any question of a conditional grant of 10 million pounds. This point may also be cleared.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, Mr. H. M. Patel is a good friend of mine. I do not like to give my reacton to what he has said. I may perhaps go point by point. About this offer of 10 million pounds, the terms are that we buy British goods and services. We have rejected that. This offer is conditional. He can work out the economics of it as to what it means. We have worked out and we have come to the conclusion that it is insignificant as compared to what we are going to lose.

It is a fact that they have given notice within the terms of the Agreement. But apart from the agreement of 1939, there is something like international commitment on the part of Britain to help developing countries. They have been professing it. U. S. A. also recognises that they will help developing countries. This is the main thing that we have taken objection to.

I do not say what they have done is legally wrong. They are not wrong. It is within the the terms of the Agreement. The British people will be the last people to do anything which is illegal and unconstitutional. They are very cautious people. I do not say that it is against Agreement or anything. But the question is of international commitment.

We also made some suggestions to them. If you permit me, Sir, I may explain what is unreasonable about it. We made four or five suggestions to them. Firstly, we told them, "You better postpone it for sometime till we develop our economy." Then, we asked them for phasing, that is, instead of applying 15 per cent at a time, it should be 4 per cent, 5 per cent, 3 per cent and so on, so that our economy is in a position to bear it. They did not agree to it.

Thirdly, we suggested inclusion of cotton textiles in U. K.'s offer under G. S. P. They did not agree.

Papers Laid

Fourthly, we suggested exploring field of complementarities, that is, areas in which there would be no conflict between British textile industry and Indian textile industry.

These are the four alternatives we offered to them in my letter and I also discussed with them on the 6th of May. In a letter I told them, 'Kindly consider these suggestions of ours.' But all of them have been turned down. Therefore, we feel that their decision or reaction, whatever you may call it, is not fair to us. It is, of course, within the terms of agreement. Mr. Patel asked me, 'Where is the question of principle'? Here is the question of principle. We believe in the idea of helping the developing countries. They have to be helped and they also are committed to this idea. Therefore, it is a question of principle.

One important paper of this country has said that we have acted in haste and should give second thought to the matter. We have not acted in haste. We have considered the whole thing and come to the conclusion that this is the only way that Indian could act, 12.52 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENT SHOWING ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON ASSURANCES ETC.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND TRANS-PORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given by the Ministers during the various sessions of Lok Sabha :--

Fourth Lok Sabha

Statement No. XXXIII
Statement No. XXVII
Statement No. XXV
Statement No. XXV
Statement No. XVV
Statement No. XIII
Statement No. VI
Statement No. V
Fift
Statement No. II
Statement No. I

Fourth Session, 1961 Fifth Session, 1968. Sixth Session, 1968. Seventh Session, 1969. Bight Session, 1969. Ninth Session, 1969. Tenth Session, 1970. Eleventh Session, 1970. Twelth Session, 1970.

Fifth Lok Sabha

First Session, 1971. Second Session, 1971.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-577/71]