

LOK SABHA DEBATES

1307

LOK SABHA

Monday, May 29, 1967/Jyaishta 8, 1888
(Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Report to U.S. Congress by two U.S.
Senators

*121 Shri George Fernandes:

Shri J. H. Patel:
Shri Madhu Limaye:
Shri S. M. Joshi:
Shri P. M. Sayeed:
Shri Indrajit Gupta:
Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
Shri K. N. Tiwary:
Shri Swell:

Will the Minister of External Affairs
be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have
studied the report made to the U.S.
Congress by Senators Gale McGee and
Frank E. Moss after their recent study
mission to Central and South East
Asia; and

(b) whether a protest has been lod-
ged with the U.S. Government for
certain disparaging remarks against
India made by them in their report?

The Minister of External Affairs
(Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) and (b).
Yes, Sir. The report expresses some
critical opinions on aspects of India
with which we cannot agree, but we do
not find that it is intended to be dis-
paraging. In any case, it is not an official
U.S. Government report and the

1308

question of any protest to the U.S.
Government does not arise.

भी जांच करेगा; च: अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब
अमरीका सरकार के किसी भी व्यवहार के
बारे में हिन्दुस्तान में कोई भी बात छापी जाती
है, तो उस का खुलासा करने का काम हिन्दु-
स्तान में अमरीकी राजदूत या उन के किसी
द्वारे प्रवक्ता की ओर में किया जाता है,
जो उनका खुलासा हमारे मुक्त के अखबारों
में या उन की ओर से अखबार हैं, जैसे अम-
रीकन रिपोर्टर, में निकालते हैं। इसी तरह
ने हिन्दुस्तान के राजदूत भी वाशिंगटन
में हैं—तो जब हमारे मुक्त के बारे में इस
किस्म की कोई गलत बयानी हो, जैसा
इन दो सिम्मेदार अमरीकी सिनेटरों ने किया,
तो क्या इस का खुलासा या इस का खण्डन
हमारे यहाँ के राजदूत की ओर से किया
गया ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is not cor-
rect to say that the Ambassador has
not contradicted these wrong impres-
sions conveyed by the American Sena-
tors about India. In any case my hon.
friend will remember that it is very
difficult in the United States to get
things published in American news-
papers. I had that experience having
been Ambassador in that country. You
send a note or a letter to the New
York Times, but it just does not pub-
lish it. That way, our Press is
more considerate, if I may say so.
But our Embassy does its best through
the Press, through the radio and by
meeting the people who form public
opinion in the United States, to present
a true picture of India and what India
stands for. If my hon. friend does
not find it in the American papers, it
does not mean that we have not made
any attempt to get it.

श्री जार्ज करनेगोवः यदि किसी मुल्क में किसी धारणी को धरणी में जाना हो, तो सब से पहले उसके बारे में यह मानू-मात हासिल की जाती है कि उनके सिवासी विचार क्या हैं उसकी कहां की पैदाइश है, उसका धर्मशास्त्र इत्यादि लेने के बाद, उनके धरणी में जाने का न जाने का फैसला किया जाता है। इसी तरह में हमारे मुल्क में जो लोग पाते हैं और फिर यह हमारे मुल्क के बारे में बहुत ही गहन किस्म की बातें दुनिया में जाकर फैलाने का काम करते हैं, तो क्या सरकार यह विचार करेगी कि इस किस्म के लोगों का हिन्दुस्तान में घाने में मनाही की जाय ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I want to assure the House that, whether it is an American or an African or an Irish a clearance has to be obtained from the Home Ministry. No one is allowed, no one is given a visa, till we get a clearance about his credentials, about anything of his past that we know. That policy applies to Americans as well as to all foreigners entering our country.

Shri J. H. Patel: Asked a question in Kannada.

श्री जार्ज करनेगोवः : उन्होंने इतना ही पूछा है कि जो विचार उन दोनों मीनेटों में व्यक्त किया है क्या उनके लिये उन को कोई पुरस्कार देने का सरकार विचार कर रही है।

Mr. Speaker: If every question must be translated like this....

Shri M. C. Chagla: We are not thinking of giving any title or award to these senators.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : मेरा इम पर प्वाइन्ट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर है.....

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या प्वाइन्ट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर है।

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : मुन लीमिये।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Under what rule?

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्रथी तक अन्य भाषाओं में प्राप जो स्पीकिंग एनाउ करने हैं, उनका ट्रांसलेशन दे दिया जाता है। क्या स्पे:शन बाबर में भी हमारी संसदे में, जो कि गण्ड नहीं है, उन को एनाउ किया जायेगा और दूसरे धरणी उन को ट्रांसलट करेगे ?

श्री मधु लिमये : धनुवाद का इन्त-जाम हो।

Mr. Speaker: After all, it is for the whole House to decide, because it would mean translation again in different languages, because the answer also has got to be translated that takes away the little time that we have during the question Hour. If the House thinks it is necessary I have absolutely no objection. But I think it is wasting the time of the whole House and that will not be good. After all, we have allowed speeches, and we have made arrangements to get them translated. I am going to the maximum extent possible to accommodate hon. Members. If even those Members who know English start putting questions in other languages, then I would say that they are only wasting the time of the House and hon. Members will be the sufferers and not the Chair.

श्री मधु लिमये : धनुवाद का इन्त-जाम करने का फैसला हुआ है, वह कब तक होगा ?

Mr. Speaker: I do not know. If that could be done, I would be very happy; if mechanically we can get it done, I shall be very very happy. The Secretariat is at it and they are trying to do what best they can.

Now, Shri Madhu Limaye may ask his question.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अमरीका में जो हमारा दूतावास है, उसके सदस्य क्या अमरीका के जो मीनिटर्स हैं या जो हाउस ऑफ रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्स के सदस्य हैं, उन से सम्पर्क प्रस्थाति कर के अपना दृष्टिकोण उन को समझाने का प्रयास करते हैं ? यदि हाँ, तो क्या इन के सम्बन्ध में कोई रिपोर्ट सरकार के पास आती रहती है ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Yes, our Embassy is in constant contact with the Members of the American Senate and the American House of Representatives and we do get report from time to time as to what conversation took place and what the reactions were.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या इन के बारे में कोई रिपोर्ट आती है ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have, but I am not in a position to disclose it because it is a private conversation. We get the reaction of the Ambassador; he meets other Senators and he tries to clarify this. But obviously I cannot place that before the House.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Has the hon. Minister any information as to whether the visit of these two senators to India was in their private capacity or whether they had come on behalf of the US Congress to whom they had reported back? May I also know whether it has been seen that in their report, a summary of which has been published in our press here, they have recommended that this is just the appropriate moment when India's difficulties should be utilised by the United States to put various types of economic and political pressure on us? It is there stated in the report. If so, is this not highly objectionable in an official report by senators, to which we could legitimately take objection and make representations through diplomatic channels? Has any such action been taken, and if not, why not?

Shri M. C. Chagla: This was not an official delegation. This was a case

of two Members of the US Congress who visited this country. It would be like two Members of Parliament here going to the United States and then coming back and saying something about what they thought of America.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: They made a report to the Congress.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We would certainly object if the American Government were to protest to us about the impression of our Members of Parliament. That was their position. It was not an official delegation. If it was certainly we could have protested at the diplomatic level.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: On a point of order. The hon. Minister said . . .

श्री क० ना० लिबारी : इस तरह के जो लोग पार्लियामेंट के सम्बन्ध आते हैं . . .

Shri Indrajit Gupta: The hon. Minister says that it is just like two Members of the Indian Parliament going in their private capacities abroad and coming back and issuing a statement. This is a document made available by them to the US Congress, not a statement issued by them casually. Can two Members of this House who go abroad, come back and make an official report to this Parliament, if they had gone only in their private capacities?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Let me change the analogy. Suppose we were to appoint a Committee to go to the US and to report to Parliament. Can we entertain any representation by the US at the official level? It is entirely the concern of this Parliament. Similarly, it was the concern of the American Congress. They were important members, of course. They came here to inquire into various things. They made a report and it was discussed in Congress. That is the position.

श्री क० ना० लिबारी : ऐसी रिपोर्टों के बारे में यहाँ बहुत सी कम्प्लेंट्स आती रहती हैं। तो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने कौनसा

इसबाम किया है कि इस तरहकी रिपोर्टें जो विदेशों में प्रेषित होती रहती हैं उन का कट्टीबिषयान किया जाये और वहाँ की पब्लिक प्रोपोपिडियन के लिये टू. क्लैम्प्ट्स दिये जायें ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I think I have already answered that question.

Shri Swell: Among the various things these two Senators were reported to have mentioned in their report is this:

"We should allow more readily for Pakistan's anxiety about New Delhi and be less excitable over her proclivities towards Peking than is now the case".

This report of these two Senators came about the same time as the American Congress decided to resume sales of spares of military equipment to both India and Pakistan. In spite of all the hullabaloo that we raised, Washington seems to be unimpressed, the Government of USA seem to be unimpressed, with our protest, and their general attitude is that we can forget China for the next ten years. How and why is it that we have so singularly failed in putting our case across either to the representatives of America or of the Government of America and impress them with the urgency and genuineness of our situation?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As I have already said, we strongly disagree with many statements made in the report of these two Senators.

As regards our putting our case across to the US public and the US Government I assure the House that we have done everything that is possible to that end.

Shri Swell: My question was not seeking an assurance. It was: how and why is it that we have failed so miserably?

Shri Banga: Because we are failing miserably.

Mr. Speaker: Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Since the Minister is not in a position to deny that a report was actually made to the US Congress by these two Senators, which gave this report a certain quasi-official character, how is it that Government still continues to treat it as the personal observations of two visitors to India and how is it that it does not insist on a proper protest being made through diplomatic channels to the US Government?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I make a distinction between a delegation sent by the US Government which would be an official delegation and this team. Any remarks made by the former, if objectionable, would certainly require a protest on our part. But when two members of Congress as members of Congress, as parliamentarians, choose to come here and make a report to their own parliament, with great respect, it is not the report of an official government delegation.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: When their report goes to Congress, certainly it becomes an official document; if it had been to the US public, it would not have been.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Will the hon. Minister tell us how he proposes to allay the impressions which are bound to be created throughout the wide world by his statement that this Government is reluctant even to protest at the diplomatic level under the so-called rules of procedure which may or may not exist about the visit to this country by two Senators and their reporting to Congress with impunity about the happenings or their so-called impressions of this country which do not exist?

Shri M. C. Chagla: On proper occasions, we have protested, and protested strongly, to the US Government. We took the view that this was not an occasion where an official protest should be made. I have explained the reason why we came to that conclusion.

Shri Banga: Are we to understand that we give all these facilities to all kinds of Johnnies coming over from the United States of America or any other country to come over here, and then make such damaging reports about our country, go back and do whatever mischief they can? Have we no opportunity at all of ensuring that those people who come over here in this manner do not abuse the hospitality that we give to them?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As I said, we are very careful in seeing who comes to our country, whether it is an American or an African. These two were Senators.

Shri Banga: They were given special facilities here. They met all of you Ministers. You should have the courage to refuse interviews to these people. Anybody and everybody who comes, either from the House of Representatives or Senate, you simply prostrate before them, give them interviews. The doors open to them, not to your own people here.

Shri M. C. Chagla: When they interviewed the Ministers, we did not know what report they were going to give. If the Ministers had not seen them, we would have been criticised.

Shri Banga: You should not meet. We do not go and meet every Minister in America.

श्री शिव भारद्वाज : मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो दो मेमेटर्स यहाँ आये थे क्या वह अमरीका के रिपब्लिकन सिटिजन्स नहीं थे, और उन्होंने जो रिपोर्ट की उस के प्रजेन्ट हमारे प्रेम्ब्लेडर ने क्या ऐक्शन लिया और क्या वहाँ की गवर्नेमेंट ने कुछा कि उन्होंने हमारी बचतानी क्यों की ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: The two Senators were very responsible.

Shri Banga: They have shown themselves to be entirely irresponsible.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: After this, do not call them responsible.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Senator McGhee was a Democrat of Wyoming, a Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and formerly of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Senator Morse, also a Democrat, was from Iowa, and a member of the Government Operations Sub-Committee of the Senate. With regard to the second part of the question I have already answered it.

भारत-पाक संघर्ष के दौरान हुई पल्लियां

* 122. श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : क्या प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) पिछले भारत-पाक संघर्ष के दौरान हमारी सैनिक वृष्टि से क्या कमियाँ थीं;

(ख) क्या सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई जांच-पड़ताल की है; और

(ग) यदि हाँ, तो वे क्या हैं और सरकार ने उन कमियों को दूर करने के लिये क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) to (c). Although the experience of the Indo-Pakistan hostilities in 1965 generally, justified the soundness of our training methods, a detailed analysis was carried out with a view to making such changes in our organisation, training, tactical concepts and procurement etc. as may have been warranted by the experience of the hostilities. The results of the analysis have been made full use of broadly as follows:

- (i) measures were taken for development and manufacture of defence items within the country besides production through the public sector;
- (ii) training in the different training establishments was reorientated to the extent necessary;