

Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

Series 2, Volume 58

March 1- 25, 1960

People's Republic of China

200. To Chou En-lai³⁰

PARTHASARATHY from DUTT.

Please transmit the following message immediately to Premier CHOU EN-LAI:

Begins- "My dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I thank you for your letter of the 26th February.³¹ I am glad that you have accepted my invitation to visit Delhi so that we can have talks about our problems and explore avenues which may lead to a peaceful settlement of these problems. I shall look forward to your visit in April.

We shall naturally try to suit your convenience about the date of your visit here. If I may suggest it, about the 20th April might perhaps be suitable. I shall probably have to leave India for Europe on the 29th or 30th April.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,"

Ends

2. For your information, Prime Minister will be otherwise engaged until

³⁰ Telegram from S. Dutt to G Parthasarathi, 4 March 1960. JN Collection. The message to Chou En-lai is available in *White Paper III*, p. 152; it was tabled in the Lok Sabha on 10 March 1960.

³¹ Published in *White Paper III*, p. 99.

about the middle of April. The Tibet Convention which is being organised by Jai Prakash Narayan³² and likely to be attended by a number of foreign representatives is being held in Delhi from April 8 to 11.³³ It would obviously be advisable for Premier Chou En-lai to reach Delhi after the Convention is over. In personal discussion, therefore, you should discourage an earlier date of the Prime Ministers meeting, although a day or two earlier would not matter. Incidentally, as you know, under our law and procedures, we could not prohibit the holding of the Convention even if we wanted to.

3. We are agreeable to definite dates being fixed through normal diplomatic channels.

201- In the Rajya Sabha: Mail-Runners Missing in Ladakh³⁴

Dr. A. N. Bose:³⁵ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that two mail-runners detailed to carry mail in Ladakh area near the Indo-Chinese border, were missing for the last two and a half months: and

(b) if so, whether they have since been traced?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a)

³² Sarvodaya leader and a leading member of the Praja Socialist Party.

³³ Afro-Asian Convention in New Delhi, 9-11 April 1960, attended by nearly fifty delegates from eighteen countries of Asia and Africa, to demand the liberation of Tibet. At the instance of West Asian and African delegates, the agenda included their anti-colonial struggles also. It decided on an Afro-Asian Council based in New Delhi with Jayaprakash Narayan as President, and also a permanent Council for Tibet to work for the rights of Tibetans and the rehabilitation of refugees.

³⁴ Oral answers to questions, 8 March 1960. *Rajya Sabha Debates*, Vol. XXVIII, cols 3054- 3055.

³⁵ PSP, Rajya Sabha MP from West Bengal.

and (b) It is true that two mail-runners of the Dras area in the Jammu & Kashmir State are missing since 23-5-1959. But this area is about 250 miles within Indian Territory and although their disappearance is still unaccounted, there is no reason to suspect that this has any political significance or foul play.

Dr. A. N. Bose: Was any enquiry made about their whereabouts?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Naturally, Sir, when people disappear we enquire about their disappearance. We found that no paper or money was missing; they just disappeared. So no question arose of intrigue or political connection with this though some people may be inclined to think that because the Chinese have committed aggression, this might be connected with that. The distance is too great in that area. There is a possibility that these two runners deserted because some charges had been made against them and they were a little afraid of the enquiry into the charges and they might have deserted and gone over into a neighbouring country on the western side.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Since my hon. friend is interested, I am also interested. Was the P.S.P. office in Calcutta or Delhi looked into to see whether such people are lodged there?

(No reply)

202- In the Rajya Sabha: Chinese Occupation of Chanthan Salt Mines Area in Ladakh³⁶

³⁶ Oral answers to questions, 8 March 1960. *Rajya Sabha Debates*, Vol. XXVIII, cols 3055- 3057.

Question:³⁷ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Chinese have occupied Chanthan salt mines area in Ladakh;
- (b) whether the residents of that area have been stopped from collecting salt from there by the Chinese army; and
- (c) if so, what action Government have taken in this connection?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) to (c) 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 any persons from our side in recent months having attempted to proceed to these mines to collect salt and having been refused access.

Shri Jugal Kishore: May I know since when these salt mines are occupied by the Chinese?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of occupation. A certain part of Ladakh has got certain Chinese posts presumably established there in various parts. This particular salt mine area is, you might say, covered by those check posts. In that sense whether it is occupied or not, you may describe it as you like but there is no actual evidence of occupation.

Shri Jaswant Singh: I would like to know whether it is a fact that the Indian nationals living in Ladakh have been prohibited to collect salt from these salt mines.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No such case has come to our notice.

Shri Maheswar Naik:³⁸ May I know whether these mines fall actually

³⁷ By Congress MPs Jugal Kishore and Ram Sahai.

under our jurisdiction or they are beyond our jurisdiction?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have just said that it is more or less covered, that is, covered in the sense of jurisdiction. But the question of jurisdiction does not arise; if I may put it this way, at the present moment it is not accessible to us.

Dr. H.N. Kunzru:³⁹ Can Indian nationals go there and collect salt?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What was the question?

Dr. H.N. Kunzru: I want to know whether Indian nationals can go there and collect salt. What is the information of the Government on the point?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have no information of any person trying to go there and no information about his being stopped.

Shri N.M. Lingam:⁴⁰ May I know if it is south or north of the Aksai Chin-Tibet road that has been constructed by the Chinese?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is neither north nor south. It is in the east.

Shri Niranjana Singh:⁴¹ May I know whether the whole of it has been occupied by the Chinese or only parts of it because south must be in Indian Territory and north may be in China?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But all this is Indian Territory. Part of it is in

³⁸ Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from Orissa.

³⁹ Independent, Rajya Sabha MP from UP.

⁴⁰ Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from Madras.

⁴¹ PSP, Rajya Sabha MP from Madhya Pradesh.

illegal occupation by the Chinese forces now. When I say illegal occupation, as I said just now, it is not that the whole place is covered with troops and other things taut certain Chinese check posts hold certain points and this particular part is covered by those check posts.

Shri Jaswant Singh:⁴² I understand that this area is covered by the check posts. May I know whether the check post is actually located near the salt mines?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

Shri Jaswant Singh: Then what is the meaning of saying that it is covered?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In the military sense it is covered. That is to say, they can guard it; they can prevent access to it if they want.

203- In the Rajya Sabha: Chinese in Chanthan Salt Mines⁴³

ALLEGED OCCUPATION BY CHINESE OF CHANTHAN SALT MINES AREA IN LADAKH

Mr. Speaker: I have received notices of Adjournment Motions. One is from Shri Hem Barua. To some extent it has been answered already. It says: "The situation of grave concern for us all created by the illegal occupation of the Chanthan Salt Mines area in Ladakh, an explicitly Indian territory, by China and the conversion of this illegally occupied area into a bastion

⁴² Independent, Rajya Sabha MP from Rajasthan.

⁴³ Discussion on the notices of adjournment motions, 9 March 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XL, cols 4911-4915.

of the Chinese by encircling this region with check-posts, thereby preventing Indians from collecting salt from the Salt Mines which legitimately belong to us."

Shri Hem Barua: May I say a few words, Sir? In our latest note to China, we have affirmed that there have been no border incidents during the recent weeks. This must be due to the fact that most of these areas are snow-bound, but in spite of it, China is slowly and persistently creeping into Indian territory and there is alleged news of the illegal occupation of the Chanthan Salt Mines. They have not only occupied this area but they have encircled the area with check-posts. At the same time they have prevented our people from collecting the salt from the salt mines there.

Mr. Speaker: Where does he get the information from?

Shri Hem Barua: I will come to it, Sir. The pity is that the Government has so far....

Mr. Speaker: I do not want arguments. First of all, let me know what is the source of information of the hon. Member.

Shri Hem Barua: This was what the Prime Minister said yesterday in the Rajya Sabha, but, then, in the Rajya Sabha the Prime Minister did not indicate the date of occupation. The date is yet to be indicated. It is a pity that wherever illegal occupation of Indian territory takes place, the news of it emanates and comes to the knowledge of the people always from non-official sources, whether it is in the case of Longju⁴⁴ or in the case of Chanthan salt mines. This is a reflection or a sad commentary on the state of things, particularly the machinery and the material the Government possess. It all emanates from non-official sources.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is going on digressing. I only wanted to

⁴⁴ See SWJN/SS/51/items 193 and 197 and subsequent volumes.

know what is the source of his information. Of course, I can immediately say that if the hon. Minister makes a statement in the other House that cannot be a matter for Adjournment Motion in this House. Otherwise, every day we will have adjournments of that House and this House on account of statements, etc!

Shri Hem Barua: May I make a submission?

Mr. Speaker: What more does he want to say?

Shri Hem Barua: In the statements made in this House during the Question Hour, certain information percolated. This question involves certain fundamentals also. My particular point in giving notice of this Adjournment Motion is this. How is it that our machinery always fails and how is it that the information comes first only through non-official agencies? Then the information goes through a process of admission, non-admission, refusal to admit, and all sorts of things. Ultimately, it is established as in the case of Longju and as in the case of Chanthan mines. At the same time....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member obviously suggests that if the same information is known to the Government there and then they must come to the House and tell the House, "Yes, yes; ' they have encroached upon one mile, two miles, that is the location", and so on. Is that the object?

Shri Hem Barua: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, for not having done so, this Government is censured! The hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I have said something about this matter in this House and also in

the other House. Surely this House does not expect me to contradict myself. I have said exactly the same thing, possibly in somewhat different language. Only a short while ago, this question came up incidentally.

The fact of the matter is, talking about the source of information which you were pleased to enquire, the hon. Member said, it is a non-official source. I will go further; it is a non-official source from Jammu, which is so completely irresponsible that it has made a habit of spreading news which has absolutely no foundation, I am merely saying that because that happens several times. The Kashmir Government have drawn particular attention to this fact that this organisation does this with the least enquiry, knowledge, just for the fun of it, I suppose; I do not know why. Anyhow, this is completely wrong. I mean what it has said. The hon. Member is rather perhaps confused by my mentioning the check posts in the other House. Nothing has happened in this area for the last many months.

We discussed this position, not of the salt mines, but of the Chinese aggression, here on several occasions. Nothing has happened there to change that position. It may be, as the hon. Member himself said, nothing can happen during the winter months because nobody goes there or can go there during the winter months. But nothing has happened to the salt mines. It is only because this organisation has mentioned something about the salt mines that they have come within the ken of the hon. Member. But they have been within that area, which months ago was broadly illegally occupied by the Chinese forces. That is bad enough; there has been no other advance or encroachment during that time and there could be none also, because of various circumstances. When I mentioned the word "checkposts", I merely said it because in various parts of this area, not now, but many months ago, the Chinese have put their check posts and that broad area is controlled by those check posts, I am not referring to these particular salt mines.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether they have prevented our people

from taking salt from there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How does the hon. Member know that? He is basing himself on some totally unreliable information from an unreliable authority based on an unreliable organisation. But again, if I may say so, apart from facts, it is physically impossible—the period is such that nobody went there or could go there.

Shri Hem Barua: The Prime Minister said that that source is thoroughly unreliable. That is what the Prime Minister of Kashmir also has said. But the fact is the news or information emanating from a source that is supposed to be thoroughly unreliable by two Prime Ministers, is corroborated by the statement of our Prime Minister in the Rajya Sabha. He has nowhere said that the salt mines are not occupied; he has nowhere said that the salt mines have not been controlled by check posts; he has nowhere said that they have not prevented our people from collecting salt from there. There is a regular admission of this information emanating from whatever source it may be; it is true.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What is this organisation which is unreliable and which is spreading the news?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member says it is a natural inference; if the salt mines in that territory are occupied, naturally the inference is Indians will be prevented.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The salt lake has been in that part of the area which was occupied months ago; nothing fresh has been occupied....

Shri Hem Barua: Occupied illegally.

Mr. Speaker: That is so; when it is occupied, it is always illegal.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So, I do not understand all these arguments nor the statement that I have been supporting the allegation of an organisation in Jammu. I do not know, as I had just stated, what language I am to use to be understood. Maybe my English is not good enough; I am prepared to use Hindi. I know no third language.

204. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Intrusion⁴⁵

Shri P.K. Deo:⁴⁶ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state how many square miles of Indian territory are under the occupation of the Chinese forces?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): It is difficult to give the precise area of Indian territory under illegal occupation of Chinese forces. The area broadly covered by the Chinese Army posts is about 12,000 square miles.

Shri P.K. Deo: May I know if this area is being inhabited by Indian nationals? If so, how many Indians are residing in that occupied area?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): It is an uninhabited area. No census has ever been taken there. Usually in summer a few shepherds wander there for grazing purposes. But so far as we know, it is practically uninhabited.

Shri P.K. Deo: May I know if the area of the Chinese occupation has remained static or is on the increase?

⁴⁵ Oral answers to questions, 9 March 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XL, cols 4849-4850.

⁴⁶ Ganatantra Parishad, Lok Sabha MP from Kalahandi, Orissa.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There has been no change there so far as we know for the last 7 or 8 months. That is to say, the position has been static.

Shri Radhelal Vyas:⁴⁷ May I know whether any income used to be derived by the Government of India or the Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir from that territory occupied by the Chinese forces?

Shri Braj Raj Singh:⁴⁸ On a point of order. The answering of such questions would affect our integrity. It is not at all proper to go into such matters as to whether any income was derived from there and whether the territory was inhabited or not. This is something which goes against the country's integrity.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are answering these points themselves.

Shri Goray: I would like to know whether the salt mines which they have occupied now or which are under the Military occupation of the Chinese formed part of the original area which was occupied by them or this is a new occupation.

Mr. Speaker: This was answered.

Shri Goray: No, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There has been no occupation, no advance. This is within the area broadly covered originally by their illegal occupation.

There has been nothing new.

⁴⁷ Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Ujjain, MP.

⁴⁸ Socialist, Lok Sabha MP from Firozabad, UP.

Shri P.K. Deo: May I know if the salt lake is within the 12,000 square miles which they have occupied.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, I shall reply in Hindi if English is not understood.

[Translation begins:

This question which has been put to me, I have replied to it many times. In six, seven, eight months, nothing more has happened; whatever advances they had made in the beginning, these salt lakes are in those areas. There is no specific news as to what happens there, or somebody is stopped from visiting the place or not.

Translation ends]

Shri Raghunath Singh: I have a very important question.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

205. In the Lok Sabha: Demands for Grants for MEA⁴⁹

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, not very long ago, I had occasion to address this House in regard to an important aspect of foreign affairs in the debate on the President's Address.⁵⁰ I am afraid I took a great deal of the time of the House then and I do not propose to tax the House's patience to that extent on this occasion. I hardly think it will be worthwhile for me to repeat what I said on that occasion, more particularly about one of the major questions before us, that is, the troubles we had in our frontiers because of Chinese incursions. We have

⁴⁹ Reply to the debate on the demand for grants to the MEA, 17 March 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XL, cols 6478-6502.

The discussion started on 16 March.

⁵⁰ See SWJN/SS/57/item 168.

discussed that on many occasions, rightly, because it is an important and vital matter.

Now, certain developments have taken place to which reference has been made. The Prime Minister of China has been invited by me to visit India for certain talks. He has accepted that invitation but yet the date has not been fixed, except vaguely about the middle or the third week of April. Some hon. Members have asked me and pressed me to say how these discussions will take place, what are the particular subjects of discussion and the like matters.

Now, I would venture to say that it is hardly possible for me or desirable for me to speak in this House or anywhere, in fact, in public about the manner of talks or the manner of carrying on talks that we might adopt. That is not the way that diplomatic conversations or any like talks take place.

In the final analysis, one puts forward in the House or in public broad policies firmly, and it is for this House or for the country to have or not to have a measure of confidence in those who speak on its behalf.

Now, the position of the hon. Speaker who spoke just before me is perfectly clear and understandable, because he thinks he has not any faith or confidence. May be, others won't have it either, but he has expressed himself with great clarity and said that the best thing for India would be to weaken the present Prime Minister and to rely on the people. With, of course, the second part, I suppose, all would agree but, perhaps, others may somehow doubt the fact that the hon. Member, Shri Yadav, as he said, represents the 40 crores of India. Perhaps, some others in this House have also some claims to representation and, perhaps, when it comes to calculation and statistics those he represents might not be easily visible without a magnifying glass. But however that may be, whatever argument he may put forward is worthy of consideration as every argument should be.

Now, with regard to the many points that have been raised, my colleague the Deputy Minister has dealt with a number of them. In regard

to this particular very important matter of the frontier incursions by China, that has become, and undoubtedly is, the major issue before us, before India, in regard to our foreign policy, because anything that affects the integrity of a country must necessarily be the most vital issue for that country. After all, the foreign policy of any country concerns itself primarily with the protection of that country, with the protection of its freedom, of its sovereignty, of its integrity. These are the first tests of a foreign policy, and in so far as it is unable to do so, well, it has failed. Whether it has failed because of wrong approaches or whatever the reasons may be, in that measure it fails. I am prepared to accept that definition, that conclusion.

Therefore, in this world today which is tremendously agitated over great problems of war and peace, in the course of a month or two it is said that some of the great ones of the earth are going to meet at a summit meeting to discuss the future of the world one might say, because behind their talks lie not only the immediate questions which they might discuss about Germany or Berlin or that very vital matter, disarmament, but ultimately the future of the world does depend not finally, but it will be affected by those talks or by subsequent talks because I do not imagine that this process of talking will end with the first summit meeting because if it ended without success, then the future would be dark indeed.

It is not for me to prophesy what is going to happen there, and I have lately said in this House and elsewhere that the prospects are somewhat more favourable than they had been in the past. I believe in that and I hope for what I believe in. It is not merely wishful thinking-of course, it may be so because I so earnestly desire that some good results must come from these talks and what follows-good results in regard to disarmament, in regard to stoppage of this horrible thing, production of atomic, nuclear weapons and their tests.

I hope so. Yet, I am constrained to say that some recent developments have rather damped my optimism. Some forces appear to be at play

which remind one rather forcibly of the days preceding the Second World War. I hope that these forces are not strong, and I do believe that the forces for peace are very much stronger. Nevertheless, it does cause one anxiety to realise that in spite of the two great wars, in spite of the public realisation of the terror of these hydrogen bombs etc., still there should be harping back in some people's minds on the ways and methods and thinking and actions which led to the Second World War, with this difference that the Second World War is supposed to be rather child's play compared to the war that might descend upon us in this age of jet aircraft and nuclear weapons. That is the broad outlook in this world, an outlook of hope, but, at the same time, tense with a great deal of apprehension.

On the other hand, one sees powerful movements, also full of hope, moving the millions of Africa, new countries arising there in their independence, new leadership, new urges, new passions, sometimes new conflicts. We talk about Algeria, and with Algeria, with their struggle for freedom, we have sympathised and we have sent them our good wishes. But it is not Algeria alone today but the whole structure of the African continent that is changing and something new is emerging, something new that will undoubtedly have a powerful effect on the future of the world.

I often wonder what this world will look like in the next 20 years, 30 years or by the end of the century-it is not far off this period. It will be very different. We have seen great changes in Asia taking place, continuing. We see now this emergence of Africa on the world scene with a tremendous bang-it has not come slowly, it has come rapidly and rather noisily-and no man knows what the effect of it is going to be, because Africa with all its story of horror and suffering for centuries past is a country full of vitality, and a nation whose people are full of vitality cannot be sat upon too long.

In Africa also one sees the most flagrant example of a policy proclaimed to be a policy of racial suppression, racial antagonism, racial discrimination, a policy of the master race, pursued by those in the

south of this continent of Africa, a policy however much it may perhaps have sympathy from some people in some countries, which at any rate, hardly any person in other countries openly accepts or sides with not even those who may be considered the conservatives of the present age. And yet, there it is, and it is an amazing sight here in Africa, these countries rising up with all their strength and vitality and passion, and anger too sometimes, and there it is still, the continuation of this policy in the far south.

What is going to be the result of all this? These two things are mutually antagonistic. The great new independent African States can never agree to this kind of discrimination and racial antagonism which, in the ultimate analysis, is continuing insult to them and indeed to everyone concerned. So, we see this. I do not know how things will develop. But I am merely pointing out to this House these tremendous changes and upheavals that are taking place so that we might see our own problems, important as they are to us, in this wider picture and wider structure.

Behind all this lies this technological development which has produced atomic energy, atomic bomb, the jet aircraft, the space age and all that coming up with rapidity which we can hardly follow in our minds and which obviously are going to change the shape of things in the world and the shape of human living and all that. That is the world we live in. It is a good world for those who dare, who are not afraid, and who can look ahead and are not lost in petty squabbles and petty arguments. It is a bad world for those who do not realise what the world is and where it is aiming and are continuously looking at their own feet instead of looking sometimes ahead, into the distance and to the stars. Whether it is a good world or a bad world, it is the world we live in and we have to face it with all its dangers and all its promises.

As I said, we should have this picture before us but inevitably we have to look at our own problems and the major problem for us in the foreign field is the problem of our frontier. There is no doubt about it, and some of us may not speak in the high key of some Members of the Opposition,

nevertheless, it is obvious that everyone of us is gravely concerned about this problem not only in the present but in the future that looms before us; gravely concerned, not merely because it has taken place-it is where it is-but because of all manner of implications attached to it, all manner of forebodings.

I ventured to point out on a previous occasion that what has happened on our frontier is bad enough but the real historical significance of this is that something new has come. All this talk which hon. Members opposite indulge in, of how we should behave on this occasion and on that occasion, what strong speeches we may deliver and the opposition may deliver, as to what we should have done in 1950 in regard to Tibet and what we should do now is I would say with all respect, a very petty change in this mighty development that has taken place, as if in 1950, if we had sent a different letter to the Chinese Government, the whole course of world history and the Chinese history and the misfortunes that have happened to Tibet would have changed.

I am amazed and astounded at this very simple type of reasoning of historical events and mighty forces at play and the lack of understanding that is shown in regard to them. Naturally, if you ask me, I am grieved at a great deal that has happened in Tibet. I think that the people of Tibet deserve our sympathy in every sense of the word. That is true. Nevertheless, the point that comes before me-not now but in 1950, 1951, 1955 and 1959-is what we as a nation can do about it, safeguarding our own honour, interests, etc. and helping the causes we have at heart. We have many causes at heart all over the world. If we have a cause at heart, naturally, somewhere in the African continent that applies even more to the Asian continent and to those who might be our neighbours. But the fact remains: how do we understand this picture and what do we do about it.

It is easy for hon. Members on that side or this side to speak bravely in this House. But it should be remembered that this great Parliament, which is sovereign in India, and whose writ runs to every corner of India, cannot

send its writs beyond the comers of India and cannot send its writs where they cannot be accepted and will not be accepted. We cannot issue an order to Africa or to the American continent or to other parts of Asia. Sometimes hon. Members speak here as if we have merely to pass a resolution here or deliver a speech here and the history of the world will change and the great forces at work in the world will somehow climb down because a speech has been made or a resolution passed.

Let us be idealists; I hope we shall never cease to be idealists. But let us also be realists and let us realise what is the world. It is no good thinking that we are living in some past age, either from the point of view of modern technology or from the point of view of modern politics and the two are intimately connected together. With all the courage in the world, it will not serve us if we are not served by modern technology in defending our country and our interests

So, let us not go on like that. A number of times we have heard this repeated: only this morning, it was said that because something was done or said or not done or not said in 1950 by us in regard to Tibet all these difficulties have befallen us. I have no answer to that argument, because it shows such an utter lack of understanding of how things happen, what might have happened or what might not have happened. It surprises me that an hon. Member of this House has advanced that argument.

In this connection, may I with all respect mention one aspect of this and sometimes the subsequent other debates, which has troubled me greatly? An hon. Member on the other side referred by name here to a member of the other House and used language which astounded me. In this connection, I think he said-he was referring to Shri Panikkar⁵¹ and quoting from his book *In Two Chinas*- that Mr. Panikkar who was our Ambassador ten years ago had betrayed the best interests of India and that he was ashamed that he has been nominated by the President to

⁵¹ K.M. Panikkar, Ambassador to China from 1948 to 1952.

Parliament as a representative of the Indian people.⁵² Now, apart from my totally disagreeing with those words that he has used, what troubles me is this: a habit is growing in this House of referring to people by name and condemning them, bringing charges against them when they are not here to reply. That occurred the other day in the course of a discussion on education. People's names were mentioned here precisely and they were charged with acts which were most undesirable. They could not answer. The surprising thing is that when that poor man ventures to answer outside, it is said, "Oh, you dare not answer". I do not understand this at all.

First of all, we use the privilege of Parliament to condemn a man and when that poor man has to say something in his own defence, it is said, "he cannot do it." This is a very surprising thing. I submit I do not know and I do not presume to know what the precise parliamentary forms and practices are in this matter. I am not referring to that but I do, and hope I know, something about the normal decencies of public life and the normal conventions which should govern parliamentary life, I do submit that any man whoever he is by name should not be condemned in this House. The hon. Member can do so outside, wherever he likes; he is on an open footing. But to exercise the privileges of this House and to bring those charges is a wrong procedure and is likely to create all manner of difficulties.

Again, if Members of this House start abusing Members of the other House, the Members of the other House have also the privilege of Parliament and no doubt they may use it. And are we going to have this kind of mutual squabbles between two Houses or within the House between Members? But apart from all this....

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Mr. Speaker, may I raise a point? This is just

⁵² By S. Mahanty, Ganatantra Parishad Member from Dhenkanal, Orissa, in the Lok Sabha on 16 March 1960. See *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XL, cols 6309-6312.

criticising your authority. Here in the House you are the custodian of the rights of the members and whenever a member says something which is not in accordance with the rules of the House you pull him up. When you have not pulled him up, it means that you have permitted it.

Mr. Speaker: it was rather unfortunate. I do not think I was present here when this was said.

Sardar Hukam Singh:⁵³ I was here.

Mr. Speaker: Whoever might have been present, it was rather unfortunate. The rules are specific. We ought not to abuse our privilege, a privilege which has been given not for the purpose of abusing others or saying things against others who are not here to defend themselves, but for the purpose of placing before the House without fear or favour what is in the interests of the country, without being deterred by the position of even great men outside. That is the peculiar privilege that we have for the exercise of our legitimate rights. An impression ought not to be created that we are abusing it. It is unfortunate that a hon. Member of the other House should have been referred to by name. If any person, whether a member of this House or that House, has written a book, it is open to any member to criticise that portion of the book without attributing any motives to him. The hon. Prime Minister stopped with saying that the members of the other House might criticise us. He did not go further and say that there are fourteen Assemblies in this country and every member in every Assembly may go on abusing us. Then there will be no end to it. Hon. Members should give respect and take respect. There is a definite rule that even when particular officers who are responsible to us have to be criticised, notice has to be given to me so that, if it is a proper case, I

⁵³ Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Bhatinda, Punjab; and Deputy Speaker of the Lok Sabha.

may pass it on to the Minister so that the Minister can come prepared to reply. With respect to those persons who are outside, whom we represent here, who are not in a position to explain or defend themselves, I am devising a method that no criticism of an outsider would be allowed. Unfortunately some words might have inadvertently escaped our notice. There is no meaning in saying that merely because they have gone into the papers so I have considered and given a definite ruling that it ought to happen. It might have escaped our notice. Therefore, whenever such abuses are made, it is open to any hon. Member to bring it to my notice so that if I have allowed it inadvertently on a prior occasion I might remove it later on. I will have no hesitation in doing so.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Sir, I must confess that it did not escape my notice. I pulled him up once and he withdrew his words, though that was in a different connection. A second time I warned him and asked him to use more temperate language. My difficulty was that he was quoting from the book written by the gentleman himself. Even then I told him when he quoted it and he was drawing inferences and conclusions that his views must be couched in temperate language. That was all I could do, because a book written by the hon. Member had been quoted. Therefore, I could not stop him from mentioning the name when he was quoting from the book itself. That was my difficulty. Otherwise, I felt it and I took exception to it and on one occasion in respect of the other contention he had withdrawn his words.

Shri Mahanty: May I also offer a word of explanation?

Mr. Speaker: Did he utter those words?

Shri Mahanty: I would like to know

Mr. Speaker: Did he utter those words with respect to an hon. Member of

the other House?

Shri Mahanty: I happened to refer to that gentleman in his capacity as our Ambassador in Peking, not as a member of the Rajya Sabha. It is an accident that he has been nominated to the Rajya Sabha.

Mr. Speaker: Did he say that he was nominated by the President in spite of all this?

Shri Mahanty: I said in respect of this gentleman that it is a pity that he has been nominated as a representative of the people.

Mr. Speaker: It is very improper. I have no hesitation to say that it is not right for any hon. Member to indirectly or directly cast an aspersion on a member of another House. It is open to him to refer to the book and make any remarks he likes, because the book is open to the public, but to criticise the President or to say that the other man is not competent to be in that House is very wrong. I would not permit it. Possibly, it is too late to take it out from the record. Let it stand as it is with this explanation that this House will not permit it. Therefore it will go on record for the future. Now the Prime Minister.

Shri Mahanty: May I seek a clarification? Are we not entitled to hold our opinions about public servants?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member may hold his opinion for himself and not give it out.

Shri Mahanty: Why?

Mr. Speaker: If any public servant is involved in anything and we have jurisdiction over him, there are methods of impeaching him by bringing it to the notice of the House. This is not the way in which he ought to be

abused. If we have no jurisdiction over him outside we have little or no jurisdiction inside also.

Shri Mahanty: I contest it.

Mr. Speaker: He must abide by my ruling. He is going one step further. It is unfair. He contests my ruling. My ruling is final.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Will you give me one minute?

Mr. Speaker: No, I am not going to allow it. Now the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Apart from this particular matter, I have again read that book to which reference was made and I have been quite unable to understand why he drew various inferences from what Sardar Panikkar has written in his book. Of course, I have read it previously too. The charge he made against him was that he, as our Ambassador, did not keep us properly informed of developments in China. How he drew that inference, I do not know, because he kept us completely informed betimes. When I read the book I found nothing in the book which we did not know. The hon. Member might have found something. And, what is more, in what he has written in the book there is absolutely nothing wrong, to my way of thinking, in his approach to this question. He was, by and large, at that time in China the ablest and most experienced Ambassador of any country and, in fact, it was his handling of a difficult situation which was appreciated not only by our Government but various other Governments also. However, opinions might differ, of course, about the course of events, what should have been done, but to have said that he had betrayed our interests there seems to me to be going too far.

When we discuss how Our Ambassadors' work, or sometimes when we talk about our external publicity, it seems to me that there is some misapprehension. It is imagined that the best publicity is presumably to

throw large numbers of leaflets, books and other things on the public in the other country or for the Ambassador, shall I say, to deliver speeches and otherwise do this kind of work and give publicity. Now, one must remember what type of people one deals with. The other Government is not an ignorant Government. It has its own means of getting information from its Ambassador, from its publicity agents, from its newspapermen, from its intelligence agents. Most important countries have all these various agencies, including the last named, spread out. They get the information from these sources. It is not correct to assume that they form their opinions by the speeches delivered by the Ambassador or by the pamphlets. Most of these blatant type of propaganda may create an impression on some unlearned gathering but it creates the reverse impression on any person who is normally considered intelligent. There is a reaction against propaganda of the blatant type, so that to measure this business by the ordinary yardstick of how many leaflets have been issued or pamphlets etc. does not help at all. I am not for a moment suggesting that our methods of propaganda are ideal or cannot be improved. I think they can be improved. They should be. There is always room for improvement. But an hon. Member suggested that they should be in charge of experienced journalists and not others.

We have tried the experienced journalists and found that they did not succeed at all. Of course, it always depends on individuals and individual journalists. An individual may be very good. But as a group they were not suited to this kind of work because they function in a different mental climate. In a different climate they would be very well but I am talking of the official climate of publicity which was not wholly suited-sometimes it was suited-to them. In fact, we had, after our experience, to revert to giving our own men special training in this. In consultation with the Union Public Service Commission we reverted to it and absorbed our publicity men into our Foreign Service so that they may not be considered as a caste apart. That is how we are functioning today and I believe we are functioning better than we used to do. But there is a great deal of room

for improvement. I admit it.

On the one side we are constantly being told that we must improve our propaganda, and on the other side we are told that we are spending too much money on it. The two of course are not necessarily contradictory but there is an element of contradiction between the two. Normally speaking, we spend far less on almost every one of our activities than most countries do on their Foreign Service and publicity. The bigger countries spend much more than we do. I am glad we spend less. We should spend less. I am not saying for a moment that I am not appreciating the criticism made about better publicity but I do venture to submit that the type of publicity that perhaps some hon. Members have in their minds does not help much. The best publicity in the ultimate analysis is what one does in one's country. All the talk about it will not convince people but what we do in our country. The best publicity figure that I have known in my term of years was Mahatma Gandhi because he did things in India. He did not talk to the outside world. He just did things in India which forced public attention to India, which brought people running to India to see what he was doing in India and which brought newspapers to write about Gandhi and his work. It was because there was solidity behind it. All the leaflets, propaganda, articles and speeches in the wide world would not.... (Interruption)

Shri Mahanty: Why not wind it up then?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We could not.

The ultimate analysis is this solid basis. People are not easily taken in by leaflets and things about any matter. It may be that about any matter we are fully convinced of our own rightness. Sometimes it is a little helpful to see oneself with other people's eyes also and not be confirmed in a Narcissus-like attitude of thinking that we must inevitably be right in everything that we do. Other people may disagree. What are we going to do about it? We cannot force them to agree by our repeating something.

We have to convince them, win them over by intellectual means and not by the bludgeon of shouting.

Shri Hem Barua: May I seek some information?

Mr. Speaker: Not now.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, let me, continue.

I am merely pointing out the approach to this question for a true understanding of it. I am by no means defending the failure that we may have committed.

Then the other things we are told about are Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan repeatedly. Nepal is an independent country. She is very friendly to us and in very close relations. Bhutan is in special treaty with us. Sikkim is in even more special treaty with us. But the way some hon. Members seem to imagine that we should go and impose our wishes, our will or even our advice on them seems to me a misunderstanding of how anyone country can deal with another country. Nothing is more disliked than any attempt at imposition, even imposing something, which we may have a right to impose. Even then it is disliked, much more so by countries who, whether they are big or small, weak or strong, have a certain self-respect to keep up—and rightly so—who do not like being told to do this or that. So the type of approaches that hon. Members sometimes suggest here are the very worst approaches that one can make to these friendly countries, self-respecting countries, with whom we have close relations.

An hon. Member talking about our foreign administrative machinery referred to the High Commission in London which, indeed, he very rightly characterised as a very miniature Government of India in the sense of its various departments. They are duplicated there on a scale. It is perfectly true. But that of course does not help us either to admire it or to decry it. We have to understand the type of work it has to do. But it is on an enormous scale. I wish it was less. But there it is. There are more

students than are anywhere. Then there is the huge Stores Department purchasing all kinds of things for us for our developmental purposes. Our Army, our Navy, our Air Force, everything have to have branches there. They may cease later on.

The criticism was that a Special Reorganisation Unit was sent there under one of our Joint Secretaries in the Finance Ministry and that the leader of this Unit was recalled suddenly because he could not get all the people there.⁵⁴ It has amazed me because I have not heard about it. In fact, I discussed the matter with the leader of that Unit after he came back as to what he had done. He had gone with a number of people and with a deputy. He spent some time there and laid down the method of work and left that team with the deputy to carry on for the next several months. He could not afford to spend months and months there. He came back leaving this team behind having done good work himself and leaving it to follow it up. There was no question of recall. It is entirely what the hon. Member has imagined. The result of his visit was substantial. Almost everything—I am speaking from memory—excepting, I think three Assistant Secretaries, all the various proposals were agreed to. Naturally, such reorganisation units function always in the closest coordination with the head of the Mission. That is the only way to work. Somebody goes from outside and issues orders "Get rid of these" without knowing the difficulties of the Mission people and the Head of the Mission—this kind of thing cannot work. After all, the people who make the heads of our Missions are supposed to be good for that work. We cannot ignore them. We cannot bypass them. Therefore, the whole purpose whenever the Special Reorganisation Unit works ... (Interruption).

Shri Mahanty: May I ask a question?

⁵⁴ On 16 March 1960, S. Mahanty referred to a special reorganisation unit under Inderjit Singh, Joint Secretary in the Finance Ministry, for a work study of the High Commission in London. See *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XL, cols 6303-6306.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will note down whatever important points they may have.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Will you allow after the hon. Prime Minister has finished?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot say.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Whenever this Reorganisation Unit works in any Ministry or in any Mission abroad it always associates itself with the head of that Ministry or the head of the Mission. That is the way to work. There were, I believe, a number of cases which they had recommended—I forget how many but it was 65 or something like that—and on subsequent talks the recommendations were varied.⁵⁵ Some people were kept for various reasons. I cannot go into the various details. The main point is that the visit of this Unit there was a very considerable success. This type of work which is close work study is paying us quite handsome dividends in making our work more efficient as also in economy.

Some hon. Member referred to the case of a person being appointed the Director of the India Stores Department in London and hinted that this was a case of—he did not use the word, I am using it—some kind of nepotism, that is, this kind of an appointment.⁵⁶

Shri Mahanty: I did not use the word nepotism.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I said so. I am saying so. He did not use the word. I am using it. I have said so. You may call it, if you like, favouritism or what you like. He said something of which I was not aware. He said that

⁵⁵ Mahanty had said that the Special Reorganisation Unit recommended the reduction of 237 posts, and could still have reduced 65 posts.

⁵⁶ Mahanty referred to "the fact that the Government of India are now completing to appoint a gentleman as the Director of India Stores Department, whose commercial knowledge is co-terminus with his failure to obtain a seat in the last elections."

this man was defeated in an election; therefore, the presumption was, to soften the sorrow of defeat. He was being given this particular post. I was surprised; I did not know, but I have had enquiries made since then. All I knew about this man was that six years ago, on high recommendation, and if I may say so, without revealing anything, the recommendation of a person, not a member of the Congress Party at all, high or low, we tried him in some work, and he turned out to be rather good at that work. He was tried in some work, and he then became ultimately the Managing Director of Hindustan Insecticides, and the DDT Factory at Always. He has done very well there. These are one or two or three of our State undertakings which have flourished, shown results, profits and all that. Naturally, he went up in our estimation. Naturally, now, after six years of his working there, he has been chosen for this more responsible work in London.

Now, about the election matter, I have not heard, but on inquiry I find that he did stand for election in 1952, that is, eight years ago.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: From which party?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am saying that. He stood as an independent being supported by one of the parties in the Opposition.

Shri Ram Sevak Yadav:⁵⁷ Namely, which party?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, I do not want to name or throw about names; it was some Opposition Party. I did not know that he had stood and he had been defeated. He had come through the normal courses, and has ultimately been approved by the Union Public Service Commission, and has been accepted, and he has done good work, and he is being given another opportunity in a wider field, for continuing that good work.

There is one thing more, I forget where, but one of the hon. Members

⁵⁷ Socialist Party, Lok Sabha MP from Barabanki, UP.

referred to reported differences of opinion between our Ambassador Chagla in the United States and our Commissioner-General there.⁵⁸ Well, I have not heard of this, I do not think his information is correct about it. There is no question of differences of opinion, because opinions in regard to policy are not formed either by the Ambassador or the Commissioner-General; they are formed in Delhi, and the implementation of that policy is left to them in their respective fields.

Some reference was made to the Tibetan refugees.⁵⁹ I entirely agree with the hon. Members who referred to them, that we should not treat them as an undesirable burden, but it is our duty and privilege to help them, to rehabilitate them, because, as far as one can see, they are going to be in India for a long time; how long, I cannot say. And, therefore, they should be rehabilitated.

This process of rehabilitation is not a simple matter, partly climatically, partly because they come from a totally different climate, a totally different world, into this new world of India, new climate of India, new languages of India. It is a difficult matter. And many of them, a large number of them are monks, Lamas. They again present difficulties. We are trying to settle them in two or three major localities, one of them being Dharamsala, Dalhousie or roundabout that area, where there would be a colony of them, and where we hope, within a fairly short time, the Dalai Lama himself will go and establish himself, surrounded by his people, helping them...

Shri Tyagi: I thought Mussoorie was a better place.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member says that Mussoorie was a better place. Well, that is a question of opinion. Mussoorie, perhaps the very reason that the hon. Member thinks it was a better place, is a worse

⁵⁸ B.K. Nehru.

⁵⁹ Atal Bihari Vajpayee spoke about Tibetan refugees on 17 March.

place, in the sense, I mean, that it is a flashy place, it is a tourist place, it is a place where people, especially monks and others, cannot easily settle down.

We had the advantage in Dharamsala of a great deal of accommodation old British barracks which are not used, barracks of British soldiers, quite good, which are not used; and the Punjab Government and our Army Authorities etc. could place them at our disposal. So, we have a good climate there, because they can only settle down in the hills. Some hon. Member suggested our sending them to South India. That would be a tragedy; if we did send them to the climate of South India, I do not know whether they would survive.

[Translation begins:

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: They may be settled in Ooty.

Translation end]

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So, they have to be in the hills. Here is good accommodation, and so we are trying to do that. It is a difficult matter. Of course, all their children are going to schools but we are organising language studies for the grown-up students.

And while, on the one side, in Sikkim, in Dharamsala and some other places we settle them in some numbers, the problem is by no means solved. The others are left over, and others are coming still, in small numbers, but are coming still. It is a continuing problem.

Some hon. Members opposite referred to the fact that reading our annual report,—which, I may in all humility suggest, is a good report, that is, good in the sense of giving as much information as we can about our various activities, because we want every Member of Parliament to be acquainted with all these multifarious activities in all the corners of the world—one finds that all the old problems still remain; there is the problem of Goa, there is the problem of Pondicherry, of de jure transfer, and there is the trouble over

An. Hon. Member: Kashmir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am talking about Indian problems—there are troubles with Pakistan and so on. Of course, he said that all the old problems remain, and now we have added a new problem of our frontier with China or Tibet. It was perfectly true. I entirely agree with him. All the old problems remain, with some variations. There are some minor problems with Pakistan, which have been settled, about some border troubles, but major problems are being discussed; some may be settled. As for Goa and Pondicherry, certainly, I can report no progress. Of course, they stand on a separate footing. So far as Pondicherry is concerned, we are at least there; the fact that the de jure transfer has not been made comes in our way.

The suggestion was made the other day, and our attention was drawn to certain appeals from Pondicherry being preferred in Paris. This is very odd, I must say, and rather undesirable, and I hope that even before the de jure transfer takes place or not, we shall be able to put an end to this business and try to bring in our Supreme Court into the picture even in regard to Pondicherry, because it is very difficult; we have been promised so often, and assured so often of this matter being finally settled, by the French Parliament or Government, and we went on waiting but all these years have passed and something or other intervenes.

I shall not take much more of the time of the House, I would submit that in this very difficult and tortured world, we have to take long views, and long view does not mean our not seeing the ground before us and merely gazing at the stars, but we just cannot understand this tremendously revolutionary period of history which is today, without having some understanding of these forces that are at work, forces, technological forces, which are converted into mighty revolutionary urges, and these nationalist and other urges which we see in Africa and elsewhere; and in Europe and America, there is great demand for peace,

and yet, somehow, a revival of the old militarism showing its head, which is rather alarming. It is rather odd. If we have to play any important part in this world, we can only do so by looking after ourselves first of all, understanding the world-trying to understand it-not throwing our weight about, but looking at these world problems with some humility, not imagining that we can solve them because that is neither right nor does it create a good impression-to throw weight about and tell them what to do. If we can manage our own little country with tolerable efficiency and success, we shall affect the world more that way than advice being given.

In these matters there may be differences of opinion, but I believe most hon. Members will agree, just as this question which is a vital one for us- about those border troubles-there is no vital difference, maybe differences in shade and degree, except perhaps among some hon. Members opposite who think differently. I am referring to the members of the Communist Party. But I doubt even among members of the Communist Party if some do not have that pull-what you call a nationalist pull-which does not lose itself in vague and amorphous internationalism. I believe, I have some international urges and feelings and I think the next stage in the world's progress is going to be internationalism unless it is destroyed before that. But internationalism which has no roots anywhere becomes quite amorphous and in the air and, therefore, it does not really play that part which it should in moulding the world. So we have to function in this nationalist sphere and this wider international sphere. We can only do good in the international affairs if we are true to ourselves and our country.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Sir, the Prime Minister in the course of his speech raised a very pertinent point. He said that some Members of this House made certain charges against the Vice Chancellor of the Aligarh University and the Vice Chancellor replied to those charges in the press. Nobody, as far as I know, from this side made any objection to that. It was the Education Minister who made objection to it. Therefore, the Prime

Minister's duty was to pull up the Education Minister than to have raised voice against us. It is very unfair to us.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not mention any name, Sir. I did not wish to mention any names. It is others who have brought in names. The name of Mr. Abdul Majit Khwaja was brought in the picture. He is not a Member of this House.⁶⁰

Shri Rajendra Singh: It was your Education Minister.

Mr. Speaker: So far as that matter is concerned the practice is this. If any outsider's honesty or his integrity is challenged, he writes to me and I immediately send it to the Minister. He would not have an access to this House except through a letter. If the Minister finds that he has made a wrong statement, it is for him to correct. I leave it at that stage. We do not have an enquiry. The hon. Prime Minister did not accuse the Opposition so far as that matter is concerned. (Interruptions)
Some Hon. Members rose-

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow new persons to get up. Shri Mahanty and Shri Hem Barua wanted to put questions.

Shri Mahanty: I wanted to ask a question with reference to the recommendations of the Special Reorganisation Unit of the Finance Ministry which went into the establishment of the High Commission in U.K. According to the Report, the recommendations were unanimously

⁶⁰ Abdul Majid Khwaja was the Chancellor of Jamia Millia Islamia and a member of the executive council of AMU. On 2 March 1960 during a discussion in the Lok Sabha on AMU, Prakash Vir Shastri, Independent Lok Sabha MP from Gurgaon, made certain allegations against several people including A.M. Khwaja, see *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XXXIX, cols 3840-3868. Khwaja, in a letter to the press, replied to these charges, see Appendix 28 for Khwaja's letter in *National Herald* on 13 March.

agreed recommendations, agreed between the High Commission..... .

Mr. Speaker: What is the clarification that he wants?

Shri Mahanty: The clarification I seek is: I would like to know why the Government have left the Assistant Secretary, as the Prime Minister has stated, untouched? Why were the recommendations not given full effect to when they were unanimously agreed recommendations.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): May I say that this was also done in agreement with the Unit?

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether the attention of our hon. Prime Minister has been drawn to a report appearing in the B.B.C. Weekly, *The Listener*, where an interview was granted to the B.B.C. by our High Commissioner in U.K. in which she has criticised our Constitution and has suggested that it needs to be amended. She has also criticised our civil servants and I quote her words: "They are doing their best, but it is a poor best," She has criticised our educational system and said-I quote her words: "There is neither English nor education at the moment in India." Then, she has criticised our educated people and said (Interruptions) I am quoting her words.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Member is going off the mark. This occasion is for seeking a clarification arising out of a discussion here. If an hon. Member has raised a particular thing and the hon. Minister in his reply has not referred to it, he may say it has not been referred to. If the hon. Minister has not referred to it he can ask for a clarification. New matters shall not be introduced here.

Shri Hem Barua: May I make a humble submission, Sir?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If it is not incorrect for me to say so, the hon.

Member wanted to raise this in the form of an adjournment motion. You were pleased to not to allow it. Now, it comes up in another form, as a clarification. I may add, since the hon. Member drew our attention to it by that motion, I read that article and found it excellent.⁶¹

206. To S. Dutt: Bhutan-China Border⁶²

The Lok Sabha Secretariat might be informed, for submission to Mr. Speaker, that I do not think it will be desirable for me to make any special statement or to answer a Short Notice Question in regard to Bhutan's frontier with China. As a matter of fact, the answer to the questions asked may be found in the recent White Paper No.3 which has been placed before the House.⁶³ This contains references to Bhutan's border. I would not like to go more deeply into this matter at this stage as it involves two countries, namely Bhutan and China.

207. To S. Dutt: Reply to Chou En-lai⁶⁴

I do not think it is necessary for me to send a signed reply to this letter from Premier Chou En-lai.⁶⁵ Our Ambassador can convey our agreement with this date. Or you may send a brief message by telegram as follows to our Ambassador.

BEGINS. Please convey following message to Premier Chou En-lai from Prime Minister:

⁶¹For Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit's interview, see Appendix 25.

⁶² Note to the Foreign Secretary, 19 March 1960.

⁶³ On 10 March.

⁶⁴ Note to the FS, 19 March 1960.

⁶⁵ See Appendix 42.

QUOTE. Thank you for your message of the 19th March.⁶⁶ The date you have suggested, that is, April 19th, for your arrival here will be convenient to us and we shall be glad to welcome you here then. With warm regards - Jawaharlal Nehru. UNQUOTE

As you know, Chou En-lai intends staying here till April 25th. This is rather longer than we expected. I suppose he intends staying in Delhi all this time. You might informally enquire if he wishes to go anywhere else round about Delhi during this period. ENDS⁶⁷

I do not think it is necessary for these actual letters to be sent to the press. You might inform the press day after tomorrow, 21st March that it has been agreed that Premier Chou En-lai will come to Delhi on the 19th April. For the present, we need not mention how long he will stay here.

It may be that some announcement might be made in Peking about his arrival date even before we make it.

Perhaps it might be better for me to make this brief announcement in Parliament day after tomorrow and not give it to the press earlier.

208. In the Lok Sabha: Chou En-lai's Visit⁶⁸

STATEMENT RE. CHINESE PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO INDIA

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal

⁶⁶ This letter is also published in the *White Paper IV*, p. 7.

⁶⁷ Dutt further informed Parthasarathi: "We shall try to send an aircraft to Rangoon if this is required. There is no need for him to stop in Calcutta unless he arrives there rather late in the evening."

⁶⁸ Statement, 21 March 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XLI, cols 6986-6987.

Nehru): I have received a reply from the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China about his coming here. The House may remember that I had suggested about the 20th April for his visit here. He has broadly accepted this date, that is, he has suggested coming here on the 19th April and to stay here till 25th April. I wanted to inform the House of this new development.

Shri Vajpayee:⁶⁹ May I know whether a copy of the letter will be placed on the Table of the House?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not usual to put every letter on the Table of the House. I have no objection, but I do not wish to introduce a practice that every letter that I get should be placed on the Table of the House.

Shri Rajendra Singh: It is so important.

Shri Vajpayee: After all, they are placed on the Table in the shape of a White Paper to be issued shortly, therefore, the letter may be placed on the Table of the House.

Shri S.M. Banerjee: It is still a Red Paper!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am prepared to place this paper on the Table of the House on the understanding that such a demand will not be made in the future.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Jan Sangh, Lok Sabha MP from Balrampur, Uttar Pradesh.

⁷⁰ On 22 March, Nehru laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha Chou En-lai's letter of 19 March about his visit to Delhi from 19 to 25 April 1960.

209. To S. Dutt: Minsar⁷¹

I agree that we should not write to the Chinese Government about Minsar at this stage. But in view of recent developments, I do not think it will be right for us to give up our right to Minsar in theory, even though de facto it is not exercised. When we discuss the general question of eastern Ladakh and Chinese incursions there, we should certainly mention Minsar and its past history. This is important in itself but much more so because it brings out more clearly India's claim to eastern Ladakh. If the J&K Government (that means India) had a treaty right to Minsar, there is some justification for stating that our territories extend to where we show them.

A separate paper might be kept dealing with Minsar for our talks with Premier Chou En-lai.⁷²

(d) Tibet

210. In the Lok Sabha: Indo-Tibetan Trade⁷³

Question:⁷⁴ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No.354 on the 27th November, 1959 and state the position in regard to Indo-Tibetan Trade on the Kalimpong-Gangtok-Nathu La Pass- Yatung caravan route during the last three Months?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

⁷¹ Note to the FS, 22 March 1960.

⁷² Nehru discussed Minsar with Chou En-lai on 22 April. See *SWJN/SS/60*.

⁷³ Written answers to questions, 14 March 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XL, col. 5654.

⁷⁴ By Congress MPs D. C. Sharma and Rameshwar Tantia.

There has been no improvement in the position as the following figures would show:

	Import	Export
	(Value in Lakhs of rupees)	
October, 1959	2.52	3.84
November, 1959	2.60	1.04
December, 1959	1.37	1.41

211. In the Lok Sabha: The Dalai Lama⁷⁵

Question:⁷⁶ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state the amount spent on Dalai Lama and his party for their maintenance in 1959 and for his tour programme in India during January-February, 1960?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): A sum of Rs. 4,41,151.46 (Rs. four lakhs forty-one thousand one hundred fifty one and nP 46) has been spent on the maintenance of the Dalai Lama and his party from April to December, 1959.

2. As regards the tour during the months of January-February, 1960, the actual expenditure is not yet known, as the bills from the State Governments and the Railway Board, who were requested to make the necessary arrangements have not yet been received. However, it is estimated that the expenditure on this account will be approximately Rs.40, 000 (Rupees forty thousand).

⁷⁵ Written answers to questions, 14 march 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XL, cols 5668-5669.

⁷⁶ By Congress MPs Raghunath Singh and Chintamoni Panigrahi; and Forward Bloc (Marxist) MP Aurobindo Ghosal.

212. To S. Dutt: Making Tibetan Refugees Self-Reliant⁷⁷

I think that the points raised in the attached letter deserve early and sympathetic consideration.⁷⁸ We have to help in making these people adapt themselves to the Indian scene and become self-reliant. We must not merely, look upon them as unskilled labour—road making etc. One of the first things to be done is to educate them in our languages. I should like to send an answer to this letter after I get your comments.⁷⁹

213- In the Lok Sabha: Evacuation of Indian Kashmiri Traders from Tibet⁸⁰

Question:⁸¹ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No, 764 on the 10th December, 1959 and state:

(a) whether Government have received any reply from the Chinese Government regarding the evacuation of Indian Kashmiri traders from Tibet; and

(b) if so, the nature of the reply received?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The reply may be seen at page 123 of *White Paper* No III which was laid on the Table of the House on the 10th March, 1960.

⁷⁷ Note to FS, 17 March 1960. File No. 29 (78) *BST/59*, MEA.

⁷⁸ For Freda Bedi's letter of 3 March, see Appendix 13(a).

⁷⁹ See Appendix 13(b) for Dutt's comments on 28 March.

⁸⁰ Oral answers to questions, 17 March 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XL, cols 6386-6389.

⁸¹ By Congress MPs Ram Krishan Gupta, Daljit Singh, Mafida Ahmed, S.A. Mehdi, Raghunath Singh, Arjun Singh Bhadauria; and GNP MP P.G Deb.

Shri Ram Krishan Gupta: In reply to a previous question, the hon. Deputy Minister stated that he had pointed out that under international usage persons of Indian origin found eligible both for Indian and Chinese nationality should be given the option of exercising their right to choose whatever nationality they prefer. May I know whether this suggestion has been accepted by the Chinese Government?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Chinese Government have said that they proceed on the assumption that they are Chinese nationals and, therefore, they must renounce their Chinese nationality and then apply for new nationality. We do not think that is the correct position to take up because we do not acknowledge that they are Chinese nationals.

Shri A.C. Guha:⁸² May I know what has happened to the property that might have been left there or might have been acquired by these Indian traders there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The persons referred to in this question are persons who are sitting there. They are there. This is a question of their coming away from there which is being impeded. So, the question of leaving property will only arise when they come away.

Shri Vajpayee: In view of the fact that the Chinese Government has rejected our claim in this regard, may I know what further steps Government propose to take? Will this question be discussed at the forthcoming meeting of the two Prime Ministers?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In such matters the only steps that are taken are continued discussions at the diplomatic level. They have been carried on. As to whether this particular matter will come up in any talks with the

⁸² Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Barasat, West Bengal.

Prime Minister of China when he comes here, I cannot definitely say how matters will take shape.

Shri Panigrahi: May I know whether Government is aware that many of these traders in Tibet have married Tibetan women? If so, do they propose to take their wives with them or do they propose to come alone?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are aware that many of them have married in Tibet. When the future of the husbands is not certain I cannot say definitely as to what will happen to their wives.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that some of these Ladakhi traders in Tibet have both Indian passports and Chinese visas also? If so, what is standing in the way of their evacuation? What is the specific ground?

Mr. Speaker: If they have got Indian passports what is the difficulty in their evacuation?

Shri Hem Barua: Chinese visas also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not say with regard to any particular individual; but generally, they did not take Indian passports because no question arose in those days of taking Indian passports. They have been living there for a considerable time. A few may have it.

Shri Hem Barua: In reply to a question on this subject on a previous occasion it was specifically said that there are some Ladakhi there in Tibet who have Indian passports and Chinese visas.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Their case is a different one. But we are talking about the Kashmiri Muslims in this question. They have been resident

there, sometimes for a generation or two and have carried on without taking any passports. Now, they want Indian passports and we are prepared to give it to them. Hence the difficulty has arisen.

Shri P.G. Deb: What is the total number of these Kashmiri traders?

Shri Sadath Ali Khan: There are 124 families, consisting of 162 males, 184 females and 237 minors of both sexes. Each family should apply to the Indian Consul General at Lhasa for the grant of Indian nationality.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether there our trade agents in Lhasa and elsewhere in Tibet are in a position to look after the facilities and welfare of the Indian traders and others in Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is difficult for me to answer about looking after their facilities. We are constantly trying to help them, sometimes succeeding and sometimes not succeeding.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether the security guards posted at the Consulate there have been withdrawn by now?

Mr. Speaker: It is a different question.

Shri Hem Barua: When the security guards are posted there the Consul-General cannot look after the interests of these people because they are not allowed to get in touch with the Consulate. If it is withdrawn, they can establish contact with the Consulate there and have their problems solved to a certain extent. That is why I put this question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The answer I can give cannot be very precise. Sometimes they get in touch with them; but it is not always very easy to do so.

214. To S. Dutt: The Dalai Lama's Treasure⁸³

It is mentioned in this note that part of the Dalai Lama's treasure,⁸⁴ consisting of silver, has been sold for about Rs. 35 lakhs. It is not clear whether this money or part of it has been spent or it is still intact.

I do not particularly like the idea of the Dalai Lama's funds being put in some new private industrial enterprise. The money, if it is to be considered trust money, should be treated as trust funds are treated by us, so as to ensure its safety. This does not exclude investment in private concerns. But the rules governing trust funds have to be strictly applied to them. I think this should be our advice. It is, however, open to the Dalai Lama to invest it otherwise.

In any event, I think that the larger part of this money should be so invested in trust funds, whether they are Government securities or some other safety securities. In doing so, he will immediately begin to get interest even though this may be on a somewhat lower scale. By putting this money in a new enterprise he will not get any interest for some years though he might make greater profit later.

I do not think we should get entangled in any way with these deposits. Of course this money will be treated just like any other money. There is no question of showing special favour against our rules and regulations.

I think we should ask for full information about the disposal of Rs. 35 lakhs for which some of the silver was sold. Further, we should request that we should be informed of any major expenditure out of this fund. I am particularly interested to know how much of the 35 lakhs has been spent already.⁸⁵

⁸³ Note to FS, 18 March 1960.

⁸⁴ Estimated at eighty lakhs of rupees, the treasure consisted of gold, silver and other valuables, according to a reply given by Lakshmi Menon, the Deputy Minister in the MEA, on 4 March 1960 in the Lok Sabha.

⁸⁵ According to a *Times of India* report of 6 March 1960, the Dalai Lama had said in an

215- To Joint Secretary(E): Refugees from Missamari to Pathankot⁸⁶

I would submit to Mr. Speaker that these questions or questions in the normal way on this subject might be answered after some days to enable us to get full information on this subject. We have asked for this information.

Our present information is that 760 persons, including old men and old women and small children, travelled by special train from Missimari in Assam to Pathankot. The train arrived at Pathankot on the night of the 6th March, The party was accompanied from Missimari by the Camp Commandant and a police escort. At Pathankot it was met by an Additional Secretary in the Home Ministry. It was found then that four infants had died en route and that 19 male adults had left the train at various places of halt. The cause of death of the four infants is said to have been general debility. These children were recent arrivals from Tibet and had been ailing for some time.

This is the information we have received thus far, but we are enquiring further into this matter. Meanwhile, therefore, I would suggest that these Short Notice questions be not answered.⁸⁷

216- To Freda M. Bedi: Dalai Lama to Move from Mussoorie to

interview on 5 March 1960 in Mussoorie that the treasure was sent to Sikkim in 1951, remained in the custody of the Sikkim Durbar, and was shifted to Calcutta in December 1959; that it belonged to him personally and would be utilised by him "in the best way possible" for his people; that his brother was responsible for the sale and investment of these items; and that "everything happens at my instance."

⁸⁶ Note, 19 March 1960.

⁸⁷ This issue was also raised by Atal Bihari Vajpayee in the Lok Sabha on 17 March during the debate on the demands for grants for the MEA.

Dharamsala⁸⁸

22nd March, 1960

Dear Freda,⁸⁹

Your letter of the 19th March. The arguments advanced by the residents of Misamari Camp to you about the Dalai Lama staying on in Mussoorie are singularly feeble. If Mussoorie is known to the refugees now, Dharamsala will be equally known to them a little while later. So far as the climate is concerned, I imagine that Dharamsala's climate is better than Mussoorie's.

We have now to think in terms not of temporary residence anywhere, but more or less permanent residence. And this permanent place of residence has to be chosen from many points of view. Almost every approach to this question leads to the conclusion that Mussoorie is not suitable. It is a place where tourists and pleasure-seekers go for a short while. It has no individuality and it is no place for serious people to live for long. While it might be possible to get another house, other than Birla's, for the Dalai Lama, it is not possible to rehabilitate a considerable number of Lamas and other Tibetans there.

Dharamsala offers these facilities. It has a good climate and I think better than Mussoorie's. It has good accommodation and it can become a good centre of Tibetans where they can live their community life, follow their religious vocations and generally live as they want to. From the point of view of any kind of religious life, this place is of course far better than Mussoorie can ever be. It is slightly further away than Mussoorie, but that again depends upon where you start measuring from. It is easier of access from the Ladakh Side which is likely to be another centre of Tibetan refugees.

I am quite sure that if the Tibetans have to settle down permanently and develop occupations etc., it is the Dharamsala region that offers them

⁸⁸ Letter. File No. 8/140/60-PMS. Also available in JN Collection. Copied to FS.

⁸⁹ A social worker; this letter was sent to her at the Tibetan Camp, Misamari, Assam.

this opportunity and not Mussoorie. You might explain all this to your deputation people.

There is a chance of my going to Tezpur on April 15th to visit the new army accommodation that is being built there. I should like to visit the Misamari camp then and, if you like, meet a deputation too. If possible, I shall do it on the 15th or on the 16th morning.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru

217. In the Lok Sabha: Taxing the Dalai Lama's Treasure⁹⁰

TAX ON GOLD AND BULLION BROUGHT BY DALAI LAMA

Question: ⁹¹ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) how much tax was levied on the gold and bullion brought by Dalai Lama from Tibet to India; and
- (b) if not, the reasons therefore?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). Gold imported from Tibet is not liable to duty and as levy of duty on import of silver coins etc. has been temporarily waived in the case of bona fide Tibetan refugees coming into India, no duty was chargeable from the Dalai Lama.

218. In the Lok Sabha: Indian Traders in Tibet⁹²

⁹⁰ Written answers to questions, 25 March 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XLI, col. 8096.

⁹¹ By Congress MPs Arjun Singh Bhadauria, S. A. Mehdi; and MJP MP Indulal Yajnik.

⁹² Written answers to questions, 25 March 1960. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. XLI, col. 8093.

[Translation begins:

Shri Bhakt Darshan:⁹³ In connection with the reply to the Unstarred Question No. 1043 dated 7 December 1959, will the Prime Minister be pleased to inform that:

- (a) Have all those Indian traders from Uttar Pradesh, who had gone to Tibet in the season of 1959, have come back;
- (b) If yes, what was their total number; and
- (c) Through which passes did they return and how many returned through each pass?

The Prime Minister and Minister of the External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b) In 1959, 1796 customary and 1132 petty traders went to Tibet from Uttar Pradesh. Of these, except three petty traders who died of natural causes in Tibet according to the information received here, all others have come back to India.

(d) The number of customary and petty traders and the passes through which they came, is as follows:

Name of the Pass	Number of Traders
Lipu Lekh Pass	640
Limpia Pass	70
Untadhura Pass	925
Darma Pass	524
Mana Pass	77
Niti Pass	682
Jhelukhaga Pass	557
Total	2925

Translation ends]

⁹³ See fn 93 in this section.