

Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

Series II, Volume 57

January 26 - February 28, 1960

(c) China & Tibet

156. To Chou En-lai¹

February 5, 1960

My dear Prime Minister,

My Government is sending you separately through our Ambassador in Peking, a reply to the note of the Chinese Government which was handed to the Indian Embassy on the 26 December 1959.²

I confess that I do not particularly like this long distance correspondence which consists of a reaffirmation of our respective views, and yet there is no escape from this when questions of far-reaching importance are raised between Governments and statements made which cannot be accepted. You were good enough to suggest that we should meet to discuss these matters and, so far as we are concerned, it has been our consistent policy to such meetings and informal approaches which sometimes lead to helpful results. But I found that the respective viewpoints of our two Governments in regard to the matters under discussion, were so wide apart from opposed to each other that there was little ground left for useful talks. I suggested in my letter of November 16, 1959 certain preliminary steps which would have eased the situation and facilitated further discussions.³ Unfortunately you have not found yourself able to

¹ From White Paper No. III. pp. 83-84.

² See White Paper No. III, pp. 60-82. Also available in SWJN/SS/56/pp. 398-423.

³ See White Paper No. III. pp. 47-51. Also available in SWJN/SS/54/pp. 492-498.

accept those proposals. I still hope that you will reconsider your decision in this matter.

In the latest note from the Government of the People's Republic of China, emphasis has been laid on our entire boundary never having been delimited. That is a statement which appears to us to be wholly incorrect and we cannot accept it. On that basis there can be no negotiations.

It has pained me deeply that the relations between India and China which have in the past been so friendly and which we had endeavoured so much to strengthen, should have deteriorated rapidly and led to bitterness and resentment. That is a tragedy for both our countries as well as for the larger issues in the world. For my part, I have endeavoured and shall continue to endeavour to find way to a peaceful settlement and for a restoration of friendly relations. But for the moment, I do not see any common ground between our respective viewpoints.

Nevertheless I think that we should make every effort to explore avenues which might lead to a peaceful settlement. Although any negotiations on the basis you have suggested are not possible, still I think it might be helpful for us to meet. I am afraid it is not possible for me to leave India during the next few months. The budget session of our Parliament is beginning on February 8 and this will require my presence here. I would, however be glad if you could take the trouble to come to Delhi for this purpose at a time convenient to you and us. You will be our honoured guest when you come here. I would suggest that some time in the second half of March might be fixed for this meeting, if it is convenient to you.⁴

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

⁴ For Chou-En-lai's reply, see Appendix 40.

157. In the Lok Sabha: Indians Detained in Tibet⁵

[Translation begins:

Indians Arrested by the Chinese

Bhakt Darshan, Ram Krishna Gupta:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 12 on 16 November, 1959 and state how successful have been the efforts to secure the release of about 37 Indian nationals or Indian-protected persons who were detained by Chinese officials in Tibet?

Translation ends.]

[Translation begins:

Lakshmi Menon: According to information available with us 14 persons have so far been released. Efforts for the release of the others continue.

Translation ends.]

[Translation begins:

Bhakta Darshan: Sir, I want to know what charges have been levelled against those Indian nationals arrested?

Translation ends.]

Lakshmi Menon: In the case of a Sikkim national the Chinese had stated that he had been held in custody because of serious charge of collusion with the Tibetan rebellion and participation in the rebellion. About another family the Chinese Government held that they were Chinese and that they had been arrested on account of breaking the law and were under trial.

⁵ Reply to questions, 9 February 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates* (Second Series), Vol. XXXVIII, cols.55-57.

Vidya Charan Shukla: May I know if any other Indian or Indian-protected persons have been arrested after the Government got intimation of arrest of these 37 people.

Lakshmi Menon; I have no information.

Ajit Singh Sarhadi: Are the persons, who are being detained, being tried for some offence or is it pure and simple detention?

Lakshmi Menon: This is only detention of the two sets of people who were kept under detention for various allegations. I have already read them out. The others were 16 Ladakhi Lamas, one Ladakhi trader and one Indian- protected person.

Hem Barua: May I know whether in this group of 37 persons of which 14 persons are so far released are included those persons about which the papers establishing their identity were not discovered or could not be traced? This was the reply that was given by the hon. Prime Minister on the previous occasion. May I know whether there are persons whose documents or papers are in doubt in this group also?

Lakshmi Menon: The persons under detention are persons who were resident in Tibet for a considerable period of time, such as, Kashmiri Muslims and Ladakhi Lamas. We hold that under articles 5 and 8 of our Constitution and also according to international usage these persons are Indian citizens.

[Translation begins:

Bhakt Darshan: Sir, have Chinese officials given any reasons why Indian nationals, who have been released, are still under detention and when can a decision be taken about them?

Translation ends.]

Lakshmi Menon: I think I answered that question. I have already pointed out that they do not accept our stand in this matter, that is, that they are Indian nationals.

Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the 14 released Indians have come over to India and, if not, whether the officers of the Government of India have contacted them and have known about their condition?

Lakshmi Menon: They have come over to India.

158. To S. A. Dange: Dalai Lama's Treasure⁶

February 11, 1960

Dear Dange,

I have received your letter of February 8, 1960 in which you refer to a report that has appeared in the papers about the Dalai Lama having brought some treasure to India. I had vaguely heard about this previously. On receiving your letter, I have enquired into this matter further.

Towards the end of 1950, two officials representing the Dalai Lama brought into Sikkim a number of boxes and deposited them in Gangtok by arrangement with the Maharaja⁷ and Maharajkumar of Sikkim.⁸

Arrangements for the storage and protection of these boxes were made by the Tibetans directly with the Sikkim Durbar. We had and indeed have no knowledge of the contents of these boxes, except that it was presumed that they must contain some kind of treasure or silver and gold. I understand that some of the boxes were brought into India in

⁶ Letter to Dange, CPI, Lok Sabha MP from Central-South Bombay, Bombay State, and General Secretary, AITUC.

⁷ Tashi Namgyal.

⁸ Palden Thondup Namgyal.

1954 and the contents disposed of by their owners. The balance was removed from Gangtok to Calcutta in December 1959. As I have said above, the Government of India were not aware of the actual contents of the boxes which had been deposited in Sikkim. Authority for the deposit of the treasure in Sikkim as well as its subsequent removal was given by the Dalai Lama to his own representatives and conveyed by them direct to the Sikkim authorities.

The Government of India came into the picture when we were requested late in 1959 by the Dalai Lama's representative to arrange for the escort of the boxes to Calcutta. In accordance with the normal rules and procedure, such escort was provided by the West Bengal Government. We have no precise information of the custody or the disposal of these boxes in Calcutta. The Dalai Lama or his nominees will, of course, have to abide by the law of the land in regard to the sale of the treasure or investment of its sale proceeds in India.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru

159. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Maps in Nehru's Book⁹

DISCOVERY OF INDIA

Ram Krishan Gupta:¹⁰, Khushwaqt Rai:¹¹

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have procured a copy of the Chinese version of the book "*Discovery of India*";

⁹ Reply to questions, 12 February 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XXXVIII, cols.663-665.

¹⁰ Congress, MP from Mahendragarh, Punjab.

¹¹ PSP, MP from Kheri, UP.

(b) if so, whether it contains any maps showing the India-Tibet boundary on the basis of the Chinese claims; and

(c) if so, the nature of action taken in this regard?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Sadath Ali Khan); (a) to (c). Yes; the maps therein were introduced by the publishers. The question of preventing such errors in future editions are under consideration.

Ram Krishan Gupta: May I know whether these maps have been examined and compared with the original maps and, if so, may I know how far do they differ from the original?

Sadath Ali Khan: I would like to clarify that the maps in various editions including the English one are small sketch maps. It may, however, be added that in the Chinese edition the boundary in the Ladakh sector is shown closely approximating to the traditional Indian alignment.

Ram Krishan Gupta: May I know whether the Government is prepared to lay a copy of this book on the Table of the House?

Sadath Ali Khan:¹² It is a Chinese book. It is in the Chinese language.

Speaker:¹³ All that the hon. Member means to ask is whether a copy could be placed in the Library.

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon): It is available in the library of the School of International Studies.

Speaker: I will get a copy.

¹² Congress, MP from Warangal, Andhra Pradesh.

¹³ M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.

Renuka Ray:¹⁴ Even if it is in Chinese, we could see the map.

Speaker: There are about a dozen copies of the maps that have been printed by the Government and kept in the Library. Hon. Members will compare and refer to them. So far as the book *Discovery of India* is concerned, I will find out if that book is available, and if it is not available, I will get a copy for the Library.

[Translation begins:

Khuswaqt Rai: May I know whether the Chinese edition of *Discovery of India* was authorized?

Translation ends.]

Sadath Ali Khan: I know there are only one or two maps in the book.

Khushwaqt Rai: May I know whether this Chinese edition of *Discovery of India* was printed there with the authority of the author or not?

Sadath Ali Khan: The arrangements for the publication were presumably agreed to between the publishers of the English edition, that is The Meridian Books, Ltd., and the Chinese publishers.

[Translation begins:

Khuswaqt Rai: May I know whether the publishers of English edition had the authority to publish editions in other countries?

Translation ends.]

[Translation begins:

Sadath Ali Khan: The publishers of the English edition has been asked by Prime Minister's Secretariat to exercise caution in future.

Translation ends.]

¹⁴ Congress, MP from Maida, West Bengal.

Surendranath Dwivedy:¹⁵ We could not follow the reply.

Sadath Ali Khan: The English publishers have been told to take greater care in this matter in the future.

Hem Barua:¹⁶ In view of the fact that the author of *Discovery of India* is also the Prime Minister of India, a wrong map printed in the Chinese version of the *Discovery of India* might give a wrong impression that these maps have the official approval of the Government of India. Therefore, may I know what positive steps have the Government so far taken to stop the circulation of the book so that there might not be a wrong impression created the world over?

Speaker: The question is, has the Government of India taken any steps to see that further copies of this edition are not circulated.

Vajpayee:¹⁷ They are circulated in China.

Sadath Ali Khan: If the circulation, as the hon. Member said, is in China, well, it is the Chinese edition, and language. I am not able to answer that question.

160. In the Rajya Sabha: Confusion of Names in Ladakh¹⁸

Location of Villages in Spiti Valley

Nawab Singh Chauhan:¹⁹ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether Government have conducted any investigation regarding the

¹⁵ PSP, MP from Kendrapara, Orissa.

¹⁶ PSP, MP from Gauhati, Assam.

¹⁷ A. B. Vajpayee, Jan Sangh, MP from Balrampur, UP.

¹⁸ Reply to question, 15 February 1960. *Rajya Sabha Debates*, Vol. XXVIII, cols. 648-649.

exact location of the three villages—Puling Sumdo, Chuva and Chuje of the Spiti Valley in the district of Kangra which have been claimed to be Chinese territory in a letter received from the Chinese Premier in December last and if so with what result?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Yes, Sir. In their latest note of the 26th December 1959, the Chinese are obviously confusing Puling Sumdo (also sometimes marked as Poling) and Pullam Sumda. The former (puling Sumdo) which has been mentioned as a trade mart in the 1954 Agreement lies in Tibet and there is no question of India occupying it. On the other hand, Pullam Sumda lies in the Nilang Jhadang area which is within Indian territory. The coordinates of Puling Sumdo are 31.20N and 71.27E while the coordinates of Pullam Sumda are 31.18N and 79.08E. During the negotiations for the 1954 Agreement, the coordinates of the former were in fact conveyed to the Chinese Government and therefore there is no room for any misunderstanding. Chuva and Chuje are shown in sketch maps published by the Chinese for propaganda purposes in recent months. They are shown as lying north of the Spiti-Pare-chu junction. On our maps (1/4") no villages are shown in the area in which Chuva and Chuje have been shown on Chinese maps, but these places appear to lie in the Spiti area on the Punjab-Tibet border.

161. In the Lok Sabha: Inviting Chou En-lai for Talks²⁰

Alleged Reversal of Policy Towards China

¹⁹ Congress, MP from UP.

²⁰ Reply to questions, 16 February 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. xxxviii, cols.1166-71.

Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Asoka Mehta,²¹ Shri M.R. Masani,²² Shri Vajpayee and others on the following subject: -

"The situation arising out of the sudden and unwarranted reversal of Government's declared China policy approved and endorsed by Parliament as evidenced in the Prime Minister's latest communication to the Chinese Premier, accepting the Chinese proposal for an unconditional meeting between the two Prime Ministers."

Do we discuss in an adjournment motion matters of policy? Also, do not we have opportunities now on the Address of the President, the debate on the Budget and so on?

Asoka Mehta: Sir, in the letter of the Prime Minister²³ that was placed on the Table yesterday it is said:

"Although any negotiations on the basis you have suggested are not possible, still I think it might be helpful for us to meet."

A distinction is here made between "negotiation" and "meeting." On this point, the House has discussed the matter over and over again, and the policy that the Prime Minister himself had put forward and that was endorsed by the House has been different. In his letter of 16th November,²⁴ the Prime Minister has said:

"It is our common desire that such a meeting should bear fruit and it is necessary, therefore, that some preliminary steps are taken and the foundations for discussion laid."

Likewise, in the same letter he has said that there must be an interim understanding. Earlier still, in the earlier letter, the position was clearer still, where it was said:

²¹ PSP, MP from Muzaffarpur, Bihar.

²² Independent, MP from Ranchi- East, Bihar.

²³ See item 156.

²⁴ See *White Paper No. III*, pp. 47-51. Also available in *SWJN/SS/54/pp. 492-498*.

"No discussions can be fruitful unless the posts on the Indian side of the traditional frontier now held by the Chinese forces are first vacated by them and further threats and intimidations immediately cease."

In the last Session, on the last day, you will recollect, we had a discussion, and on the 21st December the Prime Minister made it clear, while he gave us a gist of his reply sent to the Prime Minister of China, when he said:

"I would prefer to wait for his promised reply to my letter of 26th September²⁵ and our note of 4th November²⁶ before we discuss what should be the next step."

Throughout, therefore, Sir, the meeting if it was to take place was on the basis of certain conditions being satisfied, and the Chinese have been demanding all the time that the meeting should be unconditional.

The House, Sir,—on various occasions it had discussed this matter— has approved the stand that was taken by the Government in the past that any discussion, any meeting has to be on the basis of certain conditions, and now we find, Sir, that suddenly the Prime Minister has decided to have a meeting without any of these pre-conditions being fulfilled.

Far from any satisfactory reply having been received from the Prime Minister of China to the letter that has been sent by the Prime Minister and the note that we had sent in November, the reply received throws the whole frontier of India into the melting pot. As the note that has been given makes our position very clear, it is difficult to understand why the policy which we have consistently followed, that a meeting must be held only when there are possibilities of a fruitful discussion, should be changed. Fruitful discussions take place only when certain pre-conditions are fulfilled. A meeting without any kind of pre-conditions is fraught with grave danger.

²⁵ If I See *White Paper No. II*, pp. 34-46. Also available in SWJN/SS/52/pp. 216-231.

²⁶ See *White Paper No. II*, pp. 19-24. Also available in SWJN/SS/54/pp. 654-662.

This sudden change in policy, this acceptance of the demand made by China that the two Prime Ministers should meet, —I am sure they are going to meet where they are going to discuss something very serious, and discussion on anything serious without the necessary pre-conditions being met is something completely contrary to the policy that has been accepted by the Parliament—this sudden reversal of policy, demands a very serious consideration.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Speaker: Order, order. I have heard enough from the hon. Member. At this stage I am not going to allow any argument. I only want to know whether there is really a change of policy; if so, whether this House ought to have been consulted before such a change of policy has been undertaken. These are the two points. If I am satisfied prima facie I will allow a discussion. If I am not satisfied, of course, other opportunities may be availed of and not by way of an adjournment motion. These two points are simple. I am going to hear the hon. Prime Minister, whether there is really a change of policy.

Vajpayee: Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the President's Address. The President was pleased to state:
"My Government, therefore, pursues a policy both of a peaceful approach, by negotiation under appropriate conditions."
The Prime Minister has now invited the Chinese Prime Minister unconditionally. There is no relevance now to discuss the President's Address. A new situation has arisen, and the House should be given an opportunity to discuss it.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, Sir, that hon. Members have a feeling of any kind of reversal of policy. So far as I am concerned and my Government is concerned, there has been no reversal, and the identical

line of approach which we have followed and which has been expressed in the President's Address is expressed in the note to the Chinese Government.

The hon. Member, Shri Asoka Mehta, quoted from something I had said, that a meeting will not be in these conditions fruitful. I have not here in front of me whatever I have said, either in this House or in the other House or in a Press Conference or anywhere. I have always taken up the position that it is our policy to meet anybody and everybody in order to find a way. That is the general proposition in which I have been trained for the last 40 years, and I do not think, certainly, it will be right for me, and I do not think it will be right for this House to accept any kind of policy which refuses to meet and discuss. That is the broad approach to every problem in which most of us have been trained in the past and we followed it with those whom we struggled against and we fought against. Apart from that, Sir, the question is what our position in a particular matter is. Now, in this particular matter, when the Chinese Prime Minister invited me to meet him within, I think, seven or eight days at Rangoon, I pointed out that in that way the meeting will serve no purpose and, anyhow, I could not go there. I agreed, and I have been repeating it several times in this House, that I am always prepared to meet when it is proved, as the hon. Member has pointed out, that it will lead to some fruitful results. Now, when we consider all these developments, recent developments—we had received a reply which was published yesterday— it took us a long time, naturally, to find out the various facts, historical and others, and there was some delay—I was very anxious that that reply of mine, of the Government, to the Chinese Government should be in the possession of the House as soon as it met. But, unfortunately, there was some delay. The reply itself was prepared about the end of last month. We decided that it would be better for the Ambassador himself to take it rather than for us to telegraph it; and therefore, there was some delay. I could not place it right at the beginning of the session or even earlier. There was about a week's delay.

Another fact, if you permit me to mention, is this, a curious misunderstanding. The letter that I have addressed to the Chinese Premier is, I think, dated 5th February while the note is dated, I think, 12th February. Obviously, hon. Members will realise that the letter was dated the day I signed it. The note which had been prepared before the letter,—obviously it is part of the letter—had to be dated when it was being delivered in Peking. So, it was dated a few days later, but the note came earlier. I had to wait—I could not help it—till it was delivered before I could place it before the House. As soon as I got the news that it was delivered, immediately I placed it on the Table of the House. This was done yesterday.

Now, the only question for this House to consider is whether there has been any reversal of the policy. I submit that there has been no reversal so far as my mind is concerned and so far as we are concerned. We have been considering this matter and we came to the conclusion: we sent this letter and that letter, which it should be remembered, is a part or a necessary complement of the long note we have sent, here we have firmly and clearly stated what our policy in these matters is. We find that having regard to all the circumstances we should not rule out the possibility of meeting—not, if I may submit, of negotiating on that basis and I have said in that note which is part of the documents—and we cannot rule out this meeting from both the points of view, of our past policy and present policy and other large considerations.

So, I submit there is no such reversal. Anyhow, these matters, I admit are important and vital and this House should have every chance of discussing them. They are, in fact, possibly being discussed even in connection with the President's Address. Possibly they might be discussed later also. I would be glad to have the assistance of this House in all these matters. They are too vital to be passed through in this way. It does not, I submit, give rise to an adjournment motion.

162. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Refugees ²⁷

Question:²⁸ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether Government have formulated any scheme for rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees, at present lodged in Missamari Camp; and
- (b) if so, the details of the Plan?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri J. N. Hazarika): (a) and (b). A statement giving the information required is given below:

Statement

The scheme is intended to settle 1,000 families of Tibetan refugees on 2,000 acres of land at Bhaluckpung in North-East Frontier Agency and near the foothills of Assam. The total number of settlers is likely to be 1500. The thick jungles covering the site will be cleared by refugees themselves with the help of bulldozers and tractors. Timber and other material obtained from jungle clearance will be utilised, as far as possible, in the construction of houses for the refugees. Arrangements will be made to provide rations to the settlers for a period of one year at the end of which the first cycle of the crops will be completed and it is hoped that the refugees will become self-sufficient in the matter of food supplies. It is proposed to provide a limited number of livestock for which necessary veterinary aid will also be available. Care has been taken to provide for the medical needs and the education of the refugees. During off-season, when the settlers will be free from agricultural operations, they would receive training in handicrafts and small scale cottage industries.

²⁷ Written answers to questions, 17 February 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. xxxviii, cols. 1346-47.

²⁸ By Mafida Ahmed, Congress; Aurobindo Ghosal, FB(M); and P. K. Deo, Ganatantra Parishad.

The total cost of the scheme is estimated to be Rs. 12 lakhs. It is hoped that some of the relief organisations will make donations of (a) food and (b) agricultural implements.

In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Road Construction in Ladakh²⁹

Construction of Six Roads by Chinese in Ladakh

Question:³⁰ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a news report, datelined Bombay, contained in the *Manchester Guardian* of the 26th December, 1959 stating that subsequent to the construction of the Sinkiang Road in Ladakh, six more roads have been built by the Chinese on Indian soil; and
- (b) if so, the facts in regard thereto?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) Yes, (b) As the roads reportedly built by Chinese are in the Indian territory now illegally occupied by the Chinese it is not practicable to verify the extent of other roads constructed by them.

Vajpayee: May I know whether Government have given thought to the necessity of making some sort of arrangement in order to keep themselves informed about what may be going on in those parts of Indian territory which are under Chinese occupation?

Speaker: Through any other agency?

²⁹ Reply to questions, 17 February 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. xxxvii, pp. 1303-07.

³⁰ By A. B. Vajpayee, Jan Sangh; A. M. Tariq, Congress.

Vajpayee: Yes.

Lakshmi Menon: The hon. Member is suggesting that we may have some kind of espionage system by which we can know about these things.

Speaker: No, no. What he means is that, as in the case of Goa where we are having a representative of some other Government to look into those things, It is possible to have any other Government look into this matter. It need not necessarily be under an espionage system.

Lakshmi Menon: That is suggestion for action.

Speaker: He is asking why it has not been done.

Lakshmi Menon: It can be done only if we do not have diplomatic relations With China. When we have diplomatic relations with another country we do not ask a third agency to deal for us.

Vajpayee: May I know if our Ambassador in Peking³¹ has been directed to ascertain from the Chinese Government regarding the authenticity of the report appearing in the paper?

Lakshmi Menon: That is a suggestion for action.

Vajpayee: I am asking on a point of fact, whether our Ambassador has been so directed.

Lakshmi Menon: We have not only had reports in the newspapers, but the hon. Member would remember that even in Karam Singh's³² report there

³¹ G Parthasarathi.

³² See White Paper No. III, pp. 8-22. Also available in SWJN/SS/55/pp. 442-457.

was a reference to new roads being constructed there. What I was saying was that it is not possible to verify these reports.

Speaker: All that the hon. Member wants to know is whether through our own agency—if no new agency could be appointed there until we sever diplomatic relations—something has been done in this matter. It is not a suggestion for action. It is what is normally expected of Government.

Lakshmi Menon: Normally, whenever we have reports, they are referred to our Embassy. But so far we have not received any confirmation from Peking.

Surendranath Dwivedy:³³ The question whether this particular matter was referred to our Ambassador is not replied.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Ambassador in Peking has no sources of knowledge better than ours.

Speaker: Hon. Members evidently are under the impression that he could go there to verify.

Jawaharlal Nehru: He cannot go there. Normally, people are not allowed to go to various places even in China without permission. I do not think anybody is allowed to go to this area. Apart from that, there are no transport facilities available to anybody, unless the Chinese Government provides them.

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that we have diplomatic relations with China, has our Embassy in Peking been instructed from here to acquire

³³ PSP, MP from Kendrapara, Orissa.

information from the Chinese Government as to whether extra roads are built in this area or not?

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is the very question. They have not been instructed by us, because we do not think in the circumstances that that kind of thing will bear any fruit. Our present relations with China, as is well known to the House, are strained, and to enquire from them on such a question is not likely to lead to any results.

A. M. Tariq: The hon. Prime Minister has been kind enough to tell us that there are some difficulties due to which we cannot go there, nor has our Ambassador been able to find out anything from the Chinese Government. Are the Government of India aware of the fact that some foreign papers and some foreign journalists are building up some sort of stories and publicising them in the world creating scare and hatred among the people here? If so, what steps are Government taking to contradict such reports?

Jawaharlal Nehru: How can we contradict stories, even though we might think they are not based on much truth? We cannot contradict them without precise knowledge.

Ram Subhag Singh³⁴ What is the distance or gap between our administered area and the Chinese administered area in Ladakh? If our administration extended upto the point where the Chinese are, we could easily have known where those roads are located.

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no distance, broadly speaking. That is to say, the whole area, whether on the Chinese side or on our side, is not in the normal sense of the word administered. It is administered in a vague

³⁴Congress, MP from Sasaram, Bihar.

sense of the word, by check posts and other places under our control. Presumably, at some places not in every place—our check posts are a little distance away from theirs. So there is no gap, I do not think all along the line because it is a long line; but broadly speaking, there is no big area in between.

U.C. Patnaik:³⁵ May I know whether Government have tried to verify the statements made in this House also during previous discussions that there are a number of roads constructed from the Sinkiang- Tibet road inside our territory?

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is the very question. I may say that according to our information, some roads have been constructed by the Chinese authorities in that area of Indian territory in Ladakh which is occupied by them.

Braj Raj Singh:³⁶ The Prime Minister was pleased to say that our territory is vaguely administered there, in the sense that we have got some check posts and all that there. May I know whether the territory occupied by China is also vaguely administered?

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is what I submitted. On both sides, there is no regular administration which is normally there in a country. There are spots occupied by check posts, etc., and for the rest, there are wandering shepherds on both sides.

Braj Raj Singh: In the territory occupied by China also?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes.

³⁵ Independent, MP from Ganjam, Orissa.

³⁶ Socialist Party, MP from Firozabad, UP.

Vajpayee: In view of the fact that Government have decided not to send their patrols to the border, may I know how they had been able to reassure themselves that the Chinese are not making any further inroads into our territory?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Because we have our check posts. When they cross the check- posts, naturally it is known as the area is under the control of the check posts.

164. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Kidnapping of An American³⁷

Detention of an American in Chinese Consulate in Bombay

Ram Krishan Gupta, A. B. Vajpayee, B. C. Mullick, P. K. Deo, Rameshwar Tantia, Ila Palchoudhuri, Shree Narayan Das, Radha Raman, Raghunath Singh, A. M. Tariq, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, P. G. Deb, S. A. Mehdi, D. C. Sharma and Hem Barua:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to his statement made in Lok Sabha on the 30th November, 1959³⁸ and reply given to Unstarred Question No. 1069 on the 18th December, 1959 and state:

(a) whether Government have completed investigation into the allegations of American Consulate, Bombay and counter-allegations by Chinese Consulate, Bombay regarding the kidnapping of their national; and

(b) if so, the result thereof?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon): (a) and (b). We received from the Bombay Government, some days ago, the report of the

³⁷ Reply to questions from Congress and other MPs, 17 February 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 1318-1320.

³⁸ See SWJN/SS/54/pp. 550-555.

Bombay police on their enquiries into the allegations made by the US and Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay. The police found, on the basis of the evidence recorded by them, that, prima facie, case had been made out of assault on and forcible detention of an employee of the US Consulate-General. Little evidence was, however, forthcoming in respect of the earlier course of events; and the circumstances in which the two employees of the US and Chinese Consulates-General appeared in a taxi at the place where the assault took place have not been sufficiently explained. In the circumstances the Government felt that no useful purpose would be served by instituting formal proceedings in court. Instead, it would be sufficient if the Chinese official concerned went out of India. The Chinese Embassy was advised accordingly. The official has since left India and no further action is, therefore, proposed.

Joachim Alva:³⁹ In view of this peculiar incident where both sides have their own story to tell and in view of the legal ineffectiveness in a case of this type where law courts could not settle the problem, may I know whether the External Affairs Ministry is contemplating drawing up a set of instructions for guidance of foreign missions in India for the future?

Jawaharlal Nehru: As the hon. Member himself has said, this was a very peculiar and extraordinary incident which one normally reads about in fiction but does not come across in reality. It is very difficult for the External Affairs Ministry to make rules to deal with these matters which are on the verge of fiction.

Radha Raman: May I know whether the report which appeared in the Press that the people concerned in one of the Embassies had put obstruction in the way of the police finding out the truth about the whole case, is correct?

³⁹ Congress, MP from Kanara, Mysore State.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is correct to this extent that at the earlier stages of enquiry not much co-operation was received from the Chinese Consulate-General and the person concerned also did not appear. Later, he did appear and gave his statement.

Vajpayee: Is it a fact that when the Bombay Police reached the Chinese Consulate, they found the American gentleman with his hands and feet tied down and if so, was it not sufficient ground to proceed against?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think it is correct—but I speak without absolute certainty—that the police found a person with his hands and feet tied down. It is true that, as has been stated in answer to the question, the police found prima facie evidence of assault and detention in the Chinese Consulate of an American national. That is true. But I cannot say the conditions in which they found him.

Sonavane:⁴⁰ May I know whether both the Embassies have agreed to drop this investigation and whether they have also agreed to the conclusion of the Government of India that the investigation should be closed?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is open—it was open—for any party to institute a case in the formal legal manner. Neither of them have instituted such a case. That was left to the Government of India or, more particularly, the Bombay Government to take steps and the result of that enquiry—I repeat—was that while a prima facie case was established of assault and detention of an American national by the Chinese Consulate-General, many parts of the story were obscure and they did not think there is, in the circumstances, adequate evidence to proceed much further in the matter.

⁴⁰ T. H. Sonavane, Congress, MP from Sholapur, Bombay State.

Hem Barua: Independent of the police enquiry made into this incident, may I know whether the Government have tried to make an assessment of the highly contradictory statements made by the two Consul Generals; if so, what is the conclusion that the Government have arrived at?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Government, Sir, naturally, had to rely on the Bombay Government which is dealing with this matter, and I have stated the conclusion of the Bombay Government.

165. In the Lok Sabha: Indian Territory, Administered and Other⁴¹

Sino-Indian Border Dispute

Hem Barua: Nath Pai:⁴² and Ram Subhag Singh:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Defence Minister addressing a meeting of students and teachers at the University campus at Chandigarh on 5th February, 1960 said to the effect that "we are not prepared to hand over any part of our administered territory along the Sino-Indian borders."

(b) if so, what is the significance of the word "administered," and

(c) whether Government have made any policy decision of this nature?

Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) to (c). The Defence Minister spoke extempore for more than an hour and a full report of his speech is not available. But it is clear that the words referred to were used in a particular context. He laid

⁴¹ Reply to short notice questions, 17 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. xxxviii, cols. 1340-1346.

⁴² PSP, MP from Rajapur, Bombay.

stress on the inviolability of India's territory and said that India was not prepared to negotiate on the basis of surrender of any part of it. He referred to Ladakh and stated that it formed an integral part of India. Later in his speech, he referred to the N.E.F.A. area which, he pointed out, had been for long administered by us. In this connection, he said that this territory could not be argued about on the basis of the Chinese claim which was that the Chinese had been in possession of it and had actually administered part of it. In referring to the "administered territory" of NEFA, he was countering Chinese arguments in regard to it. So far as India's policy on the frontier areas is concerned, this had been made clear and fully stressed by the Defence Minister without any distinction between the different areas.

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that there is no contradiction to this statement so far made, and in view of the fact that the Chinese justification for the occupation of the part of Ladakh, in spite of the Treaty of 1842, is based on the ground that that portion of Ladakh has been administered by China for four years or so and Indian administration has not reached that region, why is it that a statement of this sort that gives a handle to Chinese claim on our territory should be made by the Defence Minister which I am afraid, adds further to our difficulties?

Jawaharlal Nehru: A statement of this sort was not made by the Defence Minister. If a phrase is taken out of the context of the speech, that sometimes causes misapprehensions in peoples' minds. I have just now stated that he was actually countering the Chinese statement.

Surendranath Dwivedy: As it was such an important matter, why did the Defence Minister not contradict the press report when it was published all over the country?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know. First of all, the whole thing occurred, I think, during the last two weeks. As soon as it occurred, the matter has

been noticed and questions were tabled and the obvious way was to reply to the question here and in the other House.

Hem Barua: A reference is made to NEFA as an administered area and the Prime Minister knows it that there are certain areas in NEFA where our administration has not as yet reached, within the MacMahon line of course. In view of this, when a reference is made to the administered territory of NEFA, when we are not going to surrender our territories, there is that apprehension that those regions which our administration is yet to reach, those regions are to be handed over to China. That is the impression that is created in the country,

Jawaharlal Nehru: I really do not understand where the apprehension is, except possibly in the minds of some hon. Members here. I see no apprehension, and the Government's policy is clear. And I have seldom read a report of a stronger speech by the Defence Minister than the one the Defence Minister made on that occasion; such reports I have seen. The hon. Member refers to some parts of NEFA, which are not administered as such. Well, what exactly he means by "administered" is not clear to me. Obviously, some high mountain peaks are not administered in that sense. It is obvious. But we talk of an area, not of selected high mountain peaks, or inaccessible areas and there is no doubt that NEFA as a whole, I say, is administered completely, and has been so for the last so many years.

Mr. Speaker: A doubt is created by the use of the word "administered." Whether our territory will be all right? "Administered" means that portion which is now administered.

Jawaharlal Nehru: May I point out that he was countering the argument of the Chinese that they were administering, which is completely false? It is the claim by the Chinese that is being dealt with in a particular area.

Mr. Speaker: Very well.

Tyagi: The Prime Minister and his other colleagues seem to be thinking as if administration is something substantial which must reach a place, or not reach a place. As we understand, a territory which is within India is administered by us because of the very fact that it is within India. Administration does not mean that some sword has to be poked into that area at every point.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is exactly what I am trying to point out. Administration does not mean that every little spot is occupied by an official. That is a ridiculous meaning. There are mountainous areas, large areas, where there is no official but, nevertheless, it is within the administered area. The whole of Ladakh is within India and has not been administered in the sense of an official sitting everywhere, but it is, nevertheless, within the larger area.....

Mahavir Tyagi: It is immaterial (Interruptions).

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not quite finished yet. This particular point arose, more particularly in regard to NEFA, because the Chinese have made quite extraordinary claims which have not a vestige of justification in regard to NEFA. They have said that they are actually administering part of it—they have said that—which is an amazing assertion to make, and that is being countered by the actual fact—that is in our reply to the Chinese Government too—that they are definite parts of our administered territory—Sadiya frontier tract, this, that and the other. Therefore, this reference to NEFA is not a legal argument.

Ram Subhag Singh: The hon. Prime Minister has taken some pains in distinguishing the NEFA area and Ladakh area, and this morning the Prime Minister said that in Ladakh the entire area is not really

administered area. Having regard to this fact, may I know whether in future important pronouncements like this will be made after enough consideration and sufficient care will be exercised by the Government spokesmen?

Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as this particular matter is concerned, I do not know what the hon. Member is referring to. It is a very clear enunciation of the Government's policy. There is nothing in that that any member of this House who knows facts, even if he may differ on something can take exception to. The difficulty arises sometimes in bits of things being extracted from a speech published in a newspaper which does not give the full text.

Surendranath Dwivedy: What about the impression it creates?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Are we to censor all the newspapers, as the hon. Member suggests? I am not going to have censorship.

Ram Subhag Singh: This is a fact. It is not a newspaper report. The Governor of Punjab was presiding over that meeting. The fact may be verified from him if the newspaper reports are incorrect.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have stated something on my authority. No verification is necessary when I am sure..... (Interruption)

Ram Subhag Singh: It is the students who were attending that meeting.

Speaker: We have all misunderstood it.

Khadiikar: Administration, in particular in the context of this speech, leads to some doubt because a lot of territory, particularly in Ladakh area, though not physically administered by us, was politically under our

jurisdiction as we have said. So, reference to administration leads certainly to doubt and lends support to the Chinese argument when they are advancing it again and again, namely, that we were not holding actual possession because we had no administration. Therefore this certain doubt arises and it should be promptly removed.

P. R. Patel rose—⁴³

Mr. Speaker: All matters are now set at rest.

U. C. Patnaik: May I ask one question?

Speaker: Enough questions have been answered. The hon. Prime Minister has said that this word 'administration' has been used with respect to NEFA where they claim that they were in possession. It was not intended for Ladakh. But if newspaper picks out the word 'administration' and uses it for Ladakh, it has been sufficiently explained now..... (Interruption)

Goray: When the hon. Defence Minister is here why should he not clarify? Let him say what he said.

Hem Barua: I do not want the hon. Prime Minister to change his pack-horses in the midstream but I would ask him to ask his Ministers to be a little careful while making statements of this sort which might damage the interests of the country.

Jawaharlal Nehru: In agreeing with what the hon. Member says that Ministers should be careful may I, with all respect, say that other hon. Members should also be careful? (Interruption).

Hem Barua: They have enunciated Government policy in a wrong way.

⁴³ MJP, MP from Mehsana, Bombay State.

U. C. Patnaik: Because of the statements that are being made from time to time namely that not a blade of grass would grow in these areas, we are very much concerned over the statement of the hon. Defence Minister. People feel that there is a move to surrender these areas to the Chinese. (An Hon. Member: No). It may not be true, but still there is that suspicion growing. May we request the Government to prevent that apprehension seeing that Ministers do not make such statements in future without due considerations.

Mr. Speaker: He did not admit that the present statement had been made without due consideration.

166. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Propaganda in Border Areas⁴⁴

Hem Barua, D.C. Sharma, Amjad Ali, Narayan Das, Radha Raman and Khushwaqt Rai:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 123 on the 19th November, 1959 and state:

- (a) whether enquiries have been completed in the matter of insidious propaganda being carried on by some Chinese traders and laundrymen who have opened shops recently in many places in border areas?
- (b) what action has been taken as a result of these enquiries; and
- (c) whether such propaganda has been stopped as a result of action taken?

⁴⁴ Reply to questions from Congress and other MPs, 17 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates (Second Series), Vol. XXXVIII, cols. 1329-1333.

Sadath Ali Khan: (a) to (c). Government have not come across any specific case of such propaganda, but are vigilant against any such attempt being made.

Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that cyclostyled copies of letters purported to have been written by an association formed by a body, the "Anti-Indian Expansionist Association of the People's Republic of China", are circulated in this country in which an undisguised attack is made on Mr. Nehru and his China policy and which goes on to accuse Mr. Nehru of "expansionist ambitions and practically instigating the revolt of the Tibetan rebels" and, if so, whether the Government have tried to comb out the sources of this nefarious propaganda, and if so, what success have the Government achieved so far in this matter?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall reply to this from memory. An odd sheet like this did come to our notice. It was an anonymous, cyclostyled sheet, and we tried to enquire. We could not trace it anywhere. It has not been distributed widely. Very few people know about it. In fact I think it came to us by post, as far as I remember. It is a very objectionable sheet. But it is very difficult to attach that to any propaganda. What I mean is, sometimes, people who want to get other people into trouble put across these things. One cannot catch hold of them. Certainly, it is not that it has no effect, but what I mean is, it is not widely distributed. Maybe a few persons got it by post anonymously. It is difficult to deal with such matters.

Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that the West Bengal police discovered some Chinese magazines at Kalimpong, which question the integrity of Indian territory and, if so, what are those magazines and the details thereof? It was only on the 8th January.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Maybe, presumably the West Bengal police took possession of them.

Hem Barua: They took possession, but I just want to know the character of these magazines. Whether the Government here are aware of the character of these magazines, the number of copies seized, and whether this has been a regular feature in Kalimpong where they are circulated. This sort of magazines question the territorial integrity of this country.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Some such papers were circulated originally, I think. In the recent past, there has been no such circulation. It is fairly strict. If any such case comes to the hon. Member's notice, we shall gladly take steps.

[Translation begins:

Seth Govind Das: Is this type of Chinese propaganda being carried on in places other than the border areas also, and is this kind of literature being distributed in other areas also?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is difficult to say what type of literature is being distributed. But foreign embassies in India do relay news back to their respective countries about events here and they have the right to do so. When they go beyond this and attack our country, it is wrong; we have stopped them, we have stopped them several times, and we have stopped several embassies, and it has had its impact. Generally, it does not happen, but if by any chance it does happen, their attention is drawn to it.

Translation ends.]

Manjula Devi: May I know whether any case of anti-national propoganda in NEFA in particular has been brought to the notice of Government?

Mr. Speaker: Anti-Indian propoganda in NEFA.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not heard of any propaganda in NEFA, of this type, and I do not think it is very easy for anyone to do it there either.

Manjula Devi: May I know whether any restrictions are placed with regard to the unauthorised existence of the Chinese in Assam and their unrestricted movement all over Assam?

Jawaharlal Nehru: If the thing is unauthorised, that means restriction and action is taken there. But so far as NEFA is concerned, the hon. Member might be assured, it is protected by all kinds of rules and regulations which apply not to the Chinese only but to all foreigners; and no one can go there without a permit and those permits are not easily given. In some parts of NEFA they are not given at all even with difficulty.

So far as other parts of NEFA are concerned, there is a certain freedom of movement in some areas. There too, in the inner line, the freedom of movement does not apply. In Kalimpong and some other areas, every foreigner has to register. Every newcomer gets a registration certificate for a week, and after that, except for special reasons, he cannot stay there.

Hem Barua rose—

Speaker: I have allowed a number of questions.

Hem Barua: My question follows from the previous answer. In view of the fact that these magazines were discovered in Kalimpong and in view of the fact that the Prime Minister has said that every foreigner in Kalimpong has to register, may I know whether these magazines were discovered with any registered foreigner or where?

Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as I remember, they were found in some bookshop. I am not quite sure about that.

Hem Barua: Found by whom?

Mr. Speaker: Have foreigners got bookshops there?

Hem Barua: Yes, Sir. I want to know whether the owner of the bookshop is a registered foreigner or not.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot say straightaway whether he was a registered foreigner.

167. To the Dalai Lama: Tibetan Refugee⁴⁵

February 22, 1960

Your Holiness,

I have seen your letter of January 30⁴⁶ regarding Tibetan refugees and I am glad to say that our own broad approach in dealing with the question of their settlement in India is very much the same as has been suggested by you. You may rest assured that the recommendations which you have made will receive our careful and sympathetic consideration.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru

168. In the Lok Sabha: Defence of China Policy⁴⁷

⁴⁵Letter. File No. 29(78)BST/59, p. 52, MEA.

⁴⁶ See Appendix 12.

⁴⁷ Reply to the five-day debate on the President's Address, 22 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XXXIX, cols. 2102-2142

Motion on Address by the President—contd.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker,⁴⁸ Sir, this subject has been under debate in this House for a full week and a large number of Members have spoken on it, some in favour of the motion and some in opposition to it. There are, I believe, about 240 amendments tabled; and, in the course of discussion, a large number of subjects have been touched upon. But, by and large, it may be said that this discussion has been almost a discussion on foreign affairs; and in regard to foreign affairs too, rather limited to our border issues with China and even that has been further limited to the invitation I have issued to Premier Chou En-lai in this connection. Therefore, Sir, I think, perhaps, it would be better for me also to concentrate on a few of the important issues raised—more important points raised—rather than perambulate over the whole field of these 240 amendments.

I do not deny that some of the other matters which have been mentioned in this House in the course of the debate are important from certain points of view; but, I cannot, within any limited space of time deal with these scores of matters. Now, therefore, I shall begin by dealing with this very important issue relating to foreign affairs, relating to our border, relating to the intrusion of Chinese forces on our territory and recent steps which we have taken in regard to this matter.

The way this debate has been conducted, and some of the statements made in this debate, have raised other matters too in relation to this particular subject. That is to say, it has been said by hon. Members—I only repeat—that there has been a charge. Not only a charge of reversal of policy has been advanced; but, rather it has been said that the Government, and particularly I suppose I, as being the Foreign Minister, have been unfair to Parliament, and have not been quite honest, that we are dying down, we have surrendered, we have submitted to some kind of

⁴⁸ M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.

national humiliation. It has even been said, that there is no instance in history like this and our sincerity has been doubted. That, of course, raises the matter onto a different level from the criticism of a certain policy. I hope to deal with that criticism, but I wish to point out, at the commencement, that if the Government is charged, as it has been charged by some hon. Members opposite, with submitting to anything that may be considered "national humiliation" or "surrender," then it is a matter of the highest importance for this house and this country to be clear about it.

(Mr. Deputy-Speaker⁴⁹ in the Chair)

No Government which even remotely is responsible for anything that may be considered "national humiliation" is deserving of continuing as a Government. No Foreign Minister or Prime Minister who is even indirectly connected with anything which means dishonour of India in any respect has any business to continue in his office. Therefore, it is a matter of very serious import what the view of this House and of the country is on this subject.

Now, may I add something which was not said in this House in this connection and which is reported in this morning's papers by the Press? I do not wish, normally, to quote from the Press without verification, but as I have to speak on this subject now, and it is relevant, I am taking the liberty to refer to this matter. It is a report of a speech by one of the respected Members, of this House, of the Opposition side, Acharya Kripalani,⁵⁰ who, it is said, has said that India had been "betrayed by leaders of the present Government." Further it is stated he has said: "How can we do anything when our honour is in the hands of dishonourable people?"

⁴⁹ Sardar Hukum Singh.

⁵⁰ J. B. Kripalani, PSP, MP from Sitamarhi, Bihar.

Now, Sir, that is a clear charge, and if there is, as I said, even any remote justification for that charge, then, it is not for me to stand up here and take the time of the House but to retire to my shell and leave it to others who are more honourable to conduct the affairs of this country. I know, that our respected friend, Acharya Kripalani, sometimes allows his words to run away with him; sometimes he says things which he might perhaps regret later, and I do not know if this was one of his outbursts at the spur of the moment or a definite charge after thought. But even a thing like this said at the spur of the moment from a person in his position has implications of far-reaching character, and no Government, nor can this House treat this matter as a light utterance said at the spur of the moment. Sir, it is no matter of joy to me to refer to this, coming from an old colleague, but the House, I hope, will appreciate that to be charged with dishonourable motives and to be charged to be parties to "national humiliation" is something that is very painful. Individuals apart, there are people in this House, many of them, who have spent a good part of their lives in trying to uphold the honour and freedom of India, and if in the afternoon of their lives they are told that they have betrayed the honour of India and submitted to humiliation their country, which they sought to serve with such ability and strength as they had, then the matter goes beyond parliamentary debate into some other field.

It will hardly be suitable or fitting for me to stand up before this House and claim its indulgence for a defence of my motives or honour. After, broadly, 50 years of being connected in some form or other with India's service, if that kind of charge can be made, well; it is open to anyone to make it and it is open to anyone to believe it. I do not propose to say anything about it.

Now, Sir, it is said that I have been unfair to Parliament, that I did not say anything about this to the Rajya Sabha, I did not say anything about this invitation and this was not mentioned in the President's Address. First of all, may I say, as the House knows, that the President's Address is a statement of policy of the Government? It should be remembered, it is

the Government that is responsible for it, and it is not right or proper for our respected President's name to be brought in debates like this. If the President's Address has anything wrong in it or objectionable in it, it is the Government to blame not the President, and it is open to hon. Members to criticise or condemn Government because there is some such statement in it which they disapprove of.

Surendranath Dwivedy: Nobody has criticised the President.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am venturing to say that it should be realised because— nobody has criticised the President, but the President's name is brought into the picture and, incidentally or accidentally, it becomes a subject of controversy—it is not right.

Secondly, Sir, I propose to give some dates, because it seemed to me that some people had in their mind that we have been juggling about with dates or with one occurrence following the other and trying to suppress the facts, sometimes in the Rajya Sabha debate or in the President's Address. Now, apart from what I am going to say, I hope the House realises that it would be extraordinarily folly for me to say something and to say something else a week later or five days later.

It is ridiculous. I could not consciously be guilty of it; of course I might make a mistake or something. I could not, according to all the canons of propriety and diplomatic procedure, say something in this House or the other or refer to it in the President's Address, when that matter has not borne fruit by delivery of a letter to the person to whom it was addressed. I could not do it. It is highly improper. I tried my very best to get these procedures through of sending a reply so that I should be in time to place those papers on the first day this House met, the Parliament met.

Unfortunately, there were delays right through. A good part of the month of January we worked on the subject, and the result of our labours is embodied in the note that was presented to the Chinese Government

earlier this month.⁵¹ Many people were involved in these labours. The month of January is a very heavy month for us. In the middle of the month, there was the Congress Session and other things happened and then came the Republic Day celebrations and in the course of these Celebrations, eminent guests came here. There was Marshal Voroshilov; there was the Prime Minister of Nepal; there was, later of course, Mr. Khrushchev and then the Prime Minister of Finland. It was a very heavy month for us and I was very anxious to expedite this matter. It required a great deal of investigation—not to justify our claim to ourselves—but to state the facts in an organised way so as to bring conviction to any person who read them, and, we hope, even to the mind of the Chinese Government. The result of that was the note. That was considered. As Foreign Minister I had naturally to consider it on several occasions. Later, it was put up before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet which considered it at length on several occasions. Having considered and finalised that note, the question arose about the answer I should give because the Chinese note contained a repetition of the invitation to Premier Chou En-lai for us to meet. We gave thought to it and we came to the conclusion not to refer to it as such in that note because it was thought, after considering the whole case from our point of view, that a separate letter should be sent. Now all this was finalised—the note was finalised—round about 31st January and about the same time it was decided to have this letter sent. It was considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet. I do not exactly know the date but it is immaterial. Within those two or three days all the papers were ready together. Naturally, they were parts of the same process of consideration and decisions and I sighed that letter on the 5th February. I was not going to sign the other paper because it was going to be signed by our Ambassador,⁵² prior to delivery to the Chinese Government. We could of

⁵¹ See Appendix 25.

⁵² G Parthasarathi.

course have sent that note and letter by telegram but then we thought it better that the Ambassador should deliver it himself and therefore, the Ambassador had to take it from here. It was given to the Ambassador and he ultimately took it and the matter was finished so far as I was concerned on the 5th of February. The Ambassador took it—I am not quite sure; I think he went for a brief visit to Madras for a day or so and he came back and took it—on the 8th and he left Delhi on the 9th and delivered this letter on the 12th in Peking—the note and the letter. Therefore, the note is dated the date of delivery although in actual fact this was a single transaction. In fact, the note preceded in a sense the letter. If you read that letter itself, you will see that it refers to the note which was going to accompany it. Now the letter is dated the 5th and the note the 12th because it was signed there but it emerged from here at the same time.

Some people imagine that this was some kind of a very deep diplomacy, good or bad, so as to arrange the dates in such manner, before Mr. Khrushchev's visit or overlapping it or something like that. I confess that I am not so clever in these matters. I was anxious that this should be, as I said, finished before Parliament met and I might place all these papers before this House and the other. But the decision that it should not be sent by telegram but rather the Ambassador should himself take it inevitably involved a few days' delay to reach there. This House met on the 8th February. That very morning our Ambassador took it from us and we gave him a few days to reach and he delivered it. The moment we knew he had delivered it—the Prime Minister of China was not available and it was as a matter of fact delivered to the Foreign Minister because we did not wish to lose time—we placed it, on Monday next, before this House and the other.

I might mention another thing here. Mr. Khrushchev was coming here a little later; I think he arrived on the 11th of this month and my first talks with him were on the 12th. It had absolutely no relation to this matter of delivery or writing; it had been previously considered and settled. In the

last few weeks we have had the privilege and honour of welcoming very distinguished and very important leaders, world leaders—President Eisenhower, Mr. Khrushchev, Marshal Voroshilov, Prime Minister of our neighbour country, Nepal, and the Prime Minister of Finland. All kinds of speculations appear in the newspapers as to what I discussed with President Eisenhower or later, with Mr. Khrushchev. Now obviously, I cannot, in answer to questions here or elsewhere, give out the content of confidential talks; it will be impossible for any talks to take place with other leaders if those talks were reported in this way, publicly.

Nevertheless, I shall go some distance, to some extent, in telling the House about the approach I made to these talks, not the content of the talks.

For instance, I had many hours' talks with President Eisenhower and naturally we discussed a large number of questions beginning always with the world situation, the prospects of the summit meeting, disarmament, lessening of tension in the world and going on to individual areas of the world and discussing them. Fortunately for us, we have no problem with the United States to discuss; we have no problems with the Soviet Union to discuss—no controversies or problems. So we discussed broad issues.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I was asked the moment President Eisenhower went away. Did you ask him help for the Five Year Plan? These matters are being discussed by our representatives with the representatives of other countries and of the United States. They are more or less public matters. But so far as I am concerned, I thought it highly improper that I should embarrass our distinguished guest by asking him to do this or that for us. That is not my way of approaching these questions. And although some people did not perhaps believe it—it is a fact that we discussed everything including our Five Year Plans—I did not ask him precisely and definitely to come and help us. He knows exactly our needs. At that moment it was not the right

thing for me to do. It is a minor matter because we have understood; he understood me and I understood him. I do not normally go about making demands, especially from distinguished guests who come here.

So also with Mr. Khrushchev. Our talks lasted—I do not know—for three or four hours or may be it was more than that; five hours altogether, and we discussed every subject within our ken. Again, we started all our talks always now-a-days with the summit, what is going to happen there, with disarmament, the prospects of disarmament for the reduction of world tension, plus, both with President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, the tremendous revolutionary upheavals happening in Africa, a most important thing in the world today, and with other world questions with which we are not directly related but we are related because they affect the world.

People thought no doubt that I would talk at length with Mr. Khrushchev about our troubles with China and that I would appeal to him or beg of him or request him to come to our help or bring pressure on China. I am rather surprised that people should think so. At any rate, that is not my idea of diplomacy or of treating a distinguished guest in this way. As a matter of world survey and our own problems, I did refer to our border troubles, with him, and very briefly in half a dozen sentences perhaps. I told him that this is our case; it is all for your information. Because I felt that not to refer to it was itself wrong when we were discussing our problems. But I did not ask him to do this or that for us; I did not ask him to bring pressures to bear. That, I thought was none of my business. It is for them to consider what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. There the matter ended. It was a brief talk on this subject, maybe lasting a few minutes.

The only thing that I can say about these talks is this. Whether it was President Eisenhower or whether it was Mr. Khrushchev, they were good enough to be exceedingly friendly to India, to us, and to our aims and objectives. That is all that I wanted and it would have been embarrassing for me,—and for the other party,—to try to put questions to either of

them and demand an answer. That is not the way, I think, the right way, to behave.

So, this question of our answer to the Chinese Government had no relation to Mr. Khrushchev. It so happened that the answer had been sent three or four days before. Naturally the letter and the note had already gone, and it was delivered just about that time.

I should like to refer to another matter. In the course of the criticisms, some hon. Members referred, and referred repeatedly particularly to one item,—to the failure of our diplomats in China and the failure of our defence, not now, but in the last ten years. I would wish that our diplomatic personnel were not mentioned in this way in our debates. They cannot of course say anything nor indeed can we say very much or lay on the Table of the House as to what were the reports that they sent or not. It is not quite fair. I would however say this: that broadly speaking, persons in our diplomatic service, more especially our senior diplomats, have a very high position in the diplomatic world. They compare very favourably with their brother diplomats from other countries. They are respected everywhere and respected not merely because they convey messages from us—anybody can do it—but because they are men of worth, of understanding, understanding our point of view and understanding the other point of view, and they have done great service to us.

I would say this. So far as China is concerned, because we have always attached great importance to the relations of India and China, we have sent our senior most and best men there. It is a record of our highest class men going there. One of them who was there at the crucial moment of the change of Government there, with the success of the revolution, is now a Member of Parliament.⁵³ The ones who went before him or after, especially after, have been our senior and experienced diplomats,⁵⁴ and

⁵³Sardar K. M. Panikkar

⁵⁴ R. K. Nehru, 1955-58.

we are very grateful to them for the very fine work they have done in exceedingly difficult circumstances.

So far as our defence is concerned, that is a larger issue. But during this period of ten years or so, that have elapsed, the responsibility of defence for anything that has happened is of the smallest. In fact, it is not at all their responsibility. Whatever basic policies we have followed are the responsibilities of the Government, or, to limit them still further, they are the responsibilities of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister; if you like, of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet. But in the final analysis, certainly they are responsibilities of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister. Therefore, while this House is completely justified in criticising the Foreign Minister on the ground of policy, I do not think it is quite fair to drag in others who had no responsibility and no immediate contact with that policy.

Now, one thing has surprised me; that in the course of this long debate, reference has been made so often to this letter of invitation. I do not remember— I may be wrong of course—any hon. Member referring to the long note which accompanied that letter. The note was, as I said, dated the 12th of February, and signed by the Ambassador on that date. The letter contains no policy. It is the note that contains the policy of the Government of India in regard to this affair. It is a long note which took weeks of consideration, hard thinking, revision, etc., and finalising. No reference was made to it. You talked about reversal of policy; you talked about national humiliation and all that. But the paper that contains that policy was not referred to at all in this House. It was a carefully drafted document and that has been set aside, and the mere fact taken that we have invited Premier Chou En-lai. It seems to be very odd. That letter was just a kind of addendum to the note. It is the note that contains the policy, that contains our clear enunciation of where the Government of India stands in this matter. Now, as nobody has referred to it, I presume....

Dr. Sushila Nayar:⁵⁵ No reference was made by the Opposition, but it was referred to by us.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry; I stand corrected.

Sucheta Kripalani:⁵⁶ If I may say so, even Shri Masani had a word of praise for it.

Surendranath Dwivedy: It was referred to generally, but there was no disagreement on the contents of that note.

Braj Raj Singh: Because it was appreciated. (Interruption),

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry. My point is, when you talk about policy, so far as policy is concerned, it is contained in that note and note only. You may object to my invitation, if you like. That is a matter of opinion, but it has nothing to do with policy. They used big words—reversal of policy—and in big terms—what Shri Masani said, what Acharya Kripalani said and to some extent what Shri Asoka Mehta said and others said. Surely one should say whether one agrees with the policy laid down in the note or not. As I said, it may be a wrong step, in the opinion of some Members, that I invited the Chinese Premier, criticise it if you like, but that is not a step of policy. One must distinguish between these two things.

Now, I should like to refer to another matter. They have said that I have gone back on what I have said. I do not wish to weary the House by quoting what I have said previously on this occasion, but because this charge has been made so much I am compelled to do it. Broadly speaking, I have always said—not only about Premier Chou En-lai, but everybody—that I am always prepared to meet anybody, subject to

⁵⁵ Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Jhansi, UP. See also p. 95, fn. 30.

⁵⁶ Congress, MP from New Delhi, Delhi.

convenience, subject to something; but I shall never say "no." Of course, sometimes a meeting may be more desirable and sometimes less desirable, but I never say "no" to a meeting, because that is the training I have had throughout my lifetime.

I have always distinguished between adhering to a policy and refusing to deal with the opponent or the enemy. If I have faith in myself, my people and my policy, I can meet anybody and discuss it. It is only people who lack faith in themselves who dare not talk about something to somebody whom they dislike. Politics is not a matter of likes and dislikes: if you dislike somebody's face, you would not see him. We represent great countries. When one country is faced with conflict or possible conflict with another country, it is no good condemning this country or that country. A people and a country should never be condemned. I lay it down as a proposition. Its policy may go wrong; its Government may be opposed, but we should never condemn a whole people.

Rajendra Singh:⁵⁷ Who has condemned? To whom are you referring?

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is one of the basic things that I have learnt. We never—some people might have in the opposition benches—condemned the British people throughout our long struggle. We fought them—we did not condemn them—and we made friends with them when the time came. I have proceeded on this basis always and more especially in this particular case of India and China, which raises world issues of enormous significance, two mighty countries in Asia facing each other in conflict with each other, having this tremendous dispute which, as I said previously, may not be a matter of weeks or months, but may be a matter of years and generations, if necessary. These are big things, because neither China can put us down nor can we put down China. It is patent. If that is so, one has to proceed thinking, not of short exhibitions of temper, but on

⁵⁷ PSP, MP from Chapra, Bihar.

the long-term basis, how we are to maintain our honour, dignity, integrity and everything that counts for us, and yet always, keep the door open for some way out of this conflict. It may take years before you can pass through that door or anybody else can, but it should never be closed. That is my experience from such history as I have learnt and such experience as I have gathered.

I have met many of the great leaders—political and other—of the world and tried to learn from them, I have read some books also about this subject and most of all, during the last half a century, I have lived through historic epochs. To no small extent, many hon. Members here and I have ourselves been actors in the great drama of India. So, with such experience as we have got, we have to face issues. We have to face an issue today of a greater magnitude than any we have faced previously. It is not casual talk I am indulging in, because as I said, in the context of history, two of the biggest countries of Asia and of the world, I say, have come face to face with each other, angrily face to face with each other. What are going to be the consequences? I do not know. I cannot peep into history, into the future. But I do know that when such a thing occurs, it requires all the wisdom, all the strength and perseverance of a nation to face such a contingency. I have pleaded for that wisdom and at the same time, tact and patience.

What have I said about this matter previously? Hon. Members quoting my previous statements, have said that I would meet him when a meeting would bear fruit. Even there, I never denied that I will not meet him. I said on the 5th November:

"This business of meeting. My general approach, our general approach, again if I may refer to my dim and distant Gandhian past, is always to meet, always to discuss, to avoid strong language, but to be prepared always for strong action in so far as one can be prepared, and above all

avoid, getting excited and afraid." ⁵⁸ With all respect, I would venture to present these sentiments of mine to some hon. Members opposite.

Then, on the 16th November, I wrote to Premier Chou En-lai:

"I am always ready to meet and discuss with Your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore avenues of friendly settlement... It is necessary, therefore, that some preliminary steps are taken and the foundation for our discussions laid." ⁵⁹

On that very day, 16th November, I spoke in the Lok Sabha as follows:

"Premier Chou En-lai also suggested in his letter that the Prime Ministers might hold talks in the immediate future to discuss the boundary question and other outstanding issues between the two countries. I have always expressed my willingness to discuss any matter in dispute. But, if such a meeting is to bear fruit, as we want it to, we should first concentrate our immediate efforts at reaching an interim understanding, as suggested."

So, I should like the House to observe that at no time have I said that I will not meet. It always depends on certain circumstances, in a changing situation.

(Interruptions)

Rajendra Singh rose—

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not prepared to give in. Allow me to proceed.

An Hon. Member: Sit down!

Rajendra Singh: Look at the behaviour of some hon. Members!

Speaker: The hon. Member will resume his seat.

⁵⁸See SWJN/SS/54/p. 227.

⁵⁹ See White Paper No. III, pp. 47-51. Also available in SWJN/SS/54/pp. 492-498.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have listened to strong language from the opposite side, objectionable language and unparliamentary language, if I may say so, and I would beg of them now to listen to some parliamentary language. (Interruptions)

Hem Barua: When he says there has been strong language from the opposition, it means that there was first strong language from the other side.

Speaker: The proceedings will show where strong language has been used.

Jawaharlal Nehru: On the 27th November, I said in the Lok Sabha: "It is true that much as one might desire a meeting, that meeting itself, unless it is held under proper circumstances or a proper atmosphere, with some kind of background and preparation, may lead to nothing. It may fail; it may do harm. It is a matter of judgment. It is true that any such meeting which has the faintest resemblance to carrying out the behests of another party is absolutely wrong. I do not wish to delay anything. I am not trying to escape from the very idea of a meeting. I want it. I welcome it as early as possible, but there must be some preparation, some ground for it."⁶⁰

In the Rajya Sabha, I said on the 22nd December:

"The point that is brought out throughout that letter (the letter of Premier Chou En-lai) is a strong desire to meet. So far as I am concerned, whenever the time comes whenever it is suitable, I shall avail myself of that opportunity, because the issues are too serious for any other course to be adopted."⁶¹

In my reply to Premier Chou En-lai on the 21st December,⁶² I said:

⁶⁰ See SWJN/SS/54/p. 539.

⁶¹ See SWJN/SS/55/p. 354.

⁶² See White Paper No. III, pp. 58-59. Also available in SWJN/SS/55/pp. 321-323.

"I am always ready to meet and discuss with your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore the avenues of settlement. How can we, Mr. Prime Minister, reach an agreement on principles when there is such complete disagreement about the facts? I would, therefore, prefer to wait for your promised reply to my letter of September 26 and our note of November, before we discuss what should be the next step. I wish to add that it is entirely impossible for me to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days."

Then, at a Press Conference, on the 8th January a question was asked of me:⁶³

"Do you project a meeting between yourself and Chou En-lai at some date near enough?"

The answer was:

"I am not projecting the meeting at present, but I cannot rule it out. It depends on circumstances because, as I said, we do not, I hope, act in terms of closing any doors which would help. I don't rule it out at all but, at the present moment, that is not in view."

That is to say, the meeting. I was asked further about the conditions for a meeting. My reply was:

"I don't think it will be proper for me to lay down conditions 1, 2, 3 and 4, this must be done, this kind of thing. When two countries take up those rigid attitudes, then any question of considering a matter becomes difficult. All kinds of things happen. National prestige is involved, apart from other things." Finally, a straight question:

"Does it follow that you would be prepared to meet Mr. Chou En-lai unconditionally?"

My answer:

⁶³See SWJN/SS/56/item 6.

"It means, first of all, that I am prepared to meet anybody in the wide world.

There is nobody whom I am not prepared to meet. That is number one. The second is, one wants to meet people when one thinks that the meeting will produce results, good results, and not bad results. These are the two main considerations. One does not rush to a meeting simply because a meeting is talked about. A meeting may be mistimed, misjudged and, therefore, produce bad results. On the other hand, if there is any chance of a good result, a meeting should be agreed to. So, it is difficult for me to say precisely when, where and under what conditions, a meeting might take place, but I cannot rule it out."

Here is a series of quotations from what I have said in the Lok Sabha, in the Rajya Sabha and in the press conference, and you will see the same stream of thought running in my mind—never refuse the meeting and try to get the meeting in the best of circumstances, as good circumstances as possible, and consider from time to time whether it is more desirable or less desirable.

When Premier Chou En-lai invited me to meet him within a week or so at Rangoon, apart from the physical difficulty of my going to Rangoon, I reacted against this proposal—I did not like it—for a variety of reasons. I did not quite see why I should go to Rangoon or anywhere else for that meeting but, above all, I did not like this, well, shall I say, "come next week" business; and above all, the invitation to the meeting was contained in a document, in a letter which laid down the Chinese viewpoint, and it wanted some principles, etc., settled so as to meet to discuss some principles. Now, if I had accepted that meeting, it would not have committed me, of course, to anything, but the background was the Chinese letter to me. That would have been the background, although I was not committed to it. I wanted to clear that up. I was not going to him with that document, because I did not agree with that document, and I wanted to wait as I have said, for a subsequent longer letter in reply to my letter of September 24th. That is why I said "I shall consider this

question later." So, when the letter and other papers came and we considered this and we drafted a reply to be sent, we felt— I felt and my colleagues in the Cabinet Committee felt— that since we have discussed this for a considerable time, it would be desirable in the balance to propose a meeting in India between Premier Chou En-lai and myself. Now, my letter to him does not commit him to anything, that is our case, just as his letter has not committed me. But it does make a difference on the basis "after this letter we meet," a considerable difference, to my meeting after his letter.

Hem Barua: Where is the difference in facts?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon Members opposite, well, I do not challenge their greater wisdom in these matters....

Hem Barua: I am not referring to our wisdom. I want to make one submission. Whatever the Prime Minister has read, is that a vindication of the criticism levelled by the Opposition? We said that no purpose would be served by a meeting to discuss the principles unless and until differences on facts are resolved. Till then we should not meet. Where are the differences on facts; we wanted to know that. We did not say that he should not meet Premier Chou; but, at the same time, facts are there to be resolved.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very sorry that my reading out all this has not been completely absorbed by the hon. Member's mind yet. That is my difficulty. My difficulty is, and I am quite frank with you, that there are certain vested interests opposing any settlement between India and China. I am quite frank. (Interruptions)

Rajendra Singh: I condemn it.

Hem Barua: Where is the question of vested interest ... (Interruptions)

Goray: The only vested interest is our love for this country. There is no other vested interest.

Tyagi: It is a political interest.

Jawaharlal Nehru: By vested interest. I mean mental, psychological interest, and not vested interest....

Hem Barua: The Prime Minister has failed to clarify this issue. Whenever he accuses our wisdom or our intellect, we have not yet submitted to that accusation. He failed to make the issue clear before us.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Am I, Sir, as I have done in fact, meekly [sic] to its ten to charges of dishonour and unfairness?

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame. (Interruptions)

Jawaharlal Nehru: Is it the idea of the opposition that I should patiently listen when they say that I am bringing about national humiliation? I would rather be unwise than be a traitor to this country. These are charges brought against me and if I speak calmly on this subject in this House, it does not mean that I do not feel strongly about this subject. I honour this House and its conventions; therefore, I speak calmly. I am angry at the kind of things that have been said in this House, not only angry at what has been said from the other side but from this side too. I think it is unbecoming.

Rajendra Singh: You concede that now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let him go on.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am endeavouring to reply....

Rajendra Singh: We concede that you are the first patriot in the country. We do not challenge your patriotism.

An Hon. Member: Order, order.

Hem Barua: Why should they say "Order, order"?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not interrupt a single Member when he spoke, except.... (Interruptions) I cannot understand why Hon. Members cannot listen patiently when they do not like something.

Speaker: I have always said that the Hon. Minister must be allowed to go on, and if they have any serious points of doubt, at the end of the speech, if I consider that any clarification is necessary, I shall allow one or two questions.

Hem Barua rose—

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of any clarification. I am not giving in to anybody. Sir, I appeal to you, if I do not give in, can another

Hon. Member get up and go on interrupting me?

Speaker: No.

Jawaharlal Nehru: For six days or five days I have listened to this debate, and except once....

Speaker: I can only say this much. No side should cast aspersions on the honesty or the motives of the other side. All of us are engaged in the common endeavour to see that this matter is amicably settled.

Jawaharlal Nehru: May I enquire, when we are called dishonourable persons, when we are said to betray the country, is that an aspersion or not?

Speaker: It is.

Hem Barua: I did not dispute the honesty....

Speaker: Order, order, I am anxious that neither side need attribute motives to the other side. The doubt is as to what are the changed circumstances which have necessitated such a kind of policy of requesting that he may come here. That is a legitimate ground and the hon. Minister may explain it. Beyond that, to say that the hon. Minister has let down the country, or done something else, or attributing motives is not right, nor is it necessary for this side to say that others have a vested interest.

Jawaharlal Nehru: What I said was this. I should like to explain myself. Some hon. Members—I am not referring to all hon. Members of the opposition, but certainly some individuals here— are so passionately committed to the cold war attitude. That is what I call a vested interest, that is, this cold war attitude of Shri Masani, for instance, Shri Masani and I, I regret to say, are farther removed than any two human- beings can be, in thought, Shri Masani dislikes any kind of a step taken by any country, not by India alone, which might reduce tension. You see it is a basic attitude. While I proceed with this, I will say this. It is not a question of vested interest of property and money but of mental commitment to certain ideologies. Now, for instance, take another vested interest of the other kind that is, of the Communist Party.... (Interruption)

Braj Raj Singh: Poor fellows!

Jawaharlal Nehru: They quite fail to understand a national movement, a national feeling, a national upsurge in the country.... (Interruption). Here are two. (Interruption). That is what I meant. This cold war attitude, I think, not only now but always is a wrong attitude.

Ranga:⁶⁴ Attitudes are common to all..... (Interruption).

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am making a general statement that the cold war approach is always and, I say, inevitably a wrong approach whatever happens. That does not mean weakening in meeting an opponent or an enemy. Of course, not. But that mental attitude towards cold war is the one basic lesson that I and I hope others learnt from Gandhiji. I do not mean to say that I have acted up to that lesson always. That is my feeling. I lose my temper and do all kinds of things.

Ranga: We are all comrades in the same way.

Jawaharlal Nehru: But I do believe that that is a right attitude when dealing with individuals, groups or nations. More particularly when you have to deal with the conflicts of big nations that attitude has very far-reaching consequences. When you have to think of that in the context of the world today you have to be very careful: Any man with the least sense of responsibility should realise this attitude, which increases tension, bitterness and hatred, is not a good attitude. It may end ultimately in the destruction of the world and so on. So, I was venturing to say that this mental attitude is wrong. It may be honestly held. I do not say that people who indulge in cold war are dishonest. But it is an attitude which comes in the way, apart from its being basically wrong, because the cold war is based on violence and hatred. The hatred may be

⁶⁴ Congress, MP from Tenali, Andhra Pradesh.

justified in the sense that the other party may be wrong. But nevertheless it is a wrong attitude.

Secondly, apart from being a wrong attitude, it closes one's mind and prevents considering a changing situation as it changes. We have got a fixed mind which was fixed, let us say five or ten years ago. The situation may change but we apply the same canons of interpretation to it. So, I would venture to say that in regard to these border issues if this House approves of the note that we have sent that is the policy. That is the policy note. I take it, if I understand it, that people so approve it. I am not quite sure of hon. Members of the Communist Party as to whether they approve it or not. I do not know because their approach is somewhat different. But there it is.

The Communist Party has been carrying on a big propaganda that the two Prime Ministers must meet. If there is anything which would prevent any meeting it is that propaganda of theirs so far as I am concerned because it is obvious that their objective in their propaganda is something entirely different from my proposal. There are trying to hide, if I may use the word without disrespect, their opinions and feelings on this subject, not to express them clearly enough— some of them, not all— by shouting, "Let the two Prime Ministers meet." Then they need not say anything about the question. But it is not on that basis or on that argument that I have proceeded. After all, I have to explain.

I do not know if this meeting will take place. I hope it will. But anyhow I thought it my duty and in the Committee my colleagues thought it our duty to take this step. We took it after full consideration of its consequences. Then if we took that step people objected to it saying, "What? You say that he will be our honoured guest." What else, may I ask? How else can we treat anybody whom we invite to this country? How else? Here again comes that cold war mentality of hatred. No reason, no logic, no graciousness and things are said here which, if I may say so, bring little credit to India. It brings little credit to India to say these

things, which could be repeated, about the leaders of great nations with whom we may be in conflict. How do we speak of those leaders? May I say what I have just now said, that we must never speak ill of a whole people. So also, we must not speak ill of the leaders who represent those people. For the moment they are not individuals. They represent those people. I may be a person with many failings and you may condemn me. You may do many things. But I feel sure that even those who have not a particular soft corner for me will resent if any outsider insulted me, the Prime Minister of India, because then I become a symbol of this Parliament of India apart from my failing. So, others are also symbols and something should not be said which bars any consideration of any problem, which closes people's mind and which brings in too much passion and anger. That is all that I have to submit. That does not mean our not criticising the policy of another Government or opposing it or fighting it.

I think it was Shri Masani and perhaps some other hon. Members too who talked about forming a bloc of South Eastern Asian countries, of Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia and India. I do not know if this is some kind of revival of the old idea of a third force.

Braj Raj Singh: That is not.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is not,

Braj Raj Singh: Can't be.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Whatever it may be, I should like the House to consider that this kind of thing means nothing at all. First of all, I am happy to say, we are in the closest friendly relations with these countries with Nepal, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon etc. This kind of reference to other countries in this fashion is often found rather irritating by those countries as if we want to drag them into something. They do not like it. They

are independent countries, very friendly to us often with common interests. But the moment any element comes in "Oh! they want to exercise some pressure on us Oh! they are in trouble; they want our help"— whatever it may— there is this element of making them do something which they may not like to do. That is never a right approach to any country, if I know anything about relations between two countries. There are all kinds of pressures— pressures on all countries, on our country, on their countries. To imagine that they would yield to some pressure, is not correct. They have to judge according to their situations, internal and external politics. The main thing that we aim at is friendly relations, cooperative relations and I am glad that we have got them. I do not wish to say much regarding defence, that is, the border question. We have already informed the House that we have to adopt in regard to defence not only a short view, the immediate dangers, to protect ourselves, but the long view also. We cannot exhaust our energy, our strength, in some short view and have nothing left for the long view. So, both views have to be taken, and undoubtedly they involve burdens on us, and I am sure the House will agree to our carrying those burdens because, after all, the basic policy of every country, the basic foreign policy of every country is to protect itself; other policies come later. I have talked about various approaches to foreign policy, but the basic approach of foreign policy is always to guard the interests of the country, other things follow it. Of course, we want to guard those interests, not in a narrow way, not in that type of ultra-nationalist way which does not look at the world, but we want that to fit in with world developments and world peace and all that; and in fact, in the long run it is those world interests that also come to our help.

So, looking at defence from this point of view, it is not for me to tell you, and I cannot tell you, what exact steps we take on our borders, because that kind of thing is not said in the public, but we are taking all the necessary steps available to us on our borders. We are trying to build roads, airports etc., whatever it maybe.

I think it was Shri Bhakt Darshan⁶⁵ who again repeated this business of foreign aircraft flying over our territory. I believe he said that some ex-servicemen, ex-soldiers had told him so. Now, I can assure him that our Air Force is very vigilant in this matter, and our Air Force has assured us that no such thing has happened. Apart from the fact that our own aircraft are flying frequently there— it is very difficult for an average man to distinguish aircraft at 30,000 feet; no doubt, it is 30 to 40 thousand feet—apart from that, this is a route by which the Soviet service flies to India twice or three times a week, I forget how often—the TU 104—and they see the strange thing coming. Apart from that, when Mr. Voroshilov and Mr. Khrushchev came here, there were so many flights in that connection to bring them, their parties, to bring things for them, take back things, constant flights, and therefore they probably mistook this for some kind of foreign, enemy aircraft which was intruding on our air space.

I need not say much about the situation in the Naga Hills Tuensang Division. I think that certainly it is infinitely better than it has been in the past. Nevertheless, it is true that sporadic troubles take place and it is exceedingly difficult to put an end to them. But the major improvement there is not more or less of this kind of sporadic trouble, but a change, I think, in the mind of the Naga people, which is the real, basic, helpful thing that is happening, and I hope that will bear fruit.

Now, I should like this House to consider our problems in that larger context of the world. We can never forget the world, we are too closely knit to it to separate ourselves, and in the world today the major thing that is happening is this approach of the leaders of rival countries trying to find a way out, trying to go ahead with disarmament and solve or lessen the tension which exists. This is of tremendous significance because, if this is not done and if the world continues in any other way, then all our problems will be solved by vast destruction which is not the

⁶⁵ Congress, MP from Garhwal, UP.

destruction of war, but practically, if these atomic and nuclear weapons are used a curse on the world from which it cannot recover even—this atomic radiation spreading out and creeping everywhere. Therefore, these are of the utmost importance, and therefore we should endeavour in our own way to help. We cannot do very much, we are not among the World Powers in the sense of military prowess or financial prowess; nevertheless it so happens that we have gained some prestige in the world as a people, as a country which is devoted to peace, and that is one reason also why the problems affect us, whether they are of Pakistan, or whether they are of China.. We have to face these problems bravely, we have to face them with strength, not giving in, not surrendering, but we have always to remember that our language and approach fits in with the temper of the world which aims towards peace today. So, we have today to look at it in this big way.

One of the big things that is happening today in the world, one of the very big things, is the revolutionary ferment in Africa. Recently we had this French Atomic test in the Sahara. Well, it is a deplorable thing, I think, deplorable by itself, deplorable because it begins another series of atomic tests and we must regret it, and we have tried our best, and the United Nations, indeed, have expressed themselves previously against it. But far bigger than this French atomic test in Africa is what the people of Africa are doing today, rising up, sometimes rightly, sometimes wrongly if you like, but nevertheless in a state of tremendous upheaval. That is what is happening, and it is obvious that so far as we are concerned, our hearts and our good wishes must go out to them in this tremendous upheaval. In this connection, all kinds of new problems will arise in Africa affecting the world. One of the biggest problems has been the racial problem. The House knows how the South African Union Government has fixed its policy on the basis of racial discrimination and a master race and apartheid etc. We have suffered, the people of Indian descent have suffered from it, but far more the Africans have suffered from it. Now, what is going to happen in Africa when the greater part of Africa consists

of independent nations standing on their dignity, not accepting in the slightest degree any kind of racial discrimination, well, the future will show. But obviously, things will not remain as they are today.

In this connection, may I say that I welcome the recent statement made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan,⁶⁶ addressing the two Houses of Parliament in Cape Town. It was, in so far as policy is concerned about racial discrimination, a clear and forthright statement. Naturally we feel strongly about this, and I earnestly hope that what Mr. Macmillan has said will be the firm policy in all the countries over which Britain holds sway.

I would wish that some of the leaders of the African people who are in detention or in prison, leaders of note, leaders of influence without whom no settlement can be made, are released, because unless they are released there can be no settlement of these problems.

Then I would say just a word about Goa. The first thing is that I should like to assure the House, because there appears to be some misapprehension, that we are going to take no steps which in any sense might prejudice the liberation of the Goan people. We have been, to some extent, rather restrained from taking any further steps, because we have been waiting, to some extent, for the decision of the World Court. The problem before the World Court has nothing to do directly with Goa; it has to do with Nager Haveli. Nevertheless, it has been a restraining factor in our consideration of this important problem. That decision, I hope, will come within a month or so.

Another subject which has been dealt with at some length in the debate, or at any rate, referred to repeatedly, was the question of corruption. Now, if you deal with the question of corruption, there can be no two views about it, that every possible and feasible method should be employed to deal with it, to suppress it and to put an end to it.

⁶⁶ Harold Macmillan. He addressed both Houses of Parliament on 3 February 1960.

Shri Asoka Mehta seemed to imply that I denied that there was corruption. Of course, he has got a very wrong impression. What I have said repeatedly is that while there is a good deal of corruption in our administrative services and elsewhere, I do think that the references made to it give it greater importance, that is, it appears by these references to be more widespread than actually it is. I certainly think that in the higher services the standards are fairly high. I do not deny that cases occur. In fact...

Braj Raj Singh: Not very high.

Jawaharlal Nehru: In fact, since we established a Special Police Establishment to deal with this matter, they have had a good deal of success in this. I do not know if hon. Members pay much attention to monthly hand-outs that are put in the Parliament Library from the Special Police Establishment as well as annual reports. Anyhow, a new annual report will be coming out, I think, in a month or so.

Rajendra Singh: I submit that the integrity of the Police Department, however high it may be, is not above suspicion.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member may also suspect sometimes the judiciary. I am not saying that only the police should deal with it, but it is the police that start cases, our Intelligence Departments. If they are not good, change them. But you cannot deal with them in an ad hoc way. Anyhow, I should like to give some brief report. I am placing a note on the Table of the House, a note called Review of the Work done during the year 1959' by the Special Police Establishment. ["Placed in Library. See No. LT-1919/60"].

The number of cases relating to bribery, corruption etc. was 917 in 1959, including pending cases from the year before. 1671 cases were investigated during 1959. Of these, 264 were sent for trial, 501 were

reported for departmental action, and 101 were dropped for want of proof. Of the cases sent to trial, 190 resulted in conviction of the 363 sent for departmental proceedings, 325 resulted in punishment, 1164 public servants, including 207 gazetted officers were involved in the new cases of 1959. 118 Government servants were convicted in courts, including 10 gazetted officers. Among private persons convicted, as the House well knows, were Ramkrishna Dalmia⁶⁷ and Haridas Mundhra. Monthly press releases are being issued about the work of the Special Police Establishment, and copies of these are sent to the Library of Parliament. I shall place a note on this.

The question that was really arising is about the proposal to have a tribunal, standing independent tribunal. I have ventured to say in the other House and here too in answer to questions that I do not think this is desirable or feasible. Some very eminent people with high qualifications, judicial and other, have also advised me that this is not a feasible proposition even under the Constitution of India. Apart from the constitutional difficulty, I cannot understand—there may be other ways—how this particular proposal can be said to be a helpful one. I think that if a tribunal sits down and invites applications from all over, then complaints will simply paralyse the administration, and there will be hardly any work done, and all the mind of the country and everything will be involved in these arguments, charges and counter-charges. So, I cannot understand that particular proposal. I can, of course, understand, any specific charge which has been made being investigated by any suitable tribunal, whatever it may. That is a right thing.

You have, at the present moment, a certain apparatus, whatever it may be, police etc., the law and so on. Anybody can take a person to a court for it, although I must confess that that apparatus is a slow-moving one. We want to expedite it. We want your help, your suggestions to do it. If any other proposal is there for us to consider, let us consider it. But one

⁶⁷ Founder of Dalmia-Jain Group of Industries.

thing I cannot understand is this. A specific proposal, a specific charge, can be investigated. But one cannot investigate charges which are not charges but just vague declamations.

I remember, I hope I am right, that my hon. friend Shri Tyagi many years ago talked about corruption and my old colleague Shri C. D. Deshmukh replied to it saying it is no good making these vague charges, bring the specific instance, and I shall enquire.

Tyagi: I was on these benches then, not a Minister.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Naturally, if he had been a Minister, he would not have said that. But there it is. Wherever it is, one can enquire into charges that are made. There are procedures. This Government, and this House, in fact, have taken action in regard to enquiries about big action, in the past, involving some of the most Important persons in the land.

Braj Raj Singh: Certain charges have been made during the course of the debate. Is the Prime Minister prepared to constitute some sort of tribunal for enquiring into those charges?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am glad the hon. Member has reminded me of what he said, I remember he referred to the U.P. Minister, and a contract being given to his son.⁶⁸ Is that the case?

Braj Raj Singh: Of course. I was not allowed to name the Minister.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I had forgotten about that matter. So, I am grateful to my hon. friend. When this matter was raised, as is usually done by me. I immediately wrote to the Chief Minister and to the Minister concerned and others. While we were enquiring into this matter, which enquiry I

⁶⁸ See item 29.

continued, a case for libel or a kind of defamation was started against the persons who made the charges. Those cases are still going on. This matter was also referred. I think, to the Election Commissioner, in a slightly different context. That is also going on. However, I proceeded with my own way of enquiry. Whether it is satisfactory or not, it is for the House to judge. I did not wish to interfere when the case was going on in the law courts, but I got all the charges, with such evidence as could be stated by those who made the charges; I had answers to these charges; I did not look into them; I did not think myself competent to do so. Having got all that, I sent them to the Law Minister, and the Law Minister examined them very thoroughly and wrote a long note on it which I sent to the Chief Minister; and it was shown to the people who made the charges; it was shown to the Governor. I was in a difficulty. I could not publish it because the case was going on. That is my difficulty. And it is still going on. But, in that particular note, I must say, since I am asked, although I do not wish to come in the way of the law.....

Dr. Sushila Nayar: It would not be right for the Prime Minister to express an opinion when the cases are sub judice.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am inhibited from saying it.

Speaker: He need not give us the benefit of his conclusions at this stage.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am saying that I sent all this....

Easwara Iyer:⁶⁹ On a point of order. It would be unfair for the Prime Minister to say anything about a matter which is pending in the court. If he says that there is nothing in the charge, then the court may be influenced.

⁶⁹ Independent, MP from Trivandrum, Kerala.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That has been my difficulty during all these months. Otherwise, I would have said many things, but I am merely saying this.

Ram Krishan Gupta:⁷⁰ May I know whether any such case has been received from the Punjab?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have received. In the past year or two, quite a number of things have come and they have been examined and reports have been issued. It is true one or two cases have come fairly recently—by 'recently', I mean in the last few weeks—and they are being dealt with now.

Tyagi: I wonder if the Prime Minister has the authority to investigate cases which are forwarded to him by private persons about Ministers in the States. It is only a private matter.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not a question of legal authority. My investigations only go to the extent: is there a prima facie case to be dealt with or otherwise I cannot go beyond that? I cannot punish a person.

Speaker: I may say at once that it is the responsibility of the Centre to constantly watch—not to interfere—the manner in which the constitutional machinery works in the States.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes.

The other day a leader of the Swatantra Party, Shri V. P. Menon, said that he knew of partiality and impropriety occurring in the case of Congress Ministers. Whenever I see any such thing, I write to the party concerned: "Give me some information". Immediately I had a letter sent to Shri V. P. Menon to enquire what this was about. He did send a reply which was not

⁷⁰ Congress, MP from Mahendragarh, Punjab.

very helpful. He said, "I would like to look at the files etc." As it is, he is prepared to make a statement without looking at the papers! However, I have inquired into this matter. This matter is twelve years old—the matter to which he referred—that is, 1948. It was a matter connected with his own Ministry, of which he was Secretary⁷¹ and Sardar Patel was the Minister. I think it referred to some Ministers of the old Madhya Bharat Government and Vindhya Pradesh Government. I won't go into details. But we inquired into it. We decided to start prosecutions; in fact, I am not quite sure if they were not started. The matter was then considered fully. I think it was referred to the Solicitor-General and the Attorney-General. It was considered by Sardar Patel, of course, and Shri Rajagopalachari.⁷² They both sent up a note to me, a final note, saying "we considered fully these cases; there is no substance in them. This was the report of the Attorney-General too, and they should not be proceeded with". I accepted their advice, the advice of senior colleagues and the Attorney-General. What could I do? They were all rather petty cases, petty in the sense that there was some confusion about travelling allowance etc. They were withdrawn.

Another case was about a gentleman of the name of Sardar Narmada Prasad Singh. He was later involved in a much bigger case about insurance scandals and he absconded, and remained absconding for a long time. Then he was apprehended and he spent some time in prison. I mention this, that here after twelve years Shri V. P. Menon makes a statement.....

Dr. Sushila Nayar: The gentleman concerned in the case was in the PSP at that time.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Maybe. It does not matter.

⁷¹ Secretary and for some time Adviser, to the Government of India, Ministry of States, 1947-51.

⁷² C. Rajagopalachari.

Here Shri V. P. Menon, a prominent member of the Swatantra Party, throws out this charge of how Ministers have been misbehaving and committing improprieties. And when we go into this matter, we find it was a matter of twelve years ago when Shri V. P. Menon was Secretary of that Ministry, Sardar Patel was there, Shri Rajagopalachari was consulted, so was the Attorney-General, and a certain action was taken. It does seem to be rather unfair that these charges should be bandied about—thrown about—in this way.

I have taken a lot of time, but there is just one major matter about which I should like to say something, that is, planning. Shri Asoka Mehta said that the President's Address had given no indication about the outline of the Third Plan and when it would be available to the House. The National Development Council meeting is going to take place on the 19th and 20th of March. It is hope that before the end of April, the Planning Commission will publish a Draft Outline of the Third Plan for consideration by Parliament. Meanwhile, as the House knows, there is an Informal Committee of Members of Parliament of all Parties which meets sometimes to consider the Third Plan. The tentative approaches to the Third Plan—I would repeat they are tentative; some of this information has appeared in the Press; I am repeating it more authoritatively—the tentative approaches of the Third Plan are (1) increase in national income of at least 5 per cent, per annum; (2) total investment of Rs. 9,950 crores; (3) in the public sector, investment of about Rs. 5, 950 crores with a total developmental outlay of Rs. 7,000 crores. The latter figure compares with Rs. 4,800 crores of the Second Plan as originally drawn up. In the private sector, including agriculture, small industry, housing as well as organised industry—investment of about Rs. 4,000 crores. This compares with the present estimate for the Second Plan of Rs. 3,300 crores.

At this stage, the plan for industry is being drawn up from the point of view of the economy as a whole, not public sector-private sector. What we require are physical targets. Distribution as between public and private

sector would come later, keeping in view naturally the broad policies of Government in regard to such matters. Our approach broadly is that there is a broad policy, but then there is a pragmatic approach. We want to do the job and the sooner we do it the better keeping in view that broad policy. Now Government are considering the lines along which the general public should be given an opportunity to contribute to a limited extent to the capital of State enterprises in industry and allied fields.

It is obvious that this requires a very great effort, and I repeat something the Planning Commission has said—it is so obvious, but still I repeat it because it is important—namely, the following conditions have to be fulfilled: (1) increase in agricultural production, (2) all public enterprises being carried out with economy and efficiency, yielding the maximum returns feasible, (3) in construction programmes, the cost being kept to the minimum, (4) administrative efficiency and speed, and (5) maintenance of prices at reasonable levels.

Now, Sir, I really am ashamed to take up so much time of the House, but they will bear with me for a little while more. We have come up against problems in a particular context for which there is no parallel. There is a parallel of industrial development, there is a parallel of planning in the Communist countries but there is no parallel of this kind, of combination, of a measure of planning with this apparatus. That creates certain difficulties, in the highly developed countries, it was institutional reforms leading to the Welfare State, including a system of progressive taxation which was able to defeat growth of inequality, because normally when industrialisation takes place, if it is left unimpeded and unchecked, it leads to greater inequality. The rich become richer, the poor may not become poorer, but the gap widens.

I am saying this because, it is very obvious, in this House some persons quite unconnected with modern thought and modern conditions talk about laissez faire and going back to an economy where there is no kind of planning or control. As I said, in those western countries and highly developed countries—I mean "western" or anywhere—there were

institutional reforms leading to the Welfare State, these including a system of progressively high taxation, because, otherwise, without these checks the inequalities would have increased. The pressures from trade unions and this and that are supposed to keep down these. Otherwise, the contrast between riches and poverty would have grown. That is why we are compelled. If we leave things to chance, we would grow industrially in a sense; but we would grow at the expense of the gap between the rich and the poor widening and not lessening. Therefore, come in the various types of institutional changes and controls.

Of course, in a nation we can control whatever the difficulties. But in the international sphere, I am talking about economy in the international sphere— obviously, there is no controlling authority and so international inequalities are growing. In spite of our efforts, rich countries are getting richer and richer and poor countries are making much slower progress. In the communist countries, the main thing we have seen is the relentless and cruel mobilisation of man-power. They mobilise their people and achieve results undoubtedly. We do not wish to do that. But, now the question before us is nevertheless the mobilisation of man-power not to that extent but to a considerable extent.

In the course of this debate, reference was made by some hon. Members to the speech delivered by the Governor of the Reserve Bank.⁷³ I think the question the Governor raised is an important question and we have to bear that in mind because this spiral of wages and prices, etc. is a dangerous thing for us to get into. Not only our Plans are affected but there can be practically no planning at all. We can only deal with these matters by evolving social policies, not by leaving things to chance, by evolving social policies aiming at desired ends. That is planning. The free market that is talked about by Shri Masani and his colleagues and laissez faire are just primitive ways of dealing with complicated situations.

⁷³ H. V. R. Iengar. See SWJN/SS/56/p. 3.

Just a word. I think Shri Braj Raj Singh referred to the Nalagarh Committee Report and....

Some Hon. Members: A. P. Jain.

Braj Raj Singh: Myself.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Anyhow I should like to assure him that I am informed by the Planning Commission that it has been accepted broadly and it has been included in the next year's programme, I do not know how far in detail.

I think Shri Asoka Mehta referred to an article by Mr. Lippmann,⁷⁴ an American columnist.....

An Hon. Member: Shri Khadilkar.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Shri Khadilkar. That article was a very interesting one, as often Mr. Lipmann's writings are. I should like to read two or three sentences from that article because they do pose a problem for us to consider. He says, writing about India:

"What troubled me was the disparity between the revolutionary objectives of the Third Five Year Plan and the mildness, the almost Victorian mildness and the normality of the Indian political system. I asked myself whether the gigantic economic revolution can be carried out by Parliamentary politicians and civil servants without the dynamism and the discipline or an organised mass movement."

It is an American conservative liberal rather, not any firebrand who is writing this. And, this is a problem which is before us and we shall have to solve it.

⁷⁴ See SWJN/SS/55/pp. 4 & 50.

We have to face gigantic problems, tremendous enterprises. We plan for them and the planning itself, I venture to say, is not bad. It aims at big things. But the question comes, is this apparatus of ours—I am not referring for a moment to the basic parliamentary apparatus but rather to the way it functions—is it adequate. I think that the basic apparatus is adequate or can be made inadequate. But I think we must realise that the way it is at present functioning is not adequate. I say so with extreme respect to the way we function in this Parliament—I am all for parliamentary democracy and I do believe that, apart from minor changes here and there, that is a good system specially suited to us. So, I am not challenging that basis. But I do wish to say that we are functioning more and more in a—what Mr. Lipmann says—Mid-Victorian way, not realising the urgency of our problems and are arguing, throwing our problems like shuttle-cock from one place to another.

Our other apparatus too is a good apparatus but a slow-moving apparatus. We are trying hard to think of how we can expedite that apparatus—our administrative apparatus—how to give more responsibility to people so that they can decide quickly. In the old days, the British days, the problems were simpler and they evolved their perfectionist apparatus with checks and counter-checks and all that. Now, we have got the same apparatus with unpleasantly complicated social problems and the checks and counter-checks are so much that tremendous delays occur. The only way to deal with this—and in this matter ultimately the communists and the capitalists both agree—is to expedite matters by giving a responsibility to people—dispersal of responsibility. It may go wrong; it may be a loss; but there is no greater loss to a nation than delaying. Even the cost in money is very great but the real cost is that you do not come to grips with the major problems you are dealing with. I have ventured to take a lot of time of this House. On various matters, in the ultimate analysis, whether it is the border trouble or whether it is anything else, it is our economic growth that counts. That is the only thing that gives us strength to face danger from abroad and danger from

within. And that lead can only be given by this House unitedly, not by trying to pull each other down, but, in these basic matters, by giving a united lead to work for the benefit of the country.

169. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Incursion in Ladakh⁷⁵

Reported Occupation of the Salt Lake in Ladakh by Chinese

Speaker: I have received notice of another adjournment motion from Shri Braj Raj Singh, relating to the reported occupation of the Salt Lake in Ladakh by the Chinese. What is this matter about? Is it not already covered in the previous discussions? He has said:

"It is reported by one of the foremost political parties in Jammu and Kashmir that the Salt Lake in Ladakh has been occupied by the Chinese and the local Indian population there is not getting the salt..."

Has there been a fresh encroachment or fresh aggression?

A. M. Tariq: This was denied by the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir.⁷⁶

Braj Raj Singh: I want the Prime Minister to enlighten the country about the conflicting and contradictory reports emanating from the Government of India and the Government of Jammu and Kashmir. According to the report, "the people of Zanskar, who had been using salt from Chantham have been refused access to it by the Chinese military and those who had gone to Chantham for salt were beaten up." The report also said:

⁷⁵Reply to questions, 22 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XXXIX, cols. 2094-2096.

⁷⁶ Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammed.

"A considerable number of unknown people in the guise of Buddhist monks have entered Zaskar from the Tibetan side."

Speaker: Is this lake situated in the area which was occupied sometime ago, with respect to which there had been a discussion in the House?⁷⁷ Or is it a new act of aggression?

Braj Raj Singh: This is a place which is our territory, territory in our occupation. (Interruptions) There is a contradiction in the report of the Government about this.

The report says:

"Commenting on a Jammu report that the Chinese had occupied the Chantham salt mines in Ladakh, an External Affairs Ministry spokesman said on Friday that the Government of India were making inquiries."

On almost the same day, the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir told the State Assembly that the reports were quite baseless and there was no truth in them. My point is how did the Government of India not know about this and how did they make a statement here without ascertaining facts from the Government of Jammu and Kashmir? Without ascertaining facts from other sources, they made a statement here which were contradictory to the statement of the Jammu and Kashmir Government.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think there is any contradiction. In this motion for adjournment itself, reference is made to the denial by the Jammu and Kashmir Government and the statement made by the External Affairs Ministry. The External Affairs Ministry made the statement after receipt of information from the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and such other sources as they have here. They have both denied them.

The hon. Member talked about some Chinese in the guise of Buddhist monks going to this particular area. That has been denied. That particular area he referred to is roughly 150 miles in the heart of our territory. So

⁷⁷ See also item 175.

there is no question of border incursion. Nobody can say that some disguised persons may not go there. I cannot suddenly deny it, that somewhere in the mountainous area one or two disguised persons are there. But, our information is, no such thing has happened; and it is based on information received from the Jammu and Kashmir Government who are dealing with this matter. I have before me a letter from the Chief Minister; and, I think, he made a statement in his Assembly yesterday or the day before yesterday on this very subject. So, I do not quite know what more I am to add except one thing that even the climate today is against any such thing happening. It is practically difficult. In the middle of the cold weather people wandering about there is exceedingly unlikely. But, as I said, factually it has been denied by the Jammu and Kashmir Government on the information at their disposal.

Speaker: All that the hon. Member has stated is that he has no independent information except what has appeared in the statement of some political parties. He only wanted some clarification and the clarification has been given by the hon. Prime Minister. He depends for this information on the information given by the Prime Minister of Kashmir that there has been no such occupation of the salt lake. Some casual Bhikkus coming there does not indicate any aggression or occupation. In view of the statement, it is not necessary to pursue this matter. I am not giving my consent to the adjournment motion.

170. In the Lok Sabha: The Dalai Lama's Treasure⁷⁸

Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am intervening very briefly, because the hon. Member who was just speaking⁷⁹ referred to certain

⁷⁸ Reply to questions, 23 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XXXIX, cols. 2328-30 & 2350-53.

⁷⁹ Chintamani Panigrahi, Congress, MP from Puri, Orissa.

treasures which, according to him, were carried by 900 mules to India. I have, as a matter of fact, agreed to answer a question in this regard, but I think the matter should be cleared up so far as we are concerned.

It was in 1950 that representatives of the Dalai Lama approached the Sikkim Durbar for being allowed to bring some boxes and to deposit them in the Sikkim Durbar. The Government of India had practically nothing to do with it. We vaguely heard about it and we took no objection to their depositing some boxes. We did not know what the boxes contained. The 900 mules, I suppose, refer to that, because no mules have been seen since then in this connection. We have enquired about it. In 1950, a number of boxes were brought and deposited with the Maharajkumar of Sikkim. Lately, some months back, we were asked for permission for escort, so that these boxes might be sent to Calcutta to a bank. And the West Bengal Government gave the escort, and they were flown over, I believe, from there near Gangtok to Calcutta to deposit in some bank. We had no direct connection with this matter, except providing this escort, and we have certainly expressed the hope that this money—whatever the money may be; we have no idea what it is, how much it is—that it is meant to be invested and the income from it be used for the Tibetan refugees; that is what we have heard. It is desirable that it is so used.

Chintamani Panigrahi: What is the amount?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no idea at all, what the amount is. It is not a question of money, whatever it may be some jewellery, whatever it may be. I have no idea. That is all I wish to say.

S.M. Banerjee: I want to know the number of boxes that were escorted.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I suppose somebody must know it. I do not know at the present moment.

S.M. Banerjee: Excuse me for my intervening. It was in the newspapers that eight boxes were carried.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Eight?

S.M. Banerjee: It was in the newspaper that eight boxes containing valuables have been taken. We do not know what they contained.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I think there were a large number of boxes, small and big. I do not know the exact number, but there were a large number of boxes.

171. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Refugees⁸⁰

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon): Yesterday, some Members of the Opposition while discussing Supplementary Demand No. 18 wanted to know more about the Demand and also what we are doing with regard to the Tibetan refugees. To begin with, I am very happy to announce that this Supplementary Demand is not really due to bad budgeting but as a result of unforeseen circumstances.

We had already come to the House for a grant of Rs.10 lakhs in August last. The House was kind enough to sanction the grant. I would like the House to know that this was only an ad hoc grant because at that time we did not know the magnitude of the problem that we had to face. The Tibetan refugees were coming in large numbers, but even so we had never imagined that the number would mount up to the present figure of over 16,000. So far, we have already spent Rs. 14,73,562 and 8 np. That

⁸⁰ Reply to questions, 23 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series Vol. XXXIX, cols. 2328-30 & 2350-53.

is the total expenditure incurred on the Missamari camp up to 31st October, 1959.

A question was also asked whether these amounts include the expenditure on the Dalai Lama as well. Out of this, about Rs. 6,13,000 is in respect of the amount already spent by the U.P. Government for the Dalai Lama and his party.

We were also asked whether this is going to be a regular feature of our Budget or whether we would stop asking for money for the Tibetan refugee with Rs. 39 lakhs odd. Hon. Members know that over 16,000 people who have come out to India have come away with conditions which they had found very difficult to face. It is not likely that these people will return to their original homes. The Government is fully aware of the situation and the need to face it and is making arrangements for their training, for their rehabilitation and for their settlement and absorption in our country.

Yesterday a question was also asked as to what arrangements we are making for their rehabilitation. Having found that it was necessary to rehabilitate them, we have done certain things which were already explained to the House on previous occasions by me. That is, the young people are put in schools. Those who are dedicated to a religious life have been provided with religious education and those who are old and infirm have been provided suitable accommodation and facilities to pursue their studies in perfect peace.

We have also made arrangements for their rehabilitation in various ways. Some of them are artisans and we have got production centres in which they ply their traditional arts which have an artistic value. We are also giving training to those who are anxious to learn these arts. Thousands of able-bodied men are taken for road-making in various part of India. I do not know whether hon. Members would like to know how they are dispersed. They are doing road work in Sikkim, in Punjab, in Himachal Pradesh and in Uttar Pradesh.

We are also thinking of settling them on land. One of the hon. Members raised the question whether it was advisable to settle them in the frontier areas. One of the previous speakers, Shri Bhakt Darshan, has already given the explanation. These people are settled not very near the border but in those areas where climatic conditions are more suitable for healthy living and also where land is available. For our own refugees who have come from East Pakistan, Government have the Dandakaranya scheme for the simple reason that the available cultivable land in India is limited and we have to reclaim lands which are forest lands now in order to provide cultivable land for those who wish to settle on land.

Chintamani Panigrahi: What is the number engaged in road construction?

Lakshmi Menon: I will tell you. On road work in Punjab 500 persons; on forest work 400 persons; on road work in Himachal Pradesh 1,000; in U.P. 100; and, I think, about a few thousands in Sikkim also. These numbers were, I think, given in this House on various occasions. For fuller details, I may say, there are also projects which are under examination and consideration. A handicraft centre for 250 persons in Dhramsala; settlement on land in Ladakh for 500 persons; in Siang division of the NEFA area for 1,000 to 1,500 persons; settlement in various areas of Himachal Pradesh for about 200 persons.

For settlement in Ladakh, we are thinking of reclaiming about 1,000 acres which will depend upon the available water supply, etc. All these things are being done. I would like to remind this House that this is going to be a recurring feature of our Budget. And, in the Budget Estimates, I am sure, hon. Members will have an occasion to know the actual amount estimated for the rehabilitation and resettlement of these refugees.

We were also asked whether the refugees are still coming from Tibet.

Unfortunately, they are. Not in large numbers, but still they are coming. Up to 2nd November, 2,209 refugees came to Bhutan; but most of them are dispersed in India and at present, there are 200 Tibetan refugees in Bhutan. I am giving all these figures because the hon. Member Shri Dwivedy specifically asked for the numbers that have come from Bhutan

and how they were dispersed. It is understood that 10 to 15 refugees are daily coming into India and this in spite of the precautions taken by the Chinese Government at the border.

As I pointed out, our supplementary demand for Rs. 39,89,000 also includes the expenditure incurred by the U .P. Government for the Dalai Lama. We are trying our best to reduce the administrative expenditure so that the amount allotted may be really used for the purpose for which it is allotted. On these grounds, I hope the House will vote the supplementary demands.

172. In the Rajya Sabha: Tibetan Refugees ⁸¹

Tibetan Refugees in the Missamari Camp

Jugal Kishore.⁸² Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state the number of Tibetan refugees who are at present living in Missamari Camp in North East Frontier Agency Area?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon): According to information available 4, 205 Tibetan refugees were living in Missamari Camp in Tezpur district of Assam on 18th February, 1960.

Jugal Kishore: May I know, Sir, whether any monetary or other kind of help is given by the Government of these refugees?

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, the entire expenditure on the refugees in the camp is borne by the Government of India.

⁸¹ Reply to questions, 24 February 1960. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 1623-26.

⁸² Congress, MP from Punjab.

Jugal Kishore: What is being spent monthly on these refugees by the Government?

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, I haven't got any figures relating to the monthly expenditure, but up to the 31st of October, 1959 we had incurred an expenditure of Rs. 14,73,562.08.

Jugal Kishore: May I know Sir, whether these refugees do some work in the camp?

Lakshmi Menon: Yes, Sir, there is a regular programme of dispersal and resettlement.

Tajamul Husain:⁸³ May I know, Sir, if it is the policy of the Government to spend money on the Dalai Lama whenever he goes on tour?

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, the Government has made some provision in connection with his tour in India.

Tajamul Husain: My question is whether it is the general policy of the Government to bear the expenses of his tour. That is my question which has not been answered, Sir.

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of any general policy in regard to these matters. Whenever any such question arises, it is considered on its merits, and this is the first time that it has arisen in this country.

Maheshwar Naik:⁸⁴ May I know, Sir, whether the Government have in hand any proposal to rehabilitate those Tibetan refugees stationed in the camp?

⁸³ Congress, MP from Bihar.

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, I answered that question only a moment ago.

Faridul Haq Ansari:⁸⁵ May I know, Sir, whether any refugees are still pouring into this camp.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, in small numbers they dribble in.

Bhupesh Gupta:⁸⁶ It appears that considerable assets, including gold bullion, had been brought into this country by the Dalai Lama himself or on his behalf. Since the Dalai Lama has only life interest in this property, because it goes to the next Dalai Lama, it should be related to the welfare of the Tibetan people and the refugees also. May I know, Sir, whether, in view of that particular position—the Dalai Lama has only life interest in this property and to some extent it belongs to the State—the Government have approached the Dalai Lama and his entourage to part with some of this money, at least to begin with, so that it could be spent for the purpose of relief to the Tibetan refugees? This is my question, and I would like to know the actual position from the Prime Minister.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, the hon. Member presumably refers to some moneys or some bullion which came into Sikkim ten years back and with which the Government of India had nothing to do at that time, but lately we were asked to provide for escort to have those boxes, whatever they contained, removed to Calcutta; and the West Bengal Government gave that necessary escort.⁸⁷ I understand that this money or this jewellery or this bullion is being converted and is being deposited and invested, and what the hon. Member has said—this money being used for these refugees—is already in our mind.

⁸⁴ Congress, MP from Orissa.

⁸⁵ PSP, MP from UP.

⁸⁶ CPI, MP from West Bengal.

⁸⁷ See also item 170.

Dr. D.H. Variava:⁸⁸ May I ask one question? When a foreign national is given asylum in some country, is it the diplomatic procedure that he should be given also maintenance in all cases or only in certain cases? What is the actual diplomatic procedure in regard to this matter, Sir?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, this is not a diplomatic matter at all. A foreign national who comes here is not a diplomat, and this has to be judged in the circumstances of each case. It is for the Government to decide what has to be done under certain particular conditions or when it permits a person to reside and what facilities are given to that person. There can be no fixed rule about these matters, Sir.

Bhupesh Gupta: It seems that there was—and it was clear as the Prime Minister readily admitted it—movement of some wealth including bullion from one country to another. Now may I know Sir, whether, before helping this movement, Government found out as to in which capacity the money was being brought into India, I mean whether the Dalai Lama was bringing this money in his capacity as head of a local Government or in his capacity as a private person? And if he was bringing it in his capacity as a private person, may I know, Sir, whether the normal rules and regulations under the Foreign Exchange Act and various other Acts were observed?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Is the hon. Members referring to what happened ten years ago? I do not think any particular rule was applying to this matter. The Maharajkumar of Sikkim and the Dalai Lama then came to an agreement and these assets were deposited with the Maharajkumar of Sikkim, and there they had been all these ten years. And now the normal rules presumably apply.

⁸⁸ Congress, MP from Bombay State.

M. Valiulla.⁸⁹ Are there not customs rules relating to import of jewellery into India?

(No reply)

Jaswant Singh:⁹⁰ I would like to know—as the Prime Minister said a little while ago that how this money will be used on refugees or otherwise will be kept in mind—whether it will be kept in the mind of the Government of India or in the mind of the Dalai Lama just in the same way.

Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as we are concerned, we have treated these boxes, the contents of which we are not aware of, as the private property of the Dalai Lama, and we understand that the Dalai Lama will use the assets for this purpose.

286. In the Rajya Sabha: Ladakhi Muslims⁹¹

Repatriation of Ladakhi Muslims from Lhasa

S. Panigrahi:⁹² Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether six Ladakhi Muslims of Kalimpong have approached Government for the repatriation of 121 Ladakhi Muslim families now staying in Lhasa; and

(b) if so, what steps are being taken by Government for their repatriation?

⁸⁹ Congress, MP from Mysore State.

⁹⁰ Independent, MP from Rajasthan.

⁹¹ Written answers to questions, 24 February 1960. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. xxviii, cols. 1672-73.

⁹² Congress, MP from Orissa.

Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) and (b). Yes, Sir, as will be seen from the White Papers the Government of India have made several representations to the Government of China to allow these families to return to India. The Chinese authorities have, however, raised difficulties and so far none of the Kashmiris have been able to return to India. Our efforts to secure their voluntary repatriation to India are continuing.

173. In the Lok Sabha: Ladakh⁹³

[Translation begins:

Hem Barua and Prakash Vir Shastri:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether it is a fact that Pakistan's Representative to the United Nations has written to the Security Council that no agreement should be arrived at with China about Ladakh without consulting Pakistan, and
(b) Whether it is a fact that the Indian Representative has said that this demand by Pakistan cannot be accepted?

Translation ends.]

Sadath Ali Khan: (a) and (b). Copies of Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter dated December 3, 1959 addressed to the President of the Security Council and our reply are placed on the Table of the House.

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that this Ladakh dispute has been brought to the Security Council by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan, are we to understand that India's attempt to solve this problem with China independently of the Security Council is being impeded? .

⁹³ Reply to questions, 25 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates (Second Series), Vol. XXXIX, pp. 2676-77.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Nothing is being impeded.

Hem Barua: This Ladakh dispute is a dispute between India and China at present. But this has been brought before the Security Council specifically by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan and we have also replied to that on 22-12-59. Since it has come within the purview of the Security Council.

I want to know whether this very fact has impeded the independent solution of the Ladakh problem with China, on the part of India.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have just now said that nothing is being impeded.

174. In the Lok Sabha: Afro-Asian Conference on Tibet⁹⁴

H.N. Mukerjee: Prabhat Kar:⁹⁵ Raghunath Singh: Rameshwar Tantia:⁹⁶

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state?

(a) whether there is any truth in press reports that a three-day convention of Afro-Asian countries on Tibet is to be held at New Delhi in April 1960;⁹⁷

(b) if so, who are the sponsors and what are the terms of reference of the said convention; and

(c) whether Government have given approval to the idea of the convention?

⁹⁴ Reply to questions, 25 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XXXIX, cols, 2691-93.

⁹⁵ CPI, MP from Hooghly, West Bengal.

⁹⁶ Congress, MP from Sikar, Rajasthan.

⁹⁷ Three-day Afro-Asian Convention of Tibet opened on 8 April 1960 to demand the liberation of the Tibetan people from Chinese subjugation.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Sadath Ali Khan): (a) to (c). In pursuance of the resolution passed at the All India Tibetan Convention held at Calcutta in May, 1959 it is understood that an Afro-Asian Convention on Tibet is proposed to be held in India. The Convention which was due to begin in February 1960 has since been postponed and may be held later in this year. The Convention is being organised entirely under non-official initiative and the Government of India are in no way associated with its arrangement, nor are they required to accord their approval to the holding of such a Convention.

H.N. Mukerjee: In view of certain widely circulated reports in the Press about a leading public figure, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, contacting representatives of African and Asian States and also the Prime Minister for interview, may I know whether the Prime Minister and his Government have made it clear to the sponsors like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan that such activities are not approved by the Government of this country?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is true that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan came to see me twice, I think, about this and I told him that I did not wish to come in his way, but we were not happy about this development.⁹⁸

Chintamani Panigrahi: May I know whether the Prime Minister is aware that after meeting him, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan also met the various ambassadors now residing in India, so far as the Afro-Asian countries are concerned, and if so whether the Prime Minister is aware that the Afro-Asian countries were influenced by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan to cooperate in holding this conference in India?

Speaker: The question is, whether he has been taking further steps in this regard.

⁹⁸ See SWJN/SS/56/p. 358.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I?

Speaker: Shri Jayaprakash Narayan.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not aware of what steps he has taken. I think it is true that he met some ambassadors of the Afro-Asian countries here. Also, I believe, he sent some representatives to their countries to meet people there.

Renu Chakravartty:⁹⁹ I presume an assurance has been given that visas will be given to the foreign delegates who will be attending this conference.

Jawaharlal Nehru: In such cases, no general assurance is ever given. The most that we can say is that each case should be examined in respect of each applicant. There may be, of course, a general refusal when necessity arises, but generally we consider the applications for visas on an individual basis.

Raghunath Singh: May I know whether this organisation is sponsored by any political party of India?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know. So far as I know, it is an organisation *sui generis*. A political party may support it, but it is a different matter. I am not sufficiently acquainted with this organisation to be able to give a proper answer really.

Joachim Alva:¹⁰⁰ There are some persons who belong neither to Asia nor to Africa, but who have come as visitors to this country and they overstay

⁹⁹CPI, MP from Basirhat, West Bengal.

¹⁰⁰ Congress, MP from Kanara, Mysore State.

here. When asked, they say that they work for Tibetan refugees. How do they overstay here?

Speaker: What has that to do with this conference?

P.R. Patel:¹⁰¹ The people of different countries of Asia and Africa are agitated over the question of Tibet. So, if they meet here, in India, why should not the Government have a friendly attitude towards that conference?

Speaker: The question is, why the Government of India should not have a friendly attitude towards this conference which is intended to settle the Tibetan question here.

Jawaharlal Nehru: We have a friendly attitude to any conference which intends to do that or likely to do that. What the function of this conference is, it is not for me to say. But the results of their efforts are not likely to settle any question.

175. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Infiltration in Jammu and Kashmir¹⁰²

Ram Krishan Gupta, Raghunath Singh, N. R. Muniswamy, P.C. Borooah, D. C. Sharma and Bishwanath Roy:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Chinese have occupied the Chanthan Salt Mines in Ladakh and the people of that area have been refused access to salt mines by the Chinese military;

¹⁰¹ MJP, MP from Mehsana, Bombay State.

¹⁰² Reply to Short Notice Questions from Congress and other MPs, 25 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XXXIX, cols. 2694-97.

(b) whether it is a fact that a considerable number of unknown people in the guise of Buddhist monks have entered Zaskar from the Tibetan side;¹⁰³ and

(c) if so, the nature of the action taken in this regard?

Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) to (c). This subject has been referred to three times, if not more, and statements were made on the adjournment motion and, I think, in the course of debate too. However, this is the answer. The salt mines in Chanthan area and the Salt Lakes are in the North-East corner of Ladakh, which is in illegal occupation of the Chinese forces. There have been no reports of persons from our side having attempted to proceed there to collect salt and having been refused access.

As regards intrusion of Chinese in the guise of Buddhist monks in the Paddar and Zaskar areas, the J & K. Government have already contradicted the reports. It is most unlikely that any Chinese could have come to this place after negotiating one or two snow-bound high ranges and traversing some 100 miles of our territory.

Ram Krishan Gupta: On the 22nd February the hon. Prime Minister stated that this particular area was roughly 150 miles in the interior of our territory. In view of this fact, may I know what is the position at borders of this particular area?

Jawaharlal Nehru: These reports relate to two entirely separate areas, and that produces some amount of confusion. As I said in answer to this question, the salt lake area is that area which is at present under illegal occupation of the Chinese. The other area is away in the interior, hundred miles away, and it is physically an extraordinary proposition for people to cross over the high mountain ranges and come to the other area. That is part of the Jammu province.

¹⁰³ See also item 169.

Speaker: The hon. Member refers to the salt lake mine in Ladakh.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is one area; that is, as I said.....

Speaker: In the illegal occupation.

N.R. Muniswamy: May I know whether it is a fact that the working committee of the Praja Parishad of the Kistwar Tehsil has demanded of the Government of India not to leave the Paddar area unprotected since it is in the vicinity of Ladakh where campaign in favour of the Panchen Lama is going on?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Which area?

N.R. Muniswamy: Paddar area.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That raises the entire issue of Chinese occupation there. I cannot answer it. We have debated that. It is not a matter which can be answered in a sentence or two. We have discussed this matter several times.

Raghunath Singh: With reference to part (b) of the question, what steps have been taken to prevent the arrival of Chinese spies under the guise of Buddhist monks?

Jawaharlal Nehru: What steps are normally taken to prevent spies coming in. Spy is an individual, and the very act of his spying means that he comes under false pretences. Spies do not come with a flag saying "I am a spy." Therefore, though one tries to prevent it, a person may come on false pretences. I cannot guarantee that. Every country has their spies in other countries.

P.C. Borooah: May I know whether the Chanthan salt area in Ladakh was in use by them from a long time?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot give any information as to what is happening in that area, because it is under illegal occupation by the Chinese.

Ram Subhag Singh: The hon. Prime Minister says "I cannot say definitely", and the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir State stated that the Chanthan mine area is being operated by them, as it used to be previously. May I know whether the persons attached to the Chanthan mines are mining salt at present, as usual, or not?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I believe there is still that confusion about different areas. There is a certain area which is under the illegal occupation of the Chinese. Obviously, when it is in the illegal occupation of the Chinese, we are not mining there.

Speaker: Is there any other mining area?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There are bits here and there. But I am talking of the lake in the area which is occupied by the Chinese.

Vajpayee: There are certain other salt mines, apart from the area which is under the occupation of the Chinese, and the reports relate to that area.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is that which is contradicted by the Kashmir Government.

176. In the Lok Sabha: Chou En-lai's Letter of 26 February 1960¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴ Reply to questions, 29 February 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XXXIX, cols.3163-64.

Letter from H.E. Mr. Chou En-Lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, Addressed to the Prime Minister

Jawaharlal Nehru: I beg to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the letter dated 26th February, 1960 received by me from Premier Chou En-lai. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1933/60.]

This letter has already appeared in the public press this morning, and it was at the instance of the Chinese Embassy here. I thought that before we handed it over to the Press, I should place it before Parliament, and fortunately there was no delay involved.

In this letter, as will be noticed, my invitation to Premier Chou En-lai to come to India for talks has been accepted. I had suggested the second half of March. He has said that the month of April would suit him better. So far as we are concerned, we are equally agreeable to the month of April, and we shall proceed to get a definite date fixed as soon as possible. I am likely to leave India by about the end of April, possibly on the 30th April, to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. That will not come in the way, that is the very last day of April. So, I hope that a definite date will be fixed for this for Premier Chou En-lai to come here for these talks, and I feel sure that when he comes here, he will receive the courtesy and hospitality which India always gives to distinguished guests.

Braj Raj Singh: Since we are here in a democracy where Parliament must always be supreme, could the Prime Minister suggest to the Foreign Embassies stationed in Delhi that whenever such letters are received, they should show the courtesy of Parliament being informed first and then issue to the press?

Jawaharlal Nehru: This is an extraordinary proposal. It has nothing to do with the supremacy of Parliament. Even if I had given it to the press, there will be no discourtesy to Parliament. I felt it was proper for me to bring it here, but it is not merely a question of the Chinese Embassy

doing it here. The letter was, no doubt, issued in Peking to the Chinese press and other foreign agencies.

Braj Raj Singh: It was issued here in Delhi also.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I know that. I am merely pointing it out. It appeared, I am told, in the broadcasts from London last evening. So, it becomes world news immediately, and for me to ask the Chinese Embassy here to wait for our Parliament would be rather extraordinary.

As a matter of fact, I might say that our own All-India Radio people who knew about this yesterday asked me if they could give it in their 9 o'clock news. I said: "You better not; I should like to place it before Parliament first." I could tell them that, but I cannot control the BBC and all the world agencies.

177. In the Rajya Sabha: D. N. Chatterjee's Statements in Washington¹⁰⁵

D. N. Chatterjee's Statement About China

Bhupesh Gupta: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to a reported speech made by Shri D.N. Chatterjee, the Indian Charge d' Affaires at Washington, at a dinner organised there by the Harvard Club and held at the Occidental Restaurant towards the end of November, 1959;

(b) whether it is a fact that in his speech Shri Chatterjee spoke about the likelihood of a "major show down" between our country and China adding: "And by major show down he means a war that might bring the Great Powers into the conflict";

¹⁰⁵ Reply to questions, 29 February 1960. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVIII, cols. 2091-2096.

(c) whether he also said that "India is aligned with the West"; and
(d) if the above press reports are not a correct version of Shri Chatterjee's speech, whether the Prime Minister will lay on the Table of the House a copy of the full text of the speech?

Lakshmi Menon: (a) to (d). Yes. Reports of a speech towards the end of November 1959 by Shri D.N. Chatterjee, then the Indian Charge d'Affaires at Washington have appeared in the press. As we are informed the speech was impromptu, mainly on the economic reconstruction of India, and was followed by questions on matters of current interest. Among the answer to question were references to India's policy of non-alignment, her adherence to peace, freedom, justice and human values and to her democratic system of Government. Statements attributed to the Indian Charge d' Affaires about India's alignment with the West and "a war that might bring the great powers into the conflict" do not seem to have been correctly reported. As the speech was impromptu no transcript of it is available but a note recorded by the Charge d' Affaires is placed on the Table of the House.

[Note begins:

NOTE RECORDED BY SHRI D.N. CHATTERJEE

On November 28 I addressed the Harvard Club at a luncheon function organised by the Club Committee. I spoke impromptu for about half an hour and then answered question from the audience. I did not have a prepared speech.

2. In my speech, such as it was, the question of China, Tibet, etc., did not come up at all. As far as I remember my speech was mainly on the economic reconstruction in India and on the gradual emergence of a new society in our country. I also dealt briefly with our foreign policy of non-alignment, touching on the futility of military alliances particularly for a country like ours.

3. When the question period opened some members of the Harvard Club criticised (with due politeness) the seeming attitude of acquiescence on our part in Chinese intrusion into our territory. The point of all these questions was that instead of sending notes to Peking we should send troops to the border. While dealing with these questions I stated, among other things, that we were capable of defending our own borders and were determined to do so, but that nothing would distress us more than that, out of the border incidents, should grow a major conflict involving great powers. I made it clear that it was not the intention of India to initiate measures which might bring about "a major showdown" between India and China. This point came out as some one asked whether we would bomb China.

4. As regards India being "aligned" with the west, I may say that while talking about our foreign policy of non-alignment, I explained that we did not exist in a kind of vacuum but that we had firm ideas about Peace, Freedom, Justice, and human values. An important feature of our non-alignment policy related to our refusal to have military alliances particularly with either of the contending "blocs", I said that India was "aligned" with the Charter of the United Nations and that India had marked preference for the democratic system of Government. It is possible that some members of the press have interpreted my remarks to mean that India is "aligned with the west." If that has been the case the interpretation is unwarranted. End of Note.]

Bhupesh Gupta: I would like you to kindly refer to paragraph 3 of the note. It says:

"The point of all these questions was that instead of sending notes to Peking we should send troops to the border."

There was another question about bombing China. It appears from the record note of Mr. Chatterjee himself that at no point did he stress that the policy of the Government of India in general and the Prime Minister in particular was one of peaceful negotiation and one of settlement. In the

recorded statement, nowhere do we find the words peaceful or settlement or both occurring. May I know, Sir, whether such a statement or exposition of the policy in the light of this question is in consonance with the policy of the Government of India and of Prime Minister Nehru?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a long question, Sir. The note recorded by our Charge d' Affaires—I have read through it—does not contain anything opposed to our policy. May be some emphasis was given to one aspect or another. It should be remembered, as stated in the answer, that questions are asked and the original statement probably did not say anything or much about this matter. This dealt with other questions; questions are asked and he has to answer questions, questions not related to the whole policy but a particular point and I do not see anything in this note, as far as I have been able to make it out, which is opposed to our policy.

Bhupesh Gupta: Then it will be my endeavour to try and make the Prime Minister see that there is something in it.

Mr. Chairman: Put a question.

Bhupesh Gupta: How can I put a question, Sir, without relating it to the circumstances. Here is what he says:

"I made it clear that it was not the intention of India to initiate measures which might bring about 'a major show down' between India and China. This point came out as someone asked whether we would bomb China."

Am I to understand, Sir, that if the Prime Minister were in the United States of America and if he had been asked a similar question, he would have given an answer of this kind without referring to the basic policy of peaceful negotiation and settlement?

Chairman: Mr. Gupta, your question is, "If the Prime Minister were in the United States and if he had been asked such a question, would he have given such an answer?" There are so many hypotheses.

Bhupesh Gupta: All right, Sir, I shall put a question. May I know whether the Government of India has given any instruction to their envoys and emissaries, especially in the United States of America, that if such provocative questions suggesting bombing of China, etc., are asked, they should answer in particular way? Have they given any directive? If so, I would like to know the nature of the directive?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Do you expect me to answer this extraordinary question, Sir?

Bhupesh Gupta: If I remove the hypothesis, then it becomes an extraordinary question. Anyway, Sir, may I know whether the Prime Minister's attention has been drawn to the last portion of Mr. Banerjee's—I am sorry Mr. Chatterjee's statement. I know he is a Bengali and pro-American, I know that.

Mr. Chairman: No remarks.

Bhupesh Gupta: He was speaking to a particular audience, Sir. May I know whether the attention of the Prime Minister has been drawn to the note of Mr. Chatterjee wherein he himself admits this? He says: "It is possible that some members of the press have interpreted my remarks to mean that India is aligned with the West." If the reply is in the affirmative may I know whether Government have examined the papers which published such reports to see what the Indian authorities there could do to remove any kind of misinterpretation of the speech?

Chairman: Look here, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, it says:

"It is possible that it may be so interpreted."

If that is so, then he says,

"The interpretation is unwarranted."

Bhupesh Gupta: The possibility is there, Sir.

Chairman: And the possibility is repudiated in the last sentence.

Bhupesh Gupta: I got this from the United States. Some people read about this and sent it on to me. That is the reason why I tabled this question. I did not know it myself. May I know whether the Prime Minister's attention...

(Interruption.)

Sir, has the P.S.P. taken the responsibility of replying to questions addressed to the Prime Minister? I never thought so but the hon. Member seems to be chasing me.

Anyway, Sir, may I know whether, in view of this answer, the Prime Minister has found out from the Indian authorities in the United States of America if Mr. Chatterjee or somebody acting on his behalf immediately contradicted this kind of interpretation put across in some local newspaper?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir, I did not find out and I do not think it necessary to find out.

Faridul Haq Ansari: My hon. friend seems to object to the troops being sent to the border. He seems to say that no troops should be sent to the border. May I know whether it is the policy of the Indian Government not to defend the Indian border against foreign aggression?

(No reply)

Bhupesh Gupta: In this connection, may I know as to whether it had been suggested that the troops would be led to the border by Acharya

Kripalani?

(No reply)

Mr. Chairman: Questions are over.

178. In the Rajya Sabha: Chinese Disguised as Buddhist Monks entering India¹⁰⁶

Entry of Chinese into Paddar Area in the Guise of Buddhist Monks

Nawab Singh Chauhan:¹⁰⁷ Harihar Patel:¹⁰⁸

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the news item published in the Times of India, Delhi, of the 20th December, 1959, to the effect that the Chinese agents in the guise of Buddhist Monks have infiltrated into the Paddar area of Jammu adjoining Ladakh, and that the area of Ladakh adjoining Paddar has been occupied by the Chinese;¹⁰⁹ and
(b) if so, how far it is correct?

Lakshmi Menon: (a) and (b) The reports are not correct.

[Translation begins:

Nawab Singh Chauhan: In this connection whether any party has been sent to enquire into it?

¹⁰⁶ Reply to questions, 29 February 1960. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVIII, cols. 2063-65.

¹⁰⁷ Congress, MP from UP.

¹⁰⁸ Gantantra Parishad, MP from Orissa.

¹⁰⁹ See also items 169 and 175.

Translation ends.]

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, we have no information and also no report has been received from our check posts about such surreptitious movements, and it has been denied by the Kashmir Chief Minister also.

[Translation begins:

Nawab Singh Chauhan: I mean to say that whether any inquiry has been done following reports in the newspapers; if so then what came out as a result?

Translation ends.]

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, enquiries were made and we were told that these reports were of a mischievous nature, originated by the Praja Parishad leaders.

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I ask, Sir, whether the Government is satisfied about the arrangements regarding intelligence in this particular area?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, that question is rather difficult to answer satisfactorily, but this story is so inherently improbable that without any intelligence arrangements any intelligent person can say that it is exceedingly unlikely. Apart from that, I can tell you that this area is far in the interior—within 150 miles. It is not a border area; it is far in the interior. Secondly, in order to reach there one high mountain pass has got to be traversed. Therefore, that is inherently improbable, and I do not think what two or three persons disguised as Buddhist monks can do there. But if you ask me absolutely precisely "Has anybody come there?" well, how can I say whether any individual, somehow or other, has managed to come there? Of course, I am quite sure in my mind that nobody has come to this particular area.