

Christian Missionaries in India

2676. **Shri Subbiah Ambalam:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state the amount received by Christian Missionaries in India from abroad during the latter half of 1958, giving the figures country-wise?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 19].

Museums

2677. **Shri Ram Krishan Gupta:** Will the Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received schemes from the State

Governments and curators of museums in States for re-organisation and development of museums; and

(b) if so, the details of the same?

The Deputy Minister for Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) All State Governments and Museums Authorities in the country were requested on 28-2-59 to send fresh proposals for re-organisation and development of their museums on the basis of the revised priorities laid down by the Central Advisory Board of Museums at their last annual meeting held in February, 1959. So far two requests from private museums only have been received.

(b) Details of the proposals received so far are given below:

S. No.	Name of the Institution	Items for which assistance is required.					Total Financial Assistance required
		Equip-ment	Research Laboratories	Library	Publica-tion & Catalogues	Acquisition including collections	
1.	Gaya Museum, Gaya.	3,200	500	1,000	1,500	3,000	9,200
2.	Calico Museum of Textiles, Ahmedabad.	1,00,000	1,00,000	2,00,000

12.12 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT**RELEASE BY CHINESE EMBASSY OF ARTICLE IN Peoples' Daily**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume discussion on the adjournment motion. I did not give consent or allow it yesterday. I only wanted to know what exactly was the point of view and whether it required my consent. I have heard all hon. Members on that side. We had adjourned it because the hon. Prime Minister was not here. May I request the hon. Prime Minister to say what he has to say on this matter?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Before the Prime Minister speaks, may

I know whether the Home Minister will reply to my question which I put yesterday? (Interruptions).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-Central): Sir, will you permit me to put a few things before the Prime Minister speaks because I feel there have been certain things which might have been said yesterday because we did not have the material with us and the whole position was not placed in the way it should be and the Prime Minister's intervention is very important because he will be making a statement—however short or long it may be—on the international situation and our relations with China. I, therefore, wish to place before the House certain things which will enable the

Prime Minister perhaps to give us a much better elucidation of the position as he sees it before you make up your mind about the adjournment motion being allowed.

Mr. Speaker: What was said yesterday was this. I wanted to have a copy of the statement issued and the hon. Member, if he has got a copy, may give it to me and I will receive that statement issued by the Secretary of that Party or by the Communist Party of India. That was the statement with respect to which there was some difference. We can proceed only on the material as it appeared in one paper or the other. Now, so far as that matter is concerned, Shri Nagi Reddy has said that he would submit a true copy of the statement to me. Barring that I do not propose allowing any further discussions on this matter, except to hear the hon. Prime Minister, before I make up my mind one way or the other. If he has got it, he can pass it on to me.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Apart from the authorised copy of the resolution which our Party has adopted, there are certain points.... (*Interruptions*).

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may kindly pass that on to me.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Here it is. [*See Appendix VI, annexure No. 19-A*].

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): Sir, I made that observation yesterday and I had made it clear that the discussions here had taken place on certain matters of importance without that copy in our hands.... (*Interruptions*.) My submission is that having passed some strictures over the Communist Party which is functioning here as a democratic party and Parliamentary opposition party.... (*Interruptions*.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Nagi Reddy . . . I would like that it should be given a chance to explain not only the position as has been explained by others but explain

our position in relation to the statement that we have issued. Now that you have heard what the other Members and what the other Parties have to say regarding our position and I think it is but natural that the House and you should hear our position before a reply is made and a decision is taken.

Mr. Speaker: We allow a spokesman of the Party to make the statement. Shri Dange himself is present, I would always prefer Shri Mukerjee who acted as the Deputy Leader of that Party and therefore, I gave him an opportunity. I am not proposing to give opportunity to another hon. Member. It is for them to recognise him or to throw him out.... (*Interruptions*.)

Shri Nagi Reddy: I protest very vehemently against the views you have expressed. We have not disowned anybody; my request is that we be given a chance to explain our position.... (*Interruptions*.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is rather strange as to how these parties work in this House for the reason that the same request was made by Shri Mukerjee just now. I have said that except receiving that paper which was promised to be submitted to me, yesterday, I am not going to allow any further discussion. Unless the hon. Member thinks that his words ought to prevail over Shri Mukerjee's, there is no meaning in his interfering in this matter like this. I would not allow that.

Shri Nagi Reddy: I never said that.

Mr. Speaker: It is not that he said it. Order, order. We have to function as a party but we are not doing so. That is what I find. It is not open to any junior hon. Member in that Party, since Shri Dange is not here, to say that he will explain it. I would not recognise it.... (*Interruptions*.)

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, you have paid me the compliment of being the acting Leader of a Party which is a fact. I, therefore, would request you to bear with me for one moment. We

do not wish that the Prime Minister speaks in this House on this subject today in an atmosphere which is vitiated by a kind of circumstances that might go against the interests of our country and the honour of our country

Mr. Speaker: I have listened Every statement that is made is full of complications I do not want to carry this further complication over to this House Enough has been said yesterday with respect to this Now, the hon Prime Minister

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur) Sir, I am raising a matter of privilege It is a very serious thing I am not speaking on that matter I must bring it to the notice of the House It is a PTI release

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow it It is not that every kind of statement can be brought up here (Interruptions)

Shri Nath Pai: I have always abided by your decision Why not give me one minute?

Mr. Speaker: We are now proceeding with what has been left over since yesterday If anything new comes in, we will take it up later

Shri Nath Pai: It is a matter of privilege and it gets precedence

Mr. Speaker: Merely because an hon Member thinks there is some privilege involved, must I yield? It has not yet reached me Any person who raises a question of privilege must write to me Offhand, he cannot say that it is a question of privilege or not Let him write to me and then I will see whether it should be brought before the House (Interruptions.) I will decide if there is a *prima facie* case (Interruptions)

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I asked a question yesterday If that misunderstanding is not cleared, it is not good I wanted that the misunderstanding should be cleared.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order I am not going to allow the hon. Member to go on interrupting the proceedings like this The hon Member has said that he had put a question to the Home Minister He is also here If the hon Home Minister felt that it was necessary to explain it, he would have explained, or otherwise, if he thinks that the hon Prime Minister will explain it, let us wait and see If still there is no explanation the hon Member must be satisfied with what has been said Both sides of the House are here and I am not going to allow this kind of interruption; from whichever party it comes (Interruptions) I am really sorry that there is a series of interruptions like this as a result of which no work could be done here Order, order The hon Prime Minister

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr Speaker, Sir, I must express my deep regret for my absence yesterday from the House as I had gone out of Delhi Since my return this morning, I have tried to get myself acquainted with what happened in the House by reading the official report I have not read any newspaper yet I do not know what the newspapers say. I think the official report would naturally be more reliable I must say, reading them, although I got the drift of what happened, I sensed that much of what happened yesterday was—I wish to say nothing disrespectful—an exhibition of a certain lack of restraint, if I may say so, and certain strong feelings which came in the way really, of the consideration of the matter that was placed before you or before the House

Now, the matter is important and I can very well understand the strong feelings, the matter is important not because of the one or two or more adjournment motions that were moved here but because of what lies behind those motions. It is that which has led to strong feelings in the House and in the country The actual motions were perhaps not very important but the other thing is important. Because the other thing is important, it is all

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the more necessary that we should not be led away by relatively extraneous or minor matters into doing or saying things which affect the other major things at issue. They are big things at issue and in that matter I cannot say that every Member of this House is of identical opinion. But I do think that nearly all the Members of this House will broadly agree—I imagine so and anyhow whether we agree or not, we have to realise—the importance of what is happening and the consequences of what is happening. We have to shape our policy keeping full regard, naturally, the first things, for the honour and dignity and the interests of India, secondly, the honour and dignity of the causes for which we stand. Also, we must remember that when conflicts arise which lead to a certain degree of passion on various sides, one has to be particularly careful, especially this honourable House whose word go out to the ends of the earth. We have to be particularly careful at a moment of difficulty such as this, that we function and we say whatever we have to say with dignity and, as I ventured to say last time, wisdom. That does not mean moderating any policy. We follow the policy which the House will ultimately agree to.

Now, Sir, the two matters, as far as I can gather, that were raised yesterday in two adjournment motions were a statement issued by the Communist Party of India and the circulation of an article in the People's Daily of Peking, circulation presumably by an agency attached to the Chinese Embassy here. Those were the two matters, if I am not mistaken.

Mr Speaker: Yes, they are the two matters.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Before I deal with them, may I, Sir, mention one thing. Perhaps you have, Sir, another adjournment motion today. I have received notice of it and I do not know whether you have been pleased to consider it, but I might also deal with that adjournment motion. There

is an adjournment motion—there are two in fact—asking me, first of all, as to whether there is any truth that the Chinese authorities have expressed a wish to search the premises of Indian Missions in Tibet or asked us to vacate those premises. Now, here is an instance of every rumour, which are appearing in newspapers in great abundance, affecting the people and being brought into the House by way of an adjournment motion or some other motion. There is no truth in this at all. Nobody has asked us to vacate our premises. Nobody has asked to search our Missions abroad. But everything comes in the shape of adjournment motion or a king me to make a statement. It is very difficult to keep pace with the amount of statements which are appearing in the Press now, coming from Kalimpong or Hongkong—those appear to be the two sources of information. Anyhow, there is no truth in that.

Then, again, there was another adjournment motion asking me whether it is true that the Chinese Embassy sent for a top leader of the Communist Party of India to discuss various matters with them. Now, how am I to know, Sir? I do not. I have no information on the subject. I can say nothing.

Another matter—it is not the subject of an adjournment motion, I think I was asked to make a statement on it is the visit, as it is said, of a group of Tibetans to me a day or two ago. Now, day before yesterday a large number, about 125 people, came to visit me. Normally speaking, Sir, every morning in my house a few hundred people come. It is an open door more or less. Large numbers of peasants, students and others come because, unfortunately, I am supposed to be one of the eighties of Delhi!

Anyhow, about these 125 people they said they had come to Delhi and wanted to pay their respects to me. I said, certainly come. The great majority of them were Indian.

nationals, chiefly from Darjeeling, Kalimpong and those northern areas. Some were from Calcutta, that is to say, Indian nationals of Tibetan origin representing some association in Calcutta, Banaras, Kalimpong and others. There were also a few, I forget how many, people from Tibet proper who had gathered here some days ago. They came. We had no discussion. They did give me a paper, a kind of a memorandum which I took, and then I bade good-bye to them. That is all that happened.

Coming to the two matters which were referred to yesterday, one was the statement of the Communist Party of India. Now, I have, naturally, endeavoured to get a copy of that statement and read it carefully. I presume that it is a correct copy that I have. I have no reason to doubt its correctness, but I cannot guarantee that.

Mr. Speaker: I have been given an alternative copy. If there is any difference I will point out.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, I am not going to read it, Sir, but I take it that I have a correct copy. I have read it carefully and, if I may express my own opinion about it, the whole background of the statement is not one with which I would agree. I do not agree with it. There are certain slants with which I do not agree. But the question before us, I take it, is not whether we agree with the statement or the slant given in that statement or not, but, rather, if any great impropriety has been committed by the issue of that statement. I am not myself quite clear how, normally speaking, if a statement is issued by a political party outside that statement becomes the subject matter of an adjournment motion in this House. It is not clear to me. Of course, each case depends upon the content but, broadly speaking,—whether one agrees with the statement or disagrees is a completely different matter—political parties sometimes attack each other, criticise each other, or say something

which another party may consider very objectionable. But, nevertheless, it is not clear to me how this matter can be raised by way of an adjournment motion.

Now, it has been stated that it was raised because this statement challenged the *bona fides* of what I had said two days before about Kalimpong. I have read the statement carefully. What I would say is this, that it does not precisely and explicitly do that. But it does certainly throw a hint that what I might have said, whether through mis-information or otherwise, might not be correct, so that I do not quite know what to do about it.

I shall repeat and, perhaps, a little more fully than I did previously, what I said about Kalimpong. You will remember, Sir, that in certain statements issued by the Chinese Government Kalimpong was referred to as the Commanding Centre of the Tibetan rebellion, and I said this was not true at all, and the External Affairs Ministry had also denied this. At the same time, I had said that I have often said that Kalimpong has been a centre of trouble.

Kalimpong, Sir, has been often described as a nest of spies, spies of innumerable nationalities, not one, spies from Asia, spies from Europe, spies from America, spies of Communists, spies of anti-Communists, red spies, white spies, blue spies, pink spies and so on. Once a knowledgeable person who knew something about this matter and was in Kalimpong actually said to me, though no doubt it was a figure of speech, that there were probably more spies in Kalimpong than the rest of the inhabitants put together. That is an exaggeration. But it has become that in the last few years, especially in the last seven or eight years. As Kalimpong is more or less perched near the borders of India, and since the developments in Tibet some years ago since a change took place there, it became of great interest to all kinds of people outside India, and many people have come here in various guises,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

sometimes as technical people, sometimes as bird watchers, sometimes as geologists, sometimes as journalists and sometimes with some other purpose, just to admire the natural scenery, and so they all seem to find an interest; the main object of their interest, whether it is bird watching or something else, was round about Kalimpong.

Naturally we have taken interest in this. We have to. While I cannot say that we know exactly everything that took place there, broadly we do know and we have repeatedly taken objection to those persons concerned or to their Embassies we have pointed this out and we have in the past even hinted that some people had better remove themselves from there, and they have removed themselves. This has been going on for the last few years so that here is no doubt that so far as Kalimpong is concerned there has been a deal of espionage and counter-espionage and a complicated game of chess by various nationalities and various numbers of spies and counter-spies there. No doubt a person with the ability to write fiction of this kind will find Kalimpong an interesting place for some novel of that type.

Shri Nath Pai: What is the Home Ministry doing about it? It seems to be absolutely ineffective.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Home Ministry or the External Affairs Ministry are not at all worried about the situation.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): They allow the spies to carry on espionage?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Absolutely yes, first of all, because when we suspect a person of espionage we keep a watch over him. If he does something patently wrong we take action, but there are certain limitations in the law, as the House very well knows, and we cannot function merely because we suspect somebody; and we have taken action in the past in regard to some people.

Shri P. N. Singh (Chandauli): In how many cases action has been taken?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot say that—actions of various types, as I said. Now, about this particular matter, the statement by the Chinese Government, please remember the statement, "this was the commanding centre of Tibetan rebellion". I cannot say—how can I—that nobody in Kalimpong has indulged in espionage against the Chinese Government or against any other Government. I cannot say. Somebody whispers something to somebody else's ear. But I did repudiate and I repudiate today that to say that Kalimpong has been the commanding centre gives it a place in this matter which is, I think, completely untrue.

Now, in the past several years—and I said so on the last occasion—the Chinese Government has drawn our attention to what they said were activities in the Kalimpong area, that is, activities aimed against them. And repeatedly we have made enquiries; apart from our normal enquiries we have made special enquiries. I say this because I find that in the Communist party's statement we are asked to have an investigation. In so far as espionage activities are concerned we have investigated them several times. One cannot investigate these activities in any other way except through intelligence methods. That is being done. We have fairly full reports about it. I have got—I need not go into it—a fairly full note as to when the protest came from the Chinese Government. Three or four years ago it was mentioned to me and it was mentioned to our Ambassador some years ago, and we enquired and we took action. Sometimes we found that their protests or the facts that they stated did not have any particular basis. They would say, for instance, that an organisation in Kalimpong was doing something or other. We found there was no such organisation in Kalimpong at all. There were

organisations there; there were of course people in Kalimpong. Everybody knows that. There are some emigrants from Tibet. There are old Tibetans, that is to say, who have been there for a generation or more, but whose feelings may be against the Chinese Government. That is so; there is no doubt about it, and we cannot do anything about it but we did make it perfectly clear to them in accordance with our normal policy that they must not indulge in any propagandist activities and much less, of course, in any subversive activities.

In the nature of things they could not do much even if they wanted to intimate except perhaps—I cannot guarantee that—occasionally send a message or receive a message. It is very difficult to stop that but that is on a very small scale. They could not do very much in India except again to whisper something in somebody's ears. That I cannot stop. They may have whispered something here and there. But it is obvious to me that they could not do much and they did not. Once or twice a certain leaflet was issued, certain document; somebody issued it. The moment it was issued we took action. We tried to trace it and we told them that that must not have been done. This has happened on three or four occasions. Again I repeat, we were charged with—it was said that Kalimpong was a commanding centre of the Tibetan rebellion. I denied that statement and I further said that apart from the last few years when there has occasionally been a paper or a leaflet or occasionally somebody in Kalimpong has perhaps met somebody else, privately and not publicly—that can always take place—and more particularly in the last five or six months, more particularly I might say since we received the last protest from the Chinese Government—I think the last was early in August last year—we took particular care to enquire again and we had no complaints since then. So, even if some activities took place there by some people there previously they were of a relatively small nature except of course contacts, and what can

we say about contacts in a place which, as I said, is so full of spies—there may be contacts, somebody meeting somebody. But in the last six months, we have taken particular care, and we have had no cause to think that any such action or activities had taken place there. I cannot conceive that Kalimpong could be—it has been described by the Chinese Government as the commanding centre—a commanding centre with the Indian Government not knowing about it. It is quite inconceivable to me. Some odd message can go or come and that is possible, but it cannot be, and to imagine that the Tibetan rebellion was organised from Kalimpong does seem to me a statement which cannot be justified.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Behrampore): Did the Chinese Government in August complain that somebody was organising a rebellion from there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. Not that. They did not talk about rebellion. But so far as our records go, the first mention of it was made informally to us in 1956-57 when Premier Chou En-lai came here and it was mentioned to me and I replied that our policy was that we did not wish our soil—Indian soil—to be used for any subversive activities against a friendly country. But I also pointed out that there were obvious limitations under our law to take action on the basis of suspicion, and I requested his Government to supply me with special cases and that we would immediately enquire and take action if necessary. Then a year and a half later, the same matter was mentioned to our Ambassador in Peking. At that time a photostat copy of a pamphlet which has been circulated in Kalimpong was sent to us. This was about 15 or 16 months ago, i.e., in January, 1958. There is no doubt about it, that that pamphlet was anti-Chinese. But on enquiry and examination, we found that there

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

was no such association as had been described in that pamphlet and the pamphlet itself, as a matter of fact, was two years old and has been issued in autumn of 1956—some ancient pamphlet which they have got. That pamphlet was a bad one from our point of view too but some bogus name was given and somebody had issued it there.

There were, in fact, two associations in Kalimpong—one Tibetan Association, which has been in existence for 25 years and odd and the other, the Indo-Tibetan Association brought into being in 1954. The office-bearers of either of these associations were prominent emigrants, but neither of these associations was supposed to be engaged in political activities. In July, 1958, the Foreign Office in Peking presented a memorandum protesting against the use of Kalimpong area as a base for subversive and disruptive activities and five points were mentioned. Some names of persons were given. We immediately enquired into the activities of all those persons and we made detailed reports. We found that no doubt those persons held views which might be said to be anti-Chinese, but we could not get any information of any activity, propagandist or subversive.

The charge was made that they were in collusion with the United States and with the Kuomintang authorities of Famosa or their representatives. Some of the prominent emigrants in Kalimpong had previously been in the United States and had lived there for some time. And no doubt, they had their contacts there. We had no doubt about their views about it. But we have made it clear to them, even when they settled down in India, that we do not wish Indian soil to be used for any subversive activities. Once when some letter or something was sent, we particularly looked into it. An again all these

six persons who had been named in the Chinese Government's note were given specific warnings on the 14th of August through the Deputy Commissioner of Darjeeling, and to our knowledge, since that date, they have not done so. But as I said, I cannot guarantee any secret thing.

There are three organisations mentioned in the Chinese note, viz., the Tibetan Freedom League, the Kalimpong-Tibetan Welfare Conference and the Buddhist Association which were alleged to be engaged in collecting intelligence from Tibet. We could not trace any of these three organisations, and so far as we know, they are not in existence. Two other ones which I have mentioned previously were in existence and, so far as we know, engaged in non-political activities.

Shri M. P. Mishra (Begusarai): How did the Chinese get the information? (Interruptions.)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The third objection in the Chinese note was to the reactionary views of a monthly called the *Tibetan Mirror*, which is edited by an Indian national of Ladakhi origin. As a matter of fact, we issued a warning to the editor, but we pointed out to the Chinese that many newspapers in India were far more anti-Government, i.e., anti-Government of India, and we could not and did not take any legal action against them.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Peking must be inspiring them.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: A statement was further made in the Chinese note that agents and saboteurs were sent into Tibet and arms were smuggled and despatched to the rebels. But no evidence was given and we are not aware of a single case. It is not an easy matter to cross the border between India and Tibet. Nobody can guarantee an individual perhaps going across, but to take arms,

etc., was exceedingly difficult, practically impossible, without our knowledge.

Then the Chinese Government protested against agents of the Kuomintang operating in Kalimpong, particularly one gentleman whose name was given. We enquired into this matter . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): May I ask whether all these details are necessary?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I thought they were not necessary; I agree with the hon. Member. But this matter has been discussed at such considerable length and warmth. We found that this gentleman who had been named had been in Calcutta two years earlier and had presumably returned, because we could not trace him.

Another note was presented to us by the Chinese Ambassador on the 4th August—that was in July, the previous month—drawing our attention to the setting up of a committee in Kalimpong, for giving support to resistance against violence, by the Tibetan reactionaries and that this committee was forcing people into support of the signature campaign, and also drawing attention to the alleged meeting of 15 aristocrats wanting to make an appeal for support for Tibet. We enquired into this matter and we gave him our reply that so far as the leaders were concerned, we had already warned them.

The House will see that all this took place in August and there has been to our knowledge nothing which we could have called objectionable, except private expression of opinion—that we cannot guarantee—during this period. Therefore, I venture to say that, in spite of the presence of people in Kalimpong to whom the Chinese Government might object, because they were opposed to Chinese Government's policy, and all kinds of other peoples—spies indulging in

espionage and counter-espionage—I cannot concede how these minor activities could be made the basis of a statement that Kalimpong was the commanding centre of the Tibetan rebellion.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): I would like to know one thing. We have heard so many notes that we have received regarding Kalimpong from Chinese Government. As he mentioned, in 1956, when Mr. Chou En-lai was here and when, fortunately or unfortunately, the Dalai Lama was here, he was reluctant to leave this country and asked for a sanctuary. Through the intervention of our Prime Minister who called Mr. Chou En-lai and an assurance was given that no repressive measures would be taken by the local Chinese command, and on that specific assurance, he returned. The Prime Minister promised that he would pay a visit soon to Tibet.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What the hon. Member has said is not at all correct, not at all. There is no question of my getting an assurance from Premier Chou En-lai or his giving it or my asking for it. No such question arose at all. There was a question whether the Dalai Lama should visit Kalimpong or not. It was in that connection that that was said. Naturally, we were anxious about the Dalai Lama's security when he went to Kalimpong or anywhere. We discussed this with Premier Chou En-lai and ultimately the Dalai Lama decided to go there. We had informed the people—the Tibetans and people of Tibetan origin in Kalimpong that they will have to behave when the Dalai Lama went there. They did it when he went there. So, there is no question of assurance and all that. I do not know from where the hon. Member got all that.

Shri Khadilkar: This information is from "Thought".

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would not say anything against that periodical.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

But I can say this particular information is completely basically untrue. I cannot say; one or two sentences might be true; I have not seen it—but most of the rest of it is untrue

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta-East): It is only a thought.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Coming to the statement issued by the

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug) I would like a clarification Is it because there were anti-Chinese activities at Kalimpong by the spies, is it this thing that provoked the Chinese to occupy Tibet? What was the immediate cause that provoked the Chinese Government to occupy Tibet?

Mr. Speaker: That does not arise

Shri Tyagi: It is another thought

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Presumably, the spies came afterwards

About the article in the *People's Daily* of Peking, first of all, it is not for us to object to any article that appears in a newspaper in Peking. Obviously, if we started objecting—we may disagree with them, there are many articles in the world press with which we are not in agreement, some are even very censorious of India or Indian policy—we can answer them. The only point is whether the circulation of that article here was proper or improper. That is it. Now, I should like to point out that article appeared in Peking well before they could have had any report of my statement here. It took two days for it to come across here. But when it appeared in Peking it had no relation to my statement. It appeared. I cannot say the exact time but probably some time or a few hours before. They could not have had it. But even if they had it, they have every right to do what they like as they can.

Now, about the Embassy circulating papers, a question was raised here of, shall I say, breach of diplomatic pri-

vilège. There is no such thing. It depends, of course, on how it is done. But reproducing a newspaper article in their own country can certainly not be thought of in that light. It may be an impropriety, it may not be the right thing to do. It is very difficult to draw the line. We have throughout been trying to impress on the various Embassies here that we do not approve of the cold war being brought into India. That is, articles being circulated here, attacking apart from India other countries, in that sense. And, on the whole, I would say we have succeeded, not completely, but I must say the foreign Embassies here have been good enough to avoid doing many things which I find they are doing in other countries in regard to the cold war attitude. Now, I do not wish to mention countries, but I may mention one country. If the articles that have often appeared in the Pakistan newspapers were circulated here frequently, well, we would not approve of it, and in fact, we have not in the past approved it, because sometimes we consider these articles very objectionable. We cannot stop them. But surely they should not be circulated by an Embassy here. I have given one instance. I can give many other instances. This is an instance of the very regrettable cold war between Pakistan and India. But in the bigger sphere of the cold war in the world many articles appear which use the strongest language in attacking the other country. We try not to have them circulated here. Well, the foreign Embassies have been good enough to cooperate with us in this matter. In this particular matter, as I said, it is anybody's opinion whether this was a very proper thing to do or an improper thing to do, although I would like to draw attention to the actual phrase of it to which objection has perhaps been taken. It is slightly different from the phraseology in the Chinese Government's reference to Kalimpong. Here it says the reaction-

aries in Tibet, etc., "utilising Kalimpong, which is in a foreign land, as a centre for collusion with imperialism", slightly different from saying that Kalimpong is the commanding centre of collusion. Maybe, that may be explained by saying that somebody met somebody and whispered and, as such, that is collusion certainly.

I am merely putting various aspects of this matter. It is an unsavoury matter altogether. But I want the House to deal with this matter with dignity and restraint, because behind all these minor matters lie much bigger matters which we have to face today, tomorrow and the day after, and we should not allow ourselves to be diverted from that major and difficult issue by relatively minor issues.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The Prime Minister has made a statement which surely we appreciate, the tone of it and the details which he has given us. But I find that the material in regard to the investigation of our charges regarding espionage and allied activities concludes round about August 1958. Now I have here a lot of material, and I can only have access to materials which appear in the newspapers and in books and that kind of thing . . .

Shri C. D. Fande (Naini Tal): You get information from other sources.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): From the fatherland. (*Interruptions*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In recent months, from January to March this year, for instance, a lot of things are allegedly happening in this particular area. I have not the details of it, because we have not had a discussion straightaway but I do find that these materials are appearing in the press. I find also that as far as this cold war business is concerned, the anti-Peoples' China point of view is being with impunity placarded all over the place, and even yesterday it is a frightful thought that in the absence

of the Prime Minister the mask put on the Congress Government was torn off and all kinds of things were said by the Deputy Minister which he possibly cannot second. It has happened. (*Interruptions*.) So, I wish to ask the Prime Minister that in view of these things appearing in the press, whether we should not dispassionately . . . (*Interruptions*).

Shri Tyagi: This is a very unkind cut, the spirit in which it is being dealt with.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I want the Prime Minister to assure me that he is making continuous examination of these allegations which are appearing in the press. It may be that it is not necessary for us in the House to voice about this allegation appearing in one section of the press or another, but we are perturbed these allegations are circulated with impunity. Therefore, I would request the Prime Minister..

Acharya Kripalan (Sitamarhi): May I suggest that it is better to have discussion of a couple of hours on this subject than to allow people to speak like that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not think I spoke in any unseemly manner. All that I have been saying is that I want the Prime Minister to make further investigation, continuous investigation, and tell us whether the allegations made. . .

Mr. Speaker: That he has already stated in the statement. He is a member of the Communist Party, which has issued the statement saying: we want investigation. I do not know what more he is going to say—more than what is contained in that statement.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The Prime Minister has stated as to what happened in last August and so on. Now about January, February and March, 1959, he might very well say "we are having it examined throughout from time to time". I am not asking him for the moon or something like that.

Mr. Speaker: Very well I have heard both sides So far as this matter is concerned

Shri D C Sharma (Gurdaspur): What about the mask?

Mr. Speaker: So far as the mask is concerned, it is unfortunate that hon. Members taking advantage of opportunities make insinuations. (*Interruptions*) It is very wrong Whatever might be said with respect to the Congress Party, here it is the Congress Government that he has said In one breath he says that he assures the hon Prime Minister and in the other breath he says that the mask has been removed That means that the hon Prime Minister is going on with a mask No, this is very improper I would not allow hon. Members to use this as an advantage (*Interruption*) I would not call hon. Members merely to ask a question and then take advantage of that and say 'mask and other things' to make the best of the opportunity (*Interruption*)

13 hrs

Shri Punnoose and Shri Nath Pai rose—

Shri Nagi Reddy: Yesterday many more words were said and no objection was taken

Mr. Speaker: I took objection to that

Shri Nagi Reddy: No (*Interruption*)

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is improper That is what she said

Mr Speaker: So far as this matter of an adjournment motion is concerned, it is not as if I thought that this was a censure motion against the Government. I brought it up before the House for elucidation so that I may hear both sides and try to come to a conclusion Now, there are important matters here. Only the other day the hon Prime Minister explained our attitude towards what is happening in Tibet No doubt, the news that

came from Tibet was alarming so far as that country was concerned. Naturally, all persons interested in this country must be anxious to see whether we will be affected in a particular manner so far as our country is concerned and also regarding our relations with the foreign country.

With those two aspects, if it is very important to discuss this matter, certainly I would have allowed a discussion of this matter It is not a censure motion against this Government regarding the steps that have been taken to avoid all sorts of statements being circulated or given currency to in the papers and whether they are true or false These are likely to create misunderstandings

So far as these two matters are concerned, these have been explained in extenso by the hon Prime Minister today So far all that I thought was that even on allowing this nobody impeaches the motives of the party to which hon Members belong, that is, the Communist Party But if Shri Mukerjee wanted to know a particular thing or further investigation or a constant watch over what is happening after August, there is a way of doing it. Persons who belong to this country and who want this country to keep good relations with a neighbouring country specially when the situation is delicate so far as whatever is happening there ought not to create a misunderstanding Whoever is interested—of course, all the persons are interested in the country—feels that some news has not come to the notice of the hon Prime Minister, he will carry that news privately to him instead of coming out in the open and making a statement to say that these are the things With that view I thought that it was necessary to bring it up here for clarification, otherwise I would not have brought it up. It is open to any person of this country to write to the hon. Prime Minister and say, "My information is different from your information" But why should it form part of a statement of this kind? Therefore, I thought that

it is necessary for giving an opportunity for being explained on the floor of the House; otherwise it will create disturbance in the two countries which are on friendly terms. Now, this has been sufficiently explained.

So far as the issue or circulating of the copy of an article in the *People's Daily* there is concerned, there is no doubt that if it had been circulated before the hon. Prime Minister's statement it would have been a different matter. But it has been circulated after the hon. Prime Minister's statement here. The Embassy must certainly keep a watch over events that are happening here, particularly, with respect to certain matters. It is rather unfortunate that the Embassy should have distributed it but it does not seem to offend any of those ordinary or the other diplomatic privileges. No doubt, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, it is an impropriety. I am sure the Embassy will certainly take note of it, that is, that Embassy and other Embassies also. (*Interruption.*) All the Embassies will take note of that. I do not think that we need pursue this matter further. Therefore I am not giving my consent for discussion of this matter.

One other point was raised by the hon. Prime Minister relating generally to adjournment motions. I would like to point out to all the hon. Ministers that as soon as a copy of the adjournment motion is given to me simultaneously copies are given to the hon. Ministers and to the Secretary also. On behalf of hon. Ministers it is given to the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. It is expected that they will look into it, as I look into it when I come to the House. I am handed over a copy and while I am calling upon hon. Members to ask supplementary questions, another eye is upon the adjournment motion. I have to make up my mind one way or the other. It is not that I am going to give consent to every adjournment motion if copies are given to hon. Ministers.

They ought not to think that I have allowed that motion immediately or that I am giving consent to it. It is only for the purpose, under the Rules, to give notice to them so that they may, in case I need some explanation, give the explanation.

With respect to the other thing that the hon. Member has referred, that is, that the Embassy was attacked in Lhasa and so on, as soon as I received a note from the hon. Prime Minister that there was no truth in it, I did not allow it. So far as such matters are concerned, I need not allow them. I am also watching what exactly ought to be allowed and what ought not to be allowed. This is only for the purpose of giving notice to hon. Ministers. They are entitled to tell me before I come to a conclusion as to what exactly is their reaction so far as this is concerned.

The House will now proceed with the other . . .

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I make a brief statement on an entirely different matter.

13.06 hrs.

STATEMENT REGARDING EX-
CHANGE OF BERUBARI UNION
AND COOCH-BEHAR ENCLAVES
WITH PAKISTAN

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I should like to inform the House that the President has decided on the advice of his Government to refer certain issues to the Supreme Court for their opinion. These issues relate—if I may read out—to the steps to be taken concerning the Berubari Union and the so-called Cooch-Behar enclaves.

The reference is:

"1. Is any legislative action necessary for the implementation of the agreement relating to Berubari Union?

2. If so, is a law of Parliament relatable to article 3 of the Con-