

**NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE ESSENTIAL
COMMODITIES ACT, 1955**

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF FOOD
AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. M.
THOMAS):** Sir, I beg to lay on the
Table, under sub-section (6) of sec-
tion 3 of the Essential Commodities
Act, 1955, a copy each of the following
Notifications of the Ministry of Food
and Agriculture (Department of
Food):—

(i) Notification G. S. R. No. 451,
dated the 18th April, 1959,
publishing further amend-
ments in the West Bengal Rice
(Movement Control) Order,
1958.

(ii) Notification G. S. R. No. 452,
dated the 21st April, 1959, res-
cinding the following Govern-
ment Notifications:—

(a) Notification G. S. R. No.
417, dated the 24th May,
1958.

(b) Notification G. S. R. No.
484, dated the 12th June,
1958.

(c) Notification G. S. R. No.
1086, dated the 15th Novem-
ber, 1958.

(iii) Notification G. S. R. No. 504,
dated the 14th April, 1959, pub-
lishing an amendment in the
Delhi Wheat (Export Control)
ry. See No. L.T.-1402/59 for
Order 1959. [Placed in Libra-
(i) to (iii).]

**NOTIFICATION PUBLISHING THE RICE
MILLING INDUSTRY (REGULATION AND
LICENSING) RULES, 1959**

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: I also beg to
lay on the Table, under sub-section
(4) of section 22 of the Rice-Milling
Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958, a
copy of the Ministry of Food and Agri-
culture (Department of Food) Notifi-
cation G. S. R. No. 510, dated the 22nd
April, 1959, publishing the Rice-Milling
Industry (Regulation and Licensing)
Rules, 1959. [Placed in Library. See
No. LT-1401/59.]

**REPORT ON THE WORKING OF HINDUSTAN
AIRCRAFT LTD., BANGALORE FOR 1957-58**

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF DE-
FENCE (SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA):** Sir,
I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-
section (1) of section 639 of the Com-
panies Act, 1956, a copy of the Annual
Report on the working of the Hindus-
tan Aircraft Limited, Bangalore, for
the year 1957-58, together with the
Auditors' Report thereon. [Placed in
Library. See No. LT-1405/59.]

**REPORT ON THE WORKING OF BHARAT
ELECTRONICS (P) LTD., BANGALORE FOR
1957-58**

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: Sir, I also
beg to lay on the Table, under sub-
section (1) of section 639 of the Com-
panies Act, 1956, a copy of the Annual
Report on the working and affairs of
the Bharat Electronics Private Limited,
Bangalore, for the year 1957-58 toge-
ther with a copy of the Auditors' Re-
port thereon. [Placed in Library. See
No LT-1406/59.]

**ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSI-
DERATION OF THE BENGAL FIN-
ANCE (SALES TAX) (DELHI
AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959**

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform
Members that under rule 162(2) of the
Rules of Procedure and Conduct of
Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have
allotted one hour for the completion
of all stages involved in the considera-
tion and return of the Bengal Finance
(Sales Tax) (Delhi Amendment) Bill,
1959, by the Rajya Sabha, including the
consideration and passing of amend-
ments, if any, to the Bill.

**MOTION RE SITUATION ARISING
OUT OF RECENT EVENTS IN TIBET**

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Sir,
before Dr. Kunzru is allowed to move
his motion, I want to raise a point of
order. This motion is not consistent
with the Constitution of our country.
Presumably this motion was admitted

in the House under the Seventh Schedule, item 10, "Foreign Affairs, all matters which bring the Union into relation with any foreign country."

Now, Sir, Tibet is not a foreign country. It is a part of China. If this House is going to discuss a foreign country, it must be China, because Tibet is a part of China. If this dangerous precedent is accepted by us, I say in all humility, then Soviet Russia will have a right to discuss in their Parliament our Kerala affairs and so many other matters. (*Interruptions.*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do. We understand.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I, therefore, say that Tibet not being directly connected with our Constitution, and Tibet being a part of China, whose suzerainty over Tibet we have accepted...

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): According to you it may be a part of China.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: It will infringe the provisions of the Panch Sheel which we have accepted. The Prime Minister has also entered into a declaration with the Prime Minister of China that domestic affairs in another's country will not be interfered with and there will be non-intervention.

This country has accepted the Dalai Lama. It is a hospitable country. It has given asylum to so many people. All people are welcome to take asylum in our country. But to discuss the affairs of a part of another nation, to discuss the affairs pertaining to another country, will amount to our conceding the dangerous precedent of other foreign countries discussing our internal affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Therefore, I want a ruling from the Chair whether this motion is in consonance with the Constitution of this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, in your wisdom you have allowed this motion to be discussed. I do not exactly know what will be discussed. But, I think, Sir, you should consider the constitutional point that has been raised, that if we allow this motion, we would be creating dangerous precedents.

Our Constitution does not even allow us here in this House to discuss the State subjects concerning Bengal, Punjab and other States. Sometimes exceptions are made with regard to Kerala, but that is beside the point; generally, we do not allow any such discussion. Now, Sir, obviously, we are discussing some other thing. I could have understood this point being discussed in the course of a Foreign Affairs debate. But a separate motion to discuss the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet has been admitted. I would like to know whether it would be permissible for us to concentrate on this discussion about the internal affairs of Tibet or whether, since in your wisdom you have admitted this motion, we shall confine ourselves to the important subject of Indo-Chinese relations. That is a very important point, and I have no objection that way. But, here, I think, Sir, you should again reflect and give us direction as to how the discussion should proceed.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I want to make a submission for your consideration on the point that has been raised just now.

Sir, the motion says:

"That the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet be taken into consideration."

Now we have got to consider the situation which has arisen out of the events that have taken place in Tibet. We have discussed very many subjects like that, events that have taken place in other countries and the consequences that have flowed out of them. We are not going to discuss the internal affairs of Tibet, but we are going to discuss the consequences that have flowed out of the events that have taken place in Tibet. Therefore, I

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]
hope you will disallow the point of order raised against this discussion.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): Sir, Mr. Rajah has raised a constitutional point and he referred to the Seventh Schedule, List I. But he should have referred to article 367 of the Constitution of India which says very clearly that we can discuss this matter which is before the House. In fact, apart from List I of the Seventh Schedule, it is stated that all residuary powers are with Parliament and therefore. I think we are perfectly within the Constitution when we deal with the situation that has arisen out of the events in Tibet.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: But the Constitution...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I should make it very clear that I am second to none in my determination to maintain the sovereignty of Parliament; but at the same time we have to remember that a discussion of this kind will create a grave constitutional precedent....

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: It is a dangerous precedent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And you, Sir, have not been able to allow a discussion on the U.S.-Pakistan Pact..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has just referred to a point which he raised here and which I did not allow on account of special considerations in this House—the U.S.-Pakistan Bilateral Pact. He has given notice of a motion to raise this discussion here. Well, if that is something which you can discuss this is also so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But then, Sir....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under rule 148 of the Rules of Procedure of the Rajya Sabha, discussion may be raised on any matter of general public interest. We are discussing only the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet, or in other words, the im-

pact of that situation on India. Therefore, it is admissible. I only hope that Members will exercise considerable restraint, control and patience and not run off with their emotions. Dr. Kunzru.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I move:

“That the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet be taken into consideration.”

Sir, it is not easy to speak about a situation which has caused great uneasiness among the people of India; but it is at the same time, not possible to be silent about it. The Prime Minister has dealt with some of the most important issues arising out of this situation with admirable restraint and dignity. He has set an example which, I trust, everyone in this House will follow in discussing this situation. Sir, the Prime Minister, in his statement of the 27th April has referred to many of the charges brought against India because of reaction in India of what was happening in Tibet. It is not necessary for me, therefore, to deal with those things at any length. Apart from this anyone who speaks on this question must realise that the two great countries of Asia—India and China—have to work together for the benefit of the world. We have had for two thousand years a frontier extending over 1,800 miles where unbroken peace has reigned. People talk of the Canadian-American frontier, but in this respect India and China have set an example which is more worthy of being imitated than the example of Canada and America and I trust, Sir, that the co-operation that has been the key-note of the relations of India and China for centuries will be observed in their actions even in future.

Sir, no one can deny that the reaction in India to the situation arising out of the events in Tibet was strong and swift. Even in Parliamentary parties, with the exception of the

Communist Party, united in expressing their concern at what was happening, and when the Prime Minister announced in the Lok Sabha that the Dalai Lama had entered Indian territory, the news was received with joy and enthusiasm in which most of the parties, except the Communist Party shared. We have seen that various charges have been brought against us in connection with the recent events in Tibet. It has been said, for instance, that Kalimpong was the centre from which the revolt in Tibet was being organised, and this charge continues to be repeated in spite of the repeated denials of the Prime Minister. Again, Sir, it was said that the Dalai Lama had been abducted by the rebels from Tibet and was held in duress. No less a person than Mr. Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of China, said as late as on the 14th or 15th of April that the Dalai Lama was held in duress. Again it was said that India was influenced by imperialist propaganda and intrigues. Further when it was seen that India continued to be concerned over what was happening in Tibet, India was told that she had skeletons in her cupboard and that she should be mindful of her own weaknesses when she tried to meddle in affairs, not her own. Again, Sir, some Indians were attacked as being expansionists and a Peking newspaper whose article was reported by the New China News Agency said that the Indian expansionists were plotting to make Tibet a vassal State of India. The revolt was attributed to a clique of the upper strata in Tibet. The Prime Minister has dealt with all these charges. It is not necessary for me, therefore, to go into them at all but I have to say that the responsibility for the recent events in Tibet has been placed on shoulders that cannot justifiably be expected to bear. I am reminded, Sir, in this connection of the situation in connection with the Hungarian revolt when it was tried to be made out that the revolt was due to the action of capitalists and imperialists, anti-revolu-

tionary elements and so on, but a little later it became clear that the revolt was a national revolt. I think, Sir, everybody will agree with the Prime Minister that the revolt in Tibet cannot be as easily explained as the Chinese authorities have tried to explain it away. It is due to a national upsurge and it will be good for China and the whole world, if that fact were frankly recognised.

Sir, I want to deal with two charges that have been brought against India since the Prime Minister spoke in the Lok Sabha on the 27th April. The Panchen Lama has, in the course of a speech, accused the Indian authorities of having shown certain discrimination against him in arranging receptions. He has further said that when he saw the famous Stupa at Sarnath—that is the monastery where the Buddha first preached—and quite a number of other monasteries, he felt that they were in a poor state and he wondered whether people who cared so little about Buddhist archaeological remains could care much for Buddhism. I am sorry to say, Sir, that we miss in this statement of the Panchen Lama that dignity which we have a right to associate with statements made by people in high positions like the Panchen Lama. Again, Sir, everyone knows how keenly interested the Government of India is in the preservation of the ancient monuments. The Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama came to India in connection with the 2500th Jayanti of the Buddha. Shortly before the Jayanti was celebrated, special repairs had been undertaken in many places including Sarnath and Kusinara. I greatly regret, Sir, the words used by the Panchen Lama and the manner in which facts have been twisted in order to bring an accusation against India and, the charge of discrimination against the Panchen Lama has been brought nearly three years after the event. I am in a position to say, Sir, that he was treated with every mark of respect and that

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.]

the hospitality shown to him could scarcely have been improved.

Another charge, Sir, is that several Tibetan leaders, including one of the Dalai Lama's brothers had moved from Kalimpong to Mussoorie and that there is every reason to suspect that Mussoorie would become a new commanding centre of the Tibetan rebels. Sir, it is, I am sorry to say, clear that no accusation is to fantastic to be brought against India by interested parties but the Prime Minister has made it clear that the Government of India which has not allowed the Tibetans at Kalimpong to indulge in anti-Chinese activities will not permit anyone in Mussoorie to prejudice the relations between these two countries in this crisis. Statements like these show how desperate the position of those is who want to accuse India directly or indirectly of complicity in the Tibetan revolt.

Now, Sir, leaving aside these things, we have to meet two criticisms of our policy. One is that our criticism of Chinese policy in Tibet amounts to interference in the internal affairs of China. Sir, we have before now criticised the policy of other countries in respect of the manner in which they dealt with some of their colonies. We have, for instance, criticised the French policy in Algeria and the British policy in Kenya and the Central African Federation.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Cyprus.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: We have never been told that we were going out of our province in expressing our opinion about the policies of those countries in respect of their colonies. If it cannot be said that our criticism was the result of hostility to France and England, how can Indian disapproval or Indian concern over Chinese policy in Tibet be regarded as unfriendly to China? India has recognised Chinese suzerainty subject to regional autonomy. Mr. Chou En-lai said to the Prime Minister of India:

"While Tibet had long been part of the Chinese State, they did not consider Tibet as a province of China".

He further said,

"The people of Tibet are different from the people of China. Tibet is an autonomous region and it would enjoy autonomy."

The Prime Minister has further told us that he communicated this to the Dalai Lama in 1956 and asked him, in view of the assurance given by Mr. Chou En-lai, to accept them in good faith and co-operate in maintaining that autonomy in bringing about certain reforms in Tibet. Sir, in view of this, I think the Prime Minister would have failed in his duty had he not expressed his own feelings and that of the whole country with regard to the Tibetan upheaval. Sir, the second charge that has been brought against us is that we are siding with the reactionaries. In the resolution that was passed the other day by the National Peoples' Congress of China on Tibet, it has been said: "The existing social system in Tibet is an extremely backward system of serfdom. The degree of cruelty which characterises the exploitation, oppression and persecution of the labouring people by the serf owners can hardly be paralleled in any other part of the world. Even those who have repeatedly expressed sympathy for the Tibetan rebels cannot explain why they are so enthusiastic in backing up such a backward system. The Tibetan people, for a long time, have firmly demanded the reform of their social system." Sir, we realise the need for introducing social and economic reforms in backward and underdeveloped countries. The steps that we have taken to introduce social and economic reforms in our country during the last few years would have been regarded, only a few years ago as revolutionary. Yet they have been introduced democratically, that is, with the sup-

port of the representatives and the leaders of the people. When we, therefore, express our concern at the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet we should not be held to be supporting the cause of those who would like the existing social system in Tibet to be maintained. I venture to think that the method that we have used in our country can with advantage be employed by other countries. All colonial powers also claim to have the right to introduce reforms in their colonies and they claim to do so even against the wishes of their people. But these reforms, in order to be lasting and to have their full effect should be carried out with the goodwill of the leaders of the people. Had our methods been followed, had the goodwill of the leaders been secured, I am sure that reforms could have been introduced into Tibet at no distant date and that these reforms would have created contentment throughout the country.

Sir, it is not pleasure to me to appear to disagree with Chinese policy in regard to Tibet. But situated as we are, considering the centuries-old connection between India and Tibet, the ancient religious and cultural ties that bind the two countries, was it reasonable for anyone to expect that we would maintain silence at this juncture? Sir, notwithstanding what has happened, everyone in this House, I am sure, desires to strengthen the friendly relations that have prevailed for two thousand years between India and China. But these friendly relations can be based only on frankness and free expression of opinion. No fruitful relations can be established if we suppress honest differences of opinion on our part. It would be tantamount to national cowardice. We have the right to stand up for the truth as we see it, without claiming to be always in the right. But though we may disagree with China occasionally, it is a fact—and the Chinese authorities, I believe, recognize it—that we realise

the great value of continued friendship between these two great countries. Our frontier has been peaceful, as I have already said, for two thousand years, and no one would wish that anything should be said that would disturb these friendly relations to the smallest extent.

There are just one or two matters to which I should like to refer before I sit down. The Chinese Prime Minister, Mr. Chou En-lai, addressing the Chinese National Peoples' Congress, referred to the undetermined boundary lines between China and certain neighbouring South East Asian countries and said that these boundaries could be reasonably settled through peaceful negotiations. China's claim to any territory controlled by other countries raises a serious question, but in any case I venture to think that the time chosen by him with regard to this question was scarcely opportune. I fervently hope that he did not want to make India aware of the existence of a new frontier, the North East frontier. He himself is reported to have said recently that he hoped that the friendly relations between India and China could be improved after the quelling of the Tibetan rebellion. I trust, therefore, that the relations between India and China would continue to be warm and friendly and that the frontier between India and Tibet will continue to be as peaceful in future as it has been for more than two thousand years.

There is one more point in connection with the situation arising out of recent events in Tibet that I should like to lay stress on. We all realise the value of the cultural bonds that unite India and her neighbours, but we have recognized this value in a passive way. We have done hardly anything in recent years to bring about the further development of cultural relations between us and the neighbouring countries. I think that we should recognize more actively the value of the cultural ties that I

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.]

have referred to and try to develop and strengthen them, so that the appreciation of India's motives and policies that existed in the past may continue in future also.

Lastly, I should like to refer to the entry of a few thousand Tibetans recently into India. In giving the Dalai Lama and these Tibetans an asylum in India, the Prime Minister has acted in conformity with the strong feeling that prevails on this subject throughout the country. We are not happy that events have driven these people to seek refuge in India. We shall be happy if circumstances are created that would enable them to go back to their country. The wish of the Prime Minister that the present situation should come to a speedy end and that the refugees should be in a position to return to their homes in the near future would be echoed by everyone not merely in this House but all over the country. While they are here, I have no doubt that they will be looked after carefully both by the Government and by the people of India. If they have to live here, I hope that they will be enabled to earn their own living so that they may lead self-respecting lives. I also hope that they would be given reasonable freedom to carry on any peaceful activities in which they may be interested including an expression of their opinion. We have never so far tried to stifle opinions different from ours, and even though the present situation is delicate and we cannot allow people to exploit it in order to create ill-will and bitterness between India and China, yet I hope that we shall be actuated by that broad and liberal policy which actuated our country in the past and which a small country like England has followed for hundreds of years in regard to emigres. It is not, of course, binding on us in international law to allow an unlimited number of people to seek asylum in our country, but the situation at present is

extraordinary, and I once again express the hope that the Prime Minister would deal with the matter that I have referred to with that regard for the feelings of the country and for the demands of fairness and human self-respect as he has done till now.

Sir, I have done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet be taken into consideration."

Every other speaker will have just fifteen minutes, and the time limit will be strictly enforced except in respect of the Prime Minister. Mr. Shiva Rao.

SHRI B. SHIVA RAO (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, in taking part in this debate I shall of course bear in mind your exhortations with which my hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru, commenced his speech. I am also reminded, Sir, of the wise advice which was given by a brother of mine when he was relinquishing his post as India's permanent delegate at the United Nations to take his seat on the International Court of Justice. When his successor asked him what should be the main line he should pursue when representing India at the United Nations, my brother said: "Whatever may be the topic on which you speak in the United Nations, make your language soft but let your facts be deadly." Sir, in regard to the tragedy which has overtaken Tibet the facts seem to me to be so deadly that one can afford to make one's language soft.

So far as Government's policy in regard to Tibet is concerned, its basic features were explained last week very clearly and fully in the Prime Minister's admirable statement which was read out in this House by his able Deputy Minister. My hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru, referred to one passage in that statement in which certain

conversations between our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of China were summarised. Premier Chou En-lai gave the assurance that though Tibet had for a long time been a part of the Chinese State, they, that is the Government and the people of China, did not regard Tibet as a province of China. He said that the people of Tibet were different and that the regional autonomy of Tibet would be respected. Sir, in making that statement to our Prime Minister in 1956, Premier Chou En-lai was only underlying the assurances which were given abundantly in the agreement which was entered into in 1951 between China and Tibet. The circumstances under which that agreement was signed I shall mention to the House a minute later; but I shall read out some of the relevant articles from that agreement to point out in what mood the Tibetan delegation was persuaded to sign that agreement. These articles are—in the language of the agreement—

“All national minorities are fully enjoying the right of national equality and have established or are establishing national regional autonomy.

Freedom is guaranteed to all nationalities to develop their political, economic, cultural and educational work.

The Central authorities of China will not alter the existing political system in Tibet nor will they alter the established status, functions and powers of the Dalai Lama.

The religious beliefs, customs and habits of the Tibetan people shall be respected and Lama Monasteries shall be protected.”

Sir, these are some of the articles of the Sino-Tibetan Agreement of 1951.

The beginning of the present crisis in Tibet goes back to 1950. Sir, in

that year it was my privilege to be on the Indian delegation to the United Nations. When in November of that year reports came out of China of Chinese forces advancing towards Lhasa, the suggestion was made by one of the members at the United Nations to the Steering Committee, which was in charge of the Agenda of the General Assembly of that year, that Tibet be included on the Agenda. The Leader of the Indian delegation under instructions from the External Affairs Ministry here and presumably on the basis of reports received from our Ambassador in Peking at that time—Sardar Panikkar—gave the assurance to the Steering Committee that the Chinese forces had halted at Chamdo, some three hundred miles from Lhasa, and that they had no intention of going further. And, Sir, it was on that assurance given by the Leader of the Indian delegation to the Steering Committee that the proposal to discuss Tibet in that Session was dropped. What happened subsequently? Only a few months later, in the spring of 1951, the Chinese forces resumed their advance towards Lhasa. A Tibetan delegation was summoned to Peking. It went through New Delhi. There was, I think, some delay in the Tibetan delegation leaving New Delhi for Peking because of certain transport or transit difficulties in Hong Kong enroute. The Chinese Government, I regret to say, even on that occasion very readily attributed unworthy motives to the Government of India and suggested that the delay was due to foreign influences being at work in New Delhi. When the delegation reached Peking, it was asked to sign an agreement which had already been drawn up. The Tibetan delegation pleaded for time so that it could consult the Dalai Lama who had by that time fled to Yatung. The Tibetan delegation was reminded that there was already established in Lhasa Chinese Military Headquarters and the delegation was asked to sign on the dotted line. After that, Sir, we are the people who keep other people ‘under duress’ and

[Shri B. Shiva Rao.]

make them sign statements. It seems to me a matter of very great distress that charges of intervention and of expansionism should be made against India, after the experience of China during the last ten years and after the most categorical statement by the Prime Minister last week that "We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet, but we have every sympathy for the people of Tibet and we are greatly distressed at their hapless plight." China seems to forget that while she has been through a great revolution during the last ten years, we too on the southern side of the Himalayas have not been idle. Whatever cause the Chinese might have had in the past to fear British imperialism when it was a vigorous institution in many parts of Asia, after 1947, British imperialism has ceased to exist. There are no interventionists and no expansionists, certainly not on the southern side of the Himalayas. That charge, Sir, is demonstrably untrue.

We are not concerned only with Tibet's well-being here. We have our own anxieties and apprehensions in regard to this region. In 1950, I remember when I was a Member of the other House, during a debate on foreign affairs, when someone, from the Opposition mentioned Tibet, the Prime Minister said in the course of his reply at the end of the debate in very firm tones, "Maps or no maps, the McMahon Line is our boundary". Last week in that statement which he made, he said in more general terms that he gave first priority to the preservation of the security and the integrity of India. I am reluctant to say more on the subject, because I realise that what we say in this House should not make the task of the Prime Minister, extremely difficult and delicate as it already is, more difficult.

Sir, there is a human aspect of this problem—the problem of the refugees—to which Dr. Kunzru has already

referred. I heartily endorse his plea for measures being devised to enable these thousands of refugees who have come into India, in different parts of the country from Assam to Nepal, to live in terms of self-respect.

There are, I believe, suggestions for improving the roads and communications between India and Bhutan and Sikkim and I hope that plans will be devised which will not only enable the Tibetan refugees to live in terms of self-respect, but also lighten that burden which the Government of India have already undertaken in regard to these refugees.

May I, in passing, say a word about our representative in Gangtok, Shri Apa Pant? I think a word of praise is due to our representative for the remarkable success that he has achieved in the last two years in winning the confidence, the goodwill and the affection of the people of Bhutan and Sikkim.

Sir, one final word I would like to say before I sit down. I sincerely hope that the recent events in Tibet will not stand in the way of the Government of India continuing to press for the admission of China into the United Nations. What has happened in Tibet is an argument from my standpoint in favour of China's admission into the United Nations, because I feel that if she were in the United Nations, she would have realised much more clearly than she seems to do at the present moment, that not only in India but in most parts of the world, at any rate, in those parts of the world where human dignity and interests are respected and valued, her action in Tibet is viewed with sharp disapproval. Sir, in 1948, when South Africa swallowed up South West Africa, a mandated territory under the old League of Nations, India was the first to champion her cause. South Africa was very angry with us for taking up that case in the United Nations. But even South Africa did not go so far as to charge us with

with being interventionists and expansionists.

I would say, in conclusion, that no matter where human rights are trampled, our foreign policy should be such that there is no room for the charge that we observe different standards in different parts of the world.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, Sir, Dr. Kunzru moved his motion in the House in his characteristic way and after him another eminent Member spoke on behalf of the Congress Party and therefore after these two eminent statesmen, it is rather difficult for me to do full justice to a subject of this nature. But since I have been called upon to take my turn, I would like to say a few words.

It is true that the recent events that have taken place in Tibet through the action of our great neighbour, China, have moved the hearts of everyone in this country. Sir, when such events take place in the life of nations or individuals, then alone they come out in their true colours whether they can stand the serious situation that has arisen or whether they go down surrendering before those events.

Sir, shall we continue after the lunch hour?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The House stands adjourned till 2.30 in the afternoon.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, **MR. CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, since we attained independence we have seen many international events taking place in the world which had brought about a shooting war in a localized form and a virulent

cold war all round and, Sir, we have been successful in avoiding both these kinds of wars. So far as the cold war is concerned we have been keeping away from it because our country is not in any way concerned in this respect. But as far as the events in Tibet are concerned, Sir, in spite of our attempts to avoid the cold war, the cold war has been brought to our doors. Sir, it will be noticed, as far as Tibet is concerned, we have got varied interests in Tibet; they are sentimental, cultural and historical. In addition to them we have got our self interest also in Tibet because with Tibet we have got a common border extending to hundreds of miles. Then our holiest of places, like Kailash and Manasarovar are situated in Tibet, and there are the other interests also which we had inherited from the British when they left this country and Tibet. I shall presently show what they are. Sir, we have regularly and continuously been trying to keep our friendship with our great neighbour China, and we had tried to accommodate them in 1950, and when China wanted to have effective control over Tibet, we surrendered our rights there, and there were a substantial number of people in this country who resented this, and as the mover of the motion. Dr. Kunzru had stated a little while ago, though we had a long established unbroken line of friendship with China extending over thousands and thousands of years, in spite of the common border, we wanted to maintain that friendship. But the mistake that we did at that time was that we did not take into account the new regime that had come into Tibet. The ideologies between the two countries are very different, and if the old regime had continued in China, the position would have been very different. Sir, when the events turned, as they did in Tibet recently by the action of the Chinese for reform there, the whole country, as a body, went all out in sympathy with the plight of the Tibetan people, and as my friend Dr. Kunzru has stated, it is a matter of very great regret that

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

one political party, the Communists, did not share in the sentiments of the people of India as a whole. It will ever remain a matter of regret that the Indian people did not stand together though happily it was a microscopic minority of the people who alone stood aloof.

Sir, I referred a little while ago to the international events that took place after we attained independence and I said that we naturally kept out of the cold war as we did not like it. But as a member of the international organisation we expressed our resentment whenever and wherever any aggression was committed. There was the Anglo-French aggression on Egypt and then there was the Russian intervention in Hungary's affairs in respect of which, though after initial hesitation, in response to the country's sentiments, our Prime Minister voiced the feelings of this country. Now for all the time that this thing was taking place here he was reticent and restrained, and we can very well understand his feelings, because he is a great man of peace; he wants that friendship has to be kept with all the nations, particularly so with a nation which is not only our great neighbour but with which we have the traditional friendship lasting for thousands and thousands of years. But when the people of this country felt as to how long this kind of a one-sided friendship could last, and when this great friend of ours, China, wanted to crush an unarmed people, naturally the sympathies of the people of the country went all out for the Tibetans, and as the national hero of the country—he is not merely the Prime Minister of the country, he is not merely representing the ruling party, he is a national hero—responded in his characteristic way to the call of the nation, and he came out with the feelings and sentiments of the country to tell the authorities and people of China that they are doing a very great injustice to their friends. This is particularly bad on

their part because at the Bandung Conference the same China exhorted all to join in doing away with the calamities and sufferings of the people under colonial rule, and when they resort to such tactics it brings bad taste to the country which champions the cause of those who are suffering under the colonial yoke. Then, Sir, when the Dalai Lama entered this country in safety, again the people of this great country went all out and accorded him a reception and showed their goodwill and affection for him the like of which is done only on very rare occasions. And there too in response to the wishes of the people the Prime Minister took the necessary action to make it a grand success.

Sir, next I would submit that the Prime Minister in his statement of the 27th April has dealt with all the charges but it is a matter of very great regret—I am not talking of the giants of the past age but in the present age, among the living great men of India and the world, the position of our Prime Minister is indeed very high—that his words are not accepted by our friends for whom he has striven for the last nine years to do everything even at the risk of being misunderstood by many of our friends of the Western countries and Asian countries which are neighbours of China. It is a matter of very great regret that his words are not accepted by friendly China, but we hope that China, even now, would see reason and would not strain the friendship which has lasted for thousands and thousands of years.

Then, Sir, I would submit one thing, the new phraseology which this Communist country of China has coined, words like imperialists and expansionists in reference to India—but where they are concerned they call it a policy of liberation—and the charge that they lay at the door of India, of a policy of expansion, is so absurd that even the worst enemy of our country would not accept this charge levelled by China.

Lastly, Sir, I would submit, after what has happened, that we have to be very cautious in regard to our future policy towards China, because we have seen that they are already circulating maps in the communist countries of the world whereby something like 30,000 miles of Indian territory is included in their maps. Amongst these territories not only are included some territory of the North East Frontier Agency but even some valuable portion of Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh is included in this map. Just now Mr. Shiva Rao referred to the negotiated settlement that the Prime Minister of China envisaged to have with our country in regard to this settlement of the boundaries. I would submit to the Prime Minister that we have to be cautious of the desires and intentions of our great neighbour. They are great friends. They have been great friends. But they do not accept our word and go on criticizing us to the extent which no civilised country will do. Therefore, Sir, if we are not cautious, I am apprehensive that we again may have to part with many good portions of our sacred land.

Another danger is of the Chinese nationals infiltrating into our country. There are already thousands and thousands of Chinese nationals inhabiting our country. I do not know how many Indians are living in China. This is a dangerous trend. We have to stop it. We have to be very careful, particularly when we are anxious to keep friendship with China. But this friendship would have to be reciprocal; it cannot be one-sided. We have seen what has happened in Tibet. We have to be very cautious. What have we done? What we have done is just to express our sympathies. Beyond that we have done nothing, but look at the absurd charges that they have levelled against us.

SHRI D. P. SINGH (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are deeply grieved over the tragedy that has overtaken Tibet. Sir, whenever any injustice has been perpetrated in any part of this

wide world, we have raised our voice against it. When England and France attacked Egypt on the question of Suez, we gave our full moral support to Egypt and condemned, what England and France did, in clear terms. Sir, when the troops of the United States of America entered Lebanon, we condemned it.

Sir, our heart goes out to the people of Algeria in their struggle against the French. We have always condemned wrong things done by which ever country. It is true, we all know it, that all these countries have been on terms of friendship with us, but we have said the right thing whenever an occasion has arisen.

Sir, it was only in the case of Hungary that we faltered a little but later on—also from the very beginning—we always said that the Hungarian uprising was a national uprising and that it was not proper for foreign forces—Russian forces in this case—to suppress that uprising.

Sir, now our peaceful neighbour, Tibet, has fallen on bad days. It has been said by some that Tibet has been a part of China.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Louder, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are accustomed to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and, therefore, you say everybody's voice is low.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: It has been said by some, Sir, that Tibet has been a part of China. Tibet never accepted, I submit, Sir, the overlordship of China in any sense except under duress. In the distant past, Tibet was completely independent. The Mongols and the Manchus, while overrunning China, subjugated Tibet also. After the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty, the Dalai Lama, who had earlier fled to India, returned to Lhasa in 1912 and drove out the Chinese from Tibet. The Chinese Republic then sent a punitive expedition which was prevented from recapturing Tibet on a representation made by the British Government.

[Shri D. P. Singh.]

On January 11, 1913, the Dalai Lama proclaimed the independence of Tibet by concluding a treaty with Outer Mongolia in which Tibet was declared to have become independent. As a result of a subsequent treaty between the British Government and the Chinese Government in October, 1913, Chinese suzerainty over Tibet was recognised by the British but not by the Tibetans. China, however, was definitely forbidden to interfere in any way with Tibetan internal administration. This treaty referred to as the "Simla Convention" was never ratified by the Chinese. And, therefore, when the Tibetan Government appealed to the U.N. against Chinese invasion in 1951, they mentioned that Tibet was independent *de jure* also. It was the British Government which had continued to recognise the suzerainty of China over Tibet.

Again, in 1949, it was the Prime Minister of India who recognised this suzerainty, even though Tibet considered itself an independent country and the Tibetan Government had ordered the Chinese Nationalist Mission in Lhasa and the Chinese nationals in Tibet suspected of Communist sympathies to leave Tibet. As is well known, during the Second World War, Tibet did not join the Chinese and also opened its Foreign Affairs Bureau.

In January, 1950 the Peking Government proclaimed the liberation of Tibet as one of its basic tasks during 1950. Our Prime Minister, in spite of this, thought and said that Peking would not deprive Tibet of its internal autonomy.

In April, 1950, a Tibetan mission left Lhasa for India. Negotiations were held with the new Chinese Ambassador in Delhi. It was decided on account of the non-committal attitude of the Chinese Ambassador that the mission should proceed to Peking. But the day the mission was to leave,

Chinese forces invaded Tibet. The so-called liberation of the Tibetan people was taken in hand by the Chinese. To the note sent by the Government of India a very discourteous and unfriendly reply was sent by Peking.

In March, 1951, a Sino-Tibetan agreement was signed in Peking. Internal autonomy was conceded in this agreement. Mr. Shiva Rao has already narrated how this agreement was signed under duress. In this agreement Peking was given full control over external affairs, trade and communications. On November 7, 1950, the Tibetan Government sent a communication to the U.N. which, because of India principally, was not taken up at the U.N.

In April, 1954, an agreement between India and China was signed. The Indian Government gave up all its extra-territorial rights and privileges in Tibet and proclaimed Panchsheel. Even in regard to Nepal and other territories, such as Sikkim and Bhutan, the privileges enjoyed by India under the British Government were gradually relinquished. While we went on abandoning our rights, the Chinese Government tightened its control over Tibet. The agreement concluded between Tibet and China was completely violated as is clear from the Tezpur statement of the Dalai Lama. It is also clear from the same statement that Tibet concluded this agreement as there was no alternative left for it. It should have been clear to our Government that China would not respect Tibet's autonomy on the basis of reports which they must have got and on the basis of the talk which our Prime Minister had with the Dalai Lama when the latter was in India last, about three years ago. In fact, what was done was to assure the Dalai Lama that China intended to preserve Tibet's autonomy and that the Chinese Premier knew that reforms could not be forced down the throat of Tibet. Perhaps, assured by us the Dalai Lama returned to Tibet.

Now, I would like to say something about what happened inside Tibet in about 1955. There was a conflict in Tibet over the land belonging to the monasteries which had been earlier distributed by the Chinese authorities in Tibet among the Tibetan and Chinese peasants. Chinese peasants were being sent in large numbers to Tibet and it was a sort of colonising the country. The Chinese later told the Tibetan monks that it was a mistake to have given the land to the peasants. Conflict was provoked and when it flared up, the Chinese soldiers shot down the leaders of the peasants not belonging to the Communist group. Something on the lines of what the Communists did in the International Brigade of Spain was enacted. Taking advantage of the exacerbated ill-will between the monasteries and the peasants, caused by the Chinese themselves, the democrats and the socialists who led the peasants were liquidated by the Chinese soldiers. There was also widespread bombing of the Tibetans by the Chinese planes to crush revolts which broke out against the Chinese in several parts of Tibet. In view of the resistance offered by the Tibetans, a milder tone was adopted by China. But when the Dalai Lama declined to support the Chinese in crushing the revolt and in the communisation of the country, the Chinese decided again to adopt a stiff attitude. We know how it became impossible for the Dalai Lama to stay on in Tibet.

Sir, in the wake of the Dalai Lama's escape to India a large number of refugees have crossed over. It is indeed a matter of great satisfaction that good arrangements are being made for them, although a doubt had arisen in our minds earlier in regard to this matter. Sir, it is estimated that about 10,000 refugees have already crossed over into India after the arrival of the Dalai Lama in our country. Sir, even before this, about 7,000 to 8,000 refugees, we were told, crossed into India finding life

impossible in Tibet under the Chinese. These refugees are spread over in Kalimpong, Shillong, Darjeeling and in areas close to these places. We are told, Sir, that most of them are in a desperate plight. I am sure that something will be done to bring relief and succour to them. I would also urge that so far as the refugees who have come to India and who may come to India in future are concerned, we must adopt a policy which does not prevent them from settling down in Kalimpong, Shillong, Darjeeling or in areas close to these places because if they are dispersed in various parts of the country, it will not be possible for them to eke out a living. So, they must be settled where other refugees are.

Sir the reports coming to India show that the Tibetans are now being prevented in a most brutal fashion from seeking shelter outside Tibet. There has, therefore, been a reduction in the number of refugees during the last few days. Reports show that in Nepal, as also in Bhutan, the refugees have entered and in some places the Chinese have entered the Nepalese territory in pursuit of the fleeing Tibetans. Some houses in Nepal are also reported to have been burnt down by the Chinese as these were believed to be sheltering the fleeing Tibetans.

Sir, nothing could be more untruthful than to say that in the expression of our sympathy for the Tibetans we are prompted by expansionist desires. It is a palpably absurd charge and is obviously intended to cover up the misdeeds of the Chinese. If China goes back on its plighted word in respect of Tibet and disregards the assurances given by Premier Chou-En-lai that Tibet was not a province of China, the world is expected to look upon China as a peace-loving country and when we, having given up all our past privileges and rights not only in Tibet but in Nepal and other neighbouring territories, express our sympathy for the Tibetans and give shelter and asylum to the Dalai

[Shri D. P. Singh.]

Lama and other Tibetans, we are branded as expansionists. This is strange logic indeed.

Sir, one thing to my mind stands out crystal clear. Whatever we do, it is never right to give up the correct moral position. Whatever we did in the past to appease China has produced consequences which are not very favourable to the fostering of peace in this part of the world. We must never choose between truth and freedom and friendship. In fact, friendship is generally lost if truth is forsaken.

Sir, while accusing us, the last straw came when the Panchen Lama said that the Dalai Lama was held under duress even in India and it was proclaimed that the Tezpur statement was imposed by foreigners and our External Affairs Ministry Officer was accused of preparing the statement.

All these are absurd charges. They have been refuted very convincingly and in a language of great dignity by our Prime Minister. Our Prime Minister has shown commendable restraint and forbearance in the face of extreme provocation. How one wishes that China, with her great and ancient civilisation, emulated our Prime Minister's dignity.

श्रीमती मायादेवी छेत्री (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : सभापति महोदय, श्रीमन्, आपने मुझे जो चार, पांच मिनट बोलने के लिये समय दिया है, उसके लिये मैं आपको धन्यवाद देती हूँ। मैं कहां तक इतने व्हास्ट सब्जेक्ट पर, चार, पांच मिनट में बोल सकती हूँ तब भी आपने जो यह मौका दिया है उस के लिये मैं चाहती हूँ कि आपको धन्यवाद दूं।

श्रीमन्, यह सब्जेक्ट विशेष रूप से बहुत ही गम्भीर है, पर इस समय एक बात मैं आप से कहना चाहती हूँ। वह यह है कि चाइना ने कालिम्पोंग पर जो आरोप लगाया है वह कहां तक सत्य है? कालिम्पोंग का एरिया

नेपाल, भूटान और तिब्बत का बार्डर प्रदेश है। वहां पर नेपाली पापुलेशन के साथ साथ तिब्बती और भूटानी लोग, जिन्हें खम्पा, डुप्पा बोलते हैं, सिक्किम, तिब्बत और भूटान के लोग यहां रहते हैं। यह बात ठीक है, पर चाइना की ओर से यह बात कहीं गई है कि वहां के लोगों ने चाइना के विरोध में एक आर्गेंनाइज्ड वे में विद्रोह खड़ा कर दिया है। मैं उसी एरिया से आती हूँ, लेकिन आज तक हमने आर्गेंनाइज्ड वे में कोई भी ऐसी बात नहीं देखी है। यह सत्य है कि जो तिब्बती लोग वहां रहते हैं वे अब इंडियन सब्जेक्ट होते एभी, उनके जो रीति रिवाज हैं वे तिब्बत के रीति रिवाजों से मिलते जुलते हैं क्योंकि वे लोग वहीं से आये हैं। इसलिए स्वाभाविक ही था कि जब तिब्बत के भीतर विप्लव हुआ और दलाई लामा पर विपत्ति आई तो उन लोगों का मन अस्थिर और चंचल हो गया; क्योंकि जैसे ब्रिटिश लोग अमेरिका में जा कर बसे हुए हैं, अगर ब्रिटेन के ऊपर कोई आपत्ति आये या कुछ ऐसी परिस्थिति हो, तो उन ब्रिटिशर्स के लिये स्वाभाविक ही है कि उनकी मारल सिम्पैथी ब्रिटेन के प्रति चली जायगी। इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हैं; क्योंकि यह मनुष्य स्वभाव है। तो इस प्रकार का जो आरोप है उसका हम कोई आधार नहीं देखते हैं।

दूसरा यह कि पंचम लामा ने जो यह कहा है कि जब मैं १९५६ में भारत में गया था तब बुद्धिज्म को जिस अवस्था में देखा है वह बहुत शिथिल अवस्था है, इसमें भी कहां तक सत्यता है, यह इस बात से मालूम हो जाएगी कि जब से भारत स्वाधीन हुआ है तब से, स्वाधीन होने के साथ साथ ही उसने बुद्धिज्म को रिवाइव और रीवाइटेलाइज किया है। इसका प्रमाण यह है कि १९५६ में जब भगवान् बुद्ध की जयन्ती सारे देश ने बहुत ही प्रफुल्लता के साथ, बड़े जोर शोर से मनाई थी तब तिब्बत में जिनको गार्डकिंग बोलते हैं वे दलाई लामा और पंचन लामा भारत आए थे। उनका बहुत स्वागत सत्कार हुआ था और उन्हीं के

हाथों से भगवान् बुद्ध की जयन्ती का उद्घाटन किया गया। यह इस बात का प्रमाण है कि हमारे भारतवर्ष में बुद्धिज्म की क्या अवस्था और क्या स्थान है।

तीसरा यह कि हमारे पूज्य प्रधान मंत्री जी की भी भगवान् बुद्ध के उपदेशों के ऊपर कितनी श्रद्धा है, इस बात का प्रमाण यह है कि सारे विश्व के सामने उन्होंने बांडुंग सम्मेलन में अपने पंचशील के आदर्श को रखा, जिस पंचशील द्वारा ही आज विश्व में शांति स्थापित रह सकती है। दिन पर दिन बढ़ते हुए असंतोष का एक ही उपाय है कि पंचशील द्वारा चालित संसार ही अपने को ध्वंस से बचा सकता है।

यह हमें मालूम है कि चाइना की आबादी बढ़ती ही जा रही है। चाइना में बढ़ती हुई आबादी के लोगों को रखने के लिये जगह नहीं है। लेकिन अगर जगह नहीं है तो तिब्बत के ऊपर इस प्रकार आधिपत्य जमाना और वहां के लोगों के रीति रिवाजों की परवाह न करना, उन लोगों के ऊपर अधिकार कायम करना, यह कहां तक उचित है, यह वही लोग समझें। किसी एक देश के ऊपर आधिपत्य जमाने में थोड़ा समय लगता है, समय का थोड़ा इंतजार करना पड़ता है, जिस प्रकार रशिया ने सेंट्रल एशिया में अपना आधिपत्य जमाया है। सैकड़ों वर्षों से वहां रशिया का आधिपत्य है, तब भी उसने वहां के लोगों के धर्म पर हस्तक्षेप नहीं किया। वहां पर उज्बेकिस्तान और तासकंत में और काज़कस्तान में उन लोगों की बड़ी बड़ी मसजिदें हैं और आज तक रशिया ने उनके धर्म के विरुद्ध कोई काम नहीं किया। वे मसजिद जाते हैं, अपने रीति रिवाजों से रहते हैं, मेल जोल से रहते हैं। खास मास्को सिटी पर भी उनकी एक बड़ी मसजिद है जहां पर वे लोग जा सकते हैं, अपने धर्म को मान सकते हैं। जब इस रीति से लोगों को अपनाया जाता है तब वे लोग खुद ही खशी होते हैं। आज ये लामा लोग बहुत वर्षों से अपने रीति रिवाजों पर कायम हैं। ५०० वर्षों से उनका अपना शासक चुनने का एक अलग ढंग है। वह ढंग

यह है कि साधारण जनता के भीतर से एक लड़के को चुनते हैं, जो कि अपने गुरु का रीडिक्नेशन समझा जाता है। उस लड़के के ऊपर अपने गुरु के लक्षण पाये जायें और यदि वे लोग समझें कि उसमें अपने गुरु के पूरे लक्षण हैं, तो अपना गुरु और पुराने गुरु का अवतार मान लेते हैं। साधारण से साधारण गृहस्थ के घर से भी यदि उस लड़के को चुनते हैं तो उसको अपना शासक और गुरु मानते हैं। आज तक इसी चलन से वे चलते आए हैं और उन लोगों के रीति रिवाज में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ। जब चाइनीज़ उनमें एक दम इतने परिवर्तन लाना चाहते हैं तो कैसे वे लोग उसको सहन कर सकते हैं? ऐसी स्थिति में कालिम्पोंग में जो हवा उठी थी, उसमें इन लोगों के मन में चंचलता आना जरूरी था। नार्थ ईस्ट के उस बार्डर से कई अफवाहें उड़ती आती थीं कि मोनास्टरीज़ को तोड़ दिया गया, लामा लोगों को मार दिया गया, उनमें से कितने ही वहां जो रिवर म्याज्यु हैं, उसमें कूद कर मर गये, इस प्रकार की अनेक अफवाहें जब उठती थीं तब वहां के आदमियों के मन में भी थोड़ी सी स्वाभाविक प्रतिक्रिया उठती थी। पर यह कहना कि वहां लोगों ने एक आर्गेनाइज्ड वे में काम किया है, यह सत्य नहीं है।

मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहती हूं। आपने मुझको जो दो चार मिनट बोलने के लिये दिये हैं, उसके लिये मैं आपको फिर धन्यवाद देती हूं।

3 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, it has been one of our interesting experiences to see the enemies of the Prime Minister's foreign policy having some kind words for him, at least for his foreign policy, but we never thought that we would live to see and to listen to such kind words overflowing in this manner from these quarters who thought that Panchsheel was born in sin and so on, people who want this foreign policy

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

to be completely reversed and who have not lost any opportunity to run his foreign policy down. Perhaps they are bound to say that in a situation like this, for it seems to some people that this has come as a godsend, not only to attack some parties in this country but to strike at the foundation of Panchsheel and disrupt the friendship between India and China for the building of which both Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Premier Chou En-lai had played so remarkable and noble a part. But I should have liked them to at least mention whether they stand by Panchsheel or not. They have chosen to be discreet in this matter, because silence is considered to be golden in such propositions.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes emotions and sentiments do overpower us and tend to distort our vision. But they are temporary things and we do not allow ourselves to be guided by such things. After second-thought and sober reflections we must judge what has happened in Tibet. It is not our job here to go into the internal things there. But since this has been described as a national uprising and so on, I have to submit that what has happened in Tibet is an armed rebellion by some vested interests, reactionaries, who want to prevent the march of history, social reform and progress. It seems they profit by keeping the regime of bigotry, of obscurantism, of extreme backwardness and dark superstition. Now, I would like to mention in this connection, Sir, a book and I would like hon. Members to refer to a book called *Seven Years in Tibet* by Henrich Harrer, who was tutor to the Dalai Lama. In one place the author says:

"The Lamas often smear their patients with holy spittle. Tsompa, butter and urine of some saintly man are made into a sort of gruel and administered to the sick."

Such quotations will appear in this particular book. Therefore, there is great backwardness and superstition.

What happened there, as is clear from the newspaper reports, is that the local Government had violated the agreement signed between China and Tibet—the agreement of 1951—and it is clearly said that articles 1, 3 and 12 of that particular agreement had been clearly violated and this news was circulated by a number of newspapers in this country. On the 31st of March, the *Hindustan Standard*, for example says:

"Tibet revoked her seventeen-point agreement with China, signed in 1951 and declared complete independence on March 12, according to Lukhongwa, former Prime Minister of Tibet, now in New Delhi."

This is what the paper said; even before the incidents of the 17th March took place, this happened.

Now it has been said by the hon. Home Minister in the other House that the Tibetan people are fond of prayers and all that. I do not deny that they are a religious people that they are fond of prayers. But at the same time it was reported in the *Statesman*, that monasteries had a good consignment of arms and many other papers said that arms had been piled up in the monasteries. I believe, these arms, machine guns, rifles and so on, are no part of divine worship. You being a philosopher, Sir, will be able to guide us in this matter. Therefore, it is no use trying to tell this cock and bull story because everyone knows that though the weapons may be religious, the hands that wield these weapons may be those of misled people, but the weapons came from the KMT Armed Forces and other imperialist agencies. The whole thing should be understood in the proper perspective.

It has been made out as if it is a national uprising. Sometimes I feel upset when so learned a historian and scholar like the Prime Minister characterises such a thing in this manner. I have great respect for his learning and knowledge but am I to understand that this is a national

uprising just because some people have taken to arms and gone against their State? Have not we witnessed in our country how some backward and unenlightened people are liable to be swept away by the rabid communal reactionaries and others? Didn't we see how Kasim Razvi, the Razaakar leader, roused the passions of some people and misled them to all sorts of actions necessitating police measures on the part of the Government? Are not Phizo and a handful of his followers even today carrying with them some sections of the people in hostile activities, suicidal to themselves and harmful to the country? Are we then to call all these things national uprisings, is the question that I put before the House and the country.

Now, Sir, let us judge it from another angle. Who welcomed this Tibetan uprising? The first to welcome this uprising was the great champion of freedom who lives in Taiwan, Chiang Kai-shek. What did he say? He said in a message,

"Although I am in Taiwan, my heart has always been with you in your war against Communism. With regard to the recent battle of Lhasa, I have been specially concerned with the heroic sacrifices made by the Tibetan brothers whose fate is constantly in my mind."

This comes from 'Reuter'. Then came the reaction from the United States State Department which welcomed the statement of Chiang Kai-shek and U.S. Secretary, Mr. Herter said,

"We see in the resistance efforts the heartening example of the indomitable resistant spirit."

Then, Sir, came the Wellington Conference of the SEATO Council of Ministers which put Tibet and Kashmir together—mind you, Tibet and Kashmir together were put there—for discussion. This was done. Then comes another regime, the South Viet-Nam regime, which offered 100 and odd volunteers to fight for the cause of independence and coming

nearer here, on his way from the SEATO Ministerial Conference, after including Kashmir and Tibet in the same agenda, Mr. Qadir, the Pakistani Foreign Minister, said in Singapore:

"Our sympathies are with that Tibetans. I am sure events in Tibet will make many countries review the international problems."

This was said in Singapore on the 17th of April. Such are the reactions. Am I to understand that Chiang Kai-shek, the SEATO Council and Mr. Qadir and others are such people who would welcome such developments if it were for the cause of progress or am I to understand . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: We are interested to hear your own reactions rather than the reactions of the whole world.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In order to understand what the P.S.P. leaders say and their policy, I am going to give this and I hope he will understand.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: There is no policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is touchy because that is what the P.S.P. policy is. You have given me only fifteen minutes, Sir, and so I cannot . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: We should like to know your reaction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When you were talking, he did not interrupt you. You give him a hearing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, Sir, this causes anxiety and irritation in hon. Members—at least in some hon. Members—but what can I do if facts sometimes hurt them. I should apologise to them and I should be excused for that. The world Press, the American Press, the British Press, the West German Press—all have welcomed this.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:
The Indian Press too.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And you too.

Now, Sir, recall 1953 when it was found necessary to make a surprise arrest of Prime Minister Sheikh Abdullah and then to put him under detention. As hon. Members will remember, some incidents followed and force had to be used in quelling what looked like a miniature rebellion or what contained elements of it. What did the imperialist circles in the Western Press say then? I was in Europe at that time and I distinctly remember how India was called an aggressor and how the Prime Minister was painted on the darkest colour. Sheikh Abdullah was claimed as a liberator and the separatist elements and other pro-Pakistani elements were lauded to the sky. These attempts went on and provocative declarations continue. See, how they view this Naga Rebellion. My hon. friend, Shri Sinha, may note; the "Daily Express" of February 9, 1959 said . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:
How are we concerned with all this?
We are concerned with Tibet.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The "Expressman" reports as follows: "Nehru's war . . ." I would like him to note this, not the Prime Minister who knows this. ". . . I am surprised at Nehru's . . ."

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:
What are the views of the hon. Member?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: "The situation is a blot on the Indian Army, disgrace to a Government whose leader ceaselessly preaches non-violence and the evils of colonialism."

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:
How are we concerned with all these, Sir? We are concerned with Tibet now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because I say that the P.S.P have not understood the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know the agitation and there will be greater agitation if I were given a little more time to speak on the subject. I know the Congress Party would not like to do it. As far as the P.S.P. is concerned, its anti-Communism has become so deep-seated that I am not a doctor to cure it. Now, that is the position. Why is it so? It is because the imperialists are interested in ridiculing Panchsheel, undermining these principles as the guiding line for international behaviour amongst nations for peaceful relations and a policy of co-existence. This situation is exploited to disrupt friendship between India and China. It has struck against the greatest bulwark of peace in this Asian region. This conforms to the imperialist interests and thus strikes against Afro-Asian solidarity. This is intended to break the Bandung principle and it is a regret that this simple thing is not seen by our P.S.P. and Jan Sangh people. They want to defeat peace-loving forces by methods of provocation and they are looking forward to a change in our foreign policy. For, instance, the "Hindustan Times" wrote Nehru's foreign policy "called for reassessment of the basis of our policy." This is how that paper writes about our foreign policy.

Now, Sir, I agree that there has taken place some deterioration in the situation. We should be interested in facing the situation realistically. There are two sets of people, one set, the majority of it, sits on this side and that side, and desires the restoration of normal relations between India and China and wants to prize and cherish that friendship. That set would naturally be interested in overcoming the difficulties, in setting matters right and in developing and strengthening our relations with China. On the other side, there are some people, a handful of them, fortunately, for the country, who always attack the principles of Panchsheel, our foreign policy and demand a change in the foreign policy. They would natu-

ally be interested in developing the crisis, in seeing that the dream of their dreams comes true. Sir, that is how we view this matter. We are interested in the overwhelming majority of the people, their thoughts and ideas.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The overwhelming majority is not with you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know with whom you are. The only thing I find, as far as the P.S.P. is concerned, is this. When they were saying something in the other House, the Taiwan Assembly or the Parliament was moving more or less a similar resolution. Well, I do not know with whom they are. Now, Sir . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Let him speak on the subject of the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Sapru. Let him go on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just two minutes. At least I have given some provocation to hon. friends, because the thoughts otherwise do not flow here. The irritations have to be exhibited. Now, the Prime Minister has expressed his distress over certain expressions and statements in China. I can understand his position, but the feelings of the Chinese people must also be understood. Apart from throwing coddling on Mao Tse-tung's portrait, with the police looking on, the Chinese Government and its leaders were subjected to an avalanche of insults in some quarters in this country. Secondly, about the enemies of India's foreign policy, expansionists and other things, I would like only to say that I do not understand what is meant by this, but I do not think that the Indian Government is meant. As far as the P.S.P. is concerned, I am prepared to concede that this may be an exaggeration, because the capacity of the P.S.P. to expand is very limited indeed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Diwan Chaman Lall.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One minute, Sir. Now, Sir, I want to make one point. Here I want to point out that we should be extremely careful. Only one point I would like to refer to. The Prime Minister has said that the Dalai Lama is a religious head. Besides, he occupies a high secular position. When he is already in India all due courtesies must naturally be shown to him. But I think it is wrong to advertise it as a political asylum, for the international law is very clear on the subject of political asylum. It is given to one who is a fugitive from justice, to an offender. The Dalai Lama is a religious head. He has recently been elected as a Vice-Chairman of the Standing Council of the People's National Congress and the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do. Order, order. No more. Diwan Chaman Lall.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Mr. Chairman, most of the speeches this afternoon have been magnificent specimens of balanced judgment, following the injunction that you laid down—speeches like the speech of my friend on my right and of Mr. Shiva Rao. There has been one speech that we have just listened to, which unfortunately cannot be described as a specimen of balanced judgment. It was full of hatred. It was full of suspicion, and when my hon. friend referred to a little incident that happened in Bombay, which we deplore greatly—everyone of us deplores—he must try to remember

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Does he deplore it?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: . . . whether he deplored a similar incident in which he and his colleagues were involved in Calcutta in the case of President Eisenhower. Did he deplore it at that time? Indeed, he set the example. It is a most unfortunate thing that he set an example of that nature, that his party set an example of that nature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please don't get excited.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I don't. I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, that you have drawn my attention to this fact. I have no intention of getting excited at my friend, indeed I admire him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He excites you.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: But in the matter of his debating points I am afraid he has been chasing imaginary hares. Now, Sir, it is quite obvious from the speeches that we have heard that hon. Members are quite familiar with the history of Tibet and the relationship of Tibet with the outer world. It is not my intention to deal with that history in the short time that is available to me, but I would like to pin-point certain important, salient factors in regard to that history and the urges that have impinged upon that history. It is rather important. Two factors that appear are, first of all, the assertion by the Chinese Government of their suzerainty over Tibet. And the second is the parallel assertion of the autonomy of that country. Now, Sir, my friend, Dr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, referred to the Prime Minister's statement, a very noble statement, in regard to this particular matter. I shall refer to it in a minute. These two essential features of the situation, this dual aspect was due principally to the historic relationship between China and Tibet, and in a measure to certain urges in India, as you will presently see. Now, Sir, it is true that as far back as the 7th century, the Chinese asserted their suzerainty over Tibet. They even invaded Tibet. From the 13th to 15th century, the Mongol emperors invaded Tibet, but they were careful enough—unlike my learned friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—to preserve the autonomy of Tibet. They were, in fact, the creators of the institution of the Dalai Lama.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have never been in Tibet.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may not have been

in Tibet, but his spirit has been some where very near Tibet. They were careful enough to preserve the autonomy of Tibet. So, although a military situation was created by the Mongol emperors yet they saw to it that there was no interference in the autonomy of that particular country. We come to the 18th century. In the 18th century the Chinese imported two of what they called *Ambans*, two representatives of the Chinese emperor, and installed them in Lhasa. That was an interference in Tibetan autonomy no doubt. The result was that in 1749 there was a massacre of these two *Ambans*. Every time that there has been any interference in the autonomy of Tibet by the Chinese, there has been trouble, conflict and pretty nearly war. It is an important fact to remember in regard to what we call Tibetan autonomy. Now, Sir, the British policy in India was delighted at this situation, of this dual functioning, that is, the suzerainty of China as well as the autonomy of Tibet. Why, because they were afraid of allowing Russia to get a foothold in Tibet. In fact, when Dorjiev a Russian who became a Lama of some note, took two Tibetan missions to Russia, suspicion was created in the British mind, which led to the Younghusband Mission—which was called so euphemistically, but it was a military expedition—right up to Lhasa. What followed the Younghusband Mission was the Convention of 1906 and the Convention of 1907 between Russia and Great Britain, and the trade regulations of 1908, some of which, even now to this day happen to be valid. But the basic thing that comes out of all these conventions is the insistence upon the suzerainty of China on the one side, and the autonomy of Tibet on the other. Those, again, are the two basic facts to remember.

As I said I will refer to the statement of the Prime Minister, a very noble, a very fine statement in a minute, I shall now refer to it. Probably in this very connection you will recall that in 1914 there was a

Convention which was held in Simla between the representatives of China, the representatives of Tibet and the representatives of the British Government. At this Convention certain decisions were taken. Tibet was divided into outer Tibet and inner Tibet, outer Tibet being the area nearest to India consisting of Lhasa, Shigatse and it was laid down that Tibet will not be considered a province of China and that the administrative autonomy of Tibet will be assured and guaranteed. Further no troops will be stationed in the area. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister, in his statement which was read out in this House, in paragraph 14 said:—

“When Premier Chou En-lai came here two or three years ago, he was good enough to discuss Tibet with me at considerable length. We had a frank and full talk. He told me that while Tibet had long been a part of the Chinese State, they did not consider Tibet as a province of China.”

You will see how you hark back to that important agreement of 1914. The assurances given by Mr. Chou En-lai are in line with what was decided in the year 1914, when the Chinese agreed that Tibet would never be considered a province of China, but would always be considered an autonomous region in the country of China. Now, Sir, at that time, the Prime Minister played—and I have not the slightest doubt that he will continue to play—the role of a peace-maker. That is his role, not the role of one who strikes a discordant note such as was struck by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. That is not the role to play. The role to play is the role of the peace-maker. And you will notice in that very statement the Prime Minister said that when he had his talk with the Dalai Lama he told him of Prime Minister Chou En-lai's friendly approach and of his assurance that he would respect the autonomy of Tibet.

“I suggested to him that he should accept these assurances in good

faith and co-operate in maintaining that autonomy and bringing about certain reforms in Tibet.”

That, Sir, is the role, a noble role, to play in this very difficult situation. Who says that we are not the friends of China? Of course we are. It was the Prime Minister of India who was the first person to recognize the new China that was created. It was the Prime Minister of India who kept India as a window on the world in regard to all Chinese matters. It was the Prime Minister of India who moved in the United Nations for the recognition of China. Who are these people now who try to and spoil that great, noble friendship between these two peoples? If anything goes wrong, it is the duty of India and of our great leader to point out to the people of China what is going wrong and what should not go wrong. Ends do not justify the means. If you have noble ends, you must have noble means as well. You must not have certain ends and very different means in order to approach those particular ends. That has been the policy of the Prime Minister of India always.

I am reminded that there is a tribe known as the ‘Lepchas’ who are to be found in Tibet and, I think my friend knows in Sikkim, along the Tibetan borders of India . . .

..AN. HON. MEMBER: In Darjeeling.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: . . . and in Darjeeling, my learned friend reminds me. Unfortunately the word ‘Lepchas’ means “nonsense speakers”. We have had to deal with a lot of nonsense speakers in regard to this matter of Tibet and China, and I do hope that we shall heed and listen to your injunctions, Sir, in regard to this matter and not *exacerbate* the situation which we find today. The situation today is serious as a foreign journalist said the other day. It was Mr. Kingsley Martin who said it, in the *New Statesmen*—he said:

“We must avoid uttering irrevocable words.”

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

He is right when he says that—

“For India to give up hope of peaceful relations with Peking would be the most tragic decision for India and the world. The time is bound to come for the cementing of friendship in the interests of world peace, and it is only the Prime Minister of India who can take that step.”

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, the hon. mover of this motion spoke in such dignified and restrained language that I feel deeply beholden to him. He set a good example for all of us. In the course of this discussion this example has been more or less followed, not entirely; but I do not wish to object to anything that has been said or the manner of saying it. Unfortunately in some other countries, and in China more specially, the way we function in our Parliament here or outside is perhaps not fully appreciated; that is to say that it may not be quite appreciated that here every one has a right to say—here in Parliament and indeed outside Parliament also and in Press—everyone has a right to say whatever he feels like subject to some very very broad limitations of libel or slander; and that what he or she may say may indeed be in condemnation of Government, as it often is, it does not represent Government's policy. I say this because objection is taken, has been taken in China, to remarks made by hon. Members in Parliament or outside or the Press. It is different here from what it is in China, and I am not saying that it is better or not here or it is different here. Here one can see even in the last few weeks an amazing unanimity and similarity of words, expressions and slogans coming from various quarters, which shows an amount of uniformity which is truly formidable, and it has its virtues no doubt, but I am not criticising anything. But what I wish to say is that things said in Parliament sometimes convey a very

different impression outside, and people do not realise that in such Parliaments as these are, every viewpoint has the fullest expression and need not necessarily be right or wrong.

In this connection—not by way of again, criticism but because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to a very unfortunate incident that happened in Bombay where Chairman Mao Tse-tung's picture was shown grave discourtesy—I should like to refer to that firstly to express my regret again for it and at the same time to say that the facts of this particular incident as we know them, and know them correctly—we are presumed to know them a little better than people sitting in Peking—nevertheless oddly enough our version of the facts is not wholly accepted by the Peking Government on a small matter, which is surprising. We are sitting here, we ought to know better what takes place in our country, about facts, whatever other opinions may be. However, it is a very regrettable incident with which obviously Government had nothing to do. The party which organised it, I believe, is not represented in this House even. But what is not realised is that in the City of Bombay pictures even of a leader of ours like Mahatma Gandhi have been burnt by some groups or others. Two and a half or three years ago my humble self also had been treated in that way in Bombay and elsewhere. Well, we take that in our stride and, as the hon. Member who spoke last mentioned, a few years back President Eisenhower's effigy had the honour of being burnt near the Ochterlony Monument. I regret all these cases, but what I am mentioning is that these things happen in a country like ours because of our laws, etc. They happen. Quite apart from law, I think it is a grave breach of decency to do this kind of thing or do anything else. We regret it. But people outside this country, some people, do not realise this and seem to imagine that somehow or other the Government or some Government officials

must have connived at it, otherwise it could not have taken place, or they think that we should take the people who have done this by the scruff of the neck and throw them in the dungeon.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Let them do it themselves.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am saying that it is rather difficult because it produces misunderstandings as to the way of functioning, our parliamentary procedures and the like, and other procedures where a Government does not permit opposition of any kind.

Hon. Members have referred to a statement made by me a few days ago which was read out in this House also. So far as the major facts are concerned I have stated them there and I have really nothing to add, even though after that statement was made it was not accepted—the facts I mean; even the facts were not fully accepted by the Chinese authorities and the Chinese Press, which is unfortunate because again I would say that as to what happens in India I would imagine that we could be better informed than the Chinese authorities who presumably can only be informed through certain intelligence agents that they may have at Kalimpong or elsewhere. But I do not wish to enter into polemical argument about these minor matters because the issues before us are far more serious, far deeper, far deeper than Tibet, the whole of Tibet, although Tibet is important and we are discussing events which have cast their shadow round about Tibet too. That shows that they are really deeper than that, and therefore we have to be particularly careful as to what we say and what we do. Now I accept the limitations and also the responsibility of what one should say on such occasions.

First of all, we must be alive to what we are aiming at. We are not, I hope, merely aiming at denouncing somebody or some government or some phrase. There has been too

much of this denunciation and slogan-raising. I regret to say, in China recently, and some of the slogans have been quite extraordinary. But I do not think we should be so thin-skinned as to get upset by some slogans in the excitement of the moment. We must not be led off our main path because that is of very considerable consequence in the future.

I should like again to read a few lines of what I said in that previous statement to indicate what we aim at. I said this:—

“It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia—India and China—which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia and the world. The five principles have laid down, *inter alia*, mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war used.”

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta asked rather rhetorically, “Do we stand by Panch-sheel?” Well, sometimes I wonder if the words we use are used in the same meaning or with some different meaning in our minds but—I have no claim to superiority—so far as India is concerned, we have earnestly striven to stand by these principles and I do not think we have offended any principle. It is not for me to stand up and criticise or justify other countries, but we have tried to do that not because of some temporary policy, not because those five principles have been declared in some agreement—that was merely a confirmation of what we thought, as to what we said—but because we have felt that that is the only way to func-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

tion in this world of ours. Some people say, "Oh! After all that has happened, you still hold by that." It is a curious question. If those principles are right, we hold by them and we should hold by them, even though nobody in the wide world is not holding by them. Naturally we have to adapt our policies to what happens in the world; we cannot live in isolation. But a principle should be acted upon even though somebody else has not acted upon it. One tries. Anyway, we are imperfect beings in an imperfect world. So I should like to assure the hon. Member opposite that so far as the Government is concerned—I cannot speak for every ordinary individual in India—we hold by those principles and we shall endeavour to act up to them whatever other countries may or may not do. Some people certainly—as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said—taking advantage of the occurrences in and relating to Tibet have raised a cry that India will now have to consider how far she can adhere to the policy of non-alignment. All that shows a strange misunderstanding of our ways of thinking in our policies. Non-alignment—although the word is itself a kind of negative word—nevertheless has a positive concept, and we do not propose to have a military alliance with any country, come what may, and I want to be quite clear about it, because the moment we give up that idea of non-alignment, we lose every anchor that we hold on to and we simply drift. We may hang on to somebody or some country. But we lose our own self respect, of the country's. If one loses one's own self respect, it is something very precious loss. Therefore, this business of thinking always in terms of getting something from this country or the other country is not desirable. It is perhaps not very relevant. It is said often in Pakistan, let us have a common defence policy. Now I am all for settling our troubles with Pakistan and living a normal, friendly, neighbourly life. We try for that. But I do not understand when people

say that we have a common defence policy. Against whom? Immediately the question comes up: "Against whom is this common defence policy?" Are we going to become members of the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO or some body? We do not want to have a common defence policy which is almost another meaning of some kind of a military alliance. The whole policy that we have pursued is opposed to this conception. We want friendly relations with Pakistan. We hope we shall get them. But we are not going to tie ourselves up, our conceptions, our policies, with other countries involving military defence and attacking and all that.

So the present difficulties that we have to face in relation to the happenings in Tibet will, I hope, gradually pass. But it is a tragedy not only for Tibet, but a deeper tragedy for many of us that something that we have laboured for, for all these years which may be said to be enshrined—if you like—in the Panchsheel or in Bandung, has suffered very considerably in people's minds. I may say I shall hold on to it, but the fact is in people's minds there is that crack, there is that suffering, there is that uneasiness, that something they valued might slip away. These words like all other words—Bandung, Panchsheel; it does not matter what word you use—begin to lose their shine and to be hurled about without meaning, and in fact, just like even the word 'peace' becomes almost like a thunderbolt or a minor war the way it is used. Sometimes the manner of using it—it is the manner that counts. I have come more and more to believe that means are even more important than ends. They show to us that the way one does things is even more important than what one does. And that is why I have been aggrieved beyond measure at these various recent developments and at what is being said in China—the charges made against India. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did not say a word about all these—not a word. I can understand where

those things lead to. Hon. Members of this House being seasoned public men and women may restrain themselves, may not allow themselves to be affected too much. But it is difficult for the general public not to be affected by such charges and they are charges. I do submit, which do not stand the slightest scrutiny. What have we done about this matter, about Tibet, apart from some speeches or things?

We have received the Dalai Lama and party and subsequently we have received some thousands of refugees. We have given them asylum, and it is admitted—I don't think anybody denies it—that as a sovereign country we have every right to do so, and nobody else can be a judge of that except ourselves. Now is it suggested that we should have refused to give asylum to the Dalai Lama when he asked for it? Well, if it is suggested by someone outside India I can tell them—I do not know about the handful out of the four hundred millions of people of India; I doubt if even a few thousands would have agreed with that policy;—I can tell them this that the hundreds of millions of India would have become angry at that action of ours if we had refused asylum to the Dalai Lama and his party. Almost everybody in India—a few may not have—approved of our policy, and it would have been an impossible thing, an utterly wrong thing, for us to do otherwise from any point of view, political, humanitarian or whatever you like. So this is what we have done. Of course we are charged with having connived at Kalimpong; of Kalimpong being the commanding centre—this is the word they used, I think—of this rebellion in Tibet. Now it is said that the commanding centre has shifted to Mussoorie. I know words have lost their meaning, because I find it very difficult to deal with these charges. And why has the commanding centre gone to Mussoorie? Because the Dalai Lama is there and because the brother of the Dalai Lama who nor-

mally lives in Darjeeling, I think, went to see him, and after seeing him went back to Darjeeling or Kalimpong. These are very serious charges against a country's leaders being made irresponsibly in this way by the leaders of a people whom we have not only honoured and respected but whom we have considered particularly advanced in culture and politeness and the gentler art of civilisation. It has been a shock to me beyond measure because, quite apart from everything else, I have looked up to the Chinese and I look up to them still because of their great accomplishments, because of their great culture and all that, and it has been a shock to me that this kind of thing should be said and done in the excitement of the moment. I hope that excitement will pass.

Now, Sir, I want to tell the House exactly how these matters came into our ken. On the 11th of March, for the first time we got a message from our Consul-General in Lhasa saying that there was some excitement in the town and that a large number of people had come and visited him consisting of representatives of the public and some Tibetan officials, monks, heads of monasteries, etc. They had come to him with a series of complaints about the Chinese authorities there and they said that they were very much in distress. Now our Consul General in Lhasa was naturally very embarrassed. What is he to do? He did not wish to interfere; it was none of his business to interfere and he told them: "Well, I cannot do anything for you" and he reported to us. That was on the 11th—the message dated the 10th reached us on the 11th. That was the first information we had, that something was afoot there. After that the Consul-General sent us brief reports about the general excitement in the town, the tense situation and people holding meetings, not public meetings but group meetings and all that. On the 14th he again sent us a message that a crowd of 5,000 Tibetan women had

[Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru.]
 come to the Consulate-General with the same kind of complaints and asked him to accompany them to the Chinese Foreign Office in Lhasa to bear witness to what they said. At that again the poor Consul-General was exceedingly embarrassed. It was none of his business to do this and he said: "I cannot go." and he asked, "What do you mean by that?" Well, in short he said, "I just cannot go." Quite rightly. He reported it to us. We drafted a message—it was kept ready to be sent—to say: "Don't get entangled in what has happened and was happening in Lhasa." This was on the 14th. So this kind of thing went on. And it was at this time, when speaking, I think, in the Lok Sabha, I said that there was a clash of wills in Lhasa—whether that was a correct description, I do not know. The point was there was no actual fighting going on at this time; that came a few days later. On the 20th March when it started, how it started, I do not know, nor did our Consul-General know sitting in the Consulate, and he could not be expected to know when it started. And as we now know, he did not know it then. On the 17th night the Dalai Lama and party left Lhasa, rather secretly. According to them, on the 17th afternoon at 4 O' Clock, two shells or bombs, something like that, fell into a lake in the Summer Palace. Well, this made them think, "Now this is the last moment, and now the Palace is going to be shelled and there is going to be war everywhere", and they left Lhasa. As far as I know—I am not sure—even then it was not fully his intention to leave Tibet. But as Lhasa was being shelled, subsequently that intention must have developed. Anyhow, in the course of a week, from the 11th to the 20th or the 21st, during these, say, ten days this was the news that came to us. We could do nothing about it and before the 10th or 11th we knew nothing about the situation except that we naturally knew that all kinds of cross-currents were at work at Lhasa and in Tibet. Then the question came before us, of the

possibility of the Dalai Lama coming here, and we decided that we should receive him. He came. As the House might know I resisted and I was asked repeatedly: "Are you going to throw your doors open to any number of refugees from Tibet?" I resisted that although in my mind I knew that I could not very well refuse asylum to people who were in great difficulty; I could not; but I did not want to say it and invite people to roll into India from all over the place. So that is the short story of what has happened and what we have done. And now we are called expansionists and imperialists and what not, all kinds of phrases, which I suppose would not make any real difference to what we are; nevertheless coming from those whom we consider friends, they do hurt us.

Now I want just to give you a few facts. Again an extraordinary thing appeared in the newspapers in Peking. They go back now to what had happened in 1950, that is, to some memoranda that we had sent, when Chinese armies were entering Tibet. Very polite memoranda they were. The answers were not very polite, but the point now is that they refer to them, that what we wrote to them was after consultation with the British Government, that though we called ourselves independent we really acted as stooges or tools of the British Government.

It is, of course, completely wrong and untruthful. There was no question of our consulting the British Government. Our view on Tibet was different from that of the British Government.

4 P.M.

Now, one thing about the Panchen Lama's statement. I was rather distressed to read it, that a statement should be made, so lacking in generosity and dignity, by a person who had been our honoured guest. I do not know about the petty things he says

that somewhere his staff was not given proper accommodation. I cannot answer that, whether at Aurangabad, or some such place there was some difficulty because the entourage of the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama was so big—hundred of people with them. It was not quite easy always to make as much preparation as we wanted.

About the refugees, now the latest position is that approximately 6,500 refugees are on their way down through the Kameng Division of NEFA, 1,500 are trekking through Bhutan and 700 have come to Sikkim—round about 9,000. The Bhutan Government have asked us to receive the Tibetan refugees coming through their territories and we have agreed to do so. Thus we have about 9,000 refugees for whom we have made ourselves responsible for some kind of arrangements. A few of the refugees, when they entered India, were armed. They were disarmed on entry into India.

The refugees coming through NEFA will be accommodated temporarily in a camp at Missamara in Assam. Though the Assam Government are making arrangements for their shelter, medical relief, etc., the West Bengal Government have agreed to construct a temporary camp somewhere in Cooch-Behar for the refugees who are coming through Bhutan. We are grateful to these two State Governments.

Special Officers to deal with the refugees have been appointed by the External Affairs Ministry. They are proceeding to Assam and West Bengal. It is not proposed to keep these refugees in these temporary camps for a long time and other arrangements will have to be devised for them. I cannot just say at present what or where, but it is obvious we are not going to keep them in camps.

One hon. Member—I think Dr. Kunzru, maybe Mr. Shiva Rao—said

something that we should allow these refugees to earn their own living and give them freedom to do many things. Broadly speaking, of course we intend that. We are not going to keep them as prisoners in camps. In fact, our instructions to our officers at the border were to tell them that we do not assume responsibility for their indefinite up-keep. For some time we would help them. And naturally to some extent we are responsible when these people are coming in. We cannot let them loose on India. Again, there is the question that they cannot easily be kept anywhere except in cooler climates—and we cannot send them to the rest of India simply—in mountain regions.

I think Mr. Shiva Rao said something about China and the United Nations. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to say so, obviously our policy in regard to the entry of the People's Government of China into the U.N. remains as it was. It is not—that is based on certain facts—by these things; it is not because we get angry with something that happens in China that we change our policy. That would mean that we have no firm policies, that we are deflected by temporary happenings in the world.

Just one thing more. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta talked about national uprising. Again it depends upon how you use that word. I do not know exactly what happened in Tibet. But as I said in my previous statement, according to Chinese accounts this has been a fairly big affair, a very large scale affair. Also looking at the surrounding circumstances as well as the past history of Tibet, one can very well imagine that apart from the so-called people representing vested interests—they would be there—it is a fact that large numbers of Tibetan people—I cannot say whether they are in a majority or a minority, but large numbers undoubtedly—went to the extent of taking this step which they did, which really meant a very dangerous step. Anyhow it is there, and one feels strongly about it.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Now so far as we are concerned, we have not interfered either from Kalimpong or Mussoorie or otherwise. We have exercised our undoubted right to give asylum. I have said that the Dalai Lama is perfectly a free agent to go where he likes in India or go back to Tibet.

Some people—some foreign pressmen—said about two days after he had come to Mussoorie that we are keeping him behind barbed wire. That sounds rather horrible. The fact was that the Mussoorie police, to lighten their burden, because of all kinds of curious people trying to go into the compound of the house, had put a little barbed wire on that compound before he came, to be able to protect him, for his security and general protection. But that was not to keep him in, and he goes, I believe, round about Mussoorie. He can go back to Tibet the moment he likes.

It is no use my going on repeating what I have said earlier that the Dalai Lama is not kept under duress here, that he did not enter India under any duress, except the duress of circumstances, if you like compulsion of events. And, certainly, I can speak from personal knowledge having met him and talked to him, that he is staying there of his own free will in India and even at Mussoorie. With all respect, I would say that anyone who denies this fact, well, is totally ignorant of facts and speaks without knowing.

Further, hon. Members might have seen in the newspaper headlines—because odd remarks are given as headlines—that I said that I would be happy if the Dalai Lama went back to Tibet. I did so. Somebody asked a question and I said, "Naturally I would be happy if he went with dignity". But that did not mean at all that I am going to push the Dalai Lama out or put him in an embarrassing position. It is entirely for him to decide what to do, when to do it. The only advice I gave him when I saw him was: "You have had a very hard

journey and very harassing experiences. If I may, as a person very much older than you, suggest it, you might rest for a few days, and calmly think about the events and then do what you like."

One more matter, if I may say so, especially to the press. I do not particularly fancy this constant sensational way of referring to the Dalai Lama as the God-king, and, in fact, I do not think he likes it either. This is not the Indian way; it is a foreign way of doing things. It sounds sensational, no doubt. I hope that that word will not be used. It is good enough to refer to him as the Dalai Lama. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru, would you like to say anything?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: There is nothing to reply to. I thought my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, might raise some point but he has hardly spoken to the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we pass on to the next item.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES FOR THE YEAR 1957-58—continued

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR (Nominated): Sir, ever since I had submitted the Report of the Backward Classes Commission I had kept mum. I have been studying the situation and the reaction both of the Government and of the people at large. I do not want to go into the details of the Report. All I want to say is that unless we recognise the progress the country has made and the various changes that have come about, our policy as regards the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and the other backward classes may hinder the progress of these unfortunate people.