

know what would be our feelings" (Interruptions) Let us put ourselves in their position

Mr Deputy-Speaker. Order, order

Shri Joachim Alva: All the same, we worship, and many of us worship, the Dalai Lama because we have great respect for him. Yet, India cannot be made the base of operations against China or any other friendly power. These are important facts. It is an irony of history if the Chinese are now the aggressors by having entered into the Niti Pass where then is real Niti? I do not know why the Chinese are not encouraging themselves by knocking out the British from Hong Kong and knocking out the Portuguese from Macao. Instead they worry their ancient friends in India?

These are very important considerations. We shall, today, not take any hasty decisions. The time of peace or war is a solemn one. It is all right for you to say "War! War!" But we should not want only throw away our brethren on those impassable and uninhabited Himalayan passes (Interruptions) will feel, and how the future generation will feel about it (Interruptions). These are serious considerations. With these words, I sit down.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Prime Minister

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura) I had very important things to say. It is a matter of the growing population of China, Japan and India. I am not given an opportunity to speak. I am leaving.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not been able to accommodate many groups, as hon Members know, and I hope the hon Members would appreciate my difficulty. The time is limited. Therefore, it was not possible for me to call every Member from every party.

Shri Vajpayee. I have given notice of a substitute motion. I represent an important view-point in this country. It was at my suggestion that the Government agreed to place the White Paper. It is not fair to me when no chance is given to me to speak. I would like to withdraw from the House.

(Raja Mahendra Pratap and Shri Vajpayee then left the House)

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this debate has brought out a large number of points and I should like to deal with many of them. Yet I feel that it would perhaps be better to lay stress on the highlights of this debate, if I may say so, rather than lose myself in a lot of detail.

The recent letter which I received from Premier Chou En-lai raises many points and naturally we shall have to reply to it after full consideration and not in a hurry, and that consideration is being given to it. I do not propose to deal with that letter here in this discussion, partly because this House does not require to be convinced of many of the things that perhaps Premier Chou En-lai might require to be told, and partly also because that would mean losing myself in a great deal of detail.

Now, first of all, let me take up one simple but very basic point that Shri Karni Singhji has raised. He made a rather remarkable statement that he believed in Panchsheel provided that it was with people whom you agreed with. That is really, if I may say so, a perfectly remarkable statement. 'I believe in being tolerant provided you agree with me. Otherwise, I will not knock your head'.— This is his idea of toleration and tolerance. This is his idea of Panchsheel. Some hon Members said: "We must stand on our own feet." Some other hon Members said: "You must seek the help of others." Well, people who say this seem to be, in spite of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

all their gallant language and brave behaviour, weak, timid, panicky and alarmist. That is not how a nation meets the challenge—looking around, seeing “How can anybody help me, who is going to help me?” How is anybody going to help you, if you are not strong enough to face the challenge? I say, let this be clearly understood. I as Prime Minister, and my Government, stand on it—that we will stick to our policy of non-alignment. We will stick to our policy call it what you like. It is not my policy, it is an axiomatic truth—the Panchsheel—whether we agree, or China does not agree, it is immaterial—it is an axiomatic position, I say. And I challenge anyone to show it is a wrong position. You may say “If somebody lies, you break his head.” That is a different matter. You may say “Oh, don’t tell the truth because the other fellow lies.” Is that your position?

Some of the observations made this afternoon here, I venture to say were quite extraordinary, even in excitement. I can understand a measure of excitement, even warm feeling and a desire that no one should touch or sully the honour of India, the integrity of India, the self-respect of India—I can understand all that. But Dr Ram Subhag Singh’s talk about bombing hillmen in the mountains seems to show that he has lost his balance and there is no balance left. He neither understands bombing, nor mountains, nor human beings, nor anything. It is only an exhibition of petulant excitement and anger. And if this country is going to behave in petulant excitement and anger, how would it face a crisis? Is this Parliament going to behave in this way? It is a most extraordinary thing and I am wondering what would happen if we took some of the suggestions made here. Exactly where would we land ourselves if everybody is to break the other’s head? And many hon. Members said: not an inch of our territory, not an inch of our territory. All

these brave gestures, if you would permit me to say so, have very little meaning. Certainly, not an inch of our territory or anything, if somebody forces or compels me, because we must never submit to compulsion or force in a matter of this kind. It is not a question of an inch, or yard or a mile, it is a question of submitting to compulsion, submitting to force, and we will never submit to force, whatever happens to our country.

But what do these gestures mean? I dislike this flamboyant language of an inch of territory and all that, sitting here in Parliament, not realising what it means. I dislike this business of going about bombing everybody, because you dislike his face or what he has said or done. There are many things said or done which one dislikes. Acharya Kripalani has accused me of some things. He may be right in his accusation. But I do hope he is not right when he accused me of over-politeness. I am not normally accused of that!

Acharya Kripalani: When we are concerned

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He talked about Gandhi. Whatever Gandhi might have said, he did not shout as some of us do. His action was strong undoubtedly and firm but his voice was gentle, gentle to the opponent, gentle to the enemy, gentle to everybody, always trying to win over the other person. We do not pretend to be Gandhis, because we are hardly fit to be even distant followers of his. But I do believe that at any time in international affairs, it is the gentle and firm voice that should be raised, not this shouting voice that we have got accustomed to, this cold war voice, this just cursing each other, closing everybody’s mind—where nothing counts but the bomb of Dr Ram Subhag Singh. Dr Ram Subhag forgets.

Acharya Kripalani: If the Prime Minister would not mind, I never said

that he should go on abusing everybody. I said: we should be firm and we should make our meaning clear.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I accept that completely. But Acharya Kripalani said something more. He said: you must shout; you must speak in a loud voice.

Acharya Kripalani: I submit I was making only a comparison

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a small matter. But I would submit that we are dealing with very serious issues, and such issues are not solved by mere exhibition of excitement. Certainly and obviously, at any time, more especially in such moments, we have to be firm. And we have to be firm, realising where one has to be firm. It is not being firm in the air or being firm about everything, good, bad or indifferent. There are important things and unimportant things. One has to be firm about important things and one sticks to that, come what may.

But if one tries to be firm about everything it means one is not firm at all. That is only talking firmly which is not acting firmly because there are certain physical and actual disabilities, which you cannot survive. Nobody can. A great country, the United States of America, a great country like the Soviet Union—they are the super-powers—know the limitations of firmness. They are very firm countries but they know the limitations of firmness and they stop at a certain limit otherwise they would have gone in for a war by this time and would have destroyed the world. We talk loosely. This kind of talk, namely, let us be firm, let us do this, let us fight and let us shed every drop of blood—this kind of thing, may I say, rather takes us away from the main questions that we are discussing, which are difficult. The position is a serious one.

Now I say that Premier Chou En-lai's last letter in some parts is worded in relatively soft language

and in some parts he talks about the *status quo* being kept, talks, negotiations etc. But basically that letter raises some issues which are very serious and which have been raised in that form officially almost for the first time.

As I was sitting here, I was reading certain reports of discussions in Peking in some Congress that is being held there where Premier Chou En-lai spoke more or less on the lines of this letter and where other people spoke. Of course, it does not require any particular brilliance to know that everyone spoke on those same lines, supporting Premier Chou En-lai, namely,—

"express their great surprise to find Mr. Nehru defending British Imperialism. So-and-so asked Mr. Nehru: On whose behalf was he speaking in defending British imperialism? Now Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government treat the aggressive plot of British Imperialism against China in the last century as an accomplished fact. Does this accord with the five principles advocated by Mr. Nehru...?"

and so on and so forth. There is plenty of it. Just as many hon. Members have said something about the MacMahon line strongly saying: stick to it; do not budge an inch etc.—I forget who said it, but I seem to have read it somewhere—they were equally strong against the MacMahon line there. So, here we are.

Obviously a question like this cannot be solved by resolutions in Delhi and in Peking or by strong language hurled at each other. Other ways have to be found—either peaceful or warlike. Every sensible person here and elsewhere wants to avoid war in such matters or in any matter. It is quite clear. The most powerful nations in the world are trying their utmost today to find a way outside war, and for us to think and talk of war seems rather ridiculous in this context of things.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

It is perfectly different for us to say and for the weakest and the smallest nation to say and for an individual to say: I will not submit to evil, come what may. It is quite a different thing I will not submit to it. I will not submit to coercion. I will not submit to dishonour. That is quite a different thing. Even a single individual can say that, according to Gandhiji's teachings or any teaching. Any country can say that. That is different from a country in the pride of its might saying, "Oh! we shall do this or that with our armies and bombs etc." It is a very different thing. The two approaches are completely different.

Now, what is happening in China today? And I say so, I do not wish to use strong words, but it is the pride and arrogance of might that is showing, in their language, in their behaviour to us and in so many things that they have done. It is that.

16 hrs.

And it is not a question of this mile on this side of the MacMahon line or that mile on that side. They are small matters, I say again. But it is not a small matter, the other thing, that they showed in their maps a large tract of Indian territory and called it Chinese territory. That is not a small matter. Because—you may say that you will not give an inch of the MacMahon Line, I will give it if I find that it is wrongly there, what is the good of saying these things—the MacMahon Line is a broad line between Bhutan and the Burma border and it goes on to Burma. In some places it is quite definite, in some places it is not definite, it is not marked in some places. And you have to go by other indications. The broad approach of the man who drew that line was that it should be on the water-sheds. It was a good approach. But we have deliberately left the water-sheds in one or two places. Therefore, when I say I stick to the MacMahon Line, what I mean is that I stick to that broad approach. But if by evidence or facts, whatever it

is, a slight deviation in the alignment is necessary, it is not a major matter. And that has to be decided by facts and not by anybody's coercion.

And when I talked about so-called mediation and conciliation—and I even used the word arbitration—what did I mean? I meant that in these minor alignments, etc. or in these minor questions that have arisen, wherever they may be, whatever it is—I forget the names of these places, Longju and Hoti and other places, these are the alignments. Hoti is not of course on the MacMahon Line, it is on the UP side—these alignments can always be talked about in a peaceful way, in a friendly way, and slightly altered here and there if there is enough evidence.

But that is not what we are considering today. We have always been ready for that. We are considering something much bigger, and that is a claim, the claim laid down in the Chinese maps which for the first time, mind you now in this last letter of Premier Chou En-lai and the speeches delivered now in their Congress is taking shape more definitely. At first, whenever the maps were referred to, it was said, "Oh, these are old maps, we will revise them." It was a totally inadequate answer. Well, it was some kind of an answer, postponement of an answer if you like. But now the real thing is that this is held out as something more definite. They hold by it—not the exact line, we do not know exactly where their line is, and it is impossible to discover large tracts of Indian territory. That kind of treatment or behaviour does seem to me, if I may use the word, very improper for one nation to treat another, even much more so when the nations have been friendly. And that is the point that has arisen.

The question is, again I repeat, for the moment do not worry about these petty spots. A petty spot is important if coercively and aggressively even a yard of territory is taken from us. Because, it is not a yard of terri-

tory that counts but the coercion. But all those petty spots are capable of, sitting down and, some kind of solution. Because, it makes no difference to China or India whether a few yards of territory in the mountain are on this side or on that side. But it makes a great deal of difference if that is done in an insulting, aggressive, offensive, violent manner, by us or by them. All that counts.

Now, I have been accused, with some justification, that I have kept matters from Parliament, these important matters. (*An Hon Member: Why some?*) I beg of you, you have read this White Paper, point out to me what exactly I have kept. I shall tell you what I have kept. It is only one thing that I have kept, that is, last November, December, when we were dealing with the Aksai Chin area and the road there. That had come to our knowledge apart from our letters about Bara Hoti, about this and that. We cannot come here for every little thing. But, that certainly is an important matter: the road through the Aksai Chin area. We felt its importance. We did not come here at that time.

Hon. Members said,—I forget who said—do not our Air Force take pictures and all that. I do not think there is a full realisation of what this area is and where it is. The mere act of taking pictures would have endangered that plane which took it, endangered it not only from the physical features point of view, but endangered it from the point of view of action, by the other party shooting it down, whatever the risks.

I won't go into details. But, I should like this House to appreciate what these places are. This place, Aksai Chin area, is in our maps undoubtedly. But, I distinguish it completely from other areas. It is a matter for argument as to what part of it belongs to us and what part of it belongs to somebody else. It is not at all a dead clear matter. However, I have to be frank to the House. It is not clear. I cannot go about doing

things in a matter which has been challenged, not today, but for a hundred years. It has been challenged as to the ownership of this strip of territory. That has nothing to do with the MacMahon line. It has nothing to do with anything else. That particular area stands by itself. It has been in challenge all the time. Our going about taking pictures of it from the air or, as somebody said, bombing it, is not a feasible proposition. We knew it is not an inaccessible place. Of course, people can go there.

Dr. Ram Subbag Singh: If it does not belong to India, then, there is no question of bombing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not saying that. That is just it. You make statements without knowing facts. I cannot say what part of it may not belong to us, and what parts may. The point is, there has never been any delimitation there in that area and it has been a challenged area—bits of it. I cannot say which bit is and which not. That is a question which will have to be decided.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: The same statement of our Prime Minister on a previous occasion has been used by Mr. Chou En-lai in his letter to prove that this area belongs to them.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Maybe.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: A similar statement is used in his present letter in justification of his claim.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is just what the hon. Members feel. Either I must put facts before them or delude them or leave them to make rash statements themselves: what am I to do about it? Many statements that I heard today were far removed from facts. Therefore, I have to say, I distinguish between these frontiers. There is the MacMahon line. By and large, apart from minor variations, that is a fixed line. In some parts, in the Subansiri area or somewhere there, it was not con-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

sidered a good line and it was varied afterwards by us, by the Government of India. There are many factors to be seen. But, broadly, it follows the watershed. That is the test. We hold by that. We stick to it subject to minor variations, for special reasons. A mile here or a mile there does not matter provided it is peacefully arranged. It is in regard to that that I said, let us have mediation, conciliation. There can be no mediation, conciliation or arbitration about these demands of the Chinese about large chunks of territory. It is quite fantastic and absurd basing their demand on what happened in past centuries. As I said in the other House the other day, if this argument is applied, I wonder how much of the great Chinese State would survive these arguments. How did the Chinese State, this huge State, mighty State, build itself up—by the doctrine of Panchsheel or what? In the past it built itself up by conquest obviously, all parts of it. Whether it was a few years ago, a hundred, 200 or 500 years ago, it was built up by conquest, as all great States have been built up by conquest, violent conquest, and if you apply that theory, the Chinese State was not born complete in itself when civilisation began. So, that argument of British imperialism can well be countered with past, if not present, Chinese imperialism which obviously functioned. One might say, as I said the other day, in the old days Asoka's empire, the Kushan empire and Chandra Gupta's empire spread over half of Central Asia and Afghanistan and all over; therefore, we should lay claim to that. It is an extraordinary argument, this kind of thing. The whole reason of that argument simply takes you back to past ages of history upsetting everything. It really is the argument of a strong and aggressive Power. Nobody else would use it. I have a feeling that as there is a certain paranoia in individuals, sometimes there is a paranoia in nations, and one sees that,

so that in this matter let us come to basic facts.

The basic facts are these. Number one, that this Chinese claim which was vaguely set down in maps etc., is becoming more definitely stated now. That is a claim which it is quite impossible for India or almost any Indian ever to admit whatever the consequences. That is quite clear. There is no question of mediation, conciliation or arbitration about that, because that is absurd. As somebody said, Shri Khadilkar I think, it involves a fundamental change in the whole geography of it, the Himalayas being handed over as a gift to them. This is an extraordinary claim. This is a thing, whether India exists or does not exist, cannot be agreed to. There the matter ends.

Now, having said that, so far as lines of delimitation etc., are concerned, these are matters always for argument provided the approach is a peaceful one. Take Long Ju. We have said so, you have seen the letter. We think that Long Ju is on our side of the line, just on our side within about half a mile of it. They say it is not. We think we have a good case, but I leave that out. We have said we are prepared not to go out to Long Ju. You get out too, and then the matter can be considered by maps, charts, whatever it is, because it is a minor rectification and it does not make much difference provided it is peacefully done. Or, any other minor point like that we are prepared to consider in this day, but not this light demand of handing over the Himalayas to them. That we are not prepared to consider.

Again, there is this MacMahon line that I referred to. There is the border of U.P., Himachal Pradesh and Punjab. There, when we had this treaty about Tibet in 1954, a number of passes were mentioned, that is, passes meant for pilgrims and others to go over, and traders. Those passes themselves in a sense

laid down the frontier, and the claim now made here and there, as in the letter, to the Shipki La pass etc., is undoubtedly a breach of that agreement of 1954 in so far as the passes are concerned.

Dr Ram Subhag Singh vaguely said: nobody knows what places, what areas of India the Chinese may have occupied. I beg to inform him that everybody knows it or ought to know it. If he does not know, he should try to find out from those who know, before making such statements.

Now, apart from that area in Ladakh, about which I mentioned to you, apart from that area, about the road, for the moment we know exactly where they are there. There is no part of our border at the present moment occupied by the Chinese except that Longju area, that little bit about which .

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I submit one thing? About Longju, it is said that that MacMahon line was delimited up to a length of 850 miles by Sir MacMahon. Longju is on this side of the MacMahon line. So, how can they claim Longju now?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Longju is 800 miles.

Shri Hem Barua: The MacMahon line had delimited the border up to 850 miles. The delimitation was done by Sir MacMahon himself.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Who says that?

Shri Hem Barua: And Longju is on this side of the border.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: At least, I do not know. I am merely stating the fact. I am stating the fact in so far as I know that there are no Chinese troops on this side of the MacMahon line anywhere, except that in two or three or maybe, four miles of Longju, there is a small detachment there.

An impression seems to have grown that there are masses and masses of Chinese armies perched on the frontier or are pouring into the frontier. That is not a correct impression, it is not an easy thing to do, and if it is done, it will be met, whether it is big or small or whatever it may be.

Let us realise this, the real danger at the present moment is not of Armies pouring in, the real danger is the words that are being said in Peking. That is the thing which is extraordinary, and these words which I have quoted, we cannot possibly accept, admit or agree to. That is the basic position. Now, all minor things, one talks about, one agrees to, one has conciliation, one has this or that as with any country. And our broad approach will always be a friendly approach even to the utmost or last end, because any other approach is, according to our thinking a wrong approach.

We may lose our tempers. Losing one's temper is not a good thing, but one loses it because one cannot control one-self, but a nation at least should not lose its temper, when it is faced with these serious problems, and must be firm, at the same time, restrained and controlled.

May I also add, to complete the whole picture, that it is not merely a question of this, but a question of the treatment given to our Missions in Tibet, our trade agencies? It has been a consistently discourteous treatment by the local authorities. We write, we complain, answers come, long explanations come but it does seem that it is deliberately done, to make it more and more inconvenient and difficult for them to work there.

May I say this here? I would just like to draw Acharya Kripalani's attention to one note in the White Paper—he might note down just the page, I would not read it now—which does indicate our approach to these questions, that is to say, a mixture of politeness and firmness. This is at

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

page 77 of the White Paper, the statement of our Foreign Secretary in reply to the Chinese statement

May I here say that I should like to express my regret to the Members of the Socialist Party here for a reference to them in one of these statements, and I accept entire responsibility for it. I am sorry. But I was much disturbed by that particular incident which happened in Bombay, because, whatever may happen, the Head of a State is supposed to be above criticism, and it rouses tremendous passions, if you hit the Head of a State. And what was done there in regard to Chairman Mao had made a tremendous difference suddenly to change the atmosphere of China against us. It was utilised by all our enemies, and I was moved by that, disturbed by that.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I submit one thing? Was it not brought to the notice of the Prime Minister that just after the occurrence of the incident it was disapproved by the Socialist Party then and there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It may be so, but I am trying to express my regret for this reference here, anyhow, it should not have been put in this way.

I should like this House to consider this matter, apart from its views about the cold war, apart from its views on Communism. Indirectly, Communism comes in. In the sense that China is a Communist State, in that sense, it does affect. I think it will make it more difficult for you to understand the situation if your minds are coloured by this business of the cold war, the arguments that go on between Communism and anti-Communism. What we have to face today is a great and powerful nation which is aggressive. It might be aggressive minus Communism or plus Communism. Either way it might be there. That is a fact that you have to face.

Therefore, do not confuse the issue. So far as the cold war is concern-

ed, as the House knows, or ought to know, all wise men or most wise men in the world are trying to put an end to it, and it would be a tragedy. If we, who stood up against the cold war, should surrender to its voice and technique, when the countries which started it were giving it up. Therefore, let us not have it. Cold war is an admission of defeat—mental and intellectual defeat. It is not, if I may say so with all respect to the participants of the cold war, a mature way of considering a question. Certainly, I am not speaking in terms of non-violence, although cold war is the negation of non-violence. I say if you are violent, be violent. But nobody has yet, I hope, approved of blackguardly language. That is cold war.

One hon. Member: I think Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, referred to Bhutan and Sikkim. I am glad he did so.

Shri Goray: He is being bombed all right.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: b. cause he reminded me of something about which I wanted to make some mention. In Premier Chou En-lai's last letter, he says:

"In your Excellency's letter, you also referred to the boundary between China and Sikkim. Like the boundary between China and Bhutan, this question does not fall within the scope of our present discussion".

I beg to differ from Premier Chou En-lai. It does very much fall within the scope of our present or future discussion. If he thinks that he can deal with it as something apart from India, we are not agreeable to that. We have publicly, rightly, undertaken certain responsibilities for the defence of Sikkim and Bhutan, if they are attacked. Therefore, it is very necessary for us to understand the position there, because if something happens on their borders, then it is

the same thing as an interference with the border of India.

One hon Member, I think Shrimati Renuka Ray, asked has there been violation of Bhutan's territory? So far as I know, there has been no violation

Then there was one question which was put to me—I am sorry to repeat Dr. Ram Subhag Sings's name It was a very interesting question In Premier Chou's letter, he had referred to a telegram which we received from Tibet—from Lhasa—in 1947 It is true The point which Premier Chou made was that even then, in 1947, that is, soon after we became independent Tibet claimed territory from us That was his argument It is true that we received a telegram from the Tibetan Bureau in Lhasa, which was forwarded to us by our Mission in Lhasa, claiming the return of Tibetan territory on the boundary of India and Tibet A reply was sent by us,—it did not say exactly what reply was sent by us in 1947—demanding the assurance that it was the intention of the Tibetan Government to continue relations on the existing basis until new agreements are reached on matters that either party may wish to take up

Now, what the telegram means, I do not know But this House should remember that when we discuss these small border disputes, whether it is Migyitun or this or that, all these are standing disputes with the old Tibetan Government, even in British times certain small areas which were points of dispute between the then Government of India and the Tibetan Government. There were some new disputes too. It may be that this telegram refers to those areas in disputes, relatively small areas.

Here is another instance of what we call the new approach of the Chinese Government to us, or, perhaps, an intensification of that approach. We received a complaint and a protest from them a few days

ago about the violation of their territorial waters I was surprised because the report was that it was one small ship—a frigate I think—which was taking supplies to a ship called Magar—crocodile—(its name is Magar) This frigate was taking supplies, and passing near by Hongkong, it did undoubtedly pass across the territorial waters of China, say within 12 miles or so—whatever it was They protested and said it was challenged and it did not listen to the challenge. The Magar has not come back yet But we have received a report and it said that there was no challenge when they came across and they did not know and they went on That is curious enough—petty incident of the Magar going there and being challenged

But, in this connection another incident is quoted

"Last year your cruiser 'Mysore' also did the same thing, passed through our territorial waters"

Now, the cruiser 'Mysore' had gone last year on a visit of goodwill to China among other countries. That is, it went to Hongkong, China, Shanghai and it went to Japan and, maybe, it went to some other places also I do not know It certainly went to Shanghai It is very surprising that it should be quoted and quoted a year after Certainly last year it came to within 6 or 12 miles The affair is rather extraordinary.

There are a multitude of questions that arise in this connection and we shall have to deal with them with all care, patience, firmness and forbearance And I am sure that this House will show that firmness coupled with forbearance.

If I have erred in the past in some delay in placing the papers before the House, I shall not err again. It is too serious a matter. At that time one wanted the situation not to be worsened by publicity when we were

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

dealing with them, corresponding with them and their answers come after months. This very answer from Premier Chou has come 6 months after my letter of March. One waits and times goes on. But, anyhow, the situation is such that we have to keep the country, and especially the Parliament in full touch with the developments. I do not expect, and I do not want the House to imagine that something very serious is going to happen on our frontiers. I do not at all expect that to happen. It is not such an easy matter for it to happen either. But the basic difficulty is this apparent change in the attitude of the Chinese Government when it has come out quite clearly with a demand which it is absolutely and wholly impossible for us to look at. But, if you will put that aside, the major demand aside,—they themselves say, the House will notice, that they are not, in a sense, pressing for that now and that they are prepared for the status quo to continue but there is the demand, just as the maps were a constant irritant and a reminder to us that something may happen and it is now much more obvious—it is only in that sense the situation has worsened and not in the sense that something is going to happen in the border or the frontier suddenly.

I would beg of you not to put this matter in the category of communist or non-communist. The House must have been the statement issued more or less on behalf of the Soviet Government and this House knows the very close relations that the Soviet Government has naturally with the Chinese Government. The issue of that statement itself shows that the Soviet Government is taking a calm and more or less objective or dispassionate view of the situation considering everything. We welcome that. It is not far us to divert this major issue between these two great countries, China and India into wrong channels; it will be completely wrong for us to do that and we must main-

tain our dignity and at the same time deal with the situation as firmly as we can. It is a difficult situation, difficult in the sense, physically difficult, apart from other difficulties. Remember, if the physical difficulties are on our side as they are—hundreds of miles of mountains and forests with no roads—the same difficulties are on the side of any person who rashly tries to come in. So you can balance the difficulties either way.

Anyhow, our Army and our Defence Forces are fully seized of this matter and they are not people who get excited quickly. They are brave people, experienced people and because they have to deal with a difficult job, they deal with it in a calm and quiet way but efficiently. I am sure they will do that.

There are a number of amendments. Naturally, I am not prepared to accept any amendment which is a condemnation of our policy.

Acharya Kripalani: Before you deal with the amendments, may I ask a question? Shri Dange has said that the Dalai Lama is being subsidised by your Government. Is it a fact?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not referred to the question of Tibet or the Dalai Lama, partly because, although it slightly touches these issues and it has affected them, it is a separate issue. So far as the Dalai Lama is concerned, I do not know what is meant by 'subsidy'. We have spent some money over his remaining there but we have given him no special subsidy. But some money has been spent naturally on his stay at Mussoorie and we are spending money on the other refugees.

Again, as the House knows we have expressed our views in regard to some statements of the Dalai Lama. We have disagreed with them.

Acharya Kripalani: Can this help be called a subsidy to the Dalai Lama?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am merely telling you the fact. He is given no subsidy of any kind but some money has been spent by us on arrangements for his stay in Mussoorie. That is the position.

It has been a difficult problem for us—the problem that was referred to by Shri Dange and Acharya Kripalamb. There was a little controversy as to the freedom to be given to a person who has sought asylum here and that is quite apart from the respect we have for him. Of course, it is a constitutional question. We have great respect and the people of India have great respect for the Dalai Lama. At the same time we did tell him many times that he should not make India the seat of activities against a country which is a friendly country. I wish to say this by and large, for a considerable time, he has observed a good deal of restraint considering the stresses and strains he suffered from. But sometimes he has gone beyond that and we had to contradict some of his statements. We did not wish to enter into trouble about it, but because some of his statements did appear to us to go much too far that we had to contradict them.

I cannot accept these various amendments naturally because they are in effect a condemnation of our policy. But there is one amendment tabled by Shri Naldurgkar which is acceptable to me if the House so wishes.

Shri Hem Barua: The people inhabiting NEFA, about 30,000 sq miles of whose territory are claimed by China as shown in their map, still preserve, due to the British policy of isolation, a sort of separatist psychology, and during all these years of freedom, we could not create in them a comprehensive Indian mind and as such those people are easily susceptible to Chinese propaganda. May I know from the Prime Minister what steps do the Government propose to take to see that this thing does not happen in NEFA?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, there is education, publicity, and all that, there. Most of the NEFA region had no administration even in the old times. Gradually administration has spread there. Now administration, education and all that are spreading there.

Shri P. K. Deo: I am grateful to the Prime Minister for the firmness with which he has spoken and dealt with the Chinese situation. He has rightly diagnosed this Chinese malady to be the arrogance of might. Imperialism is no longer the monopoly of the west. It can also spread to the east though it has got a different name. They call it liberation. We have seen what liberation means to Tibet. Whatever be the imperialism, this imperialism should be nipped in the bud. Unless it is nipped in the bud it will grow because it has got a cancerous and malignant growth.

From the analysis of history we have seen that all policies of appeasement have failed to stop the growth of imperialism. Sir Neville Chamberlain has failed in his policy of appeasement to stop Hitler from his aggressive imperialist designs at Munich in 1939 or so. In this particular case also, I think our Prime Minister will deal with the Chinese situation firmly and the whole country will stand behind him.

Lastly, I would like to express my thanks to my friend and comrade, Shri Dange for the guarantee he has given on behalf of China, that there will be no aggression. I would like to know what he is to China. Is he the accredited agent to China and whether it is the Chinese or the Indian speaking. Anyway, I request him to be more realistic and more patriotic in his approach to the situation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Some hon. Member mentioned or enquired if the Chinese had built an airfield in Indian territory. There is no such thing. There is only one airfield in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the eastern Ladakh, Chushu, built 4 or 5 years ago. I went there and it was an exciting trip to the borders of Tibet. But there is no Chinese air-field there.

Shri C. K. Nair: I want to know one thing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now it is too late. I will put amendment No. 4 to the vote at the end. So far as other amendments are concerned, may I put them all together?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Regarding my amendment No. 2, in view of the regrets expressed by the Prime Minister, I would like to withdraw it if the House permits me to do so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will not put all other amendments, except amendment No. 4, to the vote of the House.

The amendments Nos. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were put and negatived

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954—59, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959 and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959 agrees with the policy of the Government adopted with regard to the frontier problem existing between the Governments of India

and China and endorses the view and stand taken by them in connection with this problem."(4).

The motion was adopted.

16.43 hrs.

*GORAKHPUR LABOUR ORGANISATION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Half-an-hour discussion on the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation.

Shri K. N. Pandey (Hata): Mr Deputy-Speaker, before coming to the subject matter of the discussion today, I would like to give a brief history of the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation.

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): May I know the distribution of time between him and me?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ten minutes.

Shri Nanda: That will be all right.

Shri K. N. Pandey: I should be given more.

This scheme was introduced in 1942 in order to meet the demand of labour at various defence projects. After the war was over, at the request of the employers of coal mining the Central Government agreed that they would also be provided with labour, provided they would agree to bear the entire cost of this scheme. That is why this scheme started the supply of labour to the coal mining areas.

Since then the scheme has been in operation. Now there has been a demand from other sides that as the workers of Gorakhpur are kept in camps this camp system should be abolished and they should be treated as free workers or at par with other workers working in the coal-mining area.