

for a short period and sell the essential commodities at high prices. Other traders who do not fall under this category do not open the shops with the fear that the organisers of bandhs may cause damage to their shops.

The most sufferer section is the employees. Employees working in various offices and commercial complexes face a lot of problem in the absence of proper transport facilities. When DTC buses stop plying a handful of private bus owners ply their buses and charge more than the usual fare. The scooterists charge exorbitantly high fare from the passengers. More over all employees cannot afford to spend so much on fare.

As such, there is need to provide adequate transport facilities to the employees on the bandh days. DTC should augment its fleet so that passengers do not suffer on account of bandhs. Government should take some urgent steps and help the passengers from all such hardships.

[English]

- (ix) Need for allocating funds under the **lan. expenditure for proper maintenance of Government buildings various States.**

DR. A. KALANIDHI (Madras Central): From the inception of Five Year Plans, various schemes have been implemented by the Central and the State Governments and its undertakings in India of which about 40% have been invested in the construction of buildings, factory sheds etc. These buildings, factories are the assets of our nation. But, the expenditure on their maintenance is termed as Non-Plan expenditure and adequate funds are not set apart for this purpose. This has led to the growth of wild plants, vegetations on the terrace of these buildings, over the cornice, sunshades, sujjas, particos, etc. They are not white washed annually and painted periodically. Even though certain norms are being followed by various Governments, funds are not placed even upto the norms on the plea that they have to curtail Non-Plan expenditure. Thus the buildings are allowed to deteriorate leading

to heavy loss. Central Government and Planning Commission and Finance Commission should allocate funds for the maintenance of the buildings constructed out of the Plan i.e., Five Year Plan funds in various States and under the Central Sector, so that these buildings will be maintained upto the standards prescribed by the Central PWD. Such allocation of funds shall be treated as Plan expenditure and not as Non-Plan expenditure in view of the fact that scheme like PHC, ICCI, SIHS, IUDP, DPAP, RLEG, NMEP, HADP, RHS, RWS are not funded continuously by the Planning Commission and Central Government.

12.30 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL) 1986-87 Contd.

Ministry of External Affairs

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand No. 29 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which 6 hours have been allotted.

Motion moved\*

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account 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 31st day of March, 1987 in respect of the head of Demand entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 29 relating to the 'Ministry of External Affairs'."

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President

**Demand for grant (General), 1986-87 in respect of Ministry of External Affairs  
submitted to the vote of Lok Sabha**

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 13th March, 1986		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
1	2	3	4	5	6
29	Ministry of External Affairs	Revenue Rs. 39,45,84,000	Capital Rs. 23,41,67,000	Revenue Rs. 1,97,29,17,000	Capital Rs. 42,13,33,000

MR. SPEAKER : Hon. member present in the House whose cut motions to the Demand for Grant 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 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 officer at the Table without delay. Shri Ananda Gajapathi Raju may speak now.

SHRI ANANDA GAJAPATHI RAJU (Bobbili) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak in favour of the moneys which are allocated to the Ministry of External Affairs from the consolidated Fund of India. We support this but nevertheless at certain occasions we would like to mention our reservations in the form of a few suggestions.

Sir, ours is an ancient civilisation and it is incumbent on us to play a bigger role in world affairs and also to find our rightful place. Foreign policy is usually a consensus—a national consensus—between different parties and we would not be lacking in our duty to take part in this consensus. All I would like to say to start with is that the canvas is wide and we would like to touch upon most of what is required but nevertheless we may be failing

sometimes and we may be excused for the lapses, if any.

12.34 hrs.

[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN *in the chair*]

Sometimes there is a tendency amongst smaller nations particularly our neighbours and littoral States to consider India having hegemonistic tendencies. This is something which has to be countered because the size of India does not determine its hegemonistic attitude and this should be amply clarified at various forums and situations.

Further our precepts and aspirations for an egalitarian society towards peace should also be reflected in our foreign policy. At this juncture it is worth mentioning that our role in NAM is also something which is of paramount importance. Some days back an hon. Member spoke about the relevance of NAM and also spoke about the forums which we could utilise to better our performance and also our contribution towards a more egalitarian society.

Sir, NAM has no parallel elsewhere in the world. We should try to exploit or make use of NAM from economic angle also so that we get better projects and the strategy for growth is also initiated.

The recent conference of NAM at

Nassau was a pointer in the direction towards idealism tampered by pragmatism in an international forum. At this time, we also took advantage of trying to point out that the apartheid should be done away with and India played a major role in placing such facts before an international body.

The recent SAARC conference at Dhaka was also an introspection reflecting the biblical thought, namely 'Love thy neighbour or neighbours.' It is a positive development that a Secretariat has been established and it is something that all of us must appreciate. Nevertheless, there remains certain grey areas in which some attention and application is required. The problem of the Third World countries still persists. There is still a blanket of non-North-South cooperation; the North-South cooperation has still not reached a stage of take-off and we would urge the Government to take some more steps to see that this country is brought to a meaningful level.

Today, colonialism has given way to neo-colonialism and the Third World has taken the role of creditor nations. Usually, in the 19th and early 20th centuries, the Third World countries were debtor nations and today, in view of the high interest rates and in view of the protectionist tendencies by the western countries, the Third World has taken the role of creditor nations. That includes Latin America and Afro-Arian countries including partly the countries relating to Europe. Therefore, the high rates of interests fixed by the Federal Reserve Bank of USA are siphoning away funds from the Third World and the situation should be corrected.

SHRI G. G. SWELL (Shillong) : Ours is a debtor nation. Can you explain how it is a creditor nation ?

SHRI ANANDA GAJAPATHI RAJU : I will explain. The interest rates are so high in the western countries, and these are fixed by the Federal Reserve Bank. Whenever they increase the rate of interest by one per cent, the Third World countries debt goes up by a couple of billion dollars. That is what I mean by saying that we are a creditor nation.

The debt trap also is imminent and India should be in a position to avoid it.

The multifibre agreement is definitely a retrograde step. The multifibre agreement must be modified so that export go to the western nations. They are protecting their market at our cost and we are just on the periphery. It is like a metropolitan country taking advantage of the peripheral nations. This kind of a situation should be brought to an end so that there is more egalitarianism not only within this country but outside the country also.

Again, the international trade has come to its lowest point in the last 30-40 years. I submit that today there is no parallel to the dampening effect on international trade as there is now; because of the great depression, the trade has come down. This is a retrograde step and will definitely affect the developing countries particularly ours. I would submit a few facts which have come to our notice. Western Nations talked about development decades. They said that the sixties and seventies were the development decades. But this never happened. There are near famine conditions in Sub-Saharan Africa in the African continent and also elsewhere. We also have a role to play in seeing that these things are corrected, because of the prestigious role that we play in the Non-aligned Movement.

An attempt by the Western nations to remove protection for services, which they want to move into the GATT now in this year, should be stoutly opposed because we will be losing a lot of employment potential in this country and value added also will be reduced in the country and employment will be hit. Therefore, we should have a common dialogue with the developing nations to cut out this kind of a movement by the western countries.

One per cent of the GNP is what they said that they would allcoate towards the development of the Third World. But the percentage has not increased anything above 0.5 per cent. So, if your Department could kindly ensure that this is brought to one per cent, through some way or the other, we might benefit in the process.

[Shri Ananda Gajapathi]

We remain poor (I do not mean that we are completely poor, but to some extent) because we are poor and therefore this kind of a situation should be changed. If the North is not going to cooperate with the South, then at least South & South should cooperate & make something out of it. The common secretariat that you have set up in Dhaka could now work out common projects either some automobile projects or various other projects, which could be helpful to generating some employment in this country.

Today India and China are being considered as potential markets in the Eighties, just as Latin America was considered in Sixties and Seventies. Therefore, there should be consolidated movement by the West to see that the purchasing power in these countries, particularly in our country, is increased because it is the rich only who would trade with the rich and the rich do not find it necessary to trade with the poor, and they try to take advantage of the poor. So, it should be on an equal basis. I say this because a number of contracts are taking place and contractual obligations are going on. It should benefit India which is standing today on a more solid ground than what it ever had before.

The Brandt Commission's Report has been put into cold storage and if it is reviewed in any international forum, that would also definitely better our chances of developing more. Therefore, what I want to say is that dogmatism should give way to a certain amount of pragmatism, so that our interests are also safeguarded and the role that we play is better appreciated by other countries.

The Indian Ocean is becoming a very potential threat to peace in this zone. The present call of the US Enterprise on the Karachi Port also raised some heat in this House. If this type of things are done, the Indian Ocean zone becomes further militarised and then we will run into problems. Our Defence expenses are rising and this expenditure might rise

even further and create problems for us.

The escalation of arms race in the Sub-continent also has not come down and something should be done to contain that also. In Sri Lanka, there is an attempt towards a military solution to the problem. But the ethnic problem has to be sorted out and there should be a devolution of power to the Northern and Eastern States, not only in conformity with the unitary Constitution of that country, but some further concessions have also to be made and we should oppose tooth and nail a military solution to this problem.

Then, our attempts to de-fuse our differences with China also have not been very successful. And if we are able to de-fuse them, then definitely two cultural giants will be able to achieve mutual satisfaction in trade and exchanges that take place from time to time. Our relations with the Soviet Union also should graduate into a more mature pace. Soviet Union has been a trusted friend, we do realise the contributions that they made to the development of this country and let it be on a more matured level so that the trade relations between these two countries are put on a complementary basis. Latin American Cooperation is also necessary because we have not taken much interest in the Latin American Nations. If that take place, then our exports could also increase, the generation of employment could also increase and we would be in better position. Again we cannot just ignore the Asian countries because we have to look towards the East where the Sun is rising and the economic cooperation with them also would be of necessity.

Stabilisation of relations with the Gulf and Afro-Asian countries, also calls for further attention. Again the Western bloc which has been a cradle of rationalism and modernisation cannot be ignored. We have to have relationships with them also and we should try to get the maximum amount of technical know-how which will be useful to develop our country on a more modern basis. We cannot afford to forget the role played by the United Nations and the international institutions, particularly in terms of stabilising commodity prices and the raw materials that

we export to the Western Nations. They should be more value added in this country and we should take advantage of our being a potential market in the coming decades. Therefore, I have in the form of a suggestion, because foreign policy is basically a national consensus and we are here not to criticise the Government, but to suggest a few angles which might help our country to develop a better perspective. Therefore, what we appeal to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, is that we should attempt more egalitarian society where people of the weaker sections, people of the farming community, people of the backward regions, and people who do not have privilege, should be developed, not only on a national level, but that perspective should be developed on internal level also. Then definitely, the aspirations of the people of India will be fully met.

Thank you.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh):**  
Mr. Chairman. Sir, the House is aware of the growing dangers in which we live today. The lessons learnt from the circumstances that brought about the Second World War would have led to greater globalism in preference to narrow nationalism. This has not been the result of the various steps that the international community took. The United Nations came into existence with a variety of organs attached to it. And there were efforts made by others to bring about a global treatment of the interests of various countries. Unfortunately, this is on the decline. The United Nations itself has lost much of its charm, much of its effectiveness and its organisations are now facing serious economic crisis. The nations that have the capacity to support these organisations and bring into existence a global view of the world are now backing out, because they feel that their narrow nationalism would be better served, outside the global institutions. But one thing has sustained, and that is regionalism. Although the global institutions are not functioning, the regional institutions are. The European Community, the Association of African States, all these, together with other regional organizations are still in existence. They are still of value to those who feel

that their national interests would be better served in a group of countries, than by themselves.

Unfortunately, the regional interests have not led to the strengthening of a global perspective. And because of this, we see the growing conflict in the world. I came across the other day an interesting article in a newspaper which highlights the growing conflict that is now developing. It is from "The Guardian" of November 17, 1985. It says—I quote :

"In a world where one in three adults cannot read or write, and one person in four is hungry, military spending has reached 8 billion a year, despite the existence of enough nuclear weapons to kill everyone 12 times over. Forty years of arms race has cost between 3 to 4 trillion U.S. dollars, produced 60,000 megatonnes of explosive nuclear energy, compared with 11 megatonnes which killed 13 million people in the Second World War, Korea and Vietnam."

But all this has not led to any better understanding in the international community. On the other hand, interference in the internal affairs of States is growing. For example, take Nicaragua. A constitutionally-established Government is threatened by a major world power, not because that Government is creating any difficulty for its neighbours, not because that Government violates international norms, but because it does not conform to the ideological view of a major Super Power. What is of concern is not world peace, creating a New Order based on cooperation, but what is of interest is to see that the interest of a particular country, and above all the ideology of a particular country is served better. Others are now to conform to the ideology of one country, if they wish to exist.

But I must say that the credit goes to the people of the United States that they are standing up to their Government, to prevent this kind of action. And I think that we still have some hope that despite the actions of the Governments, peoples all over the world are for peace; are for cooperation. And this, I think, is one of the greatest achievements of the post-

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

World War II situation, namely that people have risen, and are now acting—whether it was the U.S. people in Vietnam situation, or whether it is the people of the Philippines now; they are rising against the wrong policies of their governments or the dictatorships that have been helped from outside.

But we must be careful. It is not only a question of Nicaragua. A similar situation can take place anywhere.

In fact, it does take place in Africa, in Asia and therefore we have to be even more careful to safeguard our interests and our independence.

Only recently we have seen the presence of a large naval force very near our shores. The Foreign Minister yesterday made a very strong statement against it and we welcome this. But these are dangers which we cannot take sitting or lying down. What do we do against these dangers?

**SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour) :** Issue statements.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** That is not the policy of our party; that is now confined to the hon. member's party.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) :** We are not a party to it.

**SHRI AMAL DATTA :** We say what the government has done except issuing statements.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** All right. The government has taken one of the most commendable steps in bringing countries from six continents together to initiate a dialogue on this issue, and the hon. member will agree that even his party supports it.

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) :** All good things we support.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** Thank you very much. We are taking positive action

in support of freedom of countries, in support of their national sovereignty and in support of their right to live within their boundaries as they feel best.

I have talked of the political dangers, of the military dangers, but there are also economic dangers that are becoming more and more manifest.

Taking what I call the World Bank Syndrome, the World Bank moves into give assistance to a country for its development. As soon as the World Bank loan is taken, they ask for liberalization; that means imports must be allowed on a freer basis. Once these imports come, they have to be paid for. How are they to be paid for? They are to be paid for by exports. Then they bring in restrictions on export-tariff barriers, other quantitative barriers—with the result that the developing countries are unable to export to pay for their debt. Then more debt are initiated and we find a situation in which the country is asked to devalue their own currency. As soon as they devalue their currency, the raw-materials that have to be sent to the developed countries become cheaper and their imports of the material from the developed countries become expensive. Then they get into a debt trap which I would wish to call a death trap. Fortunately, we have a Foreign Minister who is equally well versed with economic affairs having been in Economic Ministries and the Planning Commission.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :** Very good. We accept.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** Thank you again. Therefore, I am quite confident that he will not let us get into either a devaluation or a death trap both of which is being talked about in the country and I think he knows it well.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** What can he do? He is a poor man.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** He is not a poor man in the sense in which you have put it.

**SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) :** He cannot tell his Finance Minister; he does not know what he is.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** So far as we are concerned, I think, one of the most important achievements of this government has been the realisation of an old dream, the dream of helping to set up the South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation.

13 hrs.

Why I do lay so much importance on SAARC is, this was the only area in the world which had not had the benefit of regional cooperation and as I said at the very beginning, although we had not been able to reach any kind of understanding to strengthen global organisations, we have been able to at least evolve up to a regional stage, and therefore, the creation of a regional-organisation of which we are a member, has been one of the most historic achievements of anytime and particularly of this Government and I would like once again to congratulate the Prime Minister and all those who have been involved in the setting up of the SAARC.

But, Sir, I would like to repeat what I said on earlier occasions when we had an occasion to discuss this issue, that here is a potential basis of cooperation obviously between these member States, but more so between Pakistan and India, which are the two largest countries within this organisation. And, therefore, we must pay the highest attention to our relations with Pakistan. It is a rather difficult situation, because relations depend on two people. And if one of them is not as keen as the other, the progress is slow, but if the other is hostile it is far more difficult. I would not say that people in Pakistan would be hostile to cooperation with India. It is my feeling and experience. I have had occasion to talk to some of the friends in Pakistan, and the people of Pakistan wish to have the closest relations with India as the people in this country do.

**PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur) :** That is our hope, that we still have.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** That is not a hope, it is a reality. The most important thing is that the Government should cooperate.

Now, that is where we run to difficulty. That is why I would request the people in responsible positions in Pakistan that they should think in terms of closer cooperation with India. And that is why Indo-Pakistan relations have been more or less in a peak and valley situation. But mere valley and very very little time in the peak. Even today we did expect a better understanding between the two Governments, following SAARC and the meeting between President Zia and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in Delhi. There were expectations that the relations would improve, but they have not. One can understand that President Zia's Pakistan is going through a phase of transition and a new system is trying to establish itself on somewhat democratic lines. When there are temporary aberrations and I would not hope that the Government would be.

(Interruptions)

**SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj):** Democracy in Pakistan, you mean is an aberration?

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** No; I mean the less friendship at the moment between the two countries is a temporary aberration.

I have thought that ultimately Pakistan would prosper. There are more chances for that. Do you not think so?

**SYED SHAHABUDDIN :** I could quite appreciate.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** I lay greater importance on the relations with Pakistan, but our difficulty is because of lack of understanding between Pakistan and India. Look at our defence expenditure. Much of it is because Pakistan has got a large supply of arms on concessional rates and we have got to make up for that. Also because Pakistan, because of its own conception of its defence, is willing to play a client-State role in this region. We have seen not only the visit of the American Navy recently but also the statements made by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Shultz, including Pakistan in their own area of a defence parameter which they would use in situations of emergency. The

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

introduction of a client-State in an area with which we seek close cooperation does create problems for us as it would create problems for Pakistan itself. And I am sure that large numbers of people in Pakistan would wish to get out of that scenario and would wish to have a fully independent policy of their own, not controlled by ideological or security considerations of countries far away. Therefore, as a larger partner in SAARC, as a larger country in comparison with Pakistan, it is our duty to make every effort to strengthen our relations with Pakistan, to find ways and means of reaching the people of Pakistan, trying to create bonds between the people of India and Pakistan so that we may be able to live together in harmony and cooperation.

While on the subject of SAARC, I must say that I am terribly disappointed with what is happening in Sri Lanka today. The genocide there is a matter of deep regret and concern to us all. The Government of India has gone to the farthest length, I think, in trying to assist them in finding a solution.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara) : Beyond.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : My friend says beyond. I would not wish to comment on that. But there is this feeling that perhaps the assistance that we have been wanting to give to Sri Lanka has been made use of to gain time to build up a defence force which would then try to seek a military solution rather than a political solution. And it is a matter of deep regret that this should be said by no less a person than the President of Sri Lanka himself that he would first wish to have a military solution. One can see the involvement first of police, then military, then navy and now air force bombing its own people. It is not a matter which we can take lightly. I would not advocate any kind of interference in the internal affairs of States, particularly our neighbours and friends. But I do feel that we should now adopt a more firm attitude towards Sri Lanka and try to convince them that what they require is a political solution and not

a military solution.

MR. CHAIRMAN : How much more time will you require?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Sir, if it is an indication of first bell, I will finish in two minutes.

While we are discussing the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs, I would wish to remind the hon. Minister that there are two areas in which he may wish to give some more personal attention. One is an area in which we have to evolve more concretely policies which can be communicated to our missions because I have noticed that many missions are not fully aware of the exact nature of the work that they are required to do beyond answering letters sent by the Ministry and attending normal diplomatic functions.

Therefore, a better coordination in a region and a more specific understanding of their own role within a time frame would greatly assist in strengthening our foreign policy. Two, the selection of people to Missions need not be made on the basis of facility and climatic considerations. I think some kind of area specialisation is necessary and that would be possible only by varying the facilities that we give so that there is an incentive to people to go into area specialisation, understanding problems over a longer period than being shifted from one part of the world to an entirely different part. They are given one language to learn and the joke is that they would never get back to the country of the language for which they are specialising. So, a little more attention on these small matters would be of a great help.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate the Government on a very positive action that they have taken, about which I have made reference earlier, about SAARC and the entire conduct of foreign policy which has brought tremendous credit to us. Not only in India but internationally. We are a respected country all over the world and our Prime Minister enjoys tremendous popularity and support. The Foreign Minister has taken over the Ministry and I think this is the first budget he

is presenting. I would like to congratulate him and say that we wish him every success. Thank you.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : Mr. Chairman, Sir... (Interruption) .

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Foreign Minister followed by Ambassador.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : In the course of last one month, ever since we have been sitting in session, the Foreign Minister has drawn a lot of flak to himself from certain neighbouring countries for certain statements that he had made in the House. But that according to me is as it should be in a given situation. We do not need to pussyfoot, we do not need to cavil or quibble, we do not need to equivocate, to natter or resort to namby-pamby, and, above all, I think the time has come when we must shed off the image of our country as a big disjointed giant, at which any piranha fish can take a gibe, in which would some countries try to cast us. I think we are in situation when big troubles are likely to break out in the region. The Foreign Minister and the knowledgeable Members of this House will agree with me that big global troubles, sometimes war, have taken place because of miscalculation, because of misconceptions, because of under-estimation of the other man and the other party, and even today, a nuclear war is more likely to occur as a result of an accident and a miscalculation. Therefore, it is right and proper that we speak out our mind what we stand for, where we stand, up to what limit we can be persuaded to go and beyond which we will not, so that there is no miscalculation and no trouble takes place because of these miscalculations. I thank the hon. Minister for making certain blunt statements in the House whether in relation to Pakistan or in relation to Sri Lanka. He has done his duty and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him.

Because of events that are taking place our main concerns and preoccupations are with Pakistan and with Sri Lanka. In regard to Pakistan I think it bears reiteration

to tell them—as Mr. Dinesh Singh has said there is a fund of goodwill between the people of Pakistan and the people of India but this question is directed to the powers that be in Pakistan—that it should be plain to them as a pike that we have no designs against them; we do not cover a single inch of Pakistan soil. We have no stake, no interest, in their internal problems. Why should we want Pakistan or any part of it? Just to add another burden of poverty and turmoil on ourselves? It does not make any reason at all. And therefore, when we say that we are deeply interested in the stability in the prosperity and peace of Pakistan, we are utterly sincere. There should be no doubt about it. And if there are troubles today between us and the rulers of Pakistan—to which my friends Mr. Dinesh Singh has made a reference—I feel bold to say that all those troubles have not been of our making.

We welcome the process of building up understanding and of removing misunderstanding whether it is garbed under the no-aggression pact or a treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation. We welcome this. We welcome what President Zia-ul-Haq terms his peace offensive. But we would like that all these professions should be backed up by certain concrete action. We would like, for example, to be satisfied from the rulers of Pakistan as to what exactly do they mean they talk of the Simla Agreement—according to us the Simla Agreement is itself a no-aggression pact by the same breath they talk also of a reference of the Kashmir question to international fora like the United Nations. We would like to know from them as to what exactly is the purpose. We would like to set our doubts at rest as to what exactly is the purpose of so much of induction of sophisticated arms into Pakistan when it has been established that many of those sophisticated arms cannot and will not be used in a mountainous terrain like Afghanistan.

We will like to be satisfied from them as to what they are doing with the uranium enrichment facilities when they do not have any nuclear plant in the country where the fuel can conceivably be used. We will like to know from them if Afgha-

[Shri G. G. Swell]

nistan is their problem and if they have willingly reduced themselves, as my friend said, into the position of a client or a vassal State to one of the major super powers today meet there eventually. Then why this heavy concentration of the troops on the borders with India? We will like to be satisfied from them that when we speak about the settlement of our bilateral problems through bilateral negotiations why do they keep insisting on not foreclosing their systems for foreign bases.

It is a well-known fact that Pakistan as it is placed today is not in a position to take decisions by herself, it has to take into consideration the interests and the perceptions of a major power that is behind it. Would that facilitate a bilateral settlement? When we say that the introduction of another country into the bilateral affairs will not work for the settlement of our problems, we will like them to explain to us if they are sincere; if their peace offensive is sincere. Why have they refused to agree not to allow foreign bases in their territory? The Foreign Minister, I think yesterday, was pleased to make a hint at another unsettling development. While a part of the American Seventh Fleet was in Karachi, he said, two naval vessels of Pakistan were on a visit to Colombo. Is this a mere coincidence or, as you yourself said in this Report, there appears to be a growing nexus between Pakistan and Sri Lanka? What kind of nexus can it be except the nexus to crib and cabin India, to put India in her place or to injure the interests of India? There cannot be any other nexus except that. There is nothing in common between the two. One is in the north and the other is in the south. And therefore, while it is good that we must try for the settlement of our problem with Pakistan, we should not allow ourselves to be taken up the garden path. Well, I appreciate if that is what it is, the Foreign Minister coming to this House and saying that there is nothing final or fixed about the visit of our Prime Minister to Pakistan until other things have been worked out. I agree with that, and I will take this opportunity to say that unless and until these problems

are sorted out, a summit between our Prime Minister and the President of Pakistan, a high profile summit, will only raise false hopes and send wrong signals. I leave at that, Sir, as far as Pakistan is concerned.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): False hope but good image!

SHRI G.G. SWELL: In regard to Sri Lanka, I will like to congratulate the Government and I will like to congratulate my colleague here, Shri G.S. Dhillon, who at one time was my colleague, Sir, when he was sitting in that Chair.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The moment he came down you used to sit there!

SHRI G.G. SWELL: All pins and needles.

I congratulate him on having spoken out very clearly in the Human Rights Commission in Geneva about the violations of human rights in Sri Lanka. It is not only our opinion but of the entire world. As a matter of fact, we have been very restrained about it. The whole world has been speaking about the violations of human rights in Sri Lanka. Many countries have done it. Many international organisations have done it. We have done it only when we see that the situation is getting from bad to worse.

Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to express the doubts of many people in this country. We do not understand the oscillation of the President of Sri Lanka, Shri Jeyawardene between the bluster, therodomontade for a military solution and at the next breath, the effusion for a political solution. We do not understand it. I think, the request that we would make to him from here is that he should not take the Members of the House as so many fools and assume the rest of the world does not see through his game. I do not know. I am prepared to grant his sincerity, the sincerity of the Sri Lankan leaders because no country in the world can afford to have a situation like they have. But I have my doubt whether the leaders of Sri Lanka are really

in a position to take decisions by themselves. Sir, in your report, you have spoken about the presence of intelligence agencies of other countries in the world in Sri Lanka. You have hinted at their efforts to get a foot-hold, more foot-hold in the Indian Ocean and bases like Trincomalee Bay and other places to advance their geo-strategic interests. Therefore, it is open to doubt whether the leaders of Sri Lanka are really in a position to take decisions by themselves. We have come to that stage. Therefore, this is a direct threat to India.

Sir, if you look at the map, Sri Lanka is just beneath our groin, if you understand what groin is. You cannot take a knee-jerk at your groin. I cannot take a knee-jerk at my groin. Therefore, before anybody tries to do that, I have to warn him.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : There is no need to hit below the belt, I think.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : I would only protect my groin. I would only protect my groin and mash up his face. That is a different matter. I think, it is time...

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : He is a black-belt holder.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : So, before that happens, it is necessary that we speak out—not necessarily in this House, not necessarily to the Press. When the time comes when we feel the vital interest of India is being affected—this has ceased to be a purely Sri Lankan problem—we cannot afford to have a volcano erupting among the 55 million Tamil in this country. While Sri Lanka has all the rights and opportunities to settle her own problem, it has no right to impose a problem and a danger on us. We have to take steps in order to prevent that eventuality. We have to send the message not only to Sri Lanka but to all the friends behind Sri Lanka.

I would like to submit that if that eventually does happen, nobody in this world has the right to throw it in our face. If President Reagan thought it his duty to intervene in Grenada, hundreds of thous-

ands of miles away from the United States of America because of certain perceived dangers to the ideological interests of America, if he thinks today that he must interfere in Nicaragua, again thousands of miles away because of perceived ideological danger to their interests, will it lie in his mouth to charge if we try to safeguard our national interests ?

But having said all this, I would like to pose certain inconvenient questions to the Foreign Minister. I am almost sure .

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : Please take note.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : My duty is to congratulate and to support my Government but, at the same time, to point out certain things so that we can do better. *(Interruptions)* Why not ? I am almost sure that you will have no answer when you reply to these questions.

*(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Very unkind prediction!

SHRI G.G. SWELL : I will tell you. I will explain. I am saying this on record. I say you will have no answer because I find no indication of those things in this voluminous report. You are not aware of this problem. My grouse is not against you. You are a good friend. But my grouse is against your Ministry. I do not see that they have learnt the habit of cognations thinking.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Very good English.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : They have not learnt the habit of anticipating problems. I want to ask you, are Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, our only immediate neighbours? What about Burma ? It is the third largest country which is our immediate neighbour, the country whose border with us, land and sea, is second only to China, the single largest land mass in the whole of South-East Asia, a country so richly naturally endowed that it can be self-sufficient in every way, and

could not tell us and the rest of the world that it does not care for their aid, a country so near to us that we can do a great deal together in terms of trade, a country with cultural ties so deep and so strong running into the roots of history, a country through which we have been invaded once and we stood in jeopardy of losing our political freedom, a country whose Coco Islands touch our ribs and sit right at the head of the Andamans, a country with islands that could easily be turned into bases against us, is a hostile and agitated regional milieu.

We are so concerned with locking horns with Pakistan. We do not think in terms of the larger canvas. We fall into the habit of only running like a fire brigade whenever a trouble occurs.

You may not care about it. But other countries do. Japan does. But more particularly our neighbour to the North, China does.

Chinese shadow over Burma is the longest and the predominant. She has a political clout. In China wants to do, she can change the political fabric in Burma. But, apart from that, China has a very deep and widespread economic co-operation with Burma. Last year the President of China in his first visit abroad decided to go first to Burma and then to Thailand. You know very well that unlike ourselves who would like to go gallivanting round the world at the drop of a hat, Chinese leader move about only when they have a policy & objective to achieve. Following the visit of the President of China, whom did we send to Burma? Not a very articulate Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs.

While the Chinese economic development in Burma runs into hundreds of millions of dollars we made a ridiculous and petty offer of one million dollars which Burmese contemptuously ignored.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please now conclude.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: I am finishing.

Now I am not saying that we should discuss Burma. This is only by the way in order that you might think and our officers may think over this question in our own interest.

There is another aspect which I would like to draw your attention to. The Foreign Minister is aware that the President of China has been on a visit to almost all countries of South East Asia. The other day he has been also to Bangla Desh and an economic package has been worked out. Then he went to Ceylon. We know that China has been supplementing supply of arms to Pakistan. We have reports that China is behind this resurgence of Iran in its struggle with Iraq. What does it all mean? It means the encirclement of India by China in her political influence and clout interest not only in many matters abroad, but in our immediate neighbourhood as well. What are we doing about it? Is this the foreign policy role that India should play—that a big and large country like ourselves to be confined within itself and to locking horns with its neighbour and not to have a broader concept as to what our role should be. I would like to put this specific question. I would like your Ministry to do a little more of cognitive thinking, as I said, of our role.

Lastly, I will come to the United Nations. You are aware, the Foreign Minister definitely is aware. That the United Nations to-day is in a precarious state—financially. The Secretary-General of the United Nations the other day drew pointed attention to this—that this world body is in danger of disintegration as a result of the cutting off by the United States of 25% of her contribution across the board.

The other day we sang the praise of our lamented friend, late Mr. Olaf Palme, I remember his speech in the United Nations. I pay my tributes to him. He was the only world leader who had the courage to speak from the podium of the United Nations and say that the deficit caused in the finances of the United Nations as a result of American action will be made good by the rest of the countries of the world. Sir, I think, here is another opportunity.

We, as one of the biggest developing countries, a leader of the developing countries, should take this initiative and try to mobilise world opinion and resources. You are aware, even the European Community countries, are working over it. Their Ambassadors in Washington wanted to meet the American Secretary of State on this question and he refused to meet them. The whole world is worried about it. Should we sit back and pretend to be innocent? This is a rare opportunity and I urge on the Foreign Minister to think about it whether we can take initiative and play an effective role in this matter.

**SHRI K. RAMACHANDRA REDDY**  
(Mindupur) : I beg to move :

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Lack of initiative in saving the deliberate extermination of Tamils in Sri Lanka.]  
(14)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Need to normalise relationship with Pakistan] (15)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Failure to lodge strong protest with regard to the training of terrorists by U.S.A.] (16)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Inability of the Government to convince U.K. not to give asylum to people demanding Khalistan]. (17)

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY**  
(Katwa) : Mr. Chairman, to begin with, I must say the policy of our country on the matters of external affairs i.e. Non-alignment, peace and good neighbourly relations, has stood in good stead over the years.

Obviously also, our relations with socialist countries have been very useful and beneficial. Before going into the question of peace and the other broad areas in the international arena, I would like to touch upon a few points relating to our neighbours.

Of late, we are trying to have more cooperation between the countries in our neighbourhood. Though efforts are made very much to improve relations with the countries of SAARC but it seems that our relations with China, after a long spell of hostility, look quite brighter. Many rounds of talks have been held and there is a desire in both the countries that we should live in peace and cooperation. I would like that the Foreign Minister will give us a detailed account of the progress made in these relations.

Yesterday, we had a discussion about the entry of U.S. Warship at Karachi. Many points were made then. But still I want to make certain points. It is a very good attempt that the South Asian countries have tried to come together; tried to live in peace and tried to broaden their economic cooperation. I welcome it. But the point that I want to make is when we are trying to come together, we have to locate the sharks in our waters. That is the third force, to be specific the US imperialism.

Now, what is happening in Sri Lanka? The talk of a military solution by Shri Junius Jayawardhane is known to all of us. But in the meantime, the genocide is increasing. We have tried to offer our good offices for a negotiated political settlement. But what has happened actually? I completely support Shri Dinesh Singh when he said that in order to gain time to organise their attacking capacity and to exterminate the Tamil community, they had played very dubiously. Why the demand for autonomy is not being granted?

And what are they upto? I do not know. We have been shuttling around so long. Earlier it was Mr. Parthasarathy and then Mr. B. Romesh Bhandare. I do not know why Mr. Parthasarathy was dropped. I have no personal preference

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

for anybody. But is this a fact that the Sri Lankan Government did not want Mr. Parthasarathy as he was a Tamil? Are they dictating terms to us? We have to get an answer to this. We are trying to help them. Now the talks have to be done between the Tamils and the Sri Lankan Government. Let us see what they can do. The other day the Prime Minister said that they had received a new paper from the Sri Lankan Government. But it has been openly challenged and it is said that no such paper has come. In this confusing situation I want a clarification from the Foreign Minister whether in the recent past any new paper has been received by our Government for a solution of the Tamils problem in Sri Lanka.

*(Interruptions)*

Now I come to Pakistan. Here I want to make it clear that with all the people in our neighbourhood we have to maintain our solidarity and brotherhood; there is no doubt about it. When the people of Pakistan fight for democracy, we stand by them; when the people of Bangladesh fight for democracy, we stand by them; we have a responsibility. But the question is whether we can take the Zia-ul-Haq Government as the true representative of the Pakistani people. No; we cannot. While we must try for SAARC and good neighbourly relations, we have to keep in mind the fact that the Zia-ul-Haq Government in Pakistan has no independence at all; it is an appendage of U.S. imperialism. It is a part of the U.S. design that they are trying to confuse the whole people in the world; they are trying to create confusion in the minds of our people also. Now, Pakistan talks of 'No-War Pact'. We seem to be on the defensive. There are people in our country also who believe that Mr. Zia-ul-Haq is playing the role of a dove. No; he is not. What is this 'No-War Pact'? In 1949 our country offered a 'No-War Pact'; again in 1965, 1968 and 1977. They never agreed to it. What about our Treaty of Peace and Friendship, the Treaty that we have offered? It is a question of non-intervention and not giving bases to other countries. Why are they not agreeing to it? On the one hand they are saying 'No-War Pact' and on the other hand they are raising the Kashmir issue;

they want to keep it open. They are also proposing mutual inspection of nuclear installations. We have, on grounds of principle—and I support it—not agreed to it. That is on grounds of principle. Will all the nuclear countries allow this to happen? It is not a question of only the relationship between Pakistan and us. It is a part of the U.S. design that they want to disarm us. I am not suggesting that our country should go in for nuclear weapons; it is not at all necessary. The point is, we cannot allow ourselves to be deceived by them. We have to take the offensive and make it clear to our people as to what stand we have taken. There can be no question of our being on the defensive. Our stand is on grounds of principle. Now, Pakistan and America are demanding South Asia to be a nuclear-free zone. Why does U.S.A. not want this to happen in Europe? We have to understand that. It is like Israel demanding that West Asia should be a nuclear-free zone so that they can have the monopoly and have the access to nuclear capability. That is a kind of blackmail. We cannot support it, and we should not allow ourselves to be deceived by this also.

Now we have to take a particular reference of this to our internal situation also. Pakistan, as I have already said, has become a lackey of U.S. imperialism. They are trying to instigate those forces who are working in our country to divide it, to destabilise it. I have a report; I want verification from the Minister. In our country we see the communal flare-up and we should know whether there is any design by them here. My report is that U.S. has set up a special Muslim Department and Sikh Department in the CIA. That is the report. How is it now coming up? In our country it is Babri Masjid and in their country it is attack on Hindu temples—they flare up everything, so that the design of destabilisation can proceed in a very busy manner.

On 2nd February, 1986 Hindustan Times gave a report that a top colonel of the Pakistan Army has prepared a blue print for Punjab. What is that? It is to create anarchy in Punjab, capture Golden Temple. It is happening now. Then kill

people, VIPs, prop up figures like Bhindranwalle and give training in arms. All these are being done according to the plan. We also know that they are now stepping up the USA's covert action.

They have formed a Committee taking people from different agencies in USA like White House, State Department, Pentagon and CIA. The name of this Committee is "20-Committee"—it is according to the name of the room in the White House Annexe. Five hundred million dollars is the annual budget for this. What is their aim? It is to destabilise what they call the pro-Soviet Governments. Those who are not pro-US have become pro-Soviet today. They think that they have every right to destabilise the pro-Soviet Governments. Who have given them that right? We have to take a very tough stand on this. I must say, though I support principally the stand of our country on different issues of external affairs but reading this year's Annual Report of the Ministry I am quite disappointed. The report says about the Indo-US relationship that :

"India and the USA have some difference in their perception."

Is it some difference? They are trying to destabilise our country to encircle it. But this is how you have thought it fit to tell the Members of Parliament. This is not some difference. This will confuse our people. This is untruthful accounts of the reality.

We have to understand the US role the jeopardising the peace efforts in the world about which we talk much and we are sincere about it. The efforts of the six nations are very big. We pay tribute to Mr. Olaf Palme. He is the martyr to the cause of peace. What is the response of USA? They have rejected it. But Soviets have responded favourably. Today also the U.S.S.R. have appealed to US Congress in America to respond to the Six Nations call. They have declared a unilateral moratorium. The Six Nations' efforts can be usefully utilised for this purpose if they think that they cannot verify the test mechanism. The Six Nations have said that they are ready to offer their good offices to verify these things. I believe

we have to organise very serious popular campaign in our country in support of the Six Nations' initiative. It should not be confined to the administrative level or the Ministry level. It should be taken to the people also.

I want to refer another aspect of the policy of the USA, the Brigandage policy, the mafia policy and the gangsterism that they are doing everywhere in this country. It has a definite link with the kind of society they are building. I have much respect for the people of USA who fought for democracy. But the question is that you have to understand that their economy has been shifted to military industrial complexes. What the FBI Director Mr. William Webster said is :

"There are a few businesses or industries in our community that are not affected by organised criminal enterprises."

The whole outlook has been changed to criminalism.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Your time is over. Your party's time is over. Please conclude.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : I can take the same time as Shri Dinesh Singh has taken.

MR. CHAIRMAN : His party has got four hours. But you have got only fourteen minutes. Please conclude within two-three minutes.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Please allow him. He is taking sense.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Now take the case of South Africa. How they survive? It is because US backs them. Our role in CHOGM has been highlighted very much. I am not satisfied with it. I am not at all satisfied.

When Benjamin Moloise was being hanged, we were trying to persuade Mrs. Thatcher. What is CHOGM? Why don't we walk out from it ? CHDGM is nothing

but colonial nostalgia. Then who is subverting the re-union of Korea? It is United States of America. They have organised the team spirit exercise with the South Korean dictator.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : A word about Nicaragua. USA have the temerity to attack and encircle it. It is a legally constituted NAM government. It is under threats from USA. We have a duty to stand by them in all their needs and requirements.

Sir, on Libya our stand is not that forthright as it has to be. When the threat was there from USA we should have forthrightly told Mr. Reagan that you stop this madness.

Sir, people all over the world consider us a very important power. They do not consider us a super-power but a moral force which can influence the world events on not only political aspects but also on all other aspects, viz., economic aspects like fight of the third world countries, for new economic international order, South-South cooperation and fight against indebtedness. In Latin America this question of indebtedness has acquired very serious dimensions. They do not consider it as their debt; They say by brain drain from third world countries in 1970 the USA has taken away 4.7 billion dollars of what they gave as aid. They gave aid worth only 3.1 billion dollars.

Sir, UNCTAD has made startling revelations about this. Now a word about technology transfer. By way of dividend, fees and royalty in 1985 the rest of world is supposed to pay America 23 billion dollars. What is this transfer of technology? These are being produced in the USA by the skilled professionals of third world now in USA as a result of the brain drain. The loot by imperialism of the third world countries is going on. More vigorous fights against these are on the agenda. As a leader of the third world nations we have to give steadfast leadership and articulate the voice of the poor nations. I do not think in this there will be any resistance from our own people. They will stand by you, if you take more forthright stand in all aspects of our foreign policy.

13.59 hrs

[SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI  
in the chair]

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL (Lucknow) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. At the outset I would like to stress the fact that India continues to adhere to the foreign policy enunciated by our late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. That policy has stood the test of time. We have seen that some countries align themselves with some and then they pull themselves out from their international forums but India continues to stand on firm ideology and our policy of non-alignment continues to gain ground in international sphere.

The membership of non-aligned countries has increased from 25 in 1961 to 92 in 1979. Now there are 101 countries in the group of non-aligned nations. Non-alignment does not mean sitting pretty or being in isolation or being neutral. It has a special programme. These countries have intervened in many important problems and have solved them. Among them is the urge to have peace. Smaller countries can air their views and India continues to host conferences of non-aligned countries in the cause of peace. Any amount of money that is spent on these conferences is well spent. To maintain its non-aligned character as also the movement of non-aligned countries, India has kept itself busy with numerous activities in different parts of the world. As I said, it is wiser to spend on peaceful programmes than to have programmes of fighting wars. India's eagerness to be friendly with all countries, and its friendly ideologies can be seen by her remaining a member of the Commonwealth, where problems relating to the various countries can be discussed. While some countries pulled out of the Commonwealth, India's decision to remain in it was a wise one.

14. hrs.

What amuses us is the report of 16th March from London. The report says that President Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan accused India of cooling off India-Pakistan ties because of its own compulsions. Then, there was a television programme and he said that there had been no reverses as

such in Indo-Pakistan ties and the future prospects were very bright. President Zia-ul-Haq made another statement on Kashmir, and the other politicians there also did the same thing which created a controversy. The General acknowledged that the Kashmir issue would be set aside till such time when the other problems were resolved. Noise was made by others in authority that Kashmir issue should be raised in the United Nations. Then, General Zia-ul-Haq maintained that it should be resolved in accordance with the United Nations Resolution. Now, this is all double talk. The United Nations Resolution was violated by Pakistan itself by refusing to vacate the areas which it had illegally occupied by armed aggression. India wants to have good relations with her neighbours, and therefore, offered a treaty of friendship to Pakistan. The genuine desire for good neighbourliness and good relations can be seen by India's proposal that neither of the parties would offer military bases to the third country. This offer by India to Pakistan was not favourably received and Pakistan found it difficult to accept such a proposal because of its own various reasons.

Then, General Zia-ul-Haq proposed that the nuclear installations of the two countries should be kept out of the attack and India readily agreed. Anyone else would have been happy over India agreeing to this, but Pakistan started rethinking.

There have been reports that there has been heavy concentration of Pak troops in the Poonch, Rajouri and Haripur sectors and military activities have been intensified. There seems a contradiction in what Pakistan says and what Pakistan does. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is Pakistan's foreign policy towards India, because to me, it is not obvious.

The Government of India has been making efforts to normalise relations with Pakistan as is evident by the numerous bilateral meetings which have been constantly held at the highest level. On different occasions, India's concern over the acquisition of sophisticated weapons by Pakistan has been voiced as to how it leads

to diversions of resources which could better be utilised for development and other peaceful purposes. We are anxious to know the views of Pakistan on this, if it can be obtained from them.

Our neighbour Sri Lanka is having difficult times. Though it is their business to find out how to solve it, we are also concerned with it and we shall be happy if the problems of Sri Lanka are solved. Grave situation continues to prevail in Sri Lanka and Tamils are being killed. Doors for negotiations should be kept open for a peaceful solution.

There was a happy occasion for us in December 1985 when the Heads of State of Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan and India met at Dhaka and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation was launched. This area has been long neglected and these are developing countries and they must find out and discuss without mistrust how to help each other. Indian Ocean laps on the coast of Sri Lanka, Bangla Desh, India and Pakistan and these countries would benefit if Indian Ocean it declared a zone of peace. It is a matter of great concern to India that anglo-american base at Diego Garcia is to be upgraded.

Hon. member Shri Dinesh Singh mentioned about the United Nations and how it is going through crisis to crisis and how it is suffering. This world of ours is a small place and is it not better that we live together in peace than to be in isolation? UNESCO came into being after the United Nations was established. UNESCO is doing wonderful work in the field of science, education and culture and these are the basis for peace and progress of the world. We should continue to be part and parcel of UNESCO in their noble work.

I have to say a word about our missions abroad. Our people who were sent abroad, are trained in their special line. But we seldom find that they are given training in the language, of the areas where they are posted. Once they go there, they try to learn that language, but again they are posted in a far off corner where no use could be made of that language which they learnt. I have some people in

[Shrimati Sheila Kaul]

my mind, when I am talking about this. There was one gentleman who learnt Bulgarian for about three years when he was posted in Bulgaria. But he was transferred to Singapore. Now what use could be made of that language in Singapore? These are all very little things, but we must keep them in mind when we post people from one place to another.

I would like to say one thing more. I feel that no mission is small, and no country is small in its importance to us. We all have one vote each only in the United Nations. I remember that a Minister of Cyprus had voiced a feeling that theirs was a small country and I replied that they were not small at all and though we might be called big, we all have one vote each. So, no country is small and the missions of countries which are not big, should be well provided and well looked after and more funds should be diverted towards these missions. I thank you very much for giving me time to speak.

**SHRI SHARAD DIGHE** (Bombay North Central): Madam Chairman, I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. While doing so, I will place before you, certain features of our policy on External Affairs and also put before the House, through you, some of my observations regarding the same.

Madam, it is a matter of satisfaction that our foreign policy is continuously based on non-alignment, friendship and peace. The role played by our country as the Leader of the Non-Alignment Movement is well-known. Similarly, the role which we played for the achievement of the goal of disarmament and peace is also very laudable.

As far as the developing countries are concerned, the world peace and disarmament is a matter of great importance to them because development and peace, they always go together and the nuclear war especially will not only destroy the nation which will be attacked, but it will be the

end of the whole human civilisation. And from that point of view, our efforts toward peace and disarmament have to be taken note of. But for the efforts these developing countries and the third world it would not have been possible to get a joint statement of the two big powers that "a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought." Of course, a very great progress in that direction still has to be done and I am sure that we shall play a very great role in that process.

As far as the establishment of regional association is concerned, the setting up of SAARC during last year has been a very important event for the region of this part and we have played a great part in establishing that organisation. As the time is short, I will not refer to all the aspects of our foreign policy, but I would like also to refer, as the other speakers have also referred, to our policy with respect to the two neighbours, namely, Sri Lanka and Pakistan.

Now, as far as Sri Lanka is concerned, I must congratulate our Prime Minister for taking a bold and firm stand. He had very candidly asked, when he was at Male; "whether Sri Lanka should let us know whether it wanted India to continue its peace efforts or not". When the Head of the State—Sri Lanka—was taking a double stand, it was quite necessary to put candidly before them whether they really wanted our intervention for settling that dispute.

Mr. Jayawardene had specifically stated at one stage that he would seek a military solution to "what I believe is a military problem, and after doing so, I shall tackle the political side." So, he considers the Sri Lankan problem first as a military problem; and after solving it with the help of the Military, he would like to solve it as a political problem. For that purpose, he had also very categorically stated that "the Army is better equipped, and better trained now and I expect them to end the guerilla violence by the end of the year." So, his main thrust appears to be on the solution of the Sri Lankan problem as a military one. If that is so, this killing of

Tamils is likely to continue for a long time.

It is, therefore, necessary to review our policy as far as Sri Lanka is concerned, and put political pressure on them, so that Colombo might effectively re-structure its policy and restrain its soldiers from continuously killing the civilians in that part of their country. So, my suggestion is that just as we had candidly asked them whether they wanted our intervention it is also necessary to take a bold step and pressurize them politically, to stop the genocide and bring both the parties to the negotiating table, so that there would be a political solution, and not a military solution to that ethnic problem.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, I must say that there also, a little review in our policy is required. Pakistan has been speaking for a long time with two tongues; and contradictory stands have been continuously taken. Perhaps Zia is taking us for a ride, and is feeling that this great country can be continuously fooled by the different statements which he is making from time to time. But, fortunately our Prime Minister has taken a very firm and bold stand. I feel that his visit to Pakistan has been, for the present, permanently postponed. Even the visit of our Minister of External Affairs which was to take place this month has been postponed. That is a right and firm stand which is necessary, when there is a positive evidence that in the extremist movement in Punjab not only there is a continuous supply of arms from that country, but training is also given, and camps are there in Pakistan to create trouble for our country and to de-stabilize the situation as far as certain States are concerned.

So, trouble is being created in Kashmir, and trouble is being created in Punjab. It has been openly stated that it is their right to interfere in the communal troubles of this country. If that is the position, I may submit that we should not go after them and persuade them again and again to come to terms, to come to the negotiating table, because when they are talking in two tongues, in two languages, it would not be possible to settle any

of the issues which are before the two countries. The meeting of the 17th December between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of our country had raised great hopes. But since then, there has been very little progress, as far as the issues between the two countries are concerned. Merely fixing some timetable to meet again and again, and trying to discuss only the issues without giving up the basic stand on the 3 or 4 issues which are there between the two countries, no further progress can be made. At Siachen Glacier, if there are continuous attacks, if a continuous claim is being shown by Pakistan, then no solution can be found, as far as several issues are concerned.

As I was saying that on the basic issue if Pakistan is going to insist upon their own policy and is not going to budge an inch, then there can be no solution to the issues between these two countries and I do not wonder, because the problem of relationship between Pakistan and India, the problem of relationship between Srilanka and India, they are not isolated problems; they are part of global problems in which the American imperialists are definitely playing a great role and are seeing positively that India is continuously harassed by its neighbours by not solving these problems and by continuously giving trouble so that India should not make progress, India should not have its developmental works and should divert its attention and funds to the defence of this country or other purposes so that India should not become a very strong nation in this region.

DR. A. KALANIDHI (Madras Central) : Madam Chairman, at the outset, I must express my thanks to you, Prof. Madhua Dandavate and Mr. Shahabuddin for having given me a chance to speak earlier on the subject pertaining to the Demand for Grant under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs.

It is really painful for me to bring to the knowledge of the hon. Minister the fact about the Indian officials working in our Embassies in various countries. They do not bring to the knowledge of the Government day-to-day developments that are taking place; and also they do not

give a correct picture to the government about anti-national activities that are taking place. They fail to impress on the Heads of the Governments of the respective countries not to give asylum to the secessionists, particularly khalistanis and others. It is also very painful to say that, in the case of natural calamities and other accidents when our Indians die, their information is not properly conveyed to the respective families; and there is an enormous delay in getting compensation for them. I request the hon. Minister to take note of this.

I will be falling in my duty if I do not bring to the knowledge of the hon. Minister the fact about the Foreign Secretary, \* \* article that had appeared in last Sunday Times of India; a vivid article has been written by Mr. Thakur,\*\*

*(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : I think that should not go on record.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please expunge that.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : It is an open secret.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : You are a very senior Member of Parliament. A person who is not able to defend himself, why bring his name ?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : He is saying in the context of the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The person whom he mentioned is not in a position to defend himself. Please expunge his name.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : This is not a fact also.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : All right, you deny it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It will be expunged.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : They have mentioned that the Foreign Secretary had \* \* taken the family for the holiday to the finest beach resort of Sri Lanka when people were dying, when Tamils were crushed and when they were shedding their tears. Is it fair on the part of the Ministry to allow the Foreign Secretary to enjoy ? It is just like Nero fiddling when room was in fire. When people do not have a proper conduct, when it is against the code of conduct for the Government Servants, it is not fair for the government to elevate such a person to a higher grade like Ambassador extraordinary to be posted in Srilanka particularly; and I tell you, he is a person responsible for deporting Tamil leaders like Balasingam and Chandra Hasan; he is son of late—we call him Ceylon Gandhi—Chelva Nayakam. I request the Minister of External Affairs to take note of it.

I had an occasion to visit United States Assembly last year.

It is very painful for me to say that not a single memento has been placed in the Hall or anywhere. Even the smallest countries have displayed a Memento depicting the culture, art and the traditions. It is unfortunate that India has not even contributed such a thing to reflect our culture, art and tradition, whereas you are able to spend more money for implementing Hindi in the Embassies, and the Official Languages Committee, about a couple of year back visited the United States, spent quite a lot of amount and we are wasting by spending money on a language which is only one of the languages that is included in the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution. That is not only language that can enjoy privilege.

Sir, yesterday during the Calling Attention, the hon. Minister informed that the U.S. Aircraft carrier U.S. Enterprise and a fleet of five ships had reached Karachi and the Pakistan ships are stationed at Colombo. This is causing a concern to us not only to the people of India, but the people of Tamil Nadu in particular.

\*\* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

\*\* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Six thousand Tamil people are killed in the past fifteen months and three lack people have come as emigrants or refugees into Tamil Nadu and in spite of that you want to have a solution—a political solution. After the visit of the Pakistani President, Zia-ul-Huq, military action has been intensified and the British SAS and Israeli Mosads and African arms are very widely used and still you say that you have to be a silent spectator and you want a political solution.

Sir, in today Press, if I am permitted to quote, there is a news item in the *Indian Express* and I quote :

“9 Tamils killed by Lankan army Colombo, March 20 : At least nine Tamils were shot dead and 16 arrested on Thursday during a search operation by the Sri Lankan army at Nedunkeni, about 40 km. from the northern Vavuniya town, according to the Vavuniya citizens' committee sources.

No official version was available immediately.

The sources said the soldiers came in a number of vehicles including armoured cars on Wednesday night and surrounded the area. The search was launched on Thursday morning.

The sources alleged that the search operation was intended to terrorise ‘the local population into leaving the area.’

Sir, in Ampara district the innocent farmers are killed and burnt and the station is still worse & President Jayewardene has declared in an interview given by him to *London Times* that he is not resorting to a political solution, unless and otherwise the Tamil militants are killed and wiped out. I do not understand the Government of India's attitude. Why do you want to have a dialogue with a man who is not willing to come for a political solution, and who has been responsible for putting the Sinhalese against the Tamils by conducting a Padayatra

from Colombo to Kandy. History cannot be erased shortly. We should remember that. So, I only request the hon. Minister to review the entire situation and also the political situation in our vicinity. But you are trailing the other way and saying that a political situation is the answer. When this is the situation, I may point out that a dynamic Minister of Tamil Nadu, in a Television interview announces that India wants a political solution, on the face of a military onslaught by Sri Lanka. When the situation in Sri Lanka is escalating into tragic dimensions our young Tamil Nadu Minister postulates peaceful parleys.

Sir, innocent women are raped, butchered, breasts are chopped, and you call the boys as militants. But one basic thing you forget is, what made them do so ? They are fighting for their rights, for their struggle for life. It is only for their existence.

In the other situations you are reacting. What is your yardstick ? When it is the question of Palestine Liberation Organisation you immediately recognise it and on the question of Namibia you go out of the way, and on the question of South Africa you say that apartheid is the problem. But when there is genocide still in Sri Lanka you do not want to recognise that call them as leaders. On the contrary, you deport them, your administrative Secretary uses a language which cannot be mentioned here because it is unparliamentary. So, such things are still happening and still you do not want to call them as leaders. And you are calling them as militants. But the basic thing is that they are fighting for their lives. The Tamilians there are fighting for their lives. And you should not forget that it is only a struggle for existence. But I am sure that you will agree with me that there is no difference between apartheid in South Africa and genocide in Sri Lanka.

The hon. Prime Minister of India, probably because his surname is Gandhi, remembers frequently about South Africa where Mahatma Gandhi got the inspiration for the freedom struggle for India and in almost all the international forums, conferences and confabulations he advocates

[Dr. A. Kalanidhi]

economic sanctions against South Africa to end apartheid.

In the case of carnage in Sri Lanka, his Government's spokesman says that Sri Lankan Government must bear 50 per cent expenditure on the maintenance of Sri Lankan Tamil refugees in India. Our hon. Prime Minister pontifies that an environment should be created in Sri Lanka for the dignified return of Sri Lankan Tamil refugees. This seems to be the only diplomatic initiative that our Central Government is taking to end the genocide of Sri Lankan Tamils.

Our hon. Minister of External Affairs, having ministerial experience for nearly three decades, will retort by saying that the Indian delegate has raised his voice in the U. N. Human Rights Convention against the State terrorism for wiping out the minorities in Sri Lanka. Immediately the President of Sri Lanka starts talking about his determination to implement the 1983 package of peace proposals. After three years of dilly-dallying, after three years of consolidation of his military might in eastern and northern provinces and after establishing everywhere adequate ground camps of security forces, the President of Sri Lanka and his Minister of National Security are launching the peace offensive by referring to the constitution of Provincial Council, to the elections to be held to the Council and to the election of the Chief of the Council and about handing over the law and order and land settlement issues to the Provincial Council. This edifice of national solidarity in Sri Lanka is to be built on the millions of dead bodies of Sri Lankan Tamils.

The then Government of India launched a massive diplomatic offensive throughout the world when lakhs of refugees from former East Pakistan poured into India. The Government of India assisted the national upsurge for the liberation of Bangala Desh. But the present Government of India satisfied itself by giving Rs. 40 crores to the Government of Tamil Nadu for the maintenance of Sri Lankan Tamil refugees. On the floor of Lok Sabha we are told that this is a national issue and not the problem of Tamil Nadu alone.

Our Foreign Secretary goes to Sri Lanka and our High Commissioner in Sri Lanka comes to Delhi for apprising national leadership about the crisis in Sri Lanka.

We have been crying from house-tops that Trincomalle—the eye of Indian Ocean—has been leased out to American Navy. The giant 101 oil tanker in Trincomalle will feed the American Navel fleet in Indian Ocean for months and months. Our Naval movement from East to West and Vice versa will have to be around Sri Lankan coast. In the name of scientific research programme, the US Government has put sea-mines around the Sri Lankan Coast. Near Colombo the biggest transmission tower set up by the US will watch the movement of our Navy, besides the Fleet movement of other countries in Indian Ocean. Our country's southern coast is susceptible. We should not forget that Sri Lanka is another Diego Garcia nearer our coast. Yet our supine international diplomacy continues merrily. Our abracadabra is non-alignment.

Sir, I demand that we should not hesitate to put on Naval vessels in our territory between Sri Lanka and India. We cannot allow the depredations of Sri Lankan Navy on our fishermen. As a strategic project of national importance, the Defence Ministry should take up the implementation of Sethusamudram Canal project so that we have our own sea-way for ships from west to east and vice versa. Our present Vice-President during his tenure as Defence Minister in reply to a calling Attention Motion on the floor of this house had conceded the strategic importance of Sethusamudram Canal project. This Canal will protect the southern coast of our country. Should we not take at least this kind of pre-emptive steps to safeguard the sovereignty of our country? This is a part of our foreign policy.

We should demand international economic sanctions against Sri Lanka, which is no different in its ideology from South Africa. We should not be taken in by the peace offensive of the President of Sri Lanka. After exterminating the entire Tamil race in Sri Lanka, he will dump all the stateless people of Tamil origin on India. We must take adequate steps to counter this guile of President of Sri Lanka,

Finally, I conclude by telling that it is often stressed and requested by my beloved leader, Dr. Kalaignar M. Karunanidhi, that we must sever diplomatic ties with Sri Lanka and impose economic restrictions. In spite of that, if the Sri Lankan President does not come on the line, then the only solution left to us is military solution, because we have exhausted all our energies and avenues. I think, the military solution is the only solution in Sri Lanka for solving the ethnic problem there.

With these words, I thank the Chair.

[Translation]

SHRI DAL CHANDER JAIN (Dahmoh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the demand No. 29 of the Ministry of External Affairs asking for grant of about Rs. 62 crores. At the outset I would like to draw your attention to one thing. A meagre provision of Rs. 10 lakhs have been made for the promotion of Hindi in foreign countries. I would like to submit that more funds should be spent for the promotion of official language. We often observe that when foreigners visit this country they speak in their mother tongue but when Indians go abroad, they have to speak either in English or any other foreign language. I would like to bring to your notice that our policy should aim at promotion of Hindi in foreign countries to the maximum possible extent. As the couplet by Kabir says—

*Kabira khada bazaar men mange sabki  
khair*

*Na kahu se dosti, na kahu se vair*

Similarly, according to policy of our Government our country has friendship with all and enmity with none. Our neighbouring countries which extend a hand of friendship towards us but actually they are constant headache for us. We should have a practical outlook viz if we extend our hand of friendship, other side should also reciprocate, otherwise we should pay them back in the same coin to defend our self respect. Our sants and sages go abroad to propogate Indian culture and heritage and therefore it should be borne in mind that the patriots get proper respect.

Those Indians who go abroad, but malign our country they should be called back so that they could not tarnish the image of our country.

Just now, my previous speakers also pointed out that there is need to enhance our power not to harm any other country but to defend our country. We should increase our military power whether it is through making Atom Bomb or through other means. This is not to be used to harm Sri Lanka or Pakistan. We should make Atom Bomb not to harm anybody but to increase our own power so that nobody is able to cast hostile looks on us. I would like to narrate a story about a lion. There was a ferocious lion. A saint advised the lion not to kill anybody to which it agreed. But as soon as the lion agreed, people started throwing stones at it. After some time when that saint met the lion again, it complained that the people are throwing stones at it. The Saint told it that nodoubt he had forbidden the lion to kill anybody but he had never forbidden it to roar. We should follow a similar policy. If anybody casts hostile looks at our country, we should deal with them in an appropriate manner, because only then we can safeguard our respect and defend the country. Indians who go abroad have to face great hardships and our embassies are not able to assist them properly. The Government should look into it and find the reasons therefor, wherever our Indians brethren go, they should get proper respect there. With these words, I conclude.

[English]

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem): Mr. Chairman, may I, at the outset, take this opportunity to congratulate both the hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi and our hon. External Affairs Minister, Shri Bhagat, for having kept our country's flag flying high in the international arena. India's contribution during the Chairmanship, which I understand is coming soon to a close, of NAM, is something which is not only gone on record from the historical point of view but is also revolutionary in many ways. We have made NAM into an effective movement to the extent that the other powers

[Shri P.R. Kumaramangalam]

now look upon NAM not only seriously but with a certain amount of fear in their hearts.

They are afraid that our policies of nonalignment and peace will gather strength and may ultimately envelop the world and bring an end to the efforts of these global powers and their designs. Indian's contribution in so far as disarmament, apartheid in South Africa, our contributions both in the United Nations and CHOGM as well as the group of 24 Ministers' meet in April 1985, is concerned, it is something which has gone on record in history, and would always be spoken of. But while this is so, in so far as our role in the international arena is concerned, there is something happening which I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister of External Affairs. This is regarding the employees in our various embassies abroad. I have visited many embassies abroad. I have noticed that in so far as employees whom we engage locally are concerned, they are poorly paid. They are paid much less than even what the minimum wage requires us to pay to them statutorily in those countries. To amplify my point I would like to say that almost all the countries abroad have minimum Wages Acts similar to what we have, especially the Western bloc and the European bloc. Many of the employees who are engaged locally like drivers, assistants, protocol assistants, etc. come and meet Members of Parliament and other dignitaries when we visit the countries abroad, but it is embarrassing to hear from them that they are being paid so poorly in comparison to their counterparts in other embassies. One bows one's head in shame when we know that we are using the veil of immunity of embassies to deny what rightfully should be given to the employees as their wages and other terms and conditions of service under various statutes. Sir, I would request the External Affairs Minister to look into this matter. This applies not only to embassies but also to all our missions abroad. It is a very unhealthy practice that one should try to make use of the immunity and the facilities that are available to our various diplomatic missions and embassies abroad in

this manner. It is a fact that we don't even pay our regular employees in the Foreign Service sufficiently. It is embarrassing to note that some of our Foreign Service personnel who are posted abroad welcome invitations often from other embassies only in order to skip a meal; and meal does not merely mean only the food but the drinks that go with it too! It is unfortunate that we are not able to look after these who have really contributed a lot to our national interest in the international area. Our success in the international field has not come overnight nor has it come without any effort on these employees; and I do not see why they should not be treated at least on par and on equal basis in comparison to the other embassies. When you compare them, please do not compare them with Government service in India. Because, the cost of living in India is definitely much less than what it is abroad in the western countries. Of course one would look at their VCR and television, etc. and presume that they are doing very well.

But factually what matters really is that when they come home, back to India, what do they bring with them other than the VCR, television and frigidaire. Do they bring any money in real terms of foreign exchange by means of saving? If one wants to know the answer, one would find, 'No'. It is those who are fortunate enough to be appointed in Missions, especially U.N. Missions, do get back a bit, but not those in the Embassies. Their savings are very little and that establishes beyond doubt that the amount of income they get is just about sufficient and meets their ends rather than really being a posting which they can make money from. I would like the External Affairs Ministry to look at the problem of employees, especially Indian employees abroad, those who belong both to the Foreign Service and those who do not belong to Foreign Service. Many Members of Parliament who have gone abroad, I am sure, would agree with me that especially the low level employees like the driver, protocol assistant etc. etc. would invariably complain to Members of Parliament about their state of affairs.

I would like to, secondly, speak on a

very important aspect of the posting abroad with regard to Class II, Class III and Class IV employees, not the Class I, the first class rated Service, IFS 'A' Service, but I mean IFS 'B'. There is a lot of favouritism, the proper rule is not being applied, the fact that some sort of rotational system should be adopted is not being employed. Rather what really is happening is that if a particular member of the IFS 'B' Service is close to the bureaucratic power that be, not even the Minister that be, he manages to get a reasonably long tenure, if possible, a whole tenure of service abroad, while the others remain as mere clerks in the Ministry of External Affairs pushing up files with a highly negative attitude and unless there is a rotational system brought into this efficiency, this complaint would continue.

Madam Chairman, I would like to what is considered by a lot of my colleagues here as my favourite subject, Sri Lanka. Now, it is usually alleged that Members of Parliament who come from Tamil Nadu speak only on Sri Lanka, but fortunately, I think now there are more Members of Parliament from the rest of the country who are now raising their voices on the Sri Lanka issue and it is a pleasure to know that the country as a whole is worried and is taken aback and is aghast at the manner in which the Sri Lankan Government is conducting itself. Madam Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister for External Affairs would recollect that when I spoke last year in the same debate, I had said that the then President and the now President of Sri Lanka has a tendency to speak with his tongue in his cheek and I think the recent past would prove my statement to be correct. At that time I had gone on record to say that this President was one who led the famous Candy march and went on record to break the settlement which, if it had taken place, would have never given birth to the ethnic problem at all. Now, it is that very President who is saying, 'No, I will have bilateral negotiations and trilateral negotiations and I will settle' He came all the way to talk to our Prime Minister, but the ultimate was that he went back and said, 'My political experience is more than the age of the Indian Prime Minister himself.' He

had the arrogance to say that 'the Prime Minister of India is not the person who can tell me what I should do.' He went on record to say this and it is unfortunate to note that while saying this on the one hand he uses helicopters, gunships and what not taking advantage of the lull that was there.

He did not have ceasefire in Sri Lanka for the sake of ceasefire, or for the sake of settlement when he agreed to a ceasefire in Sri Lanka. He agreed to it only because he could arm him to the teeth and finally give a crushing blow on the unfortunate Tamils who are only asking for equality, why are only asking for the right to live with dignity, not to be treated as second-rate citizens or dogs.

Madam Chairman, a very unfortunate incident has taken place. Helicopter, gunships and modern equipment are being used to massacre not militants but civilians. The people living in their homes with their huts suddenly found that there was fire all-round because of the modern bombs raining on them by the Sinhalese guards. That is the real state of affairs. Madam-Chairman, why are we going to just keep quiet receiving insults, morning, night and day, sometimes individually and personally? On the one hand, we receive insults and on the other, we stretch out our hand and say, "Well, we are willing to be a mediator." Today the Sri Lankan Government literally is scoffing at us and telling us, without using the words, "We do not need your mediation." How are we still going to keep quiet? I am not saying that we have to send our military. It is not necessary. All that is necessary is, allow these young militants to fight their cause. We are not even asking help in the form of ammunition. They know how to get it and they will get in on their own. Let, at least, the Government of India give moral support. Well, for Bangladesh, we could go around the world. Our Prime Minister could hop from city to city in the world, from every capital to capital and we went on the house-top to say, "Genocide is taking place in Bangladesh." Why can't we at least say that genocide is taking place at the floor-level, when it is happening in Sri Lanka. It is now necessary to go around the world

[Shri P.R. Kumaramangalam]

arena, not just Geneva—but to go to every single capital in the world—and to go on record to say that the conduct of Sri Lankan Government is reprehensible to say the least. They are violating every single norms of human rights. They do not give even minimum respect that is to be given to human life, let alone human dignity, which is secondary.

Madam-Chairman, it is not time for the Government of India to say that we will send the Army but rather to emphasise the need for a political settlement. Yes, it is not only the people of Tamil Nadu, the people of India but the people all over the world feel that the only way for a lasting peaceful settlement is to have a negotiated settlement. But when there are murders, are we going to keep quiet? Is the world community going to stand by and say, "When Tamils in Sri Lanka are being slapped on one cheek, they should show the other cheek since after all, they are the children of Jesus Christ"? Is that the answer we have? Or, are we going to say, "No, hit back. We are there to support you." We should at least use the world power that is there in our hands to stop this genocide. Madam Chairman, may I request the Government of India to make it a formal Governmental policy to tell the world as to actually what is happening in Sri Lanka? Let the world know that the Tamils are being killed---not militants, not armed personnel of any variety, not terrorists at all---but innocent civilians. It is the unfortunate women who is being raped. It is a little child who is being massacred. It is the baby that is being murdered, not even a young-man. There are very few young Tamil-men left in Sri Lanka to be killed.

Madam-Chairman, while ending, may I also just say that today the situation is, the Government of Sri Lanka is still sticking to its guns and saying, "Yes, we will give something called, provincial council etc." and then they arranged leaks into the Press, of so-called secret negotiations, talks of secret settlement. This is the latest moves, they have started adopting and they have managed to get into the Indian Press also—not only the Sri Lankan Press, not only the South Asian Press but

the Indian Press also. They have also got into the Indian press to put things which are not true. I would like to ask the Government of India to keep the Indian Press fully briefed and informed as to what they are to do. We have nothing to hide. We genuinely wish to have peace in Sri Lanka. We do not want annexe Sri Lanka. We want Sri Lanka to develop, grow economically. We will be proud to have a neighbour which has peace, culture and growth. But we feel disturbed when we find a neighbour and many of those people who live in that neighbouring country, being massacred morning, night and day.

Actually the land settlement policy of Sri Lanka is now being used as another weapon against Tamils. Tamils are being bound, taken out of their old traditional homes and pushed away into so called refugee camps which are nothing but forests where there is no roof and they complain they are shot in large numbers and buried in mass burials. I do not know if Hitler has ever thought of it which they have now learnt. I do not know from which place they have got this education.

Of course, I do understand, that it is not so easy to have a solution to this problem. It is not that one can say "Let the Indian Army walk into Sri Lanka. The problem is solved." It would not be so. There would be flashbacks and outcomes of such an attempt. One is not just blindly asking for that. But one is asking the Government of India no longer be taken asleep. They should have their eyes open. This President of Sri Lanka and the Government of Sri Lanka will play games with us. They will tell us they are divided in themselves. They will say the Internal Security Minister is actually a rabid reactionary while the President is a revolutionary peace-loving man. All of them are of the same colour. They all belong to the same thinking. It is not new. For the last 30 years, they have adopted this system.

May I just end by saying let us not be taken for granted by the Government of Sri Lanka? Let the Indian Government show its mettle. It is respected in the world. If we go out to the world community and speak on still what is going on,

we will definitely be able to get the relief and the peace that the people of Sri Lanka require.

Sh. SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj)  
Madam Chairperson, the sordid story of Sri Lanka which is unfolding before our very eyes, is but a testimony to the failure of our diplomatic efforts during the last one year. I would have forgiven the Government's failure if it were not in Sri Lanka alone that there is the same situation on all sides; all round us we see the same story. We see the continued occupation of the Afghan people under foreign heels. We see Nepal groaning under a feudal order. We see Pakistan and Bangladesh being denied democracy. We see Burma ill-treating the people of Indian origin. The Indian Ocean is more and more heavily militarised with every passing day and there super power rivalry is reaching nuclear dimensions. Today Iran-Iraq war continues to rage raging next door to us. We are helpless spectators of this sordid scene around our security environment. We are helpless-or seem to be helpless. We only utter certain beautiful phrases from time to time but we do not seem to influence the course of events any longer.

The last one year seems to have given Indian diplomacy a certain style, a certain flamboyance which is totally out of place. Diplomacy is not flowers and champagne alone. Nor is it just cocktail circuits/and candle light dinner parties. It is cool calculation. It is persistent pursuit of national interests in a world which is still largely governed not by the force of principles but by the force of power. But by the force of power. We find a certain erratic pattern of behaviour. We see euphoria succeeded by depression. We see a quest of headlines. We see incoherence in our declarations. We see minor irritants sometimes blown up out of all proportions clouding our long term perspectives and our the distant horizons. We see sudden changes of mood & vacillations of mood and we are faced with the degrading spectacle of being forced into situation of squabbling with our neighbours.

15 hrs.

India is a historic entity. India is not

an artificial State. I do not wish to sound hawkish nor am I a dove. But I do believe in the manifest destiny of this part of the world which is called South Asia—surrounded on one side by the icy range of the Himalayas and watered by the blue waters of the Indian Ocean. We have a destiny to fulfil and in this part of the world we matter. We are there. We cannot be cut down to size. We are not apologetic about our size nor we can oblige anybody for any reason. But we have then certain corresponding responsibility which is not served by a show, by glitter or by style. I allege here that there has been more showmanship and less of substance in our pursuit of diplomacy during the last one year. And this must go. This is my appeal to the Foreign Minister.

Let us not show temper but to act. Let us kind and persuasive. We do not need anger. We need understanding. We do not have to retaliate but we have to apply a soft pressure and a soft touch.

I find not only the political environment clouded but I find that the entire economic scene which is after all the counterpart of our political objective completely in shambles. What have we achieved in the last one year? The report itself is a confession of failures. It does confess that the conditionalities of foreign external assistance are hardening. It does say that foreign aid is drying up. It does say that we have made virtually no progress in international economic negotiations. The terms of trade are becoming more and more adverse. The access to of technology, maybe it is not getting restricted if we see the headlines, but when you come actually to brassstacks and when you negotiate a deal, you know that the terms are harder and harder. Our share of development capital from private source is getting less and less. Our share of the IDA has gone down from 40 to 22%, if you want any testimony. And we are being urged to liberalise our economy and become market-minded and to adopt economic policies which by our standards are not particularly favourable from the point of view of a developing country. Sometimes I see a juvenile reaction Chairman Mao smiles at diplomats. President Reagan

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

writes a letter to our Prime Minister. He has acknowledged our letter. Well, it is then sent around if our diplomatic effort has succeeded and the world was on the threshold of a nuclear disarmament. But I do see a silver lining. During the last one year, as Mr Dinesh Singh pointed out, SAARC has taken shape. But I see it as a child suffering from malnutrition, as a rickety child which is still not capable of crawling, far less walking. And what is the reason which restrains the progress of SAARC? This to my mind is the most important question which Indian diplomacy has to tackle today. SAARC is not going forward primarily because of internal conflicts of interest and that suspicious among the States which compose SAARC. Not all of them have put their heart in it.

As I mentioned a little while earlier, we have a historic responsibility. But do we have a clear perception of our long-term interest? India is too large, too important, to be left alone and as I said, we cannot cut down our size. We have to grapple with this environment in South Asia. We have got to go to the heart of the problem. Why does this mistrust with regard to our policies persist among our neighbours? We are big enough not to nurse a siege complex. We should not think that the world is our enemy and that everybody is just cursed. Something more needs to be done by us which we have failed to do. Are we then really doing all that we can to take forward the spirit of SAARC? I am afraid, we are not. Have we given our neighbours a clear impression that not today but as a long-term perspective, we are prepared to share our markets; we are prepared for creating the vision of the common defence of the sub-continent against any extra regional incursion? Have we given our neighbours a clear understanding that technologically advanced as we are, we are prepared to share our technology with our neighbours? Are we prepared to say that while seeking self-sufficiency and self-reliance, we are still prepared for on a regional basis, economic planning on a regional basis so that it takes into account the resource endowment, and the posi-

sibilities and potential of all our neighbours? We must be able to prove to them, to these smaller nations around us—all of them put together are not equal to us in size, they are not equal to us, in population and so they have a certain natural propensity to distrust us—have we been able to convince them that the scenario that we have in front of us does not in any way involve any abridgement of their sovereignty? And that cooperation will not entail subordination?

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time would you take? Please try to conclude. The Minister has to reply and at 3:30 P.M. we have to take up the Private Members' Bill.

Sh. SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I will take three minutes more. I do appreciate that time is short but I am trying to draw a broad canvas. Let me say that the States in South Asia are not strangers to each other. With all our minor irritations which plague our steps from day-to-day we are brothers unto each other. We are all members of the same family. Our joys and sorrows are to be shared and that without any condescension. We have got to give a lead, a nudge and a push like *Karta* of a joint family. A *Krata* of a joint family denies himself many pleasures in order to satisfy the requirements of the family.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hindu joint family.

Sh. SYED SHAHABUDDIN: It is a Hindu Joint Family, and I will be very happy if this Hindu tradition were applied in our diplomatic relations. That we are there when we are needed. But we do not breathe down their neck. A time has come, therefore to take a stand on South Asia. South Asia faces the onslaught of the great powers of U.S.A., U.S.S.R and China alike. I am not making any exception because in diplomacy, we do not admit of any permanent allies or permanent enemies. They are there. They would wish to fish in our trouble waters. We can keep them out only if we develop our relations with our immediate neighbours and give them a sense of belonging to a family, as I mentioned earlier.

We talk about Non-alignment, Non-alignment is only an instrument of policy. Nothing more than that. Non-alignment is supposed to project us our national interests to take us forward. But here, I find that the very concept of Non-Alignment today, is becoming very-very diluted. It is getting eroded. We have got captive nations which call themselves non-aligned; we have got slient States which call themselves nor-aligned; we have got thoroughly aligned States which are in the Non-Aligned movement. And that is why the Non-Alignment Movement in not effective. Somehow it has become too universal, everybody being so goodie-goodie to each other that you really cannot distinguish between the bad guys and the good guys. You cannot apply any definite thrust or any definite pressure in any particular direction. That is why its ethos has been lost and Recently when we had this case of one of the members of the non-aligned States being threatened by a great power, we, the Chairperson of the Movement, kept silent, and this was noted around the world.

We have come to the beginning of a new era and an appraisal is called for both of objectives and methods of policies and instrumentalities. The party is over; it went on for 500 days. Now let us sit down to hard work. The flying is over. The plane has now been grounded. Let us now come down to earth and look around us. I would say, of all possible alternative options for our diplomacy, the only viable card is South Asian regional cooperation. Let us put our stakes on it. Let us try to move it forward; let us give it a lead, for, this is our historic task. We should not stumble from initiative to initiative, from episode to episode, or should be seen to vacillate in the pursuit of regional cooperation. But I again warn the Government; this would call for a certain hard-headedness and a certain spirit of sacrifice. There is no option to peace in our region, there is no alternative to friendship and cooperation and good neighbourliness in our region. The only alternative will be a nuclear arms race which would be devastating for all the people of this region. This nightmare is unthinkable. If we want to avoid the nuclear peril, if we want to build up an

area of friendship and cooperation, then we cannot count our pennies, we cannot run our diplomatic activity or run the diplomatic process on a day-to-day basis, as I said, by going from incident to incident. We have to have a long-term perspective and in any case the SAARC we should use as an instrument for promoting it we should propose the following steps.

We should initiate as a long-term objective a multilateral Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation, something on the lines that we are negotiate with Pakistan. We should, in SAARC, initiate the process of economic planning of the region as a whole which would maximise and realise the potential of the natural endowment of the region as a whole and give every one of the States a certain role in meeting the economic needs and sharing the economic fulfilment of the region. In SAARC we should open the doors of all our institutions of higher learning. I am afraid, our entire contribution—I have seen the Budget of the External Affairs Ministry—is only Rs. 3 crores for economic cooperation with entire third world. We are the biggest flag-bearers of technical cooperation among the developing countries and in the region itself, apart from Bhutan and Nepal, we seem contribute just about Rs. 3 crores. Suppose Bangladesh, just for the heck of it, were to give away one of their islands to a Super Power and say, "All right; we are a sovereign State; we have done this; you do what you like". Then how many hundreds of thousands of crores will be required to defend our sovereignty against such a move? Yet, we seem to be so miserly in our approach in technical cooperation even with our neighbours.

My other suggestions are these. Let us build up a system of preference which would lead one day to a Common Market in South Asia. Let us go on pushing for open frontier so that there is a traffic in culture and a traffic in human values cutting across the frontiers that we have artificially placed in our Sub-continent.

Finally, let us form the habit of consulting with all our neighbours in trying to formulate a common policy towards all world issues, whether they are political or economic in character.

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

I would now crave the indulgence of the Minister—because I happen to have served in the Ministry of External Affairs at one time—to bring to his notice certain institutional matters. Please, for God's sake, reestablish the unity of command in the Foreign Office; today our friends and foes do not know who the real Foreign Minister is, who the real Foreign Secretary is, who really commands, who really decides policies; let us have a unity of command and let us not send around divergent and contradictory signals at various levels; let us have a consistent and persistent pursuit of our national policies.

Secondly, the Service is in a bad shape; the Service to which I had the privilege of belonging once, is demoralised. It is not attractive enough to the young blood. You will have to do something in order to make it more attractive. Because that is the only instrument at your command for transmuting into reality whatever aspirations and hopes we have for the future of India, for a great India which would not only be a regional power but which would play a role in the affairs of the world.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K.R. NARAYANAN) : Madam Chairperson, Hon. Members : I am very grateful to the Members of the House for the very impressive support that they have given to the conduct of our foreign policy. I would say the impressive support—almost a consensus behind our foreign policy which was established in the House today in spite of the very eloquent dissent by my hon. friend and former colleague Shri Shahabuddin.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He continues to be a present colleague.

SHRI K.R. NARAYANAN : I would call him on Hon. friend. India's foreign policy has as its central core the safeguarding of our national interests. But as Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru said several times we have been pursuing our national interests in the context of world peace and

world cooperation. In a sense this is one of the most difficult experiments in history, to pursue a foreign policy which tries to reconcile and bring into harmony with each other India's national interest and the interest of the world as a whole. There is, of course, as a result of many difficulties, many obstacles, some of which my friend Shri Shahabuddin has brought out very pungently, the difficulty of living with our neighbours, the difficulty of tackling the problems we have with some of our neighbours while we pursue our larger goals as well as our own national interests.

I should submit that the record of Indian foreign policy has not been a failure but a magnificent success in very very difficult geographical conditions, very difficult international situation. Shri Shahabuddin talked about the armament race, about the drying up of concessional aid and about various conflicts which exist around us. He also mentioned very patriotically and very eloquently "the manifest destiny" of India. It is a phrase which has a bad odour and, therefore, I would not like to use it.

But while he has accused India of flamboyant diplomacy, I think he has pitched our present role at such a high level that it almost amounts to be a flamboyant operation of India's diplomacy. I think we have to be a little more humble while being ambitious and bold at the same time. It is unfortunate that we cannot stop the armament race, that we cannot affect the deteriorating international economic situation. We cannot succeed in getting more aid from the North to the South. These are hard difficult problems built into the present international situation.

What is important is that we have striven boldly together with other countries, particularly the non-aligned countries, the developing countries to hold the flag of independence and non-alignment high. And also to exert continuous pressure on the great powers for disarmament, for development and for a more equal and just international order.

To the extent to which a country like India with all its internal problems and

with all the problems surrounding it can do, I think, we have tried our best and that is why India is held in very high esteem in the world as a whole. He talked about "soft pressure". Well there was one President in the United States who said, "Talk softly and carry a big stick." I think we do not wish to do that. We would like to operate in a different way. I think in the midst of the provocative situation existing around us our Prime Minister, our country, has shown immense restraint and a great deal of wisdom in tackling these problems.

Let me refer very briefly to what is happening in Sri Lanka. There is no doubt that this is a situation that is trying India because though it is an internal problem of Sri Lanka it impinges on us and it will impinge even on the region. We have talked boldly. The External Affairs Minister said the other day in the House about the necessity and urgent need for stopping the killings and the violence that is going on in Sri Lanka. But the same fact compels us to display all our powers of diplomacy and even our patience in dealing with that situation.

We are afraid that the killings and violence in Sri Lanka if it goes on it would be a tragedy not only for the Tamils but even a greater tragedy for Sri Lanka itself and the situation can certainly be solved only by a political approach and, if I may say so, because we are talking about Sri Lanka, with a touch of the Buddha. The situation can be solved only by such a method otherwise Sri Lanka would be getting into a knot, a very difficult knot, which it would be impossible for it to unravel.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : President Jaywardene is not willing for a political solution and sought for a military solution. What is the use of ourselves talking about political solutions?

SHRI K.R. NARAYANAN : There have been other statements from Sri Lanka. I have no doubt that the wisdom of the politician, of the leaders in Sri Lanka and even more the people of Sri Lanka will assert itself and they would realise that it

is even in their narrow self-interest to pursue a political path, a peaceful path in dealing with their own people, in finding re-conciliation with their own people because after all the Tamils.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : This is hoping against hope.

SHRI K.R. NARAYANAN : It is not hoping against hope. There are certain compulsions of the situation. I am not saying that we have no role to play. We have a role to play and we are playing that role. We are not playing that role impatiently but with a certain degree of calculation and I am sure that the forces of peace and of good sense will prevail in Sri Lanka. We are ready to offer our good offices any time when that sense prevails, when the conditions are ripe and favourable for an effective re-activation of our good offices.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : I am afraid the entire Tamil race there may be wiped out.

SHRI K.R. NARAYANAN : I do not think that people can be wiped out. I do not believe that the brave Tamils can be exterminated whatever degree of violence is offered. I have faith in that. I have faith in the people of Sri Lanka. I have faith in the Tamil people of Sri Lanka. I think they will win with the support of the rest of the world. And India is not just sitting quiet. We are talking to other people and to other countries.

We are talking to other people, to other countries, not trumpeting about it, but effectively talking to other nations in the world, pointing out the situation that exists in Sri Lanka in order to find out a solution.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : Don't you think that you have given time for them to equip themselves with the sophisticated weapons?

(Interruptions)

SHRI K.R. NARAYANAN : I wish to say only this about Sri Lanka. It would be counter-productive if this great country

[Shri K. R. Narayanan]

adopts a highly impatient, emotional attitude towards this problem.

We have patiently pursued a certain policy towards Pakistan; of course, we have lived with Pakistan ever since independence and we will live with Pakistan. I am sure, amicably in the future in spite of the obstacles that are put in the way of friendship and cooperation between India and Pakistan.

I want to say something broader because India's national interest, India's position in the sub-continent and in the region is linked with our role in the world as a whole. Our power, our strength rises from our own unity, our own development, our own strength, but yet it is a world policy which in turn supports this strength and unity of ours.

Right from the beginning, we had opted for the policy of non-alignment. I want to say that non-alignment is not an abracadabra, nor is it a policy of being goody-goody or namby-pamby, but it is an effective policy for maintaining the independence of countries like India and new nations. We realised right from the beginning that there must be peace in the world, justice and equality in the world, if our independence is to be safeguarded and if India is to rise to its full stature in the world. That is the reason why from the time of Jawaharlal Nehru, we followed the policy of peace, non-alignment and peaceful co-existence.

The armament race is an issue which has pre-occupied our attention for a long time and during the last one year particularly, or one and a half years, this issue has become a dominant issue in our foreign policy operations.

The call given by our Prime Minister together with five other leaders of the Third World, of five continents, was a powerful expression of the yearning for peace of not only the six nations, but of the world as a whole. We have realised that while we have to work through diplomatic channels, in the United Nations and with other Governments for nuclear

disarmament, the most important thing is to organise and arouse public opinion in the world as a whole and bring it to bear upon the great powers. This has been one of our major objectives for controlling and affecting the course of the armament race. That is why we have given this subject central position in the non-aligned forum and also in the international forums.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is already going to be 15:30 hrs. The Minister is likely to take another few minutes to complete. We shall take up the Private Members' Business thereafter. I hope it has the approval of the House.

MANY HON. MEMBERS : Yes, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Minister may please continue.

SHRI K.R. NARAYANAN : Another objective of our foreign policy right from the beginning has been anti-colonialism, and in this field, in the new world of today, the classical colonialism is no more, but neo-colonialism has cropped up its head. And in places like South Africa and Namibia, colonialism has its last ugly distillation in the form of racism plus old style colonialism. We have tried to make an impact from the United Nations and from the Non-aligned Movement and we have even succeeded in reactivating the Commonwealth by making it focus its attention on the iniquity of the racial rule in South Africa. This has been one of our special achievements to make the Commonwealth Forum apply its mind to the South African question as a major world issue. Whether the role of the Eminent Persons' Group will succeed or not, it has taken a new initiative. Commonwealth has been made to take a new initiative largely at the instance of our Prime Minister in regard to South Africa and racialism there.

Now I am going to be brief because I do not have time. I want to mention another aspect of our foreign policy, which is the South-South Dialogue, the problem of South-South Cooperation. Since the

North-South cooperation or dialogue has been deadlocked, we are trying our best to break this deadlock. But instead of waiting for this, we have gone ahead very vigorously for organising South-South cooperation, not merely conceptually, but by economic cooperation between individual countries in the Third World and by cooperation with economic organisations in the Third World. I was recently in Africa and I found with what expectations they looked up to India for imbibing technology, especially intermediate technology and for cooperating with us in the economic field. I think that this is one of the foreign policy initiatives we have taken upon ourselves in order to give new life to the South-South cooperation.

Madam Chairperson, I would like to end by coming back to our own region and to SAARC, to which my good friend Shri Shahabuddin and others referred in their speeches. The fact that SAARC has emerged is a great thing, inspite of all the troubles, all the differences and conflicts in the South Asian region. Through the crevices of these conflicts and differences, the forces of cooperation which always have existed underneath, have cropped up. And this cooperation has come up in a natural way because it is not possible to force this cooperation and it has to follow an evolutionary process. It has taken place in South Asia and it is due to the wisdom of the leaders of South Asia that we are grasping this new opportunity and working for this cooperation. But we must take into account the realities of the situation and the facts in South Asia. If we try to be impatient and adventurous in going too fast forward, then this little baby may not even be able to crawl properly and grow up. Therefore, Madam Chairperson, I would like to stop my intervention by saying that India, within a very difficult international as well as regional situation, has through her wisdom tried to harness all the creative and constructive forces and played a very effective role in bringing a reconciling touch, in bringing a touch for peace as well as for safeguarding our own national interests.

15.35 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Fourteenth Report

[English]

SHRI R.P. SUMAN (Akbarpur) : I beg to move :

“That this House do agree with the Fourteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 19th March, 1986.”

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“That this House do agree with the Fourteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 19th March, 1986.”

*The motion was adopted*

RAILWAY PROPERTY (UNLAWFUL POSSESSION) AMENDMENT BILL\*

12.36 hrs.

(Amendment of Section 9)

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Railway Property (Unlawful Possession) Act, 1966.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Railway Property (Unlawful Possession) Act, 1966.”

*The motion was adopted.*

\*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II, Section 2 dated 21.3.1986.