

12.17 hrs.

## MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

**Secretary:** Sir, I have to report the following Messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

- (1) 'In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Special Marriage (Amendment) Bill, 1963, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st January, 1963.'
- (2) 'In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Limitation Bill, 1963, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st January, 1963.'
- (3) 'In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Delhi Rent Control (Amendment) Bill, 1963, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd January, 1963.'

—

12.17½ hrs.

## BILLS LAID ON THE TABLE, AS PASSED BY RAJYA SABHA

**Secretary:** Sir, I lay on the Table of the House the following Bills, as passed by Rajya Sabha:—

- (1) The Special Marriage (Amendment) Bill, 1963.
- (2) The Limitation Bill, 1963.
- (3) The Delhi Rent Control (Amendment) Bill, 1963.

—

12.18 hrs.

## MOTION RE. COLOMBO CONFERENCE PROPOSALS

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Prime Minister.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :** प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर । प्रधान मंत्री जी यह प्रस्ताव रखने जा रहे हैं मैं उनसे पहले ही अपना प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर उठाता चाहता हूँ ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** उनसे पहले यह नहीं हो सकता ।

**श्री र.म. सेवक यादव :** मैं इसलिए पहले अपना प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर रखना चाहता हूँ कि यह प्रस्ताव सही नहीं जा सकता ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** जिन वक्ता वह सब लोगें उन वक्ता में आपको बहुत दुःख कि आप अपना प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर रखें, इस वक्ता नहीं ।

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the proposals of the Conference of six non-aligned Nations held at Colombo between the 10th and 12th of December, 1962, with the clarifications given by the Delegations of Ceylon, U.A.R. and Ghana in the meetings with the Prime Minister of India and his colleagues on the 12th and 13th of January, 1963 laid on the Table of the House on the 21st January, 1963 be taken into consideration."

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन है कि नवम्बर में इस माननीय सदन ने इस आशय का प्रस्ताव खड़े हो कर पारित किया था कि जब तक चीनी हमारे देश की पवित्र भूमि के एक एक इंच से खदेड़ नहीं दिए जाते तब तक हम संघर्ष जारी रखेंगे, चाहे वह जितना लम्बा और कठिन हो और

## [श्री राम सेवक यादव]

इस प्रस्ताव को जब हम पारित कर चुके हैं तो उस प्रस्ताव के रहते हुए, यह जो कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव है, और जो उसके बिल्कुल विपरीत जाता है, नहीं आ सकता। मेरा विनम्र निवेदन है कि यह प्रस्ताव उसके विपरीत है इसलिए इसको यहाँ पेश नहीं किया जा सकता।

**श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर)**  
मुझे भी कुछ बहना है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यह कोई डिस्कशन नहीं है। एक प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठाया गया है, उसका जवाब दिया जाएगा।

पालियामेंट एक फैमला ने चुकी है। और अब जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब प्रस्ताव रखने जा रहे हैं वह इसलिए कि यहाँ पालियामेंट इस पर गौर करे। अभी उन्होंने कुछ कहा नहीं, बतलाया नहीं कि क्या होगा। पालियामेंट को पूरा हक है कि वह अपनी किसी फैसले में तबदीली करे। अभी तक तो तबदीली का सवाल ही नहीं है। मगर अगर पालियामेंट तबदीली करना भी चाहे तो उसको हक है। इसमें कोई चीज ऐसी नहीं है कि जो पालियामेंट के सामने पेश नहीं की जा सकती। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह नहीं कहा कि मैं बदलता हूँ या मैं कोई तबदीली पेश करता हूँ या और कोई चीज लाता हूँ। उन्होंने यही कहा है कि मैं इसको कंसीडर करने के लिए पालियामेंट के सामने रखता हूँ। तो पालियामेंट को हक है कि वह मोचे और गौर करे या उसने पहले जो फैसला दिया है उस पर गौर करे। जो चीज पालियामेंट के सामने रखी जाएगी उस पर वह विचार कर सकती है और फैसला दे सकती है। तो आखिरी फैसला पालियामेंट का ही होगा। इस प्रस्ताव में कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं है जो पहले प्रस्ताव के खिलाफ हो।

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** आज के अखबार में आया है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने इन प्रिंसिपल

कोलम्बो प्रोजेक्ट को स्वीकृति दे दी है। अगर यह सही है तो फिर इस पर विचार करना फिजूल है। पहले प्रधान मंत्री साहब यह कहें कि उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं कहा।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** पहले आप उनकी स्पीच तो सुनिये कि वह क्या कहना चाहते हैं।

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** पहले आप तो मेरी बात सुन लीजिए।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैंने आपकी बात सुनी और तब कहा कि आप उनकी स्पीच सुन लीजिए।

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** मैंने अभी खत्म नहीं किया है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अगर आप दो घंटे तक खत्म नहीं करेंगे तो यह बात कब तक चलती रहेगी। आपने जो कहा था उसका जवाब मैंने दे दिया। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जब लीडर बोलते हैं तो फिर दूसरे मेम्बर क्या कहना चाहते हैं।  
I will ask the hon. Member to resume his seat now.

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** मैंने उसका दूसरा पहलू भी आपके सामने रखा जो कि अखबार में आ गया है। आपने कहा कि पालियामेंट का जो निश्चय था उसमें कोई तबदीली नहीं हुई है तो मेरा कहना यह है कि पालियामेंट ने जो राय रखी थी उसके भीतर ही इस बीच में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कुछ कर दिया है जो कि पालियामेंट के उस निश्चय के खिलाफ है। इसके लिए उनको इस पालियामेंट में माफ़ी मांगनी चाहिए क्योंकि पालियामेंट ने जो निश्चय किया है उसके खिलाफ उन्होंने कुछ किया है.....  
(Interruptions)

**Mr. Speaker:** If hon. Members will only allow me to deal with the hon.

Members who stand up, then probably we might proceed more quickly. The hon. Prime Minister.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक निवेदन यह है कि श्री आपने कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी उस फैसले के खिलाफ कोई निर्णय लेने नहीं जा रहे हैं, उस पर कोई निश्चय नहीं करने जा रहे हैं और पार्लियामेंट को हक है कि वह अपने पुराने निर्णय को बदल सकती है तो यह पुराने निर्णय को बदलने का भी प्रस्ताव नहीं है। इसका मतलब यह है कि १४ नवम्बर का प्रस्ताव हमारा जहां था वही पर है। इसमें तो हमारे इस कथन में कि प्रधान मंत्री जी को मौजूदा प्रस्ताव पर विचार नहीं होना चाहिए और भी शक्ति आ जाती है।

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Prime Minister.

**Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar):** What is the decision on that point?

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no point; hence there is no decision.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should like to refer to some recent events which no doubt are in the minds—

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, विषयान्तर। चूंकि यह महत्वपूर्ण विषय है और प्रधान मंत्री जी को बड़ी अच्छी हिन्दी आती है इसलिए उन्हें अंग्रेजी में अपना भाषण न कर हिन्दी में करना चाहिए।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आइए, आइए।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (कर्नाल) :** मेरी प्रार्थना सुन लें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं आपकी प्रार्थना तब सुनूँ जब आप कोई नई बात कहते हों। हमेशा खड़े होकर आप वही पुरानी हिन्दी में भाषण दें, कहते हैं। इसके अलावा और आपको कुछ कहना नहीं होता है मैं सुनना नहीं चाहता मैं उनके लीडर से कहूँगा कि इस बात

को बन्द होना चाहिए। हर दफे, हर रोज अगर यही चलेगा तो मैं नहीं सुनूँगा।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** जब तक यहां हिन्दी में नहीं बोलेंगे यह जरूर रहेगा। आखिर इसका मतलब क्या हुआ? जब देश की राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी है और जब हम हिन्दी में भाषण देने के लिए आवाज उठाते हैं तो आप हिन्दी को दबाना चाहते हैं? अगर आपकी यही नीति है तो आप हिन्दी को कैसे ला सकेंगे?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अगर माननीय सदस्य नहीं बैठेंगे तो मुझे हिन्दी को तो नहीं लेकिन उनको जरूर दबाना पड़ेगा।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** आप मुझे नहीं दबा सकते यह तो मेरे साथ हिन्दी को दबाना है।

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member must resume his seat.

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** हिन्दी को नहीं दबाना है तो फिर हिन्दी को बुलवा दीजिये।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप बैठेंगे या नहीं?

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी हिन्दी, अंग्रेजी दोनों भाषाओं में बोलें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यह प्राइम मिनिस्टर और हर एक मंत्री की अपनी मर्जी है कि दोनों भाषाओं में से जिस भाषा में वह बोलना चाहे, बोल सकता है। इस वक्त पोजीशन यही है।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** मैं भी प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि हिन्दी में बोलें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब मैं मंत्री साहब का नाम लूँगा कि वह इस हाउस की वाक्यांश कार्यवाही में बाधा डाल रहे हैं और इसके आगे जो कार्यवाही होगी वह फिर आयेंगी।

## Proposals

**श्री राम सेबक यादव :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन आपके जगिण प्रभान मंत्री जी से है और वह यह है कि प्रभान मंत्री जी एक बार भिन्नरी पार्लियामेंट में दोनों भाषाओं में बोलें थे और जैसा कि स्वामी जी का कहना है वह महत्वपूर्ण विषय है, उनके भी समझान का प्रयास है और लखों और करोड़ों देशवासियों को समझाना है इसलिए प्रभान मंत्री जी उस अवसर पर दोनों भाषाओं में बोलें। अंग्रेजी में भी बोलें और हिन्दी में भी बोलें।

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Prime Minister.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Sir, on the last occasion Parliament discussed this question of Chinese aggression on the 10th of December, 1962 and expressed approval of the measures and policy adopted by Government to meet the situation resulting from the invasion of India by China. Since then a number of events have taken place which I should like to mention to the House.

On the 15th December, the Consulates-general of India and China in the respective countries were closed. The withdrawal of Chinese forces from the NEFA area continued during this period. There were, however, reports of violation of the unilateral cease-fire by the Chinese army. 716 sick and wounded Indian soldiers and 13 dead bodies of prisoners were returned by the Chinese forces. On the 17th December Mr. G. S. Peiris, envoy of Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, brought the Colombo Conference proposals to New Delhi and handed them over to the Prime Minister.

A joint communique was issued by Pakistan and China on complete agreement in principle in regard to the alignment of their border on 26th December, 1962.

China and Mongolia signed a border treaty in Peking on the 26th December 1962.

Premier Chou En-lai sent a reply dated 30th December 1962 to Prime Minister's letter of December 1, 1962.

Prime Minister's reply to Premier Chou En-lai's letter of 30th December, 1962 was sent on January 1, 1963.

Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike visited Peking from 31st December to 8th January.

Ghana Delegation led by Mr. Kofi Asante Ofori-Atta, Minister of Justice, arrived on 9th January in Delhi.

Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike arrived in New Delhi on 10th January.

The U.A.R. Delegation led by Mr. Ali Sabry arrived in Delhi on 12th January.

Discussions with the three delegations took place on 12th and 13th January 1963.

A joint communique was issued at New Delhi on 13th January.

The Chinese forces started withdrawing from 10th December, 1962. The latest position of Chinese withdrawals and restoration of civil administration is as follows in NEFA:

**Kameng Frontier Division:** Political Officer reached Tawang on 21st January, Adviser arrived on 22nd January.

**Subansari Frontier Division:** Chinese are reported to have withdrawn from all areas. We have not received reports about the reoccupation by us of Limeking, Naba and Taksing. The delay may be due to the fact that bridges to Limeking and Taksing have been destroyed or washed away.

**Siang Frontier Division:** Chinese are reported to have withdrawn from all areas and civil administration has been restored in Manigong and Mechuka. Tuting remained in our possession throughout.

**Lohit Frontier Division:** Walong has been re-occupied. A patrol sent from there found the Chinese near Thochu stream within our territory near Kibithoo. Restoration of civil

administration in Kibithoo has been deferred until the complete withdrawal of the Chinese from the area.

Indian administration has not yet been extended to areas between Tawang and the frontier, and in the Kibithoo area along the frontier as the Chinese have not fully withdrawn from these areas.

We have repeatedly stated in this House in answer to the Chinese proposals that we were unable to enter into any talks or discussions with them so long as the Chinese did not agree at least to the restoration of the *status quo* prior to their aggression since the 8th September, 1962. The whole House expressed its agreement on this. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Kishan Pattnayak:** On a point of order, Sir. The Parliament has never agreed to this proposal.

**Mr. Speaker:** What is the point of order in this?

**Shri Priya Gupta:** He is making a wrong statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** He can correct it when he speaks. He will have that opportunity. There is no point of order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The Chinese proposals first came on the 24th October, which we rejected. In rejecting them, we had stated then that we can only consider any relevant proposal when the position which existed on 7th September, 1962 was restored. That has come up before the House repeatedly. (*Interruptions*)

**Shri Priya Gupta:** It is imposed upon us.

**Mr. Speaker:** It cannot be imposed if he has the freedom to say something and he goes on saying in spite of... (*Interruptions*). Order, order.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** I am sorry, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** What the Members object to is that there was no mention about the line or the situation on the

8th of September in the resolution which the Parliament adopted.

**An Hon. Member:** No, not at all.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It was not mentioned because the question had not arisen. The resolution of November stands and must stand; there is no question of one's going behind it.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Then do not get irritated.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. If he cannot contain himself, then I will have to help him.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Thank you, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** Should I? Does the want that I should assist him in that?

**Shri Priya Gupta:** No. He gets irritated, that is what I submitted to you.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will only ask the Leader of the Party...

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** I am sorry, Sir, for what has happened.

**Mr. Speaker:** That expression of being sorry has been expressed so many times by the hon. Member.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** I hope he will bear in mind, certainly, all that has happened to-day and in future he will act as any disciplined Member of our party in the House will do.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you. I expect this from the leaders at least.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I was recounting, Sir, the course of events in the last few weeks, and I venture to say—it may be that an hon. Member may not agree with what I say, but I think it is a correct recount—that we passed a resolution in November and by that the House was undoubtedly bound till the House said something else. I do not think any occasion has arisen for us to consider even that that resolution should be changed in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

any respect. That resolution dealt with how this problem should be settled finally, and our position is exactly the same.

Then, as I said, firstly, on the 24th October the Chinese made a proposal called the "three-point proposal". To that proposal we did not agree and we said then that we cannot consider this even as a temporary matter, that is, even for purposes of discussing it, not for the purpose of putting aside the November resolution but for the purpose of discussing it, till the position of the 8th September is restored. That was the position. That came up repeatedly before this House, and it is perfectly true, if the hon. Member wants to lay stress on it, that that point was not formally adopted by resolution by this House. But there are many things which happen in this House, which are stated in this House and stated repeatedly with regard to Government policy and which are then admitted as the Government's policy. My point is that the November resolution was not in any sense affected by subsequent happenings; it remains still and it will remain. The position taken in this House repeatedly, and also on the last occasion when this was discussed, was that we cannot consider this matter and discuss it with the Chinese Government until the position on the 8th September is restored. That has been the position. Therefore, subsequent happenings have to be considered by us on that basis.

Now, Sir, when we met last time on the 10th December and discussed this, the Colombo Conference was at the point of meeting or was meeting that very day. It was to have met on 1st December, but then it was postponed and it met on the 10th December—10th, 11th, 12th or thereabouts—and this House happened to meet and discuss this question. Then we did not know what the Colombo proposals were going to be. But we know that they were meeting and a

reference was made to it in the course of the debate. A reference was also made by us, on behalf of the Government, to the effect that we can only consider this matter after the position on 8th September is restored.

Well, the Colombo Conference met and put forward some proposals. They went to Peking—some of their representatives—and then later came to Delhi. Their proposals as originally framed were not clear in regard to one or two matters and were liable to one or two different interpretations. So the first thing we did when they came to us was to ask them to clarify their proposals and to make us understand exactly what they were so that they might avoid any misinterpretation or different interpretations, and it was only when they had done that would we be in a position to express our opinion in regard to them.

In considering that matter the issue before us then was how far these were in conformity with what we had said repeatedly, that the position prior to 8th September be restored. Also, it must be remembered that it was stated all along that any response that we may give or the Government of the People's Republic of China may give to it or any steps we may take in regard to their proposals would not prejudice in the slightest the position of either of the two Governments as regards their conception of the final alignment of the frontier.

The whole purpose of this exercise was to create a situation when something could be considered by the two parties. Before creating that situation, I repeat, we had said that something should be done, that is, the Chinese should vacate the aggression they had indulged in after 7th September. There is no question, therefore, of our going behind or varying in the slightest the resolution passed by this House in November.

The merits of the dispute were not considered by the Colombo countries or any other. It was only to pave the way for discussion between the representatives of both the parties and, as I said, we can only discuss them if certain conditions were created and certain aggression committed by the Chinese was vacated.

Now, these proposals as explained and amplified by them in answer to our questions related to these three sectors; the western, middle and eastern sectors of our border. In regard to the eastern sector the position prior to the 8th September was that the Chinese forces were to the north of the international boundary and the Indian forces were to the south of this boundary—that is, what is normally called the McMahon Line for facility; it is not named McMahon Line officially nor did Mr. McMahon, or whatever his title was, lay down that. He recognised it as the existing boundary. Therefore, I refer to it as McMahon Line for facility. The boundary is said to be the high ridge of the Himalayas there and it continues into Burma. In fact, the Chinese Government has recognised this boundary of the high ridge in Burma. So, before the 8th September no Chinese forces elements had come across that boundary there except—there is one exception in Longju, as the House well knows, Longju being a village just on the frontier. In regard to this the position that was taken some time ago was that for the present nobody, neither party, should occupy it. The Chinese had forcibly occupied it previously and later it was suggested that neither party should occupy it. The Colombo Conference proposals, as clarified by the visiting delegations, confirm this position except as regards the Thag La ridge area, which the Chinese call Chadong area, where we have a border post known as the Dhola post. The Colombo proposals and the clarifications refer to these areas Thag La Ridge and Longju, as "remaining areas arrangements in regard to which are to be settled between the Governments of India and

the People's Republic of China by direct discussion." That is to say, in regard to the Eastern sector, the 8th September position was, according to the Colombo Conference proposals, entirely restored, except in regard to Thag La Ridge area and the Dhola post. These are within three miles of the McMahon line. About this the Colombo proposals stated that this matter may be left undecided. They left it to the parties to decide by direct discussion. That is the position, so far as the eastern sector is concerned.

With regard to the middle sector, the Colombo Conference proposals required the *status quo* to be maintained and neither side should do anything to disturb the *status quo*. This conforms to the Government of India's position that the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962 should be restored as there has been no conflict in this area and the existing situation has not been disturbed.

Coming to the western sector, i.e. Ladakh sector, the restoration of the *status quo* as it obtained prior to 8th September would result in re-establishment of all the Indian posts shown in blue in the maps circulated to members. We have circulated a large number of maps to hon. Members as well as the Colombo conference. Therefore, I am not reading them out because they have already obtained enough publicity. If we went back to the 8th September position in the western sector, this would have resulted in the re-establishment of all the Indian posts shown in blue in the maps circulated to Members. This will also mean that the Chinese will maintain the old Chinese posts at the locations shown in red in the same map. The Colombo Conference proposes that a 20 kilometre area will be cleared by the withdrawal of Chinese forces, and this area is to be administered by civilian posts of both sides, Indian and Chinese. The House will observe that this area which is to be administered by civilian posts

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

on both sides covers the entire area in which Indian posts existed prior to the 8th September except for two or three posts to the west of Sumdo. On the other hand, the 20-kilometre withdrawal by the Chinese forces entails the Chinese forces going several kilometres beyond the international boundary in the region of Spanggur and further south. The Colombo Conference proposals and the clarifications thus satisfy the demand made for the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September. The slight variation is about two or three Indian posts west of Sumdo. This is, however, compensated by Chinese withdrawals in the region of Spanggur and further south; also, by the fact that many Chinese military posts have to be removed from the withdrawal area. If hon. Members consider this matter with the help of maps, they will observe that this position, as indicated by the Colombo Conference proposals, has certain advantages over the one which we had previously indicated, that is, the restoration of the 8th September position. In the 8th September position the Chinese were there in strength, in very large strength, in that area and we had also some posts. In that particular area it was obviously much to the advantage of the Chinese, because of their large strength etc. Now, if this Colombo Conference proposal is accepted in regard to the western sector, it removes the Chinese strength from that sector and makes that sector a demilitarised area, with our posts as well as Chinese posts, by agreements being civil posts, in equal number with equal number of people and similarity of arms. It would be civil arm, police arm or small arm. This, I think, is definitely better than the restoration of Chinese posts in that area in a big way with large arms.

On full consideration of these matters as contained in the Colombo Conference resolutions and their clarifications we came to the conclusion that these proposals fulfilled the essence

of the demand made for a restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September. I, thereupon, sent a letter to the Ceylon Prime Minister, stating that the Government of India accept in principle the Colombo Conference proposals in the light of the clarification given and will take further action to place them before the Indian Parliament for consideration before the Government of India can finally accept them.

I had told the Ceylon Prime Minister and her colleagues that we would like to know the attitude of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the Colombo Conference proposals and clarifications as this would facilitate the consideration of the proposals and the clarifications by our own Parliament. I have just this morning received a message from the Ceylon Prime Minister, conveying the Chinese attitude to the Colombo Conference proposals. The telegram from Mrs. Bandaranaike reads as follows:

"In response to my telegram of January 14th I have received today a reply from Prime Minister Chou En-lai. Prime Minister Chou En-lai has reiterated his earlier acceptance in principle of proposals of Colombo Conference as a preliminary basis for the meeting of Indian and Chinese officials to discuss the stabilisation of cease-fire and disengagement and to promote Sino-Indian boundary negotiations.

The Chinese Government however maintains two points of interpretation in their memorandum that I handed over to you but they hope that difference in interpretation between the Chinese and Indian sides will not prevent the speedy holding of talks between the Indian and Chinese officials. They hope these differences will be resolved in their talks."

Perhaps hon. Members may have seen yesterday the report of what was



stated by the Chinese Foreign Minister, Marshal Chen Yi more or less to this effect; that is to say, while they repeat that they have accepted the Colombo Conference proposals in principle, they raise some vital matters in which they differ from them. It is obvious that the Chinese Government do not accept the Colombo Conference proposals as "a definite basis providing conditions for the acceptance of both parties", nor do they accept the Colombo proposals and the clarifications given by the three Colombo Conference delegations who visited Delhi. The Chinese Government maintain certain points of their own interpretation of the Colombo proposals. This obviously means that they have not accepted the Colombo proposals as a whole. We on our part are, however, clear that there can be no talks and discussions between officials as stated in the Colombo Conference proposals to settle the points left for decision by direct discussions between the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China by the Colombo Conference, unless the Government of the People's Republic of China accept in to the Colombo Conference proposals and their clarifications.

I should like to call the attention of the House to this fact that the Colombo Conference was, of course, held not at our instance. In fact, the Conference was organised and people were invited without any reference to us except when this fact was decided upon. Then the Ceylon Government was good enough to inform us that this was being done by the Prime Minister of Ceylon. Thereafter, in regard to these things, we have communicated with the Ceylon Government and not with the Chinese Government. Throughout this period we have not conferred with the Chinese Government in regard to the Colombo proposals. It is for the Chinese Government to communicate with Colombo and for Colombo to tell us, or for us to communicate to the Ceylon Government and for them to tell the Chinese.

So, now it is fairly clear from what Marshal Chen Yi has said and from the message received by us through the Prime Minister of Ceylon, it appears that the Chinese Government have not accepted the Colombo proposals in regard to certain important matters. Therefore there has not been any acceptance *in toto*. The Government of India, therefore, cannot decide about doing anything unless the position is quite clear. But we have to decide and we have to say something definite in regard to the Colombo proposals. Whether they lead to any further steps in the direction of talks with the Chinese Government depends upon the Chinese Government accepting them.

The Government of India have always maintained that they are in favour of settling differences by peaceful talks and discussions. In spite of the massive Chinese aggression they were prepared to undertake talks and discussions in regard to the differences between India and The People's Republic of China in one or several stages as may be necessary. I even mentioned in this House previously that we would be perfectly prepared to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice or to arbitration if it is agreed to. Anyhow, we were perfectly prepared to follow any peaceful method for the solution of this matter provided that the conditions for such discussions arise and the basis for these talks is created.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : श्रीमती भण्डार-  
नायके के कहने में ही बाधा थी करनी थी  
तो पहले ही कर ली होती। चीनियों  
हजार आदमियों को बन्धन क्यों किया ?  
चीनियों को सीमा में बाहर धकेल दो  
कह कर आप विरोध को चले गये थे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं तो हैरान हो  
गया कि स्वामी जी सब कुछ समझ सकते  
हैं।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** We have  
always been willing and are willing

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

to take to peaceful methods for the solution of any dispute provided the conditions for such talks are created. We had pointed out repeatedly that the conditions would be created by their vacating the new aggression that they had indulged in since the 8th September. When we made that proposal first in October the Chinese Government did not respond to it. Subsequently they added to their own proposal the fact of their unilateral withdrawal and a cease-fire. Now the Colombo Conference powers have put forward their own proposals which essentially bring about the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September. We indicated our acceptance in principle of these proposals and their clarifications to the Ceylon Prime Minister without any attempt to vary them or make exceptions to them, because we felt that these proposals have either to be accepted as a whole or rejected. Any attempt to accept them in part will mean a rejection of them as a whole. We feel, therefore, that both the Governments concerned must express their willingness to accept these proposals and clarifications *in toto* before the next stage of settling the remaining issues left for decision by the two Governments can be taken in direct talks and discussions. That is the position we have taken up and I submit to the House that that would be the correct position. I trust that the House agrees with this approach to the question, so that we may proceed on this basis.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

An Hon. Member: Shame!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is ashamed of something. He need not shout out his shame here ..... (Interruption).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह वह कह रहे हैं जो घबराकर कहते हैं कि हम अंग्रेजी नहीं समझ सकते हैं।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : गलती से कह दिया गया...

श्री राम सेवक यादव : चीन और भारत की समस्या से ज्यादा महत्व अंग्रेजी का है, आपके लिहाज से ?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Therefore to put it succinctly, the position before us is that, firstly, we cannot have any kind of talks, even preliminary talks, unless we are satisfied that the condition we had laid down about the 8th September, 1962 position being restored, is met; secondly, even if it is met and even if talks take place, they have to be about various preliminary matters. Then they may lead to other matters. On no account, at the present moment or in these preliminary matters, do we consider the merits of the case. They are not changed.

When we asked for the restoration of the 8th September line, that had nothing to do with our accepting that line as a settlement; of course, not.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को समस्याओं पर तो बहुत गुस्सा आ जाता है लेकिन चीन पर नहीं आता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप जो कह रहे हैं, मैं तो समझ रहा हूँ। मगर जो दूसरी तरफ से कहा जाता है वह भी आप समझियें। आप समझियें कि आप पार्लियामेंट में हैं और यहाँ मौरियम मामलों को कमिडर कर रहे हैं। यहाँ कोई बाहर का जलगा नहीं है। बार बार आप रकबट न डालें आप मुनें। आपको हक होगा, जो कुछ आप कहना चाहते हैं, कहने का जब आप बोलेंगे.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : हमें कौन बोलने देगा?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप अपने लीडर को कहिये कि वह आपका नाम भेजे और

इसको आप अपने लीडर पर छोड़ दीजिये। अगर वह नहीं आपका नाम भेजते हैं, तो छोड़ दीजिये उन पार्टी को।

**Shri Bade (Khargone):** How can the Chair request the hon. Member to leave the Party? That is objectionable.

**An Hon. Member:** It is a suggestion for action.

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं इसलिए कह सकता हूँ कि वह कहते हैं कि मुझे बोलने का कोई नहीं देगा। आप जानते हैं...

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** आप नहीं बोलने देंगे।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मुझे अफसोस है कि विज्ञापन पार्टी का ऐसी बात कहता है। जो नाम विज्ञापन भेजेगा, उसीको तो मैं बुलाऊंगा। अगर वह इजाजत नहीं देता है तो मेरा क्या काम है।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** जो अनुकूल बोलेगा उसको तो बोलने दिया जाएगा और जो प्रतिकूल बोलेगा, उनको धक्के मार निकाल दिया जाएगा।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** जो बार-बार इस तरह से खड़ा होता है, उसको भी नहीं बोलने दूंगा।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** बहुत मुन चुके हैं मध्यन्याय की कथा।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I regret, Sir, that this matter that we are discussing which, as the whole House realises, is one of high importance not only in the present but for the future also, should be reduced occasionally to a very much lower level by these interruptions.

I submit that the present question, although this is a complicated matter and we have to consider it in all its

aspects and it may have far-reaching results, first of all, is that in keeping fully with the Resolution that we passed in November—that is a Resolution passed in all seriousness and in all determination; and we are determined to carry it out however long it may take and however it may end—and realising that, anything that happens in between will be governed by that Resolution. Certainly, we have often said, and I hope that we shall continue saying it and acting accordingly, that our basic policy is of adopting and pursuing peaceful methods, and at the same time to maintain our determination to preserve our freedom and integrity. These are basic policies. I do not think that there is any conflict between them; there should be none. But some people...

13 hrs.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** After changing the definition of freedom and integrity.

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir):** We seek your guidance, Sir. It is very difficult for us to follow what is happening here, if every time there are interruptions like this.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** Interruptions are also part of the proceedings.

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** May I submit that the foreign affairs debates have been conducted by us with great dignity in the past? It is not quite fair to interrupt the hon. Prime Minister in this fashion.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** अगर हम इस नीति में अपनी जमीन खो दें तो यह हम को पसन्द नहीं है।

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Interruptions are relevant. I do not think that all interruptions are taboo.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Therefore, the present question before us is to be viewed in this context, first of all,

## Proposals

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

our firm determination to carry out what we have said in our November resolution, our firm determination; at the same time, we cannot, I feel, reject any peaceful method; in fact, we should definitely pursue peaceful methods where they do not come in the way of our firm determination, in the way of our integrity and freedom, in the way of anything that is honourable to India.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Determined to violate.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Some hon. Members perhaps do not agree with our general outlook, to preserve and to carry on with peaceful methods. It is open to them to disagree. But I think that that has been our policy for a long time and I do not think that that policy should be interfered with. Otherwise our policy is a useless one, and that policy becomes one of. . .

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** It has been useless, and it has been proved.

**Mr. Speaker:** Every word that is being uttered should be listened to and appreciated, so that all the implications may be studied by the hon. Members when they have to make speeches; instead of that, if they make interruptions, they miss certain words and then perhaps shout or interrupt, without fully realising what the implications would be. I would rather request them to listen patiently, to see what it means and then to reply in the debate. That would be much better.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Thank you.

What I was venturing to say was this. I was not saying anything against any Member or any party. I was venturing to say that there are two basic policies, or rather two aspects of the same policy that we pursue and we have always pursued. One is to pursue peaceful methods for the solution of anything; and we think that such peaceful methods should be applied everywhere; we have said so repeatedly, and when we tell others to do so, we cannot obviously reject

them because then we are hypocrites. But the second part that we must preserve, and we must be determined to preserve, our freedom and integrity is an equally important part. In fact, I was saying in regard to the first part, that is, peaceful methods, that if it is demonstrated that they do not preserve our freedom and integrity, then they have failed in their purpose. We have to take them, because in any event, the objective is to preserve our freedom and integrity. But if there are any aggressors, as there are today, we push them out of India, to preserve this freedom and integrity. Therefore, we have taken such steps, and we are taking steps to strengthen our Army or our Defence Forces, our economic position and all that for that purpose, and we shall continue to strengthen them, because, apart from the fact that if some such, preliminary talks take place, they are very preliminary and nobody can say whether they will lead to anything or not, I regret to say that we find it very very difficult to believe in the *bona fides* of the Chinese Government. Nevertheless, whether one believes in it or not, one has to deal with people, because if you believed in it, then all would be well; therefore, we have to pursue certain methods.

And I do submit that keeping all this, that is, keeping this close that we are going to continue strengthening ourselves to the best of our ability and proclaiming what we said in our November resolution that we shall never submit to coercion and military pressure, yet, we cannot rule out peaceful methods of approach, and that is right not in the moral sense only but even in a diplomatic sense in a political sense, because the world is rather tired of the attitude that sometimes nations take up of solving difficulties by military means, by military coercion.

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** We are not sure that the Chinese are tired of these methods.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is the reason why the Chinese aggression has created a great deal of opposition in the world. There is no doubt about it. A large part of the world, even many persons who normally would approve of what they do, many countries, I mean, have objected to it; they have criticised it in a lower measure or a higher key; that is a different matter. Anyhow we who have stood for such methods, peaceful methods, cannot possibly say that peaceful methods are bad; we can say and we shall be justified in saying that we tried peaceful methods, but they did not achieve the results hoped for, and, therefore, we have to adopt other methods. We are not rejecting other methods; we are preparing for other methods, but we cannot reject them, and, therefore, we have to consider any approach at the present moment, not by the Chinese Government but by other countries, other countries which are friends of ours, and we have to give it every consideration, and it would be bad both from the point of view of our policy and from the point of view of any diplomatic approach to this problem for us to treat the approach of these friendly countries without due consideration.

And I do submit that we are not, I would repeat, we are not at the present moment dealing with what position China takes up or not, as I have stated; the present position of the Chinese Government is, as far as I can see, one of rejection of the proposals of the Colombo Conference as a whole. We are, therefore, dealing with the Colombo proposals and ourselves, what our reaction is, not the Chinese, and I do submit that these Colombo proposals fulfil the test we have laid down of restoring the position as it was on the 7th of September. They do not fully do that, I admit, as I have said; in two or three matters, they do not, but while they do not do so there, in other matters, they go a little beyond it in our favour, and on the whole, I think that it is a mat-

ter, an adequate matter, for favourable consideration.

I would submit that we cannot take any step unilaterally in this matter, because it is for the Chinese Government to do so also, but so far as we are concerned, I have to reply to the Ceylon Prime Minister, and I wish to tell her and the Colombo Conference people that we agree to their proposals with the clarifications that they have given us because that is important, because it is those clarifications to which the Chinese Government has objected or some factors that flow out of these clarifications. I want to say that, and I trust that I shall have the approval of the House to say that to her.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** I wish to seek a clarification.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let me place the motion before the House first.

**Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur):** Before you place the motion before the House, I would like to ask one question by way of clarification. What is the next step to be taken after we finish our discussion? Is that step to be taken by the Colombo Conference or by the Chinese Government?

**Shri Tyagi:** May I also put my question?

**Mr. Speaker:** These are things that will be made clear in speeches. The Prime Minister will reply at the end. If all the clarifications are sought now, what else is left for discussion?

**Shri Tyagi:** It is not an argument. I only want a clarification so that whatever is said may be after knowing that.

In the papers we have read today, there is a news item about this. *The Hindustan Times* today carries an AP news item emanating from Colombo saying that 'China objects to a suggestion by the six Colombo Powers that a demilitarised zone in the Ladakh sector of the disputed Sino-Indian border be jointly policed by Indians and Chinese.' This is attri-

## Proposals

[Shri Tyagi]

buted to a reliable source. It is further mentioned:

"The Chinese objection was incorporated in a memorandum from the Chinese which Ceylon Premier Sirimavo Bandaranaike delivered to New Delhi, the source said".

If this is so, I wanted to know whether it has been received or not.

**Mr. Speaker:** Was this the one that the hon. Prime Minister referred to?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** No, no. Dr. M. S. Aney asked, what is the next step, that is, I take it, in regard to these matters. In regard to these matters, the first step, before the matter comes up for consideration and the next step, is for the two Governments to approve *in toto* the Colombo proposals. Having approved of them, then the question may arise of implementing those proposals in the areas in question. That will mean some of our officials or military officers going there and reporting that they have been implemented, or if there is any doubt, refer it to us. After all that is done, the question may arise or representatives of the Chinese and Indian Governments considering the matter on the merits.

As for what the hon. Member, Shri Tyagi, said, that is perfectly correct, that the Chinese are objecting to various things. In the message which I read out—the telegram which Mr. Chou En-lai has sent to Prime Minister Bandaranaike—he has rather toned it down. But I believe the Chinese Government objects to several important things, one of them being this, about this area which was to be demilitarised. There was no message to us, but he had written about this to the Prime Minister of Ceylon just as she was leaving Peking. She showed us his letter. We did not get a letter either from her or from him. But she showed us a letter which Prime Minister

Chou En-lai written to her—either he wrote it or Marshal Chen Yi wrote it, I am not sure; it was one of them—in which certain points were stated which were not in keeping with the Colombo proposals, which were opposed to them.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** On a point of clarification. Have the Prime Minister of Ceylon and the other members of the Colombo Conference which made this recommendation assured us that the Chinese will not resume aggression? If not, what next?

**Mr. Speaker:** No assurance.

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** मुझे यह कहना है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने अभी पीसफुल मैच की बात कही। २० नवम्बर को प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने सदन को कहा था कि चाहे कुछ भी हो, जंग जारी रहेगी जब तक हम बिल्कुल जीत न लें, तो क्या प्राइम मिनिस्टर की जीत हो गयी ?

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the proposals of the Conference of six non-aligned Nations held at Colombo between the 10th and 12th of December, 1962, with the clarifications given by the Delegations of Ceylon, U.A.R. and Ghana in the meetings with the Prime Minister of India and his colleagues on the 12th and 13th of January, 1963, laid on the Table of the House on the 21st January, 1963, be taken into consideration."

There are also substitute motions.

**Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad):** I am not moving the substitute motion which standing in my name.

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur):** All the others whose names are mentioned there are also not moving it.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** कल मेरी जो लोगों से बात हुई थी उस पर मैंने