

these rules which are kinding on the Table of the House?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, the time to place these on the Table of the House has not yet come. When it comes I would certainly have no objection; with your permission, I will do it. As far as the ruling which is being quoted here is concerned, he is quoting from the 'Design Competition For An Indoor Stadium'. This booklet was published when the people participated in the competition. It reads:

"The DDA undertakes to pay the following prize money within two months of the award of the assessors:

First Prize	Rs. 50,000/-
Second Prize	Rs. 30,000/-
Third Prize	Rs. 20,000/-

Provided the entries in the hands of the Board of Assessors meet the required standard of drawings called for."

This is only a sort of guideline as to on what basis they are going to work. Now about this amount of Rs. 7000, when it was found that it may work a little inadequately, was revised by the DDA and instead of Rs. 7000 it was made Rs. 10,000. Similarly, in the case of Rs. 20,000 also. Therefore, to say that rule or law is absolutely binding on them is not correct. Further more, as far as this is concerned, the decision of the Board of assessors in this respect and in respect of assessing which is the best design will be final. We are not challenging the Board of Assessors as to why they came to this conclusion that this is the best design. But the DDA, while considering the whole provision, will definitely, through the technical committee's report and also, based on the discussions here, take any other help or guideline from any other person who is more competent and expert. The D.D.A. can take it. The Government can take it. The matter is still at a very premature stage.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Are these guidelines not binding on the State?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The discussion is over. Now, there is a statement by the hon. Minister of External Affairs.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh): One point has not been answered. It is a question of ethics. Any architectural design or any money . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): That discussion is over, Dr. Siddhu. You will get some other opportunity. Then you can ask your question.

#### STATEMENT BY MINISTER

#### RECENT VISIT OF THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS TO THE U.S.S.R.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): I am on a point of order, Sir. You will kindly notice that the hon. Minister, Mr. Narasimha Rao, made a statement on his recent visit to the U.S.S.R. in the Lok Sabha yesterday. This statement which he made in the Lok Sabha yesterday has appeared in the Press and we have seen, in all the national papers, the details of the statement made by him on the floor of the Lok Sabha. I do not know what purpose will be served by making the statement on the floor of this House today. My point of order is on a question of propriety. This Government does not treat both the Houses on the same footing and uses the other House for making important statements. It is a very important statement on his visit to the U.S.S.R. His visit was important and what transpired there was important from the point of view of the country. If this statement would have been made simultaneously in both the Houses or on the same day, the purpose would have been

[Shri Narasingha Prasad Nanda]

served. No purpose would be served by making the statement now. The Minister, by his action, has belittled the position of this House. It involves a serious question of propriety. Sir, I beseech you to direct the Minister not to indulge in this kind of discrimination between the two Houses of Parliament which are equal in all respects except in financial matters and not to treat this House in this manner. You will kindly direct the Minister not to indulge in this kind of act of impropriety in future.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gujarat):

I entirely endorse what Mr. Nanda has said. Sir, we know that till now the Government was so scrupulous about it that if it was not possible for the External Affairs Minister to come over here, then the Minister of State would come or some other person would come to apprise both the Houses simultaneously on all important questions. It has never happened before. It is unfortunate that it should have happened in this case.

श्री शिव चन्द झा (बिहार) उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे कहना है कि यह वक्तव्य जो इन्होंने लोक सभा में दिया और आज यहां देने जा रहे हैं। यह काफी लम्बे समय के बाद वापस आने के बाद दे रहे हैं। कर्तव्य यह था कि आने के तुरंत बाद ही ये देते। यह इसलिए और दे रहे हैं कि चूंकि रिटर्न में अनस्टांड क्वेश्चन में यह पूछा गया था। वह कल या परसों सरकार की तरफ से आने वाला है। उसको न देते फिर भी किसी रूप में देना पड़ता। हम लोगों ने भी इसलिए क्वेश्चन के रूप में इनको प्रेशराईज किया। क्वेश्चन फ्राईडे में है। यही अनस्टांड है। इसमें इनको देना ही पड़ता इसलिए वे दबाव में आकर दे रहे हैं। इसका मतलब यह

था कि इनका इरादा था कि न दें, जितना टाल सकते हैं टालें।

दूसरी बात यह है कि यह स्टेटमेंट लोक सभा में दे दिया तो अखबार में बात आ गयी। सुबह आते ही मैंने पूछा कि स्टेटमेंट के कागज लाओ तो उन्होंने कहा कि नहीं। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि लोक सभा में जब स्टेटमेंट हो गया और लोक सभा में जो बातें आ जाती हैं उनके कागजात हमको मिल जाते हैं। इसलिए जो वहां स्टेटमेंट दिया गया है, वह हमको उपलब्ध क्यों नहीं हुआ है? बारह बजे से हम लोग यहां हैं, यह बात भी है। यह दोनों बातें आपके सामने हैं।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश): यह स्टेटमेंट जो आदर्शनीय मंत्री जी पढ़ने जा रहे हैं, उसका क्या महत्व है और इस सदन को क्या लाभ होगा? मंत्री जी ने चार दिन पहले यहां आश्वासन दिया था कि मैं इस सदन के सामने एक स्टेटमेंट दूंगा। सारा स्टेटमेंट, पूरे का पूरा, जो मंत्री जी ने लोक सभा में दिया है, सारी अखबारों में छपा है। अब तो जो टाइम मंत्री जी, पन्द्रह बीस मिनट लेंगे, वह वेस्ट आफ टाइम होगा। सारे देश के लोगों ने उसको पढ़ लिया है।

इसलिए, मैं निवेदन करता हूं कि मंत्री जी कम से कम इतना ख्याल जरूर करें कि इस सदन की मर्यादा का भी ध्यान रखें और कल जो आपने यहां स्टेटमेंट नहीं दिया, इसके लिए कोई उचित कारण नहीं है।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, I am making the statement on the day on which I am asked to make the statement. So far as

the other question raised from the other side is concerned, immediately after landing at the Palam airport, pressmen asked me and I told them that I am going to make a statement on the floor of the Houses of the Parliament and, therefore do not ask ... (Interruption) I am answering the other point raised that only after finding a question having been tabled, I made haste to make a statement. That is not true. On landing at Palam airport, the first thing I told the pressmen who came to me was, "Please do not ask me any further questions because I have to make a statement on the floor of the Parliament." I have asked for time at the earliest opportunity and I am making the statement in each House on the day allotted for the statement. This is the position, Sir. (Interruptions).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Order, please.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: He could have read the statement yesterday itself.  
(Interruptions)

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : . . (Interruptions)

जान करके इसको डिले किया है और इस सदन की मर्यादा को नहीं रखा है।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: But, Sir, I am going to add that if it is the wish of the House that any statement like this has to be made on the same day in both the Houses . . .

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: That is the practice followed.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: That is the practice.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I do not know about this practice. I was asked about the date. Whatever date was convenient to me, I had pointed out. But if it is considered necessary to make it on the same day, I have no objection. But since this date has been fixed for

making a statement, I am making it. If I had been asked to make it on the same day, I would have done this.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the practice of making a statement.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: That is a long-standing practice of each and every Minister. Your Parliamentary Affairs Minister knows it that in both the Houses, the statement is laid or read on the same day.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I really do not know about it.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Sir, he may not complete the ritual of reading out the statement which he made in the Lok Sabha. Let him just lay it on the Table of the House and we will take it as having been read. We have already read the statement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): It is a very desirable practice that if a similar statement has to be made in both the Houses, it must be made, if not simultaneously, at least on the same day.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes, Sir, I now see the point. But since I was personally not aware of this practice and since I pointed out a date which was convenient to me, the same date was fixed and so, I am making it. Nothing more than that. This is not meant as any disrespect to this House and I would like to assure that to this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The hon. Minister may proceed with the statement.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): Is there something additional?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is nothing additional. I am reading the same statement verbatim.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: You lay it on the Table of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Mr. Nanda, please let the Minister proceed with the statement.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the invitation of the Government of the USSR, I paid an official visit to the Soviet Union from 3 to 7 June 1980. During my stay in Moscow I was received by President Brezhnev and had an opportunity of exchanging views on matters of interest and concern to our two countries. I had official talks with my colleague, the Foreign Minister of the USSR, Mr. A. A. Gromyko, on a wide range of subjects covering both bilateral relations and international affairs.

I also had a meeting with the Deputy Prime Minister of the USSR, Mr. I. V. Arkhipov, who together with me is the Co-Chairman of the Indo-Soviet Inter-Governmental Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

Besides Moscow, I also visited Leningrad, a city full of historic memories. During my short stay in that city, I had an opportunity of meeting with Mr. G. V. Romanov, who heads the regional Communist Party in Leningrad.

It was my first visit to the Soviet Union, a country which had suffered great devastation in the most destructive war of our times, the Second World War. It was, therefore, a moving experience to witness massive reconstruction efforts undertaken by that country symbolised by the rise of the city of Leningrad from the ruins.

I would like to place on the Table of the House a copy of the Joint

Press Statement issued at the end of my visit. I would also like to share with the Hon'ble Members some of the impressions of my visit. Wherever I went, I was received with great warmth and friendliness which spoke eloquently of the highest esteem in which our country and our people are held.

I would also like to share with the House the universal admiration for our Prime Minister and the conference in her policies which was evident during my visit to the Soviet Union. Our Soviet friends profusely expressed their regard for Smt. Indira Gandhi and respect for her leadership of the Government of India.

My talks with the Soviet leaders were marked by a cordiality and openness which, I dare say, is a measure of the close nature of Indo-Soviet relationship and which admits of no inhibitions or misunderstandings. Fortunately, there are no bilateral problems between our two countries to preoccupy the Foreign Ministers. I did, however, review in some detail the progress achieved in Indo-Soviet economic, technical and scientific cooperations, since my last meeting with Mr. Arkhipov in February this year. We agreed that the next session of the Indo-Soviet Joint Commission will be held in New Delhi some time during October or November 1980.

Both in Moscow and in Leningrad, I had an opportunity to visit the Institutes of Oriental Research and meet Soviet Indologists. I was impressed by the depth and breadth of Indological studies, both ancient and modern, in the Soviet Union. The fact that these great institutions, more than a century old, have been engaged in the study and research of different aspects of Indian life, including the preparation of an authoritative version of the Mahabharata—these facts at once place the abiding bonds of interest and understanding between the peoples of India and the

Soviet Union in the right historical perspective.

I also visited the Progress Publishing House in Moscow which, along with many other similar Publishing Houses, is engaged in a massive and multifaceted programme of translations of literary works of Indian languages into Russian and vice versa. There is every scope to widen this exchange so as to include all the languages in the Soviet Union. The fact that the books translated into Russian run into 50,000 copies or more and are all sold out within a few days goes to show the depth of knowledge and insight of the Indian scene on the part of the vast Soviet readership. Needless to say, these offer ample scope for greater and more diversified bilateral cooperation.

As the House may recall, the Soviet Foreign Minister had visited India from February 12 to 14 this year when among other things we had discussed in some detail the evolving situation in South West Asia. A number of important developments have taken place both in our region and in the international environment since that visit. The Presidents of USSR and France met in Warsaw. The Soviet Foreign Minister and his American counterpart and colleague, the Secretary of State, met in Vienna. Therefore, my visit to the Soviet Union, apart from being a protocol visit in return for the visit of the Soviet Foreign Minister, had deeper significance in the context of the developments I have mentioned above.

We discussed international issues generally and I am glad to say that on many of them, there was similarity of views between our two countries. I would, however, like to inform the House about the important and urgent subjects which came up for a detailed exchange of views in Moscow.

The Soviet leaders were of the view that the international situation had been aggravated by several pro-

vocative moves by the USA. However, as stated above, some meetings have taken place recently between Soviet and Western leaders which appear to mark the resumption of a dialogue which was interrupted earlier this year. More meetings of the same kind are likely to take place. It is reasonable to believe that as a result of these meetings it may be possible to revive detente in Europe say by the beginning of next year. It was my assessment that the Soviet Union shared this expectation on international detente and this finds reflection in our Joint Statement.

Another problem I discussed at length with Mr. Gromyko and subsequently with Mr. Brezhnev was the regional situation in South West Asia.

The Soviet position, as we understand it, was that the Afghan issue had been artificially exaggerated by outside forces and that aggression against Afghanistan was still continuing with the help of well armed and trained insurgents based on Pakistan territory. The Afghan Government has put forward proposals for a political settlement, the first step in which would have to be a meeting between the representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan and similarly between the representatives of Afghanistan and Iran. Only after direct contacts had been established, could other countries think of participation in the working out of a guaranteed solution. But any talk about the withdrawal of forces without furnishing of complete and reliable guarantees of an end to interference in Afghanistan and without an actual end of such interference would merely hinder the achievement of a Solution. At the same time the Soviet leaders left us in no doubt on the Soviet Union's readiness to withdraw troops once a political settlement had been reached.

Our approach to the problem has been as follows: We are opposed to the presence of foreign troops in any country. The Soviet Union had announced that Soviet assistance to

[Shri Narasimha Rao]

Afghanistan was limited in time, purpose and scale and did not present a threat to security and stability in the region. However, reports coming out of Afghanistan during the past few months, even after they are discounted for the inevitable interested propaganda element, do seem to suggest that in view of the situation there, the hope that Soviet assistance to Afghanistan could indeed remain limited in time as originally intended is not very strong.

This is naturally a matter of concern to India as indeed to the others who seek a reduction of tension and a peaceful solution to the problems of the region. It is time for us to ask ourselves the question whether the Soviet troops meant for assisting in Afghanistan have not become, or are not likely to become, a pretext for those who wish to create further instability in that country. Our fear is that beyond a reasonable time frame this could well come to pass and this is why we urge that a stage has come when ways and means, other than military, should be devised to bring about a solution to the problem while this is still within the range of possibility. The emergence of a political solution in Afghanistan has, therefore, acquired an urgency greater than ever before.

I am sure Hon. Members will agree with me when I say that the situation in Afghanistan is evolving so fast that it would be rash for anyone to claim that he has an answer to the problem. For instance, after my return from Moscow, the 3-Member Committee proposed by the Islamic Foreign Ministers Conference has met in Tehran. In regard to this Committee, while we tended to believe that it would constitute an advance over the previous position of the Islamic Conference, we did not get any clearcut corroboration of this assessment, while we were in Moscow. On the whole, this Committee seems

to have had a mixed reception so far, although allowance has to be made for the extreme nature and appearance of initial public postures on both sides. Again, I have seen press reports from Washington, quoting a senior U.S. official which would suggest a slight but significant shift in the American position on the subject. We shall not let these uncertainties and ambiguities deter or dampen our efforts to work towards a solution. In such circumstances, it would be too early, if not also inappropriate, to make a definitive assessment of the situation. However, adverting to my visit to the Soviet Union, I must add that the Soviet Union seemed to have fully understood and respected the views held by India, recognising that it is but natural for a non-aligned country like India to have a different perspective on some international questions. I have every reason to believe that the Soviet leadership appreciates our efforts to attain normalisation in and around Afghanistan. This issue has not allowed even the slightest clouding of our bilateral relations; these have indeed grown from strength to strength during the last five months.

As the House is aware, the Government has had the benefit of holding consultations with a very large number of countries, both in the region and outside, and the consensus after our consultations—and these include our discussions with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries of Eastern Europe—is that there is a need to prevent escalation of tensions in South West Asia. There is also a recognition all round that the problems can be resolved only through a political solution.

Sir, since I am confining this statement to my visit to the Soviet Union, I shall conclude it with a brief outline of what appears to be the possible directions for a meaningful follow-up. It is obvious that we are too vitally interested in the region to be dismayed or disheartened by the

alternating swings of over-reaction and utter scepticism which seem to characterise the opinions of some other countries. We will not give up. The immediate task is to undertake consultations for the limited purpose of getting a dialogue started, without any strict stipulation as to the outcome thereof. This will be our endeavour hereafter, although in view of the stated positions as of today, it is not going to be an easy task. This exercise will also involve a meticulous lifting of global regional and national aspects and their inevitable inter-action. However, in the process several other lines of perception would open up for further probe and action leading, hopefully, to the contours of a political solution.

Before I end, I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to my Soviet hosts for the warm and cordial hospitality extended to me and to the members of my delegation. This visit marks yet another important stage in the consolidation of relations between our two countries. I am confident that India and the Soviet Union will, in future, continue to cooperate closely, both bilaterally as well as in the international arena.

Thank you.

### INDO-SOVIET JOINT PRESS STATEMENT

Jyaistha 17, 1902

New Delhi  
June 7, 1980

At the invitation of the Government of the USSR, the Minister of External Affairs of India, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao paid an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union from June 3 to 7, 1980.

During his stay in Moscow the Minister of External Affairs of India laid wreaths at the Mausoleum of V. I. Lenin and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

In addition to Moscow, the Indian Minister and his party visited Lenin-grad.

The Minister of External Affairs of India Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao was received by Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to whom he conveyed greetings from the President and the Prime Minister of India.

Talks were held with Mr. A. A. Gromyko, Member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao also had a meeting with Mr. I. V. Arkhipov, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and Co-Chairman of the Inter-Governmental Indo-Soviet Commission of Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

The talks and discussions were conducted in a warm and friendly atmosphere. The two sides reviewed the development of their bilateral relations and also a wide range of international question of mutual interest. They agreed to continue in future as well exchanging views on such questions through appropriate contacts.

Both sides noted with satisfaction that relations between India and the Soviet Union contributed to peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world. They are based on friendship, equality and mutual trust and are developing in the spirit of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation.

The two sides reviewed the progress of long-term agreements encompassing the key spheres and directions of Indo-Soviet cooperation.

The two sides reiterated their determination to continue developing and strengthening in every way the close relations between India and the USSR in the interest of the two peoples.

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

Having exchanged views on major international problems the two sides noted with satisfaction that the positions of India and the Soviet Union on the questions discussed were close.

India and the Soviet Union reaffirmed their conviction that the process of international detente should be extended to all regions of the globe and reaffirmed their adherence to the principles of peaceful co-existence and mutually beneficial and equal cooperation among States. They expressed their firm resolve to continue and support the struggle for ending the arms race and against imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism and all forms of domination.

The Minister of External Affairs of India, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao thanked the leadership of the Soviet Union for the warm welcome and cordial hospitality extended to him and members of his delegation during his stay in the Soviet Union.

On behalf of the Indian leaders he conveyed an invitation to Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to pay an official visit to India. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

The Minister of External Affairs extended an invitation to Mr. A. A. Gromyko, Member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, to pay an official visit to India. The invitation was also accepted with gratitude.

Both sides expressed their satisfaction with the results of the visit to the Soviet Union by the Minister of External Affairs of India, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao and consider them a positive contribution to the development of mutual understanding and friendship between the Soviet Union and India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Mr. Raju. Only one question by every hon. Member.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): Sir, before Mr. Raju seeks a clarification, may I point out that the hon. Minister has made a very important statement? (*Interruptions*) I am not asking a question. Sir, serious developments have taken place in the international scene like the arming of Diego Garcia. Sir, we have discussed in this House many internal matters, serious internal matters. But I think, there should be a discussion on the international situation also. Questions by hon. Members will not satisfy us. Hence, may I request the hon. Minister that he should permit a one-day discussion on this? You may kindly convey this to the Chairman.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am willing for a full fledged debate on international affairs.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I do not think more information, has been added to our knowledge after the visit of the hon. Foreign Minister to Moscow. It was good he went there. I would like to know, firstly, what is the divergence in approach which the Minister has actually discovered between India and the Soviet Union, for the solution of the problem in Afghanistan? What is the divergence in concrete terms? Where is it that the measure of difference is visible, is significant?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI) in the chair] Secondly, the hon. Minister has mentioned quite a number of times that a 'political settlement' a 'political, solution' is the only method and that the Soviet Union also wants a 'political solution'. It is only a generalisation. In concrete terms, what is the 'political solution', which is in the mind of the Soviet Union? What exactly the Soviet Union wants which should happen because the crux of the problem, without mixing up many



other things, is the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the Afghan soil? For this purpose, what exactly the Soviet Union wants? What does it mean by a 'political solution' or a 'political settlement' or a 'political approach'? These are the two questions. Firstly, what is the divergence in approach between India and the Soviet Union? Secondly, what does the Soviet Union want as a pre-condition to facilitate the Soviet troops to withdraw from Afghanistan, in concrete terms?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO :

Sir, in the first place, it is the troops of the Soviet Union which are in Afghanistan. This is the first point. In the very basic situation of our countries, there is a difference. Here is the Soviet Union whose troops, willy-nilly, have gone into Afghanistan. Here is India which wants peace in the region and, therefore, the perception of India has to be, to some extent, different from that of the Soviet Union. But actually, after the entire gamut of discussions, what the Soviet Union wants is a political solution. What we want is a political solution too. So far as 'political solution' is concerned, we have converged at that point. According to the Soviet Union, what is meant by 'political solution' is what I have just now read out. I have said:

"The Afghan Government has put forward proposals...." This is what came to be the final picture after so many statements have been made although in the final picture there has not been very great departure from the original stand. I am placing before the House the final picture as it came before us.

The Afghan Government has put forward proposals on the 14th of May, 1980, for a political settlement, the first step in which would have to be a meeting between the representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan and similarly between the representatives of Afghanistan and Iran. Only after

direct contacts had been established, could other countries think of participation in the working out of a guaranteed solution. Any talk about the withdrawal of forces without furnishing of complete and reliable guarantees of an end to interference in Afghanistan—and this is important—and without an actual end of such interference, would merely hinder the achievement of a solution. At the same time the Soviet leaders left us in no doubt on the Soviet Union's readiness to withdraw troops once a political settlement had been reached.

It was said in many quarters that even after all these guarantees are given, even after this settlement is reached, where is the guarantee that the Soviet Union would withdraw its troops? This was a very very persistent doubt being raised in many quarters. Refuting these doubts, they replied that those who are raising the doubts are perhaps looking at them as they look at themselves, and, therefore, these doubts are being raised. So, on this score I am convinced, on the basis of what they have told us, that there is no question of their continuing to keep their troops in Afghanistan after a settlement is reached. So, this is the position.

Now, Sir, we are not taking this solely as the basis of our efforts. No. We are talking to everyone concerned and we are trying to find out what would be the GCM or the LCM of the situation. So, the crux of the whole thing is that the Soviet Union has endorsed the proposals put forth by the Government of Afghanistan. The Soviet Union has not put forth these proposals as its own proposals. They have merely supported and endorsed them. According to these proposals firstly, the Afghanistan Government should have talks with the representatives of the Pakistan Government. Then the Afghanistan Government should have talks with the represen-

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

tatives of the Iran Government. After these contacts are established, then there will be a stage which will involve other countries also because those are the countries which have to give guarantees or be involved in working out the guarantees. So, this is the kind of *modus operandi* that they have spelt out.

Now on the other hand, the Soviet Union has made it clear that unless the solution or settlement is reached, there is no question of their withdrawing the troops. The demand of the Islamic Foreign Ministers' Conference, as the House may recall, is firstly, unconditional, total withdrawal of the Soviet troops. So, where is the meeting ground? There is no meeting ground. In the same way, the manner in which the Islamic Foreign Ministers' Conference on the 27th to 29th of January passed a resolution was such that the door was completely banged shut against any possibility of talks between these concerned countries. Now, after the second Conference on 17th to 19th of May, they have set up a three-man Committee. A three-man Committee has been set up to deal with the matter. It has been made a little more flexible. We find the decision keeps the door a little open, but this was not corroborated by the Soviets. They said that they have nothing to do with it. If the three-man Committee wants to come to Moscow, they would politely say that it should go to Kabul instead of coming to Moscow. But we still felt, here is an improvement, here is a decision of the Second Islamic Foreign Ministers' Conference which marks an improvement over their first decision. Now, again, where does this Committee stand? In regard to the Afghanistan Government, they have refused to talk to the Committee as such, but then there may be a possibility of their talking separately. The Committee has the very same persons with whom they

wanted to talk. So all these questions have to be gone into. The Afghan proposals are there before us, they merit consideration, yet they cannot be final according to us because we have to talk to several people and find a formula on the basis of which talks could go on, a dialogue could be started. This is the position.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Normally speaking, when a statement is made by a Minister... (Interruptions) Just a second. From the clarification of the Minister it seems we will be entering into a debate. We will be almost entering into a debate. There are six special Mentions. So I will give chance to five persons to ask questions.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SITA RAM KESRI): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I appeal to you, because the Government Business is not being completed and there is an understanding in the Business Advisory Committee also since the Foreign Minister has given an assurance that he is ready for any day to be allotted for the debate, it is no use wasting the time of the House. I appeal to the Opposition...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Minister, if no question had been allowed, I could have prevented this. But a question has been allowed by one Member, and the Chair also has assured some Members that they will be allowed. So I request hon. Members to be brief. We are having a full discussion on this subject matter also later on.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Brevity or otherwise depends on the question.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: Let us put questions and he can reply these together.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI):** But please make your questions short.

**SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Gujarat):** Sir, I am glad that for the first time after this Government came into power, it has taken a very clear and realistic attitude as regards the problem of Afghanistan. Because in January the Prime Minister said that Russia, had entered Afghanistan at the invitation of Afghanistan. That stand was there and the stand was, in the beginning, confused. But now I am glad that it is very clear. The stand of the Government of India now is that Russia should withdraw. So far as this stand is concerned, everybody will agree with it. But in the latter portion, the hon'ble Minister was kind enough to elaborate here that it was a conditional thing with the Russians, that unless some political agreement or political solution comes out, they are not going to withdraw; so it becomes a conditional thing. I would like to know whether the Government of India has compromised its attitude on the sovereignty of a country, whatever policy it might have, that an outside country can just go into such a country and threaten the sovereignty of a particular small country with the condition that unless a political agreement comes about, they are not going to go out. Sir, this is a vicious circle.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** I have already answered that.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GASWAMI):** Just a second. I think the subject is such that if a clarification is sought, obviously the hon. Minister will have to enter into the entire arena of debate. Therefore, I feel when the hon. Minister has assured us that there will be a debate, let us sit at that. So now I go to Special Mentions. (*Interruptions*). The clarifications will take time. The subject is such which he cannot deal with in a short time.

**SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Bihar):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, shall we come back to clarifications on the Minister's Statement?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI):** No. Because, as you know, the subject is such where a clarification and a short answer are not possible, we will have a total discussion on the subject. In fact, we should leave it at that so that the Minister's assurance remains. Now we go for Special Mentions. Mr. Mathur.

#### REFERENCE TO THE REPORTED PREPARATIONS BY PAKISTAN TO MAKE AN ATOM BOMB WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF LIBYA

**श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश):** श्रीमन्, मैं एक अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण विषय की ओर सरकार का और सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में आज प्रातःकाल एक समाचार छपा है जिसमें यह कहा गया है कि बी०बी०सी० ने अपने टेलीविजन पर कुछ चीजों का उल्लेख किया है, जिनकी तरफ तुरन्त ध्यान देने की ज़रूरत है। बी०बी०सी० ने कहा है कि चूंकि पाकिस्तान एटोम बम बना रहा है, इसलिए इस बात की पूरी संभावना है कि हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान पर आक्रमण कर दे जिससे कि पाकिस्तान एटोम बम और एटोमिक हथियार न बना सके। यह खबर बड़ी भयंकर खबर है और इसमें राजनैतिक हस्तक्षेप की गंध आती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को इस बात को ब्रिटिश सरकार के साथ लेना चाहिए। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार तो क्या, हिन्दुस्तान का कोई भी व्यक्ति ऐसा नहीं है जो अपने रात्रि स्वप्न में भी यह सोचता हो कि हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान पर आक्रमण करेगा। इसलिए मैं सरकार का बी०बी०सी० की इस खबर