

[Shri T. R. Shamanna]

position, the Kaveri 2nd Stage be taken up which will fetch about 30 m. g. of water.

On behalf of the citizens of Bangalore, I once again appeal to the Central and State Government to see that second stage of Kaveri be completed at the earliest.

I request that this issue may be taken up seriously and every effort should be made to provide sufficient and cheap water to Bangalore city.

12.55 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: NEW PATTERN OF INVESTMENT OF FUNDS OF CHARITABLE AND RELIGIOUS TRUSTS AND INSTITUTIONS

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): The Taxation Laws (Amendment) Act, 1975, inserted a new sub-Section (5) in Section 13 of the Income tax Act laying down the pattern of investment of funds of charitable or religious trusts or institutions.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Our thanks should be recorded.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): Along with me.

SHRI R. VANKATARAMAN: With a view to enabling such trusts and institutions to change over to the new pattern of investment in a smooth and gradual manner, the law provided that the new pattern may be adopted in respect of accounting years commencing on or after 1st April, 1978. This date was subsequently extended to 1st April, 1981. I had made it clear in my Budget Speech last year that this date will not be extended further.

All charitable or religious trusts or institutions will, therefore, have to switch over to the prescri-

bed pattern of investment in order to have continued benefit of tax exemption for any accounting year commencing on or after 1st April 1981. As a result, it will be necessary to convert certain categories of assets acquired by such trusts or institutions into Government Securities, bank deposits units of the Unit Trust of India and other assets specified in Section 13 (5) of the Income-tax Act.

It has been represented that the modes of investment prescribed by Section 13 (5) yield income by way of interest, acceptance of which is contrary to the tenets of Islam. The Government have, therefore, decided to modify the pattern of investment prescribed under Section 13 (5) of the Income-tax Act so as to permit charitable or religious trusts or institutions to invest the trust funds in immovable property as well. Suitable amendment to the Income-tax Act will be sponsored at an early date and shall be made effective from 1st April, 1981.

13.00 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS,  
1981-82—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
—contd.

SHRI P.K. KODIYAN (Adoor): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the report of the Minister has not taken into consideration the gravity of the international situation.

The international situation is extremely serious today. Though the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean have become hotbeds of trouble today causing serious threat to our country and though these dangerous developments are very much uppermost in our minds, yet we should not lose sight of the overall world situation. We should view these developments in the context of the world situation.

In the past one decade, there were some very healthy developments. A return from arms race to the detente and international cooperation of people and a series of victories won by the National Liberation movements were the main features of these developments in the past one decade.

But, desperate at these developments and progress of the National Liberation Movement and desperate at the setbacks suffered in arms race, the imperialist powers had unleashed a counter-attack under the leadership of the U.S. imperialists. The armament race, building up of new military bases, deployment of naval forces in the Indian Ocean area, e'tc., were the consequences of this counter-attack.

With the assumption of office by President Reagan in the USA—I should, at this juncture, express my regret over the unhappy incident, the most despicable incident, that has taken place, the wanton attack on President Reagan; I hope he would recover soon — this counter-attack has reached a very frightening proportion and as a result, the international situation has taken a worse turn. The extension of military bases, deployment of naval and military force and open threat to the National Liberation Movement—all these have added to the worsening of the international situation. The U.S. Administration has openly stated that they would send arms to the Afghan insurgents. It has made clear its intention to subvert the lawfully constituted Government of free Angola by helping the Angolan traitorous movement known as UNITA. The hated apartheid regime in South Africa is overtly and covertly backed by the USA and other Western powers. The military junta of El Salvador which is massacring the people who have risen in revolt is being supported by the USA with massive military and economic aid. Within one month of the assumption of the office, President Reagan has announced

15 billion dollars worth of military aid to various countries in the world. The speed with which the Reagan Administration has stepped up arms build-up and also increased the arms supply to various countries has surprised many people even in the United States itself. The *Newsweek* magazine has remarked:

“There is danger that the Reagan Administration might be trying too much too soon, imposing military stratagems on problems demanding greater subtlety, more diplomacy and fewer guns.”

It is this extremely hawkish policy of the U.S. imperialists that has pushed the world to the brink of disaster—the disaster of a thermo-nuclear holocaust.

Yesterday Mr. Chavan has said that both the Super Powers are aware of the dangerous consequences of the nuclear war and, therefore, they would only talk about war, but they would not start it. But we cannot rest assured by the so-called balance of terror. There are forces in the world which will go to any extent in order to protect their global vested interests. Therefore, there is every possibility of the world being plunged into a thermo-nuclear war. The situation today is extremely grave. Peace is threatened; the security of nations and peoples all over the world is threatened. There is every possibility of a third world war unless the statesmen of countries and leaders of nations keep restraint and caution in their actions and pronouncements; they have to appeal to sanity and reason in order to preserve world peace.

In this background, the peace proposals put forward by President Brezhnev at the recent 26th Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union are timely and can form the basis for negotiations on all urgent international problems of today..

[Shri P. K. Kodiyan]

His proposals have been widely welcomed. I wonder why the Government of India has not expressed any opinion about these proposals. They have not reacted to these proposals. India had in the past raised its powerful voice at times of international crises in favour of world-peace and in order to strengthen co-operation among the peoples and countries of the world. It also successfully frustrated the attempts of certain powers to divide the countries & create tension among the non-aligned countries and India being one of the leading countries of the non-aligned movement.

Which had always stood for a peaceful and amicable settlements of all international disputes has to play a crucial role at this stage. I request the hon. Minister to make the response of the Government of India clear so far as the peace initiative of President Brezhnev is concerned.

Naturally, Sir, we are all very much concerned about the US aid to Pakistan—the massive military aid to Pakistan consisting of sophisticated weapons including very modern and up-to-date bomber planes. But this aid is not an isolated development. We have to view this US aid to Pakistan in the context of what the USA has been doing in the vicinity of our country, that is, in the Indian Ocean and also in West Asia.

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

SHRI P. K. KODIYAN : The US arms aid to Pakistan is the major and most dangerous link in the chain of military encirclement of India by Washington, Peking and Islamabad axis. We have to take note of this.

The unprecedented strengthening of Diego Garcia base in the Indian Ocean, making it the biggest

US air and naval nuclear base outside the territory of the NATO powers and also the reported granting of facilities to the US Navy in Sri Lanka and Maldives are also new links in the chain of encirclement which is directed against the sovereignty and independence of India. India should strongly protest against this American move of arming Pakistan and should declare it as a hostile action. The people of India should be roused against this threat. I have no doubt that the people of India would rise as one man as in the past to defend the country's sovereignty, integrity and independence.

Coming to the Indian Ocean—since I have no time and you have rung the bell, I am cutting short my speech. I am only referring to the points. America has been behaving in the Indian Ocean as if it is an American lake. It is an international property which should be used only for peaceful purposes and for peaceful navigation. Therefore, the Government should take the initiative in mobilising the littoral and hinterland countries and take strong and collective action against the American attempts to convert the Indian Ocean into a hotbed of trouble. Now, the Government of India in this connection should also tirelessly try to ensure the success of the proposed international conference on Indian Ocean to be held at Colombo and we should emphatically demand the dismantling of the Diego Garcia and other bases in the Indian Ocean. In this we can enlist the support of even the Gulf countries because Diego Garcia is being developed as one of the main bases for the Rapid Development Force the primary aim of which is to capture Gulf Oil fields.

On the Afghan issue the only course open to us is to find a political settlement. I fully support the sober stance of the Government of India on this issue: So long as the Afghan

issue remains unsolved, it would be used as a pretext to dump all kind of arms in the Gulf Area and also in Pakistan with its dangerous consequences.

Now, coming to the non-aligned movement, in the non-alignment Foreign Ministers' Conference held in Delhi, even though there had been a compromise on a number of issues which came up for discussion, I should say that, by and large, the Conference was a success in the sense that the unity of the non-aligned movement could be preserve. But, I have a feeling that on some of the issues, India had not explained even its known position in various meetings of the Conference. In the Conference of this nature in the end, we may have to come to a consensus on various issues. But that does not prevent our representatives from arguing our case and in explaining our position. I have a feeling that this did not take place. How, there is a deliberate attempt to divide the non-alignment movement. Some countries in the movement are taking up positions incompatible with the basic principles of non-aligned movement. I have a feeling that, in the name of arriving at consensus some of the basic principles like anti-imperialism are being diluted.

I warn the Foreign Minister against the concerted move by certain countries to soften the anti-imperialist content of the non-alignment movement.

Even if India is isolated on some issues, we should uphold the basic principles of the movement. The anxiety for consensus should not end in appeasement and surrender of basic principles.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shrimati Usha Verma.

Before you begin, I would like to say that every hon. Member will take only five minutes hereafter. The Minister will reply to the debate at 14—30 hours.

Shrimati Verma.

**श्रीमती उषा वर्मा (खैरी) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप-ने जो समय दिया है उस के लिए मैं आभारी हूँ। मन्त्रीय मंत्री जी जो यह डिमांड लाए हैं और सदन में जो महत्वपूर्ण विषय चल रहा है उस के ऊपर बोलने के लिए मैं खड़ी हूँ।

मैं इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर बोलने के पूर्व दूरदर्शिता मूर्ति प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के विवेक की प्रशंसा किये बिना नहीं रह सकतीं जो अपने सतत व श्रमक प्रयास से जनता सरकार द्वारा चरमरा दिए गये सम्बन्ध को देश विदेश में पुनः सुधारने व अच्छा करने का ऐसा पुल बांध रही हैं जिस से सम्पूर्ण मानवता आसानी से पार हो सके और किसी भी प्रकार की खून खराबी नहीं हो।

हाल ही में दिल्ली में हुए निगूट सम्मेलन की प्रशंसा करती हुई मैं यह कहना चाहूंगी कि हमारी सरकार का प्रयास मार्शल टीटो, नासिर नवा पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू द्वारा अरोपित बीज को बडाने में पानी और उर्वरक का काम करेगा और ऐस ही प्रयास शीघ्र ही इसे एक फलदायक वृक्ष बनाने में नहीं चूकेगा जो सारी मानवता के लिए वरदान होगा।

इस के सम्बन्ध में मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगी कि भारत की भूमिका प्रधान मंत्री के नेतृत्व में इस ओर सराहनीय है। आज हमारे सम्बन्ध अपने पड़ोसियों से मधुर ही नहीं, वरन् और ज्यस्तदा गहरे हो रहे हैं और अन्य पड़ोसी देश भी हमारी तरफ हाथ फैलाये हुए हैं जिस के लिए हमें अपने देश का हित देखते हुए अवसर का लाभ लेना ही चाहिए।

[श्रीमती: ऊषा वर्मा]

यह भारत देश सदैव से अहिंसा का पुजारी रहा है और यहीं से ही विश्व के अन्य देशों के लोग अपने अपने विषयों को सीखे हैं। तो हमें अपनी उस गुरुता को किसी भी कीमत पर कम नहीं करना है, जिस की पूर्ति में आज इस सरकार का महान हाथ है, उदाहरणार्थ ईराक-ईरान समस्या, कम्पूचिया की मान्यता, दक्षिणी अफ्रीका की समस्या तथा अफगान समस्या को सुलझाने का एतद प्रयास हमारी ओर से जारी है।

मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह भी कहना चाहूंगी कि विश्व की बढ़ती हुई इस अराजकता में जहां चीन, अमेरिका, पाकिस्तान अपनी रक्षा पर अधिक से अधिक खर्च कर रहे हैं तो हमारी सरकार को भी चाहिए कि इस ओर अधिक ध्यान दे ताकि अवसर आने पर मुंह तोड़ जवाब देने में हम भी न चूके। पाकिस्तान की न्यूक्लियर अस्त्र-शस्त्रों की ओर बढ़ती हुई प्रवृत्ति को हमें आपसी मधुर सम्बन्ध से रोकने का प्रयास करना चाहिए और चीन तथा अमेरिका द्वारा इस क्षेत्र में दी जाने वाली मदद की हानि को अवगत कराते हुए उसे सद्व्यवहार की ओर प्रेरित करना चाहिए ताकि मानवता तथा मानव मूल्यों का हनन होने से बचाया जा सके। सदैव से भारत ने शांति का तथा मानवता का पाठ पढ़ाया है तो आज भी आवश्यकता इसी बात की है। जितने भी पड़ोसी देश हैं उनसे जो मधुर सम्बन्ध हैं उन्हें मधुरतम बनाया जाए और चीन तथा पाकिस्तान से मुंघरते हुए सम्बन्ध की गाड़ी को और अधिक तीव्रता दी जाए। आवश्यकता आज इस बात की है कि पाकिस्तान को शिमला समझौता मानने के लिए मधुर वातावरणों से समझाया जाए और यदि वह अपने नापाक इरादों को सुधारना नहीं चाहता तो "शटे

शाठ्यम समाचरेत" के सिद्धान्त से हमें उसे मुंहतोड़ जवाब देने के लिए भी कठिबद्ध व तत्पर रहना चाहिए। हमें अपने पड़ोसियों के साथ सम्बन्ध अच्छे रखने हैं किन्तु अपनी इज्जत और मर्यादा को बरकरार रखते हुए। ऐसी दशा में यदि कोई गलत निगाह उठाना चाहे तो हमें मूकदर्शक न बनकर उसके ऊपर कड़ी से कड़ी कार्यवाही करने में भी कोई कसर नहीं छोड़ना है क्योंकि "अति हूँ सिध्दाई में बड़ दोषू"।

अतः सरकार की दुरदर्शिता तथा पड़ोसियों से मधुर सम्बन्ध रखने की प्रशंसा करते हुए मैं कहना चाहूंगी कि भारत की मर्यादा की सभी प्रकार से प्रशंसा होनी चाहिए तथा विश्व बंधुत्व की भावना लोगों में जाग्रत करने में हमारा पूर्ण योगदान होना चाहिए। आपसी आमालों को झगड़े से नहीं, प्रेम से सुलझाने का प्रयास नितान्त आवश्यक है ताकि विश्व कल्याण के मूल मंत्र के शंख की ध्वनि गूँज उठे और यह सम्पूर्ण मानवता पथ-भ्रष्ट होने से बच जाए।

SHRI DAULATSINHJI JADE-  
JA (Jamnagar): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. Sir, I will restrict my observations to Chapter VII of the Report and that too a part of it. It is encouraging to note that in the last year India has paid greater attention to Latin America. There has been an increase in cultural and trade discussions and this happy trend was stressed by the fact that for the first time since Independence at the Republic Day our chief guest was the head of a State from Latin America.

Sir, under the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi our contacts have been increasing with Latin America and I learn that this interest is being appreciated and will be reciprocated. Possibly an obstructing factor on

closer relations with Latin America is the financial constraints imposed on the Ministry of External Affairs. A colleague of mine mentioned about this yesterday but just for an example I would like to draw the attention of the House that U. K. spends almost Rs. 400 crores on its establishment; Japan spends Rs. 1021 crores on their establishment. A small country like Malaysia spends Rs. 57.5 crores whereas we are only able to spend Rs. 54 crores for our External Affairs establishment. I only hope a welcome step would be there and more funds would be allotted for this purpose.

Sir, as early as 1948 Mrs. Indira Gandhi said after her tour of Latin America that it was essential to establish in India a Latin America Study Centre so that our people are encouraged to take interest in the affairs of the Latin American countries.

Even earlier, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said "Even though India and South America are far away from each other in geography--in the geography of minds, we are close to each other."

Therefore, it is sad that not enough action has been taken to realise the far-sighted ambitions of our two beloved leaders. In spite of Mrs. Gandhi's desire and understanding of the necessity to open Latin American Studies Centre, to this day not a single University in this country has been directed to implement this important measure of understanding. Without any form of support from the Government or from the UGC, it is very heartening to note that the intellectual community have been making their small and significant efforts.

One such consistent effort has been by Dr. Narayanan of the School of International Studies at the

Jawaharlal Nehru University. He, with his colleagues, has formed a Cell to pursue academic interests with Latin America.

In comparison with such efforts, the Government should note that in every Latin American country there is at least one University which has got a full-fledged Indian Studies Department. It is also unfortunate that on our part, we have never responded favourably to increase Contacts with such universities or encouraged them to continue their efforts. It immediately brings to my mind the good work that is being carried on by various individuals in Latin America to promote relations with India. I mention a few names and I hope that the Government will direct the concerned Embassies to take note of them and to associate them more with our organisations and even invite them to India. They are:—

Madaje Hilda Chen Apuyi of Costa Rica

Senior Vicotor Ben Tata of Venezuela

Senior Victor Uriquidi of Mexico

Madame Rene Cura of Argentina

Madame Anita Fernandini De Narango of Peru

The interest which they have shown towards us, towards our country, towards our leaders has been very heartening indeed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Have you taken due permission to mention the names here?

SHRI DAULATSINHJI JADEJA: I am sorry; I will take it. If the Government recognises such enthusiastic individuals, it would lead to greater personal contacts between India and Latin America.

[Shri Daulat Singh Jaiswal]

Sir, I would like to emphasise that Latin America is probably the only part of the world which has no historical, political, religious or racial bias against India. It is an area full of excellent possibilities for India.

Latin America also happens to be a large group which supports the Non-Alignment Movement. Its 24 votes in the United Nations have assumed increasing importance, as they tend to strongly align themselves with the Third World. It is all the more surprising why the Government ignores such positive aspects of Latin America. One usually notes that more time is spent on less crucial countries than on the possibilities open in cultivating better relations with Latin America. In this context the Government is well aware of the growing importance of Mexico and Venezuela with regard to the supply and control of oil.

Even on the symbolic plane, India has not given sufficient importance to contemporary events in Latin America. In this year, the Bi-Centennial Celebrations of Simon Bolivar are being held all over Latin America and the world. Bolivar is their equivalent of our Mahatma Gandhi. Yet we have not even issued a Postal Stamp in his memory. An Indian visitor in Latin America is usually surprised to see streets and various public places named after Indian leaders. There is no reciprocation of these graceful gestures on our part. It is time we thought of these small endearing things.

I am quite sure that the Government is aware of the plans of the Andean Group of countries to spend 40 billion dollars in the next few years in a concerted plan of development.

In this context, already, Korea, Japan, China and a few Asian and African countries have offered their enthusiastic participation. It is therefore surprising why no interest has

been shown by India and one various public and private sector units to explore the possibilities of participation in these plans.

It would be a mistake to assume that Latin America can wait till we have time to develop our relations with them. Vacuums are not left alone. A good example is of Canada which has in the last decade emerged as a major economic partner of various Latin American countries. When Canada could break with its historical and economic ties to concentrate on Latin America, there should be no problem for India to emulate its example. The excuses of distance, language, etc. are not real barriers.

The present time is most opportune for us to concentrate on Latin America. Such efforts will be proportionately more rewarding than elsewhere. Latin America is still a part of the developing world. There is ample scope for India to be associated and trading and cultural ties endure longest. It is not enough to send a few Trade Delegations and Cultural Troupes in a haphazard fashion. There must be a concerted drive, with specific targets and supervision of such efforts so that further time is not lost.

The Government must initiate steps which would make it worthwhile for individuals and industry to explore Latin America and its possibilities. Incentives must be granted for this purpose. The various concerned economic Ministries must co-ordinate their efforts to this end. If we fail to understand and respond to the Latin American countries today, I may warn you that tomorrow may be too late.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR (Trivandrum): Sir, as we all know the foreign policy was kindled, generated and carried forward during the days of our great struggle for freedom. At that time we had a love for liberty not only for our own people but for

almost all the people of the world. So, we expressed our sympathy and support for the liberation movements launched in Africa and Latin America. That means we have been a part of the world struggle against the imperialism. Our freedom struggle is a part of anti-imperialism.

The question now is whether the world is free from the threat of a imperialism. When we were struggling for freedom from imperialism, imperialism was trying to dominate the world. Even today imperialism has a design to dominate the world in one way or another. Are we able to carry on the struggle against imperialism as we were carrying on before? In this background we should view the world questions and the questions around us, whether it is a question of Diego Garcia, whether it is a question of arms supply to Pakistan by the U.S.A. or the question of the U.S.A. and China having access to India sub-continent. Many hon. Members have already elaborated the point of Diego Garcia. I do not want to go into it in detail. But I am more anxious about one point. Diego-Garcia Island is very near to Kerala and the American warships, naval-vessels and military aircrafts can reach Kerala from Diego Garcia within no time. The question is: are we sincere in our effort to carry our struggle against the United States imperialist forces which are surrounding most parts of the world whether it is from North or from South? But I am sorry to point out that now we, particularly the Government of India and the ruling party at the Centre and most of the States, are trying to divide the anti-imperialist forces even within India. The recent decision taken, I do not know officially or unofficially, by the Government of India and the ruling party to make cleavage in the Indo-Russian Friendship organizations and Indo-GDR Friendship

Organizations will only help the imperialist forces. The Government of India is now welcoming the multi-nationals on Indian soil with all encouragement. Who are these multi-nationals? These multi-nationals are part of world imperialism. What is world imperialism and what are capitalistic forces? The world capitalist forces are part of the world imperialist forces. Today, the Government of India and the ruling party are not sincere in their efforts to carry on the anti-imperialist struggle. Without liberating our economy from foreign dependence, we cannot follow an independent foreign policy. While speaking in the Constituent Assembly in 1947, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Chief architect of India's foreign policy clearly stated:

"Ultimately, foreign policy is the outcome of economic policy and until India has properly evolved her economic policy, her foreign policy will be rather vague, rather inchoate and will be groping."

Again, replying to the debate on foreign affairs in Lok Sabha in 1957 he stated:

"Any part we want to play in world affairs depends entirely on the internal strength, unity and conditions of our country. Our views might create some impression on others for the moment but they will attach importance to our voice only in proportion to the strength they know we have. Therefore, both from the point of view of our primary needs and from the point of view of any desire we might have to play a part in world affairs we have to pay first attention to our own country's affairs."

May I ask frankly whether the Government of India, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, or her party at the Centre



[Shri A. Neelalohithadasan Nadar]

and most of the States are sincere in their efforts to solve the problems our country is facing today? Are they sincere in their efforts to keep the country united? They are not. I am sorry to say that her Chief-Ministers in most of the States are promoting parochialism. The Chief Minister of Karnataka; Shri Gundu Rao is supporting the movement against the Tamilians and Malayalees at Bangalore and the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, Shri Anulay, is supporting the Shiv Sena and blessing the Shiv Sena, who are attacking the South Indians of Bombay. How can the ruling party and the Prime Minister and the Government of India keep the country united and project a strong India to the world? This is the question. Our experience with Shrimati Indira Gandhi as the Prime Minister from 1966 onwards have been . . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Just now you condemned parochialism, but you were be very much afraid because Diego Garcia is very near to Kerala particularly.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR : Sir, she is not having any commitment to any ideology, she is not having any commitment to individuals who stood with her always. That is her character and history. How can such a leader promote the interests of this nation and provide a leadership as was done during the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Krishna Menon and others ?

I do not want to prolong my speech further. Today, there is lack of clarity, lack of commitment to ideology, and lack of courage and capacity. Our leadership today is unable to mobilise to world opinion against the United States, whether it is the question of Diego Garcia, whether it is regarding the question of arms supply to Pakistan, whether it is regarding the question

of the US-China axis in the India, Sub-continent, because of our moral weaknesses, our internal weaknesses, we are unable to pose this question and mobilise world opinion.

Sir, Pandit Nehru had always placed before himself an Asian approach for the world problems against the European approach which was based only on power blocs. But now we are able to carry on that Asian approach ? Let us take the example of Iran-Iraq war. Two non-aligned countries are fighting against each other. the Government of India able to take the lead to bring these two countries before a table for a settlement ? the Report of the Foreign Ministry 1980-81 itself clearly states:

“Attempts were made by the United Nations, Islamic Conference, the Chairman of the PLO, Yasser Arafat and by a group of non-aligned nations, with whom India was associated to bring the conflict to an end. Their efforts, however, failed to make any headway as both Iraq and Iran adhered to their respective positions.

Sir, see the pitiable situation in which India is placed, how our initiative is lost which we were having during the days of Pt. Nehru. Sir, I am sorry, to point out that the Non-aligned Conference of the Foreign Ministers held in the New Delhi recently was a failure as far as India is concerned, because India was unable to pose the questions like Diego Garcia, United States Arms supply to Pakistan. India was unable to pose the question of the imperialist threat to the whole world and world peace and the threat to India. Then some of the friends both on the other side and this side were saying it was a success as we were able to keep the unity of the non-aligned movement. May I ask, Sir, unity for what purpose ? Unity of the non-aligned movement is necessary to fight imperialist

forces. But I am sorry to point out, Sir, that some of the agents of the imperialist forces are now included in the non-aligned movement.

Let me conclude reiterating the words of the great Panditji, who is the architect of our foreign policy and the maker of the modern India. On 15th August, 1947, the precious day of Indian Independence, giving a message to the Press he said :

“At this solemn moment when the people of India through suffering and sacrifice have secured freedom, I remember, the Constituent Assembly of India and dedicate myself in all humility to the service of India.”

Again he continues :

“It is a fateful moment for us in India, for all Asia and for the world. A new star rises; the star of freedom in the East ; a new hope comes in your being. A vision long cherished materialises. May the star never set and that hope never be betrayed”.

That hope should never be betrayed. That was the desire of Panditji in 1947 on the very day of freedom. But I am sorry to point out, Sir, Panditji's hopes were betrayed by nobody else, but his own beloved daughter, Mrs. Gandhi.

I cannot support these demands for grants which have arisen out of that betrayal. So, I oppose the Demands for Grants.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE SHARMA (Dausa) : Sir, on a point of personal explanation. Mr. Nadar has referred to the attempt of the Government of India and the the ruling Party about dividing the anti-imperialist forces in and outside the country

and thereby he has referred to the ISCUS and other organisations. Because I am associated very much with the Friendship Society, FSU, Friends of Soviet Union and as an organising person I know this allegation is totally false and absurd. “Friends of Soviet Union ” had been organized entirely by Members of Parliament and ex-Members of Parliament. I further want to say that it was done in view of the alignment of reactionary forces.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI : (Hissar) What is this, Sir ? What is this personal explanation ?

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE SHARMA : Therefore, this allegation is entirely false, malicious and motivated.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGARI : Why have you allowed him ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have permitted him. You cannot question me.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI : You are also not above the rules.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now Mr. Ajitsinh Dabhi.

SHRI AJITSINH DABHI (Kaira) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, to foster and maintain friendship with neighbouring countries has been a permanent plank of India's foreign policy. But our neighbour and cousin Pakistan, which was born out of the same mother, viz. India, has proved to be a hard nut to crack in our foreign policy. This is despite the fact that India has always followed a policy of peace, and of *detente*.

After Mr. Bhutto restored democracy in Pakistan, the prospects of *detente* were visible. But the regime of Zia-ul-Haq has pushed these prospects of *detente* back. The present military rule of Pakistan

[Shri Ajit Singh Debhi]

headed by Gen. Zia-ul-Haq have vested interest in keeping the Indo-Pak tension at a high pitch, because only in that way they can dominate Pakistan's domestic politics, and also justify the diversion of a major part of that country's financial resources, towards defence and a defence related matters. The political supremacy of the present military rulers depends to a great extent on the high level on the tension with India. That is why there is the cry-wolf, viz. that India has increased its military power to attack Pakistan.

Gen. Zia is the head of Pakistan's a Muslim nation. He had joined the Islamic Conference at Taif; and along with the heads of the other Muslim nations, he hastaken a vow to liberate Jerusalem. Therefore, now the cat is out of the bag; that is why Zia wants to equate the issue of Kashmir with the issue of Jerusalem. That is why Gen. Zia recently made a statement in the fashion of \*\*. He has made a palpably false statement that 80% of India's troops are facing Pakistan. India must be wide awake against this cry-wolf.

The BJP President, Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee knows well that Pakistan has invaded India twice in the past. When under the leadership of our hon. Prime Minister Mr. Indira Gandhi, India had beaten back the Pakistani invasion in 1971, he had compared her to Goddess Durga. But the same Mr. Vajpayee now playing the role of a friend of Pakistan, demands from Mrs. Gandhi evidence, proof that India really faces an external danger. In the face of Press reports including the American that Pakistan is making massive arms build up with American help, the pro-Pakistan stance

of the BJP seems to be a sheer hypocrisy.

It is said that our foreign policy is tilted towards Russia. This criticism does not bear truth. We should all remember that non-alignment is not a simple neutrality; non-alignment has come to connote independent thought and action. Russia is our great friend and has proved to be a friend in need during the Bangladesh war in 1971, yet our hon. Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi had refused to endorse President Brezhnev's concept of Asian collective security and had exchanged Ambassadors with communist China.

Take the recent issue of Afghanistan. When the Russian troops entered Afghanistan, immediately our hon. Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi declared fearlessly and with conviction that India was opposed to or against the presence of foreign military troops in any country. Even during the recent visit of India by President Brezhnev, India had stuck boldly to its own guns against Russia, one of the Super Powers of the world. The strength of the non-aligned movement lies in independent thought and action without sacrificing the nation's self-respect and sovereignty.

It is no wonder that self-proclaimed disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, ex-Prime Minister Mr. Moraji Desai's mean attempt of scuttle our treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation with Russia by proclaiming on the even of President Brezhnev's visit to India that Russia instigated him to attack Pakistan, has proved abortive. The recent Non-aligned Conference of the Foreign Ministers in Delhi to which India played

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the the Chair.

the host has brought a considerable stature and influence to India in the comity of nations. Our Foreign Minister, Shri Narasimha Rao deserves hearty congratulations because he has succeeded in making this Conference a great success. In the midst of conflicting pulls of pro-American, pro-Russian, pro-Islamic countries. Mr. Narasimha Rao has skilfully steered clear non-aligned movement and prevented its polarisation into Soviet and non-Soviet blocs through his deft handling, India has been able to reactivise the non-aligned movement at a time when its *raison d'être* was called into doubt. So far our hon. Foreign Minister, Mr. Narasimha Rao has played a commendable role in solving the imbroglio of Iran and Iraq in West Asia.

Again the efforts of India to get implemented the U.N.O.'s resolution no. 242 regarding Jerusalem are being praised in the Arab world.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You are going into details. Other members have to speak from your own party. The Minister has to reply at 2.30.

SHRI AJITSINH DABHI : India is opposed to colonialism of any kind even though it may be from America, Russia or China. But the question of the independence of Namibia in Africa must attract our special attention, not because all the political parties of India are supporting Namibia but because it involves a vital issue of racial discrimination—apartheid, which is a sin against humanity. In order to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia, the racist regime of South African Government is perpetrating atrocities on the black people of Mozambique and Angola who are supporting the black people of Namibia in their struggle for independence. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first Prime Minister was one of the founders of the non-aligned movement. As I said, non-alignment connotes independence of thought and action

even if it meant that one has to go alone. Pandit Nehru had said about non-alignment :

“India will follow it even if there was no country in the world to follow it and even if it meant that we have to plough a lonely furrow.”

This is exactly what our great poet Tagore also said :

जदि तौर डाक शुने केऊ ना आसे,  
ताबे एकला चलो, एकला चलो, एकला चलो

Despite the displeasure of the ASEAN countries, India had recognised the Heng Samrin Government of Kampuchea. But because of Chinese support to the Khmer Rouge, India was to some extent isolated from the ASEAN countries. But India hopes still that some day the ASEAN countries will understand India's stand. Now five ASEAN countries are reported to have met and made a collective move to persuade China to derecognise Khmer Rouge Government of Kampuchea. Therefore, India's stand on Kampuchea stands vindicated. This is an eloquent reply to the clamour being made in certain quarters in India and abroad that because of our foreign policy of non-alignment, India is being isolated.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI ABDUL SAMAD (Vellore) : Sir, first of all, I want to congratulate Mrs. India Gandhi's Government for re-establishing the image of India in its correct perspective in foreign countries and appreciate the laudable work done by the Ministry of External Affairs under the able leadership of Hon. Mr. Narasimha Rao. Of course, there may be some difference of opinion here and there, as for example, in the approach of solving the difficult problems like Afghanistan or

[Shri Abdul Samad]

Kampuchea. But one thing must be recognised that India has taken all efforts in the everall interest of world peace, in keeping up the best traditions of our country. I wish and pray that India's initiative and efforts will bear fruit in vacating the Russian troops from the soil of Afghanistan in the near future.

In the comity of 154 free and independent sovereign nations, 42 are Muslim countries. Nearly one-third of independent countries in the world are Islamic countries. India as was rightly pointed out by our illustrious Prime Minister recently, has got the second largest Muslim population in the entire world, next only to Indonesia. Therefore, I think India has got a moral responsibility to take interest in the affairs of Muslim nations as well.

We need not feel shy about any adverse propaganda carried out by certain interested parties against India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, by giving prominence to the cultural, social and religious activities of 120 million Muslims in India and providing facilities to raise the voice of the true representatives of the Muslims of India in the forum of Islamic countries, we could not only smash the false propaganda of our enemies but also establish very good and cordial relationships with these countries situated in the strategic areas of the world.

When I had the occasion to visit some of the Gulf countries recently, I was able to find immense good will and regard for our great country and venerable admiration for the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi. But, whether we have understood the real feelings of the people correctly and reciprocated in a fitting manner is to be verified in a passionate manner.

We should not forget that more than a million citizens of our country who are living in and around Gulf countries, are not only earning their livelihood but also sending about 100 million rupees of their hard earned foreign exchange to India, per day.

Sir, these developing countries have immense potentialities and even the most developed nations *viz* with each other to export their goods and man-power and attract their capital. But our efforts, I should say, in this direction are miserably poor.

The entire requirements of these developing countries—men, materials and machines—could easily be supplied by us. But very scant attention is being paid in this regard.

By strengthening our age-old cultural contacts, clearing the clouds of suspicion, assuring our cooperation and establishing friendship on a sound basis, we can easily double the export earnings of our country. For achieving this object, a thorough re-orientation in our dealings with these so-called NANA countries should be done.

Lest I should be misunderstood, if I plead for sending Muslims as our Ambassadors to Muslim countries; I would say that if that is not possible, at least let the second man in our missions in the Muslim countries be a Muslim.

I am sorry to point out one of the blunders committed recently by our missions abroad. Jamaate Islami of India held their conference at Hyderabad during the last month. They were making preparations for that for more than a year. They have invited certain religious dignitaries in Muslim countries. At the last minute, some of the most respected religious leaders and Ministers were refused visas to visit India and participate in the Conference.

Sir, I want to make it clear that I have no brief for Jamaat-e-Islami. But is it fair on the part of the Government to allow them to hold their conference and send messages also wishing the conference success and not allowing the foreign religious dignitaries to participate in it? Even in this respect a uniform policy was not adopted. It seems at the last minute, some dignitaries from the kingdom of Saudi Arabia were able to participate in the conference and not the dignitaries from the Gulf countries. Sir, I was able to assess during my recent visit, what amount of goodwill we have to lose by the act of some of our missions abroad. When those people ask through the columns of local papers, when they have issued more than 300000 visas to the people of India to live in their countries, is it fair on the part of the Government of India to deny visas for three religious personalities to visit our great country? Sir, really speaking we have no answer.

But it is heartening to note that our Prime Minister is to visit Kuwait and United Arab Emirate very soon. I wish every success for our Prime Minister. This is going to be a timely visit. I hope and trust that the visit will definitely strengthen our friendship and relations with Arab countries.

Sir, there are very many important facts to be related about Arab countries. Since there is no time I commend the memorandum recently submitted by the Kerala Muslim Cultural Centre in Kuwait, United Arab Emirate and qatar through the Governor of Kerala, for the sympathetic consideration and speedy implementation by Government of India.

Sir, one more point and I have done. I would like to point out the dearth of propoganda material in Arabic language. In the report prepared by the Ministry I could not find a single line about the distribu-

tion of propoganda materials in Arabic language.

Recently our Prime Minister made a very illuminating speech about Islam in India, during 15th centenary of Hijra celebration in Delhi. I wonder how many of our missions in Islamic countries know about that speech.

I would request the External Affairs Minister to get it translated into Arabic and give adequate publicity to the speech in the entire Arab world before our Prime Minister visits that area. I further appeal to the Minister to bring out at an early date a well got up Arabic weekly, espousing the cause of our country, to be distributed in all the 14 Arab countries and 30 other Islamic countries as well.

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

श्री राम प्यारे पनिका (राबट्सगंज) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सही है कि इस समय जो असामान्य अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति है, उसमें महाशक्तियों की आपसी होड़ तथा प्रतिद्वंद्विता में काफी तीखापन आया है। यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि उपलब्ध संसाधनों तथा कौशल का उपयोग मनवता के हित और मनुष्य के आर्थिक सामाजिक विकास के लिए न कर के मानवता के विध्वंस के लिए काम में आने वाली सामाजिक सामग्री के निर्माण के लिए किया जा रहा है। हमारे देश के लिए यह एक गम्भीर चिन्ता की बात है कि बड़ी शक्तियों का यह विध्वंसात्मक और भयावह खेल धीरे-धीरे यूरोप से खिसक कर एशिया और अफ्रीका की ओर आ रहा है।

यही नहीं, कुछ बड़ी शक्तियाँ दुनिया के विकासमान और गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों पर अपना प्रभाव जमाने का प्रयास कर रही

### [श्री राम प्यारे पनिका]

हैं। कुछ देशों ने बड़ो चालाकी के साथ अपनी नाभिकीय और सैनिक शक्ति में वृद्धि कर के संसार के कमजोर राष्ट्रों को डराते-धमकाने की चेष्टा भी की है। लेकिन यह सौभाग्य की बात है कि वे देश अपना राजनैतिक और सैनिक प्रभाव जमाने में सफल नहीं हो सके हैं।

ऐसी परिस्थितियों में लगभग एक वर्ष से हमारी सरकार ने जिस दृढ़ता और व्यावहारिक नीति से उन चुनौतियों का सामना किया है, वह सराहनीय है। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में हमारी सरकार ने, और माननीय विदेश मंत्री ने, जिस दृढ़ता से भारत की बुनियादी नीतियों पर चल कर देश की प्रतिष्ठा को बढ़ाया है, जो कि जनता रेजीम में गिर चुकी थी, उसके लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई देता हूँ।

दिल्ली में हाल ही में हुए गुट-निरपेक्ष देशों के सम्मेलन की उपलब्धियों की बहुत प्रशंसा हुई है। उस सम्मेलन में 81 देशों के अलावा 22 अतिथि-प्रतिनिधि मंडलों और 15 प्रेक्षक प्रतिनिधि मंडलों ने भाग लिया था। उस सम्मेलन में संसार में तनाव, टेन्शन, में कमी लाने में बड़ी सहायता मिली। 1961 में गुट-निरपेक्ष देशों के प्रथम शिखर सम्मेलन को बीसवीं वर्षगांठ मनाने के लिए 11 फरवरी को एक विशेष अधिवेशन भी हुआ, जिसकी अध्यक्षता हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने की और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने उसको संबोधित किया। गुट-निरपेक्ष देशों के सम्मेलन की अध्यक्षता करते हुए भारत की निष्पक्षता और उसकी रचनात्मक नीतियों की सब ओर से प्रशंसा की गई है।

इस सम्मेलन से न केवल शान्ति-यान्त्रिक और तनाव को कम करने में

मदद मिली है, बल्कि उसमें आर्थिक विकास के विभिन्न पहलुओं पर भी बात-चीत हुई है। जैसे, ऊर्जा को बढ़ाने के महत्वपूर्ण विषय के सम्बन्ध में नीतियाँ तय की गईं हैं।

पिछले एक वर्ष में हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय ने पड़ोसी देशों के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध स्थापित किये हैं, वह भी एक प्रशंसा की बात है। चाहे पाकिस्तान हो और चाहे नेपाल, भूटान और बंगलादेश हों, उनके साथ मंत्री-स्तर और सचिव-स्तर पर वार्ता कर के, और हमारे अधिकारियों ने वहाँ जा कर, अच्छे सम्बन्ध बनाए हैं।

जहाँ तक पाकिस्तान का सम्बन्ध है, सभी ने चिन्ता व्यक्त की है। जहाँ तक विदेश मंत्रालय की बजट मांगों का सम्बन्ध है, करीब करीब सभी सदस्यों ने, चाहे उधर के पक्ष के रहे हों या उधर के पक्ष के रहे हों—केवल दो तीन को छोड़ कर—इसका समर्थन किया है। जिन्होंने इसका समर्थन नहीं किया है, उनके सम्बन्ध में वाई साथियों ने बातें कही हैं। श्री बीजू पटनायक का भाषण विरोधाभास का था। एक तरफ तो उन्होंने कहा कि शांति से काम लेना चाहिए लेकिन दूसरी तरफ जब अफगानिस्तान का प्रश्न आया तो उन्होंने कहा कि शक्ति से काम लेना चाहिए। इस तरह से उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कोई स्पष्ट नीति नहीं बताई। जहाँ तक जेठमलानी साहब का सम्बन्ध है, श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण कह चुके हैं कि ऐसा लगता था जैसे वे अमरीका की रिपब्लिकन पार्टी के प्रतिनिधि हों। इस तरह से इन दो माननीय सदस्यों को छोड़ कर किसी अन्य ने कोई आलोचना नहीं की है।

इस प्रकार से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक जापान से हमारे सम्बन्धों

की बात है, हमने खास तौर से आर्थिक आयात मजबूत करने की कोशिश की है। अभी सितम्बर-अक्तूबर में हमारे राष्ट्रपति सौवियत रूस गए थे और वहाँ के नेता श्री ब्रेजनेव यहाँ आए। सौवियत रूस के साथ हमारे चार समझौते हुए जिनसे रूस तथा भारत के सम्बन्धों में दृढ़ता आई है, अोजयन आया है और गतिशीलता आई है।

यही नहीं, संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमरीका के सम्बन्ध में भारत की नीति एकदम स्पष्ट है। जनता राज में अमरीका को खुशी करने के लिए मोंराजी भाई ने सही चीजों को भी दवाने की कोशिश की थी लेकिन हमारी सरकार की तरफ से, अगर अमरीका की ओर से अनुदान दिया गया तो उसका स्वागत हुआ और अगर उन्होंने कोई ऐसी शर्त लगाई जोकि हमारे राष्ट्रीय हितों के विपरीत हो तो विदेश मंत्री ने उनको रिपेट किया है। इस तरह से चाहे रूस के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध हों या अमरीका के साथ हमारे सम्बन्धों की बात हो वह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट रहे हैं।

इसी प्रकार से अफ्रीकी देशों के साथ सदियों से हमारे सम्पर्क रहे हैं। हमारे सांस्कृतिक सम्पर्क सदियों से रहे हैं और उपनिवेशवाद के खिलाफ हमने आवाज उठाई है.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please conclude. I will not allow you. I have told you that the Minister has got to reply at 2.30.

श्री राम प्यारे पनिका : जहाँ तक अरब देशों का सम्बन्ध है, हमारे विदेश मंत्री कह चुके हैं कि जब तक वहाँ पर फिलिस्तीन का मामला तब नहीं होता है तब हमारा मन छोटे छोटे मुल्कों पर

जो कब्जा कर रखा है उसको जब तक खाली नहीं करता है तब तक वहाँ पर शांति की स्थापना करना मुश्किल है। जहाँ तक पड़ोसी देशों अथवा दूर-दराज के देशों के साथ हमारे मधुर सम्बन्धों की बात है, हर क्षेत्र में निश्चित तौर से हमें सफलता प्राप्त हुई है। इसी तरह से इराक के बारे में भारत की नीति बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री, श्रीमती इन्दिरा जी और विदेश मंत्री ने भी साफ कह दिया है कि वह मामला लड़ाई से नहीं, राजनीतिक वार्तालाप से ही हल किया जा सकता है इस सम्बन्ध में गुट-निरपेक्ष सम्मेलन के दौरान भी काफी विस्तार से चर्चा हुई थी।

इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ ही, चूँकि आप समय नहीं दे रहे हैं और मैं अभी आधा भी नहीं बोल पाया हूँ....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Why can't you conclude ? The Minister is going to reply at 2.30. You don't want to hear him ? I am going to call the next speaker, Acharya Bhagwan Dev.

श्री राम प्यारे पनिका : इस मंत्रालय की मांगों के लिए जो धनराशि रखी गई है उसको बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए।

आचार्य भगवान देव (अजमेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगों के ऊपर, सारे संसार की समस्याओं को देखते हुए आप चाहते हैं कि पांच मिनट में भाषण समाप्त कर दूँ, गागर में सागर समो दूँ।

हमारे विदेश मंत्री सामिल साधनों के होते हुए परम आराधनाया नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व और मार्गदर्शन में जो कार्य कर रहे हैं उसके लिए वे अभिनन्दन के पात्र हैं। जहाँ तक मांगों



## [आचार्य भगवान देव]

का सवाल है, संसार की समस्याओं को देखते हुए वह अर्थात् हैं, ऐसा लगता है। ये मांगे किसी अनाथालय के लिये मांगे गई है और स्वीकार की जा रही हैं। संसार में जितनी भी सरकारें और हूकूमते हैं, यदि उनके विदेश मंत्रालयों की मांगों में मैं विस्तार से जाऊ, तो इतना समय नहीं है। उन विदेशी सत्ताओं के आधार पर विभिन्न देशों में और हमारे इस देश में जो गतिविधियां चल रही हैं आनन्द मार्ग, नक्सलवादी और आर० एस० एस०— यदि इनके विस्तार में न जाऊ तो थोड़ा सा मैं दिल्ली के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग पर इंडियन एक्स-प्रेस की त्रिलिङ्ग तो पेपर के लिये दी गई है, वहाँ पर तीन महीने से तीन हजार से अधिक विदेशी ठहरे हुए हैं यदि उनके खर्च को ध्यान में रखा जाये, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो बजट पास किया जा रहा है, उससे अधिक खर्च जो वहाँ पर योग शिविर लगाया है, उस पर हुआ होगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्री और भारत सरकार इसकी जांच करके देखें कि जो विदेशी वहाँ पर आये हैं, ये कितना पैसा लेकर वहाँ आये हैं और उन पर कितना खर्च रोज हो रहा है खाने पीने और कन्वेन्स आदि पर। उसी से अन्दाजा लग जायेगा। यह योग शिविर ऋषिकेश में ले जाकर लगाया जा सकता है, इसको यहाँ लगाने की क्या आवश्यकता थी यह एक उदाहरण मैंने आपके सामने पेश किया है। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय षड्यन्त्र चल रहे हैं। विदेशी बड़ी बड़ी सत्तायें इस देश के अन्दर बहुत बड़े बड़े षड्यन्त्र चला रही हैं। उस पर पैसा खर्च किया जा रहा है, उसको देखते हुए यह बजट पास किया जा रहा है। मैं इसको अनाथालयों का ही बजट कहूँगा। यह ठीक है कि हमारी

आर्थिक स्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए हमें अपना कदम आगे बढ़ाना पड़ेगा और मैं मांग करूँगा कि विदेश मंत्रालय के लिये विशेष रकम बढ़ानी चाहिये। वित्त मंत्री जी यहाँ नहीं हैं, मुझे आशा है कि यह बात सरकार तक पहुँचेगी।

आप देखेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर रशिया, अमरीका और जर्मनी आदि देशों से हिन्दी में और उर्दू में तथा अन्य भाषाओं में पत्रकार्यें यहाँ आती हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय और देशों में हिन्दी की कोई पत्रिका निकालता है या निकालने की कोई योजना है या विदेश मंत्रालय कोई पत्रिका प्रकाशित कर रहा है, जिसमें वह अपनी नीति और गति-विधियों की जानकारी विदेशों को दे सके। मैं बोलना नहीं चाहता था, हमारी नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी और विदेश मंत्री, जैसे सुयोग्य व्यक्तियों के होते हुए हम कोई बात करें, तो सूरज को दीपक दिखाने की बात होगी।

मैंने 9-10 देशों का दौरा किया है और मैंने वहाँ के भारत के दूतावासों से जानकारी ली और वहाँ की सुविधाओं को देखा तथा सदन में इस संबंध में चर्चा भी हुई, विरोधी पार्टियों की ओर से इन सब बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए मैं चन्द बातें कहना चाहता हूँ वहाँ पर सुविधाएँ नहीं हैं, जितनी पर्याप्त सुविधाएँ वहाँ पर होनी चाहिये, वे वहाँ पर नहीं हैं। हिन्दी के बारे में मुझे अभी पता लगा, हमारे भूतपूर्व विदेश मंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जो हिन्दी के हिमायती कहलाते हैं, जो कि यू० एन० आ० में हिन्दी में बोले। क्या विदेश मंत्रालय ने इस संबंध में कोई जांच की कि आगे काम चल रहा है या नहीं, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी में काम नहीं हो रहा है। हमने सुना है कि विदेश मंत्रालय

ने वहाँ पर टाइपिस्ट भेजे हैं, लेकिन इनसे काम नहीं चलेगा। कहीं पर टाइपराइटर हैं तो कहीं पर टाइपिस्ट नहीं हैं और कहीं पर टाइपिस्ट हैं, तो कहीं टाइपराइटर नहीं हैं। इसलिये इस कमी को भी आपको दूर करना पड़ेगा।

जहाँ तक विदेश नीति के संबंध में चर्चा की गई, एक तरफ तो कहा गया कि गुटनिरपेक्ष होना चाहिये और भारत रशिया की तरफ जा रहा है तथा दूसरी तरफ विरोधी पक्ष के नेताओं ने जो विचार व्यक्त किये, उन सबको देखते हुए मुझे ऐसा लगा कि वह लोग अमरीका, चीन और पाकिस्तान की यहाँ पर वकालत कर रहे थे। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक तरफ हमारे चन्हाण साहब, भूतपूर्व विदेश मंत्री रह चुके हैं, बोल रहे थे और दूसरी तरफ श्री रामजेट मलानी जी बोल रहे थे, यदि इन दोनों की तुलना करूँ तो हमारे चन्हाण साहब ने विदेश नीति की बहुत बड़ी हिमायत की और श्री रामजेट मलानी जी को कुछ नजर नहीं आया, तो मेरे सामने राजा भोज और गंगुतेली की स्थिति सामने आ गई। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन गंभीर परिस्थितियों को देखते हुए भारत सरकार बड़ी सफलता से विदेश नीति को आगे बढ़ा रही है। जिन को कुछ भी पता नहीं है, लेकिन जब वह बोल रहे थे तो मुझे महसूस हुआ जब यहाँ पर एमरजेन्सी थी उन दिनों वे अमरीका भाग गये थे, या तो वहाँ का जो पानी पिया है उस का प्रभाव है या उन को विशेष निमन्त्रण पर अपने यहाँ बुलाया था। इस देश से तीन संसद सदस्य श्री रामजेटमलानी श्री जार्ज फरनान्डीज और डा० सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी वहाँ पर गये थे उस का प्रभाव है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,

इस देश को कभी कोई खतरा सीमाओं से नहीं हुआ, इस देश के अन्दर रहने-वालों से ही खतरा रहा है। गोरी और गजनवी से ले कर अंग्रेजों तक यही हुआ है। ये लोग वहाँ गये थे। क्या सांठगांठ कर आये, भगवान जाने। विदेश मंत्रालय को इस पर गम्भीरता से ध्यान देना चाहिये। ये लोग वहाँ जा कर सांठगांठ करते हैं या फिर यहाँ आ कर पाकिस्तान की बात करते हैं, हिमायत करते हैं। उन की जुबान पर लकवा क्यों नहीं मार गया। ये लोग वहाँ के सैनिक तानाशाहों की वकालत कर रहे हैं।\*\*

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :  
On a point of order, Sir. There are specific rules and conventions which we have been observing in this House. Countries with whom we have friendly relations, countries with whom we have diplomatic relations, we do not malign them on the floor of the House. That has been the convention and we rigidly followed it. Therefore, in all fairness to this House and to those people about whom my hon. friend is saying .....

आचार्य भगवान देव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ये वे लोग हैं जिन्होंने सदन में खड़े हो कर जनरल जिया की वकालत की है .....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :  
I have not yet finished.

आचार्य भगवान देव : इस देश को खतरा है तो ऐसे लोगों से है। चोर की दाढ़ी में तिनका...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has not mentioned anything about you.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :  
This part should not form part of the recor.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKE :  
I will go through the proceedings.  
If there is anything will see.

श्री आचार्य जगन्नाथ देव : इस में ऐसी कौन सी बात है जो आपत्तिजनक है। मैं कह रहा हूँ\*\*

आज जो विरोधी पार्टियाँ हैं उस समय यहाँ पर लोकशाही के होते हुए भी उन्होंने उस सैनिक तानाशाह की बात कर के सत्ता में आने का कुप्रयास किया, आज वही लोग उस\*\* की वकालत इस हाउस में करता हैं—इन की जीभ को लकवा क्यों नहीं मार जाता? जहाँ इस तरह की तानाशाही है—जिस ने भुट्टों जैसे व्यक्ति को, जिस का इतना बड़ा अपराध नहीं था, फाँसी पर लटका दिया। सर्वोच्च न्यायालय के न्यायाधीशों को निकाल दिया। जो अपने यहाँ लोकशाही को स्थापना करने नहीं दे रहा है, उसकी ये लोग वकालत करते हैं। हम सच्चाई की बात करते हैं तो भी इन को आपत्ति होती है। मैं आज आप को यह बात कह देना चाहता हूँ जहाँ तक पाकिस्तान का सम्बन्ध है पाकिस्तान के कन्धों पर अमरीका और चीन बन्दूकें रख कर एक बहुत बड़ा बखण्डर खड़ा करना चाहते हैं और एशिया के अन्दर बहुत बड़ा तनाव पैदा करना चाहते हैं। ऐसे सैनिक तानाशाह की वकालत हमारे विरोधी पार्टियों के लोग कर रहे हैं।

हिन्द महासागर में एक तरफ अमरीका अपने कदम बड़ा रहा है। यहाँ पर डीगो गार्शिया की बात कही गई है। मैं विदेश मंत्री से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ अभी थोड़े दिन पहले मालदीप के अन्दर ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हुई है कि वहाँ भारतीयों को परेशान करके निकाला जा रहा है—इस में अमरीका का हाथ है। मैं जिस-

लीज गया था—वहाँ की स्थिति भी ऐसी ही है—अमरीका वहाँ अपना जाल बिछा चुका है मारिशस के बारे में मैं विशेष कहना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ की स्थिति बड़ी विचित्र रूप धारण कर रही है। काफी समय से वहाँ भारतीय हाई कमिश्नर नहीं है मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उन के वहाँ न होने का क्या कारण है? मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि जल्दी ही एक सुयोग्य भारतीय हाई कमिश्नर मारिशस में नियुक्त किया जाय जो वहाँ की परिस्थितियों को ध्यान में रख कर काम करे। मारिशस को आज एक छोटा भारत समझा जाता है। उन की जो भी समस्याएँ हैं चाहे एरॉप्लेन देने की बात है या जो भी सुविधायें उन्होंने मांगी थी जिन को भारत सरकार ने स्वीकार किया था उन की पूर्ति करने की कोशिश की जाय। काम चलाऊ भारतीय हाई कमिश्नर से मैं सन्तुष्ट नहीं हूँ, उस व्यक्ति को मारिशस से तुरन्त हटा देना चाहिये और एक सुयोग्य व्यक्ति को तुरन्त नियुक्त कर के वहाँ भेजा जाना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करते हुए प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि हिन्दी के प्रचार की तरफ ध्यान दें। हिन्दी की परीक्षा जो संस्था लेती आ रही है उनकी फीस कम की जाये हिन्दी की पत्रिका प्रकाशित की जाय और सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध जोड़ने के लिये अच्छे सुयोग्य व्यक्ति विदेश भेजे जायें। आप ने देखा होगा बड़ी बड़ी चोटी लगा कर, धोती पहन कर लोग यहाँ आते हैं, क्योंकि उन में आध्यात्मिकता की बहुत भूख है इसलिये अच्छे सुयोग्य व्यक्ति वहाँ भेजे जायें इतना कहते हुए मैं विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करता हूँ और यह

मंग करता हूँ कि इस मंत्रालय का जो बजट है, वह बहुत कम है और उस को बढ़ाया जाये।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :  
hri N. C. Parashar.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur): Sir, I rise to support.....

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी (हिंसार) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कांग्रेस पार्टी वालों को ही टाइम देते रहोगे ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:  
They are entitled to some more time.  
Your time is over.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:  
Please do not be too rigid.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please allow me to conduct the business.

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : देखिय, कुछ खयाल रखना चाहिये और इस तरह से मेम्बर को किसी को गद्दार नहीं कहना चाहिये। भारत, पाकिस्तान और बंगला देश में रहने वाले आखिर में भाई-भाई है और इस तरह से एक मुल्क को दूसरे से लड़ानों की बात नहीं करनी चाहिये।

SHRI NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR: Sir, I rise to support the demands presented to this House and appreciate the report of activities placed before this House by the Hon. Minister for External Affairs.

First of all, I would refer to the commendable performance that was witnessed at the 35th Session of the U. N. General Assembly by our Foreign Minister. When he made his remarkable speech on 3rd October, 1980, a number of ambassadors from foreign countries lined up to congratulate him for the rich content and the beautiful style in which it was

delivered and that clearly outlined the role India was destined to play during the forthcoming months.

One of the important achievements that goes to the credit of this country is that as a result of the efforts made by India, UNIDO has been accepted and recognised as a Specialised Agency of the United Nations. This is not a small achievement and similarly also in the establishment of the U. N. University for Peace in Costarica, our country had played a Key-role and 45 countries ultimately came to sponsor that resolution and it was passed unanimously. In this process, we also tried to enlarge Security Council's membership and in this context India made heroic efforts but unfortunately the resistance on the part of the world powers scotched that move and most of the veto powers did not agree to this but our efforts will continue to give a larger voice to the Third World.

In the sphere of economic relations, the North-South dialogue is a land-mark for the opening of the new global order for economic relationships. The resistance has to be diluted and it has to be understood that the world has entered, not the stage of dominance, but the stage of interdependence. The advanced countries of the world are dependent upon the Third World for raw materials, for technical skill and for many of the things and the finished products that are manufactured by these so-called advanced countries have as their very basis the raw materials from the Third World on which they have to depend upon.

The World Bank has also to change its attitude. At present, the World Bank is supposed to be a democratic institution. In this World Bank, the developed nations control two-thirds of the votes and the Third World, with a large majority of the voting strength of the U. N. is helpless in shaping the policies. So, efforts for the democratisation of the World Bank should continue.

[Shri Narian Chand Paras'har]

It is in the sphere of non-alignment that remarkable success has been achieved. I was listening to some of the remarks from the Opposition side and I feel they are made without understanding as to what they mean by it. Mr. Chavan was right when he said that India has come out very successfully out of this Conference. I would like to read a testimony from one of the ambassadors from non-aligned countries. This is from Mr. Milijan Komatina, the Yugoslav ambassador and the concluding portion of his article is worth reading for evaluation and appreciation of the whole thing that is called Non-aligned Conference.

"The effects of the Delli Conference will long be the subject of evaluation. It cannot be disputed that the non-aligned countries have once again said the right word at the right time. This has greatly added to the influence and repute of the policy and the movement, which are not only viable and functioning, but which are expanding on foundations which refute anything which usurps the rights of states and nations, and which are capacitated to reflect the interests and aspirations of the entire international community. The Ministerial Conference was less a landmark standing for the beginning of a new phase, and more one marking continuity based on loyalty to the authentic principles of non-aligned policy, as defined by its creators at the Conference in Belgrade." This is an important assessment that has been made by a representative of a non-aligned country. Therefore, my hon. friends from the Opposition should see the direction in which the movement is going on and the contribution India has made by holding this important Conference here.

I would also refer briefly, to the relations which we have with our neighbours. Normalisation of relations with China is important. But what has to be understood is this. Who has created this abnormality?

It is China which has been responsible for creating an abnormal situation by attacking our country. India is doing what it can, what lies within its ambit, to normalise the situation. That is, we do not stand in the way of China normalising the relations with India. We are doing everything by welcoming their teams—gymnasts and others—and by doing whatever we can. The diplomatic relations have already been established. The ball is now in China's court. Let China come forward and India will go one step forward so that the normalisation will ultimately be achieved. But the initiative has to come from China.

Similarly, coming to Afghanistan it was on 27th December, 1979 that the Soviet troops came there. The ambassadors of the world and other representatives at the United Nations have agreed that India can do more for the normalisation of the situation in Afghanistan and for the withdrawal of the Soviet troops than any military action on the part of the Western nations or anybody else. The contribution made by our Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned countries in containing this issue is a very important one.

I would also refer to the various other efforts being made in the direction of having friendly relations with Sri Lanka, Bhutan, Nepal and a number of other countries. A number of Asian Heads of State and Asian Foreign Ministers and others have visited India during the last one year. This one year has been a very important period in the history of evolution of our policy because CHOGRAM-II—the Second Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Heads of Government—was held here and it was a great success. Similarly the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries was also a success.

With these words, I appreciate and commend the Report presented

to the House by the Ministry of External Affairs.

I would make one important observation. The Sixth Five-Year Plan does not recognise the contribution made by this Ministry for the betterment of or rather for improving, India's image abroad. It is in the fitness of things that the Sixth Plan should make its own contribution by enlarging the Budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs because our Missions abroad are handicapped seriously and adversely in projecting the country's image abroad; also various other services are crippled. The hon. Foreign Minister has made Herculean efforts, with meagre resources, to project a better image of India abroad. I would plead for greater share from the Sixth Five-Year Plan for this Ministry, for the enlargement of the Budget of the the Ministry of External Affairs.

With these words, I once again congratulate the hon. Minister for Foreign Affairs, Shri Narasimha Rao, for having achieved a signal success in the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, there can be no denying the fact that the foreign policy of the Government of India is, by and large in the right direction. There are certain areas of deficiency, but, generally speaking, the policy formulations are based on sound principles and on a correct perception of the turns and twists in international situation and relations.

Turning to west Asia, we have had a principled policy that has earned national approbation and international appreciation. Here I must place on record our appreciation of the sincere efforts made by the Government of India in trying to bring about a cessation of hostilities between Iraq and Iran. Indeed, good efforts have been made by the hon. Foreign Minister. Various efforts were made by the United Nation,

by the Summit of the Islamic Nations and by the non-aligned countries. But, unfortunately, these efforts have not brought any positive results as yet. There is no positive response from Iran. However, in view of the fact that there is a positive and substantial response to these peace-making efforts from Iraq, I must urge upon the Government to continue the peacemaking efforts in a vigorous manner. India is also a member of the Non Aligned Goodwill Committee, along with Cuba, Zambia and the PLO. We wish the efforts every success.

I must here refer to an important aberration, to a very important and serious, I should say, anachronism in our policy. I have moved a few out motions on the same asking and urging upon the Government to sever all relations with Israel. The hon. Shri Ram Jethmalani was pleased to refer to my cut motion. However, I am quite sure that the Government of India and the hon. Finance Minister will not take any advice from the hon. Shri Ram Jethmalani for, if he does so, the Foreign Minister will end up with a situation in which he will have the ignominious position of sneaking into the world capitals surreptitiously and in disguise pleading for recognition by those States. I am therefore, sure that such advice give by political perverts will not be taken by the hon. Minister (*Interruptions*)

The hon. Minister has said in his report:

“A perceptible new warmth characterised India's relations with the Arab world.”

This is the truth. I congratulate the Government for this renewal of warmth that is there. But I must also warn the Government that there are certain elements which want to harm the relations between India and the Arabs. For example, we now have the news of some false tapes in circulation in Pakistan. In one of those

[Shri G.M. Banatwalla]

tapes, it is alleged that our Prime Minister had talks with even Mr. Moshe Dayan. This is a condemnable mischief and I hope our Government will come out with a clarification and an unequivocal condemnation of such mischief.

However, I must express my disappointment with certain increases in our trade relations with Israel. We have no official trade dealings but then the private imports and exports are on the increase. In 1970-71 our imports were hardly of the value of Rs. 17,12,000. By 1975-76 these imports had increased to Rs. 1,21,62,000. Take the exports. In 1970-71 the exports were to the tune of Rs. 67,28,000 and by 1975-76 these exports had increased to Rs. 2,71,41,000.

I must here point out that in the Conference of the Non-aligned Countries that we had in New Delhi recently there was a clear call given for severance of all relations with Israel. I quote from the declaration:

“The Ministers reaffirmed the need for the continued severance of all kinds of formal and informal diplomatic, consular, economic, cultural sports, tourist and communication relations with Israel and invited those Member States which had not yet broken off such relations to do so.”

I may further quote from this declaration :

“The Ministers decided to use, in a meaningful and systematic manner, every possible means to:

- (a) weaken the Israel's economic capacity to continue its aggressive policy;
- (b) put an end to the political economic and financial support given to Israel.”

In the true spirit of this declaration I have to urge upon the Government to sever all relations with Israel. It is painful to see that immediately after the end of this Conference a press-note was issued perhaps inadvertently giving recognition to the M. Sc. Degrees granted by the Israel Institute of Technology. I hope it was inadvertent and the purpose given was to get better qualified and more qualified persons in our services. If such a press-note was given even to enable one Israeli-educated person to be included in our services, it is rather most disappointing and I urge on the Government to withdraw the same.

Then, Sir, there is also the question of the Asian Games.

Let it be clearly said that Israel will not be allowed to participate in the Asian Games that will be held here. We must also close down the Israeli Consulate.

Sir, in view of the paucity of time, I will refer only to one more point and I have done. Let me now turn to the situation with respect to the Republic of Cyprus. I appreciate the balanced approach of the Government of India to the situation in Cyprus. The President of the Republic of Cyprus visited India in October, 1980. An agreement on cultural cooperation was signed. A joint communique was also issued which reiterated sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-aligned status of Cyprus. It also welcomed the resumption of inter-communal talks under the U.N. auspices and wished these talks success.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir the constitution of the State of Cyprus requires a cooperation on an equal footing between the Turkish and Greek Communities and this denial to Turkish community has been the origin of the conflict. We recall with horror the tragedies of 1963 and 1967. It is a good thing that high level agree-

ments have been reached since 1977 and talks are in progress under the auspices of the U.N. and we wish these talks a success.

Sir, our Prime Minister is shortly going to visit U.A.E. and Kuwait. We wish her visit all success. The last point and I have done. India has great stakes in the security and stability of the entire sub-continent. But, then our response to the situation created by the military invasion of Afghanistan has not been in keeping with our concern for the security and stability of the entire sub-continent. I must say that we have compromised here even the role of the foreign policy and the role of the non-alignment policy which India is expected to play in the international situation.

I would here conclude by reminding the Government of what the Foreign Minister of Singapore said with respect to the role of non-alignment in the non-aligned Conference :

"Our only weapon is moral censure. Those who insidiously whisper in our ears that taking an open and clear stand on principles will not help want to rob the movement of even this weapon."

I hope that in the light of this, reappraisal of the policy will be undertaken. With these words, I thank you.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :  
Now the hon. Minister.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI :  
rose. (Interruptions)\*\*

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Your party's time is exhausted. Nothing is going on recorded. It was already announced that the Minister will reply. (Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :  
You said five minutes would be given after the opposition Parties speak. You have promised to give me five minutes.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Bosu, your party had taken some time.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU  
You told me that you would give me five minutes.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You will have to sit from morning till evening. As a special case I will allow only Shri Mani Ram Bagri for two minutes. He is a senior Member and I must respect him.

श्री मनो राम बागड़ी (हिंदार) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश नीति का मूलतः आज हमारा देश इतना शक्तिशाली नहीं है कि दूरे मुल्क में अपनी नीति चलाये। आधार सिर्फ यह है, मैं लम्बा बातें नहीं कहता कि भूखा मुल्क, गरीब मुल्क, गरीबी की सतह से नीचे जिनकी आवादी आधी गरीब हो उनके दूतावासों पर इन्द्रपुरी की तरह से खर्चा हो इसको विदेश मंत्री जी खुद देखेंगे, और उन दूतावासों के अधिकारियों का संसद सदस्यों के साथ क्या व्यवहार होता है वह भी आप देखेंगे ?

मैं सिर्फ विदेश नीति के आंकड़े बताता हूँ क्या हमारी विदेश नीति भारत पाक बंगलादेश को एक कर सकती? उनके हम मित्र नहीं, भाई नहीं, एका नहीं कर सके 30 साल में, कम से कम एक संघ नहीं बना सके। क्या हमारी बर्मा से दोस्ती है, चीन से दोस्ती है, लंका से हमारी दोस्ती है? क्या हमारी (उत्सव नीति है कि एक तरफ है अमरीका का झूला दूसरी तरफ है रूस का झूला और इस के बीच हम झूल रहे हैं अभी अमरीका की तरफ कभी रूस का तरफ, और हम बीच में अपनी नीति बनाये बैठे अफगानिस्तान के अन्दर अगर रूसी फौजें जाती हैं तो हम रोक नहीं सकते, और अगर हिन्द महासागर के अन्दर अमरीका का बहरी बेड़ा खतरा बन कर रहता है तो हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते। हम ऐसे यतीम और मामूम बच्चे हैं जो भी चाहे मारे। दूसरे मुल्क की



[श्री मनी राम बागड़ी]

बात करते हैं। देश के अन्दर कोई शक्ति नहीं है। यह ठीक है कि विदेश मंत्री जी बेचारे क्या कर सकते हैं। यह तो पुरानी दीवार पर अपनी कुटिया बनाकर बैठे हैं। बुद्धिमान आदमी हैं। मैं उनसे कहना चाहूंगा . . . . . (व्यवधान) बोला रानी क्या कह रही थीं? मैं अपने विदेश मंत्री जी से चाहूंगा कम से कम लम्बी चौड़ी बात तो नहीं कहता, लेकिन शायद इस बात का असर बहुत कुछ होने वाला है, सारे राष्ट्र का ही नहीं हमारा नहीं, लेकिन रास्ता कम से कम बनाओ, जैसे भारत और पाक के अन्दर पासपोर्ट को खत्म करो, भारत बंगलादेश के बीच भी पासपोर्ट को खत्म करो ताकि आप लोग नजदीक आ सकें भूलो मत चाहे कोई मुल्क हो दुनिया का वह दूसरा मुल्क है, लेकिन पाकिस्तान भाई है, बंगलादेश भाई है। यह विदेशी शक्तियों ने एक भाई को दो हिस्सों में बांटा है। हमारी नीति तब कामयाब होगी जब भारत पाक ब बंगलादेश का एक सांझा होगा कम से कम पासपोर्ट के बगैर आ सके। और ऐसा भी कोई कदम उठाये जिससे हमारा डिफम इभट्टा हो सके, हमारा व्यापार भी मिला-जुला चल सके। आखिर हम छोटे मुल्क नहीं हैं, काफी बड़ा मुल्क है। वह अन्न तो निकल गया जब एशिया एक होता, एशिया एक थर्ड ब्लाक होता। वह जमाना गया। अब तो एशिया एक नहीं, कम से कम हिन्दुस्तान को एक बनाने वाली नीति बने तब कुछ हमारा भजा हो। वह लोभ जो भारत को पाक से लड़ाते हैं, पाकिस्तान को भारत से लड़ाते हैं, बांगलादेश को भारत से लड़ाते हैं, यह देशभक्ति की बात नहीं है। आखिर भाई से भाई क्यों लड़ता है? भारत और पाकिस्तान की क्या लड़ाई है। लोहिया जी के शब्दों में सिर्फ हिन्दू और मुसलमान जी कांटे और छुरी से

लड़ते थे वह आज सावर जैट और बम से लड़ाये जा रहे हैं।

आखिर इन बातों को सोचिये, नजदीक लाइये, जिससे संसार में यदि अमन-शांति को शान्ति हमारी नहीं तो कम-से-कम घर में ही कर लें। ऐसी खबरी को कम छपने दो जिससे पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ नफरत हो पाकिस्तान वालों को कहिए कि ऐसी खबरें कम छापें जिससे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को नफरत हो। अगर भारत-पाक एक होगा तो उसका असर हिन्दुस्तान पर पड़ेगा और भारत के अन्दर हिन्दू-मुसलमान की हारमनी भी नजदीक आयेगी और देश आगे बढ़ेगा यही मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, just now I heard about the recognition by the Government of India of the Degrees conferred by Israeli universities. I have seen the hand-out given by Press Information Bureau myself, and I was taken by great surprise that whilst we are one with the Arab world, how on earth, we could suddenly go off-the-beaten-track and recognise Degrees conferred by Israeli universities? I would expect the hon. Minister to enlighten the House in this regard. It is a PIB release and I am in possession of a copy of the same.

The second thing is this: I cannot afford to forget the Government of India's "Tight-rope-dancing" And, a Government of India Circular had come into our hands which prohibited Vessels which carried foodgrains coming from America, if these vessels touched Vietnam ports at any time. That is the Government of India's Foreign policy! This is a Circular which had said that Vessels which even touched Vietnam port would not be allowed to carry foodgrain from America and that circular was endorsed by the Government of India and given to all the Shipping Lines. It is very much a part of the record of the House.

Lastly I would say one thing, Mr.

Narasimha Rao, you know what I am going to say. This is about normalisation of the relation with the largest neighbour, the largest country, in the world, that is—The People's Republic of China. Two eminent persons, one a former Deputy Director of the Government of India's National Archives, Shourin Roy and Dr. Karunakaran Gupta have written two sets of Articles which have been published in Economic and Political Weekly and other papers and they have given new food for thought. They have revealed very many important things based on documents which they have found in British Museum, British Archives, and various other sources.

Now, the mischief done by Olaf Carro, the British Civil Servant, and then, later, the Governor for N. W. Frontier, in distorting Acheson's Publication 'Sanads, Agreements and Treaties' and distorting the Chapter which talks about this boundary between China and India has come to light. These are all very revealing and something very new. I would only like to know from the Government whether they have gone through these two particular research papers, one published by Dr. Karunakaran Gupta who worked for months in British Archives and the other by Mr. Shourin Roy a former Deputy Director, Archives. And I want to know whether he has gone through that. If so, what the Government's attitude at present is, in this matter, in view of the revelations which have been made. We are anxious to know what precise steps you are taking to normalise the relation with China, to bring the relations to the pre-1962 level, because, more than 20 years have passed and we cannot afford to have this Artificial Boundary Wall standing between our two countries and serving the purpose particularly of the grabbing capitalist races. *interruptions* I oppose America. I will go through the record. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO) : Mr.

Deputy Soaker, Sir, 27 Hon. Members have taken part in this Debate and I am grateful to them for the very high level of debate that they were pleased to maintain at the end of which I am highly encouraged to note that a consensus has emerged in this House that the foreign policy of India, as before, continues to be based on a national consensus. Such a consensus is particularly useful because today we are at the cross-roads. We have to take decisions and go ahead. We just cannot rest content with old cliches. We have to take bold decisions because changing situations need bold decisions and if there is no consensus, it will not be possible to run the foreign policy of a country. Therefore, this consensus that has emerged in the House is the first achievement, the first spring-board, which give the Government of India renewed encouragement to go ahead with its policy in all its ramifications and pursue it confidently in future.

Sir, consensus naturally does not mean unanimity. There have been a few discordant notes. Even in music we have what are called 'बिबादी स्वर' They are a part of music. So I do not really consider this as anything detracting from consensus. In fact, in spite of them, the consensus has continued, not to day alone, it has continued for the last three decades and more. There has been the political ancestry of Mr. Ram Jethmalani throughout. There is nothing new in this phenomenon. There have been certain individuals in this country, perhaps even certain parties, who thought that his country ought to have taken a different course in foreign policy. They did not make any dent on the overall policies. But their existence such as it was, cannot be denied and I do not propose to deny it. As I said, in spite of these discordant notes, the consensus has continued and I shall not comment any further on this aspect of the matter.

[Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao]

The debate itself, as I see it, has disposed of almost all the points that were to be dealt with, points being raised and points being answered, more or less leaving very little scope to me to reply to the debate. The replies were contained in the debate itself. I am particularly grateful to the Hon. Members who have with great insight, dealt with these points and, irrespective of the side of the House they sit in, have come out with a very realistic analysis of policies and issues that I would other-wise have had to spend time in unreavelling. Therefore, I am doubly grateful to them for considerably lessening my task and I would not like to cover the same ground all over again. It is hardly necessary.

Yesterday, our revered Chavan Saheb made a speech which had helped me a great deal. His analysis of the situation, his exposition on several points, important points, that were raised in the debate was something which is completely in line with the thinking of the Government of India.

Except one or two points raised by him on which I shall presently dwell, I find that this was a real example of the consensus which I have referred to just now. Therefore, instead of going into all these details, what I have been intending to do, since the debate began, is to think a bit in advance.

We are on the threshold of new decade. The decade of the seventies is over and the decade of eighties has just started. Is there going to be a qualitative change in the thinking of men on world affairs, on their own affairs, on national and international affairs, on political affairs and economic affairs? Or is there just going to be a dittoing of the line of the sevenies? If so, is there going to be any outcome of this dittoing? Is there or is there not a need to

break new ground when we are standing at the beginning of this extremely crucial decade in the history of mankind? There were some of the thoughts that were crowding on my mind while I was listening to the debate and finding myself largely in agreement with many of the points raised by hon. Members.

I would, in all humility, like to share with the House some of these alternatives, some of these choices that present themselves without being dogmatic about them, because ultimately decisions need to be taken after the deliberation. There is nothing wrong, however, in posing the questions, in trying to perceive the alternatives as we see them and find them. But before I go to that topic, there seem to be some concrete points raised which need to be answered factually.

One of the very persistent objections, persistent criticisms, which has been figuring in the debates of the House on foreign policy, particularly in regard to this Government, happens to relate to our neighbours. I would like to disabuse the mind of anyone who has any illusion, any misunderstanding, on this topic because that is very necessary. If this is repeated time and again, this could erode our relations with our neighbours and it could cause incalculable harm to the image of the country and to the foreign policy of the country.

Neighbours have a special position. That position bring us into relations of various kinds, relations of all descriptions. If we have a common border, if we have common rivers, if we have common interest एक द्रव्याभिलाषी द्वेषी this could happen Both countries might want the same thing. It is natural that at some point of time, there is a conflict. It is the essence of statesmanship to steer clear of the conflict and harmonise position harmonise attitudes and live in peace. Therefore, our relations with neighbours are of very great importance.

So any lasting relationship with a neighbour as was pointed out by Chavanji yesterday, has to be delineated first. What are the ingredients of the relationship between one country and its neighbouring country? Could it be on the basis of big and small? Could it be on the basis of rich and poor? Could it be on the basis of domination and being dominated? I submit it is obvious that it could not be on any such basis. It has to be on the basis of sovereign equality. It has to be on the basis of mutuality of interest, mutuality of perception to the extent possible and also the will to harmonise, the will to live together, the will to see that the interests of both countries lie in living together and not being at loggerheads with each other. Still there will be problems. We cannot wish them away. It is inherent in neighbourhood itself that while it fosters friendship, love and affection, it could also give rise to conflict. It is a two-way lane.

What has been our policy in this regard? I would like to submit that this Government has tried to rebuild our relations with neighbours on the basis of trust, mutual advantage, reciprocity and national interest.

Now this last thing, called national interest, cannot be parted with, cannot be glossed over, cannot be diluted, because the only abiding relationship between neighbours can be of mutual interest and not one sided interest. It just cannot be one-sided. If you go on conceding, conceding and conceding you will never be able to have a lasting relationship with any neighbour. The neighbour should know where you stand and you should know where the neighbour stands. Only on that basis can there be an abiding friendship.

Sir, instead of going into too many details, I would very briefly/

recount, point by point, what has happened in regard to our relations with each of these countries.

I take Nepal first. The programme of techno-economic co-operation with Nepal is going ahead in order to make Nepal strong and self-reliant. Supply of iodised salt, Devighat hydel project, Mahendras Raj Marg hospitals and dispensaries etc. were the on-going programmes which many of the Members know about. During this year, after long and patient negotiations, agreements has been reached on preparation of project report on Pancheshwar Project. This was one of those things we were dreaming about for decades. Now it is almost coming true because we have taken a decision to go ahead with the preparation of the project report. Sir, the greatest of the projects between India and Nepal still remains to materialise even at this stage and that is the Karnali project. We are making every effort to go ahead at least with the preparations, at least with investigation. I am not in a position to say that this stage has been reached. But I can say that we are in a position to go ahead in this direction and perhaps it may not be very long before even this becomes a fact, particularly the investigation part of it. It is a huge project, perhaps costing more than Rs. 3000/- crores. It is going to be located in Nepal. Its benefits are going to accrue to both countries. Money will have to come from international agencies. India also has to bear its share. As to what decisions are to be taken in this connection—these matters are being considered. That is why it is still in the initial stages. It is still something which we have to reach.

Now I come to Bhutan. Our relations with Bhutan, as is well known, are based on imperatives of geo-politics, shared history,

[Sri P.V. Narasimha Rao]  
tradition, and mutuality of interests, as reflected in the Treaty of 1949. Our relations are cordial and mutually useful. This year, i.e. within the last one year, agreement has been reached on :

- (1) National Civil Airline linking Calcutta with Paro ;
- (2) Setting up of a broadcasting station in Bhutan ;
- (3) Discussions are going on India's participation in Bhutan's 5th Five year plan; and
- (4) Assistance extended to Chukha Hydel Project, which is well known to every one, and on Pencilment plant. Discussions are due to take place on Chukha Phase II and Phase-II of the Gyalephug irrigation projects.

These are some of the important things which were completed over the last year.

Here, again, the largest of them all is still far away ; and that is the Manas Sankosh project. If that becomes a fact, not only the relations between Bhutan and India, but also the entire economic prospects of both countries will undergo a revolutionary change. But still, for various reasons including the stupendous nature of the project, matters are moving slowly. We do not wish to force the pace, because it is Bhutan which has to come to a conclusion in regard to the usefulness of this project. We are not asking any of our neighbours to go in for a project merely because it is useful to us. They have to come to the conclusion, independently, that it is useful to them as well. And only then will it materialise. When the King of Bhutan came here recently, he told us that this was a matter which he would like to consider further. To this extent

there has been a forward movement. We are waiting for his response. I feel that there is hope that this huge project also might materialise, if not in the very near future, then after some years.

Next I come to a very important relationship, which has become the subject matter of much comment recently, viz. our relations with Bangladesh. We again wish to establish a relationship on the basis of friendship and reciprocity. A constructive dialogue has started with Bangladesh. There have been several exchanges of visits. I visited Dacca. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee visited Dacca. President Zia-ur-Rahman visited Delhi twice on different occasions ; and the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh and several other Ministers have visited this country in one connection or another. So, so far as visits are concerned, they have been many in number. There has been steady progress on :

- (1) Land boundary ;
- (2) Maritime boundary.

I will not go into the details of each item and say how much progress has been made. I am making a statement, with full responsibility, that there has been a forward movement on all these issues ;

- (3) Illegal movements across the borders. This was a very important thing which had been rankling. It was really creating difficulties on both sides, I am glad to say that we have come to an understanding, between the two Governments, and there are better prospects of this understanding being implemented by both sides.
- (4) Railway transit facilities. This was one of the issues pending for a long time on

which there was no forward movement for one reason or another. This year Bangladesh has agreed, in principle, to provide these facilities. Details, naturally have to be worked out.

- (5) Improvement in the level of trade relations.
- (6) Indian engineering exhibition held in Dacca was a resounding success, it gave the people of Bangladesh a panorama of the immense possibility of cooperation between the two countries.
- (7) Cultural exchanges are also developing satisfactorily. On this point also, there had not been much progress earlier. We tried to hammer it out this year with a certain amount of determination and I am glad to say that there has been some forward movement.

Now, I come to the toughest of the problems, Farakka. I shall not go into who did what. It is a relationship between India and Bangladesh. I shall not name parties; I shall not name individuals; I shall not name the governments. The Government is a continuing institution. I am prepared to take it as that. Now what I am going to say is factually undeniable. The Farakka agreement, concluded, you know, when, had two short comings. It did not safeguard the principal purpose of the Farakka Barrage in ensuring an adequate supply of water to Calcutta Port. Secondly it did not ensure any time-bound programme for the overall utilization of the waters of the basin. Now, these two are undeniable facts. Flowing from these facts, certain developments have taken place. There are two parts of the Farakka agreement as is known. One is the short term one and the other is the long term one. We have always taken the agreement in its entirety. These two aspects or these two parts are integrated with one another to

make the Whole agreement. Now, there is a tendency to treat this short-term agreement, or short-term use of waters, as something which is final, while the long-term aspect goes on languishing without any solution anywhere in sight, without even an attempt to come to a solution, without even an attempt to go into the details of the question, the feasibilities of the question or otherwise. This naturally is not acceptable to us. This is against the purport and spirit of the agreement itself. Therefore, we are at a very crucial point.

The Joint Rivers Commission has not been able to tackle this problem. The term of the short term agreement is coming to an end soon; and now we have to find ways and means of either salvaging the agreement, if that is possible, or we will have to see what alternative courses are open. This is the stage at which we find ourselves on Farakka. Let us not blame anyone. The question is between one country and another. Here is a problem and we are greatly concerned because it is not only Calcutta Port, but much more that is at stake on our side, Bihar is at stake, U. P. is at stake and the entire area which prospectively would have got water from the Ganga and its basin. So, it is not an easy matter for us. We cannot take it lightly and at the same time we know that even Bangladesh cannot take it lightly. Therefore it will be a test of political will; it will be a test of statesmanship and I am not able to presently envisage a right answer to the question, a right solution, for various reasons, this is the position and therefore we will have to be patient, we will have to be imaginative and we will have to go on with the effort. This will take time.

Coming to Sri Lanka, yesterday one hon. Member was rightly indignant because of the very very slow progress on the question of the stateless persons in Sri Lanka. I admit that for various reasons this delay has occurred. But I would like to assure the

[Shri P. V. Natsimha Rao]

House and the hon. Member that on our side we have neither been causing nor contributing to the delay. Nor do I say categorically that the other Government is responsible for it. There have been certain vicissitudes, certain developments which have slowed down the process. In regard to the fishermen of Rameswaram to whom the Hon'ble Member also made a reference, I would like to tell him that we are taking all possible steps. It is of course, just not possible to build a wall across the sea. We are taking whatever steps that are possible in order to see that our fishermen, even by mistake, do not stray into their waters and get into trouble. I had occasion to go to Rameswaram a year ago I personally saw the area and how difficult it is for our fishermen to really do their fishing within our waters and how difficult it is for them not to stray out by mistake; it is inevitable. The Kachhativu Agreement, on the whole, was considered to be reasonably fair to both the countries and once that agreement has been arrived at, we will have to put up with the consequences we will have to take steps to see that our fishermen do not suffer thereby.

Coming to Maldives, it is a very good picture that I would like to present to the House. Our relations have been very good and we have also recently appointed a resident Ambassador in Maldives. That shows the need for upgrading our relations and the manner in which our co-operation has been increasing year after year.

Now, finally—or may be pre-finally—Pakistan. It is known that I made more than a dozen statements in regard to Indo-Pak relations during the last one year. On an average, at least one statement was made every month. Month to month, we were making new statements in the sense we were reviewing the situation as it went on evolving. We did not make the same statement over and over.

We have sent our envoys. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan also came here. We have had visits, we have had discussions here, elsewhere, at the United Nations and other places. In relation to the actual meetings and contacts, I do not think that anything more could have been done. All that is physically possible to increase contacts, increase the frequency of discussions, increase the efforts to understand each other, has been done. I am not sure that anything more could have been done. Now, what is the real question? The real question is that Pakistan has to make up its mind. Ultimately, it is that simple because as I stated just a few days back in a statement in answer to a Call Attention, the attempt now is to suck Pakistan into something. Is Pakistan prepared to be sucked into it! Is Pakistan prepared to keep out of it! Is Pakistan prepared to play the role of a non-aligned country, pure and simple! This is the real question. I did mention this in my statement. I made a guarded statement, yes, because things are fluid. At least on that day, things appeared to be fluid. I did not want to say anything which would have the effect of pushing Pakistan into something. So, while we protested, while we expressed our concern to the authorities of the U.S. Administration—this very day—31st March—our Ambassador is to meet Gen. Haig—we have not relented on our efforts. We have done everything that is possible to make them understand that this does not merely involve giving a few weapons to Pakistan. This goes much farther. This means creation of tensions. This means a new arms race in this region. This means a set-back to the normalisation of relations between Pakistan and India and it has so many other repercussions. We have told the U. S. so, we have told Pakistan so, And, we are hoping against hope, because during the last three or four days, even that hope has dimmed a little; but we are sta

ail. However, I would like to submit to the House that if Pakistan insists being armed to the teeth and the US Administration insists on arming Pakistan to the teeth once again well, all I have to say is that it is Pakistan's teeth. I have nothing more to say on that.

But so far as India is concerned, I would like to assure the House that we shall continue to be vigilant, we shall continue to be aware of what is happening and we shall continue to be aware of what we have to do in relation to what is happening.

**SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV:**  
Are you proposing to meet Mr. Haig or are you asking the Ambassador to meet him!

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO :**  
This question was put to me the other day. We don't run like that. The point is that there is a setting in which two Foreign Ministers can meet. I have said that meetings will take place in due course. But I must say that any panic displayed on behalf of the Government of India would be counter-productive.

**SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV :**  
It is not out of panic. It is a serious situation.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:**  
Absolutely, I am serious about it. I have said so. I have not ruled out meetings. I have not ruled out discussions. I have not ruled out any of those things. But the point is, there is always setting, a kind of preparation that has to be made. It is not as though they do not know our concerns. It is not as though they are studying this problem for the first time. These decisions are made deliberately and it is not as if they do not know what India stands for. But still all efforts will be made. This

promise, this commitment, I would like to reiterate to the House.

I now pass on to the next question which has figured very prominently in the debate, viz, the security environment around us—the Indian Ocean, West Asia, South West Asia, South East Asia and our surroundings. Sir, again, I would not like to repeat all that has been said. I entirely agree with the analysis given by the hon. Members and with the very grave situation that they have perceived all around us along with its grave consequences. The only aspect which becomes relevant in this connection is the aspect of detente. And detente becomes meaningful only when it leads to disarmament. These are all interconnected. For 35 years the developed countries were able to develop in peace while the developing countries outside that club, had hundreds of skirmishes, hundreds of wars—small, big, medium all kinds of wars—and the arms such as they came, emanated from the developed countries. The developing countries were too un-developed to manufacture arms themselves; this goes without saying and it does not need great intelligence to come to this conclusion. While there was peaceful development in one part of the world, there was complete ruination in the other, major, part of the world. This has been happening for the last 35 years. When detente was mooted for the first time, the leaders of the third world said there and then that detente confined to Europe alone would not work; detente has to be global. The implication is that a limited detente within Europe would that they will not fight in Europe but will continue to fight through proxies everywhere. That is what it means. That is what was pointed out by almost all the leaders of the third world. This fell on deaf ears. It was fine while the detente was on. Even the American novels described consultations between the Soviet Union and the American



[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

Administration at different levels—technology being exchanged, data being processed and exchanged, etc.—as a great euphoric era. Incidentally, while the American novels the US Administration and the Soviet Union were acting very chummy, the common enemy, very ironically was China. Then came the reversal of detente. And now find some of the other novels conjuring up fights between the Americans and the Russians on the moon—not just on the earth. I am straying a bit in to the field of literature because I am sure that this literature, every best selling novel which sells millions of copies, gets into the psyche of the people, of the readers. That is why, it becomes important. In one of these, a picture, is conjured up than there is a great war between China and Russia, the United States is approached by both for arbitration. I have nothing against the writers I have nothing against the literature. I have nothing against imagination as such. But the point is that this is fiction which takes into account no facts of life. It is pure fiction. We can forget it. But we cannot forget the fact that while events change, the propensities of the people, the reactions of the people also to these events are likely to change. That is why, if a particular psychosis is created in a particular country, it will be very difficult to get out of that psychosis. Perhaps modern wars, or modern conflicts, are being continued and conducted on the basis of psychosis, more than anything else. Therefore, the whole atmosphere is so polluted it is so vitiated, that today even the talk of peace sounds unreal. The non-alignment movement says that there is only one way to exist, and that is to co-exist, there is no other way. Shri Biju Patnaik says it is because you are weak that you are votaries of non-alignment. Non-alignment is taken as being weak, one is non-aligned because one is weak. This concept of non-align-

ment movement is itself so faulty, so wrong historically, that at least in this country it needs to be corrected. I am afraid, we cannot really continue in this misconception.

The brunt of this reversal of detente has fallen on the Indian Ocean, because it is the nearest, beyond the confines of the erstwhile *detense* area. All of them are operating, and they have created vested interests for themselves in this ; they have an excuse which they are trying to exploit to the full. What does the Indian Ocean mean to India ? This is one thing which we have to understand. We used to talk of '*Chats Sagara Parvatanam*'. It is not only to-day, but for ages, we have taken the Indian Ocean as the medium through which India radiated in all directions. All that India stood for, travelled far and wide through this medium and if this medium is polluted, if this medium is viated, I am afraid, the first victim of this is going to be India. Therefore, we cannot remain complacent while this is happening in the Indian Ocean.

Yesterday, Shri Chavan rightly raised the question of Diego Garcia. I admit that there is nothing comparable to Diego Garcia anywhere in the Indian Ocean. Yes. But why was it omitted from the Non-aligned Declaration ? Was it omitted because somebody twisted our arm ? Was it omitted because we wanted to please somebody ? Was it omitted because India, at that point of time, was no longer interested in the Indian Ocean ? These were not the reasons at all. As Shri Chavan again pointed out yesterday, this omission was the subject of particularly heated debate, and it took a very long time to come to a conclusion on this particular subject, when it came to a consensus.

We are hopefully going to have a conference on the Indian Ocean in Colombo. The question is, when you want the United States to be present at that Conference—although I am not sure that the United States is going to attend it, mind you ; I am not saying that I have ensured the participation of the United States—by omitting Diego Garcia, while nothing has been lost on the fact and on the ground, we have desisted from giving an excuse for the United States to keep out. This was done, as was pointed out, at the particular instance of Sri Lanka, who happens to be the host country for the Conference on Indian Ocean, and we had to respect the wishes of Sri Lanka. Now you will ask, having done all this, is the United States going to attend at all? Is this Conference going to be held at all? Your guess is as good as mine in this respect, because, I am sorry to say, that the prospects seem to be receding. I have been reporting on this question from time to time to this House ; I had never sounded too confident but now, I am sorry, I have to sound even less confident, because things are shaping that way. There are certain pretexts that have come and in the light of those pretexts the presences in the Indian Ocean are being raised. Why should the Conference not be held in 1981? Suppose it is held in 1983, or in 1984, nobody will probably have any objection because by that time whosoever wants to bring his presence up to the point he wants, would have done that. Then what are you going to have the Conference about? It becomes a *fait accompli*, it becomes just a gathering of persons who gather and disperse.

So, if this Conference has to be held, it has to be held in 1981. It is of the essence that it is held in 1981. Otherwise its utility will dwindle. I am not sure that we are not going to hold it. But the choice before us is—what do we do if some one does not want to attend? Will you have the Conference not with-

standing, or will you allow the Conference to be vetoed or delayed by one whose presence is absolutely necessary? Now, this is what is called *dharma sankat*. This decision has not been taken yet. It will have to be taken as quickly as possible because there is not much time to lose. If we do intend having it, and if we do decide to have it, preparations will have to be started immediately. So, while the position regarding the Conference is none too certain, we have to take a very difficult decision in regard to facilitating, as far as possible, the holding of this Conference and the attendance of those whose presence is considered absolutely necessary.

Sir, this is the picture which is presented in the Indian Ocean. The armament race is continuing. This is well known. We all know a little English, but if some one tells us the names of the arms and the weapons, the weapons I am afraid we won't understand them. They are all English names, but we really do not understand what they mean what they cannot, what they stand for, what they are capable of doing. This is the position where we stand and we find the armament race going on uninhibited and presenting a jig saw puzzle to all of us.

There are theories of deterrence. It is very difficult to say who is deterring whom, I think, I am deterring the other man, the other man thinks he is deterring me. What we are, in effect, doing is deterring ourselves. I am deterring myself because I am always thinking of him. Because of this obsession, I am not able to do anything better. I am going on increasing my expenditure on armaments, thinking that by doing so I am stopping him. I am not stopping him, I am only stopping myself. My capacity to use this money for something good—this is what I am stopping, not the other fellow. This is the illogic of the theory of deterrence which has

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

been so much bandied about days. So, sir we have to understand that this position is to be faced by the non-aligned world because, as is well-known, firstly they are to be victims and secondly, if they want to resist it, they represent the majority of mankind and therefore, they alone have the right to resist; they have to create this strength, the will, within themselves by which, if they resist it, it will not be possible for those who are indulging in this suicidal race to continue with it. It has to be a moral force as Panditji always said. There is no physical force, there is no military force to stop it. But in this there is one very important factor which has come in, in the last one year. And that is Afghanistan. We have made it quite clear that we are against the presence of foreign troops in any country. Now this has been variously interpreted. Why don't you name Afghanistan? Why don't you name Kampuchea? Why do you say in "any country." My answer is, I mean "any country" when I say "any country". I do not mean Afghanistan alone. I do not mean Kampuchea alone. While there are some others who would like to have different prescriptions for different countries, I do not....  
(interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :  
Not at all.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : (interruptions) I do not want any foreign troops in any country. At this very Non-Aligned Foreign Minister's Conference what has been lost sight of an achievement of which we could legitimately be proud, is the paragraph on Kampuchea. I will briefly show what we have been able to achieve by consensus.

In the United Nations General Assembly in 1980 when the question of Kampuchea came up, the prospect was very clear, because we knew

what the majority would say. They said pure and simple:—

“Total withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea within a specific time frame to be verified by the United Nations.”

I am reading only the relevant portion.

Now compare this with this paragraph from the Non-Aligned Declaration:—

“Reviewing the situation in South East Asia, the ministers expressed grave concern over the continuing conflicts and tensions in the region particularly as some of the States are Members of the movement of non-aligned countries; they re-affirmed their support for the principles of non-interference in the affairs of sovereign States and the inadmissibility of the use of force against sovereign States; they warned that there was a real danger of the tensions in and around Kampuchea escalating over all wider area.”

and this is important:—

“They were convinced of the urgent need to de-escalate these tensions through a comprehensive political solution which would provide for the withdrawal of all foreign forces thus ensuring full respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all States in the region including Kampuchea.”

The difference between these two texts is self evident. This is a measure of what may very humbly claim to have achieved at the Conference of the Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers. This was agreed to by Singapore. This was agreed to by the ASEAN countries who are members of the Movement. When we say that we do not want foreign troops in any country, it is not for fear of naming

a country that we are saying this. We are saying this because we mean it and this is what has to be understood. Unfortunately this has not been understood by many, including some Members in this House.

I now come to the economic aspect which again has figured very prominently here. But before doing that I would not be satisfied if I do not add a foot-note to what has happened in Afghanistan. This seems to have entered the psychology, entered the thoughts of people here and elsewhere. References have been made repeatedly. I would like to tell the House what has happened in regard to Afghanistan; why and how it has happened is for the House to decide.

In 1980 when this Government came into power we spelt out our basic stand, namely, that we are against the presence of foreign troops in any country. I will not go into that. Within one month the Soviet Foreign Minister came here. We told him the same thing. In May, there were certain proposals from the Afghan Government carrying within themselves the element of withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan.

Sir, immediately after the Soviet troops went into Afghanistan, what was the reaction every where in the world? one reaction was, very stridently and very prominently featured everywhere in the media, that Soviet Union wants to go to the warm waters of the Gulf and therefore, it has entered Afghanistan. I am not going into the details of that. I am only dwelling upon the question of how everyone reacted to this incident.

I had occasion to say in one of my statements in Parliament that we have to sift. There are three aspects of the question. There is the local national aspect; there is the regional aspect and there is the global aspect.

There were proposals from the other side. We urged upon Pakistan; we urged upon everybody to come and sit together. I had occasion to refer to this in last years debate also. I referred to the Mahabharata, when they fought in the day and negotiated in the night. But what was the difficulty? There was no will and therefore, there was no way. That could be one aspect. The stated difficulty was, "If I go and talk to Babrak Karma, would amount to recognition of Babrak Karmal". But from the other side came the reply. "We are prepared to talk as members of the party. We will not have a label of the Government if you so wish. We will come as leaders of the PDPA." Then what? It was not possible to say "no" when the other side was prepared to talk without any pre-conditions. We wanted talks without any pre-conditions.

We went on harping on this because we wanted to sift these aspects. We were afraid that once it is regionalised or globalised the problem becomes infinitely more difficult to solve. If you localise it may be after a few meetings across the table it will be possible to see out way to a solution.

What has happened now? There were some possibilities of talks starting. On these Ultra-technical grounds of recognition, the talks did not take place. They went right upto the brink; maybe, they went upto the table and they shied away.

Then, a very peculiar thing happened. The United Nations had already been seized of the problem. In January, 1980, a vote had taken place. The matter was brought to the United Nations General Assembly a second time. Why? It is for the House to decide and for the hon. Members to imagine what could have been the reasons. I am not against the United Nations General Assembly. You can take anything there any number of times. But the more you take it to a place where it has already been voted by division, the less is the possibility of this matter

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

being sorted out at that forum. This is commonsense. This should have been very clear to anyone.

Now, the Secretary-General has been asked to name a representative. Again, an ultra-technical question has arisen. What is this gentleman to do? Is he to preside over the talks? Is he to simply sit and watch the talks or is he to take part now and then? What is his capacity? What are his functions?

I am relating the whole story so that you can compare these technicalities with the real issue. What was the issue and what are they fighting about? What is meanwhile happening to the people of Afghanistan? Now, Mr. Brezhnev has come out with a statement. He says, "If Afghanistan is to be discussed along with the Gulf question, we have no objection." What the other side wanted, he has now agreed to. The question has become regionalised. Tomorrow it can become globalised and then what happens?

Now, when is the Gulf question proposed to be discussed? Any idea? Your guess is as good as mine. Obviously, therefore, the question of Afghanistan may now remain in cold-storage as a part of the gulf question. This is the prospect they have brought Afghanistan to. We were saying from the beginning "Please remove it, scoop it out of larger issues. Make it a national question and discuss it. What all we want is the withdrawal of the foreign troops. That is what you said. That is what we want. Come on. Let us see how we do." Instead, technicalities creep in and, today, the matter has become infinitely more difficult of solution. I hope the representative of the Secretary-General is somehow able to make some breakthrough. We wish him well. But what I have to submit to the House is this

sequence of events which has made matters much more difficult.

I now pass on to the economic question which again.....

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :**  
No comments about China.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO :**  
Sir, I would have made some comment, had he not spoken in the last. He produced or seemed to produce some very old books, as very fresh evidence! I have made a statement on that. I have nothing to add to the statement. In that statement, I have categorically made it clear that after going through all the evidence available, we are convinced that we are in the right and what we consider the border between the two countries is the right border. That is our stand.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :**  
I am quoting from a publication of July, 1980. It is there.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO:**  
My statement, if I remember right, was also made in July. It disposed of the cobwebs that were sought to be created or all the objections that were sought to be raised, all the new light that was sought to be shed; we have made things quite clear and there is nothing more to add. Therefore, that is an end of the matter.

We want normalisation with China. I have made that clear. As to that normalisation means, I have also made that clear and I have to add as a parenthesis that the last two or three months, there have again been some exchanges. A Parliamentary Delegation has been invited to China from India and, of course, we have our common friends shuttling between the two countries all the time. So, there is nothing to worry about.

On the economic question, it is true that again the picture is very gloomy indeed. The Special Session of the United Nations which wanted to get the global round going the North-South dialogue started, has failed. All these facts are known.

Now, I will not take much time of the House. But I would like to pinpoint certain aspects of this North-South dialogue which I think try to break new ground not adhering to the old clichés, realising the need to break new ground and think in new directions.

The military expenditure that is being incurred by the world powers today is well-known. The Brandt Commission report and several other reports have brought out the absolute absurdity of going in for an armament race of this magnitude, while 60 to 70 per cent of mankind is wallowing in poverty. Therefore, that argument, is absolutely final; it is impeccable. There is nothing to add to that.

Sir, what unfortunately has not been understood is this concept of interdependence which has been adumbrated at the United Nations forums and also in the Brandt Commission report. This is something which it is not easy to understand. I will just read a small portion. This is what Willy Brandt says :

“The issue today is not only or even, mainly one of aid, rather of basic changes in the world economy to help developing countries pay their own way....”

It is not charity that they want; make them pay their own way. “.....and the countries of the North, given their increasing inter-dependence with the South, themselves need international economic reform to ensure their own future prosperity.”

So, it is mutual. Interdependence is something which the developed

countries also have to realise.

“The North-South debate is often described as if the rich were being asked to make sacrifices in response to the demands of the poor. We reject this view. The world is now a fragile and interlocking system, whether for its people, its ecology or its resources. Many individual societies have settled their inner conflicts by accommodation to protect the weak and to promote the principles of justice becoming stronger as a result. The world too can become stronger by becoming a just and humane society. If it fails in this, it will move towards its own destruction.”

This is the central piece of the whole thing. If we ask ourselves as to how many nations are convinced of this interdependence, we have to come to the conclusion that their number is very, very small; they could be counted on fingers. This being the case, if every citizen of a developed country thinks only of himself, only of what he is going to get in the next Budget, only of what he is going to get by voting a particular Party to power when election time comes, if this is the range of his thinking, it is futile to expect any realisation of interdependence in those countries; and if the people are not convinced, it is equally futile to expect any political Party, in open societies where elections take place, to go against the wishes of, or the trends of thinking among, the people. Therefore, it is a very big question, not merely confined to the Heads of States, not merely confined to the Governments, but it envelops all the people of all the countries. Now, has this effort been done? If we ask ourselves this question, the answer is “no”; we have not done it. But strangely and remarkably, there is one person who has done it 40 years ago, and that was Mahatma Gandhi. He went to the Lancashire mill people and said something which is absolutely classic in the annals of political economy. He went to the people who were affected.

[Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao]

How many would dare to go there. I do not know. He goes to them and gives them a straight talk.

"Pray, tell me what I am to do with the fifth of the human race living on the verge of starvation and devoid of all sense of self-respect...."

These are his words.

"It should occupy the attention even of the unemployed of Lancashire. You have told us of the help Lancashire gave us during the famine of 1899-1900. What return can we render but the blessings of the poor."

This is what he says. So, this interdependence between the poor people of India and the workers of Lancashire was first established by Mahatma Gandhi.

Not only that, he went into the intricacies of the question so long ago as 1931.

"There is no boycott of British cloth as distinct from other foreign cloth since the 5th March when the truce was signed. As a nation we are pledged to boycott all foreign cloth. But in case of an honourable settlement between England and India, that is, in case of a permanent truce, I should not hesitate to give preference to Lancashire cloth over all other foreign cloth, to the extent that we may need to supplement our cloth and on agreed terms."

We want to supplement our cloth. We are prepared to take your cloth provided there is an understanding. Then he went on to say, "But how much relief we can give you, I do not know... You must recognise that all the markets of the world are now not open to you. What you have done, all other nations are doing to-day."

Sir, he said, "All are doing the same thing, the same exploitation. So, where do you stand, my dear friends ?"

This is what he said to the people of Lancashire, those who were themselves in difficulty due to unemployment as a result of the Swadeshi Movement here. Then he says :

"I am pained at the unemployment here, but here there is no starvation or semi-starvation. In India we have both."

Now, can we imagine a person going to those very people in what mood they would have been, one can imagine—and telling them the whole truth in this candid manner, in this absolutely straight manner.

This is the kind of dialogue that is needed to-day, between the rich and the poor. This is the kind of dialogue that is needed between the North and the South. I am not able to say whether this will materialise, but it will have to materialise.

The President of Tanzania is here. He is one of the respected leaders of Africa. There are several heads of State like this, who can infuse some re-thinking on this question and that is why this limited summit in Mexico is being planned. Now, there are many reports about when it is going to be held, and how it is going to be held. I will not take the time of the House by going into those questions. But this limited summit, mini summit as it is called we have an easy word for everything is going to address itself without any agenda, without any agreement, without any negotiations, without anything of the kind. It will be a meeting of minds. It is intended to be a meeting of minds. Twentyone or twentytwo or twenty-three Heads of State, or Government come together. The expectation and hope is that this barrier between the South and the North which has been created artificially and also as a result of historical circumstances, will at

least be partly demolished when these people meet in a small group of twentyone or twentythree. It is not that there is any discrimination but it is only because it is possible to do some serious thinking only in a smaller group that this is being planned.

I now come to the last portion of what I wanted to submit to the House. I said that for the eighties there is a need for a new dialogue, a new line of thinking. I am not claiming any infallibility, I am not claiming that his alone can be the thinking. But there are certain experiences of past decades which we can ignore only at our peril. One is that there is no alternative to the non-aligned movement. Let the decade of the eighties see a fresh strengthening of the non-aligned movement so that it becomes a really crucial input in international affairs, much more crucial than it is to-day. No one can suggest an alternative to this as far as I can see and, therefore, this has to be done. This is easier said than done because we know how it is. We have seen the difficulties. But, I have no doubt that the non-aligned movement, which has now completed twenty years, has come of age; it has attained a certain maturity on the basis of which, and on the strength of which, it could go ahead with greater confidence.

Sir, I have not read about any movement which could run for twenty years without any military sanction, without any other kind of sanction, without any office, without any business rules which has still, for twenty years, remained united and come to be the most purposeful movement to-day. Compared to the non-aligned, I would like to ask : What are the aligned doing ? They are only preparing for the destruction of the world and, if there is anyone who is trying to save the world, it is the non-aligned movement and, that too without any of these instruments, That is why it is said :

सिद्धिं सत्त्वे, भवती महात्स नोद्धपकरणे ।

It does not depend on instruments, it depends on the will to do something. So, the non-aligned movement has exhibited this will for the last twenty years ; it has not been smooth-sailing awlays ; it has faltered ; it has stumbled and fallen down, only to get up and go ahead and this is good experience for any movement. No movement has smooth-sailing throughout. If it does, once it goes against a hurdle, perhaps it will never rise. That is not the case with the non-aligned movement and, therefore, the first pre-requisite of the eighties, the decade of the eighties, has to be the strengthening of the non-aligned movement.

What do we have outside the movement ? We have only, as I said, attempts—intentional or unintentional, intended or unintended—of bringing the world to a disaster.

Then, there is another thing also going on, another process of dividing the non-aligned world. One does not know what they get out of this. The only guarantee of peace that is available to mankind is being torn to bits, or is sought to be torn to bits, by weakening the unity of the nations. As pointed out yesterday by Shri Chavan Ji, this Conference in Delhi could take some legitimate pride in having kept the movement united. If you only compare it with the prognosis that was made all over the world, in all the media, then it was an anticlimax for both. Therefore, it must have come as an astonishment to them. We have to convince all these small countries that beyond the movement, outside the movement, they have nothing but extinction. There is nothing for them because to take the umbrella of Great Power or to take the protection of armaments as such is, as I said, to have a canopy of clouds to save your-self from rain. This is a self-defeating process and they will have to understand this.



[Shri P. V. Narasinha Rao]

The other very important point which the decade of the eighties will have to understand or make others understand is that technology has subordinated ideology and, that technology has become neutral to ideology. What one system can do the other system also can do likewise. So, the war of ideology, the tussle between the systems, has lost much of its meaning. It will be very difficult for people to understand this or to agree to this. But, I am making a statement which I implore Members of the House to consider, to ponder over.

There is constant talk of Confidence-building measures. But what do we start with? Do we start with armaments? If one system thinks that it is saving mankind from the other system, it is only deluding itself. But both system are showing the signs, the unmistakable symptoms of their own respective limitations within themselves. Is it possible for the systems to co-exist or even to come into the mood of Co-existence? Therefore, in the 1980s the very easy formula of systems which we are all used to, I an used to, you are all used to, will not work. We will have to see that every system, even without making an admission, even without making a public confession, will have to look inwards and see where it is cracking. The world abounds in examples of such cracking. I dont have to name the countries. This is happening today and if we do not go to the root of this and try to evolve a system which is good for co-existence it will not be possible for the 1980s to pass off peacefully.

Therefore, I would just read four sentences from a statement made by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. Long ago he said very clearly :

"Millions of people believe in what is called Western capitalism. Millions also believe in Communism. But there are many

millions who are not committed to either of these ideologies and yet seek, in friendship with others, a better life and a more hopeful future."

Therefore, this is what we have to diagonalise. Where is the rot setting? Where has it set in and how can mankind take it out? May be old habits die hard. We have been brought up in certain systems and it may not easy for us to think beyond the system but at least the new generation will have to do it. I have no doubt that the responsibility is going to fall on the new generation which, I think, is not committed to one system or the other irrevocably.

Therefore, Sir, there has to be total commitment to the concept of and the reality of an indivisible world—indivisible in all respects—in peace, in progress, in prosperity and, if not, in co-extinction. This is the indivisibility of the world. Today we are at the cross-roads. I have no doubt that good sense will prevail and mankind will take the right road.

Sir, I have taken much time. I would in the end appeal to all the hon. Members to withdraw their cut motions and see that the Demands are passed unanimously.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :  
If the House agrees, I will put all the cut motions together to the vote of the House.

Cut Motions Nos. 1 to 11, 15 to 21, 23, 25 to 32 and 34 to 66 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :  
I shall now put the Demand for Grant relating to the Ministry of External Affairs to the Vote of the House. The question is :

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the order paper be granted to the President out of the

Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1982, in respect of the head of

demand entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 31 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.'

*The motion was adopted*  
Demand for grants 1981-82 in respect of all Ministry of external Affairs voted by Lok Sabha.

No of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grants on account voted by the House on 13-3- 1981	Amount of Demand for Grant voted by the House
1	2	3	4
	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS			
31	Ministry of External Affairs	25,73,27,000 4,78,51,000	128,66,34,000 23,92,56,000

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER :  
Now the House will take up Discussion and Voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Petroleum, Chemicals and Fertilizers.

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : (हिंसा) इसके पहले घर मंत्री का स्टेटमेंट होगा।  
(अवधान)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTEMT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH) : I said that we will make a statement before the House adjourns. That is what I have said.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :  
(Diamond Hourbar) 4'O clock. that was what was decided.

श्री मनो राम बागड़ी : 4 बजे का समय निश्चित हुआ था। घर मंत्री जी ने 4 बजे स्टेटमेंट देने का वचन दिया था। यह रेडियो पर आया है (अवधान)

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH : I said, he will make a statement before the House adjourns. Let the Petroleum Ministry's Demands Discussion be taken up just now.

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : रेडियो पर 2 बजे खबर आई है कि घर मंत्री दिल्ली में बच्चों की हत्या के बारे में सदन में 4 बजे बयान देंगे। क्या उनका बयान तैयार नहीं हुआ है? (अवधान)

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH I did not say it. Please don't mis-quote me. I said, by this evening. I said, the Minister will make a statement before the House adjourns. Please don't misquote me.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Will he make a statement at the end of the day ?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH : What I said was that the Minister will make a statement by this evening. What I am suggesting is, let the Discussion on the the Demands of the Ministry of Petroleum Chemicals and Fertilizers be taken up now. Before the House adjourns, he will make the statement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : All right, now we take up the Demands relating to the Ministry of Petroleum.....

श्री मनो राम बागड़ी : नहीं, नहीं।  
(अवधान)

**SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES** (Muzaffarpur). Why cannot he make the statement just now, Sir ?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** There seems to be some difficulty. If it is ready, they will themselves come.

**SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES :** It is ready.

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH :** I have promised that the Statement will be made before the House adjourns.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** Before the House adjourns.

**SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES :** But, Sir, the Minister came prepared to make a statement. Let the statement be made by him. Let him present the statement.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :** Why should the House be treated lightly, Sir ?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** Nobody treats the House so lightly as you do !

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH :** Mr. Fernandes, I do not treat the House lightly. What we have said is that we will make the statement this evening.

**SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES :** Why not now ? The Minister came ready to make a statement, at 4.0' clock. Has he come to make the statement or not ? Let him say 'No'.

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH :** How do you know ?

**SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES :** He came to make a statement at 4 O' clock.

(Interruptions)

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी : मंत्री महोदय इस बात को इतने हलके ढंग से न लें।

सुबह इतने इतने जगान हुआ है। सरकार हर बात को उजसा देती है। (बदबखान)

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH :** Sir, if it is your desire that the Minister has to make a statement just now, we have no objection.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** I think he is already ready with the statement. So, let it be made. I request the hon. Minister to make the statement.

STATEMENT RE : REPORTED DEATH OF A BOY DUE TO SHOOTING BY POLICE ON A RUNAWAY TAXI IN DELHI ON 30-3-1981

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA) : Sir, with a view to checking the rising trend of crime, the Delhi Police have adopted, measures like patrolling by wirelest fitted vehicles, make Bandi a strategic points, and posting of pickets at vulnerable points. Barriers have been placed at selected places, where during the night, vehicles are checked. In the early hours of 30th March, 1981, a Taxi Car No. DLT 5236, came from Azadpur side towards the General Store Police Picket. It was signalled to slow down for purposes of checking. Instead of doing so the driver of the vehicle hastily reversed with the intention of speeding away from a side road. On seeing the side road similarly blocked, he drove straight at a very high speed towards the policemen on checking duty. Head Constable Mohinder Singh narrowly escaped being hit by the vehicle and Constable Subhash Singh who was standing next to a drum, used for checking purposes was hit by the same drum, on his right leg. Constable Subhash Singh fell on the ground due to the impact. The car dragged the drum along for more than 12 feet.