

upon hon. Members not to repeat mentioning such matters here, because many such things may happen. Fortunately, nothing more is happening there at the moment. Everyday we cannot be bringing up here such matters. Then it will also be making invidious distinction between one and another by this great House. Of course, we express our deep sympathies to the families of the bereaved; certainly. But, let it not be repeated here from time to time. That is all I can say.

**Shri Nath Pal:** We should ask the Chinese not to repeat it.

**Mr. Speaker:** For the present, it is done.

12.06 hrs.

#### MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

##### SINO-INDIAN BORDER INCIDENTS

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received notice of some adjournment motions on various subjects. There is one by Shri Mohan Swarup, saying—

“great anxiety is prevailing throughout the country regarding undue delay on the part of Chinese Government in releasing the ten Indian border policemen.....”.

They have now been released, I think.

“.....and returning the nine dead bodies of policemen died in the barbarous encounter provoked by the Chinese troops in Eastern Ladakh near Chang-Chenmo Valley. It is gathered that the Chinese Government are pressing the captured Indians to confess misconceived facts to suit their (Chinese) false claims and bad motives.”

That is out of date. Then there is another, saying:

“That Chinese Armies have occupied two thousand square miles of our territory.....”.

The hon. Prime Minister has informed me that he will make a statement regarding the Chinese border incidents. Let us hear him.

**Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi):** I have given notice of an adjournment motion and I would like to say a few words on that.

**Mr. Speaker:** About the border incidents?

**Acharya Kripalani:** About the adjournment motion, of which I have given notice, with your permission, Sir, I would like to say a few words before the Prime Minister says anything.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it necessary? Let us, first of all, hear him.

**Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur):** Very necessary.

**Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated Anglo-Indians):** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** What I feel is that nothing will be gained by an adjournment motion. Certainly, we must have a regular debate on this matter. After the hon. Prime Minister makes a statement, I would certainly allow it. It is a very serious matter. The House and every hon. Member is exercised over this question. But I do not think every hon. Member should be allowed to speak on the adjournment motion. It is a serious matter and the House has taken notice of it.

**Shri Nanshir Bharucha (East Khandesh):** Will Government undertake to have a regular debate on the External Affairs Ministry?

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):** Before the Prime Minister replies, he must know what the adjournment is about and what our views are in the matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** I need not repeat what the adjournment motion is to the

[Mr. Speaker]

House. It relates to the border incidents. Everybody knows it.

Acharya Kripalani: My adjournment motion refers to:

"the failure of the Government to take prompt and effective action against unabashed violation of India's sovereignty by China on 21st October, 1959, when Chinese troops penetrated deep into Indian territory and ambushed our Police patrols engaged in their normal duties, resulting in the death of nine and kidnapping of ten policemen, which failure has caused grave sense of insecurity in the minds of the public as to the Government's ability to maintain the integrity of our frontiers."

Sir, I have been to the frontier and I know that people are very apprehensive of what is happening. They also feel that the Government is not taking necessary steps to put a check to this aggression. I have further found that in the Kalimpong area, many Chinese have recently opened curio shops.....

An Hon. Member: What?

Acharya Kripalani: Curio shops.

I have also found that in the Kalimpong area, many Chinese have recently opened curio shops in the villages where there can be no possible purchaser of such goods, nor do the foreign visitors go to those parts of the country. From day to day propaganda is being carried on by our Communist friends in these areas, telling the people of the benefits of Chinese rule. This makes our people very apprehensive and I would like to know what steps the Government is taking to see that all these activities are promptly put a stop to.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, it was my intention to lay on the Table of the House a White Paper, No. 2, and at that time make some further remarks.

Shri Vajpayee (Bairampur): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Vajpayee: The laying of the White Paper is included in the list of business. The list of business cannot be entered upon unless the adjournment motions are disposed of.

An Hon. Member: He is right.

Shri Vajpayee: Let the hon. Prime Minister make a statement and the Adjournment motion be disposed of first. Then the White Paper should be laid on the Table.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I think he is right.

Mr. Speaker: He is making a statement in reply to what Acharya Kripalani has said. So, we are on the adjournment motion now. As part of the statement he may file this paper and when we come to the other item, viz., papers to be laid on the Table. I will say that this has already been done.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I was not actually going to put in the paper now. But that is for you to decide. It is immaterial whether I do it now or half an hour later. What I was saying was that I had intended making some submissions to you and to the House at that time. But since the hon. Member opposite has put forward his motion for adjournment, if you will permit me I shall more or less say the same thing now.

This motion for adjournment as well as a large number of others all relate to these border incidents and happenings and I entirely agree with some of the hon. Members, who have put them forward, that these matters should be fully discussed in this House. It is not a question, as one hon. Member just asked me, that we will have a debate on external affairs, but I am going to suggest that there

should be a special debate on this particular matter of the border areas

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** This evening?

**Some Hon. Members:** No

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not know if the hon Member wants to sit tonight for it

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** The adjournment motion should be admitted and a debate should be had today

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I was going to suggest that this debate should not take place for one full week for the reason that I want this House to have all the papers in this connection. There the debate will be more fruitful and Government will have the benefit of the advice of this House on the steps which it has taken or intends to take

Some of the papers are going to be placed before the House when I place the White Paper on the Table of the House, but, naturally, events take place with such rapidity sometimes that one cannot keep pace with them. So, the latest papers are not included in these. Some have appeared in the public press, like a letter addressed to me by Premier Chou En-lai. Now, today a little while ago an answer by me to Premier Chou En-lai was handed over to the Chinese Ambassador in Delhi to be forwarded to the Chinese Prime Minister. It would be helpful, I think, that the House should know the contents of this reply

**Shri Bagnath Singh (Varanasi):** He is not audible

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It would be helpful if the House knew the contents of Government's reply to the Chinese Government's letter. But it would not be proper for me to publish the letter or place it on the Table of the House before it has been received by Premier Chou En-lai. That is not the custom. I have to wait, therefore, till it is received by him. Then

I should gladly place it on the Table of the House as well as some other papers. The House will then be in a better position to discuss it. I have no objection to a discussion at any time, but the discussion will be somewhat inhibited by the fact that an important document is not before the House. That is my only difficulty. I was, therefore, going to suggest to you, Sir, that we should fix a date convenient to the House and to you, Sir, but allowing adequate time for this letter to be delivered there. Then we can place it before the House and other papers. So, my own suggestion would be to have the debate early next week, preferably on Tuesday next week. I do not want at the last moment to find that I have not got the papers ready which I have to get

Also, on Monday the other House is starting

**An Hon. Member:** Make it Wednesday

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** and there are various statements and other things to be made there—not in this connection but other matters. So, I was thinking that Tuesday might be the proper day for it. But I am in the hands of the House and you, Sir. I do not think anything will be lost by having a full debate on this early next week, while something might be lost by our trying to have the debate before we have all the facts before us

There are some other factual matters in this connection which I intended to say. If you permit me I shall state them now. It is not merely an answer to Acharya Kripalani's motion, but some facts and statements which I wish to make, most of which are really known to the House. But I thought I might put them in order

Since this House adjourned at the end of the last session there has been an important and tragic incident in the Ladakh area, which incident had occurred on October 21, in Chang

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Changmo valley resulting in the death of nine members of the Indian Police patrol party and the capture of ten members of the party by the Chinese forces. Apart from this, one constable, Makhan Lal is still untraced and unaccounted for. The news of this incident, as the House knows very well, was received in India with great surprise and resentment. It was a matter of grave concern to the Government of India. A strong protest was lodged with the Chinese Government, who gave a different narrative of events in regard to this incident. Thereafter, the Ministry of External Affairs sent a long note to the Embassy of China in India dealing with this incident and connected matters in some detail. All these papers are given in this White Paper which I should subsequently or now place on the Table of the House.

Subsequently, a letter dated 7th November, from Premier Chou En-lai was received by me. It has not been possible to include this letter in the White Paper, but the Chinese Government has already given publicity to it and it has appeared in the Press. I have today sent a reply to Premier Chou En-lai to this letter through the Embassy of China in India. As I have said, it will not be proper for me to place copies of this reply on the Table of the House before it has been received by Premier Chou En-lai. I hope, however, to do so within a few days.

I do not wish to discuss at this stage the contents of my reply as it would be better to do so when the full reply is available to hon. Members. I might mention, however, that Premier Chou En-lai had made certain interim proposals with a view to eliminate the possibility of any border clash in future. We agree that it is highly desirable to take necessary steps for the avoidance of any border clash and to follow this up later by attempts at a peaceful settlement of the disputes relating to the frontier. But

the proposals that Premier Chou En-lai has made in his letter, which has already been made public, seem to us to be impracticable. We have, therefore, made some other proposals which, in our opinion, are practicable and which would put an end to the risk of a border clash.

Premier Chou En-lai also suggested in his letter that the two Prime Ministers might hold talks in the immediate future to discuss the boundary question and other outstanding issues between the two countries. I have always expressed my willingness to discuss any matter in dispute. But, if such a meeting is to bear fruit, as we want it to, we should first concentrate our immediate efforts at reaching an interim understanding, as suggested. Further, some preliminary steps are necessary to lay the foundation for our discussions. It should be remembered that there is a mass of historical data, maps, etc in connection with the frontier.

On the 14th November, the Chinese authorities handed over to our police officials the ten prisoners they had taken and nine dead bodies of our men. One constable named Makhan Lal is still unaccounted for and it must be presumed that he has also died.

According to earlier reports, we had been led to believe that Shri Karam Singh, Deputy Superintendent of Police, had been killed in the course of this clash. This report has been found to be incorrect as he is among the prisoners returned to us. He has been suffering from severe frost-bite. We are expecting a report from him. Communications have been difficult lately owing to bad weather.

After the Longju incident it had been decided to place the entire frontier of India in direct charge of our army. Further steps have been taken to this end.

I would submit, therefore, that we should consider this very important matter which has moved the entire country, and, of course, Members of this House, fully in a discussion in this House, instead of dealing with it in a piecemeal way in answer to questions. The House obviously realises the importance of this matter and the various aspects of it and I think we should consider it in all its aspects. That can only be done in a full discussion of it. I would suggest for your consideration that the debate on this might take place on Tuesday, the 24th.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** May I seek clarification on one point? It is rather an important point. I do not know whether the Prime Minister's attention has been drawn to it. It is a news item in the *Times of India* of 15th November:

"Shillong Nov 14. Seven Tibetan traders and their mules blown up by mines laid by Chinese troops near Longju. Chinese are planning elaborate defence of Longju the Indian outpost captured.."

Has any information been received?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have seen this item in the newspaper. We have received no information about it. I have become slightly reluctant to accept news unless it is very high. Anyhow, I am enquiring into this matter. It is difficult to enquire as to what might be done in a territory on which the Chinese forces are sitting. Obviously, we cannot. But, such enquiries as are possible are being made.

**Shri Nath Pal:** One small information. There are reports that the ten Indian policemen were subjected to interrogation and confessions of an implicating nature have been extorted from them. Have the Government any information regarding that and whether they were subjected to any such interrogation?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Yes, Sir. Our own information is, and in fact, it has been stated by the Chinese Government that they have received statements from some of these people, Indian police prisoners with them. That means that they must have been subjected to interrogation. Otherwise, they would not have received this statement. We have not received any full account of this statement. But, some brief accounts have, I think, appeared, as far as I remember, in Hong Kong or somewhere, and we have also received some brief accounts. It is, I need not say, a very deplorable procedure to interrogate prisoners of this type. May I add, we have been anxious naturally to get a full report from these people who were released the day before yesterday, especially from Shri Karam Singh. But we have not received any report yet from him, because, as I said, weather conditions are bad for messages to be sent. I do not quite know how severe this frost-bite from which he is suffering is. Anyhow, we have been waiting for a report. That is another reason why I wanted to wait a little while to get a full report from our own men there.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** May I know if two days will be allotted for this debate?

**Mr. Speaker:** We will consider.

**Shri Goray (Poona):** Arising out of the information given just now by the Prime Minister, I would like to know this. A statement by Dr. Baliga in Hong Kong said that Shri Karam Singh was interrogated and he said that when they were ambushed, no mortars and bombs were used. Was that information conveyed to the Prime Minister by Dr. Baliga or by anybody else?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is a statement, I believe, made on behalf of the Chinese authorities that Shri

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Karam Singh said something to this effect. Dr. Baliga only heard the Chinese statement—he did not have any information of his own—and he repeated it, I believe. I do not remember that he said that to me. I saw him only for five or ten minutes. I was going away then to Dehra Dun. But, this statement has been made on behalf of the Chinese authorities.

Shri Goray: In what capacity had Dr. Baliga gone to China and interviewed Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-lai?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: A private individual, Dr. Baliga, as a large number of others including many Members of this House had been invited to go to participate in the National Day Celebrations in China on October 1st. But, owing to these various developments, Dr. Baliga did not think it fit and proper for him to participate in them and did not go on that occasion, but went subsequently about some weeks later. He went naturally as a private citizen and spent, I think, 10 or 12 days there.

Acharya Kripalani: For sight-seeing?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No sight seeing at all. He is a very eminent surgeon. As a matter of fact, the Chinese Government is much beholden to him for his work as a surgeon.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I wanted to know whether two days will be allotted. The Government has not said anything about it.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): I beg to say one word. Ours is a great nation and our Parliament is one of the greatest in the world. We should not get excited about this tiny affair. I beg to say that now, when we have received a very kind and polite reply....

Some Hon. Members: No. no.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Hear me. When we have received a very polite reply from Mr. Chou En-lai and when our Prime Minister has received greetings on his birthday, I think, let us not get excited about it and consider the question from the world stand point. I, as a world federalist, am very sorry that some little people are making so much noise about some little things.

Shri Khadliker (Ahmednagar): Has Government received any information why there was delay in handing over the dead bodies?

An Hon. Member: They were to be presented on the 14th to the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am unable to answer that. That is a question which must be addressed to the Chinese Government. How am I to answer that?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: My question has not been answered, whether two days will be allotted.

Shrimati Kennka Ray (Malda): I wish to have a clarification. The hon. Prime Minister said that the defence have taken over the control of the entire border. Does it include the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan for whose defence we are responsible?

Some Hon. Members: Sure, sure.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as Bhutan is concerned, we have stated repeatedly that any aggression on Bhutan would be considered aggression on India. But we keep no forces in Bhutan, and there is no intention of sending any forces. It is for the Bhutan Government to decide when and what kind of help they require from us. We have given them help in the way of training sometimes.

So far as Sikkim is concerned of course that is included definitely in

our immediate liabilities—protection I mean.

**Shri Banga (Tenali):** Would Wednesday suit the Prime Minister instead of Tuesday?

**Mr. Speaker:** He has already said that it might be taken up next Tuesday. The only question is whether it should be Tuesday or Wednesday.

**Shri Banga:** I am just asking whether Wednesday would suit him.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Wednesday or Thursday.

**Mr. Speaker:** They want to know if Wednesday would be suitable.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not mind; if the House prefers Wednesday. We can have it on Wednesday. There is no special astrological significance about it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Very well. So far as the time that is necessary is concerned, the debate will start on Wednesday.

**An Hon. Member:** Not Monday?

**Mr. Speaker:** Today is the 16th. On the 25th it will start. Hon. Members are aware that the time that is necessary is always decided by the Business Advisory Committee. I will call for a meeting and then it will decide. In view of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, this cannot be disposed of in an adjournment motion this evening where we sit only for a couple of hours. Let us have a full-dress debate, as the hon. Members are anxious. The Hon. Prime Minister also has never said that it is not a serious matter. He would himself like to have a good debate on this matter.

**Some Hon. Members:** Two days?

**Mr. Speaker:** The Committee will consider that matter.

In view of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister I do not think it is

necessary to give my consent to those adjournment motions.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** What about the firing in Kanpur? We have been given a very scanty reply.

**Shri Muhammed Elias (Howrah):** The hon. Minister of Irrigation is going to lay a statement with regard to the floods in West Bengal. I wanted to know....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Hon. Members are always obstructive. I have already intimated him. The hon. Minister for Irrigation will certainly make a statement both with respect to the floods in Bengal and also the floods in Orissa. I have written and informed him. Why should he be anxious when I have told him it is not necessary to bring it up here?

Yes. Shri Banerjee. What does he want?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I have to submit only one thing.

**Shri Muhammed Elias:** In view of the seriousness of this flood where five million people have been affected.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let there be five hundred thousand people.

**Shri Muhammed Elias:** ..... I wish to know whether the House would be given an opportunity to discuss....

**Mr. Speaker:** I am unable to say now. He will make a statement for the time being. Let us see.

**Shri Jagdish Awasthi (Bihar):** On a point of order, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** We have tabled an adjournment motion on this recent Kanpur firing which was very unfortunate. My intention was....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I will tell you one thing, why I moved it here. My intention is very clear. No normal firing rules were observed, and the Prime Minister was very kind enough to say some good words in respect of this Kanpur incident. My whole motion was that 18 persons including a ten-year boy were killed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I am not going to allow.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** No judicial enquiry has been instituted by the State Government. There was a wholesale massacre in the city of Kanpur. The Prime Minister has made a statement. I would only request the Home Minister to make a statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Will the hon. Member, Shri Banerjee, resume his seat or not?

**श्री जगदीश अवास्थी :** मान ए प्वाइट  
आफ आर्डर सर। मैंने जो कानपुर की  
पुलिस फायरिंग के सम्बन्ध में अपना काम  
रुको भयवा स्थगन प्रस्ताव दिया था और  
उसके लिए अपने जो यह लिख कर  
भेजा है कि वह एक स्टेट सर्क्यूलर है  
विषय यह है कि जैसा कि मैंने अपने  
एडजोर्नमेंट मोशन में दिया है कि केन्द्रीय  
सरकार का गृह मन्त्रालय एक पुलिस  
फायरिंग सर्कुलर भेजता है और उसका ही  
ग्राइडिंस में जो मॉड इकट्ठा हो जाती है  
उस पर फायरिंग करते हैं और इसलिए  
मैंने अपने एडजोर्नमेंट मोशन में लिखा  
है।

"to discuss the failure of the Central Government in not withdrawing and revising the reactionary old Police firing circular named Hallet Circular issued to State Governments during British regime, in consequence of which police firing and other atrocities were inflicted upon the citizens of

Kanpur resulting in the death of 23 persons and injuries to several others."

की मान जी इसने....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I am not going to allow. The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat, then I will tell him.

I am really surprised at this. Again and again I have been saying it. Even though I say for particular reasons I am not going to allow an adjournment motion somehow they get up and then go on. I will have only to request them hereafter not to interrupt, and if they do interrupt, most unceremoniously I will have to ask them to withdraw from the House. An hon. Member comes to this House and tables an adjournment motion. He is not satisfied with what I have said. He can persuade me later on. Or, so far as this matter is concerned the hon. Member has somehow got information that in pursuance of an order from the Central Government, the Home Ministry, this firing in Kanpur resulted. Copies of the adjournment motions, when they are tabled here are sent to the Minister concerned, and I have ascertained that there is no factual basis, no such communication has been sent at all. In view of that merely because an hon. Member tables an adjournment motion, I am not going to allow, or give consent to it, when I find that there is absolutely no factual basis for it. In spite of my having told him that it was not so, that I was not going to give my consent, the hon. Member by way of a point of order raises it and then carries on. There is no meaning in it, trying to interrupt the proceedings.

**Shri Jagdish Awasthi:** The police firing has become an all-India question.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Members will go to their States.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Eighteen people have been killed.



Mr. Speaker: Will he resume his seat or not?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am returning, but I am appealing to your sense of impartiality and justice.

Mr. Speaker: If he interrupts, unfortunately I will be obliged to ask him to withdraw from the House. There is no other course. No, no. It is not right.

Shri P. N. Singh (Chandauli): On a point of information I wish to tell the House that no judicial enquiry has been instituted up till now.

श्री जगदीश अग्रवस्ती : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इलाहाबाद में चार व्यक्ति मारे गये तो वहाँ की कार्यरिग के सम्बन्ध में राज्य सरकार ने न्यायिक जांच का आदेश दे दिया लेकिन वहाँ कानपुर में पुलिस की संघाघ्न गौली से २३ व्यक्ति मारे गये लेकिन अभी तक कानपुर की पुलिस कार्यरिग के सम्बन्ध में उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के मुख्य मंत्री ने कोई न्यायिक जांच का आदेश नहीं दिया है ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Ladies have been molested. This was the sixth time in the history of Kanpur.

Mr. Speaker: I would request him to withdraw from the House for the rest of the day and also this hon. Member who has been repeatedly saying it—Shri Jagdish Awasthi. I hereby direct Shri Jagdish Awasthi to withdraw from the House for the rest of the day. I cannot put up with this kind of interruption.

Shri Jagdish Awasthi: Yes, I am ready to go.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Will he withdraw or not?

Shri Jagdish Awasthi: I will withdraw, but before doing so....

247 (A) LSD-6.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow.

श्री बालूच (शारदापत्नी) : श्रीमान्, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह ठीक सरासर धम्याय की बात है कि देश में गोली चले और यहाँ पर उसकी चर्चा करने की भी इजाजत न मिले . . . . .

श्री जगदीश अग्रवस्ती : श्रीमान्, मैं उस पुलिस गोलीकांड . . . . .

Mr. Speaker: I shall not allow him to stay and make any more statements in this House. He is interrupting constantly. This is not the first time, I have noticed it regularly. He thinks....

Shri Jagdish Awasthi: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: He must withdraw from the House.

श्री जगदीश अग्रवस्ती : यहाँ पर पुलिस द्वारा बलात्कार होता है, गोलीकांड होता है और अन्य जुल्म होते हैं लेकिन हमें उनके खिलाफ जायज भी नहीं उठाने दी जाती ।

“यह कल्ल भी करते हैं तो चर्चा भी नहीं होगी, हम माह भी भरते हैं तो हो जाते हैं बदनाम ।”

Mr. Speaker: Will he withdraw or not?

श्री जगदीश अग्रवस्ती : मैं बस जा रहा हूँ ।

(Shri Jagdish Awasthi then withdrew from the House).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kanpur was converted into a slaughter house.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Shri Banerjee will also withdraw from the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am withdrawing, but with due apologies to you I will tell you, Sir, that Kanpur

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

was converted into a slaughter house. (laughter). You laught at your own peril You are criminals, you have murdered people and you are laughing.

(Shri S. M. Banerjee then withdrew from the House).

जी यादव : यह बहुत ही गम्भीर बात है कि २३ आदमी पुलिस कार्यालय से मर जाय और उसकी चर्चा भी न हो ।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Anthony.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I may be kindly allowed to say a word.

Mr. Speaker: I have called Shri Anthony.

Shri Frank Anthony: You will not be able to hear me in this din.

I had submitted an adjournment motion and you were pleased not to give your consent. I bow to your ruling, but no reason was assigned, and I would ask you under the proviso to rule 60(1) to give the reason because apparently you have accepted it as being a matter of urgent public importance. The reason is that I should move it as a resolution presumably as a matter of urgent public importance, but no reason has been assigned. You have not been pleased to give any reason for disallowing it as an adjournment motion. I would ask you to please read it to the House, as it is an important matter, I submit with respect, and to give the reasons why you have been pleased to disallow it as an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is coming to the same thing, which other hon. Members also have been demanding as a right. There is no meaning in this. It is open to me to say that this is not the business of the House. He says that the Communist Party is responsible for all this, or the Communist Members....

Shri Frank Anthony: No.

Mr. Speaker: ...or a number of them, and, therefore, suitable action must be taken against them.

Shri Frank Anthony: That was not what I said. What I said was that because of the openly treasonable policies of the Communist Party in India and their approval of Chinese aggression and invitation to the Chinese to commit further aggression, they should be banned.

Mr. Speaker: I am really surprised at this. The hon. Member has been a long-standing Member of this Parliament.

Shri Frank Anthony: That is why I am asking.

Mr. Speaker: But this is a resolution. Anyhow, hon Members will judge for themselves whether it is a resolution or an adjournment motion. It reads thus:

"That in view of the increasingly grave threat to India's security by the Communist Party of India, whose openly treasonable policies and utterances are an approval of Chinese aggression and an invitation to further aggression, the Party be banned."

On an adjournment motion, the party has to be banned. I am really surprised at this.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I make one small submission? With respect to firing, there has been a definite policy of the Government here. They have been advising the State Governments as to how firing should take place, when it should take place, and in case of firing, what they should do and so on. But in this Kanpur firing, that has not been observed. As a matter of fact, I am told that twenty-three persons have been killed. So, they should take note of this and do whatever is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: I have repeatedly said that the matter of law and order is entirely in the hands of the State Government. There are Assemblies there, and there are Members there who are representing smaller constituencies than we do here. If, on account of any particular action on the part of the Central Government or at the behest of the Central Government, anything has been done, then that is a different matter, but I have ascertained from the Central Government that no such circular has been issued. It may be unfortunate that these incidents have occurred, but it is for those hon. Members to take it up there. We have not got any jurisdiction over it; we cannot clothe ourselves with jurisdiction over matters over which we have none.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: But the Central Government could advise the State Government.

Mr. Speaker: No, the Central Government have no jurisdiction.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I submit that as a mark of sympathy for those persons who have been killed, I and my party Members withdraw from the House?

(Shri Braj Raj Singh then left the House).

Shri F. N. Singh: As the Union Government have failed to advise the State Government to institute a judicial inquiry, we are leaving the House in protest.

श्री यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, चूँकि यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है और हमें यहाँ पर इसकी चर्चा नहीं करने दी जा रही है इसलिए हम भी उसके प्रोटैस्ट में बाकसाउट करते हैं।

(Shri F. N. Singh, Shri Yadav and Shri L. Achaw Singh then left the House).

12-44 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

WHITE PAPER II CONTAINING NOTES, MEMORANDA AND LETTERS EXCHANGED BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF INDIA AND CHINA DURING SEPTEMBER-NOVEMBER, 1959.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of White Paper II containing Notes, Memoranda and letters exchanged between the Governments of India and China during September-November, 1959.

I believe copies of this White Paper are available for all the Members, and arrangements have been made for distribution. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-1634/59].

#### AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC PREMISES (EVICTION OF UNAUTHORISED OCCUPANTS) RULES, 1958.

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri K. C. Reddy): I beg to lay on the Table, under subsection (3) of section 13 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1958, a copy of Notification No. GSR. 1205 dated the 31st October, 1959 making certain amendments to the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Rules, 1958. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-1635/59].

#### SUGAR (SPECIAL EXCISE DUTY) ORDINANCE, 1959

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to lay on the Table under provisions of article 123 (2) (a) of the Constitution a copy of the Sugar (Special Excise Duty) Ordinance, 1959 (No. 3 of 1959) promulgated by the President on the 25th October, 1959. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-1636/59].