

*189. [The questioner (Shri B. V. Kakkilaya) was absent. For answer see col. 1567 infra.]

MEETING BETWEEN PRIME MINISTERS
OF INDIA AND CEYLON

*190. DR. KALIDAS NAG: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Government of India have been requested by the Prime Minister of Ceylon to arrange for an early meeting between the Prime Ministers of India and Ceylon?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): The wording of this question is unusual. The Prime Minister of Ceylon did not approach the Indian Government to arrange a meeting between the two Prime Ministers. Apart from this, the Prime Minister of India is himself part of the Indian Government.

The facts are that the Prime Minister of Ceylon has been invited by the Prime Minister of India to continue the talks which his predecessor, Mr. Dudley Senanayake, had in London earlier this year. The Prime Minister of Ceylon has accepted this invitation and is expected to reach Delhi on January 15.

DR. KALIDAS NAG: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister that in view of the fact that according to the census figures the number of Indians is over 7 to 8 lakhs of people in Ceylon, what would be their status and whether their status and the financial losses they are facing today would be discussed in the course of this Indo-Ceylon conference?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I don't know what the hon. Member means by financial losses. Financial loss caused by what? I don't understand it.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: By having to come over here.

DR. KALIDAS NAG: By their being obliged to come back to India and

they are seriously threatened in Ceylon as it has happened in other parts of the Commonwealth. The Indians still belong to the Commonwealth, and when they are forced to quit, they will suffer losses heavily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not your question. The question was whether these questions will also be discussed at the conference.

DR. KALIDAS NAG: Yes, Sir!

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The questions to be discussed include everything in regard to the future status of the people of Indian descent in Ceylon. I would like the House to remember that we are dealing with a mixed problem. They are not all Indian nationals, a great majority of them. Some may be Indian nationals, some are in fact; about some it is rather doubtful what they are. So the first question to be decided is as to who are going to continue definitely as Ceylon nationals and who are not. The difficulty in the past has been that there are some people there whom we consider as Ceylon nationals and the Ceylon Government does not wish to treat them as Ceylon nationals. These are some of the questions to be discussed. Suppose a person is not considered a Ceylon national, that does not necessarily mean that he has to leave the country. There are foreigners and aliens in every country but under a different status.

DR. KALIDAS NAG: May I ask the Prime Minister, that in view of the fact that nationality depends on the historical context and that there are Indians who are in Ceylon from the first Century A.D., which means that their nationality is for 2,000 years and that there are also relatively recent 2 P.M. migrations due to the labour problem, what is in store for these labour elements—mainly from South India who are the worst sufferers?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: As to the people who have been there from the 1st Century A. D., there is no dis-

pute about them. They are very much Ceylon nationals. Mostly they form the Tamil part of the population in North Ceylon and elsewhere. The argument is about the labour part of the population, and about some merchants and others also who have been living there for a considerable time.

DR. KALIDAS NAG: The hon. Prime Minister certainly knows that in Ceylon a new terminology has been imported called the "Kandyan reaction" to the Indian problem. The Kandyans, we know, are good at dancing and I would like to know whether they propose to dance the Indians out of Ceylon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question, Mr. Mahanty.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Sir, if you permit me, I would like to say regarding Dr. Nag's observation, that the remarks just now made are very untimely and it is very uncharitable to make them. These kinds of remarks do not do much good. Presently some Kandyan members of the Ceylon Parliament are coming from there and to refer to them in that jocular way is hardly happy.

INDIAN CONSULATE-GENERAL IN SINKIANG

*191. **SHRI S. MAHANTY:** Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state whether the Government of the People's Republic of China have refused to recognise the Indian Consulate-General in Sinkiang?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Yes. The Chinese Government have expressed their inability to accord recognition to the Indian Consulate-General at Kashgar on the ground that Sinkiang is a closed territory and, as such, no foreign missions can be permitted to function there. By 1953, Sinkiang had been deserted by almost all the Indian traders there. The Consulate-General was closed this year.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: May we know if the Government of India have at all taken up the matter at the diplomatic level?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was this question ever taken up by the Indian Government at the diplomatic level with the Chinese Government?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: All these dealings are at the diplomatic level. There is no other level.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: That we know. But what we want to know now is, since there is only the diplomatic level, whether this matter was at all taken up at that level?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I don't quite understand. All this is the result of taking it up. I am giving a reply to the question and it is not as if out of my head I can produce the answer to the question.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: What is the definition of a closed territory?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: A territory which is not open.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: That is a negative definition.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I may add a few facts. This Consulate-General was opened in December 1948, that is to say, at the time the Nationalist Government of China was functioning in China and had some kind of a vague control over Tibet. After the Consulate was opened there, in October 1949, that is to say, ten months later, the Nationalist Government gave place to the People's Government of China and after that the question arose about these Consulates, not only this Consulate but other Consulates also. One of the first decisions taken was that our Government should ask for a Consulate at Shanghai which is important, and the Chinese Government asked for a Consulate at Calcutta.