

The House may stand in silence for a shortwhile to express its sorrow.

The Members then stood in silence for a short while.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up questions.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR (Gwalior): Before we proceed to questions, regarding the obituary references you made, Shri Chandrika Ram, ex-Member of the Lok Sabha died on 15 February, 1980 at Patna. I could not understand why it was not possible to make this reference earlier, when you made an obituary reference on 9th June, 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: We had to get it officially confirmed.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: He died on 15th February, 1980. Does it require four months to get confirmation?

MR. SPEAKER: Certain times it does happen.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

India's Stand on Afghanistan and Kampuchea

*61. SHRI ARJUN SETHI: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Indian Government have openly spoken regarding its stand that India has agreed in principle to recognise at an opportune time the Vietnam-backed Government in Kampuchea and India has not supported the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan despite its close friendship with the USSR;

(b) whether any Indian team had also been on tour to foreign countries in this regard; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): (a) to (c). The bonds between

India and the Soviet Union remain as close as ever, and have been most recently reaffirmed by both sides, during my visit to the Soviet Union last week. The relationship has never required the two countries to take identical positions on foreign policy issues, although our judgement on several matters is often similar.

Recognition of the Heng Samrin Government is under the active consideration of Government.

Our position regarding Afghanistan is well-known. We do not approve of the presence of foreign troops or bases in another country. As such we feel that Afghanistan should maintain its sovereign, independent and non-aligned status. Afghanistan should also be assured of cessation and non-continuance of an external intervention or interference against it.

The situation both in South West and South East Asia is laden with tensions. What we fear most is that they would escalate beyond control as a result of great power confrontation. Our efforts have, therefore, been directed towards improving the climate, and reversing such a trend. In pursuance of this end, we have held discussions with a large number of foreign government representatives. Our representatives have also gone to several countries. We feel our efforts have met with some success.

SHRI ARJUN SETHI: While replying to my question, the hon. Minister in the end said—"our efforts have met with some success". In this connection I would like to know whether the hon. Minister during his recent visit to the USSR had discussions with the leaders of the U.S.S.R. about Afghanistan? Since troops from the U.S.S.R. are present in Afghanistan, what is their reaction to the withdrawal of those troops from Afghanistan?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have requested for time to make a

statement on my recent visit to the Soviet Union. I think these issues could be covered there more exhaustively.

श्री प्रदल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय श्री महोदय बयान देंगे तो उस के बाद आप हमें सवाल करने की इजाजत नहीं देंगे। प्रश्न विस्तार करना है तो सोचन लें।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: There should be discussion after he makes a statement. Everybody is interested

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: My Calling Attention Notice is pending with you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: In whatever form it comes before the House. I am prepared to answer questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Dr. Subramaniam Swamy, you can give a notice.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: My notice has been pending with you since Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the statement come first. (Interruptions)

If there is no hen, from where will the egg come?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Which come first?

MR. SPEAKER: Let us decide here.

SHRI ARJUN SETHI: I have given notice 21 days in advance. I would like to know at least something.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: If the Member insists, I could say briefly that our position on Afghanistan has been categorically stated. During our discussions, it figured and figured prominently.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: During the last Lok Sabha elections the Congress (I) party in its election manifesto had stated clearly that they

were pledged to recognise the Heng Samrin Government in Kampuchea. After that election six months have passed. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is the exact reason for so much of delay and hesitation?

Is it because they cannot make up their minds as to whose Government is there in Kampuchea? Are they still thinking of Mr. Pol Pot or Mr. Norodom Sihanouk sitting in heavenly peace somewhere? If not, what is the reason? The Government of Kampuchea is there which is in effective control of the country. When the ruling party has pledged itself publicly to give recognition, what is the reason for the delay and when will it be done?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: So far as the two reasons suggested by the hon. member are concerned, I would hasten to deny both. Before, I had informed the House that the matter is under consideration of the Government. Now I am informing the House that the matter is under active consideration of the Government. (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What is the difference between consideration and active consideration?

MR. SPEAKER: It is like non-alignment and genuine non-alignment. He must have followed the same thing!

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We are not accustomed to this Foreign Ministry verbiage. Would you kindly explain the difference between consideration and active consideration?

MR. SPEAKER: Each time we have a new Foreign Minister, we have a new word!

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: 'The matter is under consideration' means that we are examining the matter and we are in the process of making up our mind. 'Active consideration' means the stage where we have almost made up our mind.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I have full faith in the ability of the Minister. He has conducted himself very well and I have no complaints on that. However, as a general policy of this country for a very long time, we have not recognised countries where there is active presence of foreign troops. I would like to know whether the Minister has seen today's report about Afghanistan and the situation there. The *Indian Express* reports that the Indian officials have all been asked to clear out from the outskirts of Kabul. In view of our general policy not to recognise Governments where foreign troops are present in large numbers....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Including American troops.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:.... may I know whether the Government would consider withdrawing diplomatic recognition to Afghanistan?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We do not think there is any reason to do it.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: A pro-Soviet stand on this issue of Afghanistan is being hidden under the pretext of attempts to defuse the situation. Is it not a fact that the matter of withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan came up before the UN and is it not a fact that our representative in the UN abstained from voting on that resolution? If so, why? May I know whether the Government does not consider it as abstention from the demand in the UN for the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan? May I know whether this is not considered a serious aberration in our policy, if we are very serious about demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Far from being an aberration, it was in strict conformity with our policy that we very advisedly abstained from the voting on the resolution. The simple reason is, if you go through the resolution, you will find how one-sided it

was. We were not in a position to get the resolution amended in order to come into line with our thinking and therefore, we had no other alternative but to abstain.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री जी ने कहा कि अफगानिस्तान के सन्दर्भ में भारत की स्थिति यह है कि हम सभी देशों में विदेशी सेना की उपस्थिति के खिलाफ हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ अफगानिस्तान में सोवियत संघ की सेना के प्रलावा क्या किसी और देश की सेना है? अगर है तो किस की है? अगर नहीं है तो भारत सरकार साफ साफ शब्दों में यह क्यों नहीं कहती कि अफगानिस्तान से सोवियत संघ की सेनाओं को हट जाना चाहिए।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : यह हम कह चुके हैं। बार बार प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि सोवियत संघ की सेनाओं का वहां रहना इस इलाके में तनाव बढ़ा रहा है, उनको वापिस जाना चाहिए।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: The main question stands in the name of one of the Ministers of the Government...

MR. SPEAKER: The correction has been issued.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I want to know whether the Government accepts the thesis underlying this question, namely, that the Soviet Union has been guilty of invasion on Afghanistan and, therefore, its action amounts to aggression according to international law?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is why, I have neither said 'yes' nor 'no'. I have given my version in the answer.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: You should say either yes or no.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We do not agree with that formulation.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: From the statement, it appears that the Government of India's policy on Afghanistan is based on three basic issues, namely, disapproval of the presence of foreign

troops or bases in another country; maintenance of Afghanistan's sovereign independent and non-aligned status and cessation and noncontinuance of external intervention or interference against it. May I know whether it is a fact that there are other nations who also agree basically on these three postulates? If so, whether the Government of India proposes to convene a conference of all those nations who basically agree with these steps and work out a workable package approach to solve the Afghan problem?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is not just a question of calling for a conference and passing a resolution. This can be done; this has been done but with no effect. We are a little more seriously involved in this because we are in this region. We want that there should be no confrontation; there should not be further tension. First, we wanted to see that there was no further escalation of the tension. To some extent, we have been succeeding in that. Now the stage is set for making some effort to de-escalate the tension. That cannot be done by passing a resolution or gathering certain like-minded countries on this issue. That will have to be done by undertaking an effort to get the immediately concerned countries to agree on some contours of a formula, if not the formula itself in all details. That is what we are trying to do at the moment. I cannot say that we have been succeeding in this particular aspect. But I am still hopeful that the time will come when there will be success in our effort.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: My question is in regard to recognition of Kampuchea. The Minister has said that it is under active consideration. Actually, he has been saying that for quite some time.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Do you want me to say 'very active'?

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: I want you to say 'yes' and not 'very

active'. You have passed all those stages. I think you must come to some conclusions. I am saying that in spite of the fact that the Government of India agrees that all those factors that are required for recognition of a country, are there, an impression is going on that in your eagerness to improve your relations with China—because China's stand is different; they do not want India to recognise Kampuchea—unnecessary delay is being made though there is almost total unanimity in this House that Kampuchea should be recognised?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would only request Chandrajitji not to give China the credit which it does not deserve on this issue.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: Has it come to the notice of the Government that certain hon. Members have visited that country and have made some pronouncements there?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Hon. Members of Parliament, he means?

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: Yes, hon. Members of Parliament. They had visited these countries and made pronouncements. Are those pronouncements conducive to better relations or worsening relations with this country?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I must confess, I have not really applied my mind to the pronouncements made by hon. Members outside the country, but I think if they had made any statements, they were only exercising their right of free speech.

Visit of Former Israeli Foreign Minister

+

*62. SHRI K. MALLANNA:

SHRI K. PRADHANI:

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that doubts on the controversial visit of Moshe Dayan were set at rest by the Janata