

DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION) SECOND AMENDMENT RULES 1962 AND NOTIFICATIONS UNDER DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION) ACT, 1954.

The Deputy-Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri P. S. Naskar): I beg:

- (i) to re-lay on the Table a copy of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Second Amendment Rules, 1962 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 750 dated the 2nd June, 1962, under sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-235/62].
- (ii) to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, making certain further amendments to the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955:—
 - (i) G.S.R. No. 845 dated the 23rd June, 1962.
 - (ii) G.S.R. No. 884 dated the 30th June, 1962.
 - (iii) G.S.R. No. 952 dated the 14th July, 1962.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-255/62].

REPORT ON GENERAL ELECTION TO KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): Sir, on behalf of Shri Bibudhendra Misra I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Report on the General Election to the Kerala Legislative Assembly. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-258/62].

12.21 hrs.

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table following six Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the last session and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the House on the 21st May, 1962:—

- (1) The Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1962.
- (2) The Finance (No. 2) Bill, 1962.
- (3) The Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1962.
- (4) The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1962.
- (5) The Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1962.
- (6) The President's Pension (Amendment) Bill, 1962.

2. Sir, I also lay on the Table a copy, duly authenticated by the Secretary of Rajya Sabha, of the Advocates (Second Amendment) Bill, 1962 passed by the Houses of Parliament during the last session and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the House on the 21st May, 1962.

12.22 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: SITUATION IN LADAKH

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the 28th November, 1961, I placed White Paper No. 5 on the Table of the House. This contained the further notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Government of India and the Government of China. I am now placing on the Table of the House another White Paper No. 6, which contains some ninety notes sent by us to China and some seventy-five notes sent by China to us, since

the 10th November, 1961. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-256/62] Many of these have already been published in the press. The Chinese Government sometimes publish their letters and notes to us even before they reach us. This led us to publish our replies to them earlier than was customary. Normally, according to diplomatic practice, publication takes place some time after receipt of the communication. We have drawn the Chinese Government's notice to this diplomatic practice and we hope, in future, this will be adhered to. Because of this we have not till now given publicity to our last note to the Government of China dated 26th July 1962. I am now, however, placing this note on the Table of the House. This is not included in the White Paper No. 6.

During the last session of Parliament, I referred to the measures taken by Government to stop further Chinese advances into Indian territory. These steps continue to be taken by our Government and a number of military posts have been established. It may be said that it is very difficult for Chinese forces to advance now because of the establishment of Indian posts at various points without an actual conflict between the two. It is in this context that the strong and almost abusive Chinese notes must be interpreted. We have in all our notes repeatedly pointed out to the Chinese authorities the dangers inherent in Chinese aggressive activities and our determination to defend our borders even though we will avoid doing anything to precipitate a clash.

In recent weeks Chinese troops in superior strength have sometimes come up close to our posts with a view to harassing and intimidating them. This has happened in the Galwan Valley. Our men exercised the utmost self-restraint and exhibited exemplary courage and patience in the face of grave provocations from

the Chinese forces. The Chinese forces thereupon retired to some extent, but Indian and Chinese forces in this area continue to be in close proximity, though no untoward incident has occurred so far in this area.

In the lower reaches of the Chip Chap Valley, an Indian patrol, while performing routine duties, was ambushed by Chinese forces and attacked by rifle, machine gun and mortar fire. Our men had to return fire in self-defence. Two members of the Indian patrol were wounded, one slightly, in this incident. Another incident occurred in the Pangong area. Despite the provocation, our forces did not return the Chinese fire there.

A feature of Chinese propaganda in these incidents has been to allege that Indian troops have encircled Chinese forces and fired at them, while the Chinese are reported to have waved and shouted to our troops not to attack. We have found that these allegations are baseless and are merely attempts to cover up Chinese aggressive activity against our posts or patrols. As the House will notice from the correspondence contained in the White Paper, the Chinese notes display a characteristic ambivalence. The first part of the note generally contains baseless allegations, often in exaggerated and even abusive language, while the latter part refers to the Chinese desire to settle our border differences by peaceful negotiations.

The recent increase of tension in the Ladakh region has been the direct result of intensified Chinese military activity which is inconsistent with the Chinese professions of their desire to settle this question by peaceful negotiations. We in India are by our background and temperament peaceful by nature. We earnestly believe in settlement of differences by peaceful discussions and negotiations. The unwarranted Chinese aggression on our territory came, therefore, as a shock and surprise to us.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Despite the Chinese aggressive behaviour and the inconsistency between their professions and practice, we still desire to settle our differences with China by peaceful discussions and negotiations. At the same time, we will not hesitate to meet any threat to our territorial integrity with firmness and, where necessary, by force.

In a note we sent to the Government of China on the 14th May, 1962, we made concrete suggestions regarding mutual withdrawal to the boundaries claimed by the two sides in the Ladakh region with a view to creating the necessary atmosphere for settlement of the dispute by peaceful discussions and negotiations. The Chinese did not agree to it. Instead, the incidents during the last few months have created further tension. We have, in our recent note dated 26th July, 1962, again pointed out to the Chinese Government the necessity of avoiding incidents and reducing tension and of making an adequate response to the constructive suggestions made by us to create the necessary favourable climate for further talks and discussions of the boundary question. I quote the following paragraph from our note of July 26:

"Paragraph 8. The Government of India are prepared, as soon as the current tensions have eased and the appropriate climate is created, to enter into further discussions on the India-China boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials as contemplated during the meeting of Prime Minister Chou En-lai with the Prime Minister of India in 1960. The Government of India hope that the Government of China will give a positive response on the concrete suggestions made by the Government of India for relaxation of the current ten-

sions and for creation of the right climate for negotiations."

To this note of ours we received a reply in the late afternoon yesterday. This reply is rather disappointing as the Chinese Government continue to repeat the charges made by them and to maintain their position as stated previously. They go on to say in their final paragraph as follows:—

"The Chinese Government approve of the suggestions put forth by the Indian Government in its note for further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries. There need not and should not be any preconditions for such discussions. As a matter of fact, if only the Indian side stop advancing into Chinese territory a relaxation of the border situation will be effected at once. Since neither the Chinese nor the Indian Government want war and since both Governments wish to settle the boundary question peacefully through negotiations further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries should not be put off any longer. The Chinese Government proposes that such discussions be held as soon as possible and that the level, date, place and other procedural matters for these discussions be immediately decided upon by consultation through diplomatic channels. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will give positive consideration to this proposal and kindly reply at an early date."

We are examining this note of the Chinese Government and we hope to send a reply to it at an early date. We shall keep the Parliament informed of developments.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, on a point of clarification.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, may I make a submission?

Mr. Speaker: Only one at a time. Shri Kamath.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification. Will the Prime Minister be good enough to tell the House whether the Chinese have forcibly occupied all the territory up to the western boundary line in Ladakh not only as shown in their 1956 map but now in the 1960 map, and have penetrated further towards Leh?

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): A little while ago you have stated that there are a number of adjournment motions.

Mr. Speaker: Now only a question.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: In view of the statement that has now been made by the Prime Minister would it be possible for you to hold a general debate on the question arising out of the statement that has been made. That is my suggestion.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): I would like to know two things from the Prime Minister. Will he be pleased to say those two things? Firstly, in view of the categorical statement by the Chinese Foreign Minister in an interview in Switzerland that no power on earth can persuade or oblige China to give up its territories...

Mr. Speaker: We are not discussing the whole subject now.

Shri Nath Pai: I am concluding. In view of that, what makes Government of India still believe that there is any basis for negotiations? Secondly, may we know whether any incidents have taken place in Ladakh after the 24th? May we have an assurance that no such incident has taken place after the 24th in the Chip Chap region?

1329 (A) LS-6.

Mr. Speaker: There is one thing which I want to make clear. If hon. Members want to put some questions by way of clarification, I can allow 2, 3, 4 or 5 questions, but that would end here. If they want to have a regular discussions, they should not put those questions now. Now a suggestion has come that we ought to have a regular debate. If the House wants that there should be a regular debate, I cannot allow questions now and then again a debate. Now, hon. Members might choose between the two.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सीमा का प्रश्न, लद्दाख का प्रश्न बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है। यह देश के सम्मान का प्रश्न है, देश की सावरेनटी का सवाल है। प्राण दिन हम देखते हैं कि हमारी भूमि हम से छीनी जा रही है। सरकार देश की सीमाओं की रक्षा करने में असमर्थ रही है। हम इस पर बहस करना चाहेंगे, प्रश्न पूछना नहीं चाहेंगे। प्रश्न भेजने को बार पूछे जा चुके हैं, कुछ निकला नहीं है। सदन की यह इच्छा है कि इस पर बहस हो।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kandrapara): The last note of the Chinese clearly shows their intentions. I do not think there is any further room for any peaceful discussion. It can never be peaceful. So, before the Prime Minister gives a reply to China, I would suggest that the whole Parliament should discuss this matter. Then he will be in a position to know the views of Parliament before giving the reply. Therefore, I would suggest that at the earliest possible opportunity we should have a discussion on this question.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : मैं अज्ञ कर्णा कि इससे बड़ा सवाल पार्लियामेंट के सामने कोई दूसरा था नहीं सकता है। यह ठीक है कि हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बक्ष्य दे दिया है और इससे हमें कुछ जानकारी मिल गई है। लेकिन सवाल

[श्री बागड़ी]

जानकारी का नहीं है ? सवाल नीति का है । हम कौन सी नीति अपनायें कि इस देश को बचाया जा सके . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बहस चाहते हैं ?

श्री बागड़ी : बहस नहीं, मैं तो सजेशन दे रहा हूँ। ऐसी क्या बात हो गई कि दो मिनट में बहस हो गई ।

मैं अर्ज कर रहा था, स्पीकर साहब, कि मैं मानता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट का वक्त बढ़ा कीमती है। लेकिन अगर हम वक्त दे सकते हैं, मक्खी, मच्छर टैक्सो के वास्ते, जो जो इस तरह के अहम मसले हैं . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कहें कि आप क्या चाहते हैं ?

श्री बागड़ी : हिन्दुस्तान की जो नीति है उसी का यह नतीजा है कि काश्मीर के दो टुकड़े हो गए हैं और एक आजाद काश्मीर बन गया है। अगर यही नीति चलती रही तो लद्दाख के भी दो टुकड़े हो जायेंगे। इस वास्ते सवाज बहस का नहीं है। हम एडजर्नमेंट मोशन चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि उसको एडमिट किया जाए। कौम को चेतवनी दी जानी चाहिये और पार्लियामेंट को अपने सुझाव देने चाहिये। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि एक ने कह दिया 'अहम् बह्तास्मिस्तु' और दूसरे ने कह दिया "तथातु"।

Shri P. K. Deo (Kaluhandi): I beg to submit that the statement of the Prime Minister further strengthens my demand for an adjournment to consider this question, before the House transacts any other question or business, as this is the most important item. It is for you to decide how long this debate is going to take place and when it is going to take place. All that we want is that the time should be fixed very soon.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I would like to reinforce the request for a debate. I am not particular about the academic satisfaction of an adjournment motion being admitted. My principal reason is—I hope the hon. Leader of the House will accept it—that it would be positively dangerous if in the context of the facts as they are today we do not debate this question and it will be misinterpreted by the Chinese as acquiescence on our part in their aggression and an invitation to further aggression.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I seek a clarification?

Mr. Speaker: How long shall we go on?

Shri Hem Barua: I wish to ask only one question. In view of the fact that Marshal Chen Yi has ruled out war and has said that there must only be local conflict.....

Mr. Speaker: I am not allowing questions for the present.

Shri Hem Barua: ... may I know whether the hon. Prime Minister would give up raising the spectre of war whenever we.....

Mr. Speaker: Order order. I am not allowing any questions for the present.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kampur): I only wanted to know whether.....

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कई बार प्रार्थना कर चुका हूँ—

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपकी बारी आएगी तो आपको भी बोलने का मौका मिलेगा। लेकिन यह भी जरूरी नहीं है कि हर एक मੈम्बर साहब को मौका मिल ही जाए।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to know whether the reply which he wishes to send will be sent before the discussion takes place or will he take the House into confidence.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा कि इस विषय पर बहस होनी चाहिये और बहुत अच्छी तरह से होनी चाहिये और वह भी हिन्दी में होनी चाहिये। यह हिन्दुस्तान है इंग्लिस्तान नहीं।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): The hon. Prime Minister has himself suggested that in a few days time he would be sending a reply and unless there was such a very crucial situation where Government does not have anything like the confidence of the country in this matter, I think it is only right and proper that we wait till Government sends its reply and then Government come before Parliament.

Some hon. Member: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: I only allowed this opportunity to several hon. Members so that the Government and the House might know what the feelings of the House are. Government knows how hon. Members feel and how they react. If hon. Members do want some discussion on this, I can only consider it if there is a regular motion for discussion given notice of. For the present I have got this adjournment motion.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, I move that we have a discussion on this.

Mr. Speaker: There ought to be some regular notice in writing which alone I can consider when it comes before me. As I hinted some time earlier, at 4 O'clock we are having a sitting of the Business Advisory Committee and I will request hon. Members who are interested to come over there. The Government spokesman will also be there and we will know their reaction. Then, if the Government also agrees, we can fix some time.

Shri Hem Barua: I could not understand this. You said that those hon. Members who are interested could come in. Could we who are interested but who are not members of the Business Advisory Committee come in?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I am inviting them.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If a motion for discussion of a subject is moved by an hon. Member, it is a Private Member's motion and under the Rules we are to be given only 2½ hours. The adjournment motion is there. Would it not serve our purpose if you admit the adjournment motion which we can discuss for two hours? We may start at 4 O'clock either today or tomorrow and discuss this matter.

Mr. Speaker: If he is insistent, I find that I cannot allow the adjournment motion.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): On a point of order, Sir.

Shri Bagri rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There have been a series of occurrences and events that have led to this situation. I do agree that it is very important, very serious and very urgent, but it is not one particular fact that has been put in the adjournment motion. One thing to which I can particularly draw the attention of the House is that one event can be taken up in the adjournment motion but several things cannot be jumbled together. The demand of hon. Members is to discuss the situation that has been developing from time to time and what it has come to.

Shri Hem Barua: No, Sir; it is not that.

Mr. Speaker: I have read the adjournment motion. They should allow me to state my own view which I am putting to them now. I would advise hon. Members that it would be in their own interest if they ask for a discussion rather than have it discussed by way of an adjournment motion.

That was what I was asking the hon. Members. When they come to the Business Advisory Committee at

[Mr. Speaker]

4 P.M. the spokesman of the Government be there, and it could be decided then whether Government are prepared to make their own motion or whether it is required that some Members should move their motion.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The Prime Minister is here now, and let us hear from him whether he is prepared to give us a day for this discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member cannot stand up just in this manner and interrupt me. I had allowed him an opportunity when he wanted it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of procedure, Sir,.....

Shri U. M. Trivedi: May I know whether a formal motion would be necessary for this purpose, or this would be enough?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member knows the functions of the Speaker. I cannot order anything to be discussed; if I receive a notice, I have only to decide on the admissibility or otherwise of it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Let us have the opinion of the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am perfectly prepared to have a discussion. It was my intention to submit to you to fix a day for a discussion generally on foreign affairs, in which this matter might come up.

Mr. Speaker: The point is how soon we can have it, because the Members are particular that they should have it soon.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a matter for discussion. But there is one thing that I would like to say;

I am not prepared to accept that I should send my letters to other Governments, or communications, after reference to this House; I am not prepared to accept this theory.

Shri Priya Gupta: This seems to be an autocratic utterance of the hon. Prime Minister, which is not conducive at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. So long as he is heading the Government, certainly he is entitled to do so.

Shri Priya Gupta: On a point of order.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We can have that discussion.....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There is only one simple request of mine. The Prime Minister suggests that we should discuss the whole foreign affairs, but I would like to submit that we should confine ourselves only to the Ladakh situation.

Mr. Speaker: That would be for the Members. If they confine themselves only to this question, who is going to stop them?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If the discussion is open for other things also, then it will lose all its significance.

Mr. Speaker: No. We certainly can have this particular subject in view and give it prominence. But if something else is referred to briefly, then we cannot stop it. But if the hon. Members are particular that they should have specific time separately for this, then too, I do not think that Government have any objection to that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, I have no objection.

Mr. Speaker: So, there is no objection to that. So, at 4 P.M. in the Business Advisory Committee, we can just fix a day and also decide what time we shall devote to this.

Shri Nath Pai: In the meanwhile, some questions had been asked; are they all being held up for the discussion?

Mr. Speaker: When we are having the discussion, should we have those questions also?

Shri Nath Pai: Some specific questions could have been answered.

Shri Nath Pai: May we know whether incidents had taken place since the one on the 24th of last month?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of procedure. Is it not within your competence, as the symbol of the supremacy of Parliament to decide as to how much time should be allotted and when the debate on this subject of national importance should take place, the only technical point being whether a motion should come from the Government side or from our side? That is the only point at issue.

Mr. Speaker: It is within my competence, but I always decide after hearing both the parties, and, therefore, I have said that I shall hear both the parties at 4 p.m. and then decide.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What points?

12.48 hrs.

STATEMENT RE FINANCE MINISTER'S RECENT VISIT TO EUROPE

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I left India on the 2nd July 1962 for Europe to lead the Indian Delegation to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations as well as to have discussions with the Governments of the Member States of the European Economic Community and the United Kingdom on certain economic matters. I returned to Delhi on the 23rd July 1962.

The main item on the agenda of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nation at Geneva, which was debated at a high level by all delegations, was one pertaining to development. As the House is aware, the General Assembly of the United Nations has designated the present decade as the "U.N. Development decade". The Economic and Social Council had before it a comprehensive report from the Secretary-General of the United Nations which he introduced personally for consideration by the Council. I place on the Table of the House a copy of the statement I made at the Council in which I endeavoured to focus attention on the twin problems of aid and trade which are the most important ones in the context of international economic co-operation for promoting the development of the less industrialised countries. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-257/62.]

Apart from Geneva, I visited the U.K., Brussels, which is the seat of the European Economic Community, Luxembourg, Netherland, Germany, France and Italy. I had the opportunity of exchanging ideas with Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers in these countries, as well as of having fairly detailed discussions with the Ministers concerned on our economic problems particularly our requirements of external assistance and the urgency of increasing our export earnings.

During my visit, I had occasion to explain the nature of our developmental effort and the kind of programme we were engaged in. I found in all the European countries I visited a genuine desire to help us. Many of the Governments indicated their willingness to join the Consortium and they also gave me some idea of the kind of assistance which, within the framework of their possibilities, they could make available to us.

Since then, there has been a meeting of the World Bank Consortium. Italy, Netherlands, Belgium and