

that I have not looked that side. I feel rather surprised; all the Members who have put supplementaries on this were on that side and not on any other side.

**Shri Ranga:** How can you expect the other side to put such questions?

**Mr. Speaker:** But his complaint was that I have not looked at the Opposition side.

### Change in Soviet Leadership

+

- \*144. {  
**Shri P. R. Chakraverti:**  
**Shri P. C. Borooah:**  
**Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:**  
**Shri S. N. Chaturvedi:**  
**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:**  
**Shrimati Renuka Ray:**  
**Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha:**  
**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:**  
**Shri Gulshan:**  
**Shri H. C. Soy:**  
**Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:**  
**Shri S. M. Banerjee:**  
**Shri B. K. Das:**  
**Shri Gokulananda Mohanty:**  
**Shri Rama Chandra Mallick:**  
**Shri Solanki:**  
**Shri Buta Singh:**  
**Shri Kapur Singh:**  
**Shri J. B. S. Bist:**  
**Shri Yashpal Singh:**  
**Shri Bishwanath Roy:**  
**Shri Nambiar:**  
**Shri Hem Raj:**  
**Shri Kishen Pattnayak:**  
**Shri Sham Lal Saraf:**  
**Shri Rameshwaranand:**  
**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:**

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the impact on Indo-Soviet relationship of the change of Soviet leadership;

(b) whether Government have been assured through diplomatic channels that the present leadership in U.S.S.R. will continue and carry forward the existing policy towards India; and

(c) whether the Soviet commitments made to India—political, economic or

military—will all be honoured by the new regime?

**The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh):** (a) Despite the recent change in Soviet leadership, Government are confident that the friendship and collaboration between India and the Soviet Union will continue.

(b) Yes, Sir. The Government of India has been assured through diplomatic channels that there would be no change in the Soviet policies towards India.

(c) In view of the assurances of the new Soviet Government it is expected that the Soviet commitments made to India will be honoured by the new regime.

**Shri P. R. Chakraverti:** Subsequent to the visit of Mr. Chou En-lai who has warned Soviet Russia against taking to Khrushchevism without Khrushchev, namely, peaceful co-existence and unreserved friendship with India, has Russia's attitude been reversed?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** No, there is no reversal of the Soviet policy towards India, even after the visit of the Prime Minister of China.

**Shri P. R. Chakraverti:** In the context of Shri Jaya Prakash Narain's fervent wish that his voice should reach the Prime Minister and Parliament, may I know what is Government's reaction to his statement that it was pathetic to see Indian leaders one after another assuring the country and themselves that there have been no changes in the policy of the Soviet Government and that that was misleading India?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** All that I say is that it is farthest from the mind of any one of us that the country should be misled. This is our assessment based upon the various assurances given by the Soviet leaders to our Ministers, to our Mission and also publicly. I think, it will not be quite charitable for us to take a critical view

of their approach which has been very friendly.

**Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:** Did Government, after the change in leadership in the USSR, seek any specific assurance from the Soviet Government regarding continuing arms and defence aid to India or they are depending simply on the general assurance given verbally by the Soviet leaders to our Ambassador and our visiting Ministers?

**Shri Swaran Singh:** Assurances between two Governments given at Ministers' level, or received at Ministers' level, are very important, and they should not be taken lightly, and I would suggest that this is not a very correct way of trying to explain away those assurances which are given at that high level. As I have said already, we have the assurances that whatever commitments have been made either in the economic field or for the supply of military hardware, would be honoured.

**Shri Ranga:** Arising out of this answer, may I remind the Minister of what happened in regard to such verbal assurances that we had between the late Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru and the Prime Minister of China, Mr. Chou En-lai? In view of all these things, would it not be better as far as possible—I am putting it guardedly—to reduce as much of these assurances as possible into writing, so that we can be on a little more firm ground?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Ranga, is it possible?

**Shri Ranga:** Twice I have used the words "as far as possible".

**Shri Swaran Singh:** If I may remind the hon. Member, the original agreements for economic assistance, or even with regard to supply of military hardware, are in writing. They are solemn documents, and therefore, it is the normal presumption that the contracting parties to any such arrangement would honour their commitments. If, besides that, there is this added

assurance at the highest level that there is no intention to get away or to abrogate any of the commitments, that I think should be enough, and beyond that to confirm by another written agreement is not the international convention.

## WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

### Science Symposium in Peking

- \*136. { Shri D. C. Sharma:  
      { Shri Kajrolkar:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether India has refused to collaborate in science with China and turned down an invitation to the Peking Symposium on Science; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

**The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh):** (a) and (b). On April 29, 1964 the Chinese Embassy at New Delhi sent a letter to the Ministry of External Affairs inviting the Association of Scientific Workers of India to send Indian scientists to attend the Science Symposium held at Peking in August 1964. On May 4, the Ministry of External Affairs replied to the Chinese Embassy that "in the context of the occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces and the consequent violation of India's territorial integrity by China, it would not be possible for any delegate from India to participate in the 1964 Peking Symposium." The Association of Scientific Workers of India also wrote to the Chinese Embassy expressing its inability to participate in the Peking Symposium. In a subsequent note the Chinese Embassy was told that "the Government and the people of India committed as they are to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, cannot enter into any 'international scientific and cultural exchange' with China, as long as China openly advocates the use of nuclear science for war-like purposes".