

We shall now take up the half-an-hour discussion.

17.00 hrs.

*INDIAN AMBASSADOR IN U.A.R.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati) Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is needless to say that a nation's policies get reflected in the way that its missions abroad conduct themselves, for, they not only give a perspective to national policies, but also try to preserve and promote the nation's honour, prestige and self-respect in the eyes of the world.

But, Sir, can we credit our missions abroad with such an inspiring record, in spite of the full-throated praises given to them by our Prime Minister repeated *ad nauseam*? Apart from the financial irregularities, a colossal disgrace, in which some of these missions have indulged, they have let down this country *vis-a-vis* the Chinese on more occasions than one. They have brought down India in the eyes of the world.

I, Sir, do not want to hold them entirely responsible for this because their disgraceful conduct flows out of the disgraceful attitude of our Government *vis-a-vis* the Chinese. What policy are the Government following towards China, if not a policy of naked appeasement? I can catalogue the acts of appeasement on the part of the Government, one by one, but since it is not a discussion on Government's China policy, if they have a policy at all like that, I refrain from doing so.

But I would say that this Government do not have the basic sense of self-respect and that is an open, crystal-clear fact. China committed aggression on this country during October-November, 1962, a fact that constitutes the darkest landmark in the annals of our freedom. In spite of the Colombo proposals that we have accepted in disgraceful haste, China has been intransigent, China has been

piling humiliations on humiliations on a nation of 440 million. Yet, have we learnt any lesson in self-respect.

We are defeated not only in battle by China, but also diplomatically and psychologically. The greatest impact of his psychological defeat is unfortunately on our Prime Minister. It pains me to say that all his actions and attitudes towards China flow from this basic psychology of appeasement, a psychology of defeat and retreat.

In February, 1963, within less than six months of our humiliation at Chinese hands, our charge d'affaires in Peking wanted to attend the banquet given by Mr. Chou En-lai in honour of Mr. Bhutto, Foreign Minister of Pakistan, on a brief visit then to Peking. What did our Government do? Our Government readily obliged him with the necessary permission to attend this banquet. They did it: (a) in violation of the ethics of national self-respect, and (b) in violation of Government's instructions issued to different missions abroad not to attend reception given by the Chinese.

Sir, you might ask me, when were these instructions originally issued by Government to our different missions abroad? Was it before the charge d'affaires in Peking was allowed to attend Mr. Chou En-lai's banquet or after? On Government's own admission on the floor of the House, these directions were issued by Government in December, 1962, to all the members, of diplomatic and non-diplomatic, of the missions abroad, not to offer hospitality or accept any hospitality of the Chinese. These were the directions,

But what happened? Before the ink on the December 1962 directions could be dry, Government themselves violated their own directions and asked our charge d'affaires in Peking to attend Mr. Chou En-lai's banquet given in honour of Mr. Bhutto.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is about U.A.R.

*Half-An-Hour Discussion.

Shri Hem Barua: I will come to that. This is the background, the frame, and I want to fit the picture into that frame.

Now, Sir, this is what happened. Why do you issue directions or instructions if you are not in a position to honour them, if you do not mean to implement them? Why do you do all these things? Do you know, Sir, what was the occasion of Shri Chou En-lai's banquet in honour of Mr. Bhutto which our charge d'affaires attended under instructions from New Delhi? The occasion was to celebrate India's disgrace. Both China and Pakistan had come to an understanding over 12000 square miles of territory in the so-called Azad Kashmir, our territory handed over by Pakistan to China, and a treaty was signed. This banquet was given by Mr. Chou En-lai to celebrate that historic occasion of India's defeat, disgrace and discomfort. It is this banquet that our charge d'affaires was allowed to attend. If this is not shameful appeasement, then I have to re-read the meaning of the word "appeasement" in the dictionary. Sir, would you please present me a copy of *Chambers' Dictionary*?

When this humiliating episode was brought to the notice of Government, do you know what our Prime Minister said on that occasion? Our Prime Minister said here on the floor of this House on 19th March, 1963—I shall quote his words verbatim—

"Because our relations with China and Pakistan are very bad, it was desirable for him to go."

This is what our Prime Minister said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not the question with which we are concerned. We are concerned with UAR.

Shri Hem Barua: Is this not serious? Can this be an argument by any standard, by any stretch of imagina-

tion? I have been putting the same question. Why is it that you issued directions in December 1962 if you were to violate them in February 1963? On that occasion I said that it would be more graceful if the Prime Minister admits his mistake. The Prime Minister did not admit his mistake; possibly, he did not want to do so.

I would say that a nation's Prime Minister is the standard—bearer of the nations honour and prestige, and if in the process of holding the banner aloft, he has to liquidate himself, it is a thousand times better than to try to cling on to the precipice of appeasement.

The story of humiliation does not end there. In December, 1963, our Ambassador in Cairo wanted to attend the banquet given by Mr. Chou En-lai at the Chinese Embassy in Cairo. There were the standing instructions given by the Government in December, 1962, to our diplomatic missions not to accept Chinese hospitality. May I say, Sir, for your information, that these instructions of December, 1962, were renewed and re-issued in November, 1963, and sent to all our missions abroad including Cairo. Thus, our Ambassador in Cairo was armed with two sets of the same directions, one issued in December, 1962 and the other in November, 1963.

Yet, within a month, he considered it desirable to attend Mr. Chou En-lai's banquet at Cairo and, accordingly, he sent a cable to New Delhi for instructions. When the instructions were there, the latest being issued in November 1963, why should he send a cable in December 1963 in order to attend the banquet given by Mr. Chou En-lai, I do not understand. Why should he have done that at all?

The Ambassadors of Tanganyika and Uganda also sent telegrams to their respective governments for instructions. But when the Indian Ambassador in Cairo readily attended Mr.

Chou En-lai's banquet, these two Ambassadors of Tanganyika and Uganda stayed away. Mr. Chou En-lai's banquet at Cairo. Why they refused to attend, I do not know. Possibly, it was because China has not aggressed on their territory.

My submission, Sir, is, that any man who has an iota of self-respect left in him, any man who has a drop of Indian blood in his veins, would have refused to attend, refused to eat from the table of our enemy such as the Chinese are, whether there were instructions or no instructions. If Mr. Chagla could refuse to attend the reception given by Sir Patrick Dean because that Briton equated India with Pakistan on the communal issue, why is it that our Indian Ambassador in Cairo could not check the temptation of attending Mr. Chou En-lai's banquet? Sir, you might tell me. "This is high diplomacy not for you people, poorer people, humbler people like you to understand."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not tell you anything.

Shri Hem Barua: All right, Sir. If you tell me like that, then I would submit for your consideration that diplomacy, high or low, that betrays national interests is worse than prostitution.

Sir, it pains me to say, India is let down by Indians more than anybody else. It pains me to say so. Please remember that the Chinese understand the Indian pulse much better than most of us do. The Chinese invite us to receptions whenever it suits their purpose; and whenever it does not, they just kick us away. This recently happened in Algiers. You know what happened. The Chinese Delegation to the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference refused to invite the Indian delegation to the party it gave. Did the matter end there? No. They announced this with great gusto and with great fanfare even on the floor of

the Council meeting itself. The impression that one gets from the conduct of these Indians attending Chinese parties is that we Indians are essentially a shameless people . . .

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur, He should not dub Indians as shameless people.

Shri Hem Barua that we are eager to be invited, and once the invitation is extended to us, we pounce upon it like a pack of hungry quadrupeds.

When the conduct of the Indian Ambassador in Cairo was brought to the notice of the Prime Minister on the floor of the House on 30th March 1964, what did he say? Our Prime Minister said, "Well, he misunderstood our instructions." This is what he said. But may I tell you that I have seen all the instructions including the cable that was sent by this Government to the Indian Ambassador in December, 1963? I do not want to divulge the exact words used in them, although I can quote from them verbatim if I want to. I can assure you with all authority, with all sincerity, that these directions are so specific, so clear, so positive, so unambiguous in language, that even a man as intellectually under-developed as this poor self would not have misunderstood them, not to speak of the Ambassadors who are supposed to be highly intelligent men misunderstanding them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member may conclude now.

Shri Hem Barua: I will finish just now.

on the occasion of the Charge d'affairs in Peking attending Mr. Chou En-lai's party, it was the Government that violated their own directions. On this occasion, it is the Ambassador in Cairo who violated the Government's directions. There is at least some parity in perfidy.

[Shri Hem Barua]

What is here in this country? May I say that there is something rotten in the state of affairs in this country. With a vacillating Government following a weak-kneed policy, this is bound to be. And what our Government have succeeded in infusing into the brown bureaucrats of the Foreign Services is the basic quality of vacillation, the basic quality of equivocation, the basic quality of weakness. Now, these men are supposed to be highly intelligent. But it pains me to say that their actions and attitudes, even in their limited sphere, are not shining records of intelligence—it does not matter whatever our Prime Minister, the proverbial champion of wrong causes might say or might not say.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Is it not fact that in spite of clear instructions worded in simple English—proof against all misunderstanding which the Prime Minister as an apologist, claimed was done by the Ambassador in Cairo—to the effect that:

“Diplomatic and non-diplomatic members. . . .

—please follow this; it is very simple—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: What is your question?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I began by saying, “Is it not a fact. . .”.

It says:

“ . . . should neither offer hospitality to nor accept hospitality from. . . .

—Can anything be more clear?—

“ . . . members of Chinese missions”;

is it not a fact that this was issued in November, 1962, repeated in 1963. . . .

Shri Hem Barua: December, 1963.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: . . . in November, 1963 and still the Ambassador, Shri Azim Hussain, in Cairo asked the Government, suggested to the Government, on his own, that he should be permitted to attend—that was the communication sent to the Government—the banquet given by Mr. Chou En-lai; and again the Government repeats ‘No’, and after he got clear instructions, in spite of and in disregard of the instructions—a wire sent here and the Government repeating these instructions—in clear violation of the instructions he attended the banquet?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is all?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I have not finished the question. Is it not a fact that such conduct in countries which have well-established norms of diplomatic conduct would have entailed recall of the Ambassador from his station, from his mission, and failing which the Government should have at least conveyed its displeasure or its disapproval? But on the contrary is it not a fact. . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Too many ‘Is it not’s’.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: . . . and is there any truth in the press reports to the effect that this Ambassador in Cairo is being promoted to a higher post of Additional Secretary in the External Affairs Ministry and, if so, what is the reason for this sorry state of affairs. . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am finishing; just 10 seconds more. Is it the Government’s invertebrate policy towards China or is it the pseudo-secular policy responsible for this?

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): This question may be repeated.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I will repeat it to you in the lobby outside.

I cannot repeat it here. It is a Half-An-Hour discussion.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Is it not a fact that the very fact that the Indian Ambassador in U.A.R. asked the External Affairs Ministry in December, 1963 as to whether he should attend that banquet given by Mr. Chou En-lai or not shows that the instructions were not clear and that the instructions were given in such a way that there was some room for a doubt. . .

Shri Hem Barua: Only a fool will misunderstand that.

Shri D. C. Sharma: And is it not a fact that the *bona fides* of the Indian Ambassador in U.A.R. are clear. . .

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): How *bona fides*?

Shri D. C. Sharma: . . .and his good intentions are very clear by the fact that he put across. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is your question?

Shri D. C. Sharma:a cable to the External Affairs Ministry asking. .

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): But the people here said, 'No'.

Shri D. C. Sharma:for clarification of the point whether he should attend the banquet or not. Therefore, what I wish to say is this. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You need not say anything.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Is it not a fact. .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have to put a question. That is all.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am putting a question. You did not prevent them from saying all kinds of things. When we try to explain ourselves, you do not allow us to do so. I want to ask: Is it not a fact that the very fact that the Indian Ambassador in U.A.R. sent a cable to the External Affairs Ministry in December, 1963, asking whether

he should attend that banquet or not shows that his intentions were *bona fide* and that he was not a person who was going to show in any way that he was not interested in the prestige, the honour and the greatness of our country? What I mean to say is, are not his intentions very clear?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Sir, there is very little that I want to speak on this occasion. As is pointed out, we have been issuing instructions from time to time regarding the propriety of our heads of missions attending receptions and other things given by the Chinese; and our missions, I am very happy to inform the House, have always abided by these instructions. In this particular case, when Mr. Chou En-Lai's visit was announced in Cairo and a number of formal functions were likely to be held, the Ambassador made a specific reference to us—not in a cable but in a letter—saying that a number of formal functions were likely to be held. . .

Shri Ranga: But what advice did he get from the U.A.R. Government also?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I seek your protection, Sir.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: She does not need your protection. Let Government protect the country. It is the country which needs protection. It is a disgraceful conduct on the part of our Ambassador. She is trying to defend the indefensible.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: A specific enquiry was made. Unfortunately, the reply that we sent. . . .

Shri Ranga: What were those instructions? Will you please read them out? We referred to the previous communications on this subject and said that the Ambassador might attend formal functions which were held by the Governments concerned. This is the real sentence from the letter and these were the instructions given namely that the Ambassador might

[Shri Ranga]

attend formal functions held by the Governments concerned. This was a little vague. He thought that the term 'Governments concerned' meant the Government of China and the Government of UAR.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is wrong. The instructions were 'by the Governments of the countries concerned'. I have got the instructions with me here. The hon. Minister is misleading the House.

Shri Hem Barua: She has not read out the entire sentence. The cablegram is this.

"If any formal functions are held by the Governments of the countries concerned in his (Mr. Chou En-lai's) honour, you may attend them."

By this term is meant functions which have been organised by the UAR and not by Mr. Chou-En-lai.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I accept it. It is 'by the Governments of the countries concerned.'"

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: And in his honour. That is what is written. The instructions are clear. She cannot mislead the House by this kind of prevarication.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: This letter was given to them by us.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It was not a favour. We demanded this.

Shri Hem Barua: We challenge the hon. Minister that we could have these things without her giving them to us also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: She is trying to cover it up.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I am not trying to conceal anything. I am only trying to point out that there was a real misunderstanding, as far as the Ambassador was concerned.

Shri Ranga: Whoever was responsible for it should have resigned.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is shameful. The Ambassador should have been recalled.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members have had their say already. Now, they should hear the hon. Minister.

Shri Hem Barua: He must be a damn fool who could misunderstand these words.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is an ICS officer, I suppose.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Hon. Members should at least use parliamentary language while referring to these things.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: She is defending the indefensible. It is a matter for shame.

Shri Hem Barua: Let her admit the mistake. . . .

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I admit that. . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The hon. Prime Minister should have been here to reply and not the Minister of State.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I admit that the Ambassador misunderstood it, because we called for an explanation when this matter was raised, and the Ambassador said that it was a misunderstanding of the term 'by the Governments of the countries concerned in his honour'; he thought that it referred to both the countries, the country of UAR as well as China. . . .

Shri Hem Barua: What does he mean by that? That means that we shall have to learn English over again. . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no more interruptions.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Since hon. Members do not want to listen to me, I am not going to proceed any further.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why not sack that Ambassador?

Shri Hem Barua: The term 'in his honour' means 'in Mr. Chou En-lai's honour'. (*Interruptions*).

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: With your permission, Sir, I am not going to say anything more since hon. Members do not want to listen.

Shri Ranga: The hon. Minister has to apologise to the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Ambassador should be sacked.

Shri Ranga: In decency, she must apologise to the House.

The Minister Without Portfolio (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri) rose—

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let the hon. Minister Without Portfolio do it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: As my colleague has just now said, the orders issued were clear.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Very clear. They were quite clear, absolutely clear, hundred per cent clear. I have just read them out.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am also saying the same thing.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why do you not sack him? Sack that fellow or otherwise sack yourselves.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am prepared to accept the facts that there is some mistake on our part also in this. It would be wrong to suggest that it was only the Ambassador who had slipped. As his name has been mentioned, it would only be fair to tell the House that during these last two or three months, I have found him to be one of our best Ambassadors. . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He went to Djakarta and shook hands with the Chinese there also.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: (Kendrapara): Nobody is questioning his capabilities.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: No. His name has been mentioned. . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There is nothing wrong in that. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: If that is the way, then it is impossible. And how am I going to speak?

Shri Hem Barua: It does not matter whether he is good or bad. We are concerned with the fact that he had violated the Government directions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I would request hon. Members to hear the hon. Minister.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We are not concerned with that here, but we are concerned only with his conduct in this particular affair.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: If the hon. Member is not prepared to allow anyone else to speak, I shall sit down, and my hon. friend may carry on.

I would not have said a word about the Ambassador but the hon. Member has mentioned his name and said certain things which were really not in good taste and which should not have been said.

I say on definite authority that I am not merely praising him for something that he has been doing during all these years, but his contribution especially in the Colombo conference as well as the Djakarta conference has been really something very useful.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is all extraneous to the present discussion.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Therefore, I said that it was better not to refer to him here. . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is irrelevant to this debate.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am not prepared to question that, and I would not like that. . . .

Shri Hem Barua: Is that relevant from the point of view of the present discussion? It is irrelevant.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: If hon. Members do not want to hear, I shall sit down, and my hon. friends may carry on.

Shri Ranga: That is all right. We shall all go.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: At least, let me have my say. Otherwise, it becomes impossible.

I only wanted to say that the motives might not be questioned. I also said that there had been a mistake on our part also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What was the mistake on your part?

Shri Ranga: That is exactly what Government have to say. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: How can we go on at this rate? My hon. friend must allow me to speak. Does he only want that I should say about my mistake and sit down?

Shri Ranga: I am glad that the hon. Minister has said that. It is for that that we have been waiting. We are happy that he has said that.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I always try to be as frank as possible, if only hon. Members would allow me to have my say. Otherwise, it will make the functioning of parliamentary democracy impossible.

I may add that we should have seen the letter which he had sent, and the reply should have been more clear and categorical. From that point of view, I think that we made a mistake.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What was the mistake?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Not in this.

As my hon. friend has just now said, he had sent a letter, and we had to send a reply to that, and our reply was not clear.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let us have that reply. Here it is, and I have got it in my hand. The reply is very categorical.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: There is another letter from him. It is not that letter—and another reply was sent from here.

I have asked my own Ministry or the Department to look into it, and the person who sent it to be told that his reply should have been clear and categorical....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why not give a copy of that here?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: When I say that I feel that the letter was not clear and I admit the mistake, which means that I admit the mistake committed by the officer of the External Affairs Ministry who sent that letter, what more does my hon. friend want?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Ministry sent us the gist of all the instructions from December, 1962 to December, 1963. I have got copies of all these instructions here.

Shri Hem Barua: May I humbly submit one thing? This is what they have said....

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: What is the date of the letter?

Shri Hem Barua: This is what they have said:

"Early in December, 1963, just before Mr. Chou En-lai's visit to the UAR, the Indian Ambassador in Cairo suggested that he should

attend all functions in connection with Mr. Chou En-lai's visit, including the return banquet by Mr. Chou En-lai at the Chinese Embassy. In reply, he was informed that if any formal functions are held by the Governments of the countries concerned in his (Mr. Chou En-lai's) honour, you may attend them."

The quotation ends there, and the next sentence runs thus:

"This clearly meant that only the U.A.R. functions were to be attended by the Ambassador and not the return banquet by Mr. Chou En-lai. The Ambassador, however, misunderstood our instructions and attended the banquet given by Mr. Chou En-lai."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is it possible to misunderstand? Would you have misunderstood this thing?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua: Even a chaprasi would not misunderstand this.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That means that he is not good enough for that post.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would only say that in the reply, the name of Mr. Chou En-lai is not mentioned.

Shri Hem Barua: Here it is. It is written within brackets.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It is not.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Here is the copy of the letter before me, and it is not mentioned here; there is nothing within brackets.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The words 'Mr. Chou En-lai' are not there within brackets?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: No.

Therefore, it was on this basis that I asked our officers of the Ministry

why it should not have been made more clear when the reply was sent. I have myself asked for an explanation.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In whose honour? In our ambassador's honour?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It is undoubtedly vague—it must be admitted.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barackpore): Why doesn't he read out that portion so that he may feel satisfied?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: They have got it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: The letter was given. I do not know; Shri Barua says there is something in brackets.

Shri Hem Barua: Your people have put the brackets.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not know. But here there are no such brackets. I will have to see that.

Shri Ranga: They have been taking shelter behind the Prime Minister and playing ducks and drakes with our fortunes, external affairs and diplomacy.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: India's prestige is in the mud today.

Shri Hem Barua: We would not have divulged this to the House but for the fact that Shrimati Menon made a reference to it.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: No, no.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: The letter of course was given to him; though the purpose was entirely different.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: You got it under false pretences.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, I leave it at that.

I do not want to take more of your time. I would only like to say that there has been some mistake, mistake, if you like, partly of the Ambassador himself. He should have exercised his discretion. I entirely agree. He knew about our policy. But besides that, partly it is our mistake also, because when he sent a specific letter in spite of the orders of November 1963, the reply also should have been absolutely specific and clear. As it was not so, this misunderstanding arose. We have taken adequate precautions now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Has he expressed his regret? Has Government's displeasure and disapproval been conveyed to him?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I may inform the hon. Member that in fact at the instance of some Members opposite, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon asked the ambassador to give his explanation. He has given his explanation in which he has....

Shri Hem Barua: We suggested to Shrimati Menon to convey Government's displeasure and disapproval to the ambassador concerned confidentially; no shouting about it, we would also not shout about it. That was the bandabost.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Shrimati Menon might say on that particular matter. But I would be brutally frank. I do not feel satisfied within myself that the ambassador made this mistake deliberately. I am not prepared to accept that. We must be fair both to him as well as to ourselves. If it is our mistake, we should be able to tell the truth.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He deserves promotion on account of that!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

17.34 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, April 27, 1964/Vaisakha 7, 1886 (Saka).