

Shri Hem Barua: It is a very important issue.

Mr. Speaker: When the answer is being given, how can I allow all members to get up and put questions? Let the answer be finished first.

Shri Hem Barua: She has finished it.

Mr. Speaker: No, she has not.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: With regard to the information supplied, we have made enquiries. The enquiries reveal that the political workers gave one version and the rickshaw puller gave another version. Nothing more can be done because the people involved gave different versions. Regarding the inference, on enquiries it was found that they were on the Nepalese side of the border, because they have gone to Biratnagar about the establishment of a tannery. Therefore, the inference of the hon. Member is not correct.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order. Sir, as the supreme custodian of the rights and privileges of the members of the House, you have just now observed that the question was whether the India-Nepal border was adequately guarded. As you yourself pointed to the Treasury Benches, this is the only question. There is no other question at all apart from that. I put the question irrespective of whether there was any incursion or not.

Mr. Speaker: I still do not know what the point of order is. What should I answer or how should I answer it? If he only says that the answer has not been given, that is a different thing; I can ask the Minister to read or give the answer. But where is the point of order?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The point of order arises in this that you, Sir, as the supreme custodian of the rights and privileges of the members, upheld the question as relevant, but the Minister gave no answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member wants an answer?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Yes, Sir. The House wants it and you, Sir, also want the answer.

Mr. Speaker: He might resume his seat. The question was "Is the border well-guarded?"

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I have already said "Yes, Sir".

Mr. Speaker: The answer is "Yes Sir".

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It has taken so long for her to say these two words "Yes, Sir".

Shri Hem Barua: The hon. Minister has stated in reply "Yes, Sir". But may I invite her attention to her own admission on a previous occasion that this border was penetrated into by some Nepalese police in an unauthorised way? If it is well-guarded, how could it be possible?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member want her to say "No" to that question? Now we will take up the next subject.

REPORTED DENIAL OF FACILITIES BY CHINESE GOVERNMENT TO THE INDIAN EMBASSY TO CELEBRATE REPUBLIC DAY

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, under rule 197 I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The reported denial of facilities by the Chinese Government to the Indian Embassy in Peking for celebrating the Republic Day this year."

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It had been the practice for our Embassy in Peking to hold the Republic Day Reception in the Golden Hall of the Peking Hotel due to the compara-

tively better facilities than were available there. This practice had continued unbroken ever since the establishment of the Embassy. However, when arrangements were to be made to celebrate the Republic Day on January 26, 1962, the hotel authorities were visibly unco-operative in their attitude. The appointment with the hotel authorities asked for by the Embassy on the 6th January was finally given only on the 9th January 1962. During the interview the official incharge while acknowledging receipt of the Embassy's letter of the 4th January 1962, wherein a request had been made for holding the Republic Day Reception in the hotel as in the past, merely stated that it was not possible to say whether the hall would be available or not and that the earliest that a reply could be given would be by the 20th January 1962, i.e., 6 days before the Reception was to be held. The Embassy was also informed that the alternative hall too was being used as a dining room and, therefore, was out of the question. In addition, the Embassy was informed that the charge per guest for snacks supplied by the hotel would be 2.50 yen per head instead of 1.25 yen per head as in the past.

Due to the above attitude of the hotel authorities, it was decided to hold the Republic Day Reception this year in the Embassy premises, in spite of the attendant difficulties.

After this had been decided and all arrangements made, a telephone call was received from the Peking Hotel authorities on the 17th January 1962 offering the use of the Golden Hall for the Republic Day celebrations. The Embassy, in reply, informed the hotel that due to the latter's "vague and uncertain reply" to the Embassy's earlier enquiry, arrangements had been made for holding the Reception in the Embassy premises and that the hotel's services were not required.

The change in the Chinese attitude was apparently the result of the ad-

verse reaction created in the diplomatic corps and generally in the foreign community resident in Peking. Apart from the above, the Embassy had also difficulty in procuring microphones, etc., for the Republic Day Reception. This difficulty was solved at the last moment after repeated requests had been made to the Diplomatic Personnel Service Association of the Foreign Office. Similar difficulties are understood to have been experienced by our Embassy at the time of the Republic Day and the Tagore Centenary celebrations in 1961. However, in these instances the obstacles had been cleared on the person intervention of the Ambassador who had appealed to the Director of the Asian Department of the Foreign Office.

The Indian Missions in China and Tibet continue to be subjected to serve restrictions. Members of the Indian Embassy in Peking are required to obtain prior permission of the Chinese authorities to visit any place over 20 kilometres from the centre of Peking. The permission is not given for visits to important agricultural centres, communes, industrial establishments and other towns. There are difficulties also in the recruitment of local staff. The restrictions in Tibet are even more severe and the freedom of movement of our representatives and staff is severely curtailed.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the hon. Minister's statement enlightens us more than we used to know about Chinese behaviour so far as our Embassy there is concerned—there are lots of restrictions imposed by them, not to speak of withdrawal of facilities or of putting difficulties in the celebration of our Republic Day and other festivals—may I know whether Government here would like to reciprocate at least a part of these difficulties by putting restrictions on the functioning of the Chinese Embassy here and that too because this Embassy has syste-

[Shri Hem Barua]

matically indulged in violent anti-Indian propaganda all through? Why should this not be reciprocated?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: This question was answered again and again on the floor of the House by the hon. Prime Minister. About reciprocity in these things I have also mentioned yesterday that it is not a part of our policy. All the same, we have imposed certain restrictions on foreigners including persons of diplomatic status at Kalimpong with effect from the 16th August, 1961.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi (Firozabad): If the Government is not prepared by way of reciprocity in this matter or for imposing restrictions for retaliation, may I know what further indignities would the Government see our representatives in China subjected to before it decided to close our Missions there?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Why not withdraw our diplomatic personnel because of these humiliating restrictions?

Mr. Speaker: If otherwise a question is not allowed, can it be allowed if it is asked while sitting?

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): On a point of order, Sir. You have been pleased to order that when such calling attention notices are given and answered, only such hon. Members who are a party to those notices could participate in asking questions.

Mr. Speaker: Have I allowed anybody else to ask questions?

Shri Tyagi: No, Sir. What I am submitting is that this ruling tells hard on other hon. Members. Sometimes a situation might arise where silence of an hon. Member is an omission on his part. Therefore, I suggest that you might reconsider it. In important cases when there are some

answers which are provocative of some suggestion, hon. Members must have the liberty to ask questions; otherwise, it does not tell well on the rest of the hon. Members that they feel something and cannot express themselves.

Mr. Speaker: I would not have any objection to this, but hon. Members must realise the difficulties and the position that we shall land in. Every calling attention notice will then develop into a regular discussion and will continue indefinitely because according to some hon. Members one subject might be more important and according to others another subject might be more important. Therefore, let us stick to this tradition that we have established. Hon. Members who are active and are interested in a particular matter might just give the same kind of notice. Their names are included and are clubbed together. I try to call all those whose names are there. I think, for the present this should be continued unless there are some circumstances where I believe that some departure might be made.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I make an earnest request in this matter? We submit to your ruling and we appreciate its soundness. But may I submit in all humility and earnestness that in a case like this, the Chinese Embassy Affairs, the Government taking all the rebuffs and kicks without any reciprocal action—it is a serious matter—you yourself, in your discretion, could have allowed five to ten minutes. There is one Member who has given the Calling Attention Notice. There are at least half a dozen Members who are interested. Shri Tyagi is interested. Some more may be interested. Some time may be fixed, 5, 6 or 7 minutes, on such a Calling Attention Notice, not on all notices.

Mr. Speaker: If I relax in the case of one Member Shri Tyagi, Shri Hari

Vishnu Kamath would catch me up next time.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Only on a subject like this Chinese affairs, which is very important, and which is getting worse day by day

Mr. Speaker: It is really important. But, we should not open it into a regular discussion. We could have a regular discussion on it if the hon Member seems remedy under other rules. I shall certainly allow. That can be seen when he gives notice. That is a different matter altogether.

Shri Hem Barua: May I put a question, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: My question has not been answered.

Mr. Speaker: He can put it again if that has not been answered. If he has written it out, it becomes too long.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: May I know, if the Government was not prepared for reciprocal action against China, what prevents it from closing our Missions there instead of allowing our personnel and our representatives to be subjected to all sorts of indignities?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It is a suggestion for action.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: This is not Question-hour. It should be replied.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister can say that it was not the intention of the Government. That finishes the matter, if that is the policy.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: That is so.

Mr. Speaker: Papers to be laid on the Table.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What is the reply?

Mr. Speaker: She says that what I have replied is the correct answer.

12.17 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE MOTOR VEHICLES ACT

The Minister of Shipping in the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Shri Raj Bahadur): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications making certain further amendments to the Delhi Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940, under sub-section (3) of section 133 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939:

- (i) Notification No. F. 12/57/60-Transport published in Delhi Gazette dated the 1st June, 1961.
- (ii) Notification No. 12/186/59-Transport published in Delhi Gazette dated the 18th January, 1962.

[Placed in Library see No. LT-133/62].

12.18 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: We shall take up further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Transport and Communications. Out of eight hours, three hours and five minutes have already been taken and four hours and fifty-five minutes remain. Shri Birendra Bahadur Singh might continue his speech.

Shri Birendra Bahadur Singh (Rajnandgaon): Sir, I was saying yesterday was, that the grants which are covered by this Ministry are most