

Lok Sabha

April 1, 1959

Answers to Questions

DEBATE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Released by Chinese Embassy of Article in People's daily.

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Khadikar:

"The release by the Chinese Embassy in Delhi of an article in the People's Daily reiterating that the instigation for rebellion in Tibet came from Kalimpong which is termed as centre for collision with imperialism..."

This was disposed of the other day.

"In view of the categorical repudiation by the Prime Minister on Monday the 30th March on the floor of the House of the allegation that Kalimpong was the commanding centre of revolt in Tibet, the release thereafter by the Chinese Embassy constitutes violation of the diplomatic privilege enjoyed by the Foreign Embassies in India.

Further, the statement was issued by the Communist Party Secretariat justifying Chinese allegations that Kalimpong was the 'Commanding Centre' of the Tibetan revolt after emphatic repudiation of the same by the Prime Minister. The statement alleges that 'many shady happenings are taking place at Kalimpong and that a lot of doubtful foreigners are visiting the place'. On the basis of it, the statement further accuses the Indian

Government that they are violating Panch Shila which enjoins strict neutrality in each other's affairs."

So far as the facts are concerned, there is no doubt about both the facts: whether the Chinese Embassy has issued such a note after the Prime Minister's statement and whether the Communists Party Secretariat has used this expression regarding what happened in Kalimpong. Both of them are correct.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Yes.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): I may be given an opportunity to say something about it. It is a matter of very serious concern, because the hon. Prime Minister stated categorically last Monday that there is no truth in this allegation. After that, if the communist party and the People's Daily repeat that allegation, that means that the Prime Minister is telling a falsehood to this House; that is a question which the House must very seriously consider. I am not one of those who look with a certain amount of cynical indifference to the happenings in Tibet nor would I like to get hysterical with protests and condemnation of China. I would like to ask whether, in the given situation, acting as the Chinese Government has done in Tibet, it is not a violation of the agreement itself. It is an international matter. Are we not vitally concerned, because all the tribes round the Himalayan range are more or less akin to the Tibetan people? So, our concern about Tibet is not of a political nature; it is much more than that; it is of a human, moral and cultural nature. It must be recognized; it cannot be ignored in any manner by any party in this country.

Another factor is very important. When we accepted China's suzerainty over Tibet, our Government has not accepted the sovereignty of China over Tibet. So, the time has come when we must give serious thought to this matter. We are not interfering; there was no allegation so far, till certain incidents took place inside the Tibetan border that certain agents were acting from Kalimpong; they were imperialist agents, agents of Chiang-kia-shek, etc. Was there any allegation in the Chinese Press to this effect before the trouble started in Tibet? I keep in touch with the news of this nature; there was none. Now, to cover up certain actions of theirs, to make such an allegation against India is, I think, violating certain basic fundamentals on which a solemn agreement was entered into by both the countries. We have, by our own free will, given up extra-territorial rights over Tibet. I have nothing to say against that. But while giving up the extra-territorial rights, we also made it certain that its local autonomy will remain and will be guaranteed. It was guaranteed by China. I am not concerned with what is being done at the moment from a political angle, but we have to look at it from the wider angle, which resulted in consolidating Asia-African union at Bandung. What is the spirit of Bandung? The spirit of Bandung-the solidarity of Asian countries-was followed by actions in Tibet. It violates the spirit underlying Bandung declarations. Ultimately, the spirit of Bandung and the spirit of Panchsheel should prevail. This statement by the communist party or the allegation in Peoples' Daily, I think, violates certain solemn agreements entered into by that great and friendly country with our country. Therefore, any allegation or any suggestion that the Prime Minister was not telling the truth to this House and not taking the House into confidence must be repudiated here and now.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not much concerned with what the foreigners here do. But I am very much concerned with what

our own people do. The communist party has passed a resolution in which it says, in spite of the denial of the Prime Minister, that intrigues engineered by the imperialist are going on by the agents of Chiang-kai-shek in our own territory, and that they have information of this. They have no information directly from Kalimpong, but they have information via Peking...

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): Their Homeland!

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Their Fatherland!

Acharya Kripalani: ...and therefore, it must be very conclusive. Supposing tomorrow, taking the cue from our nationalists who are the lovers of this country, the Chinese Government be so mad as to think that it was necessary to destroy this nest of intrigue in Indian territory and invaded our territory, the logical conclusion would be, communist party would welcome such an act...(Interruptions).

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): You are not to advise here.

Shrimati Renu Chakarvatty (Basirhat): There is a limit to our patience (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Nath Pai: His voice must be heard.

Shrimati Renu Chakavartty: He has to withdraw it.

Shri Nath Pai: He should not withdraw....(Interruptions).

Acharya Kripalani: The Speaker must be allowed to have his say....

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Why not allow a discussion? Let us have a discussion... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no disturbance. I understood him only to say that this will lead to this consequence.

Shrimati Renu Chakravatty: He said, we would welcome any such intervention. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no disturbance. (Interruptions).

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Why don't you ban the communist party and send us all out?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-Central): Here is a Member who has made some accusations. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Renu Chakravatty: We will take instructions only from you.

Shri Dasappa: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Tyagi: It is the 1st of April, I am afraid.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Tangamani: There is a limit to the 1st of April.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let hon. Members try to be a little more patient. No doubt this is an important matter. Certainly there is some kind of trouble going on in Tibet. Now we do not want to allow it to extend to this country. We have very friendly relations with them. Also, as the hon. Prime Minister said their internal matters are not to be brought for discussion here. That is why I did not allow a discussion on this subject.

Shrimati Renu Chakravatty: No, no, what he said was...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Lady member is too interpretative. I am really sorry. (Interruptions). We have kept quiet for a couple of days in spite of whatever has happened. Naturally, one cannot be sitting quiet if a number of allegations are made from one side or the other which will be derogatory to the country or which will affect us. Therefore, the hon. Prime Minister explained at length every one of these matters. Thereafter these two news items have appeared—one is from the Chinese Embassy in Delhi releasing an article from the "People's Daily" of China and the other is a statement by the Secretariat of the Communist Party of India. The hon. Member while referring to them said that this is a matter which causes deep concern as, apart from what the Embassy says, responsible people belonging to a party in this country have made some allegation or similar allegations. (Interruptions). Of course, it is reported. Order, order. What has been stated is their interpretation. I thought of giving the hon. Members an opportunity. In the

meanwhile, they are going on talking like this. It is open to any hon. Member here to say what, according to him, is the consequences or the likely consequence of such statements. I was going to give an opportunity to the other side. I thought I might call the hon. Lady Member but in view of her interruptions I am rather hesitant to call her. (Interruptions). Order, order. I am not shutting out any Member or some party that certain allegations have been made in the "Peoples' Daily". Of course, I will certainly give an opportunity to them to say what exactly was meant and, if necessary, and if the *Peoples' Daily* has to be placed here, it will be placed. All I understood from what the Acharya said was that coming as it does from a responsible party, it might be misunderstood. That is all I understood.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: No.

Mr. Speaker: If it is a little different, it will be understood in that light. That is all. Now let the Acharya continue.

Acharya Kripalani: I want your protection to continue what I was saying.

Mr. Speaker: Very well, he might continue.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You will have to withdraw what you said.

Acharya Kripalani: That is for the Speaker to decide and he has already decided. Mr. Speaker: Very well. Let all hon. Members take it only in that light.

Acharya Kripalani: What I want to submit is that throughout history if there is a country in which intrigues are going on against another country, that

country has a right to see that those intrigues are stopped, and if our own people go and say that intrigues are going on in Kalimpong, I say this is very unpatriotic...

Shri C. D. Pande: It is treason.

Acharya Kripalani: ...and it is in consonance with the previous conduct of the Communist Party. (Interruptions) I strongly protest. After the Prime Minister has said that there is no truth in these allegations, people of our own country, our own nationals, who consider themselves democratic, who consider themselves patriotic, show only one patriotism, and that is for the communist block and nothing else. (Interruptions). I protest against this.

Shri Tangamani: Don't bother.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Acharya Kripalani has chosen to reflect upon the conduct of the Communist Party and of the Members of this House belonging to the Communist Party. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is all this shouting for?

Shri H.N. Mukerjee: You have permitted Acharya Kripalani to say what he wanted. Now may I have my say? What has happened is that throughout the discussion on Tibet we have always tried to maintain the utterest restraint and when all kinds of things were said which would obviously jeopardize the friendly relations between India and China we did not muddy the waters (Interruptions). You have noted that we were ready to take part in the discussion regarding the admissibility or otherwise of the adjournment

motion, but we exercised as much of restraint as was recommended by the Prime Minister later on.

We did not need his recommendation; we restrained ourselves. But what has happened and what has given the opportunity to Acharya Kripalani to make damaging statements about the Communist Party- the second largest political party in this country? This is a statement issued by our party headquarters.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I will allow him an opportunity. The two points that have been raised in the adjournment motion are-the release by the Chinese Embassy and the statement by the Communist Party Secretariat. The adjournment motion just says:

“Further the statement issued by the Communist Party Secretariat justifying Chinese allegations that Kalimpong was the ‘Commanding Centre’ of the Tibetan revolt after emphatic repudiation of the same by the Prime Minister. The statement alleges that ‘many shady happenings are taking place at Kalimpong and that a lot of doubtful foreigners are visiting the place’”.

This is the simple point.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is with regard to that that I want to have my say. In regard to Kalimpong in this House some time ago the Prime Minister had himself stated that in Kalimpong a great deal of undesirable goings-on are continuing for a long time (Interruptions).

Shri C. D. Pande: There are communists there also.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In the second place, the Prime Minister in his statement last Monday referred by name to a particular foreign correspondent who gave very tendentious descriptions as to what was happening in Tibet, and that correspondent had never been further than Kalimpong according to what the Prime Minister has said.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Mr. Speaker: He did not say that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: He was operating from there. So he was asked to leave Kalimpong and questions were asked in Parliament about this man. That being so...

Mr. Speaker: As far as I remember, the Prime Minister said, and there was also laughter in the House, that this person did not visit Kalimpong at all.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: He did not visit the border, that is all.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: But he was operating in Kalimpong and it was from Kalimpong that he wrote a letter to "The Statesman" objecting to the order which put a restraint upon him. It was in Kalimpong that these things were taking place.

The Prime Minister denied that Kalimpong has been the centre of prejudicial activity in regard to Tibet-China.

We certainly accepted his denial. But if the Peoples' Daily in China published the communiqué of the Government of that country which says that

Kalimpong is a place which is giving a lot of headache, now naturally in view of what is happening in Kalimpong, in view particularly of the foreign correspondent in recent months sending tendentious reports which have been utilized by our friends over here, in view of all that, it is open to any political party in this country to point out to the Government the desirability of keeping a proper check over the activities in Kalimpong. It is from Kalimpong that a former Prime Minister of Tibet has come all the way to Delhi-God knows from where the money came-in order to make representations in a particular fashion and in order to jeopardize the friendship between India and China. That being so, we have not abdicated our responsibility in regard to the maintenance of friendly relationship between India and China and the position of Kalimpong, which has been, on the hon. Prime Minister's own admission, a hotbed of international intrigue. (Several hon. Members: No, no). That being so, it is open to us and it is our right and duty to refer to the absolute undesirability of this kind of activity in Kalimpong. That is why it is open to us to say and I resent very strongly, as strongly as I ever can-the slightest reflection coming from the Acharya or anybody else in this House or outside upon our loyalty to this country (Several hon. Members: No, no). If this thing goes on like this, to hell with co- operation. If you mean to say that we are disloyal to this country, let us have a fight over it.

You know very well who are really and truly loyal to this country. The reflection which comes from this man here, in spite of his eminence, is something which we are not going to stomach and which we are going to reply in the proper way.

That is why we resent this kind of an expression.

C. D. Pande: I want to protest against the repression...

The Minister of Finance (Shri Moraji Desai): Sir, can any hon. Member be referred to as 'this man' in this House?

Several hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Shri C. D. Pande: I want one minute. Mr. Speaker: The hon. Home Minister.

Shri Manaen (Darjeeling): Apart from mentioning the names of the two correspondents, will the hon. Minister be good enough to tell this House as to what definite information he has about what has happened in Kalimpong?

An. Hon. Member: Read the newspaper.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): I have something important to say.

Mr. Speaker: I have to ask the hon. Member, Raja Mahendra Pratap, that he should not go on interrupting like this day in and day out. Unless I call him, he ought not to interfere. I am giving him this warning. In spite of his age, I will be obliged to request him keep out of this House if he persists in doing so. I cannot put up with this kind of interference however great a man he might be.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Sir, I was helping you

Mr. Speaker: He ought not to interrupt.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I am going to stop all this, but you do not hear me.

Mr. Speaker: No, I would not hear him.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: If you know what I am going to say you will see that peace will rule here and peace will rule in Tibet. I beg to say.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is very wrong. The hon. Home Minister.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): Sir, the hon. Prime Minister dealt with this delicate problem with his usual restraint and dignity the other day. One would have naturally expected that his words will be readily accepted not only by the people in this country but also by those in other countries. He holds a very unrivalled position in the international world (Interruption) and his statesmanship, integrity and passion for peace have never been questioned anywhere (Interruption). He dealt with the matter, as I said, in a manner which should have carried conviction to everyone at least in this House and if anything has been said thereafter, which is inconsistent with the authoritative observations and remarks made by him, we cannot but deplore such an attitude (Interruption).

So far as this particular motion is concerned, it has two parts. One deals with what has appeared in the Peoples' Daily of China.

An hon. Member: Of India.

Shri G. B. Pant: Of India.

An hon. Member: No, of China.

Shri G. B. Pant: Is it of India or of China?

An hon. Member: It is of China

Shri G. B. Pant: Hon. Friends on the other side can enlighten me. They will please correct me if I am wrong. But something was written in the People's Daily.

What has appeared there seems to repudiate what the hon. Prime Minister had stated here the other day.

We all have nothing but feelings of friendliness for China.

The hon. Prime Minister has been fighting the Chinese cause for the last many years (Interruption) and stood against very powerful blocs for the admission of China into the United Nations Organisation. In other ways too, when China was in difficulty the hon. Prime Minister helped China to the utmost extent possible.

Here, we are in a delicate position.

We want to maintain that friendliness with China. It is our neighbour and it is a great country. It is one with whom we have entered into an agreement and with whom our association goes back to many many hundreds of years. But, at the same time Tibet is a closer neighbour—a very weak neighbour; one who deserves compassion and pity if nothing else. It consists of almost unarmed people, who give their time to prayers and to devotion and who have hardly any mundane interests. People like that, I think, should be regarded with sympathy by everyone. And, when they are in trouble and when they are faced with a very trying ordeal, I think we cannot but feel that sympathy for them. In fact, we have cultural ties, we have religious ties and we have those ties which poor people have with other people elsewhere and both of us belong to those communities which still have faith in religion and in God. So, there are many ties binding us together. In spite of that so far as political relations go, we want to adhere to the policy which we have

accepted in our relations with China and both of us have agreed to the basic principles of Panchsheel.

After that clear enunciation of policy by the hon. Prime Minister one would have expected that his words would not be disputed. But this paper has taken a different line. Perhaps the Chinese Government may not have noticed what the hon. Prime Minister has said. If they had, perhaps they would not have repeated what had been repudiated and denied categorically by the External Affairs Ministry and the remarks made by the spokesman of that Ministry had been endorsed by the hon. Prime Minister in the course of his speech. He had also referred to that matter in full details. So, I can quite understand that some of our hon. Members should feel perturbed and concerned when the solemn statement made by the hon. Prime Minister is in any way disputed by any section of our people in this country.

The words used in the communiqué, I am told-I do not know if I am right; perhaps I shall stand corrected if they are wrong, but the communiqué issued by the Central Office of the Communist Party says....

Mr. Speaker: Have hon. Members got a copy of that statement?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is there.

Mr. Speaker: We cannot go by a newspaper.

Shri G. B. Pant: The communiqué issued by the Central Office of the Communist Party says that Kalimpong was the commanding centre of the revolt. These are the words which had appeared in the report that was published by the Chinese news agency. And if these words have also been confirmed by the Central Office of the Communist Party, after they have had the opportunity of listening to what the Prime Minister had said...

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I read out a portion of that statement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. When I asked the hon. Member to give me an authoritative statement, he said, no.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No. I have got it here. I was showing it from here.

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): I can clarify it...

Shri Tangamani: Is the hon. Minister reading from an authoritative statement issued by the party office?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I shall call Shri Tangamani by name. Should he go on talking when four others of the same party also are talking?

Shri. S. M. Banerjee: I want to read a portion ...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have allowed them to speak. I have allowed them to make interruptions also. He says every blessed thing which will destroy the goodness or the orderly manner in which this should happen. I have not been preventing them. But let it go on in an orderly manner. If Shri S. M. Banerjee wants to speak, let him speak.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want only one minute. The statement is here in The Hindustan Times.

Mr. Speaker: Is it an authoritative statement?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is a quotation; I am reading out that quotation...

Mr. Speaker: This is in the newspaper. The hon. Minister also has got that.

Shri G. B. Pant: Mr. Speaker, Sir, these are the words.....

Shri Nagi Reddy: This is from a different paper. I can clarify it because....
(Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Unless the hon. Member has got an authoritative version, we shall go by the newspaper here. (Interruptions.) Let there be no interruptions. Let me see. At the end, if an explanation is necessary, I shall give him an opportunity. Let him wait.

Shri G. B. Pant: I am not aware if Shri S. M. Banerjee is a Member of the Politbureau.

Shri Nagi Reddy: There is no Politbureau Member here. They are outside...
(Interruptions)

Shri G. B. Pant: Then, the hon. Member is in no better position than I am; it is no better than that; his position is in no way better than mine.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I shall read out the correct version of it impartially.

Shri G. B. Pant: These words have been used in the adjournment motion that this thing was said; and the Speaker had made inquiries.

And I understood that this was almost accepted that the facts that had appeared were in this adjournment motion and were correctly stated. But, as I mentioned, if it has not been said, then what is stated in the adjournment motion would not be correct. If it has been said, I would not

only consider it unfortunate but extremely deplorable that a statement like this should have appeared...

Several hon. Members: Hear, hear (Interruptions).

Shri G. B. Pant: ...after the Prime Minister had made his statement in this House and a spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry had definitely stated that this charge as utterly unfounded and baseless. In the circumstances, if Members here feel that such statements are likely to give a wrong impression to the outside people, I think that feeling must be respected. It does give rise to some sort of misunderstanding. Then, there is another statement here which is still equally important and worth noticing.

“The statement further accuses the Indian Government that they are violating Panchsheel which enjoins strict neutrality and non-intervention in each other’s affairs.”

Shri Nagi Reddy: That is a complete distortion.

Shri G. B. Pant: I am relying only on the statement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has got a copy. What is the meaning of interrupting like this? Shri Nagi Reddy: We were not asked to bring the copy. I would bring it tomorrow morning. Mr. Speaker: Let him keep quiet and listen.

Shri Tangamani: If the hon. Minister has not got the authoritative copy, let him only refer to...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. In spite of my repeated requests, no hon. Member is able to give me an authoritative version. We all go by that appears in the newspaper.

Shri Nagi Reddy: If you give me half an hour, I shall bring it. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: There cannot be interruptions like this. Hon. Members on both sides are relying upon newspaper reports. One newspaper says something and omit something else and another newspaper says something more.

Shri Nagi Reddy: Why not we get it?

Mr. Speaker: ...herefore, I shall allow both sides to refer to newspapers; unless we get an authoritative statement, we shall be proceeding on this. Let there be no interruption.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You may read from my newspaper.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to refer to it. When the communist Party gave the names of speakers, I found Shri S. M. Banerjee's name missing. But, now, I do not know why he is particular about this.

An hon. Member: He is not a Member of the Communist Party.

S. M. Banerjee: I am an Independent. But I have every sympathy with the Communist Party, and I support every right action of theirs.

Mr. Speaker: He is not a Member of the Communist Party.

Speaker: Shri Tangamani: We were not given any information that the adjournment motion would be coming up and we would have to bring that statement. (Interruptions)...

Shri G. B. Pant: ...no cause for provocation or irritation. That is far from my intention. And I tried to deal with matters in a dispassionate and detached way, so far as I possibly can.

So, I am saying that if there is any sort of allegation or insinuation or suggestion in the statement that the Government of India had failed in observing the principles of Panchseel, Panchsheel of which the Prime Minister is the father...

Shri Tangamani: Shadow boxing.

Shri G. B. Pant: The word was really ushered into existence by him; many of the sovereign States have now accepted it, and have agreed to pay their homage and allegiance to it. It would be a matter of regret if the Prime Minister were to be repudiated by some of his own countrymen.....

Shri Nagi Reddy: No, it has not been done. Who said that?

Shri G. B. Pant: Then, my statement is...

Shri Nagi Reddy: Why should he go on saying that we have repudiated something, which we have not done. He is a responsible Home Minister. And he ought not to say this kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker: He is entitled to read what has been made in the statement. Hon. Members have made a statement. I have allowed Shri H. N. Mukerjee

to have his say. Let the hon. Minister explain his own standpoint. I shall ultimately decide what is to be done.

Shri G. B. Pant: I am basing my remarks on what has been stated in the text of the adjournment motion itself.

Shri Nagi Reddy: I shall get the statement in half an hour.

Shri G. B. Pant: I am not referring to anything extraneous or external to it. Everything that I have said is germane to and arises out of the text of the adjournment motion itself. So, what I am saying is this that if this is correct, then I take it that the Mover has taken good care to see that the words that he has used are really authentic and correct. So, I am saying that if anybody here in our country has said that the Government of India has infringed the basic principles of Panchsheel that would be a matter of deep regret to everyone of us here, because, the Prime Minister has, as I said a minute earlier, persuaded many other countries, to accept this Panchsheel, and among other countries, China too. So, it would be a matter of real sorrow and even of anguish to some of us, if it were said that the Government of India had failed to act up to their professions with regard to the solemn doctrine of Panchsheel. So, I am in agreement with the spirit of the remarks made by the Mover...

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Allow a discussion.

Shri G. B. Pant: ...and also to a large extent with what Acharya Kripalani has said.

Several hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Shri Nagi Reddy: He is not prepared to read the final statement we have made, and yet he is making a statement like this. (Interruptions).

Shri G. B. Pant: Every observation that has been made... (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us hear the hon. Minister.

Shri G. B. Pant: I hope that when the hon. Members who seem to be a little excited cool down a little, they themselves will probably agree with every word of what I have said. That is all that I have to say.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I ask a question to the hon. Home Minister?

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated-Anglo-Indians): I want a clarification from the hon. Home Minister with regard to the first point raised in this adjournment motion. I submit with respect that it raises a very vital matter in respect of diplomatic convention. Can any Embassy which enjoys certain immunities in this country issue a statement in effect saying that the Prime Minister of the county is a liar, that the Government of the country...

Shri Nagi Reddy: It is not issued by the Embassy.

Shri Frank Anthony: As far as I can make you said that the Embassy here had either released or endorsed a statement, had released or endorsed it. Could the Pakistan High Commission, for instance, issue a statement here saying that the Government of India is conniving at, or encouraging, subversive activities in Pakistan...

Shrimati Renu Charkravartty: It is not done.

Shri Frank Anthony: ...and our own Embassy say this is in Peking? They would not be permitted to say, they would be turned out at least. I mean it is a vital matter. What is the Government's reaction to this obvious abuse of diplomatic privilege?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: One question, sir.

Shri Raja Mahendra Pratap: You hear me, all trouble will end.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard both sides.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We would like to reply.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of replying in this.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I just want information from the hon. Home Minister.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We have not got an opportunity.

Shri Nagi Reddy: I want to clarify the position of the Communist Party. It has not been clarified.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to hear.

Shri Nagi Reddy: May I request you one thing? Just one sentence. I will make a request.

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed Shri Hiren Mukerjee to speak.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You have allowed so many others to speak also.

Shri Nagi Reddy: Tomorrow, I will read out the statement of the Communist Party so that things can be clarified.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not going to allow

Shri Nagi Reddy: I will send you an official copy of our statement. I make a request. I am prepared to send an official copy of the statement to you, and I only request you to see that, that statement is read for clarification tomorrow in the House so that this distortion may not go on always here.

Acharya Kripalani: Shri Anthony has asked a question from the Home Minister about diplomatic immunities. I suppose that question must be answered.

Mr. Speaker: When is the hon. Prime Minister returning?

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): He is returning tomorrow. He will be present in the House tomorrow.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: To the hon. Home Minister I want to ask one thing.

Shri Nagi Reddy: May I request an answer from you for my enquiry?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: You were pleased to call me. They are not giving a chance.

Mr. Speaker: No harm. He will have an opportunity.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Only a question.

Mr. Speaker: I am not passing any final orders now.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Rose-

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow him now.

An adjournment motion has been placed before the House stating that after the Prime Minister's statement, the Chinese Embassy in India has circulated a copy of an article appearing in the People's Daily of China, where it is said to have attributed that the centre of rebellious activity-that is what I find in the adjournment motion-is still in Kalimpong.

It also refers to a statement issued by the Communist Party of India stating among others that "many shady happenings are taking place at Kalimpong and that a lot of doubtful foreigners are visiting the place".

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Quite right.

Acharya Kripalani: Quite right?

Mr. Speaker: Quite right.

These two statements are made after hon. Prime Minister's statement, and are likely to bring about unfriendly relations, or snap the friendly relations that exist between the two neighboring countries of India and China.

Regarding the earlier one relating to the issue of the circulation of a paper by the Embassy, a point was raised as to whether it was open to any Embassy to carry on or to circulate certain papers notwithstanding the fact that the Prime Minister of this country had made a statement. That is a matter of policy which has to be investigated or which has to be explained.

Regarding the second point, I have been given the P.T.I. report wherein, substantially, though not word for word, the same thing appears:

“Referring in this connection to the Chinese charge that Kalimpong has become the command centre of Tibetan rebels, the statement said, ‘we all know that many shady happenings are taking place in Kalimpong and that a lot of doubtful foreigners are visiting this place’.

Therefore, so far as that statement is concerned, the statement is not challenged.

In the adjournment motion two statements are made, one relating to the Embassy circulating the paper, a copy or an extract; the other one a statement by the Communist Party of India. The Communist Party still says here, agreeing with what that paper has said, that Kalimpong is the centre of all this trouble.

Shri C. D. Pande: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of point of order.

The hon. Members on this side have said that it is true, and therefore they stick to it. Here is a statement of the hon. Prime Minister that it was suggested some time ago that there were some people carrying on not an intrigue but a whole conspiracy here.

That was exaggerated and at the same time, he has seen to it that nothing happens. But there is a definite statement by a responsible party here notwithstanding even the recent reiteration of the hon. Prime Minister. This is likely, as Acharya Kripalani has said, to embitter the feelings between the two great countries. This is a very serious matter, if it is true.

So far as whether it is open to them from a diplomatic standpoint or not, that is also a serious matter for this House to consider.

If these statements are allowed to be made, if they are false, it may create disturbances or difficulties in the way of our foreign policy. I do not make light of this matter. Anyhow, the hon. Prime Minister is not here. Let us wait. In the meanwhile, if the hon. Members here belonging to the Communist Party want to place the statement, a true copy of the statement here, I shall only be too glad to receive it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I just beg you.....

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I had given notice of an adjournment motion about *Pravada's* comment yesterday.

You had written to me and I want to approach you. What has been your decision about that?

Mr. Speaker: It is irrelevant now.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The *Pravada* has again published it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Right though this entire debate that has been going on, one point has never occurred either to the hon. Home Minister or those great upholders of the dignity of India, that in the Communist Party statement, which has also appeared in this Press, there is a statement saying that an enquiry is being requested, an investigation by the Prime Minister. I think it is quite within our jurisdiction, and we have done it right throughout; we have not accepted the fact which has been stated on the basis of a little chit from the Deputy Minister to the Prime Minister that these foreigners have not been there and that they have not been intriguing there. Therefore, are we not within our rights, even being fully patriotic Indians, if some things are happening there, to ask the Prime Minister to institute an enquiry? Why has this thing been right throughout completely subdued and completely kept away from the House by the hon. Home Minister? We are completely within our rights.

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): The hon. Member thinks that the Prime Minister has been making statements without making enquiries. I take very strong exception to that.

Secondly, the matter had been brought to the notice of the Government by the Chinese Embassy last July, and a thorough-going enquiry was made into all the allegations made by the Chinese Government, and we have sent an aide memoire dated the 2nd August 1958 repudiating all the charges, giving them the result of our enquiry, and not one of them was found correct. And it is on the basis of that report that the Prime Minister has made his statement. There is no reason why we should make another inquiry just because the Communist Party wants it.

With regard to the second point, as to whether there was a violation of diplomatic privileges, actually there is really no violation of diplomatic privileges as such, but it is highly improper for any Mission posted in any country to make any critical statement about the Government of that country or its activities. It is not the function of a Mission posted anywhere, in any country, to make a critical estimate of that Government's policy or to criticize the activities of that Government. In this case, the Prime Minister's integrity has been challenged, his honesty has been challenged. We take very strong exception,... (Interruptions)-what is the point of shouting? We take very strong exception to the statement made by the Communist Party, the full text of which has already appeared...

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Where?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: ...in the Times of India. It is true that in that statement, by implication, they do say that a Government which is committed to Panchsheel has been giving a portion of its territory for carrying on subversive propaganda or subversive activities against them. Sir, I categorically deny that this has been done, and on behalf of the Government, I can say that no part of India will be used ever by any country or any group to do propaganda or carry on subversive activities against any country, much less against a friendly country like China.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May we be allowed to place on the Table of the House a statement...

Mr. Speaker: All that I can say is that this matter will stand over till tomorrow.

There is one other thing. Shrimati Reenu Chakravartty said that she feels, and her party feels, that these subversive activities are happening in Kalimpong, but that they only want an investigation to be made by the hon. Prime Minister. Sitting here, I can only say that there are ways of bringing this matter to the notice of the Prime Minister. The hon. Prime Minister said only day before yesterday that these activities are not being carried on, they have made inquiry and so on. So to say this in a paper or in a statement to the Press is not necessary, they might have written to the Prime Minister saying, 'Notwithstanding this, we have got this information'. Therefore, it is that Acharya Kripalani said that it is not right to do this. Let this stand over. As to who is right and who is wrong will be decided by the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: On a point of explanation...

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister will be here tomorrow.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Will the Home Minister reply to one question?

Shriamti Renu Chakravartty: May I ask whether tomorrow the entire question of the charges which we have in our possession regarding espionage there will also be allowed to be discussed?

Mr. Speaker: I have postponed my decision as to whether to admit the motion or not. I shall hear the hon. Prime Minister tomorrow and make up my mind as to whether it ought to be admitted. If I admit it, I will allow a discussion tomorrow evening. Every adjournment motion, if admitted, will be taken up at the end of the day. Therefore, if it is admitted, all hon. Members will have an opportunity to bring whatever records or materials they may

like us to have. They won't be taken by surprise. All this will happen only after admission. This is only the preliminary stage.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about the lathi charge?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I know whether it is a fact that a certain very important member of the Communist Party of India was called by the Chinese Embassy here and certain consultations were held there, certain briefs were given and after that a meeting was held and some decisions were taken? Will the Home Minister inquire about this? Also ...

(Interruptions)

An Hon. Member: What is there for the Home Minister to inquire?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: This kind of counter-challenging has been allowed in the past that certain people are spies in the headquarters of the Communist Party.

They could not prove it but it remained on the records and this sort of tendentious things are being allowed by you.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. The hon. Lady Member admits that they will go and talk by saying, why should they not?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I object strongly to the way you have tried to distort the whole matter.

Mr. Speaker: What has she said? I cannot understand.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: My point is that you have tried directly to distort what I have said. I have not once agreed that we are going to talk with the Chinese Embassy every day. Is that what you are saying? Is that what I have said?

Mr. Speaker: Now Papers to be laid on the Table.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I rise to a point of order...

The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malaviya): With your permission, may I ...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order please (Laughter).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: My point of order refers to this.

You permitted Shri Braj Raj Singh to make a certain statement and put that on the record of the House and also to be communicated to the Press of the world. That refers to an allegation that a particular Embassy had certain contacts with some particular Members of the House.

An Hon. Member: He said Communist Party.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: As far as the fact of the situation is concerned, personally I can certainly say this that there is no harm done if Members of this House go anywhere. But as far as we are concerned, as far as Communists in this House are concerned, I can categorically deny that there is any such connection between us and the Embassy of any country here, and, therefore, the insinuation is completely wrong. Besides, from the point of view of diplomatic relationship, I think it is highly improper for Members

of this House to insinuate that Members of certain Embassies, Embassies of Socialist countries in particular, have a kind of peculiar relationship with Members of the Communist Party. That is a matter of which you have to take note. What I have been noticing in these proceedings is that you are rather soft in regard to allowing certain things to get into the record, things which militate against the Communist Party.

That we can look after ourselves. The Communist Party can look after itself. But as a matter of fact, we are entitled to protection from you to see that any improper remarks, remarks which go against the whole grain of our relationship with others, are not put on the record. But sometimes you are soft in allowing such things. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: You hear everybody.
You hear me also.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear him later.

Shri Braj Raj Singh has tried to draw the attention of the House to what he had heard or to what he had been informed, that some Members of the Communist Party had discussions with the Chinese Embassy.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I did not say that. I said a very important member of the Communist Party was called. I did not say 'any Member of the House'. I wanted to know about it from the Home Minister. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is all on record. (Interruptions by several Members from the Communist Group).

Shri Braj Raj Singh: They were traitors in 1942. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: So far as I am concerned, I would never like to give any impression that I am not holding the scales even. I am sorry if I created an impression of that kind. I would be the last person to create such an impression, or to do anything to create such an impression in the mind of any hon. Member in this House or any Party. So far as I am concerned, all Parties are entitled to respect. Each Party is trying to do its best to serve this country. (An Hon. Member: Doubtful).

I do not make any distinction. It may be that each individual Party thinks that it is superior to the other Party. So far as I am concerned, all Parties are equal.

Shri Braj Raj Singh wanted to bring that matter to the notice of the hon. Home Minister. I understood from the manner in which the hon. Lady Member got up-and there was some disturbance then-that she said-"There is no harm in seeing". I do not know. It may be a misunderstanding. I thought she said-'What is the harm if I go and see?' (prolonged laughter). That was how I understood.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: No, no. I never said that. (Interruptions) You are distorting what I said.

Mr. Speaker: It is a mistake. I am saying it is a mistake. (Interruptions) If hon. Members disturb members of other parties who are speaking, it is all right. But some hon. Members disturb when members of their own party are speaking and that is why sometimes I am not able to hear them properly (Interruptions).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Even if we are 30 members, we are not frightened to face a hostile House. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. So, the matter stands.
Papers to be laid on the Table, Shri A. M. Thomas.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): Sir, what about my adjournment motion?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: And about other adjournment motions, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: I have disallowed those motions.

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, I had given notice of an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Raja Mahendra Pratap.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Sir, I just want to say a few words. I want peace in this House and I want peace in Tibet. I say if these gentlemen can endear themselves to China they can be very useful in bringing about peace in Tibet.

We can send them to Peking, China. (Interruptions). If I were the Prime Minister, I will make list of these, our communist friends. I will say: 'Thank you very much for your objecting to my declaration.' (Interruption). I would have said: 'You did very right in saying that my statement was wrong. By saying this, you endear yourselves to China. China became pleased with you. So you are the best instruments for peace.

You are patriots; you cannot be unpatriotic, no hon. friends here is unpatriotic. So we can utilize you for peace. (Interruptions). Our Jan Sanghi people and these people who are objecting to the conditions in Tibet can be

sent to Kalimpong and they can try to influence the Tibetans from there and bring peace.

We want peace in this House and we want peace in the world.

Mr. Speaker: Papers to be laid on the Table; Shri A. M. Thomas.

Shri Vajpayee: What about my adjournment motion, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: I have disallowed that motion.

Shri Vajpayee: But there is no reason given, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Vajpayee will come and see me in the Chamber.

Shri Vajpayee: No, Sir.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Shri Vajpayee and Shri Assar and others had given notice.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. (Interruptions). I am not going to allow this kind of interruptions. Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, have we forgotten Delhi? We have confined ourselves to Tibet only.

Mr. Speaker: I want Mr. Banerjee to keep out of the House for the rest of the day.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am going, Sir. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: He is so much interrupting the business of this House that I hereby order him to withdraw from the House for the rest of the day.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I am going. But this adjournment motion means...

Mr. Speaker: Let him withdraw.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Yes, Sir, I am going.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot put up with this kind of interruptions any more.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Thank you very much, Sir. (Shri S. M. Banerjee then left the House.)

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I submit, Sir...

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Papers to be laid on the Table.

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table under...

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, I rise to move an adjournment motion. If the adjournment motion is not going to be admitted, I must know the reasons why it is not going to be admitted.

Mr. Speaker: I have disallowed the motion.

Shri Vajpayee: On what ground, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Let us get along Mr. Thomas. (Interruptions).

Shri Vajpayee: It is not a continuing matter, Sir. (Interruptions). There is no State Assembly, and Parliament is the only forum. There was a violent lathi charge.

Shri Punnoose (Ambalapuzha): One word, Sir.

Shri Tangamani: There is a Municipal Corporation...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There must be an order maintained in the House. Mr. Vajpayee, Mr. Assar, Shri Braj Raj Singh jointly sent me a notice of an adjournment motion. I disallowed that adjournment motion.

Shri Punnoose: It is very important, Sir. It happened in Delhi and not in Tibet.

Mr. Speaker: Let it happen here. If I disallow an adjournment motion should they go on moving it? Then what is the use of my disallowing it? (Interruptions).

Order, order. I am going to allow a short-notice question regarding the subject of that adjournment motion. I may tell the House that it is about the death of somebody of Tibetan origin who died in police custody. That is what is reported in the Press.

That ought to be brought in by this adjournment motion. Should there be an adjournment motion if somebody dies? Death is deplorable. But, I will allow a short-notice question on that matter. I am going to allow the Minister to make a statement or answer that short-notice question.

If after each adjournment motion is disallowed, an hon. Member gets up and says: "This is my adjournment motion and I intend stating it here", then I will have to close the shop and go.

Things are being done here in such a way that I am exceedingly sorry that hon. Members do not observe decorum. I am trying to accommodate every hon. Member. They have to satisfy me. I have been saying this for three or four days. Nobody has cared to see me. Hon. Members want to make statements here.

They can come and see me and convince me about the thing. I have not been asked to revise my decision. I am prepared to meet them. Shri Banerjee or Shri Braj Raj Singh or Shri Vajpayee. They can come and satisfy me as to why I should revise my decision. Then I shall bring it before the House. So...

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): Sir, I would submit that Mr. Banerjee who has been ordered by you to leave the House did not give an adjournment motion on the death of the Tibetan. As I understand, Sir, his motion was with reference to the lathi charge right under our nose at Delhi. There is no State Legislature. I feel that a Member is entitled to know the reason of your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I said it is a simple matter of law and order. If some people gather and the police ask them to go and they refuse are beaten by police, immediately, an adjournment motion is brought in.

This Parliament is spending thousands of rupees everyday, and should we take up the time of the House like this? Is it necessary that an hon. Member should get up and go on disturbing the House? There is a limit to this.

Yes, let us go to the next item papers to be laid on the Table.