

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:**  
Sir, we want a decision.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** Mr. Gapalsamy, are you pressing for a Division?

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** Yes, Sir. I am pressing for a Division.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN:** The question is:

"The the Bill further to amend the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 and the Indian Post Office Act, 1898, with a view to removing the power of the Central Government or State Government to intercept messages and postal articles be taken into consideration."

The House divided.

5.00 P.M.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** Ayes—23.

NOES—39

AYES—23

Baby, Shri M. A.  
Balanandan, Shri E.  
Basu, Shri Chitta  
Basu Ray, Shri Sunil  
Das Gupta, Shri Gurudas  
Gurupadaswamy, M. S.  
Javali, Shri J. P.  
Kalvala, Shri Prabhakar Rao  
Maran, Shri Murasoli  
Rahman, Shri Mohd... Khaleelur  
Rao, Shri Gopala Rao  
Rao, Shri Moturu Hanumantha  
Rao Shri Yalla Sesi Bhushana  
Reddy, Dr. G. Vijaya Mohan  
Sen, Shri Sukomal  
Sivaji, Dr. Yelamanchili  
Sreedharan Shri Arangil  
Swamy, Shri Subramanian  
Uppendra, Shri Parvahaneni  
Verma, Shri Virendra  
Yadav, Shri Ish Dutt  
Yadav, Shri Sharad

NOES—39

Ahluwalia, Shri S. S.  
Bansal, Shri Pawan Kumar  
Barongpa, Shri Sushil  
Bekal Utsahi, Shri  
Bhajan Lal, Shri  
Bhardwaj, Shri Hansraj  
Bhatia, Shri Madan

Chatterjee, Prof. (Mrs.) Asima  
Desai, Shri Jagesh  
Dhusiya, Shri Sohan Lal  
Dubey, Shri Bindeshwari  
Faguni Ram, Dr.  
Fotedar, Shri Makhan Lal  
Hanspal, Shri Harvendra Singh  
Jacob, Shri M. M.  
Jadhav, Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao  
Kakodkar, Shri Purushotam  
Kalita, Shri Bhubaneswar  
Kesri, Shri Sitaran  
Khan, Dr. Abrar Ahmed  
Kidwai, Dr. Mohd. Hashim  
Kulkarni Shri A. G.  
Kuthiravattom, Shri Thomas  
Mahendra Prasad, Shri  
Malaviya, Shri Radhakrishnan  
Manhar, Shri Bhagatram  
Mishra, Shri Shiv Pratap  
Moopnar, Shri G. K.  
Narayanasamy, Shri V.  
Natarajan, Shrimati Jayanthi  
Palaniyandi, Shri M.  
Pandey, Dr. Ratnakar  
Patel, Shri Chhotubhai  
Singh, Shri Vishvijit P.  
Thakur Jagatpal Singh  
Thangakabalu, Shri K. V.  
Tiria, Kumari Sushila  
Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra  
Vora, Shri Motilal

The motion was negatived

#### STATEMENT BY MINISTER

**Re. Prime Minister's visits abroad during June and July, 1988.**

**THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO):** Sir, the Prime Minister visited Syria, Federal Republic of Germany, New York (UN) and Hungary from June 4 to 11, 1988. He also visited Jordan, Yugoslavia, Spain and Turkey from July 11 to 20, 1988. This was the first ever visit by an Indian Prime Minister after a gap of 31 years while the visit to Turkey was after an interval of 28 years. The Prime Minister received a warm welcome in all the countries visited. The talks were held in a friendly and cordial atmosphere and were characterised by goodwill on both sides. During these visits, Prime Minister reviewed matters of bilateral, re-

gional and international concern with leaders of these countries with a view to further strengthening of bilateral ties and extending cooperation with these countries on regional and international issues.

In the discussions with Syrian President Hafez al Assad and Premier Zoubi there was complete agreement on enlarging and diversifying bilateral exchanges. In the regional and international sphere, the syrian side gave its assessment about the situation in the Middle East, Lebanon, and on the Iran-Iraq war. We on our part apprised the Syrian leadership about the situation in our region. The discussions revealed a broad consensus of views between the two sides. There was general appreciation of the Indian stand. Decisions were taken on exchange of visits and meeting of Joint Trade Committee which was due to take place on 27-28th June. An invitation was extended to President Assad to visit India.

The visit to FRG was overdue as the last visit by an Indian PM was in 1971. Visit was also opportune because in recent years Indo-FRG relations have developed considerably. FRG is now our largest trading partner in West Europe. In terms of new collaborations approved by Government of India, it ranks only after USA. It is the biggest bilateral aid donor from amongst West European countries. FRG Government has also been indicating their interest in a high level political dialogue with India. An exceptionally warm reception was accorded to P.M.

PM visited Stuttgart, Munich and Bonn and had discussions with Chancellor Kohl, Foreign Minister Genscher, Economics Minister Dr. Bange-mann, Minister for Economic Cooperation Dr. Hans Klein, Chairman of SPD, Dr. Vogel and Minister-Presidents of Baden-Wuerttemberg (Mr. Speeth) and of Bavaria (Mr. Strass).

There were two rounds of talks with Chancellor Kohl in which bilateral and international issues were

discussed. It was agreed that annual political consultations between the two Foreign Offices will be held regularly. Regular seminars to promote cooperation at the academic, industrial and scientific level between the two countries will be held. Collaboration in science and technology will be promoted by setting up a joint consultative committee to review on-going cooperation and take up new proposals. There would be enhanced cultural exchanges. A Festival of India will be held in FRG in 1990 and a reverse Festival of FRG in India in 1991.

At Bonn PM addressed a special session jointly hosted by Federation of German Industries, German Association of Industry and Trade and German Foreign Policy Association. It was made clear to the German audience that while India had no intention of opening its market completely by removing all restrictions, foreign investment was welcome and would be facilitated by removing procedural delays and other difficulties which are not linked to basic policy decisions.

For the modernisation of Rourkela Steel Plant, the German Federal Government offered a DM 660 million financial package.

The visit contributed to reinforcing Indo-FRG relations in various areas.

Prime Minister's visit to New York was primarily to address the third Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament (SSOD-III). Prime Minister presented before the General Assembly his vision of a nuclear Weapon-free and non-violent world. Following the PM's statement, India tabled far-reaching proposals on a whole range of disarmament issues. The centre-piece of these proposals was a time-bound and phased programme of action for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2010. The most essential features of the Action Plan presented by India is the binding commitment by all nations to eliminate nuclear

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

weapons during a specified period of time. In addition, India presented papers on new technologies and qualitative arms race and a question of disposal of warheads in the nuclear missiles covered by the INF Treaty. P.M. availed of the opportunity of his halt in New York to have meetings with Presidents Najbullah of Afghanistan, President De La Madrid of Mexico and President Vasillba of Cyprus, as also with Deputy Premier Co-Thach of Vietnam, United Nations Secretary General Peres de Cuellar.

Prime Minister visited Hungary on 10th and 11th June at the joint invitation of President of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Mr. Janos Kadar and the newly elected General Secretary of the HSWP and Chairman of the Council of Ministers Mr. Karoly Grosz. Previous Prime Minister level visit from India to Hungary was by Smt. Indira Gandhi in 1972. Prime Minister was given an unprecedented welcome in keeping with the very close political relations and the high level of goodwill on both sides.

The exchange of views on international and regional issues was useful. Hungary supported India's stand on Afghanistan, Sri Lanka and Kampuchea. Hungary also expressed its full agreement with the Action Plan outlined by the Prime Minister in his New York speech delivered at the Special Session on Nuclear Disarmament.

On the bilateral side, ways and means were discussed to expand commercial and economic cooperation between the two countries. The two sides decided to increase the trade turnover to US \$ 200 million by 1990. It has also been decided to hold the 8th Session of the Indo-Hungarian Joint Commission at New Delhi in October 1988. Both sides expressed great happiness at the cultural co-operation between the two countries. Hungary would actively participate in the Nehru Centenary Celebrations. During the visit an agreement bet-

ween Doordarshan and Hungarian TV was signed. Prime Minister extended an invitation to Mr. Karoly Grosz to visit India which has been accepted.

Prime Minister visited Jordan from July 11-13, 1988, the first ever visit by an Indian Prime to that friendly country. Prime Minister was accorded a very warm welcome and the visit received extensive media coverage. He had talks with King Hussein, Crown Prince Hassan and Prime Minister Rifai.

PM's discussions with the Jordanian leadership were held in a friendly and cordial atmosphere and were characterised by frankness and goodwill on both sides. The Jordanian side gave its assessment of the evolving situation in the Middle East and the Iran-Iraq war. Prime Minister in turn briefed the Jordanian leadership about the situation in our region and India's relations with its neighbours. The visit also provided an opportunity for an in-depth review of the entire gamut of Indo-Jordanian bilateral relations. The talks focussed on providing a further boost to bilateral exchanges, particularly in the economic, commercial and scientific fields on an institutionalised basis. The visit of an Indian Private sector team in September 1983 and of a TFAI exhibition in September 1989 were agreed upon. The possibility of Joint ventures was also explored.

Prime Minister paid a visit to Yugoslavia from July 13 to 15, 1988. The previous Prime Ministerial visit was that of Smt. Indira Gandhi in 1983. Yugoslav Government accorded great importance to this visit and invited Prime Minister to address the Yugoslav Assembly and specially called a session for this purpose. Prime Minister held talks with President Dizdarevic Prime Minister Branko Miquilic and Party President Suvar.

The relations between the two countries have been strengthened. The visit has resulted in providing directions

for more cooperation between India and Yugoslavia on bilateral and multilateral issues.

Yugoslavia extended total support to PM's Action Plan on Disarmament. It called for more vigorous pursuit of Smt. Indira Gandhi's initiative for an international conference on money and finance. On our side we lauded Yugoslavia's initiative on the Balkan Foreign Ministers' Conference and efforts to promote Mediterranean security. As two of the founder members of the Non-aligned movement it is important for India and Yugoslavia to find new political directions in view of the far reaching changes in the international environment and the need to maintain and enhance the effectiveness of the Non-aligned Movement in the changed context. Consultation and contact would be confirmed between the two countries for this purpose, as also with a view to intensifying South-South cooperation and reviewing the world economic situation in order to formulate proposals for the resolution of the existing problems, including the debt crisis.

Bilateral cooperation has been strengthened by this visit. Three Agreements/Protocols were signed during this visit. These include an agreement on Information and Broadcasting; a programme for Science and Technology Cooperation over the next three years; and a protocol on Bilateral Cooperation in Sports. Several decisions were taken to expand trade on a balanced basis as well as to intensify economic, industrial, scientific and technical cooperation.

In Spain, Prime Minister had three rounds of talks with Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez during which apart from the internal situation in the two countries the whole gamut of Indo-Spain bilateral relations as well as regional and international questions of interest to the two sides were

discussed. In addition to exploring possibilities of strengthening political, economic and cultural relations between the two countries, an exchange of views took place on East-West relations, EEC matters, disarmament, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka etc.

French Prime Minister Michel Rocard who was vacationing in Spain during PM's visit expressed interest in meeting PM and a tripartite meeting of PM, Gonzales and Rocard took place on July 18 morning at which, *inter alia*, EEC and disarmament matters were discussed.

Prime Minister also addressed a group of top level Spanish industrialists and entrepreneurs with a view to encouraging greater commercial activity between the two countries.

The principle agreements understandings that emerged from the visit as follows:

It was decided to intensify the political dialogue between India and Spain. Spanish PM has accepted the invitation to visit India. Spanish Foreign Minister has also been invited and the visit should materialise before the end of the year. Spain is interested in maintaining a regular dialogue with India on NAM matters which we have welcomed. They reiterated their strong endorsement of the Six-Nation Initiative and promised support for our action plan on disarmament.

As part of the efforts to intensify economic and commercial relations it was agreed: (i) to consider reviving the Agreement on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy which lapsed in 1977; (ii) to explore joint ventures/cooperation in fisheries which is an area of much promise. Spain also showed interest in joint ventures in pharmaceuticals; (iii) Spain which will assume the Presidency of the EEC from January 1, 1989 indicated

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

that it would help India to expand/ safeguard its interests in the EEC and within the EEC it will help to promote the North-South dialogues: (iv) pending agreements on tourism and science and technology will be expedited (v) Spanish Government will use its influence with Iberia so that its flights to India which were suspended in February this year will be resumed; (vi) the two sides will participate in the important Trade fairs in the respective countries.

Regarding Indo-Spanish cooperation in defence related R&D, a team from Spain will come to India for further discussions. Spanish side showed interest in developing cultural relations including promotion of Spanish language teaching in India.

PM's visit laid the foundations for deepening political, economic and commercial relations between the two countries.

Until 2/3 years ago relations between India and Turkey had been insubstantial notwithstanding the historical interaction between the two countries the admiration of our leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru for Kamal Ataturk and the principles of secularism and democracy on which Ataturk based the Turkish Republic, the commitment and admiration which we share.

However, the coming to power of Prime Minister Ozal in 1983 and Turkey's decision to explore new foreign policy options, including towards India as a leader of the non-aligned countries, created a climate favourable to improving of India-Turkey relations. Following Ozal's visit to India in April 1986 relations between India and Turkey have developed rapidly in political, economic, commercial, cultural and other fields.

The Turkish side extended unprecedented diplomatic councils to PM. In addition to two rounds of private talks, extensive discussions took place

between the two Prime Ministers during the several engagements in which they were together. PM also called on President Evren.

The following three agreements were signed during PM's visit:

1. Maritime Agreement.
2. Mutual judicial assistance in Civil and Commercial matters.
3. Mutual judicial assistance in criminal matters.

In addition to the above, an agreement was signed between IRCON and the Turkish National Railways for a US \$ 25 million railway electrification project.

*Inter alia*, it was agreed that: (i) a banking delegation led by the Governor of the Central Bank of Turkey will visit India in October/ November; (ii) further negotiations for finalising the Avoidance of Double Taxation Agreement will be held in Delhi in December 1988; and (iii) Turkish side will send an agricultural delegation to India in early spring 1989.

In addition to bilateral matters there were extensive discussions at various levels on regional and international issues such as Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Iraq-Iran war, West Asia, Turkey's relations with Greece and Bulgaria and the Cyprus dispute.

PM invited President Evren and Prime Minister Ozal to visit India. The invitations were accepted.

We welcome Turkey's bid for closer understanding with us. To begin with it is necessary to establish the required infrastructure for building up relations. While airlines and direct PTI links already exist. The signing of a maritime agreement and progress on cooperation in the banking sector will create the additional infrastructure needed. Prospects of

raising the level of trade are good, but in order to avoid imbalance in our trade, it would be necessary for India to work for project experts, the beginning of which has been made with the railway project.

Just prior to PM's visit Turkey imposed restrictions on export of inverter components to Pakistan and also formally lifted the ban on the Gandhi film.

The visits have provided a fresh impetus to our growing relations with the respective countries and we look forward to a strengthening of our cooperation with them both bilaterally and in international forums.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Hon. Members may seek clarifications on the statement by the Minister. Shri V. M. Jadhav.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): Sir, I am very happy to learn about the visits of our hon. Prime Minister to the various nations, like the Federal Republic of Germany, Syria, Hungary and other countries. These visits are very fruitful in respect of international understanding on economic, social, political and educational matters. When our Prime Minister visited these countries, actually so many agreements were signed. For example, in Germany, for the modernisation of Rourkela Steel Plant the German Federal Government offered a DM 660 million financial package. In the same way, in Hungary also, our Prime Minister had very useful talks with the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and the Head of the State.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I will request you to seek clarifications.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: I would not like to repeat

what is there in the statement, but I would like to say that the Prime Minister paid very useful visits from the national point of view. (Interruptions). I know whatever visits are paid by the Prime Minister or by any of the Ministers for the cause of national interest are not going to be appreciated by you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I will request the hon. Member not to enter into a debate. Please seek your clarifications.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): He was only to express his appreciation.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: I am asking clarifications. But I have to express my appreciation also. There are various problems that India has with her neighbours—Pakistan and China. America is also supplying arms to our neighbouring country, Pakistan. So I would like to know what talks took place during the visits of the Prime Minister with these countries especially in New York with the U.S. Government.

The other clarification that I would like to seek is that the U.N. recently made a request to India to be one of the mediators in the Iran-Iraq war. It has appeared in the press. What stand has been taken in this matter? Though it is not there in the statement, but it is important: that is why I am seeking this clarification.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I think this is not relevant because it is not covered by the Minister's statement.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: The other thing I would like to ask the Minister is, how much India has benefited in the field of economic relations.

Secondly, our Prime Minister had talks in the field of science and tech-

(Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav) nology. So in which field—in the field of technology or in the field of space—have we got benefit out of this international understanding and the various agreements?

Next, I would like to say that India has benefited by the visits of the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister has definitely glorified the image of India abroad. He has followed the policy of non-alignment laid down by the founding father of this nation, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, and later by Madam Indira Gandhi. So through this House, I would like to congratulate our Prime Minister for taking a lead in this direction.

The last clarification I would like to seek is by these visits of the Prime Minister to these several countries, how far have these countries understood us and how Non Aligned Movement has been strengthened?

These are my clarifications. Thank you very much.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first of all I would like to know whether the hon. Prime Minister is available in India today or not... (*Interruptions*). The hon. Prime Minister has so far destroyed all the traditions and conventions. He should have been present, he should have made the statement about his foreign visits. This has been the custom and practice so far.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Mr. Gopalsamy, this is not without precedent and you cannot say that this is an established practice that when the Prime Minister... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He goes abroad and when he comes back he makes a statement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): The Foreign

Minister makes a statement. Your objection is irrelevant.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Narasimha Rao is a competent person all right... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I request honourable Members to maintain order. This objection is overruled. This is not without precedent. Foreign Ministers have made statements in the past and Shri Narasimha Rao, as the Foreign Minister is fully qualified to make the statement.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Mr. Gopalsamy says it is desirable.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I wanted to know whether he is available in India or not. ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra): Sir, this is the most comprehensive statement that I have ever seen. It is a 12-page statement with all the details, and you can see the attitude of the Opposition. This is the most amazing thing. Can't you show your responsibility?... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, did you allow him?

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I am interjecting... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Of course, the honourable Prime Minister has spent one of every nine days abroad. As Prime Minister he visited 52 countries in six continents within three years. He is likely to find a place in Guinness Book of Records. ... (*Interruptions*)... Why I wanted the Prime Minister to be present is because he gave a press interview in New York.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I request you to proceed with your clarification.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** I am coming to the clarification. Our honourable Prime Minister, when he visited New York....

**SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV:** Sir, I have a point of order. When I was seeking clarifications, you asked me to stick to the statement whereas the honourable Member is not restricting himself to the statement. He is not coming to his point at all.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** I am requesting Mr. Gopalsamy also to restrict himself to the clarifications.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** Sir, when our honourable Prime Minister visited the United States, in New York he gave a press interview which has appeared in almost all the national dailies. Some of the replies he gave to the press persons are very disturbing. When there was a question about the delay in taking action against those culprits who were responsible for the killings after the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi... (Interruptions)...

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** I don't think this is correct.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** This is very much relevant.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** You should restrict yourself to the statement.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** The Prime Minister had given a reply and it has appeared in all the dailies.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** You seek your clarifications.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** The Prime Minister has given a reply that justice in India is slow. He decried this country.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** You seek your clarifications. Otherwise it will not go on record.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** He decried his own country. He let down his country and he also said that smuggling was at a high pitch. This is the question for you.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** I request the honourable Member. ... (Interruptions)...

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** We are seeking clarifications on the statement made on the visit of the Prime Minister abroad. During his visit, whatever he stated has come out in the press.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** You seek your clarifications.... (Interruptions) ...

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** He let down his own country. That shows his immaturity.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** Mr. Gopalsamy, this is not an occasion for making such observations. Restrict yourself to clarifications on the statement made by the Minister.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** When he goes abroad, when he addresses a press conference....

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** No speech. Seek your clarifications.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** That is why I expected the Prime Minister to be present when he went abroad. Mr. Narasimha Rao was authorized. He is a competent person. Therefore, I would like to know from him. There is a reference in the statement to a Memorandum of Understanding with Spain. What is the achievement you have made? Our Prime Minister signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Italy two years back.



[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

But when the Italian Prime Minister visited here, when a press person asked what was the follow-up action on the Memorandum of Understanding, he replied, "Nothing has been achieved." So what have you achieved during this visit? This 12-page statement says, "Warm welcome", "Very warm welcome" and "Unprecedented welcome." These are the only achievements. Sir, Here in the statement it is mentioned that bilateral matters and many other issues were taken up. And in Damascus when our Prime Minister visited there, he made an emphatic statement in support of the Palestinian cause, that is, the demand for their traditional homeland is an inalienable right, and he condemned the illegal occupation of the Golan Heights. Sir, I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs Minister, what the policy of this Government is when the Prime Minister of this country goes and makes an emphatic statement in support of the Palestinian cause, the right for their traditional homeland. Also, when he goes to the United States and speaks about the need for a joint action plan for complete disarmament and he made a speech about peace, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what the stand is.

Here also in Belgrade he reiterated about the implementation of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. He made a statement also. He deplored those powers who have got links with South Africa. I would like to know from the hon. Minister.\*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): It will not go on record. This is absolutely irrelevant.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: When you give support for a traditional homeland for the Palestinians.... (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Mr. Gopalsamy...

\*Not recorded.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: There is reference to Sri Lanka.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I will request you once again please to be brief.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I will be brief, Sir, Because the Sri Lankan issue has been mentioned, I am entitled to seek my clarifications. There is a reference to the Sri Lankan issue.

On this very day last year our hon. Prime Minister was not here. He was in Columbo last year. All over the world the Tamils are observing this day, July 29, as the day of betrayal by this Government. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, when this Government is supporting the demand for a traditional homeland for the Palestinians, why are you trying to kill.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): This is irrelevant.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: ...a movement which is making this very same demand for a traditional homeland.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): The Minister need not reply.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This kind of double standards, hypocritic tendency, when will this Government put an end to?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Have you finished now?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am concluding. I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs Minister whether this Government will put an end to this policy of double standards in foreign affairs.

SHRI VISHVIJIT P. SINGH: Normally when he talks on Sri Lanka, he looks up there. But today he was looking to the front.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vishvijit Singh, we are not like you. We are not like bonded labour.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): That means you are not obedient to your leader. You always flout your leader. That is what you are doing.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This is a very bad remark.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have three specific clarifications to seek.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Are you happy with the visit?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I am always happy with what my leader does.

Sir, my first clarification relates to the Prime Minister's visit to the Special Session on Disarmament. I understand, Sir, and I also welcome the fact, that it was for the very first time the such a comprehensive, all-embracing proposal was put forward by any country or any agency with regard to disarmament. My clarification is with regard to the proposals of verification. Did this Action Plan contain any further advance on the original proposals of verification of nuclear arms that had already been suggested by the six-nation initiative, of which India is also a part? Did it contain any reference to the arms race in the outer-space? Did it take any stand upon the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, which India is opposing as being discriminatory against the non-nuclear nations? Further, is there any proposal by the six nations to make sure that the proposals put forward by India in this Action Plan submitted by the Prime Minister are taken further?

My second clarification relates to a very important matter which was referred to towards the end by the hon. Minister for External Affairs, i.e. that Turkey imposed restrictions on export of inverter components to Pakistan. I understand from reports that this was a very vital and very important step, because these inverter components related to Pakistan's nuclear programme. I want to know whether it was a direct result of the Prime Minister's visit that for the first time such a ban or

restriction has been imposed. Am I going on to convince Turkey to be tending further support following this first step towards Pakistan plan?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: It is... (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Do you want me to...

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: ... is Pakistan phobia.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: If you spare me from commentary, I will finish faster.

My third clarification is... the film on Mahatma Gandhi stand that ever since the... internationally, there had... to Pakistan's influence particularly key on the showing of the... ground that Jinnah had not... represented. Was it because of the Minister's visit that the ban... was lifted? Is it that the... ing shown all over Turkey?

Finally about Jordan... unprecedented diplomatic... extended to the Prime Minister... also and that the King... ed the Prime Minister... protocols? I am asking... this is not a Government... Foreign Minister with even... a clandestine visit. Are there... steps towards strengthening... lations as already have been... by the Prime Minister's visit.

Finally I would like to... clarification. There have been... of reports in the press about... Minister using chartered... Air India and Indian Airlines... fact—as reported in the... dated 26th of this month... of other Prime Ministers... have also used chartered... of Air India flights such... Reddy as President... Soviet Union, Bulgaria,...

[Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan]

and Sri Lanka; Mr. V. V. Giri, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed as Presidents and Mr. Jagjivan Ram as Deputy Prime Minister... (Interruptions)

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: (West Bengal); Is it relevant? Why are you allowing her?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I want to know what is the customary practice? I want to know whether this was the practice when other Prime Ministers, including Mr. Morarji Desai, used chartered flights of Air India and Indian Air lines to visit foreign countries (Interruptions)

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Did he use big jumbo jets for Bombay also?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Mr. Morarji Desai stopped in Iran to meet the Hinduja. That is what he did.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I think Mr. Gopalsamy may emulate the lady Member from his native State. She has been very precise in seeking clarifications.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Sir, this Statement given by the hon. External Affairs Minister is quite longish. I cannot deal with all the points read out in this Statement. But I would confine myself to two or three points which I consider important.

One is Prime Minister's visit to Syria and Jordan. It is said when the Prime Minister visited Syria and Jordan, he discussed Iran-Iraq war. What about the other burning problem in that area—the Palestinian problem? There is no mention of it. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Prime Minister discussed with the Syrian and Jordan Governments—both are involved in it—whether the Palestinian problem was discussed. If so, what is the nature of opinion expressed by Syrian Government and Jordanian Government in regard to the homeland of the Palestinians?

I would now come to the Prime Minister's visit to FRG. FRG is a very big economic power in today's world. In the Statement it has been said that trade relations with FRG stands second only to U.S.A. Further it has been mentioned in the statement that it was made clear to the German audience that while India had no intention of opening its market completely by removing all restrictions, foreign investment was welcome and would be facilitated. Now, I would like to emphasise the word 'completely' Yes. I know that market has been open to foreign investors. May I know from the Minister during this visit how many new collaboration agreements were signed between the Prime Minister and the FRG Government inviting the multinationals? This is one point, I want to know. Secondly, it has been said in the statement elsewhere that the Yugoslavian Government supported the Action Plan for Disarmament; and the Hungarian Government supported India's stand on Kampuchea, Afghanistan, etc. May I know from the Minister what was the attitude of the FRG Government with regard to the Prime Minister's disarmament plan? May I know from the Minister what was the attitude of the FRG Government towards the Afghan issue, whether they agreed with the Prime Minister with regard to Afghan action plan? May I know from the Minister whether FRG Government agreed with the Prime Minister in regard to the Action Plan for Disarmament? These things have not been made clear in the statement. The statement dealt with only the economic aspect but not with the political aspects. I would like to know from the Minister about that also.

My last point is that I would like to be very clear that there were reports, I am not sure about it. I want to confirm it from the Minister that while the Prime Minister was in New York to address the U.N. session, he gave some press interviews. The Prime Minister has said about the internal situation of India. It is reported I am not sure. He has said that the Darjeeling situation is getting complicated because of the atti-

ude of the Government of West Bengal. He was critical of West Bengal Government in regard to the Darjeeling situation. May I know from the Minister whether it is appropriate for the Prime Minister to criticise the State Government in the federal set-up while he was abroad, on a foreign soil? May I know from the Minister whether this action of the Prime Minister has enhanced the prestige of India abroad? I want these clarifications from the Minister.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would be very brief. I also want to draw the attention of the Minister regarding the last issue which has been raised by Shri Sukomal Sen. It has been reported widely in Indian press that the Prime Minister made a statement in New York that the Darjeeling problem could not be solved because of unhelpful — I am very soft at least to explain, to project the prime Minister's view—attitude— of the Government of West Bengal. To me, Sir, it is uncalled for, it is an irresponsible statement on the part of the Prime Minister of the country particularly in view of the federal set up of our Constitution. Would the hon. Minister take this opportunity to explain to us as to why this remark was made by the Prime Minister in a foreign country?

I also want to know another thing from the hon. Minister. Our Prime Minister discussed with various leaders of foreign countries during his last tour and in course of discussion regarding the regional problem he also gave his views. In this connection, may I know whether our Prime Minister has referred to the danger emanating from the nuclearisation programme of Pakistan to the leaders of the Governments where he had been to and whether in this connection, the Prime Minister has also brought to the notice of those Governments the role of the United States of America arming Pakistan to the teeth? May I also know from the Minister whether the Prime Minister on his return to India made a statement that the United States of America can stop Pakistan within 24 hours from making any nuclear weapons? I would like to know

whether this view of the Prime Minister which he has conveyed in India has also been conveyed to the other countries where he was on his visits.

My second point to which I want to draw the attention of the Minister is that our Prime Minister discussed the problem of Afghanistan with the leaders of other Governments. I would like to know whether in the course of his discussion, their attention to the violation of the Geneva Agreement by Pakistan on Afghan problem has also been drawn and whether in this connection, our Prime Minister has brought to the notice of those Governments the failure of the U.S.A. to fulfil her obligation as a guarantor Government to the Geneva Agreement.

Thirdly, may I also know from the Minister whether the Prime Minister during his visit to Yugoslavia discussed the question of next chair of the NAM with the leaders of Yugoslavia?

Lastly, it is reported in the statement that the Prime Minister also had discussion with the Hungarian leaders regarding the political solution of the Kampuchean problem. Did our Prime Minister give any indication of any outline of the policy framework with regard to the political solution of the Kampuchean problem? If it had been referred to the Hungarian leaders, what had been their reaction on the probable solution of the Kampuchean problem. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. External Affairs Minister has given an exhaustive statement relating to our Prime Minister's foreign trip to various countries. Sir, when I was going through the Statement, I found that it was for the purpose of improving bilateral relations with the various foreign countries, for improving the economic relations with the countries where our Prime Minister visited and also for the other questions of disarmament and various other aspects. Sir, I find the criticism from the

[Shri V. Narayanasamy]

Opposition parties that our Prime Minister is visiting abroad frequently. I take strong exception to that particular criticism because the head of the country goes to other foreign countries for the purpose of improving the image of our country throughout the world. Apart from that various other aspects of India's foreign policy towards various important issues are also discussed when the Prime Minister goes there. But I am surprised to find that the political parties for their narrow political gains are criticising our Prime Minister because their target is only our Prime Minister and not anything else (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): You please listen.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Let the Chair say whether it is a fact or not. (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): If the hon Members from this side of the House can put their clarifications with criticism, well, the hon. Members from the other side (Government side) have also a right to put their clarifications with praise.... (*Interruptions*)... You may conclude now.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Now, I am on the clarifications. (*Interruptions*) Our Prime Minister made a historic speech in the U.N. Session. In that he gave an action plan for disarmament. The Prime Minister also stressed two points. The major powers should not only stop acquiring nuclear weapons but should also not give nuclear weapons to other countries. This is very vital. To my mind, it seems that our Prime Minister is referring to Pakistan. The United States is supplying and giving nuclear armaments to Pakistan. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs Minister what the reaction of the United States relating to the particular statement made by our Prime Minister in the United Nations' Session relating to nuclear disarmament was.

Sir, the other important aspect is that our Prime Minister was in New York for

24 hours. During that period the Prime Minister met several top leaders of the world. President Najibullah of Afghanistan, the President of Mexico, the President of Cyprus, the Deputy Prime Minister of Vietnam and the President of the United Nations Security Council, Mr. Peres de Cuellar. I would like to know whether the issue relating to the United States supplying large-scale nuclear weapons to Pakistan and also giving package weapon aid to it has been discussed with the leaders of these countries. Another important aspect is that our Prime Minister, when he was in Spain, met the Prime Minister of France. I would like to know whether the issue relating to disarmament and Pakistan's attitude towards India was also discussed.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Tamil Nadu): And Pondicherry?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: When we discuss Tamil Nadu, I will come to Pondicherry. During our Prime Minister's visit, various commercial negotiations have taken place. I would like to know whether apart from the IRCON and the Rourkela Modernisation Project any other food-processing industry discussions have been held in other countries.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very happy that you are in the Chair being an expert in external affairs. I thank the hon. Minister for External Affairs for an exhaustive statement. It has spared the Prime Minister from taking this trouble. But I only make a small comment. In the statement, while referring to the visit and the welcome given there, he has used different terminologies. At one place "extraordinary" at another "warm" at yet another "very warm" and all that. I do not know whether it would cause any diplomatic problems, when you mention this, a uniform term is better. You call it extraordinary or warm welcome.

Sir, before I seek clarifications, I would like to differ strongly from my friend Mr. Gopalsamy in regard to the Prime Minister's visit. It is very unfair to the Prime Minister because his statistics are also

average. He visited 52 countries in 45 months. The average comes to one day in every 10 days. And he forgot that for nine days he was in India. He should have complimented him. In June and July if he was out for one day every three days, he showed extraordinary deference to Parliament because Parliament was not in session and therefore, he could make those trips and if he thinks only the Prime Minister's visit will produce the result, it is up to him. With all the complement of diplomatic staff, the ambassadors and foreign affairs officials, working round the clock, if they cannot produce results and if the Prime Minister's visit produces some results, we should welcome it and that only speaks of the working of the External Affairs Ministry.

Then there are 113 countries more to be covered in one year. The next election is only one year ahead. I do not know what will happen in the next election. Therefore, we should allow him to cover those 113 countries also. Then, we should forget about the inconvenience to Air India, to the passengers, the cancellation of flights and all that. It is immaterial. The country's interests are so supreme and the Prime Minister's visits are so important. Therefore, the first clarification I seek from the Minister is this. Before I come to the major clarifications, I just want to seek a small clarification. What is the criterion for selecting these countries? He is going round the world. I have no objection to that. How do you select the countries? Is it on the basis of the invitations you receive? Or, do you select the countries on the basis of the results we expect or on the basis of trade and economy cooperation or the agreements in the offing? Or is it on the basis of a lottery? This is the first small clarification I ask for from the Minister, the basis on which the countries are selected.

While referring to the visit to FRG you said: "Foreign investment was welcome and would be facilitated removing procedural delays and other difficulties." This is what you said while mentioning about economic cooperation. What are those procedural delays and other difficulties ex-

pressed by the FRG side? I would like to have a clarification of that point. And how soon are you going to remove them? This is mentioned on page 3.

Then the next question is relation to the Jordanian visit. You said, "The possibility of joint ventures was also explored." In what fields? In what spheres? Can you specify them? What are those joint ventures which have been discussed?

Also I am very happy about the results in Yugoslavia, quite encouraging. With our traditional relations with Yugoslavia, we can expect better results.

Then the visit to Spain, the Spanish visit, was mentioned. "There is greater scope for commercial activity between the two countries." I would like to have more information. What are the spheres of commercial activity and cooperation which you are expecting? Thank you.

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** I too have no objection no fundamental objection to the Prime Minister visiting abroad. One expects the Prime Minister as head of Government to go abroad. But then there must be a goal a clearly defined goal and direction. This is what I want really to explore. I have not been able to decipher any goal or direction in the two visits, in the two rounds of visits, to so many countries which have been described by the External Affairs Minister. I do not know whether the Prime Minister takes him into confidence at all. The style of functioning of this Government suggests that most Ministers do not know what the Prime Minister has got in his mind. But there is no doubt that judging by the publicity his visit gets within India compared to the publicity it gets locally, that the Prime Minister is not at all bothered about what he is going to get out of those countries, rather what his visits are going to do back home. In other words, when he was in the United Nations for the so-called historic speech about which Jayantí Natarajan—she has disappeared from the House—was in raptures—that visit did not get one line in the international press, whether it was New York Times or the London Times or it was La Monda in Paris. In any of these international

[Shri Subramanian Swamy]

papers his speech did not get any coverage. And within the United States none of the major networks carried any reference to his speech. Now this has been the pattern wherever the Prime Minister has gone. Hardly any response within the country he goes to and tremendous coverage on Doordarshan and the timing is beautiful. For example, when in June in Allahabad elections were going on, he could not go and campaign there. He went abroad. Everyday people here were watching the Prime Minister making speeches, attacking the Opposition. It was as good as giving those speeches here. I do not know whether there is any analysis done in the External Affairs Ministry of the impact of the Prime Minister's visit on the general population in those countries.

6 00 P.M.

SHRI HARVENDRA SINGH HANS-PAL (Punjab): It gave you the chance to say all these things.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Thank you. But this is still a democracy if you don't mind!

The second thing with regard to the Prime Minister's visit to these countries is the inability to maintain protocol. I am not talking about this visit in particular because I have not got all the details. But I do know that when he went to Japan, when our Prime Minister went to Japan, the Prime Minister of Japan did not come to receive him. When he went to the Soviet Union, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union did not come to receive him. I do know that when Mr. Desai was the Prime Minister, he was received by Mr. Brezhnev at the airport and when he went to all these countries, he was received by the heads of governments or heads of States in those countries. But the Prime Minister of India is going to all these countries allowing all these things, allowing India to be humiliated in this manner. I want to get a clarification from the Minister about this humiliation and I would like to know whether they feel that India is a country which is subservient where you can put up with this kind of a stuff. So, I would like to have a clarification on this. Now, Sir,

I would like to seek two or three more, clarifications.

There is also another impression which is being created and it is that he is in search of countries to go to. Mr. Upendra wanted to know about the system and he wanted to know whether it is by means of a lottery and so on. Take, for example, Syria. Syria did not invite this Prime Minister. Syria had in 1978 invited Mr. Morarji Desai. That invitation was reactivated by sending a message to the Syrian Government and asking them, 'Is the same invitation still valid for me or not?' and it is that invitation on which the Prime Minister has gone to Syria!

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: We have been in power too and we have friends in the Government even today and there are a lot of things that I get to know.

Now, why did he visit Spain? No Prime Minister of India has ever bothered to visit Spain all these decades. Suddenly this Prime Minister decides to go. Of course, there is some certain familiar problem. His brother-in-law happens to be in Spain and so, he has a soft corner for Spain. I am not objecting to that. But the fact is that you are visiting Spain where no Prime Minister has so far gone and you are visiting a country to which no Prime Minister has so far gone. Then I would like to ask whether he will visit Greenland which is a country up in the North Pole which no Prime Minister of any country has so far cared to visit.

Finally, I come to the question of hankering after invitations. Actually, I would like to know from the External Affairs Minister whether this kind of hankering after invitations has not devalued India's image. The same thing is happening in the case of China also. The Chinese invited the Prime Minister in 1985 and, at that time, he had arrogantly turned it down. Now the Chinese are refusing to give a fresh invitation. Like the Syrian one of 1978 and their earlier one of 1983,

the Chinese Government is refusing to issue a new invitation while the Press is all the while writing that he is going to visit China during the course of the year. I would like to know from the honourable Minister whether he shares my concern about the devaluation of the country's image that is taking place because of this kind of directionless and goalless travel abroad.

Now, what is the outcome of all these visits? Reading Mr. Narasimha Rao's statement, verbose statement—I would not call it extensive—what does one get? Of course, Mr. Vishvijit Prithvijit Singh—he is the other V. P. Singh in our House and he has disappeared again—says that this is the best statement that he has ever seen. He will also say that this is the best document that he has ever heard; But this verbose statement says. We had extensive discussions and discussed the whole gamut of relations." What is the "whole gamut of relations" with Spain? What do we have in Spain? Then, it says, "Hungary fully supported us on Afghanistan and Kampuchea." What did you expect? We have been taking stands very close to that of the Soviet Union. Hungary is a close friend of the Soviet Union. So, you expect them to support us on Afghanistan and Kampuchea. But when the Afghanistan talks took place, were you invited? Did you not try to get invited? Were you not told that you had nothing to do with it? Afghanistan is a country which is our neighbour which is connected with us, which is a brotherly country with which we have close ties and which is a country where Indians are living, and we have thoroughly and fully supported the Government of Afghanistan and the Soviet policy there. Despite that, despite the Prime Minister's visit abroad, were you invited to the Afghanistan talks? No, you were not, Pakistan was invited; but you were not. But you say that the it is the Prime Minister's great achievement.

Another thing is that the Prime Minister entered into an agreement with Spain to allow IBERIA planes to fly here. The whole of Air India was against at this announcement, because Air India was never

consulted. But the Prime Minister feels; I am a pilot, I know what it means to fly planes, you can have this. I want to know what is this *ad hocism* about? Why did you agree? There is a tremendous protest in Air India that IBERIA should not be allowed. We do not know that. And yet the Prime Minister went abroad without prior consultation, without brief, and promised the Government of Spain and allowed this flight—as if this is his private property. He said; yes, you can have it; if you want a piece of India you can have that, too. (*Interceptions*)

Finally, the theme of all Congress (I) has been a talking about Pakistan, Pakistan... what happened on Pakistan? You talked to everybody about Pakistan. But did one country support you on Pakistan? Did one newspaper editorial support you on Pakistan? I have got an analysis which is available in the External Affairs Ministry. It says that the Prime Minister's visit was a total flop as far as the rousing of opinion against Pakistan is concerned. Not one country supported you. Turkey did decide not to give nuclear materials to Pakistan. But that is because it is closely related with the U.S. and Israel. Turkey is one of the few Muslim countries which has a relationship with Israel. And it was not because of the Prime Minister's visit. Similarly, "Gandhi" film: that was decided before that and it has nothing to do with the Prime Minister's visit. The Minister says that they discussed Pakistan. And all the Congress (I) MPs, like parrots, are repeating: "Pakistan, Pakistan... America is arming". What did you achieve by this? Not one country supported you on this.

These are the points on which I seek clarifications.

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA** (West Bengal): While putting my question to the Foreign Minister, I would first like to know, what was the main thrust of the visit of the Prime Minister? Was it a visit to secure for India more foreign aid from foreign countries? Or was it a visit as part of India's campaign, as a leading nation in the Non-alignment



[Shri Gurudas Das Gupta.]  
 movement, for peace and against armaments? If it has been a visit to get some aid from West Germany or some capitalist countries, the visit cannot be said to be totally fruitless. But if it is a visit as part of our campaign for peace and disarmament, I am constrained to say—and you can very well appreciate, Sir, that we had been belonging to that part of the political movement which had been an ardent supporter of the non-aligned movement led by India—I am constrained to say that the voluminous report indicates a clear dilution of the non-aligned movement and the philosophy of non-aligned. It is because the visit took place at a time when tension was mounting in the Gulf area. The visit took place at a time when the building up of arms in the Indian Ocean was becoming prominent every day. In the course of his speeches nowhere it is found that the Prime Minister called for unconditional withdrawal of American troops from the Indian Ocean. Yugoslavia happens to be a leader of the non-alignment movement. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister discussed with Yugoslavia the question of convening an international conference on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. If it is a default, why? This is once again a sign of a serious departure of the foreign policy of India. India has not been taking steps to convene a conference for making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. Two, we see that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi had talks with Turkey. And Turkey is a member of the NATO. Since Rajiv Gandhi talks with West Germany and West Germany is also close to America, I would like to know whether he discussed with them the question of unconditional withdrawal of American troops from the Gulf. It is at this period of time when the gravest crime against humanity has been committed by American ship by shooting down the Iranian civilian aircraft and there is a campaign at least in the Indian press that the India protest against the shooting down as been a muffled one. The Indian Government had taken 24 hours to come out with an unequivocal protest against the shooting down. In this voluminous report, there is no mention that Prime Min-

ister had called for withdrawal of the American troops from that region of the world.

Thirdly, this is also a period when grave atrocity, or even genocide, was being committed against the Palestinians. What did the Indian Government do? Did the Indian Government speak about it? Did the Indian Government campaign about it? Or was the Indian Government silent about it?

On all these three important factors, i.e. withdrawal of American ships from Gulf region, withdrawal of American troops from the Indian Ocean and stopping the genocide of the Palestinians, our great Rajiv Gandhi, the great exponent of non-aligned movement, has been conspicuously silent. This is, in fact, a lamentable story of the dilution of the foreign policy laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

As far as I understand, Rajiv Gandhi and his delegation had discussed in detail some of the economic aid, cooperation, etc. with West Germany. It came out in the press that after Mr. Rajiv Gandhi had left West Germany, Mr. L.N. Thapar had gone to West Germany, took up the thread of discussion and entered into discussions with them in order to conclude some contracts with them. Who is this L. N. Thapar? He is a known economic offender and did not pay the taxes that he promised to the country. Therefore, I would like to know whether this L. N. Thapar was introduced by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi to the business world in West Germany. Is it that he, following the footsteps of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, had gone to West Germany to conclude some agreements with them? Therefore, I would like to know whether that L. N. Thappar had been introduced by Mr. Gandhi to the industrialists in West Germany.

**SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL:**  
 (Punjab): Sir, on a point of order. He is seeking clarification on the statement of the Minister. He cannot make these baseless allegations. He should confine himself to the scope of the clarifications.

(Interruptions)

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** The clarification

should be confined only to the statement made by the hon. Minister and no extraneous matters of insinuations are allowed.

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:** I put my question.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** No, you cannot. You have to confine your clarifications to the statement of the Minister and the point of order made by Mr. Bansal is very much valid.

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:** The statement has given the details of economic cooperation with West Germany. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister and his delegation had introduced to their counterparts in West Germany any individual or any industrialists in India including Mr. L. N. Thapar. That is my concrete question.

My last question, Sir, is that it is absolutely indecent on the part of the Prime Minister to indulge in controversy involving the Opposition parties while he is outside the country and visiting a foreign country. He had spoken about the Darjeeling problem and he has accused the West Bengal Government. And he has made some caustic remarks about the national opposition parties. I take exception to it. I would like to know from the Foreign Minister whether it is decent on the part of the Prime Minister, whether it has been proper on the part of the Prime Minister to make such references.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** Sir, I would first start by pointing out that four of these visits were to be undertaken last year—FRG, Hungary, Yugoslavia and Spain. When they were planned, we had no idea that we would have a drought on our hands. But after they were planned, after the host countries had made elaborate preparations and were expecting our Prime Minister to arrive there, we had to consider the situation of drought in this country and whether it would not be a little out of place if the Prime Minister went ahead with his visits. So, even at the cost of causing some embarrassment and a lot of inconvenience to the host countries, these visits were cancelled, of course, with the understanding of the host countries. And, therefore,

these visits had to be completed this year because, otherwise, this would have resulted in certain misunderstanding, misconstruction of why they have been postponed for more than a year. So, that is the main reason why visits to these countries had to be taken up.

Sir, taking the list of the countries as a whole, we will find that there is a variety; a cross section of these countries could be categorised in different ways. Syria and Jordan are very vital in the Middle-East question because they are Frontline States. Non-aligned Movement is something which we have been strengthening all the time. And, as I said, the visit to Yugoslavia was planned last year and it had to be undertaken both for an in-depth discussion of development in the Non-aligned Movement and also of bilateral matters. FRG being our largest economic partner in Europe and in view of the evolving situation in the EEC which is well-known to the hon. Members, it was necessary for us to visit and have discussions with countries of West Europe which have a clout in the EEC and which can help India and also generally the developing countries in a variety of ways. Our relations with FRG have been close and I could testify. Sir, personally that on certain matters, the attitude of some West-European countries is very close to the Non-aligned stand. It is difficult for them to come out, it is difficult for them to join the Non-aligned Movement. But during several discussions which I had earlier, I came to the conclusion that on certain issues their stand is close to the Non-aligned Movement and it would be profitable to the Non-aligned Movement to find friends outside the Movement. We stand for something which if it is endorsed only by the countries of the Movement, it is not enough. It will have to find supporters or at least those who do not oppose our stand, outside the Movement. This is a very very important aspect of the strengthening of the Non-aligned Movement. We do have friends but on all those stands, all those issues, those friends may not be with us. The stand may differ from issue to issue and it is always good to find how many friends we have outside a particular

[Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao.]

ganisation, a particular movement, who are prepared to go along at least half way, at least part of the distance with the stand which we have taken in the Movement, and which we have taken as India. To me these are a little different, the stand of the Non-Aligned Movement and the stand of India on certain matters which may or may not figure so prominently in the Non-Aligned Movement. But on both these counts it is very necessary for us to have friends abroad, find friends from those areas where it is important to find friends. I need not elaborate any further and this was the criterion why the Prime Minister visited FRG.

Spain, Sir, for the first time after a long spell of dictatorship, has come out as a democracy, as a vibrant democracy, as a socialist democracy and it is incumbent on the socialist republic of India to forge realtions with Spain for various reasons including the reason that Spain can help us again in the EEC, which I have already hinted. So, Spain is going to be important. The king Spain visited India some years back. There was no visit from our side. Even I did not, and could not, visit. Several Ministers and the Foreign Minister had come with the King of Spain. So a return visit was overdue not only from the protocol point of view but also from the point of view of changes that have come over Spain and the potential of help, assistance, friendship, cooperation which we expect from Spain and rightly so.

These are some of the considerations. There may be many other countries which also fit into these considerations but then visits have to be properly planned, properly prepared for. These visits have been properly prepared for and there is a reason, there is a criterion, a rationale for these visits.

About Turkey, Sir, I would like to submit that there have been repeated invitations from Turkey to the Foreign Minister of India, to the Prime Minister of India. I was invited, I could not go, and we had certain other constraints because we had a problem in Cyprus and also another aspect of the very close relations which existed between Turkey and

Pakistan, which gave rise to some kind of inhibition. We could get over it after the present Turkish Prime Minister visited India and his visit paved the way for our Prime Minister's visit to Turkey, which has been described as a very useful and a very good visit, a very fruitful visit and I am sure it will be harbinger of more exchanges of visits between India and Turkey. Turkey has some emotional appeal to India. Those of my generation, those of my age will testify that when we were in high school we were told about Kamal Attaturk, and we all admired him. Kamal Attaturk was the father, the architect of modern Turkey. Thus, Sir, all these visits have been planned properly and I am sure that no visit has been purposeless.

Sir, some pertinent questions have been raised and I would be pardoned if I confine myself only to these pertinent points for clarification. I would not like to comment on the other points by not answering them if that is a comment in itself. One point that has been raised is about the Prime Minister's plan of action on disarmament. Three questions have been raised, namely, whether there was any element of verification in the plan, and whether there is any mention of outer space, and the NPT. I would like to say that it will be very difficult to completely describe the plan of action in the course of a clarification. I hope that it will be possible for this House to find time to discuss it in detail so that Government is benefited by the views of the hon. Members. But to the three points raised, I would like to say that there is an elaborate arrangement suggested in the plan of action for verification, and that too, with full participation of the United Nations. It has been our creed always that the United Nations has to be brought into the picture all these operations so that the United Nations, which is the conscience of the world, takes part in these things and it is possible for all the nations of the world to be convinced that something is happening under the United Nations and is just and proper; otherwise there will be suspicions and there will not be as much confidence as is needed, and that is how the United Nations has been brought into

the picture. In regard to verification, there is an elaborate arrangement suggested. Outer space has been suggested because when it is said about all weapons, outer space is automatically included, and when it talks about moratorium on testing of outer space weapons in the first stage well, outer space comes in directly for mention.

About NPT, I would like to say that the question of NPT does not arise because by definition, the action plan is meant to completely eliminate all nuclear weapons. NPT is a treaty which seeks to retain weapons with some nuclear powers, whereas our plan, the plan of total and complete disarmament will not have any need for any NPT which becomes superfluous. Therefore the plan itself is an antithesis, in a way, of NPT and there is no need to make any separate comment on NPT. Our plan is very clear. In fact, there will be no NPT; and this is a much more comprehensive alternative for any of the subterfuges that were being resorted to, including the NPT.

Mr. Chitta Basu raised many questions regarding, whether certain matters were discussed. I would like to say, in brief, that the answer to all the points raised by him is in the affirmative. Most of the questions, if not all, were raised. I do not have the minutes because the report which I have presented is itself long. I cannot go into every detail of what was said by whom and what was the reaction. On matters which they readily agreed with our views, mention has been made. On other matters, we tried to understand each other's position. This is always what happens. Across the table, when we talk, we do not say 'Alright'; you have said this; we agree immediately'. But they do not say, 'You have said this; but we do not agree. If they do not agree, they do not say that they do not agree except on very exceptional occasions on very rare occasions. They will say 'Yes; we are trying to understand your position'. Now, this is an on-going process. It is a continuing process and during the course of a long time, the attitudes of nations can change; not because we cause circumstances also have changed

On many occasions, India's stand has been criticised in the first instance. Now, after five years, six years, seven years, they find that what India had been saying for five years, six years, seven years, has come true and then they start dishing out the same thing as their stand. This happens.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY

Can you give an example?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We are not claiming any authorship. We are not claiming any copyright. All we do is what we consider right we always say without fear or favour. Things go right. Things go wrong. Anything is possible. But we have a stand which is based on principle and not at all on opportunistic alliances or opportunistic attitudes.

Sir, a question was asked why the Palestinian problem had not been raised. I would like to point out that mention of the evolving situation in the Middle-East comprehends the Palestinian problem. The very fact that the Prime Minister visited both Syria and Jordan clearly indicates that we have had a comprehensive first of discussion. The Syrian point of view, the Jordanian point of view, the non-aligned point of view, our own point of view; all these points of view were discussed. That is why it is not an omission at all.

About the Chairman of the non-aligned movement. It is not possible to say that India and Yugoslavia decide about the Chairman of the non-aligned movement as such. It is not done that way. But the point is, when two important founders, members of the non-aligned movement meet at the highest level, there will be a discussion on what kind of Chairman you would like to have next. There have been Chairmen and Chairmen. We have to consider, in the changed circumstances, what kind of dynamism would be needed, what kind of flexibility would be needed, what kind of infrastructure would be needed and what kind of capacity would be needed in the Chairman of the non-aligned movement. Therefore, as a general principle, as a general postulate, these

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao.]

were discussed. I would not like to claim that anything more was discussed because we have yet to discuss, we have yet to address, the problem. In Nicosia, we are going to meet next, in the month of September, to think about the problem. I am not sure we are going to clinch it or at least clinch what recommendations we are going to make to the Summit. But the first exercise is going to begin at the of-reign Minister's level in Nicosia.

Naturally, under these circumstances, at this stage, nothing more could be discussed beyond the general principle or general postulates in regard to what kind of Chairman we would have. Even more important than the question of Chairmanship, what is the future of the non-aligned movement? What is the movement going to do in the nineties for instance? There have been critics of the non-aligned movement who said and who still say that the non-aligned movement was relevant only in a bipolar situation but today we have a multipolar situation emerging very fast. What is the relevance of the non-aligned movement? Now, is this not a question to which the important non-aligned countries, members of the movement, should address themselves? This is precisely the kind of exercise which important countries of the movement have to undertake. And I am glad to say that during the Prime Minister's visit to Yugoslavia there was the beginning of an indepth discussion on this question. About the future of Non-alignment, according to many pundits, ever since it started, they thought that there is really no future for it, but it has come to stay, it has become a very strong moral force. Today we have to understand, we have to figure out where we go next, where the movement goes next, from here. This is the most crucial aspect which was discussed between the leaders.

About Turkey, I have already submitted that it is a good thing, a very good augury that our relations with Turkey are being improved faster and we expect much more to happen between Turkey and India. It is quite significant that from Turkey we are going to have an agricultural delegation. Turkey has a place in agricul-

tural delegation. Turkey has a place in agriculture in the whole of Europe and, therefore, it will be a very meaningful exchange in the field of agriculture between India and Turkey apart from other fields.

About the action plan, one important factual aspect I would like to bring to the notice of the Members. When the Prime Minister visited FRG, the action plan had not yet been unfolded. After FRG he went to UN and unfolded the plan.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is not a new thing.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: He unfolded it before the SSOD, in front of the SSOD.

Sir, I would not go into any of the points which do not arise out of the statement, which are not germane to the statement. All I can say is, speeches such as of Mr. Subramanian Swamy's can be made only in a democratic set-up, and that is the best use of democracy that has made.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I hope this democracy is not there because you want to give it, it is there because the people of India want it.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is right. They have given it to you.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Yes, certainly.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I think these are the specific points which were raised.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: What about the Prime Minister's statement on Darjeeling in New York?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Here is a little information on Iberia Airlines. Air Services Agreement was concluded with Spain in January 1986. Based on this, Iberia the national carriers of Spain, started operations to Bombay since 1986. Air India received compen-

sation from Iberia as they flew to India unilaterally. Iberia has since discontinued their flights for commercial reasons. Since the time Iberia flew to India the tourist traffic from Spain to India has increased considerably. We are interested in getting the Iberia back. This is the position. So there is no question of anyone protesting...

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** What do Air India say?

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** You put the question and we will give all the answers. There is a Minister apart from me to answer such questions. Whenever details in regard to a particular matter are asked for, it may not be possible for me to answer on behalf of the Minister concerned. I would certainly like answers to be given in Parliament.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Had the Prime Minister made the statement, he would have answered all these points.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** I have made the report in general terms on which the specific aspects of cooperation were discussed. If on those aspects more details are needed, I am sure the Government will be willing to give more details. This is an evolving situation. If one agreement has been signed today, so many agreements would be in the pipeline: they will be signed later. So it is not a kind of one-time operation which ends with the visit. In fact, much more starts with the visit. This is what I would like to say.

**SHRI SUKOMAL SEN:** The clarification should be clear. We asked the question whether the Prime Minister made a statement on Darjeeling situation in New York. Why are you silent on that?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** I think it is all very clear.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** I do not think that the Prime Minister made a statement derogatory to any State Government. ... This would not be the case.

There is nothing more that I can add because incidentally I was not there personally. I could not tell any more details. The details that I know of...

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:** This is the result of frequent Cabinet reshuffles. By the time you know things you are changed and the next man comes in. What is this?

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:** Why was Prime Minister conspicuously silent on withdrawal of Americans from the Indian Ocean and Gulf area? Can you kindly answer this?

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** Sir, that is all I have to say.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** The House will now proceed with the Special Mentions.

**श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** पौने सात तो बज गये हैं अब खत्म करिये ।

**उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) :** यह पहले ही से तय है कि जो स्पेशल मेंशन्स बच गये हैं वे आज ही खत्म होंगे ।

**SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh):** One question which he should have clarified, he has not, that is, in regard to joint ventures with FRG and the Prime Minister made a statement that he would change the procedure, if necessary.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** The details need not be given by the Foreign Minister. The statement is quite comprehensive. Details of individual projects cannot be given by the Foreign Minister. As such he was not required to do it.... No, no.

**SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO:** You please ask the External Affairs Minister to answer.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA):** I am not going to ask him. You can put a question and the concerned Minister will give you the details. Now Special Mentions. Shri Thomas Kuthiravattom.