with it? By submitting to the rape of Tibet, I am very sorry to say, that the Prime Minister has repudiated what he has often said, that wherever there is injustice and tyranny, India shall not remain neutral; it will always stand for justice and fair play. It is but fair that I remind him of these words

I want the House and the country to know and to mark that China in her internal and international advance is even more quick and thorough than Russia Russia began its expansion only when its revolution was 23 years old, and even then when Europe was in the throes of the world war. China began its campaign as soon as its power was established on the mainland I want the House to mark that difference between the two regimes.

I have talked of the totalitarian and military character of the new Chinese regime. This fact comes out more clearly more recently. In a statement of the Chinese Ambassador made to our Foreign Secretary as late as May this year, he says:

> "China will not be so foolish as to antagonise the United States in the East and again to antagonise India in the West."

This, Sir, reminds me of Hitler's theory of war on one front. But strangely enough, the Chinese have chosen not the eastern, but the western front....

An Hon. Member: For the present.

Acharya Kripalani: ...which they have done in spite of the fact that in the east, the territory that they want to liberate is undoubtedly Chinese territory and the people are also Chinese people and not foreign people Of course, they tried the eastern front a couple of years back when they attacked the off-shore islands under the sway of Chiang Kai-shek. It should not have been difficult for the Chinese to take possession of these islands. They were not useful to the United States or to Chiang Kai-shek But the U.S.A resisted the attack on these islands which were not of much use to it. The late Mr Dulles made it plain that Communist will move out of the mainland only at the expense of a third world war For this, China with her population of 600 million was not prepared They were not prepared for a war. Therefore, what remained for Communist China was an incursion in the west, on the Indian frontier They think they are avoiding a second front as Hitler did. But who knows one day they may have no choice but to fight on both the fronts?

In 1954, we entered into a treaty with the Chinese Government. I am sorry to say that by that treaty, we recognised not only the suzerainty, but also the sovereignty, of China over Tibet If we did that, it was very necessary to try and settle the borders with China. All along, we had common borders with Tibet. Now, these were turned into common borders

with China. We are told that there was some talk of borders at the time the treaty was signed, but nothing was decided. Later too, there was some talk about that in 1956 when the two Prime Ministers met here, but there was nothing in writing. We knew, or ought to have known, that between China and Burma, there are border disputes and they have not yet been decided, and the Chinese Government has not been able to carry out its own promises. This, I quote from the Prime Minister. In International dealings, treaties or other documents, it is dangerous to leave matters at the level of talk without any signed documents. It is best to have everything in writing. Even when there is a talk, the notes of the talk must be accepted by both parties and signed. This seems not to have been done, in spite of the fact that semantic difficulties were felt by both the parties, as we are told by the Prime Minister. Our Prime Minister is too shrewd a politician not to know that in international intercourse, words have today ceased to have ordinary dictionary meaning. Therefore, it was the more necessary that everything should be in black and white. Even then, there are apprehensions of misinterpretation, but the field of misunderstanding is narrowed down. At least, the neutrals can see what is right and what is wrong in a document.

Some Members in the Rajya Sabha said that the Chinese had become wild with us after the grant of asylum to the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan refugees. The Prime Minister seemed to endorse this view. It may be that their wrath has increased after these events. But in this too, the Chinese are different from the Russians: the Chinese are more unreasonable. The Hungarian refugees sought asylum in many European countries, but Russia has not on that account indulged in border aggression against those countries. However, the Chinese aggression began earlier. According to Dr. Kunzru, aggression began in 1952. In 1954, we had a treaty with China. This treaty enunciated the famous five principles of peaceful co-existence. I need not discuss here these principles except to say that all these principles are based upon the maintenance of the *status quo*, however cruel and inequitous it may be.

The principles were enunciated in order to put a seal of approval on the sovereignty of China over Tibet. Therefore, on one occasion, I was constrained to say in this House that the *Panchsheel* was born in sin. In spite of the agreement and the *Panchsheel*, aggression on our borders began three months after the signing of the treaty, as pointed out in the White Paper. It has since been going on and it has been increasing. It would appear as if the Chinese were waiting simply for the signing of the treaty which recognised their sovereignty in Tibet. Every time they have indulged in the aggression, they have blamed us and drawn our attention to the *Panchsheel*. I am reminded of a Hindi proverb which I need not quote here. It has something to do with the Koswal and the danda. (*Interruption*).

Our territories have been occupied, our people have been kidnapped, our guards have been fired at, taxes have been collected, roads have been built, all leading towards India; check and observation posts established along our borders and even, as the report says, trenches have been dug in many places along the frontier. In Ladakh a regular motor road has been built and it is said that an aerodrome has been established in our territory.

Sir, much as I dislike Chinese aggression on our borders, I am much more concerned with what our Government has done or proposes to do about it. After all, the Chinese, as I have said, are working in consonance with the genius of their regime and in pursuance of their international goal. But, whatever aggressions have been there so far, I regret to say that the country has been kept in ignorance of this aggression for a long period. even though many notes, through the years, have passed between the two countries. The Parliament itself has been kept in ignorance. Information about aggression has been

[Acharya Kripalani]

elicited through questions in this and the other House. No information was even given voluntarily. Even then, it has been meagre, and, often, the acts of aggression have been minimised—may I say almost excused. Sometimes, it would appear there has been special pleading for the Chinese.

Recently, Sir, when there was a question about the road built by China in Ladakh, the House was told, if I remember aright and speaking subject to correction, that it was not a regular road but stones were kept to mark the passage. But, now, we know it is a motor road. No mention was made of the aerodrome built in our territory. We were told that the territory was mountainous—where nothing could grow, not even a blade of grass—and no people lived there.

There are places in Rajasthan today where all these conditions exist. May I know what the Government would do if some of those parts are invaded by Pakistan? (*Interruption.*)

Sir, then, another question arises If these places are so uninhabitable for man and vegetable, then, why do the Chinese want to occupy them? It is a strange thing that they should earn the ill-will of India and occupy portions of territory that are of no use to them. Our people have a shrewd suspicion and it is this that these uninhabitable places are occupied to serve as springboards for future action A springboard has not to be green or populated Our people are not thinking in terms of a few miles of barren rock They are thinking in terms of the honour of the country which has some meaning for them. Apart from that, they are thinking of something more and it is this that they are thinking about the safety and the freedom of their country in the near future. Here then lies the trouble which people with their horse-sense are able to sense.

The explanations given by the Government for their silence are too halting. They are unconvincing. The pity of it is, while there are acts of aggression on our territory, while violent and angry notes are sent to us, on our side we are satisfying ourselves merely with sending back polite notes or protests. Also, all the time, what is more painful, our people are being encouraged to keep on repeating the *mantram*: *'Chini Hindi Bhai Bhai'*. This, I am sure, makes our people, if not our leaders, look ridiculous before the world. Such conduct lowers our dignity of which we are reminded so often by our Prime Minister.

Sir, I also do not understand this over-politeness of ours. After all, in ordinary conversation, we regulate the pitch of our voice according to the hearing capacity of the listener. If he is hard of hearing, we raise our voice; if a man does not understand polite language, we may not abuse him, but we must speak in plain and unvarnished language. Nobody would be more polite and courteous than Gandhiji. But many times, he had to use hard and harsh words against British Imperialism On one occasion, I remember he wrote an article in *Young India* with the caption *Shaking the Mane of the British Lion*. It formed part of the prosecution which he had to face and for it he was awarded 6 months' imprisonment.

Some Hon Members: Six years.

Acharya Kripalani: Six years. Sir, we cannot be more polite than the Father of the Nation when dealing with aggression It is natural for us to be anxious to avoid a major complication which may precipitate a war A war between the two countries is bound to develop into a global war whether one likes it or not. But we cannot avoid war through appeasement. Appeasement is always at the expense of one's honour. It has also never saved peace. It did not save peace in Europe in 1939.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Membr has taken half an hour.

Acharya Kripalani: Sir, I will finish soon.

Anyway I would like to know what the Government proposes to do under the present circumstances. I have read the Prime Minister's speech in the Rajya Sabha several times. I am afraid, I find no indication of this in the Prime Minister's speech. Is there any idea to throw back the Chinese out of the territories they have occupied? As their aggression is described by our Communist friends as merely 'border incidents', so will our action in turning them back be a 'border incident'. When we have cleared our borders of aggression, we can, then, think in terms of negotiations, but always on the basis of MacMahon line. The maintenance of the *status quo* can only be when aggression has been stopped and the territories occupied by the Chinese re-occupied by our people. Our Prime Minister has as a last resort proposed arbitration. It is not usual to submit the cases of national territories to arbitration. National territory belongs to the people of the country. (*Hear, hear*). It cannot be the subject of arbitration. Apart from this, who can arbitrate in this case? What country except Russia will be acceptable to China? All other countries, whether they are capitalist or socialist, in the world are capitalist and as such imperialist! Even communist Yugoslavia, if it is not capitalist, is a stooge of capitalists and the imperialists, though it may call itself communist or Marxist. However, all this can come after our territory has been cleared of aggression.

During the course of his speech in the Rajya Sabha, our Prime Minister has, in answer to Dr. Kunzru, said that there could be no change in our foreign policy and that it stands as firm as a rock though today even the Himalayas are shaking. I am afraid that, when the Prime Minister says this, he is thinking merely in terms of the basic principles of our policy. What are these principles? India stands for peace. India stands for disarmament. "India stands for non-alignment with the power blocs. That is not all. There is a furthersome thing. India also stands for international justice and fairplay. The Prime Minister himself has often said, that in the case of injustice and tyranny, India will not remain neutral I am afraid we have not acted upto this principle in the case of Tibet

In this House talking about our foreign policy two years back, I have said that it is a mistake to suppose the foreign policy of a country consists merely in enunciating abstract and basic principles. It must also think in terms of appropriate strategy and tactics, through which these principles are to be given effect to. We have failed to embody our principles into appropriate strategy and tactics for effective action. It may be that in evolving these, we may have to modify our principles to some extent. There will always be a gulf between principles and practice, between the ideal and the actual. That cannot be avoided in this defective world I submit for the consideration of the Prime Minister that we have failed in our foreign policy at the level of strategy and tactics. Herein some modification is surely necessary if we are to be effective.

Sir in conclusion, I would beg of the Government to be firm. Their vacillation and the Prime Minister's varying statements confuse the public minds. A confused people cannot be ready for an emergency. Even in his Press interview yesterday, the Prime Minister talked of restraint. Restraint without action is meaningless. I can quite understand that there should be restraint in giving expression to the feelings when our people go and demonstrate against an Embassy. That is not desirable and I am one with the Prime Minister when he condemns these things. But how are the feelings of the people to get expression unless there is action behind what they want to be done? Talking of this restraint is just like talking of restraining a horse and tightening the reins and having control over it

[Acharya Kripalani]

when the damn horse does not exist, I can assure the Prime Minister, if he needs any assurance, that the country will be behind him to a man—and even to a woman if he takes effective action against foreign aggression.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Sir, I was listening to the debate very carefully.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I hope the hon. Members would also exercise restraint by limiting their remarks to fifteen minutes.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: It is a fact that China has been our traditional friend and in recent years due to the efforts of our great Prime Minister that friendship has all the more been strengthened. But while we were making efforts to strengthen that friendship, China was slowly and slowly intruding upon our territory and it encroached upon not one village or two villages but it occupied thousands of square miles of our territory. (*Interruptions*). At the time our treaty was concluded in 1954 with China, as Acharya Kripalaniji has just now pointed out, no mention was made about any border dispute nor was it mentioned in 1955. But strangely enough, Shri Chou En-Lai has written in his letter:

> "The Tibet local authorities themselves later also expressed their dissatisfaction with this line, and following the independence of India in 1947, cabled Your Excellency asking India to return all the territory of the Tibet region of China south of this illegal line."

I do not know what is the position of Tibet so that the Chinese Premier has written this letter to our Prime Minister Because, when it suits China, Tibet is a province of China as any other province. I do not know what is the content of the cable received by our Prime Minister. When it does not suit China, Tibet is immediately given a different status. I am doubtful whether we were right in recognising the sovereignty of China over Tibet. Earlier the practice was that we recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet and that practice should have continued. The Chinese Premier has himself mentioned here that it was the Tibetan authorities who raised that question. If it is so, then we should also state firmly that we will discuss this issue with Tibetan authorities. During the pre-Independent period, there used to be a British resident and his assistant used to exercise control in Ladakh and Gilgit and all the other border areas. At that time many hunters used to go towards the region which has been occupied by China at present. The British resident or the Government of Kashmir used to issue permits to go up to that boundary and we were also having our Consul at Tashkent. To say that this is a very difficult and inaccessible area is, to some extent, acceptable, but I am not going to the extent of accepting this theory that in no case it is possible to go towards that region. This area has been under the control of our Defence Ministry in some way or other. It may be that during our preoccupation with Pakistan or during the efforts which we were directing towards maintaining our friendship with China, China tried to take possession of that territory. They have not built just one road there but they have built feeder roads and a first-class road has been laid connecting many other villages with those feeder roads. It is also a fact that they have constructed an airport in that region So, I would like to know what information we received in those days from our Ambassadors in Peking and whether the Defence Ministry was in a position to produce any record or any information. Or, did it care to gather any information from that region? When the treaty negotiated in 1954, it was on the basis of the existing status, and to charge India of imperialism, expansionism is utterly baseless, because, we have been res-

pecting not only the boundaries of our neighbours but also the boundaries of Goa. It is to the credit of the Prime Minister and this Government that they did not allow anybody to enter Goa when the people were ready to march into that territory. But at that very moment, the Chinese penetrated into our territory and they occupied such a big region. They did not stop there, because, recently it has been mentioned by Kushak Bakula that the Chinese have been propagating an idea that we want to take possession of the entire Ladakh area, and we ought to be alert about that. Besides this, they wanted to create further trouble and it has been mentioned in the White Paper that their plane came to the Himachal Pradesh area—Chamba and Spiti—and also to the Punjab area and to many other places.

The trouble about Bara Hoti is also there. Now, the Chinese are claiming the NEFA territory. Regarding Bara Hoti it has been stated in the White Paper that it has always been our territory. Once we declare any place as our territory, it should always be our effort to maintain it as such. After having declared it as our territory and then later agreeing that we will withdraw our civil and military authorities from there does not make much sense. Therefore, I think that we should change our position whenever we go to discuss it at international gatherings. In the White Paper it is mentioned that it was first our asking, our proposal: we first said: "Let us withdraw our civil and military authorities". It was our External Affairs Secretary who himself proposed and they agreed. But soon after that, the Chinese penetrated into that territory. Now, the position is, our military authorities are not there. Therefore, I suggest that it should always be the effort of the Defence Ministry to study all our border problems and to study all the strategic positions and to establish their check-post.

For instance, Khurnak Fort and Spanggur are just on the Indua valley road, and to allow others to occupy these places is something which is hardly understandable. In NEFA, we were having our check-post at Longju. In that connection, Mr. Chou En-lai has said in his latest letter that some have been advocating "provocative actions on an even larger scale such as bombarding the Chinese territory".

I may point out that on the 28th August, the hon. Prime Minister was good enough to disclose in this House that Longju, our check-post, which lies within three or four miles on this side of the international border, in our territory, had been occupied by the Chinese forces and that they overwhelmed our forces; 'Our forces' meant only eight or nine persons. What I said in the House was:

> "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?"

So, to say that somebody advocated provocative actions on an even larger scale such as bombarding the Chinese territory is something which is neither based on facts nor on any reasoning, because Longju does not lie in the Chinese territory. It is in our territory, and if anybody comes to occupy that or if any force has occupied it, it is our inherent right to oust that force by any means. If we are not succeeding in ousting that force or if we have not succeeded in sending our troops or sending reinforcements by road, it is our inherent right to bombard that territory. I repeat it and I will go on repeating it for ever.

Acharya Kripalani: They will not be there for ever.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Yes; they will be removed soon. In connection with the procession in Bombay, I

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

deprecate that we should be so much agitated and we should take out any procession and insult any Head of a State. Mr. Mao Tse-tung has been and is one of the most respected leaders of Asia and the world and I highly respect him. If anybody had insulted his photograph it was very deplorable. But to characterise the whole procession as ruffian is very wrong. It is not at one place but at so many other places they have used the word. In that connection, they have said:

> "Such a matter of huge insult to the head of state of the People's Republic of China is what the masses of the six hundred and fifty million Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate, and it must be reasonably settled, otherwise the Chinese people cannot come to a stop with regard to the matter. In case the reply from the Indian Government is not satisfactory, the Embassy is instructed to make it clear that the Chinese Government will again raise this matter to the Indian Government, and the Chinese side will never come to a stop if without a satisfactory settlement of the matter, that is to say, never stop even for one hundred years".

An Hon. Member: Language of peace!

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: In this connection, I say that the 400 million people of India also would never stop unless and until the Chinese are driven out of our territory.

Here, I want also to give a small warning to our draft-makers. I hold no brief for the Socialist Party and I am ready to oppose them like anything. But to characterise, on behalf of the Government, any party as a group of "irresponsible persons" does not appear to me as a correct thing. Therefore, I am pointing out this matter. There may be some irresponsible persons, but all the people are nowhere irresponsible.

Some people are trying to link the incidents with the giving of asylum to the Dalai Lama which is considered as a provocation to the Chinese. I wish to categorically repudiate such an assertion; because, thousands of square miles of our territory in Ladakh were occupied by Chinese prior to Dalai Lama's arrival here. Perhaps, at the time when we were negotiating the treaty they constructed all these roads and forts.

Then there is the question of Bhutan. But here also much will depend on our Himalayan policy, because so far we were not worried about our frontier on this side of the country. But now it has been encroached upon and nobody is in a position to categorically state in how many places the Chinese are in occupation. Perhaps, in all the passes they are there and they have encroached upon our territory. Therefore, I shall point out here that it should be the business of the Defence Ministry to properly watch the situation and send parties there to push them out of our territory. But it has not been done so far and it is a matter of great regret to me that we have not been alert enough to protect our frontiers.

Shri C. K. Nair: Why should you isolate the Defence Ministry?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Because they are in charge of our defence. It is not the responsibility of some other Ministry. It is the Defence Ministry which is entrusted with the work of defending our country. So, it is not a question of isolating anything.

Then, regarding Bhutan and Sikkim, a little portion of Bhutan has been mentioned in this White Paper. It is stated that Bhutanese couriers have been arrested and they have not been allowed to go back to their territory.

Mr. Chou En-lai has been one of the chief architects of the policy of *Panch Sheel*. But he has violated it like anything. He has violated the treaty regarding passports and visas and now the Bhutanese people are not allowed to go back. Therefore, if we do not firmly state our position and if we do not take a firm stand on these issues, we will be creating an impression in Bhutan, Sikkim and even in Nepal that we are not very firm. Therefore, I earnestly appeal to the Government, and particularly to the Prime Minister who is very alert about all these matters, to see that our interests suffer no more. I would also appeal there should be a reappraisal of our entire policy.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Will you allow me to say a few words?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: They are exciting us.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing him for the present.

Shri S. A. Dange: The problem that is before us is certainly very serious from all points of view and, therefore, our first attempt should be to see that the seriousness does not evolve into a disaster for either country, either for us, or any other country, or for the world. Therefore, the approach to the problem must be one of settlement and not that of whipping up a war atmosphere. I think that there should be a general agreement amongst all of us here, except perhaps some people who want to open two fronts against China Of course, I can imagine those who want to open two fronts against China—one by the Americans and the second led by the Government of India, or by the spokesmen of that party at least. They think that we should teach China a lesson.

An Hon. Member: Why not?

Shri S. A. Dange: "When Dulles taught them a lesson, why not Nehru teach them a lesson? When Dulles took a firm stand, the Chinese retreated. So, if we take a firm stand, they will retreat," this is to be their two-pronged attack.

What do they want to achieve? Is it a problem of border for them? Is it a problem of the territorial integrity of our country? It is only a label for some, not all. The problem is, as put very nicely by them that Communist China has come near our border...

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Offer them tea.

Shri S. A. Dange:.. by taking Tibet under its influence—not this border question but the other question. Therefore, Tibet must be liberated so that Communist China remains that side and we remain this side and in between the buffer State of Tibet.

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): What about the area they have occupied?

Shri S. A. Dange: You can have that ambition, but what I meant to say was this This would not be a proper approach for both the countries to accept, the language of war, the language of hysteria and the language of two-fronts from some of our friends here, and a language which wants alliance with Dulles and all that sort of thing.

Acharya Kripalani: The Chinese ghost is there.

Shri S. A. Dange: So far as that alliance is concerned, I do not want to go into history, because I do not know what happened to that firmness when the Americans entered the Yalu river, had to retreat back and see the Christmas in America in spite of Dulles' strength. So, let us not have the talk of two front alliances against China. Let us stick to our problem.

An Hon. Member: Let us welcome them here.

Shri S. A. Dange: Our own problem is the problem, not of relations between two countries which are hostile to each other, but the problem of two countries who are essentially allies and friends.

An Hon. Member: Allies! (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I would advise hon. Members to hear the speaker very patiently.

Shri S. A. Dange: They are afraid of being convinced by my argument. So, it is a problem between the countries who have got a standing agreement of friendship. It may be that some people think that it should be broken; that is another matter. But today our relations with Chinese and the question of border cannot be treated as if it is a question between ourselves and Pakistan, though even with Pakistan we do not and should not take the language of war. That is why I broadly and in essence agree with the approach which has been taken by the Prime Minister.

Acharya Kripalani: You have now become his admirer, but not in the case of Kerala.

Shri S. A. Dange: On that we differ. But on some points we agree. I do not follow a whole hog policy like yours, a consistent policy of enmity towards everybody. I do not agree.

Shri P. K. Deo: They have joined others in Kerala.

Shri S. A. Dange: Therefore, my point is that with the approach we agree—we may have some differences here and there—but with the broad approach we agree—no hysteria, no questions of war, but, at the same time, defending the integrity of the country and its frontiers. Now, this approach.

Acharya Kripalani: How?

Shri S. A. Dange: How? He himself has enunciated it—the approach of negotiation on both sides. For exup *Panch Sheel*. Sertainly delineate

Acharya Kripalani: After the abusive letter.

Shri S. A. Dange: Mr Chou En-lai wrote to the Government of India on September 8th, and I may say that if he had written it earlier perhaps the tension would have been less. But it could not be written earlier for the simple reason that both sides were engaged in the Tibetan question and the Dalai Lama.

Therefore, I want, first of all, to endorse the approach which the Prime Minister has taken, and it should be taken by all countries of the world who subscribe to peace, and that approach is simply: "no war, no hysteria; let us sit down and argue."

Now comes the second problem. What is the essence of the problem? I think the essence of the problem is sometimes missed. The essence is supposed to be only the question of border. But, in my opinion, it is not only a question of border and rectifying it, but it is a question of political approach and friendly relations. These political relations have been to a certain extent disturbed. Let us recognise that there has been a disturbance. I am not saying whether we are right and they are wrong or they are right and we are wrong (*Interruption*). But the disturbance exists.

An Hon. Member: You will not say that. It does not suit you.

Shri S. A. Dange: I am talking of political questions. I am not talking of the border just now but I am talking of political relations. On the question of politics there has been a disturbance in our relations, as the hon. Prime Minister has himself admitted that may be, the Tibetan events have coloured the views of the Chinese, have soured them and have perhaps made them somewhat bitter on the question. I am referring to that political question.

Therefore the essence of the problem is not only the question of borders. It is not a question of maps. We have had here the debate on maps many a time. Now, here if the question is of maps and delineation and the boundary is fixed, then the question will arise which is aggression and which is not. Therefore the first problem would be to settle the bound aries and delineate them. Demarcate them. (*Interruption*). Having done that, take the problem whether we are on the right side or they are on the right side. Now can we do that? We can do that The position today exists that this problem can be solved in a calmer atmosphere, except for those who do not want a calmer atmosphere Therefore on the maps also

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: They do not want to be Chinese agents

Shri S A Dange: Who?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Others

Shri S. A. Dange: We shall see as to who is whose agent That is not the problem here (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order I would again appeal to the hon Members to hear him with patience

Shri S. A. Dange: I was not pleading for the Dulles line So, I do not know who was whose agent (*Interruption*)

An Hon. Member: You can only plead for China

Shri S A. Dange: With regard to the question of maps, what is the position? The Indian position is that—on this there should be no doubt—the MacMahon line was once for all settled On that question we have no doubts. The other side says—and it is said that their statement is a new one—that the MacMahon line is not the final one and was not finally settled. Therefore what can be the position? The position is that India can argue on the basis of the MacMahon line and the Chinese can argue that it is not correct, and at the same time after argument (*Interruption*) a settlement can be had, which is not at all difficult.

An Hon. Member: What were the actual (*Interruption*).

Shri S. A. Dange: Because comrade Chou En-lai himself . (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Hon Members shall have their chance

Shri S A. Dange: I cannot hear (*Interruption*) We should ask ..

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): What is the stand of the Communist Party on the MacMahon line?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If we wait now and listen, perhaps that might be clear We ought to exercise patience and allow the hon Member to continue Perhaps we might see what their position is But why get impatient?

Shri S. A Dange: The stand of the Communist Party on the MacMahon line is very simple: India has taken that as its line so far.

Acharya Kripalani: What is your line?

Shri S. A Dange: So far it was not .

An Hon. Member: You are not an Indian?

Shri S. A. Dange: I think if people want to be insulting by calling me unIndian I will question something about them also Let it be remembered

Acharya Kripalani: Oh! yes.

Shri S. A Dange: Let them remember that. (*Interruption*). No, no. He says I am not an Indian I cannot tolerate that kind of insult in this House

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I have not said that. When Shri Dange said that India has taken that as their line I said, "Are you not an Indian?" I have not said that.

Shri S. A. Dange: If I am challenged that I am not an Indian, I shall have to say something. (*Interruption*).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I have not challenged that. I repeat (*Interruption*). On a point of personal explanation, Sir. I have to say that I never said that Shri Dange is not an Indian. When he said that, I questioned, "Whether you are also in India and whether you accept that border and MacMahon line".... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No hon. Member should challenge that.

Pandit Govind Malaviya (Sultanpur): Being an Indian he may have anti-Indians in mind.

Shri S. A. Dange: Now, I am quite prepared to answer all the questions. Only thing is, let them come one by one. That is all.

So far as the MacMahon line is concerned, my stand is very simple. Certainly, it is not for one individual or one party to take a stand. It is an overall standpoint of the country. They are the borders of a country and not of a party, neither of the PSP nor of the Communists or the Congress. They are the borders of a country. On that we should be clear.

Therefore the point is that we as a whole so far had accepted the MacMahon line as our frontier. Now the hon. Prime Minister himself says that it is not demarcated, it is not delineated but there is a general contour. The general contour is accepted but the delimitation and demarcation does not exist. The moment demarcation does not exist, disputes about villages, grasslands and all that, which are there in the White Paper, are bound to arise.

Shri P. R. Patel: What about the territories occupied by them?

Shri S. A. Dange: So, here the question is, if you wish to argue on the basis of friendly relations with China—certainly India will be justified in taking a stand on the MacMahon line and ask them what they have got to say about it.

Acharya Kripalani: They have said.

Shri S. A. Dange: What they have said perhaps has not been read properly. But they themselves have said, "We do not accept it in principle." They have given a long history. We may argue about the history. That is not the point. The point is that we are realists, we know what is happening and we today certainly for the sake of amity can sit down and settle the problems. This is the position that China has taken in its letter. Therefore it rules out questions of war for the sake of settling the boundary. That is all that I want to submit. Those who want to create the war atmosphere, it is another matter for them.

An Hon. Member: They should be allowed to remain.

Shri S. A. Dange: But so far as these two people and our country is concerned, the position is simple. In the letter which is given here they say, "We are realists; we want friendship and therefore there cannot be a question of war. Though we do not accept the MacMahon line yet there has been history. You accept it. All right. Let us sit down and discuss the whole question." Certainly, India could be justified in starting negotiations on the basis of the MacMahon line. On what basis can they argue? They cannot argue on a basis which does not exist or both cannot start arguing on some boundary which is neither this nor that. Any two countries, when they argue questions of border, always have their two positions because that is why the trouble

arises. That is why the difference arises. If there had been no question of the boundaries at all then the differences would not have arisen. Why is the argument there whether Longju is south of Migyitun or whether it is north of it or whether it is on the level of it? It is because there was formerly no problem of hostility between the two countries. Formerly there was no problem there.

Somebody has asked; if a land is grassless whether it should be neglected. No. If a grassless land is certainly occupied by the Pakistanis you will have to take note of it. This land will have to be taken note of. This problem is forced on our attention now. Why? Because of the Tibetan events.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri S. A. Dange: Because when the Chinese took their sovereign rights in Tibet and occupied Tibet there were protests (*Interruption*).

Shri Braj Raj Singh: When was the road in Ladakh constructed?

Shri S. A. Dange: There was a question of passes. There was a question of routes. Naturally these questions became a question of delimitation, demarcation and later on a question of politics. Therefore that I think is the fundamental problem. If it is a problem of border it can be resolved. I thought, after the statement which the hon. Prime Minister has made here, in the Press Conference, after the statement he has made in the Rajya Sabha and after the receipt of Mr. Chou En-Lai's letter on the basis of Panditji's letter of March—if these four are taken together there is a basis for settlement without going to war or talking about war.

Acharya Kripalani: Who talked about war?

Shri S. A. Dange: Because in the first place it is a question between two friendly countries. I need not repeat that the offer exactly exists and when that exists there should not be a war hysteria so far as this question is concerned.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Occupation?

Shri S. A. Dange: Occupation can be studied as occupation only when you sit down (*Interruption*).

पंडित ब्रज नारायण ब्रजेश (शिवपुरी) : मैं माननीय सदस्य से यह जानना चाहता हूं . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जब वे बैठ गये हैं तो आप भी मेहरबानी कर के बैठ जायें ।

13 hrs.

Shri S. A. Dange: I am always an advocate of no-war with anybody, not so much an advocate.....

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Silent observer.

Shri S. A. Dange: If some people do not like the foreign policy of this country or if some people are allergic to the hon. Defence Minister—that is not a question to be discussed in this connection. (*Interruption*). It has nothing to do with it. The problem of foreign policy, of *Panchsheel* and the problem of the temperament of the hon. Defence Minister or otherwise need not be brought into the question of settling the border issues with China. But they are being brought. (*Interruption*). They are being brought in, why? Because there is essentially a political problem also. On that our country has got to find a proper approach; the grounds of it exist. But, certainly, as the Prime Minister has mentioned, the Chinese do feel sour about the Tibetan issue. Apart from the Tibetan issue, India has got the right to give asylum to anybody—there is no doubt about it. Nobody feels sour about it. But we certainly have not got the right to give asylum, to feed the person with money, to let him function

[Shri S. A. Dange]

sometimes as the Government of the other country and also to make a representation to the United Nations which amount to demanding an invasion of Tibet in order to liberate it from China, to submit a memorandum that there has been genocide in Tibet and thus conduct operations from the Indian soil. If that gentleman does it from anywhere else, let him do it. What I am troubled with is this that he cannot conduct these operations from this soil, and, therefore, certainly, some gentlemen felt very irritated. (*Interruptions*).

Acharya Kripalani: I would be entitled to remind the Chair that this is a free country where everybody can express his views

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would again appeal to hon Members that occasional interruptions might be tolerated; sometimes, they might be welcome as well But continued interruption is not fair and the hon. Member should be allowed to proceed

Shri S. A Dange: Sir, this is a very beautiful statement and a serious statement, but since it receives the clappings of the House I would like to draw attention to it

Is it the right of a free country to allow another person, or group of persons, to call themselves a Government and propagate war against another country and involve this country in it?

Acharya Kripalani: You will excuse me: these people call themselves Gods also. What is this about?

Shri S. A. Dange: Fortunately, Sir, in this country at present Gods are not commanders of armies, nor are they politicians. So, here it is not a problem of Gods, but of gentlemen claiming to be Gods. Can we in a free country like ours allow on our soil, with the subsidy from the Government of India, a person to propagate war against another country and involve this country in it? (*Interruptions*).

If he goes to Afghanistan it is his affair. The question was very simply and nicely put. If that gentleman's request is to be guaranteed by UNO, where will the troops go through, except through the Indian passes? Where will intervention come from, and where will our neutrality be? The position is that India is a neutral country, a non-aligned country. If some people want to take the position: no, we are a free country, we can allow others to carry on war, it is their policy. As far as I am concerned, even as a free country, we do not allow people to propagate war against each other, incite war between two countries or to help them in doing that. That is what I understand So, talking about a free country, if that is the conception of a free country of some people, I am sorry for that

Acharya Kripalani: We have not the Chinese concept

Shri S. A. Dange: Therefore, what I was saying was that the irritation, the sourness, arose out of this problem and that problem attracted the attention of the Prime Minister. On that point also I agree with him in the sense that if the Dalai Lama stays in this country, the gentleman can have asylum We have a right to give asylum But he should not carry on propaganda which is likely to involve us in unfriendly relations with other countries. I need not quote those paragraphs in the Prime Minister's interview and so on. But he has taken that position. He says that he gave his advice to the gentleman not to go to the U.N. and invite their intervention; in the first instance it would not come, and, in the second place, even if it comes it would be embarrassing for us and we cannot take that position. But he says that other people advised him and he accepted that advice. Well, we can

imagine who those other people are; may be successors of Dulles both in America and here So that is not the point.

Therefore, what I am saying is that the position today with regard to this major dispute on boundary questions can be solved by peaceful means Similarly, our relations with China can continue, do continue and will continue on a friendly basis Some people do not like it Some people want to blow up the *Panchsheel*, and in order to blow it up they are creating all sorts of crises So we must be on guard Against what? Both against the violations of the integrity of our country, no doubt and against war hysteria The question has been asked here whether we resist aggression On that the standpoint of the Communist Party is very clear We resist aggression If anybody invades us we fight against the invaders, there is no doubt about that

Shri Subbiah Ambalam (Ramanathapuram) How do you justify the Ladakh invasion?

Shri S. A Dange: There is another question also The gentlemen who want an assurance—I do not know why they should ask for it—must also give an assurance that they will not incite invasion from Indian side What about that? That they won't give Certainly the Prime Minister has given it that we are not going to make aggression against anybody But then some of the gentlemen have quarrelled with that policy and they say, "go and liberate Tibet"

Shri C. D. Pande: Why not?

Shri S. A. Dange: Yes it is good, correct for you We, Sir, on behalf of the Communist Party can say that we shall not side with any aggression in the name of liberating Tibet whosoever it may be That is very clear We shall not tolerate any question of any invader coming here We will fight against any invader. At the same time the Communist Party firmly believes that there will be no invasion, from China over this country, because of *Panch Sheel* (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Order, order.

Shri S A Dange I guarantee that there shall be no invasion—as far as the Prime Minister is concerned he has said so—with the same confidence I guarantee that there shall be no invasion as far as China is concerned. I cannot talk about others

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): How can you speak on behalf of China?

Shri C. D. Pande. Have you received a letter?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker Order, order If the hon Member wants to give a guarantee, why should hon Members be afraid?

Shri S. A Dange: From this shouting therefore it should be clear that behind this whole problem a third point arises, that it is not only boundaries, it is not only Tibet, but some people have a problem about us They want to think how to suppress the Communist Party

An Hon Member Why should they?

Shri S A Dange I do not know

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It shall die its own death

Shri S A Dange We have cheated you for forty years by not dying ourselves, and we shall cheat you more. Don't worry about it Sir, they say we are dying ourselves We are not dying Sir That may be very visible

So the problem is, in the name of war hysteria in the name of shouting slogans, which are not justified, against us, an attempt is made in order to isolate the Communist Party, to overwhelm it and ban it Why such a great fear about it? We are after all a small party and we have no following! Why this fear? Are they so panicky about the next elec-

[Shri S. A Dange]

tions that they want to ban us on this score? Why this hysteria? I could understand hysteria on other problems, not on this

So, the third problem is that it is a political tactics that is being followed to blow up the peace policy of *Panch Sheel*, to involve India and China in war . .

Acharya Kripalani. To ban the Communist Party.

Shri S. A Dange: and to ban the Communist Party and then introduce, not a democratic but military rule in the name of war hysteria This is the object This attempt is seriously being made China and the border are just excuses for some people and for some parties. Especially for the P S P—I name it—the main question is not whether the border is violated or not To them it is the question of two fronts liberation of Tibet, war hysteria, blow up of *Panch Sheel*, blow up of peace, then, blow up of the Defence Minister—I do not know where he comes in, and then ultimately comes in military rule for which they have a few generals ready in their pockets, I am told This policy the Communist party is not going to tolerate It certainly stands for the integrity of the country It will certainly defend the country against any aggression But we are not going to tolerate also aggression from our side, whichever party wants it In the present situation I am sure the Government of India does not want it Therefore my quarrel is not with the Government of India on that question As it is visible in this very debate, these gentlemen also have no quarrel with China as such But, for their internal political reasons, the whole thing has been whipped up

Therefore, my last appeal to all would be, play down war hysteria. Attack us as much as you like; we have freedom, no question. But do not have war hysteria Do not blow up *Panch Sheel*. Certainly delineate the borders; certainly have our borders in the way they should be and ought to be Certainly argue. Arguments can settle because there is a position of settlement by argument on both sides. Firm friendlines must persist Mistakes are there on both sides.

Several Hon Members: No, no.

An Hon. Member: The cat is out of the bag

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): He should point out the mistakes on our side

Shri S. A Dange: I am telling with regard to the political problem again. I consider that our debbling with the Dalai Lama problem as a political problem was a mistake I am not talking about the other question Why are they hurrying it up? I am only referring to the political mistakes I am not talking about the borders and integrity of our country Therefore, I support the general approach that is there in all the letters and I appeal for a peaceful settlement We are certainly against aggression There can be no doubt about that At the same time, I am quite sure, neither they nor we want to go to war on any bit of territory as Shri Jawarharlal Nehru himself has said With that position, I have made my point of view very clear

श्री भक्त दर्शन (गढ़वाल) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत और चीन के सम्बन्ध के बारे में आज इस वाद विवाद में भाग लेते समय मेरे हृदय में दो प्रकार की भावनायें उठ रही हैं । पहली भावना चिन्ता की है जोकि स्वाभाविक है । कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता श्री डांगे जी के भाषण और उन के आख्यान के बावजूद भी मुझे यह कहने में संकोच नहीं कि पिछले अनेक वर्षों के अन्दर भारत सरकार ने चीन की जनवादी सरकार

को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मान्यता दिलाने के लिये जो प्रयत्न किया और जिस के कारण उसे अपने बहुत से मित्रों से नाराजगी भी मोल लेनी पड़ी, उस के बाद भी हमारी उत्तरी सीमा पर युद्ध के जो बादल मंडरा रहे हैं उन से भारत के प्रत्येक नागरिक का चिंतित होना स्वाभाविक है । लेकिन इस के साथ-साथ मेरे हृदय में कुछ थोड़ी सी सन्तोष की भावना भी है ।

मैं उन सदस्यों में से एक हूं जो पिछले अनेक वर्षों से इस सदन में सरकार का ध्यान देश की उत्तरी सीमा की ओर दिलाने का प्रयत्न करते रहे हैं । जब-जब समद् में इस विषय पर कोई बातचीत हुई है, मुझे इस बात से बड़ा खेद होता था कि हम उत्तरी सीमा के महत्व को अभी तक कुछ भी नहीं समझते थे । बल्कि अक्सर लोग मजाक उड़ाया करते थे । मैं ने सन् १९५२ में प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय के बजट पर बोलते हुए कहा था कि हिमालय की ऊंची दीवारें अब हमारी रक्षा करने में असमर्थ हैं । हम इस भरोसे में न रहें कि हमें उत्तर की ओर से किसी आक्रमण की आशंका नहीं है । लेकिन उस समय इस बात को हंसी में टाल दिया गया था । पर आज मुझे सन्तोष है । और जैसी कि उर्दू की कहावत है "देर आयद दुरुस्त आयद", अर्थात् चाहे देर में ही सही फिर भी रास्ते पर तो आ गये । सुबह का भूला शाम तक घर लौट आये तो उसे भूला हुआ नहीं समझना चाहिये । लेकिन मुझे सन्देह है कि कहीं हिन्दी की यह कहावत चरितार्थ न हो जाय कि "आग लगे खोदे कुआ, कैसे आग बुझाये" । हम ने आग बुझाने का इन्तजाम तो किया नहीं और जब घर पर आग लग गई तब हम कुआ खोदने जा रहे हैं । पहले कुआ खोदेंगे फिर पानी निकलेगा फिर हम आग बुझायेंगे—तब तक शायद घर ही स्वाहा न हो जाय ।

अब तक के वाद विवाद में भारत की उत्तरी सीमा के सम्बन्ध में पूर्व की मैकमोहन रेखा से ले कर पश्चिम में लद्दाख तक का जो विवरण दिया गया मैं उस १८०० मील लम्बे उत्तरी सीमान्त के प्रत्येक भाग के बारे में अपने विचार नहीं रखूंगा । स्वभावतया गढ़वाल जिले में बड़ा होती, टेहरी गढ़वाल में नीलंग, हिमाचल प्रदेश में शिप्की और पंजाब के कांगड़ा जिले में स्पिती इन चार के बारे में इस श्वेतपत्र में जो बातें कही गई हैं, उन में से कुछ की ओर मैं इस सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करूंगा । ३१ दिसम्बर, १९५३ से २८ अप्रैल, १९५४ तक यानी चार महीने तक लगातार पीकिंग में भारत और चीन के प्रतिनिधियों की बातचीत चलती रही । उस के परिणामस्वरूप तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में सुप्रसिद्ध समझौता हुआ । लेकिन उस के बाद ही १७ जुलाई, १९५४ को चीन सरकार ने हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय को जो पहला पत्र भेजा उस में बड़ा होती का जिक्र हुआ है । इस बीच में हमें जो श्वेत पत्र दिया गया और उस के बाद भी पत्र व्यवहार की जो प्रतियां सदन की मेज पर रखी गई उन के अनुसार कुल ६६ पत्रों का आदान प्रदान हुआ । इन ६६ पत्रों में से १८ केवल बड़ा होती के सम्बन्ध में हैं और तीन पत्रों में उस का विशेष रूप से उल्लेख किया गया है । इसी से इस विषय के महत्व को समझा जा सकता है । यह बड़ा होती का मैदान हमारे देश की सीमा से लगभग २ मील के अन्दर डेढ़ या दो मील लम्बा चौड़ा मैदान है वह लगभग १५,००० फीट की ऊंचाई पर वहां कोई आबादी नहीं है, लेकिन भारत से चीन में जाने का मार्ग है । व्यापारी लोग जब तिब्बत की तरफ जाते हैं तो वहां कैम्प डालते हैं । इसी तरह तिब्बत के लोग भी जब उस रास्ते से आते हैं तो वहां कैम्प डालते हैं । उस का पनठाल भारत की ओर है ।

यह जो झगड़ा पिछले पांच छ: साल से चल रहा है, इस के दो कारण मेरी समझ में आये हैं । एक तो यह कि तिब्बत की सीमा के अन्दर जो गांव हैं वहां के लोग अपनी

[श्री भगत दर्शन]

भेड़ बकरियों को चराने के लिये इस इलाके में आया करते थे। चूंकि उस जमाने में कोई प्रबन्ध नहीं था, अतः वे समझते थे कि वह उन का अधिकार क्षेत्र है और उस की सीमा के अन्दर है। इसलिये जब चीनियों ने तिब्बत पर अधिकार किया तब वे तिब्बती गांव वाले और चीनी सैनिकों को ले कर आये और उस पर अधिकार को स्थापित करना चाहा। दूसरी बात यह है कि एक तिब्बती अधिकारी जिस का नाम सरजी है, एक ट्रेड आफिशल, प्रति वर्ष गर्मियों में भारत के गांवों में उस घाटी के रास्ते आता है और वहां से सन्देश ले कर वापस जाता है कि अब भारतीय व्यापारी हमारे इलाके में आ सकते हैं। लेकिन कुछ दिनों से, शायद ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के जमाने से ही, यह प्रथा चली आ रही थी कि वह सरजी कुछ दिनों के लिये इस बड़ा होती मैदान में कैम्प किया करता था और जो तिब्बत के लोग भारत की तरफ आते थे उन के पासपोर्ट की जांच पड़ताल किया करता था। उस समय तिब्बत के अधिकारियों की ओर से यह कारण बतलाया गया था कि चूंकि जो तूनजुन ला दर्रे का दूसरी ओर का इलाका है वहां से कई रास्ते कैलाश मानसरोवर, नाबरा मंडी दापा मंडी को जाते हैं इसलिये उन के पास कोई ऐसा स्थान नहीं है जहां उन का अधिकारी रह सके। इसलिये सुविधा के तौर से उसे बड़ा होती के मैदान में रहने की इजाजत दी गई। लेकिन अब होता क्या है? वह उस को अब अपना ही नहीं बतलाते बल्कि श्वेत पत्र में दिया गया है कि १५ सितम्बर, १९५५ को चीन के कुछ सैनिकों ने उस से भी दस मील निचे दावजन जा कर उस पर अधिकार कर लिया और जब हमारे सैनिक वापस आ रहे थे तब उन्हें वापस आने से रोका। इस के सिवाय सन् १९५७-५८ की गर्मियों के बाद के मौसम में उन्हों ने लापचल और सांगचा मल्ला नामक स्थानों पर भी कब्जा करने की कोशिश की यद्यपि वहां पर हमारा चैक पोस्ट पहले से काम करता था। मैं इस बारे में सदन का अधिक समय नहीं लूंगा पर सरकार से निवेदन करूंगा कि हमारी नीति यद्यपि चीन की सरकार की नीति से काफी स्पष्ट रही है, फिर भी हम ने काफी डिलजिस ढंग से इस में काम किया है। जब इस बारे में बातचीत चल रही थी, तो हमारे समझ में नहीं आता कि हमारी सरकार ने चीन की सरकार के साथ यह इकरारनामा क्यों किया, यह वचन क्यों किया कि हम अपने सैनिकों को वहां नहीं जाने देंगे? यही नहीं इसे न्यूट्रल जोन करार दिया जायगा जबकि वह हमारे देश का एक भाग था। इस हालत में वह शर्त किसी भी देश में स्वीकार नहीं की जानी चाहिये थी। इस के सिवा सन् १९५४ के यह मामला चल रहा था लेकिन २० अगस्त, १९५६ को प्रधान मंत्री ने इस सदन में मेरे एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में यह जवाब दिया था :

"A few soldiers probably strayed into the Bara Hoti plain due to ignorance. They were asked to leave the area and did so"

यानी सन् १९५४ से झगड़ा चल रहा था और १९५६ में कहा जाता है कि शायद वे गलती से आ गये होंगे जबकि वास्तविकता यह थी कि वह लोग जान बूझ कर और सोच विचार कर वहां आये थे इस सम्बन्ध में दो सुझाव देने हैं। मेरे प्रश्न के उत्तर में माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था कि हम जाड़ों में वहां पर अपने सैनिकों को नहीं रख सकते हैं। लेकिन मेरा अपना खयाल है कि वहां रहना असम्भव नहीं है। अगर हम १५,००० फीट की ऊंचाई पर अच्छा इन्तजाम कर दें तो सैनिक वहां रह सकते हैं। कम से कम नवम्बर-दिसम्बर तक के महीनों में हमारी चैकपोस्ट वहां अवश्य रहनी चाहिये। पिछले साल, जैसा कि सदन को मालूम होगा, ९ सितम्बर को हमारी चैक पोस्ट वहां से उठा ली गई।

ज्यों ही हमारे सैनिक वहां से घाटियों के नीचे उतरे त्यों ही चीन के सैनिकों ने आ कर कब्जा कर लिया । ऐसी हालत में मैं सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूं कि वहां पर चैक पोस्ट को वास्तव में बारहों महीने रक्खा जाना चाहिये । अगर ऐसा नहीं होता है तो नवम्बर या दिसम्बर तक हमारी सेना वहां अवश्य रहनी चाहिये । दूसरे आजकल चोर होती के दर्रे को पार कर, जो कि १८,००० फीट ऊंचा है लोग बड़ा होती तक जाते हैं । इस के लिये मैं ने पहले सुझाव दिया था । इस पर बातचीत चल रही है । मलारी से एक सीधा रास्ता गिरथी नदी के किनारे किनारे बड़ा होती तक पहुचता है । उस मार्ग का तत्काल निर्माण किया जाना चाहिये , वह बारहो महीने खुला रह सकता है, वहा पर आसानी रहेगी ।

यह बातें मैं ने केवल एक स्थानीय समस्या के बारे में कही, लेकिन अब हमारे सामने एक बड़ा प्रश्न आता है कि हम अपने उत्तरी सीमान्त के बारे में कौन से कदम उठायें । हमारी सरकार जो कदम उठा रही है उस का सामान रूप से हम समर्थन करते हैं । हमें अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी के कुशल नेतृत्व में विश्वास है । उन के हाथों में हमारे देश का भाग्य सुरक्षित है । लेकिन प्रत्येक माननीय सदस्य का यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में वह कुछ बातें सरकार के कानों तक पहुंचायें । ताकि उन पर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार हो सके । मेरी सम्मति में सब से पहली आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जो हमारे तिब्बती सीमान्त निवासी हैं उन के अन्दर आत्म विश्वास पैदा हो । यह कहावत प्रसिद्ध ही है कि भूखे भजन न होय गोपाला । हम असन्तुष्ट सीमान्तवासियों को देश प्रेम का पाठ नहीं पढ़ा सकते और कभी कभी उस असन्तोष के कारण उन के देश प्रेम के प्रति अविश्वास भी पैदा किया जा सकता है । इस-लिये मैं इस अवसर पर सरकार से यह अनुरोध करना चाहता हूं और चेतावनीपूर्ण अनुरोध करना चाहता हूं कि उस को इस बारे में सतर्क रहना चाहिये । मैं इस बात को स्वीकार करता हूं कि इन सीमांत प्रदेशों के बारे में पिछले कुछ वर्षों में हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री की कृपा से कुछ कार्य हुआ है लेकिन वह बहुत ही कम हुआ है और वह बहुत ही असन्तोष-जनक है ।

अभी हाल में खाद्य और कृषि मंत्रालय की ओर से एक कमेटी बिठाई गई थी जिसका कि नाम "इनऐक्सिसेबुल ऐरियाज कमेटी" अर्थात् "दुर्गम क्षेत्र समिति" था और जिसने कि ऐसे इलाकों के सम्बन्ध में और वहां पर खाद्यान्न के बारे में किस तरह आत्मनिर्भरता लाई जा सकती है, एक अन्तरिम रिपोर्ट दी है । उस कमेटी की सब से मुख्य सिफारिश यह है कि गवर्नमेंट को यह प्रयत्न करना चाहिए कि यह इलाके एनऐक्सिसेबुल न रह जाय । मैं समझता हूं कि अगर वहां सड़कों पर सचार व यातायात के साधनों की समुचित व्यवस्था कर दें तो सीमान्तवासियों का जो सबसे बड़ा कष्ट है वह दूर हो जायगा । वहां पर गल्ला तथा अन्य आवश्यक सामग्री सस्ते दाम पर पहुचाई जा सकती है और उनको अन्य आवश्यक सुविधायें भी सुलभ की जा सकती हैं । अत जो अगली दूसरी विकास योजना बनने वाली है उसमें सबसे अधिक प्राथमिकता उन इलाकों को खोलने और वहां तक सड़कें बनाने को दी जानी चाहिये ।

मैं ने अभी अपने भाषण में मलारी से बड़ा होती दर्रे तक सड़क बनाने का जिक्र किया था । उधर भूटान के बारे में चीन के प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने हमें कुछ आश्वासन भी दिये हैं । अब उनके आश्वासनों की क्या कीमत है, मैं उसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन अभी पिछली बार जब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री भूटान तशरीफ ले गये थे तो सिक्कम से उनको तिब्बत के कुछ इलाके के अन्दर से गुजरना पड़ा था और हालत यह है कि भूटान जाने के लिये हमारे देश से जो रास्ता है वह

[श्री भक्त दर्शन]

तिब्बत होकर है। अब अगर किसी तरीके से स्थिति बिगड़ गई तो भूटान में प्रवेश करना कठिन हो जायगा। इसलिए भारत सरकार पिछले दो, तीन वर्षों से यह प्रयत्न कर रही है कि आसाम और पश्चिमी बंगाल से होकर वहां दो सड़कें बनाई जायें। पिछली बार इसी सदन में मेरे एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में सरकार की ओर से यह उत्तर दिया गया था कि भूटान के लिए यह दो सड़कें तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना तक जाकर बन पायेंगी। अब यह तो वही बात हुई जैसे कि मसल मशहूर है कि आग लग गई है और कुंआ खोदा जा रहा है। उसी तरह यह कहा जा रहा है कि सड़कें बनाई जा रही हैं और उनको हम तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में जाकर पूरा करेंगे। क्या इस तरह की शिथिलता हमारे देश के लिए शोभनीय है खासकर इस अवसर पर जब कि हमारे ऊपर आफत आई हुई है। इसलिए मैं भारत सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूं कि सड़कों के निर्माण को प्राथमिकता दी जाय और अगर आवश्यक समझा जाय तो मिलिटरी इंजीनियर्स के द्वारा और एम० ई० एस० के द्वारा फौजी जवानों के द्वारा उन सड़कों का निर्माण करना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे यह कहनी है कि पश्चिमी तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में मुझे अपने बहुत ही विश्वसनीय सूत्रों के द्वारा बहुत ही चिन्ताजनक समाचार मिले हैं। अभी तक यह खाम्पाओं का विद्रोह पूर्वी और दक्षिणी तिब्बत तक ही सीमित था लेकिन अब यह विद्रोह वहीं तक सीमित नहीं रह गया है बल्कि यह विद्रोह अब पश्चिमी तिब्बत में भी फैल गया है और वहां पर खाम्पाओं और चीनी सैनिकों के बीच संघर्ष चल रहा है। उसके लिए आपको याद होगा कि अभी कुछ दिनों पहले हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बतलाया था कि स्वयं तिब्बत में जो चीनी अधिकारी हैं उन्होंने भारत सरकार को लिखा था कि भारत से कम से कम तीर्थ यात्री कैलास और मानसरोवर जायें और वहां से लोग वहां पर न जायें क्योंकि वे उनकी जिम्मेदारी नहीं ले सकते। इससे यह साबित होता है कि वहां पर स्थिति असाधारण है और बड़े पैमाने पर वहां फौजी कार्यवाहियां हो रही हैं। मुझे अपने सूत्रों के द्वारा जो सूचना मिली है उसके अनुसार वहां कई चीनी सैनिक मारे गये हैं। खाम्पाओं ने बड़े पैमाने पर वहां विद्रोह किया है जिसकी कि वजह से वहां का व्यापार बिलकुल ठप्प हो गया है। इस सदन को मालूम होगा कि वहां तिब्बत से जो हमारे भारतीय लोगों का व्यापार होता है वे बार्टर सिस्टम से होता है। लाखों रुपये का सामान पिछले साल यह वहां छोड़ आये थे और लाखों रुपये का सामान ले कर जो व्यापारी यहां से इस वर्ष गये हैं वे वहां हाथ पर हाथ धरे बैठे हैं। ताकलाकोट, ग्यानिमा, नाबरा, दापा, चोंसिंगमठ व गरतोक यह जो पश्चिमी तिब्बत की मंडियां हैं, उनमें अभी तक कोई व्यापार नहीं हुआ तिब्बती लोग आतंक के कारण अपने घरों से बाहर नहीं निकल रहे हैं और वहां अधिकारियों ने यह आदेश दे दिया है कि वहां जो भी चीजें बेची जाय वह चीनी अधिकारियों द्वारा प्रमाणित दुकानदारों या व्यापारियों को ही दी जाये और इसकी वजह से व्यापार बिलकुल ठप्प हो गया है। स्थिति यह है कि कुछ वर्षों से वहां का व्यापार ठप्प सा है और इसलिए हम को तिब्बती व्यापार पर निर्भर नहीं रहना चाहिए। इसलिए अब शासन के सामने यह समस्या आ गई है कि जो हमारे हजारों और सैकड़ों व्यापारी लोग पश्चिमी तिब्बत या पूर्वी तिब्बत के व्यापार पर निर्भर करते थे, उनके लिए क्या व्यवस्था की जाय। सरकार को उनके पुनर्वास की समस्या को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिए और बड़ी गम्भीरता से इस बारे में कदम उठाना चाहिए।

तीसरी और अन्तिम बात जो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदन के समक्ष निवेदन करना

चाहूंगा वह यह है । जैसा कि मैंने पहिले कहा था कि हमारे माननीय प्रधान मन्त्री के हाथों में देश के भाग्य की बागडोर सुरक्षित है । हम उनके नेतृत्व में अटल विश्वास रखते है लेकिन मैं उन्हें यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूं । जैसा कि अभी इस सदन में पहले भी बताया गया और जैसा कि श्वेतपत्र को देखने से सिद्ध हो जाता है कि हम ने बहुत से अपने भारतीय इलाको की पूरी तरह से देखभाल नही की, उनकी चौकसी नही की और चूंकि वे इलाके एनऐक्सिसेबल और दुर्गम थे इस कारण उन पर ध्यान नही दिया और हमारी इस असावधानी की वजह से वह इलाके हमारे हाथ से निकल चुके है । चीन सरकार हम से यह अनुरोध करती है और उसने भारत सरकार को यह सुझाव दिया है कि स्टेटस को रक्खा जाय यथास्थिति रक्खी जाय जिसका कि मतलब यह हुआ कि जो हमारे इलाके उनके कब्जे में आ गये है, वह तो उनके पास रहेंगे ही और बाकी के बारे में बातचीत चलने दी जाय, तो इसको सिद्धान्तत हमें टुकरा देना चाहिए । हम सब लोगो को यह मांग करनी चाहिए कि सारे बार्डर की और सारे सीमान्त की रक्षा की व्यवस्था सेना के हाथ में दे दी जाय जैसे कि नेफा के इलाके में फौजी अधिकारियो ने सारा शासन सूत्र अपने हाथ मे ले लिया है और यह उचित ही किया है उसी प्रकार उत्तर प्रदेश का जो तिब्बत सीमावर्ती इलाका है और हिमाचलप्रदेश, कागडा और लद्दाख का जो इलाका है वहा पर फौजी इन्तजाम किया जाना चाहिए मैं अपने भाषण की समाप्ति एक सस्कृत पद से करूगा । हमारी नीति होनी चाहिए नम्रता और दृढता, नम्रतापूर्ण दृढता और दृढतापूर्ण नम्रता की । सस्कृत का श्लोक है —"वज्रादपि कठोराणि, मृदूनि कुसमादपि" अर्थात् हम फूल से भी अधिक कोमल है मगर आवश्यकता पडने पर हम वज्र से भी अधिक कठोर हो जाय । आज देश और समय की पुकार है कि जहां हमारी नीति सारे संसार के अन्दर शान्ति स्थापित करने में फूल से भी कोमल रही है वहां इस समय हम अपने देश की रक्षा के लिए वज्र से भी अधिक कठोर बनना चाहिए ।

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Since independence we have faced many complicated situations, and I am speaking of situations arising in our relationship with other countries, but I think that this House or the vast majority in it will agree with me that no situation that we have faced has been as serious as the present one. When independence came, it came with the division of the country, and, naturally, therefore, the question that at that time Pakistan, a new territory, might try to get more than her due share was an understandable thing. We were alive to the issues, and we knew where we were Bitterness was there on both sides, and we knew where we were

But, here, we are facing a very different set of circumstances Here is a country whom we have befriended even at the cost of our being misunderstood by certain other countries, to whom we have held out the hand of friendship and have continued to do so, as the White Paper and other papers that have been laid before us show Even when they have disputed our own territorial integrity, we have done so, we have gone to the limits Our Prime Minister who has always been in favour of the friendship between India and China, of which all of us are in favour, has gone to the limits in trying to bring about a conciliation, so that they would take a reasonable attitude in the matter But it is because he has failed to succeed that he has now been compelled by circumstances to place the whole matter before Parliament and to affirm clearly and definitely that it is not possible for India to tolerate the encroachment—or whatever word one may like to us—into our territorial boundaries.

Other hon Members have spoken about the White Paper, the yellow paper and Mr. Chou En-lai's letter. I do not want to enter into any fray

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

with Shri S. A. Dange, because obviously, he has placed the case of China rather than that of India before this House, but he said that after Mr. Chou En-lai's letter, it should be clear that China seeks our friendship.

From what the Prime Minister said the other day, there was some doubt at least, some "shadow" to use his words at least during the last few months, when the reply to his letter had not come. But I think the House will agree that there is now no shadow of doubt as to what China intends and what her viewpoint is.

We have been asking again and again about the maps which she has continued to print, and in spite of this, she was vague in her answers. In Mr. Chou En-lai's latest statement, there is no vagueness left It is perfectly clear where we stand with them. He says:

> "Mr. Prime Minister, how could China agree to accept under coercion..."

—he has used the word 'coercion'—

> "...such an illegal line which would have it relinquish its right and disgrace itself by selling out its territory—and such a large part of territory as that.".

40,000 square miles of our territory, they say, are their territory today. As the Prime Minister said in the Rajya Sabha the other day, by land and by air, they say, it is India that has committed aggression and even by sea, for the matter of that. So, we should now know clearly where actually we stand with those for whom we have done much and we want to do much. When India thinks that something is right, she abides by it. That does not mean that she wants any reward from China. But the facts are there; the stark facts are that India has friended China, as I said, even at the cost of being misunderstood by other nations.

I want from the Prime Minister—who is not here at the moment—an answer on one specific point, because I would like to know what the position is regarding this matter. In *The Statesman* of the 11th September, it is reported that some Chinese commanders have claimed Lachun and Lachen, in Northern Sikkim as an integral part of the Tibetan region of China. I want to know whether there is any truth in it. Have the Government of India come to know anything about it? Again, there is an unconfirmed report of Chinese incursions in Northern Bhutan from the Chumbiai Valley, and of Chinese soldiers having gone into that area. I would like to know from the Prime Minister, when he replies, whether that is a fact, and what the actual position in regard to this unconfirmed report is. Both these reports were in *The Statesman* dated the 11th September, 1959, that is yesterday.

Acharya Kripalani: It is a very difficult place; they cannot go there.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I do not want to go into the details neither would you give me so much time. But, just to retrace the step, India not only held out the hand of friendship in regard to China's claim for admission into the United Nations, but she relinquished some rights that the British Government gave to their successor Government in regard to their position in Tibet. If this was not proof of sincere friendship, what else could have been? But, no matter what we have done, up till today we have been rebuffed and we have been insulted. The Chinese Ambassador's letter to the Foreign Secretary is the worst sort of insult that India could face.

I do not want to speak in the language of blood and thunder. I would merely say that Shri S. A. Dange is quite wrong. India is not hysterical.

India is not panic-stricken. Indian is calm in the face of this situation. India will want the friendship of China, but only on honourable terms

Now, there is no doubt that all this as I said in the beginning, is a stab in the dark, it has been a stab in the dark for the last few years There are three points in this long border between India and Tibet, or rather between India and the Tibet region of China, as it is called, where they have entered, as other speakers have pointed out already There is the Ladakh region there is Bara-Hoti, called Wu-Je by the Chinese and the NEFA where they have come in and they have occupied Longju

Lastly, Mr Chou En-lai in his statement says that the MacMahon line is not one which he will accept although when he had talks with our Prime Minister in 1956, nothing was raised about it From 1952, it was not raised, in 1954, in 1956 and in 1958, all this was not raised There were border incidents as these are called, yes, they are border incidents, let us hope, even now, those border incidents will end.

India's Prime Minister has made it clear in the last yellow paper statement that we are willing to abide by the *status quo* but the *status quo* must be the *status quo* that obtained before these encroachments took place He has even gone further and said in regard to Longju which they have occupied, if they would go out, we shall also remain out, and then we shall settle this matter, but no settlement can come as the Prime Minister has made it clear, by giving up any part of the territory of India

Shri Braj Raj Singh: He has already given up.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Let it not be thought by China or by any other nation, as the Prime Minister has pointed out, that because India speaks with a gentle voice, therefore, she will not be firm. It may be that we have gone far, we have waited long, before we have taken or are willing to take any action, because we were hoping against hope and our Prime Minister was hoping against hope, that China would see reason Let China understand that India is a nation that has won its independence by following the ways of non-violence Let China understand, if she has not understood it, before that India wishes to keep to a policy of non-alignment, and that India wants to keep to non-violence in her behaviour with any other nation, and that that will be her main approach *Panchsheel*, to India, was all in sincerity, to China, it may have been a protestation and an expedient for the time being, but to India, it is something very sincere and real That is why we have been caught napping perhaps But today the country is united Whether it is any faction or any person in this country belonging to any party or whether it is even women who, as Acharya Kripalani says, are inferior beings—he implied that they are of lesser account—everyone is united There may be some people in this country who have extra-territorial loyalities But let the Chinese not be deluded by them, because those people do not represent India today I will acknowledge that there are amongst that party some persons who in the long past played a patriotic role in their individual capacities, not as members of that party But where do they stand today? Where did they stand also in 1942 and where do they stand today?

When Shri S A Dange was speaking, we were wondering—it is actually no wonder, we felt—whether it was the case of India that was being put forward It was the case of China that was being put forward It was the case of whether there were not some Indians who wanted China to be assailed on both fronts; that was the thing that exercised his mind. Here the borders of our country have been encroached upon by another nation, a nation from whom we ex-

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

pected something better That does not count with Shri S A Dange Let China not be deluded by it

Of course, it is difficult for us to speak to the Chinese people because there is a controlled Press there But I would speak to the leaders of those people, Mr Chou En-lai and others and ask them to halt even now because, as I said, they should not think that the sympathies of the Indian people are with those few persons who have extra-territorial loyalties to their country We may tolerate those persons, we might even have expressed sympathies even from this party with some of their economic policies which they hold along with us But when our country's honour is at stake, when our integrity is at stake, there can be no question about it, we cannot tolerate such things Those persons do not represent the India of today The India of today is standing behind the Prime Minister

It may be that there are some persons here who feel that we have not been swift enough There may be some persons here who feel that Parliament should have been informed earlier These things aside, there is no doubt that today this country as a whole is standing behind the Prime Minister and the policy that India has now unfolded There can be no question that the territorial integrity of India can be violated under any terms by any country and that India can be deluded We have been slaves in the past, no doubt But we do not intend to be slaves in the future India is free and we intend to nourish and nurture that freedom of ours We do not intend to allow anyone, howsoever he may talk in the words of *Panchsheel*, to go behind it and stab us in the back, as I said, to interefere with our freedom This is something by which all of us absolutely abide

Before I conclude, I have one more point to make We do not want any *post-mortem* in regard to the past. But now of course, we shall be and must be very vigilant about our frontiers In future, we must realise—which we have not done so much in the past—that whatever be the friendship that has been extended in the matter of *Panchsheel* from China, it has its great limitations The limitations are in Mr Chou En-lai's letter Therefore, we have to be vigilant all the time We do not talk in terms of war As I said, we do not believe in a policy of blood and thunder We do not want war We feel that it would be very bad for the world as a whole if two great countries like India and China were not friendly We feel it will be very bad for India and China if they cannot remain friends We feel that in the interest of ourselves as well as of China, it is necessary that friendship is maintained But that cannot be at the expense of our honour, as I have already said It cannot be at the expense of our integrity

I say again whoever it be, whether it is a man or a woman who, as Acharya Kripalani said is only of lesser account, any citizen of India whose loyalties are to India first they all together stand behind the Prime Minister in the present situation

सेठ गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब मैं अपने मित्र श्री डांगे जी का भाषण सुन रहा था तो मुझे ऐसा मालूम हुआ कि अचानक चीन से कोई देवदूत यहां आकर बोल रहा है। उन्हें मैं देवदूत आदर की दृष्टि से कह रहा हूं। शायद देवदूत के स्थान पर कोई दूसरा शब्द कहा जाये तो उपयुक्त होगा। परन्तु मैं तो एक सौम्य प्रकृति का मनुष्य हूं इसलिए कड़े शब्दों का उपयोग नहीं करना चाहता। मुझे खेद है कि वे यहां नहीं हैं नहीं तो मैं उनसे एक बात पूछना चाहता था कि आज यदि यह झगड़ा चीन और भारत के बीच में न होकर, अमरीका या इंगलैंड और भारत के बीच में होता, तो उनकी और उनके दल की क्या स्थिति होती। हम वैदेशिक

नीति पर उनके और उनके दल के लोगों के न जाने कितने भाषण सुन चुके हैं और वैदेशिक नीति में कुछ दिलचस्पी होने के कारण मैं प्रायः इस विषय पर बोला भी करता हूं। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यदि यह झगड़ा किसी साम्यवादी देश और भारत के बीच में न होकर अमरीका या इंगलैंड के सदृश किसी पूंजीवादी देश और भारत के साथ होता, तो उन्होंने आज यह कहा होता कि हम को तत्काल लड़ाई करना चाहिए।

साम्यवादी दल के सदस्यों की बातें सुनकर मुझे सदा यह आभास होता रहा है कि इस सदन में कोई भारतीय व्यक्ति न बोल कर या भारतीय दल न बोल कर ऐसा व्यक्ति या ऐसा दल बोलता है जिसने अपने को विदेशी साम्यवादियों के यहां गिरो रख दिया है। और उनकी जो नीति होती है उसमें भारत का बहुत कम सम्बन्ध रहता है, भारत के बाहर के देशों का सम्बन्ध रहता है। सन् १९३९ में जो युद्ध हुआ, उस युद्ध में उनकी क्या स्थिति रही? पहले वह युद्ध राष्ट्रीय युद्ध नहीं था। यकायक नाटक का परदा बदला, एक छोटा सा नाटक कार होने के नाते मुझे अक्सर नाटक की बात याद आ जाती है—और उनकी सारी मनोवृत्ति ही बदल गयी, और वही बात हम सदा देखा करते हैं।

डांगे साहब ने तिब्बत की बहुत बात कही। मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि आखिर तिब्बत के मामले में हम ने कौन सा अपराध किया है। यदि तिब्बत के दलाई लामा के सदृश एक महापुरुष यहां आते हैं तो उनको यहां आदर पूर्वक रखना तो भारतीय संस्कृति के अनुरूप है। हम ने सदा यह किया है। हमारा इतिहास इस बात को बताता है। तो तिब्बत के मामले में हम ने कौनसी ऐसी बात कर डाली, कौनसा ऐसा अपराध कर डाला कि जिसकी वजह से आज चीन हम से नाराज है, यहां का साम्यवादी दल भी हम से नाराज है, हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने यह बात स्पष्ट कही है कि दलाई लामा के यहां आने के बाद जो सुरक्षा परिषद् में तिब्बत को ले जाने का मामला उठा है या इस तरह के और राजनैतिक मामले उठे हैं, हम उनके पक्ष में नहीं है। हम तिब्बत के मामले को कोई राजनीतिक विषय नहीं बनाना चाहते। जहां तक तिब्बत का मामला है, एक व्यक्ति हमारे यहां आए, हमने उनको आदर से रख लिया। इसमें तो हमने कोई बुरी बात नहीं की।

अभी कृपलानी जी का भाषण मैंने बड़े ध्यान से सुना। उनके भाषण में एक बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आयी और उन्होंने उस भाषण में कोई विधायक सुझाव रखा भी नहीं, कि वह कौनसी गृह नीति को अपनाना चाहते हैं। बार बार उन्होंने कहा "फर्म एटीट्यूट फर्म एटीट्यूड।" मैं समझता हूं उनके भाषण में "फर्म" शब्द विष्णु सहस्र नाम के पाठ की तरह आरम्भ से अन्त तक आया है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि वह कौनसी फर्म नीति चाहते हैं। उन्होंने कोई बात आपके या इस सदन के सामने नहीं रखी कि जिससे हम यह पता चलता कि वह कौनसी बात चाहते हैं, कि हम करें। क्या वह चाहते हैं कि हम युद्ध की घोषणा करें? जहां मैं इस विचार का हूं कि हमको भारत की एक एक इंच भूमि पर ध्यान रखना चाहिये, और मेरा विश्वास है कि यदि कभी आवश्यकता हुई तो जब तक भारत में एक भी भारतीय रहेगा तब तक वह भारत की एक इंच भूमि भी भारत से बाहर नहीं जाने देगा—वहां इसी के साथ मैं यह भी समझता हूं कि कड़वा-कड़वा थू और मीठा मीठा गप वाली बात नहीं होनी चाहिये। हम पंचशील के सिद्धान्तों में विश्वास रखते हैं, गांधी जी का नाम लेते हैं, अहिंसा की बात करते हैं, अहिंसा में विश्वास रखते हुए और गांधी जी का नाम लेते हुए यदि हम मन में कुछ ऐसी बातों को सोचा करें कि जो गांधी जी के सिद्धान्तों के, अहिंसा के सिद्धान्तों के, अनुकूल नहीं हैं, यह कहां तक ठीक है। इसलिये मुझे

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

कृपालानी जी के भाषण में वे क्या चाहते हैं इसका पता नहीं लगा । भाषण बहुत सुन्दर था, अंग्रेजी भी सुन्दर थी, वह शायद इसलिये कि वह पढ़ कर थे । उन्होंने कहा भी था कि प्रधान मन्त्री भी बिना लिखे उतनी अच्छी अंग्रेजी नहीं बोल सकते क्योंकि वह उनकी मातृ भाषा नहीं है । लेकिन उन्होंने क्या सुझाव दिया यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया ।

मैं एक बात में और श्री डांगे साहब से असहमत हूं । उन्होंने जो बार बार यह कि हमारी गलती है या चीन की गलती है यह देखा जाएगा, यह मेरी समझ म नहीं आयी । जबकि हमारे देश में भी इस तरह से सोचने वाले लोग हैं कि हमारी गलती है या किसी और की गलती है और हम अपनी स्थिति पर भी विश्वास नहीं है तब तो फिर भगवान् ही हमारी रक्षा करें तो हमारी रक्षा हो सकती है ।

मैं डांगे साहब की एक बात से भी सहमत हूं वह यह कि हम लड़ाई की बात नहीं सोचनी है ।

कृपलानी जी ने यह कहा कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति असफल रही । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि यह बात उन्होंने कैसे कही । केवल अभी वहीं पर, जब संकट के अवसर आते हैं तब तब हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में शंका होती है । कभी अमरीका और इंग्लैण्ड हमको कोसते हैं, कभी चीन और रूस हम को कोसते हैं, इसका कारण है । हमने एक ऐसी नीति का अनुसरण करना आरम्भ किया है कि जिस नीति पर आज की दुनिया नहीं चल रही है । आज दुनिया दो गुटों में बट गयी है, एक को नेतृत्व अमरीका करता है, दूसरे का नेतृत्व रूस और चीन करते हैं । दोनों बातें शान्ति की करते हैं पर तैयारी लड़ाई की करते हैं । आज तक दुनिया में यह कभी नहीं हुआ । जो बात की जाती है वैसी तैयारी भी होती है । यह इस वक्त की दुनिया की विचित्र अवस्था है कि बात एक की जाती है और तैयारी दूसरी की जाती है । इस वक्त दुनिया की जैसी अवस्था है उसम हमारी नीति लोगों की समझ मं नहीं आती । कृपालानी जी के सदृश जो गांधीवादी हैं उनकी समझ म तो हमारी नीति आनी चाहिये थी । और हमारी नीति स्पष्ट है । हम सब के मित्र हैं । कल की प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस में हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने "एलाईज़" और "फ्रेंड्स" इन दोनों शब्दों का बड़ा सुन्दर विश्लेषण किया है । हम किसी के एलाईज़ नहीं हैं पर हम मित्र सब के हैं । एलाईज होना और मित्र होना इन दोनों में कुछ फर्क है । वह लड़ाई के समय मालूम होता है । तो हम सब के मित्र हैं । अमरीका के भी हम मित्र हैं, हम इंगलेंण्ड के भी मित्र हैं । पश्चिमी देशों के भी मित्र हैं और रूस और चीन तथा पूर्वी देशों के भी मित्र हैं । हमारे पंचशील के सिद्धान्त हैं । हम उन सिद्धान्तों के आरम्भ से ही समर्थक रहे हैं । मैं यह मानता हूं कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उन को बड़ी सुन्दरता से हमारे सामने रखा, पर वे कोई नये सिद्धात नहीं हैं । भारतीय संस्कृति के अनुसार वे सिद्धान्त हैं । गांधी जी जिन सिद्धान्तों का प्रतिपादन करते रहे उन सिद्धान्तों को दूसरे शब्दों में हमारे सामने रखा गया है ।

इसलिये मैं यह अवश्य चाहता हूं कि लड़ाई की बात छोड़ दी जाये । लड़ाई हम किसी से नहीं करना चाहते । पहले भी हमने कई बातों को निपटाने की कोशिश की । कोरिया की लड़ाई के सम्बन्ध में हमने पहले ही कह दिया था कि ३८वें अक्षांश को पार न किया जाय और हमने देखा कि हमारे कहने के अनुसार ही कोरिया का मामला तय हुआ । इसी प्रकार स्वेज का इतना बड़ा [illegible] थी, लेकिन हमने कुछ बातें कहीं और लड़ाई तक मामला पहुंचने पर भी, वहां सेनाओं के आ जाने पर

भी, लड़ाई बन्द हुई। स्वेज की लड़ाई भी निपटाई गई। इस तरह से हमारी नीति हाल ही में बड़ी बड़ी बातों को निपटा चुकी है और मैं यह भी मानता हूं कि अगर सर्वथा नहीं तो बहुत दूर तक, आज दुनिया में जबर्दस्ती नहीं हुई, तो उस का श्रेय भारत को और हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री जी को भी है। आज जब हमारे ऊपर एक आपत्ति आई है, एक झगड़ा हुआ है और एक ऐसे देश के साथ झगड़ा हुआ है, जिस के साथ हजारों वर्षों से हमारी मैत्री रही है और जिस को आज भी हम मित्र मानते हैं—शत्रु नहीं मानते हैं, तो मैं इस बात से बिल्कुल सहमत हूं, जैसा कि प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने कल की प्रैस कान्फ्रेंस में कहा और राज्य सभा में भी कहा और जैसा कि वह सदा कहते हैं, कि हम इस तरह के मामलों को आपसी तौर पर बातचीत कर निपटाना चाहते हैं। हमारा विश्वास है कि जिस तरह से हम अन्य बड़ी बड़ी बातों को निपटा चुके हैं, उसी तरह से इस बात को भी निपटा सकेंगे। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम अपना सन्तुलन—अपना बैलेंस न खोयें और जिन सिद्धान्तों को हम स्वीकार कर चुके हैं, जिन के अनुसार, हम देख चुके हैं कि बहुत से मामले निपटे हैं, उन पर ही अवलम्बित रह कर इस झगड़े को भी निपटायें। मेरा विश्वास है कि हम अपने प्रधान मन्त्री जी के नेतृत्व में—जिस के लिये मैं अनेक बार कह चुका हूं कि यह हमारा बड़ा सौभाग्य कि हम को इस तरह का नेतृत्व प्राप्त है—विश्वास रख कर आगे बढ़ेंगे। आज सारा देश उन के साथ है। जिस तरह हम दूसरे मामलों को निपटा चुके हैं, उसी तरह इस मामले को भी हम निपटा सकेंगे।

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as I rise to take part in this debate I am reminded of the observation which he quite often made of the late Dr. Ambedkar. He used to say that free and independent India has got no other menace except the menace from China. That it has come true and is coming true is a matter which shows that people, knowledgable and intelligent and of the calibre and type of Dr. Ambedkar have already foreseen the danger from this quarter.

I was listening very intently to the speeches of both Acharya Kripalani and Shri Dange. If it is a case of precipitate action, no one, I suppose, can improve upon the excellent speech that was made by Acharya Kripalani. Some of the very good points he had raised therein it would be difficult for even the Prime Minister to get over. If, on the other hand, it is a case for a meek submission, it is no question of trying to improve upon what Shri Dange said—I think the Prime Minister has already, from that point of view, a conciliatory approach towards the solution of this problem—I think the Prime Minister has made a good speech particularly in the Rajya Sabha. We should consider things in the new background. We are not dealing with old China, as we knew. It is not the China of culture; it is not the China of philosophy; it is not the China of religion and morality. It is a new China, not even the China which was accustomed to opium-eating. We are dealing with a China which is new, a China whose population is threatening to oust the rest of the world, very nearly running into a billion and a China which has got one language and not fourteen languages that we have got in this country and a China with no community or caste and with no territorial divisions of the kind over which we are wrangling in this country today. What is more, China is proud of her achievements. We probably feel that we are slowly achieving and working our various Plans in what we call the democratic way. But China is proud of having achieved her targets under the various Plans in her own way which is neither dictatorial nor democratic but—which I would prefer to call—Chinese. Now China has been

[Shri Siva Raj]

accustomed to and is the product of years of war. So much so, today, almost every Chinaman is tough and war-minded. There is no doubt about that. Even the sober influences of religion and morality are not there now and I could never understand what relation there can be between our country and a country which calls Lord Buddha, the greatest messenger of peace and goodwill and the greatest messenger of compassion, as a political rebel and says that he wanted aggrandisement....

Some Hon. Members: Shame

14 hrs.

Shri Siva Raj: It is a shame no doubt. But at the back of their minds they had this unfortunate Dalai Lama and because they wanted to say this about the Dalai Lama, they started with Lord Budha, our messenger of peace. Undoubtedly, the Prime Minister is known throughout the world as a person who stands for peace and goodwill and who wants to settle all these difficult problems by the process of negotiations. I feel that in these discussions relating to the so-called border incidents, they do not take our Prime Minister seriously. They did not believe Lord Buddha and now they do not believe the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Dange was talking about these border incidents I think—that was my reading of history—that communism is opposed to nationalism. It is invariably called international communism Communism being international, it has no belief in borders at all. That being so, nobody could talk that China was violating the borders ... (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member may address the Chair.

Shri Siva Raj: I am addressing the Chair but I am being diverted through interruptions. Now, that is the approach. We all saw my friend saying this. But it is true that one can read into these border incidents a picture of the future prospect regarding China? Hitherto we all believed and said that the world was in the grip of the red fever but the fear now is that the world is now in the grip of the yellow fever. Shri Rajagopalachari—who probably differs from our Prime Minister on every aspect—said the other day that he entirely agreed with his foreign policy, and very rightly so, and that is because of the non-alignment. He appealed to Mr. Khruschev to stop China from all these incursions in order to see that India was not thrown on the lap of the western democracies. But, Sir, my fear is that even Russia may be thrown on the lap of the western democracies on account of this powerful move from China.

I feel that in the present circumstances it is very difficult to say one thing or another about the action that has so far been taken by the Prime Minister and the attitude that he has adopted towards this. It is very difficult to say at what particular point in this continuing series of incidents the Prime Minister should act There are on the one hand people hustling him to act at once and on the other hand people asking him to keep quiet and rest on his oars. It is indeed a difficult matter. I would much rather at the present moment leave the entire business in the hands of the Prime Minister to tackle it in his inimitable way.

श्री जयराम सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज देश पर संकट की घड़ियां दिखाई दे रही हैं और ऐसे गम्भीर विषय को कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने हंसी और मजाक का विषय भी बनाने की कोशिश की है । मुझे इस बात का आश्चर्य है कि पिछले साल से हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार के द्वारा जो तुष्टीकरण की नीति अपनाई जाती रही है, एपीजमेंट की पालिसी पर चला जाता रहा है, उस को अब भी छोड़ने की कोशिश नहीं की जा रही है और सम्भवतः तुष्टीकरण

की जिस नीति पर हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार पिछले कुछ साल से चलती रही है, उसको आज हिन्दुस्तान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी अपनाना चाहती है। हो सकता है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता, श्री डांगे, आज यहां यह कह कर कि वह चीन की तरफ से आश्वासन दिलाना चाहते हैं कि कोई हमला होगा नहीं, कोई लड़ाई होगी नहीं, कुछ ऐसी बात करें कि जिस तरह रूस की तरफ से कुछ आश्वासन आते रहे। हमने पिछले दिनों देखा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ नेतागण दवा-दारू के लिए—मेडिकल ट्रीटमेंट के लिये चीन में जाते रहे हैं। हो सकता है कि पेकिंग को भी यात्रा शुरू हो। जो भी हो, हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में रह कर यदि आज भी सफाई के साथ यह नहीं कहा जाता है कि मैकमहोन लाइन हमारी पक्की रेखा है और उसके एक इंच भी यदि कोई इधर आता है, तो हम उसको बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे, तो उसके साफ मानी ये हैं, कि हम चीन के साथ अधिक हैं और हिन्दुस्तान के साथ उतने नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं यह कह रहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की तरफ से एक तुष्टीकरण की नीति अपनाई जाती रही है। यह नीति हम शुरू से देख रहे हैं—उस वक्त से देख रहे हैं, जिस वक्त कि सिकयांग-तिब्बत रोड का निर्माण हुआ और उस के निर्माण पर हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की ओर से १८ अक्तूबर, १९५८ को एक नोट दिया गया। उस में उन्होंने कहा कि हमारा ध्यान आकर्षित किया गया है कि एक सड़क बना ली गई है। इस नोट के पैराग्राफ ५ में यह कहा गया है :—

"As the Chinese Government are aware, Government of India are anxious to settle their petty frontier disputes".

हमारी टेरीटरी में जो सौ मील की सड़क बना ली गई उसको—उस डिस्प्यूट को—गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया "पैटी फ्रन्टियर डिस्प्यूट" कहे, मैं समझता हूं कि इस से ज्यादा तुष्टीकरण की नीति और कोई नहीं हो सकती। सौ मील की सड़क हमारी टेरीटरी में बन गई और उस के एक साल बाद हम को पता चला। सब से ताज्जुब की बात यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट को, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को इस की कोई खबर नहीं दी गई कि हमारी सीमा पर हमारे बार्डर पर यह हो रहा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह न सिर्फ तुष्टीकरण की नीति है, बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के साथ जो न्याय होना चाहिए, उस को भी खत्म करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। आखिर हम हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के बार्डर पर, ढाई हजार मील पर क्या हो रहा है, उस को इस सदन को और हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को पता न लगे, यह कह दिया जाय कि "पैटी फ्रन्टियर डिस्प्यूट" है, मैं समझता हूं कि यह बिल्कुल अनुचित बात है। हम समझते हैं कि यह बहुत गम्भीर घटना है, जिस को इस सदन को और देश को बहुत गम्भीर रूप में लेना चाहिए।

अगर इस सारे व्हाइट पेपर को पढ़ा जाए, तो हमें पता लगेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार से चीन की सरकार को जो नोट गए और चीन सरकार की तरफ से हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को जो नोट आए, उन में जमीन आस्मान का फर्क है। मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता हूं कि उन्हीं शब्दों में हम को उन को जवाब देना चाहिए। मैं नहीं कहना चाहता कि यदि चीन के लोग हम को रफियन कहते हैं, तो हम भी उन को रफियन कहें लेकिन मैं यह आशा जरूर करता हूं कि हमारे शब्दों में ऐसी भावना का प्रदर्शन जरूर हो, जिस से मालूम पड़े कि यदि चीन हम पर हमला करना चाहता है, या ऐसे डिजाइन्ज रखना चाहता है, जिन से हमारी इन्टेगरिटी पर खतरा आता है, तो हम उस को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। मुझे अफ़सोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी नीति में यह बात नहीं झलकती। मैं एक के बाद एक ऐसे उदाहरण पेश कर सकता हूं, जिन से यह साबित होगा कि

[श्री ब्रज राज सिंह]

हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ से चीन की सरकार को जो नोट लिखे गए, उन में कभी कभी भी प्रोटेस्ट भी नहीं किया गया है सिर्फ ध्यान आकर्षित किया गया है। इतनी बड़ी बड़ी बातों की तरफ सिर्फ ध्यान आकर्षित किया गया है। हम यह भी नहीं कहना चाहते कि आप हमारी जमीन पर आते हो, हमारी सीमा का अतिक्रमण करते हो, हम उस के प्रति अपना विरोध प्रकट करते हैं। और ऐसा क्यों नहीं होता है? इस के पीछे दो बातें हो सकती है?

Shri Kalika Singh: It has been repeated in all the letters sent by the Government of India Protests have been made.

श्री ब्रज राज सिंह: मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि मैं ने अभी जो आप के सामने सड़क के बारे में नोट पढ़ा है, उस में कहीं प्रोटेस्ट नहीं है। इतना कहा गया है "सैटल पैटी फ्रंटियर डिस्प्यूट्स"। कोई शुरू से ले कर आखिर तक इन नोट्स इत्यादि को पढ़ जाए, लेकिन कहीं पता नहीं चलेगा कि हम प्रोटेस्ट कर रहे हैं।

मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि हम उस भाषा का प्रयोग न करें, लेकिन ऐसी भाषा का प्रयोग तो होना चाहिए, कम से कम ऐसी भावना का प्रदर्शन तो होना चाहिए, जिस से प्रकट हो कि हम अपनी तरफ से तैयार हैं। और यही बात थी, जिस की वजह से प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने इस संसद् को विश्वास में नहीं लिया, इस देश को विश्वास में नहीं लिया। यहां पर प्रश्न पूछे जाते रहे और उन का टालू जवाब देते रहे और यह कहा जाता रहा कि ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है। और जब मालूम हुआ कि अब मामला कंट्रोल से बाहर होता जा रहा है, तो मजबूर हो कर उन को इस व्हाइट पेपर को हमारे सामने रखना पड़ा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बहुत ही गैर-जिम्मेदाराना बात है, बहुत ही अनुत्तरदायित्व-पूर्ण बात है, जिस की सम्भवतः हमारे आने वाली पीढ़ियां कभी क्षमा नहीं करेंगी, यदि कोई ऐसी बात होती है, जो चाऊ-एन-लाई के आखिर के पत्र से प्रकट होती है।

मेरे मित्र, श्री डांगे, ने फरमाया कि चाऊ-एन-लाई के लैटर के आने के बाद नैगोशिएशन के लिए, बात-चीत के लिए दरवाजा बिल्कुल खुल जाता है—सब मामला तय हो जायगा। हम भी बात-चीत के द्वारा मामले को तय करना चाहते हैं। हम भी शान्ति रखना चाहते हैं। आखिर बुद्ध, महावीर और महात्मा गांधी का देश शान्ति नहीं चाहेगा, तो कौन सा देश शान्ति चाह सकता है? हमारे सामने उदाहरण है हमारे देश में एक छोटा सा पाकेट है गोआ, का, लेकिन हम ने गोआ को मिलिटरी से फतह करने की कोशिश नहीं की, उस को जबरदस्ती लेने की कोशिश नहीं की। हमारी तो परम्परा ही यही रही है और अब भी हम शान्ति अख्तियार करना चाहते हैं। हम शान्ति की नीति पर सिर्फ इस लिए नहीं चलना चाहते कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री और श्री चाऊ-एन-लाई ने किन्हीं विशेष कारणों से पंचशील की घोषणा पर—डिक्लेरेशन पर—दस्तखत कर दिए, बल्कि हम शान्ति इस लिए चाहते हैं कि यह हमारी परम्परा है। इस लिए हम शांति कायम रखना चाहते हैं। लेकिन बात-चीत किस आधार पर चले, इस के बारे में चाऊ एन-लाई साहब फरमाते हैं:

"This piece of territory corresponds in size to the Chekiang Province of China and is as big as 90,000 square kilometers Mr Prime Minister, how can China agree to accept under coercion such an illegal line which would have it relinquish its rights and disgrace itself by selling out its territory—and such a large piece of territory as that?"

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जब इस तरह के पत्रों को हम देखते हैं,जब इस तरह की उन पत्रों के पीछे की भावना को हम देखते हैं कि अब तो सारे दरवाजे बंद हो गए हैं, उस बात नेगोशिएशन के तय हो जाएगी, तो इसका मतलब यह है कि या तो इस पत्र के अर्थ को अच्छी तरह से, ठीक तरह से समझा नहीं गया है, या फिर इस पत्र के अर्थ को समझने की कोई कोशिश नहीं की गई है, या नहीं की जा रही है और जानबूझ कर कोशिश नहीं की जा रही है मैं समझता हूं कि जो दूसरी चीज है, वह ज्यादा सही है। हिन्दुस्तान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का पिछले दिनों का या पिछले सालों का जो इतिहास रहा है, उससे सभी वाकिफ हैं। आज भी श्री डांगे ने भाषण किया है और उनसे इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों ने यह जानने की बार बार कोशिश की है कि आखिर हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के जिन भागों पर चीन ने कब्जा कर लिया है, बड़ा होती पर कब्जा कर लिया है, लौंगजू पर कब्जा किया है या किसी एक रोड पर कब्जा कर लिया है, उनके सम्बन्ध में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का क्या रवैया है तो उन्होंने कह दिया कि वह इस राय से इत्तिफाक करते हैं कि कोई भी हमला किसी किस्म का बरदाश्त वह नहीं करेंगे लेकिन जिन पर हमला करके कब्जा कर लिया गया है उनमें उनको कैसे हटाया जाए, किस तरह से वह मामला तय किया जाए इसके बारे में कुछ भी नहीं कहा गया है सिवाय इसके कि बातचीत की जाए। मैं समझता हूं कि वही अपीजमेंट की पालिसी, वही तुष्टीकरण की नीति लांगजू के बारे, बड़ा होती इत्यादि के बारे में आज चीन के प्रति अपनाई जा रही है। यह कह देना कि हम अपने आफिसर्स को वहां नहीं से जायेंगे बशर्ते कि चीन भी अपने सैनिकों को हटा ले, मैं समझता हूं कि ठीक नहीं है क्योंकि चीन अपने सैनिक हटाने नहीं जा रहा है। इस हालत में तय करना होगा कि हम क्या करें। मैं यह कहता कि आप लड़ाई छेड़ दें, हम लड़ने के काबिल नहीं हैं, हमारा देश गरीब देश है, पिछड़ा हुआ देश है, हमारी आर्थिक हालत अच्छी नहीं है, हम लड़ाई नहीं मोल ले सकते हैं लेकिन लड़ाई हम न करें तो क्या हम बेइज्जती बर्दाश्त करते जायें? हम दोस्ती के लिए तैयार हैं, लेकिन दोस्ती इस तरह से कायम नहीं रह सकती है जिस तरह से कि आज तक हमने दोस्ती कायम रखने की कोशिश की है। हर एक नोट में ऐसी भाषा का प्रयोग किया गया है जिस से पता चले कि हम किसी के मातहत हों, हम किसी के अधीन हों। डा० राम सुभग सिंह जी ने कहा है कि इस सदन के अन्दर अगर कोई कुछ कहता है तो उस पर एतराज किया जाता है वहां से। हिन्दुस्तान में जनतंत्र लागू है, हिन्दुस्तान में विधान के अनुसार कार्य होता है, इसमें रहते हुए हमें अधिकार है कि हम अपना गुस्सा, अपना रिजेंटमेंट जाहिर करें

सेठ गोविंद दास लेकिन ऐसा प्रदर्शन नहीं होना चाहिये जैसा कि बम्बई में हुआ था और माओ त्से तुंग के चित्र के साथ व्यवहार किया गया है या जैसा कि यहां पर चीनी एम्बेसी में जाकर किया गया है। ऐसे दर्शन करना हमारे लिए ठीक नहीं है।

श्री अज राज सिंह मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के विधान के अन्दर रहते हुए गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ और देश में या दुनिया में जो कठिनाइयां पैदा हो रही हैं, उनके खिलाफ रोष अगर हम प्रदर्शित करना चाहते हैं तो इसका हमें पूरा अधिकार है। मैं मानता हूं कि चाइनीज कौंसलेट के सामने बम्बई में जो प्रदर्शन हुआ उसमें एक दो आदमियों ने, यह गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की रिपोर्ट है, चाइना की रिपोर्ट है, चीनी राष्ट्रपति माओ त्से तुंग की तसवीर पर टोमेटोज और एग्ज जो फेंक दिये वह शोभनीय कार्य नहीं था। इसको सभी मानते हैं। सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की ओर से कहा गया कि हम इसको एप्रूव नहीं करते हैं। यह बात दूसरी है। लेकिन देखने वाली बात यह है कि एक दूसरे देश की सरकार की तरफ

[श्री बच राज सिंह]

वे किस प्रकार की भाषा का प्रयोग किया जाता है, किस प्रकार से विरोध प्रकट किया जाता है । यह कहा जाता है कि इस तरह की बात अगर होती है तो इसको हम नहीं मानते हैं और अगर आप भी नहीं मानते हैं तो एक साल नहीं दो साल नहीं, दस साल नहीं सौ साल तक इसको आपके सामने रखते जायेंगे और रुकेंगे नहीं ।

16.16 hrs.

[SHRI BARMAN *in the chair*]

हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की तरफ से इसका जो उत्तर दिया जाता है, उसको भी आप जरा सुन लीजिये, जो एक्सप्लेनेशन दिया जाता है, उसको सुन लीजिये । हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ से उसकी इस तरह से व्याख्या की जाती है कि मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमें शक होने लगता है कि आज भी हम आजाद में रह रहे हैं या नहीं रह रहे हैं । क्या उन इलाकों के ऊपर चीन सरकार की सावरेनटी को हम मान रहे हैं ? हमारी तरफ से ३० अप्रैल, १९५९ को नोट भेजा गया जो कि बिल्कुल इरेलेवेंट मालूम पड़ता है और अगर वह भेजा न भी जाता तो भी मैं समझता हूं कि कोई दिक्कत न होती । उसमें कहा गया —

"The Government of India would like to point out that the particular procession in Bombay referred to in the Chinese Embassy's note was organised by a party called the Socialist Party which broke away some years ago from the major Socialist Party in India, namely the Praja Socialist Party".

ये तो हमारे आपस के झगड़े हैं । आगे कहा गया :–

"This splinter party consists of a small group of irresponsible persons who have no importance in the country and do not in any way reflect the standard of conduct followed by the major political parties in India. In fact it is the definite programme of this party to indulge in highly objectionable behaviour towards Government."

मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री क्यों इस तरह की बातें दूसरों के सामने कहते हैं ? वह अगर प्लेटफार्म पर आकर इन बातों को देश में कहें, तो मुझे इस पर कोई एतराज नहीं होगा । वह कह सकते हैं कि ये इरिस्पांसिबिल हैं, लेकिन उनके ही कहने से कोई इरिस्पांसिबिल नहीं हो जाता है । उनके कहने के मुताबिक वे इरिसपांसिबिल हैं, लेकिन फिर भी उस पार्टी के आज इस सदन में दस आदमी बैठे हुए हैं । मैं नहीं कहता कि यह कोई बहुत बड़ी संख्या है, यह बहुत बड़ी संख्या नहीं है । मैं तो उस तरीके पर एतराज करता हूं, जो तरीका अपनाया गया है । क्या हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री या फारेन मिनिस्ट्री के लिए यह उचित था कि देश के अन्दर जो कुछ हो रहा है एक पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में उसको विदेशों में जाकर किसी सरकार से कहा जाए कि ये इस तरह के लोग हैं और उस तरह के लोग हैं मैं समझता हूं कि रिसपांसिबिल बात नहीं है । किसी बात को कहने का कोई तरीका होता है । मैं समझता हूं ये सब चीजें जाहिर करती हैं कि आप जो पालिसी अपना रहे हैं वह अपीजमेंट की पालिसी है, तुष्टीकरण की पालिसी है चाइनीज एम्बेसी की तरफ से यह कहा जाए और बार-बार कहा जाए कि रक्शियस है, तो मैं चाहता हूं कि उनकी भाषा को समझने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये । प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की तरफ से कहा गया है कि चीन के जो लोग हैं, वे सम्भवतः यह नहीं समझते हैं कि अंग्रेजी भाषा में तर्जुमा किस तरह से किया जाए । मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर वे यह नहीं जानते हैं तो हम से सीख सकते हैं, हम से समझने की कोशिश कर सकते हैं । मैं चाहता हूं कि उसके पीछे जो भावना है, उसको समझने की कोशिश की जाए ।

एक बार नहीं बार बार नोटों में इस तरह की भाषा का प्रयोग किया गया है। १६ मई के नोट में कहा गया :—

"Groups of ruffians were allowed to make provocations and disturbances in front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General in India, and there even occurred the grave incident of insulting the head of state of China".

हमारी तरफ से रिग्रेट पेश किया जाता है। मैं मानता हूं कि रिग्रेट जाना चाहिये था। लेकिन उसके बाद भी चीन रुक नहीं रहा है, लगातार कहता जा रहा है कि रफियंस! वह ऐसे शब्द का प्रयोग करे और उसके बाद भी यहां से कुछ न कहा जाए, तो यह स्पष्ट बनाना है कि हमारी जो नीति है वह तुष्टीकरण की नीति है, अपीजमेंट की नीति है और इस नीति से देश का भला हो नहीं सकता है, देश की इंटेग्रिटी की रक्षा हो नहीं सकती है। जब मैं यह कहता हूं कि यह तुष्टीकरण की पालिसी है और इससे देश का भला हो नहीं सकता है, हम अपनी रक्षा कर नहीं सकते हैं तो मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हमें चीन के खिलाफ लड़ाई छेड़ देनी चाहिये। लड़ाई की बात मैं नहीं कहता। मैं इस बात का समर्थन करता हूं कि चीन जैसे मुल्क को जिसकी आबादी ६५० मिलियन है, यू० एन० ओ० में स्थान मिलना चाहिये और हमारी सरकार ने इस दिशा में जो कुछ किया है, वह सही किया है उसको उसका स्थान मिलना चाहिये और दूसरी बातें भी होनी चाहियें। पर क्या हमें अपने बोर्डर की रक्षा नहीं करनी चाहिए, वहां पर हमारे इलाके में जो लोग आ कर बैठ गए हैं, क्या हमें उनको वहां से हटाना नहीं चाहिये। दोनों प्रधान मंत्रियों की तरफ से कहा गया था कि नेगोशिएशन से बात तय हो जाएगी।

आप चीन के पत्रों को देखें विशेषकर जो आखिरी पत्र आया है उसको देखें। उनमें कभी भी निश्चित रूप से नहीं कहा गया है कि मैकमहोन लाइन को वे पूरी तरह से मानते हैं। हो सकता है कि १९५४ में जो बात चीत हुई है उससे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय को यह विश्वास हो गया हो कि कोई बोर्डर डिस्प्यूट नहीं है। ४० करोड़ वाले देश के प्रधान मंत्री ने जिन्होंने आजादी के दिनों में बहुत कुछ काम किया है और उसको हम मानते भी हैं, हमने भी थोड़ा बहुत उन दिनों में काम किया है, जितना हम कर सकते थे, हमने भी किया है, उसको आप छोड़ दें मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि १९५४ में जो ट्रेड एग्रीमेंट हुआ था चीन के साथ उस वक्त क्यों यह बात मालूम नहीं हो गई कि बोर्डर डिस्प्यूट है, क्यों यह जानने की कोशिश नहीं की गई कि बोर्डर डिस्प्यूट है। तिब्बत पर से हमने अपना सुजरेनिटी को खत्म किया और चीन की सुजरेनिटी को माना। उस वक्त भी प्रधान मंत्री महोदय को तमाम बातें मालूम हो जानी चाहियें थीं। आज प्रधान मंत्री महोदय को जो बातें मालूम होती हैं, वे सभी तब मालूम हो जानी चाहियें थीं।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री चीन के दिमाग को पढ़ने में, उसके दिमाग को समझने में बुरी तरह से असफल हुए हैं और उस सब का आज यह नतीजा है कि हिन्दुस्तान को खतरा पैदा हो रहा है। अगर चीन के दिमाग को भारत ने अच्छी तरह से समझा और पढ़ा होता तो सम्भव है कि आज हिन्दुस्तान पर यह खतरा पैदा न होता, यह खतरा हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं आता।

पंचशील की बात की जाती है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को यह शब्द बहुत प्यारा है। हर व्यक्ति को यह शब्द प्यारा हो सकता है। हम शान्तिप्रिय लोग हैं और हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि कभी लड़ाई हम करें। लेकिन यह कहना कि हमें मुल्क में विश्वास नहीं है, देश का शासन नहीं चल सकता है। इस तरह

[श्री इंद्र राज सिंह]

से आप देश की इंटेग्रिटी को कायम नहीं रख सकते हैं। उसके लिए हमें और कुछ करना होगा। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हम जो सो रहे हैं, उससे हम जगें। हमें चीन से साफ कहना चाहिये कि स्टेट्स को, यथा-स्थिति कायम रहना चाहिये। हमें चीन को रशियंस नहीं कहना है, हमें उनसे कहना है कि मेकमहोन लाइन को मान लिया जाए और जिस इलाके पर कब्जा उसने कर लिया उसके बारे में हमें उसे कहना है कि मेहरबानी कर, यहां से हट जाओ, हाथ जोड़ कर यह कहना है, यह प्रार्थना करनी है कि श्रीमान आप बोरिया बिस्तर उठा कर मेकमहोन लाइन के उस पार चले जाओ। अगर इस प्रकार के नम्र निवेदन को वह नहीं मानता है, शान्तिपूर्वक हमारी बात को नहीं मानता है, तब फिर मजबूर हो कर गांधी जी के शिष्य होते हुए भी, गांधी जी की भाषा में ही हमें कहना चाहिये कि अगर आक्रमण होता है तो उस आक्रमण से अपनी रक्षा करने के लिए, अपनी भूमि से उनको निकालने के लिए हम ताकत का इस्तेमाल करने से भी हिचकिचायेंगे नहीं। हमें ताकत का इस्तेमाल किसी पर हमला करने के लिए नहीं करना है, बल्कि इसलिये करना है कि हम अपनी रक्षा करना चाहते हैं। यह केवल सवाल नेफा का नहीं है, तिब्बत में जो कुछ हुआ उसका नहीं है, भूटान, सिक्किम में बफर का भी सवाल है, हमारे बीच से बफर खत्म हो रहा है, नेफा बहुत स्पार्सली पापुलेटिड है, उसका भी सवाल पैदा हो सकता है और इस तरह से अगर सारी की सारी जमीन चली जाती है, तब तो वे हमारे दरवाजे पर ही आ जाते हैं और किसी भी वक्त हम को बिल्कुल ही खत्म किया जा सकता है। इस चीज को हमें देखना चाहिये।

मैं हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मन्त्री से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में आपकी कुछ भी राय हो और अगर हम में और आप में कोई व्यक्तिगत दुश्मनी है तो वह आयें और प्लेटफार्म पर हमें गाली दें—हमारी गाली देने की आदत नहीं है, गलत काम किसी से हो जाए तो हम उसके लिए खेद, रिग्रेट तक करेंगे, लेकिन दूसरे देश से ऐसी बातें मत कहिये, दूसरे देशों से ऐसी बातें मत कीजिये अगर प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय ने अपनी ओर से यह बात नहीं की है तो जो फारेन मिनिस्ट्री है और उसमें जो इस तरह से आक्जिलरी बैठे हुए हैं जो कि इस तरह का काम करते हैं, तो उसके लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि फारेन एफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री को हमें ओवरहाल करना पड़ेगा। अगर हमें हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करनी है तो ऐसे लोगों से हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती जो यह भी नहीं जानते कि किस तरह की भाषा का प्रयोग किया जाना चाहिये अपने नागरिकों के लिये। तो मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि स्टेटस को मेनटेन करने के लिये बातचीत शुरू हो सकती है, लेकिन यहां जन का कोई सवाल नहीं। हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मन्त्री इस देश की एक एक इंच भूमि के मालिक नहीं हैं। प्रत्येक नागरिक यहां का मालिक है। किसी एक व्यक्ति को यह कहने का अधिकार नहीं है कि हम आरबिट्रेशन करने के लिये तैयार हैं। कौन आरबिट्रेशन कर सकता है? आज दुनिया में सब एक दूसरे से अलग हैं, कटे हुए हैं। कोई भी इस तरह के लोग नहीं हैं जो न्याय की बात करते हों। कश्मीर का झगड़ा हो हम देखते हैं। हम यू० एन० ओ० में जाकर देख चुके हैं कि कुछ बना होता नहीं है। हम आरबिट्रेशन के लिये भेज कर किस तरह से इस मसले को हल कर सकते हैं? इस लिये आरबिट्रेशन की यहां पर कोई बात नहीं होनी चाहिये। स्टेटस को मेनटेन करने के लिये बात हो सकती है और बातचीत करके मसले को तय किया जा सकता है। लेकिन बातचीत तभी हो सकती है जब कि चीन मेकमहोन लाइन से हट कर पीछे जाय। मैं कहना चाहता हूं,

और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने भी कहा, कि चाऊ एन लाई साहब फरमाते हैं कि मैक-महोन लाइन नाम अच्छा नहीं है। अगर यह नाम अच्छा नहीं है तो गांधी लाइन नाम रखिये इसका अगर चाहना को विश्वास हो गांधी पर। और अगर गांधी पर भी विश्वास नहीं है तो पंचशील लाइन बनाइये। दोनों जिस पर विश्वास करें, उस पर चलें। लेकिन शायद चीन इस को करने के लिये तैयार नहीं होगा। इस लिये मैं अन्त में निवेदन करूंगा कि आज देश को बहुत खतरा पैदा हो रहा है। हमें कोई ऐसी बात नहीं करनी चाहिये जिससे वार साइकोसिस पैदा हो, लड़ाई का वातावरण बने, लेकिन मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर हमें देश की इंटेग्रिटी की रक्षा करनी है तो मुल्क के अन्दर हमें यह बताना पड़ेगा अपने नागरिकों को कि अगर इस वक्त देश में कोई खतरा पैदा होता है तो उसके लिये देश की जनता, देश के कोटि कोटि व्यक्ति तैयार रहें। अगर हमने हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी ली है तो हम सब देश की रक्षा भी करेंगे। अगर आपस में मतभेद भी हो तो भी जहां तक देश की रक्षा का सवाल है, हम एक व्यक्ति की तरह खड़े हैं। किसी भी व्यक्ति के, चाहे वह कहीं से आता हो, आक्रमण को हम बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। हम किसी पर आक्रमण नहीं करेंगे क्योंकि हमारी शान्ति की नीति है, लेकिन हम अपने देश की एक इंच भूमि भी किसी को लेने नहीं देंगे। यही मेरा कहना है।

Shri Manabendra Shah (Tehri Garhwal): I was listening to the debate and arguments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that the disputed area is about a couple of villages. He also stated that the main trouble started due to Dalai Lama being given shelter in India. I wonder if he means that in 1954 we gave shelter; I wonder if he means that a big chunk of NEFA and a big hump of Ladakh is a couple of villages. If that is so, then the middle Himalayan district is probably a microscopic dot on the boundary.

Sir, we stand on facts and traditions, while the Chinese Government are standing on, what they call, "Usage and History." History, as everybody knows, can always be changed to suit the Government, and specially so if the Government is one of dictatorship, of sovereign ruler, or military government, which is the case in China.

I would endeavour to try to prove that even if we take history as a basis, our stand is the correct one. It is common knowledge that the Thirteenth Dalai Lama declared Tibet independent of China in 1912. Then the land of Lama was absolutely independent of Chinese control till 1934, and the Chinese, in spite of their sense of acquisition, which they now call "imperialistic designs" failed to crush the independence movement of Tibet in 1917. We must remember that this is a very important period—the period between 1912 to 1917—for the Simla Conference was in between this period. It is the period in which Tibet declared themselves as independent of the Chinese sovereignty. In 1919 they were forced to concede what is now known as the Truce of Rong-Ba-Tsa. According to this, that portion of Tibet which adjoined India was declared, or was conceded, by the Chinese to be independent of the Chinese sovereignty. If it was not so, I cannot understand why a demarcation had to be done after a fighting took place and a mediation had to be done by a third party. The mediation was done by Mr. Eric Teikeman. This proves that there was no control by China over Tibet in that period, and it is important for us.

Even after 1934 I do not know how far we can say that the Chinese had sovereignty over Tibet. Because, we understand that in 1934 the Chinese had sent an Official Mourner to Lhasa to pay homage to the late Dalai Lama. Ultimately he was allowed to stay on. Therefore, the nature of this official mourner is again a doubtful one.

Subsequent events also go to prove that the Chinese did not have

[Shri Manabendra Shah]

sovereignty over Tibet. In 1950-51 Tibet was invaded by the Chinese—the liberation movement, as they called it. If Tibet was dependent on China, the question of a liberation force should not have arisen. Furthermore, which is more important, they had to ask the Government of India to recognise this movement and recognise their sovereignty over Tibet, in 1954. Why? If Tibet was already part of China, why should they ask a third party, a third power, to recognise their sovereignty? It means that Tibet was really not dependent on China.

And if this is the position, Sir, the status of the Simla Conference was altogether different. At the Simla Conference, therefore, I say that the plenipotentiary of the Tibetan Government, Mr. Lonchen Shatra was a full-fledged representative of the Tibetan Government and he had full powers, which the Lhasa Government had given him, to decide an agreement with the Indian Government and to sign—either privately as the Chinese say, or publicly—any agreement that may have been arrived at Simla. The position of the representative of the Chinese Government therefore was either redundant or, if they had opposed, I think it was illegal opposition on their part.

And this MacMahon Line, which is the creation of the Simla Conference, was later on again conceded to be the line which the Tibetan Government agreed to in 1936. Therefore, historically the NEFA area is part of India, because the MacMahon Line status is not what the Chinese have claimed.

In a similar manner the same argument is applicable to Bhutan, because the portion that the Chinese are claiming also falls south of the MacMahon Line. And therefore I do not have to say anything further about the Bhutan situation.

As regards the Sikkim border, the Prime Minister has already stated that the Anglo-Chinese Convention of 1890 was signed in which the Chinese Government and the then Indian Government were parties, and it was jointly demarcated on the ground in 1895. In view of this I do not see what ground of dispute there can be. Am I to understand that there also the Chinese representative had no power? Am I to understand that the Chinese representative there was again bullied? If so, it is very difficult to swallow it.

As for Ladakh, it is clear that traditionally and administratively the hump that the Chinese are now creating was part of Kashmir. If it was not so, why should such a small thing as even giving permits for shooting have been entrusted to the Kashmir Government?

Going on to the broader issue of it, I have failed to understand, if they had already made a road well out of the international boundary, why was it necessary to make another parallel road through the hump which is ours It obviously means, in the first place, that they knew that this hump is not theirs. Later on, for some ulterior motives, they thought it best to make a road through our hump And this by itself proves that the Chinese really do not have any legal status on the hump.

Before I go on to some suggestions that I wish to offer, I would like briefly to touch the Middle Himalayan area from where I come. Here there are quarrels only about some villages or a few grazing grounds; and in this case I am very happy and the people of my area are also very happy that the Prime Minister has taken a strong stand that he is going to look after every inch of Indian soil. This has created a psychological security among the people of these areas, and if this had not been done by the Prime Minister there would have been a psychological chaos among our people, and, naturally, exploitation by some interested persons could have taken place Because a strong stand has already been taken, I do not have to deal with it in more detail.

Coming to the suggestions, I would like to suggest for the consideration of the Prime Minister the following

In the first place, all our border check posts should be immediately transferred to the Defence forces The border police should be merged into the Defence forces either as regulars or as territorial or auxiliary units There is no time to be further lost in this

Secondly, my experience has been that the check posts are situated in their proper places only in summer, in winter they go far behind That is at least what I find in Tehri-Garhwal Let the situation of Ladakh should be repeated in other areas I am to emphasise that as far as possible the check posts should stay throughout the year, if not on the proper spot, at least as near as possible to the frontier

Thirdly, there has been a special planning for the so-called border area This was undertaken on the presumption that the people near the border might not be weaned away by the developments in Tibet This creation of a class different to the hill area I have opposed before also This is an artificial division, because the hill problem is the same whether they are absolutely adjoining the international boundary or in the hills which are as a whole adjoining the international boundary Therefore, my plea is, and always has been that the entire Himalayan districts should be declared as border areas and special attention should be given for their economic development. Active defence of these regions should necessarily be accompanied by a second line of uniform defence, that is, upliftment of these people in conjunction with the special and strategic priorities that the protection of these areas demands This is possible only if they are taken over by the Centre and developed on emergent and uniform lines My suggestion is very small. As the position stands at present, the areas involved, most of the Himalayan regions in some way or the other are directly under the Centre; only a few districts of Punjab and U P are left out. Therefore, I feel that the Government should really have no difficulty in also taking them over, so that they may have a uniform policy both with respect to the economic development of the people there and the defence policy

14.38 hrs

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*].

As regards the international aspect, nobody could perhaps espouse it better than our worthy Prime Minister. I have only one humble suggestion to make We have always disclaimed a rigid approach, we have always disclaimed ideological preoccupation We should not therefore hesitate to be pragmatic if conditions so demand.

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the hon Member Shri Dange in his speech referred to the letter of the Chinese Prime Minister which was received on the 9th and he said that from that letter and the previous letter of our Prime Minister and two or three documents which have found a place in the White Paper, it would be possible to say that there would be a peaceful settlement of the issue I want to draw the attention of this House to the circumstances because the circumstances are rather significant, that is, the circumstances under which the letter of the Chinese Prime Minister has been sent.

Presumably, as he himself has said, the letter has been sent in reply to the letter of the 22nd March, 1959 of our Prime Minister But, after that, many things have taken place in these six months On the 7th of September, the White Paper was placed on the Table of the House On the same day, it was agreed that a debate on the White Paper would take place in this House. It was on the 8th that that letter was sent, presumably thinking that a debate would take place. It is a matter of surprise that the Chinese Embassy itself has circulated

[Shri Kasliwal]

a copy of that letter to a large number of Members of Parliament. They have said in that letter, because the Indian Prime Minister has placed this White Paper on the Table of the House, we are now circulating this letter of the Chinese Prime Minister.

I want to refer to this letter of Mr. Chou En-lai because I feel that it is an amazing document. It is a document which has shocked me greatly. He referred to the fundamental differences between the positions of the two Governments on the Sino-Indian boundary question. He has taken six months to find out the fundamental differences on this question. What were those extraneous circumstances which prevented him from replying earlier to the letter of our Prime Minister which he sent to him on the 22nd of March? On this, he is silent. We do not know how the mind of the Chinese Government was working at that time. As I have already said, what is the kind of language in which this letter has been couched? I can only say that it is a language which, to say the least, is regrettable. The Chinese Prime Minister has accused India virtually of aggression. I want to read that particular para which appears in his letter. He says in the third para, last sentence—

> "What is more serious, the Indian Government has applied all sorts of pressures on the Chinese Government not even scrupling the use of force to support this demand."

With my little voice, I challenge any country and every country in the world to say that India ever had any aggressive design. I go further and say that India has all along been peaceful. It is other countries, countries which have an expansionist and imperialist policy, countries which adopted an aggressive policy in pursuance of diabolical ideology, which are fond of aggression. It is those countries which have followed aggressive policies and not we. We have all along stood for peace. We have all along said, let there be peaceful negotiation of every kind of dispute. Even in the United Nations, it is our voice which we have always raised, not only on this question, but on so many other questions, let there be peaceful settlement of all important questions. Even on the question of disarmament, we have said, let all sides come together and decide by peaceful negotiations whatever is to be decided and not by language of war. Our Prime Minister has invariably in so many speeches said that if there was one thing which he hated, it is language of war. I most heartily agree with him in what he has said.

The Chinese Prime Minister, in his letter, has said that he was also for peaceful settlement by negotiations. I assure him and I assure him on behalf of this House, that we are also for peaceful settlement. Let that peaceful settlement be commensurate with the dignity and prestige and honour of this great country. We stand for peace. We stand for peace with honour. I go further and say, let the peaceful settlement be commensurate with the dignity, honour and prestige of China also. Because, we stand firm like a rock on the principles of *Panch Sheel*. What does *Panch Sheel* say? Mutual respect for each other. Both these countries have been signatories to *Panch Sheel*. Some hon. Members may say, what is *Panch Sheel*, *Panch Sheel* has been torn to pieces. But, no; *Panch Sheel* will stand true till eternity. It is a fundamental principle on which alone today nations can survive. If there are certain nations which, after having been signatories to these principles, have departed from these principles that is no ground for our saying that we should also depart from those

principles We stand firmly on those principles

Allied to this question, there is one other question and that is a very fundamental question, which I would like to raise here, because nobody has mentioned that particular point, that is, the question of the admission of China into the United Nations I congratulate the Government on having raised this question of the admission of China into the United Nations even this year in spite of enormous difficulties The Western press has criticised our Government of diplomatic hypocrisy Yet, the Prime Minister is right when he says that it is a fundamental question No great country—China is a great country—can be prevented from admission into the United Nations He is quite right But, there is one thing more When this question will come up before the United Nations—I am saying it with some knowledge because I was there last year—a debate is going to take place In that debate, I am confident that all sorts of questions are going to be raised The question of Tibet will be raised, the question of aggression of China over Indian territory will be raised There are 82 nations represented in the U N O and these 82 nations often think differently and speak differently What is going to happen? I want to say it very frankly that in the United Nations, in the comity of nations China will stand condemned as an aggressor over Indian territory in the same way that Britain and France stood condemned over their aggression in the Suez Canal in the same way that the Soviet Union stands condemned over their aggression in Hungary

There is one thing I also want to say and that is this The Chairman of the Indian delegation will, while moving this resolution in the United Nations, I hope, reflect the mood of this country in the United Nations I hope he will truly represent the public opinion in this country It was very heartening for me to read the other day, when he said in Bombay that it is only in the United Nations that a country can be more easily brought to book than otherwise

I am making some other points I have said about peaceful settlement. I say how can there be peaceful settlement when, on certain matters, China herself has departed from peaceful settlement Take the case of Wu Je and Bara Hoti What happened? I want to give certain dates and these dates are relevant It is first of all in 1954 that China made a complaint that Indians had occupied certain territory in Wu Je which was on their side Subsequently, after some exchange of notes, there was a note from China dated 26th July, 1956, in which they suggested joint investigations Very soon after that we agreed to joint investigation Not only that, we also pointed out the latitude and longitude of Tunjun La pass We said here is the pass, it will be easier for us to find out what exactly is the position of Wu Je and that of Bara Hoti On the 8th August 1958 the Chinese refused to have joint investigation One does not know why they refused to have joint investigation On the 10th December, 1958 our Ministry of External Affairs handed a note to the Chinese Ambassador requesting the Government of China to withdraw their armed personnel from Bara Hoti In his letter of the 23rd June 1959 the Prime Minister of China has made reference to the question of Wu Je and said that it should be settled by peaceful negotiation But what happened? Our Prime Minister also replied and said we were always willing for a peaceful settlement but a peaceful settlement is not possible because certain things have happened

I want to refer to that particular paragraph It says

> "Nevertheless we are agreeable to both sides agreeing not to send their civil and military officials to the area Unfortunately your

[Shri Kasliwal]

delegation did not agree to our gesture."

Although they say that there should be joint investigation, they resile from that position and then deny joint investigation, prevent joint investigation from taking place. Then, how can they accuse us?

I refer you to another position and that refers to Long Ju. Again, the same kind of tactics is followed as on the question of Wu Je—it is they who first complain, not we. Here also it is they who first complained about Long Ju, and they said certain troops of India had gone and occupied Migyitun and Samgar Sanpo and some other places. That was on 23rd June, 1959. On the 26th June, 1959 the Government of India replied repudiating the note of China and saying that we had no such troops in those areas It is most significant that our letter of the 26th June, 1959 mentions that our outpost is Long Ju. That is the first time the name of Long Ju appears in the correspondence. But on the 27th August, 1959 China, not replying to those letters, again sent a letter saying that we had occupied certain Chinese territories like Migyitun The very next day a reply was sent saying that it was altogether wrong and we had not occupied any territory of China.

I do not want to go further into all these maters. The White Paper is there. But I say we stand for peaceful settlement, and I am quite confident that with the good offices of the Prime Minister and others it is possible to have a peaceful settlement of this question, but there is only one note of warning that I want to sound. It is an old adage, an old proverb, but I might repeat it here today in this House, and it is this, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): It may sound paradoxical, but nonetheless it is true that for the first time one of the co-architects of *Panch Sheel* has challenged the very foundation of the policy of peace and good neighbourliness. I would have expected it, and many of us did expect that the challenge, if at all, would come from the USA. We never expected it from China, we were taken unawares, because we never knew till the publication of the White Paper that all the assurances, all the commitments, were treated as if they were written on a scrap of paper. And in such a position when I listened to my hon. friend, comrade Dange, I was surprised. I thought he was talking on the objective plane of a *sthita prajna* who had no attachment to his homeland or any other life of this world and was discussing the dispute as if it was a dispute between two States in Latin America I expected of him, and naturally the Indian people expect of those who support our peace policy, who vociferously say that they stand by Nehru's peace policy of non-alignment and non-commitment, to come forward here and now and defend that policy, but in the light of the actions taken by China, I cannot explain it

When I go through the White Paper, Mr Chou En-lai's letter and the latest despatch that has appeared in the Chinese press, part of which has appeared in the Indian press, it is obvious that China today wants to reopen the whole question. It is not a question of the MacMahon line I will read one small passage from this dispatch. It says:

"The Chinese official statement among other things, accused India of:

(1) drawing its maps in such a way as to cut 38,000 square kilometers deep into Chinese territory along the Sinkiang-Tibet-Ladakh section;

(2) 'invading' Parigas, Chuva, Chuje, Shipki Pass, Puling, Sumdo, Sangcha and Lapthal which are claimed to be

Chinese territory along the Tibet-Punjab-U P. frontier; and

(3) annexing 90,000 square miles of Chinese territory along the Assam-Tibet frontier"

Therefore, I would not like to repeat what Pandit Kunzru said in the Rajya Sabha,—he said that our foreign policy was in the melting pot—but this House in all seriousness must take note of the fact that the peace policy which was built up in co-operation with China and which has succeeded and is in the interests of the people of India and the people of the world, has been challenged by one of the partners Why it has been challenged is the question before us That must be squarely answered

I sometimes feel that as in the post-war era Stalin by his aggressive, expansionist attitude towards the West created a rigid polarisation for which the Soviet Union had to pay a price, at the present stage of development possibly China is aiming at the same thing, they perhaps want to polarise Asia by this policy Whether they like it or not, the effect is the same, that outside the Chinese or the Communist world all other people will have to make a choice and adopt a certain attitude, and therefore it is a crisis of a severe nature The external or international policy pursued by this nation, very effectively pursued, to the benefit of the country and the people of the world, is passing through a crisis because our so-called friendly neighbour has thrown out a challenge which it is not easy to meet.

15 hrs.

I say this because Chou En-lai has talked of history I do not know what he means thereby, because we are the successors in this country to British power that was there formerly, and all the rights and obligations that accrued to us from the Britishers are ours Under no code of international law can they be challenged. My submission is that, unfortunately, China, being outside the pale of international organisation, like an outlawed person in society, is challenging them with impunity Unfortunately, in 1954, when the treaties were signed, our Prime Minister, perhaps in the exuberant enthusiasm of the post-war era, thinking that we had acquired in Tibet certain extra-territorial rights, thought them to be repugnant and handed them back to China But if we go through the documents, through the White Paper, we find that there is a certain amount of faith on our side, but throughout, up to the final culminating act, if we take things into consideration, we find that China has committed a breach of faith with our Prime Minister That is the humble conclusion that I have come to, after going through all these papers No other conclusion is possible And what is done is in the name of history We have been checkmated in our efforts to prove the validity of our case, by being pointed out 'Ob' it is a heritage which you have got from the imperialists' I fail to understand this

If we are going to go to the roots of history in this fashion, can we have peace in this land? Can there be any settled social life and civilisation? This is one aspect There is another equally important aspect, and that must be taken note of by my Communist friends also That is that there is such a factor as geography. As I said on a former occasion, Indian civilisation, and Indian history are more conditioned by geography and by the Himalayas than anything else. We cannot forget that in this land.

Unfortunately, from today's communication, it is clear that what they want is that the boundary should be shifted from the other side of the Himalayas to our side of the Himalayas I have gone carefully through whatever has appeared here, and this is what I find

The question before us today is this. Of course, we want a negotiated

[Shri Khadilkar]

settlement, no doubt, we do not want to throw aside whatever we have pursued, and whatever we have thought was in the best interests of the country and the world, namely, our non-alignment policy But when China takes a position disregarding the past, geography and history, and all other rights that we have secured from the former rulers of this country and wants to lay a claim that their border will be on our side of the Himalayas, I am afraid, the peace policy is likely to be shattered to pieces That is the danger Is China ready for it? It is not a question, as was posed at one of the meetings in Bombay under the auspices of the Jan Sangh and the PSP and the Swentantra Party, by one of the leading Members of this House, of a change of stewardship, they wanted a different captain, they said to lead the ship of State, because we had failed Have we failed? Or, because China has posed this issue, have we got to rethink our attitude and lay a certain emphasis on a particular aspect of the policy, or as some people in this country feel 'Oh, now, there is a threat, all right, jump to the protective military umbrella of the West, that is the safest asylum for India', should we do like that? That is the question before us And it is in such a context that we have to think of our relations with China It is not Chauvinism that I am advocating I am talking very objectively If at all these two big powers want to survive and live as good neighbours, friendly neighbours certain pre-conditions are necessary, and those must be accepted by China, negotiations or no negotiations I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether we are going to throw open everything for negotiations He said in the Rajya Sabha the other day that we would be ready for negotiations, if the *status quo* is maintained, but, for the *status quo*, the Chinese must withdraw first from those places where they have made advances Somewhere, we have got to be a little tough. Otherwise, it is no use From all these letters, one would find that we are more eager for peace. It is no use pursuing a peace policy,—it is not an one-sided game or one-day traffic,—when the other party since 1954 even for petty things has been challenging whatever has been stated by our Prime Minister, they have been check-mating him, in fact, the publication of that letter by the Chinese, after we published our White Paper, is a diplomatic attack And today's communication, the communication that has been published in today's Peking daily shows that a big propaganda campaign has been switched on in China This is the reality of the position

So, my first submission is this In such a situation, where is room for negotiations? I want to know Where is room for negotiations? I sometimes feel that China is kept outside the pale of international organisation by the insistence of the leaders of that organisation They feel that they are keeping China as an outcaste, but they are playing into the hands of the Communist leadership I have a shrewd suspicion that the whole Communist leadership feels that if one of the big partners is set at large, it can operate with impunity and do anything without being challenged and being brought to book before international opinion, and it can then serve the purpose of the socialist world much better than our purpose

Therefore I would submit firstly that those who desire that in the interests of peace, India should hold her own must see that this outlawed nation is brought back within the fold of the international organisation

It has been argued that China is irritated I can understand China's irritation My hon friend has mentioned several times that the Chinese people are behind the Chinese Prime Minister I ask whether in India there live only sheep and goats and there are no people in this land who have feelings about it

About Tibet also, I would say this. What were we to do, when they created a condition by which the Dalai Lama had to leave his country, and they suppressed a popular uprising there? We gave asylum to the Dalai Lama; it was an international obligation under the U.N. Charter. We could not flout it easily. Therefore, we gave asylum to the Dalai Lama. That was on a human consideration. And they accuse us, 'oh, you have harboured the Dalai Lama, and, therefore, we shall take this turn, we shall have aggressive designs, the whole border question will have to be reopened" That has happened not only with India, but even with the Burmese, it is the same thing.

What was said in 1956? I would like to ask my Communist friends whether in international intercourse, there is not such a thing as an assurance or a word given and kept, or whether they are governed by some other law of dialectics of international intercourse. I cannot for a moment accept the latter position

Therefore, so far as the Tibetan issue is concerned, I do feel that it is not an immediate issue; it is in the background But in the long term, if we want to build durable foundations of peace with China, then China must consider the question of accepting this natural barrier. It was not Britishers who created it We had references to the Himalayas and to Tibet in the *Mahabharata* and the *Meghdoota* So, the Britishers did not discover it or create it. It is our heritage, as I have said already. Therefore, they will have to admit that this barrier could not be occupied by a mighty military power always threatening us from the other side. These things and these conditions have to be fulfilled. If they are not, what will happen? As I said earlier, we are passing through a crisis in which it would be extremely difficult to maintain our whole peace policy.

One more word and I have done. Yesterday the Prime Minister said that there are difficulties of translation. I do not know what type of Marxist literature has been translated into Chinese But once Shaw said that when Christianity went to Africa, the original Christianity was forgotten and it took the African form. From all these things, I am afraid that perhaps Marxism as translated into Chinese has been rendered devoid of all humanism, brotherhood and a question of faith and honour; is a different doctrine altogether completely devoid of the original doctrine which has been worshipped and which has given inspiration to intellectuals all over the world

Therefore—leave aside China—the policy of peace, non-commitment and non-alignment has been upheld and admired not only here but all over the world—those who understand it, including people of America. Therefore, that must be maintained. That is the supreme task before us. We have faith in our Prime Minister. Let us see how he faces the crisis.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Thanu Pillai

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): May I speak a few words? I have some experience of China and Tibet.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): Mr Deputy-Speaker, the present question of border disputes which has rightly engaged the attention of the country and for which a special day's session is being allowed cannot be dealt with so easily Hon Members who have spoken expressed anxiety, and they also doubted whether our Government have got the courage to do the needful I do not know whether in this country there is a greater patriot and more courageous man and a more courageous leader than our Prime Minister. If the integrity of India, the independence of this country and the greatness of the people are dear and near to us, we learnt it under his feet and not anybody else's. Let

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

there be no question or doubt about it. But, as is natural, an administrator's approach is much different from an agitator's Agitators can, and sometimes deliberately do, say things which they do not mean, because it suits their purpose. Not that I minimise the gravity of the present suitation, but the approach to it and the colouring to it is rather dangerous, and such a dangerous approach and dangerous colouring should not be there in this country, hampering the approach of the Prime Minister.

I do not suggest that we should be complacent. Nor should we create a fear complex in this country, because we have faith that when the call is given, when the hour comes, our people will not fail our country. We have fought not a violent battle, but a non-violent battle, of course; but when the occasion comes, we will respond to the spirit of the old violence which is in our system of culture and tradition. Let us not think now that the leader is not ferocious enough and angry enough. He is rather soft because the policy and tradition of the country is peace and not war. Some people write 'peace' and they mean 'war'. The same vocabulary and the same language may have different meaning to them. The Communists have their own meaning for 'democracy' and other things. There is a special meaning given to it. Like that, our hon. friends of other parties may have their vocabularies.

My submission is that we have been following the Prime Minister's lead and he himself has been very badly let down by the Prime Minister of China. I will read one or two extracts from the letters exchanged between the two Prime Ministers. In the minute of the talk between the two Prime Ministers written by our Prime Minister, it is stated:

> "Although he thought that this line, established by British imperialists was not fair, nevertheless, because it was an accomplished fact and because of the friendly relations which existed between China and the countries concerned, namely, India and Burma, the Chinese Government were of the opinion that they should give recognition to this MacMahon Line".

In his letter dated 23rd January to our Prime Minister, the Chinese Prime Minister says:

> "In view of the various complex factors mentioned above, the Chinese Government, on the one hand, finds it necessary to take a more or less realistic attitude towards the MacMahon Line and, on the other hand, cannot but act with prudence and needs time to deal with this matter".

He had never repudiated this MacMahon Line, but in his latest letter, of September 8, he says:

> "Regarding the eastern section of the Sino-Indian boundary, as I have stated above, the Chinese Government absolutely does not recognise the so-called MacMahon Line, but Chinese troops have never crossed that Line".

There is a variation, there is a difference, in approach. We were doubting why. The hon. leader of the Communist Group gave the answer, that is, because of our giving asylum to the Dalai Lama, the attitude of China might have changed. He is a better authority because he gave a guarantee on the floor of the House that China will not attack India. I wonder how he represents China and gave that guarantee, but he gave that guarantee.

Now, taking that interpretation, these people of peace, international peace, are conditioned by circumstances; their principles are conditioned by other actions. But we have fundamental principles never to be

assailed by success or victory. The fundamentals are fundamentals, because truth is eternal, it cannot be swayed this side or that.

Why is this so? That is because it is in the system of the ideology. We do not interfere with their ideology. We have recognised that different ideologies can co-exist That is the first essential fundamental of *Panchsheel* (*An Hon Member*' and co-existence) But there are others who would not accept the functioning of a different ideology, and when sometimes it is not to their convenience, they simply turn round and bring in some other excuses and try to flout it

There are instances where under threat we did not give up our independent foreign policy. You would remember, Sir, that when we were in a very bad plight regarding the food situation in 1952, in the American Congress, some member asked 'Why should we give wheat to India because her antecedents are not well known?' I remember to have read the Prime Minister's reply: 'We will rather starve and die but not pledge our foreign policy to suit other countries' whims and fancies'. We may have to adopt the same line; we may have to take different or stronger measures But we will not, for the sake of accommodating political parties here or political forces elsewhere, give up our policy which has been endorsed as the right policy. So far as the foreign policy is concerned, all the parties have been telling that whatever our differences regarding other matters, so far as foreign policy is concerned they will agree with the Government and the Prime Minister Now, what has happened. Here is a changed attitude and changed tone from some quarters, saying that the foreign policy is wrong that they want a change of foreign policy and a change of Government. Even this they do not have as the real object Their local political situation demands that they should somehow or other criticise this Government and it suits the convenience of these people to criticise on this foreign policy Naturally the border question and the integrity of the country is so dear that any tempo can be created in the minds of the people They only want to exploit the situation

My hon friend Shri Dange said that some people wanted to ban the communist party I would request the Government not to ban the communist party They are safe outside than underground.

Some hon friends asked, what about the Catholics and what about the Muslims The Catholics have got a spiritual loyalty to Jerusalem and Rome The Muslims have got their spiritual loyalty to Mecca and Medina. But, our comrades have their politico-spiritual loyalty to Moscow and Peking In religious wars what the Christians call a crusade, the Muslims call a jehad But I do not know what our comrades call it

Some Hon. Members: Liberation.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Yes, it is liberation; but their instrument is tirade and running down other people and running down Government The word 'liberation' is also in the Marxist miscellany; but it gives a different meaning from the meaning which we know. We have known liberation of people from bondage, from other's bonds (*Interruptions*).

Some Hon. Members: What happened in Kerala?

Shri Thanu Pillai: In Kerala the people liberated themselves from you; it is not my fault.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not bring in liberation here.

Shri Thanu Pillai: The liberation of Tibet was mentioned here. We do not want to liberate Tibet because we have accepted the suzerainty of the Chinese. If the Tibetans want to liberate themselves, it is their own work. But our friends say it is liberation and bring in Kerala here. According to them, liberation is liberating people from themselves. That is, whoever is not a communist should be liberated from his moorings and made communist. That is the system of liberation for them. There is the Liberation Army of Netaji waiting somewhere according to one hon. Member of the House; and that the Liberation Army will come. Likewise, these people also liberated Tibet from the Tibetans. But, so far as we are concerned, we have accepted the suzerainty of China and, therefore, we will never interfere.

The asylum that is being given is a human obligation. We have got a cultural tie with Tibet. We have got Hindu pilgrimage centres and Buddhist pilgrimage centre there. If there are friendly relations, they might sometimes allow us; otherwise, they may not allow us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Sir, one minute more and I will finish.

One thing I would like to submit to Government is about Ladakh. The road that goes through Ladakh is a big chunk. Some people argue that it was necessary for them because it was the short route and convenient and all that. Of course, if we are friendly with China, by all means by negotiations and settlement we can lay a road for them to pass through. It should be our territory and our road and only free passage for them, and not that they make a road of their own in our territory. So, they are transgressing into our territory. That is a wrong approach.

We endorse the Prime Minister's stand. We do not want fear complex or complacency to develop in the country. We should tell our people that our next door neighbour is not behaving in a proper way; he has changed his colour. Let us be alert.

Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the publication of the White Paper has given us a big jolt for many reasons. Firstly that such important facts about invasions of our border should have been kept a secret from this sovereign Legislature. Secondly, we cannot understand the cause of this secrecy. After all, we the Members of Parliament here make the laws. Thirdly, Government should have taken us into confidence all these years.

These facts about invasions of our northern territories have indeed alarmed the entire nation and, perhaps, other democratic nations too. The question now is, with a situation like this, how are we going to solve this? As practical people, we have to look at this matter from an entirely practical point of view. There are a number of friends here who have suggested that we should, perhaps, do a bit of sabre rattling. I would only like to point out one thing that one should never under-estimate one's adversary. In this case, India is a country standing all alone against one-third of the world. China has a very very large population. Here we are a democracy; on the other side, you have an entirely ruthless communist country, a government which does not believe in democracy like we do. Therefore, when we talk about war, let us take into consideration, the fact that we are all by ourselves here. Our Government has followed a policy of non-alignment. I have nothing to say about that. But one fact remains that due to our foreign policy we have aliented a very large section of the world's population and countries who think the way we do.

Obviously, the alternative to war is negotiations. And, our Prime Minister has been trying for all these years to solve this problem through nego-

tiations. Whether he succeeds or not is for Province to see. But, we feel that negotiations should be given at least one more trial. And, if we fail in that, then the Government of India should take absolutely stern and steady measures to see that our "friends" are ousted from our territories.

It is quite obvious that due to the Dalai Lama episode, the Chinese Government are in no mood to come to a compromise. They are also not prepared to accept the McMahon line. If that is the position, what is the alternative? Are we going to take to the pre-liberation maps? Obviously, they cannot form the basis of any negotiations now. What is the alternative? We hope the Prime Minister will kindly enlighten us as to the line he wishes to take. To us it seems a dilemma. (*Interruptions*). I would request the Government to state one point. God forbid, if the need does arise that we have to use our military to oust the Chinese from our territories, then we will not make the mistake that we made against Pakistan in Kashmir in 1948 but we will push them right out of our country and make a good job of it.

We have heard a lot about Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai all these years. Frankly, I have always been very diffident about it because I have always felt that whether it be human being or anything else, it always follows that, Birds of a feather flock together'. In this case, only democratic countries can think the way we do.

Now, if we expect that a communist country should really be our friend, I think, we are barking on the wrong tree. Of course, we give the Government of India full marks for having given this a full trial. But, I should say now that some sort of new thinking is necessary for us. We have to look around and find friends from those nations whom we have been alienating all this time.

The Chinese people are communists; they are ruthless. When I say people, I do not mean the people; I mean the Government. Obviously they cannot look at things from the same perspective we do, whether it be trade, commerce or political thought. They look at things entirely differently and, therefore, we wish to become friends with them and allienate the rest of the free world, we have to take into consideration whether these Chinese communists are really our friends or are they purely paying us lip-service and that lip-service as long as it suits their interests, and not ours.

Now, we read about China having constructed this highway through Ladakh. It is surprising that in spite of the fact that we have our Air Force with all their means of photographic equipment, they were not able to find this out long before and that there was an encroachment of this nature in our territories unobserved. I would be grateful if the Government could tell us how often an aerial survey is taken of places on the Himalayan borders. Border troubles are not new to us. Partition has perhaps been one of the greatest lessons we have learnt. From that we should learn that aggressive countries like China can never be our friends. We should have been vigilant over these areas. I cannot understand how a country like ours could have been so complacent about it. No matter what lip service the Chinese may pay us, it is an accepted fact that they are expansionists and unless we look into this, it will be too late. Supposing for argument's sake that we could come to a compromise, what is the guarantee that they will not want more territories of ours later? The *Panchsheel* was a wonderful concept and the Prime Minister deserves to be congratulated about it. But I feel that when we were negotiating for the *Panchsheel* we should have gone a step further and the Prime Minister should have made this absolutely clear about our territories. India is a democratic country and took the Chinese at their word, little realising that an attempt

[Shri Karni Singhji]

would be made to make us realise that those words would not mean anything. *Panchsheel* though theoretical and incomplete, is only possible between countries which are democratic and which think alike but not among countries which are dictatorial. I agree with the Prime Minister that we should follow a non-alignment policy. But the basic fact still remains that a country like ours, which is democratic, must find friends from the democratic world, from countries whose mental apparatus is like ours. Unless we do that, we will be left alone at the mercies of wolves around us. The Government of India has to come to a decision as to what it should do. I am quite convinced that a country like China or for that matter any other dictatorial country will always behave like this. If you are for negotiations with them, it will be mistaken as a symbol of weakness. We know that we are not a weak country and if the need arises each and every man will fight for his land But if we are complacent, China will definitely misconstrue this as our weakness and there will be no end to these border problems. I hope that an emergency for India to use her Armed Forces will never arise but if it does arise, I will only request the Government, let us give our army a really good support and let us encourage our Armed Forces and let us see that we do not have misunderstanding between the Defence Ministry and the Armed Forces. It is very important that we put our house in order so that we can get rid of this agression in any part of our country

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): This is one of the solemn occasions when this House is debating a very grave and important issue. Since the time of the Constituent Assembly right till today we have not perhaps discussed or grappled with such a serious problem. Every word we utter and every sneer and every jeer we indulge in will have a special meaning and will be transmitted across the channels of the world. We shall have to utter every word with solemnity and shall ponder over it and say it in a manner and in such a language as not to provoke our own friends or even disturb our enemies. The Prime Minister has advised us that we should be firm in our resolve for peace. That is a piece of advice which we should take in times like this. Be that as it may, there are questions which are flung at our face: whether *Panchsheel* has gone into the melting pot; whether our great friend, China, with whom we have been in friendship for the last 2,000 years has refused our hands of friendship across the Himalayas, whether that friendship has gone into the melting pot. When an attempt was made on Shri Chou En-lai's life while he was travelling in the *Kashmir Princess*, for Bandung Conference a thrill of horror ran through our hearts and there was great sympathy in our hearts. The question is asked whether that friendship has been preserved today.

The House will forgive me for narrating a personal incident. Last year, as a mere observer, I was at the great Tashkent Conference You may call it a communist or a non-communist conference. We have to-day to deal with masses of humanity, masses of men The hall was packed from floor to the ceiling. When the Chinese delegate walked up to the rostrum in that fifty nations conference there was a terrific amount of applause that I have never heard of. The second highest applause was reserved for the Indian delegate. That was again surprising. It was the second highest degree of applause for the Indian delegate in one of the important cities of Russia, right next to our door. The third highest degree of applause was reserved—I was astonished—to a man from Turkey. He was sentenced to death. An Indian Parliamentary Delegation had been to Turkey. We know what sort of relations existed between Turkey and the Soviet Union Those sounds of applause are coming

back to my mind when I hear in silence and solemnity of the speeches today, the Cheers and the counter-cheers We will have to balance them in a way to see that our friendship is not broken While we are firm in resisting inroads on our frontiers we must also be firm in our friendship I have talked to the leaders of all Parties here and I asked them whether they could give a solution What is the solution? Most of them do not talk of war I was astonished that an esteemed leader and friend like Dr Ram Subhag Singh says that we must bomb those places What is the meaning of bombing? Bombing means war and most of those territories will be destroyed Are we prepared to take the consequences?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The Prime Minister had on that day said that we were finding it difficult to drop even the paratroopers there Then, I said that if it was very difficult to send our people to our own check posts, then would it not be possible for us to bombard the Chinese out of that place? I still stick to it that if there is no other alternative left we must bombard it

Shri Joachim Alva: With all due respect to my hon friend. I say that bombing is a very serious affair We cannot take to it light heartedly It is not like going to jail and suffering inside the prison walls Those of us who have seen London and Berlin and other cities down unto dust will not talk of bombing so light heartedly Their homes have been destroyed Our friendship cannot rest on the slender last thread of bombing True we should be firm about our frontiers and security of our land I do not understand how China has turned her back on our great friendship There were five unauthorised flights by Chinese planes on our territory in 1958 which compelled our Prime Minister to write his first important letter towards the end of 1958 to Chou En-lai The correspondence is continuing and we had a letter from the Chinese Premier even this month. We have to keep these negotiations going on by keeping firm to our points

Friends, do not forget how China and Japan were interlocked in deadly warfare that the grand-children of the Japanese and the grand-children of the Chinese hate each other so much that Asia ha been shaken up We do not want to make that historic mistake—not ourselves perhaps,—their grand-children and our grand-children being interlocked in perpetual warfare

True, Acharya Kripalani talked about the buffer State of Tibet Does he know of the historic and classic buffer State of Poland—Poland which has been driven between Germany and Russia? I have seen places in Poland where five million people—women and children—were gassed That was a classic buffer State A buffer State has been described as a State which claims to be independent but is being kicked on both the sides by everybody? Is that the fate which is reserved for Tibet? We have to wash our hands off Tibet Tibet belongs to China Let us face certain hard realities of history What have we to do with Tibet when sometimes we are not able to grapple with the problems in Kerala? Our country is vast and long enough for our aspirations If we go on pushing our nose into Tibet and put it deeper and deeper, we shall be interlocked in a deadly strife which, in essence, was what Sun Yet-Sen wanted to avoid between Chine and Japan China and Japan are a perpetual warning to us We shall not take things humbly down, at the same time We stood up against the British Raj and made them go out of our land If we are cowards and if I am a coward and if you and I have no courage, then the nation will say. "Let them come along; Chinese or no Chinese"

The Chinese, as I said in the course, of my speech regarding Tibet, are an inscrutable race The House will forgive me for repeating the episode. The other day, till 2 O'clock in the morning, I sat down with the Ame-

[Shri Joachim Alva]

rican Ambassador in Prague in 1957 discussing about the release of five American prisoners who had been held up by the Chinese. 50 meetings took place with Mr. Wang, the Secretary-General of the Conference at Geneva, and Mr. Leslie Johnson, one of the ablest American Ambassadors, just about five prisoners. The conference ended and Mr. Johnson has been sent away to Thailand. But negotiations are still going on. I still fail to realise why the Chinese just did not let forth five prisoners. Perhaps in the next round of discussions, they could have ended up by the U.S.A. recognition of China! If such are the Chinese who are so inscrutable let us not deal with them lightly. Let us also be conscious about our strength, but let us not deal with them lightly.

But where the sword had to be taken, India had not failed. My friend Shri Karni Singhji is a great Rajput. We had great Rajput warriors in our history and they have rendered a good account of themselves. But, all the same, I would tell my hon. friends that this is a historic occasion and let us not, therefore, utter a single word which may break up our *Panchsheel* and other principles.

There are people outside this House—the Swatantra Party and the non-Swatantra Party—and I wish, Shri M. R. Masani was here. He wants the Prime Minister to be fired out for he wants our foreign policy to be changed. He wants our Defence Minister to be changed. Why could he not also say that the Finance Minister and the Home Minister be also taken out? Why should there be such dissentients in our home camp? He wants the Prime Minister to be out. But the day we ask our Prime Minister step down the pedestal, we will be disturbing our glorious foreign policy. Let our Chinese friends also feel that if they thus dig into the position of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, this country may also go into the SEATO camp.

We have seen the inflation in Turkey where one cannot buy a blade or have a cold drink except at high cost. That is Turkey, now, which is the hotbed of NATO powers. There, inflation has gone in such a way that the poor people cannot have food and necessities except at very high prices. Are you going to introduce such a thing in our country? Are you going to jump into the lap of the SEATO powers?

These are very serious considerations. Everybody is waiting for us to fall into their lap—that is, either the western bloc or the eastern bloc. But we have taken the position in consonance with our two thousand year old policy of tolerance, and many a time we also forget and forgive many things.

I was present at the Palam airport the other day when Gen. Ayub Khan came. Gen. Ayub Khan is a man who is far above the Muslim League group and he said, "Let us forget and forgive."

Some Hon. Members: Come to China.

Shri Joachim Alva: Yes; were we not as much excited about Pakistan sometime ago as we are about China now? So, we should not take anybody's side except our own. The highest interests and policies of a nation are its own concern, but there are people when you stretch your hand this way or that way. I still say that the Chinese are an inscrutable race. What is behind their back, we do not know. But you must also remember the history of our country, and the way we have welcomed the Dalai Lama and the way India is being made the base of his operations against China. Perhaps our friendliness may be doubted if not anything else. Now, if Sheikh Abdulla is released from Kashmir tomorrow and enthroned in China, we do not

know what would be our feelings? (*Interruptions*) Let us put ourselves in their position

Mr Deputy-Speaker. Order, order

Shri Joachim Alva: All the same, we worship, and many of us worship, the Dalai Lama because we have great respect for him Yet, India cannot be made the base of operations against China or any other friendly power These are important facts It is an irony of history if the Chinese are now the aggressors by having entered into the Niti Pass! where then is real Niti? I do not know why the Chinese are not encouraging themselves by knocking out the British from Hong Kong and knocking out the Portuguese from Macao? Instead they worry their ancient friends in India?

These are very important considerations We shall, today, not take any hasty decisions The time of peace or war is a solemn one It is all right for you to say "War! War!" But we should not want only throw away our brethren on those impassable and uninhabited Himalayan passes (*Interruptions*) will feel, and how the future generation will feel about it (*Interruptions*) These are serious considerations With these words, I sit down

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Prime Minister

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura) I had very important things to say It is a matter of the growing population of China, Japan and India I am not given an opportunity to speak I am leaving

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not been able to accommodate many groups, as hon Members know, and I hope the hon Members would appreciate my difficulty The time is limited. Therefore, it was not possible for me to call every Member from every party.

Shri Vajpayee. I have given notice of a substitute motion I represent an important view-point in this country It was at my suggestion that the Government agreed to place the White Paper It is not fair to me when no chance is given to me to speak I would like to withdraw from the House

(*Raja Mahendra Pratap and Shri Vajpayee then left the House*)

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this debate has brought out a large number of points and I should like to deal with many of them Yet I feel that it would perhaps be better to lay stress on the highlights of this debate, if I may say so, rather than lose myself in a lot of detail.

The recent letter which I received from Premier Chou En-lai raises many points and naturally we shall have to reply to it after full consideration and not in a hurry, and that consideration is being given to it I do not propose to deal with that letter here in this discussion, partly because this House does not require to be convinced of many of the things that perhaps Premier Chou En-lai might require to be told, and partly also because that would mean losing myself in a great deal of detail

Now, first of all, let me take up one simple but very basic point that Shri Karni Singhji has raised He made a rather remarkable statement that he believed in *Panchsheel* provided that it was with people whom you agreed with That is really, if I may say so a perfectly remarkable statement 'I believe in being tolerant provided you agree with me Otherwise, I will not knock your head",—This is his idea of toleration and tolerance This is his idea of *Panchsheel* Some hon Members said: "We must stand on our own feet" Some other hon Members said: "You must seek the help of others" Well, people who say this seem to be, in spite of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

all their gallant language end brave behaviour, weak, timid, panicky and alarmist That is not how a nation meets the challenge—looking around, seeing "How can anybody help me, who is going to help me"? How is anybody going to help you, if you are not strong enough to face the challenge? I say, let this be clearly understood I as Prime Minister, and my Government, stand on it—that we will stick to our policy of non-alignment We will stick to our policy call it what you like It is not my policy, it is an axiomatic truth—the *Panchsheel*—whether we agree, or China does not agree, it is immaterial—it is an axiomatic position, I say And I challenge anyone to show it is a wrong position You may say "If somebody lies, you break his head" That is a different matter You may say "Oh, don't tell the truth because the other fellow lies" Is that your position?

Some of the observations made this afternoon here, I venture to say were quite extraordinary, even in excitement I can understand a measure of excitement, even warm feeling and a desire that no one should touch or sully the honour of India, the integrity of India, the self-respect of India—I can understand all that But Dr Ram Subhag Singh's talk about bombing hillsmen in the mountains seems to show that he has lost his balance and there is no balance left He neither understands bombing, nor mountains, nor human beings, nor anything It is only an exhibition of petulant excitement and anger And if this country is going to behave in petulant excitement and anger, how would it face a crisis? Is this Parliament going to behave in this way? It is a most extraordinary thing and I am wondering what would happen if we took some of the suggestions made here Exactly where would we land ourselves if everybody is to break the other's head? And many hon. Members said: not an inch of our territory, not an inch of our territory. All these brave gestures, if you would permit me to say so, have very little meaning Certainly, not an inch of our territory or anything, if somebody forces or compels me, because we must never submit to compulsion or force in a matter of this kind It is not a question of an inch, or yard or a mile, it is a question of submitting to compulsion, submitting to force, and we will never submit to force, whatever happens to our country

But what do these gestures mean? I dislike this flamboyant language of an inch of territory and all that, sitting here in Parliament, not realising what it means I dislike this business of going about bombing everybody, because you dislike his face or what he has said or done There are many things said or done which one dislikes Acharya Kripalani has accused me of some things He may be right in his accusation But I do hope he is not right when he accused me of over-politeness I am not normally accused of that!

Acharya Kripalani: When we are concerned

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He talked about Gandhiji Whatever Gandhiji might have said, he did not shout as some of us do His action was strong undoubtedly and firm but his voice was gentle gentle to the opponent, gentle to the enemy, gentle to everybody, always trying to win over the other person We do not pretend to be Gandhis, because we are hardly fit to be even distant followers of his. But I do believe that at any time in international affairs, it is the gentle and firm voice that should be raised, not this shouting voice that we have got accustomed to, this cold war voice, this just cursing each other, closing everybody's mind—where nothing counts but the bomb of Dr Ram Subhag Singh Dr Ram Subhag forgets .

Acharya Kripalani: If the Prime Minister would not mind, I never said

that he should go on abusing everybody. I said: we should be firm and we should make our meaning clear.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I accept that completely. But Acharya Kripalani said something more. He said: you must shout; you must speak in a loud voice.

Acharya Kripalani: I submit I was making only a comparison

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a small matter. But I would submit that we are dealing with very serious issues, and such issues are not solved by mere exhibition of excitement Certainly and obviously, at any time, more especially in such moments, we have to be firm And we have to be firm, realising where one has to be firm It is not being firm in the air or being firm about everything, good, bad or indifferent There are important things and unimportant things One has to be firm about important things and one sticks to that, come what may

But if one tries to be firm about everything it means one is not firm at all That is only talking firmly which is not acting firmly because there are certain physical and actual disabilities, which you cannot survive. Nobody can A great country, the United States of America, a great country like the Soviet Union—they are the super-powers—know the limitations of firmness They are very firm countries but they know the limitations of firmness and they stop at a certain limit otherwise they would have gone in for a war by this time and would have destroyed the world. We talk loosely This kind of talk, namely, let us be firm, let us do this, let us fight and let us shed every drop of blood—this kind of thing, may I say, rather takes us away from the main questions that we are discussing, which are difficult The position is a serious one.

Now I say that Premier Chou En-lai's last letter in some parts is worded in relatively soft language and in some parts he talks about the *status quo* being kept, talks, negotiations etc But basically that letter raises some issues which are very serious and which have been raised in that form officially almost for the first time

As I was sitting here, I was reading certain reports of discussions in Peking in some Congress that is being held there where Premier Chou En-lai spoke more or less on the lines of this letter and where other people spoke Of course, it does not require any particular brilliance to know that everyone spoke on those same lines, supporting Premier Chou En-lai, namely,—

> "express their great surprise to find Mr Nehru defending British Imperialism So-and-so asked Mr Nehru' On whose behalf was he speaking in defending British imperialism? Now Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government treat the aggressive plot of British Imperialism against China in the last century as an accomplished fact Does this accord with the five principles advocated by Mr. Nehru.. .."

and so on and so forth. There is plenty of it Just as many hon. Members have said something about the MacMahon line strongly saying: stick to it; do not budge an inch etc.—I forget who said it, but I seem to have read it somewhere—they were equally strong against the MacMahon line there So, here we are.

Obviously a question like this cannot be solved by resolutions in Delhi and in Peking or by strong language hurled at each other. Other ways have to be found—either peaceful or warlike Every sensible person here and elsewhere wants to avoid war in such matters or in any matter. It is quite clear. The most powerful nations in the world are trying their utmost today to find a way outside war, and for us to think and talk of war seems rather ridiculous in this context of things.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

It is perfectly different for us to say and for the weakest and the smallest nation to say and for an individual to say: I will not submit to evil, come what may. It is quite a different thing I will not submit to it. I will not submit to coercion I will not submit to dishonour That is quite a different thing Even a single individual can say that, according to Gandhiji's teachings or any teaching Any country can say that That is different from a country in the pride of its might saying, "Oh! we shall do this or that with our armies and bombs etc" It is a very different thing The two approaches are completely different.

Now, what is happening in China today? And I say so, I do not wish to use strong words, but it is the pride and arrogance of might that is showing, in their language, in their behaviour to us and in so many things that they have done It is that

16 hrs.

And it is not a question of this mile on this side of the MacMahon line or that mile on that side They are small matters, I say again But it is not a small matter, the other thing, that they showed in their maps a large tract of Indian territory and called it Chinese territory That is not a small matter Because—you may say that you will not give an inch of the MacMahon Line, I will give it if I find that it is wrongly there, what is the good of saying these things—the MacMahon Line is a broad line between Bhutan and the Burma border and it goes on to Burma In some places it is quite definite, in some places it is not definite, it is not marked in some places And you have to go by other indications. The broad approach of the man who drew that line was that it should be on the water-sheds. It was a good approach. But we have deliberately left the water-sheds in one or two places. Therefore, when I say I stick to the MacMahon Line, what I mean is that I stick to that broad approach. But if by evidence or facts, whatever it is, a slight deviation in the alignment is necessary, it is not a major matter. And that has to be decided by facts and not by anybody's coercion

And when I talked about so-called mediation and conciliation—and I even used the word arbitration—what did I mean? I meant that in these minor alignments, etc. or in these minor questions that have arisen, wherever they may be, whatever it is—I forget the names of these places, Longju and Hoti and other places, these are the alignments Hoti is not of course on the MacMahon Line, it is on the UP side—these alignments can always be talked about in a peaceful way, in a friendly way, and slightly altered here and there if there is enough evidence

But that is not what we are considering today We have always been ready for that We are considering something much bigger, and that is a claim, the claim laid down in the Chinese maps which for the first time, mind you now in this last letter of Premier Chou En-lai and the speeches delivered now in their Congress is taking shape more definitely At first, whenever the maps were referred to, it was said, "Oh, these are old maps, we will revise them" It was a totally inadequate answer Well, it was some kind of an answer, postponement of an answer if you like But now the real thing is that this is held out as something more definite They hold by it—not the exact line, we do not know exactly where their line is, and it is impossible to discover large tracts of Indian territory That kind of treatment or behaviour does seem to me, if I may use the word, very improper for one nation to treat another, even much more so when the nations have been friendly And that is the point that has arisen

The question is, again I repeat, for the moment do not worry about these petty spots A petty spot is important if coercively and aggressively even a yard of territory is taken from us. Because, it is not a yard of terri-

tory that counts but the coercion. But all those petty spots are capable of, sitting down and, some kind of solution. Because, it makes no difference to China or India whether a few yards of territory in the mountain are on this side or on that side. But it makes a great deal of difference if that is done in an insulting, aggressive, offensive, violent manner, by us or by them All that counts.

Now, I have been accused, with some justification, that I have kept matters from Parliament, these important matters. (*An Hon Member*: Why some?) I beg of you, you have read this White Paper, point out to me what exactly I have kept. I shall tell you what I have kept It is only one thing that I have kept, that is, last November, December, when we were dealing with the Aksai Chin area and the road there. That had come to our knowledge apart from our letters about Bara Hoti, about this and that We cannot come here for every little thing But, that certainly is an important matter: the road through the Aksai Chin area We felt its importance We did not come here at that time

Hon. Members said,—I forget who said—do not our Air Force take pictures and all that I do not think there is a full realisation of what this area is and where it is The mere act of taking pictures would have endangered that plane which took it, endangered it not only from the physical features point of view, but endangered it from the point of view of action, by the other party shooting it down, whatever the risks.

I won't go into details. But, I should like this House to appreciate what these places are. This place, Aksai Chin area, is in our maps undoubtedly. But, I distinguish it completely from other areas. It is a matter for argument as to what part of it belongs to us and what part of it belongs to somebody else. It is not at all a dead clear matter. However, I have to be frank to the House. It is not clear. I cannot go about doing things in a matter which has been challenged, not today, but for a hundred years. It has been challenged as to the ownership of this strip of territory. That has nothing to do with the MacMahon line. It has nothing to do with anything else. That particular area stands by itself. It has been in challenge all the time. Our going about taking pictures of it from the air or, as somebody said, bombing it, is not a feasible proposition. We knew it is not an inaccessible place. Of course, people can go there.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: If it does not belong to India, then, there is no question of bombing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not saying that. That is just it. You make statements without knowing facts I cannot say what part of it may not belong to us, and what parts may The point is, there has never been any delimitation there in that area and it has been a challenged area—bits of it· I cannot say which bit is and which not. That is a question which will have to be decided.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: The same statement of our Prime Minister on a previous occasion has been used by Mr. Chou En-lai in his letter to prove that this area belongs to them.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Maybe.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: A similar statement is used in his present letter in justification of his claim.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is just what the hon. Members feel. Either I must put facts before them or delude them or leave them to make rash statements themselves: what am I to do about it? Many statements that I heard today were far removed from facts. Therefore, I have to say, I distinguish between these frontiers. There is the MacMahon line. By and large, apart from minor variations, that is a fixed line. In some parts, in the Subansiri area or somewhere there, it was not con-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

sidered a good line and it was varied afterwards by us, by the Government of India. There are many factors to be seen. But, broadly, it follows the watershed. That is the test. We hold by that. We stick to it subject to minor variations, for special reasons. A mile here or a mile there does not matter provided it is peacefully arranged. It is in regard to that that I said, let us have mediation, conciliation. There can be no mediation, conciliation or arbitration about these demands of the Chinese about large chunks of territory. It is quite fantastic and absurd basing their demand on what happened in past centuries. As I said in the other House the other day, if this argument is applied, I wonder how much of the great Chinese State would survive these arguments. How did the Chinese State, this huge State, mighty State, build itself up—by the doctrine of Panchsheel or what? In the past it built itself up by conquest obviously, all parts of it Whether it was a few years ago, a hundred, 200 or 500 years ago, it was built up by conquest, as all great States have been built up by conquest, violent conquest, and if you apply that theory, the Chinese State was not born complete in itself when civilisation began So, that argument of British imperialism can well be countered with past, if not present, Chinese imperialism which obviously functioned One might say, as I said the other day, in the old days Asoka's empire, the Kushan empire and Chandra Gupta's empire spread over half of Central Asia and Afghanisthan and all over; therefore, we should lay claim to that It is an extraordinary argument, this kind of thing. The whole reason of that argument simply takes you back to past ages of history upsetting everything. It really is the argument of a strong and aggressive Power. Nobody else would use it. I have a feeling that as there is a certain paranoia in individuals, sometimes there is a paranoia in nations, and one sees that, so that in this matter let us come to basic facts.

The basic facts are these. Number one, that this Chinese claim which was vaguely set down in maps etc., is becoming more definitely stated now. That is a claim which it is quite impossible for India or almost any Indian ever to admit whatever the consequences. That is quite clear. There is no question of mediation, conciliation or arbitration about that, because that is absurd. As somebody said, Shri Khadilkar I think, it involves a fundamental change is the whole geography of it, the Himalayas being handed over as a gift to them. This is an extraordinary claim. This is a thing, whether India exists or does not exist, cannot be agreed to. There the matter ends

Now, having said that, so far as lines of delimitation etc., are concerned, these are matters always for argument provided the approach is a peaceful one Take Long Ju We have said so, you have seen the letter. We think that Long Ju is on our side of the line, just on our side within about half a mile of it They say it is not We think we have a good case, but I leave that out We have said we are prepared not to go out to Long Ju You get out too, and then the matter can be considered by maps, charts, whatever it is, because it is a minor rectification and it does not make much difference provided it is peacefully done. Or, any other minor point like that we are prepared to consider in this day, but not this light demand of handing over the Himalayas to them That we are not prepared to consider.

Again, there is this MacMahon line that I referred to. There is the border of U.P., Himachal Pradesh and Punjab. There, when we had this treaty about Tibet in 1954, a number of passes were mentioned, that is, passes meant for pilgrims and others to go over, and traders Those passes themselves in a sense

laid down the frontier, and the claim now made here and there, as in the letter, to the Shipki La pass etc, is undoubtedly a breach of that agreement of 1954 in so far as the passes are concerned.

Dr Ram Subhag Singh vaguely said: nobody knows what places, what areas of India the Chinese may have occupied I beg to inform him that everybody knows it or ought to know it If he does not know, he should try to find out from those who know, before making such statements

Now, apart from that area in Ladakh, about which I mentioned to you, apart from that area, about the road, for the moment we know exactly where they are there There is no part of our border at the present moment occupied by the Chinese except that Longju area, that little bit about which .

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati) May I submit one thing? About Longju, it is said that that MacMahon line was delimited up to a length of 850 miles by Sir MacMahon Longju is on this side of the MacMahon line So, how can they claim Longju now?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Longju is 800 miles

Shri Hem Barua: The Macmahon line had delimited the border up to 850 miles The delimitation was done by Sir MacMahon himself

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Who says that?

Shri Hem Barua: And Longju is, on this side of the border

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: At least, I do not know I am merely stating the fact I am stating the fact in so far as I know that there are no Chinese troops on this side of the MacMahon line anywhere, except that in two or three or maybe, four miles of Langju, there is a small detachment there. An impression seems to have grown that there are masses and masses of Chinese armies perched on the frontier or are pouring into the frontier. That is not a correct impression, it is not an easy thing to do, and if it is done, it will be met, whether it is big or small or whatever if may be.

Let us realise this, the real danger at the present moment is not of Armies pouring in, the real danger is the words that are being said in Peking That is the thing which is extraordinary, and these words which I have quoted, we cannot possibly accept, admit or agree to That is the basic position Now, all minor things one talks about, one agrees to, one has conciliation, one has this or that as with any country And our broad approach will always be a friendly approach even to the utmost or last end, because any other approach is, according to our thinking a wrong approach

We may lose our tempers Losing one's temper is not a good thing, but one loses it because one cannot control one-self, but a nation at least should not lose its temper, when it is faced with these serious problems, and must be firm, at the same time, restrained and controlled

May I also add, to complete the whole picture, that it is not merely a question of this, but a question of the treatment given to our Missions in Tibet, our trade agencies? It has been a consistenly discourteous treatment by the local authorities. We write, we complain, answers come, long explanations come but it does seem that it is deliberately done, to make it more and more inconvenient and difficult for them to work there.

May I say this here? I would just like to draw Acharya Kripalani's attention to one note in the White Paper—he might note down just the page, I would not read it now—which does indicate our approach to these questions, that is to say, a mixture of politeness and firmness. This is at

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

page 77 of the White Paper, the statement of our Foreign Secretary in reply to the Chinese statement

May I here say that I should like to express my regret to the Members of the Socialist Party here for a reference to them in one of these statements, and I accept entire responsibility for it I am sorry But I was much disturbed by that particular incident which happened in Bombay, because, whatever may happen, the Head of a State is supposed to be above criticism, and it rouses tremendous passions, if you hit the Head of a State And what was done there in regard to Chairman Mao had made a tremendous difference suddenly to change the atmosphere of China against us It was utilised by all our enemies, and I was moved by that, disturbed by that

Shri Braj Raj Singh May I submit one thing? Was it not brought to the notice of the Prime Minister that just after the occurrence of the incident it was disapproved by the Socialist Party then and there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. It may be so, but I am trying to express my regret for this reference here, anyhow, it should not have been put in this way

I should like this House to consider this matter, apart from its views about the cold war, apart from its views on Communism Indirectly, Communism comes in In the sense that China is a Communist State, in that sense, it does affect I think it will make it more difficult for you to understand the situation if your minds are coloured by this business of the cold war, the arguments that go on between Communism and anti-Communism What we have to face today is a great and powerful nation which is aggressive It might be aggressive *minus* Communism or *plus* Communism Either way it might be there That is a fact that you have to face.

Therefore, do not confuse the issue. So far as the cold war is concerned, as the House knows, or ought to know, all wise men or most wise men in the world are trying to put an end to it, and it would be a tragedy. If we, who stood up against the cold war, should surrender to its voice and technique, when the countries which started it were giving it up Therefore, let us not have it Cold war is an admission of defeat—mental and intellectual defeat It is not, if I may say so with all respect to the participants of the cold war, a mature way of considering a question. Certainly, I am not speaking in terms of non-violence, although cold war is the negation of non-violence I say if you are violent, be violent But nobody has yet, I hope, approved of blackguardly language That is cold war

One hon Member I think Dr Ram Subhag Singh, referred to Bhutan and Sikkim I am glad he did so

Shri Goray: He is being bombed all right

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru because he reminded me of something about which I wanted to make some mention In Premier Chou En-lai's last letter, he says

> "In your Excellency's letter, you also referred to the boundary between China and Sikkim Like the boundary between China and Bhutan, this question does not fall within the scope of our present discussion".

I beg to differ from Premier Chou En-lai It does very much fall within the scope of our present or future discussion If he thinks that he can deal with it as something apart from India, we are not agreeable to that. We have publicly, rightly, undertaken certain responsibilities for the defence of Sikkim and Bhutan, if they are attacked. Therefore, it is very necessary for us to understand the position there, because if something happens on their borders, then it

the same thing as an interference with the border of India.

One hon Member, I think Shrimati Renuka Ray, asked has there been violation of Bhutan's territory? So far as I know, there has been no violation

Then there was one question which was put to me—I am sorry to repeat Dr. Ram Subhag Sings's name It was a very interesting question In Premier Chou's letter, he had referred to a telegram which we received from Tibet—from Lhasa—in 1947 It is true The point which Premier Chou made was that even then, in 1947, that is, soon after we became independent Tibet claimed territory from us That was his argument It is true that we received a telegram from the Tibetan Bureau in Lhasa, which was forwarded to us by our Mission in Lhasa, claiming the return of Tibetan territory on the boundary of India and Tibet A reply was sent by us,—it did not say exactly what reply was sent by us in 1947—demanding the assurance that it was the intention of the Tibetan Government to continue relations on the existing basis until new agreements are reached on matters that either party may wish to take up

Now, what the telegram means, I do not know But this House should remember that when we discuss these small border disputes, whether it is Migyitun or this or that, all these are standing disputes with the old Tibetan Government, even in British times certain small areas which were points of dispute between the then Government of India and the Tibetan Government. There were some new disputes too. It may be that this telegram refers to those areas in disputes, relatively small areas.

Here is another instance of what we call the new approach of the Chinese Government to us, or, perhaps, an intensification of that approach. We received a complaint and a protest from them a few days ago about the violation of their territorial waters I was surprised because the report was that it was one small ship—a frigate I think—which was taking supplies to a ship called Magar—crocodile—(its name is Magar) This frigate was taking supplies, and passing near by Hongkong, it did undoubtedly pass across the territorial waters of China, say within 12 miles or so—whatever it was They protested and said it was challenged and it did not listen to the challenge. The Magar has no come back yet But we have received a report and it said that there was no challenge when they came across and they did not know and they went on That is curious enough—petty incident of the *Magar* going there and being challenged

But, in this connection another incident is quoted

> "Last year your cruiser '*Mysore*' also did the same thing, passed through our territorial waters"

Now, the cruiser '*Mysore*' had gone last year on a visit of goodwill to China among other countries. That is, it went to Honkong, China, Shanghai and it went to Japan and, maybe, it went to some other places also I do not know It certainly went to Shanghai It is very surprising that it should be quoted and quoted a year after Certainly last year it came to within 6 or 12 miles The affair is rather extraordinary.

There are a multitude of questions that arise in this connection and we shall have to deal with them with all care, patience, firmness and forbearance And I am sure that this House will show that firmness coupled with forbearance.

If I have erred in the past in some delay in placing the papers before the House, I shall not err again. It is too serious a matter. At that time one wanted the situation not to be worsened by publicity when we were

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

dealing with them, corresponding with them and their answers come after months. This very answer from Premier Chou has come 6 months after my letter of March. One waits and times goes on But, anyhow, the situation is such that we have to keep the country, and especially the Parliament in full touch with the developments. I do not expect, and I do not want the House to imagine that something very serious is going to happen on our frontiers. I do not at all expect that to happen. It is not such an easy matter for it to happen either. But the basic difficulty is this apparent change in the attitude of the Chinese Government when it has come out quite clearly with a demand which it is absolutely and wholly impossible for us to look at But, if you will put that aside, the major demand aside,—they themselves say, the House will notice, that they are not, in a sense, pressing for that now and that they are prepared for the *status quo* to continue but there is the demand, just as the maps were a constant irritant and a reminder to us that something may happen and it is now much more obvious—it is only in that sense the situation has worsened and not in the sense that something is going to happen in the border or the frontier suddenly

I would beg of you not to put this matter in the category of communist or non-communist The House must have been the statement issued more or less on behalf of the Soviet Government and this House knows the very close relations that the Soviet Government has naturally with the Chinese Government The issue of that statement itself shows that the Soviet Government is taking a clam and more or less objective or dispassionate view of the situation considering everything We welcome that. It is not far us to divert this major issue between these two great countries, China and India into wrong channels; it will be completely wrong for us to do that and we must maintain our dignity and at the same time deal with the situation as firmly as we can. It is a difficult situation, difficult in the sense, physically difficult, apart from other difficulties. Remember, if the physical difficulties are on our side as they are— hundreds of miles of mountains and forests with no roads—the same difficulties are on the side of any person who rashly tries to come in. So you can balance the difficulties either way.

Anyhow, our Army and our Defence Forces are fully seized of this matter and they are not people who get excited quickly They are brave people, experienced people and because they have to deal with a difficult job, they deal with it in a calm and quiet way but efficiently I am sure they will do that.

There are a number of amendments Naturally, I am not prepared to accept any amendment which is a condemnation of our policy.

Acharya Kripalani: Before you deal with the amendments, may I ask a question? Shri Dange has said that the Dalai Lama is being subsidised by your Government Is it a fact?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not referred to the question of Tibet or the Dalai Lama, partly because, although it slightly touches these issues and it has affected them, it is a separate issue So far as the Dalai Lama is concerned, I do not know what is meant by 'subsidy' We have spent some money over his remaining there but we have given him no special subsidy But some money has been spent naturally on his stay at Mussoorie and we are spending money on the other refugees.

Again, as the House knows we have expressed our views in regard to some statements of the Dalai Lama. We have disagreed with them.

Acharya Kripalani: Can this help be called a subsidy to the Dalai Lama?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am merely telling you the fact He is given no subsidy of any kind but some money has been spent by us on arrangements for his stay in Mussoorie That is the position

It has been a difficult problem for us—the problem that was referred to by Shri Dange and Acharya Kripalani There was a little controversy as to the freedom to be given to a person who has sought asylum here and that is quite apart from the respect we have for him Of course, it is a constitutional question We have great respect and the people of India have great respect for the Dalai Lama At the same time we did tell him many times that he should not make India the seat of activities against a country which is a friendly country I wish to say this by and large, for a considerable time, he has observed a good deal of restraint considering the stresses and strains he suffered from But sometimes he has gone beyond that and we had to contradict some of his statements We did not wish to enter into trouble about it, but because some of his statements did appear to us to go much too far that we had to contradict them

I cannot accept these various amendments naturally because they are in effect a condemnation of our policy But there is one amendment tabled by Shri Naldurgkar which is acceptable to me if the House so wishes

Shri Hem Barua: The people inhabiting N E F A, about 30,000 sq miles of whose territory are claimed by China as shown in their map, still preserve, due to the British policy of isolation, a sort of separatist psychology, and during all these years of freedom, we could not create in them a comprehensive Indian mind and as such those people are easily susceptible to Chinese propaganda May I know from the Prime Minister what steps do the Government propose to take to see that this thing does not happen in N E F A?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, there is education, publicity, and all that, there Most of the N E F A region had no administration even in the old times Gradually administration has spread there Now administration, education and all that are spreading there

Shri P K. Deo I am grateful to the Prime Minister for the firmness with which he has spoken and dealt with the Chinese situation He has rightly diagnosed this Chinese malady to be the arrogance of might Imperialism is no longer the monopoly of the west It can also spread to the east though it has got a different name They call it liberation We have seen what liberation means to Tibet Whatever be the imperialism, this imperialism should be nipped in the bud Unless it is nipped in the bud it will grow because it has got a cancerous and malignant growth.

From the analysis of history we have seen that all policies of appeasement have failed to stop the growth of imperialism Sir Neville Chamberlain has failed in his policy of appeasement to stop Hitler from his aggressive imperialist designs at Munich in 1939 or so In this particular case also, I think our Prime Minister will deal with the Chinese situation firmly and the whole country will stand behind him

Lastly, I would like to express my thanks to my friend and comrade, Shri Dange for the guarantee he has given on behalf of China, that there will be no aggression I would like to know what he is to China Is he the accredited agent to China and whether it is the Chinese or the Indian speaking Anyway, I request him to be more realistic and more patriotic in his approach to the situation

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Some hon. Member mentioned or enquired if the Chinese had built an airfield in Indian territory There is no such thing There is only one airfield in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the eastern Ladakh, Chushu, built 4 or 5 years ago. I went there and it was an exciting trip to the borders of Tibet. But there is no Chinese airfield there.

Shri C. K. Nair: I want to know one thing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now it is too late. I will put amendment No. 4 to the vote at the end. So far as other amendments are concerned, may I put them all together?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Regarding my amendment No. 2, in view of the regrets expressed by the Prime Minister, I would like to withdraw it if the House permits me to do so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will not put all other amendments, except amendment No. 4, to the vote of the House.

The amendments Nos. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were put and negatived

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954—59, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959 and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959 agrees with the policy of the Government adopted with regard to the frontier problem existing between the Governments of India and China and endorses the view and stand taken by them in connection with this problem."(4).

The motion was adopted.

16.43 hrs.

*GORAKHPUR LABOUR ORGANISATION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Half-an-hour discussion on the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation.

Shri K. N. Pandey (Hata): Mr Deputy-Speaker, before coming to the subject matter of the discussion today, I would like to give a brief history of the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation.

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): May I know the distribution of time between him and me?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ten minutes.

Shri Nanda: That will be all right.

Shri K. N. Pandey: I should be given more.

This scheme was introduced in 1942 in order to meet the demand of labour at various defence projects. After the war was over, at the request of the employers of coal mining the Central Government agreed that they would also be provided with labour, provided they would agree to bear the entire cost of this scheme. That is why this scheme started the supply of labour to the coal mining areas.

Since then the scheme has been in operation. Now there has been a demand from other sides that as the workers of Gorakhpur are kept in camps this camp system should be abolished and they should be treated as free workers or at par with other workers working in the coal-mining area.

---

*Half-an-hour discussion.

In this connection I want to express my opinion and also give information to the House that this scheme does not supply labour only to the coal-mining area but it supplies labour to other fields also. It gives labour to the Government Cement Factory, Churk. It gives labour to work in the quarry. It also sends labour to other parts for colonisation and for constructing dams, power houses and other necessary works demanded by the Government. So, this cry of coal mining, namely that the whole system should be abolished, I fail to understand.

There is another thing also that I want to express here So far as I have met the workers who are recruited by this Gorakhpur labour organisation, they do not complain that they have to face any difficulty because of being in camps. I have not seen any camp, but as I come from Gorakhpur where these workers are recruited, I have met several of them and have asked them whether they are feeling any difficulties because of this scheme I have been informed that they are not feeling so much difficulty as others are feeling.

However, there was a demand from some side that this system should be abolished. This question was first raised in 1954 at the time of the Indian Labour Conference in Mysore and the Conference agreed to form a committee to go into the details of this matter and find out whether it is worthwhile or desirable to abolish this scheme. That committee was constituted under the chairmanship of Shri Vishnu Sahai, ICS, and consisted of representatives of employers and employees. They made an enquiry and there was a unanimous decision not to abolish this scheme Instead, they recommended that there should be two advisory committees. There was a complaint from some side that these workers are not only kept in camps but are also used to break strikes. Then this committee recommended that let one advisory committee be formed and if there is a complaint that these workers are used to break strikes that matter should be dealt with I have no information till this time that any such complaint has been made to this advisory committee. I have no information about the findings of this advisory committee.

However, this agitation was going on. What was the cause for this agitation? So far as I can understand it was this The total strength of this Gorakhpur labour is 3 per cent of the total strength of the colliery workers Whereas their strength is only 3 per cent their production is 12 per cent of the total production. As the other labourers working in the coal-mining area do not give so much production these Gorakhpur labourers are given some extra facility. That they cannot see and that is why there is an agitation. I have no objection if those workers are also given those facilities provided they also give so much production.

Shri M. K. Ghosh (Jamshedpur): It is not only from the coal mines The objections were from ore mines also

Shri K. N. Pandey: May be so. Why was this agitation started? It was because they were getting extra facilities. I do not know the reason why the other workers could not give so much production There was an agitation. I have no objection if other workers also give the same amount of production and get the same facility. There is no harm in it. Let the Ministry take the initiative and persuade the employers to give the same kind of facility to other workers also, instead of creating such an atmosphere, so that the remaining workers or other workers may get those facilities The decision for abolition of the scheme was taken Now there is a propaganda and also an agitation that the whole system should be abolished, so that the Gorakhpur labour may give the same amount of production as other ordinary workers are giving This is the only matter.

Only one other matter I want to place before the House and that is that

[Shri K. N. Pandey]

the Gorakhpur labour organisation does not insist that only workers belonging to Gorakhpur or Deoria are to be recruited through this centre. It is not so. Workers from other parts of the country are also recruited through this centre; because, I have got the papers with me and I see that from Bihar, Andhra, Madras, Punjab and from so many other States workers have come there and they have been recruited. Although their number is small in comparison to the Gorakhpur labour, still the fact is that the workers from other parts also come and are recruited from that centre.

Now I shall just say how this matter arose and how I raised this matter and requested you, Sir, to bring this matter before the House. There was an announcement from the Ministry on the 9th August 1959 that this scheme is going to be abolished, and it was said that it was as a result of the decision taken by the tripartite committee I am giving you some information about this tripartite committee also. In this tripartite committee the coal miners were also a party, they had also been invited, and a representative of the U P Government also was there. Because, the fact is that although this is a big scheme providing work to thousands of workers, the Central Government does not spend a single pie for this scheme. But simply in order to have co-ordination between State and State they are in the picture and they are minding these affairs In this tripartite committee I do not know—I have no information—whether they agreed to this proposal or not. But this much I can say that the U.P. Government representative did not agree. However, it was announced that this scheme is going to be abolished. And that is why this matter has come up here

When I put my short notice question on 28-8-59, an assurance was given by the Minister that so far as employment was concerned the Ministry can assure that these workers will be provided employment and they will take all possible steps in that connection through employment exchanges. What is the condition of these employment exchanges? If a worker goes for employment, first he has to get himself registered in the employment exchange. And then he goes home. And then when a call comes, he has to come; whereas in this scheme when a worker is called for joining work or for being sent anywhere, he is kept for so many days in the recruiting centre and maintained till he is sent to the work-site. This is the difference between employment exchange and this recruitment organisation.

May I know from the Labour Minister whether he can assure us that those workers, even if they are recruited through employment exchanges, will be maintained till the time they are sent to the work-site?

An Hon Member: They get railway fare

Shri K. N Pandey: Railway fare is something else I am told that every coal-mining worker is entitled to the railway fare. But he is entitled after twelve months, whereas this worker even if he has not worked for a single day, is entitled to railway fare. So what will be done in that connection?

However, one thing I will say. The only charge against this labour was that they were giving more production, and that is why the employers were ready to spend more on these workers If these workers are put in the same category or they are treated at par with others, then what charm will remain so that an employer will recruit them? If the hon. Minister can assure me that in spite of this they will get the same amount of production and employment, I have no objection at all.

In summing up, I wish to say that I have some doubt if the assurance given by the hon. Minister before the House will be fulfilled or not. In this connection, I have to point out to the

hon. Minister one thing. I want that, first of all, the House and ourselves should be assured that these workers who were getting employment previously will be getting employment in future also, and that they will be getting the same facilities and amenities that they had so far been enjoying. The next thing that I want to urge upon the hon. Minister is, that till this scheme materialises, the order for abolishing the scheme should be stayed. I want to bring it before the House that the Minister should form a Parliamentary Committee to enquire into the affairs of this scheme. Let that Committee recommend to the House or the Labour Minister whether it is desirable to abolish this scheme and if it is abolished, what other things should be done in this connection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One question for each Member.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajganj): I would like to be told what will happen to the present staff and the organisation which they have for recruiting these people in Gorakhpur. There is a big organisation. Several hundreds of people are employed. I ask what will happen to the present Labour recruiting Depot in Gorakhpur. I would like the hon. Minister to make a detailed statement in the matter. Secondly, I would also like to be assured that any modifications that will be made will be an improvement on the present scheme and it will not be worse than what it is today.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): In view of the fact that this organisation and the scheme, except for the employers, is opposed by every State Government barring U.P.—because in U.P. it would result in unemployment of those labourers who have been recruited under this Gorakhpur Labour force scheme—would the Government consider the question of making them permanent and stop this recruitment, or make the staff permanent or give the option to the present staff whether they want to be permanent or they want to be repatriated? When they are made permanent, they should not have any discrimination of any sort from local labour. Today, they are housed in separate barracks, under separate discipline. Though nominally they are allowed to joint trade unions, they are never allowed to join trade unions except in some places like Hyderabad. It will not create a problem for the U.P. about unemployment. If these workers are made permanent, they can open a depot. We know the conditions in the eastern districts of U.P. The unemployment problem is very acute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude his question.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: We know the problem in the eastern districts. A special depot may be opened for recruitment and as soon as they are recruited, they should be treated as other workers.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): May I know whether the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel was consulted in this respect before the decision to abolish was taken, and if not, whether the Government thinks it proper to consult that Ministry, because this labour relates to their side of work also? One question more . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One I had asked.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I want to know whether the U.P. Government has still represented that this system should be continued because it involves an area which is over-densely populated and it helps the employment problem.

श्री प्र० ना० सिंह (बस्ती) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जो मजदूर इस समय भारतीय कोलमाइंस में काम करते हैं और जिनकी संख्या करीब करीब १५—१६ १६ हजार तक है, उनको परमानेंट करने की कोई स्कीम सरकार के सामने है ?

[श्री म० रा० सिंह]

इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूं कि यदि इन मजदूरों को परमानेंट कर दिया जाता है तो आगे आने वाले मजदूरों की भरती के सिलसिले में, जो मौजूदा संगठन है, उसकी क्या स्थिति होगी और उसको क्यों खत्म किया गया है और उसको ही थोड़ी सी इम्प्रूवमेंट्स करके चलाने में सरकार के सामने क्या दिक्कतें थीं ?

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): The Gorakhpur labour organisation has nothing to do with Gorakhpur or the U.P. It has got its concern with the whole of India. Because, in the Gorakhpur labour organisation, labour is recruited from the Punjab, from Madhya Pradesh, from Bombay and from other States and from Meerut and other western districts. The fact is that it is really a backward areas labour organisation nicknamed the Gorakhpur labour organisation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now the question should be put

17 hrs.

Shri Kalika Singh: Yes, Sir, I am putting the question.

In view of that fact, will the hon Minister by changing the name from Gorakhpur labour organisation to Backward Areas labour organisation, maintain this organisation as a special case because it has been there for a very long time and means displacement of 15,000 persons?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Most of the time would be taken up by these questions if I allow all the Members.

Shri Nanda: And the questions would need a minute each to be answered.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: And perhaps only those Members have chosen to sit down who wanted to put questions!

Shri Keshava (Bangalore city): Would not the continuation of the existing system of recruitment at Gorakhpur merely for the reason that the camp labourers have no objection for its continuation be tantamount to perpetuating the evil against the larger interests? Is there no other way of safeguarding the special amenities if any, that they enjoy and yet put an end to this abnoxious system?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am coming to this side also. Shri Ram Shankar Lal.

श्री राम शंकर लाल (डुमरियागंज) मैं एक तो यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि जो लेबर एरियाज से आते हैं क्या उनकी तरफ से भी कोई इस तरह की आवाज रिक्रूटमेंट के खिलाफ उठती है या सिर्फ बाहर की एरियाज के लोग यह आवाज उठा रहे हैं । दूसरे क्या ऐसे जरिये अख्तियार किये जायेंगे जिससे इस इलाके के मजदूरों की जो कि बैकवर्ड एरियाज के हैं भर्ती बराबर जारी रहे ?

श्री खांडेकर (बिलासपुर): इस दृष्टिकोण को मद्देनजर रखते हुए कि राजनगर, धनपुरी, अगरखान और चिरमिरी छत्तीसगढ़ के इन स्थानों में उन्होंने बहुत से अत्याचार किये और इंटरनेशनल लेबर कोड के जिस सिद्धांत के अनुसार जो सेटेलमेंट कैम्प चला आ रहा है सन् १९५४ से और गोरखपुर लेबर आर्गेनाइजेशन है उनको बन्द करने का निर्णय किया गया उस सिद्धान्त के अनुसार मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या ३० सितम्बर १९५९ तक प्राइवेट एम्प्लायर्स के लेबर आर्गेनाइजेशन्स को बन्द करने का जो निर्णय किया उस को बन्द करने का इरादा है ? और क्या एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज खुल जाने के बाद भी और हर तरह की सुविधा हो जाने के बाद भी गोरखपुर लेबर कैम्प को जारी रखने का इरादा है ?

Shri M. K. Ghosh: Will the hon. Minister enlighten us as to whether the objections made by the unions

and other organisations were the extra facilities they are getting, or there were other causes, as for instance the constitution not allowing them to become members of the union and of this type of thing?

Shri Nanda: There has been considerable anxiety and agitation about something which the Government is supposed to have decided to do which might have certain repercussions, certain consequences for the employment of a considerable number of persons who are now being recruited through what is known as the Gorakhpur labour organisation. I have been asked to give certain assurances so that the interests of the persons who are now having the benefit of this system may be safeguarded.

In the first instance, at the very outset I am prepared to give one or two assurances. The first is that I am in no hurry to make a change if there is any sense, any feeling, of uneasiness among a section of the House as to what it is going to amount to. Therefore, I am going to stay action on this till some other steps have been taken. As far the steps that have to be taken, immediately, I may announce that I am prepared to accept the advice regarding the setting up of a committee of Members of Parliament, in order that they may be able to see what exactly is intended to be done, and how far there is any basis for the nervousness which some hon. friends have given expression to. I need not announce the names of the members on that committee immediately, but I shall take it up at once, and let the Members know whom we shall request to assist in this work of inquiry that is going to be instituted.

But let us understand as to what exactly Government have thought of doing, and what they do not intend to do. The point of the discussion is that about 14 000 workers who are being recruited through this organisation, possibly, will have their employment interests jeopardised. The position that we have taken, or the decision or conclusion at which we have arrived at amounts to something different. What we propose to do is this. Firstly, so far as the recruiting organisation, namely the Gorakhpur labour organisation is concerned, it has certain functions as a recruiting organisation, which are not exactly the same as those of any labour exchange. Therefore, when it is said that these people can go to the labour exchanges, and we may increase the number of labour exchanges, that is not a sufficient answer, because it is a special case It has a history. There is a special set up there. And I am not in favour of disturbing and disrupting it at once

So far as that part of the functions of the Gorakhpur labour organisation is concerned, facilities are being provided to a certain number of workers in a certain area, which is known to be depressed economically, and, therefore, the workers of that area can certainly claim certain special considerations particularly because these have been made available to them so far. Therefore, the argument that it is not only Gorakhpur, but it is the whole country that is affected, I think, undermines the strength of the whole argument for this case. But I accept the other part of it, because it is largely so; it is largely around that area, and not in other parts of the country.

The second point is that the hostility to this has arisen because of something else, which does not go under the name of the Gorakhpur Labour organisation, but which has another name. It is the Coal field Recruiting Organisation. The two things got mixed up, and, therefore, a lot of confusion arises. The labour movement has been opposed to it all along. It was because of this that a certain committee was set up, to which the sponsor of the discussion had made a reference. In that committee's report which I have got with me here, it has been stated clearly what the demand

[Shri Nanda]

or the substance of the opposition was.

> "The complaints brought to the notice of the committee in this regard broadly were: the workers did not have full freedom of movement, their lives were supervised, they were kept segregated from other labour and could not, therefore, feel identity of interests with them, they were in practice not free to join trade unions and were potential blacklegs. Allegations of maltreatment were made. It was also pointed out that the eleven-month period of contract under which this labour was recruited deprived it of certain benefits such as those relating to leave with wages, retrenchment relief and provident fund.".

That is from the point of view of the labour movement. We would not like, that in a civilised community, we should have uncivilised practices; and anything which will drive a wedge into the labour movement, which will create a special class, which will be a sore in the eyes of everybody there. We do not want that. It was to that aspect that the committee addressed itself in the beginning, and it had found that the conditions were not really as bad as they were depicted.

But still it says:

> "The Committee does not consider it necessary to attempt to record a finding on the various allegations; on the other hand, the basic fact remains that segregation and the restricted period of the contract are factors which tend to keep this labour as a separate class".

Then the Committee says:

> "The approach of this Committee, therefore, has been throughout to so alter the conditions as to make them approximate as much as possible to those of other labour. It is this approach alone which will bring about a lasting improvement in the position".

I think the principle which is enunciated here is one which should be acceptable to everybody. Then the Committee made certain recommendations in order to see that the conditions of Gorakhpur labour approximate to those of other labour. That means that at the point at which they reach the work site, there should be no difference. Since the report of this Committee, objections continued to pour in from all sections of the labour movement, the INTUC, AITUC, Hind Mazdoor Sabha—everybody—passing resolutions against this. We could not but take notice of it. In February, there was a meeting of the Industrial Committee on Coal and there, at the insistence of the labour movement, this question was taken up and a decision was taken. We did not bother about the name at that stage; that organisation might continue. But all forms of control or regulation exercised separately over Gorakhpur labour should cease. There should be a joint co-operative organisation which should look after the various aspects, recruitment, training, welfare of all labour etc. so that there should be no distinction between Gorakhpur labour and other labour. Steps should be taken to devise a scheme for this purpose.

Now a resolution to this effect was passed in February. What I am now trying to explain is that since then no major change has been made. The decision was there. Only the name has been changed. We wanted to attend to the implementation of it. I will again turn to the Report of Committee.

> "Regarding the name, it may incidentally be pointed out that the term 'Gorakhpuri labour', derived as it is from the place where the depot is situated, is a

misnomer. The labour handled by the depot does not come from Gorakhpur alone but serves the whole of eastern U.P. and the adjoining districts of Bihar....."

Because of the association of other malpractices, which everybody wants to abolish, the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation has come to be identified with all those things. I thought of cutting off this nexus, this unhealthy association. This was also one of the suggestions made here, namely, change the name.

Therefore, the idea was that we keep up the recruiting part, the essential purpose of it; a certain number of persons today have a certain facility and they should continue to have that. On the other hand, there is a set of employers who want their services. I was told that three per cent of the mining labour in the country is Gorakhpur labour, or whatever comes under that name, are able to produce 20 per cent of the production. Well and good. It is very welcome news.

This means the employers would be very keen to have them. All right. We won't come in the way of the employers having them. Let the C.R.O.—I do not want to object to its being continued—continue as the recruiting agency, as an indenting agency. They find out which colliery and which employer wants this labour. Let them go on doing it. Let them present their indent. Let the recruiting organisation, with such modifications as will not change its essential purpose, continue to provide them. That is really what I am asked to do, and I am prepared to say that it should be done. This Committee, which we are appointing, should see to it that this is secured. Whether the collective centre is necessary or not is a question which may be seen by this Committee.

There is one factor. Of the labour which presents itself for recruitment, only 10 per cent is being actually recruited, so that conditions have changed during these years. The special arrangements which were needed to send people out in the areas to get them and pay them something, are not necessary. Therefore a little change has taken place. The organisation for recruiting purposes will be devised in such a manner that those very interests do not suffer.

I have answered the main question and there are a few other matters. They ask: Will the employer be still interested now? Why will he not be interested? If he is interested in getting these people because they are efficient, and if I enable them to be placed in their hands, then, there should be no difficulty about their being employed. If his interest is in some kind of controlled regimentation and segregation which is most obnoxious, then, of course, we do not want to perpetuate those features.

The other question was about certain facilities that they are getting. Those facilities cease to be of some importance now in view of the higher wages which they get. I would say here that if the employer wants to give him a blanket and other facilities, I will not stop that. I am not at all opposed if he can continue to get all these things, but after they reach the workside, there should be no offence.

What I want to do is this. They get a contract for 11 months and they have to come back. It is not a very good or a desirable practice. All these 14,000 workers should be made permanent; they should not be made to go back. They may take leave.....

Shri Sinhasan Singh: They are not compelled to go back. Those who want to go back, go back; those who want to remain, remain. There are workers who are remaining for years and years there.

Shri Nanda: All I would like to see is that the employers give them a permanent status and that they are absorbed permanently in the industry.

[Shri Nanda]

I do not know whether all the hon. Members know that there were some recent developments in Madhya Pradesh on 20th May, 1959 which originated in a quarrel over empty trucks in the Chinnakuri colliery in Madhya Pradesh I do not want to say much. Somebody said the whole colliery remained closed. I do not know, for two months or so. (*Interruptions*). All these things should not be there; otherwise, their interests would suffer. Gorakhpur labour will suffer on account of this. I think I have covered the general question.

Ten or 12 questions have been showered by my friends. I have fully covered these questions; but if you want me to answer them I am prepared to deal with them separately also.

About staff and organisation. I think Shri Saksena asked that. In the first place, many of them will be absorbed in the reorganised set up. We will look after that.

Pandit J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): I may bring to your notice that the Chirimiri labour have said that if by 30th September the Gorakhpur Commission is not abolished they will resort to satyagraha.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Already there are so many questions. Why should you burden him with more?

Shri Nanda: Sir, it is an important question and I would like to deal with it first, because it involves—I do not call it a threat but—rather a development which we should certainly like to avoid. We have taken a decision. The terms of reference of the Committee will be on the basis of this decision. These are special exceptional, abnormal and unusual conditions, and they should be abolished as far as the workers who reach the work site are concerned. So far as Government is concerned, it will not co-operate with them. If they still remain then certain other remedies may be open. There will be other ways of dealing with the matter.

About making it permanent I have already answered that. It is not the concern of one Ministry and we consult the other Ministries. I know that the people go not only to the mines but they go to so many other places. Therefore, really, several Ministries will be concerned with it.

Now, about the U.P. Government. I have had letters from the Chief Minister and he also is of the same view that we should not disband these because the private contractors and other recruiting organisations are more undesirable. I agree with that view. For the rest, those other undesirable features objected to by the trade unions, etc., should be removed. I do not think there is any substantial difference between the view of theU.P. Government and ours. After all, it is 14 000 compared to three lakhs and half in this field. Let us not forget that when we are urging a point of view, there are repercussions on the minds and attitudes of those 3½ lakhs of workers. We have to balance all that and we must therefore provide for all the vital interests of these workers and yet eliminate those undesirable features. It is on this basis that this committee will be requested to function and I hope that there should be, after what I have stated, no occasion for any feeling of anxiety or uneasiness.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have completed our job for this session. It was an important session, no doubt. There were more of discussions than of legislation—discussion on important issues, economic as well as political. If we look back upon what we have done, certainly we can feel satisfied that we have done well. There were occasions when storms have arisen inside the House but they have blown over in a very short time. Convul-

tions have been visible but tranquillity has been restored soon after. Again, differences have arisen on specific issues but as soon as they have been discussed calmness again was regained. So, we can say that we have been successful in pushing forward and promoting democracy, so far as our objective is concerned.

Of course, it is unfortunate that even on the last day, certain hon. Members felt dissatisfied that the Chair had not been just to them. But the Chair has got used to these things. I can assure all the Members that they may feel dissatisfied with the Chair but the Chair never does feel dissatisfied with them. I am really grateful to all sections in the House that they have given complete co-operation, wherever it was needed and honestly I say that I have no grouse absolutely against any individual or any group whatsoever

Now, the hon. Members shall be going to their constituencies and I wish them well. I hope they would come refreshed and resuscitated to take the more important jobs that we have before us. Now, we have this satisfaction that by and large all sections have been co-operating in the task that we have before us I wish you all well.

17.25 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned sine die

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS: . . 7975—84

S.N.Q. No.	Subject	Columns
16	News Agencies .	7975—79
17	Bengal-Nagpur Cotton Textile Mill . .	7979—81
18	Membership of Central Trade Union Organisations . . .	7981—84

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT 7984-85

The Deputy Speaker withheld his consent to the moving of an adjournment motion given notice of by Shri Narayan Ganesh Goray regarding certain reports in Pakistan Press on the recent talks between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE . 7986

(1) A copy of corrigendum to the Annual Report of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences for the year 1958-59 laid on the Table on the 2nd September, 1959.

(2) Copy of a statement showing imports into and exports from Rajasthan of principal foodgrains by rail and river.

(3) A copy of the minutes of the sittings (Fourteenth and Fifteenth) of the Committee on Government Assurances held during the Eighth Session.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA . . . 7986-87

Secretary reported a message from Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha had no recommendations to make to Lok Sabha in regard to the Travancore-Cochin Vehicles Taxation (Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1959, passed by Lok Sabha on the 9th September, 1959.

Column

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS . . . 7987

Secretary laid on the Table the following Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current Session and assented to by the President since the last report made to the House on the 31st August, 1959:

(1) The Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1959.

(2) The Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1959.

(3) The Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1959.

(4) The Central Excises and Salt (Amendment) Bill, 1959.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE 7987—89

(1) Shri S. M. Banerjee called the attention of Prime Minister to the reported Pakistani protest to the U. N. Security Council over the contemplated extension of jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the Election Commission of India to Jammu and Kashmir State.

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru) made a statement in regard thereto.

(2) In response to the other calling attention notice by Shri Uma Charan Patnaik regarding the reported purchase of two squadrons of Sea Hawk jet fighter aircraft from Hawker Siddley Group of U.K.

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Raghuramaiah) laid a statement on the Table.

COLUMNS

MOTION *RE.* WHITE PAPER ON INDO-CHINESE RELATIONS . . 7990—8130

Shri P. K. Deo moved a motion *re.* White Paper on Indo-Chinese Relations. Out of eight substitute motions moved, one was withdrawn, six were negatived. The discussion was concluded and one substitute motion was adopted.

COLUMNS

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION 8130—48

Shri K. N. Pandey raised a half-an-hour discussion on points arising out of the answer given on the 28th August, 1959 to Short Notice Question No. 7 regarding Gorakhpur Labour Organisation.

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda) replied to the debate.

Lok Sabha adjourned *sine die*.

OF THE EIGHTH SESSION OF SECOND LOK SABHA

1. PERIOD OF THE SESSION	3rd August to 12th September, 1959/12th Sravana to 21st Bhadra, 1881 (Saka)
2. NUMBER OF SITTINGS	31
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF SITTING HOURS	197
4. NUMBER OF DIVISIONS HELD	4
5. GOVERNMENT BILLS :	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the session	11
(ii) Introduced	19
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by Rajya Sabha	2
(iv) Referred to Select Committee	Nil.
(v) Referred to Joint Committee	1
(vi) Reported by Select Committee	Nil.
(via) Reported by Joint Committees	4
(vii) Passed	24
(viii) Returned by Rajya Sabha without any amendment	8
(ix) Returned by Rajya Sabha with amendments	Nil.
(x) Pending at the end of the Session	8
6. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS :	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	92
(ii) Introduced	10
(iii) Withdrawn	1
(iv) Pending at the end of the session	99
(v) Negatived	1
7. GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS :	
(i) Moved	1
(ii) Adopted	1
8. PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS :	
(i) Received	896
(ii) Adopted	Nil.
(iii) Included in the List of Business	18
(iv) Withdrawn	2
(v) Negatived	1
9. GOVERNMENT MOTIONS:	
(i) Moved	3
(ii) Adopted	3
10. PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS :	
(i) Received	50
(ii) Admitted	28
(iii) Moved	12
(iv) Adopted	8
11. MOTIONS RE. MODIFICATIONS TO STATUTORY RULES :	
(i) Received	7
(ii) Admitted	7
(iii) Moved	Nil.
12. DISCUSSION HELD ON MOTIONS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE	1
13. HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION HELD	0
14. NUMBER OF MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE TO WHICH ATTENTION OF MINISTER WAS CALLED AND STATEMENTS WERE MADE OR LAID BY MINISTER	12
15. ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS :	
(i) Received	43
(ii) Admitted	Nil.
(iii) Consent withheld by Speaker	43
16. QUESTIONS ASKED :	
(i) Starred	1416
(ii) Unstarred (Including Starred Questions converted as Unstarred Questions)	2723
(iii) Short Notice Questions	18
17. REPORTS OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES PRESENTED:	
(i) Business Advisory Committee	5
(ii) Committee of Privileges	1 (Tenth)
(iii) Committee on Absence of Members from the Sitting of the House	2
(iv) Committee on Petitions	1
(v) Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions	5(46th to 50th)
(vi) Committee on Subordinate Legislation	2
(vii) Rules Committee	Nil.