

would happen by 3 o'clock. Therefore I was myself going to request the Minister to say something at 5'30 or 6 o'clock.

Shri Shashi Ranjan: We must be informed of the time.

Mr. Speaker: I will let you know.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): Before the House rises, I shall try to collect as much information as possible.

Shri Shashi Ranjan: Let it be at 6 o'clock.

Shri Swaran Singh: It would depend on the convenience of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Time is given till 3 p.m. and then they will have to get the information from China. I will see when it can be done.

(b) and (c). Various aspects have been taken into consideration in determining our policy in relation to Tibet. This policy does not extend to giving any political status to the Dalai Lama during his stay in India. Our policy is continually under review and will be reviewed again in the light circumstances.

श्री मधु सिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ तक आर्थिक सहायता का सवाल है यह सरकार अमरीका पर निर्भर है और कुछ विदेशी नीति के मामलों में यह रूसियों की वैचारिक गुलामी कर रही है। मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उसने रूस की मंगोलिया सम्बन्धी नीति पर विचार किया है। जैसा कि उस दिन मैंने कहा था रूस ने 1924 में मंगोलिया पर चीन की मार्बोमिकता को कबूल किया। लेकिन याल्टा में रुजवेल्ट और स्टालिन के बीच में जो करार हुआ, उस में एक वाक्य यह था

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Tibet

+

*571. **Shri Madhu Limaye:**
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri George Fernandes:
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government intend to sponsor a resolution protesting against the violations of human rights and liberties in Tibet by the Chinese authorities;

(b) whether Government have given any consideration to the proposal to extend recognition to Dalai Lama's Bureau as the Government of free Tibet in exile; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Surendrapal Singh): (a) No such proposal is under consideration at present.

"The status quo in Outer Mongolia shall be preserved."

इसका अर्थ यह है कि रूस ने उस करार के द्वारा अमरीका की सहमति से—और बाद में लाल चीन की सहमति से भी—इस मंगोलिया की स्वतंत्रता को कुबूल करवाया। पहले 1924 में उस ने मंगोलिया पर चीन की मार्बोमिकता को माना, लेकिन बाद में याल्टा में तमाम दुनिया से मंगोलिया की स्वतंत्रता को कबूल करवाया। इस सरकार ने तिब्बत के बारे में भी इसी किस्म की गलती की लेकिन रूस ने जिस तरह मंगोलिया सम्बन्धी अपनी नीति में परिवर्तन किया और चूँकि यह सरकार रूसियों की बहुत गुलामी करती है इस लिये उस से सबक सीख कर क्या वह तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति में उसी तरह परिवर्तन करेगी और तिब्बत की स्वतंत्रता की घोषणा करेगी?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): It is a wrong suggestion that we copy any country in the matter of the conduct of our foreign affairs. It is our own independent policy. It is not fair on the part of any hon. Member to suggest that we are trying to copy any other country in the pursuit of our international policy.

About Tibet, the basis on which he put the question was, because Soviet Union has adopted a certain policy in relation to Mongolia, that we should, therefore, follow a similar policy in relation to Tibet. Both have to be considered on their merits. In the matter of formulating our policy on Tibet, we should be guided by our own national considerations and we should not and need not copy any other country in relation to their handling of another problem.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, चीन बराबर कह रहा है कि भारत सरकार तिब्बत की स्वतंत्रता का समर्थन कर रही है लेकिन वह ऐसा बिल्कुल नहीं कर रही है जैसा कि अभी मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है। उसी तरह चीन की सरकार कह रही है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार दो चीन वाली नीति को चला रही है अर्थात् फार्मोसा और चीन इन दोनों को मान्यता दे रही है, लेकिन यह सरकार ऐसा नहीं कर रही है। चीन यह भी कह रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रतिक्रियावादी, अमरीकी साम्राज्यवादी और रूसी सुधारवादी एक नयी पवित्र संधि बना रहे हैं चीन के खिलाफ लेकिन यह सरकार यह भी नहीं कह रही है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिन तीन कामों के बारे में चीन कह रहा है कि यह सरकार ये सारे काम कर रही है, क्या सरकार सचमुच इन कामों को करने की कोशिश करेगी : तिब्बत की स्वतंत्रता का समर्थन, दो चीन वाली नीति का पालन और चीन की आक्रमणकारी नीति के खिलाफ रूस अमरीका और हिन्दुस्तान का पवित्र संगठन।

Shri Swaran Singh: This question relates to Tibet and it should not be expanded to cover other matters of our foreign policy in relation to China.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह प्रश्न उसी से जुड़ा हुआ है। क्या तिब्बत विदेश नीति का सवाल नहीं है ?

Shri Swaran Singh: Those questions are not related to Tibet. About Tibet our position has already been explained

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय ने बिल्कुल जवाब नहीं दिया है। चीन इस सर कार पर यह आरोप लगा रहा है कि वह ये तीन काम कर रही है तिब्बत की स्वतंत्रता का समर्थन, दो चीन वाली नीति का अनुसरण और चीन के खिलाफ अमरीकी साम्राज्यवादियों और रूसी सुधारवादियों के साथ पवित्र संधि। जब चीन कह रहा है कि यह ये तीन काम कर रही है, तो वह सचमुच इन कामों को क्यों नहीं करता है ?

Shri Swaran Singh: If anybody or any country makes an incorrect allegation against our country, then for proving that, what the other person is accusing, I should do the same thing, is a very strange suggestion which I would not like to adopt for my country. We should not be deflected by the accusations that Chinese might make that we are pursuing a particular policy. The hon. Member himself, while formulating his question, said that it is incorrect that we are pursuing that policy.

श्री मधु लिमये : करना चाहिए। अगर सरकार करती तो हम उसकी बहुत तारीफ करते। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है।

Shri Swaran Singh: So, if another country incorrectly makes an allegation that we are pursuing a particular policy, that should be a motive

for adopting that policy in a proposition to which, I am sorry, I cannot subscribe.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डो : मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि दलाई लामा का जो व्यूरो हिन्दुस्तान में काम कर रहा है वह उनको तिब्बत की सरकार के रूप में मान्यता देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि किसी भी मिदासी मामले के सम्बन्ध में और तिब्बत के मामले के सम्बन्ध में दलाई लामा की बोलों पर जो पाबन्दी उनकी बोलों पर जो ताला लगाने का काम हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने किया है तो क्या वह ताला कम से कम हटा कर दलाई लामा को तिब्बत के मामले पर बोलने की स्वतंत्रता हमारा सरकार देगी ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not accept that there is any restriction as such on Dalai Lama's making speeches. He has been making various speeches. It is one thing to place restrictions and quite another to give various types of facilities that might be asked.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डो : अध्यक्ष महोदय मुझे आपकी मदद चाहिये। मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि तिब्बत के सिवामी मामलों पर आज दलाई लामा कोई भी बात हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं कह सकते हैं और किसी भी मामले पर कोई भी विचार प्रकट करने हों तो सरकार से मैन्योर कराने के बाद प्रकट कर सकते हैं। ऐसी हालत में मेरा यह प्रश्न है कि सिवामी मामलों पर, तिब्बत के मामलों पर, तिब्बत के सिवामी मामलों पर बोलने की स्वतंत्रता हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार उन को देगी क्या ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not accept that there is any censor as such but any individual, howsoever he may be, who takes refuge in any country is expected to follow certain norms that are applicable when a person is functioning as a person who has sought asylum. (Interruptions).

I can sit down if he wants to speak.

It is a normal practice for any person who has sought asylum in any country not to indulge in any activity which may in his judgment and in the judgment of the host country unnecessarily embarrass that Government that country. This is a normal practice that is followed. There are no particular restrictions on the functioning of Dalai Lama. He is a respected individual and we have given him asylum. We should treat it in that form and not get excited over it.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: In view of the fact that the present Chinese regime in the Mainland is relentlessly pursuing a policy of unprovoked aggression and hostilities against India and in view of the latest assault and humiliation heaped on the Indian diplomats attached to the Indian Embassy in the Chinese Capital by thousands of stone-throwing Chinese hooligans

Mr. Speaker: This is entirely a different question. I have asked him to make a statement about China.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: My question is whether the Government is prepared to reopen the Tibet issue.

Mr. Speaker: There is no relevance

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, चीन के साथ हमारी जो संबंध हुई थी, उसके अनुसार चीन ने तिब्बत की स्वायत्तता का आदर करने का बचन दिया था। क्या यह सब गूरी है कि कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने तिब्बत की स्वायत्तता खत्म कर दी है ? क्या यह सब गूरी है कि तिब्बत में लाखों चीनी बन्धे जा रहे हैं जो तिब्बती लोगों से जबरदस्ती जादू कर रहे हैं और आज तिब्बत में तिब्बतियों को चीनी कम संख्या में कर देना चाहते हैं ? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि चीन ने उन संबंध पालन नहीं किया क्या सरकार अपनी

तरफ से इस बात की घोषणा करेगी कि वह रुन्नि टूट गई है और अब भारत को तिब्बत के मामले में फिर से विचार करने का अधिकार है ?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is true that the Chinese promises of respecting the autonomy of Tibet have been very flagrantly violated and thrown to the winds by the Government of the People's Republic of China. Many of the things that have been mentioned by the hon. Member opposite are really very gross violations of the human rights and as such, on the last occasion when the matter came up before the United Nations, we did support the Tibetans' case of violation of human rights and we supported that Resolution which ultimately was approved in the United Nations. As to whether this is a ground strong enough for going back upon the treaty that we have signed with China, I do not think that the stage has come when we should repudiate the treaty that we have signed.

Shri R. Barua: Apart from whatever relations there are between India and China today, China's sovereignty over Tibet was admitted by India. Therefore, in the context of the present world affairs, will it be right for India to agitate over the question of Tibet which is already an internal question, an internal matter, of China?

Shri Swaran Singh: That is one view. As I have already said, if there is a violation of human rights, then irrespective of the sovereignty or suzerainty of any country over any other part or a part of their own country, it should attract the notice of the international community. There is such a thing as human rights and violation of human rights which does attract and should attract the notice of the international community.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Umanath.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : श्रीमान्, मैं एक जरूरी बात जानना चाहता हूँ माननीय मंत्री जी से

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have called Shri Umanath.

Shri Umanath: Under Dalai Lama's regime in Tibet, the Lamas had the right to cut the hands or any part of the limbs of the serfs or even kill them without due process of law. When the Government supported the human rights resolution in the last session of the UN General Assembly, may I know whether they made themselves sure that when they supported that resolution, they did not support the right of those Lamas to be restored, and secondly whether that was the reason why excepting India other non-aligned nations did not support that resolution?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not want to go into the historic rights, powers or laws of Tibet as they prevailed before. But we had satisfied ourselves that the human rights of the Tibetans were being jeopardised. It was after assuring ourselves of that, that we decided to support the move in the United Nations to call upon the international community to take notice of this violation of human rights. The right to cut anybody's limb or something else surely has got nothing to do with human rights, and even this question that is being put really....

Shri Umanath: Cutting the limbs without due process of law is not a violation of human right?

Shri Swaran Singh: Certainly, human rights will not extend to that, and we are not trying to restore whatever are the correct or supposed, according to the hon. Member, rights in human rights. It is not for us to go into it. At the present moment, the question related to the violation of the human rights of Tibetans by the Chinese, and we have taken a stand on that.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The hon. interim Foreign Minister has spoken in a blanket way about human rights. Human rights, apart from ever so many other things, imply also the right of every man to worship in his own way. May I know from the hon. Minister whether this question of worship which is being denied to the indigenous population of Tibet after China has taken over, was also considered? May I know also whether it was also considered that all the gold that was to be found in the monasteries of Tibet had been looted from there and was being used in Hong Kong to purchase arms and ammunition and thermo-nuclear weapons and missiles and atom bombs and other things?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would require notice of this profound question.

Shri Hem Barua: Peking Radio in its broadcast in Hindi on the 10th June, at 8-45 P.M. has called upon the Indian revolutionaries to hack to pieces the Indian reactionaries and to make the waters of the Ganges red with their blood? Possibly, the Chinese have called you, Sir, and us as reactionaries, and they want us to be hacked to pieces and make the waters of the Ganges red with our blood.

श्री मधु लिखते : सब से पहले डांगे साहब की । इनको क्यों भूल गये ?

Shri Hem Barua: Oh, he is there. I did not see him earlier. He is also a reactionary.

Shri S. A. Dange: Does the hon. hon. Member accept the title of 'Indian reactionary' for himself?

Shri Hem Barua: Possibly, they do it.

Shri S. A. Dange: No, he does it

Shri Hem Barua: I do not do it, but they mean it.

Shri S. A. Dange: Why is he afraid?

Shri Hem Barua: Shri S. A. Dange has asked why we are afraid. We are not afraid, and I think you are also not afraid of this. But in the context of the present developments and the China's naked interference in our internal affairs in Nagaland, Mizo Hills and elsewhere and also at Naxalbari, may I know whether Government are prepared to have a rethinking so far as the Tibetan issue is concerned, and to help the Dalai Lama in his political mission in South-East Asia? The Dalai Lama is going to the South-East Asian countries to canvass political support for his resolution in the United Nations. May I know whether or not Government are going to help in that?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: We want a specific answer.

Shri Swaran Singh: I will be very specific. I will not go into the preambulatory part because it is full of so many loaded things that it is not for me to contradict each and every thing that he said. That he might settle with the many others sitting in the Opposition Benches who were the party who were called by the Chinese Radio to hack to pieces those reactionaries or others according to their imagination. We are not unaccustomed to hear this type of polemics of the Chinese extremists. We think that the best way is to ignore them with the contempt they deserve, and we should not unnecessarily be concerned about all the wild things that the Chinese put out in their broadcasts or other media.

Shri D. C. Sharma: You want us to become yogis.

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not want anyone to become a yogi when the professor even in his old age is so young and enthusiastic. We should retain that vigour and not think of becoming yogis, not at any rate while dealing with the Chinese.

Without going into the preambulatory part of the question, on the two issues, we have never come in the way of the Dalai Lama visiting other countries if he wants to visit those countries, and when he is in other countries it will be the Dalai Lama's desire or those countries' policy to permit or not to permit him to undertake any activities they like. But it is quite clear that we do not want our country to be used for political purposes by anybody who seeks asylum here, whether he is the Dalai Lama or any other person. We are quite clear on that issue, and there should be no misunderstanding on that score.

On the question of the Tibetan issue, I do not know precisely what is meant when a sort of vague question is put that we should do some rethinking on that issue. I would like to know the content of that rethinking before I give a specific answer. Our policy in relation to Tibet has been enunciated here from time to time. On one occasion, I remember Shri Chagla, who is in charge of External Affairs—I am only trying to give whatever information I have to serve the House—did say that all these factors which are prevailing are always before the Government and they constantly keep an eye upon the policy to be pursued, but beyond that he did not seem to go.

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : यह नहीं कहा ।
कहा था कि पुनर्विचार करेंगे ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I have nothing to add to what Shri Chagla has already said

Shri Hem Barua: He said that in the Rajya Sabha, not here

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: In view of the inhumanities inflicted on Tibetans by the Chinese, similar to those inflicted by the same authorities on Mongols and Muslims in Sinkiang, how is it that our Government are concerned with the inhuman treatment inflicted on the Tibetans alone and insist that these be taken cogni-

sance of by the UN? In view of the fact that the so-called Sino-Indian treaty, which has been referred to by the hon. Minister, has run out of time in terms of physical limits and in terms too of the fact that not even a ghost of that treaty remains, what steps Government from taking a fresh de novo outlook on the entire Sino-Indian relations in relation to Tibet?

Shri Swaran Singh: I am afraid I have nothing to add to what I have stated.

Mr. Speaker: Chagla has answered, he is not able to say.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Will, all of you, kindly sit down? I will again call everybody if you like, I have no objection.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: I had caught your eye.

Mr. Speaker: You have caught my eye, but unfortunately I cannot call everybody at the same time.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: I was in Tibet in 1951. So, let me ask one question

Mr. Speaker: Other than what Mr. Chagla said, Mr. Swaran Singh is not able to give additional information. He is not able to say anything now. Naturally, as he said, he can only repeat what Mr. Chagla said. Therefore, is there any point in your repeating the questions and his repeating the same answer? We have spent 25 minutes on this question. I do not mind spending another 25 minutes, but will it serve any purpose? If you want, I have no objection.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: Will you permit a two-hour discussion on this?

Mr. Speaker: You want a discussion?

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: My question has not been answered.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair cannot answer your question. Unfortunately, it is the Minister who has to

answer the question, and not the Chair.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: On a point of order. You have said that the Minister is not in a position to give more and better answers to the question, than what Mr. Chagla has already given. Is it not his duty to come well prepared to answer all questions?

Mr. Speaker: He is thoroughly prepared.

Shri Swaran Singh: I want to say quite categorically that it is not lack of preparation, but the Question Hour is used to eliciting information, not to ask me to alter policies. What I have said is, on the policy aspect a certain attitude has been taken and explained by Shri Chagla. In the Question Hour you cannot ask me to alter the policy. That policy continues to prevail. So, it is not lack of preparation, but my lack of willingness to be subjected to pressure to alter policy under high policy questions. That I am not prepared to accept.

Shri Namblar: We will spend one hour on this question. Let us create a record today.

Shri Nath Pai: We believed that one of the major planks of the foreign policy of India, or what remains of that policy nowadays, was to support the struggles for national independence in any part of the world wherever people are trying to rise in rebellion against the shackles of foreign rule, alien rule. Mr. Swaran Singh just now seems to have abandoned, discarded and thrown to the winds this policy of this country. This is clear from the latter part of his reply to Mr. Hem Barua's question, when he said that we are not going to allow anybody to use this country. This country should be the bastion for all those who want to fight for the freedom of their countries. Are we to understand that there is a radical change in the policy of India so far as our stance to people's struggling for freedom is concerned?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is no change in the policy about which the hon. Member spoke—support to countries and people who are fighting for their independence against the colonial rule. That policy still continues. We should make a distinction. There are struggles between the people of one region in a country and their central Government and between people of one region and the people of another region. I would request the hon. Member not to confuse between the two. There is a great deal of difference between colonial powers dominating the people and the people's fight against colonialism; this should be distinguished, howsoever uncomfortable the position might be, from the struggles which could be described as internecine struggles between the people of one region and the central government and between the people of one region and another region.

श्री उदया त सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक वाइट आफ आर्डर उठाना चाहता हूँ। मैं आप से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह पालिसी कांग्रेस पार्टी की बनाई हुई है और बार-बार कौन्सिल भी कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोग पूछते हैं तो क्या इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान कोई आरामगाह है? वह तिव्वत में जाकर अपने अधिकारों के लिये क्या नहीं लड़ते हैं? बार-बार यह कांग्रेस वाले ही क्यों भवान पूछते हैं?

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order, but only disorder. It is a Government for the country, not for the Congress Party.

श्री रामनमयन बजाज : भारत के साथ तिव्वत के सांस्कृतिक, भौगोलिक और ऐतिहासिक सम्बन्ध हजारों वर्षों से रहने हुए आये हैं। राजनीतिक दृष्टि से जो उस में फेर फार हुआ वह इतने महत्व का नहीं कहा जा सकता, वह टैम्पोररी, कुछ समय के बास्ते हो सकता है। इन फेर फारों को जिस तरीके से हम ने सोचा

करके किया और हमारा उसके साथ में जो कुछ भी बजान हम नें दिया जब चाहना के साथ हमने अपनी अडरस्टैंडिंग की, मंत्री महोदय नें यह कहा कि उस समझदारी को या जो एक अडरस्टैंडिंग थी वह बिल्कुल खत्म हो गयी है और जो आटोनोमी की निश्चित के अन्दर में वह वहा पर रही नहीं है, यहा पर अत्याचार और दूसरी चीजे सब हो रही है ऐसी स्थिति के अन्दर क्या भारत के ऊपर नैतिक जिम्मेदारी आती है, वैधानिक और राजनैतिक जिम्मेदारी तो पर तरफ है, उस में आप गिनती लगाये तो उस में मुझे उल्ला एनराज नहीं है, परन्तु हमारा नैतिक और धार्मिक जिम्मेदारी जो निश्चित के सम्बन्ध में रही है उस के बारे में इस सदन के विचारश्री चागना जी का जो एक इमॉट ट्रांजें है, हमारे मंत्री महोदय उनको कहे और यह कहे कि धार्मिक और दूसरी जो हमारी अडरस्टैंडिंग निश्चित के साथ में हमें ग्रा रही है उस में फेर फार हुआ है और उस जिम्मेदारी को निश्चित के लिये सदन की बनती हमारे मंत्री महोदय से है। एक इमॉट बारे में वह जानकारी दे या उनको कहे।

Mr. Speaker: Everybody wants to make a small speech

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not think he has sought any information

श्री स्ववराज वजाज : मैं उनमें थोड़ी सी सफाई करना चाहता हूँ और मैं

I have been misunderstood

Mr. Speaker: Please sit down I have called another Member

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: In 1951, I was in Tibet when the Chinese invaded Tibet.

Mr. Speaker: That was long ago. Come to the present... (Interruptions).

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: How can I make the Minister understand without a preamble? At that time, many Tibetans asked me why we should object to their having a representative in the United Nations while Nepal has a representative in the UN. They said, we are more similar to you than to the Chinese; we write like you from left to right. Our formula for prayer is "Om mani padme Hun" which is clearly Sanskrit, we have nothing in common with the Chinese, why are you objecting to us when the Nepaiese have their representation in the UN? Now, I ask the Minister; when the Chinese have not kept their word about Tibetan autonomy, will the Government take up the cause of Tibetans and see that they have their representative in the UN?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would like to understand what the reply the hon. Member gave, when the Tibetans asked him that question. The UN does not deal with the desires of the people, however eminent they may be. It is the governments that are represented in the UN, and unless there is the Government and that makes a representation and ask for it the UN does not consider anything.

Shri R. D. Bhandare: May I know from the hon. Minister whether the Dalai Lama is treated in this country as the head of a sovereign State who has taken asylum in this country as such facilities are given to him?

Shri Swaran Singh: No, Sir. He has not sought asylum as head of a sovereign State, as the hon. Member says

Shri Bal Raj Madhak: The hon. Minister has said that the question of Tibet is different from other places where colonial regimes exist. May I know whether he has read anything about history? Tibet has existed as an independent country for the last 2,500 years according to the chronicals—ruled by the son of Prince Mrithunjay. There were times when for sometime China ruled

over Tibet just as Afghans and Turks ruled over India. Does that mean that India is part of Turkey or India is part of Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker: Please put your question.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I want to know whether the Government is prepared to repudiate that treaty; he said the treaty has been violated by China. The one most important part of that treaty was that the autonomy of Tibet will be respected. It is a purely political clause. This political clause of the treaty, that the autonomy of Tibet would be respected, has been violated. This is not a question of human rights. In view of the fact that the most important clause of the treaty of 1954 has been violated by China, may I know whether the Government is prepared to repudiate that treaty.

Shri Swaran Singh: The same question is repeated. I would like to add that he is a professor and he must have read more of history. I have also read a little of history. Our attitude is based upon our assessment of all these historical events, and then we ultimately took a decision.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Since the policy and practice of Government appears to be that we do not intervene in the internal affairs of other countries even when some unfortunate incidents take place—for example, in Indonesia, half a million people were hacked to death on the suspicion of their being communists and we did not even utter a word against it—may I know, in that case, since certain things might have happened in Tibet where a feudal—theocratic regime has been sought to be transformed by revolutionary methods and certain excesses might have taken place, why we look upon it as something which we might even consider taking to the international forum and there by disturb and derange the delicate balance

in international relations, which we should not do in present-day circumstances?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would only humbly point out that a few unfortunate incidents is one thing; persistent violation of human rights is quite another. Whereas we can ignore a few unfortunate incidents, we should not ignore when the basic human, fundamental rights are being violated.

Steel Plant in Iran with India's Collaboration

+

*572. **Shri Brij Bhushan Lal:**
Shri N. S. Sharma:
Shri Sharda Nand:
Shri A. B. Vajpayee:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a steel plant in Iran is being set up with India's collaboration;

(b) if so, the nature and extent of help and the terms and conditions thereof; and

(c) whether Government have also considered Iran's relations with Pakistan in military matters while offering this collaboration?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Surendra Pal Singh): (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

॥

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: क्या इस बारे में कोई बातचीत चली है? हो सकता है कि उस बातचीत को अन्तिम रूप न दिया गया हो लेकिन मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या प्रारम्भिक बातचीत चली है और क्या ईरान में किसी तरह का कारखाना लगाने का हमारा इरादा है?

Shri Surendra Pal Singh: There has been no direct approach from the Iran Government to set up any steel plant with Indian collaboration. But what