

श्री कृष्ण कुमार गोयल अध्यक्ष
महोदय, ऐसा लगता है कि दिल्ली में कानून
का राज्य नहीं है, बल्कि जंगल का कानून
है। महारानीबाग में

MR. SPEAKER : Irrelevant. I cannot
allow everything.

(Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह उसी में आ
जायेगा ।

(इश्वरदान)

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (Dum Dum) :
A mere Calling Attention is not sufficient.
There should be a full discussion.

श्री हरीश कुमार गंगवार (पीली-
भीत) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश,
बिहार और पंजाब में वर्षान होने से . . .

MR. SPEAKER : We shall consider it.
I have already allowed Half-An-Hour
discussion. We will discuss it.

श्री राजनाथ सोनकर शास्त्री (सैदपुर) :
हमारी पार्टी ने फौमला किया है कि 14 तारीख
से 18 तारीख तक प्रान्तों में कचहरियों
में अनजान होगा। हमें आज सूचना
मिली है कि . . .

MR. SPEAKER : Irrelevant; not allo-
wed.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : What he is showing
is unparliamentary. Irrelevant; not allo-
wed. Papers to be laid.

12. 12 hrs.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

Eighty-Sixth Report of the Law Com- mission on the Partition Act

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE
AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI P.
SHIV SHANKAR) : I beg to lay on the
Table a copy of the Eighty sixth Report
(Hindi version) of the Law Commission
on the Partition Act, 1893.
[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2773/81]

12. 13 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY : Sir, I have to report
the following message received from the
Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha :—

“In accordance with the provisions of
Rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and
Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha,
I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha
that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on
the 7th September, 1981, agreed without
any amendment to the Victoria Memorial
(Amendment) Bill, 1981, which was passed
by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the
17th February, 1981.”

12. 14 hrs.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

FIFTY-SIXTH REPORT

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jaipur) :
I beg to present the Fifty-sixth Report
(Hindi and English versions) of the Public
Accounts Committee on action taken by
Government on the recommendations
contained in their 132nd Report (Sixth
Lok Sabha) on Customs Receipts.

12. 15 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

SEVENTH REPORT

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA (Pali) :
Sir, I beg to present the Seventh Report
(Hindi and English versions) of the Com-
mittee on Subordinate Legislation.

(Interruptions)**

Mr. SPEAKER : What he is saying is
without my permission

12. 16 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED INDO-UNITED STATES DIFFER- ENCE OVER POSTING OF DIPLOMATS

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA (Mandya) :
Sir, I call the attention of the Hon. Minister
of External Affairs to the following matter

of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon :

"The reported Indo-United States differences over the posting of diplomats in India and Washington respectively".

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) : Mr. Speaker Sir, few months back the Government of India became aware of intention of the Department of State to assign Mr. George Griffin as Political Counsellor in the US Embassy in New Delhi. Mr. Griffin was till recently the Deputy Chief of Mission in the US Embassy in Kabul.

After a careful evaluation of Mr. Griffin's activities during his earlier posting in India, the Government of India requested the United States to reassign him to another post. Government's intention was to avoid the likelihood of friction being introduced into bilateral relations with the U.S. which we value and have always sought to strengthen.

On being so informed, the Government of the United States requested us to reconsider our decision and to permit Mr. Griffin to take up his assignment in the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi.

The U.S. authorities also informed us that in case we did not find it possible to reverse our decision on Mr. Griffin's case, the United States would also ask us to withdraw the proposed assignment of a senior Foreign Service Officer, Shri T. Prabhakar Menon. We informed the United States that we would consider this unprecedented retaliatory step on their part as unwarranted and unjustified.

The U. S. State Department stated *inter alia* "That this action was taken at a time when Griffin was a target of a Soviet disinformation campaign makes it particularly regrettable." Our Official spokesman has responded as follows : "It is incorrect to suggest that views, information and pronouncements made by any other country played part in India's decision. Any such conclusion or insinuation is resented by the Government of India."

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA : Sir, a new element of friction, and irritant has been injected into the already sagging relationship between the United States of America and ourselves.

What is, surprising is not the mere rejection on our part of a particular diplomat or the retaliation of the United States of America in rejecting one of our senior diplomats but the attitude, the tenor

and the vehemence with which the United States Department of State has reacted or over-reacted to this entire attitude which is a bit perplexing.

The fissures in the relationship of India with United States of America have started showing up with Tarapur where unilaterally they have threatened to violate the agreement and then came the decision which United States of America has taken to arm Pakistan with the most sophisticated weapons and now comes the row on diplomats. The whole world knows—and I am sure that even the United States of America knows—that India does not have anything like the CIA with its tentacles spread to almost every nook and corner of the world. We do not have a vast network of intelligence, and it is ridiculous for the U.S.A. to reject Mr. Prabhakar Menon without any valid grounds. Now, let us see what Mr. Griffin has been upto in this subcontinent since 1969. We do not have to quote from Indian sources. I would seek your permission, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to quote the then Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, in his memoirs, he has had occasion to mention about the role played by Mr. Griffin. I quote Dr. Henry Kissinger.

"Dr. Henry Kissinger, in his memoirs, acknowledges direct contacts between the United States and the Bangladesh exiles in Calcutta in 1971 and refers to "a futile three-month pursuit of political accommodation that could have amounted to something if India and the Bengalis had wanted". Although he does not name the diplomat, Dr. Kissinger refers to secret meetings 'our counsil in Calcutta' had...."

At that point of time, it was Mr. Griffin who was the Counsil in Calcutta for the United States.

There is also another author, the title of the book is "Bangladesh, The Unfinished Revolution", the name of the author is it is rather tongue-twisting Mr. Lawrence Lifschultz. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy is familiar with this....

Dr. SUBRA MANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North East) : I know him, also.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA : We have no doubt about it that you know.

This gentleman, in this book, has had very interesting things to say about the role that Mr. Griffin played in 1971, 1974 and 1980-81. May I seek your indulgence to quote one paragraph from the book of this gentleman :

"The State Department no longer denies there were secret meeting between U.S. officials and Awaki League

representatives in Calcutta in 1971, not even the fact that Mr. Griffin was the State Department man responsible for this work. Rather, the insistence now is that, as a career officer, he followed instructions and did nothing improper."

He was very vitally connected with the Research and Analysis Wing of the CIA under Mr. Harold Saunders who was a very senior CIA operator.

12.24 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the chair]

Mr. Griffin, when he was stationed in Kabul, was making periodic visits to India, New Delhi. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of External Affairs why was Mr. Griffin—with such a past, with the reputation that he has enjoyed—given the multiple entry visa to visit India from Kabul. While he was in Delhi he has done extensive briefings to the press in India about Afghanistan, using Delhi as a base to carry on an activity which is inimical to our friendly nations like the Soviet Russia and Afghanistan.

AN HON. MEMBER: No question ?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: He has put one question. The rest is quotation from books—a lot of information which he has gathered. I have nothing to comment on the information which he has given. I would only submit that we had to go into the information which we ourselves possessed about what Mr. Griffin was doing. So there is no difference on that. The only question the Hon'ble Member asked was about the visa given to him. I understand that his family was here—his wife and child. Apart from that there does not appear to be any reason why he was given a visa. But when it comes to the posting of that person to our own country, then the matter becomes different. That is all.

श्री राम विलास पासवान (हाजीपुर):
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री जी ने जो जवाब दिया है, प्रश्न एक राजदूत का नहीं है। राजदूत की नियुक्ति तो एक मिनटाल है कि हमारे रिलेशनस अमेरिका के साथ कितने बिगड़े हैं और कितने अच्छे हैं। प्रश्न है अमेरिका के साथ भारत का सम्बन्ध कैसा है। आज के अखबार में निकला है कि भारत ने यूरेनियम एग्जैम्प्ट को रद्द कर दिया है, यह तो मंत्री महोदय ही बतलायेंगे

या प्रधान मंत्री जी बतलायेंगे, कि क्या कारण है कि भारत द्वारा वह रद्द किया गया है।

अभी मेरे साथी ने ठीक ही कहा कि भारत और अमेरिका का सम्बन्ध ऐसा लग रहा है कि दोनों दो किनारों पर पहुंच चुका है। अभी हम चार दिन पहले यवा लोकदल की तरफ से अमेरिकन एम्बेसी पर प्रदर्शन करने के लिए गये थे। जिस ढंग से पाकिस्तान को आर्म सप्लाई हो रहा है, उससे ऐसा लग रहा है कि दोनों देशों का सम्बन्ध एक दूसरे से टूट चुका है। श्रीमती कर्कपट्टीक भारत आई थी और गाली दे कर चली गई, लेकिन फिर भी आप दो मिलियन टन गेहूं के लिए अमेरिका के पास जा रहे हैं। आई० एम० एफ० से पैसा निकालना होगा तो फिर आपको वहाँ जाना पड़ेगा। आपकी नीति कितनी गर्म है, कितनी नरम है, मैं जानना चाहता कि आप किसी एक नीति पर खड़े रहेंगे या नहीं? इस बारे में समय ही बतलाएगा या आप अपने जवाब में बतलायेंगे।

यह पढ़ कर बड़ा दुख हुआ कि प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा भारत का कोई गुप्तचर विभाग नहीं है। हमारा कैसे गुप्तचर विभाग नहीं है? गुप्तचर विभाग है। वह हमारी लॉबी अमेरिका में काम कर रही है या दूसरे मुल्कों में काम कर रही है। आप कहते हैं कि हम किसी भी सी० आई० ए० के एजेंट को यहाँ बर्दाश नहीं कर सकते हैं। क्या आप बतलायेंगे कि जो नया राजदूत आ रहा है, जैसी कि हमें जानकारी मिली है, उनका भी गुप्तचर विभाग से सम्बन्ध है, तो आप फिर क्यों राजदूत बनाने की अनुमति दे रहे हैं? हमारा गुप्तचर विभाग है, चाहे उसका लिंक-अप जर्मनी से हो या लिंक-अप सी० आई० ए० से है, तो इस तरीके से एक दूसरे से आपका मामला मिला-जुला हुआ है।

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

हमारे मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यही हिन्दुस्तान के अखबार में निकला है कि हिन्दुस्तान के एक मंत्री, जिसका सम्बन्ध सी० आई० ए० से है, तो वह कौन मंत्री है ?

I am quoting from the book 'A Dangerous Place' written by Moynihan (Page 41):

"In New Delhi I had pressed the Embassy to go back over the whole of our quarter century in India to establish just what we had been upto. In the end I was satisfied that we had been upto very little. We had twice but only twice interfered only to the extent of providing money to a political party. Both times this was done in the face of a prospective Communist victory in the State elections."

"once in Kerala and once in West Bengal where Calcutta is located. Both times, the money was given to the Congress Party which had asked for it. It was given to Mrs. Gandhi herself.."

(Interruptions)

यह वह व्यक्ति लिखता है जो भारत में अमरीका का राजदूत था...

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN): On a point of order. I take strong objection to this. Wherfrom he is quoting ?

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Durgapur) : Are you defending the CIA agent ? (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We are not discussing on this issue. Please put your question, Mr. Paswan.

In a Calling Attention, the second questioner can take only three minutes. He is quoting so many things. Please put your questions. You cannot discuss or quote in a calling attention. You can do in the form of questions.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Lastly, Sir...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not a discussion. You put questions only. This is not proper. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: I have given you a prior notice.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER; That is all right. In a calling attention, you can put a question. I shall allow you to put questions. This is not a discussion

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस व्यक्ति मोनिहान ने, जो इस वक्त भी सीनेटर है और उस समय भारत में अमरीका का राजदूत था, यह किताब लिखी थी जो आपकी लाइब्रेरी में भी है—क्या आप ने कभी जांच करवाई कि उसके लिखे हुए वाक्य सही हैं या गलत हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This has nothing to do with the calling attention. It is completely irrelevant. The Minister need not reply. It is highly irrelevant; this has nothing to do with the calling attention.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER : How do you say it is irrelevant ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is completely irrelevant to the calling attention. I am not allowing. He need not reply. Mr. Paswan, please put your questions.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur) : Is the Prime Minister's name irrelevant ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It has nothing to do with the calling attention. I shall read.

"I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the reported India-U.S. differences over the posting of diplomats in India and Washington respectively".

It is completely irrelevant. You put your questions only. I am not allowing anybody else. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna). He is putting questions.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him put the questions. On the calling attention please do not bring in extraneous things. You will not get the reply from the Minister.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am asking you according to the wording of this motion 'the activities of diplomats, particularly, the U.S. diplomats in our country', how is it irrelevant. This is a book written by the former Ambassador.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please listen. This is the wording—the posting of diplomats in India and Washington respectively. This has nothing to do with the calling attention.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI:
Why not ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You put your specific questions. You take three minutes. You will get a reply. Please put your questions. This is not a general discussion. I am following your Hindi. I have to guide the deliberations. I have got to decide whether what you have said is relevant or irrelevant.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: It is quite relevant.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This issue has nothing to do with the calling attention. You put your questions only.

SHRI HARISH KUMAR GANGWAR (Pilibhit): Sir, I am on a point of order....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not permitting you. There is no point of order. In a calling attention, no other member whose name is not here can get up and speak. You must take my permission.

I am not permitting you to get up and speak.

I am not permitting you. Even point of order I am not permitting. You cannot get up and raise a point of order. Nothing will go on record except Mr. Paswan's questions.

(Interruptions)**

श्री राम विलास पासवान : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस किताब को पढ़ा है या नहीं पढ़ा है ? यदि उसको पढ़ा है, तो उसके बारे में उन की फाईडिंग क्या है ? अभी जो मैंने पढ़ कर सुनाया है, उस के सम्बन्ध में मंत्री जी को क्या कहना है । मंत्री जी, मैं आप से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने क्या यह जानकारी हासिल की है कि आप का मंत्री, आप की प्रधान मंत्री और आपकी पूरी पार्टी सी० आई० ए० के साथ इनवोल्व्ड है ?

मेरा दूसरा प्रश्न है जैसा मैंने पहले कहा है कि अमरीका के प्रति आप की क्या ठोस नीति है ? एक तरफ़ आप उस से भिक्षा माँगेंगे और दूसरी तरफ़ आप उस पर बिल्ली की तरह गुर्राएँगे ।

मेरा तीसरा प्रश्न यह है कि सरकार विदेश नीति को दलीय नीति बनाना चाहती है । कांग्रेस (आई) की जो विदेश नीति है, वह क्या सारे हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति हो गई है ? क्या इस विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में आप जितने पालीटीकल पार्टीज के लोग हैं, अपोजीशन के लोग हैं और ट्रेजरी बँचेज के लोग हैं, सब के साथ बैठ कर कोई विदेश नीति तय करेंगे और जैसा मैंने पहले कहा कि जो वर्तमान राजदूत हैं, जिस के लिए आप ने अनुमति दी है, क्या उस का भी सम्बन्ध गुप्तधर विभाग से है और यदि है, तो किस आधार पर आप ने यहाँ पर उन को अनुमति दी है ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : जैसा मैंने कहा न एस० एम० वृष्ण जी की पढ़ी हुई किताब पर मैंने टिप्पणी की है और न आप की पढ़ी हुई किताब पर मैं कोई टिप्पणी करूँगा । मैं तो इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो जानकारी हमारे पास है, उस के आधार पर यह फ़ैसला लिया गया और यह जो प्रश्न है, यह एक फ़ैसले के बारे में है । आप आम तौर पर प्रश्न पूछना चाहेंगे तो वह इस में समाएगा नहीं इसलिए कि यह इस संदर्भ में नहीं होगा । मैं आप को यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि हम अपनी जानकारी के आधार पर फ़ैसले करते हैं और यह फ़ैसला भी उसी तरह से हमारे पास जो जानकारी है, उस के आधार पर किया गया है । किसी और के कहने पर नहीं, किसी के वक्तव्य पर नहीं, किसी की पुस्तक पर नहीं और किसी और की किसी बात के आधार पर हम ने यह फ़ैसला नहीं किया है । यह फ़ैसला हमारा है, जानकारी हमारी है, यही मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mrs. Geeta Mukherjee...

श्री हरीश कुमार गंगवार : उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you Mrs. Geeta Mukherjee? There is so much of scientific advancement that perhaps you have become Mrs. Geeta Mukherjee.

श्री हरीश कुमार गंगवार : आप को क्या लगता है ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are you Mrs. Geeta Mukherjee?

श्री हरीश कुमार गंगवार : आप को जैसा लगता है, वैसा ही मेरा नाम है ।

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : Sir, in the statement submitted by the Minister on this Calling Attention it has been observed that the Government of India took this decision of requesting the United States not to appoint Mr. Griffin "After a careful evaluation of Mr. Griffin's activities."

Now, Sir, hon. Shri Krishna referred to some of the reports about his activities on which hon. Minister said that he has no comment to offer. Now, Sir, in view of the fact that he may not have any comment . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On what he quoted from the book he said that he has no comment . . .

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: About that he has no comment to offer.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On that matter which he quoted.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : The American State Department spokesmen Mr. Dean Fisher, in a Press briefing on September 2, was asked:

"Would you say he did not have any intelligence duties?"

He mentioned :

"That is my understanding."

Again, Sir, the same spokesman on the same day was asked :

"Did the Government of India actually state that Mr. Griffin was an Intelligence Agent?"

In reply to that, he stated :

"They never fully explained to us the reasons as to why they took the position they did."

Now, Sir, in view of this clear propaganda offensive of the United States against India on this score, will the hon. Minister now come out with the actual facts which were 'carefully evaluated' by the Government of India,—particularly in view of the fact that our Prime Minister in Bhubaneswar the other day had made a statement (duly reported in the Press) in which she said:

"We had information that the person was connected with the Intelligence service of USA."

In the face of the challenge from the USA will the hon. Minister inform the House about the facts of this case? Sir, we have a right to know this; he should tell us about the nefarious activities of the USA agents in our country. I would like him to place the facts before the House. That is (a).

Now coming to part (b), the hon. Minister said this regarding Griffin's appointment :

"Government's intention was to avoid the likelihood of friction being introduced into our bilateral relations with the U.S."

Now, Sir, was it a question of 'avoiding friction' or was it a question of blocking activities which are conducted in our national interest? I would like to have a clear answer from the Minister.

Then, one more point. (An hon. Member: KGB) I will come to that later. Another question is this. There is this refusal of the US to allow our senior Foreign Service Officer, Shri T. Prabhakar Menon into America. I would like to know whether it is normal diplomatic practice to reject officials without any charge against them? I would like to know whether the US Government accused Mr. Menon of any particular espionage or other activities. If not, I would like to know whether this step would clearly be called an unfriendly act on the part of the US Government. And my last question is about the so-called Soviet dis-information. Informations given by the USA are taken to be authentic without fail by my hon. colleagues like Dr. Subramaniam Swamy and some others. Now, Sir, he thinks that any information coming from the Soviet Union is 'dis-information'. Is it not an American term? Now, Sir, in view of the knowledge that the Government of India has about the real facts, and in view of the words of the American Correspondent, Mr. LAWRENCE LIEFSCHULTZ, and various other informations from other sources, may I know whether the earlier informations is given by the Soviet media have been confirmed? These are my three questions.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, this is essentially a limited question of posting. We came to know that a person was going to be posted. The moment we came to know—it rang a bell and we went into it. Something came to our notice which made us believe that if we acquiesce in this posting, our relations are likely to be further embittered on account of the activities which this gentleman is likely to indulge in as he did before. (Interruptions)

So, we told them that in the interest of good bilateral relations, we did not consider it proper or helpful to have this gentleman here, we said “please send him somewhere else”. It was that simple. It is true that as a result of this, a temporary phase of bitterness has come to our relations. We have accepted that in order to avert, to avoid a much more unacceptable, much more undesirable state of affairs coming into being in the future. It is not customary, it is not proper for me to delve into all the activities that he indulged in. It would not be correct, it would not be in the interest of the country and it would not be in the interest of the Government. So, I would only confine myself to making general reference to the “activities” of this gentleman —whom he was connected with, which set up he was associated with, technically, is not the question. What he was doing is the important thing and from that we came to a certain conclusion.

So far as Mr. Prabhakar Menon is concerned, the record speaks for itself. He was never posted in the United States. Wherever he was posted, he had nothing to do with the United States. While he was here in the headquarters, about six years or so he never had any occasion to deal in anyway with the United States. Therefore a more unequivocal case could not be imagined.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Pure retaliation....

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It was a question of retaliation. Nothing more. That is why we said....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: It is unjustified and unwarranted. Is it an unfriendly act or not ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Don't put words in the mouth of the Minister.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: You are not answering any of my questions.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Please don't talk like a super-diplomat. Take

this House into confidence. It is the sovereign Parliament of India. Is their behaviour unfriendly or not ?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The question is: I am doing something in order to save our relations from becoming unfriendly. How could I call it an unfriendly act, Sir ? (Interruptions)

Now, about friction, as I said, we have tried to avert greater friction in future and that is why what we have done is in the best interest of our bilateral relations. Naturally relations will depend on both. It is not a question of one-sided effort. We do hope that what we have done will, in course of time, be understood in its right perspective.

Now, about Mr. Menon, I have said that it was purely a retaliation. About Soviet “disinformation” I have said that we have not been influenced by books, by newspapers, by what any other country has stated. So, it is not for me to comment on what others have said.

I have stated that we went by what we had with us about this gentleman; and therefore, we based our decision only on that and nothing else.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. B.V. Desai.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No questions. You are not again B.V. Desai. I have called B.V. Desai.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : I have asked a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You cannot ask for a clarification when the Minister is not expected to reply.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This will not go on record. Please don't record it. Please go through the rules on Calling Attention. If you know, then please sit down. No clarification in Calling Attention. Any other Member whose name is not here, cannot ask on Calling Attention. You cannot ask. It is not a general discussion.

SHRI B. V. DESAI (Raichur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the subject of the Calling Attention, as explained just now, is very simple. It would have been a little wider perspective, had it been taken as a situation arising out of the reported Indo-United States differences. Even that much is not included in this. Therefore the question is simple the differences on postings of the diplomats. But, Sir, it is nothing but the last straw on the camel's back.

Our relationship with USA has so much deteriorated that even the smallest things, in which we were justified in asking the United States not to post a particular person to a particular post, has become so irritable to them as to ask our innocent diplomat not to proceed. He had no connections at all with the US as per the Hon. Minister's Statement. So, it is really a very surprising thing. The Hon. Minister has replied in a very lucid way and the Statement he has given is very dignified and very firm i.e. it is incorrect to suggest that views, information and pronouncements made by any other country played part in its decision. Any such conclusion or insinuation is resented by the Government of India. Yes, Sir, we do resent it. But, I would request the Hon. Minister that it should not be a step further to unfriendly act, because we have to halt it somewhere. That is why, I would like to know in this connection, what are the steps which the Government of India is thinking of improving the relations between the two countries I entirely agree that we do not know how much success we may get in this direction with the Reagan Administration, because we have got the past experience of the same political party Government, when Mr. Nixon was the President. Nonetheless, we cannot afford to be inimical with USA or with any other country.

It is not in India's interest. Therefore, a political view has to be taken of the affair and in a political way it has to be tackled. Although it is a subject of Ambassadorial postings, the situation that has arisen out of it is very serious and it has to be tackled in a political way. So, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister got any way out of it so that a deteriorating situation is halted at this particular juncture.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : It is a very general kind of question which the hon. Member has raised, and what I would like to submit to the House is that this matter is a limited matter. And after this calling Attention, I do hope that the matter will end. It should not really give

rise to any other ide issues. Posting are made. Sometimes the postings are objected to. In this case, the objection from the other side, according to us, is unjustifiable on the grounds which I have already stated. On our side, the objection was based on grounds which we consider not only adequate, but important. So, this is a matter of exercising our own judgement. Having done that, I do hope that there will be nothing more serious to this matter than what we actually see in it, viz. that it is a matter arising out of a particular posting of a particular individual. That is all.

SHRI M.V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY (Kanakapura) : I have nothing much to say, because my other friends have covered almost all the points.

As we know, and as we are all aware, Indo-U.S. relations showed an improvement during the Carter presidency. But we are now heading for a spell of mutual acrimony because of the Reagan Administration—as though India is not relevant in the pursuit of their policies in South and South West Asia.

After the inception of Reagan Administration in the United States, unfortunately the relationship between our two countries has been sour. As my friends said there has been the recent supply of sophisticated arms like F-16, and the helping of Pakistan in manufacturing nuclear bombs, knowing fully well that they will be used against our country. They are strengthening their base in Diago Garcia and there is also the inordinate delay in the supply of nuclear fuel to our Tarapur plant. We are forced to come to the conclusion that the US Administration is not sincere in continuing to have friendly relations with us.

In view of this, I want to know from the hon. Minister whether Government is forced to take any decision like break-up of diplomatic relations, and whether Government proposes to set up an intelligence cell in the Ministry of External Affairs to ascertain about the diplomats.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : The answer is a clear 'No'. We have not come to that conclusion. We are not likely to come to that conclusion, because relations between countries, relations between Governments are very, very complex. Sometimes they have ups, and sometimes they have downs. We have to live with these things. And, therefore, there is no question of taking any drastic step or drastic view of what has happened. As I said, this is a limited matter. We would like to take it as such.