

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP
SINGH : Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House now stands adjourned to reassemble at 14.45 hours.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till forty-five Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

— — —
The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Forty-nine minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

MOTION RE : PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND POLICY OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN RELATION THERETO

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now we take up item No. 8 of the agenda.

Shri B. R. Bhagat.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : I beg to move :

"That this House do consider the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto."

Shall I say something ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If you want to say anything, you can say.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Sir, I would like to make a brief statement on the SAARC summit conference held in Dhaka on 7th and 8th December, 1985.

The first Summit Conference of South Asian countries was held in Dhaka on 7-8 December, 1985. Prior to the Summit, a Meeting of the Standing Committee, comprising the Foreign Secretaries followed by a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the seven countries were held from 4-5th December to prepare for the Summit.

The Heads of State or Government of South Asian countries adopted a Charter and a Declaration and issued a Joint Press Statement containing certain important decisions on the last day of the Summit. Copies of the Charter, the Declaration and Joint Press Statement are given below.

I am glad to inform the house that our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi was un-animously requested to convene the next Summit Meeting in India. Our Prime Minister's offer in response to host such a Conference has been accepted. Prime Minister's offer for convening a Ministerial meeting on the participation of women in activities at regional level within the framework of SAARC has also been accepted.

Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi met all participating Heads of State and Government. Both bilateral and multilateral issues of mutual interest were discussed. In the meeting with President Earshad of Bangladesh, satisfaction was expressed at the present state of relations. Besides other matters, an understanding has been reached that India and Bangladesh will jointly deal with the Mizo, Chakma and TULF insurgencies. With the King of Bhutan the two leaders carried forward the discussions held only a few months ago when the Prime Minister visited the Kingdom of Bhutan. The President of Maldives extended an invitation to Prime Minister to visit the Maldives. This has been accepted with pleasure. King Birendra and the Prime Minister reviewed the development of relations since the King's visit to India. It has been agreed that President Zia of Pakistan will come to New Delhi for a day on the 17th December when discussions on

bilateral matters will be continued. The Prime Minister exchanged views with President Jayewardene of Sri Lanka on the Sri Lankan ethnic problem.

The Summit can be rightly described as an historic event. It formally brought into being what Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi called in his concluding statement: "The most populous regional grouping in the world".

The decision at the Conference to have more frequent meetings of the Heads of State or Government and of the Foreign Ministers of the member-countries has created a much-needed forum for regional consultations at a very high level. Such consultations are expected to promote goodwill, understanding and friendship among the member-countries of SAARC which will have a positive impact on the bilateral relations between these countries. New areas of cooperation have been identified and instructions given to intensify South Asian Regional Cooperation. The Heads of State or Government have placed considerable emphasis on people-to-people contacts and their involvement in the activities under the aegis of SAARC. From now onwards, the activities under SAARC will be vested with the authority of the political will and determination of the member-Governments at the highest level.

Under the leadership of Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi, India played an imported role in the Summit Conference. That role was well appreciated and widely recognized.

While the Summit Conference has ushered in a new era of cooperation among the South Asian countries, we should not underestimate the difficulties that we are going to encounter in this ambitious venture. We have still to overcome the bitterness of the past and satisfactorily resolve some of the current problems in our relations. There are also, inevitably, differences in our perception of both national interests and global issues. SAARC provides both a challenge as well as an opportunity to overcome these difficulties.

Charter of the South Asian Association for regional cooperation

We, the Heads of State or Government of BANGLADESH, BHUTAN, INDIA,

MALDIVES, NEPAL, PAKISTAN and SRI LANKA;

1. *Desirous* of promoting peace, stability, amity and progress in the region through strict adherence to the principles of the UNITED NATIONS CHARTER and NON-ALIGNMENT, particularly respect for the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, national independence, non-use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states and peaceful settlement of all disputes;

2. *Conscious* that in an increasingly inter-dependent world the objectives of peace, freedom, social justice and economic prosperity are best achieved in the SOUTH ASIAN region by fostering mutual understanding, good neighbourly relations and meaningful cooperation among the Member States which are bound by ties of history and culture;

3. *Aware* of the Common problems, interests and aspirations of the peoples of SOUTH ASIA and the need for joint action and enhanced cooperation within their respective political and economic systems and cultural traditions;

4. *Convinced* that regional cooperation among the countries of SOUTH ASIA is mutually beneficial, desirable and necessary for promoting the welfare and improving the quality of life of the peoples of the region;

5. *Convinced* further that economic, social and technical cooperation among the countries of SOUTH ASIA would contribute significantly to national and collective self-reliance;

6. *Recognising* that increased cooperation, contacts and exchanges among the countries of the region will contribute to the promotion of friendship and understanding among their peoples;

7. *Recalling* the DECLARATION signed by their Foreign Ministers in NEW DELHI on August 2, 1983 and *noting* the progress achieved in regional cooperation;

8. *Reaffirming* their determination to promote such cooperation within an institutional framework.

DO HEREBY

AGREE to establish an organisation to be known as SOUTH ASIAN ASSOCIATION FOR REGIONAL COOPERATION hereinafter referred to as the ASSOCIATION, with the following objectives, principles, institutional and financial arrangements;

ARTICLE-I*Objective*

1. The objectives of the ASSOCIATION shall be :—

- (a) to promote the welfare of the peoples of SOUTH ASIA and to improve their quality of life;
- (b) to accelerate economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region and to provide all individuals the opportunity to live in dignity and to realise their full potentials;
- (c) to promote and strengthen collective self-reliance among the countries of SOUTH ASIA;
- (d) to contribute to mutual trust, understanding and appreciation of one another's problems;
- (e) to promote active collaboration and mutual assistance in the economic, social, cultural, technical and scientific fields;
- (f) to strengthen cooperation with other developing countries;
- (g) to strengthen cooperation among themselves in international forums on matters of common interests; and
- (h) to cooperate with international and regional organisations with similar aims and purposes.

ARTICLE-II*Principles*

1. Cooperation within the frame work of the ASSOCIATION shall be based on respect

for the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, political independence, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and mutual benefit.

2. Such cooperation shall not be substitute for bilateral and multilateral cooperation but shall complement them.

3. Such cooperation shall not be inconsistent with bilateral and multilateral obligations.

ARTICLE-III*Meetings of the heads of State or
Government*

1. The Heads of State or Government shall meet once a year or more often as and when considered necessary by the Member States.

ARTICLE-IV*Council of Ministers*

A Council of Ministers consisting of the Foreign Ministers of the Member States shall be established with the following functions :

- (a) formulation of the policies of the ASSOCIATION;
- (b) review of the progress of cooperation under the ASSOCIATION;
- (c) decision on new areas of cooperation;
- (d) establishment of additional mechanism under the ASSOCIATION as deemed necessary;
- (e) decision on other matters of general interest to the ASSOCIATION.

2. The Council of Ministers shall meet twice a year. Extraordinary session of the Council may be held by agreement among the Member States.

ARTICLE-V*Standing Committee*

The Standing Committee comprising the Foreign Secretaries shall have the following functions;

- (a) overall monitoring and coordination of programme of cooperation;
- (b) approval of projects and programmes, and the modalities of their financing;
- (c) determination of inter-sectoral priorities;
- (d) mobilisation of regional and external resources;
- (e) identification of new areas of cooperation based on appropriate studies;

2. The Standing Committee shall meeting as often as deemed necessary.

3. The Standing Committee shall submit periodic reports to the Council of Ministers and make reference to it as and when necessary for decisions on policy matters.

ARTICLE-VI

Technical Committees

Technical Committees comprising representatives of Member States shall be responsible for the implementation, coordination and monitoring of the programmes in their respective areas of cooperation.

2. They shall have the following terms of reference :

- (a) determination of the potential and the scope of regional cooperation in agreed areas;
- (b) formulation of programmes and preparation of projects;
- (c) determination of financial implications of sectoral programmes;
- (d) formulation of recommendations regarding apportionment of costs;
- (e) implementation and coordination of sectoral programmes;
- (f) monitoring of progress in implementation.

3. The Technical Committees shall submit periodic reports to the Standing Committee.

4. The Chairmanship of the Technical Committees shall normally rotate among Member States in alphabetical order every two years.

5. The technical Committees may, inter-alia, use the following mechanisms and modalities, if and when considered necessary :

- (a) meetings of heads of national technical agencies;
- (b) meetings of experts in specific fields;
- (c) contact amongst recognised centres of excellence in the region.

ARTICLE-VII

Action Committees

1. The Standing Committee may set up Action Committees comprising Member States concerned with implementation of projects involving more than two but not all Member States.

ARTICLE-VIII

Secretariat

There shall be a Secretariat of the ASSOCIATION.

ARTICLE-IX

Financial Arrangements

1. The contribution of each Member State towards financing of the activities of the ASSOCIATION shall be voluntary.

2. Each Technical Committee shall make recommendations for the apportionment of costs of implementing the programmes proposed by it.

3. In case sufficient financial resources cannot be mobilised within the region for funding activities of the ASSOCIATION, external financing from appropriate sources may be mobilised with the approval of or by the Standing Committee.

ARTICLE-X

General Provisions

1. Decisions at all levels shall be taken on the basis of unanimity.

2. Bilateral and contentious issues shall be excluded from the deliberations.

IN FAITH WHEREOF We Have Set Our Hands And Seals Hereunto.

DONE In DHAKA, BANGLADESH, On This The Eighth Day of December of The Year One Thousand Nine Hundred Eighty Five.

Hussain Muhammad Ershad PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF BANGLADESH	Maumoon Gayoom PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF MALDIVES	Abdul PRESI- DENT OF THE OF
---	--	---

Jigme Singye Wang- chuck KING OF BHUTAN	Birendra Bir Shah Dev KING OF NEPAL	Bikram
--	--	--------

Rajiv Gandhi PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA	Muhammad Zia-ul- Haq PRESIDENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN	
--	--	--

Junius Richard Jayewardene
PRESIDENT OF DEMOCRATIC
SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF
SRI LANKA

**Dhaka Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of the Member States of South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
8 December 1985**

The President of Bangladesh, the King of Bhutan, the Prime Minister of India, the President of Maldives, the King of Nepal, the President of Pakistan and the President of Sri Lanka met in Dhaka on 7 and 8 December 1985.

2. The Heads of State or Government underscored the historic significance of their first ever South Asian Summit meeting. They considered it to be a tangible manifestation of their determination to cooperate regionally, to work together towards finding solutions

towards their common problems in a spirit of friendship, trust and mutual understanding and to the creation of an order based on mutual respect, equity and shared benefits.

3. They recognized that periodic meetings at their level were central to the promotion of mutual trust, confidence and cooperation among their countries.

4. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that their fundamental goal was to accelerate the process of economic and social development in their respective countries through the optimum utilization of their human and material resources, so as to promote the welfare and prosperity of their peoples and the improve their quality of life. They were conscious that peace and security was an essential prerequisite for the realization of this objective.

5. The leaders of the South Asian countries reaffirmed their commitment to the UN Charter and the principles governing sovereign equality of States, peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference in internal affairs and non-use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of other States. They reiterated that the United Nations constituted the most important forum for the resolution of all issues affecting international peace and security.

6. They also reaffirmed their deep conviction in the continuing validity and relevance of the objectives of the Non-aligned movement as an important force in international relations.

7. The Heads of State or Government acknowledged that the countries of South Asia, who constituted one-fifth of humanity were faced with the formidable challenges posed by poverty, underdevelopment, low levels of production, unemployment and pressure of population compounded by exploitation of the past and other adverse legacies. They felt that, bound as their countries were by many common values rooted in their social, ethnic, cultural and historical traditions, regional cooperation provided a logical response to these problems. They were conscious of their individual and regional strengths, their potential as a huge

market, their substantial human and natural resources and the complementarities of their economies. They were confident that with effective regional cooperation, they could make optimum use of these capacities for the benefit of their peoples, accelerate the space of their economic development and enhance their national and collective self-reliance. They were convinced that their countries, which had made important contributions to the enrichment of human civilization, could together play their due role in international relations and influence decisions in which affected them.

8. The Heads of State or Government emphasised that strengthening of regional cooperation in South Asia required greater involvement of their peoples. They agreed to increase interaction and further promote people-to-people contacts at various levels among their countries. To this end, they decided to take steps to create awareness and public opinion in the region.

9. The Heads of State or Government welcomed the progress already made in the implementation of the Intergated Programme of Action in the nine mutually agreed areas. They expressed their desire to consolidate and further expand cooperative efforts within an appropriate institutional framework in a spirit of partnership and equality.

10. The leaders were convinced that they could effectively pursue their individual and collective objectives and improve the quality of life of their peoples only in an atmosphere of peace and security. In this context, they expressed concern at the deteriorating international political situation. They were alarmed at the unprecedented escalation of arms race particularly in its nuclear aspect. They recognized that mankind today was confronted with the threat of self extinction arising from a massive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. The arms race intensified international tension and violated the principles of the UN Charter. The leaders called upon the nuclear weapons-states for urgent negotiations for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty leading to the complete cessation of testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons. In this connection, they welcomed the recent meeting between President Reagan and General

Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva and expressed the hope that the meeting would have a positive effect on international peace and security.

11. The Heads of State or Government expressed deep concern at the continuing crisis in the global economy. They underscored that deteriorating economic and social conditions had seriously retarded development prospects in South Asia and other developing countries. Sharply falling commodity prices, deterioration in the terms of trade, intensification of protectionist measures, spiralling debt burden and a decline in the flow of external resources, especially concessional assistance, had caused a serious setback to the economic development of the developing countries. These had been compounded by natural disasters and precarious world food security situation affecting developing countries. They also expressed concern over the diminishing capacity of international financial and technical institutions to respond effectively to the needs of the disadvantaged and poorer countries and regretted that the spirit of multilateral cooperation had begun to falter and weaken. This was particularly disturbing in the face of increased interdependence of developed and developing countries and the fact that economic revival of North was closely linked to economic progress in South. They believed that developments during the past decades had clearly demonstrated the structural imbalances and inequities inherent in the existing international economic system and its inadequacy to deal with problems of development.

12. They strongly urged that determined efforts should be made by the international community towards realization of the goals and targets of the international Development Strategy as well as the Substantial New Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries. They called for urgent resumption of the North-South dialogue and early convening of an International Conference on Money and Finance for Development with universal participation.

13. The Heads of State and Government were conscious of the historic importance of the Dhaka Summit and reiterated their conviction that the launching of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation

(SAARC), which they had established at this meeting, would place regional cooperation on a firm foundation, play an important role in accelerating the pace of economic and social development of their countries, promote the objectives of individual and collective self-reliance and further the cause of peace, progress and stability in their region and the world.

14. The Heads of the State or Government of Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka were deeply appreciative of the exemplary Chairmanship of their Meeting by the President of Bangladesh. They expressed their profound gratitude for the warm and gracious hospitality extended to them by the Government and the people of Bangladesh and for the excellent arrangements made for the meeting.

Joint Press Release issued at the conclusion of the first SAARC Summit in Dhaka on 7-8 December, 1985

The President of Bangladesh, the King of Bhutan, the Prime Minister of India, the President of Maldives, the King of Nepal, the President of Pakistan and the President of Sri Lanka met in Dhaka on 7 and 8 December, 1985.

The Heads of State or Government signed a Charter of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation on the 8th of December, 1985. They also adopted the Dhaka Declaration.

They approved that the Standing Committee should set up a Study Group to examine the problem of terrorism as it affects the security and stability of member states of SAARC. They further directed the Council of Ministers to consider the report of this Study Group and submit recommendations to them as to how best the member states could co-operate among themselves to solve this.

They also approved that a similar exercise be carried out with regard to the problem of drug trafficking and abuse.

They decided that the member Governments should concert their views on the

ongoing discussions on New International Economic Order and the improvement of the World Trading System through GATT taking particularly into account the interest of the least developed among the developing countries. For this purpose it was decided to convene a Ministerial level meeting. The Standing Committee should convene a meeting to prepare for it. The Heads of State or Government gratefully accepted the offer of the President of Pakistan to host both these meetings.

The Heads of State or Government emphasized that women should increasingly participate in activities at the regional level within the framework of SAARC and that Programmes and Projects should be devised to ensure their active participation in that development process. They therefore directed the Standing Committee to convene a Ministerial Level Conference on the subject to identify the areas of activities and plan a Programme of Action. They gratefully accepted the offer of the Prime Minister of India to host such a conference.

The Heads of State or Government who have decided that the Association shall have a Secretariat directed the Foreign Ministers to consider details regarding its location, structure, functions and financing and submit those for the consideration of Heads of State or Government.

The Heads of State or Government decided to hold their next meeting in November, 1986. They gratefully accepted the offer of the Prime Minister of India to host that meeting. They also gratefully accepted the offer of the King of Bhutan to host the Annual SAARC Summit of 1987.

The Heads of State or Government unanimously accepted the recommendation of the Fourth Meeting of Foreign Ministers on the emblem of SAARC.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“That this House do consider the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto.”

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) :
Sir, I beg to move :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, gives its approval and full support to the policy of the Government.”(1)

SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM (Tenali) :
Sir, I would have been very glad if the motion by our Hon. Minister had added the words ‘and its failure’, namely, this House do consider the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India and its failures in relation thereto. The tenor and tone of the Hon. Minister’s speech is to say that there are no failures at all to which, I hope, the entire House will have objection because everything and anything cannot be a total success or a total failure. There are achievements and failures both.

Sir, immediately after assuming the office of the Prime Minister, our Prime Minister has enunciated his own Panchsheel, the five principles. They are :

1. working for peace;
2. to be friends with all countries on the basis of reciprocity and mutual benefit;
3. commitment to non-alignment;
4. economic order based on justice, equality and mutual cooperation; and
5. safeguarding the independence of States by non-interference and non-intervention.

This is the panchsheel of our Prime Minister at present. How far have we achieved these five principles of our Prime Minister is a matter to be taken into consideration ! I do not want to go on repeating what the Minister has said about our achievements so far. Let us begin with our immediate neighbours.

Last time when I was speaking on this subject I had submitted that we are friends to the distant countries whereas enemies to the immediate neighbours. I think, we have failed in our foreign policy as far as our immediate neighbours are concerned. The Hon. Minister was telling about our friendship deals with Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, etc. who are our immediate neighbours. Even though our country is helping these immediate neighbours like Bangladesh, Bhutan and Nepal yet I am sorry to say that India is not taken as a total friend by these countries. These countries have been looking at us with a suspicious eye. With Bangladesh we have Ganga water and Far-raka disputes, corridor and barbed wire disputes inspite of the fact that we helped them by providing Rs. 13.20 crores for development. We have helped Bhutan to the tune of Rs. 55.53 crores for its Fifth Plan. We have provided to Nepal Rs. 25.56 crores. Apart from these countries what is our policy with regard to Ceylon, Ceylon is the nearest country and negotiations have been going on and on with Ceylon. But at the same time massacre is also going on and on as was correctly apprehended by our friends here, that is, by the time we come to the close of this discussion, there may not be any Tamils left in the entire Sri Lanka. That seems to be the rate of massacre that is going on in Sri Lanka. What is to be done now ? I am afraid to submit that our country is not serious enough to go into the matter in any particular angle. You have been going there and he has been coming here and negotiations are going on. What is the use ? But massacre is going on there and my submission is that our strength lies in reaching a solution immediately which we are not able to do. When we are taking pride for all these things, we should also admit our failures in other fronts. Our Government have failed to convince or made Mr. Jayawardene to put an end to the massacre of Indians in Sri Lanka immediately. Thousands and thousands of Tamils are being massacred in Sri Lanka. What is happening to them ? After all they are all Indians. They belong to Tamil Nadu which is a part of this country. So, this is the first failure of your foreign policies.

Secondly coming to our unfriendly Government of Pakistan, where do we stand?

[Shri N. Venkata Ratnam]

As far as Pakistan is concerned, I believe that it is a total failure. At one time Hon. Prime Minister was saying that we were able to convince America as well as France in order to see that Pakistan did not make a nuclear bomb. But we know well now and it has been accepted that Pakistan has made a nuclear bomb and we have also been informed by the press that this bomb was tested on the soil of China. So, is it not our failure when we say that we could convince the Americans, not to allow Pakistan to make bomb in spite of that Pakistan made the bomb and exploded it? As far as Pakistan is concerned, we have very friendly with that country but the reciprocity is not there from that country. All of us know that Pakistan is interfering with our internal policies also. Pakistan has been encouraging the terrorists by giving training to them in that country and there was a press report also that at one time that even from Sri Lanka people were sent to Pakistan for training and they were sent back to Sri Lanka after training to deal with the so-called extremists and they call them unpatriotic and extremists. Now, Pakistan is indulging in such activities. What are we doing for that? I am afraid that we have no sufficient teeth in dealing with Pakistan. In this context, I may mention that serpent may not bite but a serpent hisses and if it even does not hisses, its head will be crushed. So far as Pakistan is concerned, we have not evolved a strong policy to deal with that country. We have said that Pakistan came to this position due to the help given by the United States of America. I may submit to you that we must understand the international position of the USA and after the fall of Iran, the USA has no shield against Russia. Naturally, the USA sought a shield against Russia and found a very welcome friend in Pakistan to act as a shield for Russia. USA will naturally arm Pakistan because it is in their own interest to help Pakistan. Pakistan is receiving help with a different intention; Pakistan wants to receive that help and use it against India. There is no use our saying that America should not help Pakistan. America is helping Pakistan for a purpose and Pakistan is trying to use it for a different purpose. It is no use to tell America not to help Pakistan. Intentions are different here. Our

unavoidable contingency must be: Let us become strong for ourselves, by preparing an atom bomb or anything that is required, but let us be a strong nation. I am sorry to say that today we are not considered as a strong nation in the comity of nations. I think, that is one of the biggest failures of our international policy. Let us first become a strong nation. We may attend hundreds of meetings, do hundreds of things, but we would not be taken with respect or with dignity by the other countries, if we do not become a strong nation both in economic sense, military sense and in all other aspects.

I would like to tell you another point of weakness. Indian Ocean is our Ocean. But we have not been able to get it declared as a zone of peace till now. Even though the UNO passed a resolution to the effect that the Indian Ocean should be declared as a zone of peace, we have not been able to conclude a peace treaty to that effect so far and prevent other nations from arming the Diego Garcia island. Various countries are going on arming them, they are having their military installations there and are prepared to invade any country from the bases in Diego Garcia which is very near to us. You would have observed with sorrow that we have not been able to do it because of the non-cooperation of USA. The USA once went to the extent of saying that it would not participate in the debate unless the Afghanistan issue was settled. It was very uncharitable on the part of that great nation as far as this issue is concerned. It is an entirely different issue unconnected with any other issue. We have not been able to ensure peace at our own doorsteps at Diego Garcia. What is it that we are doing? What is the movement that we are building up? We are visiting so many countries and holding talks with them. But what is the use of getting a very good name, a very soft man or a gentleman? If we are not able to prevent other nations from getting into Diego Garesia, what is it that we are doing? Nothing.

The latest news is that the discussion on declaration of Indian Ocean as a zone of peace has been postponed to 1988. It is a very pitiable situation.

We are great friends, great saviours of the South African people and have taken up as Chairman of the Non-Aligned nations the cause of South African people. In the CHOGM meetings, we failed even to convince the Great Britain, the great mother, Mrs Margaret Thatcher in imposing sanctions that we and all the other countries had proposed against South African Government. It was opposed by only one lady, that was Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. But we go on boasting about our stand saying that we could neutralise the stand taken by Mrs. Thatcher. But it was not so. Instead of using the word 'sanctions' something else was substituted, according to her wish. And immediately after going to England she said that she did not go down and on the other hand, other countries had accepted her request. It may be said that she had vetoed the proposition made by all the countries regarding the proposed sanctions against South Africa. At the same time, had any one been concerned over the situation in South Africa? While talks were going on, Black leader were being hanged in public in South Africa. Could not Mrs. Thatcher prevent it? No, she did not do it. In her own homeland England, the policy of apartheid is encouraged. Indians are being killed, thrown out and beaten. What is Mrs. Thatcher doing? We can say without any fear of contradiction that Mrs. Margaret Thatcher supports the policy of apartheid at least internally.

Secondly, let us have a look at other things. While we oppose the apartheid policy of the South African Government, we should also think about the welfare of our brothers, people of Indian origin living in South Africa. These Indians are being thrown out from South Africa. What is our Government doing? We are not able to convince or pressurise the South African Government not to do any harm to Indians. For the last two to three generations, they have been there and now they are being thrown out and killed and their houses and shops are being looted. We have been declaring from housetops that the South African Government is not involved. But what is it that we are doing to see that the Indians are not thrown out from South Africa?

Regarding the terrorist activities in the country, what are we doing to prevent Pakistan, United States, Canada or Ecuador

from imparting training to terrorist elements in their countries? In all these countries, many terrorists are being trained and as far as Ecuador is concerned, they went to the extent of supporting Khalisthan. But what are we doing?

From all these things, one can certainly say that while all these Western countries are friendly in the exterior, they are not at all friendly internally. Let me give you just one example. Everybody knows that UNESCO is a great friend of the entire world body. Yet, the United States walked out of it and now the UK walked out of it. When they do not provide the required funds, who is going to suffer? The developing countries would have to suffer on account of their action. The worst affected are the developing countries. What is that you have taken in this regard? What steps have you taken in the case of USA and UK, when they walked out of the UNESCO?

15.16 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

Sir, as far as we are concerned we are no enemies of this Government. We accept wherever there is good and we do not hesitate to criticise wherever there is any failure on the part of the Government. First thing I would like to suggest, taking a bit of consideration I have been submitting to you that why USA was helping Pakistan to prepare it as a shield against Russia. And you have been declaring that USA is helping Pakistan because Soviet Union is helping Afghanistan. We will say that we are very much friends to the Soviet Union. So, the place of contention is Afghanistan. If the problem of Afghanistan is solved, USA has no ground to help Pakistan and have the moral support to say or moral strength to say that because there is no Afghanistan problem, then why are you supplying arms to Pakistan? Now we lost that moral support. Next, viewing from this angle, our relations must be result oriented. Let us not be satisfied with our Ministers, our Prime Minister or our President has gone to that State or this State, this country or that country because he is very well received, very well applauded, very much appreciated and all that. What is the use of all these things. If

[Shri N. Venkata Ratnam]

they are not result oriented what is that we have achieved by all these friendly attitudes in the country. Have you achieved any greater exports? No, nothing of that sort. Sir, as has been said in this House, our external debt goes upto the extent of 30,000 crores. What is the economic improvement we have got by our foreign policy? Nothing. Is it result oriented? No, nothing. Our country has totally failed to achieve anything by this so-called friendly attitude. I may submit that we are not against the policies of the Government, in international affairs in toto. As far as we are concerned, we are one with it. Our country and our Government has been fighting against the protectionism, unilateral and bilateral solutions practised by all the developed countries. They are harming developing countries which leave us to the mercy of World Bank and other financial institutions. They are begging from other countries who are fighting it. But the response is very dismal. We have to submit we are one with the Government in developing new international economic order that is, the promise made by our Prime Minister which I have already read. For this you have been developing greater coordination among the developing countries. As for example I have said the programme of ECDC. That is one thing and the global system of trade among the developing countries, that is we are trying to have south bank on the lines of the World Bank. There is no other thing. The Indian programme of ITEC which has begun with 44 million rupees. It is now 65 million budget. So in all these aspects, in all these spheres, wherever Government is doing good thing, we do not hesitate to support the Government. But wherever the failures are there we will oppose the Government. I would like to submit that our policy in international affairs—or External Affairs—is not a total failure, or a total success. So, let us take it that we have got failures and we must think over how to get over these failures.

I would like to say a word of caution about the attitude of all of us in dealing with our Prime Minister. We do concede that our Prime Minister is called a very clean gentleman and I would not hesitate to say that he is the cleanest of all world leaders. I do not hesitate to say. But the defect is with us and

if we called Shrimati Indira Gandhi a dictator and we also apprehend that our Prime Minister is likely to become autocratic, by our own conduct, because our attitude towards the Prime Minister is not correct, because we are exhibiting an immature attitude while dealing with the Prime Minister. As you see in this very House when the Prime Minister speaks we clap hands, when he rises we clap hands, and so on; it is a very dangerous attitude because the Prime Minister is a very young man, very fresh to the politics, and if we praise him like that touching the skies, there is a great danger that this young man, this clean leader becomes autocratic. We must be very careful about our attitude. And if we lose—we cannot afford to—this clean and young man that is going to be the greatest danger to this country. So, let us deal with him in a mature way. We are not children. We are experienced Members of Parliament. So, let us deal with him in a proper way. Let us support him where he is correct, let us criticise him where he is wrong and let us do our duty properly.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) : Mr. Chairman, the canvas of the international situation is very wide and one is apt to stray. I would, therefore, wish to confine myself to some of the important issues, both globally and those that are related to us.

Today, we live in a world dominated by fear of nuclear holocaust. It is common knowledge that the super powers have acquired nuclear weapons which can annihilate life on this earth several times over. And I although it is patent that they would not use nuclear weapons in a war against each other because it would destroy both of them, there is always the danger of something happening accidentally. Therefore, the primary concern of the people all over the world today is for peace, and disarmament as a first step towards peace.

Absence of war is not peace. Peace requires a creditable guarantee that there will be a tomorrow, that there will be a future and that one can build in the hope of leaving something behind for the generation to come.

Therefore, peace is closely linked with cooperation, cooperation on the basis of

equality, not cooperation on the basis of master and slave relationship.

It is also important for us in the developing countries because our development depends largely on the global environment. If there is an environment for peace and cooperation, then we have resources available to us, which otherwise get diverted into military uses. If there is peace and cooperation, then we have facilities for our trade and for building our own institutions to give our own people a better life. Therefore, as you will see, peace is the primary condition. And disarmament is the first step towards achieving that peace—at least disarmament to the stage that the life in the world will not be totally annihilated.

Government's efforts to build and strengthen peace and to promote disarmament are laudable. You are aware about the Six-Nation Summit for Nuclear Disarmament. I would like to extend my congratulations to the Prime Minister for hosting this conference in New Delhi and for producing the New Delhi Declaration which has been welcomed all over the world. It forms a basis for disarmament leading peace.

As I was mentioning, this conflict under which we live today, has its genesis in the Second World War. When the Second World War ended, instead of building cooperative institutions to promote a better life for the people, the world got divided into two power blocs. Two super powers emerged and wanted to divide the world into their zone of influence. At the same time, the Non-Aligned Movement took birth as an alternative to military blocs. It was the desire of the newly independent countries to retain their freedom. They did not wish to get committed to one bloc or the other. At the same time, it had the wider implications of preserving peace. The Non-Aligned Movement went through different phases. It was considered immoral at one stage, because it did not side with the people who were hoping that the newly independent countries would go with them. But at the same time, I think, it has made a very positive contribution to the maintenance of peace and promotion of international cooperation. You will have an idea when you realise that in the last 40 years or so since the end of the Second World War, the world

has spend more than 3 trillion US dollars on arms. If this money could have been transferred to building a better life for the people if it could have been transferred to giving children new opportunities, new possibilities, if it could have been transferred to the ailing to re-build their lives, the world we live in today would have been far safer, more secure and more rewarding. But what has happened is that this mad race for arms continues. I regret to say that it has not ended. Now, the super powers are thinking in terms of newer nuclear weapons, the third generation nuclear weapons, and what is even more dangerous that efforts are being made to extend arms into outer space. We are all aware, this House knows of the so-called star-wars weapons system that has been promoted to take weapons into outer space. What will happen when arms get into outer space ? Should a war break out, it will have cosmic consequences.

But at the same time; the world is not without hope. There is a silver lining in the dark cloud. While the governments persist in their mad arms race, people all over the world are now building up movements for peace against nuclear war, for disarmament. It is a heartening tendency and a very rewarding one, I hope, which in time will be able to persuade the governments to shift from arms into cooperation.

But the real problem is that we live in a world which is based on a value system of force. Whether it is the force of arms that we use or whether the force of numbers we apply,—regrettably even in this House—it is the concept of force that guides the world. What we require is to follow what Mahatma Gandhi had tried to teach us, to move out of the concept of force into a condition of consensus, that we do not apply force, that we try to persuade. It is a conceptual change which, I think, is very necessary if we want to avoid the arms race.

One can think in limited terms of disarmament but the world has been at different stages of disarmament. We lived in the stone age, threw stone weapons at each other; even then we want to war and gradually drifted into the atomic weapons. So, unless conceptually we are able to readjust to a society based on consensus instead of force, mere

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

disarmament is not a solution, is not a total answer.

Another heartening feature is the emergence of western Europe as a separate entity. The world today is largely a bi-polar world so far as force and power is concerned. There are a large number of non-aligned countries, the largest in terms of numbers and in terms of people living in them, but still so far as force is concerned, it is a bi-polar world. It is my hope that as Europe emerges and acquires an identity of its own, perhaps there will be a lessening of tension. And even if the world in terms of super power weaponry remains bi-polar, there will be other forces that will try to moderate, that will try to act as go between to prevent a climate of confrontation. And again, Sir, may I emphasise that I am not so concerned about the super powers going to war but I am concerned about this climate of confrontation going on because while we live in this climate of confrontation, of fear, oppression, development can be at best very limited.

Here again we ought to welcome the summit meeting that has recently taken place between General Secretary Gorbachov and President Reagan. Although there are no tangible results in the sense of something that can be spelt out and seen or a movement away from confrontation, but what is heartening is that their minds are shifting from the battle-field to the conference table, that they are now engaged in dialogue, and while they remain engaged in dialogue, the chances of war are always less, and therefore, we should wholeheartedly welcome the meeting that has taken place between the leaders of the two super powers and hope that this will be a continuing effort and that they will stick to the conference table and not think in terms of the battlefield.

Our Prime Minister's visit, which Mr. Venkata Ratnam did not fully appreciate, is linked with this effort for peace and disarmament. His participation in the Commonwealth Conference in the Bahamas, his visit to the United Nations, his visit to the Soviet Union, to the United

States, to United Kingdom, Japan, Vietnam, and various other countries has been not to promote himself, not to indulge in international tourism, but it has been a concerted effort to try to reach areas where the decisions are being made, to find out what is their thinking, how that can be moderated and what role India can play in moderating process. I think his visits to these countries has enhanced India's prestige and India's participation in international affairs.

In regard to the initiatives that the Prime Minister has been taking, may I venture to make a suggestion? I hope my friend, the Foreign Minister, would be able to convey it to the Prime Minister. I think that there is now an opportunity for a new initiative somewhat similar to the six-nation Summit on Nuclear Disarmament. This time we should attempt at a larger group of, not only the non-aligned countries, but also the countries of Europe — both of East and West. And if we can get them together, this could become an important pressure group for peace that could have influence at the centre of both the super-powers-in the United States and in the Soviet Union. I think, it would be a fitting legacy for him as Chairman of the non-aligned movement to pass on to his successor at Zimbabwe. Instead of handing over the Chairmanship with an initiative terminated with the Six Nation Summit, he would be handing over the chairmanship of the movement with an on-going programme, which has, to my mind, a very great potential. At least we would be actively participating in a dialogue which is the only alternative if we wish to avoid direct conflict or confrontation.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : (Guntur) : We tried it once before.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : We can always try. In foreign relations, as the Professor knows, success does not come so easily. He himself has been trying for certain things in which he has not yet been successful, but he lives in hope and so do we.

Another very notable development that has taken place only over the weekend deserves to be mentioned here. My friend,

the Foreign Minister, has very kindly made a statement and I greatly value his words, but I do feel that the occasion was so important that a statement from the Prime Minister would have been appropriate. However, I hope that in due course he will give us his own assessment of the SAARC summit held in Dhaka over the weekend.

The Summit at Dhaka fills the gap in the global chain of regional organisations. This was the only area in the world that did not have a regional organisation. All other countries have been involved in their own groupings. The absence of a South-Asian institution has to my mind also prevented the emergence of a larger Asian organisation. Asia is the only continent which does not have an Asian Organisation. All others have. Now, that we have a South-Asian Association, I hope it would be possible to build a wider Asian association for a larger group to participate in a wider dialogue. I am happy that China has welcomed SAARC and with China's welcoming SAARC, it gives the hope of the possibility of a wider Asian organisation.

To me personally it is a matter of great joy that a South Asian Organisation has emerged. I have been advocating it for quite some time and, as Prof. Ranga has said, I had made certain efforts which did not bear fruit. I remember, way back in 1967, at Bangkok, I had the honour, on behalf of India, to propose the setting up of the Asian Council of Ministers. Once they met in Afghanistan but unfortunately it has melted away. Now, with the meeting of SAARC, I hope, we shall also have an Asian Council of Ministers apart from the Council of Ministers of SAARC and that they will make a positive contribution of Asia in the process of disarmament and peace. May I also hope that we shall have in this organisation three other countries which have so far been left out, namely, **Afghanistan, Burma and Iran.** With their inclusion we would have completed the chain.

In many ways the South Asian cooperation rests on Indo Pakistan relations. I would not venture to say that it is dependent upon it. But Indo-Pakistan relations will

certainly play a part in South Asian Association. In fact, it is the absence of good neighbourly relations between these two countries that had in many ways, prevented the emergence of SAARC so far. I am very glad to say that there is a sincere effort on behalf of our Government — and Prime Minister personally — in this regard. Our Foreign Secretary has taken great interest in it; he has been going up and down to Islamabad, just as he has been going to Colombo. I hope that we shall have a better understanding with Pakistan.

I saw in the newspapers — I do not know to what extent it is correct — that President Zia has said at SAARC meeting at Dacca that there should be greater co-operation between South Asian countries in nuclear disarmament. I don't know the exact words.

SHRI H. A. DORA (Srikakulam) : Ban on nuclear weapons.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : That is general thing which has been accepted. He has said something which is a little different. I am quoting from the Times of India of 8-12-85. It says :

“The Pakistan President Gen. Zia-ul-Haq, today called for a collective pledge by South Asian countries renouncing the threat or use of force against one another and steps to banish nuclear weapons.”

This has not formed a part of the agreement that has been announced at the end of the meeting of SAARC. But I do not find anything objectionable in it. Maybe, SAARC is not ready to undertake such a commitment. But I would request Government to give some thought to it on a purely bilateral basis. Our present difficulties with Pakistan so far as I can see it, are two. One, they are proposing to make an atom bomb. They are, as things appear, perhaps on the verge of making an atom bomb. And two, they have not made a firm commitment against the setting up of foreign bases in their soil although this commitment is inherent in their joining the non-aligned movement. But if we were to go into some

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

kind of a defence understanding with Pakistan, both these dangers get dissolved. There would be no meaning for them to have a bomb or to give bases unilaterally when there is a defence arrangement between Pakistan and India. I know that there are certain dangers, there are certain risks in such steps, but the Prime Minister has been taking many risks and this risk would be, in my view, very much worth taking.

Sir, Pakistan and India are also liberalising their trade. It is again a heartening development. But may I say that mere liberalisation of trade is not the answer? One has to go into deeper collaboration in industrial field and also sharing each other's surpluses in the developmental processes of one another. Only then there would be an interest in each other's welfare and in each other's security. I hope that it will be possible for my friend, the Foreign Minister, to give active consideration to it.

To the myriads of other issues that go into the consideration of international situation, I would not wish to take the time of the House, particularly when you have rung the bell, Mr. Chairman, but I would be failing in my duty if I do not refer to the heroic struggle that is being waged in South Africa against the minority racist Government for justice and dignity. The people of South Africa have suffered tremendous indignities, poverty and slavery for a long time and they are now rising to challenge the authority of the few who have enslaved them. I commend the steps taken by the Prime Minister at the Commonwealth Conference in trying to get an economic sanction proposed against the racist policies of the South African Government. Unfortunately, we did not succeed there. I would wish to remind the Foreign Minister of the danger of getting lost in conferences and contact groups over a long period of time, instead we should have in our mind a time frame within which if nothing satisfactory emerges we would press for unilateral economic sanctions against South Africa. Let those who do not agree with us stand out and be counted, but we should not be a participant in the continuing enslavement in South Africa when we have the means at least to make a slight dent and give support to the people in South Africa.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Morugao) : Mr. Chairman, permit me at the outset to congratulate the Minister for External Affairs and through him the Government of India and the Prime Minister particularly for having brought to successful fruition a process that began at Delhi in August 1983 and now, we have, after two years, the meeting of the Prime Ministers which culminated yesterday in the declaration of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation. Still, as has been pointed out here by Mr. Dinesh Singh, this was one area where such a regional cooperation was not apparant, but there was not a functional and existing framework for such a regional cooperation. What has happen yesterday and day before has been a summit of the Heads of States or Governments, which by itself is a considerable step in defusing tensions for peace and for development in this area, but more than this happened. Something very concrete, something very substantial, something very positive has emerged and as has been pointed out here just now by both Mr. Venkata Ratnam and Mr. Dinesh Singh—they mentioned the Declaration issued yesterday, which says that 'the Heads of States and Governments present express their concern over the escalation of arms race and particularly the nuclear weapons.' This is very relevant to us, this is very positive and very relevant. And then, we are sure, at least we are very confident that now, our neighbour will stop the nuclear test, will stop the probing, using or trying to use nuclear energy for bellicose purposes. This would really be a great step forward in our bilateral relations. It would bring a lot of peace and confidence for ourselves who have been so much worried over the last months may be one year or so—over the intention of Pakistan, our great neighbour going in for atomic weapon.

As I have submitted to you and to the House, the mere fact that seven heads of States, in whose hands the destiny of such a large number of people of the world, such a large fraction of the people of the world lie, met is itself a great achievement. But there is more to it, apart even from the declaration on the nuclear weapons. When a panel is to be set up on terrorism, as reported in today's morning papers, now we get confidence that infiltration in Punjab of elements from across the border, of extremists and

terrorists will now stop or steps will be taken by the neighbouring Government to stop this infiltration. And this will definitely contribute a great deal and there will be a quantum benefit, a quantum improvement on the situation in Punjab.

Sir, meeting of SAARC cannot be minimised. The achievements have been substantial and have been more than what could be expected in this situation. It has now been decided to constitute a secretariat, a permanent secretariat of SAARC. I think, this is a very positive step. Very often it is said that all that international bureaucracy does is to make simple things difficult and difficult things impossible. I hope this will not happen in this case. I am confident that this institutional framework, the permanent secretariat that has been established yesterday will contribute to carry forward and not put hurdles to take ahead the political will, the objectives of the heads of governments and of States who met there yesterday and day before yesterday.

Mr. Dinesh Singh was carried by the enthusiasm of the achievements of SAARC and then he profounded this concept that not merely why only the countries of South Asia, why not all the countries of Asia get together for peace and for development. He has mentioned his own personal contribution in this regard. As a good disciple of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, Mr. Dinesh Singh always wants it and did so well in 1966. But may I recollect what Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru himself said, as far as Asians' identity was concerned, as far as the need for Asian cooperation was concerned, even earlier than 1966, namely in 1947. That ring will still move the hearts and minds of the people of this continent. At that time, in 1947, speaking at the Asian Relations Conference in Delhi, he said :

"The countries of Asia can no longer be pawns by others; they are bound to have their own policies in world affairs. Europe and America have contributed very greatly to human progress and for that we must yield them praise and honour, and learn from them the many lessons they have to teach. But the West has also driven us into wars and conflicts without number, and even now, the day after a terrible

war, there is talk of further wars in the atomic age that is upon us. In this atomic age Asia will have to function effectively in the maintenance of peace. Indeed, there can be no peace unless Asia plays her part."

So, Sir, these talks and these policies come from the earlier stage, come even from before independence of the country.

In this hundredth year of the Congress Party, when we are celebrating the first centenary of the Congress Party, when the Prime Minister is reiterating with great dynamism the policies of his grand father, it is worth remembering the concept of Asian collective self-reliance and collective effort for peace and development.

Obviously Sir, things as they are, if one has to be realistic, one has got to see and see immediately the differences among the Asian countries in terms of political structures, in terms of economic systems. They are so different, so wide apart that it will not be proper for me or for this House to ask the Foreign Minister of the Government of India to start the process of an Asian Solidarity Movement. But the movement has to come from the people. There can be people to people contact to bring the different Asian countries apart from their economic systems and political structures which each country has to respect as far as the other country is concerned.

There must be a people to people movement. There must be contacts among the peoples of different nations of Asia to bring Asia together and who are better than the representatives of the people? If the Government cannot do it, Why not the Members of Parliament? Why not our Members of Parliament take initiative to bring all these countries together on an Asian forum for peace and development?

(Interruptions)

I may mention here on the context of what my Hon. colleague has said and in the context of what Shri Dinesh Singh has said earlier referring to the Six Nation peace initiative, which is known in other parts of the world as the Five Continent peace

[Shri Eduardo Faleiro]

initiative, that this important contribution was actually as a result, though was signed by Six Heads of States, of efforts of a little known organisation of Parliamentarians, called the Parliamentarians for World Order.

It was PWO of which Mr. Dinesh Singh has been a Member and Office Bearer and there have been others, including myself also, which about five years ago initiated its move for Heads of States for different continents committed to peace to get together and move the two super powers towards peace. It was the success of this little known organisation of moving all the different Heads of States together on a joint Press Conference which was televised jointly all over the world, it was the success of these Parliamentarians that got us the successful completion of the Six Nation peace initiative or the Five Continent peace initiative.

Therefore, I should think that in the fitness of things, it would produce results if Members of Parliament, each one of them representing lakhs of people, some of them represent millions of people, if they come together on this forum for peace and development in Asia.....

(Interruptions)

I am prepared to yield to anybody who is wiser than me on this issue.

(Interruptions)

I may immediately say that when we have the Asian forum, no country can be excluded, China cannot be excluded, no political party can be excluded and no country can be excluded. It is, therefore, significant and heartening for us that the Prime Minister after his visits to Asian countries, just ended a few days ago, goes to Vietnam. From Vietnam he goes to Japan. Sir, we cannot interfere into the political systems.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar): I only hope that Asian forum will not be another NAM Youth Conference.

AN HON. MEMBER : Why are you worried about it ?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : If the Youth Congress wants to have a conference in moving non-aligned countries together, we must express our appreciation and we are not preventing ourselves from having a conference of the same type.

What is important and the point that I am respectfully putting across in this House today is that very often we in Parliament remain in tight compartments separated from each other and in the process of continuous debate and discussion sometimes, I should respectfully say, unable to identify issues in which all of us can come together.

I think, this is one of the issues, the Asian Parliamentary Forum for Peace and Development in which we must forget whatever differences we have and work together. Because that is the ideal thing for all of us, towards a larger arrangement, towards a larger organisation, towards an objective, that is, to bring peace and progress in this part of the world. I have said it a moment earlier and I repeat it, that if this forum and if our efforts are to succeed, then at least two prerequisites must be there. One is: the initiative must come from Asia itself, from the Asian countries themselves. It should not be imposed or appear to be imposed by any of the super powers or by any country which is not a part of this area. No. 2—we must respect the different political systems. We must respect and agree to disagree on the political and economic structures and bring all countries of Asia together irrespective of their political structures or economic systems.

16.00 hrs.

Within a few months, we will be completing our tenure as Chairman of the NAM. To my mind we have achieved a large measure of success and have made a very positive contribution to the movement while we are the Chairman of the NAM. But it is a bit premature right now to take a final assessment and there is really no need to make a final assessment or an assessment of whatever sort. History will tell what role we have played. All I can say is that everything points out to an excellent contribution, to a positive contribution in the leadership of the NAM movement. I will, however, add that though our leadership of the movement, as Chairman of the movement is going to come to an end

within a few months, we must continue with the same involvement and we must do all that we can do to contribute towards that movement. We must help Zimbabwe as the Chairman in every possible way and there also, not merely by giving financial infrastructure or by giving infrastructure in terms of human resources and I think we must also help the movement with ideas. A criticism that is often voiced against this movement is that all that the movement does is to move resolutions in the United Nations and in different forums of the world, resolutions which contained ideas which are old ideas and which were formulated decades ago and all that the resolutions do is to rehash the same old ideas and in a form which is not new. The movement is in need of new ideas.

Here I also would like to say that at this stage of the Non-aligned Movement what is more important is not more political resolutions alone. 20 years ago, 30 years ago when most of these countries which are part of the movement were old colonies, political activity was important. The resolutions in the United Nations were very important at the political level. Now these countries have attained political independence. So the emphasis and the need for support has shifted from political level to large extent to the economic level. What is happening in Africa? What is happening in Latin America? What is happening in so many countries of Asia? What they need now is not political independence because they are already politically independent. What they need is economic independence. Because what is happening is that though their old political masters have formally disappeared from the scene, the same masters are there and their economic dependence is so strong that the political independence of so many countries, of so many developing countries, of so many so-called non-aligned countries merely a world without much content. What is happening in practice is this—that these countries, so many of these countries, the developing countries are so dependent on their former colonial master for their economy and the goods they import either come from Britain or France or from some other colonial power and the technology that they get is from either of those countries or from any of the super powers. Therefore, this tie-up, the economic strings to which they are attached, makes the very concept of the existence of their political sovereignty

doubtful and an impediment. Therefore, we must help these countries on the economic front. When I say that we must help these countries in the economic field I do not mean just giving them foodgrains. What I mean is that we must give them our experience. We are a developing country ourselves and that is why our experience as to how we have tackled so many problems should be transferred to them without restriction. What is important today is transfer of technology from India to these countries. Our technology is far more appropriate compared to the technology which they are getting from West. Western technology is also expensive compared to our technology. I am sure we have done a great deal in this regard but much more can be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Now, I would like to say a few words about the programme, which is the apex programme, of cooperation between India and these countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia. The programme is known as Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation Programme. Last year about Rs. 8 crores were allotted for this programme. It is not a large sum of money but even this limited amount was not spent. Only Rs. 4 crores were spent. The Government must look into this matter and take the House into confidence as to why when we had allotted Rs. 8 crores for these developing countries only half of it was spent and the other half remained unutilised.

Now, this House must know for what reasons only this much of money had been spent? What were the constraints which did not permit us to spend the full amount? When the needs of these countries are so great and when they are so much interested in our technology how is it that the full amount was not utilised.

Sir, again and again we keep on repeating that we have a tremendous amount of goodwill in developing countries and, no doubt, we repeat it with lot of reason. It is true the names like Mahatma Gandhi, Jawahar Lal Nehru and Indira Gandhi are names which are revered and respected all over developing countries but the question

[Shri Eduardo Faleiro]

that I want to pose is that are we to increase this goodwill or are we to eat into the capital of goodwill? If we are to eat into the capital then a day will come when this goodwill which we have today in a large measure will cease to exist. We have to do much more work in that direction. It is not merely a question of decisions. The question here is that these decisions which are taken must be implemented and executed and administrative difficulties cut short and removed so that we substantially cooperate and give our helping hand to other developing countries of the world.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Sir, I would now like to point out the difficulties which come in the way of implementation of the programme. Sir, I had the opportunity to visit some of these countries. There I found that they were not availing of the programme at all though they were so much interested in it. Why is it so! The administrative difficulties come in. The ITEC programme provides that only one-way passage will be given to the candidate who comes here for training.

Now, as we know, this country, because of its foreign exchange position, can't afford the other way passage. They can't afford even one way passage and therefore, I would submit that we must see that if a particular country can't afford to pay even one way passage, if the country is to be benefited, then we must relax the rule and see that both the passages are provided to these candidates, to these people so that the programme is effective, so that the funds do not go back, so that the real fruition is come to bear on these acts and intentions of goodwill and cooperation.

Sir, I welcome and I am sure all of us do welcome from all sides of the House because in foreign policy, the party difference is not so acute and we welcome the enthusiasm shown by the Prime Minister. The visits of the Prime Minister to the United States and Japan might not have been able to change the perspective either of bilateral relations or

of the geo-political perceptions of these areas. These are the perceptions which cannot be changed by the visits, these are the perceptions which cannot be changed in regard to our national interests for a long period of time. But, however, what the Prime Minister has demonstrated is that as far as this Government is concerned, this Government will not take rigid stand, this Government will not unduly be aggressive this Government will try to find the areas of understanding this Government will try to say what Indiraji used to say, Indiraji used to say wherever we have friends, we strengthen the friendship, Indiraji used to say whether there is any difference, we try to create friendship and she used to say wherever we have enemies we try to bring them round and make friendship with them. This is how it should be, this is what subserves our national interest and if we subserve our national interest, it must subserve the Indian foreign policy.

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour) : Sir, the Motion has been brought by the Government obviously for the purpose of seeing all the foreign jaunts which the Prime Minister has been undertaking during the year, which is just ending and for that, the Prime Minister is duly eulogised. I think there is something in what my friend Mr. Venkata Ratnam has said that this kind of eulogy is going to do harm rather than good to the Prime Minister, in the long run. So, I must request my friends in the ruling party not to overdo things in that direction. The foreign policy of any country is ultimately the extension of the domestic policy and the aspirations of its people.

At the beginning, when India became independent, India wanted to develop its economy and he left out of the arms race from being tagged to one or the other power. Already cold-war was not there. India, with some other nations having similar aspiration for economic development, formed the non-aligned group which was at that time not a very large group, but as time passed on other countries which had been subjected so far and so long became independent. India found itself at the head of the Movement or in the leadership of the vanguard of a movement which was increasingly becoming larger and larger.

Today the nations belonging to the Non-Aligned Movement I think, number about

100 or 112 or something like that. So, it has become a large movement which of course was not contemplated when the Movement started. It started as a low profile movement by some countries desiring themselves for their own economic development and now it has become changed to a movement which can now no longer have a negative role by getting themselves away from the arms race and things like that but which must positively given the present international situation work for something more positive, which must work for world peace to see that the nuclear holocaust does not overtake mankind, which must see that not only the nuclear and the space arms race is halted, but even the conventional arms are reduced, which must see that the economic situation which has been an ever-widening gulf between the developed and the developing countries is reversed by some mechanism like transfer of resources from the developed to the developing countries and many other such aspirations of the vast masses of the developing countries. They must be given an expression through this non-aligned movement and it is today no longer a negative movement, but it is a positive movement. It has to be. India has held a lot of meetings of non-aligned nations, hosted non-aligned meet here in Delhi in 1983; meetings, summits or others, have been attended by our Prime Minister successively every year, here or there, but we find that although in the conferences, they talk of peace, but in the countries there is no movement for peace. Somehow, the Indian diplomacy which has developed from practically nothing before the independence, because we had no foreign policy independently of the British, suddenly has catapulted into global issues, where we have willy-nilly taken the leadership of hosts of countries aspiring for equality with the erstwhile masters. This is a very tricky and demanding job. Just because we are holding the meetings, hosting the meetings sometimes, or attending them some where, it does not mean that we are able to accomplish the task which we have set for ourselves and other countries expect of us. What we have not been able to do is to see that a movement for disarmament, for peace, against nuclear war, against space arms is build up either in the country or in the other developing countries or in the developed countries themselves. When in 1982 the USA was trying to place its missiles, Cruise and Pershing missiles, in the European continent, there was a very large movement

in those countries, in Germany, France, Spain, Italy, and everywhere—even England —, against placing of these missiles, against the setting of these missiles in their own territories. There is a very large peace movement in the USA itself. Do we have any contact with these peace movements? Are we not able to encourage and promote these movements in the countries of origin of imperialism? What have we done to that end? We have not, as far as I can see, done anything except to indulge in conference diplomacy. What should have been the objects of our policy and what are they? When we mount the slogans of our policy, it is one thing, and what we are able to achieve through the mechanism at our disposal is quite another thing.

We have a Foreign Affairs Ministry, but unfortunately, the officers of the Ministry appear to me to be totally alienated from the people of this country; I do not think that they think that this policy is suited to the ethos of the Department itself. The people who man the Department are quite another type of beings than the people of this country and the two do not share similar aspirations. There is a difference and that possibly is the reason for the failure of the foreign policy of this country. Whatever stature, individual prime ministers may attain in the international community, that is not the measure of the country's achievement in successfully implementing its foreign policy. What security have we been able to achieve politically, militarily or economically either for our own people or for those hundreds of millions of peoples who have now become habituated to look to this country to give leadership to the underdeveloped countries? What have we been able to achieve? What is the score board of the recent visits of our Prime Minister? He has been to America. He has gone to America after a long time possibly with the intention of befriending America, which has always been regarding us, quite justifiably, as a country not very friendly to them. Because we have been friendly to USSR, by some American logic, we are not friendly to them! So, our Prime Minister went there with the express object of entering into an agreement for a technology transfer. Has he come back with any such agreement? Is there any such agreement in the offing? The only thing that is given in the Joint Communique after the end of the visit is that

[Shri Amal Datta]

there will be a joint research in certain subjects --mainly health related subjects. Is that what he has gone there for ?

There have been visits to elsewhere also. But what has been the result of these visits ? The results are yet to be seen. The American visit ended six months ago. Today, I expect that Shri Bhagat will tell us something about the fall out of the visit. Six months have passed and it is not a short time.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about the visit to Japan ?

SHRI AMAL DATTA : As regards the visit to Japan, Japan has promised us about \$ 140 millions for some project or the other. That possibly is a net gain. But please remember that the Japanese trade surplus is about \$ 140 millions. So, they are giving 140 million dollars, which is only one-thousandth part of what will be their trade surplus in this year. This is a dole, which they can very well afford to give. This is the type of achievement of our foreign policy. In this way, our Prime Ministers attain world stature. Our Prime Ministers go abroad to get the publicity of the foreign media, to get the acclamation of the foreign people, so that not only in the comity of nations but in the country itself their stature is heightened. This is a use of foreign policy, which does not serve the interests of the people of this country.

So, our friends here, who are eulogising the Prime Minister should remember what is and should be the object of our foreign policy. What should be the basics of our foreign policy today ? Today, for the first time in the world's history, mankind has reached a position, when they can eliminate hunger, when they can clothe all their people, when they can give shelter to all the people and give education to everybody. That is the position today where mankind has reached. But there are some nations who are standing in the way. They have all the means of production in their hands but they will not give to those people who do not have them. So, we will have to act as the leader of the 'have not' nations to get things from the nations who have the means of production. We have to get our people as well as the

peoples of the developing world organised so that we can bring political pressure, not through conferences, but through the mobilisation of our peoples for getting those means from those who will not like to part with them. The last 50 years, let us say from the First World War to now, have seen the liquidation of lot of Empires. Starting from Czars, the Chinese, the British, the German, the French, all the Empires have been liquidated. The only Empire which remains is the American Empire, because it was very modern empire. It did not depend upon its colonies to maintain itself in power. It depended on the capital system, i.e. on its money power. Through that money power, it has increased its dominance over the world. It has increased its dominance not only in the sphere of finance, in the sphere of trade and business, in the sphere of industry, in political and strategic and in every way. Today American presence is there. There are American arms in 40 countries outside the USA. So that is today the main enemy of the progress of human-being, of mankind as much, because they follow that system. That system will collapse, if the means of production which is in their hands goes out to those people who need them. This they cannot allow. There they are the greatest enemies of the mankind today. It is only very late in the 50's when the Non-Aligned Movement started that India could recognise America as the imperialist power. It is only when America did not come to India's aid, in the 1965 war and later India recognised the real role of America in the world politics. India could recognise the USSR as a friend only when USSR came to its needs, to its help in the hour of need in 1971. So, we have taken a lot of time to understand who are our friends, and who are our enemies. But we have not been able to act according to that recognition. A perception is there. But that perception is inactive, to a large extent. It is because of the instrument of foreign policy, the External Affairs Department is structured in such a way that even if the perception is there, the action cannot be there. The objectives of foreign policy today are not merely to contain American imperialism but to see that they have to leave the basis in which they have stretched themselves out to subjugate the entire world to see that they not only reduce their military power accord to disarmament, accord to banning of unclear tests and all that, but also to see

that their financial and economic sphere behave in such a way as not to hurt the other nations. Today what is happening is that instead of money coming out of America or goods coming out of America, there is inflow into America of both money and goods. They are not only hurting the developing countries but they are hurting their own allies, the U.K., Germany, France and everybody is protesting against the USA's monetary policies, the high rates of interest and their money inflow. Why? They are getting money to build up their armaments. For that they are spending 300 billion dollars. Today it is because of the American policy that the world has to spend something like 900 billion dollars every year. This year's expected expenditure will be 900 billion dollars. With four billion dollars on people and 900 billion dollars on war it comes to about 250 dollars, of per capita expenditure on war alone in the world and that mostly comes from these developed nations. Developing nations can contribute very little. What we have today to do, if you look at our Budget, you will find that 1/3rd of the Budget goes into defence expenditure. What we started out to do is to minimise our defence expenditure so that we can devote maximum for the development of the people. But we have ended up in a position where 1/3rd of it will have to willy-nilly be spent on defence and we have not enough money left for any other thing that we want to do, for the power industry, this one and that, we are always told that our resources are very scarce. We do not have enough money. We have reached a position again where Americans are at our doorsteps. Mr. Shri Venkatarathnam said that Pakistan and India are mutual enemies and therefore what the Americans are doing is in their own interest to arm Pakistan against Russia, that Pakistan is getting arms for some other intention. It is not correct. America is giving Pakistan with the intention of seeing that India has to devote its resources not to peaceful purposes, not for its development but to war like uses so that India cannot develop. That has been, and is the fountain spring of U. S. foreign policy. U. S. domestic policy; and the U. S. foreign policy is an extension of U. S. domestic policy. So, unless we in this country, have been able to organise our people, the people of the other developing countries to contain the Americans, not only military policy but also their political and economic policies, in their own country, we

will not be able to say that we have achieved any success with our foreign policy.

Again, I warn my friends that they should analyse where we are going, what are our objects, and then if you found that our Prime Ministers successively have been able to achieve any of those goals, only then eulogise him, Just—not because he has hosted a dinner there or attended a conference somewhere else, that is not the crux of the matter. That is no criterion for eulogising a person. He has built up his stature as before him Mrs. Gandhi had built up her stature as a world leader. But what has it achieved for all the deprived people of India and the deprived people of all the developing countries? I do not think that my friends will be able to give an adequate answer to this.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I totally disagree and dissociate myself from the approach of my Hon. friend Shri Amal Datta. He has been asking, "What have they achieved? What have these conferences yielded to us? What is it we have been doing? Why do you go on eulogising your Prime Minister?"

Is anybody eulogising a Prime Minister—in this resolution anyhow—it is eulogising India and the role that she has been playing. We have done it when Jawaharlal Nehru was Prime Minister, later on when Morarji Desaiji was the Prime Minister—let me tell you—when Lal Bahadurji was the Prime Minister, when Indiraji was the Prime Minister, it is India. Only the difference lies in the manner in which each one of those Prime Ministers had presented our case in the rest of the world.

Now, today we are glad that our young Prime Minister has been able to do honours in that direction, and in that context, we are glad also that through his tours the flag of India has not been lowered, the prestige of India has been increased and we are able to face the rest of the world with a positive programme.

Then, my Hon. friends were asking for a positive programme. What is it you have achieved—they ask. What can any Prime Minister or any Foreign Minister for that

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

matter any Government achieve in a matter of five to six or ten years. But over a period of these 25 years, when after this Non-Alignment Movement has been initiated and inaugurated we certainly have achieved what my Hon. friends themselves have now given credit of. At one time very few people, later on many more, now almost more than one hundred nations have joined this Movement. Is it not an achievement? This is exactly what my Hon. friend from the Communist (Marxist) Party has just now stated: but only over this particular period.

Now, we have taken up the leadership of this Non-Aligned Movement and during the last two and a quarter years. Did we ask for it? Have we canvassed for it? While the country which had to play the host was not then prepared, then the rest of the nations asked us to shoulder this responsibility. We have accepted it. Having accepted it we have been able to play our role in a creditable manner. Have we done it or not? We have done it. There cannot be a dissenting voice over that.

Then my Hon. friend, Shri Dinesh Singh, suggested that we should expand our gamut of consultations and cooperation from the stage of SAARC to the whole of Asia. Certainly we would like to do that. Other friends also have given facts and figures as to how it has started. We have started and we will go to the whole of Asia. But there are reasons also. Indiraji took courage in both her hands and tried to convene a platform of not only Asian countries but as many other countries as possible after she became the Chairperson of the Non-Aligned Movement. Many thought that she was going to be a failure. We were also afraid. It is true that it did not succeed, but it was not a failure. And as a result of that, we were able to have a conference here where the President of Argentina and other Presidents from other continents like Norway, Sweden and Canada came and cooperated with us. Now the latest is this conference. Is that not a positive result?

My Hon. friend was saying "think of your economy". True we do that. That is why we have not been able to offer as much

assistance to all the other countries as we wanted. Certainly we would like to do that. It was this country and this Government under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru which initiated the policy of offering scholarships to the young people from the developing countries. People from Malaysia, Korea, African countries and from one or two Latin American countries came. Now a large number of them are here. So much more has got to be done. We would like to do that. But there is the question of financial constraint.

My Hon. friend was rightly concerned that our people in our own country should be developed, poverty should be eliminated and so on. We have got all these challenges. We are trying to meet challenges as best as we may.

We are trying to offer whatever cooperation and assistance we can possibly spare. That is one of the reasons why the transport facilities for N. E. States are not being developed as fast as we would like them to be because our Railway Minister was obliged to undertake the responsibility of building railways in several other countries in Africa. All this we are doing. Is it not a positive contribution?

Now, there is the other question as to what we are doing except talking about peace. World peace is the most important thing today. The United Nations has been functioning for the last 40 years or. It was only able to make a unanimous appeal to the whole of the world to have peace just for one year, not to have tests at least for 12 months. That was their achievement. But at the same time, because of the pressure that was brought to bear upon the super powers through the media, all these various inter-parliamentary forums, people to people cooperation and people's movements all over the world for peace, those two great leaders came together the other day in Geneva. Then they agreed to meet—one to go to America and other to USSR. While they would be discussing between themselves and meeting each other—it is bound to take more than one year—the UN resolution would thus be implemented at least for one year.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : What is our contribution ?

PROF. N. G. RANGA : I am not able to hear you. I am trying to meet as many of your points as possible, although I was thinking of making some other points. Therefore, here is this positive achievement.

I was rather surprised when Mr. Venkata Ratnam, who is now sitting in the Chair, said what more have we done than having meetings and meetings and conferences and conferences. It is as a result of these conferences that the Chair person of the Non-Aligned Movement has met both the leaders on both the sides, and on top of it, by taking courage in both his hands. It would have been a matter of loss of prestige if he had failed, and he did not fail. In an non-conventional manner, in an unprogrammed manner, he rushed back from New York again to USSR and persuaded both of them to hasten to meet each other and try to reach some agreement. Did it not play any role at all ? Surely, it has done. How much is another matter, it is a psychological factor. But he did achieve this result of these two great leaders of the super powers to agree to meet each other during next year in their respective countries, on behalf of their respective countries. Therefore, these visits have played a positive role. And in addition to that, we should congratulate him and thank him because he is a young man. It needs courage to go round and then prove himself to be worthy of this country. This he has done. Has he not ? Surely, every patriotic Indian here in our country, ignorant or not ignorant should land his efforts ! So many every one in the villages and towns, flooded me with their letters, congratulating and expressing satisfaction that he has played his role as a Prime Minister in a dignified manner, in a fitting manner. We should be proud of it.

Then I take other suggestions. I agree with the suggestions made by Shri Dinesh Singh. Every word that fell from Dinesh Singh today is a word of wisdom. He has had experience in the past and he has been weighing all these things in a very careful manner. He has not spoken, as I am doing now, in a controvertial fashion, and therefore, the suggestion that he has made that

we should try and make another effort to bring together more countries so far as Asia is concerned, I support that. And I hope that our diplomats as well as our External Affairs Minister would try to implement it. The External Affairs Minister needs a word of praise from me because he has had experience earlier. He had gone round. He knew the temperaments and the tempo of politics of these countries. He has now come back again to his own charge and I wish him all success and hope he would succeed in helping our Prime Minister as well as our country in making this Non-Aligned Movement a stronger force than what it is today, and help to grow it. We cannot be blind to the facts that are there all around our country.

They have all met the other day, true, in Dhaka. They have agreed not to interfere with each other. They have agreed also to see that non-nuclear atmosphere would come to prevail and so on. But at the same time, we know the limitations subject to which these gentlemen have met each other and the compulsions that they are obliged to satisfy in their own respective countries. I am particularly concerned with Pakistan, with what is happening there, and its relations with America. But that does not mean that I agree with my Hon. friend Mr. Amal Datta in considering America to be the greatest enemy of world peace today... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI AMAL DATTA : Don't you agree ?

PROF. N. G. RANGA : No, Sir. The super powers, semi-super powers are all now working. And if you consider these as enemies of world peace, just because they happen to be in possession of atomic power and nuclear power, then there are so many other countries also, not only America. What is the role France, China, England, West Germany are playing in supplying so many things to Pakistan ? What is the role which some of the developing countries all around the Mediteranean have been playing in encouraging and abetting and supporting Pakistan in her efforts to develop the nuclear bomb ? Are they not playing the role of enemy of world peace ?

We need world peace for our development, for our stability in a salvaging of the

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

crores and crores of our own poverty-ridden people here.

My friend was saying; "Oh ! you are wasting one-third of your money on defence forces." Now, let me ask what is your solution then ? Can we afford to reduce our military strength today in the light of what is happening there in Pakistan ?

SHRI AMAL DATTA : I did not say 'wasting'. I said we are forced to. There is a gulf of difference between these two words.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : All right, we are forced to, but at the same time you said : "you are doing it and it is not right." I say it is right, because if we do not do it, then we cannot be sure of peace in our country. Whatever may be the conference and all these offers that are being made by Pakistan and her friends in the world, we have got to strengthen our defence forces. You say we are wasting one-third, but may I submit, when the British were here, we were wasting half of our money, although in absolute quantum it was very much less. Today it is very much less in percentage terms; thanks to the cooperation of the people in developing the economy of our country.

Here is our friend Pakistan which wants 'No-War Pact', We had very much more than that when they invaded us without giving us any notice in Kashmir and in the Rann of Kutch and the last time on the eve of the Bangladesh Revolution. Did they give you a notice ? Did they care for it ? If our defence forces had not been big, efficient, courageous and patriotic enough, those planes from Pakistan would have come over here and rained bombs over Delhi. Our people stemmed their tide. Therefore, you cannot simply dismiss the Government of India's hesitation in accepting its 'No-War Pact' proposition.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He did not say that.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : Words have got to be weighed in the light of our experience. Our country cannot afford to be negligent of its defence forces. Defence forces have got to be the second and right arm of our foreign

policy. Foreign policy and defence forces have to work hand in glove with each other. That is why I support the policy of the Government in regard to Pakistan's offer of so-called 'No-War Pact'.

Then, what is it that we want ? We cannot afford to quarrel with America. Can we afford to quarrel with China or with Russia ? In the present world how can we keep ourselves in deferent about what is happening ? My friend Shri Amal Datta, was good enough to say that Russia has been our friend. True, Russia has been our solid friend. I am not a Communist and I have been a political opponent of Communist party, but at the same time I appreciate the comradeship that Russia had offered to us on all fronts. I want similar friendship to be developed with China. For their own reasons my friend was saying, oh, if only social and economic development of these countries were to be developed, there would be no trouble at all between one country and another. Both are Communist countries—that is, China and Russia. At the same time, they are not together. Communist China is hand-in-glove with capitalist America. Now you can draw your own conclusions. But at the same time Socialist India wants to be friend with China and with Russia. That is where I want our diplomats to cooperate with our Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister in setting the border question in a reasonable manner, in a sensible manner. I am not speaking now for the Government; I am speaking as Professor Ranga. There were times when Chou-en-lai had suggested certain ways of solving our border question. We did not look at it. I did not look at it at that time because we were all very angry with China because of her invasion of India. Jayaprakash Narayan made certain suggestions. So many people in this country called him a traitor. We did not agree with them. I agreed with him. Now the time has come when we must be courageous-enough to reach a reasonable settlement with China.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : Very good.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : That is your friend; I want to make friends with your friend; I want settlement of this side also so that my country can be friends with capitalist America and the communists too. What

should I call them?—Are they opponents of each other? No, they are brothers who are at war with each other. Sir, you are saying Mrs. Thatcher did not yield anything to us. We did not yield to her also! Nevertheless it was a consensus. Both she and our Prime Minister succeeded in a manner which was not expected, which was not hoped for, before that conference. They succeeded in weakening South Africa's Apartheid campaign. Would it go now? Would it go tomorrow or day after? It may not be. Certainly it is weakened as a result of that CHOGM conference and the role that was played by our Prime Minister as well as the British Prime Minister. It is in this way, Sir, that internationally we can carry on this conversation. Thank you.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He appears to be in love with the job of Prime Minister-ship itself!

[*Translation*]

SHRI NARESH CHANDRA CHATURVEDI (Kanpur) : Mr. Chairman Sir, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Minister of External Affairs because ever since he took over charge of this Department he has been pursuing the policy of peace, goodwill and cooperation, as advocated by the Hon. Prime Minister.

Just now an Hon. friend, while referring to the Prime Minister's image building, has said, that he is inexperienced and image building would not help much because in many matters experience is needed. I would like to remind him that in normalising relations with many countries, the Hon. Prime Minister has not only kept the ideals in view but also proved to be a pragmatic person. In this connection, I would like to cite the example of the problem of Tamils in Sri Lanka. The Sri Lanka Government did not agree to the proposals of Tamil Nadu Government in this respect. The way the Sri Lanka situation was handled and the policy that was adopted, clearly reflected his maturity. Rajivji has displayed farsightedness in all these matters and I feel no one should say that he is still lacking in experience.

The foreign policy that is being pursued in respect of our neighbouring countries is a policy of goodwill, because no country can

progress till all the energies are channelised for development and in making the environment cordial. When the Hon. Prime Minister took over the reins of the country he brought about qualitative changes not only within the country but in the international situation as well. There has been appreciable change in the attitude of the neighbouring countries whether it is Nepal, Bhutan or Pakistan. These small issues that are raised are of no consequence. U. S. A. and U. S. S. R. may be big powers but they are not capable of doing certain things because of their commitment to their blocs. When the late Jawahar Lal Nehru took over the reins of the country we were a weak country and that was why it used to be repeatedly emphasised that so long as we did not emerge as power, we would be helpless. I remember at that time although we did not have much resources yet Pandit Nehru in his capacity as the Prime Minister condemned the attack on the Suez Canal in unambiguous terms which had a healthy effect. This effect was not due to the show of strength but due to the moral backing of the biggest Asian country. In spite of our limited resources we have been taking interest in these matters even now as a matter of policy, and India occupies a unique position not only in Asia but in the entire world in providing leadership and in her sincerity of purpose. It is natural that the world should look to India as an apostle of peace and goodwill, because we never think in terms of aggression and if an unfortunate situation arises we deal with it patiently and sincerely. Today, under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi we have made progress in this regard. I would like to submit that the new programme which has been launched in regard to South Asia will prove beneficial not only to India but to the entire Asia also. No doubt, there are some small difficulties like that of South Africa, which we have discussed. The people have burnt down Mahatma Gandhi's ashram there. It is true that Mrs. Thatcher did not play the role expected of her but as a Member of Commonwealth, Shri Rajiv Gandhi mobilised the opinion of other Members in his favour and this is not a small achievement. We do agree that injustice is being done to Indians residing in Britain and the British Government have not initiated any action but this does not mean that we should leave them on their own and should not give a serious thought to it. Therefore, I welcome the steps taken and the policy adopted by Shri Rajiv Gandhi in the context of South Asia for the

[Shri Naresh Chandra Chaturvedi]

development of the entire Asia in particular and mankind in general and I support it and also congratulate the Hon. External Affairs Minister for it.

[English]

*SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU (Gobichettipalayam) : Hon. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in the debate on the international situation and the policy of the Government of India. Within a year after assuming the Office of Prime Ministership of this great country, our Hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi undertook foreign visits six times and he has been ceaselessly endeavouring to promote friendship, cooperation and understanding among the nations of the world, besides attempting to strengthen the economic ties among the member-nations. On behalf of my party the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam I commend his strenuous efforts to strengthen international amity and peace. He has earned the goodwill of several nations of the world for our non-alignment policy. Several countries of the world have paid unreserved encomium to India's role in the growth of non-alignment movement. The leaders of the world have lauded the leadership of our Hon. Prime Minister as the Chairman of non-aligned movement. Even countries like America, which is inimical towards India, is surprised to see the choice of the people of India in having such a matured Prime Minister like Shri Rajiv Gandhi. There is no iota of doubt about India's successful and rapid strides towards Twenty-first Century, under the dynamic leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. This young and vibrant leader of non-aligned nations has shown wisdom of India's hoary past. He has been scrupulously adhering to the tenets of foreign policy enunciated by his illustrious grand-father Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and implemented by his renowned mother Shrimati Indira Gandhi with zeal and zest. It is no wonder that several countries of the world are shaping and formulating their foreign policy after getting the

views of our Prime Minister on international situation and after India's foreign policy is announced. This redounds to the credit of our vivacious and vigorous Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

17.05 hrs.

I would in particular refer to the Sri Lankan problem which is assuming alarming proportions. Our Hon. Prime Minister has repeatedly reiterated on the floor of this House that Sri Lankan issue is an international problem and it should be tackled at international level. During the last one year we have discussed Sri Lankan problem on several occasions and every time we have demanded that Sri Lankan problem should be treated as a national problem, that it should be approached as a national issue since a part of the country is adversely affected by continuous influx of refugees from Sri Lanka and that Sri Lankan problem should not be treated in a cavalier and casual manner. Shri Rajiv Gandhi has unequivocally stated that it is not a problem of Tamil Nadu alone and it is a problem confronting Indian sub-continent. We have always given unstinted support to the policy of the Government of India in regard to Sri Lankan issue.

But what do we find today? We are witnessing the inviolate intransigence of President Jayawardhane of Sri Lanka. President Jayawardhane publicly proclaims that if Shri Rajiv Gandhi invades Sri Lanka and arrests him, then on that day not even a single Tamil of Sri Lanka will be alive. Let us see who is supporting him in this exhibition of audacity. Pakistan is extending its support to him. America is abetting in his atrocities on Tamil race. Israel is aiding him in training commandos. South Africa is dumping arms and ammunitions in Sri Lanka. Naturally President Jayawardhane is stalling and settlement with Sri Lankan Tamils. He is trying to ensure that by the time any such settlement is reached the entire Tamil race is wiped out from Sri Lanka. Such a situation will assure the eternal supremacy of Sri Lankans on the island.

*The speech was originally delivered in Tamil.

The entire Tamil Nadu is on the verge of a volcanic uprising. The Tamils all over

the country are greatly agitated over the delay in finding a solution of Sri Lankan problem. Our Hon. Prime Minister announced on the floor of this House last week that he and Jayawardhane would hold a discussion about this problem on 9th December. I am sorry that no such discussion has taken place between the two on the 9th December.

The officials of the External Affairs Ministry have held several rounds of discussion with the agitating leaders of Sri Lankan Tamils. But these talks have not yielded any notable result. Some ceasefire arrangement was hammered at in the discussions, but the Sri Lankan Government side is committing every day violations of this ceasefire. The innocent Tamils are being killed in hundreds. The Tamil women are being raped. The Tamil children are mauled and maimed. The Tamil mothers are being massacred day in and day out. In the daily newspapers we come across the news items of the murder of 15 Tamils, 20 Tamils etc. The Sri Lankan Army which is to protect the people of the country and which is to safeguard the sovereignty of the country is running amuck with impunity. The Sri Lankan Army has become the potent weapon of oppression. In this environment of violent confrontation against Sri Lankan Tamils, Sri Jayawardhane waxed eloquent in Dhaka about the need for wiping out terrorism and about the necessity for extinguishing extremism. I take this opportunity to say that our Hon. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's commitment to friendly relations with Sri Lanka should not be allowed to be misconstrued by President Jayawardhane. It is time that we take a strong stand in Sri Lanka matter.

I would like to recall the role of India in the liberation of Bangla Desh. We assisted in the freedom of Bangla Desh so that the millions of refugees who fled Bangla Desh could go back to the free country in honour and dignity. Our Hon. Prime Minister has solved the Punjab problem in the interest of integrity of the country. By working day and night, a solution was found to the problem of Assam for the good of the country as a whole. We should adopt such an approach now towards Sri Lankan problem so that the lakhs of Sri Lankan Tamil refugees presently in Tamil Nadu could go back in honour to Sri Lanka. We should try to remove the impression that this is a

problem of Tamils living 1500 miles away from the capital. This impression should not be allowed to gain momentum as it will prove dangerous to the integrity of the country. Though the demand for secession of Tamil Nadu has become a matter of the past, this kind of inordinate delay in finding a solution to Sri Lankan problem may lead to the creation of an atmosphere where the Tamils may start entertaining the notion of secession. This must be avoided at any cost. This continuing genocide in Sri Lanka must be ended. The State terrorism must not be allowed to wipe out a particular human race. While I welcome the laudable initiatives taken by our Hon. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in ushering an era of peace and amity in the world, I would appeal to him that an immediate solution to Sri Lankan problem must be found out so that Sri Lankan Tamils live in that country with equal rights and honour.

[English]

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH (Bulandshahr) : The international situation, in my humble opinion, though not entirely free from tensions and strife, is somewhat better and more relaxed than it was a year ago. It does not necessarily mean that all the problems which are faced by the world community have been resolved. Problems like disarmament and the arms race not between the two great powers only, but among other countries in other parts of the world, the problem of a nuclear holocaust, the problem of racial discrimination, economic backwardness, poverty, disease and illiteracy in the Third World countries, and the indifference of the richer countries towards the problem of the Third World and also a tendency of the richer countries to exploit the vulnerable position of the Third World countries for their own immediate economic gains—all these problems are there which have not been solved yet and their solution is not in sight at the moment. But, at the same time, side by side with this, one does see a certain change in the attitude and in the way of functioning of some of the important world leaders. Whereas in the past some of them were following an ostrich-like policy when they did not want to know what their counterpart were wanting to say or were wanting in the world, but now we find luckily that all these people are pulling their heads out of the sand and are looking around towards the world. This,

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh]

I think, is a very positive and helpful change which augurs well for the peace of the world. A few significant developments have taken place and are taking place on the world scene to-day which go to support this contention of mine and which also makes me feel rather optimistic about our future. Among the developments, the most important ones are the recent meeting between President Reagan of USA and Mr. Gorbachev of USSR in Geneva recently. Now we know for a fact that the peace of the world and the future of making today rests in the hands of these two powers. We also know that if their relations are bad and if these countries even growl at each other, then the world shakes with fear and if they smile at each other, then the world heaves a sigh of relief. This is a fact of life. It is very important that some understanding must come between these two countries for the sake of the world.

Though this meeting did not throw up any concrete results or any agreements, but the very fact that these two leaders met and exchanged views, I think, will go a long way in bringing and creating a better climate for the future of the world. It will pave the way for future meetings between the two countries when they might be able to resolve the problems we face.

Now we also notice a thaw in the relations between the two great giants of the Asian Continent the USSR and China which I think, is also a very positive and good development. These two nations have started a dialogue between themselves and if their relations are normalised, that will augur well for peace in the Asian Continent.

Indo-US relations, as I perceive them, as a result of our Prime Minister's efforts are also on the mend and though they are not as happy as we would like them to be but we do find that the State Development in USA is now trying to rub off the rough edges of their policy towards India and they are more keen to have closer relations in the economic and commercial fields which is also a very good development.

And the fourth development I welcome is the initiative which our Prime Minister has taken in respect of our policy towards our neighbours. It is a fact of life that a

country's standing and stature in the world is judged by the quality and by the depth of its relations with its neighbours. And having realised that and also after realising that the real test our foreign policy lies in the success of our diplomacy in Islamabad, in Thimpu, in Colombo and in other capitals of our neighbouring States and not in the capitals of Europe or America, having realised that, our Prime Minister has very wisely given a new direction to our policy towards our neighbours.

In the past we were following a policy which I might call a policy of mutual exclusiveness towards our neighbours and sometimes a wrong interpretation was put on that policy and it was made to look as if it was a tough and rigid policy. Now the Prime Minister has wisely injected a new element in our policy towards our neighbours by introducing an element of friendship, personal touch and warmth which has been welcomed by all our neighbours and it has demolished the wall of suspicion and doubt which stood between us and the smaller countries. They no longer doubt our intentions towards them. Our relations with our neighbours are friendly and our policy is on the right lines. There is no doubt that we have some problems with Bangladesh regarding refugees coming into India. We have the problem of sharing of Ganga water. We have a problem with Sri Lanka. But as I said the climate is improving. We hope with this improved climate all these problems which have proved intractable so far will get settled with advantage to both the countries.

The only difficulty we have is with our neighbour Pakistan. Try as we would for the last 35 years, we have not been able to normalise our relations with that country. Indo-Pakistan relations have passed through several phases and many ups and downs but I will say this much that even in regard to Pakistan our Prime Minister has taken a pragmatic approach and he is trying his best to be friend her. He had a number of meetings with President Zia so that they could sit together and discuss their problems freely and frankly and bring about a mechanism by which our problems can be solved. But I must say we have not achieved much success so far.

Sir, I would like to say on this question that the main reason from my viewpoint as

to why we could not bring about good relations with Pakistan is that Pakistani President is not master of his own country, mind or policy. There is so much interference there from outside, and Pakistan is so much involved in super-power politics that she is incapable of taking decisions in her own national interest. These super powers do not want countries like India and Pakistan to come together and have friendly relations. Even then every effort is being made from our side to remove and allay the fears in the minds of Pakistan that we do not have any aggressive design. We want them to flourish because if we have strong Pakistan as our neighbour it will add to our strength.

Sir, a number of suggestions have been put forward by the Indian Government to Pakistan which are in the knowledge of the Hon. Members. I would only like to mention about the latest declaration of the Prime Minister about our decision not to manufacture nuclear weapons even if Pakistan goes nuclear. Personally I have certain reservations about this declaration. It is a good gesture which the Prime Minister has made and I only hope that Pakistan takes it in the right spirit and responds in the positive way and brings a check on its own nuclear programme. My fear is that if Pakistan does not react in the way we want her to react and if she continues with her nuclear programme two things will happen. First, without a nuclear reply from our side we will be subjected to a nuclear blackmail by Pakistan all the time and we may have to succumb to her threats because of our weakness; and secondly if we try and take help from an outside nuclear country for our protection, then naturally we will be compromising our independent stand and independent foreign policy. So, I feel, that whereas we have taken the risk in making the declaration we should watch the situation carefully and do everything possible to convince Pakistan of our friendly intentions but at the same time we should keep our powder dry. So, Sir, as far as the other development is concerned which is of a very historical importance, that it is the SAARC Summit which was very recently held in Dhaka. From all sides of this House the success of this meeting was hailed and I also congratulate the Prime Minister for having steered the proceedings of the meeting in Dhaka in such a way that it has become successful and I think this augurs well for the future because

in this way the developing countries have shown to the richer countries that if help and assistance fails to come from them, for their development, they can get together and with their cooperative efforts solve their difficulties by mutual help and cooperation. I hope this will become a nucleus round which in future more and more countries of the developing world will get together for regional cooperation and later on, may be, we can have a global cooperation. I congratulate the Prime Minister for having brought about this situation.

My last word is that during the short spell of time, our Prime Minister has established himself as a world leader, the leader of the NAM, the leader of India and the Third World. A leader who has imagination and wisdom to lead the Third World in the world and, Sir, the eyes of the entire world are focussed on him and we have great hopes in him and I am sure that our destiny and the destiny of NAM countries are safe in his hands. With these words, I support the motion.

SHRI T. BASHEER (Chirayinkil) : Sir, a friend of mine from the other side of the House-CPM Member-expressed doubt about India's objective in the international scene. Sir, India's objectives in the international scene are very clear. We always stood for the cause of peace, for the co-existence; we stood with the people who struggled for liberation from the colonial and neo-colonial rule. We started with these objectives and policies before freedom struggle and that continues now and everybody knows that our position is beyond doubt and our objective is well established.

Sir, immediately after assuming office, the Hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, reiterated his commitment to the basic approach and the foreign policy. I should like to remind the Hon. Member who spoke from that side of what he stated.

I quote his words :—

“we have always believed in working for peace. Our policy is to be friends with all countries on the basis of reciprocity and mutual benefit. Our commitment in the NAM and New Economic Order based on justice, equality and mutual cooperation is unshakable. This means a total dedi-

[Sri T. Basheer]

cation to the twin causes of peace and development. We also believe in safeguarding them.—Independence of States and upholding the principles of non-interference and non-intervention.”

Sir, after Shri Rajiv Gandhi became the Prime Minister, we have been seeing how he has been upholding our country's prestige in the international field, he has visited many countries, friendly countries; he had discussed with the various heads of the countries for the purpose of easing the tension prevailing in the international scene and to convince the people for maintaining peace and the need for maintaining co-existence.

My friends mentioned about SAARC, South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation. It is a welcome step that India is going to host the next meeting in Delhi. I congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister for his initiative in this regard.

When we look at the international scene, the most serious problem that we find is the unprecedented escalation of arms, particularly nuclear arms. The arms race has intensified international tension.

The cloud of a nuclear war is looming large over the world. The nuclear war means destruction of all civilization. According to a UNO report, the number of nuclear arms in the world is between forty thousands and fifty thousands. For the arms race, the world powers are spending five lakh crore dollars annually, which means a thousand crore dollars per minute. We always talk about dangers of nuclear war and demand ban on testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons. It is true that in the international forums it had been discussed time and again. The people all over the world have been raising their voice of protest including the people of those countries who are involved in the arms race. But that has been the result ?

In its annual review 'The Military Balance 1985-86' the International Institute for Strategic Studies, a London based Institute reveals that while there have been no dramatic changes in the past year in the deployed nuclear weapons system on either

side, both Super Powers will be deploying new systems over the next few years. The Super Powers are spending more and more money and they have stepped up their production and deployment of nuclear weapons. The situation becomes more and more serious and explosive.

In Geneva Ronald Reagan and Gorbachev met together some time ago and had discussions. This is a welcome development. The world hopes and expectations were focussed on the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting. But what would be the result ? The question is : will the meeting make it a turning point for peace ?

I remember that in 1979 Brezhnev and Jimmy Carter met in Vienna. They embraced each other and they signed the SALT-II agreement. But now we realise that the hopes and aspirations aroused in the minds of the world community have been shattered. Nothing happened. The arms race continues; the rivalry continues and the tensions have intensified. What would be the result, that is the question .

In this context, I would like to quote Pandit Jawharlal Nehru what he said in this House on 10th May, 1954 when the Lok Sabha discussed control on nuclear energy.

“Hon. Members of both sides of the House have talked about banning nuclear weapons but it is not very clear to me, however, as to how sentiments and strong speeches in this House will lead to such a ban. There is no doubt that these weapons will ultimately have to be controlled, if not put an end to. But from what we know of this world, who is to bell the cat ? Each will sit back and say to himself that despite some public protestation, there will really be no attempt to control the weapons. Yet it is necessary to control them. The question remains how to do it. International law as is well known is too feeble an instrument yet to achieve it.”

So, that is the position even now. What will be the future course of action—that is the most important thing. The implementation as such is the important thing.

My friends here, from the other side, asked as to what India is doing, in regard to

peace movements that are going on. I am really astonished to hear such a question. It is India and Jawaharlal Nehru who built up the Non-aligned Movement. He was the main architect of the Non-aligned Movement and it was India's contribution. We are proud of it. But he does not see the point. How can I convince him? Our friend, Shri Jaipal Reddy is very much worried about the NAM Youth Conference. I do not know why he reacted so. I congratulate the Youth Congress, who brought together the non-aligned countries and for their contribution to the cause of peace.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : But not by bringing the delegates from Pakistan Embassy which is situated in Chanakyapuri !

(Interruptions)

SHRI T. BASHEER : At the same time, they are finding fault that we are not joining peace movements. It, is quite paradoxical.

Sir, would like to say something about the policy of Apartheid now. Apartheid continues its unashamed brutality in South Africa and illegally occupied Namibia, which is against all norms of international behaviour. Struggle against the apartheid and for ending the racist regime in South Africa reached new heights.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Basheer, you please conclude. You have taken a lot of time.

SHRI T. BASHEER : I should say that India must take a lead to put an end to this policy of apartheid.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, fortunately, foreign policy has not been a bone of contention and an apple of discord among the political parties in our country. But I do not understand as to why such an experienced politician and a seasoned parliamentarian like Shri Dinesh Singh, known for his diplomatic finesse should have chosen to lend an acrimonious dimension of partisan controversy to this innocuous seasonal motion. As you all know, our general approach in the area of foreign policy has been derived as a part of the precious heritage of our freedom struggle. It is undoubtedly strengthened by the imaginative leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, who happened to be our first Prime Minister.

But then, it is not an occasion for a general survey or a comprehensive review of our foreign policy's achievements. I thought the motion was merely meant for taking a critical look at some of the important aspects of the contemporary global scenario for developing our own specific and immediate policy initiatives. Sir, it is no doubt true that there is less of tension now in the air, after the recent super-power summit at Geneva. But this relaxed atmosphere is a bit deceptive because this summit did not really achieve anything specific or concrete. The two leaders Mr. Reagon and Mr. Gorbachev have chosen to speak will of each other that is about all. But they have not been able to initiate any move in the direction of arms control. Mr. Reagon of course is still bent on fondling his pet baby of Star War programmes. So in 1975, the world was spending 350 billion dollars on defence. Today in 1985, in 10 years we are spending more than 700 billion dollars.

In next two years, this may exceed to 1000 billion dollars. The developed world has been decreasing its quota of concessional financing. For the seventh replenishment, the IDA has reduced its aid from 16 billion to 9 billion dollars. For the Eighth replenishment, the third world countries are asking for aid to the tune of 15 billion dollars. The industrialised nations are not in a position to spare this petty amount. Our foreign policy which certainly resulted in the powerful movement of Non-Aligned Nations did not succeed in one respect. They have not been able to produce sufficient influence under super powers in respect of expenditure on defence. When the first meeting of NAM took place at Belgrade, there were 5000 nuclear weapons. Today, we have 50,000 nuclear weapons. Our Prime Minister, of course has been on a foreign jaunt spree during the last one year. Well, he has been visiting countries and people of this country have not been able to get his *darshan*, but only Doordarshan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you know everyday those who own TV sets are condemned to see the Prime Minister's photo for nearly an hour.

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum) : Even to go Adivasi areas.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Helicopter hopping is not a real visit to Adivasi areas. But these visits, in my view, were more in the nature of formal familiarisation with the heads of various nations. I would like to know from the Foreign Affairs Minister as to what these visits have fetched to this nation ? Did our Prime Minister succeed in dissuading USA from giving increased military aid to Pakistan ? Did he succeed in making United States see the dangers that would flow from Pakistan going nuclear. Did our Prime Minister succeed in persuading Reagan to see that more concessional financing is made available to our country, let alone to the Third World countries ? Mr. Reagan told our Prime Minister in his face that the only way to get aid is to go to the multi-nationals.

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

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am the only person speaking for my Party.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have already taken ten minutes.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am not even half way through.

In what way did our Prime Minister succeed in getting pressure exerted on the Pretoria regime ? What are the concrete results of these trips ? I would like the Foreign Minister to throw light on this aspect. Our Prime Minister, like any average Indian is more interested in visiting the Western countries. I would like the Foreign Minister to tell us as to how many Third World countries he has visited. And, the Members of the ruling Party, with a tongue-in-cheek have said that the Prime Minister has already attained the stature of a world leader. I would like to mention for the benefit of those Members that any person, who comes to become the Prime Minister of India, which is the most populist democracy in the world and one of the most popular democracies in the world, instantly attains the status of a world statesman.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about Mr. Morarji Desai ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am happy that they are good enough to remind themselves of Mr. Morarji Desai. Recently, when the Prime Minister...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You wind up.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I have not even begun. What is this ?

SHRI T. BASHEER : He can say anything...*(Interruption)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : When our young Prime Minister visited the U. K. recently the all India Radio was good enough to tell us as part of the news that Mrs. Margaret Thatcher departed from her convention to receive him at the airport. May I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when Mr. Morarji Desai visited the United Kingdom the then Prime Minister Mr. James Callaghan also went to the airport to receive the Prime Minister. I am not saying that this is any indication on the part of our Prime Minister.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You conclude now.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : What is this ? Do you want us to make any contribution to the debate or not ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You can contribute in the time given. I have allotted ten minutes. You have exceeded that.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Are we discussing the foreign policy or anything else ?

(Interruptions)

Do you want me to put across my Party view-point or do you want me to join the ranks of flatterers and courtiers ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : How much time more do you want ?

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS (Bhilwara) : He has wasted all the time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No, no. This is not the way. Your behaviour is not correct. I am giving two minutes for you to wind up.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS : Do not give him a single minute.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : These foreign trips should not merely be projected in such a manner as to impress the gullible people in our country. These foreign trips must also yield some concrete results. In my view, all foreign trips are in the nature of formal familiarisation. Therefore, I am of the view that our Prime Minister should visit Third World countries. Our initiative in the non-aligned world must, in fact, increase. Our senior diplomats are posted as ambassadors even in second rate western countries and not to the important countries of the Third World. Senior diplomats should be posted to important countries of the Third World. The casual diplomatic approach to the Third World countries is being exemplified by the neglect of Indian High Commission in Nigeria. There is the post of High Commissioner was vacant for more than 8 months. Even now the post of Commercial Commissioner in Lagos is vacant.

We all know that the foreign policy is, in fact, foreign trade by other means. One of the reasons why the western countries have been witnessing more interest in India is that they have lately discovered a big market in India. These nations are raising a tariff wall for themselves and they want Indian's frontiers to be opened up for their commercial penetration. As a Third World country we must take initiative to develop intermediate technology which is appropriate for Third World. It is in this area that we can emerge as a leader of the Third World.

I welcome the Declaration of the SAARC Summit. It is necessary to pursue the Declaration of the SAARC.

I would like to say just one word on Sri Lanka. We have been able to bring about meetings between the representatives of TULF and the Government of Sri Lanka. But we have not been able to make any progress. We have only given time to the Government of Sri Lanka to consolidate its military strength and mount its increased military operations. I therefore, request the Minister of Foreign Affairs to see that more pressure is put on President Jayawardene as well to see that the solution is expedited; otherwise, it will be one way solution which will be too late for our country to do anything about it.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem) : At the outset, I wish to say that I am speaking in support of the Motion which has been placed by Shri Dinesh Singh for the simple reason that the foreign policy of the Government of India has definitely been of such par excellence that it deserves approval and full support of the House.

The most important thing, which in the recent past has attracted the whole world and for which we have been very instrumental, was the Geneva Summit. We all know, especially those who have anything to do with the world affairs and international matters, that the Geneva Summit has been a turning point. It has been a glimmer of hope in the darkness which was enveloping the whole world to the extent that we had reached a stage where two super powers were not willing to talk with each other on the question of nuclear disarmament. Of course, I would not say that it has been a success in full but it is a beginning at this stage. I think it is relevant to find out and analyse what is really on. If one sees the statements that were issued by either Mr. Reagan or Mr. Gorbachev, one can clearly make out what really happened during the talks. Though Mr. Reagan says that they had frank and forthright conversations, he does not commit that they had decided in any manner that disarmament has to go on. On the contrary, Mr. Gorbachev, we must approve, has categorically stated that we must decrease the threat of nuclear war. The effort of our Hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi in this connection has been noticed and registered world over. My friend Mr. Jaipal Reddy has left. I wish he was here...

AN HON. MEMBER : He is here. Can't you see him ?

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : No, he was hiding. I am sorry. But he was relaxing to an extent where I could not see him. The fact is that we have had many Prime Ministers in our country, not one, and Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's effort insofar as the Geneva Summit is concerned, has been welcomed world over. People have said—fortunately I had the privilege of going abroad to Paris.. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is taking formal diplomatic tributes too seriously, Sir ?

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : I think my friend would permit me to say that these were not formal diplomatic tributes and I was about to say where I heard them. It is unfortunate that he does not even wait to listen to me. I heard him up. He spoke about Mr. Morarji Desai. We all know he was famous for what.

** and ...*(Interruptions)***

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : It is a fact and I can explain.

(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY (Kurnool) : Any adverse remarks should not go on record. Sir...*(Interruptions)*. It is unfair...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If there is any adverse remark, it will be expunged...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Mr. Morarji Desai was the Deputy Prime Minister when Mrs. Gandhi was their leader. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I told you if there is anything adverse, I will expunge it. Please sit down...

(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP (Kottayam) : I would like to know whether this will go on record.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If it is adverse, I will expunge it...

(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : Neither ** nor ** should be mentioned here.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : I only said everybody knows what he was famous for.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Anything adverse will not go on record. Why are you bothered ?

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : In fact, Mr. Faleiro was kind enough to send me to Paris to represent the AICC at a conference. In that conference I met a lot of people from Europe and United States and the Soviet Union who came from political parties, who categorically spoke very highly of the efforts of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, our Prime Minister, insofar as his participation in seeing to it that the Geneva Summit took place was concerned. And it came in from diplomats, I wish to categorically state that it came from politicians, people who are leaders of various parties in various countries world over. I am not speaking on statements made in the Press, I am speaking on the basis of information collected by me personally. However, I would like to highlight the question of Geneva Summit by quoting Shri Rajiv Gandhi while on a visit to Vietnam. He categorically said we must intensify the movement not only for nuclear disarmament, but for general and complete disarmament for the purpose of world peace. I, therefore, think that our efforts and the Government's efforts have been directed to ensure that something more than a glimmer of hope is the outcome of the Geneva Summit. To move towards this end we intend to have more meetings and we seek somehow by using our best of efforts and our influence in the international arena that the two super-powers do come to an understanding on nuclear disarmament.

It is rather unfortunate that the Opposition has picked up the question of international affairs to attack the Government. I may point out that an impression does exist in the world that our country has always had a steady and consistent foreign policy. But it is unfortunate that there is a certain amount of agitation on the part of the opposition for the amount of publicity that our leader, the Prime Minister, has obtained in the world Press. I do understand that because many of them would like to get a little percentage of that coverage. But without taking up their criticism, may I just say in addition to Geneva, we have a lot of other points which we can speak about and add feathers in the cap of our leader as well as our Party as a whole. I would just like to say that the recent SAARC Summit which has just ended was

**Not recorded.

welcomed by Mr. Jaipal Reddy. I have noted that and I am obliged to him for the small mercy which he has granted to us.

The Charter of collective self-reliance is the outcome of the Summit, which is something really a turning point in international politics. I would say for the South Asian countries to come out with a Charter like this is something which will go a long way. It would help not only the other Member countries, but also our country in moving forward.

Our understanding and cooperation with Japan in the economic arena in so far as steel, automobile and electronics is concerned, has been really welcomed by all, including those on the other side who have vested interest for supporting it, but the country on the whole has understood that this bilateral understanding on the economic front will help us in moving forward. The momentous step that the Government of India took in recognising the SADR born out of Polisario movement is something which has been appreciated the world over from the point of view that the Government of India stuck to its foreign policy of fairness and non-alignment and especially that it has always supported every freedom struggle the world over.

18.00 hrs.

Finally I would like to say a few words on Sri Lanka. When the Hon. Member from the other side. Mr. Jaipal Reddy was speaking, he was trying to do justice to the subject. But I am obliged to what little he did for this simple reason that I think he had very little time. Otherwise he may have spoken far more in favour of Tamils which we require at the moment, in terms of support. The issue which is fundamental is this. (Interruption) Mr. Amal Datta doubts whether I am a Tamilian. I would like to frankly admit that I am an Indian. Are all those who are elected from Tamil Nadu only Tamils? They are Indians first and second, they are Tamils.—Not Bengali first and then an Indian! I would like to submit—if I may humbly submit—that Sri Lankan problem is slightly getting out of hands. It has been a problem which India really was not directly responsible for. But however, because of the influx of refugees and our

kinship with one portion of the ethnic population as well as an indirect kinship with the other portion of the ethnic population, and the fact that Sri Lanka is situated so close to us, this problem has become ours now, Our efforts in re-starting the negotiations, I feel, is heading to almost a full stop. We must remember, after the Thimpu talks, even though Sri Lankan Government came forward and said, it agrees to ceasefire and the terms of that ceasefire, it actually, under the guise of retaliating to violence, is wiping out all forms of resistance and in fact is on the rampage to completely finish a community in totality. Is India going to sit back quietly and say it not our matter? Let us be very clear. This is not a problem which is an internal matter of Sri Lanka. It has now become a problem of the world. Human rights are involved. Very fundamental issues have come up. Are we going to sit back and say, Mr. Jayawardhane is a President of Sri Lanka; he is sympathetic and he wants a political solution; and then stop with that? We know, he is talking to us with his tongue in his cheeks! While he comes and he talks to our Prime Minister and to our leaders and to our representatives very positively, his people in Sri Lanka are on the rampage. They do not want to leave even the women and children. Today's report in the Press categorically shows that women and children have become targets,—not just rebels alone. So far as our policy on Sri Lanka is concerned I think it needs a re-consideration. Yes, a political solution may be the only solution but how to go about it and the methodology to achieve it—that is something which is very important. And I call upon if possible—as a humble Member of this House—the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister to apply their minds to solve this problem as otherwise these things may go out of hand and we may be guilty of not being active when it is necessary. May I just say this finally that the foreign policy of India has to be approved in totality for the simple reason that world over today we have become a power in so far as international politics is concerned, we are considered to be people who are important. And to end up, I would say that it is rather unfortunate that the members who sit on the opposition benches are feeling unhappy about it; they are also part of this country; let them not forget that; and let them be proud that we have a great international reputation.

[Shri P. R. Kumaramagalam]

With these words I conclude.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, I am having a big list of participants with me. But the time has already crossed 6 o'Clock.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : It is an important thing. So, we will postpone it for tomorrow.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): I think the time of the House should be extended by one-and-a-half hours.

AN HON. MEMBER : You adjourn the House now and continue this tomorrow.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : The Prime Minister will intervene tomorrow.

(Interruptions).

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : Because tomorrow the Minister has to reply in Rajya Sabha. *(Interruptions)*. So, I submit that we would extend the time of the House by one-and-a-half hours.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We will extend the time for this by one-and-a-half hours. I think the House will agree.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : This discussion was put down in the List of Business as to begin at 2 o'Clock, but it did not begin at 2 o'Clock and it began at 2.45.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : So we are extending further. We will see after that.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : No, Sir, Tomorrow only.

(Interruptions)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : He has to be in Rajya Sabha tomorrow. So, how can he do it here tomorrow? *(Interruptions)*. Let us extend it by one-and-a-half hours and finish it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That depends on the Prime Minister.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : You have already taken one full day today. Then

it will again take a complete day tomorrow. Then, for one debate we will have to devote two days. We want your cooperation.

(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Why don't you refuse the speakers on your side who are saying the same things over and over again?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : I think your number is more than ours according to the size of your parties.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : We would like to hear the Foreign Minister *in extenso* when we are fresh also, but not after the fag end of the day.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We will extend the time by one-and-a-half hours and see.

Before I call the next speaker, Mr. Janardhana Poojary will lay the Paper on the Table.

— — —

18.10 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE—*Contd.*

[*English*]

Notification under customs Act, 1962

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARI) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. 356/85-Customs (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 9th December, 1985, together with an explanatory memorandum regarding exemption to pig iron of all varieties irrespective of phosphorous content when imported into India from the basic customs duty in excess of 25 per cent *ad valorem*, under Section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962.

[Placed in Library. See No. L.T. 1571/85.]

— — —