

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

the House representing the people of this country. Therefore, I think it is a very serious matter which ought to receive your serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The matter relates to this. I expunged a portion which I did not think it proper to remain in the record. It was already intimated to the various sections of the Press. The Press were aware of it and no paper published it—the expunged portion. But, somehow or other, in the *Free Press Journal* of Bombay this matter which I had expunged appeared. And, underneath that it was also stated that this portion was, no doubt, expunged by the Speaker. There is not even a possibility of saying that he did not know this and published it inadvertently or by mistake. No more proof is necessary than this statement that it was deliberate.

Under these circumstances I have written to the Editor. The Editor may not know everything that happens during the night; somebody might publish it in the Press. I have drawn the Editor's attention to it and I have asked for an explanation. Usually such things are sent to the Editor. It is an important thing. After the receipt of this reply, if it is a matter that can be washed away with an apology I will do so; or I will bring it before the House for such action as it may deem proper. I do not want that any hasty action should be taken; nor should we be indulgent wherever the decisions of the House are deliberately flouted.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): May I make a submission, Sir? You may in your wisdom take whatever decision you want as to what has to be done regarding the publication of the expunged portion. But I would like to draw the attention of the House that whenever a portion is expunged, I think it normally used to be done on the floor of the House and it was always intimated to the Member from whose speech it is expunged. Every Member knew that such a

thing was done. Here, actually, the portion expunged was a certain remark of Prof. Hiren Mukerjee. Actually he was not informed, that such and such a portion had been expunged. It was only late in the night that he knew of it when somebody from the Press phoned and told him that such and such portions of his speech had been expunged. I think it is only right that as soon as a matter is expunged it must be intimated to the House. At least the Member from whose speech it is being expunged should be intimated of the matter.

Mr. Speaker: I shall certainly do so. I do not know if it was not done due to inadvertence. I will inform the hon. Member concerned when I expunge such portions only which according to me need not be brought to the House because they affect the reputation of the House and if brought to the House it would not serve the purpose for which the expunction is made. In this particular case the hon. Member who made the remarks might not have been informed due to inadvertence. I will certainly see to it that in such a case the hon. Member concerned is informed of that fact.

12.1 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: SINO-INDIAN RELATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Before we take up any other matter, the hon. Prime Minister wants to make a statement.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, three days ago, on the 16th December, I received through our Ambassador in Peking, Premier Chou En-lai's reply to my letter of the 16th November. This letter has already appeared in the Press and so I need not give any details about its contents.

I read this letter with regret. It does not accept the reasonable and practical proposals which I had made

to Premier Chou En-lai in order to secure an immediate lessening of tension along the Sino-Indian border and to create the necessary atmosphere for a peaceful settlement of the border problem. It is merely a re-literation of claims to extensive areas in our territory which by history, by custom or by agreement have long been integral parts of India. It does not contain any reply to the detailed letter which I had sent to him on September 26 and the note of November 4 in which some salient facts bearing on the situation had been mentioned. Premier Chou En-lai has stated in his letter that he would send a reply to his previous letter and note of mine in the near future.

I have today sent a reply to Premier Chou En-lai referring to the above facts and stating that I am sorry to find that he had based his claim on recent intrusions by Chinese personnel into parts of Indian territory. It is, in fact, these intrusions which had brought about the present situation and created apprehensions. I have further stated that I cannot accept the allegation that Indian forces had occupied any part of Chinese territory, or committed aggression at Kongka Pass or at Longju, where our established check-post was attacked by Chinese troops.

Premier Chou En-lai in his letter has spoken of the 'friendly manner' in which Indian personnel who were captured in the Chenmo Valley were treated. I have referred him again to the statement of Shri Karam Singh about the treatment that he and his colleagues received while they were prisoners in the custody of the Chinese border forces. This statement clearly indicates the deplorable treatment to which the Indian prisoners were subjected.

Premier Chou En-lai had suggested that he and I should meet on December 26 so as to reach an agreement on the principles which are presumably to guide the Officials on both sides in the discussion of details. I have

repeated, what I have said previously, that I am always ready to meet and discuss with him the outstanding differences between our countries and explore the avenues of settlement. I have, however, pointed out that I do not see how we can reach an agreement on principles when there is such complete disagreement about the facts. I would prefer to wait for his promised reply to my letter of September 26 and our note of November 4 before we discuss what should be the next step. I have added that it is quite impossible for me to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days. In my reply I have expressed my agreement with him to the sentiments which he had expressed in the last paragraph of his letter, to the effect that the principal concern of our two countries should be—I am quoting "with the programme of long-term peaceful construction to lift ourselves from our present state of backwardness, and that we should not be parties to the increasing of tension between our two countries or in the world." India has welcomed the fact that there is some lowering of world tensions and that—again I quote—"the world situation is developing in a direction favourable to peace". It is for this reason, even apart from the imperative need to improve the relations between our two countries, that in spite of recent events, I have continually stressed the need for a peaceful settlement of our problems.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Premier Chou En-lai has been publishing everything which he has been sending to our Prime Minister. May I know whether this letter which our Prime Minister has sent to Chou En-lai will be published here or whether a copy of it will be supplied to us?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have given the substance of the letter. It may vary a little here and there. It will be released to the Press after two or three days so as to allow it to reach him.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): May I know whether Mr. Chou En-Lai's letter was sent to the Press from the Chinese Embassy or from the Government of India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The letter was issued in Peking to the Press and to the radio there. In fact the message that I received from our ambassador in Peking containing Mr. Chou En-lai's letters stated at the end of it that as soon as I received that letter, they would release it to the Press. They have released it to the Press.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Sir, as you know, I and some leaders of the Opposition Parties have given notice under Rule 193 of the Rules of Procedure that we are desirous of having discussion on the latest letter received from the Chinese Premier in reply to the Prime Minister's letter dated the 16th November, 1959.

The reason for this is that the latest letter received from the Chinese Premier rejects *in toto* the proposals made by the Prime Minister in his letter of 16th November. Further the Chinese Premier asks for our withdrawal from a number of places all along the frontier and lays claim to places that are indisputably in India and agreed to as such by China in the treaty signed with us in 1954. From the reply, it appears that our territories in Ladakh have not been occupied by China but are being effectively colonised.

Parliament must have an opportunity to discuss the reply received and consider the situation arising out of it before it adjourns. In view of the urgency and the great importance of the matter sought to be discussed, we hope time will be found for discussion in the two days left. If this is not possible, I think we can prolong for a couple of days the sitting of the House and discuss this matter.

I am anxious to have this discussion because I find that they (the Chinese) have rejected the Prime Minister's proposals which were favourable to the Chinese and unfavourable to us and the other conditions laid down for a meeting. Further, I say that we seem to have forgotten what we knew before—the importance of time. Time ripens a fruit but if not properly picked up, then time also rots the fruit. One good thing that we had learnt from Gandhiji was that he took action at the proper time. When the psychological time is past, then of course, it cannot be recovered. And even the Chinese Prime Minister has reminded us of what he calls an 'eloquent proof'. For many years while aggression was going on in Ladakh, we did nothing and he calls that as 'eloquent proof' of our having accepted the Chinese contention. So, I submit that all along we have made the mistake of not taking into consideration the factor of time and I believe the correspondence on the part of China is only to waste time. They yet claim the very same things that they have claimed in their maps. There is no basis, I believe, for talks but time is being lost. Why is time lost? I humbly submit—because they (the Chinese) want that turmoil in the Himalayan regions should continue and they want to organise subversive movements on our Himalayan borders. Further, they want to frighten the people and the small kingdoms that are on the borders. Therefore, it becomes very necessary that we must in time decide what we propose to do because I feel that the tone of the letter and the contents of the letter are such that there seems to be no possibility of any negotiations. They (the Chinese) have not even left a basis for negotiations. They have even told us that what Karam Singh said is wrong and what they say is right. There is no point that we have raised which has been answered in the letter. So, I think, it is very necessary that we do not allow time to be wasted by this fruitless correspondence. Therefore, I think a discussion upon the matter is very necessary and

essential and I hope you will find time and the House will find time to discuss the matter before anything further is done.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, the House knows that I am always anxious, at any rate willing, to have discussions about any important matter arising in connection with foreign affairs, more especially a matter of this kind. We have discussed it on two occasions. But quite apart from the question of the House or you finding time for this discussion I really do not understand the argument of the hon. Member that time is passing and some how the passage of time will be arrested by discussion. Time will nevertheless pass in spite of a discussion.

Acharya Kripalani: The House will give its opinion whether the time should be allowed to pass or not.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is exactly the point I was going to suggest. The hon. Member has said that it is not good to negotiate and that is a trick for time to pass on the part of the Chinese Government. Well, I do not know what the hon. Member has in mind. But so far as I am concerned and so far as this Government is concerned, we will negotiate and negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end. I absolutely reject the approach of stopping negotiations at any stage. That, I think, is not only a fundamentally wrong approach, but, if I may say so, with all respect to the hon. Member opposite, it is fundamentally anti-Gandhian approach. That does not mean that any action which is necessitated should not be taken. That is an entirely different matter. But negotiations will go on so long as this Government functions, to the end.

Shri Jadhav (Malegaon): Adept the 1942 policy of Gandhiji.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That does not mean, as I said, any action that we intend should not be taken. If the hon. Member means a declaration

of war, well, the hon. Member, if I may suggest to him, might consider the question a little more carefully as to what war involves and how we attain our object by a declaration of war.

Therefore, Sir, I am in your hands. I merely state what I think of a further discussion at this stage, when we are obviously in the middle of this correspondence. The correspondence may not be to the liking of the hon. Member or to my liking, the letters that we receive, but that is the way now countries function short of war. There is no other way. The other way is war, and that way is to be avoided as far as one can avoid it. That has been our policy and that is the policy, at any rate, the declared policy of every civilised nation. For us to jump into something without exhausting all possibilities, something which will be disastrous not only for the countries jumping into it but for the whole world, is not a matter lightly to be undertaken, and we know this Government will not undertake it in that way.

But there are many other things which this country has to do in the way of preparation, in the way of strengthening our defences etc., and those things certainly should be expedited, undertaken to the best of our ability and as speedily as possible.

There is one thing more, that it is up to you and the House to decide whether they want a discussion, but I regret I shall not be here day after tomorrow as I have important engagements which I cannot forego; as the House is ending tomorrow I have made those engagements.

Acharya Kripalani: I did not want to interrupt the hon. Prime Minister, but every time to bring in the plea that this or that will lead to war and war is very disastrous, I think, is not very fair. I think that I know enough of Gandhiji, that he always negotiated, but the time came when he said that action must be taken. What action the Government takes is another question. Let them take any

[Acharya Kripalani]

action but it should not be that time should be lost and in the meantime subversive activities should go on on our borders and our friends should be intimidated in every way. That is all that I wanted to say.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): I strongly endorse the statement of our hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, I am a little alarmed by the endorsement of the hon. Raja Saheb, but I would beg this House to consider one thing. There are, I would again repeat, only two ways in which nations deal with each other, diplomatic or war; there is no third way.

Acharya Kripalani: Is there an end to diplomacy ever?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is by war, nothing else than war.

Acharya Kripalani: There are many other things that can be done.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no other way. Diplomacy has many shares, many ways, but if it is diplomacy it is communication, it is talking till talking stops when there is war. Till there is actual, absolute declaration of war there is diplomacy.

Acharya Kripalani: But if the other party wants to waste time, what is to be done?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know. Therefore, I should put it to the hon. Member to think a little clearly on the subject. Clear thought is necessary and clear thought leads to only one conclusion. There is no alternative to ceasing talking but war. It does not matter what it is. The hon. Member is thinking that time is being wasted. How, I do not know, time is wasted. It is not at all clear to me how it is being wasted; I think it is very profitably employed.

Acharya Kripalani: If there is a discussion you will be able to understand.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But I can't pit my wits against the hon. Member, but I think I would suggest to him to consider what he himself was saying and what the consequences are. I do think that frequent discussions on the same thing will not help. There is no additional fact before us at the present moment. We have discussed it. We are committed, naturally, to take such steps as we can, as the country can, with such speed, as we can to strengthen our defences. The hon. Member referred to some infiltration or subversive activities in our borders. I do not know where subversive activities are taking place (Interruption). I can't answer for any odd individual, but I think our newspapers sometimes rather exaggerate rumours which they get in Kalimpong Bazaar, in Kathmandu Bazaar or some other bazaar, and we need not accept everything that comes by way of rumour. We have to be vigilant and all that, but some things, I do submit, are not always desirable; to exaggerate them creates a wrong impression in the country.

There is the position, Sir. I am entirely in your hands and in the hands of the House in this matter. One thing I may add—I am sorry I forgot to say so—we have asked our Ambassador in Peking to come to Delhi for consultation and he will be arriving here in about four days time.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, the information demanded from Shillong about airspace violation and all that is surely not a bazaar thing. The Press carries news about airspace violation and all that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How to make it clear, I do not know. I thought I had made it clear. Every plane of ours that flies from there, the report goes that it is an enemy plane. How am I to repeat that they are looking up at a plane and are not able to recognise what kind of aircraft it is? Our planes are flying all the time all over the place.

Acharya Kripalani: Then let us say that the airspace is free for everybody? Everyday violations are there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No foreign plane is there, I repeat. I should like to have proof from anybody to counter my statement. We know it definitely. We get an account from the hon. Member opposite in his motion for adjournment we enquire and we find that our planes are flying and they are doing good work. How am I to explain this?

Acharya Kripalani: In answer to a question it has been said that planes have crossed.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, I have one little point to make. The Prime Minister just now said that we cannot go on acting on Press reports which are bazaar reports. In fairness to the House and the Press we have got to say that on a previous occasion when some reports emanated from Kalimpong the Prime Minister angrily repudiated them but, unfortunately, to a point, regarding Tibet and Ladakh they proved right. Secondly, if the House is kept informed from time to time we shall depend not on what the Press tell us but on what he tells us, but we are very often informed too late.

Regarding the remarks, how does a discussion stop passage of time, I must say that a discussion does not stop the passage of time, time keeps on marching, but if we have a discussion definitely the Government knows the mood of the country and, far more important, China also is informed how this country is feeling about it. It is for this reason, Sir, that we plead that we be given an opportunity of discussing this.

It is unfair to suggest every time that we demand that we be firm we are asking for war. Nobody wants war. It has been made innumerable times clear that in your pursuit of peace we are with you. It is unfair to stand

behind, that is what we want to suggest. Nobody wants you to go to war. There is a charge against us that there are war-mongers in this country. Who wants war? (*Interruption*). We are not in war so far as Peking is concerned (*Laughter*). You do not know where to laugh. Sir, this is a very unfair thing and you should not allow that. Acharya Kripalani is the last person in the world to demand that. We are standing by him. He never meant that the country should go to war, but that China should not be allowed to proceed further. Only a week ago the Prime Minister told us that there was no road. I had asked the question whether the road was constructed without our knowledge and why we were prevented from noticing it. He told us that there was no such thing as a road, it was only a question of removing a stone or building a culvert. Mr. Chou En-lai now says that 3,000 people were working for a period of two years. It is this thing that worries us, this passage of time. Therefore, he should make a reply in that context and not indicate that others are wanting to start a war.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not say at any moment that we should not believe anything that appears in the press. I said that occasionally Kalimpong Bazaar rumours appear there. Take this particular fact which has its humorous side—that we get a number of adjournment motions day after day, and I go on saying that, after due enquiry, we find not a single aircraft coming from outside. (*Interruption*). Please let me proceed I am not referring to some other previous things. I am talking of the last few days. The fact is that our aircraft are functioning there very adequately and very efficiently. Nobody, no layman, can possibly find out, when an aircraft is flying at about 20,000 or 30,000 ft, what its markings are and what its country of origin is. They cannot. About that particular area, during these days, I can say with the greatest certainty and definiteness that no foreign aircraft is

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

coming, because we have been in the air all the time doing work that has been allotted to our people. I do not say that every statement in the press is wrong. That would be ridiculous for me to say.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I did not wish to intervene, but I feel aggrieved that we have strayed away from the point which Acharya Kripalani raised, and that was, whether it was desirable to have a further discussion on this particular problem or not, so that Government may be benefited. It was not a question of cessation of diplomatic relations or the alternative that the Prime Minister seems to think, namely, war. I humbly submit there are other ways also. We have ceased to have relations with Portugal. Does it mean we have gone to war with Portugal? What about sanctions such as economic sanctions and other things? There are other things, apart from the two alternatives. I do feel that the Leader's hands would be strengthened considerably if he were to know the latest pulse of the House as well on this very important juncture.

Shri Hem Barua: About the air-space violation,.....

Mr. Speaker: I have heard enough on the matter. We should not enlarge the scope of this subject. Regarding the motion for discussion of this point, well, we are adjourning tomorrow and we will be meeting again only after a month or a month and a half. This is a very serious matter.

Acharya Kripalani: We are willing to sit late.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, the decision that has to be taken and the action to be taken thereon are certainly in the hands of the Government. But I consider that on this matter, before we adjourn, there must be a discussion, an expression of views on all

sides of the House, regarding what further steps may be taken. Every step need not lead to war. There may be other things also. I therefore think that I ought to allow a discussion on this subject. I fix tomorrow evening—4 O'clock to 6 O'clock—a couple of hours, or say, 2½ hours, for the discussion of this subject.

12.43 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON ASSURANCES

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given by the Ministers during the various sessions of Second Lok Sabha:—

- (i) First Statement—Ninth Session, 1959 [See Appendix III, annexure No. 84].
- (ii) Supplementary Statement No. III—Eighth Session, 1959. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 85].
- (iii) Supplementary Statement No. X—Seventh Session, 1959. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 86].
- (iv) Supplementary Statement No. XIII—Sixth Session, 1958. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 87].
- (v) Supplementary Statement No. XVI—Fifth Session, 1958. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 88].
- (vi) Supplementary Statement No. XXIV—Fourth Session, 1958. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 89].