



**Indian Parliament on the issue of
Tibet**

RAJYA SABHA DEBATES

1952 -2005



Published : 2006

©Tibetan Parliamentary and Policy Research Centre

Published by :

Tibetan Parliamentary and Policy Research Centre
H-10, 2nd Floor, Lajpat Nagar - III,
New Delhi - 110024, INDIA

Printed by :

Vee Enn Print-O-Pac
Okhla, New Delhi - 110020
vnprints@gmail.com

FRIEDRICH-NAUMANN-STIFTUNG
&
THE TIBETAN PARLIAMENTARY AND
POLICY RESEARCH CENTRE

The **Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung** (FNSt) established in 1958 is a non-profit organization for public benefit. It promotes the liberal principle of Freedom in Human Dignity in all sectors of society, both nationally as well as internationally, in developed as well as developing countries.

The Foundation is active in more than 75 countries. In the South Asian Region comprising the SAARC countries the Foundation's work encompasses projects concerned with support for economic liberalisation; fostering regional economic co-operation in South Asia; promotion of civic rights; and environmental protection. All these activities are carried out in co-operation with local, national and international NGOs, the emphasis being on self-reliance and the setting up of democratic institutions.

Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung in partnership with the **Assembly of Tibetan People's Deputies** has set up the **Tibetan Parliamentary and Policy Research Centre** (TPPRC) with the purpose of strengthening the Tibetan diaspora in building up a healthy democratic working ethos. The objective is to prepare the Tibetans in exile for the assumption of responsibilities that would respond to their hopes and aspirations through a framework of legislative, executive and judicial institutions based on the concept of the Tibetan polity guided by *Saddharma* and with a view to generating human values and considerations based on man's free will, equality, justice and non-violence. There is also the standing need to constantly remind the Tibetan diaspora of their national identity, culture and heritage and the global community of Tibet's unique contribution to the world of thought and culture.

Established in 1994, the Centre has already reached a very representative section of Tibetans residing in India and Nepal, encouraging them to get actively involved in their new democratic institutions and helping their leadership to formulate a vision for the future. Moreover, the Centre has a sound back-up programme of publications to disseminate information to build up national and international public opinion for the fulfillment of a just cause.

Shri M. Valiulla: What are the countries?

Shri D.P. Karmarkar: I said, China and Nepal. These are the two countries which come nearest to India in the volume of trade.

Shri M. Valiulla: Out of the goods exported to Tibet, how much are Indian made and how much are foreign-made?

Shri D.P. Karmarkar: Most of them are Indian-made. I cannot give the exact proportion of the foreign-made goods.

Shri M. Valiulla: Is there any limit fixed for our exports to Tibet?

Shri D.P. Karmarkar: Our exports to Tibet are governed by our export control orders which apply to Tibet as they apply to all other countries.

Shri M. Valiulla: From the figures, I find that we are exporting more and importing less. How is the balance of payments adjusted?

Shri D.P. Karmarkar: I have to find out.

Shri C. G.K. Reddy: In the answer, China was mentioned as one of the countries exporting to Tibet. But is not Tibet a part of China? At least the Government appears to have accepted it as such.

Shri D.P. Karmarkar: Yes, that is true.



14 December 1953

Oral Answers to Questions

CONFERENCE WITH CHINA ON TIBET

***264. Shri Govinda Reddy:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether Government purpose to hold a conference with the Communist China to discuss the outstanding matters regarding India and Tibet; and
- (b) If so, the steps taken so far in this regard?

The Deputy Minister for External Affairs (Shri A.K. Chanda):

- (a) and (b) It is not our practice to refer to Governments by their political creed. It has been agreed to hold discussions on this subject in Peking towards the end of this month. Our ambassador, who had come here for consultations, has already left for China and will followed by one or two officers of the External Affairs Ministry.

Shri M. Govinda Reddy: May I know the scope and purpose of these talks?

Shri A.K. Chanda: I do not think, Sir, that on the eve of this conference, it will be desirable to enter into a discussion on this.

Shri V.G. Gopal: What are the most outstanding matters regarding India and China that is still pending for discussion?

Shri A.K. Chanda: I would like to repeat what the Prime Minister said in the other House the other day: "The House will appreciate that on the eve of this conference in Peking it will not be desirable to discuss these questions in detail. These questions are going to be discussed by both Governments on the basis of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity."

Shri C.G.K. Reddy: We are not asking for the details of the discussions that are to take place. We want to know what are the items on the agenda for this meeting?

Shri A.K. Chanda: I do not think it will be in the public interest to refer to them here.



23 March 1955

Written Answers to Questions

PERMIT SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL BETWEEN INDIA AND TIBET

219. Dr. Raghbir Singh: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state by what date the permit system for travel between India and Tibet is likely to be brought into operation?

The Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

The permit system is expected to be put into practice from May this year. As soon as the details have been finalised,

information will be released to the press and generally made available to the people of the regions concerned.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

20 September 1955

Oral Answers to Questions

EXPORT OF RICE TO TIBET

***523. Dr. Raghubir Singh:** Will the **Minister for food and agriculture** be pleased to refer to the reply given to my Starred Question No. 425 on the 22nd December 1954, and state:

- (a) whether any rice has been exported to Tibet during the current year under the agreement entered into with the Government of the Peoples Republic of China for the purpose;
- (b) if so, the quantity of rice which has so far been exported;
- (c) the arrangements made by the Government of India for the transportation of this rice; and
- (d) the total expenditure incurred by Government on making these arrangements?

The Deputy Minister for Food and Agriculture (Shri M.V. Krishnappa):

- (a) Yes, sir.
- (b) 1,827 tons.
- (c) The rice is first railed from the milling centres in Assam to Siliguri from where it is carried by trucks to Gangtok, where it is delivered to the Chinese representative.
- (d) As accounts have not been finalised, the total expenditure incurred on these arrangements is not yet known.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: May I know, Sir, how much more rice is still to be exported?

Shri M.V. Krishnappa: According to the target, we have to supply 2,200 tons, out of which we have already supplied about 1,827 tons. About 300 tons still remain to be supplied.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: May I know, Sir, how much more time it will take to send the remaining rice?

Shri M.V. Krishnappa: The supply could not be affected due to some breaches on the railway lines. As soon as they are repaired, the remaining rice will be sent.

Shri M.Valiulla: How does the Government settle the account in this matter?

Shri M.V. Krishnappa: They have opened their Bank account in Calcutta, and they will pay in cash.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

28 September 1955

Written Answers to Questions

TRADE WITH TIBET

433. Shri M.Valiulla: Will the **Minister for Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether since the Sino-Indian Agreement on Tibet, our trade with Tibet has gone up; and
- (b) if so, to what extent and in what articles?

The Minister for Commerce and Industry (Shri T.T. Krishnamachari):

- (a) Yes, Sir; to some extent.
- (b) The figures of estimated value of India's total trade with Tibet during 1953-54 and 1954-55 were as follows:

	1953-54	1954-55	
Imports from Tibet	- 10,000	12,647	(Value in '000 of Rs.)
Exports to Tibet	- 20,112	27,107	

2. A comparative statement showing details of India's trade with Tibet only in commodities, which have registered an increase during 1954-55 over those in 1953-54 is attached.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

19 December 1956

Written Answers to Questions

AVAILABILITY AND PRODUCTION OF TIBETAN WOOL

217. Shri M.Valiulla: Will the **Minister of Commerce and Consumer Industries** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether enough Tibetan wool is available in India for the purposes of cottage woollen industry in the Second Five Year Plan; and

(b) whether any steps have been taken to produce similar type of wool in the country?

The Minister for Commerce and Consumer Industries (Shri Morarji Desai):

- (a) The cottage woollen industry requires mostly indigenous wool and there has been no difficulty felt in obtaining its small requirements of Tibetan wool by imports.
- (b) Breeding of sheep to yield superior fleece is carried on at some research stations in the country.



26 August 1957

Oral Answers to Questions

DISCOVERY OF ANCIENT SANSKRIT AND TIBETAN MANUSCRIPTS IN TIBET

***264. Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray:** Will the **Minister of Education and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether he is aware that recently a large number of ancient Sanskrit and Tibetan manuscripts dating from the eighth century A.D. were discovered at the Sakeya monastery near Shigatse in Tibet; and
- (b) if so, whether Government propose to depute competent scholars to study and fetch copies of all such documents for further critical study or to obtain microfilmed or Photostat copies of the important documents through normal diplomatic channels?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (Dr. K.L. Shrimali):

- (a) No, Sir.
- (b) This will be considered after the facts are known.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray: May I know if any attempt has been made by the Ministry of Education to check up on a recent Tass Agency report that similar discoveries were made in Soviet Armenia dating from the 8th to 16th Century?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The Government has no information about this matter, and I cannot say anything unless we get information about this matter.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: May I know whether after having got the notice of the question the hon. Minister anticipated a question like this and whether he tried to get some information?

(No reply)



1 December 1958

Oral Answers to Questions

तिब्बत से चांदी के सिक्कों का लाया जाना

१८१. श्री राम सहाय: क्या वित्त मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि तिब्बत से १ अप्रैल, १९५८ से अक्तुबर, १९५८ के अन्त तक चांदी के कितने सिक्के लाये गये और ऐसे सिक्कों पर कितना शुल्क वसूल किया गया?

BRINGING OF SILVER COINS FROM TIBET

Shri Ram Sahai: Will the **Minister of Finance** be pleased to state the number of silver coins brought from Tibet from 1st April, 1958 to the end of October, 1958, and the amount of duty realised on such coins?

वित्त उपमंत्री (श्री बी.आर. भगत): तिब्बत से, १ अप्रैल १९५८ से अक्तुबर १९५८ के अन्त तक चांदी के ४०,४२,५९४ सिक्के लाये गये और इन पर सीमा शुल्क के रूप में १७,३३,९३२ रूपया वसूल किया गया!

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat):

The number of silver coins brought from Tibet from the 1st April 1958 to the end of October 1958 is 40,42,594 and the customs duty realised thereon is Rs. 17,33,932.

श्री राम सहाय: क्या माननीय मंत्री महोदय यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि पिछले तीन वर्षों में जो सिक्के वहां से आये हैं और जो तदाद अभी बतलाई गई, वह अनुपात में कम है या ज्यादा है?

श्री बी. आर. भगत: कम है!

श्री राम सहाय: तो इसका क्या कारण है?

श्री बी. आर. भगत: अब वहां के अधिकारियों ने इन सिक्कों के लाने पर सख्ती कर दी है और आम तौर से ये सिक्के नहीं आ सकते हैं !

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: सख्ती का सवाल नहीं है ! चीन की हुकूमत ने इन सिक्कों को लाने के लिये नये कायदे बनाये हैं ! चुनांचे अब ये सिक्के भारत नहीं आते ! यह सिक्के - में याददाश्त से कह रहा हूं - पहले बहुत नहीं आते थे, लेकिन इनका आना फिर बढ़ गया ! इसकी वजह से याटूंग में हिन्दुस्तानियों की नई नई दुकानें खुल गई और यहां से सामान जाने लगा ! अब चीन सरकार ने नये कायदे बनाये हैं, जिनकी वजह से यह चीज़ रूक गई है !

श्री राम सहाय: भारत सरकार की इस सम्बन्ध में क्या नीति है ? क्या इन सिक्कों को यहां लाने का प्रोत्साहन देना है या कोई दूसरी नीति है ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: इसमें भारत सरकार की नीति का सवाल नहीं है, चीन सरकार की नीति का सवाल है !



20 April 1959

Oral Answers to Questions

DEMONSTRATION BY TIBETANS IN KALIMPONG AGAINST CHINA

***8. Shri Bhupesh Gupta:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a number of Tibetans in Kalimpong held demonstrations against the Peoples' Republic of China?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

Kalimpong has a considerable population of persons who are of Tibetan origin but who are nationals of India. It has also a number of émigrés from Tibet.

There were two meetings held in the Kalimpong Town Hall on March 24 and 25 which were chiefly attended by the Tibetan population of Kalimpong. These meetings were peaceful. The hope was expressed that the Dalai Lama was safe and the people were exhorted to pray for the welfare of Tibet and the Dalai Lama. It was also decided to send a deputation to Delhi. On the 25th March, there was a peaceful procession also in the town. There was no demonstration against the Chinese Government as such.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I would only like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a newspaper, *Hindustan Times* of March 27, 1959, caption which says, "Tibetans in Kalimpong demonstrate against the Chinese Regime."

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: That is the caption but what does the news itself say?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Shall I read the caption, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: Caption may be something and the news may be something else.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I want to know whether after receiving this question, the hon. Minister made enquiries as to the truth or otherwise of this caption? This carries with it also a picture.

Shri D. A. Mirza: May I know whether there is any law in our country that prohibits the holding of demonstration against a brutal attack on one country by another?

(No reply)

Shri Jai Narain Vyas:

May I know whether any pro-China meetings were held in Kalimpong?

(No reply)

Mr. Chairman : Next Question



20 April 1959

Oral Answers to Questions

TIBETANS PERMITTED TO ENTER INDIA

***24. Shri J. H. Joshi:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the total number of Tibetans who have recently been given permission to enter India and stay here?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Since the 1st March 1959, the Dalai Lama with a party of 86 persons has entered India. Apart from this party, 7 other Tibetans have also entered India.

श्री पां० ना० राजभोज: क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि सरकार उनको स्पेशल फेसिलिटीज इसलिये देती है क्योंकि तिब्बत की परिस्थिति ठीक नहीं है?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: किसको?

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज: टिब्बैटन लोग जो यहां आये हैं उनके बारे में मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ ! क्या सरकार उनको कोई स्पेशल फेसिलिटीज दे रही है कि नहीं ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: जो लोग आ गये वे आ गये ! जहां तक दलाई लामा जी की पार्टी है उसके लिये तो पूरी जिम्मेदारी हम ने ली है ! वे इस वक्त मसूरी का सफर कर रहे हैं ! बाकी जो पांच, दस आदमी आये हैं, ऐसे लोगों को रिहेबिलिटेट करने का सवाल हमारे सामने नहीं है कि वे रिहेबिलिटेशन मिनिस्ट्री के चार्ज में कर दिये जायें !

Shri N.M. Lingam: May I enquire if the Government proposes to fix any limit beyond which refugees will not be allowed to enter?

Some Hon. Members: Why?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Question of limit, Sir, has not arisen. The questions are based on the assumption that large numbers are trying to push in. Nobody is trying to push in. Very few, as I said—only seven or eight—generally are trying to come in the whole month. The question does not arise yet. We examine each case as it is.

Pandit S. S.N. Tankha: The hon. Deputy Minister stated that permission has been granted for 86 persons who are accompanying the Dalai Lama. Is it not a fact that the Dalai Lama's party now consists of 120 persons and they must all have been given permission?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir, so far as I know, it does not consist of 120 persons. The figure 120 was mentioned at one stage, but on further enquiry and looking at the people, they are fewer.

Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya: I want to know whether, along with the Dalai Lama or independently, any of those who formed the Cabinet of the Dalai Lama—previous to the Panchen Lama Cabinet—have come here?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I believe that there are two, three or four—I forget how many—of the previous ministers with him.

Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti: Should we not allow friends of India to come into our country? Are we to limit the frontiers in such a way that intellectuals and friends would be barred from entering this country? What international law is there to prevent such people from entering the country?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Lady member is needlessly agitating herself.

Shri M.H. Samuel: Will he give us an assurance that the Tibetans who come into our country will not do anything to embarrass our relations *vis-à-vis* the friendly country, China?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, that is naturally expected, Sir.

Shri Jaswant Singh: Before this trouble between Tibet and China, was there any restriction on the entry of Tibetans into our country?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No restrictions. But the normal papers had to be carried by parties going from one country to another.

Shri Jaswant Singh: Even now, those who carry the normal papers, would they be allowed entry into our country?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no doubt—if the normal papers are carried, they would. The question now arises about the people who do not carry any papers at all and even they are admitted in certain cases.

Shri D.A. Mirza: May I know whether the Government of India will give protection to those Tibetans who want to take asylum in India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Hon. Members referred to what I have said on previous occasions.



DALAI LAMA'S STAY IN INDIA

***25. Shri V.K. Dhage:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state where the Dalai Lama will stay in India?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Arrangements for the stay of Dalai Lama and party are being made in Mussoorie.

Shri V.K. Dhage: May I know what privileges and facilities are afforded to the Dalai Lama and party are being made in Mussoorie.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member means by 'privileges'. Facilities are facilities. Arrangements have been made for his comfortable stay having regard to his security, etc.

Shri Rohit M. Dave: May I know if the attention of the Government of India is drawn to the fact that in the statement issued on behalf of the Dalai Lama from Tezpur, concern has been shown for ensuring perpetual security of the sacred religion and freedom of his country, and if so, will the Dalai Lama be given reasonable facilities to carry on his legitimate activities in pursuance of this concern?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. Member means if he will be given freedom to carry on legitimate religious activities, certainly. If he refers to political activities, political activities are not carried on from one country with regard to another.

Dr. H.N. Kunzru: Is it a fact that in England, which has freely granted asylum to political refugees, the refugees have been allowed to carry on normal political propaganda in favour of their views? Only they have not been allowed to collect arms or to make warlike preparations against the country to which they belong.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is rather difficult to draw a line. Certainly to some extent it is permitted and to some extent it may not be permitted. It is difficult for me to lay down hard and fast rules.

Dr. H.N. Kunzru: Does the Government of India ask these people to refrain from collecting arms for being sent to Tibet or doing any other thing which will amount to a warlike act against China, or even prevent the Tibetan refugees from giving expression to their views with regard to the future of Tibet or stating matters of fact when they feel that it is necessary to do so to clear up the position in Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Members might have noticed that we have given a fairly large measure of freedom of expression of views to the people and the Dalai Lama himself has made a statement as he felt like making it. We have not come in the way of his statement. As for what we expect people to do, that depends on many things. It is not a question of the Dalai Lama, but all manner of other folk coming in. The Dalai Lama is a responsible man. But there are so many others. We do not quite know how they might function and not function. It is an ordinary right in every country including England to limit the functioning of foreigners who create difficulties with other countries. There is no rule of law about it. The rule of law is that the country—the host country—has the right to limit it. To what extent it does so and in what manner, is always a matter of circumstances and the situation.

Dr. A.N. Bose: Is it proposed to extent diplomatic immunities and extra-territorial rights to the Dalai Lama and his party?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not understand his question. There is no such thing as 'extra-territorial rights'.

Shri Santosh Kumar Basu: Should not the main consideration in these matters be the external and internal security of our own country?

Mr. Chairman: That is accepted. What he says is, the main consideration in these matters should be our security—external and internal. That is accepted on all hands.

तिब्बत में भारतीय व्यापारी

२१. श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या प्रधानमंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या यह सच है कि तिब्बत के भारतीय व्यापारी संघ ने भारत सरकार से प्रार्थना की है कि वह चीन की सरकार से तिब्बत में उनकी

व्यापार व दैनिक जीवन संबंधी कठिनाइयों को दूर कराने के लिये कहें;

(ख) यदि उपरोक्त भाग (क) का उत्तर 'हां' हो तो वहां भारतीय व्यापारियों ने क्या-क्या कठिनाइयां अनुभव की है; और इस संबंध में सरकार ने अब तक क्या कार्यवाही की है और उसके क्या परिणाम निकले हैं; और

(ग) तिब्बत में उपद्रवों में भारतीय व्यापारियों की सुरक्षा के लिये सरकार द्वारा क्या प्रयत्न किये गये हैं?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू):

(क) और (ख) भारत सरकार को, तिब्बत के भारतीय व्यापारी संघ की कठिनाइयां दूर करने के बारे में, कोई आवेदन अभी हाल में नहीं मिला है! अक्तूबर १९५८ में, यातुंग के भारतीय व्यापारी संघ ने, अपने प्रतिनिधियों के जरिये जो ज्ञापन (मेमोरैंडम) प्रधान मंत्री को दिया था, उस पर की गई कार्यवाही का विवरण सदन की मेज पर रख दिया गया है!

(ग) हाल के उपद्रवों के दौरान में हमारे प्रधान कौंसल और व्यापारिक एजेंटों के लिये स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक आ जा सकना या भारतीय राष्ट्रियों से संपर्क स्थापित करना कठिन था! हमने चीनी अधिकारियों से कहा और यह आशा प्रकट की कि आमतौर पर भारतीय राष्ट्रियों की पूरी हिफाजत की जाये! हमें यह विश्वास दिलाया गया कि जहां कहीं भी चीनी फोर्जे तैनात होंगी, हमारे राष्ट्रियों की रक्षा की जायेगी!

यातुंग के भारतीय व्यापारी संघ द्वारा भारत के प्रधानमंत्री को दिये गये ज्ञापन पर की गई कार्यवाही

(१) उत्पादन व कर योग्य माल पर कटौती देने के लिये माल उतारने का प्रमाणपत्र:- भारत सरकार इस बात पर विचार कर रही है कि वर्तमान प्रक्रिया में कहां तक फेर-बदल की जा सकती है!

(२) भारतीय व्यापारियों के पासपोर्टों का नवीकरण करने के लिये यातुंग स्थित भारतीय व्यापारी एजेंट को शक्ति प्रदान करना:- व्यापारियों को पासपोर्ट जारी नहीं किये जाते हैं, लेकिन वे १९५४ के चीन भारत करार के अनुच्छेद ५ (१) के अन्तर्गत निर्धारित व्यापारी प्रमाण-पत्र रखते हैं जिस वर्तमान प्रणाली के अन्तर्गत सिक्किम की जांच चौकियां इन प्रमाण-पत्रों का नवीकरण करती हैं, वह सन्तोषजनक रीति से चल रही हैं और उसमें कोई परिवर्तन करना अभीष्ट नहीं है!

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

27 April 1959

Paper laid on the Table

Statement RE: SITUATION IN TIBET

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Sir, I beg to lay on the table a Statement that is being made by the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha on the situation in Tibet, on April 27th, 1959.

Shri V.K. Dhage (Bombay): What Statement?

Mr. Chairman: The Prime Minister is just now making a statement in the Lok Sabha on the situation in Tibet and she is placing a copy of it on the table.

Shri V.K. Dhage: We would like to hear it?

Mr. Chairman: You would like her to read it?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta (West Bengal): We would like it to be read here, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: She will read it to you. How many pages is it?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Eleven pages.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: She should be in a position to give us an idea of the main points in it.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It will be difficult...

Mr. Chairman: No no. She would rather read. All right.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, this is the statement:

"I have made several statements in the House in regard to the developments in Tibet. The last statement was made on April 3, in which I informed the House that the Dalai Lama had entered the territory of the Indian Union with a large entourage. I should like to bring this information up-to-date and to place such additional facts as we have before the House.

A few days ago, the Dalai Lama and his party reached Mussoorie, where Government had made arrangements for their stay. I have had occasion to visit Mussoorie since then and have had a long talk with the Dalai Lama.

In the course of the last few days, reports have reached us that considerable numbers of Tibetans, numbering some thousands, have recently crossed into the Kameng Frontier Division of the North-East Frontier Agency and some hundreds have also entered the territory of Bhutan. They sought asylum, and we have agreed to this. Some of them carrying arms were disarmed. We do not know the exact number yet. Temporary arrangements are being made in a camp for their maintenance until they can be dispersed in accordance with their wishes and the necessities governing in such a case. We could not leave these refugees to their own resources. Apart from the humanitarian considerations involved, there was also the law and order problem to be considered. We are grateful to the Government of Assam for their help and co-operation in this matter.

So far as the Dalai Lama and his party are concerned, we had to take adequate measures on grounds of security and also to protect them from large numbers of newspaper correspondents, both Indian and foreign, who, in their anxiety to obtain first hand information in regard to a matter of world importance, were likely to harass and almost overwhelm the Dalai Lama and his party. While we were anxious to give protection to the Dalai Lama and his party, we were agreeable to giving these newspapermen suitable opportunities to see him. I had received an appeal from nearly 75 representatives of news agencies and newspapers from Tezpur requesting me to give them such opportunities. A senior officer of the External Affairs Ministry was, therefore, deputed to proceed to Tezpur in advance to deal with the press representatives and photographers who had assembled in that small town of Assam. This officer made the necessary administrative arrangements to meet, as far as possible, the wishes of the newspapermen to see the Dalai Lama and to photograph him. Soon after entering India, the Dalai Lama indicated his wish to make a statement. We were later informed that this statement would be released at Tezpur. Our officer made arrangements for the distribution of a translation of the statement to the newspaper correspondents.

In view of certain irresponsible charges made, I should like to make it clear that the Dalai Lama was entirely responsible for this statement as well as a subsequent briefer statement that was made by him from Mussoorie. Our officers had nothing to do with the drafting or preparation of these statements.

I need not tell the House that the Dalai Lama entered India entirely of his own volition. At no time had we suggested that he should come to India. We had naturally given thought to the possibility of his seeking asylum in India and when such a request came, we readily granted it. His entry with a large party in a remote corner of our country created special problems of transport, organisation and security. We deputed an officer to meet the Dalai Lama and his party at Bomdila and to escort them to Mussoorie. The particular officer was selected because he had served as Consul-General in Lhasa and therefore was to some extent known to the Dalai Lama and his officials. The selection of Mussoorie for the Dalai Lama's stay was not finalised till his own wishes were ascertained in the matter and he agreed to it. There was no desire on our part to put any undue restrictions on him, but in the special circumstances, certain arrangements had necessarily to be made to prevent any mishap. It should be remembered that the various events in Tibet, culminating in the Dalai Lama's departure from Lhasa and entry into India had created tremendous interest among the people of India and in the world press. After arrival in Mussoorie, steps were taken to prevent the Dalai Lama from being harassed by crowds of people trying to see him as well as by newspapermen. Apart from this, no restrictions about movement were placed on him. He has been told that he and his party can move about Mussoorie according to their wishes. It should be remembered that the Dalai Lama has recently not only had a long, strenuous and dangerous experience but has also had harrowing experiences which must affect the nerves of even a hardened person. He is only just 24 years of age.

These are some bare facts, but behind these facts lie serious developments which may have far reaching consequences. Tragedy has been and is being enacted in Tibet, passions have been let loose, charges made and language used, which cannot but worsen the situation and our relations with our northern neighbour. I am sure that the House will agree with me that in considering matters of such high importance, we should exercise restraint and wisdom and use language, which is moderate and precise. In these days of cold war, there has been a tendency to use unrestrained language and often to make wild charges without any justification. We have fortunately kept out of the cold war and I hope that on this, as on any other occasion, we shall not use the language of cold war. The matter is too serious to be dealt with in a trivial or excited way. I would, therefore, appeal to the press and the public to exercise restraint in language. I regret that occasionally there have been lapses from this on our side. In particular, I regret that grave discourtesy was shown some days ago to a picture of the head of the Chinese State Chairman Mao Tse-tung. This was the work of few irresponsible

people in Bombay. In the excitement of the moment, we cannot allow ourselves to be swept away into wrong courses.

It is not for me to make any similar appeal to the leaders, the press and the people of China. All I can say is that I have been greatly distressed at the tone of the comments and the charges made against India by responsible people in China. They have used the language of cold war regardless of truth and propriety. This is peculiarly distressing in a great nation with thousands of years of culture behind it, noted for its restrained and polite behaviour. The charges made against India are so fantastic that I find it difficult to deal with them. There is the charge of our keeping the Dalai Lama under duress. The Chinese authorities should surely know how we function in this country and what our laws and Constitution are. Even if we were so inclined, we could not keep the Dalai Lama under some kind of detention against his will, and there can be no question of our wishing to do so. We can gain nothing by it except the burden of difficult problems. In any event, this matter can be easily cleared. It is open to the Dalai Lama at any time to go back to Tibet or wherever he wants to. As the Panchen Lama has made himself responsible especially for some strange statements, I have stated that we would welcome him to come to India and meet the Dalai Lama himself. Should he choose to do so, every courtesy will be extended to him. I have further said that the Chinese Ambassador or any other emissary of the Chinese Government can come to India for this purpose and meet the Dalai Lama. There is no barrier for anyone to come peacefully to India, and whether we agree with him or not, we shall treat him with the courtesy due to a guest.

Another and an even stranger allegation has been made about "Indian expansionists" who, it is alleged, are inheritors of the British imperialism. He is perfectly true that British policy was one of expansion into Tibet and that they carried this out by force of arms early in this century. That was, in our opinion, an unjustified and cruel adventure which brought much harm to the Tibetans. As a result of that, the then British Government in India established certain extra territorial rights in Tibet. When India became independent, we inherited some of these rights. Being entirely opposed to any such extra-territorial rights in another country, we did not wish to retain them. But in the early days after Independence and partition, our hands were full, as this House well knows, and we had to face a very difficult situation in our own country. We ignored, if I may say so, Tibet. Not being able to find a suitable person to act as our representative at Lhasa, we allowed for some time the existing British representative to continue at Lhasa. Later an Indian took his place. Soon after the Chinese armies entered Tibet, the question of these extra-territorial rights was raised and we readily agreed to give them up. We would have given them up anyhow, whatever developments might have taken place in Tibet. We withdrew our army detachments from some places in Tibet and handed over Indian postal and telegraph installations and rest houses. We laid down the five principles of the Panchsheel and placed our relationship with the Tibet region on a new footing. What we were anxious about was to preserve the traditional connections between India and Tibet in regard to pilgrim traffic and trade. Our action in this matter and whatever we have done subsequently in regard to Tibet is proof enough of our policy and that India had no political or ulterior ambitions in Tibet. Indeed, even from the narrowest practical point of view, any other policy would have been wrong and futile. Ever since then, we have endeavoured not only to act up to the agreement we made, but also to cultivate our friendship with the Chinese.

It is, therefore, a matter of our deepest regret and surprise to us that charges made which are both unbecoming and entirely void of substance. We have conveyed this deep feeling of regret to the Chinese Government, more especially at the speeches delivered recently in the current session of the National People's Congress in Peking.

I stated some time ago, that our broad policy was governed by three factors; (1) the preservation of the security and integrity of India; (2) our desire to maintain friendly relations with China; and (3) our deep sympathy for the people of Tibet. That policy we shall continue to follow, because we think that is a correct policy not only for the present but even more so for the future. It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia- India and China, which have been peaceful neighbours for the ages past, should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy. But we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia and the world. The five principles have laid down, *inter alia*, mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war used.

I have already made it clear previously that the charge that Kalimpong was a centre of the Tibetan rebellion, is wholly unjustified. We have a large number of people of Tibetan stock living in India as Indian nationals. We have also some Tibetan émigrés in India. All of these deeply respect the Dalai Lama. Some of these have been exceedingly unhappy at development in Tibet; some no doubt have anti-Chinese sentiments. We have made it clear to them that they will not be permitted to carry on any subversive activities from India and I should have to say that by and large they have acted in accordance with the direction of the Government of India. I cannot obviously say that someone has not done something

secretly, but to imagine or say that a small group of persons sitting in Kalimpong organised a major upheaval in Tibet seems to me to make a large draft on imagination and to slur over obvious facts.

The Khampa revolt started in an area of China proper adjoining Tibet, more than three years ago. Is Kalimpong supposed to be responsible for that? This revolt gradually spread and no doubt created a powerful impression on the minds of large numbers of Tibetans, who had kept away from the revolt. Fears and apprehensions about their future gripped their minds and the nationalist upsurge swayed their feelings. Their fears may have been unjustified, but surely they cannot be denied. Such feelings can only be dealt with adequately by peaceful methods than warfare.

When Premier Chou En-lai came here two or three years ago, he was good enough to discuss Tibet with me at considerable length. We had a frank and full talk. He told me that while Tibet had long been a part of Chinese state, they did not consider Tibet as a province of China. The people were different from the people of China proper, just as in other autonomous regions of the Chinese State -the people were different, even though they formed part of that State. Therefore, they considered Tibet an autonomous region which would enjoy autonomy. He told me further that it was absurd for anyone to imagine that China was going to force Communism on Tibet. Communism could not be enforced in this way on a very backward country and they had no wish to do so even though they would like reforms to come in progressively. Even these reforms they proposed to postpone for a considerable time.

About that time, the Dalai Lama was also here and I had long talks with him then. I told him of Premier Chou En-lai's friendly approach and of his assurance that he would respect the autonomy of Tibet. I suggested to him that he should accept these assurances in good faith and co-operate in maintaining that autonomy and bringing about certain reforms in Tibet. The Dalai Lama agreed that his country, though, according to him, advanced spiritually, was very backward socially and economically and reforms were needed.

It is not for us to say how far these friendly intentions and approaches materialised. The circumstances were undoubtedly difficult. On the one side there was a dynamic, rapidly moving society; on the other, a static, unchanging society fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reforms. The distance between the two was great and there appeared to be hardly any meeting point. Meanwhile change in some forms inevitably came to Tibet. Communications developed rapidly and the long isolation of Tibet was partly broken through. Though physical barriers were progressively removed, mental and emotional barriers increased. Apparently, the attempt to cross these mental and emotional barriers was either not made or did not succeed.

To say that a number of "upper strata reactionaries" in Tibet were solely responsible for this appears to be an extraordinary simplification of a complicated situation. Even according to the accounts received through Chinese sources, the revolt in Tibet was of considerable magnitude and the basis of it must have been a strong feeling of nationalism, which affects not only upper class people but others also. No doubt, vested interests joined it and sought to profit by it. The attempt to explain a situation by the use of rather worn-out words, phrases and slogans, is seldom helpful.

When the news of these unhappy developments came to India, there was immediately a strong and widespread reaction. The Government did not bring about this reaction. Nor was this reaction essentially political. It was largely one of sympathy based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons. Also on a certain feeling of kinship with the Tibetan people derived from long-established religious and cultural contacts. It was an instinctive reaction. It is true that some people in India sought to profit by it by turning it in an undesirable direction. But the fact of that reaction of the Indian people was there. If that was the reaction here, one may well imagine the reaction among the Tibetans themselves. Probably this reaction is shared in the other Buddhist countries of Asia. When there are such strong feelings, which are essentially not political, they cannot be dealt with by political methods alone, much less by military methods. We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet; we have every desire to maintain the friendship between India and China; but at the same time we have every sympathy for the people of Tibet, and we are greatly distressed at their hapless plight. We hope still that the authorities of China, in their wisdom, will not use their great strength against the Tibetans but will win them to friendly co-operation in accordance with the assurances they have themselves given about the autonomy of the Tibet region. Above all, we hope that the present fighting and killing will cease.

As I have said above, I had a long talk with the Dalai Lama three days ago at Mussoorie. He told me of the difficulties he had to face, of the growing resentment of his people at the conditions existing there and how he sought to restrain them, of his feelings that the religion of the Buddha, which was more to him than life itself, was being endangered. He said that up to the last moment he did not wish to leave Lhasa. It was only on the afternoon of the 17th March when, according to him, some shells were fired at his palace and fell in a pond nearby, that the sudden decision was taken to leave Lhasa. Within a few hours of the same day he and his party left Lhasa and took the perilous journey to the Indian

frontier. The departure was so hurried that even an adequate supply of clothes could not be brought. When I met the Dalai Lama, no member of his entourage was present. Even the interpreter was our own. The Dalai Lama told me that the two statements which had been issued were entirely his own and there was no question of anybody coercing him to make them. Even though he is young, I could not easily imagine that he could be coerced into doing something he did not wish. All my sympathy goes out to this young man who at an early age has had to shoulder heavy burdens and to face tremendous responsibilities. During the last few weeks he has suffered great physical and mental strain. I advised him to rest for a while and not to take any hurried decisions. He felt very unhappy at conditions in Tibet and was especially anxious that fighting should stop.”



28th April 1959

Written Answers to Questions

SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS IN TIBETAN MONASTERIES

***156. Shri Maheshwar Naik:** Will the **Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that a large number of Sanskrit manuscripts of valuable interest to India are lying in Tibetan monasteries; and
- (b) if so, what action has been taken by the Government of India for the recovery or otherwise making use of the same?

The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayun Kabir):

- (a) and (b) It is believed that there is a large number of Sanskrit and other manuscripts in Tibetan monasteries but we have at present no detailed and reliable information on the point. A proposal to send some scholars to Tibet to study such manuscripts has for the present been deferred.



4 May 1959

Paper laid on the Table

MOTION Re: SITUATION ARISING OUT OF RECENT EVENTS IN TIBET

Shri H.D. Rajah (Madras): Sir, before Dr. Kunzru is allowed to move his motion, I want to raise a point of order. This motion is not consistent with the Constitution of our country. Presumably this motion was admitted in the House under the seventh schedule, item 10, “Foreign Affairs, all matters which bring the Union into relation with any foreign country.”

Now, Sir, Tibet is not a foreign country. It is a part of China. If this House is going to discuss a foreign country, China, and this dangerous precedent is accepted by us, I say in all humility, then Soviet Russia will have a right to discuss in their Parliament our Kerala affairs and so many other matters (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Chairman: That will do. We understand.

Shri H.D. Rajah: I, therefore, say that Tibet not being directly connected with our Constitution, and Tibet being a part of China, whose suzerainty over Tibet we have accepted...

Shri H.P. Saksena (Uttar Pradesh): According to you it may be a part of China.

Shri H. D. Rajah: It will infringe the provisions of the Panch Sheel, which we have accepted. The Prime Minister has also entered into a declaration with the Prime Minister of China that domestic affairs in another’s country will not be interfered with and there will be non-intervention.

This country has accepted the Dalai Lama. It is a hospitable country. It has given asylum to so many people. All people are welcome to take asylum in our country. But to discuss the affairs of a part of another nation, to discuss the affairs pertaining to another country, will amount to our conceding the dangerous precedent of other foreign countries discussing our internal affairs.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Shri H. D. Rajah: Therefore, I want a ruling from the Chair whether this motion is in consonance with the Constitution of this country.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta (West Bengal): Sir, in your wisdom you have allowed this motion to be discussed. I do not exactly know what will be discussed. But, I think, Sir, you should consider the constitutional point that has been raised, that if we allow this motion, we would be creating dangerous precedents.

Our Constitution does not even allow us here in this House to discuss the State subjects concerning Bengal, Punjab and other States. Sometimes exceptions are made with regard to Kerala, but that is beside the point; generally, we do not allow any such discussion. Now, Sir, obviously, we are discussing some other thing. I could have understood this point being discussed in the course of a Foreign office Affairs debate. But a separate motion to discuss the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet has been admitted. I would like to know whether it would be permissible for us to concentrate on this discussion about the internal affairs of Tibet or whether, since in your wisdom you have admitted this motion, we shall confine ourselves to the important subject of Indo-Chinese relations. That is a very important point, and I have no objection that way. But, here, I think, Sir, you should again reflect and give us direction as to how the discussion should proceed.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha (Bihar): Sir, I want to make a submission for your consideration on the point that has been raised just now.

Sir, the motion says:

“That the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet be taken into consideration.”

Now we have got to consider the situation, which has arisen out of the events that have taken place in Tibet. We have discussed very many subjects like that, events that have taken place in other countries and the consequences that have flowed out of them. We are not going to discuss the internal affairs of Tibet, but we are going to discuss the consequences that have flowed out of the events that have taken place in Tibet. Therefore, I hope you will disallow the point of order raised against this discussion.

Shri V.K. Dhage (Bombay): Sir, Mr. Rajah has raised a constitution point and he referred to the Seventh Schedule, List I. But he should have referred to article 367 of the Constitution of India, which says very clearly that we can discuss this matter, which is before the House. In fact, apart from List I of the Seventh Schedule, it is stated that all residuary powers are with Parliament and therefore, I think we are perfectly within the constitution when we deal with the situation that has arisen out of the events in Tibet.

Shri H.D. Rajah: But the constitution.....

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Sir, I should make it very clear that I am second to none in my determination to maintain the sovereignty of Parliament; but at the same time we have to remember that a discussion of this kind will create a grave constitutional precedent....

Shri H.D. Rajah: It is a dangerous precedent.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: And you, Sir, have not been able to allow a discussion on the U.S-Pakistan Pact....

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has just referred to a point which he raised here and which I did not allow on account of special considerations in this House—the U.S.-Pakistan Bilateral Pact. He has given notice of a motion to raise this discussion here. Well, if that is something which you can discuss this is also so.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: But then, Sir.....

Mr. Chairman: Under rule 148 of the Rules of Procedure of the Rajya Sabha, discussion may be raised on any matter of general public interest. We are discussing only the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet, or in other words, the impact of the situation on India. Therefore, it is admissible. I only hope that Members will exercise considerable restraint, control and patience and not run off with their emotions. Dr. Kunzru.

Dr. H.N. Kunzru (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I move:

“That the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet be taken into consideration.”

Sir, it is not easy to speak about a situation, which has caused great uneasiness among the people of India; but it is at the same time, not possible to be silent about it. The Prime Minister has dealt with some of the most important issues arising out of this situation with admirable restraint and dignity. He has set an example, which, I trust, everyone in this House will follow in discussing this situation. Sir, the Prime Minister, in his statement of the 27th April has referred to many of the charges brought against India because of reaction in India of what was happening in Tibet. It is not necessary for me, therefore, to deal with those things at any length. Apart from this anyone who speaks on this question must realise that the two great countries of Asia—India and China—have to work together for the benefit of the world. We have had for two thousand years a frontier extending over 1,800 miles where unbroken peace has reigned. People talk of the Canadian-American frontier, but in this respect India and China have set an example which is more worthy of being

imitated than the example of Canada and America and I trust, Sir, that the cooperation that has been the key-note of the relations of India and China for centuries will be observed in their actions even in future.

Sir, no one can deny that the reaction in India to the situation arising out of the events in Tibet was strong and swift. Even in Parliament all parties, with the exception of the Communist Party, united in expressing their concern at what was happening, and when the Prime Minister announced in the Lok Sabha that the Dalai Lama had entered Indian territory, the news was received with joy and enthusiasm in which most of the parties, except the Communist Party shared. We have seen that various charges have been brought against us in connection with the recent events in Tibet. It has been said, for instance, that Kalimpong was the centre from which the revolt in Tibet was being organised, and this charge continues to be repeated in spite of the repeated denials of the Prime Minister. Again, Sir, it was said that the Dalai Lama had been abducted by the rebels from Tibet and was held in duress. No less a person than Mr. Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of China, said as late as on the 14th or 15th of April that the Dalai Lama was held in duress. Again it was said that India was influenced by imperialist propaganda and intrigues. Further when it was seen that India continued to be concerned over what was happening in Tibet. India was told that she had skeletons in her cupboard and that she should be mindful of her own weaknesses when she tried to meddle in affairs, not her own. Again, Sir, some Indians were attacked as being expansionist and a Peking newspaper whose article was reported by the New China News Agency which said that the Indian expansionists were plotting to make Tibet a vassal State of India. The revolt was attributed to a clique of the upper strata in Tibet. The Prime Minister has dealt with all these charges. It is not necessary for me, therefore, to go into them at all but I have to say that the responsibility for the recent events in Tibet has been placed on shoulders that cannot justifiably be expected to bear. I am reminded Sir, in this connection of the situation in connection with the Hungarian revolt when it was tried to be made out that the revolt was due to the action of capitalists and imperialists, anti-revolutionary elements and so on, but a little later it became clear that the revolt was a national revolt. I think, Sir, everybody will agree with the Prime Minister that the revolt in Tibet cannot be as easily explained as the Chinese authorities have tried to explain it away. It is due to a national upsurge and it will be good for China and the whole world, if that fact were frankly recognised.

Sir, I want to deal with two charges that have been brought against India since the Prime Minister spoke in the Lok Sabha on the 27th April. The Panchen Lama has, in the course of a speech, accused the Indian authorities of having shown certain discrimination against him in arranging receptions. He has further said that when he saw the famous Stupa at Sarnath – that is the monastery where the Buddha first preached—and quite a number of other monasteries, he felt that they were in a poor state and he wondered whether people who cared so little about Buddhist archaeological remains could care much for Buddhism. I am sorry to say, Sir, that we miss in this statement of the Panchen Lama that dignity which we have a right to associate with a statement made by people in high positions like the Panchen Lama. Again, Sir, everyone knows how keenly interested the Government of India is in the preservation of the ancient monuments. The Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama came to India in connection with the 2500th Jayanti of the Buddha. Shortly before the Jayanti was celebrated, special repairs had been undertaken in many places including Sarnath Kusinara. I greatly regret, Sir, the words used by the Panchen Lama and the manner in which facts have been twisted in order to bring an accusation against India and, the charge of discrimination against the Panchen Lama has been brought nearly three years after the event. I am in a position to say, Sir, that he was treated with every mark of respect and that the hospitality shown to him could scarcely have been improved.

Another charge, Sir, is that several Tibetan leaders, including one of the Dalai Lama's brothers had moved from Kalimpong to Mussoorie and that there is every reason to suspect that Mussoorie would become a new commanding centre of the Tibetan rebels. Sir, it is, I am sorry to say, clear that no accusation is fantastic to be brought against India by interested parties but the Prime Minister has made it clear that the Government of India which has not allowed the Tibetans at Kalimpong to indulge in anti-Chinese activities will not permit anyone in Mussoorie to prejudice the relations between these two countries in this crisis. Statements like these show how desperate the position of those who want to accuse India directly or indirectly of complicity in the Tibetan revolt.

Now, Sir, leaving aside these things, we have to meet two criticisms of our policy. One is that our criticism of Chinese policy in Tibet amounts to interference in the internal affairs of China. Sir, we have before now criticised the policy of other countries in respect of the manner in which they dealt with some of their colonies. We have, for instance, criticised the French policy in Algeria and the British policy in Kenya and the Central African Federation.

Shri P.N. Sapro (Uttar Pradesh): Cyprus.

Dr. H.N. Kunzru: We have never been told that we were going out of our province in expressing our opinion about the policies of those countries in respect of their colonies. If it cannot be said that our criticism was the result of hostility to France and England, how can Indian disapproval or Indian concern over Chinese policy in Tibet be regarded as unfriendly to China? India has recognised Chinese suzerainty subject to regional autonomy. Mr. Chou En-Lai said to the Prime Minister of India: "While Tibet had long been part of the Chinese State, they did not consider Tibet as a province of China". He further said, "The people of Tibet are different from the people of China. Tibet is an autonomous region and it would enjoy autonomy."

The Prime Minister has further told us that he communicated this to the Dalai Lama in 1956 and asked him in view of the assurance given by Mr. Chou En-lai, to accept them in good faith and co-operate in maintaining that autonomy in bringing about certain reforms in Tibet. Sir, in view of this, I think the Prime Minister would have failed in his duty had he not expressed his own feelings and that of the whole country with regard to the Tibetan upheaval.

Sir, the second charge that has been brought against us is that we are siding with the reactionaries. In the resolution that was passed the other day by the National People's Congress of China on Tibet, it has been said: "The existing social system in Tibet is an extremely backward system of serfdom. The degree of cruelty which characterises the exploitation, oppression and persecution of the labouring people by the serf owners can hardly be paralleled in any other part of the world. Even those who have repeatedly expressed sympathy for the Tibetan rebels cannot explain why they are so enthusiastic in backing up such a backward system. The Tibetan people, for a long time, have firmly demanded the reform of their social system." Sir, we realise the need for introducing social and economic reforms in backward and underdeveloped countries. The steps that we have taken to introduce social and economic reforms in our country during the last few years would have been regarded only a few years ago as revolutionary. Yet they have been introduced democratically, that is, with the support of the representatives and the leaders of the people. When we, therefore, express our concern at the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet we should not be held to be supporting the cause of those who would like the existing social system in Tibet to be maintained. I venture to think that the method that we have used in our country can with advantage be employed by other countries. All colonial powers also claim to have the right to introduce reforms in their colonies and they claim to do so even against the wishes of their people. But these reforms, in order to be lasting and to have their full effect should be carried out with the goodwill of the leaders of the people. Had our methods been followed, had the goodwill of the leaders been secured, I am sure that reforms could have been introduced into Tibet at no distant date and that these reforms would have created contentment throughout the country.

Sir, it is no pleasure for me to appear to disagree with Chinese policy in regard to Tibet. But situated as we are, considering the centuries-old connection between India and Tibet, the ancient religious and cultural ties that bind these two countries, was it reasonable for anyone to expect that we would maintain silence at this juncture? Sir, notwithstanding what has happened, everyone in this House, I am sure, desires to strengthen the friendly relations that have prevailed for two thousand years between India and China. But these friendly relations can be based only on frankness and free expression of opinion. No fruitful relations can be established if we suppress honest differences of opinion on our part. It would be tantamount to national cowardice. We have the right to stand up for the truth as we see it, without claiming to be always in the right. But though we may disagree with China occasionally, it is a fact – and the Chinese authorities, I believe, recognise it – that we realise the great value of continued friendship between these two great countries. Our frontier has been peaceful, as I have already said, for two thousand years, and no one would wish that anything should be said that would disturb these friendly relations to the smallest extent.

There are just one or two matters to which I should like to refer before I sit down. The Chinese Prime Minister, Mr. Chou En-lai, addressing the Chinese National Peoples' Congress referred to the undetermined boundary lines between China and certain neighbouring South East Asian countries and said that these boundaries could be reasonably settled through peaceful negotiations. China's claim to any territory controlled by other countries raises a serious question, but in any case I venture to think that the time chosen by him with regard to this question was scarcely opportune. I fervently hope that he did not want to make India aware of the existence of a new frontier, North East Frontier. He himself is reported to have said recently that he hoped that the friendly relations between India and China could be improved after the quelling of the Tibetan rebellion. I trust, therefore, that the relations between India and China would continue to be warm and friendly and that the frontier between India and Tibet will continue to be as peaceful in future as it has been for more than two thousand years.

There is one more point in connection with the situation arising out of recent events in Tibet that I should like to

lay stress on. We all realise the value of the cultural bonds that unite India and her neighbours, but we have recognized this value in a passive way. We have done hardly anything in recent years to bring about the further development of cultural relations between us and the neighbouring countries. I think that we should recognise more actively the value of the cultural ties that I have referred to and try to develop and strengthen them, so that the appreciation of India's motives and policies that existed in the past may continue in future also.

Lastly, I should like to refer to the entry of a few thousand Tibetans recently into India. In giving the Dalai Lama and these Tibetans an asylum in India, the Prime Minister has acted in conformity with the strong feeling that prevails on this subject throughout the country. We are not happy that events have driven these people to seek refuge in India. We shall be happy if circumstances are created that would enable them to go back to their country. The wish of the Prime Minister that the present situation should come to a speedy end and that the refugees should be in a position to return to their homes in the near future would be echoed by everyone not merely in this House but all over the country. While they are here, I have no doubt that they will be looked after carefully both by the Government and by the people of India. If they have to live here, I hope that they will be enabled to earn their own living so that they may lead self-respecting lives. I also hope that they would be given reasonable freedom to carry on any peaceful activities in which they may be interested including an expression of their opinion. We have never so far tried to stifle opinions different from ours, and even though the present situation is delicate and we cannot allow people to exploit it in order to create ill-will and bitterness between India and China, yet I hope that we shall be actuated by that broad and liberal policy which actuated our country in the past and which a small country like England has followed for hundreds of years in regard to émigrés. It is not, of course, binding on us in international law to allow an unlimited number of people to seek asylum in our country, but the situation at present is extraordinary. I once again express the hope that the Prime Minister would deal with the matter that I have referred to with that regard for the feelings of the country and for the demands of fairness and human self-respect as he has done till now.

Sir, I have done.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved: "That the situation arising out of the recent events in Tibet be taken into consideration." Every other speaker will have just fifteen minutes, and the time limit will be strictly enforced except in respect of the Prime Minister. Mr. Shiva Rao.

Shri Shiva Rao (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, in taking part in this debate I shall of course bear in mind your exhortations with which my hon. Friend, Dr. Kunzru, commenced his speech. I am also reminded, Sir, of the wise advice which was given by a brother of mine when he was relinquishing his post as India's permanent delegate at the United Nations to take his seat on the International Court of Justice. When his successor asked him what should be the main line he should pursue when representing India at the United Nations, my brother said: "Whatever may be the topic on which you speak in the United Nations, make your language soft but let your facts be deadly." Sir, in regard to the tragedy which has overtaken Tibet the facts seem to me to be so deadly that one can afford to make one's language soft.

So far as Government's policy in regard to Tibet is concerned, its basic features were explained last week very clearly and fully in the Prime Minister's admirable statement, which was read out in this House by his able Deputy Minister. My hon. Friend, Dr. Kunzru, referred to one passage in that statement in which certain conversation between our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of China were summarised. Premier Chou En-lai gave the assurance that though Tibet had for a long time been a part of the Chinese State, they, that is the Government and the people of China did not regard Tibet as a province of China. He said that the people of Tibet were different and that the regional autonomy of Tibet would be respected. Sir, in making that statement to our Prime Minister in 1956, Premier Chou En-lai was only underlying the assurances, which were given abundantly in the agreement that was entered into in 1951 between China and Tibet. The circumstances under which that agreement was signed I shall mention to the House a minute later; but I shall read out some of the relevant articles from that agreement to point out in what mood the Tibetan delegation was persuaded to sign that agreement. These articles are—in the language of the agreement—

"All national minorities are fully enjoying the right of national equality and have established or are establishing national regional autonomy.

Freedom is guaranteed to all nationalities to develop their political, economic, cultural and educational work.

The Central authorities of China will not alter the existing political system in Tibet nor will they alter the established status, functions and powers of the Dalai Lama.

The religious beliefs, customs and habits of the Tibetan people shall be respected and Lama Monasteries shall be protected.” Sir, these are some of the articles of the Sino-Tibetan Agreement of 1951.

The beginning of the present crisis in Tibet goes back to 1950. Sir, in that year, it was my privilege to be on the Indian delegation to the United Nations. When in November of that year reports came out of China of Chinese forces advancing towards Lhasa, the suggestion was made by one of the members at the United Nations to the Steering Committee, which was in charge of the Agenda of the General Assembly of that year, that Tibet be included on the Agenda. The leader of the Indian delegation under instructions from the External Affairs Ministry here and presumably on the basis of reports received from our Ambassador in Peking at that time—Sardar Panikkar—gave the assurance to the Steering Committee that the Chinese forces had halted at Chamdo, some three hundred miles from Lhasa, and that they had no intention of going further. And, Sir, it was on that assurance given by the Leader of the Indian delegation to the Steering Committee that the Proposal to discuss Tibet in that Session was dropped. What happened subsequently? Only a few months later, in the spring of 1951, the Chinese forces resumed their advance towards Lhasa. A Tibetan delegation was summoned to Peking. It went through New Delhi. There was, I think, some delay in the Tibetan delegation leaving New Delhi for Peking because of certain transport or transit difficulties in Hong Kong enroute. The Chinese Government, I regret to say, even on that occasion very readily attributed unworthy motives to the Government of India and suggested that the delay was due to foreign influences. When the delegation reached Peking, it was asked to sign an agreement which had already been drawn up. The Tibetan delegation pleaded for time so that it could consult the Dalai Lama who had by that time fled to Yatung. The Tibetan delegation was reminded that there was already established in Lhasa Chinese Military Headquarters and the delegation was asked to sign on the dotted line. After that, Sir, we are the people who keep other people ‘under duress’ and make them sign statements. It seems to me a matter of very great distress that charges of intervention and of expansionism should be made against India, after the experience of China during the last 10 years and after the most categorical statement by the Prime Minister last week that “We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet, but we have every sympathy for the people of Tibet and we are greatly distressed their hapless plight.” China seems to forget that while she has been through a great revolution during the last ten years, we too on the southern side of the Himalayas have not been idle. Whatever cause the Chinese might have had in the past to fear British imperialism when it was a vigorous institutions in many parts of Asia, after 1947, British imperialism has ceased to exist. There are no interventionists and no expansionists, certainly not on the southern side of the Himalayas. That charge, Sir, is demonstrably untrue.

We are not concerned only with Tibet’s well-being here. We have our own anxieties and apprehensions in regard to this region. In 1950, I remember when I was a Member of the other House, during a debate on foreign affairs, when someone, from the Opposition mentioned Tibet, the Prime Minister said in the course of his reply at the end of the debate in very firm tones, “Maps or no maps, the McMohan Line is our boundary”. Last week in that statement which he made, he said in more general terms that he gave first priority to the preservation of the security and the integrity of India. I am reluctant to say more on the subject, because I realise that what we say in this House should not make the tasks of the Prime Minister extremely difficult and delicate as it already is, more difficult.

Sir, there is a human aspect of this problem—the problem of the refugees—to which Dr. Kunzru has already referred to heartily endorse his plea for measures being devised to enable these thousands of refugees who have come into India, in different parts of the country from Assam and Nepal, to live in terms of self-respect.

There are, I believe, suggestions for improving the roads and communications between India and Bhutan and Sikkim and I hope that plans will be devised which will not only enable the Tibetan refugees to live in terms of self-respect, but also lighten that burden which the Government of India have already undertaken in regard to these refugees.

May I, in passing, say a word about our representative in Gangtok, Shri Apa Pant? I think a word of praise is due to our representative for the remarkable success that he has achieved in the last two years in winning the confidence, good will and affection of the people of Bhutan and Sikkim.

Sir, one final word I would like to say before I sit down. I sincerely hope that the recent events in Tibet will not stand in the way of the Government of India continuing to press for the admission of China into the United Nations. What has happened in Tibet is an argument from my standpoint in favour of China’s admission into the United Nations, because I feel that if she were in the United Nations, she would have realised much more clearly than she seems to do at the present moment, that not only in India but in most parts of the world at any rate, in those parts of the world where human dignity and interests are respected and valued, her action in Tibet is viewed with sharp disapproval. Sir, in 1948,

when South Africa swallowed up South West Africa, a mandated territory under the old League of Nations, India was the first to champion her cause. South Africa was very angry with us for taking up that case in the United Nations. But even South Africa did not go so far as to charge us with being interventionists and expansionists.

I would say, in conclusion, that no matter where human rights are trampled, our foreign policy should be such that there is no room for the charge that we observe different standards in different parts of the world.

Shri Jaswant Singh (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, Sir, Dr. Kunzru moved his motion in the House in his characteristic way and after him another eminent Member spoke on behalf of the Congress Party and therefore after these two eminent statesmen, it is rather difficult for me to do full justice to a subject of this nature. But since I have been called upon to take my turn, I would like to say a few words.

It is true that the recent events that have taken place in Tibet through the action of our great neighbour China, have moved the hearts of everyone in this country. Sir, when such events take place in the life of nations or individuals, then alone they come out in their true colours whether they can stand the serious situation that has arisen or whether they go down surrendering before those events.

Sir, shall we continue after the lunch hour?

Mr. Chairman: All right. The House stands adjourned till 2:30 in the afternoon.

The House resembled, Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

Shri Jaswant Singh: Mr. Chairman, Sir, since we attained independence we have seen many international events taking place in the world which had brought about a shooting war in a localized form and a virulent cold war all round and, Sir, we have been successful in avoiding both these kinds of war. So far as the cold war is concerned, we have been keeping away from it because our country is not in any way concerned in this respect. But as far as the events in Tibet are concerned, Sir, in spite of our attempts to avoid the cold war, the cold war has been brought to our doors. Sir, it will be noticed, as far as Tibet is concerned, we have got varied interests in Tibet—they are sentimental, cultural and historical. In addition to them, we have got our self interest in Tibet because with Tibet we have got a common border extending to hundreds of miles. Then our holiest of places like Mt. Kailash and Manasarovar are situated in Tibet. There are other interests also which we had inherited from the British when they left this country and Tibet. I shall presently show what they are. Sir, we have regularly and continuously been trying to keep our friendship with our great neighbour China, and we had tried to accommodate them in 1950. When China wanted to have effective control over Tibet, we surrendered our rights there, and there were a substantial number of people in this country who resented this, and as the mover of the motion. Dr. Kunzru had stated a little while ago, though we had a long established unbroken line of friendship with China extending over thousands and thousands of years, in spite of the common border, we wanted to maintain that friendship. But the mistake that we did at that time was that we did not take into account the new regime that had come into Tibet. The ideologies between the two countries are very different, and if the old regime had continued in China, the position would have been very different. Sir, when the events turned, as they did in Tibet recently by the action of the Chinese in the name of reform there, the whole country as a body went all out in sympathy with the plight of the Tibetan people, and as my friend Dr. Kunzru has stated, it is a matter of very great regret that one political party—the Communists—did not share in the sentiments of the people of India as a whole. It will ever remain a matter of regret that the Indian people did not stand together though happily it was a microscopic minority of the people who alone stood aloof.

Sir, I referred a little while ago to the international events that took place after we attained independence and I said that we naturally kept out of the cold war as we did not like it. But as a member of the international organisation we expressed our resentment whenever and wherever any aggression was committed. There was the Anglo-French aggression on Egypt and then there was the Russian intervention in Hungary's affairs in respect of which, though after initial hesitation, in response to the country's sentiments, our Prime Minister voiced the feelings of this country. Now for all the time that this thing was taking place here he was reticent and restrained, and we can very well understand his feelings, because he is a great man of peace; he wants that friendship has to be kept with all the nations, particularly so with a nation which is not only our great neighbour but with which we have the traditional friendship lasting for thousands and thousands of years. But when the people of this country felt as to how long this kind of a one-sided friendship could last, and when this great friend of ours (China) wanted to crush an unarmed people, naturally the sympathies of the people of the country went all out for the Tibetans, and as the national hero of the country—he is not merely the Prime Minister of the country, he is not merely representing the ruling party—he is a national hero—responded in his characteristic way to the call of the nation, and he came out with the feelings and sentiments of the

country to tell the authorities and the people of China that they are doing a very great injustice to their friends. This is particularly bad on their part because at the Bandung Conference the same China exhorted all to join in doing away with the calamities and suffering of the people under colonial rule. When they resort to such tactics, it brings a bad taste to the country which champions the cause of those who are suffering under the colonial yoke. Then, Sir, when the Dalai Lama entered this country for safety, again the people of this great country went all out and accorded him a reception and showed their goodwill and affection for him the like of which is done only on very rare occasions. And there too in response to the wishes of the people, the Prime Minister took the necessary action to make it a grand success.

Sir, next I would submit that the Prime Minister in his statement of the 27th April has dealt with all the charges but it is a matter of very great regret - I am not talking of the giants of the past age but in the present age, among the living great men of India and the world, the position of our Prime Minister is indeed very high - that his words are not accepted by our friends for whom he has striven for the last nine years to do everything even at the risk of being misunderstood by many of our friends of the Western countries and Asian countries which are neighbours of China. It is a matter of very great regret that his words are not accepted by friendly China, but we hope that China, even now, would see reason and would not strain the friendship which has lasted for thousands and thousands of years.

Then, Sir, I would submit one thing, the new phraseology which this Communist country of China has coined, words like imperialistic and expansionists in reference to India—but where they are concerned they call it a policy of liberation—and the charge that they lay at the door of India, of a policy of expansion is so absurd. This country would not accept this charge levelled by China.

Lastly, Sir, I would submit, after what has happened that we have to be very cautious in regard to our future policy towards China, because we have seen that they are already circulating maps in the communist countries of the world whereby something like 30,000 miles of Indian territory is included in their maps. Amongst these territories, not only are included some territory of the North East Frontier Agency (NEFA) but even some valuable portions of Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh is included in this map. Just now Mr. Shiva Rao referred to the negotiated settlement that the Prime Minister of China envisaged to have with our country in regard to this settlement of the boundaries. I would submit to the Prime Minister that we have to be cautious of the desires and intentions of our great neighbour. They are great friends. They have been great friends. But they do not accept our word and go on criticizing us to the extent which no civilised country will do. Therefore, Sir, if we are not cautious, I am apprehensive that we again may have to part with many good portions of our sacred land.

Another danger is of the Chinese nationals infiltrating into our country. There are already thousands and thousands of Chinese nationals inhabiting our country. I do not know how many Indians are living in China. This is a dangerous trend. We have to stop it. We have to be very careful, particularly when we are anxious to keep friendship with China. But this friendship would have to be reciprocal; it cannot be one-sided. We have seen what has happened in Tibet. We have to be very cautious. What have we done? What we have done is just to express our sympathies. Beyond that, we have done nothing, but look at the absurd charges that they have levelled against us.

Shri D.P. Singh (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are deeply grieved over the tragedy that has overtaken Tibet. Sir, whenever any injustice has been perpetuated in any part of this wide world, we have raised our voice against it. When England and France attacked Egypt on the question of Suez, we gave our full moral support to Egypt and condemned what England and France did in clear terms. Sir, when the troops of the United States of America entered Lebanon, we condemned it.

Sir, our heart goes out to the people of Algeria in their struggle against the French. We have always condemned wrong things done by whichever country. It is true, we all know it, that all these countries have been on terms of friendship with us, but we have said the right thing whenever an occasion has arisen.

Sir, it was only in the case of Hungary that we faltered a little but later on—also from the very beginning—we always said that the Hungarian uprising was a national uprising and that it was not proper for foreign forces—Russian forces in this case—to suppress that uprising.

Sir, now our peaceful neighbour, Tibet, has fallen on bad days. It has been said by some that Tibet has been a part of China.

Several Hon. Members: Louder, please.

Mr. Chairman: You are accustomed to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and, therefore, you say everybody's voice is low.

Shri D.P. Singh: It has been said by some, Sir, that Tibet has been part of China. Tibet never accepted, I submit, Sir, the overlordship of China in any sense except under duress. In the distant past, Tibet was completely independent. The Mongols and the Manchus, while overrunning China, subjugated Tibet also. After the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty, the Dalai Lama, who had earlier fled to India, returned to Lhasa in 1912 and drove out the Chinese from Tibet. The Chinese Republic then sent a punitive expedition, which was prevented from recapturing Tibet on a representation made by the British Government.

On January 11, 1913, the Dalai Lama proclaimed the independence of Tibet by concluding a treaty with Outer Mongolia in which Tibet was declared to have become independent. As a result of a subsequent treaty between the British Government and the Chinese Government in October 1913, Chinese suzerainty over Tibet was recognised by the British but not by the Tibetans. China, however, was definitely forbidden to interfere in any way with Tibetan internal administration. This treaty referred to as the "Simla Convention" was never ratified by the Chinese. And, therefore, when the Tibetan Government appealed to the U.N against Chinese invasion in 1951, they mentioned that Tibet was independent *de jure* also. It was the British Government, which had continued to recognise the suzerainty of China over Tibet.

Again, in 1949, it was the Prime Minister of India who recognised this suzerainty, even though Tibet considered itself an independent country and the Tibetan Government had ordered the Chinese Nationalist Mission in Lhasa and the Chinese nationals in Tibet suspected of Communist sympathies to leave Tibet. As is well known, during the Second World War, Tibet did not join the Chinese and also opened its Foreign Affairs Bureau.

In January 1950, the Peking Government proclaimed the liberation of Tibet as one of its basic tasks during 1950. Our Prime Minister, in spite of this, thought and said that Peking would not deprive Tibet of its internal autonomy.

In April 1950, a Tibetan mission left Lhasa for India. Negotiations were held with the new Chinese Ambassador in Delhi. It was decided on account of the non-committal attitude of the Chinese Ambassador that the mission should proceed to Peking. But the day the mission was to leave, Chinese forces invaded Tibet. The so-called liberation of the Tibetan people was taken in hand by the Chinese. To the note sent by the Government of India, a very discourteous and unfriendly reply was sent by Peking.

In March 1951, a Sino-Tibetan agreement was signed in Peking. Internal autonomy was conceded in this agreement. Mr. Shiva Rao has already narrated how this agreement was signed under duress. In this agreement, Peking was given full control over external affairs, trade and communications. On 7th November 1950, the Tibetan Government sent a communications to the U.N. which, because of India principally, was not taken up at the U.N.

In April 1954, an agreement between India and China was signed. The Indian Government gave up all its extra-territorial rights and privileges in Tibet and proclaimed Panscheel. Even in regard to Nepal and other territories, such as Sikkim and Bhutan, the privileges enjoyed by India under the British Government were gradually relinquished. While we went on abandoning our rights, the Chinese Government tightened its control over Tibet. The agreement concluded between Tibet and China was completely violated as is clear from the Tezpur statement of the Dalai Lama. It is also clear from the same statement that Tibet concluded this agreement as there was no alternative left for it. It should have been clear to our Government that China would not respect Tibet's autonomy on the basis of reports which they must have got and on the basis of the talk which our Prime Minister had with the Dalai Lama when the later was in India last about 3 years ago. In fact, what was done was to assure the Dalai Lama that China intended to preserve Tibet's autonomy and that the Chinese Premier knew that reforms could not be forced down the throat of Tibet. Perhaps, assured by us the Dalai Lama returned to Tibet.

Now, I would like to say something about what happened inside Tibet in about 1955. There was a conflict in Tibet over the land belonging to the monasteries which had been earlier distributed by the Chinese authorities in Tibet amongst the Tibetan and Chinese peasants. Chinese peasants were being sent in large numbers to Tibet and it was a sort of colonising the country. The Chinese later told the Tibetan monks that it was a mistake to have given the land to the peasants. Conflict was provoked and when it flared up, the Chinese soldiers shot down the leaders of the peasants not belonging to the Communist group. Somethings on the lines of what the Communists did in the International Brigade of Spain was enacted. Taking advantage of the exacerbated ill-will between the monasteries and the peasants caused by the Chinese themselves, the democrats and the socialists who led the peasants were liquidated by the Chinese soldiers. There was also widespread bombing of the Tibetans by the Chinese planes to crush revolts which broke out against the Chinese in several parts of Tibet. In view of the resistance offered by the Tibetans, a milder tone was adopted by China. But when the Dalai Lama declined to support the Chinese in crushing the revolt and in the communisation of the

country, the Chinese decided again to adopt a stiff attitude. We know how it became impossible for the Dalai Lama to stay on in Tibet.

Sir, in the wake of the Dalai Lama's escape to India, a large number of refugees have crossed over. It is indeed a matter of great satisfaction that good arrangements are being made for them, although doubt had arisen in our minds earlier in regard to this matter. Sir, it is estimated that about 10,000 refugees have already crossed over into India after arrival of the Dalai Lama in our country.

Sir, even before this about 7000 to 8000 refugees, we were told, crossed into India finding life impossible in Tibet under the Chinese. These refugees are spread over in Kalimpong, Shillong, Darjeeling and in areas close to these places. We are told, Sir, that most of them are in a desperate plight. I am sure that something will be done to bring relief and succour to them. I would also urge that so far as the refugees who have come to India and who may come to India in future are concerned, we must adopt a policy which does not prevent them from settling down in Kalimpong, Shillong, Darjeeling or in areas close to these places because if they are dispersed in various parts of the country, it will not be possible for them to eke out a living. So, they must be settled where other refugees are.

Sir the reports coming to India show that the Tibetans are now being prevented in a most brutal fashion from seeking shelter outside Tibet. There has, therefore, been a reduction in the number of refugees during the last few days. Reports show that in Nepal, as also in Bhutan, the refugees have entered and in some places the Chinese have entered the Nepalese territory in pursuit of the fleeing Tibetan. Some houses in Nepal are also reported to have been burnt down by the Chinese as these were believed to be sheltering the fleeing Tibetans.

Sir, nothing could be more untruthful than to say that in the expression of our sympathy for the Tibetans, we are prompted by expansionist desires. It is a palpably absurd charge and is obviously intended to cover up the misdeeds of the Chinese. If China goes back on its plighted word in respect of Tibet and disregards the assurances given by Premier Chou En-lai that Tibet was not a province of China, the world is expected to look upon China as a peace-loving country and when we, having given up all our past privileges and rights not only in Tibet but in Nepal and other neighbouring territories, express our sympathy for the Tibetans and give shelter and asylum to the Dalai Lama and other Tibetans, we are branded as expansionists. This is strange logic indeed.

Sir, one thing to my mind stands out crystal clear. Whatever we do, it is never right to give up the correct moral position. Whatever we did in the past to appease China has produced consequences which are not favourable to the fostering of peace in this part of the world. We must never choose between truth and freedom and friendship. In fact, friendship is generally lost if truth is forsaken.

Sir, while accusing us, the last straw came when the Panchen Lama said that the Dalai Lama was held under duress even in India and it was proclaimed that the Tezpur statement was imposed by foreigners and our External Affairs Ministry Officer was accused of preparing the statement.

All these are absurd charges. They have been refuted very convincingly and in a language of a great dignity by our Prime Minister. Our Prime Minister has shown commendable restraint and forbearance in the face of extreme provocation. How one wishes that China, with her great and ancient civilisation, emulated our Prime Minister's dignity.

श्रीमती मायादेवी छेत्री (पश्चिमी बंगाल): सभापति महोदय, श्रीमान, आपने मुझे जो चार, पांच मिनट बोलने के लिये समय दिया है, उसके लिये मैं आपको धन्यवाद देती हूँ! मैं कहां तक इतने व्हास्ट सब्जेक्ट पर, चार, पांच मिनट में बोल सकती हूँ तब भी आपने जो यह मौका दिया है उस के लिये मैं चाहती हूँ कि आपको धन्यवाद दूँ!

श्रीमान, यह सब्जेक्ट विशेष रूप से बहुत गम्भीर है, पर इस समय एक बात मैं आप से कहना चाहती हूँ! वह यह है कि चाइना ने कलिम्पोंग पर आरोप लगाया है वह कहां तक सत्य है? कलिम्पोंग का एरिया नेपाल, भूटान और तिब्बत का बार्डर प्रदेश है! वहां पर नेपाली पापुलेशन के साथ साथ तिब्बती और भूटानी लोग, जिन्हें खम्पा, डुप्पा बोलते हैं, सिक्किम, तिब्बत और भूटान के लोग यहां रहते हैं! यह बात ठीक है, पर चाइना की ओर से यह बात कहीं गई है कि वहां के लोगों ने चाइना के विरोध में एक आर्गनाइज्ड वे में विद्रोह खडा कर दिया है!

मैं उसी एरिया से आती हूँ, लेकिन आज तक हमने आर्गनाइज्ड वे में कोई भी ऐसी बात नहीं देखी है! यह सत्य है कि जो तिब्बती लोग वहां रहते हैं वे अब इंडियन सब्जेक्ट होते हुए भी, उनके जो रीति रिवाज हैं वे तिब्बत के रीति रिवाजों से मिलते जुलते हैं क्योंकि वे लोग वहीं से आये हैं! इसलिये स्वाभाविक ही था कि जब तिब्बत के भीतर विप्लव हुआ और दलाई लामा पर विपत्ति आई तो उन लोगों का मन अस्थिर चंचल हो

गया; क्योंकि ब्रिटिश लोग अमेरिका में जाकर बसे हुए हैं, अगर ब्रिटेन के ऊपर कोई आपत्ति आये या कुछ, ऐसी परिस्थिति हो, तो उन ब्रिटिशर्स के लिये स्वाभाविक ही है कि उनकी मारल सिम्पैथी ब्रिटेन के प्रति चली जायगी! इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है; क्योंकि यह मनुष्य स्वभाव है! तो इस प्रकार का जो आरोप है उसका हम कोई आधार नहीं देखते हैं!

दूसरा यह कि पेंचेन लामा ने जो यह कहा है कि जब मैं १९५६ में भारत में गया था तब बुद्धिज्म को जिस अवस्था में देखा है वह बहुत शिथिल अवस्था में देखा है वह बहुत शिथिल अवस्था है, इसमें भी कहां तक सत्यता है, यह इस बात से मालूम हो जाएगी कि जब से भारत स्वाधीन हुआ है तब से, स्वाधीन होने के साथ साथ ही उसने बुद्धिज्म को रिवाइव और रिवाइटेलाइज़ किया है! इसका प्रमाण यह है कि १९५६ में जब भगवान बुद्ध की ज्यन्ती सारे देश ने बहुत ही प्रफुल्लता के साथ, बड़े जोर शोर से मनाई थी तब तिब्बत में जिनको गाडकिंग बोलते हैं वे दलाई लामा और पंचन लामा भारत आए थे! उनका बहुत स्वागत सत्कार हुआ था और उन्हीं के हाथों से भगवान बुद्ध की जयन्ती का उद्घाटन किया गया! यह इस बात का प्रमाण है कि हमारे भारतवर्ष में बुद्धिज्म की क्या अवस्था और क्या स्थान है!

तीसरा यह कि हमारे पूज्य प्रधान मंत्री जी की भी भगवान बुद्ध के उपदेशों के ऊपर कितनी श्रद्धा है, इस बात का प्रमाण यह है कि सारे विश्व के सामने उन्होंने बांडुंग सम्मेलन में अपने पंचशील के आदर्शों को रखा, जिस पंचशील द्वारा ही आज विश्व में शांति स्थापित रह सकती है! दिन पर दिन बढ़ते हुए असंतोष का एक ही उपाय है कि पंचशील द्वारा चालित संसार ही अपने को ध्वंस से बचा सकता है!

यह हमें मालूम है कि चाइना की आबादी बढ़ती ही जा रही है! चाइना में बढ़ती हुई आबादी के लोगों को रखने के लिये जगह नहीं है! लेकिन अगर जगह नहीं है तो तिब्बत के ऊपर इस प्रकार आधिपत्य जमाना और वहां के लोगों के रीति रिवाजों की परवाह न करना, उन लोगों के ऊपर अधिकार कायम करना, यह कहां तक उचित है, यह वही लोग समझे! किसी एक देश के ऊपर आधिपत्य जमाने में थोड़ा समय लगता है, समय का थोड़ा इंतज़ार करना पड़ता है, जिस प्रकार रशिया ने सेंट्रल एशिया में अपना आधिपत्य जमाया है! सैंकड़ों वर्षों से वहां रशिया का आधिपत्य है! तब भी उसने वहां के लोगों के धर्म पर हस्तक्षेप नहीं किया! वहां पर उज़्बेकिस्तान और ताशकन्त में और काज़कस्तान में उन लोगों की बड़ी बड़ी मसजिदें हैं और आज तक रशिया ने उनके धर्म के विरुद्ध कोई काम नहीं किया! वे मस्जिद जाते हैं, अपने रीति रिवाजों से रहते हैं, मेल जोल से रहते हैं! खास मास्को सिटी में भी उनकी एक बड़ी मसजिद है जहां पर वे लोग जा सकते हैं, अपने धर्म को मान सकते हैं! जब इस रीति से लोगों को अपनाया जाता है तब वे लोग खुद ही खुशी होते हैं! आज ये लामा लोग बहुत वर्षों से अपने रीति रिवाजों पर कायम हैं, ५०० वर्षों से उनका अपना शासक चुनने का एक अलग ढंग है! वह ढंग यह है कि साधारण जनता के भीतर से एक लडके को चुनते हैं, जो कि अपने गुरु का रीइन्कार्नेशन समझा जाता है! उस लडके के ऊपर अपने गुरु के लक्षण पाये जायें और यदि वे लोग समझे कि उसमें अपने गुरु के पूरे लक्षण हैं, तो अपना गुरु और पुराने गुरु का अवतार मान लेते हैं! साधारण से साधारण गृहस्थ के घर से भी यदि उस लडके को चुनते हैं तो उसको अपना शासक और गुरु मानते हैं! आज तक इसी चलन से वे चलते आए हैं और उन लोगों के रीति रिवाज में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ! जब चाइनीज़ उनमें एक दम इतने परिवर्तन लाना चाहते हैं तो कैसे वे लोग उसको सहन कर सकते हैं? ऐसी स्थिति में कलिम्पोंग में जो हवा उठी थी, उसमें इन लोगों के मन में चंचलता आना ज़रूरी था! नार्थ ईस्ट के उस बार्डर से कई अफ़वाहें उड़ती आती थी कि मोनास्टरीज़ को तोड़ दिया गया, लामा लोगों को मार दिया गया, उनमें से कितने ही वहां जो रिवर म्याज़ु हैं, उसमें कूदकर मर गये, इस प्रकार की अनेक अफ़वाहें जब उठती थी तब वहां के आदिमियों के मन में भी थोड़ी सी स्वाभाविक प्रतिक्रिया उठती थी! पर यह कहना कि वहां लोगों ने एक आर्गोनाइज़्ड वे में काम किया है, यह सत्य नहीं है!

मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहती हूं! आपने मुझको जो दो चार मिनट बोलने के लिये दिये हैं, उसके लिये मैं आपको फिर धन्यवाद देती हूं!

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Mr. Chairman, it has been one of our interesting experiences to see the enemies of the Prime Minister's foreign policy having some kind words for him, at least for his foreign policy, but we never thought that we would live to see and to listen to such kind words overflowing in this manner from these quarters who thought that Panchsheel was born in sin and so on, people who want this foreign policy to be completely reversed and who have not lost any opportunity to run his foreign policy down. Perhaps they are bound to say that in a situation like this, for it seems to some people that this has come as a godsend, not only to attack some parties in this country but to strike at the foundation of Panchsheel and disrupt the friendship between India and China for the building of which both Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Premier Chou En-lai had played so remarkable and noble a part. But I should have liked

them to at least mention whether they stand by Panchsheel or not. They have chosen to be discreet in this matter, because silence is considered to be golden in such propositions.

Mr. Chairman, sometime emotions and sentiments do overpower us and tend to distort our vision. But they are temporary things and we do not allow ourselves to be guided by such things after second thought and sober reflections we must judge what has happened in Tibet. It is not our job here to go into the internal things there. But since this has been described as a national uprising and so on, I have to submit that what has happened in Tibet is an armed rebellion by some vested interest reactionaries who want to prevent the march of history, social reform and progress. It seems they profit by keeping the regime of bigotry, of obscurantism, of extreme backwardness and dark superstition. Now, I would like to mention in this connection, Sir, a book and I would like hon. Members to refer to a book called *Seven Years in Tibet* by Henrich Harrer, who was a tutor to the Dalai Lama. In one place the author says:

“The Lamas often smear their patients with holy spittle. Tsompa, butter and urine of some saintly man are made into a sort of gruel and administered to the sick.”

Such quotations will appear in this particular book. Therefore, there is great backwardness and superstition.

What happened there, as is clear from the newspaper reports, is that the local Government had violated the agreement signed between China and Tibet—the agreement of 1951—and it is clearly said that articles 1, 3 and 12 of that particular agreement had been clearly violated and this news was circulated by a number of newspapers in this country. On the 31st of March, the *Hindustan Standard*, for example says:

“Tibet revoked her seventeen point agreement with China, signed in 1951 and declared complete independence on March 12, according to Lukhongwa, former Prime Minister of Tibet, now in New Delhi.”

This is what the paper said; even before the incidents of the 17th March took place, this happened.

Now it has been said by the hon. Home Minister in the other House that the Tibetan people are fond of prayers and all that I do not deny that they are a religious people that they are fond of prayers. But at the same time it was reported in the *Statesman*, that monasteries had a good consignment of arms and many other papers said that arms had been piled up in the monasteries. I believe, these arms, machine guns, rifles and so on, are no part of divine worship. You being a philosopher, Sir, will be able to guide us in this matter. Therefore, it is no use trying to tell this cock and bull story because everyone knows that though the weapons may be religious, the hands that wield these weapons may be of those who misled people. The weapons came from the KMT Armed Forces and other imperialist agencies. The whole thing should be understood in the proper perspective.

It has been made out as if it is a national uprising. Sometimes I feel upset when so learned a historian and scholar like the Prime Minister characterise such a thing in this manner. I have great respect for his learning and knowledge but am I to understand that this is a national uprising just because some people have taken to arms and gone against their State? Have not we witnessed in our country how some backward and unenlightened people are liable to be swept away by the rapid communal reactionaries and others? Didn't we see how Kasim Razvi, the Razaakar leader, roused the passions of some people and misled them to all sorts of actions necessitating police measures on the part of the Government? Are not Phizo and a handful of his followers even today carrying with them some sections of the people in hostile activities, suicidal to themselves and harmful to the country? Are we then to call all these things national uprisings, is the question that I put before the House and the country.

Now, Sir, let us judge it from another angle. Who welcomed this Tibetan uprising? The first to welcome this uprising was the great champion of freedom who lives in Taiwan, Chiang Kai-shek. What did he say? He said in a message,

“Although I am in Taiwan, my heart was always been with you in your war against Communism. With regard to the recent battle of Lhasa, I have been specially concerned with the heroic sacrifices made by the Tibetan brothers whose fate is constantly in my mind.”

This comes from 'Reuter'. Then came the reaction from the United States State Department which welcomed the statement of Chiang Kai-shek and U.S. Secretary, Mr. Herter said,

“We see in the resistance efforts the heartening example of the indomitable resistant spirit.”

Then, Sir, came the Wellington Conference of the SEATO Council of Ministers which put Tibet and Kashmir together—mind you, Tibet and Kashmir together were put there for discussion. This was done. Then comes another regime, the South Vietnam regime, which offered 100 and odd volunteers to fight for the cause of independence and coming nearer

here, on his way from the SEATO Ministerial Conference, after including Kashmir and Tibet in the same agenda, Mr. Qadir, the Pakistani Foreign Minister, said in Singapore:

“Our sympathies are with the Tibetans. I am sure events in Tibet will make many countries review the international problems.”

This was said in Singapore on the 17th of April. Such are the reactions. Am I to understand that Chiang Kai-shek, the SEATO Council and Mr. Qadir and others are such people who would welcome such developments if it were for the cause of progress or am I to understand...

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: We are interested to hear your own reactions rather than the reactions of the whole world.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: In order to understand what the P.S.P leaders say and their policy, I am going to give this and I hope he will understand.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: There is no policy.

Mr. Chairman: Please sit down.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: He is touchy because that is what the P.S.P policy is. You have given me only fifteen minutes, Sir, and so I cannot...

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: We should like to know your reaction.

Mr. Chairman: When you were talking, he did not interrupt you. You give him a hearing.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Well, Sir, this causes anxiety and irritation in hon. Members—at least in some hon. Members—but what can I do if facts sometimes hurt them. I should apologise to them and I should be excused for that. The world Press, the American Press, the British Press, the West German Press—all have welcomed this.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: The Indian Press too.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: And you too.

Now, Sir, recall 1953 when it was found necessary to make a surprise arrest of Prime Minister Sheikh Abdullah and then to put him under detention. As hon. Members will remember, some incidents followed and force had to be used in quelling what looked like a miniature rebellion or what contained elements of it. What did the imperialist circles in the Western Press say then? I was in Europe at that time and I distinctly remember how India was called an aggressor and how the Prime Minister was painted on the darkest colour. Sheikh Abdullah was claimed as a liberator and the separatist elements and other pro-Pakistani elements were lauded to the sky. These attempts went on and provocative declarations continue. See, how they view this Naga Rebellion. My hon. Friend, Shri Sinha, may note; the “Daily Express” of February 9, 1959 said.....

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: How are we concerned with all this? We are concerned with Tibet.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: The “Expressman” reports as follows: “Nehru’s war” I would like him to note this, not the Prime Minister who knows this. “...I am surprised at Nehru’s...”

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: What are the views of the hon. Member?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: “The situation is a blot on the Indian Army, disgrace to a Government whose leader ceaselessly preaches non-violence and the evils of colonialism.”

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: How are we concerned with all these, Sir? We are concerned Tibet now.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Because I say that the P.S.P. have not understood the point.

Mr. Chairman: Go on.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I know the agitation and there will be greater agitation if I were given a little more time to speak on the subject. I know the Congress Party would not like to do it. As far as the P.S.P. is concerned, its anti-Communism has become so deep-seated that I am not a doctor to cure it. Now, that is the position. Why is it so? It is because the imperialists are interested in ridiculing Panchsheel, undermining these principles as the guiding line for international behaviour amongst nations for peaceful relation and a policy of co-existence. This situation is exploited to disrupt friendship between India and China. It has struck against the greatest bulwark of peace in this Asian region. This conforms

to the imperialist interests and thus strikes against Afro-Asian solidarity. This is intended to break the Bandung principle and it is a regret that this simple thing is not seen by our P.S.P. and Jan Sangh people. They want to defeat peace-loving forces by methods of provocation and they are looking forward to change in our foreign policy. For instance, the "Hindustan Times" wrote Nehru's foreign policy "called for reassessment of the basis of our policy." This is how that paper writes about our foreign policy.

Now, Sir, I agree that there has taken place some deterioration in the situation. We should be interested in facing the situation realistically. There are two sets of people, one set, the majority of it, sits on this side and that side, and desires the restoration of normal relations between India and China and wants to prize and cherish that friendship. That set would naturally be interested in overcoming the difficulties, in setting matters right and in developing and strengthening our relations with China. On the other side, there are some people, and handful of them, fortunately, for the country, who always attack the principles of Panchsheel, our foreign policy and demand a change in the foreign policy. They would naturally be interested in developing the crisis, in seeing that the dream of their dreams comes true. Sir, that is how we view this matter. We are interested in the overwhelming majority of the people, their thoughts and ideas.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: The overwhelming majority is not with you.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I do not know with whom you are. The only thing I find, as far as the P.S.P. is concerned, is this. When they were saying something in the other House, the Taiwan Assembly or the Parliament was moving more or less a similar resolution. Well, I do not know with whom they are. Now, Sir...

Shri P. N. Sapru: Let him speak on the subject of the motion.

Mr. Chairman: Please sit down, Mr. Sapru. Let him go on.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Just two minutes. At least I have given some thoughts otherwise do not flow here. The irritations have to be exhibited. Now, the Prime Minister has expressed his distress over certain expressions and statements in China. I can understand his position, but the feelings of the Chinese people must also be understood. Apart from throwing cow dung on Mao Tse-tung's portrait, with the police looking on, the Chinese Government and its leaders were subjected to an avalanche of insults in some quarters in this country. Secondly, about the enemies of India's foreign policy, expansionists and other things, I would like only to say that I do not understand what is meant by this, and I do not think that the Indian Government is meant. As far as the P.S.P. is concerned, I am prepared to concede that this may be an exaggeration, because the capacity of the P.S.P. to expand is very limited indeed.

Mr. Chairman: Diwan Chaman Lall.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: One minute, Sir. Now, Sir, I want to make one point. Here I want to make one point that we should be extremely careful. Only one point, I would like to refer to. The Prime Minister has said that the Dalai Lama is a religious head. Besides, he occupies a high secular position. When he is already in India all due courtesies must naturally be shown to him. But I think it is wrong to advertise it as a political asylum, for the international law is very clear on the subject of political asylum. It is given to one who is a fugitive from justice, to an offender. The Dalai Lama is a religious head. He has recently been elected as a Vice-Chairman of the Standing Council of the People's National Congress and the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee.

Mr. Chairman: That will do. Order, order. No more. Diwan Chaman Lall.

Diwan Chaman Lall (Punjab): Mr. Chairman, most of the speeches this afternoon, have been magnificent specimens of balanced judgement, following the injunction that you laid down—speeches like the speech of my friend on my right and of Mr. Shiva Rao. There has been one speech that we have just listened to, which unfortunately cannot be described as a specimen of balanced judgment. It was full of hatred. It was full of suspicion, and when my hon. Friend referred to a little incident that happened in Bombay, which we deplore greatly—everyone of us deplores—he must try to remember...

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Does he deplore it?

Diwan Chaman Lall:whether he deplored a similar incident in which he and his colleagues were involved in Calcutta in the case of President Eisenhower. Did he deplore it at that time? Indeed, he set the example. It is the most unfortunate thing that he set an example of that nature, that his party set an example of that nature.

Mr. Chairman: Please don't get excited.

Diwan Chaman Lall: I don't. I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, that you have drawn my attention to this fact. I have no intention of getting excited at my friend. Indeed, I admire him.

Mr. Chairman: He excites you.

Diwan Chaman Lall: But in the matter of his debating points, I am afraid he has been chasing imaginary hares. Now, Sir, it is quite obvious from the speeches that we have heard that hon. Members are quite familiar with the history of Tibet and relationship of Tibet with the outer world. It is not my intention to deal with that history in the short time that is available to me, but I would like to pin-point certain important, salient factors in regard to that history and the urges that have impinged upon that history. It is rather important. Two factors that appear are, first of all, the assertion by the Chinese Government of their suzerainty over Tibet. And the second is the parallel assertion of the autonomy of that country. Now, Sir, my friend, Dr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, referred to the Prime Minister's statement, a very noble statement, in regard to this particular matter. I shall refer to it in a minute. These two essential features of the situation, this dual aspect was due principally to the historic relationship between China and Tibet, and in a measure to certain urges in India, as you will presently see. Now, Sir, it is true that as far back as the 7th Century, the Chinese asserted their suzerainty over Tibet. They even invaded Tibet. From the 13th to 15th century, the Mongol emperors invaded Tibet, but they were careful enough—unlike my learned friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—to preserve the autonomy of Tibet. They were, in fact, creators of the institution of the Dalai Lama.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I have never been in Tibet.

Diwan Chaman Lall: My friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may not have been in Tibet, but his spirit has been somewhere very near Tibet. They were careful enough to preserve the autonomy of Tibet. So, although a military situation was created by the Mongol emperors yet they saw to it that there was no interference in the autonomy of that particular country. We come to the 18th century. In the 18th century the Chinese imported two of what they called *Ambans*, two representatives of the Chinese emperor, and installed them in Lhasa. That was an interference in Tibetan autonomy, no doubt. The result was that in 1749 there was a massacre of these two *Ambans*. Every time that there has been any interference in the autonomy of Tibet by the Chinese, there has been trouble, conflict and pretty nearly war. It is an important fact to remember in regard to what we call Tibetan autonomy. Now, Sir, the British policy in India was delighted at this situation, of this dual functioning, that is, the suzerainty of China as well as the autonomy of Tibet. Why, because they were afraid of allowing Russia to get a foothold in Tibet. In fact, when Dorjiev a Russian who became a Lama of some note, took two Tibetan missions to Russia, suspicion was created in the British mind, which led to the Younghusband Mission—which was called so euphemistically, but was a military expedition—right up to Lhasa. What followed the Younghusband Mission was the convention of 1906 and the Convention of 1907 between Russia and Great Britain, and the trade regulations of 1908, some of which, even now to this day happen to be valid. But the basic thing that comes out of all these conventions is the insistence upon the suzerainty of China on the one side, and the autonomy of Tibet on the other. Those, again, are the two basic facts to remember.

As I said, I will refer to the statement of the Prime Minister, a very noble, a very fine statement in a minute, I shall now refer to it. Probably in this very connection you will recall that in 1914 there was a Convention which was held in Simla between the representatives of China, the representatives of Tibet and the representatives of the British Government. At this Convention certain decisions were taken. Tibet was divided into outer Tibet and inner Tibet, outer Tibet being the area nearest to India consisting of Lhasa, Shigatse and it was laid down that Tibet will not be considered a province of China and that the administrative autonomy of Tibet will be assured and guaranteed. Further no troops will be stationed in the area. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister, in his statement which was read out in this House, in paragraph 14 said:

“When Premier Chou En-lai came here two or three years ago, he was good enough to discuss Tibet with me at considerable length. We had a frank and full talk. He told me that while Tibet had long been a part of Chinese State, they did not consider Tibet as a provinces of China.”

You will see how you hark back to that important agreement of 1914. the assurances given by Mr. Chou En-lai are in line with what was decided in the year 1914, when the Chinese agreed that Tibet would never be considered a province of China, but would always be considered an autonomous region in the country of China. Now, Sir, at that time, the Prime Minister played—and I have not the slightest doubt that he will continue to play—the role of a peacemaker. That is his role, not the role of one who strikes a discordant note such as was struck by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. That is not the role to play. The role to play is the role of the peacemaker. And you will notice in that very statement the Prime Minister said that when he had his talk with the Dalai Lama he told him of Prime Minister Chou En-lai's friendly approach and of his assurance that he would respect the autonomy of Tibet.

“I suggested to him that he should accept these assurances in good faith and co-operate in maintaining that autonomy and bringing about certain reforms in Tibet.”

That, Sir, is the role, a noble role, to play in this very difficult situation. Who says that we are not the friends of China? Of course we are. It was the Prime Minister of India who was the first person to recognize the new China that was created. It was the Prime Minister of India who kept India as a window on the world in regard to all Chinese matters. It was the Prime Minister of India who moved in the United Nations for the recognition of China. Who are these people now who try to spoil that great, noble friendships between these two peoples? If anything goes wrong, it is the duty of India and of our great leader to point out to the people of China what is going wrong and what should not go wrong. Ends do not justify the means. If you have noble ends, you must have noble means as well. You must not have certain ends and very different means in order to approach those particular ends. That has been the policy of the Prime Minister of India always.

I am reminded that there is a tribe known as the ‘Lepchas’ who are to be found in Tibet and, I think my friend knows in Sikkim, along the Tibetan borders of India....

...**An Hon. Member:** In Darjeeling.

Diwan Chaman Lall: ...and in Darjeeling, my learned friend reminds me. Unfortunately the word ‘Lepchas’ means “nonsense speakers”. We have had to deal with a lot of nonsense speakers in regard to this matter of Tibet and China, and I do hope that we shall heed and listen to your injunctions, Sir, in regard to this matter and not *exacerbate* the situation which we find today. The situation today is serious as a foreign journalist said the other day. It was Mr. Kingsley Martin who said it, in the *New Statesmen*—he said:

“We must avoid uttering irrevocable words.” He is right when he says that—

“For India to give up hope of peaceful relations with Peking would be the most tragic decision for India and the world. The time is bound to come for the cementing of friendship in the interest of world peace, and it is only the Prime Minister of India who can take the step.”

The Prime minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Mover of this motion spoke in such dignified and restrained language that I feel deeply beholden to him. He set a good example for all of us. In the course of this discussion this example has been more or less followed, not entirely; but I do not wish to object to anything that has been said or the manner of saying it. Unfortunately in some other countries, and in China more specially, the way we function in our Parliament here or outside is perhaps not fully appreciated; that is to say that it may not be quite appreciated that here every one has a right to say—here in Parliament and indeed outside Parliament also and in Press—everyone has a right to say whatever he feels like subject to some very very broad limitations of libel or slander; and that what he or she may say may indeed be in condemnation of Government, as it often is, it does not represent Government’s policy. I say this because objection is taken, has been taken in China, to remarks made by hon. Members in Parliament or outside or the Press. It is different here from what it is in China, and I am not saying that it is better or not here or it is different here. Here one can see even in the last few weeks an amazing unanimity and similarity of words, expressions and slogans coming from various quarters, which shows an amount of uniformity which is truly formidable, and it has its virtues no doubt, but I am not criticizing anything. But what I wish to say is that things said in Parliament sometimes convey a very different impression outside and people are not realize that in such Parliaments as these are, every viewpoint has the fullest expression and need not necessarily be right or wrong.

In this connection—not by way of, again, criticism but because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to a very unfortunate incident that happened in Bombay where Chairman Mao Tse-Tung’s picture was shown grave discourtesy—I should like to refer to that firstly to express my regret again for it and at the same time to say that the facts of this particular incident as we know them, and know them correctly—we are presumed to know that a little better than people sitting in Peking—nevertheless oddly enough our vision of the facts is not wholly accepted by the Peking Government on a small matter, which is surprising. We are sitting here, we ought to know better what takes place in our country, about facts, whatever other opinions may be. However, it is very regrettable incident with which obviously Government had nothing to do. The party, which organized it, I believe, is not represented in this House even. But what is not realized is that in the City of Bombay, pictures even of a leader of ours like Mahatma Gandhi have been burnt by some groups or others. Two and a half or three years ago my humble self also had been treated in that way in Bombay and elsewhere. Well, we take that in our stride and, as the hon. Member who spoke last mentioned, a few years back president Eisenhower’s effigy had the honour of being burnt near the Ochterlony Monument. I regret all these cases, but what I am

mentioning is that these things happen in a country like ours because of our laws, etc. They happen. Quite apart from law, I think it is a grave breach of decency to do this kind of thing or do anything else. We regret it. But people outside this country, some people, do not realize this and seem to imagine that somehow or other the Government or some Government officials must have connived at it, otherwise it could not have taken place, or they think that we should take the people who have done this by the scruff of the neck and throw them in the dungeon.

An Hon. Member: Let them do it themselves.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am saying that it is rather difficult because it produces misunderstandings as to the way of functioning, our parliamentary procedures and the like, and other procedures where a Government does not permit opposition of any kind.

Hon. Members have referred to a statement made by me a few days ago which was read out in this House also. So far as the major facts are concerned I have stated them there and I have really nothing to add, even though after that statement was made it was not accepted—the facts I mean; even the facts were not fully accepted by the Chinese authorities and the Chinese Press, which is unfortunate because again I would say that as to what happens in India. I would imagine that we could be better informed than the Chinese authorities who presumably can only be informed through certain intelligence agents that they may have at Kalimpong or elsewhere. But I do not wish to enter into polemical argument about these minor matters because the issues before us are far more serious, far deeper, far deeper than Tibet, the whole of Tibet, although Tibet is important and we are discussing events which have cast their shadow round about Tibet too. That shows that they are really deeper than that, and therefore we have to be particularly careful as to what we say and what we do. Now I accept the limitations and also the responsibility of what one should say on such occasions.

First of all, we must be alive to what we are aiming at. We are not, I hope, merely aiming at denouncing somebody or some government or some phrase. There has been too much of this denunciation and slogan raising. I regret to say, in China recently, and some of the slogans have been quite extraordinary. But I do not think we should be so thin-skinned as to get upset by some slogans in the excitement of the moment. We must not be led off our main path because that is of very considerable consequence in the future.

I should like again to read a few lines of what I said in that previous statement to indicate what we aim at. I said this:

“It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia—India and China—which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia and the world. The five principles have laid down, *inter alia*, mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war used.”

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta asked rather rhetorically. “Do we stand by Panchsheel?” Well, sometimes I wonder if the words we use are used in the same meaning or with some different meaning in our minds but—I have no claim to superiority—so far as India is concerned, we have earnestly striven to stand by these principles and I do not think we have offended any principle. It is not for me to stand up and criticise or justify other countries, but we have tried to do that not because of some temporary policy, not because those five principles have been declared in some agreement—that was merely a confirmation of what we thought, as to what we said—but because we have felt that that is the only way to function in this world of ours. Some people say, “Oh! After all that has happened, you still hold by that.” It is a curious question. If those principles are right, we hold by them and we should hold by them, even though nobody in the wide world is not holding by them. Naturally we have to adapt our policies to what happens in the world; we cannot live in isolation. But a principal should be acted upon even though somebody else has not acted upon it. One tries. Anyway, we are imperfect beings in an imperfect world. So I should like to assure the hon. Member opposite that so far as the Government is concerned—I cannot speak for every ordinary individual in India—we hold by those principles and we shall endeavour to act up to them whatever other countries may or may not do. Some people certainly—as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said—taking advantage of the occurrences in and relating to Tibet have raised a cry that India will now have to consider how far she can adhere to the policy of non-alignment. All that shows a strange misunderstanding of our ways of thinking in our policies. Non-alignment—although the word is itself a kind of negative word—nevertheless has a positive concept, and we do not propose to have a military alliance with any country, come what may, and I want to be quite clear about it, because the moment we give up that idea of non-alignment, we lose every anchor that we hold on to and we simply

drift. We may hang on to somebody or some country. But we lose our own self-respect, of the country's. If one loses one's own self respect, it is something very precious loss. Therefore, this business of thinking always in terms of getting something from this country or the other country is not desirable. It is perhaps not very relevant. It is said often in Pakistan, let us have a common defence policy. Now I am all for setting our troubles with Pakistan and living a normal, friendly, neighbourly life. We try for that. But I do not understand when people say that we have a common defence policy. Against whom? Immediately the question comes up: "Against whom is this common defence policy?" Are we going to become members of the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO or some body? We do not want to have a common defence policy which is almost another meaning of some kind of a military alliance. The whole policy that we have pursued is opposed to this conception. We want friendly relations with Pakistan. We hope we shall get them. But we are not going to tie ourselves up, our conceptions, our policies, with other countries involving military defence and attacking and all that.

So the present difficulties that we have to face in relation to the happenings in Tibet will, I hope, gradually pass. But it is a tragedy not only for Tibet, but a deeper tragedy for many of us that something that we have laboured for, for all these years which may be said to be enshrined—if you like—in the Panchsheel or in Bandung, has suffered very considerably in people's minds. I may say I shall hold on to it, but the fact is in people's minds there is that crack, there is that suffering, there is that uneasiness, that something they valued might slip away. These words like all other words—Bandung, Panchsheel; it does not matter what word you use—begin to lose their shine and to be hurled about without meaning, and in fact, just like even the word 'peace' becomes almost like a thunderbolt or a minor war the way it is used. Sometimes the manner of using it—it is the manner that counts. I have come more and more to believe that means are even more important than ends. They show to us that the way one does things is even more important than what one does. And that is why I have been aggrieved beyond measure at these various recent developments and at what is being said in China—the charges made against India. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did not say a word about all these not a word. I can understand where those things lead to. Hon. Members of this House being seasoned public men and women may restrain themselves, may not allow themselves to be affected too much. But it is difficult for the general public not to be affected by such charges. I do submit, which do not stand the slightest scrutiny. What have we done about this matter, about Tibet, apart from some speeches or things?

We have received the Dalai Lama and party and subsequently we have received some thousands of refugees. We have given them asylum, and it is admitted—I don't think anybody denies it—that as a sovereign country we have every right to do so, and nobody else can be a judge of that, except ourselves. Now is it suggested that we should have refused to give asylum to the Dalai Lama when he asked for it? Well, if it is suggested by someone outside India, I can tell them—I do not know about the handful of the four hundred millions of people of India; I doubt if even a few thousands would have agreed with that policy;—I can tell them this that the hundreds of millions of India would have become angry at that action of ours if we had refused asylum to the Dalai Lama and his party. Almost everybody in India—a few may not have—approved of our policy, and it would have been an impossible thing, an utterly wrong thing, for us to do otherwise from any point of view, political, humanitarian or whatever you like. So this is what we have done. Of course, we are charged with having connived at Kalimpong; of Kalimpong being the commanding centre – this is the word they use, I think – of this rebellion in Tibet. Now, it is said that the commanding centre has shifted to Mussorie. I know words have lost their meaning, because I find it very difficult to deal with these charges. And, why has the commanding centre gone to Mussorie? Because the Dalai Lama is there and because the brother of the Dalai Lama who normally lives in Darjeeling, I think, went to see him, and after seeing him went back to Darjeeling or Kalimpong. These are very serious charges against a country's leader being made irresponsibly in this way by the leaders of a people whom we have not only honoured and respected but whom we have considered particularly advanced in culture and politeness and the gentler art of civilisation. It has been a shock to me beyond measure because quite apart from everything else, I have looked up to the Chinese and I look up to them still because of their great accomplishments, because of their great culture and all that, and it has been a shock to me that this kind of thing should be said and done in the excitement of the moment. I hope that excitement will pass.

Now, Sir, I want to tell the House exactly how these matters came into our ken. On the 11th of March, for the first time we got a message from our Consul-General in Lhasa saying that there was some excitement in the town and that a large number of people had come and visited him consisting representatives of the public and some Tibetan officials, monks, heads of monasteries, etc. They had come to him with a series of complaints about the Chinese authorities there and they said that they were very much in distress. Now our Consul General in Lhasa was naturally very embarrassed.

What is he to do? He did not wish to interfere; it was none of his business to interfere and he told them: "Well, I cannot do anything for you" and he reported to us. That was on the 11th—the message dated the 10th reached us on the 11th. That was the first information we had, that something was afoot there. After that the Consul-General sent us brief reports about the general excitement in the town, the tense situation and people holding meetings, group meetings and all that. On the 14th he again sent us a message that a crowd of 5,000 Tibetan women had come to the Consulate-General with the same kind of complaints and asked him to accompany them to the Chinese Foreign Office in Lhasa to bear witness to what they said. At that again the poor Consul-General was exceedingly embarrassed. It was none of his business to do this and he said: "I cannot go." And he asked, "What do you mean by that?" Well, in short he said, "I just cannot go." Quite rightly. He reported it to us. We drafted a message—it was kept ready to be sent—to say: "Don't get entangled in what has happened and was happening in Lhasa." This was on the 14th. So this kind of thing went on. And it was at this time, when speaking, I think, in the Lok Sabha, I said that there was a clash of wills in Lhasa—whether that was a correct description, I do not know. The point was, there was no actual fighting going on at this time; that came few days later. On the 20th March, when it started, how it started, I do not know, nor did our Consul-General know sitting in the Consulate, and he could not be expected to know when it started. And as we now know, he did not know it then. On the 17th night the Dalai Lama and party left Lhasa, rather secretly. According to them, on the 17th afternoon at 4 O' clock, two shells or bombs, something like that, fell into a lake in the Summer Palace. Well, this made them think, "Now this is the last moment, and now the Palace is going to be shelled and there is going to be war everywhere", and they left Lhasa. As far as I know—I am not sure—even then it was not fully his intention to leave Tibet. But as Lhasa was being shelled, subsequently that intention must have developed. Anyhow, in the course of a week, from the 11th to the 20th or the 21st, during these, say, ten days—this was the news that came to us. We could do nothing about it and before the 10th or 11th we knew nothing about the situation except that we naturally knew that all kinds of cross-currents were at work at Lhasa and in Tibet. Then the question came before us, of the possibility of the Dalai Lama coming here, and we decided that we should receive him. He came. As the House might know I resisted and I was asking repeatedly: "Are you going to throw your doors open to any number of refugees from Tibet?" I resisted that although in my mind I knew that I could not very well refuse asylum to people who were in great difficulty; I could not; but I did not want to say it and invite people to roll into India from all over the place. So that is the short story of what has happened and what we have done. And now we are called expansionists and imperialists and what not, all kinds of phrases, which I suppose would not make any real difference to what we are; nevertheless coming from those whom we consider friends, they do hurt us.

Now I want just to give you a few facts. Again an extraordinary thing appeared in the newspapers in Peking. They go back now what had happened in 1950, that is, to some memoranda that we had sent, when Chinese armies were entering Tibet. Very polite memoranda they were. The answers were not very polite, but the point now is that they refer to them, that what we wrote to them was after consultation with the British Government, that though we called ourselves independent we really acted as stooges or tools of the British Government.

It is, of course, completely wrong and untruthful. There was no question of our consulting the British Government. Our view on Tibet was different from that of the British Government.

Now, one thing about the Panchen Lama's statement. I was rather distressed to read it, that a statement should be made, so lacking in generosity and dignity, by a person who had been our honoured guest. I do not know about the petty things he says that somewhere his staff was not given proper accommodation. I cannot answer that, whether at Aurangabad, or some such place there was some difficulty because the entourage of the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama was so big—hundred of people with them. It was not quite easy always to make as much preparation as we wanted.

About the refugees, now the latest position is that approximately 6,500 refugees are on their way down through the Kemang Division of NEFA, 1,500 are trekking through Bhutan and 700 have come to Sikkim—round about 9,000. The Bhutan Government have asked us to receive the Tibetan refugees coming through their territories and we have agreed to do so. Thus we have about 9,000 refugees for whom we have made ourselves responsible for some kind of arrangements. A few of the refugees, those who are armed when they entered India were disarmed on entry into India.

The refugees coming through NEFA will be accommodated temporarily in a camp at Missamara in Assam. Though the Assam Government are making arrangements for their shelter, medical relief, etc., the West Bengal Government have agreed to construct a temporary camp somewhere in Cooch-Bihar for the refugees who are coming through Bhutan. We are grateful to these two State Governments.

Special Officers to deal with the refugees have been appointed by the External Affairs Ministry. They are proceeding to Assam and West Bengal. It is not proposed to keep these refugees in these temporary camps for a long time and other arrangements will have to be devised for them. I cannot just say at present what or where, but it is obvious we are not going to keep them in camps.

One hon. Member—I think Dr. Kunzru, may be Mr. Shiva Rao—said something that we should allow these refugees to earn their own living and give them freedom to do many things. Broadly speaking, of course we intend that. We are not going to keep them as prisoners in camps. In fact, our instructions to our officers at the border were to tell them that we do not assume responsibility for their indefinite up-keep. For sometime, we would help them. And naturally to some extent we are responsible when these people are coming in. We cannot let them loose on India. Again, there is the question that they cannot easily be kept anywhere except in cooler climates—and we cannot send them to the rest of India simply—in mountain regions.

I think Mr. Shiva Rao said something about China and the United Nations. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to say so obviously our policy in regard to the entry of the People's Government of China into the U.N remains as it was. It is not that is based on certain facts—by these things; it is not because we get angry with something that happens in China that we change our policy. That would mean that we have no firm policies, that we are deflected by temporary happenings in the world.

Just one thing more. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta talked about national uprising. Again it depends upon how you use that word. I do not know exactly what happened in Tibet. But as I said in my previous statement, according to Chinese accounts this has been a fairly big affair, a very large scale affair. Also looking at the surrounding circumstances as well as the past history of Tibet, one can very well imagine that apart from the so-called people representing vested interests—they would be there—it is a fact that large numbers of Tibetan people—I cannot say whether they are in a majority or a minority, but large numbers undoubtedly—went to the extent of taking this step which they did, which really meant a very dangerous step. Anyhow it is there, and one feels strongly about it.

Now so far as we are concerned, we have not interfered either from Kalimpong or Mussoorie or otherwise. We have exercised our undoubted right to give asylum. I have said that the Dalai Lama is perfectly a free agent to go where he likes in India or go back to Tibet.

Some people—some foreign pressmen—said about two days after he had come to Mussoorie that we are keeping him behind barbed wire. That sounds rather horrible. The fact was that the Mussoorie police, to lighten their burden, because of all kinds of curious people trying to go into the compound of the house, had put a little barbed wire on that compound before he came, to be able to protect him, for his security and general protection. But that was not to keep him in, and he goes, I believe, round about Mussoorie. He can go back to Tibet the moment he likes.

It is no use my going on repeating what I have said earlier that the Dalai Lama is not kept under duress here, that he did not enter India under any duress, except the duress of circumstances, if you like compulsion of events. And, certainly, I can speak from personal knowledge having met him and talked to him, that he is staying there of his own free will in India and even at Mussoorie. With all respect, I would to say that anyone who denies this fact, well, is totally ignorant of facts and speaks without knowing.

Further, hon. Members might have seen in the newspaper headlines—because odd remarks are given as headlines that said that I would be happy if the Dalai Lama went back to Tibet. I did so. Somebody asked a question and I said, “Naturally I would be happy if he went with dignity”. But that did not mean at all that I am going to push the Dalai Lama out or put him in an embarrassing position. It is entirely for him to decide what to do, when to do it. The only advice I gave him when I saw him was: “You have had a very hard journey and very harassing experiences. If I may, as a person very much older than you, suggest it, you might rest for a few days, and calmly think about the events and then do what you like.”

One more matter, if I may say so, especially to the press. I do not particularly fancy this constant sensational way of referring to the Dalai Lama as the God-king, and, in fact, I do not think he likes it either. This is not the Indian way; it is a foreign way of doing things. It sounds sensational, no doubt. I hope that word will not be used. It is good enough to refer to him as the Dalai Lama. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Chairman : Dr. Kunzru, would you like to say anything?

Dr. H. N. Kunzru: There is nothing to reply to. I thought my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, might raise some point but he has hardly spoken the point.

Mr. Chairman: Then we pass on to the next item.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

10 August 1959

Oral Answers to Questions

THE DALAI LAMA'S PRESS CONFERENCE

***21. Dr. Z.A. Ahmad:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the press conference held by the Dalai Lama on June 20, 1959;
- (b) whether Government were informed prior to the conference of the nature of the statements the Dalai Lama was going to make at the press conference; and
- (c) whether Government have expressed their reaction to the propriety or otherwise of making such statements?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No.
- (c) In a statement made on behalf of the Government of India, it was stated that the Government would not recognise any Tibetan Government on Indian soil.

Dr. Z.A. Ahmad: I want to know whether statements of the type that were made by the Dalai Lama would be repeated. I ask this question in view of the fact that the Prime Minister earlier made a statement and expressed the hope that he would not like the Dalai Lama to say or do anything to India which would embarrass the Government. Now, these statements are of that nature and if the Dalai Lama is not frankly told that such statements should not be made, I am sure such statements would be repeated causing embarrassment to the Government.

Shri V.K. Dhage: What was the question?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, I did not understand the question.

Mr. Chairman:

The question is whether the Dalai Lama has been told that he should not repeat such statements since they cause embarrassment to the Government.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a difficult matter, Sir, to know a hard and fast line. On the one hand, what the hon. Member has said is correct; on the other hand, it did not seem proper to us to put any undue restrictions on the Dalai Lama. He is a man of note and position, ability and intelligence, and he is anxious not to embarrass us. At the same time, no doubt he suffers from inner compulsions to say what he feels. And it becomes a little difficult for any hard and fast line to be drawn.

Dr. Z.A. Ahmad: Sir, there are ways and means of doing things. I think if the matter is considered important there are ways and means which the Government can adopt to ensure that such things do not happen in future.

Dr. A. N. Bose: May I ask how the statement of the Dalai Lama has caused any embarrassment to our Government? All that we know is, he said that wherever the Dalai Lama is, the people of Tibet regard him as their Government. He did not even claim it to be a Government on his own; far less, did he want the Indian Government to recognise it as Tibetan Government. So my question is, why should the Indian Government take it as an embarrassment to them?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Because it might be misunderstood. The hon. Member is right; he did not make a claim that he was functioning as a Government. That is perfectly true; nevertheless what he said might have led some people to imagine things.

Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil: Did the statement made by the Dalai Lama cause embarrassment to the Government, or to the questioner and his party?

(No reply)

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

भारत में तिब्बत के शरणार्थी

*२४ श्री राम सहाय:

श्री महेश्वर नायक: क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) भारत में ३० जून, १९५६ तक तिब्बत के कितने निवासी आये; और

(ख) उनमें से कितने अपना खर्च स्वयं बरदाश्त कर रहे हैं और कितनों का खर्च सरकार को बरदाश्त करना पड रहा है?

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

*24. Shri Ram Sahai:

Shri Maheshwari Naik: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Tibetans who arrived in India up to the 30th June, 1959; and

(b) how many of them are meeting their own expenses and for how many Government have to bear the expenses?

वैदेशिक-कार्य उपमंत्री (श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन):

(क) १२,३९६

(ख) उनके रहने के लिये जो कैंप खोले गये हैं, बुनियादी तौर पर उन का खर्च भारत सरकार उठा रही है फिर भी केन्द्रीय सहायता समिति की ओर से शरणार्थियों की सहायता के लिये अनुदान के रूप में जो वस्तुएं प्राप्त होती हैं, उनका भारत सरकार ने स्वागत किया है! जिन शरणार्थियों के कोई सम्बन्धी अथवा मित्र भारत में हैं, उन्हें उन के पास जाने की अनुमति दे दी गई है!

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

(a) 12,396

(b) The Government of India are bearing the basic expenditure of the Camps established to receive them. The Government of India have, however, welcomed contributions in kind, received from the Central Relief Committee towards the relief of the refugees. Refugees who have relations or friends in India have been permitted to join them.

श्री राम सहाय: भारत सरकार द्वारा तिब्बत के लोगों पर अब तक कितना खर्च किया जा चुका है !

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: ज़रा मुश्किल है कहना क्योंकि खर्च अलग अलग प्रदेश की हुकूमतों ने किया है! कुछ हमारा भी खर्चा हुआ है! शायद १० लाख इसके लिये रखे थे !

श्री व्यंकट कृष्ण ढांगे: रखे थे य खर्च हुए?

श्री पां० ना० राजभोज: क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि रिलीफ फंड से कितना मदद मिली है और अब तक तिब्बत के रिफ्यूजीज़ पर कितना रुपया खर्च हुआ है?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: इसका अभी मेने जो जवाब दिया उस से ज्यादा मैं जवाब नहीं दे सकता! मुझे मालूम नहीं है क्योंकि कोई रुपया हमारे पास तो आता नहीं है! रिलीफ कमेटी सामान वगैरा उन्हें पहुंचाती है !

Shri Maheshwar Naik: May I know, Sir, whether the rate of influx of Tibetan refugees has since been reduced?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, for some time, there are no refugees coming in. Recently we heard that a number, I think about a hundred, were coming through Bhutan. That is, we were informed by the Bhutan Government that they had come there and they propose to send them on to India.

Shri Maya Devi Chetty: May I know, Sir, how many Tibetans refugees have been so far taken by the Sikkim Government for asylum or for their settlement?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I could not give the number, but it is proposed to send a fairly considerable number to Sikkim for work there. The dispersal has been as follows:

About 225 have been sent to Kalimpong to join friends and relatives. About 320 to Dalhousie—some old lamas have been sent there and we have undertaken to look after them. They may carry on their Buddhist Lamaist activities there.

About 254 to Gangtok, that is Sikkim, at present for work on roads: to Bomdila, for road building, 497; and to Kalimpong (temporary visits) 59. That is from the Missamari camp. From the other camp, Buxa camp; 40 have been sent to Ladakh; 3 to Mussoorie; 3 to Sokhia Pokhri (Darjeeling District); to Kalimpong 62 and to Gangtok 271. Thus, according to this, to Sikkim, there are about 770 persons sent.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: May I know, Sir, what is the total estimate of expenditure per month—not generally—on account of these refugees and whether this estimate has been made irrespective of the resources or the assets that have been brought by the Tibetans themselves, including the Dalai Lama, and what is the amount of such assets brought from Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot answer that question, but we had set aside Rs. 10 lakhs for this. Now, much of the expenditure has been incurred by the State Governments concerned. No doubt we have to pay them much of that, but we have not got their accounts, etc. So, I cannot say. But now most of the able-bodied men are being given work chiefly road-making. Young boys and some of the young lamas are being sent to schools, or other educational arrangements have been made for them.

Mr. Chairman: Have they got any assets—that is the question.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: What is the total amount?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know. Sir, what assets individuals may have brought with them. We are not aware of any very large sum being brought by these people.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: There is the normal regulation that when foreigners come here they have to declare the assets they bring in whatever form they are. May I know, Sir, whether any such declaration has been made by the Dalai Lama or on his behalf or any such people who may have brought huge quantities of personal wealth?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: These foreigners came rather in unusual circumstances and through unusual routes. We had no customs officials sitting on the border there. But apart from that, many of them came in a rather destitute condition, with hardly a change of clothes. It is quite possible that some may have brought something. I have no information about it.



10 August 1959

Oral Answers to Questions

EXPENDITURE INCURRED ON TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

*37. **Shri J. H. Joshi:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the total expenditure incurred on giving asylum to the Dalai Lama and his party from the day of his entry into India up to the 15th July, 1959; and
- (b) the total expenditure incurred by Government on rehabilitating other Tibetans who have come to India?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) The exact expenditure is not yet known as reports from Assam and West Bengal Governments are still awaited. A Sum of Rs. 1,37,252. approximately has, however, been spent by U.P and N.E.F.A Administrations on the Dalai Lama and his party from the date of their arrival in India up to the 15th July, 1959.
- (b) Since the dispersal from Camps has begun recently, it is not possible to indicate the expenditure on rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees.



13 August 1959

Oral Answers to Questions

RESTRICTIONS ON INDIAN TRADERS IN TIBET

*132. **Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to refer to the answer given to Unstarred Question No. 21 in the Rajya Sabha on the 23rd April, 1959 and state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Tibetan Government have imposed restrictions on the movement etc. of the Indian traders in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse and that they are being compelled to come back to India; and
- (b) the number of Indian traders in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse and their number in the whole of Tibet?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Since the recent disturbances in Tibet, movement from one trade centre to another is being controlled through the Chinese Military control authorities and the Preparatory Committee. Although no open orders regarding restrictions on movements of Indian traders of Yatung, Phari and Gyantse have come to our notice, it is a fact that travel permits are not being given freely. Indian traders are encountering various difficulties but it cannot be stated that they are being compelled to return to India.
- (b) The total number of Indian traders keeps fluctuating at different times. At present there are 97 traders in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse. The total number of traders in the whole of Tibet at present is near about 2,117.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या यह सच है कि बहुत से ट्रेडर्स जो कि वहां पर जेनरेशंस से रह रहे हैं वे हिन्दुस्तान आना चाहते हैं लेकिन उनको इन्डियन्स नहीं समझा जाता है और उनको इजाज़त नहीं दी जाती है !

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It is true and a statement on the subject was made yesterday or the day before in the other House and it has appeared in all the papers about the difficulties experienced by people of Indian origin, by Kashmiri Muslims and Ladakhis, who are in Tibet.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या यह बात सच है कि वहां जो हिन्दुस्तान की ट्रेड एजेंसी है वह ठीक ढंग से फंक्शन नहीं कर सकती है क्योंकि जो हिन्दुस्तान और चीन में व्यापारिक समझौता हुआ था उसके विरुद्ध बहुत सी चीज़ें की जा रही हैं ?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Yes, Sir. The answer was given that many restrictions are imposed on traders and these make it very difficult for our traders to carry on their trade.

Shri B.K.P. Sinha: Under international law, a man's nationality is determined not only by his residence but also by volition, his desire to accept the nationality of the country. May I know, Sir, whether the Chinese Government or the Communist system accepts this principle of nationality or do they have some other principle of nationality?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I do not know what the Communists accept, but as far as Tibet is concerned I have already told him.

Shri N.M. Lingam: Since this is matter between India and China in regard to Tibet and Indian traders therein, will the hon. Deputy Minister please tell us what steps Government have taken to bring this to the notice of the Chinese Government?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon:

From time to time these difficulties are brought to the notice of the Chinese Government through our Ambassador in Peking.

Shri M.H. Samuel: May I know, Sir, if Government have any information on the subject, as to whether there is a large concentration of Chinese troops on the Sikkim and Bhutan borders and that China has claimed these territories also as part of her territory?

Mr. Chairman: That is another question.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: That does not arise out of this question.

Shri Jaswant Singh: I would like to know whether the Deputy Minister has accepted that Indian traders are facing difficulties in Tibet-both those who are residents there as well as the seasonal traders who go there and join in the summer. I would like to know what steps Government are taking to see that these Indian traders are given due relief and help.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The normal step, Sir, is to approach the Chinese Government both in Tibet and in Peking. And we have approached them and sent them full details of this repeatedly-and in some detail I pointed this out and reminded them about this.

Shri Jaswant Singh: But then I would like to know what the Chinese say in regard to the difficulties that the Indian traders are facing; whether they are prepared to help them or they have not given any help.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have not had any answer to our latest memorandum from Peking, but the local people in Tibet, the local Chinese Authorities in Tibet, give various answers to various things, which according to our opinion are not always relevant.

Shri N.M. Lingam: Since this development is a sequel to the Tibetan upheaval and since generally the attitude of China is becoming more and more hostile to India, has the Government considered the question of taking up the whole question of Indo-Chinese relations after the happenings in Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member means by the 'whole question'. As questions arise, they are taken up, sometimes more than one question. There are several matters like this, which we have taken up with the Chinese Government and have addressed them on the subject. Some replies came sometime ago. We have addressed them again. As for the first part of his question, it is rather difficult to say what the reason is for this kind of thing. To some extent there has been pressure on the Indian traders even before these Tibetan developments. I know that when I passed through a little corner of Tibet last year, at Yatung, the Indian traders came to me and complained of various disabilities from which they suffered. A year or two they were in a much more prosperous condition, but now disabilities are gradually coming in. I had taken up the matter then. But it is true that all this has increased considerably in the last two or three months or so.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: We would like to know from the Prime Minister about the welfare particularly of our Indian nationals there. We know that they are in difficulties with regard to trade and other things as the Prime Minister has said. But do our missions there keep themselves properly informed about the welfare of our people and that they are not being harassed for one reason or the other? We are very anxious about that aspect of the question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Apart from the traders there and apart from the people in our missions, there are two main groups, both of these groups come from Ladakh. One is a group of Ladakhi Muslims and the other group is a Ladakhi Buddhists. The Buddhist lamas, etc. go there to study, live in monasteries, and the Muslims go there for various purposes and remain there for quite a considerable time. Now, with regard to these latter groups, there is an argument going on between the Chinese government and ourselves as to whether they are to be considered Indian nationals or not. I do not want to take up in answer to the question the story of this argument. We think they are Indian nationals; they claim to be Indian Nationals; they want to be Indian Nationals. But the Chinese Authorities in Tibet have not accepted this claim and pointed out that they have been there for a long time and they have not got their requisite papers, etc. which they did not have in the normal course previously. They were not called upon to do so. So, in so far as these people, that is the Ladakhi Muslims, are concerned our information is that considerable pressure has been brought to bear upon them, and they have not been easily accessible to our missions there. But for the other Indians, there are real economic troubles.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: Is there any restrictions on other Indians visiting our missions or is there none? The other Indians, these Ladakhis, can they go freely to our Indian mission or not?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think there are any rules prohibiting them from coming. But the fact of the matter is that it is difficult to travel without all kinds of permits. There is no conveyance available, no vehicles available. The road may be not open to traffic. So, it is not strictly speaking, easy for people to go from one town to another.

Shri B.K.P. Sinha: May I know what practical consequences will follow out of the denial of Indian nationality to these traders or other citizens of India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: One practical consequence will be that they will not be allowed to leave Tibet. Otherwise, they are entitled to leave Tibet and go back to what they consider their original homes in Ladakh.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: The Prime Minister was please to say that they have submitted a memorandum to the Chinese Government and that they have been waiting for a reply. May I know when this memorandum was sent and whether the Government of India will think of approaching them again if they do not get an answer?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So many memoranda have been sent to the Chinese Government, formally and informally—not one, they are quite a number. I should think that one of our principal memoranda was sent about, maybe, three weeks ago. But since then, other matters have been brought to the notice of the Chinese Government.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether our mission people visit our Indian nationals there. There may be practical difficulties for them to go to the mission, but what about our mission people going and keeping in touch with our nationals?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not difficult within the same town, say, Yatung, where people can visit each other more or less. But it is difficult for them to go for instance, to Gyantse because of transport difficulties.



तिब्बत से चांदी तथा चांदी के सिक्कों का लाया जाना

*२९७. श्री राम सहाय: क्या वित्त मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि १ नवम्बर, १९५८ से ३० जून, १९५९ तक तिब्बत से कितनी चांदी तथा कितनी चांदी के सिक्के भारत लाये गये और उस से भारतीय कोष को कर के रूप में कितनी आमदनी हुई?

BRINGING OF SILVER AND SILVER COINS FROM TIBET

*297. **Shri Ram Sahai:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state the quantity of silver and the number of silver coins which were brought into India from Tibet between the period from the 1st November, 1958 and the 30th June, 1959 and the income derived by the Indian treasury through tax on this account?

वित्त उपमंत्री (श्री बी०आर०भगत): निर्धारित अधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गये आयात लाइसेन्सों के अनुसार, भू-सीमाशुल्क सम्बन्धी निश्चित रास्तों से १ नवम्बर, १९५८ से ३० जून १९५९ तक तिब्बत से भारत में चांदी के २०,२८,२५९ सिक्के लाये गये ! इस से भारतीय राजकोष को सीमाशुल्क (एकमात्र आय) के रूप में ८,४५,१५६ रूपये मिले !

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B.R. Bhagat): 20,28,259 silver coins were brought into India and Tibet from 1st November, 1958 to 30th June 1959, through the authorised land customs routes, against import licenses issue by the prescribed authority. The customs duty (the only income) derived by the Indian treasury on this account is Rs.8,45,156.

श्री राम सहाय: क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या कोई ऐसा रास्ता भी है कि जिससे अनआंथोराइज्ड तरीके पर यह चांदी लायी जाती है?

श्री बी० आर० भगत: बहुत से रास्ते हैं!

Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya: Is Rs. 8 lakhs not too high on Rs.20 lakhs? And still they make substantial profits out of it?

(No reply)

श्री राम सहाय: क्या मंत्री महोदय बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि पिछले वर्ष जो आमदनी हुई थी उसके मुकाबले में यह कम है अथवा ज्यादा?

श्री बी० आर० भगत: बहुत कम है!

श्री राम सहाय: मैं यह मालूम करना चाहता हूँ कि कम होने का कारण क्या है?

श्री बी० आर० भगत: लोन में दिक्कतें हो रही हैं और यह बढ़ती जा रही है!

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: The other day when I asked a question on the subject, the Prime Minister informed us that the assets, coins and otherwise, brought by the Dalai Lama and his entourage had not been accounted for. They came without going through the normal customs formalities. May I know whether subsequently the Ministry of Finance, in conformity with the existing laws and regulations, have cared to ascertain from the Dalai Lama and his entourage as to what amount of money, coins and otherwise, they have brought into this country?

Shri B.R. Bhagat: That is too large a question for this, but I can inform the hon. Member that no such step has been taken.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I am concerned with the legal part of it. What types of steps have been taken in this matter? Because it has been reported in so many newspapers that lots of money and other assets have been brought into this country.

(No reply)

Mr. Chairman: It will be a good yogic exercise if he stops talking for half an hour.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: That is my yogic exercise.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Ram Sahai:

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: He has not replied, Sir.



INDO-TIBETAN TRADE

***345. Shri Maheshwar Naik:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Indo-Tibetan trade has been affected by the political disturbance in Tibet:
- (b) what was the volume of trade between India and Tibet prior to the Tibetan upsurge; and
- (c) what is the latest position?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir. The Indo-Tibetan trade has suffered considerably during the last few months especially since the disturbances.
- (b) And (c). The total volume of Indo-Tibetan trade during the quarter Jan-March, 1959, was Rs. 81.98 lakh approximately. The figure, however, declined to Rs. 26.82 lakhs approx. during the quarter April-June, 1959.

Shri Maheshwar Naik: May I know whether Government have taken any measures for the restoration of normal trade between the two countries?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, Sir, I do not recall all the measures but we certainly want normal trade to be restored and we are pointing out to the Chinese authorities in Tibet and difficulties that have arisen in regard to it. For instance, one of the major difficulties is the question of payment and the currency. Many of our traders cannot deal in the goods there. All these difficulties have arisen and we are pointing out these things as much as we can because we cannot interfere in the internal trade arrangements otherwise.

Shri Maheshwar Naik: May I know, whether it is a fact that all sorts of impediments are being put against the Indian trade being run smoothly and that particularly the Indian traders who are engaged in trading in Tibet are not allowed to even borrow money from the local money lenders?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:

That is what I said, Sir, that there are difficulties. I do not know whether one such relates to the question of borrowing money but I imagine it is difficult to borrow money.

Shri Jaswant Singh: The question is not only of the Indian currency being made legal tender who have been doing business in Tibet have had to completely suspend their business and I would like to know what the Government is doing either to restore normal conditions there or to rehabilitate the traders. This is a very serious matter because a very large number of people are affected by this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have just answered, Sir.

Shri Jaswant Singh: There is a second part to my question, sir.

Jawaharlal Nehru: We cannot force trade on another country. If a country deliberately wants to stop it, it can do a hundred and one things over-hand and under-hand to make it difficult for the trader to function. We cannot deal with such a matter. If there is any breach of treaty regulations, then we can take up that matter.

Shri Jaswant Singh: The main question was, Sir....

Mr. Chairman: "Did they suffer? Do you rehabilitate them?" That is the second part of the question, is it not?

Shri Jaswant Singh: Yes, Sir. I want to know whether Government is taking action to rehabilitate them.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, have the Indian traders there suffered? Are any measures taken to rehabilitate them? That is what he wants to know.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: None whatsoever. We have absolutely no such idea and we are not thinking of any such action. First of all, such a question does not arise and secondly these traders in the past have not done badly at all. It is only in the present that they are not well off.

Shri Jaswant Singh: It is their misfortune to be Indians, Sir.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: May I know whether the Government of India was consulted or at least was informed by the Chinese authorities of their intention to declare the Indian rupee as not legal tender in Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no mention of this in the Treaty. All that the Treaty says is that customary rules will continue to prevail. You can interpret that as you will but there is no special reference in the Treaty to the rupee being legal tender or not.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: The first part of my question has not been answered, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Were we consulted? That is number one.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Was it unilateral? That is the second part of the question and the third part is, was it in the trade agreement? One question in three stages, is it?

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: Yes, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir, we were not consulted and we can hardly raise any objection to the fact we were not consulted by them before they made changes. The point is that where such changes are made, they must not in the interests of the countries concerned, have an immediate upsetting effect on past transactions. It is open to any country to make a change for the future so that the traders and others know where they stand but making a change which applies to past transactions does create a tremendous amount of difficulty because after they have paid for some goods, then let us say, 50 percent or 75 percent of the value suddenly disappears. Therefore, normally it should not apply to past transactions.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: But are they applying to past transactions?

(No reply)

Shri Maheswar Naik: It is reported that Indian traders resident in Tibet are not being allowed to enter the Indian Consulate-General. Is it a fact and, if so, have the Government thought it necessary to take any action in that regard?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think there is any difficulty in regard to the Indian traders coming to the Consulate-General but some people like the Ladakhi Muslims who claim to be Indian nationals and whom we are prepared to accept as such but who are not accepted as Indian nationals by the Chinese authorities at present have difficulties in coming to the Consulate-General.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: I want the Prime Minister to inform us on this point. The Treaty obligation was that the customary rules and customs will prevail. One of the customary rules was that the Indian rupee will be the legal tender in Tibet. Now that unilateral action has been taken by the Chinese authorities to declare it as not legal tender, will the Government of India take up this matter with the Chinese authorities? That is number one. Number two is

Mr. Chairman: You are putting a series of questions.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: Have the Government any information about the amount of Indian rupee involved in this, the extent to which the Indian traders there have suffered?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are constantly taking up this and like matters with the Chinese Government, putting to them whatever we think were the errors committed in regard to their obligations arising out of the Treaty. This is being constantly placed before them. I have no idea of the amount involved.

† † † † † † † † † † †

25 August 1959

Oral Answers to Questions

INDIAN TRADE AGENT IN TIBET

*369. **Shri V.K. Dhage:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Shri Laxman Singh Jangpani, the Indian Trade Agent in Tibet, was delayed by four weeks recently because of the Chinese authorities changing his route, even though he possessed the normal seasonal visa for entering Western Tibet; and
- (b) if so, what are the reason for which his route was changed?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) The trade Agent had been issued a Chinese visa for entry by Niti Pass. When he was on his way towards the pass, Chinese Government informed us that it would not be possible to provide the usual facilities of security guard

and mobile wireless set on Tibet side of Niti pass. The Chinese authorities suggested that the Trade Agent should be diverted to enter the Tibet region through the Lepu Lekh pass, since the necessary facilities had been arranged from Taklakot.

Since it is not possible for the Trade Agent to function without the usual escort and mobile wireless set, which provides the only means of communication with India, he was instructed to return and enter the Tibet region through the Lepu Lekh pass.

Shri V.K. Dhage: Is it a fact, Sir that this gentleman came back to Almora later?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: No he is on his way, Sir; he had to come back and then go again via Lepu Lekh pass.

Shri V.K. Dhage: May I know Sir, what setback it has meant to the Indian Trade with Tibet?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It has meant this that the man was delayed by seven weeks and Government have incurred a loss of Rs. 7,000 by his coming back and going by another route.



25 August 1959

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

76. Shri M. Basavapunnaiyah: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the names of countries from which contributions have been received for the relief and rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees in India and the amount of contribution received from each country?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): All contributions coming from Indian or foreign voluntary agencies are received by the Central Relief Committee for Tibetan Refugees presided over by Shri Acharya J.B. Kripalani, which co-ordinates such voluntary relief activities.

It is understood that contributions have been received from the American Tibetan Relief Committee, the Catholic Relief Committee, the Indian National Christian Council and the Co-operation for American Relief Every-where. Most of the contributions were in kind; in any case, the Government is not aware of their estimated value.



31 August 1959

Oral Answers to Questions

तिब्बत के लोगों को वापस लौटाने के लिये चीन की प्रार्थना

*४३९. **श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान:** क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या चीन की गणराज्य सरकार ने भारत आये हुये तिब्बत के लोगों को अभयदान के विश्वास पर वापस लौटाने के लिये भारत सरकार से प्रार्थना की है !

CHINA'S REQUEST FOR THE RETURN OF TIBETANS

*439. **Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether the Government of the Peoples Republic of China have requested the Government of India for the return of the Tibetans who have come to India with the assurance of amnesty to such Tibetans?

वैदेशिक कार्य उपमंत्री (श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन): हमारे पास कोई सूचना नहीं है ! चीनियों ने इस सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार के साथ कोई लिखा-पढ़ी नहीं की है !

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): We have no information. The Government of India have not been approached by the Chinese in the matter.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या सरकार को अखबारों में प्रकाशित इस सूचना का पता है कि चीन की तरफ से या चीन के एजेंट्स की तरफ से भूटान की सरहद पर और भारत की सरहद पर जो तिब्बती रेफ्यूजीज आये है, उनके अन्दर इस प्रकार के लेटर्स सर्क्युलेट किये गये थे ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: आपने क्या लेटर्स कहा ?

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: जी हाँ !

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: इसकी कोई सूचना नहीं है!

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या यह सच है कि ये जो तिब्बती रेफ्यूजीज़ यहां पर आये हुये है, उनका जाना तो दरकिनार रहा, अभी तक उनका आना जारी है और यू० पी० में अलमोडा की तरफ से लोग आ रहे है?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: हमारे पास तो कोई इत्तिला नहीं है! इक्के-दुक्के शायद आते हो, लेकिन कोई खास तादाद में नहीं आ रहे है! शुरू से उधर से नहीं आये है! जो लोग आये है, वे दूसरी तरफ से आये है! अलमोडा की तरफ से कोई आ गये हो तो आ गये हो, मुझे कोई खास इत्तिला नहीं है!

† † † † † † † † † † †

8 September 1959

Written Answer to Questions

DISABLED TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

*172. **Shri P.N. Rajabhoj:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- the number of Tibetan refugees in India who are physically handicapped; and
- whether any special arrangements have been made by Government to rehabilitate the disabled refugees?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- According our information there are 42 physically handicapped Tibetan refugees in our camps.
- Yes, Sir. We are considering a proposal to make special arrangements for these disabled refugees in Bombay under the supervision of the All India Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. The World Veterans Federation have offered to finance this scheme.

† † † † † † † † † † †

8 September 1959

Written Answer to Questions

RESTRICTION ON INDIAN PILGRIMS IN TIBET

*611. **Shri Faridul Haq Ansari:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether Indians are no permitted to visit Tibet on Pilgrimage?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): There is no ban on the visit of Pilgrims to Tibet. The Chinese Foreign Bureau at Lhasa however informed the Indian Consul General that since they were carrying out certain military operation he should advice the Indian pilgrims not to go on pilgrimage or they should go as few in number as possible this year and that if in spite on this they go on pilgrimage responsibility of safety should be borne by themselves.

† † † † † † † † † † †

24 November 1959

Written Answers to Questions:

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS TO NITI AND MANA PASSES ON THE INDO-TIBETAN BORDER

*41. **Shri V.K. Dhage:** Will the **Minister of Transport and Communications** be pleased to state:

- whether it is a fact that the Government of India have asked the Government of Uttar Pradesh to construct roads to Niti and Mana passes on the Indo-Tibetan border; and
- if so, which Government will bear the cost?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the Sabha.

STATEMENT

Central grants-in-aid aggregating Rs. 13 lakh have been approved for the construction of following State roads which lead to Niti and Mana Passes:

		<i>Grant Approved (Rs. Lakh)</i>
Joshimath-Niti Village Bridle road	—————→	6.00
Niti Village-Niti Pass road (Hill Track)	—————→	8.00
Badrinath-Mana Pass Bridle road	—————→	4.00
		13.00

2. According to detailed estimates sanctioned for these roads, the projects are likely to cost nearly Rs. 14.15 lakhs and the balance of Rs. 1.15 (14:15 – 13) lakhs will be met by the State Government from their own resources.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

26 November 1959

Written Answers to Questions

MISSAMARI TRANSIT CAMP FOR TIBETAN REFUGEES

***138. Shri Maheswar Naik:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government have decided that the Missamari transit camp for Tibetan refugees which was to be closed on October 1, 1959, should remain open for some more time;
- (b) what is the present rate of influx of Tibetan refugees into India; and
- (c) how this figure compares with that of the period following the Tibetan upsurge?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) It is not correct that the Government had decided to close down Missamari camp on October 1, 1959. While every effort is being made to disperse the refugees from this camp to different rehabilitation centres, the camp may have to be continued longer if necessary.
- (b) The rate of influx after June, 1959, has been small. Only 1922 refugees entered India in the course of last 4 months in small batches.
- (c) On the other hand, 11,834 refugees came in the months of April, May and June, 1959, i.e. during the period immediately following the Tibetan upsurge.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

1 December 1959

Oral Answers to the Questions

INDIA'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE INCLUSION OF TIBET DISCUSSION IN U.N. AGENDA

***191. Shri M.P. Bhargava:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether any instructions were sent by Government to the Indian Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly regarding the attitude to be adopted by India on the question of the inclusion of discussion on Tibet in the United Nations agenda; and
- (b) what are the reasons for which India did not take part in the voting on the questions?

The Prime Minister and Minister Of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) Yes.
- (b) the instructions sent to the Delegation were in accordance with the statements made by the Prime Minister in Parliament and elsewhere on several occasions. The Government of India had considered this matter fully, even before it was brought up in the United Nations, and were of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by a discussion of this issue in the UN in existing circumstances. When this matter came up for discussion in the UN on the question of inscription, India did not participate in the voting. When the resolution sponsored by Malaya and Ireland was discussed, the Delegation abstained.

Shri M.P. Bhargava: May I know whether it is a fact that according to the United Nations procedure, any country can abstain from voting and explain its reasons for doing so before or after the vote?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May be so, Sir. I do not know.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

9 December 1959

Oral Answers to the Questions

INDIANS ARRESTED BY THE CHINESE AUTHORITIES IN TIBET

***39. Shri Faridul Haq Ansari:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Indian citizens who have so far been arrested or detained by the Chinese authorities in Tibet from border areas;
- (b) what are the reasons of their arrest or detention; and
- (c) what steps Government have taken to get them released?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): So far as we know, about 31 Indian

citizens or Indian protected persons are detained by the local Chinese authorities in Tibet.

- (a) Except in one case where the person concerned has been accused of participation in the Tibetan rebellion, no specific reasons have been given despite our Consul General's request to the Chinese authorities.
- (b) The question of the release of Indian nationals detained by the Chinese authorities has been taken up with them on a number of occasions. Attention is invited in this connection to the White Papers Nos. I and II particularly to the notes of 25th July 1959, and 24th September 1959. No reply to these notes has, however, been received.

Shri Faridul Haq Ansari: May I know, Sir, whether the Government intend to pursue their effort for the release of these people with the Chinese Government?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: These 31 persons are: 16 Ladakhi lamas, another a Ladakhi trader, 4 the so-called Indian protected persons from Sikkim and three Indian-nationals from Himachal Pradesh, but really whose whereabouts are not known. Now, the difficulty has arisen in regard to some of the Ladakhis. They go on saying that those are not Indian nationals because they have been living there, and sometimes because some of these people have married Tibetan wives. That type of difficulty arises. We are pursuing the matter all the time.

Shri D.A. Mirza: May I know, Sir, whether these Indian citizens who have been taken prisoner are alive or they are liquidated.

(No reply)

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

14 December 1959

Written Answers to the Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

***442. Shri M. Basavapunniah:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Tibetan refugees in India as on 31st October, 1959;
- (b) the amount spent on them by the Government of India till 31st October, 1959; and
- (c) the amount spent on the Dalai Lama and his entourage by the Government of India upto 31st October, 1959?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) 13,756
- (b) Rs. 23,26,219 approximately.
- (c) Rs. 2,93,671 approximately.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

17 December 1959

Written Answers to the Questions

REPORT OF THE INDIAN TRADE AGENT IN TIBET

201. Shri V.K. Dhage: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Indian Trade Agent in Western Tibet has recently submitted a report to the Ministry of External Affairs about the trading season there; and
- (b) if so, what is his report?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) As is usual, the Indian Trade Agent in Western Tibet has submitted a report on completion of his recent tour of Western Tibet.
- (b) While it is not customary to disclose the contents of individual reports, it may be stated that the trading season in Western Tibet has been slack this year on account of various difficulties, which our traders have had to encounter in selling goods and in barter of their merchandise. The difficulties of the traders have been indicated in our note of 26th October, 1959, to the Chinese Government and subsequently published in White Paper No. II.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

10 February 1960

Written Answers to the Questions

NUMBER OF LADAKHI INDIAN NATIONALS CAME FROM TIBET

29. Shri S. Panigrahi: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Ladakhi Indian nationals who have come back to India from Tibet since the 23rd January, 1959; and
 (b) the manner in which they have been rehabilitated?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) 103 Ladakhi Lamas.
 (b) They have gone to their homes in Ladakh. The expenses of their journey have been borne by the Government of India.



15 February 1960

Oral Answers to the Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

*I 14. **Shri Ram Sahai:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to refer to the answer given to Starred Question No. 442 in the Rajya Sabha on the 14th December, 1959, and state:

- (a) the number of Tibetan refugees who arrived in India by the end of January, 1960;
 (b) the amount of expenditure Government have had to incur on them; and
 (c) what means have been made available to them for earning their livelihood?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) the number of Tibetan refugees who arrived in India up to 17th January, 1960 is 16,367.
 (b) Rs. 12,15,627 excluding the expenditure incurred by the Assam Government on behalf of government of India.
 (c) Gainful employment found for Tibetan refugees so far has been on road construction work and production of handicrafts.

श्री राम सहाय: क्या मैं यह जान सकूंगा कि ये जितने शरणार्थी यहां आए हैं उन में से कितने लोग अपनी आजीविका उपर्जन के लिये प्रयत्नशील हैं?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Does he want the actual figures of people employed?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: आपके सवाल का जवाब देना ज़रा मुश्किल है कि कौन प्रयत्नशील है कौन नहीं ! कोई कतार तो होती नहीं ! कुछ सिखाने से हो जाते हैं कि कुछ मौका देने से हो जाते हैं ! कोशिश की जाती है जहां तक मुमकिन हो उन्हें सिखाया जाय और काम दिया जाय !

Shri Jaswant Singh: This expenditure of Rs. 12 lakhs which is said to have been incurred on these Tibetan refugees, has this been incurred on their maintenance or on their rehabilitation?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Both for maintenance and for rehabilitation.

Shri Jaswant Singh: I cannot hear that.

Mr. Chairman: Both maintenance and rehabilitation. She said that in a low tone.

Shri Jaswant Singh: What is the amount of maintenance that has been given to each person?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There are certain schemes for settlement. I have not got the actual breakup of the figures, but I can mention the schemes if the hon. Member wants to have it.

Shri Kailash Bihari Lall: How far is it true that the Dalai Lama has much wealth with him, and may I know whether he has contributed anything towards the fund for helping the refugees?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: That does not arise from this question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It does not arise, of course, but we shall nevertheless give this...

Mr. Chairman: If it does not arise, you need not answer.



24 February 1960

Oral Answers to the Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN THE MISSAMARI CAMP

*273. **Shri Jugal Kishore:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the number of Tibetan refugees who are at present living in Missamair Camp in North East Frontier Agency Area?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): According to information available, 4,205 Tibetan refugees were living in Missamari Camp in Tezpur District of Assam on 18th February, 1960.

Shri Jugal Kishore: May I know, Sir, whether any monetary or other kind of help is given by the Government to these refugees?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, the entire expenditure on the refugees in the camp is borne by the Government of India.

Shri Jugal Kishore: What is being spent monthly on these refugees by the Government?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, I haven't got any figures relating to the monthly expenditure, but up to the 31st of October 1959, we had incurred an expenditure of Rs. 14,73,562.08.

Shri Jugal Kishore: May I know Sir, whether these refugees do some work in the camp?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Yes, Sir, there is a regular programme of dispersal and resettlement.

Shri Tajamul Hussain: May I know, sir, if it is the policy of the government to spend money on the Dalai Lama whenever he goes on tour?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, the Government have made some provision in connection with his tour in India.

Shri Tajamul Hussain: My question is whether it is the general policy of the Government to bear the expenses of his tour. That is my question which has not been answered, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of any general policy in regard to these matters. Whenever any such question arises, it is considered on its merits, and this is the first time that it has arisen in this country.

Shri Maheswar Naik: May I know, Sir, whether the Government have in hand any proposal to rehabilitation those Tibetan refugees stationed in the camp?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, I answered that question only a moment ago.

Shri Faridul Haq Ansari: May I know, Sir, whether any refugees are still pouring into this camp?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, in small numbers they dribble in.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: It appears that considerable assets, including gold bullion, had been brought into this country by the Dalai Lama himself or on his behalf. Since the Dalai Lama has only life interest in this property, because it goes to the next Dalai Lama, it should be related to the welfare of the Tibetan people and the refugees also. May I know, Sir, whether, in view of that particular position—the Dalai Lama has only life interest in this property and to some extent it belongs to the State—the Government have approached the Dalai Lama and his entourage to part with some of this money, at least to begin with, so that it could be spent for the purpose of relief to the Tibetan refugees? This is my question, and I would like to know the actual position from the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, the hon. Member presumably refers to some moneys or some bullion which came into Sikkim ten years back and with which the Government of India had nothing to do at that time, but lately we were asked to provide for escort to have those boxes, whatever they contained, removed to Calcutta; and the West Bengal Government gave that necessary escort. I understood that this money or this jewellery or this bullion is being converted and is being deposited and invested, and what the hon. Member has said—this money being used for these refugees—is already in our mind.

Dr. D.H. Variava: May I ask one question? When a foreign national is given asylum in some country, is it the diplomatic procedure that he should be given also maintenance in all cases or only in certain cases? What is the actual diplomatic procedure in regard to this matter, Sir?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, this is not a diplomatic matter at all. A foreign national who comes here is not a diplomat, and this has to be judged in the circumstances of each case. It is for the Government to decide what has to be done under certain particular conditions or when it permits a person to reside and what facilities are given to that person. There can be no fixed rule about these matters. Sir.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: It seems that there was—and it was clear as the Prime Minister readily admitted it—movement of some wealth including bullion from one country to another. Now may I know Sir, whether, before helping this movement, Government found out as to in which capacity the money was being brought into India. I mean whether the

Dalai Lama was bringing this money in his capacity as head of a local Government or in his capacity as a private person? And if he was bringing it in his capacity as a private person, may I know, Sir, whether the normal rules and regulations under the Foreign Exchange Act and various other Acts were observed?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Is the hon. Members referring to what happened ten years ago? I do not think any particular rule was applying to this matter. The Maharajkumar of Sikkim and the Dalai Lama then came to an agreement and these assets were deposited with the Maharajkumar of Sikkim, and there they had been all these ten years. And now the normal rules presumably apply.

Shri M. Valiulla: Are there not customs rules relating to import of jewellery into India?

(No reply)

Shri Jaswant Singh: I would like to know—as the Prime Minister said a little while ago that how this money will be used to refugees or otherwise will be kept in mind—whether it will be kept in the mind of the Government of India or in the mind of the Dalai Lama just in the same way.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as we are concerned, we have treated these boxes, the contents of which we are not aware of, as the private property of the Dalai Lama, and we understand that the Dalai Lama will use the assets for this purpose.

† † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †

24 February 1960

Written Answers to the Questions

EXPENDITURE INCURRED ON THE DALAI LAMA'S TOUR

*271. **Shri N.C. Sekhar:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the amount spent by Government on the tour of the Dalai Lama in various parts of the country since he left Mussoorie recently; and
- (b) what are the other facilities accorded to him during his tour?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) The figures of actual expenditure are not yet known as the bills from the State Governments and the Railway Board who were requested to make necessary arrangements have not yet been received. However, a sum of Rs. 42,000 was provided on this account.
- (b) For rail-journey, the Railway Board provided an air-conditioned saloon with meals. For road journey, three cars were provided. At various places of halt, the State Governments provided accommodation at Government guest houses wherever available, or at suitable hotels elsewhere.

† † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †

8 March 1960

Written Answers to the Questions

GOLD BROUGHT BY THE DALAI LAMA TO INDIA

159. Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether Government have been furnished with any statement by and or on behalf of the Dalai Lama regarding

- (i) the quantum and value of gold; (ii) the currency; and (iii) other assets brought by him into India?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

Government does not have any precise information about the exact quantity or value of the treasure. They have been informed that the value may be approximately Rs. 80 lakhs to Rs. 1 crore.

† † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †

7 April 1960

Oral Answers to the Questions

DEATH OF TIBETAN REFUGEES IN TRAIN

*24. **Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan:**

Shri Jugal Kishore: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that five Tibetan refugees died in train during their railway journey from the Missamari camp in Assam to Dharamsala in March last; and

- (b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, what are the causes of their death and what was the number of the Tibetan refugees traveling by that train?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) four infants died during the train journey from Missamari to Pathankot.
(b) The cause of death was general debility. They were in a poor state of health, having recently arrived from Tibet. The number of the Tibetan refugees traveling by that train was 754.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: इस सफर में जो रेल ले जाई जा रही थी, वह किस के इंतज़ाम में ले जाई जा रही थी, सीधे गवर्नमेंट के इंतज़ाम में या अन्य किसी संस्था के इंतज़ाम में?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: On behalf of the Government. The party was escorted by the Camp Commander, Shri B. B. Dam.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या यह सच है कि इस सफर में कोई मेडिकल ऐड का इंतज़ाम नहीं था?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir. Medical aid was given at every railway junction and also at other important stations by railway doctors and others.

Shri M. Valiulla: What was the capacity of the train? Was it overcrowded?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I do not know that, Sir.

Shri Jugal Kishore: May I know whether any Tibetan refugees were found missing?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: They were found missing at Missamari but they came back after some time.

Shri Jugal Kishore: May I know whether any Chinese were found mixed up with these Tibetan refugees?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: No, Sir, Certain selected Tibetan refugees were taken to Pathankot.

Shri Maheswar Naik: May I know, Sir, in what way the Government of India is responsible for the deaths of these Tibetan refugees while being transported?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There is a long answer, Sir. These were children who were weak and their mothers did not report the state of their health to the medical officer.



13 April 1960

Oral Answers to Questions

FOREIGN EXCHANGE SOUGHT BY THE DALAI LAMA

***97. Shri Bhupesh Gupta:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Dalai Lama or any other person deputed on his behalf applied for foreign exchange;
(b) if so, what is the amount applied for and the purpose thereof; and
(c) how much amount has actually been sanctioned?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir; persons deputed by the Dalai Lama did apply.
(b) and (c) Three persons were granted foreign exchange worth Rs. 3,000 to proceed to Manila to receive the 1959 Ramon Magsaysay award for community leadership awarded to the Dalai Lama. Similarly three persons were granted Rs. 22,500 for proceeding to the United States of America for presenting an appeal to the United Nations on behalf of the Dalai Lama.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Before I ask the question, may I draw the attention of the hon. Prime Minister to one Mr. D.K. Sen, styling himself as the confidential adviser to the Dalai Lama who stated in London on March 14 that about 37,500 pound worth of gold had already been sold to pay the expenses of their three-men delegation to the U.N. He also revealed that much of it was going to be paid as fees to American lawyers to put their case to the United Nations. May I know why Government has sanctioned foreign exchange in this case when clearly the Dalai Lama is putting up a case contrary to the position taken by India in the United Nations Organisation?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know anything about Mr. Sen who is referred to or Sardar Sen's statement. It is not in conformity with my information. As for the broad question why we gave some foreign exchange amounting to Rs.

22,000 odd. We felt that not to do so would be coming in the way of something which the Dalai Lama was anxious to do and we did not wish to obstruct him in carrying out his wishes in this matter, although that wish was not in conformity with our position.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: The proposition has nothing emotional or sentimental about it. In this case, here is a person enjoying the asylum or the hospitality of this country and he was putting a case contrary to the position taken by the host country in the United Nations, and for this the foreign exchange of India was being expended in order that the case which is not in conformity with the position taken by India could be put up. Sir, I would like to have some legal or other arguments in favour of the position taken by the Government in this matter, apart from sentiments.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We can hardly have any legal argument over this question. It was considered as we have often considered such questions and given facilities for the propagation of views which are entirely opposed to ours. That is our broad approach to public questions. We gave this opportunity and though we were not in favour of this matter being taken to the United Nations, we felt that our preventing this by not issuing foreign exchange would probably not be right, in view of our broad policy.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Did you ask the Dalai Lama or those people who made the representation on his behalf, to make a statement before the Government of India, when asking for this foreign exchange, whether they had any amounts in certain financial institutions or banks in the U.S.A. or Britain or any other country wherefrom the foreign exchange could be drawn?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know nothing about it.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There was an inward remittance of Rs. 47,350/- to the Dalai Lama's account because of the Ramon Magasaysay Award and we have given him only Rs. 25,000/-.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: That is not the point. The point I raised was...

Mr. Chairman: She says money that they received for the Ramon Magasaysay Award comes to Rs. 47,000 odd where as we have granted them only 22,000/-

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Rs. 25,000/-, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: So we have some extra still left.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: No, Sir that is not the point. It seems they would make it look as if we are making money out of this deal. Not at all. What I want to know is this. Normally when an application for foreign exchange is made, the person is asked to file certain statements. May I know from the Government whether the Dalai Lama or those who were representing him were asked by the Government or the Finance Ministry to file a statement, specially with regard to the point that I have made, namely, whether they had any account abroad, prior to taking the decision as to whether the sanction should be given, apart from sentiments?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not remember what kind of statement was asked for.

Shri Jaswant Singh: Sir, we in such matters are liberal, because we give foreign exchange to political parties also whose views and ideals are opposed to ours. So I do not see any harm in a case like this where the Dalai Lama seeks redress in another place if we had given him some foreign exchange.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Is the hon. Member giving the answer?

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: I would like to have an answer from the Prime Minister to the question whether it is not a fact that the Communist Party of India had been given foreign exchange for going abroad to propagate their views?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Then tomorrow I will file an application, if you like. But the ...

Mr. Chairman: Next question.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

13 April 1960

Written Answers to Questions

PURCHASE OF PROPERTY BY THE DALAI LAMA IN BODH GAYA

***29. Shri P.N. Rajabhoj:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether Government have received any request in regard to the Dalai Lama's intention to purchase property in Bodh Gaya?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): No, Sir.

13 April 1960

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN DELHI

32. Shri P.N. Rajabhoj: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that a large number of Tibetan refugees are begging in Delhi; and
- (b) if so, what action Government are taking in the matter of rehabilitating these persons?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) and (b) Some 100 Tibetans refugees were camping outside Mori Gate, Delhi. It was believed that they earned their livelihood by taking recourse to begging. It is understood that they have now gone to various places with more congenial climate, such as Simla Hills, Dharamsala and Rawalsar.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

21 April 1960

Oral Answers to Questions

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OPENED FOR TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

***222. Shri Dayaldas Kurre:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government have made any arrangements for providing education to the Tibetan refugees in India; and
- (b) if so, what is the nature of the educational institutions opened for them?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) There are three schools for Tibetan refugees children at Gangtok, Kalimpong and Mussoorie. The school at Mussoorie may shift to Dharamsala. Hindi is taught at the Camps in Buxa, Missamari and Dalhousie to the adult refugees.

Shri Dayaldas Kurre: May I know, Sir, whether government have any intention of imparting vocational training to these refugees?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Yes, Sir, vocational training is imparted.

Shri Dayaldas Kurre: May I know, Sir, the amount of money that has been allocated for their education in the current year?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I have got a separate break-up of the figures for education.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are drawing up some larger schemes for education and rehabilitation of these Tibetan refugees, more especially for the young people?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: May I know as to how the cost of this education will be met? Has any approach been made to the Dalai Lama to part with some of his fortunes so that the money could be spent for the education of what he calls to be his own people?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as I know, no approach has been made to the Dalai Lama on this question, but the Dalai Lama himself wrote to me a few days ago expressing his anxiety that arrangements should be made for the proper education of the children and the young people and suggested that he would like to contribute certain sums, what, I forget at the moment.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: May I know the reason why the Government is not placing before him in a very courteous letter as to how much would be required to meet the expenses of education and asking him as to whether it will be within his competence to meet a substantial part of it?

(No reply)

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

26 April 1960

Oral Answers to Questions

FOREIGN EXCHANGE SOUGHT FOR AFRO-ASIAN CONVENTION ON TIBET

***279. Shri Bhupesh Gupta**

Dr. A. Subba Rao: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government were approached for sanction of any foreign exchange on behalf of the organizers of the Afro-Asian Convention on Tibet and against Colonialism, held in Delhi on 9th to 11th April, 1960;

- (b) if so, the amount for which the sanction was sought; and
- (c) what was the amount sanctioned in different currencies?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) to (c) No foreign exchange was granted directly for any purpose connected with the Afro Asian Convention. But last year Shri Samar Guha and Shri H.R. Pardiwala were given, on application, foreign exchange for Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 4,000 respectively.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: May I know, Sir, whether the Government is aware that the office of the Air India International here were approached by this Convention and they were asked to instruct their office in Nairobi and other places to issue return tickets to non-nationals for coming to India and for attending the Conference? May I know, Sir, whether in such a case foreign exchange is involved when such return tickets are issued on the instructions of the Indian head office by an office abroad to non-nationals and if so, whether any sanction was obtained for that?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have tried to understand the question. I have no information of any type relating to this question.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Is the hon. Prime Minister aware that ticket No. 098489158 was issued by Mr. Billimoria at Nairobi at 3445 East African Shillings in the name of one Mr. Ongn, who came and attended this Conference? This was done on the instructions of the office here. May I know, Sir, whether this does not involve foreign exchange?

Mr. Chairman: He is not aware, he says.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It has nothing to do with the Government. I am not responsible for what the undertakings do.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: What I want to point out is that such things could not have been done unless and until proper application had been made for some foreign exchange release, because it involved some element of foreign exchange.

Mr. Chairman: Next question.



8 August 1960

Oral Answers to Questions

COMING OF TIBETAN REFUGEES TO INDIA

***21. Shri M.S. Gurupada Swamy:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether, it is a fact that there is a steady trickle of Tibetan refugees into India from various points; and
- (b) if so, how many Tibetans have entered India during the last three months?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) and (b) The movement of Tibetan refugees into India has fluctuated from month to month. During the period April-June, 1960, 3,128 Tibetan refugees arrived in India.

Shri M.S. Gurupada Swamy: As the inflow of refugees to India is becoming rather alarming, and as there is no hope of stopping this inflow very early, may I know, Sir, whether the Prime Minister proposes to take up this matter of solving this refugee problem at some international level, as this problem is entirely caused by the acts of a foreign Government?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Evidently, Sir, this is a matter of importance and adds to our burdens. But I do not understand what is meant by taking it up at the international level. Am I to spread out these Tibetan refugees internationally in various countries or what?

Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy: No, Sir. I want to know, Sir, whether the Prime Minister would take up this question before the U.N., so that it may be...

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. We do not propose to do so. I do not see how that will help those poor refugees or India in this matter.

Shri Faridul Haq Ansari: May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact that this influx of refugees recently is due to the violent struggle going on between the Tibetans and the Chinese Government?

(No reply.)

Mr. Chairman: Next question.



19 August 1960

Written Answers to Questions

OCCUPATION OF 'Khemchok' PASTURE IN SIKKIM BY TIBETANS

***327. Shri Maheswar Naik:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a press report to the effect that some 500 Tibetans have occupied Khemchok, a pasture land in Sikkim near Lachen;
- (b) whether it is a fact that the Chinese authorities in Tibet have claimed this area to be inside Tibet and instructed these Tibetans to settle in the area permanently and pay taxes to the Chinese authorities in Tibet; and
- (c) if so, what action has been taken by Government in this matter?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) About 500 Tibetans including women and children arrived with large herds of sheep and yak in Northwest Sikkim in June 1960. On enquiry it was found that they had come to Sikkim as refugees and did not intend to return to Tibet. As they were refugees, temporary employment is being found for them and Government have dispatched one forage and one wool expert to advise the Government of Sikkim and help in their settlement.
- (b) The Government have no further information on the subject.
- (c) Does not arise.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

24 August 1960

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

***413. Shri P.L. Kureel URF Talib:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government have made any investigation about the antecedents and character of the Tibetan refugees who have come to India;
- (b) the expenditure so far incurred on their rehabilitation by Government and other agencies, separately; and
- (c) whether the Dalai Lama has given any assistance to any official or non-official agency for this purpose and if so, what?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) it is not possible for Government to have an investigation into the antecedents of all the Tibetan refugees. They are, however, screened by our police on entering India.
- (b) Rs. 41,59,614, have been spent by the Government during 1959-60 relief and rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees. Expenditure incurred by private agencies on this account is not known.
- (c) The Dalai Lama is known to have distributed Rs. 50,000 among the Tibetan refugees. He has offered another Rs. 50,000 towards the establishment of a Tibetan school. It is likely that he has also provided assistance to the refugees in other ways.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

29 August 1960

Oral Answers to Questions

TIBETANS IN HIMACHAL PRADESH

***482. Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the number of Tibetan families which crossed over into Himachal Pradesh during the months of June and July, 1960?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): 604 Tibetan refugees entered Himachal Pradesh in June, and 386 in July, 1960.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: May I know whether these families are going to be rehabilitated in Himachal Pradesh or in some other State?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: They are being rehabilitated in Kinnaur District in Himachal Pradesh.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: What are the views of the State Government regarding the rehabilitation of these refugees? Has the State Government chalked out any plan regarding their welfare and employment?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The answer is already given. All these things are done in consultation with the State Government and as I have pointed out, they are being rehabilitated in Himachal Pradesh and those who cannot be

rehabilitated either because they are old or infirm are looked after properly.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: May I know whether these people are being given land or whether they are being given some training in various arts and crafts so that they may be able to earn their own livelihood?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Just now they are merely engaged in road construction works.

Shri Maheswar Naik: May I know if movement of these refugees from one state to another is regulated by Government or they are free to move to any part of the country?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: These people came into Himachal Pradesh and they are being rehabilitated in Himachal Pradesh.

Shri Maheswar Naik: But are they free to move from one state to another?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no legal bar to their movement. But there would seem to be practical difficulties if they wandered about. The Government does not particularly approve of their wandering about because there are difficulties. They do not know the language and other difficulties are there.



29 August 1960

Written Answers to Questions

TOMB OF ZORAWAR SINGH IN TIBET

285. Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether Government have received any report of the destruction of the tomb of the Dogra General, Zorawar Singh, conqueror of Ladakh and if so, what are the details in this regard?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

Government have seen reports appearing in the press regarding the destruction of the tomb of Zorawar Singh. They are not in a position, however, to confirm or deny the reports as they are unable to obtain reliable reports.



1 September 1960

Oral Answers to Questions

BAN ON ENTRY OF TIBETAN REFUGEES THROUGH BHUTAN

***589. Shri M.S. Gurupada Swamy:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government have banned the entry of Tibetan refugees into India through Bhutan?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): It is not a fact that the Government of India have banned to entry of Tibetan refugees into India from Bhutan. About 1800 Tibetan refugees have entered India so far through Bhutan.

Shri M.S. Gurupada Swamy: May I know, sir, whether any request was made before to the Bhutan Government that these refugees should be settled down there itself and not be allowed to come to India?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: When the refugees entered Bhutan, they could have stayed on there, but because of the limited resources of the Bhutan Government, we were asked whether we would be able to settle them in India. The Bhutan Government has given employment for about 3,000 refugees in road making.

Shri M.S. Gurupada Swamy: May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact that refugees are still coming from Bhutan to India, and if so, what the number is in the current month?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I have not got the break-up for the current month.

Shri Faridul Haq Ansari: There has been a report in which it says those who are in Bhutan are running away from Bhutan towards India. May I know how far it is correct?

Mr. Chairman: They are not running away from Bhutan.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Hon. Member's question is so odd that I do not understand it - running away from whom, how, who is running about, for physical exercise or what?

Shri Faridul Haq Ansari: Leaving Bhutan and coming to India.

Mr. Chairman: The answer was that Bhutan had accommodated already three thousand refugees and more could not be accommodated, and therefore they were coming to India. That was the answer.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

6 September 1960

Written Answers to Questions

ATTEMPT ON THE LIFE OF THE DALAI LAMA

***670. Shri P.L. Kureel URF Talib:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government are aware of a recent incident in which an attempt was made on the life of the Dalai Lama; and
- (b) whether Government have made any special arrangement for the security of the Dalai Lama?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) No, Sir, there was no such incident.
- (b) The arrangements made for his protection are adequate.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

6 September 1960

Written Answers to Questions

MOVEMENT OF TIBETAN REFUGEES FROM NAUTANWA AND SUNNALI

462. Shri Niranjan Singh: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government have received any report from the District Magistrate, Gorakhpur, directly or through the State Government about the moving of Tibetan refugees from Nautanwa and Sunnali;
- (b) if so, what is the number of such refugees; and
- (c) what is the total number of refugees who are likely to leave India?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) Yes, Sir, a report was received from the Government of Uttar Pradesh.
- (b) About 400 Tibetan refugees were reported to be camping in the Gorakpur District.
- (c) 265 of these refugees have left for Nepal so far.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

28 November 1960

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN SIKKIM

***31. Shri N.M. Lingam:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that a large number of Tibetan refugees have crossed over to Sikkim in recent months; and
- (b) if so, what is their number?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) 3,991 from 1st June to 15th October, 1960

Mr. Chairman: Question hour is over.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

28 November 1960

Written Answers to Questions

KASHMIRI MUSLIMS LEAVING TIBET

***32. Shri N.M. Lingam:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a large number of Kashmiri Muslims, who were so far being prevented from leaving Tibet, have crossed into India?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

Yes, Sir, about 670 Kashmiris have come to India so far.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

28 November 1960

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN BHUTAN

***38. Shri P.N. Rajabhoj:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Government have agreed to bear a part of the expenses incurred on the temporary rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees in Bhutan; and

- (b) the number of Tibetan refugees in Bhutan who have expressed their wish for settlement in India?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
(b) Their exact number is not known. There are 1791 Tibetan refugees in Bhutan at present and most of them wish to resettle in India.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

28 November 1960

Written Answers to Questions

PROPOSALS BY THE BURMESE PRIME MINISTER REGARDING INDIA-TIBET BORDER

***42. Shri Harihar Patel:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether the Burmese Premier Mr. U Nu recently made some concrete proposals on the India-Tibet border question and its solution?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): No, Sir.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

14 December 1960

Written Answers to Questions

CHINESE ROCKET BASES IN TIBET ALONG U.P BORDER AREAS

227. Shri Maheswar Naik: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether his attention has been drawn to a Press report to the effect that China has been building rocket bases in Tibet along the Uttar Pradesh border areas; and
(b) if so, whether Government have examined its possible effects on the security of Indian territory?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) Our attention has been drawn to the Press report. We, however, have no information on the subject.
(b) Measures have been taken and will continue to be taken to ensure the security of India from external aggression.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

19 December 1960

Written Answers to Questions

FOREIGN AGENCIES ENGAGED IN THE RELIEF AND REHABILITATION WORK OF TIBETAN REFUGEES

267. Shri Harihar Patel: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the names of foreign countries and foreign private relief agencies engaged in the relief and rehabilitation work of the Tibetan refugees in India; and
(b) the number and names of camps run by them in India, Sikkim and Bhutan?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) the Governments of Australia, United States of America and New Zealand have placed Rs. 10 lakhs, Rs. 4,75,000 and Rs. 2,63,920 respectively at the disposal of the Government of India for the relief and rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam donated 1,300 tons of rice.

The following private organizations (foreign and Indian) have been providing foodstuffs, clothing, medicines, etc:

1. Co-operative for American Relief Everywhere;
2. American Emergency Committee for Tibetan Refugees;
3. Catholic Relief Services in India;
4. National Christian Council of India;
5. World Veterans' Federation;
6. Indian Red Cross Society;
7. Junior Chamber International;
8. The Buddhist Society of Thailand.

- (b) No camps are run by any foreign Government or private agency in India.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA, SIKKIM AND BHUTAN

***457. Shri N.M. Lingam:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the present tempo of influx of Tibetan refugees in India;
- (b) the number of Tibetan refugees at present in India; and
- (c) the schemes formulated for the rehabilitation of these refugees in the States?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) The influx of refugees has been on a reduced scale in recent months.
- (b) About 17,300.
- (c) About 500 refugees are being rehabilitated on land in Bhalukpong, NEFA. Another 3000 will be settled on land in Mysore State. A scheme to settle about 1000 refugees in Ladakh is under consideration. The other refugees are employed in road construction, forests, handicrafts, etc.

Shri N.M. Lingam: May I know, if there is a tendency on the part of these refugees to go back or do they intend to settle down in India permanently?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The answer shows that they intend to settle down in India and arrangements are made for that purpose.

Shri N.M. Lingam: What is the number of refugees who crossed over to Bhutan and Sikkim after entering India?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There are in all some 4,000.....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Crossed over from where to where?

Shri N.M. Lingam: From India to Bhutan and Sikkim after coming first to India.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Many come to Bhutan and then to India. Some remain in Bhutan. They do not come to India first and then go to Bhutan. There may be a few odd cases.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: May I know, Sir, whether the very good American arms that they brought along with them were recovered from them and why these arms were not auctioned in order to realize some money so that some expenditure might be met from the proceeds of those sales?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member's information is as frequently happens, not wholly correct.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I take it that it is partly correct.



2 March 1961

Oral Answers to Questions

REHABILITATION OF TIBETAN REFUGEES IN SOUTH INDIA

***270. Shri Jugal Kishore:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Tibetan refugees sent by the Government from Darjeeling and Kalimpong to South India for rehabilitation;
- (b) what amount will be spent on their rehabilitation; and
- (c) whether other such refugees will be sent there and if so, how many and when?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) 576 Tibetan refugees including 109 children have been sent from Darjeeling and Kalimpong to Mysore.
- (b) The scheme of settlement on land in Mysore of Tibetan refugees is likely to cost about Rs. 40 Lakhs.
- (c) The total number of refugees to be settled in Mysore will be about 3,000. Another batch of about 600 refugees is proposed to be sent from Darjeeling-Kalimpong area when accommodation is made ready for them on the Land Settlement site.

Shri Jugal Kishore: May I know as to how long will these refugees be coming to India and what steps are Government taking in this connection?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It does not arise from this question, Sir.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: This is a question I ask sometime in all humility. May I know from the Government as to

whether, in view of the heavy expenditure that is being incurred in this connection, we have asked our friend, the Dalai Lama, to make a little contribution towards the expenses?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Dalai Lama has been contributing, I believe, to various schools, etc., of Tibetan children in the north.

Pandit S.S.N. Tankha: Will the climate of South India be suitable for these refugees?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Yes, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That particular place is about 2,500 feet or even 3,000 feet in altitude. The representatives of the Dalai Lama who went there said that it would be suitable.



14 March 1961

Oral Answers to Questions

TIBETAN FUGITIVES KILLED BY CHINESE TROOPS

***409. Shri Jugal Kishore:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that over 4,000 Tibetans of a group of 5,000 fugitives from Lhasa region were recently killed by the Chinese troops on their way to the border;
- (b) whether some of them managed to escape and crossed over to Ladakh;
- (c) if so, what is their number; and
- (d) what steps Government are taking for the safety and rehabilitation of these Tibetan refugees in Ladakh.

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) We have no information.
- (b) and (c) No Tibetan from the Lhasa region have entered Ladakh as refugees. 327 Tibetan refugees have, however, entered Ladakh from Eastern Tibet between 27th October 1960 and 12th January 1961.
- (d) All Tibetan refugees in Ladakh have been moved well away from the border. Those who were sent early last year from Missamari were engaged on the construction of Leh-Kargil road till the end of November 1960. The question of their rehabilitation on land is under consideration.

Shri Jugal Kishore: Are any Tibetan refugees living in Ladakh at present?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, I have started in my answer that there are 327 refugees who have entered Ladakh, but there are no refugees living in Ladakh as such.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: How far, Sir, is it true that the Tibetan refugees who have entered Ladakh from the eastern border have given this news that their actual number was 3,000 and out of them only 300 had been able to reach here and the rest of them had been killed by Chinese?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It might be true, Sir, but we have no direct source of information.

Shri Faridul Haq Ansari: Is it not possible for the Government to make enquiries about these allegations that are being made on the floor of this House about the assassination of these refugees?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, if they are killed on the other side of Tibet, how are we to get the information? I would like the hon. Member to answer it.

Shri B.K.P Sinha: Sir, the question is this: Did the refugees inform any representative of the Government of India that they were 3,000 in number and in the course of their flight most of them were killed by the Communist Government of China?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I have already given the answer.

Shri B.K.P Sinha: What is the answer?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The answer is that we have no source of information.

Shri B.K.P Sinha: May I know whether the refugees gave such information?

Mr. Chairman: That is what she says. She says that the Government is not in possession of any such representation by the refugees.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Sir, he is a more knowledgeable person!

Mr. Chairman: Yes, yes; not more knowledgeable than you. There are differences on these questions, I know.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

20 April 1961

Oral Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES

***34. Shri Arjun Arora:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Tibetan refugees who arrived in the country during the year 1960 and in the first three months of the year 1961;
- (b) whether they are screened before being given shelter in the country; and
- (c) the number of Tibetan refugees who have returned to Tibet during the same period?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) From 1st January 1960 to the 25th March 1961, 16,928 Tibetan refugees entered India.
- (b) All Tibetan refugees entering India are screened at the border check-posts.
- (c) 201.

Shri Arjun Arora: May I know Sir, what tests are applied to ensure that the persons coming from Tibet are in real need of asylum?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a broad question, Sir...

Mr. Chairman: I know it is.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ... and it is a question which I am unable to answer.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: May I know, Sir, the total expenditure incurred during this period by the Central Government as well as by the State Government?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: For that a separate question may be asked.

Shri Arjun Arora: May I know, Sir, if our gates are open to all the people coming from Tibet who describe themselves as refugees?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir, subject to screening.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

25 April 1961

Oral Answers to Questions

THE DALAI LAMA'S APPEAL SEEKING SUPPORT FOR THE LIBERATION OF TIBET

***70. Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether his attention has been invited to the statement made by the Dalai Lama on the 10th March, 1961, in which he has appealed to India and other members of the common-wealth for lending their full support in the United Nations to the cause of liberating Tibet from Chinese aggression; and
- (b) if so, whether Government has received any formal appeal from the Dalai Lama in this regard?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) The Government has seen the reported statement of the Dalai Lama.
- (b) The Dalai Lama addressed a letter to the Prime Minister urging such support.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या इस पत्र के ऊपर कोई कार्यवाही की गई?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: दलाई लामा साहब यहां तशरीफ लाये थे कुछ दिन हुये और उनसे बातचीत हुई थी! उन को भी समझा दिया गया है कि हमारी नीति क्या है!

Shri Jaswant Singh: Is it a fact that the Government of India are embarrassed in giving support to Tibet because of the commitments they have made in the past?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Government of India is normally not embarrassed. It has to deal with question which involves difficult decisions. Being embarrassed does not help in decisions. As a matter of fact so far as this resolution in the U.N. is concerned, it is not being taken up during this session of the U.N.

Shri A.D. Mani: In view of the intense feeling in the country about this matter, would Government consider telling the Dalai Lama that the moral sympathies of the country are with him in the liberation of Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Our own policy of accepting Tibetan refugees to come here in considerable numbers, in looking after them, in trying to give education to their young people and training, etc., is a more effective testimony of our moral sympathy than a few words said here and there.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: If the letter is along the lines of the question, then it is assumed that Tibet has to be liberated and aggression has been committed against Tibet. May I know if such a thing had been written in the letter by the Dalai Lama to the Prime Minister which takes Tibet as a separate country from what the Government of India says, whether it was pointed out to the Dalai Lama that the view of the Government of India in this matter was not what was made out in such a letter and that the Government of India held Tibet as an autonomous region of the Peoples Republic of China?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In this matter the Government of India's view is not fully the same as that of the Dalai Lama nor is it the same as the hon. Member's opposite.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: My view is the same as the Prime Minister's view. I supported Panchsheel. I still stand by it. (*Interruption.*) The hon. friends there never supported it. They never understood it. May I know whether it is right for the Dalai Lama to write such a letter and got it published in the Press saying that steps will be taken in the United Nations to get the aggression vacated, and so on, and spread the impression that the Government of India is in sympathy with such things? I am talking of the specific move.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Dalai Lama, when he came here more than two years ago, was told that he was a very welcome guest and all that, but we would not like him to use the soil of India for any active agitation. In determining these things, of course, is rather not very easy always. By and large, the Dalai Lama has been careful not to indulge in any such activity as might be considered by us undesirable. We have not come in the way, however, of his occasionally expressing his views about these matters.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Is the Prime Minister aware that certain foreign exchange was sanctioned by the Ministry of Finance to facilitate this kind of petition being made or application whatever it is, on behalf of the Dalai Lama at the United Nations, that is describing the position of Tibet as it is here in this question? May I know whether this kind of sanctioning foreign exchange, when we are advising the Dalai Lama to not to do so, is in consonance with the policy of the Government when Government does not favour such a kind of thing being made from the soil of India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That foreign exchange was sanctioned at the request of the External Affairs Ministry by the Finance Ministry, that is the External Affairs Ministry was fully responsible for that because we thought that we should not come in his way of doing this. It is sometimes a little difficult to draw the line as to what we should prohibit and what we should permit. We thought that in this matter we should draw the line so as to allow him to send some of his representatives to the United Nations.

Shri Faridul Haq Ansari: When the question of this resolution on Tibet in the U.N. General Assembly was raised here, the hon. Prime Minister was good enough to say that the Indian support to the resolution depended on the language of the resolution moved there. May I know whether the Government of India has resiled from that position?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I have not quite understood this question.

Mr. Chairman: The attitude of the Government of India will be decided on the way in which the resolution in the United Nations Assembly is couched.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Actually the Government of India has always decided on the text of the resolution which comes up. It is not decided in the air.

Shri Jaswant Singh: The Prime Minister stated a little while ago on this question that the fact that we are giving asylum to the Tibetans to such a large extent and are looking after them shows that our sympathies are there. On the other hand, the Tibet as a nation is being exterminated by China and we are sitting quiet. How do these things tally?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: That is the language he would like to pass on.

Mr. Chairman: Nothing to know hereafter. Next question.



THE DALAI LAMA'S INVESTMENTS IN INDIA

***149. Shri R.P.N. Sinha:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Dalai Lama's investments in business in India have been made in consultation with Government; and
- (b) if so, what is the extent of these investments?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) No, Sir.
- (b) The government understands that the Dalai Lama has invested some money in a Cast Iron Spun Pipe factory but have no knowledge of the extent of the investment.

Shri R.P.N. Sinha: Is government aware that some unscrupulous persons in the country have been trying to exploit the Dalai Lama financially? If so, do they propose to give him correct advice in the matter?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is quite possible that unscrupulous people will try to take advantage of any position like that. But I have no particular knowledge of any particular unscrupulous persons doing that. That Government has given him general advice suggesting that he should invest his savings or whatever he has in reliable undertakings. That is all the Government has done. But, as has been said, the Dalai Lama has started a cast iron pipe concern for producing cast from pipes somewhere in the Hazaribagh district in Bihar and he has invested some money in it.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: In the event of foreigners investing money in our country for starting factories, the general rule is that the Government should see that 51 per cent of the equity shares is held by Indians. May I know whether in this particular case this rule has been observed and if there has been any agreement between the Dalai Lama and the Government that no profits earned here on account of his investment would be allowed to be remitted either to the sterling or the dollar area?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no agreement of any kind nor is it considered necessary in this case. It appears, so far as we know, that debentures have been taken on behalf of the Tibetan refugees. The rest of the money has been thrown open for public subscription in India and we have been informed that all profits would be used for the Tibetan refugees in India.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: The hon. Prime Minister has said that these shares have been taken on behalf of the Tibetan refugees. As far as we know, the Company Law does not allow shares being taken in this manner; they have to be taken in certain names.

Dr. H.N. Kunzru: Debentures.

Mr. Chairman: Debentures.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Debentures, not shares.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: You have to name the Tibetan refugees. Somebody buys the debentures also. This is the law. Evidently the Ministry has no proper information. May I know, Sir whether in this particular case these debentures or shares, as the case may be, have been taken in the name of the Dalai Lama or in certain other names and if they have been taken in the names of a large number of people, whether it has occurred to the Government that it might be a method of income-tax avoidance or evasion?

Shri Manubhai Shah: All the assumptions of the hon. Member are incorrect. Firstly, this is a normal private sector project under the Industries Act and licensing has been done in the normal way. The Dalai Lama and his friends are owning a portion of this concern, the rest is being thrown open to Indian participation and the stipulation is that as far as possible, for ten years, the capital belonging to the foreign parties namely the Dalai Lama and his associates, would not be repatriable.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Now, sir, we have got a little business answer. Let me proceed. Now, the hon. Minister said that there had been some stipulation, that for ten years to come the capital would not be allowed to be taken out of the country. May I know, Sir, whether there is any such agreement which covers remittances of profit and interest from this country to any country in the sterling area or in the dollar area?

Mr. Chairman: The Prime Minister has answered the question and said that it would be used in the interests of the refugees. That is what he said.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I know the Prime Minister has his good at heart. The question is relating to the agreement. I would like to know because the Government Industrial Policy Resolution provides such things, and under the Industrial Development Regulations they have such powers, whether any agreement has been arrived at that the remittances of the profits earned will not be allowed, under the stipulation, to be shipped out of the country to the sterling or the dollar area, the stipulation I am talking about.

Shri Manubhai Shah: As far as this country's Industrial Policy Resolution is concerned, there are no restrictions on repatriation of dividends or profits or interest held by any foreigner.

Shri A.D. Mani: Would the Government be able to give an idea of the total value of these investments?

Shri Manubhai Shah: About Rs. 40 lakhs.

Shri M.H. Samuel: I just wanted to know what is the authorized capital of this firm, how much was the issued capital, and out of the issued capital how much the Dalai Lama and his Tibetan refugees have taken.

Shri Manubhai Shah: Its authorized capital is Rs. 1 crore. The issued capital and the paid-up capital in the first instance will be Rs. 40 lakhs, and the share of the Dalai Lama and his brothers and associates will be about Rs. 15 lakhs. The earning of profits will depend upon the profitability of the enterprise when it goes into production.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Now, Sir, he said that the authorized capital was Rs. 1 crore. May I know, sir, in the matter of sanctioning the capital issues and in respect of floatation of Rs. 1 crore, whether considerations of priority were taken into account, and whether it involved any foreign exchange expenditure and if so what?

Shri Manubhai Shah: Sir, this is a very high-priority industry because it helps to utilize the pig iron of the country into making pipes, which have a great export potential. Therefore, all these angles have been looked into.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: What about foreign exchange?

Shri Manubhai Shah: Foreign exchange is covered by the foreign investment of the Dalai Lama.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

1 May 1961

Written Answers to Questions

REPATRIATION OF KASHMIRI MUSLIMS FROM TIBET AND ARRIVAL OF TIBETAN REFUGEES IN LADAKH

211. Shri Niranjana Singh: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state the number of Kashmiri Muslims so far repatriated from Tibet during the current year and the number of Tibetan refugees who reached Ladakh during the same period?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

The number of Kashmiri Muslims repatriated from Tibet during the last few months is about 700. The number of Tibetan Refugees who came to Ladakh direct during the same period is 267.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

1 May 1961

Written Answers to Questions

RESTRICTION ON INDIAN DIPLOMATS IN LHASA

250. Shri Maheswar Naik: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the reports to the effect that restrictions on the movements of Indian diplomats and their families in Lhasa have been further tightened and they are now virtually under house arrest, is correct;
- (b) whether it is a fact that the Indians in Lhasa military prisons, who number nearly a thousand, are being subjected to inhuman tortures; and
- (c) if so, what action is being taken by Government in the matter?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) while the restrictions on the movement of our personnel of the Consulate General and Trade Agencies outside the urban limits and their functioning in Tibet continue, there has been no further tightening of such measures recently.
- (b) The Government is not aware of this.
- (c) As will be observed from various Notes published in the series of White Papers on Sino-Indian relations, we have been repeatedly urging the Chinese Government to remove the difficulties experienced by our Mission and our nationals in Tibet.

4 May 1961

Written Answers to Questions

RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AGENCIES IN TIBET

342. Shri Niranjan Singh: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that our trade agencies at Gyantse, Gartok and Yatung in Tibet are working under certain restrictions recently imposed on them by the Chinese Government;
- (b) if so, what are those restrictions; and
- (c) what are the future prospects of the Indian traders in Tibet?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) and (b) There have been no restrictions placed on our Trade Agents recently. The old restrictions, however, continue.
- (b) The future prospects of the Indian traders depend largely on policies and attitude of the Chinese Government and the manner of implementation of the letter and spirit of the subsisting agreement.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

14 August 1961

Written Answers to Questions

ENTRY OF TIBETAN REFUGEES

***39. Shri M.H. Samuel:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) what is the number of Tibetan refugees who have entered India since May 1, 1961;
- (b) whether any of them has been sent back; if so, how many; and
- (c) how these new refugees have been deployed in the country?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) 1,997 Tibetan refugees have entered into India since 1st May, 1961 (upto 27th July, 1961).
- (b) No, Sir.
- (c) About 76 percent of the new batch of refugees have crossed the Indian border at Ladakh and entered with large herds of cattle. They are stationed in Rushpu, Hanle and Numa Mode area for the present along with their livestock. Although there is no immediate problem in respect of resettlement of these refugees, the question is under consideration. The rest of the refugees have entered India through the North Eastern border and most of them are at present in the North East Frontier Agency. They are being evacuated to the Tibetan Refugees Transit Camp at Bhalakpung. Later some will be deployed for roadwork and others in Agricultural Settlement Schemes.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

14 August 1961

Written Answers to Questions

LADAKHI TRADERS' PREPARATION TO GO TO TIBET

24. Shri Niranjan Singh: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that a large number of Ladakhi traders are preparing to go to Western Tibet this year for exchanging their goods with Tibetan salt and pashmina; and
- (b) if so, what facilities have been offered to them by the Government as compared to those offered during the last year?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) According to information available with Government up to July 25 this year, 168 customary and 89 petty traders had left Ladakh for Tibet for purposes of trade.
- (b) The traders continue to receive the usual facilities, e.g., prompt issue of Traders Certificates. As far as possible our Trade Agent in Gartok extends his protection and assistance to our traders, while they are at the trade marts of Western Tibet.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

30 August 1961

Written Answers to Questions

REHABILITATION OF TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

***453. Shri P.N. Rajabhoj:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that a Tibetan delegation is exploring the possibilities of rehabilitating Tibetan refugees in the

STATEMENT**N.E.F.A**

1. Bhalukpung Camp	-	2,854
2. Kaming Frontier Division	-	126
3. Subanshri Frontier Division	-	348
4. Siang Frontier Division	-	1,791
5. Working on Road Construction	-	<u>2,050</u>
		7,169

West Bengal

1. Buxa Camp	-	1,405
2. Darjeeling District	-	<u>5,371</u>
		6,776

Sikkim

1. Between Mangan and Toong	-	2,287
2. Lachen	-	159
3. Gnathang	-	18
4. Rangpo Lake	-	15
5. Lachung	-	192
6. Chung-Thung	-	15
7. 12 th Mile and 15 th Mile	-	26
8. Munshithang	-	44
9. Jemu	-	299
10. Gangtok	-	575
11. North Sikkim	-	<u>114</u>
		3,744

Uttar Pradesh

1. Sandio Camp (Pithorgarh)	-	800
2. Gairsen Camp (Chamoli)	-	78
3. Buakhal Camp (Pauri)	-	<u>143</u>
		1,021

Himachal Pradesh

1. Mahasu District	-	1,144
2. Chamba District	-	848
3. Mandi District	-	63
4. Sirmur District	-	15
5. Kinnaur District	-	<u>35</u>
		2,105

Punjab State

1. Dalhousie Camp	-	930
2. Simla District	-	182
3. Kangra District	-	988
4. Lahaul and Spiti	-	<u>2,883</u>
		4,983

Jammu and Kashmir

1. Rupsho and Hanle areas	-	2,866
2. Stakna	-	637
3. Nubra	-	18
4. Sukzong	-	150
5. Leh	-	<u>365</u>
		4,036

Mysore

1. Periyapatna Taluk	-	2,162
2. Patients in various Hospitals and trainees	-	<u>300</u>
		2,462

GRAND TOTAL	-	<u>32,296</u>
--------------------	---	----------------------

REHABILITATION AND INFLUX OF TIBETAN REFUGEES

*25. **Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- whether it is a fact that the Dalai Lama recently discussed with him the progress made in the rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees in India;
- if the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, what is the actual position in this respect and how many refugees have so far been provided with work; and
- whether it is a fact that their influx from Tibet has not yet stopped; and if so, what is the reason therefore?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- Yes, Sir.
- The position regarding rehabilitation and resettlement of Tibetan refugees is furnished in a statement which is placed on the Table of the House.
- Although the influx of Tibetan refugees into India from Tibet still continues, yet the same is on a much reduced scaled than in previous years. The reasons for reduced influx are presumably the policy of relaxation towards Tibetans adopted by the Chinese since last year.

STATEMENT

Mysore.—3000 Tibetan refugees are in the process of settlement on land in Periyapatna taluk of Mysore State.

N.E.F.A.—A scheme for settlement of 5000 Tibetan refugees on land settlement in N.E.F.A. has just been sanctioned.

J & K.—The Government of India are contemplating settlement of 4000 Tibetan refugees in Agricultural or grazing settlements in Ladakh (J.&K.).

Road Construction.—A total of over 9000 Tibetan refugees have been found employment on various road works.

Training in Small Scale Industries.—A batch of 150 Tibetan refugees have undergone condensed training in various trades like Carpentry, Black-smithy, Electro-plating, Pottery, Shoe-making, Tailoring etc. Although exact figures are not available yet some of them have absorbed themselves in various Tibetan refugee settlements as a result of the training received by them.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या इसकी संख्या मालूम हो सकती है कि कितने रिफ्यूजीज़ तिब्बत से भारत आ गये हैं?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I think over 30,000

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान: क्या भारत सरकार ने इस बात को जानने की कोशिश की है कि चीन की सरकार ने अपने लोगों के ऊपर बाहर किसी जगह जाने पर जो पाबन्दी लगा दी थी उसको अब ढीला कर दिया है उसका क्या कारण है, क्या उनकी आर्थिक समस्या के कारण या और किसी वजह से वे उन लोगों को बाहर भेजना चाहते हैं?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू: माननीय सदस्य पूछते हैं कि क्या भारतीय सरकार ने जानने की कोशिश की है कि क्यों ढिलाई हुई है उधर से? जानने की कोशिश तो वाकयात से होती है! कोई खास ढिलाई नहीं हुई है! हो सकता है कुछ थोड़ी बहुत हुई हो! यह भी हो सकता है कि हमारा गलत ख्याल है कि ढिलाई हुई है! ढिलाई न हुई हो!

Shri T.S. Pattabiraman: May I know whether any Chinese spies have infiltrated along with the refugees and, if so, whether any of them have been apprehended so far?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: A number of people have been apprehended from time to time and either they have been ultimately, after enquiry, released or proceeded against.



DETENTION OF INDIAN NATIONALS IN TIBET

*31. **Shri A.B. Vajpayee:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- the number of Indian nationals who are still being detained by the Chinese officials in Tibet;
- the efforts made by Government to get them released; and

(c) the outcome, if any?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) According to information available with us, there are six Indian nationals still under Chinese detention in Tibet.
(b) And (c) Our Consul General at Lhasa has been pressing for their release but his efforts do not seem to have produced any result so far.

Shri A.B. Vajpayee: Is it a fact that these six men are being maltreated by the Chinese in prison and may I know whether our representative in Lhasa has had any contacts with them?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I have already stated that all attempts made by us have not borne fruit. They have been charge with various offences and they are undergoing sentences in jail.

Shri A.B. Vajpayee: Are we to understand that the Government have no information to the effect that these Indian nationals are being maltreated by the Chinese?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Chinese deny that they are Indian nationals. They say they are not. That is the first point in dispute. In addition to that they say, they have committed offences against the law. Therefore, they are in prison. Now, as to how they are treated in prison, sometimes some little bit of information might reach us through a third or fourth source. Normally, what happens inside a prison is not broadcast and it is not known.

Shri A.B. Vajpayee: May I know whether our representative in Lhasa has asked the Chinese for permission to contact these Indian nationals?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot straightway remember, but I think sometime or other they were asked for permission to contact them and the permission was not been given because they were in prison. They said, "Our nationals are in prison. They have committed offences."

Shri Arjun Arora: May I know, Sir, how long these men have been in detention?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not remember—for a considerable time, I think.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: One of them was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment on 20th June, 1960, a third to 15 years' imprisonment on 2nd May 1960, another in December 1960 and the last was arrested in 1959.

Shri A.D. Mani: Am I to understand that the Government repeated the charge to the Chinese Government that these persons were not treated well and that the Government knows that they are Indian nationals?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: We have told them that they are Kashmiri Muslims. They have themselves declared that they are Indian nationals, but the Chinese did not accept our point of view.

Shri Bairagi Dwibedy: What are the main offences committed by these nationals?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: That they have incited the Kashmiri Muslims to accept Indian nationality. One was charge with being in possession of an anonymous anti-Chinese poster, and some of the reasons are not disclosed.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया: क्या मंत्री महोदय बतायेगी कि उनकी मुक्ति का जो अभी तक प्रयास हुआ और उसमें कोई सफलता नहीं मिली, तो क्या अभी भी कोई प्रयास किये जाने की संभावना है?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: We always try our best, and as a result of our efforts, one of the national was released on the 19th April 1962. We will carry on negotiations and we will try our best to see that they are released.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

23 April 1962

Written Answers to Questions

SMUGGLING OF FOOD GRAINS INTO TIBET

17. Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government are aware that the Chinese administrators in Tibet are pressing the Indian traders to smuggle food grains and other essential commodities from India to ward off famine in Tibet; and
(b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, what is the actual position in this regard and what efforts are being made to check the smuggling of food grains, etc.?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) and (b) The Government of India have seen reports that the Chinese authorities in Tibet have occasionally been inducing Indian traders to deliver food grains and other essential commodities to them but are not aware that this is due to famine in Tibet. The Government of India has no information that there is any large-scale smuggling of goods from India to the Tibet region. They have been taking steps to prevent unauthorized trade across the borders, and reports received from border check-posts etc. indicate that measures so far taken have been effective.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

30 April 1962

Written Answers to Questions

SOUTH VIETNAM'S OFFER OF RICE FOR TIBETAN REFUGEES

***116. Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Government of South Vietnam have offered 200 tons of the rice for the relief of Tibetan refugees in India?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Yes, Sir.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

16 June 1962

Written Answers to Questions

DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED BY THE INDIAN TRADERS IN TIBET

***35. Shri Niranjan Singh:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- a) whether Government are aware that the Indian traders who were disposing of their merchandise before the expiry of the trade agreement with Tibet experienced difficulties; and
b) if so, what steps Government took to help these traders?

The Prime minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) Yes, Sir. The Chinese authorities in Tibet have imposed additional restrictions, on the eve of the expiry of the Trade agreement to make it difficult for Indian traders to dispose of their merchandise. They have warned local Tibetans not to enter into barter agreements with Indian traders, and have further dissuaded them from bartering or selling wool and other traditional items to Indian traders. A month before the expiry of the Trade Agreement, the Chinese authorities announced new Customs Regulations imposing fresh duties on the trade. They have also prohibited all transactions in Indian currency and have severely restricted trade remittances.
(b) The Government of India have always urged the rights of Indian traders under the terms of the 1954 Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between India and Tibet region of China. The Chinese authorities have, however, continued throughout to maintain an uncooperative attitude in this regard. Moreover, the protection of the 1954 Agreement is no longer available to our traders from the date of its expiry, viz., the 2nd of June 1962.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

13 August 1962

Oral Answers to Questions

STAFF OF INDIAN AGENCIES WOUND UP IN TIBET

***257. Shri Niranjan Singh:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the staff of the two Indian agencies wound up in Tibet, have returned to India; and
(b) if so, when they reached India?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir, except for the class IV employee at Yatung who was not permitted to leave Yatung because his Indian nationality was questioned by the Chinese authorities. All other India based staff of our Trade Agencies in Yatung and Gyantse have returned to India.
(b) The staff members and their families crossed the Tibet-Sikkim border in batches on the 12th June, 17th June, 18th June, 19th June, 21st June, 23rd June, 25th June, 26th June and 4th July, 1962.

Shri Niranjan Singh: May I know why these batches did not come all at once together? Why have they come one day after another? What was the reason?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: That was because they did not have enough transit accommodation. Therefore, they had to come in batches.

Shrimati Maya Devi Chetty: Is the Government aware of the fact that one of the traders from Kalimpong is being held up by the Chinese, that he had been stopped and subjected to harassment and has even been refused the supply of necessary things including foodstuffs? If so, what steps do the Government contemplate to take in order to release him as early as possible?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The only case I know of is that of the Class IV employee.

Shrimati Maya Devi Chetty: I am asking about the traders. One of the traders from Kalimpong is being detained.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I do not have information.

Shrimati Maya Devi Chetty: One of the traders is being held up.

Shri A.B. Vajpayee: What was the reply, Sir?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I said I had no information about any trader from Kalimpong.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया: क्या माननीय मंत्री जी यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगी की वहां पर जो जायदाद रह गई है उसका क्या भविष्य है?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: We had left four Class IV employees to look after the buildings at Yatung but they were arbitrarily arrested by the Chinese.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया: वहां जो चल और अचल सम्पत्ति है उसका भविष्य में क्या उपयोग होगा और क्या नहीं होगा? क्या उस सम्पत्ति के बदले में हमें मुआवज़ा मिलेगा, इस बारे में हमारी सरकार क्या प्रयत्न कर रही है और जो लोग देख भाल करने के लिये वहां पर रखे गये हैं उनको इधर बुलाने का क्या प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Will you please repeat the question in English?

Shri V.M. Chordia: What will happen to the property, movable and immovable, left there? Secondly, when will the persons who are looking after this property there be called here?

Shri Lakshmi Menon: As far as the immovable property is concerned, I have mentioned just now that four class IV employees of Tibetan origin and one Nepali were asked to look after the agency in Yatung but they are arbitrarily removed by the Chinese authorities and were arrested on the 17th July. As far as the property of the traders is concerned, they were not able to sell them and they were left there. The Chinese have it in their custody and say that they will look after it.

Shri V.M. Chordia: When we are not allowed to bring our property here and when we have to keep four persons there to look after the property there, why should we waste money like this instead of asking the Chinese to compensate us by giving us the amount of money?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The matter is still under discussion with the Chinese authorities.

Shri V.M. Chordia: What about the private property?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is an entirely separate issue. We helped the traders to deal with the Chinese but they dealt with them directly.

Shri Bairagi Dwibedy: May I know whether there is any assessment of private property left there?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There is an assessment of private property left there but I have not got the information right here.

Shri A.D. Mani: The Minister said something about the persons in charge being arbitrarily arrested by the Chinese. It is an amazing piece of information. I should like to ask the Government what relief it is giving to the persons left behind in respect of the harassing restrictions that the Chinese authorities are imposing the Indian nationals in Tibet.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, none of them are Indian nationals. I had stated in the answer that four of them are Tibetans and one is a Nepali.

Shri N.C. Kasliwal: I just want to know whether the non-Indian staff who were allowed to come here were subjected to harassment by the Chinese authorities?

28 August 1962

Written Answers to Questions

REHABILITATION OF TIBETAN REFUGEES IN LADAKH

***687. Shri Mahabir Das:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that after the joint consultations between the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and the Government of India it has been decided to formulate a special scheme for the rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees in Ladakh; and
- (b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, the number of Tibetan refugees proposed to be rehabilitated under the scheme and how much expenditure is likely to be incurred on their rehabilitation?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh):

- (a) and (b) There is no proposal before the Government of India to formulate a special scheme for the rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees in Ladakh.
There are approximately 4,000 Tibetan Refugees in Ladakh and the Government of Jammu and Kashmir is exploring possibilities of rehabilitating as many of them as possible as agriculturists provided suitable land can be found.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

12 September 1963

Written Answers to Questions

PROPERTIES LEFT BY INDIANS IN TIBET

***545. Shri Sitaram Jaipuria:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Indians have left behind huge properties in Tibet;
- (b) if so, what is the value of the properties left; and
- (c) what steps are being taken by government in this connection?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) These properties are estimated at about Rs. 55 lakhs.
- (c) The Government of India has pressed for equitable compensations to be paid by the Chinese Government to the concerned Indian traders.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

19 September 1963

Oral Answers to Questions

INDOCTRINATION CLASSES FOR PRISONERS OF WAR IN TIBET AND SINKIANG

***660. Shri A. D. Mani:** Will the **Minister of Defence** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Chinese are keeping as prisoners of war about 1,000 young Indians in Tibet and Sinkiang.
- (b) Whether it is fact that indoctrination classes for the said prisoners have been started there under Colonel Chen Hao; and
- (c) What representations the Government of India have made on this subject to the Government of China?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Defence (Shri D. R. Chavan):

- (a) and (b) The Chinese Government have informed that they have released all the prisoners of war they had taken. We have no information that they are holding any Indians as prisoners of war or that they are indoctrinating them.
- (c) Does not arise.

Shri A.D. Mani: Sir, has the government's attention been drawn to reports appearing in the foreign Press that these persons listed as missing or as unaccounted for are "being kept in Sinkiang for indoctrination? The foreign Press has made this allegation.

Shri D.R. Chavan: So far as our prisoners of war are concerned, they are all accounted for except 771 persons belonging to the army and 123 persons belonging to the Assam Rifles and General Reserve Engineer Force who are reported to be unaccounted for. But, Sir, indications are that these missing persons are also supposed to be dead.

Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha: What was the last portion, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: The last portion was not audible.

Shri D.R. Chavan: Indications are that these missing persons are dead and are not prisoners of war.

Shri A.D. Mani: I would like to mention again that allegation has been made in the foreign Press that some of these so-called unaccounted persons or missing persons consisting of Gurkhas are being kept in China for purposes of indoctrination. How many persons of Gurkha origin are there in this list of unaccounted persons?

Shri D.R. Chavan: We have no such information.

Shri A.D. Mani: I should like to ask the minister whether the prisoners who have returned to India have given any account of attempts at indoctrination made when they were in captivity and, if so, what is the nature of indoctrination which the Chinese attempted to force on them?

Shri D.R. Chavan: Sir, the Chinese attempted to indoctrinate some of the prisoners of war and last time it was mentioned by the Defence Minister that about twenty seven officers were taken through the streets of China. So, I would like to mention for the information of the hon. Member that attempts were made at indoctrination.

† † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †

19 September 1963

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES IN INDIA

549. Shri Sitaram Jaipuria: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government have made any assessment of the number of Tibetan refugees living in India at present;
- (b) if so, what is their number, and
- (c) what is the progress so far made in the rehabilitation of those refugees?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) Approximately 37,000.
- (c) 8,500 refugees have been or are in the process of rehabilitation on semi-permanent basis on land, 13,000 have been employed gainfully on other works 2,000 are continuing their religious studies and practice as Lamas.

† † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †

18 February 1964

Written Answers to Questions

REHABILITATION OF TIBETAN REFUGEES IN BHUTAN

73. Shri R.S. Khandekar: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Government of India have decided to give some assistance to the Government of Bhutan for the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees in Bhutan; and
- (b) if so, the details of the assistance proposed to be given?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) Yes, Madam.
- (b) The Government of India have sanctioned a grant-in-aid of Rs. 10,58,500 for rehabilitation of 1,000 Tibetan refugees on land.

† † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †

21 April 1964

Written Answers to Questions

CHINESE PROPAGANDA ON TIBETAN RETURN TO TIBET

***12. Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a news-item which appeared in the Deccan Herald of the 14th March, 1964 in which it is stated that a Chinese broadcast on 8th March 1964 is reported to have launched a propaganda from Lhasa appealing to the Tibetans abroad "to return to the motherland", and
- (b) if so, whether Government of China has made any proposal to the Government of India on this behalf?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) The Government of India have seen the news-item which appeared in the Deccan Herald of the 14th March, 1964 about a Chinese broadcast appealing to Tibetans abroad to return to Tibet.
- (b) No, Sir.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

21 April 1964

Written Answers to Questions

SMUGGLING OF FOOD GRAINS TO NEPAL AND TIBET

- 3. Shri R.S. Khandekar:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:
- (a) whether it is a fact that there has been an increase recently in the smuggling of food grains out of India to the border countries like Nepal, Tibet etc.; and
- (b) if so, what are the steps taken by Government to prevent such smuggling?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

- (a) No, Sir.
- (b) Proper vigilance is maintained on the border.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

5 May 1964

Written Answers to Questions

DALAI LAMA'S VISIT TO CEYLON AND BURMA ETC.

- *253. Shri R.S. Khandekar:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:
- (a) whether it is a fact that curbs have been placed on the proposed visit of Dalai Lama to Ceylon, Burma etc.; and
- (b) if so, what are the reasons there for?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) No, Sir.
- (b) Does not arise.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

8 September 1964

Written Answers to Questions

CONCENTRATION OF CHINESE TROOPS IN TIBET

***44. Shri Chandra Shekhar:**

Shri Jagat Narain:

Shri M.M. Dharia:

Shri J.C. Chatterji:

Shri P. Abraham:

Shri R.K. Bhuwarka: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Government have received reports of fresh concentration of troops by Chinese in Tibet along the Indian border;
- (b) whether Chinese have constructed stone cairns in the demilitarized zone of Ladakh;
- (c) if so, whether these facts have been brought to the notice of the Colombo Powers and other friendly countries; and
- (d) what other steps Government have taken to meet this threat?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) It is a fact that the Chinese Government have been concentrating their troops, developing communications and consolidating the logistic capacity of the Chinese armies in Tibet in areas along the India-China border.
- (b) Yes, Sir.
- (c) Indian Missions in all the Colombo Conference countries had been instructed to hand over to the respective foreign offices copies of the government of India's protest note to the Chinese Government dated 26th February, 1964 on this subject.
- (d) Government are taking all possible defence, diplomatic and publicity measures to counter the Chinese threat.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

तिब्बत से आये शरणार्थियों का पुनर्वास

३३३: श्री प्यारेलाल कुरोल 'तलिब': क्या वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

- (क) क्या यह सच है कि तिब्बत से आये हुये शरणार्थियों को नेफा में बसाया गया है;
- (ख) यदि हां, तो कितने शरणार्थी परिवार वहां बसाये गये है और उन्हें भूमि आदि के अतिरिक्त और क्या सुविधायें प्रदान की गई है; और
- (ग) क्या सरकार ने इस बात की पूरी पूरी जांच कर ली है कि उन शरणार्थियों में कोई चीनी जासूस तो शामिल नहीं है और सरकार ने उन शरणार्थियों पर कुल कितना धन खर्च किया है?

वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री दिनेश सिंह):

- (क) जी हां, कुछ शरणार्थियों को!
- (ख) करीब ५०० परिवारों को बसाया जा रहा है! जब तक वे दो फसले नहीं उगा लेंगे तब तक उन्हें राशन मुफ्त दिया जाता है! इसके अलावा, उनके रहने के लिये साधारण झोंपडियों की व्यवस्था है, चिकित्सा की सुविधायें है और बच्चों के लिये स्कूल की भी व्यवस्था है! एक बैल या गाय और कुछ सुअर देने की व्यवस्था है! इसके अलावा शुरू शुरू में हलों के सेट, कृषि-उपकरण, बीज और उर्वरक देने तथा जंगलों को साफ करने के लिये अधिक सहायता का प्रबन्ध है!
- (ग) जी हां ! १६,६२,२१४ रू० (अगस्त, १९६४ तक)



1 December 1964

Oral Answers to Questions

TIBET ISSUE IN U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

*301. Shri U.S. Duggal:

Shri Sankar Pratap Singh Dev:

Shri Ram Singh: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

- (a) whether India has decided to support the consideration of the Tibet issue in the United Nations General Assembly when it comes up in December, 1964; and
- (b) if so, what are the details thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon):

- (a) and (b) The government of the Philippines, Nicaragua and El Salvador have jointly proposed the inclusions of the item "Question of Tibet" on the Agenda of the XIX Session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Whether an item shall or shall not be considered by the General Assembly is decided upon on the recommendation of the General Committee constituted for the purpose by the General Assembly. In accordance with their normal practice, the Government of India will support the recommendations of the General Committee, including the one relating to the consideration of the item on the "Question of Tibet."

The Government of India sympathies with the Tibetan people who are suffering great hardship, privation and oppression. The Government of India will support any resolution that calls for restoration of human rights and fundamental freedom to the Tibetan people.

Shri Ram Singh: I want to know whether Government is going to mobilize world opinion in favour of the stand.

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon: I do not know whether we are actually mobilizing world opinion but it is well known, our attitude towards these things. The member countries of the United Nations know that attitude and that itself is mobilization.

Shri A.D. Mani: Madam, since the Prime Minister is here, may I ask whether it is proposed, under this item, to stimulate discussion in the U.N. General Assembly on the extinction of human rights in Tibet?

The Prime Minister (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): This item pertains to the question of human rights and if the question of Tibet is raised in this connection, whether we stimulate any discussion or not, the government of India will certainly express its views and opinion in the matter.

Shri G. Ramachandran: From the various answers given to this question by the Minister in charge, are we to understand that there is some shift, however little it might be, in our policy in regard to this matter of Tibet being raised in the United Nations at this stage?

Shri Lal Bahadur: No, Madam. We have always held this view that in the matter of human rights we must support those countries where they are oppressed. Therefore in accordance with our old policy we do support this proposal which has been put forward.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: Madam, the Minister has stated that India as a rule supports whatever the decision of the General Committee is to which this matter is going to be referred. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps the Government of India is taking to see that this question is recommended to be taken up by the General Committee. Will the Indian representative there do something so that this question may be accepted?

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon: I do not think India is a member of the General Committee which consists of the Chairman of the various Committees of the United Nations General Assembly. Therefore I do not know whether India can take any other part unless it becomes the Chairman of a Committee and thereby gets elected to the General Committee.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: May I ask rather an unpopular question perhaps but still I would ask.

Shri G. Ramachandran: You always do that.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: In deciding the policy of the Government in regard to this matter having regard to the situation with regard to the position of Tibet and India's internal affairs. May I ask whether the Government has taken into account the possible repercussions of whatever the Government would do in regard to this matter on the Afro-Asian countries and also whether in this connection the government has taken into account the fact that Government's attitude however well-intentioned it might be is liable to be understood as something which is emanating from the fact that India has some trouble or dispute with China? It is liable to be understood that way; that is what we find. Therefore I would ask the hon. Prime Minister to make a clear statement on the subject as to whether all these international implications and repercussions in regard to this matter which would be taken into account in advising the Indian representative to enunciate and evolve its stand on the Tibet question when it is sponsored by the American stooges...

(Interruptions)

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon: This is a question of fundamental human rights and we have always stood for the maintenance of the human rights whether it is in Tibet or anywhere else.

Shri Faridul Haq Ansari: May I know whether in deciding our stand that the Government of India take in the United Nations on any question after the Chinese invasion, it only decides on the basis of whether China will be pleased by it?

(No reply)

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

23 November 1965

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETANS IN INDIA

287. Shri Sitaram Jaipuria: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state the number of Tibetans living in India at present?

The Minister of External Affairs (Sardar Swaran Singh): Approximately 50,000 Tibetan refugees are in India at present, out of whom 26,214 are registered under the Register of Foreigners Act, 1939 excluding children below the age of 16.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

3 May 1966

Written Answers to Questions

COLLECTIVE FARMING SCHEME FOR REFUGEES FROM TIBET

- 2. Shri Jagat Narain:** Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:
- (a) whether it is a fact that Government have started a collective farming scheme for the rehabilitation of refugees from Tibet; and
 - (b) if so, the salient features of the scheme?

The Minister of External Affairs (Sardar Swaran Singh):

- a) There is no collective farming scheme for Tibetan refugees though a number of them have been rehabilitated on land in settlement at Bylakuppe (Mysore), Chandragiri (Orissa), and Mainpet (Madhya Pradesh).
- b) Does not arise.



17 May 1966

Oral Answers to Questions

CHINESE FORCES CONCENTRATION IN TIBET

***283. Diwan Chaman Lall:**

Shri Chitta Basu:

Shri D.L. Sen Gupta:

Shri R.S. Khandekar: Will the **Minister of Defence** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether government's attention has been drawn to a report appearing in the London "Observer" dated the 17th April, 1966 to the effect that (i) the Chinese are holding massive military exercises in South Tibet, (ii) that movement of a considerable number of troops has been made under cover of darkness, (iii) that apart from reservists, the Chinese have 18 to 20 divisions facing India and finally (iv) that it will not take the Chinese more than 4 days to move their troops against the Indian border; and
- (b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A.M. Thomas):

- (a) while Government are aware about the concentration of Chinese troops and their offensive posture on our northern borders, no report regarding large scale movement of Chinese troops or holding of massive military exercises by them in South Tibet has recently come to the notice.
- (b) Government are keeping careful watch over the situation and will take such measures to protect our security as may be called for.

Shri Chitta Basu: May I know whether the Government in aware of the fact that the Chinese are mobilizing forces in Gilgit and Ladakh areas?

Shri A.M. Thomas: Sir, these matters have been referred to previously also and my senior colleague has already answered these questions.

Shri R.S. Khandekar: There are alarming reports in the newspapers that the Chinese have improved their logistic position and there is apprehension in the public mind that China may attack India any time, may be before the monsoon. The Government has always replied that it is aware of this and it is taking all possible steps. May I know whether the government intends appointing a Committee of Members of Parliament and take them into confidence so that they can satisfy themselves that there is preparedness to meet the Chinese menace?

Shri A.M. Thomas: There is no doubt that their offensive preparedness has improved both in the matter of the Army as well as in the matter of communications. But, Sir, the proposal made by the hon. Member cannot be accepted. I do not think the House would expect the Government to constitute such a committee to go into this. With regard to the size and concentration of troops, in fact, some two or three days back the Defence Minister did give some idea about the size of the Chinese Army in the Tibet area. They have also troops in Sinkiang, Chinghai and Szchwan from where they can deploy in the border areas within a few days. The Government of India is watching this development and is taking all the necessary steps.

Shri B.K.P. Sinha: May I know if the Government of India have made efforts to ascertain whether China has been able to develop tactical nuclear weapons, a system which has almost become part of the conventional weapons system. If so may I know how the Government propose to meet this sort of challenge?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y.B. Chavan): These tactical and conventional nuclear weapons have different connotations in different countries. It is a question of distances to be covered and the size of the forces to be used. I do not think at the present moment, China has started making use of these tactical nuclear weapons. Anyway, I would like to emphasize this one aspect at the Chinese threat, it is there but we should not create panic about it by saying that they are likely to come before the monsoon or after the monsoon. It is really a propaganda that the Chinese are interested in. I would like to tell hon. Members that the real threat of Chinese today is from conventional weapons. I think we will have to take note of that particular aspect. The real and immediate threat is from conventional weapons.

9 December 1966

Written Answers to Questions

TRADE WITH TIBET

***643 Shri D.Thengari:** Will the **Minister of Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Commerce and Trade connections with Tibet have been cut off completely;
- (b) whether it is a fact that due to the trade cut off, the people of NEFA on the border areas are facing acute economic distress; and
- (c) if so, the steps being taken by Government to remove the economic distress?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri P.S. Naskar):

- (a) Regular trans-border trade has ceased.
- (b) and (c) As NEFA Administration has opened subsidized fair price shops along the border, there is no such distress.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

13 June 1967

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES

758. Shri. Niren Ghosh: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- a) whether it is a fact that an American newsprint manufacturer is proposing to recruit Tibetan Refugees now in Kangra district of Himachal Pradesh for his operations;
- b) whether it is also a fact that the U.S. Government have sanctioned resettlement of 3,000 refugees at present residing in U.S.A; and
- c) if so, whether Government have given permission in this regard?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M.C. Chagla):

- a) and (b) Our attention has been drawn to a report on the subject in the newsletter published by the Dalai Lama's Bureau.
- c) We will have no objection if these Tibetans can find employment in U.S.A and the U.S. Government permits them to settle there.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

11 August 1967

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN REFUGEES

875. Shri Sundar Singh Bhandari: Will the **Minister of Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there has been an increase in the number of Tibetan refugees reaching Uttarakhand during the last two months;
- (b) if so, whether Government have examined the reasons for this increase; and
- (c) whether it is a fact that Chinese infiltrators are also entering India in large numbers in the garb of Tibetan refugees?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y.B. Chavan):

- (a) and (b) Yes, Sir.
- (c) The Government are vigilant about the possibility that some of the Tibetan refugees might be Chinese agents. All necessary steps to safeguard the security of the country are being taken.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

5 December 1967

Written Answers to Questions

REFUGEES FROM TIBET

769. Shri Bhupender Singh: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- a) whether there has been a marked increase in the flow of refugees from Tibet to India during the last six months;
- b) the number of Tibetan refugees who have come to India since January, 1967 and how does this number compare with that in 1966;
- c) the policy of the Government in dealing with the refugees; and
- d) whether it is proposed to settle them in India on a permanent basis?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External affairs (Shrimati Indira Gandhi):

- a) Yes, Sir.
- b) 867 Tibetan refugees entered India till 19th November 1967, while 240 Tibetans crossed over to India during the year 1966.
- c) On entering India the refugees are screened and those cleared of suspicion are either moved to sites of re-settlement or sent to work camps. Those suspected are detained for further interrogation.
- d) Yes, Sir. As long as they wish to stay.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

5 December 1967

Written Answers

TIBETAN REFUGEES

804. Shri M.C. Shah: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the total number of Tibetan refugees who have come over to India, since Chinese occupation of Tibet?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): The total number of Tibetan refugees who have come over to India since March, 1959 is about 51000.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

12 December 1967

Oral Answer

INFILTRATION OF TIBETANS INTO SIKKIM, BHUTAN AND INDIA

***444. Shri Surjit Singh Atwal:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that recently there has been a heavy infiltration of Tibetan into Sikkim, Bhutan and India;
- (b) if so, the total number of Tibetans who have crossed over to India during the last three months; and
- (c) what steps have been taken by the Government to check their further infiltration?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Surendra Pal Singh):

- (a) and (b) The migration of Tibetan refugees cannot really be described as infiltration since they are people in distress who are fleeing from religious persecution at the hands of the Chinese Government. No Tibetan refugee is known to have entered Sikkim during the last three months and only two are reported to have entered India through Bhutan during this period. 320 of them are known to have entered India through other routes during the previous three months.
- (c) Those of them who are suspected to be Chinese agents are firmly pushed back into Tibet. Attempts are made to generally dissuade the others, but whenever necessary they are allowed to enter the country on humanitarian grounds.

Shri Surjit Singh Atwal:

May I know whether these 300 or so of Tibetans who have entered India are staying at one place under security or they are allowed to move from place to place?

Shri Surendra Pal Singh:

All these refugees who enter India are first screened at the border checkpost. If any of them are found to be Chinese agents they are pushed back into Tibet. Those who are suspected to be agents and others are taken to the camps where they are interrogated further and if they are cleared from the security point of view, all attempts are made to rehabilitate them according to the various schemes in force.

श्री ए०एम०तारिक: मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर सहिबा से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह बात तो बिल्कुल दुरूस्त है और इस बात को हमने तसलीम किया है कि हिन्दुस्तान की जो सिक्क्योरिटी इन्टेलीजेंस है वह बहुत कमज़ोर है और इस बात का हमने एतराफ किया है और फिर यह जान कर कि इनफिलट्रेशन होता है चाहे वह तिब्बत से हो, पाकिस्तान से हो, चायना से हो, उसको रोकने के लिये सरकार ने क्या सही कदम उठाये हैं जिस से सरहदों पर इनफिलट्रेशन रूके!

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह: महोदय, गवर्नमेंट ने क्या कदम उठाया है यह कहना बड़ा मुश्किल है! मगर कोशिश हमेशा यह की जाती है कि इस किस्म के आदमी जो सिक्क्योरिटी के ऐंगिल से गलत हो उनको आने न दिया जाय! इसके लिये क्या मेजर्स लिये जा रहे हैं उनके सम्बन्ध में कहना बड़ा मुश्किल होगा!

Shri Surjit Singh Atwal:

May I know from the hon. Minister out of these 300 Tibetans, how many have been found to be Chinese agents after screening, how many have been pushed back, how many have been left free, where they are putting up, whether they are free to move about in the country and whether it has come to the knowledge of the Government that they are still doing propaganda for some parties?

Shri Surendra Pal Singh:

These 320 Tibetans who have been allowed to enter India are the ones who have been screened and not found to be of any security risk at all. They have been sent to the rehabilitation camps and every attempt is made to rehabilitate them. They do not wander about all over the country.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:

I take it that these are people who have been forced under persecution and distress to come to this country and may I know what is their story about the state of affairs in Tibet at the present moment?

The Deputy Chairman:

That question does not arise out of this.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta:

When they came we were told that they would not be allowed to take part in political activities but I find that they are...

The Deputy Chairman:

The Question Hour is over.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

12 December 1967

Written Answers to Questions

MOVABLE PROPERTY LEFT BY INDIAN MISSION IN LHASA

1059.Dr. (MRS) Mangladevi Talwar: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government have received any reports about the movable property left by the Indian mission in Lhasa in 1951 under the care of the Nepalese representatives; and
- (b) if so, what action has been taken in the matter?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Indira Gandhi):

- (a) Yes, Madam.
- (b) A part of this movable property has been arbitrarily taken over by the Chinese Government. The Government of India have registered their strong protest with the Chinese Government against the latter's unilateral and arbitrary action. We have also stated that we reserve the right to take further appropriate action.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

21 March, 1968

Written Answers to Questions

RESETTLEMENT OF TIBETAN REFUGEES

***735. Shri Brahmananda Panda:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

- (a) the amount so far spent on resettlement of Tibetan refugees in India in each camp.
- (b) Whether any of these refugees have applied for Indian citizenship; and
- (c) If so, the details thereof?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Surendra Pal Singh):

- (a) The total amount spent on the resettlement of Tibetan refugees up to 31st March, 1967, is approximately Rs. 5.5 crores. This includes Rs 1.46 crores spent on education. The details separately for each camp are being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House.
- (b) No case has yet come up for consideration.
- (c) Does not arise

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

27 November, 1969

Written Answers to Questions

CHINESE ATOMIC ESTABLISHMENT IN TIBET

***735. Shri S.A. Khaja Mohideen:** Will the **Minister of Defence** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government is aware of the fact that China has been moving for some time its atomic energy establishment in Lop Nor in Sinkiang to a place in northern Tibet; and
- (b) if so, the details of the same and the reaction of the Government of India in the matter?

The Minister of Defence Steel and Heavy Engineering (Sardar Swaran Singh):

- (a) and (b) Attention is invited to the answer given to Starred Question No. 98 on 20th November, 1969

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

31 March, 1971

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN INDEPENDENCE ISSUE IN THE U.N.

83. Dr. Bhai Mahavir: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Government of India propose to sponsor the cause of Tibetan independence and human rights in Tibet in the U.N.; and
- (b) if not, what are the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Surendra Pal Singh):

- (a) No, Sir. Sponsoring the cause of Tibetan independence in the United Nations would amount to interference in the internal affairs of another sovereign state. An initiative in regard to the human rights of the Tibetan people would be, at the present juncture impractical and it would also not lead to any useful result.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

28 July 1971

Written Answers to Questions

CHINESE ARMY ON INDO-TIBETAN BORDER

378 Dr. B.N. Antani:

Shri Lokanath Misra:

Shri Sundar Mani Patel:

Shri Jagdish Prasad Mathur: Will the **Minister of Defence** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that China has deployed above 50,000 troops on the Indo-Tibetan border;
- (b) whether Government of India has received any report in this regard from its intelligence sources; and
- (c) if so, the details thereof and the reaction of Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (Shri Jagjivan Ram):

- (a) to (c) Yes, Sir. Attention is invited to the answer given in the House to Part (c) of Starred Question No. 371 on 9th June 1971. The development of these troops on our borders has been taken into consideration in planning our defence requirements.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

17 March 1972

Written Answers to Questions

PLEBISCITE IN TIBET

***99 Dr. Bhai Mahavir:**

Shri Sundar Mani Patel: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government attention has been drawn to a demand made by Dalai Lama asking for plebiscite in Tibet in order to ascertain whether the Tibetans desire to remain under the Chinese rule and
- (b) if so, what is Government's reaction thereto?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Surendra Pal Singh):

- (a) Government have seen press reports to that effect.
- (b) Government of India regards Tibet as a part of China and there is no change in Government's stand on this question.

INDIANS IN JAIL IN TIBET

473. Shri Sadasiv Bagaitkar: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether it is a fact that a large number of Indians are in detention in Tibet;
- (b) if so, what is the exact number of Indians in Jail in Tibet, and
- (c) what steps Government have taken for their release?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Samarendra Kundu):

- (a) to (c) The government of India had repeatedly taken up the matter of return to India of persons of Indian origin in Tibet in formal notes and communications to the Chinese Government since 1958. While Papers one to four of Notes, Memoranda and letter exchanged between the Governments of India and China, which have already been tabled on the floor of the House on various occasions since 1959 onwards. These contained numerous references to the question of the return to India of persons of Indian origin from the Tibet Region of China. This question has also been raised with the Chinese side recently.

The Chinese Government replies to these representations from the Government of India are also contained in the above-mentioned White Papers. In general, the Chinese government has taken the line that Indian nationals are free to leave Tibet and that those who stayed behind in Tibet have done so in their own accord. The Chinese response to our most recent representation on this matter is awaited.



1st February 1980

Oral Answers to Questions

GRAZING INSIDE BHUTANESE TERRITORY BY TIBETANS

***67. Shri Sawaisingh Sisodia:**

Shrimati Hamida Habib Uliah:

Shrimati Ratan Kumari: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether it is a fact that the Government of India have expressed their concern to the Government of China over increased grazing activity by the Tibetans inside Bhutanese territory; and
- (b) if so, what are the details in this regard?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao):

- (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. We took up the matter with the Chinese Charge d'affairs in New Delhi in July, 1979. The Chinese Charge d'Affairs promised to refer the matter to his Government.

Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the aspect that you have to give a chance to every Member wanting to speak so that all parties can be represented here. I would request you kindly pay attention to other Members also. I have been requesting you since morning to allow me to put questions, but you are not giving me an opportunity.

Shri Sawaisingh Sisodia: Sir, I am putting the supplementary. On one pretext or the other, the Chinese are illegally and without any authority in the habit of trespassing into the territories of neighbouring countries with ulterior motives. So, in the case of trespassing into Bhutan. I would like to know from the hon. Minister the measure which his Ministry is contemplating to avoid such trespassing and prevent them from entering the Bhutanese territory in future.

Shri P.V. Narashimha Rao: Sir, there are a few aspect of the matter which have to be considered. In the first place, the Bhutan-Tibet border being an undemarcated traditional border, it is not uncommon for graziers from both sides to trespass into each other's territory to find new pastures. This is one aspect. The other is that when this happened, the Bhutanese Embassy in Delhi also lodged a verbal protest with the Chinese Embassy here and they were told that this would be conveyed to the Government in China and there the matter ended. In addition to the Bhutanese protest, we also told them that we are equally concerned about these incursions taking place. So from Bhutan's side and our side, we have expressed our concern. They have finally said that there is no question of any intrusions into the Bhutanese territory. There is the question of the demarcation of the border also, but that is a much wider question.

Shri Sawaisingh Sisodia: Sir, the hon. Minister must be aware that this is not a simple question of grazing of the cattle. This is a question of usual trespass by the Chinese on the territories of neighbouring countries. Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister with all seriousness how many times the Bhutan Government sent protests to the Foreign

Ministry and when was such a protest sent last and what really is the action taken to avoid such trespass under the guise of grazing in future?

Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao: Sir, according to our information the protest was lodged in July 1979. That was the protest lodged by the Bhutanese. And on the 18th July, 1979 we also told them that we are concerned over it. This is the position.

Shirmati Hamida Habibullah: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the matter is so serious that it seems that under the guise of grazing a lot of other activities are going on. That is the suspicion. The Hon. Minister has given us a reply that the matter has been brought to the notice of the Government. I would like to know from the hon. Minister that when such a serious matter was brought to the notice of the Government in July 1979, even after so many months why we have not been given any assurance of any sort. Surely we should be in a position to know what other activities are going on there under the guise of grazing because it is a matter that is worrying us very much.

Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao: Sir, the Government is aware of the question of grazing not being as simple as it is made out to be, but the Government also does not want to exaggerate it out of all proportion. We are aware of the implications of this matter and we shall take whatever steps are possible.

Mr. Chairman: The question Hour is over.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

14 March, 1980

Written Answers to Questions

REPATRIATION OF TIBETANS FROM BHUTAN

251. Shri Kalraj Mishra: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the representatives of Tibetans in India have represented to the Government to stall repatriation of Tibetans from Bhutan;
- (b) whether Government had any discussion in the matter with the King of Bhutan during his recent visit to India, and
- (c) if so, what are the details thereof?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao)

- (a) Yes, Sir
- (b) And
- (c) The Prime Minister raised this issue with the King of Bhutan during his recent visit to India. The King informed the Prime Minister that his Government had offered Bhutanese citizenship to all Tibetan refugees resident in Bhutan and those who had accepted Bhutan citizenship were welcome to stay on in Bhutan. As regards those who may not accept Bhutanese citizenship, the question of their possible rehabilitation in India will be considered in consultation with all concerned.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

26 November, 1980

Written Answers to Questions

TIBETAN'S SCHOOL SOCIETY

751. Shri Narsingh Narain Pandey: Will the **Minister of Education** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that in 1961 Government of India formed a Tibetan School Society to run various schools for Tibetan refugees and others at Mussoorie, Dalhousie, if so, what were the aims and objectives thereof;
- (b) whether is also a fact that Government are under pressure from Tibetan refugees to handover these schools to their Society, if so the details thereof
- (c) whether it is also a fact that Indian teachers in the above mentioned schools have been appointed as per qualification laid down by the Central Board of Secondary Education but they have not been made permanent so far; and
- (d) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Education and Social Welfare (Shri S.B. Chavan):

- (a) the Tibetan Schools Society (now called Central Tibetan Schools Administration) was set up by a Resolution of the Government in 1961 with the main object of establishing and managing schools for the benefit of children of Tibetan refugees. The Administration runs schools at Mussoorie and Dalhousie apart from other places.
- (b) The Tibetans have expressed a desire to take over the administration of residential schools at Mussoorie and Dalhousie at present managed by the Central Tibetan Schools Administration.

- (c) Yes, Sir.
- (d) The Governing body of the Central Tibetan Schools Administration considers that in view of the peculiar circumstances in which the Central Tibetan Schools Administration was set up, it is not possible to make this organization permanent and to convert temporary post into permanent ones.

* * * * *

27 November, 1980

Written Answers to Questions

**INSTALLATION OF SOPHISTICATED AND DANGEROUS
NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN TIBET BY CHINA**

889. Shri M. R. Krishna: Will the **Minister of Defence** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that China has installed sophisticated and dangerous nuclear weapons in Tibet which are obviously posing a threat to India;
- (b) whether it is also a fact that the French authorities are fully cooperating with China in her armament deal and development; and
- (c) if so, what is Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Shivraj V. Patel):

- (a) No confirmed information is available to suggest that China has installed sophisticated and dangerous nuclear weapons in Tibet.
- (b) There are reports to suggest that France has agreed to supply some defensive military equipment and manufacturing technology to China.
- (c) The developments which have a bearing on our security are monitored and their implications analysed for appropriate action to ensure full defence preparedness.

* * * * *

5 December, 1980

Written Answers to Questions

MILITARY CONCENTRATION IN TIBET

1587. Shri G.C. Bhattacharya: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government is aware of the fact that military concentration in Tibet has lately been increasing; and
- (b) if so, what steps are being taken to counteract its impact on India?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao):

- (a) Available reports do not suggest any noticeable change in the deployment of Chinese troops across our frontiers.
- (b) Government of India constantly keep under review development affecting India's security.

* * * * *

23 March 1982

Written Answers to Questions

CONCENTRATION OF CHINESE TROOPS ALONG INDO-TIBETAN BORDERS

2404. Shri J K Jain: Will the **Minister of Defence** be pleased to state:

- a) whether any unusual concentration of Chinese troops has been noticed recently along the Indo-Tibetan borders;
- b) whether any air exercises have also come to the notice from across the borders recently;
- c) if so, what are the details in this regard; and
- d) what steps are being taken by Government to meet the situation?

The Minister of Defence (Shri R. Venkataraman)

- a) and b) No, Sir
- c) and d) Do not arise

* * * * *

20 July 1982

Written Answers to Questions

INCREASED MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN TIBET

1009. Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy: Will the **Minister of Defence** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government is aware that China has prepared a number of air strips and constructed radar stations in certain strategic areas of Tibet and has also increased military activities on the border;
- (b) if so, what are the details in this regard and Government's reaction thereto;
- (c) whether it is also a fact that China is modernizing her atomic weapons missiles and airports on the Tibet border; and
- (d) if so, what are the details thereof and what action Government propose to take in the matter?

The Minister of Defence and Home Affairs (Shri R. Venkataraman):

- (a) and (b) government has information that there is a military activities in Tibet but there is no information to suggest any recent increase in military activity on the border. It will not be desirable to disclose further details. Government, however, keep all developments impinging our security under close watch and take adequate measures to maintain full defence preparedness.
- (c) and (d) There is no confirmed information on the modernizing of atomic weapons and missiles by China.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

24 March 1983

Written Answers to Questions

ARREST OF TIBETANS

2752. Shri Shiva Chandra: Will the **Minister of Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether some Tibetans have been arrested in the country in the last one month;
- (b) if so, how many and on what charges; and
- (c) what is the number of Tibetans who are still in jail and the reasons therefor?

Minister of State in Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Nihar Rajan Laskar):

- (a) & (b) Yes, Sir. 1465 Tibetans were arrested in Delhi for violation of prohibitory orders under section 144 Cr. P.C. 4 persons were arrested in Dehradun
- (c) None

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

25 March 1983

Written Answers to Questions

VISITS OF DELEGATIONS SENT BY THE DALAI LAMA TO CHINA

2898. Dr. Bhai Mahavir: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- a) whether Government have any information in regard to the Dalai Lama's delegations who visited China for negotiations;
- b) if so, to what extent Government are kept informed of such negotiations
- c) whether the Government of China have given indication to the Government of India for a peaceful settlement of the Tibetan issue; and
- d) if so, what are the details thereof?

The Minister of State in The Ministry of External Affairs (Shri A.A. Rahim):

- a) Yes, Sir. The Dalai Lama sent the fourth such delegation to China in April 1982.
- b) The negotiations are essentially between the Tibetan delegations and the authorities in China. Our officials are generally informed by the Tibetans from time to time as necessary.
- c) The question of Tibet and the Chinese policy towards that region of China are not a subject of discussion between the Government of India and China.
- d) Does not arise

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

12 December 1985

Written Answers to Questions

TIBET ISSUE IN INDO-CHINA TALKS

2522. Dr. Shyam Sundar Mohapatra: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- whether issue of Tibet is being featured in the Sino-Indian talks and what is India's stand; and
- whether the Tibetan representatives are being invited to project their views?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri K.R. Narayan)

- and (b) No Sir. Government consider Tibet to be an autonomous part of the People's Republic of China.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

26 November 1987

Written Answers to Questions

REPRESENTATION FROM TIBETANS RESIDING IN INDIA

2008: Shri Suresh Kalmadi: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- whether Government have recently received any representations from Tibetan people residing in India to review the Government policy towards Tibet and its people in view of the recent happenings in Tibet;
- if so, the details thereof; and
- what is the Government's attitude towards the recent development in Tibet?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri K. Natwar Singh):

- and b) Government have received representations from the Assembly of Tibetan People's Deputies, the Tibetan Youth Congress, Tibetan Women's Association and Tibetan Freedom Movement Committee urging Government to review its policy towards Tibet in view of recent happenings in Tibet.
- Government recognizes Tibet as an autonomous region of China. While India has long-standing cultural and religious contact with the people of Tibet, we have no desire to interfere to the internal happenings of Tibet.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

3 December, 1987

Written Answers to Questions

चीन और तिब्बत संबंधी मामला

२७९३ श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : क्या विदेश मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

- क्या सरकार निकट भविष्य में चीन और तिब्बत संबंधी मामले को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठाने का विचार रखते हैं!
- इस समय भारत में कुल कितने तिब्बती रह रहे हैं; और
- दलाई लामा के पांच सूत्री शान्ति कार्यक्रम पर सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है?

विदेश मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री के० नटवर सिंह)

- जी नहीं
- अक्तुबर १९८६ में ७४,०००
- यह कार्यक्रम एक ऐसा कार्यक्रम है जिसका ताल्लुक चीन और उस देश के एक स्वयत्तशासी क्षेत्र के बीच के संबंधों से है! सरकार इन पहलुओं पर किसी तरह विवाद में नहीं पडना चाहेगी!

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

3 December, 1987

Written Answers to Questions

ANTI-CHINESE RIOTS IN LHASA

2798. Shrimati Krishna Kaul: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- Whether Government's attention has been drawn to anti-Chinese riots in Lhasa in Tibet in the first week of October 1987;
- Whether the Chinese have blamed H.H the Dalai Lama for inciting these riots; and
- If so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shir K. Natwar Singh):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) Government have seen reports to this effect.
- (c) Government recognizes Tibet as an autonomous region of China.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

10 December 1987

Written Answers to Questions

CHINESE ACCUSATIONS OF BORDER VIOLATIONS BY INDIA

3646. Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that China has accused India of repeatedly crossing the line of actual control between the two countries, nibbling with Chinese territory violating Chinese air space and amassing troops along the borders; and
- (b) if so, what is Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri K. Natwar Singh):

- (a) Yes Sir
- (b) These accusations have been refuted by Government. Government have stressed the need for maintaining peace and tranquility along the border. It is Government's policy to settle all problem that arise along the India-China border through peaceful negotiations.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

10 December 1987

Written Answers to Questions

DEMANDS FROM TIBETAN LIVING IN INDIA

3647: Shri Ramsingbhai Pataliyabhai Rathvakoli: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether it is a fact that a number of demonstrations were held at Delhi, Bombay and various other places in the country during 1st January 1986 to 20th November, 1987 by various organizations of Tibetan people living in India;
- (b) If so, the reasons and the details thereof;
- (c) The details of arrests or detentions made during the same;
- (d) Whether Government has received charter of demands and representations of these people and organization at Delhi and at other parts of the country during the above period;
- (e) If so, the details thereof and what are their main demands and grievances; and
- (f) The reaction of the Government thereto and the action taken thereon?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri K. Natwar Singh):

- (a) Yes, Sir
- (b) The demonstrations were held to mark the observance of the "Lhasa Uprising Day", to protest against the officials level talks held between India and China in 1986 & 1987 and to express solidarity with Tibetans affected by the recent demonstrations in Lhasa.
- (c) According to available information, 217 Tibetan demonstrators were arrested during those period. They have been released.
- (d) and (e) Representations received from Tibetan groups requests, inter-alia, that the Tibetan issue should be raised at the United Nations, that the demand for Tibetan independence should be supported and that H.H. the Dalai Lama's 5-point Peace Plan also be supported.
- (f) Government regard Tibet as an autonomous region of China. Government would not like to be drawn into controversy in matters that concern relations between China and an autonomous region of that country.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

10 December 1987

Written Answers to Question

FACTS ABOUT TIBET

3648. Shri Ramsingbhai Pataliyabhai Rathvakoli: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the reported posters pamphlets, letters and cyclostyled papers, issued, published and pasted in Delhi and other places of the country very recently under the heading "Facts about Tibet" issued by Assembly of Tibet People's Deputies, Delhi

- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
(c) the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri K Natwar Singh):

- (a) and b) Government have seen the pamphlet entitled "Facts about Tibet" issued by the "Assembly of Tibetan Peoples' Deputies". The pamphlet disputes that Tibet is a part of China and opines that the "Tibetan people were totally opposes to the Chinese occupation of Tibet and still continue to do so".
c) Government regard Tibet as an autonomous region of China.

+++++

30 March 1989

Written Answers to Questions

तिब्बत में मार्शल-लां के विरूद्ध दिल्ली में प्रदर्शन

@ ३६४ ग. श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: क्या गृह मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि;

- (क) क्या तिब्बत में मार्शल-लां लगाये जाने के विरूद्ध हाल ही में दिल्ली में प्रदर्शन किये गये थे; यदि हां, तो वे प्रदर्शन किस-किस तारीख को और किस-किस स्थान पर किये गये थे; और
(ख) प्रदर्शनकारियों की मांगे क्या थी?

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन कार्यलय में राज्य मंत्री तथा गृह मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री (श्री पी.चिदम्बरम्)

(क) जी हां, श्रीमान! विवरण निम्न प्रकार से है:-

प्रदर्शन की तारीख	प्रदर्शन करने का स्थान
२७-२-८९	नई दिल्ली स्थित यू.एन.डी.पी.कार्यलय के बाहर
०६-३-८९	नई दिल्ली में चीनी दूतावास के नज़दीक
१०-३-८९	नई दिल्ली में इंडिया गेट के नज़दीक
१२-३-८९	-तदेव-
१३-३-८९	नई दिल्ली स्थित चीनी दूतावास के नज़दीक
१४-३-८९	नई दिल्ली स्थित चीनी दूतावास से बाहर
१५-३-८९	-तदेव-
१६-३-८९	-तदेव-
१७-३-८९	-तदेव-
१८-३-८९	नई दिल्ली में इंडिया गेट के नज़दीक

मुख्य मांगे निम्नलिखित थी:

- १) तिब्बत में तिब्बतियों को मानव अधिकार बहाल करना !
- २) तिब्बत से तिब्बतियों पर किए जा रहे अत्याचारों को बंद करना !
- ३) तिब्बत को स्वतंत्र करना !
- ४) तिब्बत में मार्शल-लां समाप्त करना !
- ५) पाचेन लामा की मृत्यु की जांच करना !
- ६) दलाई लामा के पांच-सूत्री कार्यक्रम और संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ द्वारा १९५९, १९६१ और १९६५ में पारित संकल्पों को लागू करना !
- ७) तिब्बती राजनैतिक कैदियों को रिहा करना !
- ८) संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ द्वारा हस्तक्षेप !

+++++

28 March 1990

Written Answers to Questions

SUPPORT FOR INDEPENDENCE OF TIBET

1982. Shri Santosh Bagrodia: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether it is a fact that some members of the Union Government have supported independence of Tibet; and
(b) If so, what is Governments' policy towards Tibet?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri I.K. Gujral)

- a) and b) The Government of India's stand on Tibet remains consistent and well-known. Tibet is recognized as an autonomous region of China

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

2 May 1990

Written Answers to Questions

तिब्बती शरणार्थी

८०. शंकर दयाल सिंह: क्या गृह मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

- (क) भारत में इस समय कुल कितने तिब्बती शरणार्थी हैं;
(ख) क्या उनमें से कुछ शरणार्थी तिब्बत वापस चले गये हैं; और
(ग) उनके पुनर्वास के लिए अब तक क्या उपाय किये गये हैं?

गृह मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सुबोध कान्त सहाय):

- क) देश में लगभग ८०,००० तिब्बती शरणार्थी हैं!
ख) १९८३ से कुल १११ तिब्बती शरणार्थी भारत से तिब्बत वापस गए!
ग) तिब्बती शरणार्थियों को आवास सहायता उपलब्ध कराई गई है और उन्हें जम्मू और कश्मीर, हिमाचल प्रदेश, पश्चिम बंगाल, सिक्किम, अरुणाचल प्रदेश, उड़ीसा, मध्य प्रदेश, महाराष्ट्र और कर्नाटक राज्यों में कृषि, हस्तशिल्प उन्मुख योजनाओं में बसाया गया है!

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

28 August 1990

Written Answers to Questions

सारनाथ में तिब्बतीयन संस्थान को आवंटित धनराशि

*२७२. श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह: क्या प्रधानमंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

- (क) सारनाथ स्थित तिब्बतीयन संस्थान के विकास के लिए पिछले तीन वर्षों में कितनी धनराशि आवंटित की गई थी; और
(ख) उक्त संस्थान में मुख्य रूप से किन-किन विषयों की पढाई हो रही है और किन किन देशों के छात्रों को वहां अध्ययन की सुविधा प्रदान की गई है?

मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री चिमन भाई मेहता):

- (क) सारनाथ स्थित केन्द्रीय उच्च तिब्बती शिक्षा संस्थान के लिए आवंटित की गई धन राशि इस प्रकार है:-

	१९८७-८८	१९८८-८९	१९८९-९०
योजनागत	६६.४०	४९.००	७०.०० (लाख रुपये में)
योजनेर	३१.००	४३.००	३७.८५
कुल:	९७.४०	९२.००	१०७.८५

- (ख) संस्थान में पढाई जाने वाले मुख्य विषय इस प्रकार हैं- तिब्बती अध्ययन, संस्कृत, तिब्बती, पाली, अग्रेजी और हिन्दी भाषाएं तथा एशियाई और तिब्बती इतिहास, राजनीति विज्ञान और अर्थशास्त्र! संस्थान में नेपाल, भुटान, संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका, जर्मनी, जापान, और कनाडा सहित विभिन्न देशों से अध्येता और छात्र आ रहे हैं!

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

RESTRICTION ON DALAI LAMA'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES IN INDIA

447. Shri Suresh Kalmadi: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- whether it is a fact that Government have issued directions restraining Dalai Lama from indulging in political activities in India; and
- if so, the details of such directions and the reasons therefore?

The Minister of State in the Prime Minister's Office (Shri Kamal Morarka):

- and (b) Government have all along maintained that H.H the Dalai Lama, who is a respected religious and spiritual leader, should not conduct political activities on Indian soil, incompatible with Government's well known stand on the status of Tibet

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

9 Dec 1991

Written Answers to Questions

तिब्बत के मामले में भारत का दृष्टिकोण

1670. श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: क्या विदेश मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे की:

- तिब्बत की स्वातंत्रता दिए जाने के मामले में भारत सरकार का दृष्टिकोण क्या है!
- इस समय भारत में कितने तिब्बती बसे हुए हैं; और
- वे मुख्यतया कहां-कहां बसे हुए हैं?

विदेश मंत्री (श्री माधवसिंह सोलंकी) :

- तिब्बत के संबंध में सरकार की नीति बराबर एक सी रही है और सुविदित है! सरकार तिब्बत को चीन का एक स्वायत्त क्षेत्र मानती है!
- इस समय भारत में बसे तिब्बती शरणार्थियों की संख्या ६८,६३९ है!
- तिब्बती शरणार्थी मुख्यतया हिमाचल प्रदेश, उत्तर प्रदेश, जम्मू और कश्मीर तथा कर्नाटक में बसे हैं!

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

26 April, 1995

Written Answers to Questions

चीन के कब्जे में भारतीय क्षेत्र

३५९६. श्री अनन्तराम जायसवाल : क्या विदेशी मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे की:

- क्या यह सच है कि भारत और चीन के बीच सीमा विवाद के संबंध में वार्ता हुई है;
- यदि हां, तो किन-किन मुद्दों पर क्या वार्ता हुई;
- चीन के कब्जे में भारत की कितनी वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन है और क्या हाल ही में दो देशों के बीच हुई वार्ता में भारत ने भी उक्त भूमि को मुक्त कराने के लिये मुद्दे पर बातचीत की थी और यदि हां, तो उसके क्या निष्कर्ष निकले;
- क्या भारत तिब्बत की मुक्ति के संबंध में चीन से विचार-विमर्श करेगा; और
- यदि हां, तो कब तक और और यदि नहीं, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं?

विदेश मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री आर० एल० भाटिया) :

- और (ख) भारत और चीन सीमा के निष्पक्ष, उपयुक्त और परस्पर स्वीकार्य समाधान के लिये भारत-चीन संयुक्त कार्य-दल की रूपरेखा के अन्तर्गत विचार-विमर्श चल रहा है!
- जम्मू एवं कश्मीर में लगभग ३८,००० वर्ग किलोमीटर क्षेत्र चीन के कब्जे में है! इसके अतिरिक्त १९६३ के तथाकथित चीन-पाकिस्तान 'सीमा करार' के अन्तर्गत पाकिस्तान ने पाकिस्तान आधिकृत कश्मीर में भारतीय क्षेत्र का लगभग ५१२० वर्ग किलोमीटर क्षेत्र अवैध रूप से चीन को दे दिया है! सीमा के प्रश्न के शांतिपूर्ण समाधान से संबंध मसलों पर भारत-चीन संयुक्त कार्यदल की ६ और ७ जुलाई, १९९४ को हुई सातवीं बैठक में विचार-विमर्श हुआ!

(घ) और (ड.) सरकार का विचार यह है कि तिब्बत से संबंध सभी मसलों का समाधान एक और चीनी अधिकारियों और दूसरी और तिब्बती समुदाय द्वारा शांतिपूर्ण वार्ता-ज़रिये ही किया जा सकता है!

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

19 December 1995

Written Answers to Questions

REOPENING OF OLD TRADE ROUTE TO TIBET

2349. Shri Virendra Kataria: Will the **Minister of Finance** be pleased to state:-

- (a) whether the Chief Minister of Sikkim has presented a Memorandum to the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister to take up various issues with China including reopening of the old trade route to Tibet through Nathula Pass so that the State may increase its commercial activities;
- (b) if so, the details of demand contained in the Memorandum; and
- (c) the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Dr. Debi Prasad Pal):

- (a) to (c) The Memorandum submitted by the Chief Minister of Sikkim to Prime Minister deals with a number of issues including border trade with China.

Border trade with China was resumed in July 1992, across the Lipulekh Pass in the UP-Tibet Sector of the India-China border. Trade across the Shipkila Pass in the Himachal Pradesh- Tibet Sector of the India-China border started in July 1994. The volume of border trade between India and China was Rs.22 lakhs in 1992, Rs.41 lakhs in 1993 and Rs.28 lakhs in 1994.

The issue of opening further trading points at Nathula (Sikkim) and Demchok (Ladakh) has been taken up with the Chinese side.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

26 February 1997

Written Answers to Questions

RATION CARDS AND PHOTO IDENTITY CARDS FOR TIBETAN REFUGEES

494. Shri Sanjay Dalmia: Will the **Minister of Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Tibetan refugees have been issued ration cards and photo identity cards;
- (b) if so, the details thereof, statewise;
- (c) whether they have the right to exercise their franchise and to contest election in India;
- (d) the details of economic assistance, facilities and protection; and
- (e) the expenditure incurred on them; year-wise?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Mohd. Maqbool Dar)

- (a) and (b) Tibetan refugees have been issued ration cards by various State Govts. However, they have not been issued Photo Identity cards by the Election Commission of India as they are not Indian citizens.
- (c) No, Sir.
- (d) Tibetan refugees have been provided rehabilitation assistance under various agricultural and handicraft schemes.
- (e) Upto the year 1992-93, an amount of Rs. 1616.23 lakhs was incurred on Tibetan refugees. After that, the following expenditure has been incurred during the last three years:

Year	Amount of Expenditure
1993-94	Nil
1994-95	Rs. 30 lakhs
1995-96	Rs. 34.32 lakhs

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

17 December 1998

Written Answers to Questions

STATEMENT OF DALAI LAMA REGARDING AUTONOMY FOR TIBET

2097. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that H.H. the Dalai Lama has stated that he is seeking autonomy for Tibet, as a part of China; and
- (b) if so, whether India is ready to offer its good offices to facilitate the process of dialogue between the Government of People's Republic of China and H.H. The Dalai Lama?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jaswant Singh):

- (a) According to reports available with Government, His Holiness the Dalai Lama, in a statement in Washington on November 10, 1998, stated, 'I am not seeking independence for Tibet, nor do my actions seek its separation from the people's Republic of China. I am for autonomy, genuine autonomy for' the Tibetan people to preserve their distinct identity and way of life.
- (b) According to reports, there are some prospects of negotiations between the Government of China and His Holiness the Dalai Lama. We would welcome such a process.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

16 December 1999

Question to be Answered

PROTEST BY TIBETAN REFUGEES AGAINST CHINESE DELEGATIONS

1583. Shri Swaraj Kaushal: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government are aware of the fact that whenever any Chinese delegation or leader visits India, the Tibetan refugees protest against them and as a result of which Indo-China relations are affected;
- (b) if so, whether Government have tried to talk to Dalai Lama in this regard; and
- (c) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jaswant Singh)

- (a) (b) & (c) Government's consistent policy in regard to Tibet is that it is an autonomous region of China. India has close historical and cultural ties with Tibet. The presence of Tibetans in India is to be seen in this context. Government do not permit Tibetans to engage in political activities. Activities that disrupt law and order are dealt with in accordance with our legal provisions.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

15 March 2000

Question to be Answered

TIBETAN REFUGEES

2159. Shri Swaraj Kaushal: Will the **Minister of Home Affairs** be pleased to state:-

- (a) what is the estimated number of Tibetan refugees in the country at present;
- (b) whether Government have made any arrangement to monitor their activities; and
- (c) if so, the details thereof ?

Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri. Ch.Vidyasagar Rao)

- (a) It is estimated that 93,100 Tibetan refugees are staying in the country at present.
- (b) and (c) Powers of the Central Government under different enactments governing the entry, stay, movement and exit of foreigners in India, including Tibetan refugees, have been entrusted to the State Governments/Union Territory Administrations under articles 239 and 258 of the Constitution of India. Suitable instructions are issued to the State Governments/Union Territory Administrations, from time to time, to monitor the activities of foreigners and to detect and deport those who are illegally staying in the country or are indulging in adverse activities.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

3 May 2000

Question to be Answered

TIBETAN DEMONSTRATION IN CAPITAL

3990. Shri Swaraj Kaushal: Will the **Minister of Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the effigy of Chinese President alongwith China's flag was burnt by the lady Tibetan demonstrators

- recently in New Delhi on the 41st Lady Rebellion Day;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
 - (c) the number of Tibetan ladies arrested in this regard; and
 - (d) the action taken against those ladies?

Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Ch.Vidyasagar Rao):

- (a) to (d) On 12 March, 2000 a group of Tibetan women held a demonstration at Parliament Street, New Delhi and burnt the effigy of the Chinese President alongwith 41 pieces of red cloth. 60 women demonstrators were detained by Delhi Police under section 65 of the Delhi Police Act, 1978 and were subsequently released.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

22 December 2000

Question to be Answered

RECOGNISING TIBETAN SYSTEM OF MEDICINE

3665. Shri Santosh Bagrodia: Will the **Minister of Health and Family Welfare** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government contemplate to recognize Tibetan system of medicine, which is a treatment based on herbal medicines;
- (b) whether Government would consider to take advantage of this system of medicine in the matter of planting herbal plants; and
- (c) if so, the steps taken or proposed to be taken in the matter and if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Shri A. Raja):

- (a) At present, there is no such proposal.
- (b) and (c) Central Council for Research in Ayurveda and Siddha (CCRAS), an autonomous research organisation under the Department of Indian system of Medicine and Homoeopathy has one Amchi Research Unit at Leh (Laddakh) which is engaged in research work on Amchi System of Medicine.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

26 April 2001

Question to be Answered

DEMONSTRATION BY TIBETAN REFUGEES DURING LI PENG'S VISIT

449. Shri Swaraj Kaushal: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Tibetan refugees had organised demonstrations during the visit of Chinese leader Li Peng;
- (b) if so, whether this was not a misuse of hospitality of the Indian Government;
- (c) whether Chinese Government has expressed their unhappiness over such demonstrations; and
- (d) whether these demonstrations come in the way of normalization of our ties with China?

The Minister of State for External Affairs (Shri U.V.Krishnam Raju):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) to (d) No, Sir.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

24 July 2003

Question to be Answered

CONSENSUS ON TIBET IN TALKS WITH CHINA

487. Shri Janeshwar Mishra: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that any new consensus has been reached between India and China on Tibet issue;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) whether it is also a fact that Tibetan refugees in India have opposed this new consensus?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Vinod Khanna):

- (a) There is no change in India's position on Tibet.
- (b) and (c) Does not arise.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

INDIA'S STAND ON TIBET

495. Shri Sanjay Nirupam: Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:-

- whether India has changed its stand that the Autonomous Region of Tibet is now recognised as a part of People's Republic of China;
- if so, the reasons thereof; and
- if not, what stand was taken by India during the Prime Minister's recent visit to China?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Vinod Khanna):

- There is no change in India's position on Tibet.
- Does not arise.
- In the Declaration on Principles for Relations and Comprehensive Cooperation signed by the two Prime Ministers on June 23, 2003, it is stated that 'the Indian side recognizes that the Tibet Autonomous Region is part of the territory of the People's Republic of China'.



24 July 2003

Re: Statement

**REGARDING VISIT TO GERMANY, ST. PETERSBURG,
EVIAN AND CHINA BY PRIME MINISTER**

प्रधान मंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी): सभापति जी, पिछले दो महीनों में मुझे जर्मनी, रूस फ्रांस और चीन की अपनी यात्रा के दौरान विश्व के कई नेताओं से मिलने का अवसर मिला। मैंने दिनांक 27 से 30 मई तक जर्मनी की यात्रा की। उसके बाद मैं राष्ट्रपति पुतिन के निमंत्रण पर सेंट पीटर्सबर्ग के त्रिशताब्दी समारोह में भाग लेने के लिए वहां गया। तत्पश्चात मैं राष्ट्रपति शिराक के निमंत्रण पर एवियान में जी-8 देशों की विस्तृत वार्ता में शामिल हुआ। दिनांक 22 जून से 27 जून तक मैंने अलग से चीन की यात्रा की।

जर्मनी और चीन की मेरी यात्राएं द्विपक्षीय थीं जबकि रूस और फ्रांस की यात्रा महत्वपूर्ण घटनाओं के उपलक्ष्य में थी जिनमें केवल चुनिंदा देशों को ही आमंत्रित किया गया था। ये सभी यात्राएं यूरोप और एशिया के प्रमुख देशों के साथ हमारी चलती हुई बातचीत तथा अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में भारत के बढ़ते हुए महत्व की मान्यता को दर्शाती हैं। मेरी इन यात्राओं से इन देशों के साथ हमारे द्विपक्षीय संबंधों को मजबूत करने और प्रमुख अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दों पर हमारे दृष्टिकोण को स्पष्ट करने का मौका मिला।

ऐसी यात्राओं से हमें अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समुदाय के महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दों पर दूसरे देशों के विचारों को बेहतर ढंग से समझने में भी मदद मिलती है।

जर्मनी की मेरी यात्रा चांसलर श्रोएडर के निमंत्रण पर थी जो उन्होंने अक्टूबर 2001 में भारत की अपनी यात्रा के दौरान मुझे दिया था। जर्मन नेतृत्व के साथ द्विपक्षीय संबंधों का विस्तार करने और उनमें तेजी लाने के बारे में मेरी उपयोगी बातचीत हुई। हमने क्षेत्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्दों पर भी विचारों का विस्तार से आदान-प्रदान किया। जर्मनी का मानना है कि आतंकवाद के खिलाफ विश्व स्तर पर दृढ़तापूर्वक कार्रवाई की जानी चाहिए वह कहीं भी हो और किसी के भी विरुद्ध चलाया गया हो।

भारत और जर्मनी, दोनों ही व्यापार और निवेश संबंधों में तेजी लाने के इच्छुक हैं। मैंने भारत में निवेश के अवसरों तथा भारत और जर्मनी के बीच अनेक अनुपूरक पहलुओं पर प्रकाश डाला जिनसे विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी सहयोग को अधिक बढ़ावा मिलता है। मुझे अनेक जर्मन सांसदों, व्यापार प्रतिनिधियों तथा भारत-विद्याशास्त्रियों से मिलने का मौका भी मिला। म्यूनिख में मेरी बवेरिया के मंत्री-अध्यक्ष एडमंड स्टोइबर के साथ लाभप्रद बातचीत हुई।

जर्मनी जो यूरोपीय संघ में हमारे सर्वाधिक महत्वपूर्ण वार्ताकारों में से एक है तथा जो जी-8 देशों का सदस्य और इस समय सुरक्षा परिषद का सदस्य भी है, के साथ अपने लगातार बढ़ रहे उच्च-स्तरीय संबंधों को हम महत्व देते हैं। प्रति वर्ष शिखर बैठकें आयोजित करने के हमारे निर्णय के अनुरूप हम अगले वर्ष चांसलर श्रोएडर के भारत आगमन की प्रतीक्षा में हैं।

सेंट पीटर्सबर्ग का 300वां वर्षगांठ समारोह शानदार एवं प्रभावशाली ढंग से मनाया गया। इस विशेष समारोह के लिए भारत को आमंत्रित करना भारत तथा रूसी संघ के बीच घनिष्ठ स्ट्रेटिजिक संबंधों का द्योतक है। यह भी कहना उचित होगा कि इस समारोह में विश्व के प्रमुख नेताओं की इतनी बड़ी संख्या में भागीदारी रूस के महत्व तथा अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर राष्ट्रपति पुतिन के सम्मान की प्रतीक थी।

सैंट पीटर्सबर्ग की मेरी यात्रा के दौरान मुझे राष्ट्रपति पुतिन, फ्रांस के राष्ट्रपति शिराक, चीन के राष्ट्रपति हू जिन्ताओ तथा ब्रिटेन के प्रधान मंत्री टोनी ब्लेयर के साथ द्विपक्षीय बैठकें करने का अवसर मिला। संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति बुश से भी मेरी अनौपचारिक बातचीत हुई।

राष्ट्रपति पुतिन के साथ अपनी मुलाकात में हमने द्विपक्षीय, क्षेत्रीय तथा अंतर्राष्ट्रीय हित के मुद्दों पर विचार-विमर्श किया। हम, दोनों देशों के बीच विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में व्यापक बातचीत जारी रखने पर सहमत हुए। राष्ट्रपति पुतिन ने भारत के साथ रक्षा संबंधों को और गहरा बनाने की रूस की प्रतिबद्धता को दोहराया। वार्षिक शिखर सम्मेलन की हमारी सामान्य प्रक्रिया के अनुरूप, मुझे आशा है कि मैं रूस का निकट भविष्य में द्विपक्षीय दौरा करूंगा।

जी-8 के देशों के साथ व्यापक बातचीत के लिए कुछ चुने हुए विकासशील देशों को आमंत्रित करने की पहल के लिए मैंने राष्ट्रपति शिराक को धन्यवाद दिया। बहुध्रुवीय विश्व के महत्व पर हमारी समान समझ थी जिसके लिए संयुक्त राष्ट्र का पुनर्गठन करना जरूरी माना गया।

प्रधान मंत्री ब्लेयर के साथ हुई बातचीत में हमने अपने द्विपक्षीय संबंधों के स्तर पर संतोष व्यक्त किया। प्रधान मंत्री ब्लेयर ने हमारी महत्वपूर्ण सुरक्षा चिंताओं के प्रति संवेदनशीलता और समझ-बूझ दर्शाई।

चीन के राष्ट्रपति हू जिन्ताओं के साथ मेरी मुलाकात में उन्होंने कहा कि चीन का नया नेतृत्व भारत के साथ मित्रता बढ़ाने पर बहुत बल देता है। हम इस बात पर सहमत हुए कि चीन और भारत, जो विश्व की कुल आबादी का एक तिहाई भाग है, को मिलकर प्रभावी ढंग से काम करना चाहिए ताकि 21वीं सदी को एशिया की सदी बनाया जा सके।

भारत उन 14 विकासशील देशों में से एक था जिन्हें एवियान में जी-8 देशों की विस्तृत वार्ता में आमंत्रित किया गया। इस वार्ता में स्वतंत्र रूप से तथा खुलकर बातचीत हुई जिसमें विभिन्न आर्थिक, विकास, पर्यावरण और सुरक्षा संबंधी तथा अन्य मुद्दों पर विकासशील देशों की चिंताओं पर प्रकाश डालने का मौका मिला।

मैंने अपने भाषण में, सहस्राब्दि विकास दौर के निष्कर्षों पर सार्थक अनुवर्तनी कार्यवाई करने की तत्काल जरूरत पर जोर दिया जिससे एक ऐसी विश्व-व्यापार व्यवस्था बनाई जा सके जो विकास को बढ़ावा दे सके। मैंने मौजूदा प्रतिबद्धताओं का पालन करने तथा विशेषकर अल्प-विकसित देशों में विकास हेतु अतिरिक्त वित्तीय संसाधन पैदा करने के नए विचारों की जांच करने की जरूरत पर बल दिया। मैंने सुझाव दिया कि यद्यपि क्योटो प्रोटोकॉल की पुष्टि नहीं हो पाई है, फिर भी, जैसा की प्रोटोकॉल में व्यवस्था की गयी है, प्रोत्साहनों और प्रौद्योगिकियों के हस्तांतरण के जरिए स्वच्छ ऊर्जा विकास को बढ़ावा दिया जाना चाहिए।

विकासशील देशों को उनके जैव-विविधता संसाधनों तथा उनके परंपरागत ज्ञान का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए समुचित क्षतिपूर्ति की जानी चाहिए। मैंने इस कटु सत्य की ओर ध्यान दिलाया कि यदि इन क्षेत्रों में तत्काल और स्पष्ट प्रगति नहीं होती तो विकासशील देशों में आर्थिक उदारीकरण तथा उत्तरदायित्वपूर्ण उपायों के लिए राजनैतिक समर्थन जल्दी ही बिखर जाएगा।

जी-8 शिखर बैठक के अवसर पर मुझे ब्राज़ील तथा मैक्सिको के राष्ट्रपतियों से मिलने का अवसर मिला। दोनों ही राष्ट्रपति इस बात पर सहमत थे कि विकासशील देशों की चिंताओं को प्रभावी ढंग से स्पष्ट करने के लिए विश्व व्यापार संगठन से जुड़े मुद्दों पर एक स्ट्रेटेजिक गठबंधन बनाने की, जी-15 जैसे समूहों में प्रभावी सहयोग बढ़ाने की और संयुक्त राष्ट्र को सुदृढ़ बनाने की जरूरत है।

जी-8 देशों की विस्तृत वार्ता विकसित और विकासशील देशों के बीच उच्चतम स्तर पर संपर्क बनाने का एक उपयोगी मंच बन सकती है। एवियान में पधारे कई प्रतिभागियों ने यह विचार प्रकट किया कि भविष्य में भी जी-8 की अध्यक्षता करने वाले देश इस पहल को जारी रखेंगे।

मैंने प्रधान मंत्री वन ज्याबाओ के निमंत्रण पर इस वर्ष 22 से 27 जून तक चीन की यात्रा की। लगभग दस वर्ष के बाद भारत के प्रधान मंत्री की यह चीन की पहली यात्रा थी। इस यात्रा से मुझे चीन के नए नेतृत्व के साथ व्यक्तिगत तौर पर बातचीत करने का अमूल्य अवसर प्राप्त हुआ। चीन में मेरा बड़ी गर्मजोशी और शालीनता के साथ स्वागत किया गया तथा मुझे इस बात का विशिष्ट रूप से एहसास दिलाया गया कि वे भी हमारी तरह परस्पर सद्भाव बनाने तथा हमारे द्विपक्षीय संबंधों में विविधता लाने के लिए पूरी तरह इच्छुक हैं। मेरी सभी बैठकों के दौरान आपसी विश्वास और समझ-बूझ पैदा करने की चल रही प्रक्रिया को मजबूत करने की दोनों पक्षों की प्रतिबद्धता

को दोहराया गया।

हमने दस समझौतों पर हस्ताक्षर किए जिनकी सूची सदन के पटल पर रखी गई है। भारत-चीन संबंधों में पहली बार दो प्रधान मंत्रियों द्वारा एक संयुक्त घोषणा-पत्र पर हस्ताक्षर किए गए। संयुक्त घोषणा-पत्र भी सदन के पटल पर रखा गया है। इस घोषणा-पत्र में उन सिद्धांतों और समान विचारों का उल्लेख किया गया है जिनसे हमारे द्विपक्षीय संबंधों के भावी विकास का मार्ग प्रशस्त होगा। इसमें बहुध्रुवता की ओर बढ़ते हुए रुख को मजबूत करने के लिए, विश्व व्यापार संगठन संबंधी मुद्दों पर और विकासशील देशों की चिंताओं पर हमारे दोनों देशों को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर मिलकर कार्य करने की प्रतिबद्धता की भी पुष्टि की गई है।

यह घोषणा-पत्र भारत-चीन सीमा प्रश्न के समाधान को दोनों देशों द्वारा दिए गए महत्व को परिलक्षित करता है। इस प्रश्न के अंतिम हल के सिद्धांतों पर कुछ समय से विचार-विमर्श चल रहा है। प्रधान मंत्री वन ज्याबाओ और मैं इस बात पर सहमत हुए कि समग्र द्विपक्षीय संबंधों के राजनैतिक परिप्रेक्ष्य में सीमा समाधान के ढांचे की खोज के जरिए इन चर्चाओं को एक नई गति प्रदान की जानी चाहिए। हमने इस प्रयोजन के लिए विशेष प्रतिनिधि नियुक्त किए हैं। राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा सलाहकार हमारे विशेष प्रतिनिधि होंगे। चीन ने अपनी ओर से अपने सबसे वरिष्ठ उप-विदेश मंत्री को नियुक्त किया है। प्रधान मंत्री वन ज्याबाओ तथा मैं इस बात पर भी सहमत हुए कि वास्तविक नियंत्रण रेखा के स्पष्टीकरण से संबंधित संयुक्त कार्य सहज रूप से जारी रहे तथा सीमा क्षेत्रों में बनी शांति और अमन-चैन को बरकरार रखा जाए।

हमारे द्विपक्षीय आर्थिक संबंधों पर विशेष बल दिया गया। मेरी यात्रा के दौरान चीन में सी.आई.आई., फिक्की तथा एसोचम (ASSOCHAM) के वरिष्ठ व्यवसायियों का एक बड़ा शिष्टमंडल मौजूद था। मैंने बीजिंग तथा शंघाई में भारत और चीन के व्यवसायियों की दो बैठकों को संबोधित किया जिनमें बड़ी संख्या में लोग उपस्थित थे। हमारे वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्री बीजिंग में चीन के संबद्ध मंत्रियों से मिले। उन्होंने संबंधित एजेंसियों तथा चीन के व्यवसायियों के साथ भी गहन विचार-विमर्श किया। हमारे संचार, सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी तथा विनिवेश मंत्री ने भी इसी तरह शंघाई में उपयोगी बातचीत की।

दोनों ही पक्ष हमारे आर्थिक संबंधों की क्षमता से भली-भांति अवगत थे। यह द्विपक्षीय आर्थिक सहयोग में संभावित प्रतिपूरक पहलुओं का पता लगाने के लिए एक संयुक्त अध्ययन दल गठित करने के निर्णय में परिलक्षित हुई। यह संयुक्त अध्ययन दल दोनों देशों की सरकारों को व्यापार बढ़ाने, निवेश को प्रोत्साहन देने तथा हमारे व्यापार समुदायों के बीच अधिक से अधिक सहयोग को बढ़ावा देने के लिए ठोस उपायों की सिफारिश करेगा। हमने आर्थिक संवाद एवं सहयोग तंत्र स्थापित करने का भी निर्णय लिया जिससे इस क्षेत्र में हमारा समन्वय मजबूत हो।

एक और महत्वपूर्ण बात यह रही कि भारत-चीन सीमा पर नाथुला दर्रे से सीमा व्यापार संबंधी ज्ञापन पर हस्ताक्षर किए गए। इससे भारत और चीन के बीच सीमा व्यापार के लिए एक तीसरा सीमा दर्रा नियुक्त हो गया है।

इस ज्ञापन के साथ ही हमने एक ऐसी प्रक्रिया की भी शुरुआत कर दी है जिससे भविष्य में भारत-चीन संबंधों में सिक्किम एक मुद्दा नहीं रहेगा। तिब्बत के संबंध में, मैं इस सदन को आश्वस्त करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी दशकों पुरानी नीति में कोई बदलाव नहीं आया है। हमने कभी भी इस बात पर संदेह व्यक्त नहीं किया कि तिब्बत स्वायत्तशासी क्षेत्र चीन लोक गणराज्य की भूमि का हिस्सा है। इसलिए इसे दोहराने के विरुद्ध कोई तर्क नहीं दिया जा सकता। हमने श्रद्धेय दलाई लामा अथवा तिब्बती शरणार्थियों की भारत में उपस्थिति के बारे में कोई नई बात नहीं कही है। मेरी यात्रा के दौरान हमारे सांस्कृतिक संबंधों को भी नए सिरे से बढ़ावा मिला। हम दिल्ली और बीजिंग में सांस्कृतिक केन्द्र स्थापित करने पर सहमत हुए हैं। मैंने बीजिंग विश्वविद्यालय में एक भारतीय अध्ययन केन्द्र का उद्घाटन किया तथा इस केन्द्र को चलाने के लिए भारत की ओर से कुछ अंशदान देने की घोषणा की। हमने अगले वर्ष पंचशील, जो कि भारत-चीन संबंधों की एक आधारशिला है, की 50वीं वर्षगांठ मनाने पर सहमति व्यक्त की है। मुझे लोयांग में व्हाइट हार्स टेंपल जाने का सुअवसर मिला जो भारत से चीन आने वाले प्रथम बौद्ध भिक्षुओं के आगमन का प्रतीक है तथा जो हमारे संबंधों के सांस्कृतिक और ऐतिहासिक आयाम को रेखांकित करता है। चीनी पक्ष कैलाश मानसरोवर यात्रा हेतु अतिरिक्त मार्ग खोलने के मेरे सुझाव पर विचार करने पर भी सहमत हुआ है। मेरी इस यात्रा के दो उद्देश्य पूरे हो गए - चीन के नए नेतृत्व के साथ घनिष्ठ संबंध स्थापित करना और हमारे विविध द्विपक्षीय सहयोग को नई गति प्रदान करना। हम चीन से इस बात पर सहमत हैं कि हम सौहार्दपूर्ण चर्चाओं के जरिए अपने मतभेदों को दूर करने के प्रयासों के साथ-साथ विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में परस्पर लाभदायक संबंध बनाए रखेंगे। मैं इन सभी यात्राओं के नतीजों से संतुष्ट हूँ।

जर्मनी के साथ हमारी वार्ता सुदृढ़ हुई है। राष्ट्रपति पुतिन एक बड़े बहुपक्षीय कार्यक्रम के मेज़बान के रूप में अपनी व्यस्तताओं के बावजूद पहले ही दिन आधी रात के बाद मेरे साथ द्विपक्षीय बैठक करने के लिए आए। यह इस बात का सूचक है कि वे हमारे द्विपक्षीय संबंधों को कितना महत्व देते हैं। राष्ट्रपति शिराक ने जी-8 विस्तृत वार्ता का इस ढंग से संचालन किया जिससे विकासशील देश होने के नाते हमारे विचारों का मूल महत्व उजागर हुआ। चीन के साथ आपसी विश्वास और समझबूझ बढ़ाने की दिशा में प्रगति हुई है। जिन नेताओं से भी मैं मिला, सभी ने स्वाभाविक रूप से दक्षिण एशिया की स्थिति में रुचि दिखाई। मुझे यह देखकर खुशी हुई है कि हमने पाकिस्तान की ओर मित्रता का जो हाथ बढ़ाया है, उसका सभी नेताओं ने समर्थन किया और सराहना की तथा यह आशा व्यक्त की कि पाकिस्तान भी इसका प्रत्युत्तर देगा। सभी ने आतंकवाद के खतरे की कड़े शब्दों में निंदा की। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि मेरे वार्ताकार क्षेत्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर शांति को बढ़ावा देने की हमारी नीति को पूरी तरह से समझते हैं। (समाप्त)

Shri Pranab Mukherjee: Sir, I would like to suggest for your consideration and for the consideration of the Government that this is a very important visit and, for the first time, a Joint Declaration has been signed by the two Prime Ministers - of China and India. Joint Declaration has been laid on the Table of the House. We have not yet got the opportunity of studying it. Therefore, my respectful submission to you is that kindly allow us to have a full-fledged discussion on the statement of the Prime Minister on a date convenient to the Prime Minister. If you kindly agree to it, we can suggest that let there be a full-fledged discussion on this statement. This is my submission for your consideration.

श्री सभापति : मैं इस पर विचार करूंगा।

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्री (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : सर, हमें स्वीकार है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति : ठीक है, स्वीकार हो गया तो अब विचार करने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है।... (व्यवधान)

Discussion on the Statement by the Prime Minister on his Recent Visits to Germany, St. Petersburg, Evian and China

The Deputy Chairman: Now, we will take up the discussion on the statement by Prime Minister, which he made on 24th July 2003. One and a half hour is being given for this discussion. Prime Minister has a meeting. So, we have to finish it within the stipulated time, or, may be early. So, kindly abide by the time frame and put pointed questions. Shri Natwar Singh.

Shri K. Natwar Singh (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful for the Treasury Benches for agreeing readily to have a discussion on the Prime Minister's visit to China and several other countries. He made a statement on 24th July and we sought a discussion on this important statement. Now, we, on this side, see Prime Minister's visit to China as a continuation of the process started by the former Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, in December 1988, where he broke a logjam which had lasted for too long and put behind him 1962 and undertook his trail-blazing visit to China. Your Government has come long way from May 1998, when, after the explosions at Pokhran on the 11th and 13th May, you wrote to the President of America, Mr. Bill Clinton, that these nuclear explosions were China-centric, that we had two neighbours who were hostile to us, one them at that time was a nuclear power. You did not have to give explanation to the American President; you owe an explanation to the people of India and to the Parliament of India, which was not forthcoming at that time and a Minister of yours called China as 'enemy number one'. So, what is happening?

Shri Swaraj Kaushal: Who said that? He never said that. Will you confirm that he ever said that China is enemy number one? You should be very certain about facts.... (Interruptions).

Shri K. Natwar Singh : I was a Member of the other House when this particular debate took place. I participated in the debate; I spoke in the debate; I opened the debate. You can check the records. If I am wrong, I will take back what I said. Are you satisfied now?

Shri Swaraj Kaushal: When did he say this? Did he ever say that China is our enemy?

Shri K. Natwar Singh: To the best of my recollection, he has said this. And, if he did not say, I will stand corrected. Now, Madam, through you, I want to know what has happened in these five years? Is it that events in Iraq and Afghanistan have

influenced your decision? As you said in Srinagar, what has happened in Iraq and Afghanistan हमारे लिए चेतावनी है। Now, we welcome this change in the attitude of your Government towards the People's Republic of China. I have personally some knowledge of Sino-Indian relations. I tried my best to keep in touch and abreast of the events; and I keep learning each day. I spent a year learning Chinese at Peking University, and China was my first posting over half a decade ago.

The statement that you made on the 24th is very comprehensive both in letter and spirit. It exudes friendship, warmth and good neighbourliness, which we welcome. At the same time, Madam, there are elements in this statement and the declaration, which make me seek some clarifications, and, I do so in the spirit of what Mr. Hubert Vedrine, distinguished Foreign Minister of France and friend of Jaswant Singhji, said:

“I am convinced that in our era, foreign policy must continually be explained. The public must know how its political leaders look at the world, how they assess the balance of power, and how they see the problems that our foreign policy confronts. The public must know the different options before the country and the reason for which, at the end of the day, we end up choosing one course of action rather than the other”.

Now, Sir, in a document issued by the Ministry of External Affairs, that was distributed to the Standing Committee on External Affairs on 11th of July – when we were discussing your visit to China – on page 7, it says,

“In February, 1979, the then External Affairs Minister Mr. A.B. Vajpayee paid a landmark visit to China”. Now, Sir, on 27th of April 1989, in this very House this is what he said.

“प्रधान मंत्री जी चीन गए थे, पाकिस्तान गए थे। ये देश हमारे पड़ोसी हैं। चीन के साथ हमारे संबंधों का एक बड़ा कटु अध्याय है। मैं स्वयं १९७९ में चीन गया था। बातचीत अच्छी हुई मगर उन्होंने उसी बीच वियतनाम पर हमला करके सारी यात्रा पर पानी फेर दिया”

The External Affairs Ministry calls it a landmark visit. It was a revert visit; you came back and you said this yourself, “इस बार इस तरह की कोई दुर्घटना नहीं हुई, मुझे संतोष है।”

Mr. Rajiv Gandhi did not have to return because the Chinese did not attack anybody, but when you were there they did. Now, similarly, with regard to Tibet, in your statement and in the declaration, it is said:

“On Tibet, I would like to assure this House that there is no change in our decades old policy. We have never doubted that the Tibet Autonomous Region is a part of the territory of the People's Republic of China.”

I will come to the various statements that have been made by the various Government since 1954 on Tibet. But, I would like to say, in the same debate, Madam, the distinguished Prime Minister, the then Leader of the Opposition, said this about Tibet, and on what Rajiv Gandhi had done on Tibet. On 27th April, 1989, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said:

“मैंने उस दिन सलाहकार समिति में भी यह प्रश्न उठाया था कि जब प्रधान मंत्री चीन गए और चीन के नेताओं ने तिब्बत का सवाल उठा दिया तो उन्होंने तिब्बत के बारे में हमें कुछ कहने का मौका दे दिया। मैं नेहरू जी का प्रशंसक हूँ मगर तिब्बत को चीन का अंग मानकर नेहरू जी ने हिमालय जैसी भूल की थी। यह भूल किस कारण हुई, इसमें मैं विस्तार से जाना नहीं चाहता। तिब्बत को भी स्वतंत्र होने का अधिकार है। तिब्बत को चीन का ऑटोनॉमस रीजन माना गया था। आज कहां है ऑटोनॉमी? मानवाधिकारों का उल्लंघन हो रहा है, मार्शल-लॉ घोषित कर दिया गया है, बड़े पैमाने पर दमन है, आतंक है।”

...and, continued like this. Now, Sir, if you allege Jawaharlal Nehru committed a Himalayan blunder, what blunder has you committed? A celestial blunder? Because, you have extended the language precisely used by Shri Rajiv Gandhi and Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, let me bring it to your notice, and I do say with the utmost respect. I quote from India-China joint communiqué issued on December 6, 1988: “The Chinese side expressed concern over anti-China activities by some Tibetan elements in India. The Indian side reiterated the longstanding and consistent policy of the Government of India that Tibet is autonomous region of China and that anti-China political activities by Tibetan elements are not permitted on the Indian soil. The India-China joint communiqué on December 16, 1991, Mr. Narasimha Rao was there, it says and I quote: “The Chinese side expressed concern about the continued activities in India by some Tibetans against their motherland and reiterated that Tibet was in alienable part of the Chinese territory and that it was firmly opposed to any attempt and action aimed at splitting China and bringing about independence of Tibet. The Indian side reiterated its

longstanding and consistent position that Tibet is an autonomous region of China and it does not allow the Tibetans to engage in anti China political activities in India". Declaration on Principles of Relations and Comprehensive Cooperation between the Republic of India and People's Republic of China, 2003, says "The Indian side recognizes that the Tibet autonomous region is part of the territory of People's Republic of China. Previously, it was, in 1988, "Tibet is an autonomous region of China"; in 1991, "Tibet is an autonomous region of China"; in 2003, "Tibet autonomous region is part of the territory of People's Republic of China". I am only concerned with the nuances. Nobody is disputing that Tibet is an autonomous region of China. It has been declared. I just want to request humbly and respectfully, if the Prime Minister could take the House into confidence, if there is any particular reason for the subtly and the slight change in language because these nuances are important. Number two, I also want to ask because the language used in 1954, was 'Tibet region of China', in 1958 'Tibet region is part of the People's Republic of China and, then, I have quoted other three. In all previous visits by the Prime Minister, there were either joint press communiqués or joint statements about a particular region for having a declaration, which were signed by you and your counterpart, Mr. Wen Jiabao has to have a declaration with your signature.

Now, with regard to Sikkim. In your statement, you were good enough to say that another development of significance is the Memorandum of Border Trader through Nathula Pass on the India-China boundary. This adds the third point of crossing for border trade between India and China. With this memorandum, we also start the process by which the Sikkim will cease to be an issue in India-China relations. I just wanted to ask through you, madam, from the hon. Prime Minister was it not possible to include Sikkim into the Declaration also? Was there any pressing reason that it was not included in the memorandum which was signed, I think, by the External Affairs Minister and the Commerce Minister of China?

Was there any exchange of views in this matter? Did we put across to the Chinese, bearing in mind the friendship between us and the Chinese Republic, the people of China, as friends, that it would help matters if Sikkim was included in the Declaration, rather than in the Memorandum? I do not know whether this discussion took place. And if you think that this is something, which cannot be declared, I will respect confidentiality because all matters cannot be discussed in the House, but I am sure, the House will be interested, the country will be interested, to know why Sikkim could not be included. I am not even going for reciprocity. I think, the people of Sikkim have... (Time-bell)

The Deputy Chairman: There are two speakers.

Shri K. Natwar Singh: I think this was known that this discussion would take place, and the Prime Minister should have arranged his schedule accordingly.

The Deputy Chairman: I go for the time. It is not my decision.

Shri K. Natwar Singh: Madam, I beg an indulgence. This is an important matter.

Madam, the people Sikkim have welcomed this arrangement; I am not critical. I am merely asking why this is not included in the Declaration.

Then, there was the question of the statement made on Arunachal Pradesh. We know that this incident took place on the 26th June when the distinguished Prime Minister was in Shanghai. It was made public a little later. Our position on Arunachal Pradesh is well known, and we reject Chinese contention that Arunachal Pradesh is not a part of India. This is nothing new that they have said. What I am requesting is to throw light on the fact as to why this incident took place at this particular time. I am not attributing any motives. It may be purely accidental because border has never been demarcated. Now you have appointed your national security advisor as the interlocutor on this, with his Chinese counterpart, and, I am sure, the two sides will agree to have some kind of a criterion on the basis of which the demarcation can begin; may be, now, or after some time. What I wanted to know was whether it was a pure accident. If it was a pure accident, then, I think, we could have accepted that. But the fact is that this incident does violate the letter and spirit of the 1993 Agreement and the 1996 Agreement. And if you allow, Madam, I will read out the relevant paragraphs because if an accident happens, or if either side crosses unintentionally, then a mechanism is provided in both these Agreements. In the 1993 Agreement, it was laid down:

"The two sides are of the view that the India-China boundary question shall be resolved through peaceful and friendly consultations. Neither side shall use or threaten to use force against the other by any means. Pending an

ultimate solution to the boundary question between the two countries, the two sides shall strictly respect and observe the line of actual control between the two sides. No activities of either side shall overstep the line of actual control. In case personnel of one side cross the line of actual control, upon being cautioned by the other side, they shall immediately pull back to their own side of the line of actual control. When necessary, the two sides shall jointly check and determine and segments of the line of actual control where they have different views as to its alignment.”

In November 1996, an Agreement was signed. It says:

“While conducting exercises with live ammunition in areas close to the line of actual control, precaution shall be taken to ensure that a bullet or a missile does not accidentally fall on the other side across the line of actual control.”

Article VI (4) says: “If the border personnel of the two sides come in a face to face situation due to differences on the alignment of the line of actual control or any other reason, they shall exercise self-restraint and take all necessary steps to avoid an escalation of the situation. Both sides shall also enter into immediate consultations through diplomatic and/or other available channels to review the situation and prevent any escalation of tension”.

Now, I don't know, Sir. But the newspaper reports are that the other side came into our territory, their claim is that our people went to that side and our people were disarmed and detained. This violates the spirit of both these Agreements. I am sure, the House would like to know from the Prime Minister whether we conveyed our disappointment at this incident or the manner in which it was handled and, certainly, the abrupt manner in which a pronouncement was made that the People's Republic of China did not recognize Arunachal Pradesh as part of the territory of India.

The Deputy Chairman: Thank you. Your party's time is over, Mr. Natwar Singh.

Shri K. Natwar Singh: Having said this, may I, once again, say that we have welcomed your visit to China. We have welcomed the sentiments expressed by both the countries in the Declaration and in your statement where you have said that the friendship between these two countries is good not only to us bilaterally but also for Asia. It is good for the world peace. It is good for a new international political order, if these two countries see eye-to-eye, which we do on so many issues. Ten agreements have been signed. These will further intensify our relations to the mutual benefit of both the countries. Therefore, you went to China with good wishes of the people of India and I am only hoping, Sir, that some of the clarifications that we have sought will be treated in the spirit in which they have been sought. Thank you very much.

The Deputy Chairman: Now, I have to abide by the time because the Prime Minister has a meeting and he has to go. Shri Ramachandraiah. Your party has 5 minutes. Please put your questions. A lot of ground has been covered by Shri Natwar Singh and you can put your questions.

Shri C. Ramachandraiah (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you, madam. I agree with the Prime Minister that though the Kyoto Protocol has been ratified, the encouragement for clean energy development should be pursued and, if necessary, through incentives and transfer of technologies. Although India is one of the countries, which has been committed to the use of renewable energy, much has to be done in this country. I am sure, the Prime Minister would have taken up many unresolved issues of WTO. The major issues, in my opinion, is to prevail upon the developed countries to withdraw the substantial subsidies that are being offered by them to their farmers for agricultural and allied activities so as to enable the developing countries like India to step up their agricultural exports. I personally feel, if it is not done, eventually, we will end up as net importers of even food grains also.

I congratulate the Prime Minister for his honesty in saying that the recurrent theme in all his meetings was the commitment of both sides to strengthen the ongoing process of building mutual trust and understanding. Apparently nothing tangible seems to have been achieved. But in all these meetings a commitment has been included. That is a very positive step. It has been stated in the statement that a process had been started by which Sikkim would cease to be an issue in Indo-China relations which has been chronic and recurring issue.

I should be frank in saying that the Prime Minister's trip has yielded some, however, small gains on the score. This time, the Chinese came around to state that Sikkim is a problem left over from history. We are certainly happy about it. But doubts continue to persist in the minds of a vast majority of our people as to whether we have achieved this success in relation to Sikkim, essentially by compromising on Tibet. There is a need for the Government to convince the people

of the country that nothing of that sort has been done. What is really paining is that immediately after the conclusion of what was considered as a successful visit, China has made a statement about Arunachal Pradesh and raised this issue, which it has been doing for the past five decades. Needless to say, the Government of India should again take up this issue with the Government of China. I personally feel that, on economic front, to pick up trade with China, which essentially an export-oriented country, is a distant dream. China with all its development, I feel, rather has got a very small domestic market for exports. It is one of the favourite centers for outsourcing for big economies like America and other countries. I have to put it differently. The export element in its economy is very strong and it needs the Indian market as it has been trying for overseas markets; whereas, we are also on the same length. But this is a matter of the future. It is not certain what economic cooperation between the two countries is really feasible and tenable. Nevertheless, efforts have to be put in. I congratulate the Prime Minister for making a *suo motu* statement, which has enabled us to discuss this issue. Thank you.

The Deputy Chairman: Shri Nilotpal Basu. You also have five minutes.

Shri Nilotpal Basu (West Bengal): I will not take even five minutes.

At the very outset, let me welcome, on behalf of my party, the initiative taken by the Prime Minister to visit all these countries, particularly China. Now the first question that I am going to put is this. We are in very troubled times, so far as the world is concerned. India is a developing country. We had discussed this issue in connection with 9/11 incident as well as subsequent Iraq war. I think it has been a great tradition in this country that overall foreign policy making has been marked with a great degree of national consensus and that was, of course, broken during the Pokharan blasts. But, subsequently, we have tried to have certain convergence of ideas. One of these convergence of ideas was on the question that unilateralism is bad for the world in general and particularly so for a country like India. We would like to judge the success of your visit, hon. Prime Minister, in the light of how far you have been able to utilize this tour to develop the idea of multilateralism. There are certain significant elements in your statement about an emerging scenario because in our assessment after the Iraq war, there has been a significant development in terms of pushing the idea of multilateralism and a whole lot of countries are, in fact, realizing that unless the United Nations' system is restored, unless the principle of multilateralism is restored, unless the rule of law is restored at the international level, the developing countries like India face a great degree of problem.

So, from that standpoint, we would like an assessment from you, hon. Prime Minister, as to how far this trip was successful. This is immediately connected with the question as to what extent the co-operation will be there with China on issues related to WTO—Shri Ramachandraiah has raised it—because this is another area where I think, there can be a close convergence between the Chinese and the Indian positions because today's world is as much a world of those who are having huge markets than as compared to those who are having the capital to invest in those markets. So, as the biggest markets, there would be areas of agreement which can be identified and then developed and on which there can be a great degree of convergence between the Indian and the Chinese positions. So, from that point of view, what is the progress made?

Thirdly, the other question which we would like to put and on which we, as CPI (M), are particularly happy because the original position, we had taken at that point of time on which we were charged of being traitors, seems to be now the national mood that the border disputes with China will have to be overcome through a process of dialogue. And, some progress has been in terms of setting up the Joint Working Group. So, would we ask the hon. Prime Minister: What is the tentative time-schedule? I ask this because very unfortunately, certain new questions have come up which are not really congenial to the process which was indicated in the Joint Declaration in so far as the border dispute question is concerned. So, what could be the tentative time-table?

Finally, Madam, a very small question again. I agree with some of the formulations of Ramachandraiahji. Now, in spite of the fact that there is an apparent assimilatory in our priorities in terms of the economic orientation in the sense that we also want to export and they also want to export, what could be the areas or sectors where there can be a real convergence and synergy of interests? Say, I.T. is one of the sectors which, in fact, the I.T. and Communications Minister has also elaborated. So, what are the areas where you think there can be some kind of convergence, including the I.T. which is a very good case because their strength is on the hardware sector and our strength is on the software sector. So, apart from I.T., what could be the other areas where you think there can be durable cooperation between the Indian and the Chinese Positions?

The Deputy Chairman: Shri.V.V. Raghavan. Now, here, I have a little difficulty because there are only 20 minutes and there are eight names. So, only two-and-a-half minutes to each Member.

Shri Ram Jethmalani: This is not fair.

The Deputy Chairman: It is not my responsibility. The time is allotted in the Business Advisory Committee. I am bound by it.

Shri V.V. Raghavan (Kerala): Madam, we welcome the Prime Minister's initiative in strengthening the trend of multipolar world order together with great countries, China, Russia, France and Germany. China, Russia, France and Germany together with India can play a very vital role in this crucial international situation today. The multipolar trend is to be strengthened jointly and any force, which wants hegemony in the world affairs, can pick up trails by these countries being together. That is very good trend which the hon. Prime Minister has strengthened by his historical visit. The Joint Declaration signed by our Prime Minister and the Chinese Premier is a milestone in the relationship of these two countries.

The joint effort on WTO issues, mobilising all the developing countries for safeguarding their very vital interests, is a very welcome step. That has to be pursued just now; the Cancun Ministerial Conference is to take place. Our Minister, Mr. Shourie, is there; but that is not enough. Very crucial issues, as far as India is concerned, are discussed in these Ministerial meetings. So, this joint effort for mobilising the developing countries to safeguard their vital interest is a welcome step. We must do something more to implement these things.

Madam, it is a very welcome step that a High-Powered Joint Commission has been set up to sort out our boundary issues. There are elements in our country also who do not like the relationship between India and China grows. There must be some elements trying to sabotage the growing cooperation between the two great nations. So, it is up to the hon. Prime Minister to see to it that such elements do not play havoc with the development of this cooperation and friendship between two nations.

The decision to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the *Panchsheel* is also very welcome. This celebration should be organised in such a way that the Non-aligned Movement is again revived and you lead the Movement in working towards a Multi-polar World Order. This is an urgent need.

Shri Manoj Bhattacharya (West Bengal): Madam, the time-limit of two-and-a-half minutes is too less to have a discussion. However, I will try to confine myself to this time-limit. Of course, I can ask some questions only; I cannot really discuss.

Madam, I thank the hon. Prime Minister for the statement he made on 24.7.2003. In the statement referred to in parts (a to d) of Rajya Sabha Starred Question No. 63 answered on 24.07.2003, it was mentioned:

“PM underlined the need to eliminate tariff and non-tariff barriers, especially phasing out all trade-distorting agricultural subsidies, removal of restrictions on the free movement of natural persons for providing services and border access of developing countries to pharmaceuticals”.

Madam, this goes without saying that we aspire to do so. Now, this in relation to the hon. Prime Minister's participation in the G-8 Enlarged Dialogue in Evian at the invitation of President Chirac. Incidentally, we observe that these sorts of words are exchanged but in fact, only the G-8 countries take the advantage. So, what great could come out following the participation of our Prime Minister at Evian meeting of the G-8? This is one.

Secondly, it is very interesting that para 19 of his statement, the Prime Minister says:

“Premier Wen Jiabao and I agreed that these discussions should be given a new momentum by exploring the framework of a boundary settlement from the political perspective of the overall bilateral relationship”.

What surprises me is that the Government of the People's Republic of China has put its senior-most Vice-Foreign Minister as a member in that Joint Commission, whereas we have not allowed any political personality to be there. Instead, we have Mr. Brajesh Mishra, who may have been an astute bureaucrat but I fail to understand what relation he has with the political developments, or, the political ethos of the country.

The hon. Prime Minister may kindly explain that,

Madam, kindly excuse me for raising this question. Some of the commentators, leading commentators on foreign affairs, in the recent past, in difference periodicals and newspapers are commenting that - I, of course, personally welcome this sort of efforts on the part of the hon. Prime Minister and the Government of India to promote good neighbourly relations, particularly with the People's Republic of China, with other neighbouring countries of ours, including Pakistan, of course - now everything in the Foreign Affairs Department is being regulated by the diktats or the desire- I should not say 'diktats' as it would be hurting the hon. Foreign Affairs Minister but the desire - of the U.S. State Department is omnipresent in the Foreign Affairs Department. I have started believing or I tend to believe so ... (interruptions) omnipresent, not omnipotent. I have also started believing so particularly after the news being published that a person like Ariel Sharon who is responsible for disturbing the entire Central Asia, who is continuously and perpetually attacking the freedom movement of the Palestinians for their democratic aspirations, is being invited to India. I am really very sorry to say this. So, personally, I have started feeling that practically everything is being dictated by the State Department of Washington. I have also started doubting whether some of the postulates of the hon. Prime Minister's visit to China were also articulated by them. That may also kindly be explained by the hon. Prime Minister. Madam, with these words, I conclude. I perhaps, have taken less than two-and-a-half minutes.

The Deputy Chairman: No, I think your subject was maths or something else because your calculations are a little wrong.

Shri Manoj Bhattacharya: Maths was also a subject of mine.

The Deputy Chairman: You better check your marks. Shri. R.S. Gavai.

Shri R.S. Gavai (Maharashtra): Madam, at the outset, I extend my thanks to the hon. Prime Minister for making a statement on his foreign visit. I have to seek only a few queries from the Prime Minister. I am not going to make any speech. During the Prime Minister's visit to China, India recognised "Tibet Autonomous Region" as a territory of the People's Republic of China. My further query is, by referring to Tibet Autonomous Region, the Government of India has, in a way, accepted Chinese claims that only "Tibet Autonomous Region" is the real Tibet, whereas the truth is that after occupying Tibet in 1949-50, China took away two of the three provinces of Tibet, namely, Kham and Amdo and assimilated them into adjoining Chinese provinces of Sichuan, Yunnan and Gansu, Qinghai and Kanlho. I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what is the policy of the Government of India on the rest of Tibet, which is outside the Tibet Autonomous Region. Does it mean that the Government of India has given up other parts of Tibet permanently?

Madam, my final query is, whether the Government of India is aware of the fact that a week after Prime Minister's return to India, China has decided to help Pakistan with Rs. 30 million to start a third nuclear power plant. I mean to say, China continues to support and provoke Pakistan against India in all possible manner. If China continues to use Pakistan as a proxy against India, how can the Government of India hope to improve relations with China? Thank you very much.

श्री बशिष्ठ नारायण सिंह (बिहार): उपसभापति महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य के बाद दूसरी बार इस सदन में उनकी यात्रा के संबंध में विचार-विमर्श हो रहा है। यद्यपि कई सवाल पूछे गये हैं और उनकी यात्रा के बाद कई टिप्पणियां भी आई हैं। मैं मानता हूँ कि हाल के वर्षों में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर भारत ने जितने जानदार और शानदार तरीके से अपने पक्ष को रखा है, उससे भारत की वैदेशिक नीति की सफलता जाहिर होती है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी की इन चार देशों की यात्रा में न केवल वैदेशिक मोर्चे पर बल्कि व्यापारिक और अन्य मुद्दों पर भी भारी सफलता मिली है और भारत के पक्ष को विदेशों में समझाने में बड़ी सहायता मिली है। मैं मानता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इधर हाल के वर्षों में जो प्रयास किया है, उसकी सफलता का मूल्यांकन आज के समय में तो सही ढंग से नहीं किया जा सकता लेकिन आने वाले वर्षों में किया जा सकता है - उसका असर भी होगा। लेकिन एक दो सवाल दिल और दिमाग में उठते हैं और लगता है कि उन सवालों पर भी साफ दृष्टि आ जाए और मन में जो शंकाएं पैदा होती हैं, उनका हल हो जाए तो यह बहुत अच्छी बात होगी। दस वर्षों के बाद चीन की यात्रा, और वार्ता के लिए पाकिस्तान के साथ रास्ता खोला जाए, यह अपने आपमें एक बहुत बड़ी सफलता है। भारत के पड़ोसी देशों के साथ भारत के संबंध अच्छे हो जाएं तो शायद आने वाले वर्षों में जो महाशक्तियां कहलाने वाले देश हैं, उनको इन देशों में हस्तक्षेप करने का मौका भी समाप्त हो जाएगा। इस दिशा में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सोच

समझकर तथा भविष्य को दृष्टि में रखकर ऐसी पहल की है, यह बहुत बड़ी बात है। लेकिन एक चीज़ हम जानना चाहते हैं। इसी देश में, तिब्बत के सवाल पर दलाई लामा जी रहे हैं और मानवाधिकार के सवाल, ऐट्रोसिटीज़ के सवाल, तिब्बती लोगों के जीवन की शैली - ये न केवल भारतीय परिधि के अंतर्गत उन्होंने उठाने का काम किया है बल्कि विश्व के मंचों पर भी उठाने का काम किया है। क्या इस बार की यात्रा, यद्यपि फॉरेन मिनिस्टर और प्रधान मंत्री जी की भी बात स्पष्ट रूप से आ गयी है कि तिब्बत के स्टैंड पर हमारा कोई परिवर्तन नहीं आया है लेकिन पीस के सवाल पर और हूमन राइट्स के सवाल पर श्री दलाई लामा जी ने इतने वर्षों तक जो की भारत में रहकर, न केवल भारत में बल्कि विदेश के स्तर पर काम किया है, क्या उसपर किसी स्तर पर कोई आंच तो नहीं आने वाली है? एक बात के लिए मैं इस बार बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने ब्यूरोक्रेटिक मोर्चे से की जाने वाली वार्ता को राजनायिक टेबल पर पूर्णतः लाकर एक बड़ी सफलता हासिल की है, शांति का एक नया दरवाज़ा और वार्तालाप का नया दौरा खोज दिया है इसके लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई देता हूँ और यात्रा में जो सफलता मिली है, उसके लिए बधाई देकर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

Shri Ram Jethmalani (Maharashtra): Madam, I wish to express my deep sense of unhappiness, and personal anguish. For really, forty years, I have heard the statements of Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. I have heard his speeches in Parliament. I have read about them. I have watched his political movements with great interest and great reverence. I admired him, I adored him. I projected him as a colossus. My regret is that I don't find that Atalji in this statement, at all. If within two and a half minutes I have to put questions, may I formulate my questions?

Mr. Prime Minister, I want to ask you. Have you forgotten all that you said before you became the Prime Minister on the subject of China? Do you want the nation also to forget that? May I remind you that there is a binding resolution of both Houses of Parliament in 1967, five years after the ignominious defeat? You opposed extension of the 1962 emergency. You told this House and you asked in rhetorical terms, "have you forgotten the scared pledge which we have taken in 1962?" Today, I want to ask you, have you forgotten the sacred pledge which you were reminding others about it in 1967?

I want to be a friend of China. I want India and China to become as thick friends as is possible. I want this phenomenon to take place as early as possible. I welcome all efforts. Indeed in your visit, you should have talked about this whole area becoming a nuclear free zone. We should get of our nuclear armaments - India Pakistan, China and even other Asian countries. Of course, we must develop friendly relations; but, Mr. Prime Minister, not at the cost of national honour and dignity. Tell this House that our case on China or against was flawed. I am one of those who in 1962 said, "There is something wrong with the Indian case." But at that time we were dubbed as being some kind of anti-national people that we were not supporting the cause of the country. But I think we were right. There is a flaw in our case. And if there is a flaw in our case, please, have the moral courage to stand up and say to the world that we were wrong and let those resolutions be modified. The problem of this border settlement is a very easy problem. Go to the International Court of Justice; tell them to appoint a commission of experts. Let both sides go to the commission, present their case and whatever the decision comes, we should gracefully accept it. By the Constitution of this country, you are bound by a Directive Principle to have all international disputes settled in arbitration. Not arbitration, go to adjudication. Find some group of responsible people, impartial people, independent people who can sit and resolve this problem. But you are wasting your time by appointing groups of officers, exchanging maps and in high sounding words, you merely tell us that they are still determining some kind of mechanisms which do not exist, which are in the air. Your Security Advisor, who is now going to handle this affair, I do not know what he knows about security at all. A person who could not keep a plane, an Indian Airlines Plane in Amritsar which led to the ignominious phenomenon of my very, very dear friend going all the way like a laundry man to give home delivery of those terrorists who were all sanitized, bagged, cleaned up and we went and delivered them in Kandahar. What is this Security Advisor? This Security Advisor knows nothing about security. For God's sake give it in better hands. Thank you.

श्री शंकर राय चौधरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे कोई सवाल नहीं पूछना है। मैं आपके मार्फत से माननीय, आदरणीय प्रधानमंत्री जी से कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। महोदय, एक कहावत है, बहुत पुरानी कहावत है कि "शादी और दोस्ती बराबर वालों में होती है"। आज जब हम चीन की तरफ अपनी दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ा रहे हैं तब हमें इसका खयाल रखना चाहिए। क्या हम और चीन बराबरी के दर्जे में हैं या नहीं हैं?

हम लोगों को इस सवाल का जवाब अपने दिल के अंदर, अपने आपसे पूछना पड़ेगा और फिर आगे बढ़ना पड़ेगा। मैं मानता हूँ कि जहाँ

बराबरी नहीं है, वहां दोस्ती नहीं हो सकती, वहां समझौते हो सकते हैं। समझौता हुआ है और मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूँ कि वे इस नाजुक मौके पर, जहां उन्हें काफी अहतियात से, दबे पांव, दबी जबान से जो कुछ करना था, उन्होंने वह बहुत अच्छी तरह से किया है। महोदय, इतिहास एक बहुत कठोर शिक्षक है। चीन के साथ हमारा पुराना इतिहास ट्वेन्सांग और फाह्यान का है तो एक नया इतिहास भी है। यह नया इतिहास १९५० से शुरू होता है। हम जब चीन के साथ समझौते कर रहे हैं तब लाज़िमी है कि १९५० से आगे वाला इतिहास हमें भूलना पड़ेगा लेकिन उसका एक हिस्सा और है अगर वह भूल गए तो हम बड़ी गलती करेंगे।

वह है १९६३ में चीन और पाकिस्तान के बीच जो समझौता हुआ है, जिसके तहत चीन ने पाकिस्तान को हर किस्म की मदद देकर-नॉर्थ कोरिया और चीन ने हर किस्म की मदद देकर - अपना एक उपग्रह बना दिया है, सैटेलाइट बना दिया है, जो कि हमको संभाल कर रखे और बाकी चीन अपना काम करता रहे। यह उनका नेशनल इन्टरेस्ट है और वे इस तरफ बढ़ रहे हैं। चीन के भी दो पहलू हैं, एक पहलू, जिसके साथ माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी अपने चीन सफर में मिले हैं और जिसके तहत १० एग्रीमेंट साइन हुए हैं। उनके साथ हमारा व्यापार बढ़ गया है और बढ़ रहा है। उनके साथ हमारे कल्चरल कांटेक्ट्स होंगे, टेक्नोलोजिकल कांटेक्ट्स होंगे। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है और यह होना चाहिए। लेकिन दूसरा पहलू हमारे सामने नहीं आता है। पाकिस्तान की तरह हमें (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: आप जरा टाइम का ध्यान रखेंगे।

श्री शंकर राय चौधरी: आधा मिनट! पाकिस्तान की तरह हमें यह पता होना चाहिए कि चीन की सरकार में पीपुल्स लिबरेशन आर्मी का बहुत ज्यादा हाथ है और चीन के प्रधानमंत्री, चीन के प्रेज़िडेंट के साथ हमारे प्रधानमंत्री मिले हैं। वे यंगजमिन साहब से भी मिले हैं, जो चाइनीज़ मिलिट्री कमीशन के अध्यक्ष हैं और चाइनीज़ कौंसिल के सीनियर मेंबर हैं। इसलिए जब हम चीन के साथ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाते हैं तो ये सब चीज़े याद रखते हुए बढ़ाएं। आखिर में मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को दोबारा बधाई देते हुए, एक और कहावत बताऊंगा, लेकिन इस दफा अंग्रेज़ी में -speak softly, but carry a big stick. यह स्टिक हमारे पास नहीं है। धन्यवाद।

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Yashwant Sinha, would you like to intervene now?

Shri Yashwant Sinha: Yes, Madam.

The Deputy Chairman: Okay. I have got three more speakers before me.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Yashwant Sinha): Thank you Madam Deputy Chairperson. I am grateful to the cross-section of this House for having responded so enthusiastically to the outcome of the visit of the hon. Prime Minister to China and to the other three countries in Europe.

Madam, naturally, most of the discussion has been confined to the outcome of his visit to China. But, the hon. Prime Minister, as he did in statement, also referred, in detail, to his visit to Germany, to Russia, particularly St. Petersburg, and to France for the Evian Summit. The European leg of this tour was equally fruitful because with Germany we were able to, once again, establish the tradition of annual visits at the highest level and the invitation that the hon. Prime Minister extended to the German Chancellor and his acceptance of that invitation would prove that we wish to continue the summit-level exchanges even in future. Our relations with Germany have grown substantially over a period of time, specially the economic part of the relationship, and there is also a great deal of political understanding on the international and regional issues between Germany and India and this was the nature of discussion that the hon. Prime Minister had with the Chancellor Schroeder.

In St. Petersburg, it was an occasion to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the founding of that city. The Indian Prime Minister, Madam, was among the forty-one other Heads of States who were invited along with two international organizations.

I am quite sure that the hon. Prime Minister, in this House, have not lost sight of the fact that at the dinner, which was hosted by President Putin, the Prime Minister of India was seated on a table where other participants were, apart from the host, namely, President Putin; the President of USA; the outgoing and incoming President of the European Union. This was a distinction; this was an honour, which was bestowed on the Prime Minister of India, on Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, in his personal capacity, as well as, on the great country, called, India.

Madam, Deputy Chairperson, I have had the opportunity of accompanying the Prime Minister on many of his trips, and I can say without any fear of contradiction that the Prime Minister of India, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee, is now internationally recognised as "A Man of Peace". He is respected; he is honoured, because they know that he is genuinely interested in peace. Recent initiatives, which the hon. Prime Minister has taken, are substantial and overwhelming proof of that.

With respect to China, Madam Deputy Chairperson, I am grateful especially to Mr. Natwar Singhji for having lent support to the visit, and the results achieved during the visit. He has raised a few questions. I will endeavour to reply to few of them. The first thing that I would like to say is that at this point of time, in our history, let us not indulge in the credit-taking game, because if we indulge in credit-taking game, then the blame game will also equally start. So, let us not go into the history of Indo-China relations, who did what at what point of time. The fact of the matter is that the Prime Minister of India went to China after a gap of ten years. And, this particular visit, we achieved results, which could only be described as landmark results, substantial results, path-breaking results, which will definitely take the relations, between these two countries, forward.

Of course, the world has changed after Iraq and Afghanistan episodes. The hon. Prime Minister was quite right in referring to it in his Srinagar speech, and his other speeches, conversations and dialogues that he has had. I think, nobody will disagree with the fact that we are living in a world, which is different. Therefore, a Foreign Policy is not frozen in time, it is not static. If it is dynamic, then, the Foreign Policy has also change along with time, along with developments at the international level.

The visit of 1979 of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, as a Foreign Minister, then, was a first contact, at a very high level, between China and India, after 1962. And, the importance of that visit arises from that. Let me also take the House, Madam, through you, into confidence and say that when the Prime Minister was in China, in meetings after meetings, it was the Chinese interlocutors, who kept referring to his 1979 visit, and reminding him of the dialogues that he had in Beijing at that point of time. There have been statements in the past, but there is a continuity in Government.

Policies don't change. Agreements, covenants are not disregarded or thrown into waste paper basket only because Governments change. That, certainly, is not the tradition of great countries; that is not the tradition of India. Therefore, while we are in Government, we are bound to honour all that has been done by the previous Governments. Agreements between two countries have to be respected until they are annulled by the methods prescribed. I would like to take a minute of your time, Madam, to point out here that what we have said on Tibet is something, which did not begin in 1998. It started in 1954. Between India and China, there was an Agreement of trade and intercourse between Tibet Region of China, and India in 1954. What did we say in that Agreement? We said.....

(Interruptions)

Shri K. Natwar Singh: I read this out.

Shri Yashwant Sinha: No, you did not read this out.

Shri K. Natwar Singh: No, I read this out. You did not hear it. It said, 'being desirous of promoting trade and cultural intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India.etc. etc. I read it out. It was the first item on my paper.

Shri Yashwant Sinha: Okay; okay. I will take it. Then, I will not repeat what Mr. Natwar Singh has said....(Interruptions) We said in 1954, '...being desirous of promoting trade and cultural intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India and of facilitating pilgrimage and travel by the peoples of China and India.' Then we went on to give the other parts of the Agreement. Then, did you quote the 1958 Agreement?

Shri K. Natwar Singh: Yes, I did.

Shri Yashwant Sinha: You did. This was a note sent by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of China in India. And there, we said, and I quote. "The Government of India recognizes that Tibetan Region is part of the People's Republic of China." The point to note is; we talked about the Tibet Region in both these formulations without talking about the autonomy of Tibet. After that, there was a change in 1988 when Shri Rajiv Gandhi went to China. Then we talked about Tibet as an Autonomous Region of China, and that formulation has continued with very minor variations. And that was the position which has been reflected in the Declaration which the Prime Minister signed with the

Chinese Prime Minister. Now, why was there a Declaration? This was the Question which Mr, Natwar Singh raised. There have been joint statements and there have been communications. Why a Joint Declaration to be signed by the Prime Ministers of the two countries? Only in order to emphasis the importance of that occasion, the Chinese and the Indian sides, both took the Prime Minister's visit to China as a very serious business. And when you have the serious bilateral business, you try and reach an agreement at the highest level. And by signing the Declaration, the two Prime Ministers have, in effect, given this importance to the visit, and this has happened, as is well-known, Madam, for the first time, that a declaration has been signed. And why a declaration has been signed? It is a comprehensive declaration. It is not merely relating to border, to Tibet or anything. It is a comprehensive document which talks about the aims, the objectives, of this declaration, the long-term objectives of the relationship between the two countries, and goes on to talk about a whole lot of economic issues. Mr. Ramachandraiah was talking about the WTO. Mr, Nilotpal Basu was talking about the WTO and the convergence or the complementarities of the two economies. I am sure, the House is aware, because there is a document in public domain, Madam, that both Governments have agreed to appoint an Expert Group of Economists and the concerned Government Officials. To do what? To do exactly this which Mr, Nilopal Basu has mentioned, to study complementarities of the two economies so that the future policy and the future direction of our relationship could be systematically determined.

On WTO, there is a great deal of convergence and our Commerce Minister, Madam, is already on record, having said that in his discussions, at multilateral forums, as well as at the bilateral level in Beijing, when he was accompanying the Prime Minister, there was a great deal of convergence of views between China and India. And, I am quite sure, that in the Ministerial which is taking place in Cancun, this convergence between China and India is going to play a very important role in determining the outcome of this Ministerial visit.

Now, Mr. Natwar Singh also raised the issue of why Sikkim was not included in the Declaration. Because Sikkim and Tibet are not linked. There was no question of linking; I mean, we didn't want to tell them because we are saying so on Tibet; therefore, you say this on Sikkim. Sikkim came in only because we signed a Border Trade Memorandum with them which flows or emerged out of the earlier agreements; and- when you say— when both sides say 'Sikkim State' we are referring to Indian State of Sikkim Quite clearly, I mean, we can't be referring to a Pakistani State; we can't be referring to a Myanmar State, when we are talking of a Sikkim State. That was the reason why the Prime Minister said in his Statement to this House that it is not going to be an issue. There will be more to follow.

Madam, now the Chinese Statement about Arunachal Pradesh and I will be done with this. Clearly, I mean this is something which is well known that we have a difference of opinion with regard to our boundary. We have a difference of perception even with regard to the Line of Actual Control. Therefore, with regard to what we consider to be our boundary, with regard to what we consider to be the line of Actual Control, we often send our patrols into those areas and if there are differences, then, the Chinese patrols also come. There was no premeditation. There could not have been, because they didn't know that we were going to send our patrol into that area on the 26th.. They could not have, therefore, planned this to embarrass the Prime Minister of India and ensure that the gains of his visit were lost. So, let us not connect it with that at all. It was a stray incident. Such sporadic incidents do take place; and as Mr. Natwar Singh, Madam, has quoted, there are agreements on how the people, the forces should conduct themselves in case they come face to face. We have a feeling that the Chinese patrolling party did not honour that particular agreement. Therefore, we have brought it to the notice of the Chinese Government through their Embassy here. We have also received their reply which is under our consideration, and we will take further steps with regard to the facts as we see them. Therefore, Madam, I would like to say that some of the things which have been raised about this having happened deliberately with a view to embarrass the Prime Minister are not correct.

Now, one more point which I would like to make is that as far as Tibet is concerned, the House is aware that what should be the autonomy of Tibet; what should be the range of that autonomy; what should be the relationship between Tibet and China, is something which third parties are not going to settle. This is something, which will be settled between His Holiness Dalai Lama and the Chinese Government. I am happy and I am sure the House is aware that they are already in touch with each other and those discussions are going on. But it has been the Government of India's policy ever since His Holiness Dalai Lama came to India and as is reiterated in all the agreements which have been read out here by Shri Natwar Singh ji that we regard him as a spiritual leader, as a religious guru and no Government has so far permitted Indian territory to be used for political purposes by the Tibetans, here and that is the reiteration which we made while in Beijing. So, all in all, Madam Deputy Chairperson, there is no difference in this House. As far as Mr. Ram

Jethmalani is concerned, I am sure the Prime Minister will, in his reply, be covering the points that he has raised, but as far as this House is concerned, this House, I take it, is fully behind the Prime Minister in his peace initiative with Pakistan. This has been an outstanding visit; this has been a landmark visit and I have no doubt, Madam, that with the initiatives which have been taken up between China and India, not only in the economic field, not only in the cultural field, but also in the political field, where the boundary question is outstanding, we will be able to make progress in future at a much faster pace than has been the case in the past. Thank you.

Shri Fali S. Nariman (Nominated): Madam, I have no questions because my hon. Friends have asked them all, but we all have our own opinions on how the Government conducts its policy at home, and we all vociferously express it here in this House. But, I believe that when the Prime Minister goes around the world and meets world leaders, the Prime Minister goes on behalf of the entire country, and therefore, I say with utmost respect to some of my hon. Friends, I believe, that this is neither the time nor the occasion for polemical speeches, or, searching questions. It is, I believe, a time for congratulations. The Prime Minister having made so many personal contracts with so many Executive Heads of State in a couple of Months, speaks volumes for his leadership and his energy. He has said in his statement that he as reason to be satisfied with the result of his visit. I personally feel that he has done us proud, and I would like to say so. Our country, by this visit, has been projected successfully as major player in the world affairs, and as an Indian citizen, not aligned to any political party, I would like to thank the Prime Minister for his statement on his visit abroad. Thank You. Madam.

Shri Swaraj Kaushal (Haryana): Madam, my friend, in fact, senior friend, Mr. Jethmalani, is never soft; and, if he is soft, its not Jethmalani. But, today his comments were rather harsh. I am sitting here on the Opposition benches, and we have seen and observed Mr. Jaswant Singh for good five years now. We have seen him interacting with Mr. Colin Powell, and my request to Mr. Jethmalani will be, we should not judge this man only by one fact, only by one incident. I believe, he has been one of the ablest External Affairs Ministers of this country, and this country should be proud of him. Now, I have a question—the External Affairs Minister could recall— regarding Shanghai-5. Madam, the Charter of Shanghai-5 is to fight terrorism, separatism, and the five countries who are members of Shanghai-5 decided to share intelligence and undertake joint operations, and their Charter includes not only fighting terrorism but also to fight separatism. And, this naturally interests us a great deal, Madam. And, Madam, there has been a demand for broadening the membership of Shanghai-5

(MR. CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR)

to include India, Iran and Uzbekistan. And, Sir, President Putin in a couple of his observations has been advocating that the membership of Shanghai-5 should be broadened to include India, Uzbekistan and Iran. In the last meeting of Shanghai_5, Mr. Chairman, Uzbekistan was present as an observer. Now, my question to the hon. Prime Minister is, did you discuss about broadening the membership of Shanghai-5 to include India? If so, what was the response of the Chinese leaders?

Shri Eduardo Faleiro (Goa): Mr. Chairman Sir, while congratulating the hon. Prime Minister on his visit to the four countries, I would seek two clarifications. Now, on the return of the hon. Prime Minister, this incident has been taken place in Arunchal Pradesh. And I can say this with full responsibility that the report of this incident in Arunachal Pradesh was leaked by our own Intelligence agencies, specifically the RAW, releasing and leaking this information to the Press.

Secondly, the hon. Foreign Minister has spoken of how this declaration on principles for relations and a comprehensive cooperation between the two countries is so very important. Now, the point made here, almost at the outset, in this declaration is that China and India agreed to strengthen multi- polarity at the international level. Now, this is being repeated, both in the meetings at the highest level with the Chinese leaders, and with the Russian leaders. This is being repeated to the point that Mr. Primakov, who came here as Foreign Minister and then as the Prime Minister, spoke about the strategic triangle of Russia, China and India. Now, the point is this: are our words and deeds in consonance or are they opposing each other? Because, I have here, Sir, a report of 18th of July in the People's Daily of Beijing, which is the main organ in Beijing and also an organ of the party there, on 'US dreams of Asian NATO'. And I am quoting, from the report of Beijing—and this United States, India holds an important strategic position, linking the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean." Now, this is important, "Talks between Pentagon senior advisers and their New Delhi counterparts were held in late May on the prospects for a new security system for an Asian version of NATO.

A Pentagon report recommended that the United States should construct a long-term alliance with India to contain

Washington's potential Asian adversaries, and particularly China." This has all been reported by the World Press also. And then, Sir- I quote again, "Washington's basic purpose for closer ties with India and an Asian version of NATO is to extend its status as the world's sole superpower." Now, General Myers, who is the Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff, the topmost man in the Defence establishment, came here just last week.

Mr. Chairman: Please, conclude.

Shri Eduardo Faleiro: Yes, Sir. General Myers came here. Now what was precept for the strategic partnership? The question I am asking is this, Sir: are we, the people of India, to become the foot soldiers of the American Empire? Are we to revert to the colonial or a semi-colony of the American Empire? I want clarifications from the hon. Prime Minister on these two matters. Thank you, Sir.

प्रधान मंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी): सभापति जी, मैं सभी माननीय सदस्यों को धन्यवाद देता हूँ जिन्होंने इस चर्चा में भाग लिया है। कुछ मुद्दे उठाये गये थे जिनका उत्तर मेरे सहयोगी श्री यशवंत सिन्हा जी ने दिया है। विदेशी मामलों पर बहस एक महत्व रखती है। उससे प्रकट होता है कि देश के चिंतन की दिशा क्या है और अधिसंख्यक जनता क्या चाहती है। मैं बहुत दिनों तक विरोधी दल में रहा तब श्री नटवर सिंह जी सत्ता पक्ष में थे, सत्ता पक्ष में नहीं थे, सत्ता में थे, राजदूत के रूप में और मुझे याद है, अगर मैं गलती नहीं करता कि मेरे एक भाषण के बाद श्री नटवर सिंह जी ने मुझे एक पत्र लिखा था और उसमें मुझे बधाई भी दी थी मेरे भाषण के लिए कि आपने बहुत अच्छा भाषण दिया। (व्यवधान)..

श्री के. नटवर सिंह: मैं आप को अब भी बधाई दे दूंगा, आप अच्छा भाषण दे दीजिए।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: नहीं, अब ज़रा बात बिगड़ गई है।

श्री सभापति: इनकी बधाई देने की आदत है, ये बधाई देंगे ही।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: अब छोटा सा सवाल उठाया जो कई बार उठाया जा चुका है। मुझे अच्छा नहीं लगता। राजीव गांधी हमारे बीच में नहीं हैं, हम सब उनका आदर करते हैं। वे चीन में गए थे। मगर मैं उससे पहले चीन गया था और मेरे साथ चीन का जो समझौता हुआ था वह यह था कि सीमा पर *peace* और *tranquility* बनाई रखी जाएगी। जो, बाद में श्री राजीव गांधी जब गए, उस समय दोहराया गया। अब कहा जाता है कि आपने राजीव गांधी का नाम नहीं लिया तो मैंने कहा कि राजीव गांधी ने मेरा नाम कब लिया था? लेकिन क्या डिबेट इस स्तर पर जाएगी? बहुत सी बातें जो मैं पहले कहता था - राम जेठमलानी जी ठीक कह रहे हैं, वे मेरे व्यक्तित्व में अब पुरानी झलक देखने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। वक्त बदल गया है। सबसे बड़ा परिवर्तन तो यह हुआ है। पहले मैं जनभावनाओं को प्रकट करता था और उन पर मैं अपना रंग भी चढाता था। अब मैं जनभावनाओं को ध्यान में रखता हूँ और राष्ट्रीयता का रंग चढाकर हर सवाल को देखता हूँ। अब कोई शिकायत कर सकता है। वह शिकायत जायज़ होगी कि आपने तिब्बत के बारे में पहले क्या कहा था? हां, मैंने कहा था और मुझे पीडा है। लेकिन इस पीडा का मैं क्या करूँ? इस पीडा को दूर करने का जो सबसे अच्छा उपाय हो सकता है, वह हमने निकालने की कोशिश की है। मैं फिर कहूँगा, इस बार मैं कोई दूर की कोड़ी नहीं लाना चाहता था। राजीव गांधी के साथ भी ऐसा हुआ था। उन्होंने इस परिवर्तन को लिया था, इसका उल्लेख किया था। पहले तो हम कहते थे और इसका उल्लेख हो चुका है, मैं उसे दोहराऊँ यह आवश्यक नहीं है - "तिब्बतन रीजन इज़ पार्ट" - इसमें आटोनोंमस नहीं था। पहली बार जब राजीव गांधी जी गए, उस समय जो वक्तव्य निकाला गया, उसमें यह बात कही गयी। इस बार भी इस बात पर जोर दिया गया है। अब इस बात को हम बार-बार कह भी नहीं सकते। तिब्बत रीजन बहुत बड़ा है और उसमें से एक आटोनोंमस रीजन है लेकिन यह फिर बहस को जन्म देने वाली बातें होंगी, मैं इसमें जाना नहीं चाहता। किन्तु इसमें कोई मतभेद नहीं है, परिवर्तन है। जेठमलानी जी की तारीफ है कि अभी भी वे ऐसी बातों के समर्थन में भाषण कर सकते हैं और अदालत में पैरवी कर सकते हैं जिनको उन्होंने पहले कभी नहीं माना और जिनके बारे में वे पूरी जानकारी भी नहीं रखते हैं। लेकिन खड़े हो जाते हैं, वकिलों का यह गुण है। वे अच्छी वकालत करते हैं। केस अगर हारने वाला भी हो तो जीतने की संभावना बढ सकती है। लेकिन मुझे यह कहकर चिढाना कि उस समय क्या कहा था? हां, कहा था। अब आप भूल गए? हां, भूल गए। आगे चलो। भविष्य की ओर देखो। कब तक हम इतिहास के बोझ को लादे हुए घूमते रहेंगे? इतिहास को तोड़ डालेंगे लेकिन इतिहास में हम भूल भूलैया में फंस नहीं सकते। भविष्य बनाना है और भारत भविष्य के निर्माण के द्वार पर खड़ा है, यह मेरी इस यात्रा में मैंने देखा है। भारत के प्रभाव को अन्य देश स्वीकार कर रहे हैं, वे हमारी महत्ता समझ रहे हैं। वे यह भी जानते हैं कि भारत कुछ सिध्दांतों से बंधा हुआ है। और उन सिध्दांतों पर दृढ़ रहेगा। हमारी इज़्जत बढेगी। सारे देश की इज़्जत बढ रही है, इसमें कोई मेरी इज़्जत नहीं बढ रही है। मैं तो आज हूँ,

कल नहीं रहूंगा लेकिन जो भी प्रधानमंत्री आएगा उसका सम्मान होना चाहिए, इस अर्थ में कि उसकी कहीं हुई बात को वजन दिया जाना चाहिए। मतभेद तो हो सकते हैं और मतभेदों को हम रौंदकर भी नहीं चलते, न ही मतभेदों की उपेक्षा करते हैं और न ही कोई चिढ़ाने वाली बात करते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस दृष्टि से यह चर्चा सार्थक रही। अरूणाचल के बारे में जो कुछ कहा जा चुका है, उतना पर्याप्त है। मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहता। हमारे और चीन के मतभेद हैं, परसेप्शन, लाइन ऑफ़ एक्चुअल कंट्रोल पर परसेप्शन में मतभेद हैं और वे सामने आ गए। लेकिन जिस तरह से हमारे लोगों के साथ व्यवहार हुआ वह उस मर्यादा के अनुकूल नहीं है जितना चीनियों ने स्वीकार किया था। इसकी ओर हमने उनका ध्यान दिलाया है। अन्य देशों में भी किस तरह की प्रवृत्तियां काम कर रही हैं। सत्ता पक्ष अलग है, जो प्रतिपक्ष में नहीं हैं लेकिन सत्ता में भी नहीं हैं, वे एक अलग दृष्टिकोण रखते हैं। इसकी भी जानकारी मिलती है। सब कम से कम इस मत के हैं कि भारत और चीन को साथ रहना चाहिए। भारत, चीन और रूस का नाम भी लिया जाता है। जब तीन विदेश मंत्रियों की बैठक हुई तो दुनिया के अनेक देशों ने नज़र उठाकर सोचा कि यह हो क्या रहा है। कोई किसी के खिलाफ़ षडयंत्र नहीं हो रहा था, किसी के विरुद्ध साज़िश करने के लिए हम इकट्ठा नहीं हुए थे। मगर चीन, भारत और रशिया, जब इन देशों के मंत्री मिले तो दुनिया ने समझा कि एक नया रास्ता खुल रहा है। बात आगे ज़्यादा नहीं बढ़ी क्योंकि सब देशों ने ठीक तरह से परिवर्तन नहीं किया है अपनी नीतियों में। समय लगेगा और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति हमें यह समझाती है कि जल्द मत करिए, धीरे-धीरे चलिए। जल्द छलांग लगाकर लाहोर पहुंच गये थे तो फिर कारगिल में आना पड़ा था वापस। अब हमारे मित्र समझ गए हैं और जो विरोधी दल के नेता आए थे वे भी कह रहे थे कि हां, धीरे-धीरे होना चाहिए, धीरे-धीरे। हम धीरे-धीरे चले, मित्रता के साथ रहे। पाकिस्तान के साथ भारत की मित्रता हो, यह बहुत ज़रूरी है। हम मिलकर रहे तभी संसार की चुनौतियों का उत्तर दे सकते हैं। लेकिन मिलकर रहने का मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम आतंकवाद के साथ समझौता कर ले या आतंकवाद को दरकिनार कर दे, दरगुज़र कर दे। आतंकवाद का मुकाबला करना होगा, उसको दृढ़ता के साथ कुचलना होगा और फिर मित्रता के हाथ बढ़ाकर, देश को ओर दोनों देशों को साथ-साथ ले जाकर अपनी गरीबी से लड़ने के खिलाफ़ प्रयत्न करना होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा यह उद्देश्य समान है और भारत और चीन इस दृष्टि से एक-दूसरे का सहयोग कर सकते हैं। डब्ल्यू. टी. ओ. में सपोर्ट करने की बात हुई है। मिलकर चलेंगे, इसका प्रयत्न होगा और हम चीन के साथ और भी व्यापार संबंध बढ़ाने का ध्यान रख रहे हैं। बढ़ाने की बहुत गुंजाइश है लेकिन शख़ शुबहा दूर होने में समय लगेगा और इसलिए उतावलापन ठीक नहीं है, मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

श्री सभापति: बहुत, बहुत धन्यवाद। सदन की कार्रवाई कल ग्यारह बजे तक के लिए स्थागित की जाती है।

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

4 August 2003

Question to be Answered

TIBETAN HERBAL MEDICINE RESEARCH CENTRE

1547. Shri Rumandla Ramachandrayya: Will the **Minister of Health and Family Welfare** be pleased to state:

- whether Tibetan Herbal Medicine Research-cum Treatment Centre is being set up on the outskirts of Vishakhapatnam;
- which Organization is setting up this Centre;
- whether Government are providing any help for this Centre; and
- if so, the details thereof?

Minister of Health and Family Welfare and Parliamentary Affairs (Smt. Sushma Swaraj):

- Yes, Sir.
- The centre is being set up by Smt. Yeluri Seshamma Memorial Educational Society.
- and (d) There is no Central Scheme to extend assistance.

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

11 August, 2003

Question to be Answered

TRADE LINK BETWEEN PITHORAGARH INDIA AND TAKLAHOT MANDI TIBET

2240. Shri Rajkumar Dhoot: Will the **Minister of Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

- whether it is a fact that the trade link route between Pithoragarh in Uttaranchal and Taklakot Mandi in Tibet under the Indo-China border trade could not be opened in June as usual, as Government did not convey their approval

- to the State Government;
- (b) if so, the reasons therefore;
- (c) whether Government have assessed the loss suffered by the traditional businessmen and the State Government on this account; and
- (d) the steps taken to restart the above trade link route?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Shri S.B. Mookherjee):

- (a) & (b) The trade link route between Pithoragarh in Uttaranchal and Taklakot Mandi in Tibet under the Indo-China border trade could not be opened in June, as usual, due to SARS in China.
- (c) While no assessment has been made by the Government for loss suffered by the traditional businessmen and the State Government on this account, trade has suffered partially.
- (d) The trade link route has already been resumed w.e.f. 1st July, 2003.

* * * * *

13 August 2003

Question to be Answered

CHANGE IN NATIONALITY BY TIBETAN MONASTERIES

2418. Shri B.P. Singhal: Will the **Minister of Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Dalai Lama is running several Tibetan Monasteries in India in which the name, religion and nationality of minor Indians are being changed as Tibetan Nationals;
- (b) if so, the details of the action taken by Government in the matter; and
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor?

Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Swami Chinmayanand):

- (a) Government is aware that Monasteries are functioning in various parts of India. No instances, relating to forcible change in the religion and nationality of minor Indian have come to the notice of the Government.
- (b) and (c) Does not arise

* * * * *

18 August 2003

Question to be Answered

FRAUD ST RESERVATION BY TIBETAN NATIONALS

2833. Shri B.P. Singhal: Will the **Minister of Tribal Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that some Tibetan nationals have obtained employment in Government sector by taking advantage of the reservation policy of SC/ST, falsely declaring themselves as ST Indian nationals and have thus enjoyed admissions in schools and obtained Government services on a regular and not under ad hoc basis;
- (b) if so, the number of such instances which have come to Government's notice; and
- (c) the action being taken by Government to punish such persons?

Minister of Tribal Affairs (Shri Jual Oram)

- (a) and (b) Only three cases of this nature have come to the notice of the Central Tibetan Schools Administration (CTSA) out of which allegations in two cases on verifications have not been found correct. Verification of the third cases is under process.
- (c) Action shall be taken as per rules after the process of verification is completed.

* * * * *

3 March, 2005

Question to be Answered

DEVELOPMENT OF ROAD TRANSPORT IN TIBET BY CHINA

356. Shri Ekanath K. Thakur (Manoj Bhattacharya): Will the **Minister of External Affairs** be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government are aware of the fact that China nearly doubled the length of its road transport network in Tibet to nearly 40,000 km. over the last decade;
- (b) if so, whether it is a fact that the state of infrastructure in India along the border is awful and it is the result of

- Government's policy of not developing connectivity along the frontiers; and
- (c) the action proposed to be taken in this regard?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri E. Ahamed)

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) No, Sir.
- (c) Government attaches importance to development of infrastructure in India's border areas. Our infrastructure development plans in the border areas are in place and the same is reviewed from time to time. While certain border roads are already under construction, others are in planning stage.

