

there has been any response either from Hanoi or from the United States of America?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: There is a separate question on this. But we have no official reaction conveyed to us. There have been press reports about which I shall answer when the question comes.

\*556. [The questioner (Shri B. N. Mandal) was absent. For answer, vide col. 4322 infra.]

\*557. [The questioner (Shri Jagan-nath Prasad Pahadia) was absent. For answer, vide cols. 4321—4323 infra.]

\*558. [Transferred to the 1th December, 1966.]

\*559. [Transferred to the 9th December, 1966.]

#### TRIPARTITE MEETING

\*560. SHRI R. T. PARTHA-SARATHY: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state the amount spent by Government on Tripartite Meeting held in October, 1966 in New Delhi?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DINESH SINGH): Government is not in a position as yet to give this information. The exact expenditure can be computed only after the detailed bills etc. have been received.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: May I ask the hon'ble Minister whether it was worthwhile to spend so much—although the Minister is not giving the exact amount spent on the Summit Conference—amount on a conference in which the President of the U.A.R. participated when the avowed intentions of the U.A.R. and the entire Arab nations have been clearly reflected in the fact that in the Security Council elections the Arab nations *en bloc* voted against India?

1335 RS—2

In such a situation what is the purpose in holding such a conference here at such a colossal cost?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I must say, Sir, that I am not only surprised but pained that an hon'ble Member from our side should have put such a question. The fact that we had this Conference in India has not only been acknowledged in this country but all the world over and it would have been worthwhile even if we had spent double this amount.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Of course, I do not agree with what the hon'ble Member from the other side said about the Arab nations or their attitude in the Security Council. Well, it is for them to do what they like. But my objection to the holding of this Tripartite Conference is because the Tripartite Conference as such seems to have no aim in view. As such I do not know why this Conference was at all held.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

SHRI G. MURAHARI: The question is that so much money has been spent on a conference which had no avowed aim before it. That is why I would like to know from the Government why the Government thought it appropriate to spend so much amount at this Conference when they had no avowed aim before this Conference because even non-alignment has not been defined by this Conference.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I am very sorry it will be practically impossible for me to explain to the Member the reasons of this Conference when he has already understood it. It is something that has been discussed in this House. It has been discussed in the newspapers. It has been talked about all over the country and abroad.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: But we are still in the dark.



SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: From some previous questions it was clear that the External Affairs Minister, Mr. Chagla, was not prepared to be coerced or pressurised in any way in the matter of aid, etc. If that was the decided stand of the Government of India, may I know, Sir, why a mention with regard to the pressures of the aid-giving countries was mentioned in the Tripartite Conference?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Pressures were effected and that is why they were mentioned. If it is a fact that certain countries are attempting to pressurise, we have to mention it. But because we have mentioned it, it does not mean that we shall succumb to these pressures. It only gives us strength because there is collective thinking about it and there is response in all the countries.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know, Sir, if this Conference was a vote-catching mission on behalf of India and whether the Prime Minister canvassed support for our Security Council seat during this Conference or we recognised the sovereignty and the freedom to vote of all the countries including the Arab countries which are our friends?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Sir, there was no question of catching any votes. There were only two other countries besides India. There was no question of even raising this matter in a Tripartite Conference of this kind: it was not even raised. We were able to get vote, because of the good work that we have done internationally, and which has been recognised.

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, क्या यह सत्य है कि ट्राइपार्टाइट काँफ्रेंस के अवसर पर जो वहाँ माइक की व्यवस्था थी, जब-जब प्रधान मंत्री जी बोलने गई हैं तो अक्सर वह खराब रही है और जो बहुत ही अप्रसन्न रहते हैं और इतना पैसा खर्च करने के बाद भी ऐसी दुर्व्यवस्था क्यों हुई ?

**श्री दिनेश सिंह :** कितना भी पैसा खर्च करें, तब भी किसी न किसी चीज के बिगड़ने की गुंजाइश हमेशा रहती है। वहाँ पर जो माइक्रोफोन था वह कुछ देर के लिए ज़रूर बिगड़ गया था, लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री की स्पीच को सब ने सुना और कोई कठिनाई नहीं हुई।

**श्री राजनारायण :** दूसरों के समय क्यों नहीं बिगड़ा ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

#### INDIA ON NUCLEAR ISSUE

\*561. SHRI BANKA BIHARY DAS: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the news-item published in the *Times of India* (Delhi Edition) of November 8, 1966 captioned "USA, USSR annoyed with India on Nuclear Issue"; and

(b) if so, what is the stand of India in the matter of proliferation of nuclear weapons?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Government's efforts have been directed towards securing early agreement on a comprehensive non-proliferation treaty which will embody an acceptable balance of mutual obligations and responsibilities of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers. These are principles embodied in United Nations resolutions to which both the powers referred to have subscribed. What constitutes balance of responsibilities and obligations is under discussion and different views have been expressed. The question of annoying them by our stand does not, therefore, arise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question-hour is over.