

long time is taken only because of procedure and red-tapism? If so, what is the Government going to do to expedite the matter?

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: This was referred to the Chief Labour Commissioner on 18th November and since then, as I said, there is a similar case before the Tribunal and the Chief Labour Commissioner thinks that we should await the award of the Tribunal so that he can take similar action.

SHRI D. THENGARI: The Minister said that the Chief Labour Commissioner is awaiting the decision in a similar case before the Tribunal and we are also told that the arbitration proceedings are continuing. What exactly is continuing there?

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: The arbitration proceedings have been stopped now because he is awaiting the award.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Next question.

*595. [*The questioner (Shri Surjit Singh Atwal) was absent. For answer vide col. 4109 infra.*]

MR. AVERELL HARRIMAN'S VISIT TO INDIA

*596. SHRI M. C. SHAH: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state the main subjects discussed with Mr. Averell Harriman during his recent visit to India?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): During Mr. Harriman's visit there was exchange of view on current international problems. Among these were the situation in Vietnam, the Congo and in West Asia, the Crisis in the United Nations, the problem of nuclear proliferation.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: May I know whether Mr. Harriman spoke about the attitude of the U.S. Government in case of a nuclear attack by China?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: This matter was not specifically raised with Mr. Harriman.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I know if the Minister's attention has been drawn to the statement of Mr. Harriman that the points of view of India and France on Vietnam are not identical, while the French Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, after their talks with the Indian leaders, had said that the attitude of France and India was identical on Vietnam? Which of these versions is correct?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: It is not customary to contradict the statement of one dignitary belonging to one country by the dignitary belonging to another country. It is very embarrassing for me to comment upon what the distinguished American may have said in contradiction to what the distinguished French statesman may have said but our views on this question are well known and I have mentioned them even on the floor of this House more than once. Our basic approach is that there should be cessation of hostilities and that there should be a political solution because we believe that a military solution of this problem in Vietnam is not possible.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know at whose instance Mr. Harriman visited this country, whether he himself wrote to the Government of India that he would like to come and have some consultations or whether the Government of India invited him to come for such consultations? May I also know in this connection whether the Government of India told Mr. Harriman in the course of the discussions that in its view the Geneva Agreement of 1954 should be observed and that the American troops should be withdrawn from Vietnam in pursuance of that agreement? May I know whether this suggestion was made by the Government of India when they met the American representative and lastly, since he has said he was a distinguished man and the French also are distinguished men, we believe we are also distinguished men and therefore may I know, in view of the fact that such a confusion had been created by Mr. Harri-

man's public utterance with regard to what passed between him and the representatives of the Government of India, as referred to by Mr. Sinha, why the Government did not take any steps at least to clarify the position, at least not to allow such impression to gain ground?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Is it in public interest?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: On the question of invitation, the House would no doubt be aware that Mr. Harriman visited a number of countries and when we learnt that he is coming in this direction also, we extended an invitation. We will do that again whether he is an American representative or Soviet or French. We would like to exchange views and take the opportunity of giving our view-point to these roving ambassadors.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Roving or roaming?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am sure that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, when he has his earphone on, is not that hard of hearing which he sometimes pretends. Regarding the second point as to whether we made our position quite clear to Mr. Harriman, we did because that is the object of having these talks and we did explain our position on this Vietnam question very clearly to Mr. Harriman and he was not in doubt of that at all but that may not be entirely in the manner in which he enunciates because he presumes certain things and then says whether this thing was said or not said. That is not the way we conduct our affairs. We have our own views on this issue which have been enunciated on the floor of this House and we stick to those views and we explained our position quite clearly to Mr. Harriman. Further, the details of the talks are not matters which are normally discussed in public. The third point which has been said is that they are two distinguished statesmen and we also are distinguished. We hope we are. Sometimes the hon. Member opposite has doubts. . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not the Foreign Minister.

156 RSD.—2.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: In modesty I may not say but it is a fact that we are very distinguished and we play a definite role in the world. We play a definite role in the world and therefore our position does not depend upon the positions that might be taken by the representatives of one or the other countries. We have our own view and therefore it is not necessary for me to make a choice between what is put forward by an American statesman or a French Minister or an Ambassador. We have got our own views, which are known to the country and which I have explained many times on the floor of this House.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: The hon. Minister has said that the question of eventual nuclear attack from China was not discussed. But in view of the fact that Mr. Harriman and the United States of America have commended our decision of not making an atom bomb, in view of the fact that they commend this attitude is it possible to separate the question of an eventual nuclear attack from China from this question? Either there should be some guarantee that there will be some help from the nuclear powers, or no power in the world has a moral right to say to us that we have done well in taking that decision.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I take note of this exposition by the hon. Member; there is nothing for me to answer.

WELFARE OF ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL FUND

*597. SHRI S. C. DEV: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have decided to create a fund for the welfare of serving armed forces personnel and for the resettlement of ex-service-men including officers; and

(b) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (DR. D. S. RAJU): (a) and (b) A statement is laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha.