[Shri Ram Vilas Paswan]

स्थिति में नियम 377 का क्या महत्व है जब कोई मैम्बर यहां उठाता है और उसका जवाब ही नहीं दिया जाता है ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under Rule 377 the statements are read in the House and the replies are being sent to the concerned Members by the Government. It is not under any rule. It is obligatory. Now announcement by H.S.

14.55 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that the Business Advisory Committee which met today has recommended that in order to provide time for discussion on the Motion of No-Confidence to be moved by Shri Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna—

(i) the House may sit also on Monday, 16th August, 1982. There will be no Question Hour on that day;

(ii) the House may continue to sit during lunch hour also on that day;

(iii) the discussion on the Motion of No-Confidence may continue upto 7 P.M. on 16th August, 1982 when the Prime Minister may intervene and thereafter the mover may reply to the debate.

I think the House agrees.

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao.

(Interruptins)

When the Chair is on his legs, you have to sit down. I think all the Members have read the rules. You may speak one by one so that everything is audible. What you want to tell the Chair or the Government cannot be audible if all of you go on speaking together. Even the other Members may not be able to understand what you want. So, on behalf of all the Opposition I am allowing Prof. Madhu Dandavate.

(Interruptins)

Let there be an orderly manner in which we may conduct the House.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I am rising on a very important procedural point. Just as rules in this House are important, the conventions and norms which have been observed in this House for years are as important and sacrosact as anything else.

I wish to point out to you that this country has seen Prime Ministers like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, like Shastriji. We have seen Prime Minister like Shri Morarji Desai. They had gone out of India. They had returned. They had made statements. Not on one occasion when the Prime Minister has gone on tour, on behalf of the Prime Minister who is present in the capital, at no stage, the Minister of External Affairs has made a statement. (Interruptions). Let me complete.

I take it for granted that I am on my legs with your permission. If you withdraw your permission, I may take my seat.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Somebody else is objecting.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Therefore, it is very necessary. (*Interruptions*) When the Prime Minister is already in the capital and she refuses to come to the House after such an important tour and make a statement on foreign tour, it is denigrating the institution of the Parliament. (*Interruptions*). It is showing total disregard to the Parliament and destroying all the conventions. (*Interruptions*). I have to complete my submission. (Interruptions). I must complete it. I do not want to leave it half way. Before we adjourned for

lunch we, all the Members of the Opposition, made a submission that kindly request the Prime Minister. On behalf of all, we can do it through you. We can catch your eye. But we cannot catch the eye of the Prime Minister. And, therefore, we requested you that on behalf of all of us, you request the Prime Minister to make a statement. We would not be prepared to accept the statement from the Foreign Minister, who has not even gone on tour with the Prime Minister. Therefore, we demand that the Prime Minister alone must make a statement on her visit. We are not prepared to listen to the statement of the Foreign Minister.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Narasimha Rao.

(*Interruptins*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please hear him.

(*Interruptins*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Mr. Narasimha Rao, you make your statement.

At this stage, Prof. Madhu Dandavate and some other hon. Members left the House.

STATEMENT RE. PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): As the House is aware, the Prime Minister paid an official visit to the United States from 27th July, 1982 to 4th August, 1982 at the invitation of President Ronald Reagan. On the way back she broke journey in Tokyo for a day at the invitation of the Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Zenko Suzuki.

2. The Prime Minister's talks with President Reagan covered a wide range of subjects and were marked by warmth and openness. They were followed by a working lunch with the Secretary of State, Mr. George Shultz. She also had very cordial informal meetings with members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. All these meetings were useful in the furtherance of the object of the visit, namely putting forward India's basic policies, obtaining a better insight into the policies and concerns of the United States, and generating greater friendship and understanding between our two countries.

3. Reference was made by the U.S. President to India's commitment to democracy and non-alignment. The Prime Minister emphasised the role played by our economic planning—with its emphasis on self-reliant growth with social justice—in the strengthening of democracy. The discussion of the international scene included an interchange of assessments of the situation in Afghanistan and West Asia, with special reference to Lebanon. They were agreed that solutions could be found only through political negotiations. President Reagan's attention was drawn to India's concern at the increased flow of arms into our region and to our opposition to foreign interference of any kind. It was pointed out in particular that India's misgivings over the acquisition of sophisticated weapons by Pakistan arose out of past experience of such weapons having been used by Pakistan against our country.

4. The role of international financial institutions in promoting economic development was also discussed. Concessional assistance is needed by developing countries like ours to keep the debt servicing burdens low and to finance investments in areas of social development. These are areas where private capital would not be forthcoming. India had made good use of the I.D.A. funds, and a reduction of these funds from the previously assured levels would upset our planned