

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON HIS FOREIGN TOURS

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI): Madam Deputy Chairman, I seek leave to make a statement to the House on my visits abroad since the House last met and to give hon. Members a brief assessment of the talks I have held with the leaders of each of the countries that I have visited.

I paid an official visit to the Soviet Union from 21 to 26 May. I flew to Bangladesh for a day on 2 June. From 5 June to 18 June I visited Egypt, France, Algeria, the United States of America and Geneva in Switzerland.

As the House knows, our relations with the Soviet Union have throughout been excellent and my visit helped further to strengthen the friendship and mutually beneficial co-operation that exist between our countries.

I was accorded an especially warm reception in the Soviet Union. I had several meetings with Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, during which he reiterated the importance which the Soviet Union attached to maintaining high-level contacts with India and to enlarging friendship and understanding with India. I, on my part, pointed out the high value which the Government and people of India attach to our ties. Our discussions were most cordial and far-ranging, covering bilateral relations and international issues of importance. In regard to bilateral relations, we agreed to expand and deepen our existing co-operation in various sectors in a long-term perspective. The international issues discussed included peace and disarmament and the developments in South-East Asia, South-West Asia, West Asia, Iran and Iraq, Southern Africa, Central America and South Asia. We also briefed them on the efforts we have been making to develop friendly relations with our neighbours as well as our initiatives as the Chairman of the Non-aligned Movement. I also met Mr. Nikolai Tikhonov, Chairman of the USSR

Council of Ministers, Mr. Andrei Gromyko, who has now become the President of the Soviet Union and was then Foreign Minister, and other leaders.

The outcome of our discussions have been set out in the Joint Statement which was issued at the end of my visit. Two agreements were signed. The first, an Agreement on Economic and Technical Co-operation, provides for Soviet participation in some important projects included in our Seventh Five-Year Plan, particularly in the power, coal and petroleum sectors. There is also provision for Soviet participation in the iron and steel and machine building sectors. Soviet co-operation under this Agreement is to be covered by a credit of 1 billion roubles.

The second agreement signed was on the main directions of economic, trade, scientific and technical co-operation between our countries upto 2000 A.D.

My programme included visits to Minsk in the Byelorussian Republic and Frunze in the Kirghiz Republic. At a public function in Moscow organised by the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies and the Soviet-India Friendship Society, the Lenin Peace Prize was awarded posthumously to our late Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi. A square in Moscow was also named after her.

In my assessment, the visit has been very useful in enabling the leadership of the Soviet Union to get acquainted with our point of view and in taking Indo-Soviet understanding and co-operation to a new level of cordiality.

The purpose of my visit to Bangladesh on 2nd June was to express India's sincere sympathy to the Government and people of that country over the devastation and loss they had suffered as a result of cyclone. President Jayewardene of Sri Lanka, who was in New Delhi for discussions, also went with me to Bangladesh. We had talks with Lt. General Ershad, President of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. The visit was also an expression of the growing spirit of solidarity among the countries of South Asia.

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

Egypt and Algeria have been close colleagues of ours in the Non-aligned Movement. Shrimati Indira Gandhi was to have visited both countries in April, 1984 but could not do so. After I assumed office, their invitations were renewed.

In Cairo, President Hosni Mubarak received me with great warmth and cordiality. We had an in-depth exchange of views both on international and bilateral matters. Egypt was particularly appreciative of our chairmanship of NAM, our role in promoting disarmament and our efforts to bring about an early end to the Iran-Iraq war. There was agreement on the need to co-operate closely with each other and to remain in touch on the West Asia question. We also were of accord on the need to maximise bilateral economic and commercial co-operation. It was decided that the possibilities might be explored in a more concrete manner at the first meeting of the Indo-Egyptian Joint Commission, which is likely to be held in October, 1985. I also had discussions with Mr. Kamal Hassan Ali, Prime Minister of Egypt.

In Algeria, I had extensive discussions with President Chadli Bendjedid, covering the entire range of bilateral and international issues. The talks were very cordial and relaxed. There was identity of views on international issues of mutual concern and we have agreed to keep in close touch, particularly on NAM issues. It was agreed to set up an institutionalised system of annual exchanges between our two Foreign Offices alternatively in Algiers and New Delhi. I also had talks with the Prime Minister Mr. Abdelhamid Brahimi. In order to give a further impetus to our economic and commercial exchanges we agreed to purchase half a million tonnes of Algerian crude. Algeria has indicated its readiness to accord high priority to the award of commercial contracts and projects to India.

On the question of Western Sahara, our sympathy and support for the Polisario was reiterated. I received Mr. Mahfoud Ali Beiba, Prime Minister

of the SADR and Member of the Executive Committee of the Polisario. It was made known to him that, following the SADR'S participation at the 20th OAU Summit in November, 1984 upgradation of our relations had been under active consideration.

My visit to France followed a series of high-level exchanges since President Giscard D'estaing's visit in January, 1980 the late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's visit to France in November, 1981, President Mitterrand's visit to India in November, 1982 and Shrimati Indira Gandhi's short transit stop-over in Paris in September, 1983. My visit proved to be very useful and reinforced the foundation for a more dynamic bilateral relationship.

President Mitterrand and I took stock of the world situation and the imperative need to promote international peace as well as greater cooperation between the developed and developing nations. I also had extensive discussions with the Prime Minister Mr. Lauren Fabius.

In my meetings, I stressed the need to develop the political and economic aspects of our bilateral relationship in a balanced manner. The French displayed marked receptivity to our point of view.

Two accords were signed during the visit one on the setting up of an Indo-French centre for Promotion of Advanced in India and the order for French assistance in the conversion of urban wastes into energy and depollution of the Ganga river. Overall Indo-French economic cooperation in a number of fields is expected to be significantly enhanced.

I inaugurated the Festival of India on 7th June. As Members are aware, the Festival will continue until mid-1986, and already it has had a marked impact on the French public.

In Paris, I also addressed the UNESCO and reiterated our support to the work which that organisation is doing.

My visit to USA, from June 11 to 15, was most useful.

I had an opportunity to exchange views with President Reagan on major international issues and also on matters of immediate concern to India like reports of Pakistan's plans to produce nuclear weapons and the activities of some terrorist elements. The talks were characterised by warmth and openness.

I welcomed the desire of the President for close cooperation with us on the international dimensions of terrorist violence against India.

I found both in the President and his advisers a great deal of interest and understanding in regard to what we are trying to do in India. Even where we have differences in policy or in approach, I got the feeling that we could still discuss the issues and work together. We value these high-level contacts and would like to continue the dialogue. I believe there is good scope for building on these foundations to broaden our understanding and cooperation.

Honourable Members would have seen the text of the joint statement which was issued at the conclusion of my visit to the United States, which lists out some areas of economic, scientific and technological cooperation. We have identified some specific areas of collaboration, like extending the Science and Technology Initiative for another three years, initiating a vaccine action programme and a long-term research and technology development programme and a programme for advancement of commercial technology.

India was honoured by the invitation extended to me to address a joint meeting of Congress. I also had meetings with other important members of the Administration as well as prominent scientists, leaders of the Press and the media and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Both in Washington and in Houston there were functions with the Indian community. Vice-President Bush graciously accompanied us to Houston, where I paid a brief visit to NASA. A major event in my programme was the formal inauguration of the Festival of India, which was dedicated to the memory of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. President Reagan has referred to the Festival as "an unprecedented nationwide celebration".

Honourable Members would have seen reports about President Reagan's recent surgery. I am sure the entire House would join me in conveying to him, to Mrs Reagan and to the American people our best wishes for his full and speedy recovery.

On the way back from the United States, I broke journey for a day in Geneva where I was accorded the privilege of addressing the International Labour Organisation. In my address I reiterated India's commitment to ameliorating the conditions of our workers in both the organised and unorganised sectors and to urge greater action on the part of I.L.O. in the service of unorganised workers all over the world.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN Shri Satyanarayan Reddy and Shri Parvathaneni Upendra.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Dy. Chairman, I welcome the statement of the Prime Minister and his visit abroad. I happened to be in the United States during his visit and I had participated in some of his functions. I would like to know one or two points from the Prime Minister. One is the American attitude towards arming Pakistan remains the same despite the attempt by the Prime Minister to convince the Reagan Administration to desist from such a step. I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether during his private talks, any hope has been given that the U.S. Administration would change its attitude. Secondly, during my visit, I found a large number of non-resident Indians eager to invest in industries and other projects in this country but our Embassy and our Missions in USA

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta]

as well as in other countries are so non-co-operative and unhelpful in their attitude that many of the Indians have complained to me that their enthusiasm is being dampened due to the unhelpful and non-cooperative attitude of our Embassies and Missions. I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether he would like to warn the Embassies concerned that they should be more prompt in attending to the request of the non-resident Indians. Similarly, the Prime Minister has referred to the Festival of India there. While the Festival of India went of very well in Washington at other places, which I visited, which you also happened to visit, there is hardly any trace of publicity regarding the Festival of India in other centres and particularly the Indian Community in various places is not at all being involved in the celebration there. Hardly anybody knows about the Festival of India being celebrated in the rest of the States in the United States of America. I would also like the Prime Minister to take note of it and give suitable instructions. These are the three-four points which I would like to know from the Prime Minister.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Madam, Dy. Chairman, I congratulate the Hon'ble Prime Minister for his successful visit to these three countries, major countries. The main question which is in the minds of all of us is terrorism of which India is now a victim and terrorist school is being run in U.S.A. Terrorists, who want to create problems for us are being trained. Whether any discussion took place in this regard with the American Administration and what steps are being taken to prevent those people who are interested to create problems for us are not trained in that school or in any part of that country. In this all democratic countries are interested. You know the presence of U.S.S.R. in Afghanistan U. S. army is there. Lot of problems are being created. Refugees are coming to our country. I would like to know whether any discussion took place with the USSR authorities about the problem of Afghanistan.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am glad that the Prime Minister had taken a bold and forthright stand in putting across our country policy of non-alignment of peace and of opposition to an arms race. But, Madam, you will appreciate, and I think our Prime Minister will also appreciate, that putting across one's point of view is one thing and getting others to be influenced in favour of one's point of view is another thing. Our Prime Minister in his statement has stated that his US visit was most useful. May I know from the hon. Prime Minister how and to what extent the usefulness has been manifested in preventing the US Government from arming Pakistan, particularly with nuclear weapons and also in disbanding the training school, the training camps run on US soil for training terrorists.

Secondly, he has referred to his visit to Algeria, and to his talk with the Polisarian Liberation Front leaders. When and in what exact manner is our Government of India going to respond to the liberation activities conducted by the Polisarian Liberation Front leaders. When and in what exact manner is our Government of India going to respond to the liberation activities conducted by the Polisarian Liberation Front, in extending recognition to the Government run by the Polisarian Liberation Front?

And thirdly, our Prime Minister has stated that some collaborations—economic collaborations—trade collaborations and science and technology collaborations have since been finalised between the US Government and our Government. I do not know whether everybody will agree with me, but we know that mostly these collaborations with the imperialist forces like the US are dangerous to the continuation of any country's independent policy, particularly on war and peace. So what is the assessment of our Prime Minister as to what extent and how long our Government will be in a position to continue with its policy of non-alignment, of peace and of opposition to any arms race and imperialist military strategy, while inviting

multinationals and advance technology of Western imperialists and their trade and economic collaborations? Thank you.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairman, I do not think there can be two opinions about the fact that the Prime Minister's recent foreign tour to the various countries was a grand success. And I feel, as an Indian, a young Indian, that our young Prime Minister, having undertaken these arduous journeys so soon after becoming Prime Minister once again with a popular mandate and at great personal risk, has really done Indian proud. Madam, after Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who was the father of modern India's foreign policy, there was a fillip given to the foreign policy of India and to India itself by Shrimati Indira Gandhi when she became the Chairperson of the Non-aligned Movement. And now that Shri Rajiv Gandhi has taken over that mantle, he has really done India good by not only taking up a powerful diplomatic offensive at this stage, as a measure of goodwill, but also by his economic offensive. For a developing country like ours which is poised for growth at this stage, I think the economic offensive which has also been taken will really take India into the 21st century and on the right lines. Madam, this is not an occasion for us to engage in any discussion on foreign policy, but arising out of the Prime Minister's tour, I would like to ask three simple questions. They are very specific. One is whether, in the context of the nuclear bomb by Pakistan about which the Prime Minister has also had talks with President Reagan, he is considering having some sort of direct *detente* type talks with President Zia-ul-Haque so that there could be a lasting peace in this region. The second is whether, as a part of the continuing diplomatic offensive, the Prime Minister will, as early as possible, undertake a visit to our great neighbour. China, which is almost overdue. And finally, I would like to know whether he will, during his

ensuing visit to the United Nations in October, while meeting several other important Heads of State, carry on this diplomatic offensive which he has launched just now.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Madam Deputy Chairman, I note with great satisfaction that our Prime Minister has successful visit to the USSR. The reception accorded to him, the policies pursued by our Government throughout the economic collaboration and trade between us and the USSR, all received a fillip during his visit to that country. But my apprehension regarding his visit to the USA still exists. There are four major disturbing features which exist between our policies, between us and the USA. The first is that they are arming Pakistan with sophisticated weapons. Those weapons are disproportionate to the needs of Pakistan. The apprehension in the minds of our people is that those weapons are being amassed, stockpiled, and will be ultimately used against our country thus disturbing the peace in our region and entailing a lot of destruction. The second point is Pakistan is going ahead with the manufacture and production of the nuclear bomb. People say that they have already made the bomb, even tested it; I do not know. In any case, it is apparent that they are going fast ahead with the manufacture and production of the nuclear bomb. Once they acquire the nuclear bomb, it will be a constant source of danger to our region and to peace in this region. The third point is terrorist training camps or terrorist training colleges are in operation in America and because of these training exercises going on in America we have already experienced a lot of hardship and a lot of tragedy. The fourth is that the Indian Ocean is being used by the Americans for setting up military bases which is very dangerous for this particular region. I would like to know whether on all these points he has been able to convince the American President and the American people that we are very sore on all these four points and that they

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta]

must mend their policies, their outlook and see that India also exists here, and arming Pakistan with these lethal weapons or not making any attempt to stop Pakistan from manufacturing the nuclear bomb, are matters which would not aid or further good relationship between the two countries. If there has been any success on these points during his visit to the USA, we could say that his visit has been successful or partially successful. But if on all these four points we have not been able to extract any particular concession, I would still congratulate him to the extent that he has endeared himself to the American people and I would not say that there has been any improvement or any sign of hope that our relations with the USA would improve.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Madam, after hearing the some what overstated well-orchestrated eulogies from an honourable member who is obviously on the wrong side of the House, I would like to say that I am happy that the Prime Minister's first 'get-acquainted' visit overseas has met with the unquestioning accolade of his own party.

Madam, I do believe that the Prime Minister's travels abroad were motivated by a sense of high national purpose and good intentions. But such are the motivations of every Head of Government. It is precisely here that one of the difficulties arises because to convert good individual intentions into good international relations is difficult. We have also watched with some fascination the accompanying media hoopla which, I am sure, was a matter of satisfaction both to the object and the subject of it. I am also happy, Madam, that the Prime Minister, following upon his visit to the Soviet Union, in a statement in the Press, said that he shares with Mr. Gorbachyov a similarity of approach to the problems facing their respective countries and that is a matter of

happiness for all of us. I am nevertheless a little apprehensive and it is my fervent hope that that sharing of similarity does not extend to shared philosophies on the question of internal emergency. However, Madam, I would like to take this opportunity, while congratulating all the officials, the entire embassy staff of all the countries concerned and, of course, the Prime Minister, for the success with which his visit has not, to seek three clarifications.

My first clarification relates to a statement that he has made, and which has appeared in the Press, that on the question of terrorism he has held discussions with the officials in the United States who have shared with the Government of India some information, but not all the information that is in their possession. Now, the Prime Minister's statement—these are not his exact words; I am trying to quote as best as my memory serves—that all the information in their possession has been shared presupposes that the Government of India has suspicions about other activities, about other information which has not yet been made available to the Government of India. Would the honourable Prime Minister like to elucidate what that other information is—that is his and the Government's suspicion—which they feel, is in the possession of the United States, which the FBI or any other agency like this, but which is not being shared as yet with us.

My second clarification relates to his visit to the Soviet Union. I shall not go into the question of the one billion rouble credit. It is a very complicated question and it will take too much of our time. But I would seek clarifications on the proposal which I believe was voiced by General Secretary Gorbachov about South-Asian Security Zone. I may be faulted in the exact nomenclature of it, but not on the information. Is this different from the earlier proposal that was mooted and what is the Government of India's response to it?

My third clarification relates to his visit to France. It is a recent matter of newspaper reportage that the French Ambassador to Islamabad has talked of supplying Pakistan with a nuclear reactor. Did you, Mr. Prime Minister, in your meeting with President Mitterrand or with the Prime Minister Fabius take up these matters and discuss the question of France-Pakistan nuclear co-operation and, if so, what are the details of it? Thank you, Madam.

6.00 P. M.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Madam Deputy Chairman, there was a lot of interest shown by the Soviet Union, France and United States in regard to the visit of the Prime Minister to those countries. They showed a lot of interest, naturally because they wanted to see the new Prime Minister of India, how he looked like....(Interruptions)

AN.. HON. MEMBER: Much better than Morarji Desai....

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: (Interruptions) And they were particularly curious as his visit was the first visit after a smooth succession in India after the last General Elections, and they did naturally like to cultivate him. And nothing wrong about it. And I must say, without indulging in flattery, that his visit was good, useful and rewarding. (Interruptions) I have very carefully listened to the statements of the Prime Minister regarding his talks with the various Governments of the countries which he visited. Two or three things are uppermost in my mind. I want to ask a clarification whether he discussed those things with the Governments there.

One point referred to by my hon. friend here was the Afghanistan issue. Of late, there has been a considerable talk about 'Finlandisation' that is, to give Afghanistan a status like Finland. Was this question discussed by the Prime Minister with the Soviet leaders and, if so, what was the

reaction to this, to bring about normalisation in Afghanistan? Second, when he visited the United States, did he really discuss about the arms supply to Pakistan and did he also explore the possibility of purchase of US arms by India, because some time past there was an offer by the United States Government to sell arms to India? Was this question also discussed? If so, what is the area which was covered by this discussion. Thirdly, when he visited these two super powers, did he discuss about demilitarisation of the Indian Ocean, which was a very live issue? There is super-power rivalry in the Indian Ocean which is growing day by day. I think we all will be interested to know whether the Prime Minister had occasion to discuss with the Soviet leaders and also the American leaders, so far as this question is concerned.

Madam, finally I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether his discussions with the American President have convinced him that America in future would not offer any scope or ground for encouraging terrorism or terrorist activities or training of terrorists in that country which will, in the long run, affect our security here. I would like to know whether any positive assurance was given by President Reagan to our Prime Minister in this regard. Lastly, I again say that his visit was good and I welcome it.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I come to the specific points that were raised. Yes, we did bring up the question of the U.S.A. supplying weapons to Pakistan. But we made it very clear that it was only affecting us to the extent that we had to spend money in purchasing arms ourselves and we were not interfering in what was happening between the U.S.A. and Pakistan. We were not there to whine about what was happening in a neighbouring country. India is big enough, strong enough. We do not need to whine about what is happening elsewhere.

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

Festival publicity: I think the hon. Members have had their heads in the sand like ostriches because the amount of publicity that the festival, especially in the United States, has got, no other event in the history of the United States has got. Whether it is T. V. or newspapers or magazines or journals, you name it and everything is full of the Festival of India. The Festival is targeted at bringing India to the Americans and not to the Indians who live in America. You must remember that. As regards the Indians, we hope they will come back and see India here.

The next point that was raised was regarding the N.R.I. investments and the problems they have with the Embassy there. I am afraid that although no specific cases were brought to my notice when I was there, this definitely is a shortcoming. Our dealings are very bureaucratic and sometimes a little time-consuming. We are trying to rectify them. We have the India Investment Centre in New York which specifically deals with such investment matters. But we have recognised this weakness and we are taking steps to rectify it.

The issue of the terrorist training school has been taken up at various levels in the United States. I think somebody mentioned that I talked to the officials about terrorist training school. No. I didn't. I don't remember talking to any officials. I think you must be aware that the official level talks are done by the officials on both sides.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The statement that you made specifically says that the information that was available with them is shared by them with you or with the Government of India. But it is your belief that all the information available with them has not been shared. That is the statement.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I have understood the last part of your sen-

tence. But I have not understood the first half of your sentence.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The question was: was any information given to the Government of India by the U. S. Government relating to terrorists? Then you said: Some information was given, but all the information available with them has not been shared. That is the point.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: You said that I talked to the officials. I did not talk to the officials. It was for the officials to talk to the officials.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes, of course, they are part of your team.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I don't know what you did when your Prime Minister went abroad. I don't know whether it was with the officials.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, No. When you go as Prime Minister, officials accompanying you are going on a Prime Ministerial visit. They are not going as officials.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I think, maybe, Jaswant Singhji will explain to you one day how these things work.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would be delighted because it would be educative. But if you could answer the second part of it...

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: How can I answer the second part when I have not understood the first part.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: You suggested that the second part is understood, but the first part you did not want to recognise. If you could understand the second part, perhaps...

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: You are getting very complicated. The fact is that before my visit, I had sent an emissary. This is slightly out of the visit. I had sent a special emissary

to the US specially for this. You might remember reading it in the newspapers. And they had assured him that they would give full co-operation. After that, the co-operation had increased sufficiently but we got the feeling that everything was not being given to us. If you ask us what was that everything, it is the same as when you say that we are not telling you everything. And we can ask you; what are we not telling you?

The next question that was raised was whether the issue of Afghanistan had been raised and discussed in the countries. It has been discussed in all the countries, and specially in the USSR and in the US. And we got the honest feeling that both these countries did want a solution on that but both the countries felt that the other country did not want a solution. And we have tried to help them in clearing this air. We have not been actively, directly involved in any mediation or any such efforts. But we tried to clear the atmosphere to help the talks, and we believe some of the steps we have taken did help in clearing the air at the last meetings.

One Member mentioned about the US arming Pakistan with nuclear weapons. I am not aware of this. In case you heard about it, please let us know and we will check about it. Regarding the recognition of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, this is a question like I said that we are considering. And the fact is that we are considering it. What more do you want me to tell you about that?

I think one of our Members mentioned about technology from the west and the dangers it has to developing countries. Well, we feel India is strong enough not to come under any such pressures, and we have an economy which is strong enough to bear up to such pressures. But I do believe that some such technology is being sought from the State from which the hon. Member comes.

We will definitely carry on the diplomatic efforts that we have started off at the UN, and also at CHOGM just before the UN. And not only at such international fora, but we will carry on this right through. We feel that India has tremendous credibility and we should use this for the betterment of humankind, for the betterment of the developing nations, and we will be doing our best.

The Indian Ocean also was discussed. The nuclear weapons being present in the Indian Ocean was discussed. And the stand of the countries is well-known. There was no substantial change in their positions.

Jaswant Singhji said a lot of things about the accolade from our Members and about emergency for at least four or five minutes. And then he went on to ask three totally different questions. I am not sure whether he wants me to comment on his banter before he came to the questions or does he want me only to comment on the question.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Both.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Well, the first thing he said was about the accolade from our side about my visit. I do not think there is any accolade from our side. I do not think it is necessary. Whatever impressions my visit has made, they have made in the countries that I have gone to. We do not need to comment on them here. And, I would like to remind the hon. Member about how seven years ago when our Prime Minister also visited certain foreign countries, he visited the U.S., he also went to the Press Club and he gave certain interviews, and instead of talking about the world issues, we discussed peculiar dietary habits. Was that the pinnacle of Indian diplomacy?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA : This is unbecoming of you to refer to that.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : He mentioned about Emergency. I do not think that has anything to do with my visit abroad. If you want to discuss it, we can discuss it separately. He also did not

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

want to go into the credit we got of one billion rupees, he found it too complicated. I do not know why he mentioned it that he found it was complicated. The French supply of reactor to Pakistan is a serious matter and we have been looking into it. But the first information that we have got is that this reactor be with full-scope safeguards, which means the maximum safeguards possible under the international agreements and if that is so, then it is adequate for us. We do not need further safeguards on that particular reactor. But we are checking up whether this is actually so or not.

The U.S. did offer arms, weapons, to India. I do not think it would be right for me to tell you what sort of weapons they offered. But our position was made clear to them that we were a little suspicious about the terms and conditions under which they give weapons and we told them quite frankly that this was the major problem. It had been a problem in the past when certain supplies had been cut and we thought that on weapons which were of strategic importance we cannot have an agreement which can be suddenly switched off and on without any say on our part. The second problem was of political pressures with the weapons, and we brought out both the points. There were political reasons for the way they would do things, with the supplies, and we felt that we had been put under pressure in the past, other countries had been put under pressure, and we would like some sort of building up of confidence before we took such a step and we are looking into that as to how this can be done.

The question of terrorists was brought up with the U.S. Administration. In fact, it was brought up after my visit again in the context of the Air India accident and the TWA hijacking.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): Including the training camps.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Anybody else wanting to say something?

AN HON. MEMBER: Did they assure you that they would be disbanding the schools?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Anybody else wanting to say something?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: The schools, they say, are outside the purview of their laws. (*Interruptions*) Do you want to say anything else? You can finish and after that I will speak.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: We are simply worried that such schools are there.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Why don't you worry to listen instead of just talking and worrying about that? We have brought this to their notice that we think that this sort of thing is not all right. We have also said that where certain questions developed which were not a problem earlier then laws can be changed to deal with such things. Terrorism today is at a level which has never been seen before. Today the mood also in the international circles is very anti-terrorist and it is time that action could be taken at an international level to try and solve this problem. After my return, I have again written to them on international terrorism specifically pointing out that there could be no progress towards getting rid of international terrorism unless State-sponsored terrorism is put an end to. Thank you.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: In connection with that school, we understand that the Government of India is in possession of the film on how the training camp is being operated and conducted on the U.S. soil, particularly in Alabama, and it was shown to the Members of the Consultative Committee for the Ministry of External Affairs. Is the Government considering to show this film through the national hook-up on the Doordarshan so that people of our country could come to know as to who the people are who are being trained there and who are the people training them?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Straight answer to it is 'No'. We are not intend-

ing to show. We are intending to show it to the Members. We do not want to show it on an open network because apart from showing it to those people who are going there it would also be showing to people who know nothing about where to go, in case you had not thought of that. And as a matter of details the film is not about the training that it going on in the camp; it is an interview with the principal or the Dean or whatever he is of the school. It is a straight interview; it has one or two minutes of very dramatised stocking and walking down the road and shooting. But it is only an interview; the substantial part of it is interview. And we will be showing it to the Members, Bhagatjit is going to fix up a date, and hopefully he will do it this week.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Armed clashes between the Assam and Nagaland Police in the first week of June, 1985 at Merapani on the Assam and Nagaland border resulting in a number of casualties—contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we come back to calling attention. Shri K. Mohanan.

SHRI K. MOHANAN: I shall conclude my speech within 2 or 3 minutes. These two Chief Ministers, the Chief Minister of Nagaland and the Chief Minister of Assam.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But let the people who want to go out, go and then the business may start. It is not fair. They had not come here only to remain present when the Prime Minister will be present.. (*Interruptions*). It is not fair.

SHRI K. MOHANAN: It is utter disrespect to the House. You can go but don't make noise.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In the House Members can come in and go out any time they like.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Not in such a way.

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): We are here to listen to you.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Only to show your face to the Prime Minister.

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: We will listen; don't worry.

SHRI K. MOHANAN: Even without a single Member in the House, I can speak. So you don't bother.

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Are you getting the inspiration from this side?

SHRI K. MOHANAN: Madam, the two Chief Ministers, of Nagaland and Assam, are openly violating the Constitutional obligations of protecting the unity and the integrity of the country. Therefore, I would like to know from the Government, what action has been taken in this regard? The hon. Minister has mentioned in the statement that the Commission of Enquiry, appointed under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1952, will go into the facts. But, before that, I would like to know whether the Home Minister is prepared to ask the State Governments to put at least the senior officers, those who were responsible for controlling the police of their respective States, under suspension?

[**The Vice-Chairman (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal)** in the Chair.]

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the North-Eastern Region is very sensitive area. We know the episode of Assam. We know who were working there and with what intention they were working there. We know all that. But my question to the Government is: are you preparing more grounds, fertile grounds, for the imperialists and their agents to sow the seeds of disruption in the region again? My specific question to the hon. Minister is—I have mentioned this earlier in my speech—whether the BSF personnel were involved in this and whether the BSF personnel in the Nagaland region are under the control of the Nagaland