

Pharmaceutical Corporation Limited, Ranikhet (U.P.) for the year ended 31st March, 1979.

(4) A statement (Hindi and English versions) explaining reasons for not laying the Annual Reports of the Indian Medicines Pharmaceutical Corporation Limited, Ranikhet (U.P.) for the years 1979-80 and 1980-81 within the stipulated period of nine months after the close of the Accounting year.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3096/81].

12.22 hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

STATEMENT SHOWING REPLIES BY GOVERNMENT IN RESPECT OF DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

SHRI S B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO (Rajahmundry) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table (Hindi and English versions) of the Statement showing final replies of Government in respect of Chapter V and further information in respect of other Chapters of the Seventh Action Taken Report of the Estimates Committee (Sixth Lok Sabha) on Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms—Recruitment, Training and Orientation of All India Services.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICES OF PROFIT

SECOND REPORT

SHRI JAMILUR RAHMAN (Kishanganj): Sir, I beg to present the Second Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Statement by Minister—Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN- TARY AFFAIRS AND WORKS AND

HOUSING (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): Sir, during the visit of the Chinese Foreign Minister to India....

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is Mr. Narasimha Rao?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Narasimha Rao is in the other House.

12.23 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. SINO-INDIAN TALKS HELD IN BEIJING ANNEXATION OF GOLAN HEIGHTS BY ISRAEL AND SITUATION IN POLAND

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN- TARY AFFAIRS AND WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): Sir, during the visit of the Chinese Foreign Minister to India, we had agreed that official level talks would be held in Beijing regarding both bilateral problems and bilateral exchanges. Talks were accordingly held in Beijing for five days from December 10 to 14. There were three session of plenary discussions, and several meetings of sub-groups on matter concerning the boundary, trade and economic cooperation, cultural exchanges, and science and technology. Various members of the delegation also met senior officials of the concerned Ministries and visited a number of institutions. The delegation had a meeting with Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Huang Hua. The atmosphere was friendly and cordial throughout all the meetings and discussions.

Regarding the border, it was not our anticipation that it would be possible to make substantive progress in the first round. The two sides have had a fairly detailed exchange of views, and although fairly wide differences persist. We hope that they could result in a better understanding of each other's positions. In the light of the report of our delegation, we are now considering how we should take

[Shri Bhisma Narain Singh]

this matter forward. We may, however, regard the fact of the meeting itself, the first on this subject in 20 years, as a positive step. This, I understand, is the Chinese view also.

The delegation reviewed the level of exchanges in various fields such as culture, trade, economic cooperation and science and technology, and tentative programmes for the future are now being considered by the various Ministries and agencies.

As I have repeatedly informed the House, it is the desire of the Government to normalise relations fully with China. This is only possible when we can bring about a complete resolution of our problems as well as a stable relationship in all fields.

Sir, may I now refer to a development that has taken place in the middle East. I refer to the Israeli Government's decision to annex the occupied Syrian territory of Golan Heights. The matter is already before the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Security Council has been specially convened to discuss this matter. In the General Assembly, India has co-sponsored a draft resolution which, while expressing its grave alarm at the Israeli decision to apply Israeli law to the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights, and reaffirming that acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible under the NU Charter, principles of International Law and relevant UN resolutions, asks, *inter alia*, that the General Assembly:

(1) Declare that the Israeli decision is null and void and has no legal validity whatsoever,

(2) Strongly deplore the persistence of Israeli policy of annexation which escalates tension in the region,

(3) Demand that Israel rescinds forthwith its decision,

(4) Call upon all States, Specialized Agencies and other International Institutions not to recognise this decision,

(5) Request the Security Council, in the event of Israel's failure to implement this resolution, to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

While this matter is currently being debated and discussed in the UN in New York, it is clear that Israel continues to pursue a policy of expansionism by force. It is highly provocative and aggressive, being a policy of conquest and confrontation which will further aggravate the already tense and indeed volatile situation in West Asia.

Sir, I finally turn to the developments which have recently taken place in Poland. Hon'ble Members are aware that a state of emergency was declared in Poland from midnight on 12/13 December and an Army Council of National Salvation was constituted. This was announced in a radio broadcast by Prime Minister Jaruzelski who said that he was taking these measures "obeying the Polish Constitution".

We have been following these developments, under conditions of interrupted communications. The Polish Ambassador in New Delhi called on me yesterday, under instructions of his Government, and gave an account of the recent developments. He also conveyed to me message from our Ambassador in Warsaw that the Polish authorities are giving the Indian Embassy the necessary protection and that all the members of the Indian community in Poland are safe.

What is happening in Poland is primarily the concern of its Government and people. We earnestly hope the present crisis will be overcome by them in the shortest possible time. We view such developments from the stand-point of our commitment to the principle of non-interference.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I have to make a request. We cannot make comments on the statement but I demand that discussion be permitted on a very vital issue.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप नोटिस दीं जि। ।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have already given you notice.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: (Guntur): what is the use of discussion...

RELEASE OF MEMBER

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following telegram dated 16 December, 1981, from the District Magistrate, Ujjain, to-day:—

"I have the honour to inform you that Shri Satyanarayan Jatiya, Member of Lok Sabha who was arrested on 15-12-1981 for obstructing the rail traffic at Ujjain Railway Station was released on 15-12-1981 at 8.30 P.M. on assurance of maintaining peace."

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJAPAYEE (New Delhi): There is no mention about the beating.

12.29 hrs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS BY MEMBERS

MR. SPEAKER: Dr. Swamy.

SHRI N. K. SHEJALKAR (Gwalior): I have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

SHRI N. K. SHEWALKAR: I want to draw your attention to Rule 357. It mentions that explanation can be made only regarding something which has been said in the House. On a previous decision of the House itself in Lok Sabha debates—actually I am not

quoting the commentary on procedure by Shakhdar at page 351 but—on 4-6-1971 there was exactly a point which arose before the House. If you permit me, I shall read out.

It was said:

"In the newspapers of June 2, 1971, news report has appeared"

Explanation was being given by Prof. Madhu Dandavate then....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Why do you involve me in this debate?

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: I have to quote what is already there. I am not involving you.

MR. SPEAKER: I have with me the explanation of Prof. Dadhu Dandavate.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: To make my point clear, the point was raised that contradiction should have been issued outside the House. The House has nothing to do with the statement. If Members of Parliament issue statement, it has nothing to do with the House.

"Shri S. M. Benerjee: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, your point of order is correct.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: It should be expunged.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJAPAYEE: I entirely agree with the views of Shri Dandavate, but this is not the place to make a contradiction.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: He can issue a contradiction to the press but this forum should not be used for that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The signatures were collected in this very House.... (Interruptions.)"

It was said further:

"MR. SPEAKER: This relates to something which happened outside the House. If the signatures are