

at the basement of the Botany Department; and

(c) if so, the action taken by Government in the matter?

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) The University has accepted the suggestion of the Audit for the inclusion of the value of gifts received from abroad in the Balance Sheet and has asked its Departments to furnish the particulars of such gifts and their value.

With regard to the expenditure on the installation of air-conditioning plants, the University has clarified the position to the Audit and the matter is under correspondence.

Rules for Transaction of Business under Union Territories Act, 1963

5458. **Shri Sequeira:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2365 on the 14th June, 1967, and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Rules for the more convenient transaction of business with the Ministers in each of the Union Territories have not been published anywhere; and

(b) if so, whether on re-consideration Government propose to lay a copy of the rules on the Table of the House?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri K. S. Ramaswamy): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir.

12.48 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED MOVEMENT OF CHINESE ARMY ON BHUTAN-SIKKIM BORDERS

Shri S. Kundu (Balsore): I call the attention of the Minister of Defence to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

The reported movement of a Chinese armed division specialised in sabotage activities on Bhutan and Sikkim borders.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Government have seen a press report of a Japanese Language Radio Moscow broadcast to the effect that China has moved a Division specialised in sabotage activities into the mountainous area bordering Bhutan. The threat from China to India and its neighbours is a continuing one.

As I had indicated in a statement made by me on the floor of the House on 16th June, 1967 in response to a Calling Attention Notice, Chinese forces have for a long time now been in position in strength across our Northern borders. However, the House may rest assured that all developments across our borders are duly taken note of and suitable measures taken wherever necessary to safeguard our security and territorial integrity.

As regards the report of the deployment across Bhutan of a Chinese Division, specialising in sabotage, Government have received no information to this effect from the Government of Bhutan. As the House is aware, the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru had stated on 28th February, 1963 on the floor of this House that should a threat arise to the territorial integrity of Bhutan,

[Shri Swaran Singh]

"The Government of India will on a request by the Bhutan Government, be prepared to give them all necessary assistance for the defence of the territorial integrity of Bhutan". Government stand by that statement.

Shri F. Venkatasubbalah (Nandyal): What about Sikkim?

Shri Swaran Singh: About Sikkim, I have already on an earlier occasion clarified the position, that we have treaty obligations with regard to the defence of Sikkim.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): There have appeared reports about concentrations on the Sikkim border also.

Shri S. Kundu: This is a very important question. There is radio and press propaganda, and there are attempts by the Chinese to sabotage the internal defence of certain countries of Asia, which have assumed a sinister significance particularly when Mao has been repeatedly saying that power grows out of the barrel of a gun. Such menacing propaganda has been going on recently in Bhutan. One of the Indian officers there was man-handled and beaten with the butt of a gun. There is also a strong rumour that the sabotage activities of the Chinese are spreading rapidly in Bhutan. The hon. Minister says we have got no information from the Bhutan Government. Under the treaty the Minister can get information, all sorts of information, when such a serious threat has broken out. When this call attention notice was given, the hon. Minister did not take any care to get that information; no treaty forbids his getting definite information, and he simply says that the Bhutan Government has not given any information. That is not the answer to this call attention notice. I think it is the duty of the hon. Minister to get it, and since he has not got it specifically, will he find out the exact nature of the threat? Nehru had also given that

assurance, but we were caught un-awares.

Mr. Speaker: This is exactly a speech.

Shri S. Kundu: My question is this. Let the hon. Minister now definitely ascertain, and report to the House at the earliest possible date, from his own sources whether the apprehension caused by the report in the press among the public is true or not.

Shri Swaran Singh: Apprehension in the minds of China's neighbouring countries is understandable, and the menacing postures of the Chinese on the borders of these mountainous countries and opposite our own borders are a matter of grave concern to us and to other countries. This is the information that was specifically asked, about the movement of a particular division on the Bhutanese and Sikkimese border, and I have tried to trace the origin of this report, and I have mentioned in my statement the origin of this report. Under our treaty obligations, the request has to come from the Government of Bhutan, and I will appeal to the hon. members that while dealing with our neighbours we should also respect their susceptibilities and should not say anything which might create wrong understanding or wrong appreciation of our attitude in the minds of those neighbouring countries.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi (Cuddalore): You could have got it from Russian sources.

Mr. Speaker: Will you kindly sit down? You are not called.

The question put is this. Suppose the Bhutan Government fails to give us information about the Chinese armies and all that, have we any method of getting it?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is no refusal by the Bhutanese Government to give any information. In fact,

they always are very co-operative and give information to us. And this was a way of saying that so far the Bhutanesse Government themselves have not got any information, otherwise they will pass that information to us.

श्री रबी राव (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, 1962 के चीन के आक्रमण के दिन से ऐसा मामू होना है कि सरकार का जासूसी का जो काम है वह असफल रहा है। क्या श्री महोदय बतायेंगे कि क्या यह खबर जो उन को मिली है वह रूसी सूत्र से मिली है रूस की सरकार ने सब से पहले यह खबर की है यदि यह सही है तो क्या रूस सरकार के यह खबर देने के बाद भारत सरकार के कोई मंत्री या विदेश मंत्रालय या रक्षा मंत्रालय ने रूस सरकार के साथ कोई सलाह-मजबिरा किया था, अगर किया बातों सबन को बताना चाहिये, अगर नहीं किया तो फौरन उन के साथ सम्पर्क कर के इस के बारे में कार्यवाही करनी चाहिये।

Shri Swaran Singh: According to my information, no special contact has been established with the Soviet Government to ascertain or to verify the correctness of this information. This appeared in a Japanese language broadcast according to a press report, the origin being Moscow, some Soviet radio. It is not customary that merely on hearing a radio report, we rush to the Soviet Government and get confirmation or otherwise. This appeared in the newspapers only a couple of days ago. We will certainly investigate it further, and I will be very glad to give information to the House if there is any information worth giving.

Mr. Speaker: He will further investigate it.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order. He said that this news appeared in some Japanese paper. As a matter of fact, it has not appeared in any Japanese paper; it is the Soviet bulletin circulated in Japan in

Japanese language which gave this news. He should know that.

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): In 1962 to those who have analysed this situation, it appeared that there was not enough military and political co-ordination in the Government of India. In asking a question I will just by way of preface say that today in Burma, Nepal and the whole of South Asia, we find that the Chinese have come out of their previous cautious and flexible policy and it seems that Mao's struggle against those whom he regards as revisionists is entering a decisive phase. The question is about the help and aid which this particular unit of the Chinese armed forces which is specialising in sabotage activities may give. Will the hon. Minister tell us the steps he is going to take to prevent guidance and help reaching the revolutionary groups or groups believing themselves to be revolutionary groups operating in this whole strategic area? Is he aware of this shift in the military and political strategy of the Chinese and is he taking steps to meet this new challenge?

Shri Swaran Singh: If I may venture, this is really more a matter for the External Affairs Ministry to size up the overall attitude of the Chinese in their new posture, etc. My colleague in the E.A. Ministry has heard the analysis of the hon. Member and he will take note of his view of the situation.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Perhaps the hon. Minister will readily agree with me that so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, there is no kite flying of information; items of news are official; that is government-controlled news. The particular news item on which we based our call attention notice has been published in Japan in the Japanese language officially by the Soviet Embassy in the form of a Soviet news bulletin. In the light of this fact that this seems to be officially released by a friendly country, (a) did not the Minister feel

[Shri Nath Pai]

his duty to check the authenticity of this news and (b) may I know whether, as is referred to in the call attention notice, this particular division is stationed across the border with Sikkim—we have our own sources with regard to Sikkim; regarding Bhutan we have to depend on what information is given by Bhutan—and whether we have sought to check our own information reports if any, with those of the Soviet Union and (c) is he aware that the fact that the Soviet news item says that in fulfilment of their expansionist schemes the Chinese are about to create similar Viet-nams in India, Burma and this is only the cat's paw?

Shri Swaran Singh: We have checked up the position across the Sikkim border, between Sikkim and the Tibetan border. Our information is that there is no fresh concentration of Chinese troops or any unusual movement across the Sikkim border. About Bhutan I have little to add to what I have already said. I have mentioned that I shall investigate it further. . (Interruptions). . . and if there is any further development, I shall inform the House. It is true that the Soviet information could be taken as quasi-official although the persons who actually disseminate the news say that it is not always official, but we attach great importance to it and we shall certainly investigate it further. Maybe, it will have to be related to a point of time which will have to be specified. Now, about the last point—

Shri Nath Pai: Creation of more Viet Nams.

Shri Swaran Singh: About the creation more Viet Nams, the hon. Members of the House are no doubt aware that these days China is taking great pains to encourage lawlessness activities in various countries including our own. We are aware of it; and those whom they pretend to support or claim to support, they themselves, I think, are getting somewhat

nervous and are out to proclaim that they are not being supported by the Chinese.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): They are afraid of you!

12.55 hrs.

PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSAL OF ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: On the 5th July Shri Nath Pai raised the question of the procedure for disposal of adjournment motions which are not pressed for vote. He *inter alia* referred to the procedure of adjournment motions being "talked out". In his subsequent discussion with me he referred to Direction 44 of the Directions by the Speaker.

As I have already pointed out, there existed a provision for adjournment motions being "talked out" in the Standing Orders of the Central Legislative Assembly. This procedure was omitted in 1950 when the rules of the Provisional Parliament were framed. In the present Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha there is no provision for an adjournment motion being "talked out"

According to rule 62 read with rule 339 of the Rules of Procedure the Speaker has to put the question to the vote of the House unless a member who has moved the motion has withdrawn it by the leave of the House. However, according to Direction if the mover of the motion informs the Speaker that he does not want to press it, the motion is not put to the vote of the House and it is deemed to have been withdrawn by the leave of the House. This Direction applies also to a motion for adjournment. Therefore, I consider that when the mover of a motion for adjournment has stated in the House that he does not want to press it, the Chair need not either put the motion to the vote of the House or