

Shri D. C. Sharma: Is it that our export promotion drives lose their momentum after about six months? What efforts are going to be made psychologically and otherwise to keep up this momentum throughout the Third Plan?

Shri Satish Chandra: The presumption of the hon. Member is not at all justified because in the year just passed i.e. 1959, we exported goods worth about Rs. 45 crores more than in the previous year.

Shri Basappa: May I know whether the World Bank Mission had expressed a pessimistic view of our export drive?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Yes, Sir; I have read it in the papers. I have not seen the actual report. It is for individuals or the different bodies to express their own opinion. But when I had met them I had told them that I did hope that we would be able to improve and increase our exports in the coming few years.

Chinese Trade Agency, Kalimpong

†
 *1681. { Shri Assar:
 Shri U. L. Patil:
 Shri Hem Barua:
 Shri P. G. Deb:
 Shri Arjun Singh Bhadauria:
 Shri Vajpayee:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that recently an Indian Police sentry posted outside the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong was attacked by Chinese inmates while he was doing his duty to arrest a suspicious character;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) whether any action has been taken by Government against these attacks?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) and (b). On the 19th January, 1960, when the sentry on duty at the

rear of the Trade Agency was questioning a person who desired entry, a Chinese official caught hold of his left arm and two other Chinese officials dragged the visitor inside.

(c) We have protested to the Chinese Embassy against the Chinese officials' interference with the sentry's performance of his official duty.

Shri Assar: In view of the fact that the members of the Chinese Embassy do not enjoy diplomatic immunity, may I know why no action has been taken against the Chinese officials?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I really do not know what action can be taken. We pointed out that it was all wrong because this man was posted for their safety and it was wrong of them to have interfered with him in the performance of his duties.

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, it is a serious incident. An Indian sentry has been manhandled on Indian soil. I want to know why the Government cannot arrest the Chinese officials who had dared to manhandle the Indian sentry on the Indian soil?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The Chinese have said in their protest that the sentry had pointed out his rifle at the visitor and that was why he was manhandled. . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Vajpayee: Are we to give credit to the Chinese protest? The question is why Government did not take any action against the Chinese officials.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister says that they have got a counter case.

Shri Vajpayee: They have no case; there is no case. . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Tyagi: In view of the latest information given by the Minister that our sentry is alleged to have pointed his rifle towards the Chinese, in that background, I want to know how our Government lodged a protest against China instead of submitting their apology to China. If the Government were convinced that their own man

was misbehaving, I think they ought to have submitted an apology rather than a protest.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: If you permit me, I will explain, Sir. There are two versions. The Chinese in their note of protest handed over to us on the 6th February, 1960 alleged that the sentry had raised his rifle to threaten the visitor to leave the Agency and that later three guards had appeared to prevent the Chinese visitor from entering the agency. They further stated that the local police officials apologised for the misunderstanding. We have denied all these things because our own version was very different. As I have pointed out, this man was a bean curd seller and he was coming to the Agency and was trying to enter by the back door and our sentry asked him to come by the front door and he tried to create an ugly scene and so all these things had happened.

Shri Tyagi: Shall I take it that the Government had not accepted the plea and their argument that our sentry had committed any excess? Is that the position?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: In our note on 4th of April, 1960 we rejected the Chinese allegations and stated that but for the exemplary behaviour of the sentry in the performance of his duties, an ugly incident might have occurred. We also took exception to the Chinese officials interfering with the sentry's performance of his official duties and pointed out that any communication by the Agency officials should be addressed only to the SDO at Kalimpong, and not conveyed to the sentries.

Shri Ranga: In view of the fact that no diplomatic privilege and other things are involved in this particular case, why is it that the ordinary machinery did not take charge? Whenever such complaints are made to the police, the police take charge of the case and arrest the culprits? Why has that procedure not been followed? Why did the Government intervene and lodge a protest and thus invite a

counter protest and so on? I would like to have an answer for this. Government need not have been brought into it at all.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: On a point of order. Interference with the duties of Government officials is a cognisable offence under Sections 332 and 353 IPC. So, when the offence is cognisable, why was it that a case was not registered? Have the Government enquired whether a case cannot be registered? . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Next question. Shri Raghunath Singh. . . (*Interruptions.*) Order, order. All that the hon. Members can do is to elicit information from the Government. Notwithstanding that, I have allowed some suggestions also. In some cases there may be an honest difference of opinion. I do not dispute it at all. But the Question Hour is not the time when hon. Members can press upon the Government to take some action. There are other methods. All hon. Members on this side know how to press upon the Government. Resolutions, discussions—many things can be done. How many questions can I allow by way of suggestion?

Shri Vajpayee: We moved an adjournment motion and that was ruled out. We moved a calling attention motion and that was not allowed. But, now you say all these things.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members know only adjournment motion. I have allowed this question and this question has been answered. If further they want to impress upon the Government that a particular action should be taken let them move for one hour discussion. I cannot say whether I am going to allow it or not. Anyhow, let them move and if I consider it is a matter of sufficient importance where the Government should take only one course, I shall consider. It may be considered a small matter. It is left to them. I am not in a position to consider these

things now. When that motion comes, I will consider.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, unless the Government orders that the case should not be registered, in the ordinary course of law it must have been registered. That is why I want to know whether Government interfered in this matter and asked the State Government not to register a case.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: We have already brought it to the notice of the Chinese Embassy, that it is a matter for reporting to the Sub-divisional Officer in Kalimpong. It is not certainly a matter for the External Affairs Ministry, but we went in because a protest was lodged by the Chinese Embassy.

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: Is there any diplomatic immunity?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I want to know whether the Chinese Embassy...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members including lawyers put questions which are very clear. If there had been any diplomatic immunity how can the S.D.O. take up the matter? That question was asked and it was said that it was a matter for reporting to the S.D.O.

Shri Tyagi: They only want the Ministry to act a little more boldly. *(Interruption).*

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If all hon. Members want to talk simultaneously I have no objection.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, may I put one supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: No, Sir.

Shri Hem Barua: This is a different supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed enough supplementaries on this.

Export of Textiles

*1682. **Shri Raghunath Singh:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Indus-

219 (Ai) LSD—2.

try be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Professor Maria May, a West German fashion expert, who toured India on a mission to advise the Indian Government on measures to promote the export of Indian textiles to the Federal Republic of Germany, has submitted any report to the Government of India?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): Yes, Sir

Shri Raghunath Singh: May I know what are the main suggestions made for improvement of Indian exports of textiles?

Shri Kanungo: The suggestions made are: complete overhaul of the production patterns, new designs and study of the designs and patterns of importing countries.

Handloom Industry

†

*1683. { **Shri Tangamani:**
Shri Sampath:

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether any proposals have been received from the various State Governments for assistance to the handloom industry from the cess fund for the year 1960-61;

(b) the demand from the State of Madras in this regard; and

(c) the total amount sanctioned?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). At a meeting held between the representatives of the State Government, Planning Commission and this Ministry, it has been tentatively agreed that the ceiling of Central assistance to Madras State for the development of handloom industry during 1960-61 will be Rs. 103.58 lakhs (Rs. 25.40 lakhs as loan and Rs. 78.18 lakhs as grant).

Shri Tangamani: May I know whether at this meeting the Government of Madras demanded more for setting