

RAJYA SABHA

Tuesday, the 28th April, 1964/the
8th Vaisakha, 1886 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the
clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

GEN. CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S PROMISE
TO INDIA

*117. SHRI A. D. MANI: Will the
PRIME MINISTER be pleased to
state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to an interview given to Shri K. V. Narain, Correspondent of the *Hindu*, a report of which was published in the *Hindu* of March 21, 1964 to the effect that General Chiang Kai-Shek promised that he would undo the wrong done by the Peking regime and resume China's policy of good neighbourly relations with India; and

(b) if so, whether Government propose to revise their policy in regard to the recognition of the Government of Formosa?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
(SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON): (a) Yes, Sir. Government's attention has been drawn to the news item published in the *Hindu* dated March 21, 1964.

(b) No, Sir. The Government of India have no intention of revising their declared policy in regard to Formosa.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, may I ask the Government whether in the past, when Gen. Chiang Kai-Shek and Kuomintang were in power in China, they had made the same territorial claims as the Peking regime does on Indian territory and that this modification of Gen. Chiang Kai-Shek is a substantial modification of the stand taken by him in the past?

206 RSD—1.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: We do not think it is a substantial modification at all because he has himself said that he would undo the wrong done by the Peking regime. In cartographic claims against India published by the KMT regime—the same claims were made by Gen. Chiang Kai-Shek as successor Government.

SHRI A. D. MANI: In view of the fact that there has been a shift in the policy of Gen. Chiang Kai-Shek and in view of the fact that the Government of France have recognised the separate existence of the Government of Formosa, does not the Government believe in the universality of the membership of the United Nations and also does it not believe that the time has come for recognising the separate existence of Formosa as a separate entity, distinct from China?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: No, Sir.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Is it not a fact that the Government of Chiang Kai-Shek is in effective control of Formosa and other neighbouring islands? So far the policy of the Government of India has been to recognise a Government which is in control of the territory over which it rules. May I know whether this stand will be applied to the Government of Chiang Kai-Shek also and, if not, why not?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: Because Formosa was regarded as part of China.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Am I to understand that the Government wants Formosa to go to Communist China against the will of the people there?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Well, both the Governments—the People's Republic of China and the Government of Formosa—deny separate existence of both of them. They both claim the whole of the place.

There is no point in our going against the declared wishes of both of them.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, in view of the fact that both the Governments, the Government of Formosa and the Government of Peking, have reconciled that France should recognise both of them, would they not reconcile to this view if we also recognise both of them?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Well, what France has done is not quite clear to me; it is very doubtful. Anyway, there does not seem to be any obvious reason why we should change our attitude at this moment.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know the policy of the Government of India about permitting the citizens of India to visit Formosa?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Mr. Chairman, may I request the Prime Minister to reply sitting? He need not stand every time.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Sir, I would like to preserve the decorum of the House.

The citizens of India can go to Formosa not by an ordinary passport, because we do not recognise visas or passports, but by some kind of certificate, I believe. They can go there if they get that certificate.

(Interruption)

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Sir, in respect of making claims on Indian territory, there seems to be no difference between the Peking claims and those of the Chiang Kai-Shek Government's. At the start of aggression on India's borders Gen. Chiang Kai-Shek also made similar claims, similar to those of Peking.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I believe the hon. Member is correct.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Sir, very recently the leader of an Opposition Party, Mr. Masani, went to Formosa. He met Mr. Chiang Kai-Shek. May

I know whether permission was given to Mr. Masani to go, and also, on his return back whether Mr. Masani gave any report of the discussions he had with Gen. Chiang Kai-Shek to the Government of India?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: No, Sir.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I answer that question, Sir? I do not quite know what was given to Mr. Masani to go there. He made some arrangements with the Government of Formosa himself and he went there. On his return he saw me and gave me some account of his visit there.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Apart from what the Government of Formosa or the Government of China might say about both being one single entity, may I ask whether it is the Government's policy not to accept the separate existence of Formosa and to insist on its return to the control of the mainland of China? This amounts to interference in the internal affairs of a country which wants to have separate existence.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is not our policy to make arrangements about Formosa or China. We are merely accepting a fact which exists, and it is a fact that both of them hold to a single country.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GYA: Sir, I want to put one question. May I know whether, in view of the fact that even the Government of Formosa says that Tibet is an integral part of China, our recognition of Formosa will do any good to India?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Does the Government of India not say that Tibet belongs to China?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I must proceed to the next question.

*118. (The questioner (Shri Deokinandan Narayan) was absent. For answer, vide cols. 890—893 infra.).