

उस को हम तनखाह की सूरत में नहीं लेंगे बल्कि हम उस को इदारे के मफाद के लिये, उस के फायदे के लिये खर्च करेंगे और मैं यह शहादत दे सकता हूँ कि वहाँ जो बड़े से बड़े लोग थे उन के बच्चे अक्सर भूखे रहते थे । उन के बच्चों को कपड़े नहीं मिलते थे उन के बच्चे खुद तालीम को तरसे हैं लेकिन कौम के बच्चों की तालीम के लिये उन्होंने हर तरह के संसूब बनाये और कोशिशें कीं और जिस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि कौम ने यह देखा कि यह तालीमी इदारा जो इस किस्म की कुर्बानी दे कर आगे बढ़ रहा है उस में गांधी जी ने भी यह तय किया कि जिस तरह से भी हो सके उस की मदद की जाय और गांधी जी के वह तारीखी अल्फाज मैं दोहराना चाहूंगा जो उन्होंने इदारे के वाइस चांसलर को लिख कर भेजे थे कि आप अपने काम में लगे रहिये । अपना काम करते रहिए । सारी तालीम का काम लगन का काम है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan, it is already 5 o'clock now. Before we take up the Calling Attention Motion, there are two other items. You can continue your speech on the next Non-Official Bill Day.

SHRI KHURSHED ALAM KHAN: Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Now, Mr. Jagannath Pahadia to lay the Papers on the Table.

(Interruptions)

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE— contd.

Notification of Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA): Sir, I beg

to lay on the Table, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962, a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification No. F. 347/7/78-TRU, dated the 1st February, 1980. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-235-A/80].

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): The External Affairs Minister...

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir, just listen to me. When the Deputy Chairman left this House, I think, at about 2.45 P.M. or so he said that the Calling Attention Motion will be the first item on the agenda at 5 o'clock. Am I to understand that this House changes its decision as per the incumbent in the Chair or is there some procedure?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Kulkarni, when the Deputy Chairman was in the Chair, I believe, I was not here. Then at 2.30 p.m. he said that the non-official Bills will be taken up and at 5 o'clock the Calling Attention matter will be taken up.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, you can find out the correct position from the tape.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): At 1 o'clock the Chairman himself said that he was adjourning the House to meet at 2.30 P.M. when the Calling Attention matter would be taken up. Then the Calling Attention matter was postponed to 5 o'clock. Now it is being postponed again.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): It is not being postponed. You please

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda]

listen. Now there is a statement to be made by the External Affairs Minister. I call upon the External Affairs Minister to make the statement.

I. Refusal of entry to Shri Romesh Chandra, President World-Peace Council by the British Government at London Airport.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, on the 25th January a report was received that Shri Romesh Chandra, President of the World Peace Council, had been held in detention by the British Government on his arrival at the London airport the previous day.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

Our High Commission in London was informed of this on the morning of the 25th January by the Secretary of the World Peace Council in London. Our Acting High Commissioner immediately moved the Foreign Office and the Home Office for Shri Romesh Chandra's release. He was informed that the Secretary of State of the British Home Office had exercised his powers under the immigration Act of 1971 to refuse entry to Shri Romesh Chandra on the ground that "his exclusion was conducive to the public good". The Acting Indian High Commissioner was also informed that Shri Romesh Chandra had already been put on a plane to Warsaw. In this connection, however, we understand that Shri Romesh Chandra had visited Britain twice in 1979. This incident is the first we know of where an Indian citizen has been denied entry into Britain on the ground that he is an official of a political organisation. While the British Government has the sovereign right like any other State to exclude the entry of any foreigner, we cannot but express our dismay and concern over the indignity and discourtesy to which an Indian citizen has been subjected.

This has been conveyed to the British High Commissioner. The British Government will, I trust, take notice of the parliamentary and public reactions in India and adopt early measures to prevent recurrence of such incidents in the interests of cordial Indo-British relations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, the statement is not quite satisfactory. Mr. Romesh Chandra is here now. He is an eminent Indian citizen who is internationally well known, and, he has rightly said, that he is the President of the World Peace Council, a leader of the peace movement, who, you must have seen in the papers was invited even by the United Nations to appear in commission for consultation and so on, on behalf of his organisation. Mr. Romesh Chandra was visiting England in connection with attending a conference which was to be held there one day after his arrival there, and from there he was expected to come here to attend the meetings of the Central Executive Committee of the Party and National Council which he is attending along with us just now. In fact, I am coming from that meeting. There was no question of immigration in this case. It had nothing to do with immigration. There could not have been even the remotest suspicion and the British Government case is also not that here was an immigrant or a would be immigrant they were dealing with. Here, Sir, I find, I have got a photostat copy of the order of the Immigration Officer which reads:

"IMMIGRATION ACT, 1971

Refusal of leave to enter to Romesh Chandra

The Secretary of State has given directions for you not to be given entry to the United Kingdom on the ground that your exclusion is conducive to the public good.

I therefore refuse you leave to enter the United Kingdom. I have

given/propose to give directions for your removal on 25th January, 1980 at 10.35 hours by Flight BA 708.

You are not entitled to appeal against refusal of leave to enter because leave was refused in obedience to directions given by the Secretary of State personally on the ground stated above.

The contents of this notice have been explained to you in English (by me)."

Then some signature is there as Immigration Officer and date is given as 24th January, 1980.

Now, Sir, next day on the 26th, the Guardian carried the news item very prominently because Romesh Chandra is prominently and internationally known citizen apart from being a prominent Indian. It says:

"Whitelaw Shakes Cold war fist at Soviet-backed organisation.

Peace Council President barred from Britain.

The Home Secretary signalled a return to Cold War stances yesterday by refusing to let the leader of the Soviet-backed World Peace Council into Britain for a Conference. The decision is clearly part of the current fist-shaking in the direction of the USSR."

Immediately the matter was taken up in the British Parliament. The report says:

"Two Labour MPs protested angrily at Mr. Whitelaw's behaviour yesterday. Mr. Bob Cryer (Keighley) said: "It is bloody disgraceful". He went on: "The Government has become so besotted by events in Afghanistan that they are restricting free and fair comment on behalf of those who wish

to see peace prevail rather than the Cold War. Mr. Chandra has been excluded from this country without any public justification whatever."

"Mr. James Lamond (Oldham E) tried to raise the subject in the Commons yesterday, saying that the Government was taking a back-door method just because they don't approve of these kinds of activities."

Now, Sir, other things I need not say. In 1961 many people were similarly treated in other countries. Sir, my question now is, first of all, when the British House of Commons, Members of Parliament, make such protests, call it a bloody act or whatever it is—I have read out to you—why don't you at least protest against it? You should have said in your statement that the Government of India protest against this act. Sir, this has not been done. And this is a case eminently fit for launching a political and diplomatic protest at the highest level, at least from the Foreign Minister of this country to the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom. Why has that not been done? Sir, we should not be less in reacting to it than the British Parliament or the members of the Labour Party. In British Parliament, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher is supposed to be an iron lady and we are told here that India too have got an Iron lady. It does seem, our iron lady in such a matter is made a wax. You call her iron lady; I do not call her so; she is a very nice lady. But why this kind of thing? Let Mrs. Margaret Thatcher who is called Thatcher the snatcher, realise it. Well, we know we are a self-respecting nation and no self-respecting nation would tolerate it. It is an international issue. It is an attack against India's peace policy. It is an attack not merely against an individual, it is an attack against the world peace movement. Had Shri Romesh Chandra been otherwise known as supporter

of imperialism, of the Conservative Party or of some reactionary people in this country, he would not have been prevented entry. You know very well what is the significance of the attack. No wonder, it is being taken up in every Parliament of democratic countries and other countries of both the worlds, the socialists world and the capitalist world. This is point number one which I want the Government to explain.

Besides, Shri Romesh Chandra is a Commonwealth citizen. We are supposed to be in the Commonwealth. His passport is an Indian passport. Why was the Indian passport disrespected in this manner? In this case the Home Secretary himself intervened. He has directly, personally intervened to stop Mr. Romesh Chandra in this manner. A Commonwealth citizen, that too from the biggest Commonwealth country in the world, wants to enter a country on a peace mission and he is prevented, his presence is not liked, 'is not conducive to public good'. You should protest against it. You should call upon them to explain why such scurrilous, insulting and humiliating statements are made. Then he was detained. We have got the telephone here. We have learnt it from the London Peace Office that he was not allowed to speak to anybody, not even to Labour MPs. He was confined to a room and the next day, as if he was a criminal, he was put in the plane. He was not asked to go out of the plane and then sent to Warsaw. From there he went to the Soviet Union and from there he came here. Is it the way to treat a peace loving person? Sir, Mr. Romesh Chandra may not be that kind of VIP in terms of the Government for whom a plane can be brought back from mid air in Assam nor picked up, but certainly he is an internationally renowned figure, well-known personality in the world peace movement.

The World Peace Council has re-

ceived many awards for his service to the cause of peace. He knows it, many Members opposite know it. They themselves had been in that movement. I have no quarrel with them individually, Sir. What a high prestige does he command in the world. How highly is he held by all peace loving people in the socialist countries, in the capitalist countries, in the third world countries, in all the continents of the world? Such a man is treated in this manner. Sir, we have protested against the Immigration Act. Now you see, the Immigration Act is not merely being used for insulting sisters and mothers in the name of virginity tests, but is being misused by the Thatcher Government against the peace loving movement, peace forces, against the peace loving persons of the greatest country, greatest peace loving country of the world, India. What greater insult can there be? I should like to know, is that the only way to say this thing? I am very sorry that our Government has reacted so haltingly in this manner. I know Mr. Narasimha Rao. He has also been there in the peace movement. I have no personal quarrel with anybody, not with him. After all if India is a peace loving country, they have also made their contribution just as we have made from this side. It is not a party issue. It is not the issue between the Government and the opposition. Here is an issue of national prestige and national honour. We had projected an Indian citizen who, to our great satisfaction and, if I may say so, glory has championed the cause of peace and helped the World Peace movement, recognised all over the world and the British Government, who sends Lord Carrington to do the pussy-talk here, asks it Home Secretary to tell the immigration authorities: "Hold up that man. Detain Romesh Chandra. Put him in isolation. Then put him back on a plane". He was not allowed to talk to anybody. Was he allowed to talk to the Indian High

Commissioner? Why was the Indian High Commissioner not instantly informed? The British Government should have immediately informed the Indian High Commissioner, given him the facilities to come to the airport to meet Mr. Romesh Chandra, which, I am sure, he would have done. Why was that not done?

The British Government has deliberately insulted us. Mrs. Thatcher is a cold war lady. She wants world to be taken to the brink of war. She has been yearning for war, armaments, attacks and all that. Even many Western countries are not going with her in this matter in the European continent. Here she has chosen India deliberately. Mr. Romesh Chandra's visit is only an occasion. That visit has been chosen deliberately taken advantage of to insult the World Peace forces, World Peace Movement and, if I may say so, even the Government of India. Now Sir, if for example a Conservative of Mrs. Thatcher's party comes here to our country and we put him back on a plane and ask that plane to take that man to hell, how would it look? Would the British Parliament keep quiet? I would like to know. I am suggesting retaliatory measures therefor. The Government should make it known.

First of all, the Government should protest. Secondly, the Government should ask for an unconditional apology to Mr. Romesh Chandra and to our nation, to this Parliament. And, thirdly, the Government should get an assurance from Mrs. Margaret Thatcher that such incidents will not be repeated. These are absolutely essential things to be done. Otherwise, they will think that we can stomach anything coming from them. This will embolden them—the British authorities—to insult, humiliate other Indians who are going there and those who are already living there—Indian citizens or the people of Indian origin.

Now this is a big issue. I think it should be taken up. I gave a Calling

Attention Notice for a thorough discussion in the House. Unfortunately while the British Parliament is agitated over it, we do not seem to be so agitated. I therefore demand such action. I want Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi—I repeat I want Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi to address a protest letter to Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. Number two, I also want the Foreign Minister to call the British High Commissioner here to formally lodge a diplomatic protest and ask the High Commissioner to convey the protest, in addition to asking for the assurance that I have sought. This is how the matter should be treated.

Sir, this is going to be an international issue, I tell you. The World Peace movement, the anti-imperialist peace forces have taken it as an insult to themselves. People in Africa, people in the Arab world, people in Latin America, people in America and people in the United Kingdom and other countries of Western Europe—all of them, to my information, have taken this as an insult to them. Now, in the light of all that I have said, I would request the hon. Minister to give an answer. Again I say, personally, over this matter I would not like to enter into any controversy or quarrel with them. I should like the Government to go with us. We too should go with the Government. Otherwise you call a meeting of the Opposition leaders and other Members of Parliament in the national interest and decide what steps should be taken against the Thatcher Government which is responsible for so publicly and internationally insulting our country and our policy of peace before the world.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Sir, before the Minister replies I want to seek a clarification. May I know from the Minister whether he will only give a statement of regret? I fully reciprocate the

[Shri S. W. Dhabe.]

feelings expressed by Shri Bhupesh Gupta whose feeling is the feeling of this House—that Indian citizens are treated very shabbily by the British Government. And this is not the first incident. A number of times we raised questions here about virginity test and other things under immigration laws and felt that the attitude of the British Government is not proper, hostile to the Indian citizens. Sir, will the Minister tell us what steps he will take, whether we should reciprocate the action against British citizens if they come to India. An eminent person like Mr. Romesh Chandra, President of the World Peace Council, has been expelled on the grounds of public good. It is a really shameful reason that is given by the British Government. I would ask the hon. Minister to take strong action in this matter and the world should not feel that Indian citizens can be treated like this in any part of the world. The Indian High Commissioner was not informed. No information was given, as if it was a secret deal. I think it is a very serious matter and I would like the hon. Minister to say that further steps he is going to take in this matter.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : उप-सभापति महोदय, यह रमेश चन्द्र की बात नहीं है बल्कि ब्रिटिश सरकार की तरफ से। It is a planned affront to all of us इसका खूब जोर से विरोध करना चाहिए श्रीमन्, आपको याद होगा जब हम लोग उधर थे और मिसेज थेचर अभी पावर में नहीं आई थीं उस वक्त से बोल रही थीं कि हम विदेशियों के साथ, एंशियंस के साथ कड़ी नीति अख्तियार करेंगे। हम लोगों ने आवाज उठाई थी तब हम लोग वहाँ पर थे। अब वह पावर में आ गई है और अपनी नीतियों को कड़ा कर रही है। वह यह सब एंशियंस और विदेशियों को इंग्लैंड से निकालने के लिए इस तरह का सलूक कर रही हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से

पूछना चाहता हूँ लार्ड केरिंगटन फारेन सेक्रेटरी यहाँ पर आए थे क्या आपने उनसे यह बात की थी कि इस तरह का डिसक्रिमिनेशन क्यों किया जाता है? यदि यह बात की थी तो उन्होंने क्या जवाब दिया था; दूसरी बात यह है कि हम कामनवैलथ में हैं। कामनवैलथ फैमिली आफ नेशन्स है। उसमें रहने के बाद भी इस तरह का सलूक होता है। जैसे कि रमेशचन्द्र जी के साथ हुआ। ब्रिटिश सरकार यदि अपनी नीति को नहीं बदलती है, साफ नहीं करती है तो क्या आप उनको साफ शब्दों में कहने के लिए तैयार हैं कि भारत कामनवैलथ से निकल जाएगा। उपसभापति महोदय, आप जानते हैं कामनवैलथ क्या है, हम दोनों न्यूजीलैंड में देख चुके हैं क्वीन को हम लोग टोस्ट करते थे। मैंने वहाँ पर अमेडमेंट दिया कि क्वीन को हटाओ। जब एक नेशन सोवरेन है तो फिर क्वीन को क्यों टोस्ट करते हैं? क्वीन हेड है यह हमारे लिए इनसल्ट की बात है। लेकिन इस तरह की नीति ब्रिटिश सरकार नहीं बदलेगी तो आप साफ शब्दों में कह दें कि भारत कामनवैलथ से निकल जाएगा और हम लोगों को निकल जाना चाहिए।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, Mr. Ramamurti is here.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, in this blatant order the Secretary of State has arbitrarily given a direction that "You are not to be given entry to the United Kingdom" on the ground that "Your exclusion is conducive to the public good." Was any inquiry conducted? The person has not been given an opportunity and no charge has been made. He was visiting the United Kingdom and so many other countries as President of the World Peace Council. So, how has he ever disturbed the public peace in Great Britain in his entire life? Nothing is stated about it. And here comes the Secretary of State of Great Britain who, in his own wisdom, arbitrarily decides—he is a citizen of the Commonwealth; we are in the

Commonwealth today—that his presence in Great Britain is not conducive to the public good. And here is a Government which only says: “We have brought it to the notice of that Government”. I want to know what retaliatory measures the Government of India proposes to take. Are you going to say for example, to somebody from Great Britain who comes here, who is a public man: “Your presence in this country is not conducive to the good of the country.” Can you take such a retaliatory measure and teach them a lesson? Otherwise, what is the use of saying that you have protested—not even protested; you do not have the courage to lodge a formal protest against this. Why this supineness? I want an answer to this.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, there is no controversy on this issue as far as we are concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: But they are creating a controversy.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, we have all been associated with the world peace movement and there is no question of our taking a line different from the one taken by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. There are certain matters which we have to take into account. There is an Immigration Act in England which happens to give certain totally arbitrary powers to the Home Secretary there. The powers are so arbitrary that any order passed in pursuance of those powers is not appealable, is not even justiciable. If hon. Members want, I have got the text of it here.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: We know the Act. We are not talking on legal grounds.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is very clear that on this matter the question is not one of being an Indian, not one of being a visitor, although he was both. He was an

Indian and, at the same time, he was a visitor. But he was not ordered to go on either of these two grounds. And, as I have said, he did visit the United Kingdom twice in 1979—in fact only in December 1979 he paid a visit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He visited many times.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Then he was allowed. There was no question of his being sent back at that time. Now what supervened between his December visit and the January visit is naturally a political matter and, therefore, this in the ultimate analysis has to be taken as a political decision.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: We are also talking about a political decision.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, in this connection, we have had a very long question—answer session with the British High Commissioner here. Now I would only read one short portion of what he has told us. This will put the entire thing in the right perspective. What he says is :

“In the majority of cases, officials of front organisations require visas with the result that their applications to enter the UK are refused before their travel. Mr. Chandra, of course, required no visa. The decision to refuse entry is consistent with the British Government's policy of restricting the propagandist activities in UK of officials of leading organisations which are in effect instruments of Soviet foreign policy.”

(Interruptions)

Now they have made no bones about it; they have not concealed it. They have told us why they have taken this action.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I formally request through you that

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

the documents be laid on the Table of the House in the national interest.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, this is not a document.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whatever it may be what you are reading.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I can place the entire thing on the Table of the House. There is no secret about it. Sir, what I have read is . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, it is clear, he has agreed to do it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has agreed to lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: . . . the Portion which gives the intention of that Government and the reasons why they have taken this action. That is what is relevant and that is what I have brought before the House. So it is an entirely political decision. We do not agree with this. We are one with the House in saying that this decision is wrong. But it is a political decision; nevertheless, taken in pursuance of a provision of law which exists in the United Kingdom. These are the limitations, and these are the facts. So, Mr. Ramesh Chandra has come to Delhi.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : लार्ड कैरिंगटन से क्या बात हुई, वह बताइये ।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : मैं वह भी बताऊंगा ।

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): What is the political decision! Will you kindly elaborate upon it?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am coming to that point also. Let me first dispose of the question.

Sir, not only when Lord Carrington came here but even since a long time before that there have been complaints in regard to the implementation of the Immigration Act in Britain and also the treatment meted out to Indians and perhaps foreign nationals also under the provisions of the Immigration Act because that aspect is also taken care of by the Immigration Act. The Immigration Act in England is not concerned with solely immigration but also with the entry or the refusal of entry to persons visiting England. So, it is an Act which has both the aspects. Now, on both these counts we have been telling the British Government that so many hardships are caused to the visitors and also to immigrants. As was pointed out by Shri Bhupesh Gupta, there have been many difficulties and many times these matters were taken up with the British Government. And when Lord Carrington came recently, our discussions pointedly centered round both these aspects. Now I am able to say that he, at the end of the discussions, gave us the impression that so far as the treatment meted out to the visitors is concerned, this is a matter which can be further examined in the light of experience, and we are at the stage when we are going to take up these matters in greater depth and see that something concrete is done to rectify the position there.

Now, unfortunately, this Ramesh Chandra's matter suddenly came up. The Foreign Secretary, perhaps, was not concerned with it, it is the Home Secretary who has done it. Therefore, after speaking to Mr. Ramesh Chandra tomorrow—he is coming to me tomorrow—after finding out what the other facts are, the collateral facts, the attendant circumstances, if there is anything further to be done, if we feel, then, we will

certainly do it. This is what I would like to submit to the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, we ask for this record of the question and answer session. I am glad the hon. Minister has been a little bit frank. I have no complaint on this score. But, Sir, Parliament would like to see these things. Full text of it should be laid on the Table.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: This is something which our officers gathered from them by way of record of discussions. It need not be placed on the Table of the House. I have read the relevant portion and brought out the kernel of the whole thing that it is a political decision. There is no need to place it on the Table of the House. At this rate we will not be able to carry on any discussion with any of the missions; that will be difficult.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I entirely agree. We, on this side of the House, do not view this matter as an illegal question at all. We all know it is an entirely political question. The banning of his entry into Great Britain was entirely a political decision because there is no question of immigration and he was not going to settle there. All these things were known. Therefore, we are concerned with what the political reaction of the Government of India is and what the political retaliatory measure is. After all, we have got also our dignity, the dignity of our country to safeguard, and the dignity of the country requires that if the Act in this arbitrary manner...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The political reaction will come only when we have a visitor from England belonging to a party we do not like, which is difficult to imagine.

(Interruptions).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, retaliatory question can come. Political reaction can be there now.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: About relations I have already said in the statement that we have brought it to their notice that although what they have done may not be illegal, it can have repercussions on the Indo-British relations. This is what we have told them plainly, and we are going to take it up again with them if necessary after speaking to Mr. Romesh Chandra when we are in full possession of the facts.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): You have said the matter is political. I am expecting, we all are expecting, in our national interest, what retaliatory measures you are going to take, because the British Government and the British politicians have never behaved with such madness and immaturity. That is what I wanted to know.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have already said that. The question of political retaliation can arise only when an identical situation arises.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I request Mr. Sathe to give good coverage to the proceedings on the subject in that House specially for the British listeners.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You mean he should tell the press to do this?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI V. P. SATHE): I believe in freedom of the press. I cannot dictate to them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not ask you to tell them; you could do it on All India Radio and Television.

SHRI V. P. SATHE: I said so; you did not listen to me.

II. Winding up of the Commission on Public Expenditure

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI