

**SHRI T. V. ANANDAN:** Now there is going to be formed a new Railway Zone by the integration of two Railways and the travelling public are not going to be affected by it, it is true. But then the question of seniority of the staff in this new arrangement will arise. We have had very bitter experience in this regard when in 1951 the Railways were integrated but the seniority question is yet to be solved on many Railways. Therefore, when these two Railways are made to form a Zone the seniority of the staff should be protected and the formula evolved by the all-India seniority committee has been overlooked by the Railway Board introducing their own formula. In this respect, Sir, before this integration takes place, I request the hon. Minister to give an undertaking that the recognised union concerned will be consulted in the matter of seniority.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is giving an undertaking seeking a clarification?

**SHRI T. V. ANANDAN:** Yes, Sir.

**SHRI RAM SUBHAG SINGH:** How can I give any undertaking? But I do promise that we shall take everything into consideration and there will be no intention to affect anybody's seniority. Nobody will be adversely affected.

**ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR (i) THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) NO. 3 BILL, 1964 AND (ii) THE INDIAN TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964.**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I have to inform Members that under rule 186(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted the following time for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return by the Rajya Sabha of—

(i) The Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1964—Thirty Minutes,

(ii) The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill, 1964—One hour,

including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to these Bills.

**MOTION RE FILLING A VACANCY IN THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964**

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (SHRI BHAKT DARSHAN):** Sir, on behalf of Shri M. C. Chagla I beg to move:

“That Shri Mahabir Prasad Shukla be appointed to the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915 vice Shri Tarakeshwar Pande who has resigned his seat in the Rajya Sabha.”

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

**MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—continued**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before I ask the hon. Minister to reply to the debate I have allowed Mr. Sudhir Ghosh to say a word of explanation.

**SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal):** Sir, on a point of personal explanation just for a moment. May I very respectfully remove one item of misunderstanding which I seem to have created yesterday, in the course of our debate, in the minds of three very respected colleagues of ours, Shri A. D. Mani, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee and Shri G. S. Pathak. **MR. Mani** said:

"I have very great respect for Mr. Sudhir Ghosh. But the suggestion that he made that there ought to be negotiations between India and China on the border question is fraught with dangerous implications and is likely to be misconstrued in Peking."

Sir, I never said anything of this sort. What I did say was this:

"It is not beyond the wisdom and ingenuity of the world leaders of today to find means of getting together a group of impartial men, who have nothing to do with China or India, perhaps with the imprimatur of the United Nations, to examine this border dispute purely on merits, and to work out a scientifically re-delineated India-China border, which may be acceptable to both parties on the basis of give-and-take."

Well, the House will remember that our former great Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, himself offered to send this dispute to the International Court.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): This does not remove from our minds the dangerous implications this proposal has.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: I have not suggested negotiations between India and China.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: Not at all convincing.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: I did not suggest negotiations between India and China. I suggested mediation I have talked about . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have clearly stated what you had to say.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI (Gujarat): Are we raising a new debate?

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: I repeat I do not suggest any negotiations between India and China.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have allowed Mr. Pande to put a question for a clarification.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I am not enthused over the statement made by the Foreign Minister giving a resume of the international situation, that is there today, particularly where India stands in relation to that situation. But I will not deal with that thing. I will only ask a few questions of the Foreign Minister as to how he visualises the future of this country *vis-a-vis* the proposals that he is going to have for the admission of China into the United Nations. According to my opinion, this admission of China into the United Nations is fraught with great danger. Sir, the House is painfully aware of the fact that even without being in the United Nations China is creating a horror.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pande, I am afraid, you said . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Just two minutes, Sir, because it is very important that the Foreign Minister must know this problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Put your question.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Sir, China is making headway in African countries. We have no friends there left, we have neither in South-East Asia nor in Africa. If China is armed with the power of veto, I may also ask him whether he wants to admit China with the veto also, whether he wants to divest Nationalist China or the Taiwan Government of that veto, to get it transferred to Communist China. If that is the case, it is a suicidal step for India that we should recommend or we should participate or should assist in the admission of China into the United Nations. Because the

[Shri C. D. Pande.]

power of veto is so great, I fear that China will make a solid wall against us in the African and Asiatic countries. We know from our own experience that Russia has got the power of veto and she has obliged us on the Kashmir issue for which we are beholden to her. Now, if the same power of veto is secured to Communist China and she uses it always in favour of the African countries, where she has already made much headway, how can you stand their onslaught against us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you any other question?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: One more question, Sir. The other question is whether the Government has taken any steps in this regard. Of course we cannot help, we cannot bar the entry of Communist China into the United Nations. Can the Foreign Minister promise this House that we shall not try to give her the power of veto? Secondly, if the power of veto is given to Communist China, then we should convince the United Nations and press on them that India also should have that power of veto in the Security Council. Otherwise, you arm your enemy to shoot you down, because you are committed to the theory of admitting China into the United Nations. That commitment is over now, because China has betrayed us.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras): Sir, I was under the impression that the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you want? Is it a point of order?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Not a point of order, Sir. If you will please allow me, I would say that I was under the impression from the newspaper reports that this debate would be on the 22nd and 23rd and under that impression I have in fact rushed to Delhi by plane. Considering the

importance of this debate and since many things have happened since the last session, the Cairo Conference, and other conferences, the atom bomb and so many other things, I would request that you may kindly give some more time for this debate.

SHRI ABID ALI (Maharashtra): Let us finish now.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I would request you to give some more time for this debate.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Half of the trouble is due to you.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Half the problem is due to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. He is dealing with me and I will tell him what I think.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I would only urge that at least the debate may continue till the lunch interval and the hon. Minister can reply after the lunch interval. I would also point out, Sir, that yesterday the House sat only up to 5. p.m. and so considering the importance of this debate, some more time should be allowed. Are you allowing it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not allowed anything. Have you finished?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Do you accede to the request?

MR. CHAIRMAN: When you finish I shall say. I cannot do so till you have finished. I am very sorry I am not in a position to oblige the hon. Member, and as announced, the Minister of External Affairs will reply now.

SHRI SYED AHMED (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I only want to make a suggestion so that the hon. Minister may make it clear in his reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did not want to disturb the debate. You hon.

Members should have approached me before. These gentlemen had approached me before and so I allowed them.

**THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH):** Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to go into details and I shall endeavour to confine myself to answering some of the important points that have emerged in the course of the high level debate that took place yesterday on the international situation. First of all, Sir, I will take this matter which has aroused doubts and which has necessitated a personal explanation by Mr. Sudhir Ghosh. I am afraid even after his personal explanation the House does not appear to be satisfied.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Correct.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** And it is therefore necessary for the position in this respect to be briefly recapitulated and the salient points again brought to our mind so that there may not be any misunderstanding on this score. In the first place, Sir, reference has been made to the Colombo Proposals, and one hon. Member, a senior Member of our party, Mr. Sapru, said that there is nothing sacrosanct in those proposals.

**SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY:** They are most sacrosanct.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Without using any expression or adjective, let us examine impartially the background of those proposals. It will be wrong to regard them as Indian proposals and therefore, we should view it in that perspective. When the massive Chinese aggression took place in the year 1962, a group of non-aligned Afro-Asian countries got together and they put forward certain proposals which, if acted upon by both the sides, that is to say, the People's Republic of China and India, could be the basis of negotiations. Let us keep this always before us. It will be wrong to suggest that they are Indian proposals. In fact, we did not entirely like those proposals and

if they were our proposals, then those proposals would have been completely different. But in a spirit of respect and regard for our Afro-Asian non-aligned brothers, we accepted those proposals in a spirit of compromise. Our acceptance itself meant a certain compromise on our part and therefore, it will be wrong to suggest that they are Indian proposals.

What are those proposals? The entire background of those proposals was that a party that has gained by a unilateral act of aggression should not enjoy the fruits of that aggression, before going to the conference table. That was the philosophy behind them. It is quite obvious that if negotiations have to start, they should start on a basis of honour, on a basis of equity.

**SHRI P. RAMAMURTI:** Just one question.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** No question at this stage.

**SHRI P. RAMAMURTI:** Just one interruption. If that is the philosophy behind them, are we to understand that, when the Colombo proposals did not allow India to occupy Dhola and all the other 47 out-posts, the Colombo Powers had come to the conclusion that we had committed aggression?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** It is a great pity that unfortunately in our own country we have got some people who are anxious to find a point not in our favour but in favour of the other country.

**SHRI P. RAMAMURTI:** I am saying that you are giving an interpretation which will go against us. The interpretation you are giving is likely to go against us. If this is the basis of the Colombo Proposals, then people are likely to say that on this basis the Colombo Proposals did not ask us to occupy Dhola and the other places. That is why I am saying you are giving a wrong interpretation.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** I am very glad even the Communist leader here is amenable to the strong sentiments which are shared by everyone in this country.

**SHRI P. RAMAMURTI:** Of course.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** And once he is trying to substantiate it and that is something which gladdens me and I hope he will continue this, so that the beatings of his heart may be nearer to the beatings of the hearts of millions in this country.

I am trying to explain it and I am not going into the details. I am only saying that this was the main objective behind it. In their attempt to give content to that, on details they might not have exactly seen our viewpoint, and therefore, I described it as a compromise and not something which is entirely to our liking. So I do not see any danger in our position being misunderstood by the general proposals which I am placing before this honourable House. We must keep this aspect of the Colombo Proposals before us.

What happened thereafter? We said that we accept the Colombo Proposals *in toto*, and if the other party, namely, China, also is prepared to accept them *in toto*, then we are prepared to negotiate and to discuss the question on merits. China, on the other hand, whereas they continue to say that they accept these proposals in principle—an expression the exact meaning of which I have never been able to understand—they were never prepared to act upon what was enjoined under the Colombo Proposals to be done by China. So this is the position in which we find ourselves and I think we have gone to the maximum limit in trying to accept the proposals which by themselves were compromise proposals. And so to suggest that we should give in on that score is, to my mind not fair to us and therefore, it is likely to em-

barrass us. I would request that on a matter of this importance, we should not indulge in just theoretical suggestions and that we should carefully weigh the suggestions that are put forward. We are so anxious that our image is not being damaged, that our viewpoint is not being misunderstood. But if we ourselves introduce these elements of doubt, then surely nothing damages our image more than the projection of ideas which create doubts in the minds of our countrymen, and certainly these are things which are bound to affect our position. I hope by this clarification no doubt would be left in any person's mind in the country that in the matter of the Colombo Proposals we had taken a very fair stand. If I did not mention this in my opening speech, it was for this reason that having clarified our position and the People's Republic of China having categorically stated that they do not accept the liability to act under the Colombo Proposals, there was nothing further on this score that we could do. Therefore, it is wrong to suggest that on this issue we should compromise our position. It will not be fair either to the Colombo Powers. It will certainly not be fair to our country that we should raise doubts on this issue.

Another point, Sir, which is of equal significance and perhaps the seriousness of which was not fully appreciated by the two very respectable colleagues of mine, was raised. It was said that after all it was an undefined boundary and perhaps by some give and take there could be some possibility of a compromise. I think that such a suggestion having been made with the best of intentions and perhaps in innocence is likely to be greatly misconstrued. Let us try to understand the position correctly. In our anxiety to find a way out of the difficult situation let us not create a situation where the basic thing slips, because that will be a very dangerous thing for the country. We should try to understand the correct

position. I remember distinctly the seriousness with which this matter was handled in this House and in the other House by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. He made it clear that it would be wrong to imagine that this is just a matter of little border dispute between the two countries. It is a clear case in which very sizable areas of our country are being demanded by China and it is really a territorial claim which has been made by China and not just a border dispute. I remember very distinctly the expressions that were used by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. Lest any misgiving should arise on this score, I would like to clarify precisely the position with regard to the boundary question as it has been confused when tried to be explained by some colleagues in the House.

The common border between India and China is not a new or unknown border, but one which has been formed through centuries of history of neighbourly co-existence between the two countries. There was never any dispute about this border in history, not even during the first ten years of the existence of the People's Republic of China, until, in fact, China put forward vast and fantastic territorial claims against India in September 1959. We have to see this posture of China. It is not just a border dispute. We have to realise this difference. It was not a border dispute which China thus precipitated but territorial demands, involving over 60 000 sq. miles of Indian territory and affecting the sovereignty and integrity of India. To call it a genuine and honest misunderstanding about the border, as Shri Sudhir Ghosh has done, is something contrary to facts.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: I did not say there is genuine misunderstanding. I said there can be such a thing as genuine misunderstanding.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, I think it will be better if Mr. Sudhir Ghosh does not attempt to explain

something which cannot be explained. In such a situation it is better to accept the fact of the situation.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Sir, on a point of order, in this House free expression of opinion should be possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it is very much possible.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, our stand has been that India's northern boundary is well-defined and delimited, though not demarcated, and that when national boundaries have been defined and delimited by custom, tradition, history, geography and treaties, as it is in the case of the Sino-Indian border, it remains the valid and recognised boundary even though not demarcated on the ground. Had the Chinese case been that there is some doubt about the border at certain specific points, it could certainly have been possible to clear and settle these doubts through negotiations. But the Chinese case is not that, but that vast areas of India belong to China. Now this is a matter which we should not lose sight of and it is in this context that we have to see what our attitude and what our approach should be.

The third point that was suggested and which again was repeated by my dear colleague, Mr. Sudhir Ghosh, with whom I have had the opportunity of working in close collaboration, is this. He said that the United Nations or the world statesmen should find some group of people who could suggest some boundary or some delineation which could then be considered by the two countries. Now, if you examine this thing, there is not much substance in it but on the essence of the proposal our attitude has not been that of recalcitrance.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: I am sorry, Sir. I only meant the same thing as the Prime Minister meant.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Why do you feel uncomfortable? There is no need to feel so uncomfortable. If that is your meaning, then I am only trying to interpret your mind perhaps in a simpler language.

**SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH:** The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, offered to send the India-China dispute to the International Court. He also offered mediation.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Sir, this was precisely what I was trying to say. If he had said that yesterday, probably so much misunderstanding would not have arisen. This is nothing more, as now mentioned by him, than what was said by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. He had said, "I am prepared to take this matter to the Court of International Justice."

**SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH:** That is exactly what I meant.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** He also said, Sir, "I am also prepared to refer this to arbitrators chosen by the two countries and their decision or award would be acceptable to me" But Mr. Sudhir Ghosh forgets that this was categorically rejected by China. At that very time when this was said by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, it was rejected by China.

**SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH:** That is not the end of the road. It can still be done.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh):** Mr. Sudhir Ghosh wants United Nations intervention, which means Anglo-American intervention.

**SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH:** U.S.-Soviet intervention.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** Sir, there is no Soviet intervention. All that we have got from the Soviet Union is generous help.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Sir, so far as this is concerned, I do not want either Anglo American intervention or Soviet intervention.

(Interruptions.)

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh):** Sir, why should the Congress Party expose itself so badly in this House?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** For your edification.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Sir, this is not a matter which we should consider in a light-hearted manner. This is a problem of grave concern to us and, therefore, any half-baked suggestion without full thought being given to its various aspects and its ramifications will be a very dangerous exercise and even if persons with high intellect and great understanding are the authors of any such suggestion, I would appeal to them that while dealing with such a difficult and delicate issue any attempt at over-simplification or any attitude of innocence will not help the situation at all. Let us try to understand its full implications. It is a problem with which we may have to live for years together. Let us have that resoluteness, let us have that determination, let us have that clarity of approach while we are dealing with this problem. It will be very dangerous if we permit our best of intentions to overtake us when we are dealing with a neighbour of the type of China and when the problem is difficult and delicate as it is when vast territorial claims are made against us. I would, therefore, beg of hon. Members from both sides of the House to view this problem in all seriousness and not be carried away merely by a very obvious temptation sometimes to score a debating point this way or that way. The matter is much more serious to be explained away or to give any satisfaction to any person merely on the

ground of trying to score a debating point. The matter is much too serious and we should, therefore, view it in that background and perspective and not try to throw up suggestions which may not have much meaning. If there is anything, it could be discussed, it could be considered but before it is put across, it must be very thoroughly examined. These things are made use of in various international forums and also for purposes of injuring our case amongst other friendly countries. So, let us be very cautious when we make any such statement. This much about this problem.

Now, Sir, I would make a brief reference to another matter, the Indo-Ceylon Agreement, about which the distinguished leader of the D.M.K. made a very impassioned speech. I would very briefly try to meet some of the points that he raised. Sir, the first point that he made while criticising this was that this was a matter which was entirely for the Government of Ceylon, that it was not an Indo-Ceylon problem. Now, let us examine the validity of this argument. Here is this question about which the distinguished leader of the D.M.K. himself referred to various earlier discussions between the two Prime Ministers. In fact, the dialogue about this started more than twenty years ago; even before Independence there were discussions between the then representatives of the Government of India and the representatives of the Government of Ceylon. In 1940 there was a discussion about this matter. After Independence, there were four or five discussions between the two Prime Ministers and there were other discussions at official level. So, it is not correct now to say that this is a problem with which we are not concerned. At the same time, he shows more concern about the people there and yet he wants to take an easy line and say that this is entirely for Ceylon and that we should not bother about it. Now, you may have objections to the substance of the

agreement but to say that this is a matter with which we are not concerned is certainly not borne out by events and by closing our eyes to a problem, the problem does not get solved. We have to tackle the problem howsoever inconvenient and difficult it may appear to be. The very trend of its handling before and the way that the two countries were dealing with this problem should not leave any doubt in anybody's mind that this was a problem with which we were not very much unconcerned. Here were people of Indian origin whose future was uncertain and, therefore, we were greatly concerned. The second point raised by him was that this was a human problem and the question of human rights should have been given a great deal of prominence in our approach. I entirely agree with him: It is very much a human problem and it was this main consideration, that this was a human problem and human rights were involved, that made us tackle it this way and we have tried to find a solution to this very vexed problem: How does this problem involve human rights? Here is a group of over nine lakhs of people who are not Indian citizens—because we say that they cease to be Indian citizens—and Ceylon does not accept them as Ceylonese citizens. They have not got the right to vote there and they are generally denied many of the things that are permitted and allowed to the people who have acquired Ceylonese citizenship. So, it is very much a human problem. Here is a group of over nine lakhs of people whose status is not determined. Ceylon is not recognising them as such. We are suggesting to them that they should but they do not. Yet, he posed a very simple question, "Would they shoot them down? Are they going to throw them into the ocean?" Now, the distinguished leader of a group like the D.M.K. can take that attitude; I cannot take that attitude. I have to take a realistic attitude, not a political approach. He may have his eyes on the General Elections and



[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

he may be thinking of using this as a big lever for his election campaigns in Madras State but as a member of the Government, I have to take a more realistic view. The future of these people is a matter of grave concern and I hope it should be a matter of grave concern to the D.M.K. leader also. Here are the people who have got no status whatsoever. They are not Indian citizens. Even if they are Indian citizens, I cannot do much for them there except that if they find themselves in difficulty, they have to come back. That is the normal connotation of issuing a passport to an individual—the host country can always send him back. If they have not got Ceylonese citizenship, then it is very necessary that I should find an answer so that they can get the citizenship either of Ceylon or of India. That is precisely the approach and it is for the restoration of the human rights to these people, the fundamental rights of citizenship so that they can enjoy this civil right and rights under international convention and law that we entered into this agreement. I am . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: May I just intervene and ask whether it was contemplated that there would be communal representation, that they would be placed in a communal register?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr Sapru has raised a very valid point and he knows my answer. This was never mentioned and we have strongly protested against that. This was a matter which was never mentioned in the course of the discussion. Persons of Indian origin who had earlier been given Ceylonese citizenship were kept in a joint register so that we had no reason to doubt . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: May I just point out that they would be second class citizens?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: This is something which is so obvious; it

does not require a Judge to put forward that idea. We have always taken the view . . .

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras): The hon. Minister should enlighten us whether people of Indian origin in Ceylon are satisfied with the agreement that you have arrived at? You call it a great concession and say that you had treated it as a human problem. Are the people in Ceylon, people of Indian origin, satisfied with the agreement you have arrived at?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Why do you repeat it? I have still got my power of hearing. If the hon. Member had waited a little, he would have got the answer. I know that the leader of his Party has given him instructions to raise all types of row about it but let him hear me first, let him hear the other side of the picture.

I was saying that this group of over nine lakhs of people should be given either Ceylonese citizenship or Indian citizenship and it is precisely what we have done. There may be difference of opinion about the number of people . . .

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: I am sorry to interrupt again but the Minister has not yet answered my point.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I have not finished yet, my friend. Why are you so impatient? I know that your leader is annoyed but I think Members of his Party should show more forbearance. I have not finished yet and I will not run away like that. Notwithstanding the wishes of your leader, I am not a person who runs away easily.

Sir, the question of grant of citizenship right to these people was of importance and, therefore, we entered into negotiations so that this uncertainty, this Statelessness and this absence of any status should end. Hence we started negotiations and the basic agreement has been welcomed

even by the critics of this. There will be no uncertainty and people will get either Ceylonese or Indian citizenship under this decision. Those who are to get Ceylonese citizenship will get absorbed in their society, in their civil life and in their stream of life and the others would become Indian citizens who enjoy normal usual rights in the country where they stay.

Now this point which has been raised by my very respected colleague, Mr. Sapru, about the separate electoral register is a valid point because this was never discussed and we have taken very strong objection to this and we hope that our efforts in this respect will succeed because it was never contemplated that these persons who are given Ceylonese citizenship rights should be placed on a separate electoral register. Our way of thinking in this country has always been that there should be no separate electorate in any form or shape and therefore we are strongly of the view that this is something which was not contemplated and therefore this should not be the position. I hope the Ceylon Government, after the election when new Government is formed, will take note of this attitude of ours and will not do anything which will create a situation which was not contemplated at the time of negotiations.

Now, Sir, the third point which was raised by Mr. Annadurai and for which the Member of the Swatantra Party is very keen—actually he is getting impatient—was this. He asks whether this has been accepted by the people who are involved. I will be quite candid. This is a compromise formula; I do not like the whole of it, nor does the Ceylon Government like the whole of it. The people concerned, all of them, do not like it; some like it, others don't. I am conscious of the fact that Mr. Thondaman and his party have made a statement where they say that this agreement is not acceptable to them. But let us not forget one important thing, which probably is not known

to hon. Members, that there are lakhs of people there in Ceylon who want to come back to India on their own and they have been approaching the Indian High Commission for grant of travel facilities to return to India.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: They are a small number.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Only time will show. It will one of the important things in procedure that applications will be invited from all those who are persons of Indian origin in Ceylon to apply either for Indian citizenship or for Ceylon citizenship. And once these applications are invited we can see as to whether the number is so small as is contended by the hon. Member there or whether the number is large as is our information. After all we are functioning there although we do not make loud speeches and this is a matter about which we did not want to talk at all because if we said that a large number of them were wanting to come back, in the negotiations that is not a point which goes in our favour.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI (Madras): Sir . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: May I finish, Mr. Annadurai? I have great respect for you. After I finish this point you can put questions. The procedure that we are trying to settle is one which will give an indication of the wishes of the people. Now, the principles have been decided by negotiation and maybe the number of applicants who apply for Indian citizenship may not be large or may fall short of it. That is a matter which, when we know that situation, we can consider as to how best we could solve it. This is an aspect which we have to keep in mind.

Then there are other features about this formula.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: There is one thing.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Please; I have not finished the Ceylon thing. I do not give way yet.

Sir, the other important thing is that people who are repatriated will be permitted to take out their assets unlike the unfortunate people who are coming from Burma. So there are several good features of this agreement and it is really very unkind if in a sweeping way it is brushed aside and said that it is a betrayal of this or betrayal of that. That type of expressions we are all accustomed to hear. Unless there is any substance behind them, merely strong words do not cut much ice. This was a very considered decision that we took after ascertaining the opinion of the people concerned. I had myself occasion to discuss this matter both with Mr. Thondaman and Mr. Aziz, the two leaders belonging to two groups, when I was in Colombo. And we were in touch with the Government of Madras. It is true that we have not consulted the Opposition leaders here but the way that their mind is working I cannot say what would have happened if I had consulted them unless of course I had accepted their veto. Whereas I am prepared to have their opinion I cannot agree to a veto being exercised by them. If they say that this is not acceptable, we cannot sit with crossed legs without moving forward because we carry the responsibility and not they. We have to view this agreement in this perspective and given goodwill and understanding on both sides I am sure that this agreement will not turn out to be to our disadvantage. It will solve a long-standing dispute between the two countries and the misunderstanding and bitterness that was being generated as a result of this problem will be eliminated.

Mr. Annadurai, I think unwittingly, said that it is a small country and asked, 'why do you care so much about it?' I think that should not be our attitude with regard to our

neighbours. The smaller a country, the greater should be our respect for their susceptibilities and our attitude should be one of good neighbourliness and not a chauvinistic approach. If I may be quite frank, I say a great deal of harm is done to persons of Indian origin in Ceylon by the extremely intemperate speeches made by the party to which Mr. Annadurai belongs. A great deal of misunderstanding is created between persons of Indian origin in Ceylon and the Ceylonese by the extremely unwise and intemperate speeches that are made by the D.M.K. leaders in Madras and I would appeal that in a matter of such complicated international nature it is not wise to adopt this attitude of not caring for other country's susceptibilities even though it may be a small country. That is not the way that we should function in this country.

Yes, Mr. Annadurai, you wanted to ask something?

**SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI** The hon. Minister was pleased to state that there are lakhs of Indians who are anxious to go over here. When the India-Pakistan Citizenship Act was passed the Indian Embassy there called for registrations. How many were registered then?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** I am glad he has reminded me of that. Besides these three lakhs of people who are now being taken by Ceylon as Ceylonese citizens at the time when the India-Pakistan Citizenship Act came into force the Ceylon Government took 1,34,000. Add this three lakhs to that and that makes it 4,34,000. This 1,34,000 was the number taken ten years back. If you add the increase in population and also add another 6,000 who have been given Ceylonese citizenship in between, the total number comes to, practically the same that we are taking. It is more or less half and half basis. He asks, 'what was the number of applications at that time?'

Even at the present moment when we have somehow discouraged people from applying there are 40,000 applications pending with our High Commission. So even now there are people who are wanting to come away when we have not invited applications and I know it that both Mr. Thondaman and Mr. Aziz . . .

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It is Thondamaan; at least the name can be pronounced properly

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That is what I said; Thondamaan.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It is not Thondaman; it is Thondamaan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As long as you understand who is meant, it is all right.

श्री ए० बी० बाजरेयो (उत्तर प्रदेश):  
मान न मान, कोरे फर्क नहीं पड़ता ।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not know the exact number but it is a fact that we rejected a very large number of applications and we did not give them Indian citizenship and at that time this has been one of the complaints of the Ceylonese Government that at that time we did not grant citizenship rights to many people who had asked for such citizenship rights. I wish that these questions were not probed in that form. It is not in the interests of the people for whom he is speaking. We should therefore proceed in the right spirit because this is a matter which we have settled after a great deal of controversy and it is our intention to go ahead with the follow-up action based upon that agreement.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: My point is that when the hon. Minister stated that lakhs of people are anxious to go over here, it should be based on certain facts and the only fact now available is the working of the Indo-Ceylon Pact of 1953 or 1954. At that

time when the Indian High Commission there called for applications for registration as Indian citizens, it was very meagre, which means that many people are not anxious to go over here. That was my point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he has adduced many facts to give a reply to what you asked.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): May I know whether the Government of India have made it clear to the Ceylon Government that they will not consider the agreement binding on them if the new Ceylon Government also insists that Indian citizens, who are going to be given citizenship in Ceylon, are to be placed on a separate register?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We have made our position quite clear and our Prime Minister has written to the Prime Minister of Ceylon where he has made it absolutely clear that this step that they are contemplating—they have not yet taken this step—to take, namely, placing the persons to whom they grant Ceylonese citizenship rights on a separate register, will not be acceptable to us. We have made the position quite clear and let us work for their not insisting on this. Rather than giving an ultimatum at this stage, we should depend on our capacity . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: What you have said just now is that if they do not accept our suggestion, that will not be acceptable to us. Does it mean the additional proposal of a separate register or the whole Indo-Ceylon Agreement?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Let us not spell out things of a hypothetical nature. We hope that this will not happen. It is very interesting that DMK leader did take exception to this. Probably he believes in separatist things, but whatever may be his attitude, we are quite clear as to what we should do. We are quite

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]  
determined to see that these people are not placed on a separate register. It is of significance . . .

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Sir . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I have given way more than once. I have gone out of my way to accede to your wishes.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: The hon. Minister has stated that I made certain derogatory statements about Ceylon when I mentioned it as a small country. I said that in the context that when a small country like Ceylon can work out the democratic tenets why not a large country. In that way it was indirectly a tribute to Ceylon and not a derogatory statement.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I leave it to the Ceylon Government to decide as to whether it was tribute and I am sure that this clarification might be of some satisfaction to them. It is not of much satisfaction to me because the impression that was created in my mind was not one of tribute. It was different.

Now, Sir, it might be of interest for the House to know that the two leaders, whose names have been mentioned before, Mr. Thondaman—I hope the pronunciation is correct now—and Mr. Aziz . . .

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: You are coming nearer.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: They have both welcomed this basic decision that the state of uncertainty about the future of these people would come to an end. They will get either Ceylonese citizenship rights or Indian citizenship rights. I know they are worried about the number.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: They have both repudiated the Pact in their conferences.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: No. Probably you have not cared to listen to me with the same care with which I listened to your interruption. I have said that they have welcomed this decision that the uncertainty about their status is going to end. They will get either Ceylonese citizenship rights or Indian citizenship rights, which is a step in the right direction. Both of them have said so. They do not agree about the number . . .

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: They have certainty over the uncertainty that you have created.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you should now allow the Minister to proceed.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: There is nothing further. I know that I cannot convince him, because he is raising this more with a political objective. I do not grudge it. All of us are politicians and public men, but he should not grudge my explanation of the situation and the agreement that has been entered into will, I hope, be appreciated by persons of goodwill in both countries. We all of us are interested in improving our relations with our neighbouring countries and it would be wrong to think that we can improve those relations by sticking to our hard position. We should approach these problems in a spirit of mutual accommodation. We should in an increasing measure try to bring about a spirit of accommodation rather than have a rigid approach while considering these problems which create difficulties. I do not plead any helplessness. If we try to argue in a very longish way, I think that would not at all help us. We have taken this decision and we intend to implement it. So, there is no question of any helplessness or being apologetic about it.

These were the few main points about China and about the Indo-Ceylon agreement that were highlighted. There were certain other matters, but

I will not take long over them. I shall try to go over this ground rapidly. Now, I welcome the suggestion made by my colleague, Shri Govinda Reddy, when he said that we should encourage the visit of non-officials, including Members of Parliament, to some of our neighbouring countries and also other countries in Asia and Africa. I welcome that and it is our intention to organise visits by non-officials, including Members of Parliament, so that they might explain our viewpoint and our stand on some of the issues. I also concede that the work that can be done by these non-official groups can be of a more lasting character. There is the diplomatic work. That has to continue because that is essential and that is inescapable. Besides that it can be supplemented and it should be supplemented by these visits. It is our intention to organise such groups.

A point was mentioned by Shri A. B. Vajpayee, about the Indian Press Attache in Moscow not being up-to-date. I have checked it up with a senior officer of the Ministry who was in the President's Party. He has informed me that he acted with all possible speed and with efficiency. There was no ground to complain. As all of us are aware, our President does not make speeches from written scripts. He makes his speeches extempore. That was taken down by stenographers and it took some time before it was actually typed out and supplied to the members of our Press corps.

**SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE:** May I know whether the Indian journalists have been contacted? Are they satisfied?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Now, I would appeal to the Indian journalists to contact me or the hon. Member can give me their names. I will find out from them what their complaint exactly was, instead of giving it in an indirect manner. I know that they are all my friends and I will find out from them what was their precise difficulty. And if any difficulties are

there, we will see that such difficulties are removed in future. I myself am very anxious that Indian Press representatives who go out in any of these delegations should be given the maximum facilities. It is in our interest and it is no favour to them and if there are any shortcomings it is my intention to remove them. I am not complaining about this point having been raised. This gives me an opportunity to look into these things, which may have escaped the notice of those who had organised such visits.

1 P.M.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** Is the Minister aware that the biggest shortcoming of our diplomatic staff in Eastern Europe is that they do not know the language of the country? They expect the Russians and others to learn English to be able to talk to them.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Sir, language difficulty is not only there in Eastern European countries but in several other parts of the world. I do not know why the hon. Member talks always of Eastern European countries. Maybe the German language and the French language are equally foreign to us or the Czech or other languages or the Latin American ones. It is a fact that there are language difficulties for our diplomats who go abroad but we try to rectify that deficiency by providing interpreters in various languages and in course of time—some of the diplomats are good—they pick up the language, but we will have to live up with this problem. For instance, when the Eastern European diplomats come to India, they face difficulties. This is a thing which is common and we have to tackle this according to the best of our capacity and to the best of the capacity of the individuals concerned.

About British Guiana, Mr. Mani had mentioned that we should convey our feelings with regard to the British Guiana situation to the United Kingdom Government. He would no doubt

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

be aware that two distinguished Indians, Mr. Tek Chand, a former Member of Parliament and retired Judge, and Mr. Mirza Bakar Ali, were in the group who had gone to British Guiana to watch the elections. They were supposed to give their report to the United Kingdom Government, and I will have an opportunity of discussing the political situation with them because as experienced public men they can give good advice even outside the limited scope of their assignment, namely, to watch the elections. We have always felt great concern about the unfortunate racial conflict there. We are not happy about it, but we do not think that the cry for partition is the answer. We in India know what such a cry means and what misery it can bring to people. Maybe out of frustration they are now crying for partition, but it is a matter which will have to be handled with sympathy and with care, and we will see what best we could do, but let us not put in our finger more than what the situation justifies. They are British Guianese, maybe persons of Indian origin, and therefore we should, while having all the sympathy for them, not create an impression as if they are functioning under our guidance or under our inspiration. That is not in their interest, that is not in our interest either. This is the situation with regard to that area of the world.

I know that the leader of the Swatantra Party will be angry with me. He is already annoyed with me as he said, because I have not made any reference to any of his remarks. In fact there was nothing new in that. The Government's policy both with regard to Israel and Taiwan is well known and nothing has happened in between to change that situation. About the other basic question, I think that just as I do not have any objection to his being the leader he should also get reconciled to my being a Minister, because there may be more competent men in his own party to lead his party but I never object to that. Therefore, he should also

give me this satisfaction that he should leave me alone to do my duty according to the best of my lights. So long as I enjoy the confidence of my Prime Minister and my party I will be content. I am sorry if I do not enjoy his confidence although I will always try to understand his viewpoint and will try to see if there is anything in that. But he blamed me of confusion. His speech was so lucid and it was practically so transparent that there was nothing for me to reply on that

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Sir, pointed questions were put to the hon. Minister. He has touched all the minor points, but the main points in the debate were the admission of China to the United Nations and the atom bomb, and nothing has been said about these.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: On both these issues I would be glad to speak but I thought I had made the position clear. With regard to the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, we have continued to stick to our stand even after the 1962 aggression, and that stand continues. There is no change in policy. I know that Mr. Pande does not agree with that, but the arguments on either side are so well known that I need not repeat them. That policy continues and that does not call for alteration.

SHRI A. D. MANI: (Madhya Pradesh): I should like to ask one question. That point was raised in the debate by me and others. Why did the Government of India change their stand on that particular issue, namely, of treating China's admission as a substantive issue? The Government of India voted first in favour of China's admission being treated as a substantive issue, but now as a result of Afro-Asian pressure they changed their stand and have agreed to treat it as a procedural issue.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Once for a change Mr. Mani is not factually

correct. We have not changed our position at all. Whenever there was any occasion for voting, we had always said that it was a matter which should be decided by simple majority.

**SHRI C. D. PANDE:** But the situation has changed.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** If there is a change in the situation on account of the Chinese aggression or hostility to us or by their exploding a bomb, those are different things. It should be considered. But having given consideration to those issues and even after the aggression in 1962 we continued to stick to the earlier policy that we had adopted, namely, of supporting their admission into the United Nations; and that policy continues unaltered and therefore there is no change in that policy.

On the bomb I had in my opening remarks clarified the position as best as I could, and I am glad that there is a growing appreciation of the Government's policy of developing our nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and there is a greater realisation of the various integrated issues involved in this, and there is greater support not only amongst our own party but even amongst Members of the opposition that we should continue our efforts for developing nuclear energy even with greater vigour and with a greater purpose, namely the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We should not talk too much of the future one way or the other. The policy is what I enunciated today. Why should we unnecessarily try to project ourselves too much into the future? This is the policy that we are pursuing and we should not try really to clinch the issue more than this. On the positive side we are determined to work even with greater determination for disarmament, for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and for generating a climate of peace because we believe that war and conflict are not the answer to the world situation as we face today, but it is peace and reconciliation and an atmosphere of under-

standing, and we should therefore continue to work hard even against all odds for bringing about a world where disarmament, peace and reconciliation are the keynote and not conflict, escalation of tensions or armament race.

Thank you, Sir.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There are three amendments by Shri A. D. Mani. Are you pressing them, Mr. Mani.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** I press my amendment No. 3 but would like to withdraw amendment Nos. 2 and 5.

*\*Amendment Nos. 2 and 5 were, by leave, withdrawn.*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are you pressing Amendment No. 6, Mr. Mani?

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** I press, because it has not been touched by the hon. Minister in his reply.

My amendment reads thus:

3. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that while the participation of India in the conferences of non-aligned nations is useful, Government should take steps to impress upon the conferences the need for recognising the threat of China to the independent nations of Asia and also to conform to the recognised international procedure of accepting without challenge the credentials of representatives duly authorised by their Governments, for participation in the work of the conferences'."

**PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh):** Sir, I would request the hon. Member not to compel the House to vote on this amendment because it is a very important amendment. The Govern-

\*For text of amendments, *vide cols.* 4805-06 *supra* of the Debate dated the 22nd December, 1964.



[Prof. M. B. Lal.]  
ment cannot be allowed to be defeated by the party in power but all the same an amendment of this character does not deserve also to be defeated. Therefore, taking this into consideration, I would appeal to the hon. Member concerned kindly to withdraw his amendment.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like the hon. Minister to kindly make a statement on this because it has not been touched in his reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani, now if you press, I would put it to the vote.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, I beg to withdraw the amendment.

\*Amendment No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amendment Nos. 6 to 11 are in the name of Mr. Raghunatha Reddy. Are you pressing them Mr. Reddy?

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I beg to withdraw the amendments.

†Amendment Nos. 6 to 11, were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the amendment of Mr. Sudhir Ghosh to vote.

The question is:

1. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy'."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the Motion as amended to vote.

The question is: )

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Gov-

\*For text of amendment *vide* cols. 5018 *supra*.

†For text of amendments *vide* cols. 4803—05 *supra* of the Debate dated the 22nd December 1964.

ernment of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration and having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fourteen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock. THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

#### THEFT OF CARS AND SCOOTERS IN NEW DELHI

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the theft of cars and scooters in New Delhi in which some well-connected youngsters are reported to be involved.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI L. N. MISHRA): Sir, on the morning of the 17th May, 1964, a report was lodged at police station Nizamuddin regarding the theft on the night of 16th May, 1964 of a Fiat car. On receipt of this report a case under section 379 I.P.S. was registered and investigation was taken up immediately. The car was found abandoned in a damaged condition in Moti Bagh area on 17th May. As no evidence was available, the police were unable to trace out the culprits and the case was closed. Subsequently, the brother of the complainant furnished some information which appeared to be relevant to the case. On