

Particularly, the reason for delay in the second test flight of the Intermediate range surface-to-air missile, Agni, officially scheduled for the last week of February, 1992 is shrouded in mystery. This launch has been postponed repeatedly since its successful test firing in May, 1989.

The proposed shifting of the Chief Architect of the missile programme to Delhi, at this juncture, to head the Defence Research and development Organisation (DRDO), which is an umbrella outfit for all defence related research and development, is bound to raise many disturbing questions, including the seriousness of Government intentions to pursue all the missile projects to the logical conclusion of their induction to the services, since the surface-to-surface missile Prithvi and the surface-to-air missile Trishul are also yet to go on production.

Therefore, I request the Government to clarify the reasons for the delay.

- (v) **Need to review the decisions for withdrawal of monetary support to National Textile Corporations units and British India Corporation; units in Kanpur**

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Kanpur is a major industrial city in northern India. There are five mills of National Textile Corporation and four mills of British India Corporation in this city. Government has withdrawn its financial assistance to these mills due to which twenty eight thousand workers of these units are likely to be rendered jobless. This has caused a widespread resentment and discontentment among the trade unions of this city and of Northern India. Government has decided to retire many labourers under the voluntary retirement scheme. It would also affect the industrial environment of Uttar Pradesh.

Therefore, I urge the Central Government to restart these mills and save these labourers from being rendered jobless.

- (vi) **Need to expedite functioning of Naval Academy at Ezhimala, Kerala**

[*English*]

SHRI M. RAMANNA RAI (Kasargod): Sir, decision was taken to have Naval Academy at Ezhimala in Kerala in 1982. Only consideration was the merit of the site and fitness of Ezhimala. The concerned Government rendered all the required help. Because of the interest taken by the then Kerala Government, the land was acquired and the possession of land was handed over to the Naval Academy.

Even after 10 years, it has not become the Naval Academy in the real sense as so far only fencing of the area, construction of gate and posting of security and watermen have been done. Naval authorities have not even constructed roads there. Drinking water and electricity have also not been provided there.

I urge upon the Government to expedite and complete the work to enable the functioning of the Naval Academy without further delay.

13.45 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Forty five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at fifty three minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL)
1992-93
Ministry of External Affairs

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on

Demand No. 24 relating to Ministry of External Affairs for which six hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House whose cut motions to the Demand for Grant relating to Ministry of External Affairs have been circulated may, if they desire to move their cut motions, send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move. Those cut motions only will be treated as moved.

A separate list showing the serial numbers of cut motions treated as moved will be put up on the Notice Board shortly. In case any Member finds any discrepancy in the list he may kindly bring it to the notice of the officers at the Table without delay.

Motion moved:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Accounts shown in the Fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1993, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 24 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh):
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I must, without meaning any disrespect to my good and genial friend, the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs, convey that discussing the Demands for Grants of the ministry of External Affairs in the absence both of a policy and of a Minister to administer whatever is there of that policy is very strange indeed.

I frankly do not recollect last as to when Parliament has been subjected to this phenomenon wherein the Demands for Grants of the Ministers are being taken up in the

absence of the Minister. But, then, Sir, perhaps there is unintended appropriateness in this somewhere, when there is no policy, why do we have a Minister? In that sense, perhaps it is only proper that we go through this ritual of discussing the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs without a Minister.

I have gone through the Annual Report of the Ministry. It is symptomatic of the time and the challenge that the nation faces that. This report is already far outdated. It is compendium of information so much or so far as various arrivals and departures go but as a document which would illuminate our efforts or would inform us as to where the Government stands so what the Government policy is in the fast changing world, I am afraid, I have to say that the report is singularly out of synch.

What is the principle challenge? It is the enunciation of a foreign policy in the changing world. I make a distinction between the enunciation of a policy and the conduct of diplomacy. I will not attempt to do what the Ministry ought to be doing. But I will dwell just a little longer on the aspect of the vital need of enunciation of foreign policy. In this decade of the 1990s, when the turn of the century is nearer, the world is without any recognisable grid, because we cannot make that map of the world, in which to formulate a policy, we have to conduct a fresh survey. If as is commonly said that there exists and indeed must exist—not just a nexus but a corelationship between the internal and the external and that external must indeed be a true reflection of the internal then I put it to you, as any surveyor would tell you, the first requirement of accurate grid laying is to correctly establish our own position as a nation, where do we stand what is this nation that we call alternatively India or Bharat or Hindustan? It is not simply a question of semantics but it is vitally necessary to address ourselves to this task if we are to find a policy framework within which we conduct our foreign policy in the fast changing world.

I said earlier, in the morning, when we were discussing a particular aspect of our

[Sh. Jaswant Singh]

policy, which is the concern of this House, that great nations worthy of the name that they carry do not structure policy on a carving for either international approval or of international friendship.

15.00 hrs.

I was struck in the morning by references being made to our time-tested friends, India's old friends etc. and during the short time that I had between break for lunch and now, I could not help but come to this conclusion that there must be somewhere a great lacune, a great hollow, in the conceptualisation of our policy, if the harking back is constantly either for international approval or to seeking international friendship.

Great nations, I put it with humility, act as they do propelled by indomitable sense of destiny and that destiny is born of history. Great nations do not crave power. They represent it. I submit to you and here I think I leave it as a thought for Government to also reflect upon that in this I think we are failing somewhere. I hold that all great nations will have an ennobling military tradition. It is an aspect on which we ought to reflect at this moment, because it is an input to the formulation of proper foreign policy.

Secondly, that all great nations will have a spiritual; under-pinning to State and to society.

And hence, thirdly, in consequence all great nations will have the cultural ability to withstand the assault of global materialism.

If find it relevant to share all this because I believe that if the globe is changing as indeed it is and in this fast changing world, we have to establish and formulate a policy for ourselves, then the starting-point is to establish what is our way.

There are some additional observations that I would like to make very briefly. Firstly, unlike in domestic policy, the errors of foreign policy will haunt successive genera-

tions of Indians to come. Domestic policy is an internal matter and is relatively more easily remedied.

If we make an error in the realm of foreign policy or in the conduct of our diplomacy, the successive generations will pay the price and I do not have to give many examples other than to cite the continuing problem of Jammu & Kashmir, the question of Tibet, that Sino-Indian relations ought to be after so many decades still bedevilled and the questionable employment of the Indian army in the role as IPKF. These are all legacies and these legacies are decades old but they illustrate the point that I make, that in the realm of foreign policy, mistake are much harder to correct.

There are some other thoughts that have to be shared that, as the whole world has changed, our approach cannot continue to be reverential and unquestioning of handed-down wisdom, and thirdly that foreign policy can only be the child of principle, a true reflection of the noble face of India.

The conduct of diplomacy, on the other hand, is always and will be a matter of circumstance.

Therefore, finally it should be our endeavour to go beyond the superficial and the surgical surface, flotsam and jetsam of recent events and, to attempt to reach those deeper currents and the heaving of human concept and evolution in this fast changing world.

Some of the consequences of this changing world present themselves starkly and also unmistakably. There ran, I hold, an old global fracture along the Berlin Wall. That has been repaired in part, in part it has been bridged over and in part it is being badly mended. But some great tectonic shifts must have taken place to break this, to mend this, to surface this great global divide and to dissolve the glaciers of hostility in which the world had been imprisoned for the past many decades. Inevitably, therefore, some new strains have appeared in the globe where the next global fracture will emerge perhaps it is

only visible now as a hair line crack or in its very first indication and it is a task in the formulation of our foreign policy that the Government has to address itself to.

Sir, what are we witnessing in the world when simultaneously we see both fusion and fission. Regarding Masterichut, the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs devotes a whole paragraph. Is this Masterichut an example of fusion? Is that the norm that the globe is going to follow? Or, are we going to witness fission, as we have seen in what was formerly the USSR or what we are witnessing in Yugoslavia or elsewhere? In this conflict between fusion and fission, what is it that we are witnessing as a deeper under-current of human endeavour? Is it the end of nationalism or is it a near more focused search for individual identity, and an assertion of smaller and smaller groupings? There is then the great collapse of communism. In that is there the victory of an alternative West? Because it always defined itself in contrast to communism, as standing against communism. Has the West not lost its very *raison d'être* in their collapse of communism, in this implosion of communism? In this changing world is mammon, the new God as the economic reality, the only reality and economic arrangement is the new principal determinant of foreign policy? Or, is it like earlier such Gods only a fable, an illusory God? I had hoped that in the report of the Ministry of External Affairs, some of these issues would find articulation and I would be able to discern where the Government of India is heading in this respect.

Sir, of course, there are things which the report does address itself to. It is self-evident that we should re-examine the relevance of Non-Alignment and look afresh at the concept and not merely either turn the phrase around or continue with its incantation as a support system because yesterday's solution will not provide answers to today's problems. I am struck by the thought that the Report shies away from this task. Do shy from it because we are immobilised by the terrifying velocity of the change that has overtaken us? Or, do we shy from it be-

cause we have not, also, like the victims themselves-entirely understood, not having anticipated, not entirely understood the rapidity or the speed with which the communist system has collapsed on its own self?

So that all that we can do is tentatively and some what apprehensively, peer over that enormous or creator of thought that has come into being. And in that creator of thought that has come into being because nothing else has replaced it, we too are at sea. That we should be at peace with our neighbours, that we should resolve issues with the People's Republic of China, that we should recognize the might of united Germany and the might of the economic super power in Japan, that we ought to redefine our affairs in West Asia and our vast community of shared preceptions with ASEAN or Asian countries, or the new realities of the United States of America, recognize the changes that are taking place in South Africa etc., are self-evident because they are all aspects of the conduct of diplomacy. After that, we are to, if we have a policy, find the right diplomacy to give voice to that policy, thereafter, have the necessary security policy and the armed forces, to impart to that foreign policy, the heeded international currency and also simultaneously, the much needed and long overdue reordering of our house internally so that our internal and our external are in harmony. All this is self-evident. These are not, I put it to you, tasks of foreign policy. These are in the realm of day-to-day conduct of the Government. And that is why, I felt that unless I make this distinction even at the cost of taking some of the time of the House, I would not be able to put across to you some of the more detailed points and observations that I have to share.

If we start thereafter in examining the consequences of or absence of a policy, of an absence of a governance resulting in a situation of drift, then we find that in five or seven areas of crucial importance to the country, we are a drift. I will take first relations with neighbours. I will not take the time of the House by quoting from the report of the Ministry of External Affairs. Of course, relations with neighbours ought to be cordial; of course, we must settle outstanding prob-

lems. But this is an incantation that I come across in every successive report of the Ministry of External Affairs. Every year, we repeat that very point and feel that the purpose of our policy enunciation or execution has been served.

We have problems with Pakistan which are a combination of their nuclear ambitions, of their continuing support to inciting terrorism and insurgency within India, of their trade in narcotics through India. I am not listing all the many difficulties that we have. But if these be amongst the three principal difficulties that we have, then I would like the Government and the hon. Minister to inform us that in these three, in terms of action on the ground—and perhaps this is a phrase that the Government is fond of using nowadays what has been achieved?

With Bangladesh, there is a very serious difficulty and that difficulty relates to unchecked illegal immigration into our country. This is a difficulty that has been present the past many decades now. It has acquired dimensions and a proportion which is not merely sociological, it has very deep ramifications for the polity of our country. I do not know why there was this great hurry for the Government of India to sign piece of paper about Tin Bigha. I am not going to dwell on Tin Bigha. But surely, even at the time of signing of this Tin Bigha, a statement could have been made about the continuing problem of illegal immigration. I would be grateful if the Government informs us as to what is happening on this particular aspect of Indo-Bangladesh relations.

On the question of Indo-Sri Lankan relations, I remember a consultation held with some of us by a former Prime Minister to which I too had been called and I recollect even then saying and submitting to the then Prime Minister that it should be the task of Indian shores and India must not become a hinterland of the ethnic struggle, conflict within Sri Lanka. We ought to reflect and reflect gravely, that is precisely what has

happened—that in a very real sense the strains of the conflicts within Sri Lanka do not now find a hinterland in India. If my apprehensions be correct, then firstly how far was our policy in the past directed correctly and where do we stand now in removing this as a problem that we face?

15.17 hrs.

[SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARAYA in
the Chair]

Recent developments in Afghanistan make me worried. Ahmed Shah Masood is a Tajik. He is amongst those who continued to live in Afghanistan when others had left it. I do not know if the Government of India has maintained any contacts with Ahmed Shah Masood. Have we had any kind of relationship with him, informally even? Or did we put all our eggs in the sachet of President Najibullah, with the result that we find ourselves now in an Afghanistan where the UN initiative in Afghanistan is a thing of the past, events have overtaken that initiative. Is it correct that a majority of the Pashtta in any case during the late fourteen years or so had left and found sanctuary in Pakistan and are perhaps, therefore, aggrieved that Ahmed Shah Masood is heading or is going to head the new arrangement in Afghanistan? Thirdly, if the southern part of Afghanistan, the Hazara, is largely Shia, then have we got a situation in Afghanistan wherein that land, divided between three large blocs is going to become an arena not just of further civil war, but of conflicting interests that perhaps Indian interests will take a second position?

I am struck by a reflection; it will take me only a minute to share it with the House. What is it that we are faced with? When the Mujahudeen confronted a great super-power in the form of Soviet Union, they were able to bring that super-power down to its knees. That super-power had finally to leave Afghanistan. In the process of bringing that superpower down to its knees, very few of the Afghans remained with President Najibullah. What was in Afghanistan Army roughly 8000,

slowly dwindled to just about forty-odd thousand. What is it that the Mujahideen did to that super power? If these Mujahideens were such great Aghans then what happened to these very Mujahideens could not enter three miles inside Afghanistan, leave alone take a city, they could not even find a tree under which to go and declare a Government of Afghanistan. I put this question deliberately. What was that and what is it that has taken place now? Which of those Mujahideens have now moved towards Kabul? What is the force that is moving these Mujahideens and what is it that we are actually confronted with, in the turmoil in Afghanistan? I put it to you, Madam, that what happens in Afghanistan directly affects the sub-continent and if it affects the sub-continent, it affects India's national interest. I would like to be informed by the Government as to where they stand what are the developments in Afghanistan, how are they influencing it and what steps they are taking to ensure that the current turmoil in Afghanistan also does not become a cauldron of civil war, of civil strife or of contending ethnic rivalry.

I now come to West Asia. I have a limited time and have to cover many points. We have consistently advocated that we have adopted a total West Asian policy. We were treating it as a kind of shackle around our mobility-intellectual and conceptual mobility—that we have to impart to it a certain amount of reality and mobility by recognising it. Having full diplomatic relations, recognition had been done long years ago.

Even after having full diplomatic relations with Israel I remember on numerous earlier occasions, pointing out that that recognition is not the conferment of a distinction on a nation. It is merely the obtaining of a diplomatic convenience. And yet, the Government of India delayed this complete diplomatic relations with Israel. I cannot understand why.

SHRI MANI SHANKER AIYAR (Mayiladuturai): May I ask a question? When Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was the Foreign Minister of India, did he diplomatically recognise Israel?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We certainly had diplomatic recognition with the State of Israel. But, it is the question of up to what level. You have asked as to when my senior colleague, Shri Vajpayee was the Minister of External Affairs in the period 1977 to 1979, did he improve or did he upgrade the level of our relations with Israel. No he did not. But, I think that only underlines the point. You do not score a point against me. You, in fact underline the importance that we are giving. Had we been a Government on our own, we would have certainly taken that step. We were a part of a coalition arrangement, a coalition of ideas. We ascertained what we could and we could not ascertain what we could not. Yet, now that full diplomatic relations with Israel has been finally achieved, we do not thump ourselves on the back as having been proven right. We still regret that even now, the Government of India is defensive about it; and they are shying away and they do not wish to take advantage of all those various benefits that could follow bilaterally. The issue is would they unleash the energy of full diplomatic relations between Israel and India.

In similar terms, I put it to you that when it comes to South Africa, for example, so much is changing. Your report itself recognises that change. Tentatively it says that all sanctions about person to person or people to people relations are now not applicable, in the case of South Africa. I put it to you that we need to move much more rapidly than that. There are large numbers of Indians, people of Indian origin in South Africa. There is a new reality. President de Klerk moved with, I must say, great courage and great vision, to alter the course of that obscenity that is apartheid. It is not any longer in the interest of India to continue to speak about South Africa in yesterday's clichés or idioms. By all means have proper and full consultation with Nelson Mandela have all other helpful and proper consultations with even Buthelezi or with the representatives of people of Indian origin who are in South Africa but do move and move fast and move timely.

In similar fashion, I come to relations with Taiwan. I do not understand when so

[Sh. Jaswant Singh]

much importance is given to foreign economic relations, why we ought to continue to treat our relations within Taiwan as being subject to a third country's veto? Why is relationship between Taiwan and India subject to someone else's veto? By all means hold consultations with that someone else. If your inhibition is one the grounds of relations with People's Republic of China and say that short of full diplomatic recognition or what ever, will have trade offices; we will trade; we will invest there; we will invite them to invest with us. I do not know what holds you back in this regard.

This morning, we spoke about Indo-US relations. I will come to the totality of the question of Indo-US relations in a moment. But part of the aspect of the Indo-US relations is the challenge that we face today about reform of the United Nations. There are three good paragraphs here in the report of the Ministry about reform of the United Nations. I do not think the reform of the United Nations comprises merely of expanding the permanent membership of the Security Council. Of course, that is part of it. But, what I would like the Government of India to be addressing itself to on the question of the reform of the United Nations, this over-used cliché phrase that if the world is to play on a level playing field, then the application of sanctions cannot be selective. It cannot be applied in one fashion when it come to a country in the Gulf region or in another fashion when it comes to Mediterranean African country and altogether a third fashion, when it comes to the State of Israel. This level playing field does not exist. And in the creation of this level playing field, that is where, I believe is the principal challenge in the reform of the United Nations. It is to that the Government of India be addressing itself. It is not merely an expansion of the permanent membership of the Security Council.

Before I go on to Indo-US relation, I will say a word about overseas Indians. There is a whole chapter on the question of overseas Indians and I commend the Government. This is perhaps the first time that so much space

has been given to the question of the problem of overseas Indians. They are in various categories. By and large, their problems are addressed in the chapter that is given here, But I would like the Government to clarify the demand that continues to be made by overseas Indians which is about dual citizenship. There is this umbilical cord which you can call social, which you can call cultural, which you can call religious, whatever. Large number of these overseas Indians continue to look back to the mother country. They continue to seek from public representatives like ourselves the facility of a dual membership to be able to live and work as citizens of the country where they are now domiciled and continue to have the honour and the benefit of being citizens of India. Where does the Government of India stand on the question of dual citizenship?

We had an impromptu discussion of Indo-US relations. It was exemplified by newspaper reports that had appeared. Even then, I said that the reality of today is, we have set out as a country on course of action, be it the missile programme, be it our space research programme or be it the question of non-proliferation treaty. The country will have to accept that in this, we will not be find friends and we will have to stand up and pursue this path on our own. When we pursue this path on our own, whether it is the United States of America or the Russian Federation or anyone else, in the new reality that obtains, we will have to fight for our rights. That is why, I had put it to the Government that it should clarify where it stands because the whole question of the United States of America attempting to bring pressure on Russia will have to be stopped in its track whatever was our agreement we have had or are likely to have with Russian Federation. I say this because such incidents will continue to recur and because they will continue to recur, the answer is not and I put it with humility, Madam-in routine expressions of outrage. The answer will have to be found by us in Parliament by arriving at a national consensus on the price that the nation is ready to pay if you are to pursue this path. I would appeal to the Government that

it must address itself to the whole aspect as an index of what Indo-US relations are to become, as Advaniji pointed out in the morning. Of Course, we share so much. We share a language divided between American and Indian, English we share common preceptions about human rights and deemocracy. But then, Sir, there are very many great divides at the level of day-to-day functioning of diplomacy. The question of terrorism trade and drugs divide the United States of America and India. I do not wish to elaborate on this point but the United States of America does not approach the question if terrorism with the approach of a level playing field. Terrorism has become a currency for employing as a tool, as an instrument and as an leverage. We have to resist. I do not believe that the United States of America is unaware of the dimension of drug traffic that flows from Afghanistan to Pakistan from Pakistan to India and then onwards. I put it to you that the United States of America has not, till now, shared full information with the Government of India or the authorities in India or the agencies in India on the question of drug traffic from Pakistan. It is a matter that ought to be of very deep concern to us and we ought to take it up with the Government of United States in very very serious terms. Of Course, the question of Super 301 divides us and it is not just a matter of economic sovereignty. It is the question of economic interest of India being subserved. I would, therefore, like the Government of India to clarify where it stands on the question of Super 301. I would also like the Government to clarify on yet another potential dividing point, that is, the impending UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio in the month of June now. Would the Government of India please inform us on these issues so that the total question of Indo-US relations will be placed both in the correct perspective and on an even keel. Madam, I could labour endlessly. Our globe is a very large entity and issues involved are very many. The report of the Ministry of External Affairs runs into many hundreds of pages. It is not possible to cover all aspects with brevity, conciseness or even with intelligibility. But I leave two conceptual poles with you around the magnetic field of

which please structure the new foreign policy that is now absolutely and vitally necessary. These two conceptual poles are "beneficial bilateralism and the rejection of a unipolar world and an endeavour by India to create and move towards polycentric world you.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Madam Chairperson, I have also read the Annual Report. And I have also gone through several policy statements at the NAM Foreign Ministers' Meeting in September 1991, the Commonwealth Summit in October 1991, the G-15 Summit in November 1991, the SAARC Summit in December 1991 and the Security Council Summit in January 1992. It almost sounds like a calendar. But I searched in vain for any fresh ideas, for any intimation of the changes that are taking place and any appreciation of the pace with which the world is changing. Madam Chairperson, I found conventional wisdom, a string of pious platitudes, worn out phrases with which I am quite familiar, hackneyed formulations, a desire perhaps to conceal the reality, and a singular lack of originality to deal with a novel situation, a desire to get out of the old rut and face the new resurgent reality. Madam, the Annual Report and these documents smell like old dusty files or like faded flowers of yester-year.

The key issue today in the contemporary international relations is our repose to what has been called the New World Order, which is being hammered into shape by successive blows from the only superpower or Supreme Power, as Shri Vajpayee called it, the all powerful United States of America. It has led to the emergence of a new alliance system which covers the whole of Europe and perhaps includes Japan, to the detriment of the deprived Third World and for the consolidation of the North, to the accentuation of the North-South divide and dichotomy. And this is leading to an assumption of total leadership by the North over the destiny of the world and the North is symbolised by the United States. President Bush has shown a missionary zeal. I do not know whether he was a preacher at some time in his career. He has that feel of a mission, as if possessed of the gospel of free

[Sh. Syedshanha Buddin]

market and the tenets of democracy and the self-righteousness of the only defender of human rights. The US leadership—once again shows that arrogance of power and the bluster of the big bully, the only big bully in the bloc to which the world has been reduced today.

Now we have to respond to this threat of a new imperialism under Pax Americana, to the extension of the Monroe doctrine in a new form to the entire world. And the world is at a cross-roads today. The question is, 'which road do we take?' The question for us is, 'Which road do we propel the world into, by whatever means we have at our disposal?' One road leads to a world federation, may be in the distant future, where there is human freedom, equality, international justice and human dignity; exploitation of the totality of natural resources of the world in the common interests of all humanity because it is the common heritage of all mankind; to the collective effort to protect the environment that envelops our planet, our common habitat and in the meantime to a freer unrestricted flow not only of capital and raw material and manufactures that they want, but of the technology and of manpower that we want. A truly global economy which guarantees a minimum standard of life for all the inhabitants of the planet; a world free from want, fear and war; a world in which perhaps State enemies and even State boundaries would become increasingly irrelevant.

And the other road leads to neo-colonialism; colonialism not only in terms of our economic resources but a colonisation of our culture of our mind and spirit, of our soul, the dominance of one alliance system over the rest of the world and rising disparities and with one superpower holding the entire humanity to ransom; with one power combining the role of the legislator, the prosecutor, the judge and the executor. Therefore, the question is, as I put it, which road shall the world take and which road shall India propel the humanity.

We, as a people, have always believed

mankind to have a common destiny. We believe all mankind to be one single family. We believe in eternal principle of freedom, peace and dignity for all. From Buddha to Gandhi and from Ashoka to Nehru, we have had a clear vision of the world and of our place in world. We, therefore, as a people have a clear vision and we instinctively relate to the first road. But the Government, I am afraid, in these documents has not give us any evidence of clarity of vision or of purpose. They have not defined the goals or the distinction of humanity, nor the strategies to get there, nor the place of our region and of our own place or how best to use the NAM and the SAARC to achieve the purpose, for a more equitable world order. People have the clear vision. I would like to know from the Government whether the Government has it or not.

Madam, I am aware of the constraints of diplomacy. We face an economic crisis and we are economically vulnerable and we suffer from instabilities of our own making, generated by distortions of our own great experiment and promoted by machinations of our friends close-by. We have also been shell-shocked by the sudden collapse of the USSR. But we are also heirs to an ancient civilization and we are a historic State. We are not an artificial State, an ersatz entity, and we are capable of making an effective contribution to defining the contours of the new world order to the molding of the intellectual climate of the age. We have a responsibility but the Government shirks it. This responsibility is directed towards mankind as a whole: towards all the wretched of the earth; towards the developing world of which we are a part; towards our own region whose destiny we share and finally to our own people. We have to exert ourselves and we cannot give up in the face of all the pressures that we have to face.

Now, what is our attitude towards this supreme power that has appeared on the international horizon. The annual report has something very interesting to say on the Indo-U.S. relation and you will bear with me

if I quote a couple of sentences, Page VII of the report says: "The United States is our largest trading partner, a major source of technology supportive of our efforts to overcome the temporary economic difficulties and economic reforms...."

....." A new feature in the relations is cooperation initiated on the defence side, a strong mutual desire to further expand our bilateral and multi-dimensional ties. India's liberalised economic policies have opened new possibilities of a long term mutually beneficial economic partnership with United States."

Here we are. This is our view of the United States. There is this perception of hope and aspiration directed towards the United States. I do not know which way the Government is trying to lead us to.

Madam have we resigned ourselves to the status of a Subedar, owing allegiance to the Global overlord? Have we become the regional agent or the collaborator of the supreme power in its designs? Do we see ourselves or not as a regional power endowed with independence of judgement and freedom of action which is the essence of Non-Alignment? I am sure that the hon. Minister will spontaneously and summarily reject the charge of subservience that deeds speak louder than the words. We have seen a strong hesitation. I have marked 'hesitation' in this Report, to define our role in the world of the future. We have accepted conditionalities imposed upon us by the IMF, the USA and the World Bank without a whimper. We have voted on the side of the United States on the question of Zionism. We have established diplomatic relations with Israel under pressure to win American favours. We have abstained in the UN on the question of sanctions against Libya. We have reneged on our commitment to supply rice to a starving Cuba and we seemed to have accepted without any protest the veto of the United States. Of course, we hope to learn more about it, there is, the reported denial of the transfer of technology which is being made a conditional upon good

behaviour by a third power to India. We have sought, as the Report itself says, defence cooperation with United States. We have agreed to have Naval exercises in the Indian Ocean which we long proclaimed to be a Zone of Peace and from which, we wanted all the foreign Navies to get out, including America.

We are ready - if the Statements made by the hon. Minister are any indication to give in to the Dunkel Draft minus a comma here and a fullstop there. We are prepared to accept the blackmail of Special-301 to which my colleague Mr. Jaswant Singh referred. In the process we have soft pedalled the NAM and for all practical purposes given up the Leadership role that was ours, not only in NAM but also in G-77. This seem to have been lost now, Madam Chairperson.

We have not taken any initiative to build the South Asian personality. I recall eloquent affirmation of the South Asian personalities by the treasury benches in the last debate, or the SAARC as the instrument to give a shape and a form to that South Asian personality. We have not mere I shall not go into details any significant progress in resolving bilateral disputes with our neighbours. We have not even initiated any dialogue with Pakistan on the nuclear question or on the question which is vitally important of balanced arms reduction between the two countries and an elimination of the armament race or support to the insurgency across the borders., We have remained silent on the tragic rape of democracy and of humanrights in Myanmar except for making a moted expression of concern by some spokesmen. This is happening in our neighbourhood. We have fallen silent now having burnt our fingers on the ethnic question in Sri Lanka. We have given them up and we have become now, rather we have been reduced today, to be the spectator of the drama that is taking place before our very eyes in Kabul.

We have not been assigned any significant role in the West Asian talks and the reconstruction of Cambodia. It seems we are losing not only our nerves but also our sense of mission, our credibility, our status,

[Sh. Syedsha ha Buddin]

our prestige; we have been marginalised.

Now, what needs to be done? I feel the critical areas for our diplomacy are consolidation of South Asia. We cannot play any role in the world unless we emerge as the spokesman of the aspirations of the developing world and of the interest of South Asia as a region. For this, we have to take a very hard decision in order to secure a more propitious security environment. We have to try to reduce our Defence expenditure but in step with the power balanced and the requirement of the situation so that we can have independence of action, so that economically we are no longer vulnerable, so that we do not have to howto to the IMF and the World Bank. Once we have regained that independence of action, and once we are no longer vulnerable to economic blackmail, then we have to assert our role in South Asia and in the Indian Ocean; and we have to build up ties with our other neighbours in Asia and Africa particularly in Central Asia, in South East Asia, in West Asia and in Southern Emperor of the New World Order. We should have the courage to tell him to get off his high horse. Then we shall have to remind him that in world history hegemony has never been permanent; that power has to be tampered with wisdom and justice; and that the present advantage must be utilised with an eye on the long term future because humanity does not stand still humanity is looking today for friends and not for masters; it wants cooperation and not confrontation; huamnity shall not surrender to the USA; it shall not surrender to white power or yellow power of brown power or black power; it shall not surender to Christinaity resurgent or Islam resurgent or Zionism resurgent or even for that matter to Hindustan resurgent.

People want freedom and peace; freedom and peace spring perpetually and eternally in the heart of man; and today all social groups in the world, all nationalities in the world, are demanding identity and dignity which has become a common aspiration of all mankind. Unfortunately, I found that we have shocked ourselves. We have confined

ourselves. We have bound ourselves hand and feet, we have lost our initiative, we have lost our manoeuvrability, we have lost our freedom of action, and we have lost our independence of judgement. Why?

I would like to ask the Minister and the Prime Minister, whoever is here, who is afraid of Uncle Sam? Are you, Mr. Minister? Are you afraid of Uncle Sam?

SHRI RAGHUNANDAN LAL BHATIA (Amritsar): I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry. My friend Shri Jaswant Singh has given a detailed account of the situation that is prevailing in the world today and he has also pointed out a number of things which we find missing in this annual report. But I am sorry to say that he did not come out with a single suggestion that the Government of India should undertake to remedy the situation. After all, the foreign policy is based on the national consensus and we all have to contribute to it and that is how the Government can react to these suggestions.

Shri Shahabuddin in his speech has shown some fears as if we are being dominated by the Super Power, America. I want to make it clear that India will never subjugate and will never come in to any kind of a pressure. We will continue to have our independent policy and our independent thinking.

Madam Chairperson, it is true that there have been considerable changes in the world now. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the collapse of the Communist Governments in the Europe, a strange situation has arisen, that the world has become unipolar instead of bipolar. The cold war is over and all the Governments all over the world are restructuring their policies keeping in view the changes that have occurred in the world.

Now it is a question before us: India as a great nation who has been playing a very role in the world affairs, as a leader of the non-aligned, played a very important role on any of the issues that came before it, had an independent judgment and we have taken a

certain position in the world, as an independent nation. Now under the changed circumstances how should we reconstruct our policy, taking into consideration the new changes that have taken place? Some people suggest that India should watch the situation for some more time and have a passive role at present.

There are others who feel that India's foreign policy has been always active and we have taken a considerable part in the affairs of the world and have taken a strong position wherever any issue arose. We cannot get rid of our position; we have to play an important role and continue to play an important role in the world affairs.

The question arises, what are the tools that we want to play? Is it diplomacy, is it negotiation, or is it our armed strength, or should we utilise trade, culture and the most important role which is the media is playing? We shall deploy them. It is very important that we take into consideration all the tools that are at our disposal.

In the past India has played well by deploying diplomacy. We have been quite successful in various fields, and by negotiations we have been able to achieve much.

16.hrs.

But whenever our national integrity integrity had been threatened India had used force also. As we know, Pakistan had attacked India three times and India had to use force. We cannot allow anybody to interfere in our affairs and to look at us from the angle as Pakistan has been doing.

We have to fix our priorities also. In the changed situation, as has been described by my friends in the opposite and as we all feel, there is a need to express our priorities, whether it is in the region or in the international field.

So far as the region is concerned, it has been mentioned by both the speakers before me. About our neighbours, they have spoken about Pakistan; they have spoken about

China; and they have spoken about Bangladesh. We have to express as to what is our position with regard to these outstanding problems and how are we going to solve them.

In the international field, there is a question of Palestine; there is a question of South Africa; there is a question of rich versus poor; and there is a question of indiscriminate nuclear policy. We have to deal with these.

I will now come to our neighbours as it has been very much emphasised by my friends Shri Shahabuddin and Shri Jaswant Singh.

16.03 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

So far as Pakistan is concerned, Shri Jaswant Singh has put a very pertinent question as to what are we doing. This is a problem, a legacy with us. I want to assure him that at every stage, India had played an important role in solving this. But there are certain situations which we cannot help. For instance, there is a feeling among the leaders in Pakistan, it is a kind of complex with them, that India never accepted partition. And the other feeling that they have is that India is seeking hegemony over Pakistan. These are all fallacious. It has been made very clear right from the beginning and in many a statement of the different Governments that came to power in India that we have nothing to do with these.. We have accepted partition. The sub-continent was divided. And we wish them well. They are an independent country. They are a sovereign country. They can decide whatever they want. We have never interfered. But this feeling, this fear, always comes to their mind. They are raising the issue of Kashmir. About Kashmir also, they put forward an argument that in Kashmir there is a Muslim majority and secondly Kashmir is contiguous and therefore, they have a right. But they forget that Kashmir fate was decided long before when the Maharaja had accepted joining with India. Then, many elections had taken place in Kashmir under the Indian Constitu-

tion. The people of Kashmir had accepted it. They continue to live with us. Kashmir continues to be a part of India. It is difficult to explain to them. Both India and Pakistan are independent countries. If they have more trade with us, then both of us can flourish. If they have better relations with us, both of us can play a better role in this region and in the world. But somehow or the other, this feeling has remained with them and nobody has been able to remove it. The superforces, the super powers, believe in the policy of divide and rule and they have been playing with this problem. This problem remains up-hill today. I am sure that our Government is trying to solve this problem with Pakistan. Our Prime Minister had met Mr. Nawaz Sharief a couple of times. There have been effort to have joint meetings in both the countries. But, so far no result has come before us. But, so far as Indian Government is concerned, it believes in peace; it believes in negotiations and they are continuing their efforts to see that we improve our relations with Pakistan.

Coming to China, there has been no inter-action between India and China. In 1988, Shri Rajiv Gandhi took an initiative and a delegation of the Congress Party was sent to China to which I was also a Member. We met the Communist Leader there; at party level we discussed the problem and we were happy to note that China wants that the problem between India and China be solved peacefully. When we reported the matter to our Government, there was exchange of delegation from both sides. They also assessed the situation and reported the matter to our Government. Then, the then Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, went to China. It was a break through. The situation changed considerably and there was every hope that the relations will improve. Three agreements of trade, travel and cultural affairs were all signed by them. But, unfortunately, the two Governments which followed after Shri Rajiv Gandhi, did not take any interest and the result was that the things again remained as they were. Now, again, I would request our hon. Minister that inter-action should start. He should take action so that we are able to improve our relations with China. If these two great powers come together, it will be benefi-

cial to both and I feel that there will be three benefits that will accrue to us if there is a greater cooperation between China and India. The first benefit will be the reduction in our defence budget because two-third of our army is standing at that border and our officers and Jawans are working at the height of 13000 ft, 14000 ft or 15000 ft where even supplies are very difficult to reach and they are being air-dropped. So, with this cooperation, I am sure, there will be tremendous reduction in our defence expenditure, which we can deploy to other developing areas.

The second benefit that will accrue to us is that we will have an open market for more than 100 billion people. China is producing capital goods, India is producing consumer goods and this inter-action and this cooperation between the two countries will benefit us considerably because we are producing the consumer goods which they require. This increase in trade will be beneficial to us.

The third and the most important factor or advantage that we will have is that the cooperation between China and India will totally change the geo-political situation of this area and that is very important. We will be playing together a role not only in this region but in the world. Both countries have been friendly from historical times. We had relations from historical times and both countries have large population and a culture and a history. So, together we will be able to play very important role.

Therefore, I urge upon the Minister that whatever thread has been left by Shri Rajiv Gandhi should be carried forward intensively so that we improve our relations with China.

I want to refer to our embassies abroad also. We have embassies in very many countries. They were opened at a certain stage or at a time when the policy of non-alignment became very popular, and since India was helping all the colonial countries, whenever they were freed, they joined our movement. But now we will have to review the situation. There are embassies in so many small small countries where we do not have any trade whatsoever or where we

have negligent trade. So, I will request the Minister to keep in view the economic situation of the country and have one embassy for three-four small countries, which can look after all those areas, rather than having embassies in all the countries of the world. This will help us both ways.

Lastly, as I have told you, we have some tools like diplomacy, negotiation, trade, culture, media and, of course, our armed strength. In order to consolidate them, we need a leader. Fortunately, we have a leader in Shri Narasimha Rao who with his experience of five decades and who is a philosopher, has united this nation. Therefore, under his leadership, I want policy initiatives to be taken with regard to China, and specially with regard to Pakistan and also about strengthening SAARC, so that we play an important role in the world affairs. Thank you.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHRI (Serampore): Sir, these days it is not much fashion-able to refer to election manifestoes, particularly of the Congress (I) party, since these are obeyed mostly in breaches. But our hon. Finance Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, while replying to the discussion on the General Budget last month, quoted profusely from the Government is, in fact, translating the promises in the manifesto into reality. This has inspired me to see through once more the election manifesto to look at what has been written in matters of foreign policy.

After the usual abuse of the National Front Government, it is written there, and I quote:

"It is for us to ensure that the ending of the cold war does not mean domination by any one power centre."

Again it is written:

"It is for us to ensure that the new world order is based on the philosophy of non-violence enunciated by Gandhiji, and it is for us to ensure that it is founded on the principles announced by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru - peaceful co-exist-

ence abjuring the quest for dominance"

Now I want to ask the Government, what actions have they taken to ensure that these promises are translated into reality.

In this Annual Report 1991-92, apart from the chapters dealing with particular issues, there is one chapter where our foreign policy perceptions and our major achievements are summarised. But it is indeed surprising to note that not a single word has been used there with reference to the promises in the election manifesto. In the chapter on States, two paragraphs have been devoted to show the changes in the Indo-US relations and I must say that Virtually similar words have been used in the Presidential Address too

It is said in the report, and I am quoting:

"There has been a significant and perceptible improvement in the Indo-U.S. relations. Our shared values of democracy, individual liberty and respect for human life provided a strong basis for close cooperation between the two largest democracies of the world".

These 'shared values' appear to be a recent invention by this Government. I would like to discuss here the focal point of our present Government's foreign policy, this is the Central theme. The other issues, particularly our position vis-a-vis our neighbouring States, would be discussed by the colleagues from my party.

May I ask the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that the U.S. Government- whom we are eulogising in this Annual Report as had been supportive of our efforts to overcome our temporary economic difficulties and programme of economic reform? Does this Government really share these values of democracy, individual liberty and respect for human rights? Can you, for a moment, forget Vietnam? what this U.S.A. had done in Vietnam in the name of democracy and individual liberty is known to all. I know that Vietnam is an event of the past. I also know that the Soviet Union is dead or it has been

[Sh. Sudarsan Ray Chaudhri]

killed. It is said that the changed global situation has changed the U.S. policy too and, therefore, we must speed up the process of befriending the U.S.

Does a leopard ever change its spots? The U.S. imperialism continues to be the U.S. imperialism; rather in this changed global scene, it had assumed much more dangerous character.

What is the case of Cuba? This tiny island State is situated only some miles away from the U.S. mainland. Apart from the 30-year trade and economic embargo, the U.S. there. The U.S. -offensive has particularly been aggravated since the dismantling of the Soviet Union. The United States is now trying all the tricks -covert and overt- to destabilise the Cuban economy by accentuating crises in food, medicine and consumer goods. Not only that. All of us know that counter-revolutionaries are being continuously aided and abetted by the C.I.A. what is the fault of Cuba? It stands up heroically against the American hegemony.

What is the case of Libya? Nobody supports domestic or international terrorism. But why these sanctions against Libya? Is it proved that the two Libyans are guilty of the Lockerbie air crash? How is it that U.S. thinks that the Libyan judiciary is worthless and the U.S. thinks that the Libyan judiciary is worthless and the U.S. judiciary alone is the repository of all the wisdom on the earth? Here, I must say that the entire United Nations machinery is being growingly usurped by the United States in its bid to have global hegemony. Take the case of Gulf war or the case of Libya. Why chapter VII of the U.N. Chapter has been invoked against Libya? It is said that sanctions under Chapter VII can only be invoked in case of breaches of peace, threats to peace or acts of aggression. But before resorting to such means, the measures included in Chapter VI should be used to reach a peaceful settlement. I would like to ask whether the Libya's refusal to extradite two men to U.S. or Britain, whose crime has not been proved in Libyan court,

constitute a breach of peace or an act of aggression? would Chapter VII be similarly used against the United States for its persistent failure to extradite Mr. Anderson of Union Carbide to us?

So, this is the real face of the United States with whom we are sharing great values and that is why perhaps we have failed to supply rice to Cuba, we have failed to straightway oppose the Sanctions Resolutions against Libya. We do not want to antagonise the U.S. which never presses for withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab land which seeks to in fact kill the children of Libya, Iraq and Cuba from hunger and destitution and by supporting this U.S. Government's action we are ensuring the new world order, as has been stated in the manifesto which is based on the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence.

Sir, why this softness towards the United States? Does the United States Government really treat us on an equal footing. Does it consider us as its friend? Then what is the reasons behind the stoppage of sale of wheat to us? Is it because we wanted to supply rice to Cuba or Cuba has requested us to supply them rice, and even the threat of using trade sanction against Russia if it transfers the rocket technology to India? This matter has already been referred to in the House in the Zero Hour today., Then why this Pentagon Report which dubbed us as hegemonistic and prescribed the use of force against us if we do not toe the American line on non-proliferation? Sir, we must remember that President Bush has told that he, on the whole, was supportive of the views expressed in the Pentagon report. Yes, we know that James Baker and others in the State Department have assured us that this Pentagon report is not the official view of United States Government. But should we buy this argument? Is it not a fact that Washington is blowing hot and cold in its attitude towards India? Sometimes Senator Wally Herder puts forth a legislation threatening to deny India of the 'Most favoured nation status'. The US State Department have assured that they do not see eye to eye with Wally Herger. Then, in the case of Sena-

tor Dan Button, he put forth one more legislation that unless human rights organisation have been granted access to Kashmir and Punjab, the United States' aid to India would be suspended. Then comes the assurance that they are not serious on this piece of legislation. May I remind you of Mr. Lagomarsino's amendment against India in the line of Pressler's amendment against Pakistan? That time also President Bush declared that he would veto it and we rejoiced over American magnanimity and perhaps our Foreign Department's capability. But can't we see the real message of the United States through this off and on syndrome? can't we see what Mrs. Carla Hills, the US trade representative was telling that for the time being the Special -301 would not be used against us and the very next moment telling that unless we change our patent laws immediately, Special -301 will be imposed against us? And what is our reaction? We told that 'Indo-US differences will be narrowed down and that too within the Dunked framework and so don't be angry with us'. Can we not see how the United States has been pressing us on the question of NPT? This highly discriminatory treaty that wants to perpetuate the nuclear monopoly of some nations is being thrust upon us and the US is trying to make us join the Five Nations Conference on the plan of having South Asia as nuclear weapon free zone. But, has the US agreed to take its hands off Diego Garcia island in the Indian Ocean from where it can target its strategic missiles against so many Asian countries? We refused to do so, but they are shoring from the housetops that we must agree to the nuclear weapon free zone and instead of outrightly rejecting that proposal, we have been lured into the talk traps with America in the coming two months. The US Government is speaking about NPT. But what about their own Star Wars project? The Pentagon Report clearly revealed that the US still seeks to project itself as the world policeman, but unfortunately, we are now so much enamoured of the United States that we fail to understand its game plans. Even in its relations with Pakistan, the US is acting with sinister duplicity. It is now disclosed that the US knew as early as in 1983, of Pakistan's nuclear weapon plan, but in spite of that, it did

not stop giving aid to Pakistan and despite the suspension of commercial and military aid to Pakistan under Pressler Amendment in October, 1990, the sale of sensitive military aid and spare parts had continued unabated. This is the USA with which we have tied ourselves and we are doing everything against our cherished principles in each step.

Sir, we know fully well that Israeli Zionism has been still practising racial discrimination, but we have joined hands with the US to rescind the UN Resolution that equated Israeli Zionism with racism. That was only the first step. Next, we have established full diplomatic relationship with Israel. But has Israel changed its policy? Has it shown slightest of signs that it would withdraw from the occupied Arab land? Rather, it has accelerated its attack. It has mounted its assault on Lebanon. The Israeli helicopters have murdered Sheik Abbas Musawi. The Moscow Conference was boycotted by the PLO in the wake of continued Israeli intransigence. Later, the Washington round also yielded no result. Even, as late as on 1st of April, Israel have killed four Palestinians in the occupied Gaza strip. Today's newspaper has carried one report that Israeli forces have been attacking South Lebanese villages and the US, while leading a total blockade on Iraq causing inhuman hardships upon the civilian population including its children and women, is doing nothing to pressurise Israel. This is the US with which we are sharing values and this is the Israel whom we have offered full diplomatic recognition and that too, without having any full-scale discussion in this House.

Sir, as my esteemed colleague Shri Shahabuddin has already stated, this Government has made a complete 'U' turn not only on matters of economic policy at the behest of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, but in matters of foreign policy too, we have drifted ourselves far away from our policy of non-alignment, the basics of which is anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism. It is the deed that matters, not the outward label and not the outward packaging. One may wax eloquently on non-

[Sh. Sudarsan Ray Chaudhri]

alignment, but in reality, we are doing everything, we are doing something atleast, which go against the principles of non-alignment. True, the whole world has changed. The Soviet Union is not there. But what should be our response to this change? should we lead ourselves to be a client state of the United States? Should we forge a sort of subsidiary alliance with US? Unfortunately that is what this Government is doing. The process started since the time of the Chandreshkhar Government when refuelling facilities were offered to the U.S. warplanes for the Gulf, and then recognition of Israel, or our refusal or reluctance to supply rice to Cuba. There is a clear sign of growing capitulation to the United States. Even we have agreed to join Indo U.S. military exercise in the coming summer. Our hon. Minister of Defence has declared it after his return from U.S. In fact, the joint exercise has already started. It has not been reported in this House. I quote from *the Economic Times* dated 9th April, 1992.

"A team of US Marines has recently completed a four-week training course for para commandoes and air force instructors in advanced commando techniques at the Para Training Centre in Agra,

Headquartered in Tokyo the American commando teams is part of the US Pacific Commando and was in India for four weeks till end of March as part of an ongoing exchange of defence personnel under the Kickleighter proposals for enhanced Indo-US defence ties."

What is more serious? It has been reported here from the spokesman from the Defence Minister, Shri Sharad Pawar's office: "The Army and the Air Force, however, were unaware even of the presence of the American marines in Agra."

In return of this, what we are offering? That is more dangerous.

"In return, New Delhi may oblige the US army, keen to learn about India's expe-

rience in low intensity conflicts in Sri Lanka, Kashmir, Punjab and the North-eastern States by granting its officers visiting rights to the High Altitude Warfare Schools in Gulmarg and the Jungle Warfare School in Virangte on the Assam Nagaland border."

This sensitive area would be exposed to the U.S officials. What can be the common policy and what can be the common interest with the U.S. Government? Are you not being drawn into the U.S. global military strategy? Against whom this joint exercise is directed? In what way will it benefit India? The experience of such strategic cooperation with the United States of the Third world countries is well known, whether in Chile or South Korea or Phillipines or every where. The United States have used such cooperation to subvert democracy there and to enforce its own dictates. What is most shocking is, the matter has been settled completely without having any semblance of discussion in this House

I know that this Government is behaving in this manner on the basis of the assumption that since the Soviet Union is not there and since we are getting money from the World Bank of the IMF, we must toe the U.S. line. This is dangerous. If we give an inch now, we have to surrender a mile tomorrow. Therefore, we have to discard the policy of playing second fiddle to United States. We are not opposed to the American people; we are opposed to the American Government because it represents the imperialist hegemonist policy..

Only the other day, you may remember, Robert Gates, Director of CIA has declared that the United States focus had been shifted from the former Soviet Union to the Third world countries. In these circumstances, the basic theme of our foreign policy should be to forge unity of the Third world countries, to forge further South-South cooperation.

In November last, G15 Conference was held at Caracas where leaders of tiny States like Malaysia and Zimbabwe participated and where Mahathir Bin Mohamad and Rob-

ert Mugaby raised their voice against hegemonistic West. I would like to quote two or three lines from the speech of Robert Mugabe:-

"The South, therefore, must resist the arrogant stance taken by the Group of 7 in multilateral negotiations...Let us say 'No' to this arrogant attitude; 'No' to the subordination of all our countries to their whims; and 'No' to the reduction of all of us to nothing but worshippers of these economic gods..."

Mahathir Bin Mohamad said:-

"The new agenda, therefore, should be for a "Supportive World Order" where decisions which affect the vital interests of developing countries are not made by a privileged few in total disregard for the views of the countries concerned."

I request the Government not to ditch these tiny States like Malaysia and Zimbabwe. (*Interruptions*) Cuba, the tiny State means, geographically, not quality-wise. We must react to them.

Lastly, I would like to make one request. The Solidarity Committee of Cuba has been formed here in India. Many non-political personalities and intellectuals have been included in it. They are collecting relief materials.

They are collecting one kg of rice from each worker's family. Is this Government prepared to make ship transport arrangement to have these goods delivered to Cuba?

Thank you

SHRI SUDARSAN RAY CHOUDH RI
(Serampure): I beg to move:-

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re.1."

[Failure to reject Indo-US Joint naval exercise.](1)

"That the demand under the Head

Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Dilution of anti-imperialist thrust in the Foreign policy..] (2)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Growing capitulation to the U.S. hegemonistic designs.](3)

SHRIBHOGENDRAJHA (Madhubani):
I beg to move:-

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to promote solidarity and friendship with the democratic forces in Myaamar (Burma).](14)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to oppoeed up efforts for peaceful settlement of Afghanistan problem.] (15)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to indentify efforts to roactivate the non-aligned movement particularly to achieve unity among the developing countries.] (16)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100. "

[Need to take a firm stand against U.S. military aids to Pakistan which is indirectly encouraging secessionist elements in Punjab.](17)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Sh. Bhogendra Jha]

[Need to undertake practical measures without further delay for constructing multi-purpose dams on river Kosh at Barakhhetra in the mutual interests of India and Nepal.](18)

" That the demand under the Head Ministry of External affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take early steps for multi-purpose dams at shishapani over river Kamala and at Nunther over river Bagmati in the mutual interests India and Nepal.] (19)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to speed up steps to fully normalise relations with the people's Republic of China.] (20)

That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to undertake steps to settle the border dispute with the People's Republic of China.] (21)

" That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100. "

[Need to take the Indian Council of World Affairs.] (22)

SHRI M. RAMANNA RAI (Kasargod): I beg to move:-

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to normalise our relations with People Republic of China.](30)

" That the demand under the head Ministry of External affairs be reduced to Re 1.

[Failure to help settle Tibetan's issue amicably.](31)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to improve our friendship with Nepal.] (32)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re.1."

[Failure to improve our relations with Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Mayanmar (Burma).](33)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of external Affairs be recuded to Re. 1."

[Failure to re-consider our relations with Israel](34)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re..1."

[Failure to take intiative for the peaceful settlement of Afghan issue.](36)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re.1."

[Failure to take note of U.S. designs against Cuba.](36)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re.1."

[Failure to send food articles to Cuba..] (37)

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAV (Jaipur): I beg to move:-

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to give proper direction to our foreign policy to safeguard the national interest.](46)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to make compulsory use of Hindi in Indian Missions abroad.](47)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to protest American military assistance to Pakistan.](48)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to develop cordian relations with Nepal.] (49)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Es. 100."

[Need to adopt merit as exclusive criteria for appointing Ambassadors abroad.] (50)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to improve our relations with Pakistan.] (51)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to persuade Pakistan not to give training to militants who are making disturbances in India.](52)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to improve our relations with

neighboring countries] (53)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to get back the land occupied by China.](54)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to arrive at an agreement with Sri Lanka to maintain peace.](55)

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to making more effective the role played by India in Security Council.].... (56)

SHRI BIJOY KRISHNA HANDIQUE (Jorhat): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the Grants asked for by the External Affairs Ministry and oppose the cut motions.

While on the subject, I would like to make certain observations in the context of Government's foreign policy.

The world today is being tossed about in a sea-change of political scenario, a scenario where our traditional value and thinking are traumatized by sweeping change questioning even their relevance and validity.

In such a situation, international relationship cannot remain in a vacuum and remain passive, awaiting stabilisation of things and then to react. Rather, the nations are expected to play a meaningful role in giving a form and shape to the stabilisation through an organised channel. And it is a challenge to the Government to play this purposeful role.

An analysis of the conditions governing the scenario bears out the US Government's persistent effort to let unipolarism consoli-

[Sh. Bijoy Krishna Handique]

date itself so that it becomes a permanent feature. So, the watchful endeavours of our Government should be a consistent resistance not to allow to itself down.

US Agenda is clear to contain nuclear capability of the threshold countries.

I am not advocating the augmentation of nuclear capability of three countries including India. What I object to is the discriminatory and unequal attitude of the nuclear naked powers. Thus there is renewed pressure on those countries including India to sign the NPT and this mounting pressure on India to sign the NPT has been a series of calculated moves.

First, sir, you remember there was the pressure on the Indian Chief of the Army last year, a strategy of ominous significance.

Second, came the visit of the U.S. Under -Secretary of State Mr. Reginad Bartholomew apparently to discuss the de-escalation of INDO - pak tension but the real intent was to voice American's suspicion that India may already be possessing nuclear weapons or close to developing them and as the U.S. Administration interprets that India's other nuclear facilities may have a military angle. Their suspicion is being fuelled by India's decision to subject only four of its nuclear installations to IAEA safeguards - a decision rightly taken since the reprocessing plants at Trombay and Tarapur are open to international inspection only when the fuel is from one of India's four safeguarded reactors.

Third, came the visit of General Hans Blix, the IAEA Director, who is piqued at India's zealously-guarded nuclear sovereignty and who has gone a step beyond the NPT conditionalities pointing out the deficiency in those provisions which exclude enforcement of surprise inspection. He is not inclined to accept India's objection to the NPT on the ground that it excluded nuclear weapon States for rendering their nuclear sites to international inspection but insists on subjecting the other non-nuclear signatories

of the Treaty to stringent scrutiny.

Fourth, this was followed by the visit of Senator Mr. Larry Pressler His declaration that India does not possess a nuclear device while Pakistan does, cut no ice with those who keep a track of the U.S. Government's shifting opinion on Pakistan and India in this context of nuclear capability. For, we have reasons to believe that the U.S. is playing India and Pakistan against each other.

Sir, going through all these amendments from symington to GLENN to Solarz and then to Pressler, it is just American interests which govern the application of these amendments. Thus Pakistan's Kahuta enrichment facility directly attracted the symington amendment or the December, 1987 conviction of Mr. Arshad Z. Parvez for the alleged attempt to export to Pakistan the margin steel used in nuclear weapons should have attracted the Solarz Amendment. But all these amendments were waived because the then Afghanistan issue in respect of helping the guerrillas against the then Soviet-backed, Najibullah Government settled things and American aid to Pakistan continue to flow in full cry. Even after the soviet pull-out from Afghanistan, the Solarz amendment was not invoked and the American aid continued to sustain the new Pakistan democracy under Ms. Benazir Bhutto. But interestingly enough the same U.S. Administration is now averse to Pakistan on the prospect of the growth of all potential fundamental Islamic Confederation stretching possibly from Turkey to the Asian Republics of the former Soviet Union. Here, I am rather tempted to quote the chief of the CIA Mr. Robert Gates. The I.S.A.'s game-plan is clear that it wants to play India and Pakistan against each other. I quote:

"India and Pakistan have all the nuclear components too make nuclear weapons at short notice but do not have assembled and deployed nuclear bombs. They do not actually stockpile weapons for safety reasons"

Thus, he equates India and Pakistan on the question of possessing nuclear capability

ity. This is the premise and Washington's interests, however, would sometimes tilt it towards India against Pakistan or towards Pakistan against India whenever it suits their convenience. And the fifth the last not the least is the calculated release of the Pentagon document timing with the visit of the Indian Foreign Secretary Shri Dixit. Through the Deputy Secretary Mr. Lawrence Eagleburger hints that this document need not be taken not of as serious input, yet its contents are rather disturbing as the document threatens India with war under certain circumstances and expressed the need for creating a balance of power in south Asia to checkmate India's alleged hegemonic ambition and allegations which the history of India's peace efforts clearly repudiates and which is fully known to the US Administration. This is the real test for India's diplomacy and determination as well in the face of a super power's pressure and blackmail and calls for India's sticking to its guns that the NPT is discriminatory. For trekking down through history such discrimination is incompatible with India's vision of nuclear weapons free world order.

It was Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's vision that informed India's proposal to the United Nations General Assembly of a truly non-discriminatory nuclear non proliferation treaty. It was the same vision that inspired the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi to launch the six-Nation Initiative on nuclear disarmament. And it was again this vision which found the concrete and detailed expression in the Action Plan for a nuclear weapons free and non-violent world order, which the then Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi submitted to the United Nations Third Special Session on Disarmament in 1988. The call of the then Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi to the UNO that the Action Plan be fulfilled within this century is appropriate, realistic and timely. But all said and done, we should bear in mind that in keeping with our traditional commitment of atom for peace, soon we have to take a decision on non-proliferation in general but definitely not within the purview of the NPT. We must make it clear to the world that our ultimate goal is non-proliferation, a

genuine non-proliferation applicable in the case of all States, nuclear as well as non-nuclear. We have to agree on how to proceed about it in the context of the existing dangerous realities of proliferation of nuclear weapons in more nation States that existed before the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

It is heartening to note that the hon. Prime Minister Shri Rao has already expressed his willingness to discuss the issue of non-proliferation but not in the purview of the NPT. In this situation, non-alignment becomes all the more relevant than before because of the complexities inherent in a multi-polar system. For we must not fail to take note of the distinct signs, though in a nascent stage, the emergence of a multi-polar world.

It is being assessed that China, Japan and Germany will be playing a very increasingly important role in the world affairs. It is in this change-over from the mid-century bipolarity to an assertive multi-polarity, that India as an active partner has a meaningful role to play in helping this process to take shape.

The External Affairs Ministry, however, has to counter a dis-information campaign launched by interested parties which are intended to create a climate of American indispensability chanting that neither non-alignment nor socialism is a workable approach in the context of the world situation today. It is no doubt true that the NAM's agenda must evolve with the changing times, that the non-aligned countries are yet to democratize their respective political systems, if their demand for a democratic world order is to achieve any measure of credibility and relevance. This is the area, where India has to play a purposeful and leading role and not just be led by other powers. I hope the hon. External Affairs Minister will take note of these points made by the hon. Members of this House and see that India really plays a leading meaningful role. And this is the right situation for India to give the lead to the whole world.

[Translation]

PROF. PREM DHUMAL (Hamirpur):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, India's foreign policy has not become as dynamic as it should have been in view of the rapidly changing international scenario. A new challenging responsibility has be-fallen on India's shoulders that of leading the third world nations and thus playing an important role in international affairs. Today, we first wait for other countries reaction before reacting to any international event. Tibetan refugees have been living in Himachal Pradesh for many years. Chinese Prime Minister visited India and he was given a War in welcome here. But we did not think it right to highlight their problems...*(Interruptions)* I am speaking about Tibetan refugees. You should have taken up their problems have arisen there and local people are also facing many problems. We should have taken up their problems with China. Congress people often talk of their election manifesto. Today, shri Bhatia was sating, that we lost self-respect during the rule of National Front Government, page-56 of election manifesto states:-

[English]

" It is this respect that the Congress Government will recover."

How did you recover that respect? It is by carrying private letters?

[Translation]

India's Foreign Minister has now become a messenger. Is this a way of functioning and the last para states:-

[English]

"On specific foreign policy issues , the Congress will seek to evolve a common approach so that to the maximum possible extent, India speaks in one voice,"

[Translation]

Many M.P's expressed their views on the issue raised during the Zero hour today

moring. All were unanimous in the House on that issue. With the help of this agreement, would you prepare a new foreign policy and led a voice to India's views. Mr.. Chairman Sir, today morning we realised as to what extent we have lost our prestige. Previously also when the matter had come up for discussion, we had realised this thing. India had promised to supply some quantity rice to Cuba. America told us not to supply rice. It stated that if India supplies rice to Cuba then America would stop supplying wheat to India. I would like to draw your attention towards the sixth decade. India and America were not in agreement on most of the issues. There existed difference of opinion between the two. Even at that time the issue of supplying wheat was not given a political colour. Under PL-480, wheat was supplied almost free of cost. Today, America has emerged as a single super power and is therefore, dictating the world and has no regard even for the human values. children in Iraq and Libya are crying for food and milk, but America has no concern for them. America wants its own will to prevail upon all the countries of the world and unfortunately India has not taken the stand which it should have taken. Government has been unsuccessful in it. How can we plead for others, when we ourselves are being subjected to ban. We cannot supply ten thousand quintal rice to Cuba. Our Commerce Minister says that if America does not supply us the wheat we would try it buy it from the international market, even if we are not able to get it on concessional rates. Therefore, we should takes a clear cut stand on our policies in the light of the National Consensus. I hope hon. Minister will pay due attention it. Prime Minister has not come yet.

There is another very interesting thing. Our Prime Minister and Pakistani Prime Minister met in Dabose. You have stated in your Annual Report that the talk had been very fruitful. The very next day a full day Government sponsored strike was observed in whole Pakistan over tthe Kashmir issue. What is your criteria of measuring fruitful talk, it is beyond our apprehension. Pakistan is continuously interfering in our intenal affairs by provding mulitary aid and training

to militants in Kashmir. In the Report it has been stated that in September, 1991 Pakistan Foreign Secretary was told by our Foreign Secretary to desist from carrying out its activities. You conveyed your displeasure but was its impact felt? It should be clarified as to what is Government doing in the interest of the country.

I would not like to go into detail. I would only like to draw your attention towards some specific issues. Regarding passports, you have mentioned clearly on page 69 of the report that a total 35 lakh 2 thousand and 9 hundred seventy two applications were received. But only 26 lakh 90 thousand passport were issued. My friend Shri Ram Naik was saying that there were long queues for passport in Bombay and people did not have any room for standing in the lines. A large number of applications are lying pending. And as per your report you have not been able to issue passports to nine lakh people. There is also an Annexure on Page 23 to this report. The business of using up Passports does not involve any financial loss rather it fetches money. Your income was to the tune of twenty crore forty lakh ninety thousand, eight hundred and thirteen rupees while your expenditure was six crore eighty lakh seventy one thousand three hundred and eighteen rupees. This means a net profit of fourteen crore rupees even then you do not issue passport to people. It is often said that there is a shortage of staff. Staff strength should be increased. The employees there do not have any avenues of promotions. That is the main reason of corruption prevailing over there. When passport will be issued in lesser number then it sure to breed corruption there. If facilities are provided, staff strength is increased, then more people would get passports and Government income would increase. Therefore, I request you to increase the staff strength in Passport office give them more promotion avenues and put an end to corruption there.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, page 62 of the Report refers to the propaganda carried out in foreign countries. Just now, a friend of your party was saying that we are unable to counter effectively all the propaganda bi-

ased against India. It has been stated that such and such number of cassettes and pamphlets have been sent. I would like to know, whether Government monitors the use of the materials sent from here to the foreign countries? Does the money spent in India proves to be of any use or not?

I would like to submit that non-resident Indians should have the facility to contact the High Commission and Embassies in their respective countries of stay. The publicity being made on Government level should be intensified and use the services of non-resident Indians simultaneously, because they can explain the Indian view points in a better way.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I have already said that Hindi language should be used in the official working of the Ministry of External Affairs. You have not mentioned it at page 76 of your report. I have specifically stated that the Ministry of External Affairs have no translators. The Ministry take the services of the translators of Jawahar Lal Nehru University. Somewhere you have mentioned in the report that translators have been appointed by the Ministry. It is not the factual position. Therefore, I urge upon the Government to accord more importance to the use of Hindi language and more and more work should be done in our National language Hindi.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to mention some points. Although Mr. Bhatia was saying that Shri Jaswant Singh had not given suggestions. So I am specifically stating in a very clear term that national consensus should be evolved on the issue of foreign policy. An Expert Committee on the line of the Planning Commission should be set up and an attempt should be made to strengthen the 'SAARC'. India should take initiative for developing a common market of 'SAARC'. The Government should protect the interests of Indians who are residing abroad. For example, Indians, in Fiji and Burma are facing a number of problems; these problems should be solved by our Government. It is not enough only to make a statement in the House that we would protect their interests. Barring this statement what concrete

[Prof. Prem Dhuma]

steps you have taken to protect their interests. As hon. Shri Jaswant Singh too has said on behalf of the N.R.I.'s and it has been the long awaited demand of N.R.I.'s also to provide dual citizenship. Indian citizenship should also be provided to them. This demand is being raised time and again. are you going to do something in this regard?

The issue of environment has become the major problem for the entire world. I would like to submit that a South Asian Environmental should be set up to protect the environment and Protection Authority. Government and private institutions which are expert in environment, should be given due representation in that Authority. India should contribute to make U.N.O. more powerful. India is a big country. India should get a permanent place in the Security Council. All of us and our Government should put efforts in this direction. The Government should place its policy before the House. My hon. senior colleagues would speak more on the subject. Therefore I conclude without taking more time of the House. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me time to speak.

[English]

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Mayiladuturai): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. Our debated here is based upon the annual report of the Ministry of External Affairs and that report is as that report should be - a document couched in sober diplomatic language with measured words and measured tones.

17.07 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

But I think, we on the back-benches of Parliament have the liberty to not be statesmen like and to not be bound down by the niceties of the idiom of diplomacy. Consequently I shall attempt to free myself from the constraints which bureaucracy of the Minis-

try of External affairs necessarily has to put upon itself and attempt to explain to this House what is the real meaning behind the very sorber words in which the annual report meaning is couched.

It is true that the world has changed remarkably. It has changed almost beyond recognition since the last time that House had the opportunity, which was not in the Tenth Lok Sabha but in the 9th Lok Sabha, to discuss matters of foreign policy. But I think an excessive number of words should not be wasted in stressing the obvious that the world has changed. The question which I wish to put to our Minister of State for External Affairs is: event world has changed have our objectives in foreign policy changed? What, if any, is the change in the world situation that would warrant our changing the objectives for which we have stood since at least 1947?

I would submit that the central issue in our foreign policy should not be the question of whether the world has changed or not changed, but how we are to pursue our old objectives in the new circumstance. Changes in the world situation do not necessarily impose on us any obligation to change our objectives. What changes in the world situation do impose upon us is a need to change some of our tactics in the pursuit of our old objectives. However, I am not here referring to the very informed debate we have so far had in this House but the wider debate that has been taking place in the country. There are far too many people in this country, particularly media commentators, who have panicked because of the changes in the world situation, who see in the disintegration and collapse of the Soviet Union, the collapse of a crutch upon which our foreign policy was leaning and are, therefore, asking that since the crutch has been removed, this cripple should find himself another crutch to walk on. And it is to those people that I wish to address my remarks I am happy to say so, Sir, because there do not seem to be many victories of that kind of thinking in any side of the House. I wish to say to them and I wish to remind them, of two or three such basic and fundamental facts which we tend to

forget surprisingly. The first and foremost is this. In 1946-47, when we articulated our policy of non-alignment, we were economically much weaker than we are today. Militarily, we were very much weaker than we are today. And since back in 1947, we were the only country in the entire international community to emerge from the colonial experience into the post colonial world, in the United Nations or in any international gathering, we were virtually in a minority of one in terms of numbers. I think we need to remind this House that the first two ambassadors of India to the Soviet Union were not even given the courtesy of an audience by General Secretary, Stalin. The first of our ambassadors was none other than the our sister of the Prime Minister of India at that time. The second was the persons who went on to become one of the most distinguished Presidents that the Republic of India has had. Between 1947 and 1955, Indian foreign policy, the same policy of nonalignment, which we continue to espouse today, did not have the support of the Soviet Union and yet, we articulated it. It was no we who went running to the Soviet Union for their help and assistance. It was the Soviet Union which, over a period of approximately a decade, came to the realisation that in an independent India, a non-aligned India, an India which was willing to stand up for its values, perspectives and objectives, it was finding a valuable friend in international relations. And it was not until after Panditji visited the Soviet Union in the middle of 1955 and the return visit of Bulgar and Khrushchev India towards the end of that year, that friendship between India towards the end of that year, that friendship between India and the Soviet Union became cemented and became an integral and essential part of the Indian foreign policy.

Why is it, Sir, that this weak and solitary voice in international affairs grew between 1947 and 1955 to the point where one of the world's great super powers wished to become a partner of ours? The reason was that we had the courage to articulate our point of view on all the major issues that arose in the world. We never said that because we were a weak under developed country and militarily,

we had no right to say anything in the world. We took a stand on Palestine. We took a decision in November, 1947, when a minority of three, namely, India, Iran and Yugoslavia asked that neither should the Jews be driven into the sea nor the Arabs should be driven out of Palestine, there should be no partition of Palestine, there should be a unitary state in which the Jews and the Arabs live together and conduct a polity on the principles of democracy. When it came to voting, Yugoslavia let us down. But we had the courage to stand up for our point of view. We stood up alone because we believed at that time that if imperialism was permitted to the same mistake or commit the same crime in West Asia as had committed here in India, that is to say, if western imperialism was going to be Palestine, then it would not be good for India, for Asia or for the world. The world did not listen to us then. It has begun to sit up and listen to us now. If the current West Asian peace process is ever going to arrive at a satisfactory solution, it will be a solution based upon what we had advocated in 1947, namely, equal rights for the Arabs and the Jews in an integrated unified state of Israel.

At that time, when we counted for nothing militarily, politically and economically, we took a stand on the Korean issue which was so unpopular in 1950 as to be rejected by both sides. Yet it was so valuable for both the sides that by 1953, this economically dependent, militarily weak and politically cloudless India was asked to become the Chairman of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission which was essential to bring the war in Korea to an end.

In 1954, we were not even invited to the Geneva Conference on Peace in Indo-China. Yet, Mr. Krishna Menon made something of a nuisance of himself by being present there even when he was not invited. Yet, whoever has written the history of Geneva Conference of 1954, has had to concede that India which was not even invited to that conference-like today our India which has not been invited to the Middle East Peace Conference- played such a crucial role in bringing about peace in Indo-China that it was India

and not any other country that was asked to become the Chairman of the Commission that was Set up to supervise and maintain peace in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam.

We Sir, mattered in the world because we stood up for what we believed in. And here I must pay tribute to the remark that was made by Shri Jaswant Singh. We did not count our popularity and our success in terms of the amount of applause we could get in the international community. We counted ourselves in terms of the way we had the courage to stand up for what we believed in and had the capacity to persuade others who were initially of a different view, to come round to our point of view. It was only because India was able to persuade the world that there was a third way that round about the end of the Fifties, the emerging countries, as the winds of freedom blow across Africa, came to the emerging from the throes of colonialism can have was the foreign policy which was first articulated by India.

Our present generation has got used to what is really a historical aberration. Between 1965 and 1991, the non-aligned movement constituted two-thirds of the international community. We were non-aligned before we were in a majority. We remained non-aligned when we were in a majority. And if we are going to continue to count in the post-Cold War world, in the post-detente era, we must continue to be non-aligned. If Indian foreign policy attempts to make compromise with the existing balance of power in the world, then it is not going to count for any thing, because the world does not look to India to function in like a drum-major. We are not here to give *danda* as if we were sitting in a *Mushaira*. India represents one-sixth of humanity. India represents the oldest continuous civilisation in world history, which had been capable of demonstrating the validity of unity in diversity. India represents certain values, the absence of which, will render our entire species and our entire planet extinct in a few minutes, owing to the onset of the nuclear age. If we are going to survive -when I say 'we' here, I mean the whole world- if the world is going to survive

the nuclear age, it can survive only if the ethic upon which we conduct out international relations is the Indian ethic of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, the Indian ethic of non-violence, the Indian ethic of compassion, the Indian ethic of tolerance and the Indian ethos of unity in diversity. If the world does not learn that lesson from us, then it is incapable of surviving the nuclear age. And I say this quite conscious of the fact that we are now coming to the end of the 20th Century, which has been the bloodiest century in the history of humanity. Western civilisation produced as its first flower, in this century, after I was born, a man like Adolf Hitler who was admired by millions. It was a civilization in which people succeeded in conducting their internal difference in such a manner that 50 million human beings, ten times the population of Delhi, have lost their lives.

This is a civilization which has stated with pride and not with shame, that the sun, never sets on the British empire. This is a civilization which has built its economic development on the basis of the blood of West Africans stolen from the coast of West Africa and taken as slaves to run the factories and farms of the North American Continent. This is a civilization which has stolen the land of the Red Indian all the way from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast and then made sacrosanct this theft with a prayer in the name of the lord our God. Are we going to hand over dominance in the nuclear age to a civilization which has caused more blood sheds, more sorrow and more horror than any other civilization in the world? That is the question that is before us. We have to fashion our foreign policy in terms of much larger objectives than paragraphs in a joint communique. And it is in working towards these larger objectives; in working towards the greater contribution that India has to make to world that we have to fashion our foreign policy

There is an expression which we first coined, that is the 'New World Order' which has been hijacked by Western civilization. These three words have now come to mean a world order in which one particular political

power attempts to set all the rules for the game and then plays it according to its will. Again, I pay my tribute to Shri Jaswant Singh for having drawn attention to so many specific instances where this has been done. I think the worst thing that we could do is to seek permanent Membership of the Security Council without a veto. To do that is to get ourselves co-opted into a world order which is inherently unjust, inherently undemocratic and inherently inequities. It would be the exact equivalent of a Maharaja or a Nawab or a Nizam in the days of paramountcy agreeing to become a subsidiary ally provided they were given a 21 gun salute. Sir, our country is not in need of 21 gun salute from the Americans or from any one else. Our objective must be much larger than that. We would not wish to get co-opted and become by implication partners in the perpetuation of inequity. We must say that there is need for the expansion of the permanent Membership of the Security Council, if indeed we need to have Security Council at all. But that we will not accept two in levels the Security Council: one of the five victors of the Second World War, which ended half a century ago and second, those of us who petition the chancelleries and say that we will keep our mouths muted if you let us into the Security Council on a permanent basis even if you do not give us a veto. I think it is extremely important that at this particular juncture in our affairs and in the affairs of the world, we assert ourselves anew.

The word 'non-alignment' was a nomenclature. It was a nomenclature that was valid for a world in which the fundamental reality was the existence of two blocs with neither of which we wished to be aligned. It is possible that that nomenclature has been rendered obsolete by the march of events but the objective for which we stand has not been rendered obsolete. And in pursuit of those objectives, I think we need to harp back very consciously to the first major move made in Indian foreign policy by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru in March 1947 when he convened the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi. Sir, in the last one year for the Cold War; it is not the commencement of the process of disarmament; it is not the collapse

and disintegration of the Soviet Union. The single most important reality for us here, in our part of the world is that there is a possibility again of an Asian resurgence; of the establishment of an Asian identity in world affairs which was the primary objective in March 1947 and which was not pursued for various reasons thereafter. We have now got a series of countries in Central Asia which have become independent, which are asserting themselves independently and with which we must re-establish our countries' old relationships. It is extremely important that we do not look upon these Central Asian Republics in the perspective of the Christian powers of Christendom who are all the time referring to them only as Islamic power.

Sir, there is much more in our history that is tied with Fevghana and Bokhara and Samarkand and then it is tied with London, New York and Paris. It is extremely important that we avail of the obvious goodwill which these new Central Asian Republics have been demonstrating to us to build up very strong relationships with them, politically, economically and militarily.

Equally, never in the last fifty years have we had the opportunities that we have now in East Asia. There is a mighty economic power, Japan, which is only too willing to enter into a relationship with us.

Our difference with China are in the process of being resolved, thanks to the great initiative taken by Shri Rajiv Gandhi in December 1988.

In South-East Asia, we are seeing the burgeoning of economies which are geographically, extremely close to us, where there are large Indian populations present and with whom we have had cultural, historical and political relationships of high importance.

There in West Asia, we find that in the entire Gulf area, including Saudi Arabia, there is a new found wealth that did not exist earlier. There is a peace process of sorts that is underway with Israel. Our objective in regard to Israel must be to make Israel an

Asian country. The day Israel seizes to be an outpost of Western imperialism in Asia, it becomes totally acceptable to us. But, if in the process of merely seeking a place at the Middle-East Peace Talks' table, we are to make ourselves a surrogate of any other power, if we are to mute our voice, if we are to speak in different accents to what we have been speaking so far, nobody is going to listen to us. Because, once, we start clapping to them, next time, they will ask why are you not clapping louder.

I would, therefore, say that unlike the objective stated in the President's Address of now building what they call a comprehensive and multi-faceted relationship with Israel, I suggest that we desist from doing so and that we concentrate all our attention on the most deprived citizens of Israel who are the citizens of Arab origin. If India is going to undertake a relationship with Israel, I trust, it will be aimed at giving in India, opportunities to Arab citizens of Israel which are denied to them in Israel. I would also suggest that we do not expand our relationship in areas where it is not necessary for us to do so. We can learn drip irrigation without going to Israel and we can defend ourselves without having to go to Israel. Let us not blot our escutcheon any further. There may have been a logic to re-establishing full diplomatic relations with Israel at this particular juncture in time. But, let it be calibrated to the West Asian Peace process; let it be calibrated to giving justice to Israeli citizens of Arab origin. Let us not become in any way, the running dogs of Manhattan imperialism. That is why, if there is any problem that exists in the Ministry of External Affairs about finding an Ambassador to go to Tel Aviv my suggestion is that the Consulate General of India in New York might be concurrently accredited to Israel because after all much of Israel is run from Manhattan. If the Ministry of External Affairs were to shy away from appointing a senior Indian Foreign Service Officer who knows the Middle-East better than any of my former colleagues in the Indian Foreign Service merely on the ground that he is a Muslim which is a danger that I think, we are about to encounter, then I would regard that a shame. If that officer were not be sent to Tel

Aviv because we have got better officers, well and good. But if we are to shy away by saying that the Israelis might find it extremely sensitive that an Indian Muslim fetches up in Tel Aviv to represent India, then I would regard that as shameful.

Sir, I recognise that you have been extremely indulgent to me and given me much more time than I am entitled to.. Let me just seek your indulgence for just one minute more. I have found here in a speech that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru delivered in this very House, standing over there on the 4th of December, 1947, when he explained what it was that led us to take the unpopular minority decisions that we took on the Palestine issue, the following passage:

" I point this out to the House (our stand on Palestines) as an instance, that in spite of considerable difficulty and being told by many of our friends on either side that we must line up this way or that, we refused to do so and I have no doubt that the position we had taken was the right one and I still have no doubt that ours would have brought about the best solution.

This applies to many other things. But inevitably it means that to some extent we have to plough a lonely furrow in the United Nations and at international conference of this type. Nonetheless, that is the only honorable and right position for us to take and I am quite sure that by adopting that position, we shall ultimately gain in national and international prestige, that is to say, when we take a long view of the situation, not a short view of getting immediately a vote here or there.

Commending Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's views to our present foreign policy establishment that we take a long view and not a short view suggest that we not get panicked or frightened by the changes that have taken place recently but, recognise that with our present military strength, our present economic strength, and our person political strength we are in a much better position

today than Panditji was in 1947 to pursue a policy of Non-Alignment.

I would urge the Government to regard the Action Plan presented by the late Shri Rajiv Gandhi to the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament as the central plank of our foreign policy, because that Action Plan divided into three parts dealt first with what we should do to start a process of disarmament; second with what we should do to bring the process of disarmament to a conclusion by the year 2010 AD; and third and much more importantly the single most important element of that Plan dealt with how we were to construct World Order that would be able to sustain a world without nuclear weapons. I will not go into the details of it, but, it seems to me that in a single document everything that we wish to achieve for the world, for ourselves and for our region is set out in that very carefully considered document. It was given, in the last United Nations General Assembly, somewhat short because there was only one reference to it by the Indian Delegation in the entire proceedings of the General Assembly

I trust now that, after Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao has brought it centre stage in the Security Council Summit, the late Shri Rajiv Gandhi's Action Plan will once again become the Central point of our foreign policy; and whether we get the support of everyone in the world or not, we at least will have the courage, we will have the moral strength, we will have the self-confidence to stand up for what we believe in.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore):
Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar deserves to be congratulated on a very constructive speech which he has made. And he began by saying that he would speak uninhibited by the shackles of bureaucrats in the Government or the Ministry. He made a good job of it.

What is emerging from this debate is that the ship of foreign policy has lost its moorings. It is a drift on the highseas without any compass, without any rudder drifting about; and this change mainly has come about over the last year. Momentous changes

have taken place, not only changes momentous changes have taken place in the world; there is no doubt about that. But, as Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar has said, these changes do not make it obligatory for our country to resort to changes which completely cut off our ties, our moorings with the past.

The Non-Alignment, I understand, in the old rigid sense of Non-Alignment between two Super Power Blocks is no longer relevant. But does it mean that our non-aligned conscience is also dead. We have conscience; we have a philosophy.

We have a certain principle and objective which we followed all these years. I would say that our position as a major and responsible regional power enjoins upon us the duty in today's circumstances, of resisting all unreasonable solutions which are sought to be imposed by the North on the rest of the world. That is our duty, in line with and consistent with the adherence to non-alignment which we have followed all these years.

I understand that subservience to — it may be enforced subservience, because of our economic and financial bankruptcy — but enforced subservience to international funding organisations, may cannot that inevitably we have to accept certain World Bank or IMF prescriptions which have now led to these new economic, industrial and financial policies adumbrated by a Finance Minister who at one time was the distinguished Secretary of the South-South Commission under the Chairmanship of President Julius Neyerere. It is really ironic. You read what Dr. Manmohan Singh, in his capacity as Secretary of the South-South Commission used to say and write at that time, about the equation between the developing countries and the developed countries of the North, what he used to write and say about the dangers which are inherent in a world economic order which is dominated by a handful of rich countries. and if you would remember what he wrote and spoke the about need for the South-South countries, to go together, and depend more and more on each other and on their own collective

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

strength, I really find it astonishing how today the same gentleman is philosophies which are just the opposite of what he used to expound as Secretary of the South-South Commission. However, that cannot be helped. Such metamorphosis takes place in man

As many friends here have already said, even if you are under such compulsions, which you cannot resist in the field of economy or finance or industry, must it also cannot all these areas, the political areas and foreign policy and defense policy areas, in which we have taken to change our policy? Is it prescribed by the World Bank and the IMF that, "If you are going to get loans from us you must do these things also, that you must go in for long term strategic defense cooperation with the USA?" Is it laid down by them?

I would like to know it. How has this come about? Who took the initiative? Who took the initiative in this matter? Here in this report at page 7, it says, "A new feature in Indo-U.S. relations was the cooperation initiated on the defence side." But it does not say who initiated it. Was it initiated by the Government of India, or by the Government of the United States? We must know that.

"The visit of our Chief of Army Staff to the USA in August 1991 and the visit of the Commanding General and the U.S. Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific Command to India are noteworthy"

All these are very studiously restrained phrases used by this Ministerial report. They are noteworthy. They are certainly noteworthy. But the point is, what are the implications of it? Where do we go from here? All these years we had such a close relationship. In the area of Defence, we were with the Soviet Union. Everybody knows about it. Eighty per cent or more of our Defence forces' equipment is of Soviet origin

But to my knowledge, never in those years did our Army or our Air Force go in for exercise with the Soviet counterparts?

And what has happened now to bring about this change? I would like to know what these proposed joint naval exercises are meant; how are they to benefit India; against whom are they directed; have we now worked out some common perception with U.S.A. of some common enemy; to safeguard against whom we have to go in for these joint exercise. I do not know what sort of impression it is going to create on all those countries of the non-aligned world, the developing countries of the Third World, who used to look upon India as their leader in all these matters of peace and disarmament, non-alignment and so on. Why are we doing it? What is the idea unless somebody pressurised us to an extent where we cannot say 'no'?

Is it essential, when we ask for loans from the World Bank or the I.M.F., that we must fall in line with the American blockade, economic blockade of Cuba? What harm has Cuba done to anybody? What have they done? Cuba and India were together for years as close friends and partners in the Non-aligned Movement. I would remind you that Mr. Fidel Castro was the Chairman of NAM and when his term was completed, it was he who handed over the Chairmanship to the then Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. We worked together for years. Cuba has never done any harm to us. Has it done any harm? The Foreign Ministry should tell us.

And now when their Foreign Minister, Mr. Malmierca came to Delhi with a request, a modest request, for some rice or wheat to help them. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, they are really in dire distress now. No essential commodities are available there. The people are suffering acute pangs of hunger. There is no food. There is no medicines. They did not want it from us as a charity or as a donation. But they certainly wanted it on some terms of credit, delayed payment. True. They asked for one hundred thousand tonnes of rice. I am told that our Government here first of all said that we do not have very substantial stocks with ourselves and we will try to give them ten thousand tonnes of rice and later on if it is

possible we many consider giving them further ten thousand tonnes of rice. Wheat, of course, we said that we cannot give because we have not give it.. So, Mr. Malmierca, who is a quite a senior Minister in the Cuban Government, sat around here in Delhi for ten days, waiting for a finalisation even of these ten thousands tonnes of rice offer. And you will be surprised to know, Sir, that at the end of his stay here, he was informed that nothing can be done. why? There was no reply. The Government said: "sorry, it cannot be discussed any further". Are we, entitled to have some suspicions about some arm-twisting done by the very power, which has been blockading Cuba economically for the last thirty years? Why have we succumbed? For what? What would have happened if we had given this rice to Cuba? Would the United States "Navy have invaded India? Or would they have sent Ms. Carla Hills again here to threaten us with economic sanctions? I must point out that very disastrous and harmful consequences are going to follow from all these actions. You are losing your friends, deliberately jettisoning your friends.

We have decided to give full diplomatic recognition to Israel. All right. But what has happened to our stand, which we have pursued for many years, that they must vacate the occupied Arab lands? That is a decision of the United Nations also. In the Golden Heights and the Gaja Strips of those Arab lands which they forcibly occupied must be vacated.

Did we put it forward as a condition for giving them recognition? There is nothing on record to show that. Then, what is the meaning of Zionism, I should like to know. We know how they behaved in those occupied territories; how they are treating this captive Arab population there. Anyway, we agreed to both in favour of rescinding the United Nations old Resolution about Zionism. But, why have we now gone in for this without at least standing our ground on the question of vocation of the occupied Arab lands? I would like to know what has been the reaction among our Arab friends. I know some people are propagating here in Delhi that what is the use these Arab people never gave us any-

thing. What is the use of our friendship with the Arab? What did we get from them? We got nothing. So, what is the harm if the Americans are so keen on our giving full diplomatic recognition to Israel; what is wrong with it? Such talk I hear here and there among certain circles. What we will be trying to do I would like to know because nobody has told us anything. This morning you heard what went on in this House. Everybody without exception on all sides of this House complained bitterly of the fact that this House is kept in the dark. The Government does not come here and tell us anything as to what it is doing; why it is doing it. So we should not be accused of making allegations with which somebody may say a baseless that kind of *obiter dictum* won't do. All these things are taking place. I know when Mr. Yasser Arafat came here recently, he was hopeful. We had some talk with him. We met leaders of various parties. He was hopeful that if India gave full diplomatic recognition to Israel, it would be a sort of passport for India to get into the Middle East cooperation, Middle East peace process and according to him the Arabs were very eager for that. The Arab wanted very much that India should be a participant in that peace process of the Middle East. Perhaps he thought and may be wrongly; - now it appears wrongly- that if India recognise Israel because Israel was blocking the entry of India into the Middle-East conference on this ground, it may affect us. Now what has happened? We are nowhere near middle East conference. Anyway I do not know what is going to happen. This supper power, which is now described by Shri Vajpayeeji, as supreme power is going about brandishing sanctions against everybody- right and left. Sanctions against Iraq had a plausible justification in the beginning because Iraq had committed aggression against Kuwait. Subsequently, those sanctions continued and that hurt only the poor, the children's and the women and the civilian in that country who are unable to get food, milk, medicine, or anything.

Then, sanctions about Cuba, I have spoken about; sanctions against Libya. Now the Time Magazine- everybody knows the Time Magazine has come out with an article

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

after having done some research on their own where they say that the two people who are being demanded by the Americans to be handed over because they are responsible for the blowing up of that plane at lockable. The time Magazine says that this is a concocted story. It is not these two people at all the Lockerbie blow up was carried out by somebody totally different. I do not know, who is to be believed. But, they are demanding these people must be handed over to them, they could handed over to somebody else; to Arab League or so some other neutral country or somebody.

Now, there is threat of a sanction against the Russian Federation in the matter closely connected with us, the question of transfer of rocket technology. Here is a supreme power which wants to function entirely with the aid of threat of the sanctions and see the way we are behaving - surrendering, kowtowing. Not only we will have no respect in the world but I am quite sure, this sword, this weapon of sanctions, sooner or later, will be wielded against India also, the moment they feel that we enough issues on which we differ with them even now, on which they will try to make us scuttle down under the pressure of sanctions.

All the non-signatories of the Non-proliferation Treaty, all of them who have not signed, have been under pressure and several of them have succumbed. India has not succumbed and India should not succumb. That is the view, I think, in this House.

We have been advocate of our comprehensive global nuclear disarmament as the only viable option to this NPT and we should make it clear that the distinction which was once made in the Non-proliferation Treaty is now obsolete. That distinction has no meaning now. All powers should become equally subject to the same regime.

Fundamentalism and authoritarianism, unfortunately, are still rampart in many parts of the world. Just now a new danger has emerged. We were always worrying about

the Central Asian Republics of the former Soviet Union that they might represent some kind of fundamentalist threat on our borders. Of course, the governments there up to now are behaving in a rather friendly and cooperative manner towards India and I hope that process will be carried on by us. But now the developments in Afghanistan on our border, in the last few days, certainly cause some deep concern to all of us. We always stood for an Afghanistan which would be independent, non-aligned and would not be fundamentalist but would be sickle. But now what is happening there? I do not know what is the view of the Government of India. They should tell us. But there is a real danger of a fundamentalist Afghanistan emerging and that, I think, would be something much more dangerous than what is happening in the Central Asian Republics.

Effective economic cooperation between the SAARC countries and the NAM countries is essential today. Others have spoken about it. But among these groupings, the bigger countries, the larger countries will obviously have to make some more concessions than others, if they want to bring all these countries together.

There are sub-regional groupings also which on economic questions and other question, should be sought to be brought together. Somebody has spoken here about a larger Asian identity which should be sought to be brought about. Well, this can be done though our initiatives if we work properly utilising SAARC and the Non-Alignment Movement for this purpose. It means now we have to deal with a more unpredictable and un-restrained type of superpower which will try to marginalise the countries of the South. Therefore, power equations I think now are going to depend much more on economic than politico -military equations. Economic equations are going to be the most important, and realising that, I support everything that Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar has said about the fact that we are now a much stronger country than we were so many years ago when we pursued this policy consistently. In fact, the United States of American may look very strong but we know what kind of eco-

conomic crisis and depression they are suffering from. Everything is not well for them either. Some journal has described it as the mother of all depressions - the depression which is going on in the United States and vis-a-vis other countries like Japan or Germany and so on. We know that the United States is not in a strong position, dominant position rather it is in a weak position. We should not get over-powered by the idea of our big country in the West threatening us and, therefore, our having to go by it.

Finally, what about Pakistan? I know that it is a difficult problem. I think that it is of vital importance for India's long-term interests to mending fences with Pakistan. Of course, two have to play the game. It cannot be done by one side only. It is because it would involve the mutual reduction in Defence expenditure which is in the interests of both the countries.

But, since the Government of India has so far, not been also to make any striking achievement in the field of mending fences with Pakistan, I would suggest that non-governmental agencies should be used much more imaginatively and vigorously to promote exchanges between the two countries to diffuse tension to the extent possible and to try to pave the way for a situation in which India and Pakistan can establish, on a normal footing, their neighbourly relations. Let the non-governmental agencies of various kinds be discussed here. Let them be utilised much more than what has been done in the past.

Finally, I would say that people are preaching that socialism is dead. Socialism is not dead. It will never die. The ideology is not dead. But one ideology now - which we have to take note of, which is becoming uppermost in almost all countries in the world, whether it is the former socialist countries or the countries of the West or other countries of the Third world - is the desire for democracy. On democracy, we have seen what is happening in our neighbourhood. This democracy is bidding now to become universal - a universal ruling political system

which is the best bulwark against different forms of authoritarianism and fundamentalism.

I would conclude by saying that the slogans on which we should now pin our objectives and go forward and preach these slogans - which India is capable of doing - are : democracy, development and peaceful Co-existence which includes dis-armament. These are the three issues on which it is possible today to unify and mobilise the vast masses of people throughout the world in their respective countries. I repeat the slogans - democracy, development and peaceful co-existence which includes dis-armament. I hope our foreign ministry's ship - which is sailing about the high seas, without knowing where to go, will inform us as to whether they have decided on any firm moorings on which the country can be mobilised and rallied behind them in order to take us out of this mess.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us now take up the Supplementary list of Business. Papers to be laid by the hon. Minister

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): Sir, before the hon. Minister lays the papers, may I know what is the reason behind this notification? What necessitated the Government to review the customs duty on capital goods further after the Budget? (Interruptions) Let him please explain the reason behind it.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Otherwise we will not allow him to lay it on the Table of the House. (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL (SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV): It is only a small amount (Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : He is only demanding an explanation. (Interruptions)

SHRI INTERJIT (Darjeeling): We should have formal explanation instead of cross-talk between Members. (Interruptions)

17.59 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE - *CONTD.*

**Notification Under Customs Act,
1962**

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SHANTARAM POTDUKHE): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications: (Hindi and English versions) under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:-

- (i) Notification No. 160/92 - Customs published in Gazette of India dated the 20th April, 1992 together with an explanatory memorandum seeking to prescribe a concessional rate of customs duty of 25 per cent *ad valorem* or 15 per cent *ad valorem* on capital goods imported under the Export Promotion Capital Goods Scheme, subject to specified conditions.
- (ii) Notification No. 161/92 - Customs published in Gazette of India dated the 20th April, 1992 together with an explanatory Memorandum seeking to prescribe a concessional rate of customs duty on components imported for the manufacture of capital goods to be supplied to manufacturer-exporters under the Export Promotion Capital Goods Scheme, subject to specified conditions.
- (ii) Notification No. 162/92 - Customs published in Gazette of India dated the 20th April, 1992 together with an explanatory memorandum seeking to fully exempt capital goods and components imported under the Export Promotion Capital Goods

Scheme from auxiliary duty of customs. [Placed in Library See No. LT-1799/92]

(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Where is the explanatory memorandum referred to in the papers that have been laid on the Table of the House? Where is the explanatory memorandum (Interruptions)

SHRI INDEDR JIT (Darjeeling) : I support the demand for some explanation

(Interruptions)

SHRI INDERAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): It may kindly be withdrawn and be brought again along with the Explanatory Memorandum .

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Sir, it can be laid on the Table tomorrow. Don't allow this now, Sir.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central): He has laid the Explanatory Memorandum along with this.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Where is it?

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: It is stated here "together with an explanatory Memorandum".

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Where is it? We must get this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There is a mention about the Explanatory Memorandum. But where is the Memorandum? It is the Notification, not the Memorandum.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: So, he should come to lay it tomorrow. He should not be allowed to lay it today.