

it to 5 per cent and later on to 10 per cent, so that that class of society which cannot afford to have its own telephone is able to have access to a public call office within easily walkable distance.

Another difficulty pointed out was about the time fixed for cancellation of trunk calls. It was said that 3 hours notice for cancellation was much too long. We have already reduced it to 30 minutes. This, I think, will meet a great deal of this difficulty.

There have been complaints here and in the press about the billing system. It has been said that a telephone call comes that you have not paid your bill and then the phone is disconnected. We are actively examining the possibility of introducing two methods. One is, like electricity bills, we should introduce the system of rebate or penalty, whatever you may call it, if a person does not pay the bill within a specified period. Secondly, even after that if the bill is not paid, we might send a registered notice, the cost of which may be borne by the subscriber himself.

**Shri Jyotirmoy Basu** (Diamond Harbour): What about inflated bills?

**Shri I. K. Gujral:** About the billing system, we are trying to mechanise it in all the bigger sections. It is not the computer; my friend need not get upset about it. It is just mechanisation, which will meet a great deal of this difficulty.

About philately, the newspapers have been making a point and our Prime Minister also wrote a letter sometime back that the quality of our stamps must be improved. We have decided that in the very near future we shall call an all-India seminar to discuss the various aspects of it, how to improve our stamps and make them better earners of foreign exchange. We propose to call all concerned—the

artists, philatelists and all those who understand this line from the export angle—to participate in this conference and help us in evolving a concerted policy in this regard.

**Shri Jyotirmoy Basu:** What are you doing about enhancement of cable rates by Britain?

**Shri I. K. Gujral:** I will not try to reply to that just now because the time at my disposal is short. I hope my colleague will reply to that point tomorrow. I will only say this that the U.K. Government has increased the rates only unilaterally. Therefore, what we decide is entirely our own business. We have not yet decided what we shall do about it, and I think by the time a decision is taken we will be able to come to this House and take the House into confidence.

**Shri Jyotirmoy Basu:** What about installing meters inside the premises of the subscribers for recording the numbers of calls made?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. The House will take up the half-hour-discussion.

17.42 hrs.

#### VIETNAM\*

**Shri Umanath** (Pudukkottai): Sir, regarding the half-hour-discussion which stands in the name of Shri Gopalan, because Shri Gopalan is absent, under Rule 55(v) I have applied for raising that discussion. But since Shri Krishnamoorthi, whose name is second on the list, is present in the House, he will speak for a few minutes and I will follow him.

**Shri V. Krishnamoorthi** (Cuddalore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister of External Affairs while replying to Starred Question No. 6 on 22nd May, 1967 regarding Vietnam stated that they were in touch with

[Shri V. Krishnamoorthi]

the Secretary-General of the United Nations and also with some countries with regard to Vietnam. I submit, Sir, India is the Chairman of the International Control Commission and its role is very important. Our effort to settle the Vietnam affair is more great than that of any other party. But I am sorry to point out that our Government has miserably failed. They have not taken proper initiative to bring about a peaceful settlement in the Vietnam affair.

As we all know, in Vietnam, our American friends in the guise of protecting the South Vietnamese against the so-called aggression by North Vietnam have poured millions of soldiers, American and Australian soldiers, and have dumped ammunitions and other things. Instead of doing good to Vietnam they have done more harm than what they expected from the North Vietnamese. In the past two years there have been killing, murders of both women and children and all sorts of things. There is no peaceful settlement of it at all. Both the parties, the Americans as well as the North Vietnamese, have understood, they have come to realise, that it is no use fighting and it will result in a loss to both the sides. In these circumstances our Government should take more effective steps to bring about a peaceful settlement. Instead of settling the matter the Government of India keeps quiet and things are developing fast. You must have read from the papers, Mr. Speaker, even today, that the North Vietnamese are not at all insisting upon any conditions for peace talks. I have also read in the Press that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, is not at all insisting that there must be certain conditions for peace talks. When both the parties are trying to meet together without any pre-conditions, it is the duty of the Government of India, which is the Chairman of the International Control Commission, to negotiate with both the parties and other countries with a view to solving this problem amicably.

I am sorry to say, our American friends, in the name of safeguarding democracy, freedom and other things, have entered into the arena of Vietnam, which is a black spot for the American people. They are doing one thing in respect of Vietnam. In order to avert attack by North Vietnam they have poured military arms and ammunition into Vietnam. But take the case of West Asia. Israel is attacking UAR. Instead of condemning, they are supporting Israel. So, I appeal to the Minister of External Affairs to take up this matter as an independent country and try to settle it with more vigour. I say that the Ministry has so far failed to bring about a settlement. It has got more onerous responsibility. Even though both the parties are trying to bring about a settlement, the Government of India has failed to negotiate with them. Without taking any more time I would appeal to the Minister of External Affairs to take a little more pain to bring about a peaceful settlement between both the parties.

**Shri Umanath:** This question gets added importance because of the fact that our country's representative happens to be the Chairman of the Control Commission. As far as our Government is concerned, I am sorry to say that it has ultimately taken up the objective position of shielding the American position, as far as Vietnam is concerned.

Let us take the question of withdrawal of American troops. It is shown as though this is a fight between North and South Vietnam Government, in which the South Vietnam Government has got an agreement, legal agreement, with the Americans because of which they are coming in. It is not so. I would submit that as far as the question of withdrawal of American troops is concerned, the entire Vietnam, both North and South Vietnam are one,

and they are against the American existence or presence there. To bring home the point I want to quote the *Indian Express* of 27-4-66, and *Indian Express*, as we all know, is run by Shri Goenka, who cannot be accused of being a Communist. That paper says

"In both North and South, whole of Vietnam is regarded as one country. By their behaviour, the people of South Vietnam seem to be insisting that they belong to North Vietnam—at least to the extent of desiring a withdrawal of US troops."

So on this question the entire Vietnam people want that the American troops should go. And yet if the American troops are there, what are they there for? They are there for some other purpose, and not because they want to fight. In this connection I would like to quote the then President of the United States, President Eisenhower. He had made it clear they are in Vietnam. At a conference of State Governors held on 4th August 1963 President Eisenhower said

"Let us assume we lose Indochina. The tin and tungsten that we so greatly value from that area would cease coming. So when the United States votes 400 million dollars to help that war, we are not voting a give-away program. We are voting for the cheapest way that we can, to prevent the occurrence of something that would be of a most terrible significance to the United States of America, our power and ability to get certain things we need, from the riches of the Indo-chinese territory and from South East Asia."

It is clear that though the entire Vietnam people do not want them, the American troops are there, as President Eisenhower puts it, to further

their own selfish interests. I am sorry to say that on this question our Government has not taken the position that the American troops should withdraw unconditionally.

Secondly, there is the question of the Geneva Agreement. Whenever the question of the Geneva Agreement is raised, they say "we are for the settlement of the issue by both the governments on the basis of the Geneva Agreement." That is not the correct position. It is not as if both the governments are violating the Geneva Agreement. It is not so. On that question it is not correct to say that the North Vietnamese have infiltrated into the South, that was the provocation for the South to retaliate and that is how they violated the Geneva Agreement. That is wrong. Within 24 hours of the signing of the Geneva Agreement, here is the statement made by the then President, General Eisenhower on 21-7-1954 which says

"The United States has not itself been party to or bound by the decisions taken by the conference. The Agreement contains features which we do not like."

So within 24 hours of the signing of the Geneva Agreement, here is the United States which renounces the agreement. So also the Dien Government. The then Prime Minister Mr Dien declared on 16-7-1955

"We did not sign the Geneva Agreement. So, we cannot be bound in any respect by these accords."

So, is it not clear that the United States of America as well as the South Vietnam Government renounced this agreement the moment it was signed? So, is it not but proper for our Government to say to the United States as well as the South Vietnam Government that they have got to implement the Geneva Agreement,

[Shri Umanath]

But our Government does not take that stand which it should take

Then, I would like to take the question of bombing of North Vietnam. Here also our Government takes up this position which is contained in the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's broadcast from New Delhi on 7th July, 1966 —

'We would appeal for an immediate ending of the bombing in North Vietnam

This should be closely followed by a cessation of hostilities as well as of hostile movements and action on all sides throughout Vietnam, in full observance of the Geneva Agreement."

Our Government tells America to stop bombing and simultaneously it tells the South Vietnam Liberation Movement to stop their liberation movement also. It means, by implication our Government says that so long as the South Vietnamese people do not stop their struggle and so long as they continue their struggle America is justified in bombing North Vietnam. This is a very horrible position which is not consistent with our past traditions of freedom struggle. The Government has to decide whether a sovereign country like North Vietnam, could be bombed by America and whether sovereignty could be violated. It is not a question of balancing between the two.

Then, I go to the question of trade. The present position is that our Government has stopped trading with North Vietnam. The other day when a question was put, Shri Chagla replied, "Yes, we have stopped it because the commodities that we send to North Vietnam may pass on to China." That was the reason given. My submission is that this is not the real reason, because if the reason is that a commodity will go through North Vietnam to China, there is Hong Kong attached to the mainland of China. Have we stopped our trade with Hong Kong? We know, daily

goods are passed between Hong Kong and Mainland China, still we have not stopped our trade with Hong Kong. Then, every now and then on the floor of the House the question is raised that some commodities are passing through Nepal to China, still, have you stopped trade with Nepal? We have not done so. We know that there are very close relations between Pakistan and China. Is there any guarantee that goods will not go through Pakistan to China? Still, we have not stopped our trade with Pakistan. Then, why have you stopped trade with North Vietnam?

The real position is that the answer given is not the answer, it is to cover up the real reason. Trade with North Vietnam was stopped in 1965 and in 1965 America passed an amendment to PL-480 Law which said that they would not give aid to those countries which had trade with North Vietnam or Cuba. On that basis in the same year 1965 we have also stopped trade with North Vietnam. Our Government has submitted to the dictates of America. We have got in our soul and we could straightaway tell them that we have a sovereign right to trade or not to trade with any country.

Then a very unfortunate position has come. Even the voice of the freedom fighters of Vietnam is being banned. I have received a communication from the National Book Agency of Calcutta that the Assistant Collector of Customs, Postal Appraising Department GPO Calcutta has addressed them saying why a particular book which has come by ordinary post should not be confiscated. What is the name of the book? It is *South Vietnam on the Road to Victory*. This is the book that has been confiscated.

Ours is a land which took pride in expressing solidarity with the freedom fighters in Spain, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia against the Fascist Mussolini and others and we have come

to a pass that our country has now become a country which gags the voice of freedom fighters of South Vietnam Has the Government banned any American literature? Has the Government banned any South Vietnamese literature which talks of their struggle against the Vietnamese people there?

The reason for confiscation given there is that it contains materials which undermine the friendly relations of India with foreign States This means, naturally their struggle is against American imperialism and they are afraid that America will mistake them This is a very horrible position It was only in the British days that literature concerning the Russian Revolution was prohibited by Britain Have we come to a pass that we have to take a position that Britain took then? I would like to have answers to these questions

**Mr. Speaker** A number of Members are there who want to ask questions Some of them have written to me that they want to participate in the debate I would like to tell them that there is no debate now but it is only a half an-hour discussion We have already spent about 15 minutes now Now only questions can be asked

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok** (South Delhi) The question of Vietnam has been agitating the minds of the people for a long time What is this problem? Here is an area that traditionally was a meeting-ground of India and China Culturally it is part of India but geographically it is nearer to China There have been wars between Vietnam and China for centuries Then the French came in With the precipitate withdrawal of the French after Dien Bien Phu there has been a power vacuum there, and China has been trying to fill that vacuum This is the real problem

China has carried war by proxy to that area Actually, the people of Vietnam would have very much liked India to fill that vacuum, but un-

fortunately because of our unrealistic foreign policy, India is nowhere in the picture and therefore, the Chinese are coming there and they are trying to subvert the constitutionally established government there and trying to bring it within their control This is the real crux of the problem

People talk of our moral duty to support freedom fighters, there I should say that in foreign policy, morality does not come in charity does not come in but only national interests come in We have to see what our national interests demand? Our national interests demand that Viet Nam which is a very strategic area should not be allowed to go under Chinese hegemony This is the real problem and this must be prevented

Our International Control Commission is ineffective In fact it does not serve any real purpose It was to have supervised truce and the elections but no elections have been held there The Commission was not meant to meet the situation that has developed there It cannot stop the war

The real thing is that peace must be brought there and it should be done in such a way that the whole area will not come under Chinese hegemony and that can be only done if China also is asked or pressed to stop its war by proxy We are not in favour of the American troops being there but we are equally opposed to the Chinese troops or the Chinese-supported troops of North Viet Nam being there

I am glad that a good thing has happened now North Viet Nam has suggested that they are prepared to sit down for peace talks without laying down any preconditions that the American troops must withdraw It is a good offer and both sides should avail of it and some kind of peace should be established which should be in the interests of those people without any interference from China or from America

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

So far as India is concerned, my submission is that the best course for India to follow is to keep quiet. Sometimes, keeping quiet is also a part of the policy, and here is a case in which instead of taking sides, we should keep quiet because thereby our interests would be served better than by any other course.

18 hrs.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): I would like to know from the hon. Minister if Government intend to pursue their present hesitant and lifeless and sometimes almost helpless policy in regard to Vietnam, in spite of our being chairman of the International Control Commission. I say this because a war of the utterest barbarity, even though it is undeclared, is being conducted by the United States, with 400,000 American soldiers operating on the scene, with America spending 22 billion dollars, which amounts to more than the total gross national product of our country, with methods like the use of poison gas and napalm and fragmentation bombs and cutting dykes and all kinds of other enormities which we have associated with the worst kind of fascism; and in spite of all this, our Government have a tepid attitude and only says from time to time, and that also very infrequently these days, about the necessity of stopping bombing of North Viet Nam, which has never stopped and which goes on all the time. May I know if Government are going to put up a braver show, because sometimes it is better to follow the Indian tradition of speaking up for what is right and just in international affairs, and here in Viet Nam something is being done by the American imperialists, which is of the utterest barbarity? May I, therefore, request the hon. Minister to revive something of the old spirit of India's foreign policy in regard to this matter which is a festering sore in international life today.

श्री राजकीर सिंह (रोहताक) : अमेरिका और चीन दो दुल्स की लड़ाई के दरमियान इस गरीब देश वियतनाम का कबुतर निकला जा रहा है और जितना इन्सानों के मरने से नुकसान घोर वहाँ की धन-दौलत का जितना नुकसान है वह ऐसी बात है कि जो कहीं नहीं जा सकती। हिन्दुस्तान एक भ्रमन का पुजारी देश है। सिक्कोरिटी कौंसिल का मेम्बर है, इन्टरनेशनल कंट्रोल कमीशन का चेयरमैन है। मैं मिनिस्टर माहब से आप के मार्फत यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कि जब हम भ्रमन का नारा बुलन्द करते हैं और हमारी सरहदों के पास एक ऐसा देश जो हमारे बडे नजदीक है, उसे जो हमारा दुश्मन है वह खत्म कर रहा है और उसे खत्म करने के बाद चीन से हमे भी नुकसान पहुच सकता है तो ऐसी हावात में मैं उन से पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या कोई स्पेसिफिक तजवीज उन के सामने है कि य० एन० ओ० के मार्फत या सिक्कोरिटी कौंसिल में कोई रेजोल्यूशन पेश करके या अपने बतौर एक इन्टरनेशनल स्टेटस के जो मिला है बतौर इन्टरनेशनल कंट्रोल कमीशन के चेयरमैन के, उस स्टेटस के मार्फत क्या हम अपना मार्ग प्रेशर या पोलिटिकल जो प्रेशर हो सकता है उस को एकमसाइज करके ताकि इस रोजन में भ्रमन हो और फिर आगे जो जेनेवा गेप्रीमेंट है उस की तजवीजात के इम्प्लीमेंटेशन की कोई तजवीज जेरे गौर है ?

श्री रबी राय (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सवाल यह है कि वियतनाम के सिलसिले में जब हमारे सदन में बहस हो रही है तो इस बारे में मैं बिदेस मंत्री से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो जो सवाल साम्यवादी दस के जगिए या अमेरिका के जगिए उठाए जाते हैं उस के बारे में हम को सोच विचार करना पड़ता है, हम को लगता है कि वियतनाम से ज्यादा बहुत्वपूर्ण सवाल रोडेसिया का

है जहाँ कार्बे लोगों के ऊपर बोरे लोप ब्राह्मण कर रहे हैं और फिलहाल जो अम्बिया के राष्ट्रपति धाये थे वह उसी सिलसिले में धाये थे। रूसी धाएगी का क्या दृष्टिकोण हो सकता है, अमेरिका की जनता का क्या दृष्टिकोण हो सकता है, हिन्दुस्तान की की जनता का क्या दृष्टिकोण हो सकता है, इन तीनों दृष्टिकोणों में फर्क है। असल में चीन हमारा दुश्मन है और चीन का बियतनाम के साथ, उत्तरी बियतनाम के साथ ताल्लुक रहता है। हो सकता है कि चीन सीधी सेना नहीं भेजता है डर के मारे। लेकिन आज इस सवाल को हिन्दुस्तान सरकार की धोर से, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की धोर से बियतनाम की धोर से देखना चाहिए। आज उत्तरी बियतनाम और दक्षिणी बियतनाम और उसी तरह से पूर्वी जर्मनी और पश्चिमी जर्मनी, इस तरह से साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियों ने जो तोड़ दिया है उस को फिर समान करने के लिए, जुटाने के लिए, एकत्र करने के लिए, यूनिटी लाने के लिए दोनों बियतनाम के लिए यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि भारत सरकार की धोर में पहल होनी चाहिए, यह नहीं कि क्या गोलाबारी होती है, अमेरिका से क्या कार्यवाही होती है उस सिलसिले में चिन्ता करे बल्कि बुनियादी सिलसिले में दोनों बियतनाम का जो विभाजन हो गया है, दोनों बियतनाम को मिलाए के लिए कोशिश होनी चाहिए यही हमारे सामने मसला है।

**Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli):** The hon. Member, Shri Umanath, has clearly explained as to how the Government of India....

**Mr. Speaker:** Since he has clearly explained it, no repetition is necessary.

**Shri Nambiar:** Please hear me. He has said that our trade with North Vietnam has stopped. At the same time, I want to point out that our trade with South Vietnam is on the increase. Moreover, strategic mate-

rials like brass sheets, strips, tyres and many items are being daily shipped to South Vietnam, and payment is made in dollars. This shows that not only do we not trade with North Vietnam but we help South Vietnam and thereby the Americans to fight North Vietnam and the Vietnamese people. At the same time, we have by our own action abdicated our role as chairmen of the International Control Commission and we are allowing the Americans to bomb even the neutral zone. We have asked the Control Commission to quit the neutral and demilitarised zone as well.

Moreover, it is also clear that not only the India Government is supporting the Vietnamese war, but certain political parties in India, particularly the Jan Sangh has been named by the radio as being ready to send volunteers to the Vietnam war.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** This is absolutely wrong.

**Shri Nambiar:** I will explain.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, please. You are going to a different subject.

There are half a dozen more. I think the Minister should reply now. It is 6.05 already.

Vietnam is a different thing. Let us not talk about Jan Sangh and other parties now.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** There are agents of China in this House.

**Shri Umanath:** Not American agents?

**Mr. Speaker:** Half an hour is over. Shall I ask the Minister, or shall I adjourn?

**Shri Nambiar:** It was Westmoreland, Commander-in-Chief of the American Forces in Vietnam who gave a broadcast....

**Mr. Speaker:** It was going on very well. Why do you want to spoil it?

**Shri Nambiar:** If such a broadcast was not made, I shall congratulate Mr. Madhok here and now. Let him clear the position.

**Mr. Speaker:** Please sit down. All right. Half an hour is over. Do you want to hear the Minister?

**An hon. Member:** Please allow me.

**Mr. Speaker:** How can I allow him? That is not proper. Either I allow all the half a dozen or I do not allow anyone. It is not proper to allow only one or two. How can I choose? Mr. Chagla.

**The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla):** I am really surprised that my friend Mr. Mukerjee should have said that our policy has been a hesitant policy. It is in sharp contrast with what Mr. Madhok says, that we should keep quite. I do not agree with Mr. Madhok. India, as Mr. Mukerjee has rightly said, has always spoken up in the cause of justice, in the cause of right. In the case of Vietnam, our policy all along has been consistent, and the right policy. From the very start we have said that there can be no military solution of the Vietnam problem. The solution can only be at the conference table.

We have said further that such a solution cannot be brought about unless there is unconditional cessation of war.

We have not stopped there. We have given every assistance to U Thant to bring about a peaceful solution. I cannot divulge to the House what we have done in the diplomatic field, but I assure the House we have a representative in Hanoi, we have a representative in Saigon and we have done whatever is possible to bring about a settlement.

May I remove one misapprehension from the mind of my friend Mr. Madhok! I agree with him that we should try and contain China, we

should not permit China to expand. Our view is that the present American policy, far from containing China, is helping China, and I will explain why. The more the bombing goes on, the more the war is escalated, the more North Vietnam is driven into the ambit of China. Does my friend Mr. Madhok know that China dominated North Vietnam for a thousand years? North Vietnam does not want to become a vassal of China.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** Yes, that is the right course.

**Shri Umanath:** I rise on a serious point of order. We have got diplomatic relations with North Vietnam. It is not in order for the Minister to say that a sovereign government is likely to become a vassal. Will we accept that position if any other Government says so about us? That is not fair.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no point of order.

**Shri Umanath:** Let him say about North Vietnam on merits, but to call a sovereign government ...

**Mr. Speaker:** Even North Vietnam may not be very much offended by that. Why are you? (*Interruptions*). The Minister has a right to have his opinion.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I have every right to say what is a historical fact, that North Vietnam does not want to be dominated by China.

**Shri Umanath:** No country wants it.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** Therefore, the longer the war goes on, the greater the escalation and the more North Vietnam has to turn to China for help and assistance. Therefore, we have been pleading with the United States that in the common objective of the containment of China, this war should be brought to an end. I must answer one or two questions which had been raised and which were based on com-

plete misunderstanding of the functioning of the International Control Commission. It was set up for a very limited purpose—to supervise the truce, not to face a war situation. If my hon friends look at article 29 of the Geneva Agreement, it enjoins on the Commission to ensure control and supervision of the execution which is possible only with the co-operation of the two parties. It has got no power to enforce the provisions of the Geneva agreement. Its only function is supervision and control, it can only investigate provided a complaint is received. When the complaint is received it passes a resolution which is confidential, it forwards the resolution to the two co-chairman, the UK and the USSR. It is for these two co-chairman to release or not to release that resolution. We are often asked what is the Commission doing? Why does it not do something to stop this terrible fighting? Hon Members do not realise that it is not within the power of the Commission, it has neither the machinery nor the jurisdiction power nor the capacity to stop in any way the terrible war that is going on. If they only study the Geneva agreement they will see how limited the functioning of this Commission is. Even within these limitations, it has served a useful purpose. It is a symbol of peace. I think even the North Vietnam Government is agreed that the Commission has served some useful purpose and that it should continue.

As regards trade with North Vietnam, my friend Mr Umanath is quite wrong about facts. He said that our trade with North Vietnam stopped due to the food agreement we signed with the United States in 1965. It is not so. It was in 1963—much earlier than 1965—that instructions were issued that all exports to North Vietnam required prior clearance and the reason for that was given here in answer to a question, namely, that we found that goods which we sent to North Vietnam were being diverted to China. (Interruptions) Mr

Umanath's accusation was that we were influenced and coerced by the United States.

Shri Umanath. Even now I say it. Why do you send it to Hong Kong?

Shri M. C. Chaglia. I say it is not correct. With regard to South Vietnam the position is equally clear. The sale of lethal weapons is banned. Normal trade in textiles, etc. continues. Civilian trucks were exported by some private parties. The export of petroleum and petroleum products has been banned so that we do not send anything to South Vietnam which could be used in a war.

Shri Nambrar Brass sheets, strips, tyres, etc. (Interruptions)

Shri E. K. Nayanar (Palghat) On a point of order. What the Minister is saying is wrong.

Mr. Speaker. He may be wrong, but what he has said, he has said.

Shri E. K. Nayanar. On May 20 last, the public sector undertaking, Hindustan Steel shipped 121 tons of iron rounds to South Vietnam. This was exported. This was done by a public sector undertaking of the Government of India. But what the Minister says now is that there was no such trade. It is wrong.

Shri M. C. Chaglia: My hon friend Shri Umanath mentioned about banning a book. That is a matter which as he knows comes under the Sea Customs Act and it is within the jurisdiction of the Finance Ministry and not within the External Affairs Ministry, and he might put that question to the Ministry concerned.

— There is one thing more. This morning we have seen the news which should be welcome to the whole House. This is a statement made by Lord Brockway who is as strongly opposed to this war as this country is and most Members of this House are.

**Shri S. Kandappan (Mettur)** Has it been confirmed? Has it got any veracity?

**Shri M. C. Chaglia:** Not confirmed, but I take it—as Lord Brockway has said it—as correct. According to Lord Brockway, the Vietnam representatives at the Peace in Vietnam Conference at Stockholm which he attended had narrowed down the demands to three: an unconditional halt to bombing of North Vietnam, admission of direct representatives of the liberation front to negotiation, and a peace settlement conforming to the terms of the Geneva agreement. I sincerely hope that the reaction of the United States to this would be favourable, that this narrowing down of the demands, as Lord Brockway has said, and that North Vietnam is prepared to come to terms or to dis-

cuss and settle, will induce the United States to stop bombing and to come to the conference table.

18.17½ hrs.

**BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FOURTH REPORT**

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): I beg to present the Fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

18.18 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday July 11 1967/Asadha 20 1889 (Saka)*