

the hon. Railway Minister that two railway bridges are needed in my constituency, Purnea.

One bridge is required at Khushki Bagh railway crossing. It is situated at National Highway No. 31, and as such the traffic is very heavy on this crossing due to which there is fear of a major accident occurring at any time, and in the past also some accidents have occurred. The same problem is there at the railway station in Purnea Banmankhi area, because from here the road branches in two directions. Besides, there is also a jute-mill, and people use bullock-carts, tractors, trolleys to reach there and due to this heavy but slow traffic, there is always fear of accident. After the construction of the bridge, the distance between jute-mill and the other side, will reduce by 4 to 5 kms. The farmers and other people of this area will be benefited by it.

Therefore, I request the Railway Minister to take immediate action, so that people of this area can be provided with the said facility, and the accidents avoided.

12.25 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL) 1986-87 MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—CONTD.

[English]

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU (Gobichettipalayam): Sir, the External Affairs Ministry is doing its best under the leadership of the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Sir, with regard to the friendly relations between the countries, to most of the countries, Shri Rajiv Gandhi when he became the Prime Minister of India, in January 1985, told that the friendly ties between all the countries are being kept well. In fact, actually our Prime Minister is following the foot-steps of his grand-father Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and also the foot-steps of his mother, late Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

Sir, in 1983, the Non-Aligned Meet of

the friendly countries was held under the leadership of late Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in New Delhi and it brought out some proposals. Accordingly three proposals were decided to be put up before the friendly countries. One was with regard to the crisis in the world economy. Actually, the developing and the developed countries are facing a very great crisis with regard to the world economy. With regard to the I.D.A. also, they prepared a proposal in 1983 itself. Now, what happened to those proposals? I do not know whether they are being implemented or not. I want a categorical answer from the External Affairs Minister with regard to the proposals which have already been mentioned in 1983 Convention. Even with regard to other countries, we do not know whether we are taking firm steps by intensifying our relationship between the other countries. That is to be reviewed again.

Presently, our Prime Minister is the Chairman of the NAM and he wants to maintain peaceful co-existence and friendly relations between all the countries. But other countries like Pakistan are not following the principles of our hon. Prime Minister, that is, peaceful co-existence and friendly relations. I want to know from the hon. Minister for External Affairs whether we are taking concrete steps with regard to Pakistan and what is actually Pakistan doing? A surreptitious role is being played by Pakistan now. In the case of Sri Lanka, they are playing the very same role. In Sri Lanka they are spending about Rs. 12 crores a day. For military purposes alone, they are spending about 116 million rupees every day. What does it mean? One day, Mr. Jayawardene had come forward and said "I want to find a political solution to the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka."

But the other day he said that it would not be a political solution, but only a military solution. I would like to know what concrete and firm steps the Government of India are contemplating to take with regard to the Sri Lanka problem. The recent intensification in the military activities in Sri Lanka clearly indicates that the Sri Lankan Government are strengthening

[Shri P. Kolandaivelu]

themselves with arms and ammunition. They are not for a political solution at all, but a military solution to this problem. When such is the case, what is the use of sending our Foreign Secretary, Shri Ramesh Bhandari who is going to retire by the end of this month, and perhaps there is a proposal to extend his tenure. I request the hon. Minister—I requested him the other day also during the Calling Attention—to take up this issue at his level and see that this problem is solved. By sending a Secretary, an official of the Government of India, would not serve the purpose. The officer would be an officer after all. He cannot have a political interest: it is only the Minister, who would be having the political interest in order to settle this issue.

There was a setback even in Tamil Nadu with regard to Panchayat elections. The Congress (I) and AIADMK have an alliance, but in the Panchayat elections, there was a set back for this alliance. Why? It was because of the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka which has been prevailing for such a long time and has not been settled so far. Even our late Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi tried her level best to settle the issue, but was not able to do it during her life time. Our hon. Prime Minister is a young, dynamic and energetic person and he has got the capacity to settle this issue. He has settled so many issues; he signed the Punjab accord, which is a Magna Carta; he found out an accord for Assam problem also. Why can't he do it for Sri Lanka problem? After all, it a matter than can be settled in twelve hours. We have to take firm and concrete steps to find out a solution to this problem.

Recently, Dew Gunasekara, a Politburo Member of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka attended the Congress of the Communist Party and he stated to the press that the situation in Sri Lanka was very serious, and there was every possibility of a civil war breaking out in Sri Lanka. Even the civil administration, which is there only in name, is not doing any work at all. When such is the situa-

tion, what are we going to do? Are we going to leave the matter like that and leave the Tamilians there to face the disaster as it comes? Is it our attitude? During the last one year more than 3000 people have been murdered? In fact, our Foreign Minister admitted in this august House that actually a genocide was going on in Sri Lanka. When our Foreign Minister said that, Jayawardene and Athulathmudali raised their voice and said that our Foreign Minister should not have said that. While every country and all the leaders are stating that genocide is going on in Sri Lanka, Jayawardene and Athulathmudali are not at all accepting the situation, and the ethnic problem which has been prevailing there for the last so many years. I request the hon. Foreign Minister to find a solution to this problem as early as possible.

Suppose you delaying the matters, so many lives will be lost, so many ladies will be killed and so many children will be maimed. So, that is the problem. They are waiting for a word from India. It is reported in the 'Hindu': "Delhi awaits a word from Colombo". But it is not the case. If we are delaying the matter, we are actually strengthening the enemy on the other side. So, I request the hon. Minister for External Affairs to take concrete steps immediately in order to save the lives of the poor Tamils living in Sri Lanka.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I stand to support the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs and I take this opportunity to voice my concern about the developing situation in and around our region.

Sir, there is a tendency now to confuse regional problems with global ones. Problems which are haunting us at home and in our neighbourhood are basically global in nature. Involvement of super powers, specially the super power from across the Atlantic, which is basically an imperialist force, has created real dangerous problems for us. Subversion at home and pressure on our borders are growing apace. We are faced with a very palpable and real problem of destabilization, a threat

to our security and even a threat to our freedom and integrity. This, in sum total, is the situation at home and in our neighbourhood,

The picture of the world at large is no less disquieting. The new doctrine of domination, hegemonism and intervention has become the accepted more of international diplomacy. International institutions are sought to be subverted. The concept of weighted voting in the UN under the aegis of the United States of America is the threat not only to the institution that has been evolved by the world community for safeguarding the security of the world, of the international community, but it is also a threat to the freedom, sovereignty and independence of the nations. Sir, genocidal terror in Sri Lanka or South Africa, or the Zionist terror in Palestine are growing and they are growing with the support of the imperialist forces. This, in short, is the total scenario of the world today.

In this context and in this perspective, we have to look at our foreign policy, as to what extent we have been able to safeguard our own security and contribute to a stable and durable world order based on mutual understanding, peace, disarmament and development. In this context, today we are proud about our leadership. We had lost everything after the assassination of Madam Gandhi, when India's foreign policy, and in fact the very existence of India, was in doldrums. Out of those harrowing conditions, the people of India rose like one man and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi took over the reins of power. And Sir, in pursuit of peace and in pursuit of disarmament and development, in conformity with our traditions in foreign policy and in conformity with our contributions to a stable world order, Shri Gandhi in one year's time, made perhaps the largest number of visits abroad, that any Prime Minister of India had ever made. It was a pursuit for peace and a pursuit for harmony.

Pursuit of harmony. But unfortunately, the growing threat to our security—growing threat to security at large—has not been reduced and we are faced with a very-very difficult situation. We have

therefore to analyse whether our initiatives in any way have lessened international tension or had increased danger to our security. Knowingly or unknowingly some gaps exist in the over all situation.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the Foreign Minister even at the risk of...

(Interruptions)

An hon. Member : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir.....

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Mr. Deputy Speaker's attention, I have already drawn, I said. I will draw the attention of the Foreign Minister to the problems, I am raising in the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He is telling you,...

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : All right, I stand corrected, through you. I will draw attention of the Foreign Minister to the real problems that we are facing and even at the cost of being repetitive, I do it. Our threat perception must be very clear. Let us not be totalogical. Let us not delude ourselves. Our initiative for peace in the neighbourhood. Many speakers have spoken about the situation, I am not going to repeat them and there is no use repeating them *ad nauseam*. I would make certain relevant references to what is happening in the neighbourhood. Our two threat perceptions are—one from Pakistan and the other from Sri Lanka. Are they basically regional? My contention is that they have ceased to be regional problems. They have been globalised and the global powers—the imperialist powers—we must understand the nature of imperialism and the neo-colonialism today. It has become a neo-fascist force under Reagan Administration. Subversion in Nicaragua; subversion in Angola; and support to South-African racist regime is growing by leaps and bounds. I have drawn his attention to the forces of destabilisation which are being exported from abroad, besides other things, i.e. war machinery is being

[Prof. K.K. Tewary]

supplied to our neighbours. I would like to remind him of my reference to American attempt to destabilise and this started not only yesterday or not only after Mr. Rajiv Gandhi took over, this is an old hat-old story. But it became very intense when India too a very aggressive posture and in order to maintain peace and international sanity, it adopted absolutely aggressive as the Chairman of the NAM. Madam Gandhi's assassination was the culmination of these forces ganging together to destabilise this country, to break the unity and morale of the Indian people.

I would like to know from the Foreign Minister Sir, through you, what has happened and what is happening?

Federal funds of American Government which are supplying weapons to Pakistan; funds which are being supplied to Contras in Nicaragua; funds which are being supplied to the subversives in Angola the support which is being extended to the rascists of South-Africa and the Zionists of Israel, was not the same fund made available for a comprehensive study on the likely scenario of India, in case Madam Gandhi was assassinated? It is a very pointed question. I would like to know, the House and the country wants to know why only this option, why only this alternative the American authorities could have thought of?

Another alternative, for example, could have been Madam Gandhi and Congress—I could have been defeated. That was an alternative—the political alternative was not studied. A study was commissioned and federal funds were made available and Hardgrave made a study at the behest of the State Department of America. This had never happened in any civilised country and in civilised international diplomacy, where the Head of the Government likely assassination study was commissioned and ultimately I would not go into the details of the bizarre picture that has been depicted by this man Hardgrave.

In spite of our insistence, that study has not been made available to us. I would draw my own conclusions, of course not

based on wild imagination or wild guesses, but on concrete facts. Indira Gandhi was a thorn in the flesh of imperialism. She was done away with.

Sir, we are not one of those *banana* republics. We the people of India have fought for our freedom. We have defeated the mightiest imperial Power on earth. How come, Mr. Foreign Minister, that now those same terrorists are being protected, being sheltered, being promoted in the United States of America, Britain and Canada? Is it not year duty, and of the Government of India to let the people of India know what is happening? What would have happened if the Head of the British Government, the Prime Minister of Britain or the President of America would have been shot dead, and a previous study of this nature had been conducted by Government of India, or any other Government in the world?

Sir, this is not the end of the story. This is not the end of the conspiracy. The conspiracy is still going on. Every day, conspiracies are being brought to light, being discovered on British soil, on American soil, that Rajiv Gandhi will be assassinated. Who are the people behind this conspiracy? Why is this being done?

(Interruptions)

I would like to know and understand the plea taken by the British Government, that the laws of Britain prevent the British authorities from taking stringent measures against these forces. I would like to know from the Foreign Minister what will happen if these elements hatched a conspiracy against Mrs. Thatcher? In the past, when Mrs. Thatcher became the target of terrorist attack, what actions were taken? Did these rules and laws prevent the British Government from taking the most severe steps against those terrorists? What happens in America when terrorists gang up and endanger the life of the Head of the State and of an important personality there? What laws are applied there, I would like to know. In spite of this palpable evidence, and in spite of undeclared war, I would say, against the security, stability and unity of our nation, what concrete

steps have been taken, what course has been charted out by your Government to tell them that Indira Gandhi's sacrifice was a tremendous sacrifice that the nation had made, to preserve its unity and integrity; and that any steps again to repeat that horrendous crime will be resisted by the united might of the people of India?

I would expect the Government to take more vigorous steps in order to expose the trickery, fraud, dissimulation and treachery of these Governments. I would also like to know from the Foreign Minister: if the British law prevents terrorists from being punished why as a measure of retaliation, you cannot extend moral and material support to the freedom fighters of IRA? The Irish Republican Army is fighting, fighting for a just cause, fighting for their freedom. Why can't Government of India, because the British authorities have been extending all facilities to the terrorists, murderers and offenders, why can't Government of India do the same? Why can't Government of India demand the liberation of Puerto Rico which is a colonial territory of American Government even now?

The Foreign Minister owes some explanation to this House. I now come nearer home. What is happening in Pakistan? Suddenly this problem has not cropped up. All your initiatives were admired and appreciated, but with what results? What has happened?

Don't you know that Pakistani atom bomb is almost ready? As the American authorities connive at the manufacture of atomic weapons, and stockpiling to arms, growing arsenal of Israeli Zionist governments, similarly, they are winking at this, and I would like to know why don't you ask the American authorities about this? why the Symington amendment has been suspended in the case of Pakistan? The President of America has not given a certificate, which was required by the American Congress because they were going to vote much heavier amount in the form of aid and military package to Pakistani authorities. All these things are happening. Terrorists are being trained and now your report, has revealed, and I

am glad that you have accepted ultimately this and I am happy that you have accepted this, and you have brought this matter ultimately to the notice of the House, because we have always said, that there is a nexus between them, and this is a product of the hegemonic consensus between the imperialist powers on the one hand, and our neighbours; who are just trying to find a foothold. Sri Lanka and Pakistan—there is a nexus between the two now. The visit of *Enterprise* to Karachi harbour and then the visit of two ships of Pakistani Government to Sri Lanka—this should be a strong enough signal to you to open your eyes and to do something not only with regard to the growing threat from Pakistan, but, also to save the civilians innocent harmless civilians from** Shri Jayewardene.

Therefore, Sir, the entire scenario, the entire picture inside the country, this is the result of an externally inspired subversion; we are sought to be encircled by American forces and this is dangerous because now American hegemony and intervention is sought to be imposed on the sub-continent and in and around the sub-continent and their professed purpose is number one, that they want to continue their stranglehold on the economic resources of this region; and number two, they want to stop what could be the expansionist policies of the Soviet Union. Therefore, I think a more realistic attempt will be made to come to grips with the problems that we are facing as a country.

The initiatives taken by the Prime Minister have been admired all over world. His visits both to the Moscow and Washington and also to a number of other countries in Europe and in our neighbourhood have had the desirable impact, they have created the friendly atmosphere that the imperialists would not like all over the world.

I would also like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to certain things which are happening—which have been happening in the past—and perhaps we may lose sight of the perspectives with our

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Prof. K. K. Tewary]

neighbouring countries, when trouble starts brewing.

In Nepal elections are round the corner. Some forces which are hostile to our country, they are taking undue interest in what is happening in Nepal and some people who are more close to the establishment, or to certain powers in Nepal, and they are indulging in all kinds of anti-India propaganda and an atmosphere is gaining ground in Nepal against India.

I think the Government of India should take notice on before it is too late; and then a word about our Embassies. We have Ambassadors all round the world. The most important thing is the service conditions of our people working there. But there is something which I have noticed to my utter dismay. It is neither in the interests of the country, nor in the interests of the people working there. So many things are happening I may bring to your notice certain things about the persons in our embassies abroad, and our embassies are in an utterly poor shape. There is lack of dedication. There is lack of teamwork. In Washington, for example, where we were supposed to work and develop friendly relations, with the American authorities, I found the Embassy to be in a very bad shape. A person who was holding the rank of Deputy Ambassador—I will give it in writing, I am not naming the persons—he, a person who was posted as Deputy Ambassador in Washington, now he is in Delhi, he is,** I was told by some of the employees working in the Embassy that they work only part time in the Embassy and full time for the American agencies, and American companies and this is what is happening in Britain also.

These are matters which we can ignore only at our peril. Therefore, I demand improvement in the service conditions and facilities as are justified. But at the same time, we must keep an eye on the activities of people who are indulging in activities which are not very friendly, not very useful, not very much in our favour.

**Expunged as ordered by the chair.

With these words, I again support the Demands of the Ministry and expect the Foreign Minister to address himself to some of the questions I have raised.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : In your speech when you have mentioned about Sri Lanka you have used certain words about Shri Jayawardene. That will be expunged.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Nothing will go on record. Take your seat.

(Interruptions)**

DR. G.S. DHILLON (Ferozpur) : I am supporting this Demand, At the same time, I am talking about some points. In old times, I had a lot of experience here. I had seen times when discussion on External Affairs was a sort of an exercise on the then prevalent subjects like the *panch-sheel*, co-existence, non-interference all such sorts of pleasant words. But times have changed. They are just pious words. We are faced with situations which are completely at variance with these high sounding words. We do not have those principles as co-existence or non-interference any more, though we respect them. They used to be held as sacred at a time when Panditji was in power.

At least we can begin with co-existence with our neighbours. But I would say that the trouble we are facing not only from the power blocs but from our neighbours also. There is no co-existence in the real sense. We have problems with Pakistan; we have serious problems with Sri Lanka. Though we are on the way to normalise, we still have problems on border issue with China and even some other countries like Bangla Desh.

I come from Punjab. Recently there have been some negotiations, some mutual visits to each other's country by our Secretaries and other prominent people. We have been hearing that the process of normalisation is on. There is a demand for restoration of trade relations or opening of the borders or resumption of cultural

**Not recorded.

programmes and all that. We have to see—howsoever these efforts may sound well, have the old issues, in spite of Simla Agreement and so many visits, been solved?

They do not spare any international forum where they do not speak against us. So far as we neighbours are concerned, most of the misery and trouble that we are facing in Punjab today is from our neighbours. I can say that I see their hand in every day-to-day happening. They have training camps on our borders—some training camps are so near and some are in the interior. Our boys, our young people go there, get their training, come and do all sorts of mischiefs they can do. The problem is that on the one hand we are asking for developing trade; opening of border, etc., and on the other hand, we see them immediately with their hand in our problems. How to deal with it is a serious matter and I hope, a person of the stature of Mr. Bhagat will apply his mind and call some of us, call Mr. Ramoowalia and some of his friends for discussion. It is not my view, it is not the Congress Party's view, it is their point of view also. Only recently, Mr. Barnala came out with a statement that a part of the trouble may be from inside but most of that is from that country and we should take up this issue rather seriously.

13.00 hrs.

[SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI
In the Chair]

Take the case of Sri Lanka. They too are our neighbours. We too have been talking about peaceful relations, our old and historical background with this country but the position is going from bad to worse. I am happy, Prof. Swell raised this issue and said some good words about me and for my work in the U.N. Commission. But may I take the House into confidence that in spite of our best efforts, they did not move an inch. In a place like Geneva, President Jayawardene of Sri Lanka sent his own real brother to represent his case. What is the problem? After all, it is purely an ethnic problem. Many countries have these linguistic or ethnic or some other problems. They take it that the unitary

system of government in Sri Lanka is a sacred one and they do not recognise the problem that any other cultural group or ethnic group has the right to live there. We raised this question. We said, we have 1,35,000 people as Sri Lankan refugees in India and there are 45,000 people who are settled in some European countries like Switzerland, Germany and few others. I should tell the House as to what stand they took about our refugees and the refugees in Europe. They said that "We did not drive them out. The Tamil Nadu terrorists forced them to join hands with them and then they forced them to India, and most of the Tamil Nadu terrorists belong to that sort of thinking and they are being trained on our coasts". Worse than that is the stand that they have taken, and I must say, we feel ashamed of such neighbours who can go up to this devilish sort of thinking. They said, "No, we have not driven them out, they have gone for some drug business and they are quite indulging in narcotics business and all of them are doing the same thing for money making". In this way they are doing the double mischief about the refugees in India and the refugees in Europe, bringing them bad name and, at the same time, pushing them out.

I did not hear what the Deputy Speaker said about the word genocide. They protested against this word; their Ambassador or High Commissioner handed over a note to our Minister. He used the word genocide. I do not know how later on he modified; but in my opinion there is a pure genocide going on in Sri Lanka, undiluted genocide, May be, I may be indulging in reference which may not be very pleasant to hear. What is genocide? Killing another group or community or ethnic people, whatever it might be, indiscriminately. And they say, no, this war or fight is against militants. Civilians may have died during the cross-fire. What type of cross-fire? Cross-fire and bombing on Jaffna. Are there some civilians in between the helicopter and the house below? In indiscriminately they are killing them and that is pure genocide. The matter was reported by one of our very eminent reporters, the correspondent of the Times of India in London. It was reported that President

[Shrimati Basavarajeswari]

Jayawardhane has said that he will go in for a military solution. They resented this. They spoke against that journalist. I have no hesitation in naming him, Kuldip Nayar. Then we asked, what did you say actually, if he is wrong, what did you say. President Jayawardhane said that we will deal with military matters with military and political matters with political part. What is the difference? You use the word military with military and political with political, Yet he did not rule out military solution. It is just a distortion of words. So, I would suggest that under such circumstances lot of time has been taken during the negotiations and goodwill shown. A time has come that we should have nothing to do with Sri Lanka at the negotiating table unless they come out with certain commitments—as I have seen today, certain commitments being asked by our Prime Minister. That is only solution, By agreeing to meet them on negotiating table last year by our arranging a meeting at Thimpu they gained time. They not only gained time for their military, for the supply of arms, but gained time for many other problems. I am sorry, we could not have so much homework done as they have done. This is all that I wanted to say about Sri Lanka. Our stand should be stiff; we should not be misled by empty promises. They are upto any mischief. Howsoever they say this is not genocide, we should take it as genocide. Thousands of people have been killed and finished already. Pakistan President has said this, I saw this only today, he was addressing the rally of army people, saying, 'It is not essential for us to talk peace. Similarly, these people have the same way of thinking. It is surprising that at a time when our country is facing hardships two goodwills of Pakistan visited Colombo. What type of goodwill? Definitely it is not based on the principles of peaceful co-existence.

Mr. Foreign Minister, the other day you told us about your meeting with the American Foreign Relations Committee that Moynihan said that we in India have not voted for USA on a number of things. I think that is the right reply which you

gave that they have not voted for us a number of times. On what should we vote for them? Should we vote on the question of Palestine? Should we vote for Israel? Should we vote for apartheid? Should we vote for Nicaragua or their policy? I can say about Philippines. I do not know what they expect from us. In Philippines we are happy that Madam Aquino has come and that tyrant has gone. I am all out for Madam Aquino, but something really which surprised me is the new trend of American diplomacy. Some tussle was going on, they held an election and the election results were there and the American Senate sits, the American statesmanship say that all election is wrong, that is rigged, forged and all sort of things. We know that that was wrong, that was rigged. We are with the people of Philippines who forced Marcos to run away. We are for Madam Aquino because she came and led the movement of the people who forced Marcos to run out of the country, and not because of what the Senate said about the elections. Tomorrow if some elections come in our way, who are they to give verdict on the merits of our elections or any other country's election? That is very wrong. Now they sit in the Senate over the the supply of hundreds and millions to countries. Still it is going on; that has not been agreed to as yet. But Reagan is doing his best to get it through in the American Senate. What for? For overt and covert action against Nicaragua and some Central American States. What is this 'overt' and 'covert' action? Who are they to sit in a regular legislative body, pass a resolution and then tell the world that 'these are the various governments we don't like, we are taking overt and covert actions'? We should strongly condemn such tendencies in their diplomacy. As an independent country, as leader of the non-aligned movement—we are very proud that we are the leader of the non-aligned movement—we should strongly come out with condemnation of such misuse of their resources and their wealth over all these smaller nations.

There are a number of points which are very difficult to be dealt with in a short time. One particular matter is about Namibia. Whereas they are flouting the

Un resolutions on South Africa and Namibia—I am talking of the Americans—they do it very shame-facedly. Part of Angola is occupied by South Africans, but recently, the leader of the UNITAB, Mr. Swambi, was invited, he went there, he talked to the top leaders and he has promised support to fight against the government there in Angola. The whole world, even the American people, have condemned this.

Who are they to judge about another country which is free and independent, and their merits to remain in power or not to remain in power? So, the people like Swambi must be condemned openly by all of us.

Since you have given ring twice, I would not say anything further. I thank you very much. I would like to rise to speak at some other time.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Idukki): Madam-Chairman, I rise to support the Demands for Grants relating to the Foreign Affairs Ministry.

During the last year, we have vigorously followed our policy of Non-alignment, peace and friendship with other nations. In fact, our foreign policy is only the projection of our internal policies and that its foundation was laid even during the time of freedom movement. During freedom movement, non-violence was the corner-stone of our political action. Likewise, non-alignment is the corner-stone of our foreign policy. For the last 38 years of independence, this policy has been consistently followed by us and we owe very much to Panditji and Indiraji for this.

Non-Alignment is not just not siding with power-bloc but it is something more than that. It is dynamic and vibrant as it should be. So, we raise our voice against—all kinds of oppression and colonial exploitation. We support the people of South Africa in their fight for freedom from the minority White Government. We support the Palestinians in their struggle for homeland. We support Nicaragua in their fight against U.S. imperialism. As has been said here, probably we were also

among the first to recognise the Aquino Government in Philippines.

Non-alignment also means peace and disarmament. I do not want to narrate the efforts that we are making in this direction. We are aware of the Delhi Declaration made by the Six-Nation Summit asking for one year moratorium of nuclear tests. We are aware of the fact that the Soviet Union have announced a six-month moratorium of all nuclear weapon tests and they have further extended it for three months. Mr. Gorbachev himself has said that they would not have any nuclear test until U.S. did it. Yesterday, we did read in the Press that United States has done underground nuclear tests thereby breaking perhaps the longest period of absence of nuclear tests. U.S. has done this utterly ignoring the world opinion. As the Chairman of the NAM, it is for us to exert maximum pressure on the United States to keep out of such tests and to bring super-powers again to the negotiating table.

Sir, yet I see a silver lining in the dark cloud. I mean, they have expressed their willingness to come together. We know President Reagan and the Soviet Leader Gorbachev met in Geneva and they agreed that a nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought. I hope the spirit will continue and as Chairman of Non-Aligned Movement, we have a lot to do in this direction.

We are happy that our Prime Minister is taking the aspirations of the entire people of this country and the peace-loving people in the world and we all wish him success in his efforts.

Sir, if you see last year's performance of the Ministry I will say that the best achievement on our side was with regard to the formation of SAARC. In the field of South-Asian regional cooperation. The SAARC has given the framework for better cooperation between our neighbours. But I should say that the situation in our neighbourhood is full of tension, distrust and violence. In this context cannot but make a reference to Sri Lanka. It has been discussed many times in this House. It is

[Prof. P.J. Kurien]

unfortunate that Shri Jayewardene is trying for a military solution to the simple ethnic problem. In fact, technically, you can say it is their internal problem. But is it their internal problem? 6,000 and more Tamils have been killed, if the reports are correct and somebody was saying it is 3,000 and there were other reports too. But whatever may be, a good number of Tamils have been killed for the last 15 months and again nearly 1-1/2 lakhs of refugees are there in the Indian soil. Therefore, this ethnic problem has its direct impact and repercussion on us and it is nothing but genocide. Hon. Minister himself has said in this House this has an element of genocide which has caused much reaction in that country. The hon. Member Mr. Dhillon was just now saying that it is undiluted genocide. This being genocide, we cannot simply ignore it saying that it is their internal problem. But it has another dimension also that this ethnic problem in Sri Lanka has assumed a new dimension posing a threat to our own security. There were reports that Israeli Secret Intelligence Agency MUSA is working in close cooperation with Sri Lankan security forces. There were again reports that Pakistani involvement is there in the Sri Lankan military operation of killing the innocent people and Pakistani Assistance in arms and ammunition has been extended to Sri Lanka. It was reported that the American fleet was in Karachi and the Pakistani Naval ships visited Colombo. What does all this mean? All this means that some kind of conspiracy is going on against our country. Pakistan offered bases to American imperialism and you know that South Africa is also assisting Sri Lanka. Then Israel is assisting Sri Lanka. All this put together you can see a scenario which is quite disquieting for our country. Actually we are being encircled by hostile forces and, therefore, I am sure that this has new added a dimension to the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka.

I would request the hon. Minister to see it in this perspective and act very carefully and firmly and to safeguard the interests of our country. The Jayewardene is trying for military solution is evident from their own statement. Recently there

was interview by Lankan National Security Minister Shri Athulathmudall to the BBC in which he has spelt out the programme of military operation. He was saying that first he can finish Eastern parts and then move over to other areas of Tamil Majority and settle the Sinhalese there. Even Jayewardene himself has said that he prefers a military solution first. So it is very clear that they are going for a military solution. In this context, what should we do? Dr. Dhillon was just mentioning that we should step all kinds of negotiations with them. Whatever it is I want to say one thing. All types of diplomatic pressure should be exerted. All other avenues should be explored so that this ethnic problem is once and for all settled. We should tell Sri Lanka plainly that we have no stake in Sri Lanka. We are not interested in destabilising that country. We are interested in maintaining the integrity of that country. But we are equally interested that our Tamil brethren should live in that country with honour and dignity like any other citizen of that country. We are equally interested that the refugees who have come over to India should go back to their country with honour and dignity. This we should tell them plainly and I would say that we should see to that. Still Jayewardene will not understand. We should bring home to them the futility of attempting a military solution to the ethnic problem. We have the example of Pakistan. Pakistan tried to solve the internal problem through military means and it ultimately resulted in the division of Pakistan. There is saying in the Bible. It says in Malayalam : *'Valeduthavan Valat—* He who takes to sword shall perish by the sword. This is a saying from the Bible. So we should prevail upon President Jayewardene to see that it is in their interest to settle this ethnic problem through a political solution and it is in their interest that they do not go for a military solution, and it is for us to see the dimension of this problem which, as I said, has a security aspect which we should not ignore and all efforts should be made to settle it. The entire country is with our Prime Minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi in his efforts to solve this problem and I hope our efforts by all means will be relentlessly continued and the country and all sections

of our people wish you all success in this effort.

While talking about our neighbours, I have to say something about Pakistan. As has been already said, there is Pakistani involvement and assistance in the military operations against the innocent Tamils which is going on in Sri Lanka. But we are trying to improve our relations with Pakistan. I agree there is much scope for normalisation of relations with Pakistan. Our Prime Minister himself took the initiative in this direction. He had a number of meetings with Gen. Zia on various occasions. Last December Gen Zia visited Delhi and met our Prime Minister. There was an agreement that both countries will not attack each other's nuclear installations. Recently our Prime Minister met Mr Junejo, the Prime Minister of Pakistan also. But in spite of all this, things are not moving as fast as we expected and perhaps not in the proper direction. Mr. Junejo recently stated the Kashmir issue be again referred to the United Nations. What does it mean? That means that they have gone back from the spirit of the Simla Agreement. They want to revive the old problem. It means that Zia is really playing a hide and seek game. He really does not want to settle the disputes with India. He does not want peace with our country. He wants to make it appear as though he wants peace with this country. But he really does not want it. Maybe with such an impression created, especially in the West, he can get more assistance from the west. Gen Zia may be using the issue of peace merely to bargain with the west. I would request the Government to be careful of this trick of Gen. Zia.

Then, Sir, we should be really concerned that Pakistan is going to be a nuclear power within a short time. We should be concerned with the fact that they are securing arms and sophisticated military equipment which cannot be used in the mountainous terrain, as they claim against Afghanistan. They can only be used against us and most of them are deployed on our border. Furthermore, how they are trying to destabilise our country has already been said in this

House by the hon. Members. A number of extremists trained there are coming to our country and they are creating serious problem in Punjab. So we should be very careful in our dealings with Pakistan. It is true and I read in some press that Gen Zia has said that they have no hand in the military training and that they are not training Sikhs. But everybody knows that it is not true. The fact is otherwise. But with regard to the nuclear capability, I know that we are committed to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I agree and it should be so but, at the same time. I would suggest that we should keep our nuclear options open. We should not let ourselves be taken by surprise by any other country. We should continue our efforts to improve our relations with Pakistan. At the same time, we should understand the threat and the inherent dangers in the situation as it exists today.

I would like to say one word about China also. I welcome the efforts made by our Prime Minister to improve our relations with China. There should be continued and relentless efforts in this direction and we should see that our relation with China is put on an even keel. Of course, there is the boundary dispute. That is there. We should try to settle that boundary dispute.

Further, I would like to say a few words about our Missions abroad. I have to say that I am getting a lot of complaints from our people who are working in the Gulf countries about our Missions there. Most of these people of Indian origin, working in Gulf countries, are illiterates and skilled workers. They have a number of problems. The attitude of our Missions is said to be not helpful. They always adopt a bureaucratic approach to the problems. They do not go out and help the poor workers who have gone there only to earn their livelihood. For example, I tell you an instance. Three weeks ago, I gave a complaint to the Minister of State for External Affairs that one of my constituents' had been arrested in one of the Gulf countries and I asked him to send a telex to the Embassy there to get a report as to what had happened,

[Prof. P.J. Kurien]

just to find out what is the position and if there is any way to get him out. I understand, the Minister has sent two or three reminders. Still the Embassy people could not contact in spite of the fact that full address of the person arrested was given. They could not contact the person and give a proper reply to this. If this is the way the Embassy people are pursuing the matter for which the Minister has given directions, then we can imagine the plight of the poor people, who are Indians, who are approaching them there. Therefore, the Embassy should be properly staffed with officials of commitment.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B.R. BHAGAT): Please give us the details.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: I will give you the details. They should show sympathetic attitude to these poor people who are working there.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about our people working in Nigeria. Some of these Indians working there have lost their jobs.

(Interruptions)

But they cannot come back because they are not able to repatriate the money they have earned there. Our Embassy should intervene and assist them. Further, their children who are educated there, especially who have taken medical degree, cannot come back because of the fact that we are not accepting that medical degree. We should look into it and study whether that medical degree can be accepted. If that is not up to the standard, we should organise some refresher course or something like that so that those Indians are not punished. They are our brethren who went there to earn their livelihood; they gave us foreign exchange and I would request the hon. Minister that we should take serious note of this aspect and take action.

With these words, I support the demands.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA (Sangrur): Mr. Chairman,

through you, I first congratulate the hon. Foreign Minister for pursuing the policy of non-alignment initiated by great leaders like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Policy which has earned a good name, good fame, respect and honour for our country throughout the globe. Due to the policy of non-alignment, our country got an opportunity and privilege to be the Chairman or Leader of the non-alignment movement in the world. This policy of non-alignment has added to the number of our friends and has reduced the number of people who are inimical or opposed to us. During my previous speech on the coming of the Seventh Fleet to the Pakistan Port, I had expressed my views about certain issues, Today I am taking up only the issues which are confronting the Indians living abroad.

We daily receive a number of letters from the Indians living abroad that they are asked to take a visa before returning to meet their next of kin or to visit their home to meet their family members. The situation is so painful that before the Indian Embassies in Canada, Britain and USA long queues of Indians are waiting for the visa. In some cases when there is an emergency, for example, some dearest member of the family dies here, either the man is not allowed to come to the country or his visa is delayed. This practice is creating bitterness adding to the dissatisfaction in the minds of the Indians, especially the Punjabs, living in these countries, namely, Britain, Canada and USA.

It is said that in U.K.—the Minister will please clear it in his reply—the Indian Embassy is collecting 2,000 pounds daily as income for issuing visa because, I think, the application fee for the issue of visa is 15 or 20 pounds. And when the visitors come to the Palam or Bombay Airport, they are badly searched, they are insulted. All these things are adding to the bitterness. We as serious and responsible persons here want to avoid the bitterness, at least decrease the bitterness, and add to their satisfaction, but everything is going the other way. I will urge upon the hon. Minister to withdraw immediately or scrap the order of the prerequisite of taking visa in respect of those who are coming to Punjab to visit their families.

In many countries, there is the practice of dual citizenship. Pakistan has given this facility, Bangladesh has given this facility, Indonesia has given this facility. I urge upon the hon. Minister that our Government also should think of giving dual citizenship to the Indians living abroad.

We Indians are very sweet by nature; the Indians are patriotic; we love our motherland; wherever we may go, we do not forget our culture; the Indians living in foreign countries have love and affection for their culture, for their motherland and for their families. They should be given the right to vote during elections in India. All non-resident Indians should be given the right to vote. I would request the hon. Minister to think over this also.

The Indians living abroad are earning money in those countries and they are sending remittances worth crores of rupees every year. I think, Prof. Tewari will support me at least in this matter...

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : In many matters you are changing your views.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA : I am not changing. It is your goodself who is takings now in a cordial manner.

The remittances are made.

They are serving and helping the country. But here the plight is that they are being raided. enquiries are being made as to wherefrom they got this money, what is the number of the draft, what is the name of the bank where the money is deposited. This humiliation should be stopped and further facilities should be provided to all the Indians sending remittances back to India.

At the outset I told the House and requested the Government to take care that the countries who have given the opportunity of migration to Indians should be considered more particularly. For instance, I had the opportunity to meet Mr. Joe Clark, the Foreign Minister of Canada at a dinner hosted by the Hon. Foreign Minister. He was very kind to invite me also to that function, Mr. Joe Clark, the

Foreign Minister of Canada painfully told us that his Government is perturbed over the news items or publicity being carried out in this country that Canada is in connivance with certain extremist activities.

Madam, I am sure and I hope this House is with me, that the Government of Canada is very honest. The approach is very sincere. The Government has never given any impression or there is no information with us that the Government of Canada at any time acted to destabilise our country or against the integrity or sovereignty of our country.

Specifically the point which I want to urge upon the Government and the Minister is that our Government should be more cautious and should take steps to develop mutual relations, harmony and better understanding between India and Canada and with other countries where Indians are in large number as migrants. I am sure that Canada has a glorious history of high morale and the Muruni Government in Canada is observing the same morale, the morale not to disturb or destabilise other countries including India. I am emphasizing that more cultural, trade and other relations, other ties should be strengthened.

The Canadian Ambassador Mr. Warden recently visited Punjab and met the Minister of the Punjab Government, officers certain leading journalists and educationists. That visit has a very good impact in further strengthening the ties of friendship between India and Canada.

I have also got a letter that in Canada. Members of Parliament have formed an Indo-Canadian Members of Parliament Friendship Organisation. I will also request my colleagues that we should also take a step in this regard.

Madam, regarding Sri Lanka the policy of my party is very clear. My party does believe in the principle of co-existence and the democratic system of tolerating the opponents' views also. In Sri Lanka our Tamil brethren are being subjected to genocide.

[Shri Balwant Singh Ramoowalia]

The Hon. Chair expunged the remarks made by Mr. Tewary from the proceedings in this regard. But I take it on the basis of right to live and on the basis of humanitarian grounds that Sri Lanka is killing and using forces, indiscriminate forces, to kill the innocent people there.

So I again urge upon the hon. Minister that a team either from India should be sent or our Embassier in London, Washington and Ottawa should be asked to give immediate report about the visa system. The Embassies can also meet the Singh Sabhas, Gurudwara committees, leaders of the Indian communities and leaders of other social organisations consisting of Indian people there and this visa system should be immediately scrapped.

With these few words I thank the Chair very much.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Check your facts about the involvement of the Candian government.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA : I am speaking after checking up.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponani) : Sir, I rise on a point of order. To accuse a Member of Parliament of having taken a brief from the embassy is serious. I respect Prof. Tewary very much but this is rather too much and must not be allowed in this House. (Interruptions) How can you accuse an hon. Member of taking a brief from an Embassy? What is happening in this House?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will go into the record.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : We have overwhelming evidence that Canadian Government has given millions of dollars to extremist organisations there in the name of ethnic welfare. Funds have been given to extremists.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will go into the record.

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : I am accusing him because the Member has to speak about facts. No Member has the right to become a spokesman of a foreign power.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : What is this happening in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please resume your seats. I will go into the record.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : In this House nobody should become a spokesman of any country.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Please ask him to withdraw his words.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : I will not withdraw it. Nobody should become a foreign country.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA : It is irresponsible.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : I can prove what you are saying is wrong. What you are saying is not true.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will go through the records.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur) : Madam Chairman, I am glad that my hon. friend from Akali Dal has welcomed the non-alignment policy that has been pursued by our Government. One of our friends, an eloquent speaker, Shri Shahabuddin day before yesterday or on the last occasion accused the Government of following a policy from day to day, from year to year and not a consistent well thought out and long term policy. I wish to contest that statement.

This non-alignment policy has been adopted by the Government not in one year but over a long period of years as long ago as 1952 when this Government sent its delegation to Ottawa on behalf of India to the Common wealth Parliamentary Conference. On behalf of our Government we enunciated our stand of non-involvement in the then rising rivalry between

the two great post war powers, viz., USA and USSR. Afterwards we called it non-alignment policy. Therefore, over all these years we have been evolving this policy. It is in pursuance of this long-standing policy... We have been fortunate enough in seeing the friendship between the USSR and India to grow more from strength to strength, with the result that today it is very difficult for anyone to try and create a rift between these two great countries. But that does not mean that we have become communist. That does not mean that we have become satellite of the Soviet Russia. Although our friends communists, are here, in our own country, in charge of one of the States and also in the opposition benches here, we have not become communists.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
Two States.

PROF N. G. RANGA : Nevertheless we are friends with the communist country, the Soviet Russia and we are proud of the fact that we are very good friends of that country because that country has been playing fair with us so far as the international policies and programmes are concerned. But, unfortunately it has not been the case with America. At one time, I was a great friend of America because I thought and most of us at that time thought that being herself a democratic country, America would welcome the growth of friendship between America and ourselves. We were suddenly surprised over the disappointment that had arisen due to Pakistan. Contrary to the advice given by the then Home Minister, Sardar Vallabhai Patel, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, placing his faith on the ideals of the United Nations and believing that America also would be just jealous about those principles of Non-alignment non-interference, respect for each other's sovereignty and so on, even to the United Nations over Kashmir issue. How did that Kashmir issue arise? It was because with the backing of Pakistan Government, the tribal people invaded Kashmir. And what did we ask the United Nations to do? We asked them to hold Pakistan responsible for that aggression and persuade Pakistan to withdraw from the occupied area. And what did the United Nations do? They wanted us to

heed to the advice and indeed to succumb to the power and influence of the USA and the UK and their allies they get us bogged in their discussions and are keeping that dispute still alive. This was our bitter experience with the USA. From that time onwards, she seems to have taken upon herself the mantle of the Great Britain, France and other European empires. Just as in the middle of last century, Lord Palmerston gave an ultimatum to China with the result that there was a boxer revolution in China and the Chinese were subjected to the Western, and so on like that America today wants to boss over the whole of the world. Why? She says, in order to protect democracy. Whose democracy? Not our democracy but their democracy. We have no quarrel with the American democracy, I am all in favour of American democracy. I am all in favour of American people and their way of democratic life. But that does not mean that America should now go about all over the world simply ordering things about. This is what she is doing. She calls Nicaragua a cancer. But she encourages Sri Lanka. I do not wish to castigate Sri Lanka for the role she has been playing dishonourable role and disgusting role, inhuman role vis-a-vis the Indian settlers in Sri Lanka and who are the settlers? Not those people who have gone there as labour for the last 10 years or 50 years as temporary settlers but they are the settlers for hundred of years, & centuries ago lakhs of our people had gone over there and settled down and if those people cannot be treated as honourable citizens of Sri Lanka, how would it be possible for the great majority of people in most of the countries to be treated as citizen of their respective countries. And yet Sri Lanka has been behaving towards them in an dishonourable manner, as I told you, in an undemocratic manner and bordering on bestiality?

What is the role that America is playing? Has she got any kind of advice to be given to Sri Lanka at all? What about Great Britain and what about France or any of the so-called democratic countries of the West? Why is it that they do not assert themselves? On the other hand, they encourage and connive at Pakistan

[Prof N.G. Ranga.]

playing her role in Sri Lanka and Israel playing its role in Sri Lanka. And who is acting as provocators in Sri Lanka and as abettors of Sri Lankan Government? These are the Governments, these are the people. How is it possible for us to believe that these people are as sincere about democracy as we are. They may be democrats in their own countries, they certainly have no message at all to be given to other democrats in the rest of the world, because their fingers are soiled with the blood of our own Indians in Sri Lanka.

My hon. friends from Tamil Nadu are very much upset; we are all upset over the whole issue. Our hearts are bleeding over the manner in which Sri Lanka is butchering our people there in that country. For too long a time we have been patient and we will continue to be patient, too, yet, there is a limit for anything. That is why I welcome the suggestion made by one of our hon. friends the other day that we should send a Parliamentary delegation, a good delegation of democrats, to go round the whole of the world and plead with it to see that Sri Lanka would respect human rights, respect the charter of the United Nations and respect the minimum rights for citizenship of our people in Sri Lanka.

All of us would like to agree with those friends who have said that our prestige is very high and our position is very big. Indeed, the most powerful representative of the American External Affairs, the Secretary of State has said that India is now emerging as a great power. What sort of a power are we? Are we a great power when American Navy could go to the Persian Sea with impunity with nuclear arms? Are we a great power when we are incapable of seeing to it that the United Nations resolution in favour of keeping Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is respected by America? We could not do anything when Diego Garcia has come to be armed, turned to be a base, Persian Gulf is turned into a base. They say that they are doing it because Russia has gone to Afghanistan] It is true that it is a sore point as far as people like me are concerned. I wish Soviet Russia had not gone there at all. And when she had gone

there, what is the stand we have taken? It has been a principled stand. We have made it very clear to Soviet Russia as best as we could, in as friendly a manner as we could, to leave Afghanistan, go back again to her own realm and Soviet Russia has offered to go back provided there would be peace there in that country, provided there is some kind of an assurance that there would not be trouble from Pakistan to start with and from behind Pakistan from United States of America. Is that guarantee forthcoming? It is for America to assure the rest of the world that she would not interfere through Pakistan and through Afghanistan in Soviet Russia affairs. In what way are we the guardians of Soviet Russia integrity? We are not. We are her friends, who do not want her to be invaded, to be troubled and belittled and in any other way weakened. One friend has got to see to it that the other friend is not unnecessarily troubled? Is there anything wrong in it?

14.00 hrs.

And yet, Americans have not got that much of common sense to be able to recognise this simple axiom of human relationship and friendship between one person and another.

Pakistan is now armed to her teeth, we say, not only to protect the American interest as against Soviet Russia, but also (indeed, mainly), in order to attack us, and to weaken us. What are the feelings of Pakistanis towards us? Everybody knows it and they themselves talk about it. Some said that it is because of the dictatorship and that very soon there is going to be democracy there. What sort of democracy do they have in Sri Lanka? The Communist-allied party, as well as the so called democratic party and the conservative party, both are opposed to Indians. Similar is the position in Pakistan also. Was Bhutto so great a friend of India? Are those people so great friends of us? There is no chance of any political party in Pakistan trying to become genuinely friendly with India from a political point of view. Trade, we would have; travel, we would have and cultural contacts we would have, but not political friendship because Pakistan has been pursuing a policy of vengeance against India. I say that advisedly, not on behalf of the Government but as Prof. Ranga who has paid

special attention to the study of foreign affairs during all these years of our freedom. She has been very bitter towards us. Would that bitterness come down? We hoped that it would come down when we released 90,000 prisoners of war after having spent crores and crores of rupees on their maintenance, after having come away from Bangladesh and then after having signed the Simla Pact. I asked Indiraji before she went to Simla and after she had come back, "Are you quite sure that we would have some peace now?" She said that it was only an experiment, it was only a chance and at best it was only a hope. But we should always go on hoping and she was right also. I go on hoping for friendship with Pakistan. Today, she is situated, egged on by America with all her armaments not only with F-16s but also with nuclear armaments. And with such a capacity which has been built up by America that Pakistan is offering to supply arms to all those countries in the Gulf area and also in Africa. So, she becomes an additional supply-base, a store house and a manufacturing annexe of the United States of America for the most modern arms here next door to us. All this is in order to strengthen America on one side and to threaten us on the other.

Under these circumstances, how can I say to myself that India is a great country? We are being threatened from every side. And they say that they are going to protect us from Soviet Russia. They say that in between there is Afghanistan, she has swallowed Afghanistan and she would swallow Pakistan also. Let America come over here, take over Pakistan and gobble us, just as Great Britain has gobbled Fa-land. They say to us, "We are here, we are great democratic neighbours and you can trust us. Therefore there would be no fear at all, because Pakistan is only a colony of us." It may suit Pakistani leaders, some of them but not all, because Pakistani citizens are just as Patriotic about their country as we are about our country. Therefore, I am sure, Pakistan would not, whatever may be their feelings towards us, succumb and fall so low as to become an open colony for America. Nevertheless, she is almost as bad as that under the control of America. Under

these circumstances, how can I feel safe in my own country, in spite of the excellent diplomatic efforts that have been made on our behalf by Indiraji, by our Rajiv Gandhi now and our External Affairs Minister and our other experts? All praise for them! They are doing very good work.

SHRI H.A. DORA (Srikakulam): You suggest a positive solution to it. We are not able to save this country in spite of the best diplomatic relations that we have established hitherto. Suggest a solution.

PROF. N.G. RANGA: Therefore, I am not feeling very happy about it. Through Ceylon at that end, Pakistan at this end. And through China, America is now trying to engulf us. That is one of the reasons why I have been pleading for the last several years and that India should try to develop friendship with China also. China also is a Communist country so is USSR. China and USSR were at one time bosom friends, now they are not such good friends. They were enemies earlier; now they are trying to become friends. Now why should we not try to develop our friendship with China? Some of the unhappy things in the recent history had better be forgotten. Will they have claims over their territories? They said that we have claims over our territories? But they are taking too long a time. Now, let us sort them out. It is in their interest also to gain us as a friend. It is in our interest also to gain China as our friend, and if we have to gain China's friendship, then we need not depend so much on Soviet Russia. We need not be afraid of America at all. Then, America would not be able to ambush us. Through China, America is working on the Pakistan's claims against us. If we are able to—develop some friendship with China—by making some concession on this side in return for some other concessions from their side, it would be possible for us to see to it that these three great powers—China, USA and USSR—all of them will be looking at each other and we might have some peace here in our country for development.

SHRIMATI MEIRA KUMAR (Bijnor): Madam, last Friday and today, some misgivings have been expressed by some of

[Shrimati Meira Kumar]

the hon. Members, regarding the success of our foreign policy. I don't think our foreign policy can be judged by immediate success on return vis-a-vis every single international event or every single country. It has to be judged in view of the long term influence it exerts on larger and larger number of people and countries. And if viewed in this context, the basic precepts of our foreign policy have stood the test of time. Non-Alignment—the bedrock of our foreign policy has grown since 1961 and has assumed the character of a universal international movement covering a clear majority of the mankind and two-thirds of the membership of the United Nations. Most of these Non-aligned countries, which are erstwhile colonial countries, militarily weak, economically backward. They all have a common stake in promoting disarmament, global economic development and increasing the area of peace. The movement is opposed to neo-imperialism, imperialism, racism, exploitation—economic exploitation—of the developing countries by developed countries and hegemonism of the Big Powers.

As the founder-member and lately as Chairman of the non-aligned movement, India has ceaselessly made efforts to create world opinion against these practices and tendencies. True, we have not reached our goal, but what is significant is that we have not given up. We have not wavered. We have gone ahead, and we have gone ahead together with so many countries of the Third World.

Concerning our mission of disarmament, we have taken initiative in having a dialogue with the nuclear weapon States, wherein five more countries of the five continents, viz. Mexico, Sweden, Greece, Argentina and Tanzania have joined us to put a stop to arms race. We have continued to exert pressure through the Delhi Declaration and the Geneva Summit.

For ending racism and colonialism, we have made effective use of the forum of United Nations; NAM and also the Commonwealth, to draw attention to the situation in South Africa and Namibia.

With regard to our foreign economic policy, we have persistently tried, and we are trying to iron out the difficulties in the North-South dialogue, and we are forging ahead with South-South cooperation. SAARC has been a noteworthy development, and the role it would play in regional cooperation cannot be underestimated.

Of course, the situation in Sri Lanka, although it is their internal problem, has been a matter of grave concern to us. We are concerned, we are making efforts; but the need of the hour is restraint, which we have to exercise; and it should not be mistaken for a soft line. Moreover, there is no guarantee that a hard line would bring about the desired results. All the same, the situation in Sri Lanka is fast deteriorating, and through you Madam, I would urge upon the Foreign Minister to take timely action. As Prof. Ranga has earlier suggested we should send our delegations throughout the world, to create an atmosphere which would oppose what is happening in Sri Lanka, and which would exert pressure on the Sri Lankan Government to respect human rights.

As regards Pakistan, there are some longstanding and in-built hurdles in the way of our friendship with Pakistan. But we are trying to overcome these. We have the determination, we have the will, and I am sure we will succeed.

It is this determination and this political will to dedicatedly work for world peace and a just economic order in the world, while safeguarding the sovereignty of the country and our national interests, even in the most trying circumstances, it is this determination that is the quintessence of our foreign policy and so far as this determination is concerned, we have not failed.

I would like to say a few words, regarding the Ministry of External Affairs. I am speaking from personal experience as I have served in this Ministry for twelve and a half years. The Budget for the Ministry of External Affairs is Rs. 302 crores, which is only 0.7 per cent of the total budget of the Central Government, I would draw

your attention to this. The budget is only 0.7 per cent of the total budget of the Central Government. The burden on the exchequer is so little as to be negligible, And with this minuscule budget a country as large and as important as India projects its foreign policy in the world. With this minuscule budget we the founder and lately the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, want to create the world opinion against neo-imperialism, racism, economic exploitation, hegemonies and all things bad; with this minuscule budget, we want to have highly dynamic and vibrant foreign policy and be active all over the world. Is it possible? With this budget we are running 135 missions abroad, we are maintaining our representational officers, our junior staff, we are sending out and receiving delegations. We have representational officers totalling about 600 and odd, which is one-fourth of the strength of the British Foreign Service. So, you can imagine, the burden that our Foreign Office officers have to carry with such little facilities as compared to their counterparts of other important countries. One might say that I am comparing a developing country with a developed country. But we cannot really overlook the pivotal role that India expected to play among the developing countries and also on behalf of them and on the world stage. Our activities are bound to increase manifold in the international arena and we have to manage all this with this small budget and with such a small service. It is to the credit of the Ministry of External Affairs that we have successfully managed and projected a foreign policy which has established the credibility of our country which has earned her respect and which even under the most difficult international situations, has remained admirably positive.

A glaring example is that of ITEC. It is a bilateral assistance scheme which is operated by the Ministry of External Affairs. ITEC gets a pittance of Rs. 9 crores to give assistance to 60 developing countries. I think, we should do something about it.

Of course, we realise that the Ministry of External Affairs Budget is a non-plan expenditure and does not contribute

directly to the development activities of nation building. Nonetheless, it does indirectly contribute to making the international atmosphere favourable in terms of foreign aid, trade, joint ventures, foreign collaborations, investment, grants, loans, transfer of technology, and so on. There are also tangible gains if we have less tensions and more peace. We cannot exist in isolation, and we cannot let slip opportunities to benefit from development activities going on in other countries.

There is an impression that the Foreign Service officers live in great luxury and style abroad. That is a myth. Of the total Budget of MEA, 65 per cent goes in the form of grant-in-aid to developing countries like Bhutan aid, Nepal aid. It is only 35 per cent which is spent on establishment costs. The Foreign Service officers get their basic pay which is at par with what their counterparts get here. The Foreign Service allowance component, which really gives rise to this myth, is based on the cost of living index of the countries in which these officers are posted, just as their counterparts in other services here get their DA and CCA on the basis of the cost of living index of various cities in India. Generally, due to non-availability of correct cost of living index, the foreign allowance paid to these officers is 15 to 20 per cent less than the actual cost of living. With the result, the ability to entertain, which is an important part of the representational duty of these officers, gets limited. And if these handicaps are combined, it has a telling effect on the effectiveness and sophistication of Indian diplomacy. We have to bear all these points in mind. I would again request the Foreign Minister, through you, Madam, to bring about increase in the Foreign Allowance and the Representational Grants if we have to conduct our diplomacy with sophistication and finesse,

The Representational Officers at least have some motivation, but the junior staff when posted abroad, do not even have that, except perhaps a few electronic gadgets. They work in very dangerous and hazardous conditions in most of the countries abroad. You must have heard of the case of security guards being gunned

[Shrimati Meira Kumar]

down in Kampala. There are so many other cases of security risk, of danger to them. They have accommodation problem. They have children's education problem. They are very poorly paid. There is very little motivation for them and, therefore, something has to be done very soon to improve their conditions.

So far as the Foreign Service officers are concerned, their promotional avenues are blocked. There is an incredible bottleneck at the top, with the result that the young, intelligent and enterprising people are getting attracted to other services in the private sector. There is a suggestion that posts should be made available in other Ministries at the Joint Secretary level. It would not only solve the cadre problem but it would also provide an additional expertise to the Foreign Service officers in the field of culture, science and technology, commerce, industry and so on. With the increasingly complex pattern of foreign policy, we would become irrelevant if we just confine ourselves, to the political work. We will have to branch out and additional expertise in various fields would be in the long-term interest of the Service.

With these words, I support the Demand for Grant of the Ministry of External Affairs and thank you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) :
Madam, after many years I am noticing—I do not wish to be misunderstood—that in this year's debate a note of anxiety, of misgivings I should say, to some extent, is being expressed by many Members from both sides of the House. And this is not anything surprising. While it is true, as the last speaker said...and I congratulate

her on her speech by the way—that the overall policy the country has been following, the overall policy of non-alignment, of standing for peace against war, for disarmament and so on, remains in tact and everybody support that, but, after all, we cannot go on simply repeating from year to year, the broad contours of this framework because within that framework the Government has to act on specific issues, it has to react to specific situations. And during the last year, I think, it is some feelings of some inconsistency. I should say, some vacillations, some illusions, that are creating this undercurrent of anxiety which is being rightly expressed here. I think the basic cause of this anxiety is the fact that a year ago or so, unreal atmosphere of euphoria was sought to be created about our relations with our neighbours.

Now it is appearing suddenly as though we have suddenly got a shock and come to earth that things are not turning out the way we thought they would. I think initiative in foreign policy does not consist entirely as Mr Tewary sought to make out of visit to different countries by our Prime Minister. That of course is of it no doubt. But to create some kind of illusion or euphoria about progress towards a good neighbourly policy in this regard is not correct. Because, we have missed out certain realities refused to recognise certain realities which of course many members are now here expressing. This good neighbourly policy towards our neighbour is very important from our own national interest and the point of view of our security. If you go through this book which has been given to us and if you read between the lines the policy is lying

in shambles, and everyone here has spoken about it. The plain fact of the situation is that the two immediate neighbours with whom we have tried very hard to improve matters, tan and Sri Lanka, are becoming more Pakis and more adamant in their hostilities. They are not elenting. They are not thawing under the charm of our Prime Minister or the personal relations that they may have with him. The reason for it should better be recognised once for all. Mr. Tewary hinted, I find myself in agreement with him surprisingly on many of these points. The problems presented by these two countries have acquired global dimension. That is the main point. With Pakistan it is so obvious of course one does not need to dilate on it. But in the case of Jayawardhane's Government too the fact of the matter is that they are being supported and encouraged from behind the scenes (Pakistan, not so much from behind the scenes either) by those very powers, those western powers.

PROF. N.G. RANGA : Western and Eastern also, China.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Well, to some extent, yes; you are right, from what evidence is there. They are being supported. They are not masters of their own situation. Many facts have been cited here by Members about how these powers are operating for their own interest using Pakistan and Sri Lanka for their own purposes. Some small facts I just wish to add to the collection that is already there. President Jayawardhane's son Ravi is currently in Israel now. He is incidentally the Security Adviser to the resident of Sri Lanka. He personally led the Security Forces in the eastern region against the Tamils. These things are on record they may not be available in our Press but if you study International Press and listen to BBC and so on you get lots of information. He is in Israel at the moment but he is on mission because he is apparently the main negotiator for arms purchases from South Africa, from Israel, from the UK, from China. Reference has been made to the fact that when the Seventh Fleet appeared off Karachi—we were accustomed to it appearing in the East—but this time it

appeared in the West off our shores. It is apparently for the innocent pastime of allowing several thousand and odd group to enjoy recreation and rest facilities in Karachi city. At what price to the citizens of Karachi, I do not know—that will be known later on. But at the same time Pakistani naval vessels and Chinese vessels were visiting Colombo. It is not I, but this book which talks about "growing military nexus" between Pakistan and Sri Lanka. It is stated explicitly that there is a growing military nexus. It is a very serious thing to say and should be explained to the Parliament of India in a little detail, on what evidence, on what facts the Government of India is making such a serious allegation in cold print, there is a growing military nexus—that is a very serious matter—between these two countries.

Madam, recently the Chinese President, Zao Ziang, visited Colombo, and he is reported to have told President Jayawardhane that he had come there to express Chinese solidarity with Sri Lanka against the designs of a sub-continental super power (*Interruptions*). That means, you, Mr. Ranga, I do not whether you consider yourself as a super power...

PROF. N.G. RANGA : Part of it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : ...because you are one of the votaries of super power theory, which is doing us no good, I tell you.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He is a 'super' power.

PROF. N.G. RANGA : Super power theory has started from you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : The Security Minister of Sri Lanka, Mr. Atulitramudali, has told in an interview to the British Broadcasting Corporation that within six weeks the Tamil problem in the

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

eastern region will be solved and after that they can deal with Jaffna. You have seen, no doubt, yesterday's report in the press that the Finance Minister Mr. Ronnie de Mel has announced the allocation of an extra 100 million for defence spending this year to help combat Tamil militants. So, it is quite obvious that we have been—I do not blame the Government for trying to bring about some negotiations to try to get peaceful settlement and all that, but for Heaven's sake do not spread illusions about all this. Sri Lanka is a small country compared with India. True, but behind it stand big powers who are trying to use Sri Lanka for their own purpose and the more this turmoil goes on within that unhappy Island now, the more killings and this genocide goes on, perhaps it will become easier for the external forces to secure a foothold in that Island obvious reasons. So, it is not only Mr. Jayewardene who may be a problem for us, but also other powers may become by proxy our neighbours, off our shores. It is better we talk out plainly about this, we are not doing it adequately, in my opinion. Even in the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations we are not able to get any response. Why is it so? Why are we isolated on this issue? Nobody speaks for us in the councils of the world on this question of the killing of Tamils in Sri Lanka. We are very proud of this non-aligned fraternity of which we have been the leader and all that, I think it is a big force in the world today, but where is our diplomacy and where is our skill which can at least get voices to speak on our behalf on this issue? It can only be done if they realise what is going on, what is the real game behind all this, because certainly the non-aligned countries of this region are not very happy at the fact that this creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is being indefinitely delayed. They want it as much as we do. But do they understand what is happening in Sri Lanka? They understood Diego Garcia well. But do they understand what is going on in Sri Lanka? Another Diego Garcia may appear tomorrow on the soil of Sri Lanka. Do they understand the significance of the appearance of the Seventh Fleet in

Karachi? So, we have to do some more active diplomatic campaigning—shall I say? some lobbying, some work, some hard work and not the one last year at the time of Thimpu Conference. There was such an atmosphere of euphoria you created, as though things were coming and going in our way because of your wonderful personality and charm and all that. Therefore, today many people let down and they can't understand, what is happening why suddenly we have been reduced to this position. So, Madam, I would say that we are being out-manoeuvred. We are being out manoeuvred. This is a serious manner. I may support the general policy of this Government but I cannot support inconsistencies, weaknesses, vacillation and contradictions which are creating problems for our country.

About Pakistan, I do not want to say much because much has been said about this. But in the case of Pakistan even about this talk which took place between the President Zia and our Prime Minister, it was stated that an understanding had been reached about not attacking each other's nuclear installation. What has happened to that now? There is no agreement. Nothing is put on paper. Nothing is signed because later on Pakistan insisted that this understanding must be made part and parcel of that no-war pact which they were proposing. So, nothing has come out of even that. There is not much of worth anyway because whose word you would believe. But anyway, there is nothing. So I should say, really if you ask me what is the solution I cannot tell you in one word. Obviously, we are not going in for military intervention in Sri Lanka. I hope we cannot go to war with Sri Lanka because it would be the most disastrous thing, not for them but for us. Therefore, shorter than military intervention, we have to take much more initiative much more positive steps and firm steps, in the comity of nations. That is all we can do. Give whatever help and relief we can to these unfortunate Tamil people, as lakh of them have to run away from Sri Lanka, and now they have to be sheltered in our soil. And it is creating so many problems. I don't think President Jayewardene understands at all that there is an ethnic problem or he does not want

to understand. Ethnic problem does not exist for him. It is question of terrorists, who are disturbing the peace and law and order in his country and, therefore, they must be put down through a military solution. It is so simple-for that—as far as he is concerned. Therefore, in order to do that, he must go to the various quarters to get assistance. That is the way he is looking at it. But where are our other friends and nations throughout the world who will understand our point of view and exert pressure—moral pressure, political pressure and diplomatic pressure—on the Government of Sri Lanka? The Government of Pakistan, I believe, is beyond the capacity of being moved by moral pressures. So, we are in great difficulty. I think, no doubt, difficulties have increased greatly.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Hon. Member's time is over.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Madam, what can I say? I have so many things to say, particularly about the Foreign Minister's reported remarks—some of them—during his visit to U.S.A. for the meeting of Indo-US Joint Economic Commission. I would like to ask him for clarifications. If they are not correctly reported, he should say so categorically. For example, in the meeting, Mr. Patric Mohniyan asked about the India's voting record in the United Nations and alleged that we are continually voting with the Soviet Union. Apart from this being an insult, a way of asking explanations from us for this kind of thing. Mr. Bhagat is reported as having said that he will look into the record. Why should he look into the records? We are not anybody's servants. We are free to vote as we like. It is not the business of Mr. Moynihan or anybody else to ask explanations from us. As an independent self-respecting country, we do not own explanation to anybody, even if Mr. Bhagat had gone there to negotiate 500 million dollar collaboration deal. That does not mean that we have to give explanations about our conduct at the United Nations.

On Afghanistan, it seems he was asked in the press about what he considers to be a solution for the Afghan

problem. Well, we have spelt it out on many occasions, the Government I mean, to define well the position. In the press, it is reported, he said about Finlandisation and the Austrialisation of Afghanistan. I do not know whether the reports are correct. They have appeared but they have not been contradicted. Therefore, I am having to raise them. If Finlandisation and Austrialisation are dirty words, we should not use this kind of dirty expression. We should spell out our stand which is quite clear.

There is also a report that the Americans were charmed by the assurances given by Mr. Bhagat, of course, not in his personal capacity but as representing the Government. With these assurances, did the Americans agree to give up their earlier objections and hesitancy to give up their earlier objections and hesitancy to supplying us with certain types of equipment and technology which they had refused to give and refused to give to any developing country? What were those assurances? I would like to know what sort of assurance they were. As far as defence equipment is concerned. I can understand. They may say there are so many spies roaming about in India nowadays that any country would be a bit concerned as to whether Ram Swarups and so and so would get hold of defence secrets. Whenever we ask here about the equipment that is to be purchased, we are assured it is nothing like that. It is for monitoring the weather or doing something, rather super-computers for monitoring the weather. What assurances have been given which suddenly melted the hearts of Americans? I would like to know.

There is a report also, by the way, that night vision equipment for the armed forces, goggles and other equipment which are required by our tankmen and our infantrymen when they move at night, some deal has been struck with the famous multinational company the International Telephone and Telegraph Company of USA, which I think has a rather dubious record of what it did along with CIA in Chile a few years ago, in overthrowing the elected Government of President Allende. It was ITTC whose sordid role in that

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

affair came to light. I do not know whether you are simply purchasing equipment from them or you want to bring them here to set up some kind of facilities, or what you want to do. But I say, be on guard. Be careful with these people. Otherwise, your foreign policy itself will be subverted when there is too much flirting because with this type of multi-national companies, you are opening the gates a little too wide now.

About inconsistencies, I must say one thing. We are always talking, and rightly talking, about our uncompromising & total opposition to apartheid in South Africa, and we have been propagating the need for a comprehensive and total boycott of all manner of relations with that racist regime in Pretoria. I think the entire country stands behind that policy. Now here I got hold of document including the photographs, published in Business magazine, which shows that, you know there is a very flourishing diamond industry in South Africa, diamond mining and diamond cutting, and Indian Businessmen Delegation, who deal in diamonds, from Bombay, two names are mentioned here, Mr. Madhukant Bhukanvala and Dr. H.J. Modi, the first Indian diamond industrialist to go to South Africa. How they have gone, how did they manage to go, so many photographs of receptions, given to them, of the meetings held by them with their counterparts in South Africa and Ministers have met them and so on. This was sent to me by some South African gentleman—I do not want to name him—who ends his letter by saying 'Disgustingly and sadly yours'. 'Disgustingly and sadly yours'. Why these secret contacts are being allowed to be maintained? For economic advantage or for what purpose? You must find out how these things are happening some time. A few weeks ago or a few months ago there were reports in our Press of our Arya Samajists' delegation being allowed to go to South Africa. When we asked about it, we were told that that was some sort of a cultural exchange because the Arya Samaj is active there also among the Indians who are South African Indians. Does it mean that total boycott of the apartheid regime

excludes cultural exchanges? What does it mean? I cannot understand. If we want to maintain our credibility in the eyes of the African people—not only in South Africa but in the whole of that continent, then we must plug this loophole. I do not know who is responsible for it. Whoever is responsible should be taken to task. I am prepared to hand over these papers to the Minister. Let him find out how these people are being permitted to go and enable our critics to dub as the hypocrites in the world I know the Government is solidly against apartheid. They must see that their whole official machinery and so is upto the mark and does not permit this kind of thing to go on because everybody knows nowadays that for money anything can be done in this country. Corruption is running not right in every quarter of our national life.

So, I do not wish to take any more time. I only wish to say that on Sri Lanka and Pakistan a very, very serious situation has arisen and we must think afresh how to behave, how to act, and how to intervene. If they are going on a global scale, we must go global scale also. But at least we should be realistic and we should not spread illusions and we should not spread a euphoria that because of Indian diplomacy and skill we are winning round these people who are actually playing a different game and outmanoeuvring us with the help of certain powers.

SHRI MULLAPPALLY RAMACHANDRAN (Cannanore): I am happy for being given this opportunity. I wish to mention a few points on external affairs. I have been hearing members from both sides on the subject and I have noted with deep satisfaction that there are no differences regarding the cardinal principles underlying the foreign policy of India.

Even during the time of our independent struggle the forefathers of our nation discussed international matters at great length. But it was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of our foreign policy, who provided in the later twenties the Indian National Congress with a well defined and a clear outlook on foreign policy. The foreign policy formulated and

adopted by the Indian National Congress has stood the test of the time. Even the critics of the Government inside and outside the Parliament have words of appreciation for our foreign policy which has been well established for the last 38 years now.

Through our fight against fascism, our fight against imperialism & our fight against colonialism as also racial segregation we could draw the attention of the world population. Our present fight against neo-imperialism as well as neo-colonialism also has evoked great response all over the world. As Chairman of NAM, our hon. Prime Minister is making all-out efforts to defuse the tension in different parts of the world and also towards ending cold-war. Our policy of non-alignment as well as peaceful co-existence always stood us in good stead.

Speaking about foreign policy, the most important factor which comes to my mind is our relations with our good neighbours. Our relations with Pakistan were cordial through many years. But unfortunately, the hide and seek game adopted by Gen. Zia's administration has made the things difficult. We know that U.S. imperialism is dumping sophisticated armaments into Pakistan under the pretext of transporting these armaments to the Mujahideens in Afghanistan. This has created a very serious situation, Pakistan's interference in our internal affairs also has assumed an alarming proportion. It was during the time of the confusion and turmoil prevailing in Punjab that the extremists were trained in Pakistan and they have been provided with sophisticated arms, supplied by America.

The subversive as well as secessionist activities carried on by the extremists in Punjab were clearly supported by Pakistan in collusion with America. We had bilateral talks with Pakistan on several occasions. But Pakistan did not respond to our request not to give assistance and armaments to the extremists in that region. We know that the armaments piled up by Pakistan will have a clear bearing on our economy because that may definitely add

to our burden on our defence expenditure. We stand committed to the letter and spirit of the Simla Agreement. But the statements made by certain responsible Ministers in Gen. Zia's Government as well as certain officials in Pakistan are making the things worse. We know that these statements relate to the State of Jammu and Kashmir as well as the minority community in India. These statements are definitely prompted by the designs of the U.S. imperialism. This fact is further confirmed by the presence of the Seventh Fleet in the Karachi Sea. This august House had occasion to have an elaborate discussion on this crucial subject and our hon. Minister for External Affairs has come out and he has expressed his anxiety and concern in this House in this respect. It is important that mere lukewarm protest alone will not solve the situation. We must come out vehemently and register our strong protest with Pakistan regime. We should also make it a point to see that our Indian Ocean is made a zone of peace.

Coming to the question of Sri Lanka, we know that genocide going on inside Sri Lanka has very few parallels in recent history. We know that more than 1,24,000 refugees reached India and it has caused very dangerous situation in India. It has created a socio-economic problem for the people of our country.

According to reports that are available, Sri Lanka is getting support from Israel as well as from Britain. So also, they are getting maximum support from the U.S. imperialists. A few minutes ago, hon. Member Shri Indrajit Gupta has made a reference to the visit of Mr. Jayawardene's son to Israel.

15.00 hrs.

His visit is not accidental; his visit is in connection with a request to Israel for giving armaments to Sri Lanka.

The Indian Ocean has become an arena for the world powers to test their might. The foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean poses a threat not only to India but also to all peace-loving nations throughout the world. The Anglo American clique is concentrating on Diego Garcia and their influence is apparent. In

[Shri Mullappally Ramachandran]

this respect it is my humble submission that the Government of India must come into the open and try to convene an emergent meeting of the littoral nations and see that these littoral nations are not aligned with the big powers of the world.

Our relations with Bangladesh have been cordial throughout ever since the independence of that country. But unfortunately certain hitches and hindrances have developed on the way. After the formation of the SAARC, we hope that we can improve our relations with that country. I know our relations with Nepal, Bhutan and Maldives, the three member-nations of SAARC, are cordial and we should see that these cordial relations are always kept in tact.

Our border dispute with China appears to have been forgotten. But looking at the international political scenario, one is constrained to be reminded of the saying, "China is a sleeping monster". Moreover, the latest political development, the nexus between the USA and China, the nexus between China and Pakistan and the nexus between China and Sri Lanka must be taken into account seriously. It is a clear indication of the emerging threat from China.

India stands for political solution so far as Afghan question is concerned. Unfortunately, in spite of our ceaseless efforts, we could not find a political solution to the Afghan question. Our relations with Afghanistan have always been cordial and we are trying our utmost to improve our relations with that country.

Millions of blacks are fighting in South Africa for getting emancipation from racial segregation. In this respect India, who has always stood behind the people of the world who are fighting for human rights, should express its solidarity with the fighting people of South Africa.

15.03 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *In the Chair*]

Africa and Latin America are striving

hard to have a new social and economic order. In their fight against neo-colonialism, our country should come forward and pledge its support. We must stand by those people of Latin America and Africa who are trying to have a new economic and social order.

A very significant part can be played by India in the complex international situation as a champion of the cause of the third world countries whose relevance is yet to be affirmed.

Lastly, I appeal that, while holding the flag of non-alignment as well as peaceful co-existence high, we should see that we stand by the socialist countries of the world, especially the Soviet Union, who have always stood behind us during stresses and strains.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL (Ladakh) : Mr. Chairman Sir, While supporting the demand for grant of the Ministry of External Affairs, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues and friends in congratulating the Government and the leadership for pursuing the policy of non-alignment, the foundation of which was first laid by our late Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru along with late Martial Tito of Yugoslavia and the President of Egypt Shri Nasser. Since then our leaders headed by late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri of course for a short period, and then by our late Prime Minister Smt. Indiraji for a long number of years (of 13 to 14 years) and now under the young and dynamic leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi are carrying forward our policy of non-alignment. By the efforts of our leaders, past and present, the non-aligned movement has grown manifold and presently over hundred countries are associated with it. Our efforts should continue to strengthen the NAM. But this does not mean that in our efforts of strengthening the NAM we should overlook our interests and the different political nexus growing against us in our own area.

Take for instance the Sino-Pak nexus, the Pak-Sri Lanka nexus, the Sino-Bangladesh nexus and the Sino-Sri Lanka nexus, all with the intention of putting our country in an embarrassing position. Behind all

this nexus the hands of some of the western imperialist countries are very much visible.

In such a situation our efforts should be to solve the problem of our borders. We must see to it that how we can improve our relationship with our neighbours. Our main problems, as I put it earlier and what I feel, are that of solving the border problem with China and the illegal occupation of the so called Azad Kashmir area by Pakistan.

As per Press reports we have, I think, completed some six rounds of discussion with China on the border issue. And as per the Press reports, China has proposed for a package deal i.e., India would retain its hold on Arunachal and China would remain in possession of the area in the western sector i.e., Aksaichin area of Ladakh in J & K.

As you know Sir, over 37,500 sq. kms. of area in the Ladakh sector is under the illegal Chinese occupation. India has offered to settle the dispute in a sector to sector plan. China initially rejected that proposal but later on accepted this proposal with a stipulation that a settlement, if arrived at through sector by sector plan should form part of a comprehensive solution of the boundary dispute.

My personal feeling is that China cannot afford to give up Aksaichin because Aksaichin is the lifeline for Chinese supply to Tibet region which is at the moment under their control. So, I do not think they will agree to give up Aksaichin. But that does not mean that we should give up our claim of that area. Is it not possible if you initiate discussions with China to exchange Aksaichin area with some part of western Tibet, namely, the area west of river Indus which is from Kailash-Mansrover to Damchek in Ladakh. That area some couple of centuries ago used to be a part of Kingdom of Ladakh but in 17th century it went to Tibet under certain agreement. Since there is not much of time at my disposal I do not want to go into the details but that area if China agrees to exchange for the area at the moment under Chinese illegal occupation,

namely, Aksaichin then, I think, that will be beneficial to both the countries. This is just my thinking. That area is right from Indo-Nepal-Tibet tri-junction to Damchek in Ladakh. That area is about the same in size as that of Aksaichin. I think if agreed to it will be very useful for both the countries. This is just a suggestion. I think Government should explore these possibilities with the Chinese when they meet next.

Sir, the root of dispute with Pakistan lies in Kashmir. What I feel is that we must resolve that dispute under the spirit of Simla agreement bilaterally so that both countries could sit together and discuss the problems in a way that a solution could be found. My personal feeling is that India should explore the possibility of converting the present line of actual control with minor adjustments here and there as a permanent border between India and Pakistan. This is again my personal opinion. How long could we continue to fight with Pakistan, China or Sri Lanka ! All these things, I feel, the Government under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi can settle it. He has got the mandate of the people and he is in a position to settle this issue firmly and authoritatively. This is my suggestion. The Government should explore the possibilities for this.

Now, coming back to the political nexus between China and Pakistan, China is giving military hardware to Pakistan, nuclear knowhow and training of SSG Commando forces to create instability in our country. Of course, both China and Pakistan are playing the game together and at the moment, we are facing this problem both in Punjab and Kashmir. So we must also think in terms of similar action. That does not mean that we should train some guerillas elsewhere. No, Is it not possible if we give enough economic aid to Vietnam and Kampuchea. Vietnam is the only country which can strike hard in the back of Chinese, which they have proved several times in the past. Of course, they do not require guns and ammunitions. What I feel is that they need economic aid, they need help in the agricultural fields, they need help in dairy

[Shri P. Namgyal]

development, they need help in the textile development, and they need help in the railway rolling stock. Similarly, our country is the only country which has given recognition to Kampuchea. But I feel that we have failed to convince the Non-Aligned countries to give recognition to Kampuchea. I think we must make efforts and explain to our friendly countries our position about Kampuchea. Kampuchea is the victim of the so-called Pol Pot regime. According to some estimate, over 4.4 lakh people, mostly intellectuals and anyone seemed to be non-productive, had been eliminated during the three years regime of Pol Pot between 1975-79.

So, Sir, we must give economic aid to rebuild the economy of that country so that they can also contribute something for the overall political solution in that region and also to resolve the problem of border disputes. If they are exerting pressure, we should also exert pressure through some other means.

About Sri Lanka, many distinguished hon. Members from both sides of this august House, including the hon. Minister, Shri K.R. Narayanan, expressed their views. Only political solution will bring an end to the hostility in that country and India should use its good offices to end the hostility there and settle the issue. They must try to bring both the parties to discuss the issue across the table and not by confrontation.

I agree with the hon. Member, Shri Indrajit Gupta, as he has rightly pointed out, that Sri Lanka is also facing a terrorist problem what we are facing in Punjab and elsewhere. We must use our good offices to settle that issue amicably by explaining our position as well as their viewpoint to both the groups and bring them to a round table conference.

With these words, I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak and I conclude with a support to the Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The time allotted

for this item is practically over. There are still ten hon. Members who want to speak and then the Minister has also to reply. I would request the hon. Members to be brief and conclude within five minutes only.

Shri Unnikrishnan.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is the only opportunity that we get in a year to speak on this Ministry. It would be unfair to ask anyone to conclude within five minutes.

Sir, this debate on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry provide us with an opportunity to discuss at length the foreign policy, its various determinants, processes as well as conduct of our diplomacy. The context of this debate is very crucial and interesting this year. It takes place at a time when the euphoria over the biggest electoral mandate has worn thin and has lost its considerable lustre and glamour ! It is as though the romance and honeymoon is over and history has begun ! In a phase of this kind, you would be judged by your specific and concrete achievements rather than vague generalities and how you deal with issues of great concern, relevance and significance to our national interest.

Our foreign policy remains what it was, of non-alignment and peace in its essentials and it cannot be changed by anyone whosoever is in power, without injuring our national interest. But I would be failing in my duty if I do not point out that while the foreign policy has not changed in its essentials, there are certain variables and nuances which seem to have changed and attempts at deviations made in the hope of doing something spectacular, to build a new image of the leader. Its most concrete manifestation was in dealing with the crisis in Sri Lanka. The people of Tamil origin in Sri Lanka have certain undeniable organic and historical links with the people of Tamil Nadu and even Kerala. One will have to do violence to facts and history to deny these organic links. Therefore when an attempt is made to slaughter and exterminate the Tamil population of Sri Lanka, it is more than an issue of human rights which can

and ought to be represented in the world forums like the UN Human Rights Commission. The dimensions of this problem can only be overlooked at our peril. That is not to suggest that it is a problem which lends itself to easy solutions. It is only to underline our own organic links - I repeat - with the Tamils of Ceylon who are being subjected to an unprecedented threat of annihilation. You cannot run away from this reality by saying that it is a domestic matter of a small neighbour. At a global level, it is also the result of US policies of intervention and support to client regimes to prop up their global interests. Therefore, the Sri Lanka crisis stared at us as a vital issue of our foreign policy which affected us in many ways. Very deeply and I regret to say that it has been dealt with, in a most uninspiring, amateurish and immature and if I may say so, even in a melodramatic manner. We compelled the Tamil militant groups to come to Thimpu which has only exposed every one concerned and resulted in more ferocious attacks on the lives and property of the Tamils and hardened the extremist groups' attitudes. I am very sorry to say that we have not added feathers to our own diplomatic skills or endeavours, but only burnt our own fingers in the process and landed in a situation from which we find it difficult to extricate ourselves. It has unnecessarily been mixed up with the policy of conciliation to our neighbours or a good-neighbourhood policy. Good neighbourhood? Yes. But how? I am one of those here in this House, who had warned about the implications of this policy even when it was projected during the Janata years.

Countries of South Asia are bound not only by geographical proximity and historical and cultural links, but also by our common experience under imperialism and in spite of many contradictions and factors which divide, it is important that we evolve a common purpose and understanding and perspectives. But at the same time, let us not forget, that India constitutes one-sixth of humanity and we have our own vital national interests and also I am not ashamed to say so-a global role and it can

not adopt a low profile. This is no argument for a domineering role on an excuse to dominate our neighbours. The complex problems of South Asian Cooperation can only be sorted out by patient efforts of our diplomacy, for there are far too many complex factors of national identity and powers at work in this region prodded by imperialists and neo-colonialists. Therefore, our relations with our neighbours whether it be Sri Lanka or Pakistan or Bangladesh, have to be understood and dealt with in this context only.

Sir, with Pakistan Shri Rajiv Gandhi started with sentiments or statements like "not allowing Delhi to be a Hiroshima" and "the danger of our neighbour acquiring a nuclear bomb" and so on. Bravado does not always pay in diplomacy and it is a dangerous method to conduct our complex foreign relations! In the past, India never tried to raise an alarm over Chinese nuclear experiments or capacity. It only prodded us in our endeavours for activating our nuclear programmes for peaceful purposes. Pakistan's crude attempt at gaining an entry in to the nuclear club ought not result in a response of alarm and panic, conditioning the minds of our people in a different way from what it has been or used to be for the last 30 years. Our emphasis ought to have been to go to the roots of Pakistan's policy of acquiring sophisticated military hardware from the United States. In this connection, I want to invite the attention of the House to the recent publication by the Iranian authorities of certain documents from the archives of the US Embassy in Teheran seized by the Iranian Revolutionary Guards, which has acquired considerable significance, for it reveals Pakistan's attempt at acquiring sophisticated US military hardware including aircrafts and the US agreement for that, for use against India—specifically mentioned—long before the Soviet troops had arrived in Kabul. The response of the US Administration has been to make an alibi that it is to prevent Pakistan from acquiring nuclear weaponry and to stabilize the regime that they are providing arms to Pakistan. Therefore, United States wants this debate on nuclear potential of the sub-continent to continue at a high profile and this point

[Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan]

is being missed in the debate in this country, particularly at the government level. The second phase of Rajiv Gandhi's foreign policy's misadventures began with the agreement with President Zia on December 17 which was almost a dramatic development. It was projected as though something new has emerged. Was that reiteration necessary? In 1972, the Simla Agreement was a high watermark of our relationship, carefully worked out; but it is Pakistan who has been moving away from the spirit and terms of this Agreement, whether Kashmir or on Khalistani camps. Therefore, it is important for us to understand the total involvement of the United States, its interests and diplomacy in pushing the South Asian States to greater confrontation.

The plain fact is that it is a military industrial complex and oligarchy which influence the decision-makers in Washington. That is the source of inspiration and springboard for initiative in action in the United States—in the global perspectives—their strategy in South-Asian or in Latin America or in the Indian Ocean region.

Sir, we have also to be clear in our minds that the central fact of our existence is that the national interest of India and the United States at this phase of our history are contradictory. That is a long-term conflict within the international system, more fundamental than the rivalry of two major forces disproportionately large percentage of global resources are consumed by developed countries is a euphemism of western countries and Japan. The response to this from the developing countries can only be a continuing struggle against neo-colonialism. If this basic perspective is not woven into our own policy of non-alignment, it would cease to be non-alignment, for non-alignment is not an act of balancing trick of neutrality, but only a non-alignment policy which has anti-imperialism and fight against neo-colonialism in its core or as its central thrust would be relevant and meaningful for our interest. In this context, I want to invite the attention of the House to some thing strange which has

happened a little while ago. Senator Charles Percy of the United States landed here a few months ago. He is reputed to be good friend of India and so also it is said. I also have met him. He is supposed to have told this Government to introduce a new oil seed, for after all don't we need an oil seed programme and is not there a shortage of oilseeds. He promoted an oilseed called 'Hallophyte' or whatever name it is. There is money to be made also Sir. It is said to be billion dollar business. It is a new technology of genetic engineering and some firms are reported to have suggested to the Government of India, to the chagrin of our scientists working in our scientific laboratories the year round. That we can start with imports of this new oil which can also be a new kind of PL-480 programme and later on areas in India can be used for developing this new strain which will produce edible oil to meet our own shortages.

Sir, I want to know what are the facts of this Percy mission or a mercy mission and it is to be clarified by this Government whether in the name of introduction of new technology this is going to be permitted. Sir, this is important for us to remember. It is the neocolonialism which is the driving force. As I said that is what, one of the apologists of this policy in the United States, one of the strategists Prof. Guy Pauker of Rand Corporation said, I quote :

“Struggle for new international economic order is a demand for redistribution of political power that U.S. should raise forces dedicated to non-Soviet threats to U.S. interests from developing nations attempting to withhold resources from industrialised countries.”

That is also the logic of rapid deployment force. Sir, we can not overlook these facts only at our own peril. We can allow anybody to talk to us with disdain. We can not allow anybody to take us for granted. The other day we had the question of two Kuwaiti nationals walking into the Country who are supposed to be, or alleged to be, VIPs., i.e. these Kuwaiti nationals who were refused Visas, I am told, by our

Missions in West Asia. We have to make it clear that this country cannot be turned into a *go-shaala* of some kind where any straying cow can walk in and walk out and find Sanctuary! It is a very serious matter. I would like to know how and why these Visas were refused to these Kuwaitis, because the administration of the Indian Passports Act comes under this Ministry.

I will now conclude by saying that in pursuing a policy of non-alignment and peace, India must re-emphasize and re-activate our own role in disarmament—a pioneering role which was initiated by Jawaharlal Nehru and the late Krishna Menon. The world still yearns for peace. Recently when the much lamented Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme was assassinated tragically—he had himself become a symbol of this yearning. Therefore, we have to vigorously pursue these goals and initiatives, viz. disarmament and de-nuclearization of Oceans, while remaining firmly anti-imperialist and safeguarding our own vital national and security interests.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur) : I rise to support the Demands introduced in this House by the Minister of External Affairs.

During the year under reference, India has continued to play the role of peace-maker and as the Chairman of the non-aligned movement, which has been able to make significant contributions to the cause of peace.

The long-delayed Summit talk between Reagan and Gorbachov came to some sort of conclusions, and these eleven words quoted in our Report, viz.

“A nuclear war cannot be won, and must not be fought.”

are a realization of the fact that the western world Powers' honeymoon with nuclear militarism is going to be over, if not soon then at least at a later stage.

The Prime Minister's address to the U.N. General Assembly on the occasion of the 40th anniversary celebrations of the

U.N. contained a remarkable advice to the world leaders on the need to cure the world of nuclear militarism, and for linking man's creative genius for his enrichment, and not for destruction. These were the wise words, and a word of hope for all mankind. It was remarkable that the Prime Minister was given the honour of addressing the U.S. Congress in Washington, and the Japanese Diet in Tokyo. It was again as a high water mark of recognition for Indian foreign policy that Madam Indira Gandhi was awarded posthumously the highest awards in Cuba as well as in Vietnam for her glorious contribution in the field of world peace & struggle for freedom for not only India during her life time when India was also free, but also for other nations which were clamouring for freedom from the colonial yoke.

Our contribution for improving Indo-French relations by holding the Festival of India in France, i.e. Paris has also been noticed by one and all. I have been told that for hours together i.e. for 6,7 or ten hours, people in the countryside of France have been witnessing the staging of *Mahabharata* and evincing keen interest.

The Festival in USA has also been a success. The plans to hold a Festival in USSR, and later in Japan are also important decisions which will bring us closer to the nations of the world.

The present Foreign Minister, Shri Bali Ram Bhagat took over on 25th September, along with his Minister of State, and they have been taking whatever has been possible, to usher in an era of hope in accordance with the lines laid down by our Prime Minister.

India has to look to the East, as also to the West and I am happy that fresh ground has been broken in bringing about the normalisation of relations with China on the one hand and in having a greater emphasis on our relations with Japan and Korea, on the other.

It is significant that the Prime Ministers of two countries China and India, they met in the month of October in New York, during the U.N. celebrations, and they exchanged various ideas

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]

of mutual interest. Not only this. We are committed to normalisation for the solution of the border problem, but this has also to be a long and negotiated process. So far six rounds of talks have been held and the next round has been planned for 1986. And with the present Secretary, Shri A.P. Venkateswaran, the Secretary who is coming, with his long experience as the Ambassador to China, it should not be difficult for India to come to some sort of a normalisation in this respect. China, when we talk of China, Sir, we think only of that old China of Mao-Tse-tung. But that China has changed, and a lot of change is taking place, delegations of this country are going there, delegations are coming here, but this need not be at the cost of our friendship with the Soviet Russia and who has been our abiding friend, a friend who has stood with us at time our need, and because it is possible and it should be possible, and desirable that we extend a hand of friendship not only do we think of East or West and in that there has been a gesture of sending a delegate, high level delegate of the Communist Party of China to attend the centenary celebrations of the Indian National Congress is a welcome step. The relations, the promotion of trade and commerce between these two countries are also to be welcomed and it is in this context that I would urge the continuation of the dialogue with China for the solution of border problems, as well as for the promotion of other things like the problem of trade and commerce on a speedier note. With Japan we have to be more quick because Japan is now coming up on the international scene and the U.S.A. has got a feeling that though they had defeated Japan in 1949, militarily, they are being defeated by Japan economically in the years to come. Therefore, Japan's advance in science and technology should be of great interest and if some sort of cooperation can be established between the two countries I think that would be a good reason for hope and in this context the Prime Minister's visit to Japan in the month of November and December this year, is of great significance. It was in response to Prime Minister Valasone's

visit to India in the month of November and December 1984. And therefore, the Japanese taking some interest in the area of cultural relations between India and Japan and the Prime Minister's address to the Diet, emphasises this aspect of the cooperation between the countries of Asia as whole, and India and Japan in particular is of great importance to us.

An agreement between India and Japan for cooperation in the field of Science and Technology has already been signed, and this is a step in the right direction, because in the march towards the twentyfirst century India has to learn a lot and absorb the technology and science and especially in the field of telecommunications, where about 100 telephone exchanges have been imported from Japan so that about two lakh connections in districts have to be given to all the State capitals, also an agreement has been signed and we have many other things to learn from them. It would be of mutual interest to each and our trade and commerce will also flourish in these linkages between the two countries, and we should develop our diplomatic links with these countries. Our relations with our neighbours are cordial and the understanding with Bangladesh is clear in that one single visit our Prime Minister to sympathise with the people of Bangladesh in the hour of catastrophe has been welcomed. Our friendship is a source of solace and comfort to those people and they welcome it even today. They cherish the memory. All these gestures, whether in Bhutan where the Prime Minister visited and was given traditional welcome in the Bhutanese Buddhist style or his sympathy with the people of Bangladesh, are signs of positive achievement and they are the milestone in our close relationship with these two countries.

Since India is in the fag end of the leadership of the Non-Aligned Movement, it would be worthwhile to see what has been the positive contribution of the Non-Aligned Movement and Indian's leadership to this Movement during these years.

It was a difficult time when Prime

Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, took over the chairpersonship of the Movement. When the two countries, Iran and Iraq were fighting and the Non-Aligned Conference could not be held there in Iraq on account of that war, India came to the rescue of this Movement and offered to hold the Conference at a very short notice. The world leaders, who had assembled here in the month of March, 1983 for this Conference, paid their rich tributes to the capacity and genius of India for organising this Conference and upholding the ideals and saving the Movement. Therefore, India rose in stature in the eyes of the world. So also breaking the deadlock of confrontation between the East and the West, India has been able to refurbish her image and brighten the hope for the future not only for the West but also for the East and also the developing nations. The visit of our Vice-President, Mr. R. Venkataraman, to East European countries like Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, GDR, had also its fair share of enhancement of Indian image in the East European eyes. Such exchanges of VIPs and delegations from abroad to this country and from this country to abroad, should be encouraged. The visit of delegations sponsored by the Indian Council for Cultural Relations should also be encouraged. They will contribute a lot to the improvement of relations between India and other countries. India will gradually emerge as a savior of world peace, as a voice for sanity and as a nation marching for peace and prosperity for the whole mankind.

[Translation]

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI (Srinagar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, our Government and our Prime Minister have played very constructive role in connection with the Iran-Iraq war. In South Africa, our Government has played an important role for abolishing the policy of social-discrimination. There the downtrodden people are struggling for their honour and independence, our Government's efforts to extend them the support should be continued. Similarly I support the Government's strong policy in favour of P.L.O. in

Palestine.

Our foreign policy should get unanimous support all over the world. There may be some differences but, by and large, it has been unanimously approved. The House fully approves the policies of the Prime Minister and the Government. But our greatest success lies in the fact that the six countries in South-Asia jointly formed an organization and we are continuing our efforts in the matter of trade and sorting out our problems by mutual consultations.

I take it as a great achievement. In this connection, the need of the hour is to strengthen Indo-Pak friendship. I know that the presence of the Seventh Fleet of the United States at Karachi and such things create differences between India and Pakistan. The supply of armaments to them by the big powers is also causing anxiety in this country.

Nevertheless, I subscribe to the views expressed by the Foreign Minister that despite differences with Pakistan, it is in our own interest to extend the hand of friendship to Pakistan because except friendship there is no other way out. In this connection, bilateral talks is the right thing. There were four to five wars between Pakistan and India. One was fought in Kashmir in 1947-48. The second one was in 1965. In 1971 we fought over Bangladesh. We had to open a front in Kutch also. These wars resulted in a great loss to both the countries. We wish to open new vistas of development for the poor and make policies to eradicate poverty from this country. We do not have any other way out except making friendship with Pakistan. We should also try to make Pakistan understand this vital point.

I feel that we cannot develop good relations with the military regime there. But I am of the firm view that we should strengthen the relations which we have developed with people there. It is in our interest and I assure full cooperation to the Government in this regard. We should start communication link with them and the trade should be increased. We have

[Shri Abdul Rashid Kabuli]

sent cultural delegation to Pakistan and we should send more of such delegations there. Our relations with them should be maintained. I feel that a marked change has come about in Pakistan Government. All these things had a very healthy effect on the people there. We have to win their confidence and their hearts. When the people of Pakistan come to know that India, even after being a great power, does not have any malafide intention towards Pakistan, then I feel that Pakistan will become our fast and true friend.

Kashmir problem has become a hurdle in the way of good relations between India and Pakistan. I want to tell that as far as my National Conference Party is concerned, it is very clear to it that the relation of Jammu and Kashmir with India as per Instrument of Accession cannot be changed. But whenever I hear the Hon. Prime Minister or External Affairs Minister saying that the Kashmir problem will be solved in the light of Simla Pact, then it makes me think about it. Pakistan also repeats the same and we also tune our voice with her in this regard. Our Hon. Prime Minister and our Government have said the same thing a number of times and the Pakistan Government also says that the Kashmir problem will be solved in the light of Simla Pact.

I want to make it clear that if you want to sort out this problem with Pakistan, I don't know much about it, you know better, but this much I want to tell you that there should be a solution to this problem. Because the policies keep on changing. Recently a lot of members of Congress-I said and my friend Shri Namgyal also said that the minor adjustments might be made in the ceasefire line either to this side or to that side. Let the area on that side, *i.e.* Occupied Kashmir go to Pakistan and let the area on this side remain with us. I do not know whether or not these kind of speeches are indicative of the Government policy. But at this moment I must say, as a representative of a responsible political party that the Government must come forward in this

matter and inform our Foreign Minister about the kind of solution it wants in regard to the Jammu-Kashmir problem. If the Central Government wants to go in for a final accord with the Government of Pakistan, it should do so only after taking the people and the leaders of Jammu and Kashmir into confidence. Otherwise the accord would not be authentic. And we assert this point.

[English]

SHRI P. NAMGYAL : Just a clarification. Whatever I have expressed is my own personal opinion and is not my party's view. That is what I would like to clarify.

[Interruptions]

[Translation]

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI : I would like to submit that Pakistan has all along been demanding plebiscite and the Muslim League and several other political parties there have been following suit. They have said that a solution to the Jammu and Kashmir problem that has been pending for a long time should be found. Mr. Chairman Sir, I want to tell the House that the House that the solution to the problem of Jammu and Kashmir lies within Jammu and Kashmir itself. I regret to tell the Foreign Minister that the policies followed by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir after 1953, have not been proper. The people of Jammu and Kashmir very earnestly and honestly acceded to the Indian Union, but after 1953, when Sheikh Abdullah, who was the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, was arrested, for the last 22 years, Governments were formed and dismissed there at the behest of the Centre. The people of Jammu and Kashmir were not able to participate in the democratic process and this was the greatest threat to the country and to the State. It is to be understood that the people of Jammu and Kashmir must be taken into confidence and made to realize that they are a part of the Indian Union and that they have an equal share in the democratic institutions of India. Until this is realized and the people given the

power to form and dissolve their Governments, through the exercise of their franchise, I am afraid, you will be creating difficulties and problems in Kashmir and you will provide an opportunity to the external powers to say that Kashmir is a disputed area, a troubled area. I feel, it is not right to create doubt about the future of Kashmir. Through you, Sir, I address the Government that it would be held responsible for all this. The people of Kashmir have sacrificed immensely for the nation, yet in spite of our protests, you installed the Government led by Mr. G.M. Shah there and that was highly unrepresentative. We had been saying for two years that by doing this you were not causing any benefit either to the country or the State. However you dissolved it after two years and this was a welcome move on your part. Better late than never. What I want to point out is that the people demanded the leadership of the National Conference two years back but out no step was taken in that direction.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : This matter falls under the Home Ministry.

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI : Jammu and Kashmir is a typical example for the Foreign Ministry and, therefore, I want to tell the Foreign Minister that it is his problem also inasmuch as he has to face it whenever he goes abroad. This is why I am establishing the connection of this problem with it. The stability of Jammu and Kashmir lies in its democratic functioning, and if the political stability is restored there, the difficulties of both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister may decrease and, therefore, foreign powers may embarrass us much less. Therefore, I want to submit that installing a defector Government by the Centre after dismissing the popular Government tantamounts to breaking the hearts of the people there. By this, the divisive forces are being encouraged there and in this manner, our great country is being weakened. That is why I am cautioning you.

In the end, I would like to request that if you want to create a conducive environment, you should carry the things

that have begun there to their logical conclusion and allow the people to form their own Government. Let the Governors rule be in force for six months under the Jammu and Kashmir Constitutions and after six months let there be general election. This will be in the interest of the Foreign Minister as well as the Government.

16.00 hrs.

Finally, I would like to submit that our efforts to bring about friendly relationships with Pakistan have been successful and this has been published in 'The Times of India' and other newspapers today. General Zia has himself agreed that a political settlement should be reached with Afghanistan and this settlement should be of the type that does not create any difficulty for the Soviet Union. He further says that he is opposed to the view of granting outside aid to the rebels. The Soviet Union sincerely wants to withdraw its forces from Afghanistan. I would like to read you the extract from the newspaper.

[English]

This is from the *The times of India* of today, 24th March 1986 :

"Washington, March 23 (PTI) : The Pakistan President Gen. Zia-Ul-Haq, in an interview to Los Angeles Times Syndicate opposed the U.S. view that aid to Afghan rebels should be increased.

The Soviet Union he said was seriously interested in a political settlement. 'We are in touch with them directly and indirectly and from all accounts, the signals we are perceiving are that the Soviet Union wishes to withdraw, he said.'

[Translation]

I want to stress the point that it was only due to Afghanistan that the military regime of Pakistan benefited and received foreign aid. Professor Ranga has remarked that the Soviet Union wishes to withdraw

[Shri Abdul Rashid Kabuli]

its troops. To create a conducive situation under which political settlement can take place is in our country's interest. We have to see that Pakistan is not hostile towards the Soviets and that the external powers do not create any difficulties for Russia. There are 3 lakhs of refugees in Pakistan. Ways of sending them back to Afghanistan must be found. I would ask the Foreign Ministry to help in achieving this as early as possible.

With these words I conclude and express my thanks to you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

DR. G. S. RAJHANS (Jhanjharpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir. I fully support the demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. I do not want to repeat what has already been said by the earlier speakers. The misfortune of those who speak at the end is that, what they want to speak has already been spoken by others. I was much pained over what Shri Narayanan said about Sri Lanka after intervening in the debate on Friday. Some refugees have come to Delhi. I do not know how many of you have met them. But they come over to my house a couple of days back. Their tales of woes would move even the most hard-hearted men. They cannot help weeping after hearing the tortuous methods in which the innocent Tamils are being killed. Wasn't Jaffna bombed to annihilate the entire Tamil community residing there? To fire at the innocent Tamils after making them stand in queue is nothing but annihilation of the Tamils.

16.02 hrs.

[SHRI SOMNATH RATH *In the Chair*]

Hundreds of women being raped in front of their husbands and children is certainly inhuman. We cannot raise our voice against this, and go on saying that we are waiting patiently and watching the course of events. If we believe that some solution will come out, then I would say that we are in the dark. I shall also say that I was unhappy and disappointed to read the report of the Ministry of

External Affairs. You may agree or disagree but it is true that you are surrounded by hostile neighbours. You do not want to see the reality. Today, you are saying that there is military nexus between Pakistan and Sri Lanka. If this has happened, what were you doing till now? This has not happened overnight. What was the Intelligence Wing of Ministry of External Affairs doing so far? This is not a new thing. This is a very strong nexus and it has got the backing of U.S.A. You should try to understand all these things.

Some of my friends have said here that we are having friendly relations with China and may be China may be our good friend, but I would like to say that you should go through our history of past 22 or 24 years. China had attacked our country, but since then not even 24 inches of land has been regained by us. Secondly, is China not helping Pakistan in its nuclear programmes? I am seeing the writing on the wall that Pakistan is going to explode an atom bomb very shortly and China would be with Pakistan and USA would also side with Pakistan. You have not given me an opportunity to speak earlier, otherwise I would have explained to you as to what is happening in Nepal. Nepal is also raising the same points which are being raised in Sri Lanka today. People of Indian origin are being crushed very badly today in Nepal. They are not being granted the citizenship in Nepal. They are being denied the opportunity to recruit themselves in the Police and army in Nepal. The problem of Sri Lanka is not a very recent phenomenon. The people who have been studying internal affairs might be knowing that this thing has been happening in Sri Lanka for the last 10 years, but we have awoken only three years back. This matter is so serious that sufficient time should be allotted for a discussion on this. We should know it very well that our country has been surrounded by hostile neighbours from all sides.

Recently, I had gone to USSR. I met some people from USA and had a discussion with them. They were staying in the same hotel in which I was staying. USSR

has started inviting US tourists to Tashkent. They were very intelligent people. Some of them were professors. They said that we had not made any attempt even to educate them on various issues. They do not know as to what is happening in Sri Lanka or as to what is happening in Bangladesh, but what is your attitude towards China. They also said that there is a great difference between US Government and US people and that we should try to understand that difference. The people of USA have sympathy with India. I would request our Ministry of External Affairs to educate the people of the world on various issues confronting the country today.

[English]

SHRI G.M. BANTWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Chairman, Sir, our foreign policy is on sound lines and it is indeed in the right direction. Every credit must be given to the Government for having persistently upheld the main features of our foreign policy even in the difficult world situation. Among the main features, one can very well think of the strong sense of identity with the Non Aligned Movement, the opposition to nuclear arms race and the move to militarise the outer space, the treatment of Indian Ocean as a zone of peace; the uncompromising support to the struggle of the Palestinians—persistent demand for the withdrawal of all forces from Lebanon beginning with that of Israel and so on. I must also record my appreciation of the efforts to make specially the Indo-Algerian relations as a model of South-South cooperation. I must also record my appreciation of the visit of our Prime Minister, specially to Oman on the occasion of the accession of the throne by Sultan Qaboos-bin-Syed. One must also appreciate the close contact that we are having with the Gulf countries and also India's active role in the promotion of SAARC.

In the limited time at my disposal, however, it may not be possible for me to take up all these subjects. I will confine myself to just a few areas of our foreign policy which need greater life and vigour, and which have not yet been touched by the other speakers.

The conflict in Chad has serious international dimensions. Of course, the conflict is a purely internal conflict. But Chad being the centre of Africa, is the victim of involvement of imperialist forces. To quote the Libyan Leader Muammar Gadafi USA aims at

“the take over of that country and the installation of an American base that would allow it to control the whole of the African continent.”

The United States is making military preparations in the Mediterranean on the pretext of Libya's involvement in the recent airport attacks. This is despite the Libyan repeated denial of any complicity in the same.

(Interruptions)

I am not here to teach you the foreign policy. You have to understand. I may not be held responsible for this limited time.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Banatwalla, please continue.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Despite this, the economic and political sanctions are imposed against Libya. This 'State Terrorism' needs to be condemned emphatically. I am happy that there was a good Government response in the shape of the meeting that came about of the Non-aligned Bureau. India being the Chairman, took the necessary initiative and the Bureau reaffirmed its support and solidarity with Libya in safeguarding its territorial integrity and independence.

The United States military preparations in the Mediterranean to attack Libya need serious attention. The American News Week revealed that American pilots on the Sixth fleet in the Mediterranean were being secretly trained on precision attacks in Israeli's Negy deserts over three years.

This brings me to the question of Israel and it is a matter of serious concern that despite United Nations condemnation, Israel persists in its policy of terror and open defiance of international legal norms. The policy has

[Shri G.M. Banatwalla]

raised new heights with the most despicable act of air piracy indulged into by Israel. Israeli war planes/intercepted a private Libyan aircraft which was flying over the Mediterranean and forced it to land in the occupied Palestine. This aircraft carried Syrian political delegation. King Husshin of Jordan and King Fahed of Saudi Arabia and others telephoned President Asad of Syria to express their denunciation of this act of air piracy. I do not know what was the reaction of the Government of India and what Government of India did and whether the Government of India conveyed any reaction whatsoever in this matter. But then we must all affirm India's support for Syria in confronting the Israeli aggression.

However, I must appreciate India's denunciation in the United Nations of Israel's repeated violation of the sanctity of sacred places in Jerusalem.

The unnecessary Iran-Iraq war has now lasted longer than even the Second World War and has brought about tremendous death and destruction of both the sides. There are now allegations of even use of chemical weapons. Iran has accused that Iraq has used chemical weapons against its troops. Not only that. There are complaints of even civilian casualties from chemical warfare. There is even a report by the United Nations Commission. One would like to know the reaction of the Government of India. However, this fact further reinforces the need to bring immediate cessation of hostilities on just and fair terms. The Government of India is making every effort in this direction and we wish it success.

It is reported in the press that the Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr Turgut Ozal is coming to India next month for a state visit. We all welcome his visit, especially, since the visit of Jawaharlal Nehru to Turkey in 1960, there has been no exchange of visits at that level. Turkey has lately established close friendly relationship with many developing countries. India and Turkey have also a long history of friendly relations and I am

sure the proposed visit will open a new chapter in the Indo-Turkish relations. I suggest that at the proposed meeting between the Prime Ministers when the Turkish Prime Minister visits us, we should take up with Turkey the question of Cyprus and support be reiterated to the efforts of the UN Secretary General in finding a just and lasting solution to this problem. It is unfortunate that the intransigence of the Greek Cypriots side is a great hindrance. Another problem is related to the Turkish Muslim minority in Bulgaria who are subjected to persecution and repression by the Bulgarian Government.

Before I conclude and as there is not much of time left, I may simply say a word about the India-Pakistan relations. The destiny of this sub-continent lies in close friendly relations between India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. I would suggest that the Government draw up a long term policy so to tide over occasional irritants that come up in our relations... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : He has given an assurance to Gen. Zia last year only.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA : I have not yielded to anybody. Unless you give me time, I cannot go over all this. This hon. Member, Mr Unnikrishnan is very much after spoiling the relations of India with Kuwait and has raised the question of two Kuwait nationals having entered... *(Interruptions)*. In the first place those two Kuwaiti nationals were not invited... *(Interruptions)* I am not yielding to anybody. In the first place, those two Kuwaiti nationals were not invited by the Indian Union Muslim League. They have been invited by some orphanage. In the second place how can one know whether a particular national of a country is in the prior reference list in the secret circular of the Home Ministry. It is for them to take care of. Since motives are being imputed, I reject them with the contempt that they deserve. Let the Government take note of this conspiracy that is going on to spoil the relations of India with the Gulf countries where a large number of our workers also

reside. I hope the Government will clarify all the issues that have come up here so that such frustrated political elements that we have here in the opposition may not think of prospering politically even at the cost of national interest... (Interruptions) I am not yielding to anybody. He had spoken a lot. Everything comes with the political motive over here.

(Interruptions)

It is so easy for those who have guilty conscience, to accuse others of being anti-national. I would conclude by referring to one thing and that is the need to strengthen our foreign Office.

(Interruptions)

Sir, there was the Sen Committee that was appointed to review the working of the Foreign Office. The report was submitted by...

(Interruptions)

I visited Islamabad. I had talk with President Gen. Zia. All the time I had talk with President Gen. Zia, our Ambassador was present there. In his presence, the entire talk had taken place. I told you that there are certain politically frustrated elements who have been wiped out but then one or two have come here... (Interruptions) and are now trying to exploit this...

(Interruptions)

The politically frustrated element cannot succeed with any motive that they have. Sir, I was submitting...

(Interruptions)

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : Sir, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Tewary, what is your point of order?

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar) : The hon. Member was making a very good speech. It is none of our business to question his patriotism...

MR. CHAIRMAN : This is not a point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions)**

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Tewary, Point of Order arises only if any of the Rules of the House is infringed. In the name of Point of Order, no speech can be made.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude. It will not go on record.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA : I have to point out to the Report of the Sen Committee. The Sen Committee was appointed in order to review the working of the Foreign Office. This Committee has submitted its report, I believe, in April 1984. The report, however, has not yet been released nor has it been placed on the Table of the House. At least the nation should be taken into confidence; Parliament should be taken into confidence with respect to the suggestions of the Sen Committee for strengthening and improvement of the working of the Foreign Office. A greater consultation and cooperation is also necessary between the Foreign Office and the Defence Ministry. The Pillai Committee had said that this cooperation is far from satisfactory. I hope that the hon. Minister will pay greater attention to bringing out this necessary coordination between the Foreign Office and the Defence Ministry of our Government.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Bajapur) : Sir, one clarification. May I know whether the whole opposition is frustrated or only Mr. Unnikrishnan?

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have called the hon. Minister. Nothing else will go on record.

(Interruptions)**

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, on Friday last and today the House has debated the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs. I am happy to say and to note, after hearing the 14 Members who spoke today and the eight Members who

**Not recorded.

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

spoke on Friday, that they were following the traditions of this House, showing the customary consensus, on the foreign policy of the Government. This has been the tradition. The roots of the foreign policy of this country back to even pre-Independence days of our national movement. Some of the basic ideas that had emerged then had been formulated by our first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. There is a consensus behind it and I am happy to note that.

Although Mr. Banatwalla was the last speaker, I am again happy to note that he had the last word on foreign policy when he said—and I am quoting him—“The foreign policy of the Government of India is not only sound but is on right lines and directions.” (*Interruptions*) When I say this, I speak of the very high level of participation from all sides and also the great support that we got from senior Members, for example, my very distinguished predecessor, Shri Dinesh Singh, the father of the House and a very senior and leading Member, Prof. N.G. Ranga and our young members and also the leaders of the Opposition.

The only discordant note, if I may say so, was from three very distinguished Members and good friends of mine. The remarks made by Shri Indrajit Gupta surprised me the most because he has always been down to earth, rational and very logical. He has said—and I am quoting him—“There is a misgiving in the House because there are illusions and euphoria; the Government has tried to build illusions and euphoria in good neighbourly relations” which, according to him are lying in a shambles. He is not in a very happy company when I compare him with Mr. Shahabuddin, the hon. Member who spoke on Friday. He also used the word ‘shambles’ but that was about economic policy; he said, “The pursuit of international economic relations by Government of India is in a shambles”; he said, “The foreign policy is a failure.” Mr. Unnikrishnan has said that the policy is ‘melo-dramatic’. My suspicion is this. For the first time I saw him reading his speech. If he had spoken extempore, he

would not have said this. Somebody must have written out for him because he was in a hurry. He is brilliant when he speaks extempore. Today he was not the best self. But the fact is that I consider all this & I still maintain that there is a consensus behind the foreign policy pursued and continued by the Government of India as per the tradition of this House. These criticisms are only some of the nuances in making a speech or style. Wrong direction is a matter of substance. I can join issues with the hon. Member if our foreign policy has gone in the wrong direction in any manner even on a small point. I am prepared to join the issue. But I maintain that whatever the criticisms have been—whether of illusion or of melodramatism or of being in shambles, I consider them all as nuances in making a speech or style.

Having said this, I would like to begin by stating the basic principles of our foreign policy briefly. Then, I can go to the points raised by the Hon. Members.

The House is well aware of our country's commitment to non-alignment as a policy and as a movement—to serve as a level in international relations and to build a safer and more equitable world order. The initiatives that the Government has taken in the field of disarmament, both within and outside the movement, have I am sure the full support of the Members. The renewal of six Nations proposal for a verifiable suspension of nuclear tests received a positive and prompt response from the Soviet leadership. From President Reagan a reply has also been received, which is being examined. As the reply is addressed to the leaders of the six Nations, our reaction would be made known only after consultation with the other participants in the five continents about the Peace Initiatives.

However, the recent detonation of yet another nuclear test by the USA is a matter of profound regret. We urge upon the USA administration to heed the international public opinion and reconsider their policy on this crucial issue.

As India's chairmanship of the Non-aligned Movement is coming to a close, we

are going on to the next summit, the Eighth Summit, in Harare, in September and we have called a Ministerial meeting at the Foreign Ministers' level of the Coordinating Bureau of the non-aligned countries which will be a sort of a preparatory meeting for the Harare Summit. There we are going to discuss and lay down clearly the policies, the economic issues and the political issues before the Bureau.

As the House is aware, in 1983, under the Chairpersonship of Smt. Indira Gandhi, the Delhi declaration, both the political declaration and the economic declaration, highlighted the basic issues that the mankind faces, which my friend Shri Dinesh Singh described as global issues, the rise of globalism after the II World War and the present possible threat to it and even the threat to the United Nations system. The fact is that India is the one and the only country—I think its record is second to none—which has pursued relentlessly without any deviation the basic foreign policy in matters of globalism. The first issue it raised in the 1983 Delhi Summit—was disarmament and nuclear disarmament. The second issue was development, equal development and in between was the nexus between disarmament and development. All these related issues are the issues underlying the framework of the global issues. An hon. member mentioned about our commitment to anti-Imperialism and our opposition to neo colonialism. Our commitment to this comes under this framework. Our record shows that right from the beginning in this very difficult world, when mankind faced very critical choices, India's foreign policy was conducted with not only great clarity but also pursued on basic principles of peace and consistency. We kept the direction. We never deviated from the direction. We never made any compromises. Therefore, the charge that we build up friendship with one country and, as such, we are making compromises does not hold water. I will come to this specific matter a little later.

The point I am making is that we pursued the basic principles of India's foreign policy—non-alignment, peace and disarmament. Non-alignment means independence of action. There cannot be any compro-

mise. The basis of non-alignment is independence of action and not committing oneself to either this or that military bloc so that one's independence is not compromised. Therefore, when a country is wedded to non-alignment it cannot surrender notionally or even in an illusory manner its right to independent action. We judge all issues on the basis of its merits and decide upon it.

Sir, on the economic front also non-aligned countries are faced with a very difficult situation. The selective recovery in some industrialised countries has not led to the much needed re-vitalisation of the global trade and development climate.

Now a word about the debt situation. Shri Dinesh Singh said that debt trap might prove to be death trap. Fortunately here too India followed a basically consistent economic policy of self-reliance with socialist and progressive objectives. India is the only country—of course, outside the Socialist countries—which is no where near the debt trap. That is another basic policy. That is one of the fundamental principle that foreign policy and the domestic economic and social policies are interrelated. If you want to have an independent foreign policy—non-alignment and independence of action—then in your domestic economic policy you must also be self-reliant. India has precisely pursued that policy. Today India is in a position not only to build itself on the basis of total self-reliance but also we have the lowest foreign debt—one of the lowest in the world. Only 6 per cent of our resources in the Seventh Plan come from external resources. Therefore, we are nowhere near the debt trap. That also goes to show the right direction and the sound foreign policy and the domestic economic policy which Mr. Banatwalla referred to.

The long-term developmental imperatives in Africa need to be addressed in an organised way. The on-going South-South cooperation should be further strengthened. This concept again came from Delhi Declaration under the leadership of our late Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. The economic declaration spoke collective self-reliance of the developing countries,

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

The idea was that all the developing countries must build their economy on the basis of self-reliance and together they must provide a system or a framework of collective self-reliance.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Collective self-reliance means including foreign countries...?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Collective self-reliance means the collective self-reliance of the developing countries. Again I am referring to this because it is not an illusion. We know how Imperialism is working. We know in the international arena how the major bigger powers are working. As I said, the entire framework of the international economic situation, economic framework, is tilted in favour of the interests of the major industrialised powers. We know how the international trading system has collapsed, the international monetary and economic system have collapsed. We were warned that we must follow a quicker progress, quicker road that some countries were following. You remember that in this House from the other benches, the Swatantra Members and others were saying that we must follow the quicker road of development which some other countries were doing. I said this was not the road for us. I think in the long run it will be quicker and safer because it was built on our own basis. But this has led to the basic thing, that is, the debt problem and debt trap and the exploitation of the economy. We also know the North-South dialogue for which again initiative was taken by the then Prime Minister, late Shrimati Indira Gandhi. The meetings at the Cancaon and various other forums in other places were held. We know that there would not be any progress in the North-South dialogue because the economies of the industrialised countries were in such a bad shape mainly because of the very heavy load of armaments. When industrialised countries are spending something like 800 million dollars a year, the result is that they are faced with all kinds of economic crisis. In these powerful economies, they have a high rate of inflation and have a low rate of growth. About 40% of the industrialised capacity

in these countries are unutilised and they have a high rate of unemployment mainly because a very large chunk of the resources is diverted to the economies which are totally unproductive-like weapons, nuclear weapons which are of no use, except the use of power because the whole theory is power and it comes from the nuclear weapons. Therefore, they are not in a position to make any concessions to the developing countries despite what has been talked about a new international economic order or meeting the demand of the developing countries. The Delhi Declaration said that there should be an international monetary and financial conference. That demand was rejected. Any dialogue regarding a new international economic order was rejected. There is, therefore, no progress and that is the reason we knew that we have to build the policies on the *terra firma*, on the basic solid foundation and that is why we have said that we must have collective self-reliance based on South-South Cooperation. And during this period we have followed this. The hon. Member has rightly said that Algeria and India provided a framework of good South-South Cooperation. I can add many other examples to—Indonesia and other countries. We are trying to build up this wherever there is a possibility.

Then, there was the SAARC Conference. I am happy to note that most of the Members have welcomed it. Even though some might have said that we must make quicker progress, but when on the international forum, globalism is, as rightly said, weakening, the regional arrangements need to be followed in the pursuit of equality of all the regional members, and mutual interest of members and creation of spirit of cooperation. Our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, gave a call in Dhaka, Bangladesh, for the creation of the spirit of SAARC, the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation. All the seven countries working together can create a climate for peace, stability and cooperation. Although we have kept the political and contentious problems out of the SAARC, the idea is that once this spirit of SAARC and the process of SAARC proceeds further, its roots gets strengthened, we will be able to

deal in a better climate with even the bilateral and other problems. Ultimately, the idea is to find a solution to the global problems, to strengthen globalism and in the process, the charter of United Nations, to create a better world with peace and stability on the basis of cooperation and peaceful co-existence. The idea is to make use of all the avenues. The point that I am making is that India has been pursuing this actively on all fronts, whether it be economic fronts, whether it be bilateral fronts, regional fronts or in the United Nations. The United Nations is facing problems. On whose side are we? In the matter of cut of its funds, the withdrawal from and weakening of the UNESCO and other multilateral agencies, we are always on the side of the United Nations and are working hard.

Hon. Member, Mrs Meira Kumar was right in saying - she had the experience of the foreign office for twelve and half years, although she is new to Parliament - that we do not determine the success of foreign policy in a day or by one incident, but we have to see its direction. Even the mightiest of powers do not achieve what they want with all the strength that they have. India's power is the correctness of its policy, the principles behind its policy and the moral strength with which she pursues those policies and not make compromises. In order to earn quick dividends, India will never make compromises. That is the tradition we have been following.

I will give you one instance. India cut off all its relations with South Africa even in 1946. At that time, twenty per cent of our trade was with South Africa, but we cut that off. Compare it with bigger countries, powerful countries, because they are continuing to do it; it is because they have certain interests; India does not have. That is the tradition of our policy, whether it is our foreign policy or economic policy. Its root lies in the high moral values of our national movement and the quality of our leadership. Our leaders in this country gave a high level of moral values to our foreign policy. I would again repeat that we would never make any compromises.

With these general remarks, I will now come to some of the points made by the hon. Members. I would like to deal with two subjects in detail because they have been raised by almost every Member. I am not able to deal with some of the subjects, but that does not mean that I did not pay any attention to them; that is because of the shortage of time and the length of the speech I may ultimately end up with.

These two subjects are Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Let me first take up Pakistan. Many Members have spoken about our relations with Pakistan; there have been some complimentary as also some critical references. I would like to state our policy with regard to this important neighbour. As Members are aware, our relations with Pakistan have been different in character and content to our relations with any one of the other neighbours. We have had a chequered post. We have fought three wars and an atmosphere of confrontation and distrust and sometimes even hostility had been a constant factor.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: We had been attacked thrice. They attacked us.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Yes, I agree. But we did not run away. We fought and won.

A major development in bilateral relations was the Simla Agreement of 1972. This has been a watershed in our relations with Pakistan. Since then, the two nations have been at peace. In spite of contradictions in Pakistan's policy, as mentioned by some hon. members, we have always reiterated our commitment to this historic agreement and we stood by it in letter and spirit. India desires cooperation, harmony and friendship with all her neighbours. This applies equally to Pakistan. As such, while we know as to what we would like our future to be, we cannot also set aside the experience of the past and we will decide our policy on the realities of today.

On Friday, hon. member Shri Sharad Dighe was mentioning that General Zia was taking us for a ride. I can assure him that we do only what is in our in-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

trest. No one can make us do anything to the country.

Now much has been said about the euphoria or illusion or even melodrama of the visit of President Zia. President Zia's visit on 17th December had resulted in some understanding between the two leaders. This was the culmination of discussions which had taken place till then. In the past 16 months, our Prime Minister and President Zia had had six meetings. There was one meeting also with Prime Minister Junejo in Stockholm. The fact that the leadership at the top level and at the level of Foreign Ministers, Foreign Secretaries and even Finance Ministers have been meeting, talking and discussing is, itself a qualitative change. We agreed on several measures and these were aimed at normalisation of relations and development of greater confidence and trust amongst each other. The Finance Ministers met and they opened discussion about trade. The Defence Secretaries met and discussed about the Siachin Glacier. The Foreign Secretary went to Islamabad and discussed about the No War Pact offered by Pakistan and the Peace and Friendship Treaty offered by us. There has been some progress in the trade talks. For the first time Pakistan agreed in principle that private trade would be opened. So far Pakistan has banned all trade from India. Now they have agreed to remove that ban. Details about the items and all that are to be discussed. It was decided that the Secretaries will meet and decide upon the details on that. The Defence Secretaries did not agree on anything concrete but they agreed about the basic principle. Even regarding this sensitive matter of the border, when the troops are facing each other eyeball to eyeball, it was decided that we will not resort to force in settling the dispute, about the Siachin Glacier. This is the first thing. Secondly, they said that they would meet again in Delhi, discuss these things and then settle the matter. This itself is the change and this change is worthwhile. The fact of the matter is that since then, the Foreign Secretaries also discussed it and they decided to meet again.

We did not expect that the peace and friendship treaty and the integration of the

two things, viz. the non-aggression pact and the peace and friendship treaty will be settled in one round of talks. We need more round of talks. Even the discussion on non—striking of each other's nuclear facilities has been criticised.

Why have all sorts of motives been attributed? We have said it in this House that it does not mean any change in our nuclear policy. It only means that both the countries will not strike each other's nuclear facilities. And so far as India is concerned, we have certainly no intention of striking. So, if there is an agreement, certainly there is no point of striking at nuclear facilities. That does not mean that there is any change in all sorts of things. So things are being said that there is a change, that they have accepted Pakistan's nuclear right to make bombs and all these things. We have not. And we have said this, that it is our belief and we know that Pakistan's nuclear programme is not at all peaceful. We are prepared for it. Once Pakistan acquires a nuclear bomb, it changes the entire security dimension in the country. We are prepared for all that. But this agreement about non-strike of nuclear facilities between the two countries is that the idea is only to create a climate of confidence. I was telling of the past conflicts, confrontation and even wars. To build up on a basis of friendship, you must first create confidence. These are all confidence building measures. What was agreed to between the two leaders on December 17 was a confidence building measure, and ultimately leading to two Foreign Ministers' meeting and deciding/ about the peace and friendship treaty and working out, if there is an agreement on it that basic thing. The Prime Minister on the invitation of President Zia will visit Islamabad. There is neither any melodrama nor any illusion in our policies about good neighbourly relations. These are not all in a shambles. The idea is how differently we proceed on building relations with Pakistan. What is our objective? I would also like to mention to the hon. Members that such developments have not been uncommon in our relations with Pakistan. There has been no change in our policy towards Pakistan of any kind. We have to persevere in

our efforts for a durable peace so that our scarce resources can be utilised for the betterment of the content and quality of life of our people and not diverted to defence. So what we are trying to build up is the durable structure—a framework of peace with Pakistan and we will seek it, but all the time, don't say that we will be failing in our duty, if we lower our guards against our defence or security. I agree with the hon. Member when he made the point that the real difficulty comes from the outside forces operating. We have said it in this House times without numbers that the difficulties in this region, in the Indian Ocean, in South Asia, in the Persian Gulf, all these areas comes because of the involvement of the outside powers—major outside powers. This has affected the Indian Ocean on which we have a unanimous declaration of the United Nations that it should be made as a Zone of Peace. But instead, there is a military presence of all kinds and this has become not a Zone of Peace but a Zone of Conflict. This is one thing.

Then there is outside involvement of major powers in this region—whether it is Pakistan or Sri Lanka or the nexus between them. The hon. Member said about nexus, you wanted an explanation it is there in the book itself. It says :

“the growing military nexus between Pakistan and Sri Lanka following President Jaywardene's visit to Pakistan in April, 85 and the visit of President of Pakistan to Sri Lanka in December, 85 is being viewed with some concern.”

We have said times without number, about involvement of major powers, funds coming, and also supply in some other areas of Pakistan. But, I say, if you view this in totality, you don't expect 100 per cent achievement in a day.

17.00 hrs.

No country, no Power—I said, the very very mighty Powers have not achieved their foreign policy objectives, or security objectives, or others. But the point is about the lines and the directions we pursue. In this region, I can say that

our relations with all the countries. *(Interruptions)* I am coming to Sri Lanka; our relations with Sri Lanka, the bilateral relations are good, our relations with Bhutan, with Bangladesh... *(Interruptions)* How do you say that? What problem? There is no problem.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara) : What do you mean? What is the content that you are putting in this statement? Sir, the Minister is making a very significant statement, that the bilateral relations between India and Sri Lanka are very good. What is the content that he is putting in his statement? It is an extraordinary statement from the Minister of External Affairs.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : It is not an extraordinary statement. It is a statement of fact. We have no bilateral problem with Sri Lanka.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : Because we have diplomatic relations ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : We have no bilateral problem with Sri Lanka.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : What is the Minister saying ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : We have always said, and maintained this position. On bilateral relations it is not a problem. We have said it in this House. *(Interruptions)* Please hear me, and then you come to a conclusion.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : I think the Minister said it sarcastically. *(Interruption)*

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU (Gobichetipalayam) : In Sri Lanka, are we maintaining friendly relations even after the genocide ?

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : Yes; that is what he says. He says there is no problem. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : This is a very emotional issue, I know; but let us build on certain solid basis of facts and foundation. I was saying that our relations... *(Interruptions)* Will you hear me now? *(Interruptions)* On our

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

relations with all our neighbours, about Pakistan I have dealt with about Sri Lanka, I said and I maintain that our bilateral relations with Sri Lanka are not bad. They are good.

AN HON. MEMBER : Are they good ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Yes, they are good. *(Interruptions)* Otherwise, i.e. if the bilateral relations have not been good, on a problem which is, as we have said—and all the sections of the House agree—an ethnic problem, i.e. the Tamil problem in Sri Lanka is an internal problem, how will the Government of Sri Lanka ask for our good offices to be used ? Which country will do it, if it does not trust you...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI K.P. UNIKRISHNAN : On his own, he is not concerned. He is taking a very philosophical attitude. It is not only a diplomatic attitude; it is a philosophical attitude.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar) : Phrase it differently.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I feel the Minister said it sarcastically, when he said that the relations with Sri Lanka are good.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Sarcasm is for some other occasion, not for a serious matter like this. I still maintain it. I said : You take the history of it. This problem is a very emotional problem. I agree. But, you know, *(Interruptions)* they asked for our good offices, to help them in settling this issue. What were we doing ? To which country you will go...

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. P. UNIKRISHNAN : Are we seeking the sequence of events ? Everybody in this House knows the sequence of events.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : If you disturb me like this, you cannot.. *(Interruptions)* I am going to make my own statement. *(Interruptions)* I maintain the position that our bilateral relations with Sri Lanka are

good; and there is trust at the level of the Prime Minister, and the President Jayewardene of Sri Lanka. *(Interruptions)* They have asked us in the last ten months...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Allow the hon. Minister to reply.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : For the last ten months, on their request, we were using our good offices to help them in settling the problem. *(Interruptions)* This can only happen if the relationship is friendly and good-neighbourly.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : Then what happened ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Otherwise, this can never happen. You cannot ask anybody...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : At least accept Prof. Tewary's formulation : Not that it is always good, but this time it is better.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : But all the same, since late 1983 the Government have made their good offices available to Sri Lanka to work out a political solution. We believe that this is a problem that Sri Lanka is facing, it is a very serious problem and it has aroused the concern not only in one section, but in all sections of the House; it is in the entire country. All the Members have spoken. This matter has to be settled, but on what basis ?

(Interruption)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : Members are concerned, but the Minister does not seem to be concerned.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : No, no. I am more than concerned;

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : The Minister does not seem to be concerned.

(Interruption)

AN HON. MEMBER : It is your philosophy.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let the Minister reply, no interruptions please.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : The Minister is more than concerned, but he should not lose perspective and the direction. In fact, firstly, what has been our direction and perspective? Now the position is, the first thing we have been saying right from the beginning is that all killings of innocent civilians must stop. We have been saying that. First we tried, after the Thimpu talks to work out a framework of cease-fire, and the cease-fire was there, but when there was any violation, we said that the violation must stop. I said it in the House that the responsibility of the Sri Lankan Government to stop the violence is there, that they must restrain their security forces. I said it.

That is our position, that if you want any solution.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISRA (Salem-pur) : What is Government of India doing? Murders are taking place there daily. I would like to know as to what steps are being taken to check killings there?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : What is your suggestion?

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISHRA : What efforts would be made to check the killings?

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : This, if I may say so, is immaturish or melodramatic, if we do something, anything like that.

AN HON. MEMBER : Like what?

(Interruption)

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : You do not want to.

(Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN : There should not be a running commentary. Let the Minister reply.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : It is a sovereign government, it is our neighbour, they

have a problem, and it is recognised by every body that it is an internal problem of Sri Lanka, it has been recognised by everybody that this problem has to be solved, and it is a problem of unity and integrity of Sri Lanka, then what do the hon. Members want? Even if he is from my side, what does he mean when he says that, "You are not doing anything"? We are doing everything possible.

So, let us know what can be done and this is what I am saying. I say that the first thing that has to be done is the killings should stop, as we have been saying. There is collapse of cease-fire. But now the killings are going on, and the killings are going on because of the reported pursuit of a policy by the Sri Lankan Government that they want to go in for a military option before they go in for a political solution.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : That is the whole point.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : We are totally opposed to this. If that is the situation, if the Sri Lankan Government thinks that there can only be a military solution to this problem, well, we have no role to play. Then we have no rule to play.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU : Why do you not bring an ultimatum then?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : This is a very complex problem.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : Now, you say you have no role to play.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I think the hon. Members get jittery when they get the facts. Otherwise, they should not disturb me. You hear me. Hear me and tell me that you do not agree with this. I openly say. Our policy is very straight-forward, very clear and very categorical.

17. 09 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the chair]

I said immediately, in the present day situation.

(Interruption)

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

I am the one who had got the worst from the Sri Lankan Parliament, and every body there for making a correct—absolutely correct—statement, when I was calling a spade a spade. I should not lose sight of it. We are trying to solve a great human problem. Some hon. Members said “Do not get impatient”. I agree that in this matter we have to exercise great patience and we should exercise great restraint. But all the same, you must drive on the correct path. The correct path is that the killings must stop immediately. As long as the killings of the civilians do not stop, there cannot be any political talk or anything. This is here the Sri Lankan Government has to change because first they said political option and then they said military option first and political option afterwards, meaning thereby what is happening there as a result of this accelerated killing and violence. There is, and this is the only impression we get a feeling that the Sri Lankan Government are talking of political solution to us and using our good offices, our Foreign Secretary goes there, repeatedly runs around, but they do not want to pursue that. He brings together various elements of a political solution—land settlement, devolution of powers of the zonal councils, district councils. All these are discussed and then we go back to square number one. This will not do. Therefore, I made a strong statement that now they should tell us if they are serious about finding a solution to it. We cannot keep on dragging it ad nauseum. The Sri Lankan Government in their last communication have told us that they want our good offices and they want a political solution. But still, as you must have seen the Prime Ministers statements—he made two statements from Baroda—he said that the killings must stop and that they should talk directly to all shades of Tamils. They have to create a confidence. At this moment, they should start the negotiations directly with the Tamils. If, at that moment, there is any difference which requires narrowing down or there is anything to help them, we will do that. The first condition is that the killings must stop as they still believe in the political solution. You asked as to what we had done in the international forums and said that all are in their

favour. All are not in their favour. They are losing ground internationally. Some hon. Members said that we could not get anything in the Human Rights Commission. My colleague, Dr. Dhillon, is here. He knows that we got what we wanted. Many Members who spoke, condemned the Sri Lankan Government, the killings there and their policy of following a military solution. They opposed it. They said that they must settle this problem because it is the question of their own citizens. They must restore to them the dignity and honour. In their speeches, they said all this. This is what we wanted. The Sri Lankan Government in the Human Rights Commission stands condemned for the killings and for their behaviour there. I think, Dr. Dhillon, as our representative, has done a good job there. But here out of ignorance, we say that we have not achieved anything. Because of their wrong policies, pursuing military options and talking about political options, the Sri Lankan Government are isolated more and more. At the same time, they got involved in another wrong policy in calling Mossad the most hated organisation of Israel—I should not borrow words from Prof. K.K. Tewary—and SAS mercenaries as well as those of South Africa reportedly, in order to build up the military muscles and to deal with their own people. The wisdom requires that it is far better to talk to their own people and settle it. It is always easier, more cheaper to strike a bargain; otherwise, you cannot suppress three million Tamils, you cannot annihilate them. This will ruin Sri Lanka. My colleague said, the other day, that if they follow the military option—he is a very experienced diplomat, I am a politician, so I speak very straight forwardly—they will tie themselves in knots which they will find difficult to unravel. I think, he is right in that. Therefore we say that we will help them if they want to pursue this policy. The objective is that the aspirations of the ethnic Tamils in Sri Lanka must be met. Their legitimate demands for devolution and for the autonomy and for various other things should be met within the overall framework of this policy. It should be the duty of any wise government to accommodate their own people. You see

our own example how we have tried to accommodate the various sections. We cannot apply different rules to Sri Lanka.

(Interruptions).

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU : By the time you reach an accord, all the Tamils will be dead.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Right now...
(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Minister, I think it seems the Sri Lankan Government, in spite of the good offices of Indian Government, is not sincere and I think, they want to prolong the issue and they want to strengthen their hands for some military solution. That is what everybody feels I think.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Sir, I have taken long time on this but because this is a very emotional issue...

(Interruptions).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Now we are convinced that our relations with that country are.

(Interruptions).

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : After all that he has said, we are convinced that there are very good, excellent relations with Sri Lanka.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : With other neighbours also. I think you won't challenge our relations with Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh. The on-going relations with these countries are good. The framework of cooperation is building.

About Burma my hon. friend said that we are neglecting Burma. You cannot lay the charge that we are neglecting Burma, when we sent Prof. G.G. Swell, our Ambassador there...

(Interruptions).

SHRI G.G. SWELL : The biggest joke of the century.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : If the relations are not active and not grown, Prof. Swell knows that we are not responsible for it. On our part we want to

build up friendly relations with Burma...
(Interruptions).

SHRI G.G. SWELL : We have no cognitive thinking.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Shall I say something about USA if the House permit me? A number of things have been said. Some of the Members have referred to our relations with USA. Our relations are good and improved, particularly with the visit of the Prime Minister in last June and his talks with President Reagan and other leaders and his subsequent talks with President Reagan in United Nations when he went there in October in connection with the 40th anniversary of the United Nations. It has given a positive momentum to our relationship. Some Members have said does it mean a shift in our policy, It does not mean a shift in our policy because our basic principle has been that we want to build friendly relations with all countries. Of course, our emphasis is with the neighbours. With Soviet Union we have a special relationship the time-tested relationship of 30-35 years. So, that is a special relationship which we have—a treaty of peace and friendship. The Soviet Union is one country which has always stood by us in our times of crisis, in difficult times and you know a friend in need is a friend indeed and that applies to Soviet Union. If anybody thinks that our building a close relationship or better relations with United States will in any way dilute our relations with the Soviet Union, he is illusion. If the word 'illusion' applies anywhere, that applies there if anybody thinks like that. But let me put in perspective our relationship with USA. Since Independence, our relations with USA have followed an uneven course. We have had differences in perception. There have been occasions when U.S. foreign policy and strategic objectives have militated against India's security and development interests in South Asia and the Indian Ocean. We want to improve relations with all countries, whether big or small and are prepared to meet them half way. It is with this basic approach that we are trying to strengthen our relations with the United States. This is not being done either at the cost of our relations with other countries or by changing our

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

consistent stand on various international issues,

Then, hon. Members asked me some questions. Shri Indrajit Gupta put some questions. They are with regard to my visit to Washington in connection with the Joint Commission meeting.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Your reported speech.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Let me say this. This was a Joint Commission meeting. The relations discussed were purely bilateral.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Bilateral relations are always good.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I met the President, and Vice President; Of course, also the Secretary of State and Defence Secretary. He asked me two specific questions. He said : Senator Moynihan asked you about the voting record and you said I will look into it. I did not say I will look into it. This was in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee meeting. He suddenly came out. He was not a member. *(Interruptions)* Later on I was told, he was not a member. He just came in *(Interruptions)*. He came in as in a Parliamentary Committee where even a non-member can attend; he just came in.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: No, no. How can he attend ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I was told this.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : You please explain it a little more.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I am giving all the background. I will come to that. I was told that he was not a member of the Committee.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : This thing can happen in the United States; they do happen.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : He came to attend. I think all the Senators can attend the Committee as here any member can

attend the committee.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Only those who are called as witnesses can come before the Parliamentary Committee.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : We walked into Senate Chamber when it was sitting.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : ...informally.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : ...and we were congratulated inside here.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Anyway, I don't vouchsafe, but I was told. I am only giving you the background. I was told.

SHRI G.G. SWELL ; It is quite possible. It is normal practice there.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : We want to know what he said.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : He came out with a study done by his committee, or some Committee in the Senate, of the voting records of all countries, India, China and others. It was 16 per cent for and the rest against China was 22 per cent for and rest against. All these figures he was giving. To that I said, we have not made any studies of our voting and I have no facts and when I go back I will have a look. I did not say I will look into it.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : You are Foreign Minister of a great country. You are an explanation to him. Why ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order please.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You could have told him—mind your own business.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : What more said also. I have not said as yet...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please sit down. Order, order.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I think you should have...

(Interruptions)

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : It is much worse.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : It is not much worse. I said, I don't have any statistics.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : Why should you have ? Who is he to ask ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : You have a very poor opinion of your Foreign Minister,—that anybody will ask questions and he will give an explanation. No, I did not give an explanation. I said, I don't have the figure. (Interruptions) Please hear me.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Let him finish.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : This is unfair. I am angry at him that he has such a poor opinion. I don't have a poor opinion of him if he says something. He should know me.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : It is not a question of my opinion about you or your opinion about me. It is a matter of fact.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I have spent my time for the freedom of the country. I would have given my life. Now he says I can barter away that.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : This is not the time to get agitated. It is not a question of...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Unnikrishnan, let the Minister finish it, I don't want (Interruptions). You can ask later when he finishes. Let him finish. Please sit down.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Firstly I have a right to admonish Mr. Unnikrishnan because I am senior to him, as a friend. I

would never attribute motive and mud-slinging as 'you are giving explanation'. I know how to behave. You look at what I said next. I said, 'Mr. Senator Moynihan, it is the United States which has been voting against India and the Soviet Union which has been voting with India. It is not India which has been voting against the United States.' You forget about this and don't hear all this. I said, the issues before the U.N. are all global issues. I said on South Africa, on Namibia, on the global issues, on Palestine and all these other things. I said, 'It is you who have taken a stand against the people. The Soviet Union has been with us.' This is the reply I gave. You forget about it. It is said that I have bartered away the country's honour. (Interruptions). I will die/** if anybody says, I have bartered away the country's honour.

(interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Please don't ** I request you not to**

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Don't **, otherwise Mr. Unnikrishnan will be in trouble !

(Interruptions)

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : About the other point, Finlandisation or Austriaisation—I did not use this expression. It was the expression used by the press, I never used it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : But you mentioned those two countries.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : No, no. I did not mention them. They used this expression 'Finlandisation'. I never used it, I am not that much good in English. Finlandisation and Austriaisation—I never used those words.

The third thing you asked is in a different context.

(Interruptions)

PROF. G.G. SWELL : In what context ?

** Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : It will take more time, he knows it.

Then he asked me another question : **Why are you sending, Arya Samaj delegation ? Don't have any relations with South Africa. You are sending Arya Samaj delegation...**

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What I asked you was, the papers said that you had given some assurances to them which satisfied them so much that they agreed to give you some high technology which they have never given before to a developing country. I asked, what were those assurances.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I did not discuss the high technology thing. That I never discussed with them and the question of any conditions—it was mentioned to be about the super computer they were willing to give to us, which we wanted for monsoon studies and meteorological studies. This is done by the science and technology people. I never discussed it and the question of what conditions are there, what guarantees are there is a matter bilaterally to be settled between the two Departments. I did not give any assurance, nor was I asked because the question does not arise. The Arya Samaj Delegation to South Africa—well, this was raised last time. Out of respect for Madhuji I did not say anything. *(Interruption)*. You did not remember, but you know.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am far from Arya Samaj.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : No, no. You hear me, I did not say.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You can abuse me in any way, but don't call me as Arya Samaji.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : When you hear me, you will see—you know, last time I did not utter a word although all sorts of things were said. Even you came up and said, 'Why did you give it ? I looked into the facts. For the first time it was decided because there are nearly 700

to 800 thousand Indians living there. For religious purposes, for discourse or something because many of them are Arya Samajis, it was decided that they should go, and for the first time it was decided—five or six, the number was decided—to send them. That was in the year 1978, when the Janata Government was there, and Madhuji was there. *(Interruptions)* I did not say this because, I did not want to. Then, in 1980, this matter came up. I went into the matter. I also saw the anomaly and I was surprised as to how it happened. It happened in 1978. They were sending the delegation from 1978. In 1980, Indiraji came back to power; Congress-I came back to power. It was decided at the high level, "We should send it, since a decision has already been taken. But we should restrict the number". They wanted a large number. We restricted it to 3 to 5 and not more than that. This is continuing since then.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You want to allow it to continue.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Well, we will examine it. If it is the desire of the House that from next year we should not send it, we will examine it. I have no strong views on this.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Now, your permission is required to re-examine it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What about the visit of diamond merchants from Bombay whom I have named and shown you that photograph ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Have they gone to South Africa ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : My goodness ! All that I had spoken, You were not listening ! I gave some names of the diamond merchants who went to South Africa from Bombay, with all the photographs with their reception there and everything. How were they allowed to go ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I am sorry, I had not looked into it. I will look into

it now. Normally, we do not have any commercial relations with them.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : But people are going. All sorts of clandestine things are going on.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I will have a look into it. My Department has not briefed me on this. They have not briefed me.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : They have gone to South Africa. That would create a bad image. What would the Africans feel about it—India's hypocrisy? Please do something.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Now about the two Kuwaitis who had come here, this is a matter on which I have been informed that the Ministry of Home Affairs feel that this is a case of official lapse and they are taking action against erring officers.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : You should see it. That comes under you, not under them. I did not ask it. They were refused visas.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Should I offer explanation for refusing visas?

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : This House can ask the reasons for refusing visas.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : They came under "Visa Applied For". Their passport was imprinted, "Visa Applied For". That stamp was there on their passport. That was the status—visa applied for.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : They were allowed to come; they were received and treated as State guests.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : A point was made about the difficulty of Indian workers abroad. You have made a point about visa. You have said about the double citizenship, is it not?

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA : I said, Indians who want to

come back to meet their family here are required to get visa from Indian Embassy from that country.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : It is only for those who want to go to Punjab. Otherwise there is no problem.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA : That is the problem.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : That is the temporary phase for security reason. As soon as the situation is normal...

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA : That is for more than three years now.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Now, about the Indian workers abroad, the point is, they are looked after by the Ministry of Labour and on the respective Gulf country or North African country where they are working. By law, our Missions are not allowed to intercede on their behalf. They have courts. If there is any legal matter, they have court facilities. They have to go there. We cannot interfere.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN : But our Mission can use their good offices.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Yes, good offices can only be used, if they accept them. So, to that extent, we can do. But as a matter of fact, as a missionary function, we cannot do it.

There are a number of other areas but I think the House may be tired by now.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : The training and shelter of terrorists by U.K., America and Canada, you have not touched. That is important.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Yes, That I can find there. So far, you know the House has expressed great concern about the anti-Indian activity of the extremists and the lack of action on behalf of the Governments there. So far as United Kingdom is concerned, insensitivity to India's concern has taken the form of the U.K. granting privileged entry into the United Kingdom and resident facilities to

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

Khalistanis. There has been violence and even murder of the moderate Sikhs there some of whom are Indian nationals, by these extremists, as well as forcible seizure of Gurdwaras around 20 out of 140 seized, thus far. Inflammatory, and communally tinged writings in the U.K. based ethnic media have become a standard feature. Government have always drawn attention to this repeatedly.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Have you lodged protest you have been drawing attention for several years? You should have lodged a protest by now.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Government of India is disappointed with the U.K. Government's attitude and policies.

We have taken it up and expressed our concern repeatedly and I want to take up again this matter when the British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe visits India. He is paying an official visit from 31st March to 2nd April. We will take it up as a final effort. We have expressed to them our concern.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : What about China?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Our relations with China....

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Don't you say something about China?

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISHRA (Salempur) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like that the hon. Minister should give some information about China also. What has been the progress about the land which is under illegal occupation of China. He should kindly briefly tell what is the approach of our Government in this regard.

[English]

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : With China following as I said, the good neighbourly relations with all our neighbours, we have been trying to normalise relations with China also and there have been exchanges

in other fields cultural, commercial and others. But with China, the Central issue in our relationship with China, is the border and the vacating of the territories which they have occupied. We have told them this and we are discussing. Unless this question is settled, our relations with China cannot be normal and, therefore, we had six rounds of boundary talks with them. The last one was in Delhi and we are going to have seventh round this year, at a mutually convenient time. The substantive issues regarding the border will be discussed. In the first five rounds, we discussed principles. In the Sixth, we discussed substantive issues and the relations stand at this point.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : The hon. Minister's offer to** should be expunged from the records.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will check up. We will see.

I shall now put all the cut motions moved to the Demand for Grant relating to the Ministry of External Affairs to vote together, unless Shri K. Ramachandra Reddy desires that any of his cut motions may be put separately.

All the cut motions were put and negatived

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I shall now put the Demand for Grant relating to the Ministry of External Affairs to vote.

The question is :

"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."

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

The motion was adopted

**Demand for Grants (General). 1986-87 in respect of Ministry of External
Affairs Voted By 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 Voted by the House		
1	2	3	4		
	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs. Capital Rs.		
29.	Ministry of External Affairs	39,45,84,000	23,41,67,000	1,97,29,17,000	42,13,33,000

17.41 hrs.

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE :
DISAPPROVAL OF THE RAVI AND
BEAS WATERS TRIBUNAL ORDI-
NANCE, 1986**

AND

**INTER-STATE WATER DISPUTES
(AMENDMENT) BILL**

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now we take up items 19 and 20 together.

I have to inform the House that the President has recommended under article 117 (3) of the Constitution the consideration of the Inter-State Water Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 1986 by Lok Sabha.

Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : Sir, I beg to move : "That this House disapproves of the Ravi and Beas Waters Tribunal Ordinance, 1986 (Ordinance No. 2 of 1986) promulgated by the President on the 24th January 1986,"

The reasons for moving this statutory resolution is to register our protest as far as the ordinance is concerned which has nothing to do with the substance of the Bill as it is being presented here. But we

are extremely concerned about the situation that has arisen in Punjab. Situation in Batala, some other districts and in Golden Temple are some of the examples. Even in the worst days earlier there was no rioting between Hindus and the Sikhs and that has also started and the situation has led to a serious concern inside the country that if immediately it is not put an end to, we shall be in further danger.

The first concern is that the Punjab accord must be implemented without any dragging of feet anywhere. From that point of view, I consider this Bill being brought in the form of ordinance is itself evident of dragging of feet or immature handling on the part of the Government in the matter of handling implementing the Punjab accord. It should have been brought much earlier. It could have been brought in any of the sessions earlier, but it was not brought. This is a fact.

Our first concern in the Punjab is the activities of the terrorists who want khali-istan and who are being supported in every way by the Zia's military dictatorship which is hand in glove with the American imperialism. They are out to destabilise the country and, therefore, for the sake of the whole of the country, the Punjab problem must be solved.

I also want to mention that the soft attitude taken by the Akali government