

[Sh. Jagdish Awasthi]
disappointment is removed.

[*English*]

(viii) **Need to Extend the Scheme for
Providing Subsidised
Foodgrains in Sikkim to All In-
cluding Non Tribals**

SHRIMATI D.K.BHANDARI (Sikkim):
Sir, Sikkim is a small backward State. Under
the Centrally sponsored scheme, sub-
sidised foodgrains are being distributed to
tribal population in the State, the objective
being alleviation of poverty. In Sikkim, pov-
erty pervades the rural mass. The State
Government has, therefore, proposed to the
Union Government that the Centrally spon-
sored scheme of providing subsidised
foodgrains be extended to the entire popula-
tion of about three and a half lakhs. The
present arrangement of covering only tribals
in such a backward State would only lead to
heartburning and a feeling of neglect among
the non-tribal who in Sikkim are as poor and
backward as their tribal brethren. One can
hardly draw a line between these two seg-
ments of the population in the State. Also in
Sikkim, the tribals having been scattered all
over the State, the present scheme of pick-
ing one and living another just on the basis of
tribal and non-tribal would hardly meet the
ends of justice, fairplay and equality, leave
aside human consideration. I would, there-
fore, earnestly request the Union Govern-
ment to view this aspect sympathetically and
extend this scheme of providing subsidised
foodgrains to all the poor people of Sikkim.

12.45 hrs.

[*English*]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1988-89 —
CONTD.

Ministry of External Affairs—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House
will now take up further discussion and vot-
ing on the Demands for Grants under the
control of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Shri Saifuddin Ahmed.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN AHMED (Mangal-
dai): Sir, for a long time, we are pursuing a
wrong foreign policy specially with USA and
Pakistan. In the Annual Report External
Affairs Ministry reported about the increased
confidence in bilateral ties with USA to avoid
popular....(*Interruptions*)

America is also trying to be fool us by
declaring that both India and Pakistan are
friendly countries. In order to divert our mind
from the act of arming Pakistan with most
sophisticated weapons like AWACS, India is
offered licence for super-computers. But
these super powers know fully well and also
from the Pakistan Scientists own declaration
and from other sources that Pakistan is
proceeding with great speed the nuclear
weapon oriented programme aiming only
against India. And yet USA is arming Paki-
stan with sophisticated and huge weaponry.
America knows fully well that supply of so-
phisticated weapons to Afghan Mujahideen
are coming through Pakistan to arm extrem-
ists. But yet USA is determined to continue
supply of sophisticated arms to the
Mujahideens even after the withdrawal of
Russian Army from Afghanistan.

Huge arms supply to Pakistan by the
USA is defended in different times at differ-
ent places. Sometimes, they say that it is

supplied as a reward for helping Mujahideens in Afghanistan. Again they say that they are helping Pakistan only to give defence against Russia. These are lame excuses. All these weapons are supplied only against India because they want that there should be destabilisation in India.

For all these grave things, our Government is not paying great care to solve it. Now also, our Government is contending by making some statement before the reporters. But no effective and diplomatic action is taken up. Nothing is done to create worldwide action against it. Thus, at the time of the signing of the Geneva Accord, our Government tried to talk to Pakistan President. The aim and object of that move is not yet revealed. But that was a cut-throat move which was known to all.

The causes of this failure of our Government are manifold. The first is that our Government does not like to discuss important and serious matters with the opposition leaders because Government thinks that opposition always misleads the country and the Government.

Regarding the propaganda machinery, our Government is very strong inside the country but diplomatic activities outside the country is very very poor and, therefore, Government totally failed to create world opinion against the evil designs of Pakistan with the help of USA.

Therefore, I would like to suggest that our relationship with these two countries demand reconsideration. And our diplomatic ties with them should be re-considered again. At the present stage, we should cut off our diplomatic relationship with Pakistan.

With this, I oppose the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry and support the Cut Motions.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri): At the outset I support the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs.

I want to place on record the basic policy that was enunciated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. During that period in the debate Acharia Kripalani said India will have a common foreign policy and will have united front in the area of foreign policy. That policy remains valid and everyday it is being established that that policy is going from success to success. The recent INF treaty is a story of success of our foreign policy. I congratulate the Prime Minister for his initiative to help the process of signing the INF treaty.

I would only like to bring to the notice of the Foreign Minister the new changes that have taken place. The changes are that after the Iranian revolution, the wave of fundamentalism has almost shaken all the countries of south east and south west Asia. The forces, those who stand for secularism, are under strain. The Government of India must take note of it.

Pakistan is now implementing the Shariat Law. It was never before; Jinnah never conceived that Pakistan will be a theocrat and that the medieval culture will be brought in. However, that is a sad fact. It has its own impact on us also.

Bangladesh is going Islam. Everybody knows that Bangladesh is now closer to China, Pakistan and USA. China has built up one Chinese Division inside Bangladesh. China is supervising one ordnance factory in Bangladesh. So, they are coming closer although they have forgotten the story that Bangladesh's entry was resisted by China in the UN. This is one part of the story that must be taken note of.

So far as China is concerned, our problems are well known. For years a series of

[Sh. Brajamohanmohanty]
 negotiations have taken place. It is neither here nor there. I don't want to disclose the deliberations of the Consultative Committee; but the fact remains that absolutely no light has come out of these negotiations. On the contrary again they have intruded into a particular part of Arunachal Pradesh. It is definitely a distressing situation for us. In spite of our diplomatic operations they have not responded to our request and they have continued to occupy it.

China is selling missiles not only to Iran: but also to Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan and China are in certain matters together. So far as Pakistan and China is concerned, one analysis is that China is not setting the border dispute simply to create an atmosphere of strength for Pakistan. That is why this combination is a dangerous signal for Indian security and for India's integrity. We must note this.

Another thing we must remember is that China has built up military bases in some African countries. In Tanzania they have missile facility base. In another country they have built up a military base. Now what does it indicate? Does it not indicate that China is expanding militarily and this is against our security considerations.

So far as Gulf Cooperation Council in which six countries are associated individually they have links with each other but collectively they have the closest link with Pakistan and Pakistan is helping them build up air defence system. What is our reaction? You will find in this region we are losing our friends and we are leading to a position of isolation. Let us take Indonesia. What has been the change in Indonesia? Once upon a time they allowed Pakistan to use their bases at the time of Bangladesh war. Now, of course, they have changed that stand. They are no longer pro-Chinese or Pro-Pakistan but all the same one thing we

should not forget. They have changed their basic stand so far as Indian Ocean is concerned. Their stand was the super-powers and those who are not connected with Indian Ocean should vacate. Now they say all powers should have presence there and proportionately. It is a great change. All the same we have now made up our relationship with Indonesia. So far as India-China is concerned what is the problem there. I do not want to repeat. This is the position around. Now I shall come to Pakistan. I would quote Zia's statement in Dubai. He said in an interview:

"Pakistan had no quarrel with India and had been attempting to improve the relationship."

Further he says:

"Prime Minister Junejo had met Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi number of times, I had met him number of times and everytime we meet we find that he is outcoming and we come back very happy and after wards nothing happens."

This is a pretentious statement. It was made for wooing the foreign countries where we have goodwill. This has been done to mislead. Let the Foreign Minister clarify it in his reply.

So far as Siachin glacier is concerned the position we have adopted is that it is watershed. What is the stand of Pakistan. Once upon a time President of Pakistan had said that Siachin is no-mans land. Now they say it is part of Pakistan territory. My submission would be that we have to stick to our water-shed argument. That is a very crucial point for defence of Ladakh. It was reported in the Press that there was a proposal for discussing that dispute at Defence Secretaries level. Unfortunately when initiative was taken from India there was no response from

Pakistan. The Foreign Minister may kindly enlighten about this.

Similarly those hijackers who have been convicted in Pakistan courts since last one year their conviction sentences have not been implemented. Here I would like to draw the attention of the House of the fact that in the Presidential Address it was mentioned that Pakistan is openly helping the smuggling of weaponry to India. My submission would be that now they are giving the fire-cover.

13. 00 hrs

I had raised it once. The leftover weaponry may be sent to the terrorists of Punjab. This is a dangerous situation. They say that they are not involved. Who will believe it?

Now, Pakistan's complaint is why India remained silent for years. Why India intervenes at the phase of settlement? Actually, the problem is that Pakistan wanted to introduce the Durrand Line as one of the issues in the Geneva Conference. If the existing Durrand Line would have been accepted, that would have given a valid right so far as Pakistan-occupied territory in Kashmir is concerned. They have several kilometres of common boundary with Afghanistan. Fortunately, that was not allowed to be introduced for Pakistan to succeed in its mischievous game.

Sir, the Panthic Committee of the terrorists is meeting in Lahore. Who does not know it? Recently, there was a news that Sikh terrorists have entered into a treaty with Pakistan and they have agreed that the territory of Khalistan will not form any part of Pakistan. Originally, the capital of Maharaja Ranjit Singh was Lahore. Now, they have entered into an agreement with Pakistan. Pakistan is wholeheartedly supporting them, supplying them weaponry and giving them training, etc.

Now the time has come when we must negotiate with Pakistan from a point of strength. Once upon a time, we were thinking in India - even Shri Jayaprakash Narayan about confederation between Pakistan and India. Today, one cannot think of that. We had a common culture. We had a common way of life. Today, we have been so much alienated that there cannot be a talk of any common establishment either of confederation or some sort of common understanding. That is a very very remote possibility. I am quoting the observations of a reputed writer Dr. Afzal Iqbal, former Pakistan Ambassador. His book *Islamisation of Pakistan* is very eloquent about it. He says:

" They (Pakistanis) do not think of the five thousand years of their history which they shared with their Indian cousins and contributed to a culture which created Gandhara and bequeathed gracious monuments of Harappa and Mohenjo Daro to posterity. Nor is their pride directed to the Mughal legacy for most of the visible symbols of the glory of this period now belong to India that is Bharat. The Muslims of Pakistan, in their anxiety to carve for themselves an image of their own, tend indeed to repudiate their pre-Islamic past. Their history seems to start with the landing in Sind of Mohammad Bin Quasim, the teenage general of Hajjaj bin Yusuf. They tend to identify themselves more with Arabia, the original home of Islam, then with the land of their own birth..."

This is a crisis of culture. I would urge upon the hon. External Affairs Minister that we should always stand for friendship with Pakistan but absolutely without compromising our basic ideals.

So far as our relations with super powers are concerned, we must take note of the changes. So far as USA and the USSR are

[Sh. Brajamohanmohanty]

concerned, their relationship is not that strained as it used to be one or two years earlier. USA is not that strong. USA is not enjoying the predominant position in the international economy. The rate of US Dollar is declining. The stock market is collapsing every day. USA is not in a position to compete with Japan or West Germany.

They want more investment in India. So, naturally they cannot neglect India. It is not that it is at their mercy they are going to transfer high technology. It is not that they are generous with India that they are having some interest to have some collaborations here. We should tell them frankly that their relationship with Pakistan should not be at the cost of their relationship with India and they indulge in any type of agreement with Pakistan or any type of accommodation with Pakistan which will affect our interests. You know that USA Navy and Pakistan Navy have their joint naval exercises and you know that the Indian Ocean is full of hostile ships which number around 100. So, these are the factors.

My last submission would be that the Foreign Minister must take note of the security interest of the country and have the foreign policy within the basic norms to our policy. He must take note of the security orientation of our foreign policy.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat):
Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, as far as the foreign policy of the Government of India is concerned, the Minister of state reminded us yesterday that this is a policy which has been founded on principles and traditions which are there from the time of achievement of independence, the main architect of which was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and we have been supporting this policy in general throughout this period because we do be-

lieve that in a country like ours, our national interests are best served by this policy of supporting peace, disarmament, non-alignment, anti-colonialism, anti-racism, anti-imperialism and active cooperation with the powers which in this case, it happens to be, as historical experience has shown us, Soviet Union and some socialist countries have steadfastly stood by us and helped us in all possible ways through all the trials and tribulations which we have had to face but this does not mean that within the parameters of this general policy, this overall foreign policy, that there are no weaknesses sometimes and some vacillations and, I think, that it is our duty to point out those. At the moment, I am not going far afield because I have not got much time but I should say that the historical experience which was elaborated here in great detail by Mr. Tiwary, the historical experience of our relations with Pakistan and USA during the last 40 or 41 years is something which we cannot lose sight of and I fully agree broadly with the broad analysis which Mr. Tiwary gave us, of those relations and reminded us as to what had happened at crucial moments in our history, in our dealings with Pakistan and USA and that is why the only thing I wish to point out in this connection is that while we certainly follow the policy of trying to improve our relations with all countries, irrespective of what they may or may not have done to us in the past and we should try to have normal relations with all the countries, nevertheless, we should not, in my opinion, do something which is not quite in keeping with the time-tested principles and traditions of our foreign policy. I am referring here, but briefly, because I propose perhaps to say something more on it when we go to discuss the grants of the Ministry of Defence. But it is very closely inter-connected with the foreign policy and that is why I am mentioning it. That is the question of the new dimension which we are seeking to give to our new policy, namely, to have co-operated with the U.S.A. in defence matters. I do not think Jawaharlal

Nehru ever advocated that, ever practised it. I do not think Mrs. Indira Gandhi ever practised or supported it for very simple reasons. Because many times we have found that any type of defence agreements which we seek to have with the U.S.A. not that efforts have not been made but ultimately they break down. They break down for very simple reason that the Americans have got certain very rigid and strict conditions which they like to impose on any country which wants to enter into defence deal or defence co-operation with them. One being that they reserve the right to keep up the flow of defence help or defence aid according to the situation as they see it in a particular country or a particular region. They are not prepared to give guarantees of supplies of spare parts, even of equipments which they supply if they feel that something is happening in that are which is not to their liking. And also in the past they were very much chary about allowing the recipient countries to develop their own independent production facilities of those things which they were trying to acquire. But apart from that, I do feel that this policy is leading to a somewhat contradictory position. If we really believe in all the historical analysis which both Mr. Tewary and to some extent the Minister himself gave yesterday, then I do not think that it is consistent with that to now try to enter into what is described loosely as co-operation in defence matters with the U.S.A. Even if it be only the question of acquiring some equipment or acquiring some new technology even so we must be cautious because in the same breath we are saying, in the same report we are saying and in the same speeches we are saying that these are the people who are behind the Pakistan Military regime. They are the people but for whose active support Pakistan would not be doing all the things which they are doing now including, as everybody says clearly, that we have evidence of their active collusion and complicity and assistance to the terrorists across the border in Punjab. The arms

which have been supplied are all. U.S. arms and the U.S.A. has said, at least the spokesman of U.S.A. has said that even after the Soviet pull-out from Afghanistan, they will continue to supply modern arms to Pakistan. Who is doing all this? It is Pakistan. I hope they do not mind if I say that the regime in Pakistan is not its own master, is not completely its own master. Everybody knows it. At the same time we are now thinking of making a slight shift in our policy in the sense of entering into co-operation in defence matters with the U.S.A. I suggest, Sir, that this is not a policy in the interest of our own security and independence. It is fraught with serious dangers which may land us in great difficulties at times of crisis and we should be extremely cautious about these matters. And I would suggest that we should stick to the old paths which we have followed. I am not advocating that you should never go to any other country or any other power for any help in the matters of defence equipment and technology other than the Soviet Union. This is not my case at all.

But, here is a specific instance and we know what these arms are meant for, what they are being used for, what they are being stock-piled for. We can see what the U.S.A. is doing everyday in different parts of the world. They have proposed up Israel in another part of the world. Everybody knows it. And after killing the high official of the P.L.O., the second in command to Yassar Arafat the other day in Tunis, I am surprised to find the official spokesman of the Israeli Government openly boasting and bragging and saying, "Yes, we have organised this killing and if it is necessary, we shall have some more people killed also.

A special commando force which was special trained was sent across the Mediterranean to Tunis. They landed secretly at night by boats which had been provided beforehand, and wearing certain uniforms as a kind of disguise, they broke into his

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

house and killed him in front of his wife, shooting about 70 to 75 bullets. They do not try to hide it. They do not try to deny their complicity. They are saying openly, "Yes, we have done it"

These are the kind of people with whom you want to deal. We know their complicity with the South African racist regime. Though they condemn the killings of the Palestine leaders and Palestine fighters in the Occupied Territory, we should not forget the recent brutal killing, the deliberate assassination of Mrs. Dulcie September in Paris, who was the representative of the African National Congress. She was shot down brutally at the door of her office. All these things are organised. These are forms of state terrorism which have been employed against Liberation Movements. And with what face, with what credibility, can we tell the world that we want to enter into some kind of defence cooperation now with this Super Power, the USA? I would strongly advise the Government against it. It is upto them to decide. In the eyes of the majority of our friends abroad, with whom we have had the closest relations and still have, and whom we consider our friends and allies in a common cause, this move will not do any good to our image. And it is better from the point of view of our own future security and our interests, to get out of it and not to embroil ourselves further into it.

We have also seen what is happening in the Indian Ocean to which a reference has been made yesterday here also. Since the 1971 declaration of the United Nations that the Indian Ocean should be made into a zone of peace by a concerted attempt by all the littoral countries plus the USA plus the USSR whose ships and navies are using this ocean by getting together and working out an agreement by which a sort of demilitarisation of the Indian Ocean can take place, to this date, this move has been systematically

scuttled by no other country than the USA. UK also is there, but it is more so by the USA. They are at all costs preventing this conference from being held. Three or four days ago, they have repeated their performance in the United Nations Security Council, refusing to have any such conference or even a preparatory committee for the conference. Meanwhile what is happening? The number of naval vessels and the number of bases in the Indian Ocean is proliferating all the time. Perhaps our Government has come to realise that this vision of the Indian Ocean as a demilitarised zone of peace is more or less a Utopia. Therefore, I find that this time in our defence arrangements, much more emphasis is being placed on the strengthening and development of our navy. Of course, it does not strictly come under 'foreign policy', yet I mentioned it. I think they made this arrangement so that it becomes really what is called a 'Blue Water Force'. We want to have a third aircraft carrier, we have bought a nuclear powered submarine for training purposes, and we have invested in some anti-submarine special type of heavy aircraft. So, we are developing our navy. That means the proliferation which is going on does not exclude us and we are part of it also. It must be because the Government feels that there is not much possibility of having agreement on a zone of peace at all.

Sir, I find this from the Jane's Defence Weekly which is considered to be quite a reliable and authoritative journal. It is pointed out in this journal just now that a top secret intelligence base is being built at Geraldton, West Australia, which is capable of monitoring the military communications over the Indian Ocean, particularly those emanating from India and Indonesia. The information obtained by this intelligence base, says Jane's Weekly, would be part of a reciprocal exchange with the US systems, in conjunction with the United States Systems. Well, obviously, that information, if it is monitored by the US systems, would be

passed on to all the friends of the USA, including Pakistan and others.

13.20 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

So, the militarisation of the ocean is going on. There is not much reference to it here. I said it last year also. Should our Government not think of taking some new type of initiative regarding this Indian Ocean? It will become an area of great danger and menace to us, otherwise. We took some action in Sri Lanka for other reasons, but that was also something which is very closely linked up with the Indian Ocean question. But if it is not possible to have a Conference in the United Nations, under the aegis of the United Nations due to this constant, obstruction, by the USA and UK, what about other littoral countries stretching from Madagascar in the West right upto West Australia, I should say in the East. It is a strange thing. But now-a-days, as I recently found when I was there, the West Australians do not consider themselves to be people of the Pacific Ocean. but they consider to be the Indian Ocean People, because West Australia looks out towards the Indian Ocean. They were also amenable to the idea that why not littoral countries of this region try to come together if the USA or UK and others do not want to co-operate? That is their look out. But the interests of the littoral countries, their security is at stake. They should consider whether some other possible move can be undertaken in which these countries can get together, even if it is not a formal United Nations Conference, and try to work out some principles and some broad guidelines which would assist the de-militarisation of this Ocean and then stand on those principles and let world public opinion decide. I think only India can take this initiative. Only India has the prestige and understanding in this area to take such an initiative.

Another crisis has erupted in the Gulf. I cannot say anything about it because it is just a recent happening of two days. I hope in the end, when we get the Government reply, they would cover this point also. They have not expressed my concern so far. The Gulf situation to my mind, if it is not controlled, might lead to unimaginable consequences. Now, the great power involvement in the Gulf conflict is looming very realistically on the horizon. The Americans have attacked the Iranian oil platforms and vessels, They sunk some of them and threatened further action.

Mr. Shevaradnadze, the old friend of Mr, Natwar Singh, speaking on behalf of his Government has issued a warning to the USA, that if they step up their Naval and military activities in the Gulf, then the USSR also will not sit quiet and just watch. What does it mean? The Gulf is an area of great concern to us also. I should like to have from the Government, at least an expression of some concern over what is happening in the Gulf, where a large number of Naval vessels are concentrated already and now it needs only a slight spark to set off a big conflagration which would have very very grave consequences. The effect of it we would feel also because it is after all a prime oil producing area of the world.

One word about Sri Lanka. I really do not know, the people of this country, irrespective of the parties or differing opinion are certainly very much concerned about the fact that these hostilities in Sri Lanka are continuing seemingly without any end. There seems to be no doubt and no use trying to hide it now that when the IPKF was sent there, they were not fully equipped with the kind of intelligence that they should have had—whether it was a military intelligence or other intelligence, but I feel they were let down. Neither they knew nor they were given information about what type of arms and equipment the LTTE have, nor adequate

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

information about the training and fighting capabilities of the LTTE, nor about the extent of support and sympathy, I would say rather, the support which the LTTE does enjoy among the local Tamil population there. It is a fact now. Everybody knows it. Our own Brigadier or Maj.Gen.Pandey is on record. He issued a statement admitting the fact that the local people are behind the LTTE boys. They consider them to be the people who have been trying to protect them in that earlier period when the Sri Lankan Army and Air Force were trying to annihilate them. This combination of circumstances put our IPKF people in some difficulties, I think, in the beginning and certainly we never visualized at that stage that so many troops would have to be committed eventually to this operation. I do not know whether in any previous armed conflict in which India has taken part, we have ever had to send so many troops out to a foreign country; certainly not in Bangladesh in 1971, as we have had to do here, now. Some papers say 15 brigades- I do not know; it may be 15 brigades more or less; anyway, quite a massive show of military force.

Nobody in this country wants this fighting to continue indefinitely. Either the Government should tell us that we have broken the back of the LTTE, and now it is only a question of days before they are compelled to stop fighting and surrender. So, I do not think that it is a very pleasant prospect at all, because after all the prime duty for which we went there was to get LTTE to surrender its weapons, its arms and thereby stop the fighting and create a situation which would pave the way for the other parts of the Accord, viz. the Constitutional amendments, the setting up of provincial councils, the devolution of powers to the future provincial which would be autonomous for the North, and then the elections. It was a kind of package deal, that the Accord as a whole would normalize the situation eventually,

restore peace and also assure to the Tamils in the North the kind of autonomous rights which they were yearning for, within a united Sri Lanka. But the fighting does not stop. How can the other measures be taken at all, though I must say that I do not think President Jayawardane has kept his part of the bargain? I would like to know a little more about it. It seems to us from Press reports that president Jayawardane's commitments under the Indo-Sri Lankan Accord have also only been partly fulfilled; and he is not also very eager so far, to ensure the kind of devolution of powers, and the assurance that there would be one composite provincial council of the North and the East, to which the powers would be given, that there would be a general amnesty for all political prisoners. Without these, how can we hope to restore any normalcy or peace there, I do not know. What is the position, I would like to know because the situation seems to be like some sort of a morass, a quagmire in which we have got stuck. I do not support those people who go on accusing and abusing the Government for what they call some kind of an adventurist military attack on Sri Lanka. At that time, under the circumstances, I think this Accord was the best that could have been done. But its implementation has run into severe difficulties. Who is responsible for that?

The LTTE, I am told, is willing now to surrender its arms-Mr. Natwar Singh will be able to clarify this-but not all its arms. The LTTE boys are saying: 'We cannot possibly surrender all our arms, because we do not know what is going to happen in the future. Suppose we surrender all our arms, and at one stage the IPKF is pulled out from Sri Lanka; then what is going to happen; who is going to protect our people in the North? Therefore, we are prepared to come to a negotiated settlement; not that we are not prepared to surrender any arms. We are prepared to surrender; but let there be some settlement, some understanding. Give us

some assurance of what will happen in the future because they have no confidence whatsoever in President Jayawardane. Understandably so, I should think.

There is a great wave of Sinhala chauvinism in the South the JVP has come up and started killing people right and left and has assassinated even a person like Kumara Natunga who was such a popular figure in Sri Lanka. He is not a Tamil, but he is a Sinhala who stood for the unity of the Tamils and the Sinhala people; who was fighting for the unity of the Sinhala and the Tamil people and who was fighting for the rights of the Tamil people in the North; and whose funeral was attended- I don't know- by some five lakh people in Colombo, which is an unprecedented thing. This JVP terrorists organisation in the South with whom we don't have to deal yet; it is not our job under the Accord, the IPKF is not fighting to tackle the JVP. But who will deal with them? I do not know. Is Shri Jayawardane capable of dealing with them? So, what is going to happen we are not able to understand. I think it is in the best interest of our country that we should leave no effort unfulfilled to try to see that this fighting is brought to a stop by some agreement and negotiations. In the long run, as we are seeing in so many countries, it is always counter productive to have your army in a foreign country for too long. So many examples, recent examples, we are quoting here every day about other countries. It causes so many complications and problems if it becomes too much prolonged; and I do not like our Indian jawans to be exposed to that kind of a situation where they are among a foreign population of which one part considers that they are spending all their time trying to kill them and another part thinks that the country has been handed over to a foreign army. This kind of an atmosphere, this kind of a feelings of distrust will not do us any good in the long run. I cannot say, bring IPKF back immediately;

we cannot do that also. Then what will happen thereafter? But this fighting cannot be allowed to go on indefinitely also. What is the point in it? So, we should use every possible means at our disposal and every initiative possible should be taken to try to bring about an end to the fighting through a negotiated agreement and settlement and compel President Jayawardane to carry out his part of the bargain so that elections can be held as soon as possible. Once those elections are held, I don't think IPKF has any business to remain there; and nobody has any business to insist that IPKF should remain there. If the elections are held and the Provincial Councils are set up and the powers are developed and given to them; let our army come back, they cannot remain there indefinitely causing all sorts of difficulties for ourselves and for other people also.

I would say one or two words about Afghanistan. I agree with Mr. Natwar Singh that India has played a very constructive and a very useful role in the settlement or in this agreement at least in bringing about this agreement, which has taken place in Geneva. People behave as though it is a very ordinary thing; there is nothing extraordinary. The other day I met some eminent people here who were saying, what it is; it is a non-agreement; it is anti-climax; it is an agreement which can never be implemented. What is the use of encouraging such an agreement to take place. But I say one year ago nobody could have imagined that such an agreement was possible. President Zia, no less a person than President Zia, in one of his statements, described it as a miracle. Of course, primarily, it is due to the determined initiative of Mr. Gorbachev. He said, whether you like it or not now, our army is going to pull out. It will have to pull out because it is something which has been there for the last 9 years.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOOWALIA (Sangrur): It is an historic event.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Now you see those people who were always shouting against the Soviet presence in Afghanistan, suddenly became the people who are totally against their being pulled out and against the agreement, because their stipends will be stopped! This is the whole point. Nothing pleases them better than to have the Soviets there so that Pakistan can go on using that as an excuse to get arms, lethal arms, from the USA, and the so-called Mujah, based in Peshawar can go on getting not only arms, but a great deal of dollars and money and all that in order to keep up their fight.

The point is, after eight years of this bleeding wound-what Mr. Gorbachov has described as a "bleeding wound"- it is a fact that the Mujahideens have not been able to form any kind of a national liberation front. There are seven groups, desperate groups of different tribes among them unable to come to terms with each other. The old tribal structure of Afghan society cannot be cured by becoming so-called refugees in Peshawar where the tribal people among them are leading quite difficult existence perhaps in the camps, but some of the leaders of these Mujahideens are reportedly living in five star hotels in Peshawar and having a good time, Luxurious time. They are not able to form any kind of a national liberation front and they have not been able to establish any liberated area enough it is frequently said that except for the towns and cities the rural areas in the countryside are under the control of the gurillas. That is not correct. There is no settled, established liberated area, as such where they have been able to establish this. And these tribal groups which are outside, I think they are not so much anti-communist, anti-Marxist, they may use those phrases, but I do not think that they understand much about them, as they are against the whole idea of there being any centralised authority in Kabul, which they were never accustomed to, in spite of there being a King or a Government or whatever it

was in Kabul in the past, these tribal Jingas, the tribal people never accepted the central authority of Kabul. And therefore, they always have this fear that with the new Government now established there in Kabul since 1978 a central authority will be exerted and it is against that they are actually fighting.

Now I want to know, if the United States of America can advise the Sandanista Government of Nicaragua to negotiate directly with the Contras, the Contras being the U.S.aided rebels there, they have advised them that you talk directly, then why should not the Mujahideens enter into direct talks with Najibullah in Kabul on the same analogy? Why are they trying to prevent them from talking to the Najibullah Government? Najibullah has offered to talk to everybody without restrictions. He says that everybody is welcome, come, let us come and discuss and try to form a new front, which will include even those people who have been fighting against the Government. But they are not prepared to talk.

So, I feel that Pakistan also and their patrons in the West have been victims of their own propaganda. They used to say that if the Soviets withdraw, this Government in Kabul will not last for a single day. If that is so, why are they insisting that there must be some interim government set up before the troops pull out? According to their own theory, let the troops pull out and the Government in Kabul will collapse in one day. Nothing can be better for them!. But they went on saying that there must be some interim government formed there. So they are really hoisted by their own retard, their own propaganda is now against Kabul and the Mujahideens are in no position to replace the Kabul Government. Afghanistan may remain turbulent, I agree. Nobody knows what is going to happen. There will not be peace, there may be a great deal of civil strife. There may be turbulence. As for the

Soviet Union, I am sure, they realise that. In spite of that they are going to pull out their troops. What is our concern? We should look at this problem from our own point of view or our own national interests of India. That is our prime concern, and these millions of dollars which have been poured to the Mujahideens along with all these stinger missiles from America and blow pipe missile from U.K., and God knows what more weapons. Some commentators who are supposed to be well-informed say that in no case will the majority of the Mujahideens return to Afghanistan. A great number of them will remain there and they will become part of Pakistan along with their arms and that is not a prospect which should please President Zia very much because they will create no end of trouble inside Pakistan. And it does not please us also because, as we have said earlier during the debate on Punjab this mountain of arms which is accumulated there in the hands of tribes men and whom are they going to use them against, once the Soviet troops are withdrawn? If you can't find a Russian to kill, whom will you kill? You will kill a Pakistani or you will kill an Afghani or you will smuggle those arms across the border into India for a fat profit? So, the prospect for us is also rather alarming from that point of view.

Now, Sir, we should try to persuade the United States and the United States Congress to give a second thought to this Symington Amendment which the United States Congress applied. The waiver of that Amendment was done to help Pakistan because the Americans think that a higher priority should be given to fighting the Soviet troops there rather than to the question whether Pakistan becomes a nuclear power or not. Knowing full well that they are going in for nuclear weaponry, they waived this Symington Amendment and said, 'We will continue to help Pakistan, though we know that they are developing a bomb.' Why? Because in their minds top priority is not

whether Pakistan gets a bomb or not, but whether they can be bolstered up to fight against the Soviet Union. But now what will happen, I want to know. Now, after Gorbachov has pulled out the troops, what is the justification for the waiver of this Symington Amendment? And our Government should take it up with the highest circles, I don't say the Americans will agree with them because the old firm of Carlucci and the other gentleman, I have forgotten, have assured us that arms will continue to be supplied even after the Soviet withdrawal, but we have a good argument to stand on now that once the Soviet troops are withdrawn, and you know also that Pakistan is developing nuclear weaponry, then you should rescind that decision of the United States Congress by which this Symington Amendment was waived. There is no ground for it now, at least we can build up international public opinion on this question. Once the common focus of so-called insurgency is removed, then the arms will be used not to kill Soviets, but to kill Afghans and Pakistanis. Well, if they want that to go on, it is their funeral, but we do not want to be at the receiving end of all this fall-out which will take place and which may affect us, which will bring help to the terrorists.

So, Sir, I think that we have done a good job. Even after the attempts which will be made now, I hope, by Dr. Najibullah to form a broad based Government including even those who had left the country, including those who have been fighting against the Government, including, if necessary, the King—I do not know if the King wants to come there or not now, whatever it is, but our main concern should be that there should be a friendly Afghanistan, friendly to India. Afghanistan Government standing for peace and non-alignment, that is what is in our interests and for that purpose, we should use our diplomacy, but of course in a discreet way, we are not going to force ourselves on the stage, we never did it, I think,

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

in a very crude or blatant way, we should be discreet, we should operate in a way in which our efforts can be helpful and useful and we should see to it that smuggling of arms from across that border and the smuggling of drugs, drug trafficking running into millions and millions perhaps of dollars. Should somehow or other be plugged. We have to do that. Otherwise, in spite of the cessation of hostilities in that country, these arms and drugs will continue to come through. They will, of course, help these terrorists in Punjab. But they will harm in many ways the interests of our country. Therefore, we should try to see things now in the new situation when new ideas are afloat and new initiatives are being taken, new moves are being thought of. It is a new world with a new form of inter-relationship which is developed, which was not there a couple of years ago. We should also have some new ideas and new initiatives with which we can project ourselves on the international scene.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINH (Surendranagar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs not only because I am a Member of the ruling party but because I feel convinced that the performance of the Ministry of External Affairs has been commendable. I would like to say that in the international scenario, specially in the last few years when there has been turbulence around the world, India has not only maintained but also enhanced its political image in every corner of the Globe. Amongst the principal reasons are that our society has thoroughly imbibed the democratic principles and the Parliamentary system of governance and we have created that kind of an image round the world, especially in Asia that despite our limitations, we cherish this system of adult franchise. It is, perhaps, because of this very cherished position that we are placed in, that some of our neighbours possibly feel jealous and that is seen all around India. Let me

recapitulate what is happening.

Afghanistan has been often and much spoken about. I wish to say that the situation is now so transient and unstable that it is foreseen that in the times to come, there is going to be a scramble for Afghanistan not only from the Super Powers but also from all other neighbouring powers. When this situation arises very soon, perhaps in a fortnight's time, India should have its options and should play its role with great dexterity and should see that its interests are well-maintained—whether it is with Afghanistan or with the various factions within Afghanistan or whether it is the neighbours of Afghanistan or whether it is with the Super Powers.

Sir, our other neighbour is Burma. We must also shake up from our slumber and realise that Burma is not and will certainly not be what it had been in the past. We are reading from reports about the students unrest in Burma. There is growing awareness and awakening in Burma. Our hon. Prime Minister made a visit to Burma. It was very commendable and a big thing. But I think we need to do much more to establish a far more meaningful role not only in the arena of trade and commerce but in the political area as well because here is a vacuum where India could very easily fit in. If Pakistan which is a Member of SAARC can also identify itself as a West-Asian country, why cannot we invite Burma to identify itself not only as a South-East Asian Nation but also as a possible Member of the SAARC! Why cannot we take initiative in that field? China is changing more rapidly than perhaps any other country in the world. Recent report is unheard of that in the Peoples National Congress there are dissensions and there are whole groups of Members in the Peoples National Congress who do not put up their hands for any Bills that are moved there as it was in the last year. Things are happening very fast there. In the field of

trade, the country is opening up; there is, perhaps a greater rush of multinationals rushing to China than to any other country in the world. In this scenario, we have to keep our eyes open; we have to see how best we can arrive at a method whereby our disputes are settled as easily and as amicably as possible and also, more than that, to see how best we can be good trading-partners. After all, there are lot of similarities in the economic sphere between the two countries.

In the Indian Ocean, there is an apprehension that the Super Powers are playing their part, whether it is the Americans in Diego Garcia or whether it is the Russians in Africa, in Somalia, where they have their bases. Both these are explosive, and India has taken an admirable stand to see that we stay aloof from these land we work in the international fora, whether it is U.N. or other international fora, towards seeing that the Indian Ocean becomes a lake of peace.

There is one thing more that we should do as far as the Indian Ocean is concerned. some 12 or 13 or 14 years ago, there was a very useful project initiated called the MONEX wherein all the nations in Africa on the Indian Ocean sea-bed, in Asia, on the Indian Ocean sea-bed, in Australasia and South East Asia were to work in a coordinated manner in a scientific field to ascertain the origin of the monsoon currents that originate in the Indian Ocean and thereby study and make the monsoon more predictable. Today, after three years of monsoon failure, we know how important it is to have such a scientific information. I regret to say that this MONEX never completed its task because the participating countries in Africa, Asia and Australasia could not, in a coordinated way, have a consensus on funding it, and when they got the expertise from Russia and America, the two countries were more interested in their own political interests than to find out more about the monsoon. We should

take the initiative of revitalising this interest and have the MONEX restarted.

Much as been talked about the NAM. I wish to say that we should now expand our whole approach to NAM and not have just a little focussing which we do conventionally. I know, it is very important to have a strong base amongst the frontline African States to overcome the problems of apartheid or whether it is a problem of the other parts of the globe. But, I think, the world looks for new avenues. We should now, within the NAM, have certain very important aspects for global peace, such as, the environment or even family planning. Population explosion can be one of the most important causes for global unrest. Why can't the NAM take greater interest in participation in these things. I was very happy to learn that the SAARC has branched off into these fields; they have branched off into having a commonality in the field of environment and certainly in the field of tourism because we are all bound in one geographical region. So, we can think in a collective way in this field.

As far as the Super Powers are concerned, I think there has been a very encouraging development. I dare say the initiative taken by the great leaders of USSR that we have seen stages and a series of meetings whether it is Reykjavik and thereafter Geneva and now the latest Summit of Moscow - where we have found a ray of hope of at least super powers coming to a greater understanding and greater possibility of nuclear disarmament.

I hope and I would like every Member in this House to support me when I say that when the Special Session for Disarmament convenes on the 1st of June in the United Nations and our Prime Minister hopefully will go, and we should all be concerned to see that he goes, that India's position is made clear and we make an impact in the Special Session of the United Nations so that the

[Sh. Digvijay Singh]
 progress towards disarmament and towards at least peace from the nuclear possibilities point of view is further enhanced.

There is another organisation called Parliamentarians Global Action open to every Member of Parliament. I happen to be active in it. We have had a few meetings in it. This is an organisation which needs Members of Parliament from every political party. We have been active; we have been accorded, we have been even recognised to such an extent that 19th of November last year, Organisation received the first Indira Gandhi Prize for Peace, Disarmament and Development. We would like every Member to participate in it. We have been very active and even responsible for getting six Heads of Nations, a Group of Six together and the Group of Six met on the 20th January in Stockholm and enunciated some very good programmes. One of them is the international verification - the setting up of an organisation which would undertake verification of nuclear capabilities of various countries is very essential. We would like to go further by working towards finding a methodology, an organisation, an institution which could somehow regulate and control trade in Uranium and Plutonium. This is the ultimate goal, this would be panacea for any future nuclear holocaust.

Islamabad is a capital of a country which saw a lot of explosions. We have been given to understand that the explosion in Islamabad which took place only two weeks ago, happened because there were huge stocks of armaments, possibly meant for Afghanistan and could also come to India. But the first people to come there to supervise the place and to see that there are no further explosions to these accumulated stocks were the American experts. It is something very alarming. And now we hear that third-world countries like Sudan and its capital Khartoum acting as a trading spot for

availability of enriched Uranium. Where are we going? You can buy. Even Pakistan buys from there. Iran and Iraq buy from there. I believe Iraq bought it. Israelies got to know about Uranium when they bought and they bombarded it and destroyed it. South Africa buys from there. This is proliferating and the only solution here is to have a strong international lobby and a whole ethos built up against this kind of system whereby the whole world can be destroyed.

I will not take much time. I will say just one thing that we do know that America and the United States do play a vital role in giving support to our neighbours who are not all that friendly with us whether it is Pakistan or China. But we also know that America is a country which has a sizeable Indian population. We have a system of NRI. I think, we should work here to see that these NRIs who are affluent, they come after Jews, the Indian NRIs are the second most affluent nation resident group of people living in the USA.

14.00 hrs.

Why cannot we motivate them and make them strong politically, make them see that they get elected-whether it is Republican or Democrat-and they have their political presence felt in the USA? This is a role which our Embassy in Washington can play, being a catalyst.

Ultimately it has to be the security council of the UN which needs to be strengthened. I feel quite confident that with the happenings in the world, with the awareness in the world and with the knowledge of the destructive possibilities of a nuclear holocaust even on a small scale between the two third world countries can mean annihilation, with this background, the world is getting more land more aware and in that awareness we would like India to play a vital role, a role of leadership.

[Translation]

PROF. NIRMALA KUMARI SHAKTAWAT (Chittorgarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. Non-alignment and Panchasheel are two basic ingredients of our foreign policy. Since we achieved independence we had to face so many internal and external pressure, yet we remained firm on our this policy. This can be attributed to strong & firm leadership of the party which has all along been in power at the centre except for a brief spell of two years.

After our independence, under the dynamic leadership of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, the role of India in the international sphere was identified and we always kept ourselves away from the politics of col war. There is no gain saying the fact that Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was the founder of Non-Alignment, when he was the Deputy Chairman of the Interim Government, it was Pt. Nehru who first gave an idea of Non—alignment on 7th September, 1946, and in those days the Non-alignment movement was considered an affairs confined to Tito, Nasser and Nehru only. But Nasser entered the international arena in 1953 and Yugoslavia was alienated towards Soviet Union. This Non-aligned movement is not only an ideal policy, but it has played a significant role in the economic and social development of the country. It was very essential for the development our country and for building economic relations to establish links with both the Super-powers. That is why, today, India is called the chief spokesman of the Third World.

By the non-aligned movement we have proved that international relations can be demarcated and along with it we have been able to raised the U.N.O. to the level of an ideal seat of power. We have been able to contain colonialism to a considerable extent. Therefore, I want to submit that in putting an end to colonialism and in developing interna-

tional democracy, the non-aligned policy of our country achieved enormous success except few exceptions. For example, although Iraq and Iran both are non-aligned countries, they are at present involved in a prolonged war which has reached to a point that makes it the most gory battle in the matter of bloodshed, only next to the second world war. The way oil-vessels were destroyed recently makes our heart fill with terror.

I will also say that though we are making efforts to declare the Indian ocean as the Zone of peace, but several warships are sailing around our waters. I will say that we have achieved some measure of success but some exceptions are definitely there. We have not made much progress in South-South Cooperation. The reason is that many nations are not prepared to accept this concept, still we have not stopped making efforts in this direction. Recently, at the behest of President Julius Nyerere, Shri Manmohan Singh, the renowned economist and deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission was appointed as the Secretary-General of the South-South Commission and I think that our country will definitely achieve success on this matter as well

Among the super powers the Soviet Union is our best friend. Our friendship has stood the test of time and they have always lent their support to us at the time of need and crisis. For example, they supported us when we were dragged in wars in 1952, 1965 and 1971. And I want to emphasise that our friendship with Russia has not come in the way of our policy of non-alignment at all. I would also like to submit that in 1971 war, despite our signing a treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation with U.S.S.R., we refused to accept the proposal of Asian Collection Security Scheme put forward by Mr. Breyier offered, as it was against our policy with China.

[Prof. Nirmala Kumari Shaktawat]

We have also to see as to which nations are our friends. We did not accept the afore-said treaty yet it did not affect the Indo-Soviet relations in any way. We can proudly claim today that we are having Rs. 5 thousand crores worth of trade with the Soviet Union, whereas in 1954 our trade was worth Rs. 1.3 cores only. Along with it, U.S.S.R. has given us MIG-29 which were not given even to the nations under the warsaw pact.

Chairman Gorbachev visited our country in 1986 and Shri Rajiv Gandhi also went there and this has made our relationship more profound and Shri Gorbachev in his speech at Vladivastok stated that Indo-Soviet friendship was an important step in maintaining international stability.

In so far as other super power. i.e. U.S.A. is concerned, we have many things common. It also believes in the principles of democracy. We share the same opinion on the issues of democracy, freedom and racial equality. Still, I want to submit that U.S.A. does not support us on bilateral matters at the international field. It is always concerned about its own interest first, and then about the interests of India. U.S.A. has always looked up to our non-aligned policy with suspicion. A former secretary of State of American, while commenting on non-alignment, said that whoever was not with America was against it. This way America has constantly opposed us and in 1954 signed a defence treaty with Pakistan.

Similarly, in 1965 and 1971 wars, Pakistan made use of the American weapons against us. After our peaceful nuclear explosion of 1974 at Pokhran, America adopted a rigid posture against India and stopped the supply of nuclear fuel and spare parts for Tarapur Atomic Power Plant. This America is unsuccessfully trying to destabilise the South Asia region by supplying sophisticated weapons like F-16s, AWACS, Har-

poon missiles etc. to Pakistan. All this has made our relations strained with America. On his visit to India in the begging of the month, the Defence Secretary of America has also commented that supply of arms to Pakistan will continue even after the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and Justified its supply. Therefore, while Improving relations with America, the Government will have to keep these things in mind.

I would also like to draw the attention of the Government towards our relations with our neighbouring countries. We have always tried to improve our relations with our biggest neighbour China which has border extending upto 1800 miles common with us. But China has never responded favourably to our proposal. I would like to say that India was the second non-communist country which in 1949 accorded recognition to the communist regime came into power after revolution in China. Similarly, we also helped them during Korean war and in 1954 extended our cooperation to them in promotion trade with Tibbet, but in 1962 China attacked India and forcibly took control of large tract of our land. In 1976, Mrs. Indira Gandhi tried to solve the border issue through negotiations, but all our efforts proved futile. Therefore we should impute motives in the intention of China with great care & caution. China has intruded in Sum-dorong valley and opposed our granting of statehood to Arunachal Pradesh. China is continuously supplying arms to Pakistan which are further being passed on to terrorists in Punjab. It is difficult to understand the present policy of China because China is developing friendly relations with all countries but it is not known as to why China is adopting such a attitude towards India. this fact is to be kept in mind.

In 1985, SAARC was set up for promoting regional cooperation among the countries of South Asia, but this is possible only if

Pakistan and India cooperate with each other. I do not want to say much about Pakistan except that whenever internal disturbances being to surface in Pakistan, the administrators of Pakistan change the direction of their arms to us. Since 1971, Pakistan is playing a diplomatic game. Pakistan is not eager to openly waging war against India, but is clandestinely acquired the know how of manufacturing atom bomb and is also supplying arms to extremists in Punjab as a part of her policy of undeclared cold war against India.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMCOOWALIA : Pakistan is not supplying arms to people of Punjab, only to terrorists.

PROF. NIRMALA KUMARI SHAKTAWAT: I mean so that only a handful of people who are terrorists are being supplied arms in Punjab. That is why I used the term terrorists so all of us must make concerted attempt for the success of SAARC which depends on improvement of our relations with Pakistan. Through SAARC, we must warn Pakistan that she should desist lending help to the terrorists for their gory activities in Punjab. I would also like to state that the administrators of Pakistan are against our country due to their vested interests but our relations have been quite cordial with the people of Pakistan for decades. Therefore, my suggestion to the Government is when we are organising Festival of India in many countries, why should we not organise Festival of India in Pakistan, and allow Pakistan to organise their festival in India. Through cultural exchanges, it is quite possible we may be able to develop cordial relations further.

In 1987, India signed an agreement with our neighbouring country Sri Lanka and sent Indian peace Keeping Force to establish peace in the island. But all our efforts have not fully succeeded due to non-cooperation of a terrorist organisation LTTE, as a result of which we were inflicted heavy damage.

Therefore I request the Government to pay immediate attention and fully implement the agreement through Indian Peace Keeping Force engaged in fighting to establish peace in that country. (*Interruptions*)

Our relations with Bangladesh have strained further due to influx of Chakma Refugees in Tripura which is an economically backward state. We must talk to Bangladesh on the issue because 50 thousand refugees are already in Tripura for a long time.

I would also like to state that the whole world nowadays is spending one trillion dollar on arms, which is equivalent to the Budgets of many poor countries, inhabiting 2/3rd of the world population. so much money is being spent on armaments, whose even 1.5 percent is not spent on medical research. I would like to congratulate the Government for being in the forefront of disarmament movement and for making efforts in this direction. Fortunately, the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs was the Chairman of Disarmament and Development Conference held in 1985 at UNO in which 153 nations took part. We are really proud of it and the Government should pay attention to the conclusions arrived at during the conference.

The recent visit of the Hon. Prime Minister to Japan and Vietnam will foster the economic ties and will open a new chapter in our foreign relations with other countries.

I would like to state that India has played an important role in the new detente policy agreed upon by the two superpowers in 1987 through the INF Treaty. The six-nation peace initiative started by Shrimati Indira Gandhi has taken a firm shape under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. I would also like to state that if we keep on moving on this path and superpowers keep on striving for peace, then a day will come when our dream

[Prof. Nirmala Kumari Shaktawat]
of world peace will get realise and whole world will be able to save the world from dooms. I am not only hopeful but also confident that with the reigns of the Ministry of External Affairs in the hands of talented person like Shri Rajiv Gandhi assisted by Shri Natwar Singhji, we will be definitely able to realise the dream of Shrimati Indira Gandhi to bring about peace in the world. I hope we will repeat the history of Bhagwan Mahavir and Lord Budha to spread the message of peace in the world.

With these words I conclude.

[English]

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOOWALIA (Sangrur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the foreign policy of India. For the last 40 years we are following the policy of non-alignment, the policy whose structure was laid by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, With the help of this policy we have played vital role in narrowing down the conflicts between different nations. Recently our role in the Afghanistan has been appreciated. We want peace in the neighbourhood of our country. so, the withdrawal of Soviets from Kabul will certainly bring a new era of mutual relations between India and Afghanistan. Also Sir, India's role in supporting the P.L.O. and opposing the evil designs of Israel is worth appreciable. India's role in the African movement in supporting the fighting people of Africa against the racial regime is also commendable.

One thing I would like to bring to the notice of the Government, through you, Sir, and that is on 6th February, 1988, Mr. Eduardo Faleiro said in Oman that India will hold discussions to bring an end to the Gulf war. Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister while addressing a meeting of Army. Commanders had said that Iran-Iraq war is at a stone's throw distance from this country. So, Sir,

through you, I would like to urge upon the Government that India had always played a vital role in bringing peace in the matter of Korea and Suez canal and we have been considered as champions of world peace but I fail to understand as to why our Government is just playing the role of silent spectator to the Iran-Iraq war which has become a slaughter of humanity.

Sir, India's relation with the Arab world needs a special consideration. Not in any case we should leave Pakistan as the only country that has very close relations with the Arab countries. That is why I say, Sir, with all the force at my command that the Minister should make some serious effort to play an active and effective role in bringing an end to the Iran-Iraq conflict. In this connection, I would suggest that India should immediately call a meeting of the NAM, should persuade the chairman of NAM to call a meeting.

PROF. N. G. RANGA. (Guntur) What the united nations have not been able to do, you want us to do.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOOWALIA: Yes, we should not be disappointed. I know, Resolution 598 of the Security Council has been ineffective but I am only emphasising our previous role. In the last 40 years during such events we have played a vital role in the Korean conflict and Suez conflict. We have been and we are being considered as the champions of the world peace. So, my suggestion is that like the Delhi Declaration of Disarmament and Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we should make an endeavour to end this war. There should be an appeal from Delhi that the Iran-Iraq war should end. The Prime Minister should appoint a special envoy and he should visit both Tehran and Baghdad to persuade these countries that we do not want the presence of foreign forces in our neighbour or in the Indian Ocean. Resolution 598 of the Security

Council should be fully implemented without any selection or division of its operative clauses, Sir, Pandit Nehru had two very close allies and friends in Nasser and Tito. They formed the famous trio and played a historic role in world affairs for years and years. Similarly, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi should talk to President Mugabe and President Kenneth Kaunda. These are two heroes of the world, who dedicated themselves to achieve everlasting peace and harmony and to bring the agonies of the world to an end. He should talk to them also on this issue. The six-member Gulf Co-operative council has already passed a resolution. The resolution was adopted unanimously by the 8th Session of the Arab Parliamentary Union in Tunisia. So, there is support already for this cause all over the world. We too must play our role as we had been playing in the previous years.

I would like to bring one thing to the notice of the hon. Minister. There is a propaganda going on to tarnish the image of the Sikh community. I had visited Canada and America where a campaign of misinformation is going on. Our embassies should clarify about this issue. In the Punjab press also, it has been published that a campaign to tarnish the image of the Sikh community is being carried out by some vested interests in the South East Asian Countries and in some western countries also. It has also appeared in the press that some video films are being shown which tarnish the image of the Sikh community. It is also alleged I only use the word 'alleged' that some members of the Indian Embassies are also hand in glove with these mischievous elements. So, I urge the hon. Minister to take some action, if there is some information available on this matter.

With these few words, I thank you.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR
(Hamirpur): Sir, I rise to support the demands for grants of the Ministry of External

Affairs and their report submitted to this House. As the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs, Shri Natwar Singh said yesterday during the intervention, the test of a national policy is that it has a national consensus behind it. Even when there was a change of Government and a new Government came into being after the Congress Party's defeat in 1977, the nation stuck to the same policy with regard to foreign affairs. When somebody pointed out to Shri Vajpayee, the then Minister for foreign, Affairs that his role and his speeches as a Jan Sangh leader were contradictory to his role and his speeches as the Foreign Minister of India, he replied that he was concerned with the foreign policy of the Government of India and not with the foreign policy of the Jan Sangh. So, that shows that the foreign policy of India based on a national consensus had emerged as an important concept for the nation to follow and that it did not undergo and change even when the complexion of the Government changed. India is one of the very few parliamentary democracies where there is a strong national consensus behind its foreign policy because it is based on sound principles of non-alignment, Panchasheel and similar other concepts which were outlined even before our Independence. It is a tribute to the vision and genius of the leaders of our national struggle that the Asian Relations Conference was held before India attained independence, that India became a member of the United Nations. We are one of the founding fathers of that institution which is a ray of hope for making. During the year under review a noticeable change has taken place and is a welcome change. The focus had changed to Asia. We have taken due note of the Asian dimension in the evolution of our foreign policy. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's stop-over in Tokyo during his visit to Vancouver to participate in the Commonwealth Heads of Governments' Conference was the first sign of this and the recent visit of the Prime Minister to Japan has strengthened that impression that we are not

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]
 forgetting the Asian Dimension in our foreign policy formulations. The commemorative Asian Foreign Relations Conference held in New Delhi last year, was also another step in this direction and the talks between our Government and the foreign Minister of Japan Mr. Kuranari were also significant developments in this connection. The participation by the Mayor of Hiroshima that famous victim city of nuclear holocaust-in the Asian Foreign Relations Conference in New Delhi was also a significant step in the right direction. Japan is now more and more looking towards the South and South-East Asia. We have had assistance from Japan. Japan is the largest participation in the ODA assistance to us.

What I want to emphasise is that, one of the historical distortions that came into our foreign policy in the initial stages was that we were being exposed to the Western influences for a pretty long time. We were more oriented towards West and as a result, the cultural linkages between the Asian countries, between China, between Japan, between Indonesia, between South-East Asia, were not explored and exploited to the extent to which they should have been from the very beginning. So even in the United Nations, Japanese is regarded as a hard language. But we should provide for and we should have some sort of scope for greater and more frequent cultural exchanges between Asian countries on the one hand and India on the other. At this moment, we are more oriented towards the West, in our literature, in our culture. We are exposed to the Western influences. But basically our roots are with countries in Asia, with Japan, with Sri Lanka, with China, with Indonesia. There is a ground swell of public opinion in our favour in case we are able to do this. So setting up of the Departments for Japanese and Chinese studies in Delhi University was a step in the right direction. I would plead with the Minister of State for External Affairs that

this movement to bring Asia into focus into our Universities, into our diplomatic relations, into our adventures is given a greater push and we are bale to take into account the developments in Asia more vigorously and more seriously then has been the case hitherto.

As regards China, I am of the opinion that the efforts of the Government of India to normalise her relations should be hailed by that country, because we are bound by traditions of cultural affinity. And now the times are changing. China of today is not the same China which was prior to 1979, when USA also recognised China, though India was primarily responsible for pleading their case for admission to the U.N. China is undergoing vast changes and there are talks now of Sino-Soviet Summit. Though there are some defects also but this shows, the winds of change are blowing. China has also put three conditions for such a summit. One of the conditions is almost fulfilled, i.e. withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan; the second was the reduction in the presence of Soviet armies on the border with China; and the third is the withdrawal of Vietnam forces from Kampuchea. In this connection, I would suggest that the Indian initiative for solving the Kampuchean problem is also taken up with renewed vigour, because once this problem is sorted out, we will have lesser tension in Asia.

About eight years ago, when I visited the United States of America and addressed one of the University student groups, one professor challenged me saying that the day would never come when Soviet Russia would pull out its troops from Afghanistan. I said: No; I am hopeful that a day would come. I thought it could be within five years. But it is now within eight years. Now from the 15th May. Soviet troops would be pulling out. If this can be done, on this side, the Vietnamese troops can also be pulled out, provided a negotiated settlement is arrived at, and

China agrees not to aid the rebels from Vietnam.

Nobody could imagine only a year ago, that the INF Treaty would be signed, that Soviet troops will be pulled out of Afghanistan, that changes would occur in the Sino-Soviet relationship. But today we are seeing the defreezing of the situation. All this is due to the initiatives taken by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and his Government, and also to the policy of non-alignment.

Basically, the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan is the result of policies followed by Government of India which has always been insisting on the withdrawal of foreign troops from other soils. Though Russia is our friend, it was made clear to Russia so many times. Similarly, we would plead for this concept again and again.

The heightening of military tensions as evidenced by U.S. actions in this recent Iran-Iraq conflict is also there; so are our efforts to reduce the tension. The signing of the INF treaty is a landmark in the history of our foreign policy, in the sense that it is a direct outcome of the pleas made by the non-aligned movement to bring the two sides together. After the failure of the Reykjavik summit, it was feared that the escalation of tension would take place. Fortunately, INF Treaty was signed on 8th December, which is a red-letter day for the foreign policies of the two countries who signed this, as also for India. Not only this; I am aware of some resistance to the INF treaty in the United States itself. There is a conservative opinion against it. But, then, the Reagan Administration has this to its credit that they have gone ahead with this Treaty and it holds out a hope to the world. as Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi pointed out some days earlier, the total effect of the treaty would be a control on 3% of the total nuclear arsenal in the world. But that does not matter. A beginning has been made. What is important is that a beginning

has been made, and we are moving towards disarmament; and , therefore, the world expenditure on weapons would be reduced to a considerable extent, and it would be employed and utilised for development, for betterment of health prospects, for removing sickness and for removing illiteracy and things of that type.

China has been trying to show its military presence in the southern seas; and I would like to quote a report from 'Times of India' dated 11th January 1988 wherein the reaction of the ASEAN countries to this has been summarized-even though the ASEAN countries did not make the resistance very conspicuous. The report says:

" However, Vietnam does not repeat this mistake. Just before the Liberation Army daily story appeared, the Vietnam news agency took official note that "a number of countries have conducted activities aimed at claiming their sovereignty over Vietnam's two archipelagos of Truong So (the Spratleys) and Hoang Sa "(the Paracels)" ... The Vietnamese noted that this was being done through both legislative and administrative means, an obvious reference to Manila, and through explorations and surveys, an apparent reference to China's orval activity".

So, China is increasing its naval presence. But that need not construe a threat to us. There may be many other implications. But, in case we are able to solve Kampuchean problem and the Indian initiative in this is very important because India is one of the countries that has given recognition to Kampuchea; and the intervention of Prince Sihanouk and bringing them to the negotiated table the present Prime Minister and the leader of the erstwhile Government there would be a step in the right direction.

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]

I would also plead for an enlarged role to the Indian Council for Cultural Relations because it is through this cultural relationship that we can cement the ties between various countries; it has done a good work though there are some improvements which can be needed. There should be an increased cooperation and coordination between the UGC and our universities, between institutions of our academic learning like Sahitya Academy, Sangeet Natak and others and the Indian Council for Cultural Relations so that all these ties can be cemented and we are able to come together.

A word about Pakistan, we are another afraid of Pakistan, but the Pakistani rulers think that they can intimidate us by aiding terrorists across the border or by launching some sort of insidious propaganda within the people, Pakistani people that they have to take a revenge for our role in Bangladesh war. Bangladesh was the creation of the folly of Pakistan. India had not very significant role to play. But Pakistan should also realise that their intervention, which is serious, implicit or open in this sort of a conflict, which they are engendering in a neighbouring State of Punjab in India is not good for Pakistan. The people of Pakistan and the people of India have been like brothers; they have been living together. Therefore, in the interest of the Pakistan Government and the people of Pakistan—Punjab is a prosperous State—they should not interfere into our internal affairs. Any intervention by Pakistani people by aiding terrorists in a propaganda way or by giving arms to the extremists is an act of hostility, and therefore it needs serious condemnation on all sides. The training that they are imparting and the way they are carrying on a propaganda against India in their various institutions does not augur well for the future of Pakistan also. It is in the interest of Pakistan that India and Pakistan should have cordial ties. Therefore, they should desist from doing anything that

comes in the way of intervention or in the way of intensification of the activities of the terrorists on this side of the border. India stands for a peaceful world including peace in Pakistan. Pakistan and India hold out an olive branch in China and other countries. But that does not mean that India will do it at the cost of its own defence. India's foreign policy has stood the test of time. It has been cemented by Soviet friendship and friendship all over the world. Indian forces have unfurled the flag of peace in Korea, In Gaza and in every part of the world. This is a tribute to the leadership that was given to the world by the NAM. The late Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi served adequate recognition for this. She launched this movement and Shri Rajiv Gandhi with his efforts has strengthened the movement further. The movement that was started with 40-50 countries has now crossed the mark of 100 countries. Is it not a tribute to the policy and the wisdom of the Government of India. It is because of her foreign policy that India's voice is heard with respect. I wish that, after the eighth level official talk between India and China, further progress will be made. I also wish that Shri Natwar Singh should continue his diplomatic efforts and also the efforts of various other nations to defreeze the tension and to bring peace to the world .

China is our neighbour. Pakistan is also our neighbour. There are other neighbours also. The role of SAARC is also very important and we have taken steps for the formulation of regional institutions in cooperation with or in line with the national institutions that will further cement the atmosphere of friendship which we have for all the neighbouring countries.

Our diplomatic visits to Korea, North Korea and South Korea, have been all right, and they also contributed to important developments, and the visits of Shri N.D. Tiwari and Shri K. C. Pant have also added to the atmosphere of goodwill. Therefore, with

these words, I appreciate and commend the efforts being made by the Government of India under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi for de-freezing the world situation to remove the world tensions, bring in world peace and promising an era of peace and progress to the entire mankind in which way we want the world to dawn. Let the world have a new dawn without any blot of war and bloodshed and remove fear for ever. The heart is free of hatred and the nations of the world may march together in line with the foreign policy formulated by the Government of India and the Charter of the United Nations to a better and prosperous world.

SHRI R.L.BHATIA (Amritsar): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. I will not cover all the areas as my friend Mr. N.C Parashar has done, I will only touch upon two subjects because the time allotted to me is very little.

The signing of the agreement between Islamabad and Afghanistan and guaranteed by U.S. and U.S.S.R has paved the way for the withdrawal of the Russian forces from Afghanistan. It is a historical accord and the tension that was going on in this area, in our region, for the last eight years, seems to be coming to an end. We welcome it. India has welcomed it and India has also played a very important role in assisting the UN. Secretary-General's special envoy in this, for reaching an agreement. Our Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh has met many world leaders and at U.N. as well as in the non-aligned meetings we have suggested some formulations, and we thought that the present agreement is also based on these formulations. For this I congratulate our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi as well as our Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh.

Ever since the Russian forces landed in Afghanistan there have been so many misgivings about it. Some suggested that the

Russian forces are there because they wanted to reach the warm waters of the Indian Ocean. So said that "the Russian forces will be there; they will never come back." The Russian point of view was that they were invited there. That is how they were there. But this Geneva Accord has proved that all the machinations of the imperialist powers and all the charges which they were levelling are found to be untrue.

We are very much interested in Afghanistan and this Accord which has taken place is because of our past historical ties with that country, our trade with them our cultural relations with them, political relations we have developed in the past so many years and especially because Afghanistan is a non-aligned secular socialist country and we have common perceptions in this region, as well as in the world around us. So, that is why we have played our role, that is how it has been the concern of the Government of India.

In this connection Shrimati Indira Gandhi requested Mr. Zia to cooperate, together to find a solution but that offer was spurned. Again now Mr. Rajiv Gandhi also has asked Mr. Zia, that we should play our role. But that also they have spurned that offer, of the Government of India. But anyway, now that the Accord is there, we have to see whether this accord will work upon, but there are certain dangers because the rebel Afghans have not accepted this Accord and Pakistan-Afghanistan boundaries have not been settled as yet. Some people have developed vested interests over there. What will they do with so much of weapons and the way of life they have been leading into? I am emphasising this accord, because it has a direct relation with India. After this accord, all these weapons will be diverted to India. Pakistan is already supplying arms, giving training to the terrorists, and the latest induction of modern weapons, rockets, etc. by the terrorists reveal that all these weap-

[Sh. R.L. Bhatia]

ons have come to India. Now the major thrust will be towards Indian side. I request the hon. Minister to take into consideration this point. India must be prepared for that situation because the fall out of this situation is likely to be on India, and especially on Kashmir and on Punjab.

The second point which I would like to point out is about China. India and China had very good relations, but the 1962 War—the question of boundary, affected our relations and thereafter practically our relations have been cooled. No initiative was taken from our side or their side to improve the relations. Now, more the twenty five years have passed. I think, it is time that we should have a new look. Even Russia is having a second look on all its policies and programmes, We should also have a second look and try to improve our relations with our neighbour, China. Now, China has also changed quite a bit. After the post Mao era, one can notice certain changes. They used to aid and abete rebellions in the outside world, but they have almost stepped that, on an ideological ground, I would say. They were also aiding and abetting third world countries, that is also not seen now. They are improving their relations with many countries, They have already settled their border problems with Japan, Burma and Pakistan. That was quite some time back. Now, they are trying to improve their relations with Soviet Russia. The friendship societies of both countries have started functioning and all the Engineers who left twenty years back, had come back and are completing the projects which are aided by Russia. They have tried to solve their river island problem also. Many things are happening between the two countries. Trade have increased, delegations are being exchanged, leaders are going and coming and the leaders of other socialist countries are going to China. They have improved their relations so far as the cultural and economic side are concerned. I

agree that they have not been able to develop political relations and ultimately, that will be their objective to do so. My request is that, in the changed circumstances and in the changed mood, which China has, we should take some initiative to improve our relations. I am glad that some time back, two Ministers—Mr. Tiwari and Mr. Pant went there and later on their delegation had also come. It is a good thing. What I want to say is, we should take initiatives to improve our relations with China and it will be very beneficial to us, in the sense that market of Rupees one hundred crore will be open to India, secondly if we improve our relations with them; large amount of money which we are spending now on defence and deployment of our forces could be reduced; and thirdly friendship between India and China will change the whole geo-political situation. Therefore, it is imperative that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has taken a so much initiative in our foreign policy and we have succeeded in many. My emphasis is that, China being our neighbour, if we improve our relations with them, it will be very beneficial to us. Therefore, I request you to take it very seriously. You know, Chinese takes a long time to take decisions, that is their habit. The talks which they are going to have with Russia, they are having for the last 10 years. And so far they are able to have talks only on economic and cultural fields. They have not yet been able to open talks in the political field. Luckily we have get only one problem with them and that is the border. After 25 years, the sentimental approach on both sides is not there and we should take into account the reality of the situation. I would request that after taking all the aspects into consideration and talking to the leaders of the opposition a national policy about China be formulated and taken action thereon so that the tension between the two countries is not there and India is in a position to deploy its finances and funds in the economic field and for development of the country.

With these words, I support the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs.

[*Translation*]

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI (Srinagar) Mr. Chairman, Sir, through you, I would like to praise the foreign policy of our Government pursued since 1947. It has been quite successful. We have been quite successful in furthering the policy of developing friendship with all countries of the world enunciated by Gandhiji and Jawaharlalji. The present government has taken right steps and is honestly following these policies.

The concept of Panchsheel and Non-aligned Countries given to the world by India has earned both respect and recognition all over the world. There was a time when the whole world was divided in two blocks. One block was represented by imperialist America and the other by U.S.S.R and its allies. The concept of Non-aligned Countries given to the world by India has strengthened further. Now the concept of non-aligned countries is being accepted in the whole world as an approach in the right direction worth adopting. Probably, this might be the reason for some good results that we have been able to achieve in the last few years in the form of INF Treaty signed between two superpowers which agreed to reduce 50 percent stock of their strategic weapons. Gradually, more and more countries of the world are coming to the fold of India's view point which was initially adopted by some countries after much persuasion.

The policy of confrontation adopted by Israel against the Arab Nations has not only endangered peace to West Asia but also to the whole world. Regrettably, the inhuman acts of Isreal got the backing of America. Due to this support, Isreal waged war against the nations opposed to it and established the dirty precedent of state terrorism

in the world.

The world knows that America has constantly been supporting Isreal in matters all misadventurism. I am citing an example. When Isreal started violence against Palestinians in West Bank and Gaza Strip to suppress the freedom loving people, it burnt down their houses and colonies and forced them to flee from their motherland. With the result, since 1947 till date, lakhs of Palestinians have been compelled to take refuge in Jordan, Syria and other Arab countries. Lately, a new policy of confrontation has been started by Isreal to evict as many Palestinians as possible from there. On this critical issue, America put pressure on United Nations in New York to close down P.L.O. Offices there with a view to implementing the Resolution adopted by the Congress of the U.S.A.

It is height of injustice that on the one hand the already suppressed community is being tortured and terrified, the whole world is condemning Israel for it, while America, instead of helping them, is trying to get the membership of PLO which has not yet attained the status of a full fledged country, terminated. America forcibly wants to get the office closed by violating the charters of United Nations in whose establishment U.S.A. played an important role.

15.01 hrs.

[SHRI ZAINUL BASHER *in the Chair*]

India has achieved respect in the world due to its determined, sincere and bold support for the Palestinian cause. India commands so much respect in Middle East what even the Muslim majority countries do not enjoy as much respect as India enjoys, even more than Pakistan and Bangla Desh. I want to congratulate for this achievement. We have adopted the same policy since 1947. Gandhiji favoured liberation of Palesti-

[Sh. Abdul Rashid Kabuli]

nan and opposed Zianism. There is no doubt that this policy has proved very beneficial for us. So we should be proud that we have adopted a good policy. Lakhs of Palestinian people have become refugees and took shelter in other countries at present. Brutal massacre is taking place there. India should take some effective steps at such crucial time. For, India is the leader of the non-aligned countries, it commands a great deal of respect in the world. It has played a very effective role in making the non-aligned nations powerful so we should give practical shape to our policy. For instance, we set up African Fund to oppose apartheid being practised there and lent our support to the black people with full economic strength and power at our disposal. We are extending all help to them. In the same way, we should extend our support to Palestinians also. We ought not give only moral support rather we should stand by them on all forums and organisations and all occasions. Not only this, we should give support to Shri Yassar Arafat under whose leadership the people are struggling for the freedom of Palestinian. It is a fact that a large part of Palestine is under the occupation of Israel, and they are being meted out very inhuman treatment, India should take initiative for their rescue.

Besides, as it has been pointed out by various hon. Members, I want to point out that America has committed excesses on us in many matters. We offered our hands of friendship while that country supplied arms to our neighbouring countries against us. I do not know what assistance they are providing us in technology and science, but in reality we have been put to disadvantageous position in all respect. We should not continue our efforts to have friendship at the cost of our honour and country's integrity. America is behaving in the same manner as Israel is. I just now mentioned the closing down the offices of PLO. An incident took place only yesterday. The Gulf war between Iran and

Iraq is a matter of their concern. This war is quite unfortunate and the Indian Government tried to end the war which is a good step. It is our duty as being a neighbouring country, for, God forbid, if it converts into the third world war, the entire world would be ruined, But it is a sad commentary on the part of America that it is ruining one or the other country for the sake of its own interests and establishing its dictatorship by playing the role of a police force. Yesterday's attack on oil Rigs was very unfortunate, leaving aside the war between Iran and Iraq, is it possible for the world to protect itself from the worst circumstances created by America? Even a minor mistake, use of force or terrorism of any super power is quite sufficient to ruin the world. I congratulate U.S.S.R in this regard that it has warned America against this attack condemning it as a unwarranted step. As far as the war of Iran and Iraq is concerned. I want to ask whether it is not a fact that U.S.A. helped Israel to destroy the nuclear installations of Iraq. How they have become friendly none? It has its own interests for which it is supporting some Gulf countries, But in reality, it has tried to create clash between them. It is interested to destroy the middle-east and create confusion between the two countries. According to the information available, it is supplying arms to both countries in one way or the other. So I would like to warn you against the possible dangerous situation likely to be created. Keeping in view our commitments for peace in the world and utilising our leadership, we should clearly warn America to withdraw its 6th or 7th fleets from Indian ocean which is being used to terrify the world and sever its vested interest. We must not forget that America is crossing its limits nowadays. It is quite unfortunate that when Palestine is struggling to achieve independence, Abu-Jihad was murdered by Israel claim army and Mossad with the support of America. We are aware of the importance of independence struggle, for, we ourselves have gone through it and made a lot of sacrifices. I want

that Indian Government should put its pressure over America wherever he tries to prove his supremacy. As far as Afghanistan is concerned, I congratulate Russia as well as America for hiding discussions, India also played its role effectively at the most opportune moment. As long as arms supply is there from two super powers, normalcy cannot be restored. There is no hope of peace to be established in Afghanistan and the prevailing confusing and massacre does not seem to have an end in near future. I would submit the hon. Minister that we cannot ignore the fact that United America continues to supply arms to Mujahidin and Russia to the Najibullah Government, the circumstances will not change. Even then, it is matter of joy that to some extent agreement has been reached. But India will have to prepare the ground in this matter. This agreement is not a complete one. In order to make this agreement complete, pressure should be put on these countries to come to an agreement. Non-aligned countries can play a role in it. The issue of our friendship with China has been widely debated. India and China have centuries old relations. China has occupied the Aksai-Chin area of Jammu and Kashmir I regret to say that whenever improving of relations and border issues between India and China were discussed, no mention was made about Akasi-Chin. I assert that Aksai Chin is an integral part of Jammu & Kashmir and Jammu & Kashmir cannot be separated from India. So we cannot ignore this area. We feel disappointed to see your silence in this regard you raise the issue of North Eastern regions by you are saying nothing about Aksai Chin. The total area of Jammu and Kashmir in 1947 was 87 thousand square metres and it included the areas of Jammu, Kashmir, Laddakh, Gilgit and Aksai Chin. We have left 24 seats vacant in Jammu & Kashmir Assembly for them. It is the responsibility of the Government to take possession of that territory of the country which is at present not in our control and for which 24 seats in the

Assembly have been kept vacant. Will this dream ever be realised? There are 100 seats in Jammu & Kashmir Legislative Assembly in which 24 seats are lying vacant. We cannot gain our full strength without these. Unless these 24 Assembly seats are represented in the Assembly, our Assembly will remain incomplete legally and theoretically both. I hope the Government would give serious thought to the issue, particularly about Arab Countries, raised by me.

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA (Robertsganj) : I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry for External Affairs, I have been listening to the discussion since yesterday. The hon. Members of both sides have supported our foreign policy. Main aspects of the policy have been clarified. I want to mention of book written by the former President Nixon. He has written in a book named 'Victory without War', India would have almost allowed Pakistan if he had not intervened in the war of 1971. In the light of this I want to submit that the entire world know that India's foreign policy rests upon old eternal values. The people of this country have always faith in the good for all "sarve Bhawantu Sukhina." Our former Prime Minister Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru had formulated the foreign policy on the basis of those perpetual values. It may be so that President Nixon forgot the fact that in 1971 when Pakistani forces surrendered, the then Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi had said that we followed the Gita as our ideal and we are the people of the country, who never lost their patience even at the time of adversity. We believe in the theory of "Labha Labho, Yada Yado" and we do not want to occupy an inch of area of any other country. Due to this reason, our great leader Shrimati Indira Unilaterally declared cease fire at that time. But I would like to say this thing that still there are such persons who were or are occupying high positions in their perspective countries and are not agreeable to our for-

[Sh. Ram Pyare Panika]

eign policy, say like this and who give vent to their feeling through their books and statements. Our foreign policy is never aimed at occupying an inch of land of another country. But in the given war like situations, particularly with Pakistan, I would like to submit that our leaders met the Pakistani Prime Minister Junejo three times and extended their hands of friendship and proposed to improve cultural and trade relations with each other, but it appears as if Pakistan is least bothered about them in view of our clear cut foreign policy, whenever we tried to come closer over the negotiation table, it spurned out offer by saying that they want "No War Pact" only so as to mislead the world. Does it not see the spirit of 'No War Pact' in our peace and co-operation proposals, treaty of friendship and offer of improvement in trade and cultural relations between two countries. Their intention are wrong. Recently, on the 12th of march, Pakistan again reiterated his proposal of 'No. War Pact'. India is the country which initiated the Afghanistan treaty, although the whole world have an inching that India is pro-Russia and so it doesn't want that the Russian forces should leave Afghanistan. But now it is clear that a totally baseless allegation was levelled against us. The whole world has seen our efforts on the issue of Afghanistan treaty and our hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of External Affairs Shri Natwar Singh welcomed it. But even after all these things, America did not give any indication of suspending its military -aid to Pakistan, So it appears that India is not going to gain anything from Afghan-Accord. America's policy has become clear.

Just now, some hon. Members made a passing reference to Janata rule. At that time also, we had more or less same foreign policy, but as far the principles are concerned, there were some aberrations in the foreign policy during that time. Prof. Madhu Dandavate has left the house, may be know-

ingly that Panika is about to say something. You may remember that in those days how we were getting closer to America and one of our foreign based ambassadors had to stoop so low. I don't want to mention it in precise terms because that is an unparliamentary language. You might be remembering this also that when Shri Atal Bihari Bajpai was sitting in the guest house of China, the Chinese returned the gesture by attacking on Vietnam. It was due to our distorted foreign policy. Time has witnessed that whenever there was some distortion in our foreign policy. We have to bear its adverse consequences.

Sir, janata Party changed the foreign policy in practice though they had declared in writing that they would not change the foreign policy due to which we had to face the consequences. So it is imperative that we should remain alert from Pakistan, as also said by our Hon. Prime Minister while addressing the conference of Commanders at some place. From reliable sources, it is known that Pakistan has made much head way in the process of obtaining enriched uranium and also making atom bomb and even then they talk of "no-war pact". So India must review the situation very cautiously and in the present situation it would not be prudent on our part to reduce our military capabilities. An amount of Rs. 130 crores have been earmarked on this score and if need be, we can enhance this amount also. But we want to have good relations with our neighbouring countries and it is a matter of happiness that our relations with China have improved due to the visits of foreign ministers to each-other country and this will pave the way in settling our disputes.

I do not want to say anything about Japan, Kampuchea and Vietnam, as the Hon. Prime Minister already expressed his views yesterday in this regard, but just now Shri Bhatia was saying so, I would like to submit in clear terms that the whole world

has supported and applauded the Srilanka-accord except our opposition parties and Pakistan. Our intentions are clear. Only our proposition parties and Pakistan has criticised it because they don't want us to be successful. It is necessary that the Sri-Lanka accord is fully implemented so that the Tamilians can live peacefully in Sri Lanka and carry on their business and set up administration of their choice.

Sir, not only with Sri Lanka, but with other countries also, we have good relations. We left the chairmanship of SAARC for Bangla Desh. We are cautious every where. In today's meeting, we hosted 45 nations although it was not our responsibility. Our hon. Minister of External Affairs Shri Natwar Singh and our Hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi deserve to be congratulated as they have not given any chance to the world to raise fingers on us. It is the reason that whether our foreign policy is of non-alignment or any other thing, the countries who want peace in the whole world, accepted our leadership and made Shrimati Indira Gandhi the Chair Person and after her, Shri Rajiv Gandhi was made its chairman. The reason behind it is that we never made agreements on the cost of our national interest.

They say that India is pro-communist. Nixon has written in a book that India has got remarkable political achievements. He has also written that India is pro-Russia with regard to economic and military affairs. But it is not so, On the basis of friendship, we only want cooperation for maintaining peace in the world. Our foreign policy is not pro to anyone and if it is, then it is pro-India. The meaning of pro-India is that we aim at to maintain peace all over the world. So India never wants to attack on any other country or to interfere in the internal matters of others and similarly we do not like that any country should interfere in our internal affairs.

[English]

SHRI TARUN KANTI GHOSH (Barasat): Mr. Chairman Sir, I rise to support the budget proposals of the Foreign Ministry.

As we know, India since independence has pursued a very correct foreign policy which has been appreciated throughout the world. This policy was enunciated by our great leader, the first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It may be said that the same policy has been followed by Indiraji and Rajivji also is following the same policy.

Our foreign policy is not a weak policy. It is a positive neutrality, positive non-alignment. Positive non-alignment means that we don't bow out to any big foreign power; but at the same time we don't hesitate to say the right thing even if it is against the biggest power in the world.

I would like to say that the Natwarji who is our Minister of State for Foreign Affairs has been doing a commendable job going wherever there is need for his presence. I appreciate very much India's support to the African nations. India has been subjugated under foreign rule for a long time. It is very right that we must support all the oppressed nations in the world. That is exactly what we are doing. We are supporting the African nations where there is still the apartheid being practised. Because of their colour there is discrimination. We should give them more support so that in the near future this blasphemy would go away from the world.

We are also following a policy of giving support to the Arab States which I feel is a correct policy as far as we are concerned.

The need for our close relationship with our neighbours is also very much there. I know, we have got good relations with Burma, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka is a good example. I want to tell that our young Prime

[Sh. Tarun Kanti Ghosh]

Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi has tackled the situation wonderfully well. Naturally we regret that many army people have died there—no doubt it—but a situation was being created where Sri Lanka could have been one of the biggest conspiratorial ports against India. Shri Rajiv Gandhi stopped that with his foresight and bold leadership.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, it is our great regret that the people of Pakistan do not realise the heart of India. Pakistan was one day a part of India. Pakistani people should know and I want to announce this from the Lok Sabha that we have nothing but a lot of affection and goodwill for the people of Pakistan. Unfortunately the Army Generals, the dictators who are now running Pakistan want to create an anti-India feeling to stay in power. They know that the day the people of Pakistan realise that India is not their enemy; but a real brother, their stay in power will not be there.

It is also so unfortunate that American which is a democratic country is helping Pakistan. We have the greatest respect for the American people. But now we have seen that the American administration and the people of America are two different things. It is so unfortunate that America is giving arms to Pakistan which is under dictatorship and which is not a democratic country against India. Whatever they may say that it is being given against Russia or due to the Afghanistan problem yet even after the Geneva accord they have announced that they will continue to give arms to Pakistan. Why do they want to do it? Is it that they want to continue trouble in Afghanistan or is it against India? We have the greatest respect for the American people but India can never be cowed down by any threat from Pakistan, America or anybody. It is not possible to cow down 800 million people of India. So I would like to appeal to the American administration not to commit the same mistake which was

committed by Nixon in those days when we had conflict with Pakistan due to their wrong strategy in Bangladesh. Today once again I want to make an appeal to the Reagan administration that they are following a wrong policy. They are antagonising 800 million people's goodwill. For what! I see no reason why they should go on doing this. They should stop arming Pakistan. They should not make the peaceful Indian Ocean an arena of conflict. The American arms should not be flown to this region. We want peace. We want brotherhood. We are progressing. We do not want war in this region. We do not have any territorial ambition against any country.

I would also like to say that Pandit Nehru from the very beginning wanted to make friendship with China. We realise today what a great leader he was and what a tremendous foresight he had. If China and India could become good friends then there would be no power on earth to come and dictate terms to us. Unfortunately China did not accept India's friendship. They betrayed Nehru's friendship. Even today they are keeping some of our border land. I fully support Rajivji's declaration that we want to have friendship with China because of China becomes friend of India then Pakistan will lose its strategic stance. Pakistan knows very well that India can never be cowed down but India can be surrounded by China on the one side and Pakistan on the other side and through that they want to create trouble.

Further Pakistan should not create trouble in Punjab. Punjab is one of the most prosperous State not only in India but in the whole of sub-continent and by giving support to the terrorists they are doing more harm to the humanity and to our friendship than any other thing.

The latest development that has taken place in Iran and Iraq war is very unfortunate.

I do not know whether it is right or wrong the shelling by Americans of Iranian oil platforms and the Iranians shelling the American ships but after the American attack Russia has warned and I appeal to America not to escalate the conflict there. This may lead to a bigger conflict. I request the Foreign Minister to take cognizance of it and we must do something to stop this unnecessary man slaughter. At one time our forefathers used to learn Persian. So we must tell our brothers and sisters in Iran and Iraq—once Persia—to stop this madness. If they have got anything they should settle it across the table and have peace in this region

Lastly I would like to say that the policy which is being pursued by Rajivji has the support of the entire nation, has the support, I think, of all the political parties of this country. I fully support what they are doing and in giving my support to the Budget, I conclude my speech.

SHRI P.K.THUNGON (Arunachal West): Sir, I have been sitting right from the morning and listening with rapt attention to the deliberations. I have, for a change, heard from even Opposition benches praising the foreign policy, non-alignment policy. I certainly would like to join with my colleagues in congratulating the Government, particularly the Prime Minister and the External Affairs for pursuing incessantly and fruitfully the non-aligned policy formulated by our late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and strengthened by Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

I don't want to elaborate about the usefulness of our foreign policy not only for our country but for whole of the human-beings on this earth. I would simply like to pose a few questions before us. While our foreign policy is no doubt one of the best in the world, in the present circumstances, whether we shall have to give a thought to have certain changes wherever necessary? For example, I want to cite the conditions in

Tibet. We must now look back. We must learn from the history that what we committed at a certain point of time in the history, whether that kind of blunders of that kind of things we should go on committing.

In the beginning of our Independence, I think, the committed some blunder in respect of our policy towards Tibet. That's why today we are facing a lot of problems in respect of our relations with Tibet, China and other neighbouring countries.

So far as international arena is concerned our foreign policy has proved very successful. But there are certain drawbacks so far as our neighbours are concerned. Therefore, I would like to urge upon the Government to give a serious thought in this regard.

Inside Tibet, human rights are being violated now. That's why we are facing more and more problems from our northern border. You will be surprised to know that every sixth Tibetan in Tibet has been killed by China. Every sixth Tibetan has been killed because of Chinese atrocities.

We talk very loudly for the interests of black brothers and sisters in South Africa. At the same time, we shall have to think whether this is not the time to speak in the same tone about our brothers and sisters who are languishing in Tibet under the atrocities of China. We have a very good international image so far as our foreign policy is concerned. But if we start giving some kind of doubt to the international community that when we speak about South Africa. When we speak about Palestinians, we are silent about Tibet. So, there may be some doubt in the international communities minds that as if India is playing a dual role or some sort of a double game. Therefore, I urge that in this regard, a serious thought may be given.

[Sh. P.K. Thungon]

I would like to mention about Burma. It is well known to every knowledgeable Indian that insurgence in Nagaland operate from Burmese territory. Insurgence inside Arunachal Pradesh operate from Burma. Therefore, this is high time that we shall have to think very seriously to have proper relationship with Burmese Government and the people of Burma so that our security is properly protected.

I would like to mention a word about Bhutan. In Tibet, there was under-development, regional imbalances and that is why the Chinese Government got the opportunity to say as if they were the saviours of Tibetan people there. We shall have to be careful with our neighbours who are very close to us. There, if people are kept in such a backward area and kept in such an isolation, later on, there may boomerang as we have faced in the case of Tibet. We have been hearing of talks, particularly in Arunachal Pradesh, with China about our international boundaries. After the occupation of the Sumdorong Chu Valley in Arunachal Pradesh, we have been hearing the talks at various places in Delhi and in Peking. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister that there is a strong feeling amongst the people of Arunachal Pradesh and not only the people of Arunachal Pradesh but the people those who are in those areas, in those far-flung border areas that as if their interests are not properly looked after by the Government of India. Why should this feeling come up? I would like to suggest to our hon. Minister that when he conducts talks, if possible to take some of the representatives of those areas to the talks. I am told and I am rather surprised that when we had a talk with China, which was after the Sumdorong Chu Valley incident, some of our officers could not even pronounce the name properly. I do not know whether it is right or wrong, I demand an explanation from the hon. Minister in his speech. And on the other side of the

table in the talks, our officers were humiliated by saying that how can it be your land when you cannot even pronounce the name. If these are the things which really humiliate our nation or our position, we cannot even demand properly. I wish it is wrong. If it is wrong, I will be rather happy.

I would like to make one point about the Macmohan Line. Only two days ago, a statement has come out from the Vice-Premier of China stating that they do not recognise the Macmohan Line. I would agree with him. Why should they recognise the Line? When the Macmohan Line agreement was made, when the agreement was signed, at that time it was not China, it was Tibet who signed it and who recognised it. Therefore, when the question of Macmohan Line comes, the question of Tibet again arises. These points have to be kept in mind when we start talking across the table, at whatever level it may be.

Sir, now I would like to mention a few words about Nepal. We have very good relations with Nepal. Nepal and India are the only two countries where the people can go freely and can work freely in both these countries. Unless we are very careful the world is advancing very fast materially and in all respects - I would like to make a word of caution that unless in pursuing our policies in respect of Nepal we are careful, perhaps some of them may try to score a point.

Lastly, because I am not in the habit of fighting with you and you have already rung the bell, I would like to talk about the background of the humiliation or the insult that the Chinese are perpetrating on us. The Hon. Member, my Hon. colleague has very rightly pointed out about the 1962 invasion by China. It is known to the nation that because of their treachery we had lost Pandit Nehru. He could not recover from the shock he suffered. After that there are series of insults that they have perpetrated on us.

So far as I remember, I came here in 1980 as a Member of Parliament. One of our Members was to be sent in a delegation to China. Our Speaker's name was proposed and China refused to give visa stating that as Arunachal Pradesh was within China, our Speaker was a Chinese and so he did not need a visa. This was a real insult.

After that, in 1982 when the ASIAD took place, the people of Arunachal Pradesh sent a team of Lion dancers. Then they objected saying that this Lion dance was a Chinese dance.

After that again the Sumderong Chu Valley incident took place.

Then in this August House we passed a Bill giving Statehood to Arunachal Pradesh. And that also they objected.

Recently they have again objected about the McMohan Line.

So, what are we going to do about all these insults? Are we going to quietly sit and pocket all the insults? I would like the Hon. Minister to take a serious view of it. We shall have to by hook or crook take back our territory. Even an inch should not be given to them. We must take back the Sumdorong Chu Valley.

Many members have mentioned about Pakistan. Sir, it is known that they are sending arms to the terrorists in Punjab. It is known that they are sending their people to help our terrorists. I would like to know from the Hon. Minister, what are we doing? Then we are seeing everything and we have got every possible proof, what are we doing? Even Gen. Zia is again and again telling lies. Their Prime Minister is also telling lies to our Prime Minister. What are we going to do? We shall have to think very seriously. If they can send terrorists inside our territory, can't we send our terrorists there? Sir, what I

meant was that I do not want further escalation. In what way are we going to tackle this situation? That is the main point. We are suffering from various problems created by our neighbours. So, I think it is time we shall have to give a serious thought.

At the end, Sir, I would like to go a little further away from India. I had an opportunity to visit a few countries in Latin America. They are very good friends of India and they look to India as the leader of the Non-aligned Movement. Therefore, they have great expectations from India. I would like our Hon. Minister to give a serious thought to this aspect also, so that, though they are located very far away, we can still have more cultural and trade relations. We must have more and more economic and cultural and other mutual programmes.

At the end, I must again thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. Since you have rung the last bell, as a disciplined member, I must sit down.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY (Kurnool): Mr. Chairman Sir, let me heartily congratulate the Hon. Member from Arunachal Pradesh who has just now completed his speech, for his very practical approach and for stating the hard truth in this House. The debate on foreign affairs attracts lots of pious platitudes and pulpit sermons. We Indians are very emotional and we wax eloquence about great principles of Dharma right from the Buddha onwards. But our foreign policy is expected to be result-oriented. Everybody knows the twin objectives of the foreign policy. The first is to improve the national security environment and lessen the tension on the borders and to lessen the defence problems. The second objective is to increase our trade, commerce business and industry with all other countries. If we judge our foreign policy on the basis of these twin objectives, we will certainly be able to have a realistic assessment of our success or

[Sh. E. Ayypu Reddy]
failure

15.52 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Let me not make a long speech. I may pose some of the important problems. The first problem which my predecessor has touched is our relations with China. Last Year, it was admitted that China had occupied a portion of Arunachal Pradesh, that is the Sumdorong Chu Valley. We were very apprehensive that they might be going to occupy much more. In fact, they did not recognise Arunachal Pradesh as a separate State. Now, it is very astonishing to find that there is not even a mention as to what you have done with this occupation of a portion of Arunachal Pradesh by China. You have not mentioned anything about it. You have simply glossed over it. You have merely said that you have entered into a trade pact amounting to 150 million to 200 million dollars. Why should we gloss over this important aspect?

Then with regard to Bangladesh, last time also, the problem of the Chakma refugees was there. Now what is your answer to this? You have stated that the issue of the Chakma refugees in India was raised, but no agreement has been reached regarding their repatriation to Bangladesh. Is this the reply that we expect of you? What are you going to do about the repatriation of these Chakma refugees? What concrete steps have you taken or are going to take? There is no answer so far as China and Bangladesh are concerned.

May I also ask a question about Tibet? Do we have to have certain set of standards for some countries and yet another set of standards for some other countries, as far as suppression of human rights are concerned? Are we not going to apply the same

standards to all and in particular to the suppression of human rights in Tibet? Don't we have even a single word to utter? Don't we have the courage to utter that word against the suppression of human rights in Tibet?

Next I will come to the Ceylon problem. Your revelation that Prabhakaran was paid—regarding this you have not explained anything. I expected some sort of explanation from you. But there is no explanation whatsoever, in the report given to the House,

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K.NATWAR SINGH) : I made a detailed statement in the House.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY: Then, when are we going to get it? Recently the Prime Minister told in a Press Conference that as soon as the elections in Ceylon are held, the problem will be sorted out and the Army will be withdrawn. There must be a timetable for this. We expect that our IPKF will come back to India in a time schedule and in a time frame. We do not want to become unpopular both with the Tamilians and with the Sinhalese. A greater stay there is likely to earn for us no goodwill. Therefore our object must be to withdraw our IPKF as urgently as possible.

Now I will come to Afghanistan. It is very big question though we welcome the Geneva Agreement. The question mark over Afghanistan is as big as it was previously. In fact there was a statement by General Zia-ul-Haq that Najibullah would be overthrown and Mujahideen will take over Afghanistan. So far as India is concerned we are not able to see any sort of relief. During the last eight years on account of Russian occupation there, we have been paying very indirectly a heavy price, because Pakistan was being armed to teeth by the USA. The next result being, we have to increase our Defence preparedness and go in for more sophisti-

cated arms. The burden was borne by us. This problem is not going to be lessened on account of Geneva talks or Geneva Agreement, because USA itself has not given any assurance that it is not going to send arms to Pakistan. On the other hand, today morning, there was a question regarding supply of sophisticated arms to Pakistan, such as AWACS and other aircrafts and it was admitted that America is supplying the finest weapons to Pakistan. It continues to do so. In fact now it has proclaimed that Pakistan is a surrogate of USA. You see the position here. So far as Pakistan's foreign policy is concerned, it is paying its dividends all round. It is able to hunt with the hound and run with the hare. It has been able to get the maximum benefit from all.

Now Pakistan's policy of hate India is paying dividends to it. It won't give up. Our trying to bridge or trying to have diplomatic talks or trying to arrive at some sort of a settlement with Pakistan have totally ended in a failure. Why? It is because of hate India policy which is being preached and practised by Pakistan. It is paying dividends. They are getting the biggest and mightiest help from USA. They are going to continue that policy. Now the Geneva Agreement proclaims Pakistan as a surrogate because a-guarantee was given by USA.

16.00 hrs.

At the same time, Pakistan is an Honourable member of the non-aligned movement. It is non-aligned. It is having good relations, is a member of NAM. What is more, it has become the favourite of USA, and Uncle Sam is prepared to tolerate anything for Pakistan. Even if Pakistan is sitting on the neck of USA and tries to take away nuclear weapons or nuclear weapon technology from USA, they are not going to mind it. They are not going to object to it. That has become very clear, because except one Senator Glenn, no other person seems to

have taken any objection to Pakistan going nuclear and manufacturing nuclear weapons. So, what are the practical changes of your policy, so that Pakistan's hate-India policy does not pay it dividends? China is also encouraging Pakistan, because so long as it goes on practising a hate-India policy, it will be a favourite of China also. At the same time, all our Gulf country friends are going to help Pakistan. Mr. Kabuli was saying that India's prestige in the Arab countries is far bigger than the prestige which Pakistan and Bangladesh are having. Quite right. I agree with him: we must maintain our relationship with all the Arab countries, and improve them.

But so far as Pakistan is concerned, unfortunately we are not able to cope up with their diplomacy; and you have to find a way-out; and we must be in a position to tell the world and tell all those people who are encouraging Pakistan to hate India and practise the policy of hate-India, that it will not pay, and India will not tolerate such a pursuit of Pakistan's foreign policy.

We are very happy that we are trying to improve our relations with Japan. Japan is a force to reckon with. In fact, it is the economic giant of Asia, and it is absolutely necessary for us to improve our trade, technological, industrial and commercial relations with Japan.

With regard to NAM, I am very sorry to say that it is not able to play an positive role. For instance, in the Geneva Agreement there is no mention about NAM. What is NAM doing now? In the fight between Iraq and Iran, nothing concrete has been achieved by the NAM, though both Iraq and Iran are members of NAM. Similarly, even in bringing about the Geneva Agreement, we never heard anything about NAM. What are the relations of NAM to the active intervention of American in the Gulf war? Tension has been created very recently by America's

[Sh. E. Ayypu Reddy]

directly intervening and destroying the oil platforms of Iran. What is the reaction of Government of India, and what are the reactions of NAM countries? Are they intending to meet; what is the stand they are going to take with regard to bringing about peace and to preventing intervention by this Super Power in the Gulf war?

With regard to keeping Indian Ocean a zone of peace, unfortunately, the conference is yet to take place—in 1990. We have to make every serious efforts and see that the Indian Ocean is kept a zone of peace.

Some of these problems, especially with our neighbours, have to be looked into in a realistic way. While we are admitting that Pakistan is trying to destabilise our country and there is a clear proof that Pakistan is interfering and trying to destabilise our country by bringing disorder and anarchy in Punjab, I appreciate what my predecessor has said that we must do something of the type which they are trying to do; we should try to pay them in the same coin. Though it is a reaction which an ordinary Indian or an educated man may not like to have, that would be a reaction of an ordinary India. So, something has to be done so as to prevent Pakistan from bringing anarchy in India.

[Translation]

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER (Ghazipur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands of Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs and besides, I would like to express my views on the foreign policy.

Sir, much have been said about Pakistan in this August House. The Government of India has its own policy about Pakistan and in our country there are two schools of thought with regard to it. One school of thought propounded the policy of firmness with Pakistan and the other advocated leni-

ent view to be taken with Pakistan. Such views have been propounded in this August House but both of them recognise the military dictatorship in Pakistan, not the people of Pakistan.

It is regretted that neither of the two schools of thought appreciates the feelings of the people of Pakistan. Everyone say that we have deep relations with Pakistan and we have been divided only forty years ago. We are brothers, but inspite of this deep relation, our country is not recognising the facts regarding the hardship the people of Pakistan are facing, the administration which has been forced upon them and they have no voice in it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, so far we will not give recognition to the feelings of the people of Pakistan and support their movement for democracy and extend our moral support, our relations with Pakistan cannot improve. It has been our experience that our relations with Pakistan was found to be strained whenever there was military dictatorship in that country. It is because the military administrators in Pakistan who create an atmosphere of hatred against India in their country and draw a very fearful picture of India before the people of Pakistan in order to remain in power in Pakistan.

Our relations with Pakistan were found to be very cordial, whenever there was democracy in that country. We always had good relations with the democratically elected Prime Ministers in that country. It is only when democracy is restored there, our relations with that country will be good. Otherwise we cannot maintain cordial relationship with the people of that country. We are very close to each other and appreciate the sentiments of love and warmth that we have for each other. There cannot be two opinion about it. There cannot be other example of peace and harmony between the people of two different countries in the world

than that of Pakistan and India provided democracy is restored in Pakistan.

The same is the case with Bangladesh. We are as much close to the people of Bangladesh as we are close to the Pakistani people. Prior to 1947, formed part of one country, we all belonged to that country. But situation in Bangladesh is as worse as it is in Pakistan. Bangladesh also has been placed under military regime on the line of Pakistan. The people of that country are also struggling for the restoration of democracy in the country. The people are raising their voices against the military junta. We have a special commitment with Bangladesh. We played a very important role in the independence of that country. We made them independent and restored democracy there. Now it has been captured by military dictators. The kind of relations we had at the time of democracy in that country are no longer the same now with the military administrator. Our relations with both Pakistan and Bangladesh are not good. We can have good relations with these two countries only when democratic Governments are formed there. We should, therefore, extend our full support to their agitation which they have launched for the restoration of democracy.

It should not be forgotten that India, Pakistan and Bangladesh taken together are called a sub-continent which is our common heritage. It is on this land that we started our freedom movement and it is on this land that we started our struggle for the restoration of democracy a century ago at different places, such as Dhaka, Lahore, Calcutta or Madras, even prior to establishment of Congress Party, which has completed 100 years of its coming into being. We had started our struggle for the restoration of democratic traditions. This is a legacy to the jointly shared. We are forgetting our brothers who are being suppressed by the military junta and we are behaving with them in a manner as if they are aliens to us. Techni-

cally, it may be a separate country in terms of the international law, but can we ever forget our common lineage, common history and the heritage of freedom movement that are share jointly .

I want that we should extend out full support to the people of Pakistan and Bangladesh who are trying to restore democracy in their respective countries .

The second thing I would like to say is about China. A lot of things is said about China. We sometimes hear that Indo-China relations are improving and sometimes we hear that they are not. The wound inflicted on us by China by attacking on us in 1962, has by now healed up but it has left a permanent scar on us reminding us from time to time that as large as 1000 kilometres of our land is still under illegal occupation of China which makes us to groan for it. Any citizen of India will groan for this loss. What the Government is doing in this connection? What are we doing in this regard? Sometimes we read in the newspapers that India is holding talks with China. A few days ago our colleague, Shri Thungan had said in Arunachal Pradesh that the Chinese troops have intruded into the Indian territory. We did not pay much attention towards it. There is no harm if we can maintain good relationship with China and solve the border disputes through bilateral discussion. I would, rather, welcome this measure. But if they go on disgracing us, rejecting our proposals and taking unilateral action on borders, how far it be tolerated? How long will we go on doing this. Does the Government of India not remember that as large as thousand kilometres of our land is in illegal occupation of China. What reply will we give to the people of India

We make tall claims about our foreign policy. I also welcome it. But what action we are going to take to retrieve thousand kilometres of land now lying in Chinese posses-

[Sh. Zainul Basher]

sion. While the Hon. Minister of External Affairs gives his reply, he should spell out the measures the Government of India proposes to take to retrieve thousand kilometres of our land from Chinese possession so as to satisfy the whole country.

I would like to say a few words about Sri Lanka. A contingent of army is still present there. We had to send our army to that island under the compulsion of India-Sri Lanka Agreement because we were left with no alternative. We all welcome the steps taken by the Government in this regard. But we should withdraw our troops as early as possible. To-day we find that we have been placed in a position where neither Sri Lankan Government, for whom we sent our army, nor the L.T.T.E., of course it is not unexpected on their parts, is welcoming us. The Government of Sri Lanka, for which our army made a sacrifice, for which the Government of India did a lot, is not supporting the action of the government of India. The statements made by them in this connection is very derogatory and disgraceful to the people of India. Whatever we say, they contradicted it. It is contradicted in some form or the other either by the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, or by the any other Minister or the President of Sri Lanka, Mr. Jayawardane himself.

It was all right that we took the responsibility to restore peace in Sri Lanka. Now as soon as peace is restored there, it will be in our country's interest to withdraw from that island. It will not be in our country's interest if our army is allowed to prolong further. After all, U.S.S.R. also had to leave Vietnam. No army of a country can stay in alien land for a longer period. It will have to face humiliation if its stay is lingered on in the alien land. It will, therefore, be in the fitness of things that sooner we withdraw our troops from Sri Lanka, better it would be.

With these words, I again support the

foreign policy. At the same time I congratulate those officers of the Ministry of External Affairs who are working abroad. Their work is good. I have a word of praise for the sacrifice they are making and for duty they are performing under very odd circumstances in foreign countries in order to implement the foreign policy of the Government of India. I congratulate all of them for the same.

[English]

SHRI MAHABIR PRASAD YADAV (Madhepura): I rise to support the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

It is very good that India is following the policy of Gautam Buddha.

"Nahin Vairen Vairani
Samdanti Na Kadachana"

Inspite of the fact that the situation and circumstances have changed, yet India is following the policy of non-violence. In spite of the fact that India is getting provocations from the neighbouring country, India is following the path of non-violence. The two basic features of India's external policy have been *Panchsheel* and Principles of non-alignment. I appreciate them very much. But the Government should take into consideration the changing situation and circumstances. Non-alignment is a very good thing. Jammu & Kashmir is an integral part of India. Can our Government take the test how many countries in the non-aligned movement are ready to say that the Jammu & Kashmir is an integral part of India? I have a feeling that so many countries will not come to our rescue.

Mr. Kabuli was telling about Israel. But he never came to the point how far Pakistan is giving trouble to India. I believe, it is not Pakistan that is having enmity with India. It is something like the Headmaster through

the class teacher. Pakistan is a class teacher and headmaster is somewhere else. Had the headmaster not instigated, this class teacher could not have the courage to go against India. Therefore, only the Buddhist philosophy in the changed circumstance cannot work as I feel, Buddhist country like China attacked India in the year 1962 and India could not save itself from that attack. Buddhism, I think, is not to be taken as a basic philosophy in the changing situation and circumstances. I repeat the word of Tulsidas:

“Bhaya Bin Hoi Na Preeti”

Love and Lovliness cannot come without fear. In politics, vice, virtues lamp and lion should go together. We the Indians have to be prepared liked Bhagwan Krishna. We should not only have lotus and *shanka* in our hands, flute in our mouth but also *chakra* and *gadda* in our hands. Unless and until we have *gadda* and *chakra* in our hand, I feel that India is not going to have regard and respect. We see that everywhere we are being browbeaten. The creator is browbeating the creator, that is, Bangladesh is browbeating India. Here I give some figures. The figure of aid to Bangladesh is Rs. one crore, fifty-one lakhs, and that of loans it is Rs. eight crores. You know that Chakma problem has not been solved. The Chakma refugees problem is still there. Yet you are going to give loans and aid to Bangladesh. Are we not doing that at the cost of India? I fail to understand, Bangladesh is giving you the refugee problem and yet you are giving them loans and aid.

Now I come to Nepal. Nepal is our very good neighbour. But when China attacked India in 1962, Nepal could not have a word to say that it was wrong. Yet you are going to give Nepal the aid of Rs.21 crores and the loans of Rs.25 crores. I do not object to this. You may give loans and aid to Nepal or Bangladesh. But what is Nepal doing to us?

Day before yesterday, Mr. Rajhans raised a matter under rule 377. He said, our vehicles are not allowed to pass over the barrage which has been constructed by India in the territory of Nepal. Our vehicles are not allowed to pass over that barrage. Our buses and trucks are allowed to pass only when they pay toll at a very exorbitant rate. Therefore, I do not object to the loans or aid to be given to Nepal or Bangladesh, but the interests of India must be kept in mind.

Jawaharlal Nehru was a very great man. You will appreciate that just one kilometre ahead of the Indian territory, Kosi barrage was constructed and like that, Gandak barrage was also constructed at a short distance from the Indian territory, in the territory of Nepal. But our Indian interests are suffering their like anything. Even the Minister is not allowed to pass over the barrage without keeping the flag down. This is the way Nepal is behaving with India. I do not mean that I object to the basic features of our foreign policy. It is very good—non-alignment or panchsheel, or whatever you say. But the interests of India must be kept in mind.

Lastly, I will say one thing. I will quote one line of Kennedy: “The best way to prevent war is to remain prepared for war.” We must remain prepared for war at any cost, but we must not go down and get demoralised. Let us stand on our own legs and see that Indian is defended at any cost and India must act in such a way that it is appreciated all over the world.

[Translation]

SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD SINGH (Jahanabad): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I express my thanks to you for providing me time to speak on Demands of Grants in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs.

The foundation of our foreign policy was

[Sh. Ramashray Prasad Singh] laid by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. While in jail, he had written a book "Glimpses of the World History". I had the opportunity of reading this book while I was in jail. I find that our foreign policy is based on the views expressed by Panditji in the above book. In the year 1917, Jawaharlal ji propounded a new theory in the world that the labour struggle will be very helpful to the world and it will be helpful to the national movements started in India to remove the Britishers from Indian soil. Our country's foreign policy is based on this principle. This policy was formulated by that great man and we are treading on the path shown by him. There are no two opinions about it that the policy of non-alignment and peace has raised the prestige of our country. Except for two years, the Congress Party has all along been in power in the country. During those two years, the power came to the hands of some other party. During this period they did not extend any help to the Government of Kampuchea. They did not recognise the Kampuchea Government. But as soon as Indira Gandhi's Government came to power, it immediately gave recognition to Kampuchea. There can no other better evidence of our policy of non-alignment than this. It shows how strong our policy of non-alignment is. Though there are only two super powers in the world yet it is only due to our non-alignment policy that the Geneva treaty was signed and it is a fact that the said treaty reduced tension in the world.

The third thing I would like to say is the issue of Afghanistan. As regards the presence of soviet troops in Afghanistan our non-aligned country has all along been saying that the U.S.S.R. should withdraw its troops from Afghanistan, if Afghanistan does not indulge in any conspiracy. When the question of withdrawing the troops came to reach a final stage, two Defence Ministers came to Pakistan and they strongly said that even if the U.S.S.R. withdraw its troops, they will continue to supply arms to Pakistan. It amply

shows that there was a conspiracy to supply arms and it has nothing to do with the presence of soviet troops. These imperialistic forces are afraid of the policy of non-alignment and engaged in creating instability in our country. The forces are working through Pakistan. I, therefore, request the Government to further strengthen our non-alignment policies. It is a great thing that we are leading the non-aligned countries. It is due to that we come across such good developments in our country.

Some other problems like the Sri Lanka Problem are also there. At a time when communal forces and separatist forces were present in that Island, the Indo-Sri Lanka Accord was signed. In accordance with the provisions of that accord, the Peace Keeping Force had to be deployed there to stamp out these forces. Our peace Keeping Force is working to give the Tamils their rights. We hope that our army will achieve success in its task before returning to India and the Tamils will get their legitimate rights. The report further reveals that sincere efforts are being made to hold Indo-China talks. The whole country is looking at the date on which such a meeting will be held and this problem will be solved. I do not want to say anything special. Therefore, I conclude here.

[English]

SHRI VIR SEN (Khurja): Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Sir, our foreign policy has stood the test of time and I think that the best test of pudding is in the eating. With a little modification I would say that the test of the pudding is in the number is in the number of purchasers or buyers.

As you see, two-thirds of the world has accepted our policy of non-alignment and this perhaps is sufficient proof that our for-

oreign policy is based on sound reason and sound footing.

Sir, our policy is based on non-aggression, non-interference and we do not think and we do not desire of extensionism. These are the bedrocks of our policy. Of course, during these 40 years of Independence we have been trying to solve our problems with our neighbours and with others through negotiations. But there are certain problems which have not subjected themselves to negotiation and one of the problems is that of China occupying 40,000 square kilometres of our land. Twenty-six years have passed and still the land is in the occupation and we have not been doing anything for that. Yesterday, an Hon. Member who was a Foreign Minister also, pleaded for peace, peace at any cost, meaning thereby that we should seek peace China even if they do not agree to return the 40,000 kilometres of land. I think this is an advice of imbecile passivity, imbecile acquiescence and I do not think that of course we can continue to follow such an advice and continue to accept this advice. Here the question of the honour of the land is involved. If that land remains with the Chinese and we acquiesce in it, naturally it mars our sense of self-respect and honour. So, if we have to deal with China, naturally for the time being of course I don't think there is any possibility or any option of entering into an armed conflict. That, of course, I do not think, I do not support of course that armed conflict is a solution. But what I think is that negotiations cannot go on for ever and there is a time, of course, when the time for negotiations runs out. At that time, of course, we have to take some action and what type of action can be, in my opinion, the military power that we have to build up and that alone is the solution. As long as China knows that in comparison, they are greater in number and they are stronger in power and they have a nuclear power, as long as they understand that India is weak, of course, they will not agree to any proposal. You will see,

during the last week, the Chinese Vice-Premier said, we do not recognise Meghalaya; let there be some concession on both sides. I do not think, of course, we can go by their words. We cannot take face value of their words. The last experience and the past experience has been, we have been crying for friendship, for brotherhood, we cried hoarse, Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai. But we were betrayed. So, we should take lesson from the past experience and we should know that Chinese are not reliable people and they can be cheating in words. So, as a matter of fact, what we should do is—of course, we cannot rely on their words on hints given by the Chinese authorities. As I said, the only solution, of course, is to build ourselves stronger so that China also realises that we can by force, take the land which they occupied for the last 26 years.

The main policy is regarding American, our relations with America. When we take that into consideration, we have to see, what is the role of America in the world politics and what are their objectives in the whole world. In my view, the Americans have a dream of world domination and they have been trying to do this. That is why, they are spreading their tentacles throughout the world. Their tentacles are visible in the Indian Ocean; their tentacles are visible in the Gulf and everywhere. In Africa also, their tentacles are visible. You see, their policy is world domination. Alexander was the first person who dreamt of this policy and after that, it was Bonaparte Napoleon who followed this policy. Hitler was the third person. Now, it is the American President who follows the policy with the same idea and same view to dominate the whole of the world. Their policy and method is little different from what the other people did. They followed the policy of military action, military domination. But America follows the policy of neo-imperialism, imperialism of new type, economic imperialism through loans, through military assistance and through debts and by subju-

[Sh. Vir Sen]
gating countries by proxy. This is the policy which, of course, we have to see, in relation to India also. This is the policy which they are adopting with regard to India also. What I say is, America, according to their policy, want every nation—weaker or developing nation—to come into their fold, to toe their line. If they do not toe their line, whichever party refuses to toe their line and refuses to serve their interest, they are against it. They would like to topple the Government...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI VIR SEN: For some Members, you have given one hour.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: it is according to the time available. What I mean is that American policy with regard to India also is that of an attempt to subjugate India and it is not directly, of course; it is indirectly, through proxy and through Pakistan. They are arming Pakistan not with a view that Pakistan is going to fight with Afghanistan or with Russia but their covert intention is to arm Pakistan so that some day they can fight and subjugate India through Pakistan. Pakistan is being armed to the hilt with a view that some day, they can attack India. This aspect of the question should be taken into account when the Government of India considers its relations with America and Pakistan.

America is engaged throughout the world in destabilisation, subversion and toppling of Governments and instigates rebellion. You will see that they are not only instigating rebellion but they are feeding rebellion, feeding Nicaragua, feeding contras and supplying arms and ammunition. They are aiding Mujahideens, rebels of Afghanistan who are located in Pakistan. These are the methods they are adopting and they sometimes go into direct action against Libya and India. During the last few

days, they have taken direct action in the Gulf also.

Sometimes they say that they stand for democracy. But, they do not stand for democracy. They support dictatorship. They do not stand for human rights. They contribute to blood-bath in several countries and they take international law into their own hands. They throw the principles of international law to the winds. It appears to me that with the Americans behaving as they are doing now, the international law has to be rewritten in a new form. This is a very dangerous things. America is behaving like a gangster and a bully boy. Wherever there is disagreement, America is exploiting the situation. Now, their covert action has been abandoned and they are coming forward overtly, explicitly and evidently. This is a dangerous development and I think that in our relations with America, we will have to take into consideration these things also.

American policy is governed by their own interests and their interests are of paramount importance to them. What are their interests? In my view, their interest is, first the sale of arms. They want to keep their weaponry industry alive and that is why they are supplying arms to all the countries wherever they are and in this sale of arms, they do not hesitate to supply arms even to those countries with which they are belligerent, for example, Iran. They clandestinely sold arms to Iran and they transferred the profits to contras. This is the morality they are showing.

We have to be very cautious in relation to American and we have to deal with them whatever our diplomatic language may require. We may call them friends. We may address them in any way but in the heart of hearts, we must know that they are hostile to us in every respect and this hostility will some day show through Pakistan.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI VIR SEN: Now, I would leave the other things.

What I would like to say is that these two Treaties, the INF Treaty and the Afghan Treaty, have been acclaimed by the world. We have also contributed to the execution of these Treaties. What I feel is that Mr. Reagan's tenure had been barren; there was no achievement in the seven years of his term; he was very anxious that something should be achieved during his tenure; that is why, he was keen that some sort of Agreements should be made and he entered into these Treaties, the INF Treaty and the Afghan Treaty. This was his necessity, his need to keep his name in the history that he had done something.

On the other hand, Mr. Gorbachov has been exemplary and masterly in his diplomatic art; he has come off with flying colours and has shown exceptional clarity of thought, a clear vision of objective and a clear and realistic appraisal of world problems and their solutions; he has shown himself to be real peace-maker, a master diplomat; I think, with the achievement he has made, he has qualified himself for the award of the Nobel Prize for Peace.

In the end, I would like to say one thing. Of course, we have been dealing with Pakistan. Pakistan has been thwarting our efforts for peace and friendship. The Prime Minister has indicated yesterday also that they have been thwarting out efforts for peace. Then what is the solution? In my opinion, some sort of a modified Monroe Doctrine should be applied; our Government of India should apply this modified Monroe Doctrine. In the Monroe Doctrine President Monroe had said that if any outside country interfered with American neighbouring countries, then America would come to their rescue and

help. I think, in this way, if we declare that we shall come to the aid of every country in the sub-continent whenever it is attacked by any other country or whenever it is in economic crises or any other crisis, if we declare that we shall come to their aid in such a situation and we shall arm ourselves in such a way that we are able to support them and give them succour in their hour of need, if such conditions are created, if such a declaration is made, then some sort of a solution can be found to our problem with Pakistan. Otherwise, there will always a confrontation with Pakistan, and Pakistan is playing in the hands of America; this problem will always remain.

With these words, I support the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI HAROOBHAI MEHTA (Ahmedabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I join in the encomiums that have been showered on the foreign policy of our country. Except for one speaker yesterday and one speaker today, almost all the Hon. Members from all sides of the House have rightly appreciated our foreign policy and the progress achieved by our foreign policy. It is founded on very solid foundations laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, that is, our foreign policy will centre round 'quest for world peace'. It is not as if it is only centering round the security environment of India. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru never envisioned our foreign policy as something like a turtle withdrawing its limbs so that it can only protect its own interest. We are committed to contribute to the struggle for world peace, the non-alignment. Non-alignment genuine; not in the sense of criticising one power and another power alternatively; but non-alignment by strengthening the forces of peace as against the war mongering forces in the world.

The foreign policy, as has been rightly said, represents the conscience of our coun-

[Sh. Haroobhai Mehta]

try. So much so, it has the solid foundation in the hearts of the teeming millions of our country that even during the short interval when some other parties, ruled and the Foreign Minister belonged to a party which had a congenital preference for imperialists, despite certain clandestine, efforts, they could not change an inch in our foreign policy. The foreign policy laid down by Panditji and strengthened by Indiraji has been given a great leap forward by our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi. This is particularly the year of our achievements, at the height of our achievements. The INF treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States where in India has contributed is one of the achievements. Many people who cannot see the progress of India even though they belong to this country have said that India has not contributed. But I am reminded of the words of His Excellency the Soviet Ambassador in India that the foundation of the Treaty between the United States and the USSR was laid in Delhi and that is in Delhi Declaration signed by our Prime Minister and Mr. Gorbachev, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Soviet Union. There was also an initiative of India in Afghanistan, in Harare and in various other places. Wherever oppressed people needed the assistance of enlightened people, India has given the leadership.

I am afraid therefore that certain narrow views are sought to be advocated on our problems with our neighbours and this should not be highlighted further. Our policy even with regard to Pakistan was, as stated by Madam Indira Gandhi in these words, 'if you think that our interest conflicts, then you can have one agreement or hundred agreements; but we will not have peace'. We believe-India has believed and India does believe today-that our interest-i.e. Pakistan and India's interests-are largely the same. Our major problems are the problems of poverty, of the economic backwardness of

our country and the incessant efforts of the foreign powers to pressurise us.

We all know, and most of us have been involved in the freedom struggle what deliberate attempt there was to create friction within ourselves. In order to weaken the freedom struggle they knew that if all the religions and all the castes kept together then their unity would create a strength which no one will be able to move, not even the great British Empire. But they knew also that they could divide us on any issue-whether it was language or religion or anything else and then they would have a chance of defeating us. That is why their effort was to create differences.

Madam Indira Gandhi speaking to this House on July 31, 1972 said, after partition they - that is imperialists - could not do it in the same manner. Therefore an attempt of those forces who were interested in keeping our subcontinent weak was to see that the confrontation should continue between various parts of the sub-continent, so that we would be more involved in this sort of quarrel than in tackling the basic problems and trying to become strong in ourselves.

This is what we have to study. Where this is the State of Affairs, do we permit it or should we say 'Enough of the traps of others'. Today we must realise what is in our real interest's. There is no doubt that the real interests of this country, as of Pakistan lie in peak between the two countries.

I am sure, the same pronouncement made by the Prime Minister Indira Gandhi also forms the basis of our foreign policy even as regards Pakistan. Unfortunately Pakistan does not see reason to the extent that Pakistan still continues to have certain evil designs on our territory.

On 6th February a Minister from Pakistan - i.e. the Minister for Rural Development

from Sind - came to Gujarat and at Gandhinagar he said that Junagad still belongs to Pakistan and we don't recognise Junagad as a part of India and we shall continue to show Junagad in the map of Pakistan, since the problem is before the UN. This evil design of Pakistan should be exposed and contained.

We don't have any enmity towards any neighbour. Similarly, as regards China several people have advocated a belligerent policy. But I don't think that our foreign policy is so fragile or so brittle that negotiations would impair it and that we should resort to arms and friction for each and every problem. Negotiations and peaceful efforts are the strengths of the foreign policy. Therefore I support the policy of India in the matter of China on our border crisis.

Our quest for world peace is not just aimed at establishing world peace for the sake of peace. Our efforts for peace are also related to development. As Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has said a war is a negation of development.

17.00 hrs.

So also Pandit Nehru said and our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi has also said that the importance of disarmament lies in efforts of development of the world. Any expenditure on arms is negation of development and, therefore, we should continue to strengthen our support for disarmament accord. I must congratulate the Government on its awareness and alertness on various problems as, for example, Israel. It has shown promptness and fortitude in condemning aggression by Israel on Palestinians. Our Government very promptly condemned the murder committed by the Israel Government on the second in command of PLO. When our Tennis team was to be sent for Davis Cup to play on Israel land I had earlier written to the Government that we

should not send the team in view of the affairs there. The Government was prompt enough to declare that our team will not go in the present situation. Similarly our Cricket team was not permitted to go to Bangladesh when 21 opposition parties there had demanded that the Cricket tournament should not be held in the situation.

My submission, therefore, is that our foreign policy which has been acclaimed all around should be developed and I wish God speed to the Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs in further expanding the advance of our foreign policy in the interest of world peace.

THE PRIME MINISTER (Shri Rajiv Gandhi): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we have had an illuminating debate with many valuable and constructive suggestion and I would like to thank all the Members who have participated constructively in the debate.

There is a broad national consensus on the principles and objectives and on the way we conduct our foreign policy. Despite differences that occur in detail the main constituents of our foreign policy have been re-affirmed and re-iterated a number of times. The main constituents have a continuing relevance in today's world.

Sir, the world is changing very rapidly, especially international relations, in the last two or three years. New attitudes are developing, new ways of thinking are springing up and all this will pose new challenges to all countries in the world especially countries like India who play a significant role in international affairs. In such a situation, one cannot remain mired in the past. One must remain flexible. But at the same time one's basic principles and fundamental ethical perceptions must be rock steady on the postulates on which we have based our foreign policy.

[Sh. Rajiv Gandhi]

At one time we were regarded as immoral and impractical when we based our foreign policy on an ethical foundation. Today, this has changed. Now the world is accepting the indispensability of non-violence, of freedom from nuclear weapons and of disarmament. Today, the world accepts that there can be no real, complete development if truth is not unburdened of the weight of bloc interests and spheres of influence. The world is coming round more and more to our way of thinking, in seeing humanity as one without segmented interests, in celebrating and accepting the diversity of different peoples of this earth. Countries which were highly suspicious of peaceful coexistence, are today talking of peaceful coexistence and not of deterrence.

During these years, since our foreign policy was given a firm grounding by Jawaharlal Nehru, the world has started coming around to our world-view. And this is evidenced most recently by the Delhi Declaration, which was signed in November 1986, affirming non-violence and nuclear disarmament. It is being affirmed by the logic of reversing and ending escalating nuclear weapons development.

The SIX-NATION INITIATIVE was started with Indira in May 1984, at a time when the dialogue between the major powers was at a standstill, at a time when nobody thought that the tensions could come down. But by the efforts that she made, by the continuing efforts of the SIX nations in the FIVE-CONTINENT INITIATIVE, by the continuing efforts of all those involved in disarmament, by creating the atmosphere, the right atmosphere in the world, we have, for the first time, seen the dismantling of nuclear weapons after the signing of the INF treaty.

We have seen tensions coming down, especially amongst the major powers, and an acceptance of different socio-economic

systems. We see, for the first time, a little light for a true international democracy developing and moving away from a bipolar world.

This is the time for us to look ahead to a world where there may not be nuclear weapons, where disarmament will have taken place. We have to safeguard ourselves against new developments which could pull us back into the same competitive arms race. Beyond nuclear weapons, we must see that there are no other means of mass destruction developed. We must see that new dimensions are not added to the arms race and, equally important, we must see that no highly accurate conventional weapons are developed, what we have termed 'surgical weapons' in the FIVE-CONTINENT INITIATIVE, weapons, which used effectively, could remove the entire leadership of a nation without causing widespread damage but still causing complete chaos.

So, is the time to start thinking of how we can start controlling these things and putting things on to a new track. We need new structures of international cooperation. We need a really effective United Nations system, restructured to reflect international democracy and sovereign equality. We need international cooperation based on the recognition of one common family of human beings, an inter-dependence of interests, and the symbiosis of growth in the South with stability in the North. We need a world order based on the insights and values of Gandhiji and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sir, coming to South Asia, we have, on a number of occasions, reiterated our commitment to friendship and cordial and cooperative relations with Pakistan. We entertain the warmest sentiments for the people of Pakistan, with whom we share much in common—language, music and literature. We have a common history. There is no ill-will towards the people of Pakistan.

We wish them well. And, therefore, we greatly welcome any exchanges at the people's level—visitors, tourists, students, journalists, trade unionists women's groups. At every level, we would like to see many more exchanges. We seek inter-action with the new generation who have been born and who have grown up as Pakistanis but whom Pakistan policies have kept distanced from a personal knowledge of India. Peace between Pakistan and India is peace between their peoples.

To promote such contacts and build cordiality in the Shimla spirit, we have proposed a number of steps. I do not want to give an exhaustive list but I would like to read out some. We proposed a Treaty of Peace and Friendship. We proposed an agreement for non-attack on nuclear facilities, we have proposed discussions on new ground rules on the border. We proposed an MOU on hijacking. We proposed an MOU on air space violations by military aircrafts. We proposed expansion of private trade. We have proposed a move to a non-discriminatory trade regime and the MFN treatment. Indo-Pakistan joint ventures have been proposed. Exchanges of writers, of intellectuals, exchanges of media, cultural exchanges, troupes, films, drama, music, dance. We have proposed exchanges of books, periodicals and newspapers. We have proposed many other confidence-building and risk reduction measures, as may be mutually agreed. We have proposed the easing of travel restrictions. We have proposed cooperation on drug trafficking and terrorism. Unfortunately, we have stuck with very unsatisfactory responses from the Pakistani side.

On the other hand, Pakistan forestalls people to people programmes. They pursue what is very obviously a nuclear weapons programme. They assume hostile postures in areas such as Siachin. They allow their territory to be used for the support, sustenance and sanctuary of terrorists and sepa-

ratists. We have informed the Pakistan Government that our Home Secretaries—The Home Secretary of Pakistan and the Home Secretary of India—must meet to discuss the sudden increase of terrorism on our borders. We must have good communications between our two countries at various levels. On the military side, we already have a hotline. Perhaps a hotline is needed between the some Secretaries also to see that any tensions that build up can be defused and reduced as soon as possible or immediately.

We had one such hotline between the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan and the Foreign Secretary of India. But, at their request, it has been dismantled. We would like to have it restored and put back so that tensions, if they build up, can be reduced quickly.

I hope that we can get on quickly to genuine and sincere normalisation of our relations. A prosperous, stable Pakistan, with its independence, sovereignty and integrity fully assured, is in India's national interest. We would like to see a Pakistan like that.

A little further West, in Afghanistan, we welcome the Geneva Accord. It should lead to a cessation of interference and intervention in Afghanistan. It should lead to the return of refugees. The Agreement in Geneva has opened a window of opportunity for peace and stability in Afghanistan, assuring its independence and sovereignty and its non-alignment. We have played our role constructively and quietly in facilitating this process. We regret that Pakistan did not respond to our invitation for consultations. We could have made things a little smoother, perhaps.

In our view the best guarantee of peace, stability and non-alignment in Afghanistan is a strong Government in Af-

[Sh. Rajiv Gandhi]

ghanistan. And, we would like to see a strong Government in Kabul. We have vital stakes in this. Therefore, we are inviting President Najibullah to visit India to discuss all aspects of the post Accord situation. We wish the people of Afghanistan an era of progress, reconstruction and rehabilitation and we pledge our support to this endeavour.

Sir, our Agreement with Sri Lanka was universally welcomed as the only basis for a fair and lasting settlement in Sri Lanka; a settlement meeting all the legitimate needs and demands of the Tamils; an Agreement that strengthens Sri Lanka's unity; an agreement that meets our security concerns.

In the last 9 months the IPKF has stopped the conflict between Tamils and Tamils. The IPKF has stopped the conflict between the Tamil militants and the Sri Lankan army. The LTTE has been disarmed - a large section of the LTTE has been disarmed by the IPKF.

Near normalcy has been established in the North and we are moving towards normalcy very rapidly in the East. The Sri Lankan Government has released most Tamil detenus and has framed legislation for provincial councils. For the LTTE we keep channels open. We welcome them to join the political process and to test their standing in the democratic process.

Sir, in South Asia, SAARC has been moving very well and it is moving rapidly. We are very satisfied with the progress. SAARC is reaching new potentials and establishing a good framework for relationships in South Asia. A Member has raised the question of SAARC being used to settle bilateral issues. I would like to make our position very clear. SAARC is not a bilateral forum and we will not use it to sort out our bilateral issues. We have direct contacts and we deal directly on bilateral issues.

Sir, with China we have been endeavouring to improve our relations. We are building a climate of trust, looking for a new and productive phase in our relationship. We recognise that the process of normalisation is complex. The border question needs peaceful negotiations. It needs mutually acceptable outcomes and we need to keep in mind the national sentiments in both countries. The maintenance of peace and tranquillity on our borders becomes vital while we talk of long term settlements. We are strengthening cooperation in many fields with China. We are glad that the efforts to normalise relations have been welcomed by all sections of the House. We have accepted, in principle, that I should visit China on their invitation.

Our relations with Japan have advanced significantly. I have had a large number of meetings with their ex-Prime Minister Nakasone, when he was Prime Minister and after. And on this visit to Japan, I had a very long meeting with Prime Minister Takeshita. Japan is now our largest bilateral donor of official development assistance. It is also our third largest trading partner. We except an increase in Japanese investment, in joint ventures with Japan, and in technical collaboration with Japan.

On my way back from Japan, I stopped over in Vietnam to meet the new leadership that has taken over. Vietnam is a true and sincere friend of India, with whom we enjoy shared values, shared principles and many shared geo-political perceptions. My visit reaffirmed the strong historical ties between the two countries. We have established a strong political understanding with the Vietnamese leadership, an understanding to promote all round cooperation in economic, social and cultural development, an understanding that will strengthen and safeguard the forces of peace and stability in Asia.

We had talks about Kampuchea. As you

are aware, Sir, India has been active in trying to find a solution for the problems in Kampuchea. We are playing our part. We hope the talks between Prince Sihanouk and Prime Minister Hun Sen will be resumed soon.

There is an important role for the ASEAN countries. I hope that they too will come forward and play that role. Our relations with the ASEAN countries are progressing smoothly. We have increased economic, commercial and other relations. The Prime Minister of Singapore visited India a little while ago and I have visited Indonesia and Thailand. We have long-standing ties with Malaysia.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Gulf War continues. We have persistently deplored this fratricidal conflict between two non-aligned countries. We have remained in close touch with both. We have endorsed the United Nations Security Council Resolution 598. The negotiating process to implement the Resolution has been undermined by the resumption of the war of the cities and by the resort to chemical weapons. We deplore the intensification of the Great Power naval presence. The incidents in the Gulf involving US warships are becoming more and more serious and we urge the utmost restraint on all sides. The need of the hour is statesman like caution, reversing the escalation and promoting a negotiated settlement.

In West Asia, our support to the Palestinian cause the PLO is historic and consistent; and dates back to our freedom struggle. We condemn the brutal behaviour of the Israeli forces in the Occupied Territories. The recent cruel assassination of Abu Jihad is also an act that will only escalate tensions in the area and will make it more difficult to normalise matters and to find a solution. The situation is critical and brooks no piecemeal approach. I believe there is growing support for an International Conference on the Middle-East. The Palestinians have an inal-

ienable right to self-determination and we support them in that right.

Moving to Central America, we support the Contadore process. It has led to the Guatemala Peace Accord in the middle of last year, which should lead to a just and lasting settlement ensuring the right to self-determination, independence, security and integrity of all States of the region, free of interference and intervention from outside.

There is much evidence of the growing affection and shared perceptions and concrete support from Latin America to India, despite the long distances that separate our countries. I must make special mention of the genuine efforts that Daniel Ortega has been making in Nicaragua to bring about peace, to uphold the independence of Nicaragua and to strengthen non-alignment in the region.

Our relations with Peru have improved tremendously during these past years. Peru is blazing a new trail in Latin America. Argentina and Mexico are partners in our Six-Nation Initiative and we are working unitedly for disarmament. We had a lot of co-operation between Brazil and India in the GATT negotiations. Because of our unity and like-mindedness we were able to have our way and swing things in favour of the developing nations. We must expand our co-operation with Latin America to a level commensurate with the great interest and sympathy for India in Latin America.

Our relations with the USSR have been traditionally close and warm. These are now expanding at an unprecedented pace, improving qualitatively to new levels. Special mention must be made of the new thrust in increased trade and economic co-operation, and especially in science and technology co-operation that we are starting up. The Festival of India in the Soviet Union and the Soviet Festival in India have been great successes.

[Sh. Rajiv Gandhi]

We are looking forward to General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to India in November this year.

We have been steadily improving our bilateral relations with the United States since Indiraji's visit in 1982. The United States is now our largest trading partner with growing scope for increased economic cooperation and technology transfers. We have been holding useful consultations on international and regional issues with the United States. On defence matters, our concentration is on high technology with a view to strengthening our self-reliance.

Our foreign policy is based on the basic postulates given to us by Gandhiji, of one humanity, of non-violence and of speaking the truth. On one humanity, we have fought for ending the divisions, the narrow walls that we have built. We have fought for ending *apartheid* which has spawned colonialism in Namibia. We have fought against invasion, subversion and destabilization in Southern Africa that *apartheid* is causing. Our response to the challenge is seen in the AFRICA Funa. Forty-five countries have responded, and pledged over a quarter of a billion dollars, including Rs.50 crores from us. Several donors, including India have initiated projects.

Increasing recognition of the Non-aligned Movement is taking place in the world. At one time it was called immoral. Today, it is accepted by all nations. The principles and practices of non-alignment are seen as the only path for assured peace, stability and prosperity in the world. We have grown from a small minority to an overwhelming majority; and even those who are not in the Non-aligned Movement have started talking the non-aligned language. We must maintain the unity of the movement, because that is what will give us

strength.

In the economic field, the irrational world order is harming development in the South, and continued prosperity in the North. We need a new consensus on an economic order, a new consensus on development and a cooperative world order.

India has been fighting for disarmament, nuclear disarmament, from long before it was fashionable. The INF Treaty is a historic step in this process, but it must be remembered that it is only a first step. A lot more needs to be done. Much must be built this process. To make further progress, we must work towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound programme. We must include all nuclear weapon powers in the process. We must see that weapons, nuclear weapons, do not extend into new dimensions. We must see that there is no development of other weapons of mass destruction or surgical weapons. We must replace doctrines of deterrence by doctrines of peaceful co-existence.

In 1988, we conclude the 40th year of India's independence. We also begin the birth centenary year of Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of our foreign policy. His vision was much in advance of his times, but it is getting world-wide recognition today, a quarter of a century after his death. We are the proud inheritors of an ancient civilization whose basic precepts are the source of our foreign policy. We have remained steadfast to Jawaharlal Nehru's vision. There are new challenges and new prospects and new possibilities ahead. We have to abide by our own principles, but interpret them anew to suit evolving circumstances. We shall work towards peace and amity in our neighbourhood and the resolution of regional conflicts. We shall work for human rights and justice in the world, for international democracy among sovereign equals, for cooperative world order, for one humanity.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall now put all the cut motions moved to the Demands for Grants relating to the Minister of External Affairs together to the vote of the House.

All the cut Motions were put and negatived

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall now put the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the respective sums of not

exceeding the amounts on Revenue Accounts 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 the 31st day of March, 1989, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand No.23 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs"

The motion was adopted.

Demand for Grant for 1988-89 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 18th March, 1988		Account of Demand for Grant voted by the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
23	Ministry of External Affairs Ministry of External Affairs	69,26,00,000	15,50,00,000	334,72,00,000	77,50,00,000

[English]

Ministry of Steel and Mines

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos.67 and 68 relating to the Ministry of Steel and Mines for which 4 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House

whose cut motions to the Demands for Grants have been circulated may, if they desire to move their cut motions, send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move. Those cut motions only will be treated as moved.

A list showing the serial numbers of cut motions moved will be put up on the Notice Board shortly. In case any member finds any