

श्री राम विलास पासवान : तब मैं वाक आउट करता हूँ। कम से कम लोग जान तो जायेंगे कि पानी के प्रश्न पर मैंने वाक आउट किया है।

15.54 hrs.

At that time Shri Ram Vilas Paswas
Left the House

सभापति महोदय : वाक आउट नहीं है, उनको काम है इसलिये जा रहें हैं।

(xx) Need to fix Pay Scales of MITCO
labourers according to Central
Government Scales.]

श्री रीतलाल प्रसाद वर्मा (कोडरमा):

सभापति महोदय, भारतीय अन्नक व्यापार निगम (मिटको) केन्द्र विभिन्न शाखाओं के सभी कर्मचारी केन्द्रीय वेतनमान आधार पर माहवारी वेतन पाते हैं किन्तु मिटकों के अन्नक-संसादित करने वाले कारखानों के लगभग 1,000 मजदूर, बिहार सरकार द्वारा निर्धारित न्यूनतम मजदूरी पाने के लिए विवश हैं। वे 1972 से अभी तक माहवारी वेतन लेने के हकदार नहीं हैं। वे अन्न नियमों के अधीन मिलने वाली सुविधाओं से वंचित हैं। यह सौतिला व्यवहार है। मेरी वाग्गिज्य एवं अन्न मन्त्री से पुरजोर अपील है कि अन्नक व्यापार निगम के 1000 मजदूरों का मासिक वेतनमान केन्द्रीय स्तर पर निर्धारित किया जाय ताकि उन्हें क्रांति कारी कदम उठाने के लिए विवश नहीं होना पड़े।

15.55 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE : INTER-
NATIONAL SITUATION AND POLICY
OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN
RELATION THERETO

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA
RAO) : I beg to move :

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

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved:

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

There is a substitute Motion. Dr.
Subramaniam Swamy.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY
(Bombay North East) : I beg to move :

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

"This House, having considered
the present international situation and
the policy of the Government of
India in relation thereto, urges upon
the Government to restructure the
foreign policy giving primacy to
friendship with neighbours and to
equidistance from the two super
powers."

I hope, Sir, you will accept that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Satya-
sadhan Chakraborty.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
I can move this motion and dis-
cuss it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Your turn will come.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): Mr. Chairman we are discussing the Motion moved by the hon. External Affairs Minister. It is now three minutes to four. Yesterday, the Deputy-Speaker wanted all the bills to be passed so that we could take up the international situation early. But today I find that the Chair declared lunch break and so many special mentions had been admitted and the Lowry Bill is yet to be introduced. Now, the ruling party members showed their interest in discussing the international situation. But today I find that they are not so keen otherwise.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBERS : No, no. We are all keen.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : We started now. We should have started earlier. My only submission is that we should have started earlier.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Will CPM disagree with the Government's foreign policy or not ?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : You will know, after hearing me. Mr. Chairman, Sir, you will agree that the international situation today is such that all right thinking people feel doubly concerned about it. This House has discussed the international situation many a time, and it was pointed out that the clouds of war are hovering. And there is a danger that the world may be engulfed in a war which will destroy the whole civilization. The humanity may be exterminated from this earth. Sir, this danger can never be minimised.

16.00 hrs.

Today we find that there is an attempt to legitimise the use of nuclear weapons in the name of limited nuclear war. A constant propaganda is going on in the West particularly in the United States of America and UK that nuclear war is winable. It will remain limited to certain zones and there is no danger of the whole world being destroyed. Not only that. The most dangerous idea that is propagated is that even after the war, sufficient number of human beings will be there and they will be able to live after this devastation. You will agree with me that this is a very false theory. But the propaganda is done with a purpose to make nuclear war acceptable to the people also so that it gains legitimacy. Now the world is also spending, as I mentioned earlier during the debate on the Demands of the External Affairs Ministry, more than 600 billion dollars on armaments. This is a heavy burden on the developing countries. This arms race is compelling the developing countries to squander their resources for the purposes of defence and security. Had there been disarmament or halt of this arms race and the world more peaceful, the scarce resources of these countries could have been spent on development, planning to raise the standard of living of the people, to eradicate poverty, illiteracy and ill-health.

The process of de-colonisation started many years back and gradually most of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America gained political independence. But even after this de-colonisation we find that the colonial, economic, political and cultural structures remain intact, because these structures were built by the imperialists and coloniatists to maintain their dominance in all the spheres-political, military, economic, cultural. Unfortunately, even after this liberation or political independence, the economic dependence remain. And because the

people of the Third World countries have become politically conscious and the imperialists have become more intelligent and subtle and they try to control these countries in indirect ways.

In the non-aligned summit rightly the leaders emphasised that there should be a new economic order. Why? Because the whole international economic structure is to maintain a system whereby the developed western countries could plunder the resources of the developing countries in the name of trade. Because of unequal condition, the trade has become a plunder. And that is why there was a demand for the restructuring of the economic institutions. I would once again like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that today some 20 per cent of the population of the world is enjoying the lion's share of the resources of the world. The industrialised lot has a monopoly over the resources of the world. They consume more energy, more food. Actually, if you look at the world, you will find the world is divided into haves and-nots the industrialised haves and the developing have-nots- and the developed industrialised countries headed by the United States of America, want to maintain this system, want to maintain their privileged position and that is why they are preparing for war. Previously in those days there was the gun-boat diplomacy. Even today we find the same thing. This preparation for war will help them in two ways. Firstly, they are investing the resources for war preparations. It was Eisenhower who pointed out about the military industrial complex in the United States of America. Through this war production they can keep their economy going. Secondly, they can impose heavy burden on the developing countries and that is why it is necessary for them that they create such conditions in different parts of the world so that the developing countries are compelled to divert their resources for war

purposes and they also produce guns so that we are compelled to by guns; and we do not produce butter. This is the system they want to sustain. That is why they are interested in maintaining the status quo. The United States, the United Kingdom, France, Italy all these developed western imperialistic powers want to maintain the status quo—the position of dominance and dependency. That is why you will see that all their activities are directed to that end—first of all create the conditions of destabilisation, create the conditions of uncertainty and also prepare to intervene, whenever it is necessary to intervene in the interest of the imperialist powers. With that aim they have developed the Rapid Development Force. What is this Rapid Development Force? It is only the mobile interventionist force of the United States of America. They can intervene in any place, they can carry the soldiers, they can operate and they can come back. You will find that whenever it was found necessary, they intervened in Lebanon. Not only intervention, there was open occupation of Granada. This is the policy of the imperialist powers. This is the world that we find today divided between haves and have-nots. The developing countries are trying desperately to fight the economic exploitation of the developed countries, the imperialist powers.

DR. SUBRAMAINAM SWAMY :
Sir, will Professor Chakraborty allow me an intervention? Sir, while on intervention, he should also explain the Afghanistan intervention,

SHRI SATAYASADHAN
CHAKRABORTY : Don't worry. To your satisfaction I will explain that also.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, how did the British rule in India? They ruled

(Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty)

India because they had the collaborationists in India. The Rajas and Maharajas were the collaborationists. Those who were collaborationists were given certain privileges. Today also if you look at the third world countries you will find that there are some collaborationists. And these imperialist powers want collaborators. Who are the collaborators? They are mainly those States where the social base of the ruling class is very narrow—either the military dictators or the kings or the military junta. Why? It is because they do not represent the people, just as in India the Rajas and Maharajas did not represent the people. So, they collaborated with the British imperialism as against the people of India. So also today there are regimes which are collaborating with the United States of America. These are reactionary regimes and they are nothing but the stalking horse of the American imperialism.

DR. SUBRAMAINAM SWAMY :
And who collaborated in 1942 Sir ?

MR. CHAIRMAN No intervention please. I will not allow any intervention unless he yields.

DR. SUBRAMAINAM SWAMY :
But who collaborated in 1942 ?

SHRI RAMAVTAR SHASTRI
(Patna) : Sir, he was not born at that time, So he does not know anything of it.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Mr. Chairman, Sir, in today's world we find when the developing countries demand that a portion of the resources of the developed countries should be transferred to the developing countries for their development, there is a stiff resistance by the developed countries and the imperialist countries. You will be surprised to hear that the United States wishes that some countries, because their population

is high and they are not in a position to utilise their resources, they do not deserve economic help and that they should be abandoned to perish. Only those countries will be helped where the population is small and where they are ready to collaborate with the United States of America. This is the dangerous theory they have propagated.

Sir, our country is the leader of the non-aligned movement. (In the Conference of the non-aligned Countries we rightly pointed out about the imbalance in the international situation.) We are eager to conduct the North-South dialogue to have a world where there will be more equitable distribution of resources. But all our appeals have fallen into deaf ears. No country of the West, no imperialist power, is ready to share its resources with the developing countries, (just as the Central Government is not ready to share its resources with the States.)

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur) :
No, no, No like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What a comparison.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Yes, when the States demand there you don't agree.

So, we are now for the South-South dialogue. I think this should be strengthened. We should pool our resources to help each other and jointly fight the imperialist powers. The Non-aligned Movement is basically a movement against imperialism against colonialism. It is also a joint front of the developing countries against the status-quo powers. It is a joint front for the development of the backward countries.

Sir, what are the problems faced by the developing countries like India and its neighbours? First we have the problem of national integration. Because these are the nations in the making, you will

find that imperialist powers are working so that there is national disintegration and that is why they encourage those forces which are interested in disintegrating and this you will find not only in India, but also in African countries, and Latin American countries.

The second problem of these countries is economic development. It is true that for the economic development of these countries, just as transfer of technology, transfer of resources from the developed countries is necessary, so also it is absolutely necessary that these countries undergo some radical economic reforms. If we demand equitable distribution of resources so far as the international community is concerned, does it not logically follow that internally also there should be equitable distribution of resources? That is why, we find that because of the lack of land reforms and equitable distribution of resources in all these countries, there is the elite, the vested interests who are against any radical land reforms and there are governments also who are trying to protect the interest of the vested interests refusing to have radical reforms! Otherwise if this is not done, then all these governments will say that since the developed countries refused to give us resources, that is why there is poverty and there is unemployment. This is wrong. It is a part of it. As a matter of fact, most of these countries where there are military dictators refuse to have any radical economic reforms, equitable distribution of resources, fighting poverty and unemployment through radical economic reforms. Sir, there should be a drastic change in the internal policy also.

In this background we should see what is happening around our country. It is true that now we are surrounded with hostile neighbours. I deliberately use the word 'hostile' because some of our neighbours have become hostile. Now the question is : Why is it so? The success of foreign policy of any country is measured by the good relations it is

capable of maintaining with its neighbours. But here, you will find that our neighbours have become hostile. There are people like Dr. Subramaniam Swamy and others who believe that it is because of the policy of our Government, these countries have become hostile.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
What do you believe?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : What I believe, I will say now.

Mr. Chairman, I think they are not correct. They will never see the actions of American imperialism and what are the forces that are working around us.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Chairman, let us take Pakistan. I want friendly relations with Pakistan. We must be very friendly with the people of Pakistan, but unlike Dr. Subramaniam Swamy I make a distinction between the people of Pakistan and the Government of Pakistan, the ruler of Pakistan.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
He wants a Communist Pakistan.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : What is Pakistan? Pakistan is a part of the American strategic consensus. Pakistan is willing partner of American imperialism in its drive for global domination. Pakistan is a collaborationist Government. The support base of the Pakistan Government is very narrow.

Yesterday I was reading a book. I found that 70% (Seventy) of the Pakistani soldiers come from West Punjab. That is why they have instability in the system itself.

Pakistan is following two lines—

(Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty)

1. It has been collaborating with the imperiatist powers.

2. It belives in the two nation theory.

And because of that theory they had to loss Bangla Desh and also they went to speak on behalf of the Muslim of the sub-continent, including the Muslim of India. That is how they try to legitimise their claim on Kashmir.

One thing has happened. We find that there are some leaders in India who admire Zia-ul-Haq. They certify about his peaceful intention. I do not know why? Also, there are magazines and newspapers which telling, look here, Zia-ul-Haq is peaceful. He is not a hawk, he is a dove and he is sincerely interested in no war pact. How can there be a no war pact until and unless Pakistan agress that it would not give its land or territory for military base to another foreign power, to the United States of America.

In 1981 they wanted to elevate the Mutual Security Agreement with the United States of America to Military Security Pact. From Agreement they came to Pact on the basis of 1959 Pact, which referred to the Baghdad Pact. what did it mean?

In January 1981 Zia-ul-Haq had asked for elevation of 1959 Mutual Security Agreement with the U.S.A. to a full Security Pact. U.S. Arms Aid Agreement re-affirmed the American commitment to 1959 Agreement which in turn referred to the Baghdad Pact. If this is the position, is Pakistan really non-aligned, through it is member of the Non-Aligned Movement? This is the danger. If Pakistan isloated from the United States of America, (if Pakistan pursues a policy of independent real non-alignment-they are talking of genuine non-alignment) it should be address ed to Pakistan, they do not address to Pakistan. Pakistan should follow policy of non-alignment, then there can be

lasting peace with Pakistan. Unless and until Pakistan reverses its policy, it is difficult. And there also, there is a problem, I would like to draw the attention of the Foreign Minister to the movement for the restoration of democracy in Pakistan. They have said. "Do not talk with the military dictator talk with the representatives of the people. We are fighting for democracy." They say this-that unless and until democracy is re-established in Pakistan, there can be no lasting peace.

Decidedly, if we help and support the Movement for Restoration of Demockracy in Pakistan, it is not any interference in the internal affairs. It is because you want that the democratic Government in Pakistan should be there so that a meaningful dialogue can be conducted. That does not mean that I would say that so long as Zia-ul-Haq is in power, the Government of India should not conduct any dialogue. We should do and we should try to have good relations in spite of so many dtfficulties.

Sir, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy has gone. So far as Afghanistan is concerned, I would like to draw his attention and I would like to quote from the American sources that the Americans are sending arms and all that to Afghanistan via Pakistan and Pakistan is a willing tool in sending armed personnel to Afghanistan to fight the Afghan regime. If this is done, how can there be peace in Afghanistan?

Bangla
Then, I come to Bangladesh. The other day, we discussed about fencing the border of Bangladesh and all that. We want a very friendly relation with Bangladesh. We were very happy and the people of India were very happy when democracy was restored and when Bangladesh after liberation struggle became free. We were really happy that we had the neighbour then which was wedded to democracy, wedded to Non-alignment and wedded to peace. Unfortunately, things have changed

and then, I find that Mr. Ershad went to Washington and said: Americans should help me because I am surrounded by Communist States—West Bengal and Tripura. That is how he wants to get American support and help. And in Bangladesh today where is democracy? There is instability. Sir, we should try to develop good relations with Bangladesh. But at the same time, there should be a democratic Government in Bangladesh. Any instability in Bangladesh is also a danger for us. We should never allow the imperialist power to gain upper hand in Bangladesh. That will be dangerous for us and also for the Non-aligned Movement and for world peace.

There are problems in Sri Lanka. The Minister has already issued a statement. I agree that there should be a political settlement. But there is again this problem. Until and unless the democratic forces in Sri Lanka can assert, there can be no lasting solution in Sri Lanka. It is the democratic masses who can usher in a democratic solution. Until and unless that is done, solution is very difficult. The Sri Lanka Government should realise this and the Government of India should be very vigilant so that the United States of America cannot take any advantage out of it. It seems that it has already taken. It has got a foothold in Trincomalee and the danger of American imperialism is also there in Sri Lanka.

I now come to the question of Sino-Indian relations. China is a great neighbour of ours. We have differences. But we should have friendly relations with China and we should settle our disputes with China. Now, you will see that most of the people who live in India and China have fought against imperialism. So, there should be a common bond against imperialism and fighting this dominant position of imperialist power. I think, we should make sincere efforts and Chinese should also make sincere efforts to settle the

issue. Any tension between these two great countries will weaken the anti-imperialist front and what is why, it is absolutely necessary that we should have good relations with China.

The Government of India is saying that there is danger from outside and from within. The danger from outside is mainly from the United States of America with its policy of balkanisation, destabilisation and creating hot spots.

You have seen what is done in Nicaragua. With the CIA, the invisible Government is operating, violating all international law, laying mines in ports and the Government of the United States of America say that for a limited period, the international law would be inoperative. What is happening? The same United States Government is also working around India to create destabilisation and all that.

How do we fight it? It is by acquiring new arms? May be. If it is absolutely necessary, it should be. If you can do without it, good. But if we are compelled, we cannot do anything. But I think, as Lenin said, that the best defence of a country is the unity of the people, the consciousness of the people. If the people are united and politically conscious, then that becomes a mighty force which no power on earth can defeat. The example in Vietnam. The peasants, because of their will to fight, because of their unity and dedication, fought not only one imperialist power but also Japan, France and the United States of America and defeated all of them. Why? They had no modern arms. It is the unity of the people, the will of the people and their patriotism.

What do you find in India today? When you are speaking of dangers from outside, if you see internally, there are the forces of disintegration. Even after so many years of freedom, we fail to hold the nation together. There should be serious heart-searching why this is so. Why is it that

(Shri Satyatadhan Chakraborty)

we cannot keep the nation together? Is it simply due to foreign hands or is it also due to the policies pursued by the Government? Why? Say something. Definitely, there is something in the policy which is being pursued by the Government of India which is strengthening the forces of destabilisation and the forces of disruption. It is for you to answer.

You are talking of national defence. But are you pursuing a policy of national defence? But you are pursuing a policy of national defection, not national defence. That is the greatest weakness of India. Externally even though you proclaim that you want to fight the forces of war, internally you are pursuing a policy which is disuniting the people. Internally, you are pursuing a policy resulting in concentration of power and wealth. With such a nation, are you really in a position to fight the foreign forces? I think you are not.

Is the Government rousing the people? Like Dr. Subramaniam Swamy who has talked of 'equi-distance', you talk of 'super-power rivalry'. Is it because of the super-power rivalry?

I had analysed and the summit have also agreed that the struggle is between the developing countries and the developed countries. The struggle is between imperialism and also the newly liberated countries.

Mr. Chairman, if that is so, you all agree that this is the struggle; the U.S.A. is trying to destroy the whole of the socialist states. That is what they want. Instead of talking of super-power rivalry, should we not unite with those forces which are interested in peace-which are interested in fighting Imperialism? These are the forces that we find in the Socialist countries. That is why because of our enlightened self-interest, to carry forward our struggle and to strengthen our struggle, we

should unite with the Socialist countries as a common front against the forces of war, against the forces of destabilisation, against the forces of exploitation. But, then, you talk of Super-Power rivalry. And someone was talking of equidistance. This is nothing but blurring the vision; this is nothing but to hoodwink the people; this is nothing but your lack of desire to fight the enemy and rouse the people. If you do not say openly that the Americans are interested in destabilisation, if you do not say openly that the United States of America is preparing for war, how can you identify and rouse the people, unite the people, to fight against the very forces which are preparing for war? I do not understand this.

Now, Government should be very forthright in denouncing the war plans of the U.S.A., in denouncing the exploitative system-international exploitative systems and also strengthen the non-alignment movement. That is our hope so that unitedly we fight the exploiters. Also I would like to draw the attention of the House to one thing which is very important. Please allow me only two minutes. To-day we find intellectual colonialism. This is a great danger. Ivor Jennings says that we may not be in India but, because of English, we were able to dominate the minds of of the Indian people. This is Western education. And it is the Western intellectual system that is dominating us. We are not producers of knowledge; We are consumers of knowledge; we consume what is produced in the West. This is intellectual colonialism, I do not hear anything from any ruling party Members or from the Government about it I want to find out. You talked of new Information order.

16.38 hrs.

[SHRI CHINTAMANI PANI-
GRAHI *in the Chair*]

If you do not find the intellectual

colonialism and if you remain as consumers of knowledge, if our minds are captured by the people who want to exploit us or who are exploiting us, then, it will be very difficult to have self-reliance in other spheres.

Before concluding, I would say that only the other day, the Japanese Prime Minister visited our country—very good. But, I want to draw the attention of House that Japan has assumed a military posture. In the name of team spirit of 1984, there was a joint exercise of the American Forces, Japanese Forces and the South Korean Forces. Japan is now becoming a military power. The militarisation has started; the U.S.A. has told Japan that it has to share the military burden of the U.S.A. Japan is doing that; they are planning to attack North Korea. I saw in the newspaper that they are going to deploy Pershing missiles in South Korea to attack North Korea. These are the dangers. You develop economic relations. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to point out that danger is there. Also you know what is South Korea. It is nothing but a colony of U.S.A. There is no democracy. The other day you would have seen that the students were agitating. The North Korea Government appealed to world Parliaments that there should be unification of Korea; American Forces should withdraw from South Korea there should be unification—peaceful unification—of both Koreas.

Now, I mentioned this because the Japanese Prime Minister came here and he said so many good things. He praised our Prime Minister but he forgot to mention how it is allowing the joint exercise being done.

Sir, in conclusion I would say that if you really want to fight then you will have to unite India. You are now afraid of one Bindranwala.

How will you fight forces? For that a complete change in your economic policy is necessary and also instead of taking about super-power rivalry you should strengthen the bonds between socialist countries and the non-aligned movement and fight the forces of de-stabilisation and forces of war. Thank you.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, after going through the proposed amendment of Dr. Subramaniam Swamy the old memories get revived. Before Janata party came to power in their election manifesto they suggested that they what would change the foreign policy of the country because it is being tilted in favour of one super power. But after Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee assumed the office of the Foreign Affairs he came out with the statement that the foreign policy of Indo-Soviet relations and Indo-soviet friendship is written in granite stone. So, I thought the idea of tilting was over but today Dr. Subramaniam Swamy wants to wip a dead horse, that is, by saying :

“...giving primacy to friendship with neighbours and to equidistance from the two super powers.”

I do not know whether Dr. Subramaniam Swamy has the authority of his party to talk in this language. I am sure if his party accepts this then it will stand on its head.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : This is a part of our national party executive decision.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY: Sir, we cannot ignore certain international episodes and experiences. We have to analyse them in proper perspective.

(Shri Brajamohan Mohanty)

When we are discussing the international situation we should not forget that day by day the gap of our differences with the United States of America is being widened. The United States of America has given a threat to withdraw from UNESCO. Mr. Roagan has not only visited China but he had also to give concession regarding nuclear assistance to China. The Carter formula regarding aid to human rights area was relaxed in favour of Pakistan when financial assistance was given to them although human rights are not respected there. Now, we saw the nuclear proliferation norms being relaxed. They did not allow us re-processing of the spent fuel in Tarapore but that concession has been allowed to China. That is the press report. Not only that, day by day the China-USA-Pakistan axis is also getting closer and closer. So, it is no use discussing and analysing Pakistan alone. We have to analyse Pakistan along with USA and China.

We should not forget another aspect that Zia-ul-Haq himself has given a statement to the American press ; he wants from America the security guarantee. That means, USA will remain a guarantee for the Security of Pakistan. That is besides the arms supplied to Pakistan, besides the base in Diego Garcia, besides the support to Pakistan. Now Pakistan is not satisfied with that, Pakistan wants and Zia-ul-Haq wants that he must have the security guarantee. Not only that, The Defence Minister of Pakistan categorically asserted, whether U.S.A. has any military base in Pakistan or not, the fact remains that USA must formulate the security planning considering as if the basis are there. This is the position. How could you imagine that Pakistan will remain independent? It is not possible. Their internal situation is such. Religious fundamentalism is there. Religious fundamentalism has been the main plank of the existence of Pakistani military rulers. That is why the Ahmediyas have been isolated and reduced to second class citizens. You know that is there. We know this type of religious

fundamentalism with which the Pakistani military rulers are aligned, How is it that they could come out of the situation and have friendship with India on reasonable basis ? There are various internal troubles. The upsurge for democratic movement is growing every day in Pakistan, Pakistan rulers think their survival is possible only with understanding with super-power, they being the stooge of the super-power. That position is very clear and it is now becoming inherent. Pakistan remains as stooge of USA. I am placing all these points before the House. Not only that Pakistan is accumulating all sorts of arms and ammunitions; their arms are there in the Indian border. About 3 months ago the New times of the Soviet Union warned India saying that in Occupied Kashmir 30% of the tank forces of Pakistan had been accumulated. Not only that. Afghanistani refugees are being sent to the places; may be in the name of tribals revolting, they make make an entrant. This is the situation.

You know the Afghanistan problem 30 lakhs of Afghanistan refugees are in Pakistan. They are playing havoc in side Pakistan. Pakistan does not want to have discussion with Soviet Union. Sir, we are opposed to any county having forces in another country. We are opposed to it. We are opposed to the the presence of soviet forces in Afghanistan. But one thing we must remember. There are certain situation there. Unless that is rectified the withdrawal of Soviet forces are not possible You may agree or may not agree, but the presence of Soviet forces inside Afghanistan is serving as a deterrant of Pakistani aggression against India. We should not forget that; that is the reality of the situation.

DR SUBRAMNAIAM SWAMY : Is it the Government policy, Sir?—Soviet Aggression in Afghanistan is preventing Pakistan from attacking India?

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY
Why do you botoer ? I take the responsibility. That serves as a deterrant against Pakistani aggression. We want

that the sooner the Soviet forces withdraw the latter it is. But what is the reality? Regarding Pakistan's nuclear bomb every day you get news reports that nuclear bomb has already been done. Mr. Reagan persuaded China not to supply nuclear technology to Pakistan. China did not take it. This is all press report; I have no Embassy contact. Sir, I am a poor man, I have no Embassy contact. Press reports indicate that it is the situation. Taking the other side of the picture, who does not know that Islamabad is the Centre of the Kashmir Liberation Movement?

All sorts of subversions and subversive activities are being directed from Islamabad. So, this is the situation that we should have know. The People of Pakistan and the people of India should live as friend and brothers. But so long as the military administration is there in power, it is very difficult and it is almost impossible to have cordial relations. Now, the forces of the military administration in Pakistan are trying to extricate themselves from the principles of bilateralism.

About the Simla Agreement, who does not know? We had a commitment that both Pakistan and India should have bilateral negotiations and we should solve all our problems in a peaceful manner and every issue should be solved by mutual negotiations. (I would like to quote the relevant portion of the Simla Agreement which categorically says that we should have bilateral negotiation and no issue should be raised in the international forum. Now unfortunately, the other day we found in the press posing a question, how could there be bilateralism? Even the former Foreign Minister of Pakistan had said on an earlier occasion "No bilateralism. There should always be internationalism". I ask: why internationalism? It is the conspiracy of super powers in South East Asia. That will weaken the Indian sub-continent. That is why when a debate on Bangladesh was going on, I warned that an attempt will be made to internationalise the issue and we should

be careful. International issue means to weaken India and weaken India's image in Asia. I am placing before this House Article 3 Clause 2 for information.

"5. (ii) In Jammu and Kashmir the line of control resulting from the ceasefire of December 17, 1971 shall be respected by both sides without prejudice to the recognised position of either side, neither side shall seek to alter it unilaterally irrespective of mutual differences and legal interpretations. Both sides further undertake to refrain from the threat or use of force in violation of this line."

So, bilateralism has been accepted by both the countries. But in spite of that several violations have taken place against the Simla Agreement. They want to take it out from the bilateral forum and they want to extricate themselves from the bilateralism. That is, some suggestions were made by them that there should be no negotiations with Russia for withdrawal of their forces from Afghanistan. They say that will be dangerous. That means "we will commit ourselves to the bilateralism". That is why those friends who visited Pakistan, two starwatts from your side left and visited Pakistan. On return they said that they did not see any hysteria of war or war preparations in Pakistan. I am surprised to see their statement. They should understand the Gandhian ideology. They must remember that they have committed the Himalayan blunder of going over there...

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): You don't compare them with Mahatma Gandhi.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY: Some people will get inspiration from Gandhi's ideology. It is not applicable for all.

Now, I come to Bangladesh problem. What is the difference in so far

(Shri Brajamohan Mohanty)

as this country is concerned? In so far as the internal problems concerning India and Bangladesh are concerned, they are to be solved according to the India-Bangladesh agreement. Our foreign policy is based on upsurge created in the freedom movement of our cultural heritage. The Treaty between India and Bangladesh, in the first sentence, says like this :

“Inspired by common ideals of peace, secularism, democracy, socialism and nationalism,”

But today the rulers of Bangladesh are inspired by communalism. But the people are not at all so. So, my submission would be that there should not be any misunderstanding with our perceptions about Pakistan and Pakistan questions. There should not be any confusion about it. We must have clear perception that at any time any thing might happen and military rulers might take any advantageous move. The indications are here.

And that is what the indications are there.

Shri Jethmalani wrote an article in the Indian Express dated 21st February, 1984... (*Interruptions*). Shri Jethmalani had written in that article that the American arms had been used against India in the 1965 war, and that danger is there, but not now. I do not know, since when he has developed himself as a prophet in India.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY: Sir, our foreign policy has been built up on the upsurge that we created during our freedom struggle and it is based on our cultural heritage. There is no second thinking about it. But the fact remains that we must take not of the new situations, the new postures

and the new developments all around us, and if necessary, we have to give re-orientation to our policy in some spheres. So is the case about the nuclear options. If Pakistan develops Islamic bomb, what should be our attitude? We must think of it seriously and decide what we have to do, whether we should also have the bomb, or do something to assure our national security. I do not say that you must go nuclear and have atomic weapons and all that, but at the same time we must be very careful and watchful. We have also to take note of the fact of arms' supply by China to Pakistan. Naturally, we must be very cautious and; in any case our security efforts should not be weakened.

There is another aspect which we must consider, and that is the role of the United States of America in the New Information Order, New Economic Order, and how it disrupted the IMF and IDA loans to the developing countries recently. These are the factors which are widening our differences. Time has come when we must decisively act and we must persuade the United States of America so that they change their stance and policies on certain matters so that peace can be assured in the world. Day by day peace is being endangered, and the gap between the the two Super Powers is being widened. Our national security is in danger. Peace must be total, it cannot be localised, and you cannot have total peace without localised peace.

17.00 hrs.

श्री राजेश कुमार सिंह (फिरोजाबाद):
सभापति महोदय, पिछले सन् मे 6 दिसम्बर 1983 को जब अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर चर्चा हो रही थी, उस समय नेम, चोम, डियागो गार्शिया, ग्रनाडा और विश्व के बहुत से पहलुओं पर विचार हुआ था। इन चार पांच महीनों में ऐसी स्थिति बनी कि वह और भी बदतर होती गई।

मैं खास तौर से अमेरिका से शुरू कर रहा हूँ। अमरीकन वाइस-प्रेसीडेंट मि. जाज बुश यहां विजिट करने वाले हैं और उन्होंने यह कहा है :

U.S. Vice-President, Mr. George Bush said that his visit to New Delhi is meant to continue US's interests in India and he described the relations between India and the US as very good.

लेकिन मान्यवर, माननीय मन्त्री जी ने राज्य सभा में इस संबंध में थोड़ा सा साफ किया कि जब तक आर्म्स सप्लाय पाकिस्तान को यू. एस. ए. के द्वारा हो रहा है, तो हमें दिमागी तौर पर कैसे एतबार होगा कि हमारे संबंध अच्छे हैं। बात चीत के जो संबंध हैं, वे अच्छे हैं और इन सारे पहलुओं पर मैं इसलिए चर्चा कर रहा हूँ ताकि आने वाले समय में इन पर गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिए।

यह साफ है कि इस सब-कान्सीनेन्ट के अन्दर चाहे वह यू.एम्.एस.आर बात हो या यू.एस.ए. की बात हो और चाहे चीन की बात हो, उनका अपना एक प्रयास यह रहा है कि वे कहीं न कहीं ऐसी जमीन देखना चाह रहे हैं जहां वे अपना प्रभुत्व कायम कर सकें और यह बात साफ है कि यू.एस.ए. के लिए पाकिस्तान की सरगर्मी ऐसी मित्ती, जहां से वह अपने मकसद को पूरा करने की कोशिश कर रहा है और यह हमारे लिए एक चिन्ता का विषय है। इसमें दो राय नहीं हो सकती कि आर सोफिस्टीकेटेड आर्म्स की सप्लाय बनी रहेगी, तो हमारे देश की इन्टेग्रीटी को खतरा बना रहेगा। हमारी 'सोवरेन्टी को खतरा बना रहेगा। तो यह निश्चित रूप से हमारे लिए एक चिन्ता की बात है लेकिन एक बात बार बार मेरे मन में आती है कि पाकिस्तान की एम्बेशन न्यूकिलयर पावर

बनने की है और साथ ही साथ वह अपनी आर्मी को आर्गेनाइज करने का प्रयास भी कर रहा है और जो उसके स्रोत हैं, वे आज से नहीं बल्कि 1950 से हैं। 1950 से लगातार उसका यह क्रम चल रहा है और उस क्रम में अमेरिका की एक अहम भूमिका है। हमारी विदेश नीति क्या रही है इतने लम्बे अर्से में, यह कुछ मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। इसलिए मैं गंभीरता से यह बात कहना चाहूंगा कि यह एक गंभीर विषय है और इस पर मन्त्री जी को गंभीरता से सोचना चाहिए और सिर्फ इतना कह देने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि हम इक्वी-डिस्टेंस थ्योरी में विश्वास करते हैं। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि रूस के साथ हमारी फ्रेंडशिप है, इसलिए इसकी वजह यह हो सकती है। रूस के साथ हमारे संबंध अच्छे हैं और इस वजह से अमेरिका की विदेश नीति में कुछ टकराव की बात आती है। अगर यह मान भी लिया जाए, इसके साथ एक प्रश्न यह भी जुड़ जाता है कि हम जानते हैं कि अमेरिका की अपनी नीति क्या है। दुनिया के अधिकांश ऐसे राष्ट्रों से उसकी दोस्ती है, जहां पर मिलिट्री शासन है और जहां पर लोकतन्त्र नहीं है। हम लोकतन्त्र में आस्था रखने वाले लोग हैं और रूस से हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे हैं। मैं इस मुद्दे को इसलिए उठाना चाह रहा था कि अभी हाल ही में य.एस.ए. की सीनेट की फोरन रिलेशन्स कमेटी ने एक रिपोर्ट दी है। उन्होंने कहा है :

U.S.A Senate's Foreign Relations Committee has counselled the American Government to hold consultations with New Delhi on its arms sales in India's neighbourhood.

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इस तरह की रिपोर्ट वहां की सीनेट की फोरन

(श्री राजेशकुमार सिंह)

रिलेशनस कमेटी की है। उन्होंने कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के दृष्टिकोण को, उसके व्यूज को समझना चाहिए और उसके बाद अपना दृष्टिकोण उसके प्रति अपनाना चाहिए। उन्होंने आर्म्स सेल्स के बारे में भारत से कन्सलटेशन करने की बात भी कही है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि:

This points needs to be hammered during the talks with Mr. Bush.

हमें अपनी बात को जोरदारी के साथ रखने की जरूरत है जब हम उनसे बातचीत करें क्योंकि लड़ाई और आर्म्स रेस के बारे में जब हम आगे बढ़ते हैं, तो अन्तर-राष्ट्रीय सद्भावना की कोई बात नहीं बनती है। यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात है और इसमें हमारी तरफ से पूरी कोशिश होनी चाहिए। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी कानकुन में श्री रीगेन से मिली थी।

तो एक उम्मीद हुई थी कि अमेरिका से हमारे सम्बन्धों में सुधार होगा लेकिन वह सुधार नहीं हुआ। हमारे सामने यह मसला नहीं है कि हमारे और दूसरे देश के व्यूज कहां मिल रहे हैं, कहां नहीं मिल रहे हैं, यूरोप में कहां मिशाइल्स लगाये जा रहे हैं, अफगानिस्तान में किसी देश की क्या भूमिका है, सेंट्रल अमेरिका में क्या भूमिका है। किसी देश या राष्ट्र की दोस्ती दूसरे राष्ट्र या देश से आइडेन्टिकल व्यूज होने से ही नहीं होती है। ऐसा कुछ नहीं है। इस पर आपको विचार करना चाहिए कि किसी दूसरे राष्ट्र से परस्पर सम्बंध हमारे तभी अच्छे होंगे जबकि विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में दोनों आइडेन्टिकल व्यूज रखते हों, ऐसी बात नहीं है। हमारे सम्बन्ध

दूसरे राष्ट्र से अलग-अलग व्यूज रखने पर भी अच्छे हो सकते हैं अगर हम एक-दूसरे के विचारों को समझें, उनको एप्रीशियेशन हो। वह जरूरी है कि दूसरे राष्ट्र से दोस्ती बढ़ाने के लिए हममें आपस में सहयोग हो।

मैं आपसे अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि एक लम्बे असें से हमारी विदेश नीति में कहीं न कहीं खामियां हैं। मान्यवर आप, देखेंगे कि नान-एलानमेंट मूमेंट की हमको लीडरशिप मिली क्योंकि बगदाद की स्थिति ऐसी नहीं थी कि वह कांफ्रेंस वहां होल्ड करता, इसलिए यह लीडरशिप हमें मिल गयी। इसको एक साल गुजर गया, दो साल बाकी हैं। मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ कि एज ए चेयरपरसन आफ नान-एलाइन मूमेंट आपने क्या उपलब्धियां की, अब तक की आपकी क्या उपलब्धियां हैं? मेरा ख्याल है कि आप की सबसे बड़ी उपलब्धि यह हो सकती अगर आप ईरान-इराक वार का कुछ हल निकाल सकते। ईरान-इराक वार का सबसे बड़ा फेक्टर हमारे सामने है। इसके क्या रिजल्ट्स आप के सामने हैं? ईरान-इराक वार वैसी की वैसी बनी हुई है। गल्फ कन्ट्रीज की स्थिति भी वैसी ही बनी हुई है। इसमें हमें कोई कामयाबी नहीं मिली है। आपने नान-एलाइन मूमेंट की लीडरशिप की बात कही। हमारे पड़ोस में इन्सटेबिलिटी बनी हुई है। सारे नेबर हमारे खिलाफ हैं। श्रीलंका, बंगलादेश, पाकिस्तान में अगर ऐसी स्थिति है तो हमारे नान-एलाइन मूमेंट का चेयरपरसन होने के बाद हमारी क्या उपलब्धि रही? कोई उपलब्धि नहीं रही।

वेस्टन यूरोप में जो एक्स्ट्रीमिस्ट मूमेंट चला रहे हैं, उन्हें शेल्टर मिल रहा है। इस बारे में अब तक आपने क्या पहल की,

हमारी विदेश नीति का उन राष्ट्रों पर क्या प्रभाव रड़ा ? मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि कुछ नहीं पड़ा। हम घूम-फिर कर वहीं आ जाते हैं। इसपर आपको विचार करना चाहिए। एक तरफ हमारे देश की एकता को, अखण्डता को तोड़ने का प्लान चल रहा है और उसमें कुछ राष्ट्र साजिश कर रहे हैं हम दुनिया में शान्ति के दूत बने हुए हैं। हमारे रिलेशन्स विदेशी राष्ट्रों के साथ कैसे हैं, इसके बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेशी ताकतें हिन्दुस्तान में उग्रवादी आन्दोलन को सपोर्ट कर रही है। कहीं न कहीं इसमें उनका हाथ है, यह बात हमारी प्रधान मन्त्री ने कही है लेकिन वे उस देश का नाम नहीं बताती हैं। इस में अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से अमेरिका की बात आती है। मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे कौन-सी विदेशी ताकत है जो हिन्दुस्तान की एकता और अखण्डता को तोड़ने का प्रयास कर रही हैं, हिन्दुस्तान में अस्थिरता लाना चाहती हैं ? इसके बारे में भारत की जनता को जानकारी होनी चाहिए। अख-बारों में इसके चर्चे आ जाते हैं, आप कह देते हैं लेकिन कोई बात सामने नहीं आती है। हम यह जानना चाहते हैं कि किससे हमें खतरा है। हमें यह जानना चाहिए, हमारे मुल्क के लोगों को यह मालूम होना चाहिए। अगर यह नहीं होता है तो यह बात कह कर ही हम रह जाते हैं।

यह बात सही है कि बड़ी पावर्स की इस सल-कंटीनेंट में, एशिया में एक भूमिका है, उनके अपने-अपने इन्ट्रेस्ट्स हैं। हमारी सोवियत यूनियन से दोस्ती है और मैं उस दोस्ती का हामी हूँ लेकिन अफगानिस्तान का इञ्चू आज तक वैसा ही बना हुआ है। क्या दोस्ती का मतलब यह कि हम अपने दोस्त से किसी उचित बात को भी न कह

सकें। अगर आप ऐसा नहीं करते हैं तो नान-एलाइन मूवमेंट के नेता की हैसियत से आपके बारे में दुनिया के लोगों की क्या राय होगी। आप जब ईरान-इराक लड़ाई की बात करते हैं तो आपके सामने पाक और बंगलादेश के सम्बन्धों की बात आ जाती है। श्रीलंका में तमिलों को बूचर किया जा रहा है। आपके बारे में कहा जाता है कि तमिलों को प्रवोक करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। इसके पीछे कौन लोग हैं ? आपका प्रभाव जब यहीं नहीं है तब अन्य जगह क्या पड़ेगा ? यह बात मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि जबकि हमें अपने रिलेशन्स बेटर बनाने चाहिए, इस पर हमें विचार करना चाहिए, हम नामिविया की इंडीपेंडेंस के लिए चिन्ता कर रहे हैं, गल्फ कन्ट्रीज के लिए चिन्ता कर रहे हैं, विश्व की शांति के लिए चिन्ता कर रहे हैं। लेकिन अपने पड़ोसी मुल्कों से मधुर सम्बन्ध बनाने की कोई ठोस चिन्ता आपको अभी तक नहीं हुई।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा। मानववर, भारत चारों तरफ से खतरे के दौर से गुजर रहा है। भूयान छोटा सा देश है। हमारे बहुत से अमान हैं उस पर। बहुत छोटा सा देश है। हमारे उससे घनिष्ठ संबध है। लेकिन हाल ही में अख-बारों में देखा :

Whether the Government of India was consulted before Bhutan sent a delegation to Beijing to negotiate a border settlement.

आपको इसकी जानकारी है या नहीं है। मैं जानना चाहूंगा :

was New Delhi kept informed of the progress of the talks ? What are the areas under dispute ? Are Indian interests involved ?

(श्री राजेशकुमार सिंह)

इसकी सफाई हो जानी चाहिए। छोटा सा मुल्क है। जो कल तक हमारी रहनुमाई में रहा, हमको बड़ा भाई मानता रहा, उसकी भी यह स्थिति है। अगर यह स्थिति है तो विश्व शांति की कीमत के सामने हमारे पड़ोसी देशों की शांति की कीमत भी कोई कम नहीं है।

कुछ बातें और कहना चाहूंगा। अगर इस बात को मान लिया जाए कि देश को चारों तरफ से खतरा है तो आप सारे दलों को जो पार्लियामेंट को रिप्रजेंट करते हैं, उनको कान्फीडेंस में क्यों नहीं लेते हैं। मैं तो यहां तक कहता हूँ :

If necessary, to form a broad-based national coalition government.

इसकी भी जरूरत हो तो करना चाहिए अगर सही माने में देश खतरा है। खाली चुनावी प्रचार है तो और बात है।

(व्यवधान)

इस स्थिति का प्रभाव पड़ेगा। हिन्दुस्तान का सारा अक्वाम जब एक राष्ट्रीय सरकार के रूप में आपके सामने काम करेगा तो निश्चित रूप से तमिल समस्या और बंगलादेश समस्या का हल निकल आयेगा।

(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय, आज वोल्ड स्टैप लेने की जरूरत है। हिम्मत करने की जरूरत है। क्योंकि राष्ट्रीय एकता सबसे बड़ी चीज है। राष्ट्रीय हित को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए कोई भी कदम उठाया जाए। पहले भी ऐसा हुआ है। दुनिया में वर्ल्ड वार के समय लोग आपस में मिले हैं, पार्टियां आपस में मिली हैं। आज अगर हिन्दुस्तान को खतरा है तो पूरे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को इसकी चिंता है और हिन्दुस्तान के

सियासों लोगों को इसके लिए पहल करनी चाहिए। और अगर खतरा है तो वह भी साफ होना चाहिए। प्रधान मंत्री जी कहती हैं कि नेशनल इंटरेस्ट की वजह से वे यह बात नहीं कहती हैं तो वह कौन सा नेशनल इंटरेस्ट है, वह भी साफ नहीं होता है। लोगों में भ्रंति पैदा नहीं होनी चाहिए और साफ बात होनी चाहिए। हमें किस तरह से खतरा है यह साफ होना चाहिए।

हमारे जिनके साथ पुराने सम्बन्ध रहे हैं, किसी वजह से पाकिस्तान और भारत के रूप में आज हैं, लेकिन हमारा प्रयास होना चाहिए कि हमारे संबंध अच्छे हों। हम उनको दूसरों के हाथों में खेलने न दें। इसके लिए आपको पहल करनी चाहिए। आज अगर इस कांटीमेंट में लड़ाई की स्थिति पैदा होती है तो वह सिर्फ यहीं तक सीमित नहीं रह जायेगी। जिस तरह से विंग पावर्स एशिया में रोल अदा कर रही हैं, वे यहां की खुशहाली को समाप्त करने की कोशिश में हैं। आज अगर वह स्थिति होती है तो वह अनौखी स्थिति होगी। इसलिए भारत को "नाम" के चेयर परसन की हैसियत से अपनी भूमिका अदा करनी चाहिए, नहीं तो वह पड़ोसी देशों से दोस्ती ही निभा ले और चेयर परसन की बात को भूल जाए।

SHRI R.R. BHOLE (Bombay South Central): Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I thought I must mention something about Dr. Subramaniam Swamy's amendment. I was wondering whether this amendment really is going away from our declared foreign policy.

17.15 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

He tries to amend the original Motion in this way:

He urges upon the Government to restructure the foreign policy giving primacy to friendship with neighbours.

Now, Sir, I want to know whether our policy is or is not that of friendship not only with our neighbours but also with every Country.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: How can you be friendly with every country?

AN HON. MEMBER: Dr. Swamy does not believe in friendship.

SHRI R.R. BHOLE: This clearly shows that Dr. Subramaniam Swamy thinks that we are not following the policy of primacy in friendship with the neighbours, particularly our neighbours and the others.

And then the second part of his amendment is this. He wants us, our country and our policy to be equidistant from the two super powers,

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: You are leaning towards one.

SHRI R.R. BHOLE: Now his allegation is that we are leaning towards one. I would ask, are we leaning towards one or do we want to be friends with both the powers? we have declared, and Dr. Swamy knows, that we want to be friends with not only one power but also all the other powers. We want not only to be equidistant, we want to be closer to each of the powers. We want to come closer to each of the powers. Due if one of the powers wants to lean away from us, or they want to act in such a manner that we start suspecting their actions, then, we can not be leaning, we cannot be equidistantly leaning towards that power. Their power is running away from us. And, therefore, our declared policy is that we want to be friends with everybody, we want to be closer with every country including the super powers and

therefore I feel that this amendment is as good as having no meaning.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: It is a substitute Motion, it is not an amendment.

SHRI R.R. BHOLE: Sir, it is not necessary for me to say that our security environments are daily deteriorating. And the result is, that we as an independent nation, after about 36 years are not in a position to spend adequate, sufficient funds for the development of our country thereby giving the benefits to the large number of weaker sections, to a great population of the weaker sections and workers as well as the rural agriculturists. It is in this context, therefore, that we are now having our hazards in the security environment.

So far as the attitude of Pakistan is concerned, at present it is very unfortunate that they are having—in fact the other day our Defence Minister has stated it—a large bulk of the Pakistani forces on our borders from one end to the other. The other factor which we have to take into consideration in so far as Pakistan is concerned is that Pakistan is acquiring weapons and dangerous weapons and equipment, which can be used and it can reasonably be said that it can only be used against India. Weapons like super sophisticated Harpoons, M 60 tanks, fighter bombers F—16s can only be used on the plains of Punjab and perhaps on the deserts of Kutch but certainly not on the mountains of Afghanistan. We have a very bad experience. The United States had supplied arms to Pakistan in 1965 and 1971. In both the conflicts with us they had used the arms supplied by the United States, against us. There is, therefore, no reason why we should not suspect in the present context that will not use these super-sophisticated weapons only against us and not, as they say, against Afghanistan. This is specially in the context of what Bhutto when he was the Prime Minister said that they want to fight with India for thousand years. Ayub had also said that if they had more forces and better wea-

(Shri R.R. Bhole)

pons, then they would teach a lesson to India. This is the mental attitude of the rulers of Pakistan. These are the people who are now acquiring weapons and equipment in large quantities. Recently we have heard another very disquieting news that the Chinese are giving nuclear aid to President Zia. It is also reported that China has exploded a nuclear device for Pakistan. If this is so, than this news is really very disquieting. Therefore, we ought to be very careful. This is so far as Pakistan's attitude is concerned.

We have also a large coastline and the Indian Ocean. We want it to be a zone of peace. But it is very unfortunate that the big powers have a rivalry there and Armadas are being paraded in the Ocean. Therefore, our security environment is again in danger. It is very unfortunate that although the United Nations has passed resolutions after resolutions make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, nobody bothers to implement these resolutions. The super powers have not been effectively implementing UN resolutions, Not only this. They are also not using the UN as a peace keeping institution.

In fact, we are now seeing also that there is a growing tendency of adopting resolutions which remain largely unimplemented. More and more countries are carrying out negotiations outside the framework of the United Nations. In fact, the Secretary General at one time in 1982 had reported that the attitude of the members, specially the big powers, is such that United Nations is becoming weaker and weaker and he had pleaded with these powers to strengthen the United Nations. But uptil now that has not been the attitude of those powers that are to be counted. We only hope that it will not become as useless as the League of Nations which collapsed in 1939. It is, therefore, very necessary that we must strengthen this very important organisation, namely, the United Nations.

For that we have, as we all know, the Non-Aligned Movement. We are wedded to that Movement. Our Prime Minister has visited the United Nations and is trying her level best to strengthen this organisation so that there could be peace not only for us here in this country but also for other countries. It will certainly become a heaven for all of us. We are seeing the utter recklessness in promoting the arms race. I have no doubt that the whole House, including our friends on the other side, does not like this arms race and we all want peace. Our foreign policy is also a declared one and that is that we want to be friends of all and we want peace so that we could develop ourselves.

Insofar as our attitude on Sri Lanka issue is concerned, I am happy that we are following a very right policy. As we see, there is a diversified policy that we are following. We have made distinction between the problems of the Tamils of Indian origin in Ceylon and the other political and economic problems. I am sure, the Opposition also will support us on what we are doing on Sri Lanka issue. I know that our DMK friends are not so much satisfied but we did distinguish between one problem, namely the problem of the Tamils of Indian origin in Ceylon and the other political and economic problems there.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say more because there are large number of Members who will be speaking. I have no doubt that this House will whole heartedly support the motion moved by our respected Minister of External Affairs.

DR. SUBRAMANAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East) : Sir, on the very last day the Foreign Minister has moved a Motion on the international situation and also for consideration of the policy of the Government of India in respect of that international situation. Sir you know that, with your permission I have also moved a substitute Motion,

I am sorry to say that most of the Speakers—particularly our friend, who is not here, Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty—have not dealt with the international situation *par-se* India's policy, but have dealt much more with the ideological questions of the United States imperialism, and a bit of their mind has been given here.

The question really is what the international situation is and how do we judge the success, if any, of the Government of India's policy in meeting that international situation. Some of the situation is not of our making. In fact, most of it is not our making, but it is there. The question is how to meet it and what should be the policy that should be pursued?

There is no doubt when I speak here and I am a Member of the Janata Party and I will be speaking what I consider to be the right policy to which our party has adopted and that there should be no disagreement or feeling that the views that I am expressing are my own views. They are not. They happen to be the party's views. Some of the Members asked whether I will be speaking my own opinion or of the party's opinion. I have no opinion, what I say is the party's opinion. Sometimes I go ahead, as I first go to Pakistan and George Fernandes and Patnaik go afterwards. But basically they are the same.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV
(Azamgarh) : But, Sir, when Prof. Madhu Dandavate is going? We are interested in that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE
(Rajapur) : I am only present in Parliament.

AN HON. MEMBER : Dr. Swamy is very unfair. He does not send Prof. Madhu Dandavate.

SHRI INDERJIT GUPTA
(Basirhat) : Why don't you send Chandrashekhar.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
You mean send him to Pakistan and not let him return.

Sir, there are world hot spots today and the question is what is the Government of India's direction to cooling the hot-spots, at least lowering the tempers. Afghanistan is a hot spot. In December, 1979 a few days before Shri Narasimha Rao became the Foreign Minister and Mrs. Gandhi became the Prime Minister again, the Soviet troops in large numbers occupied that country and installed a puppet called Barbarak Karmal as the President of that country. They say they went on invitation, but we know that invitation was given by a person who is dead, namely Hafizul Amin. That is a claim of the Soviet Union.

Now, here the non-aligned country, Afghanistan, very close to our border, with great historical links with India and that it is in our history that those who occupied the Khyber Pass ultimately posed a threat to our country. They are occupying a country which is next to another country, which by all means is not a stable country, because it does not happen to be a democracy.

Sir, I accept the principle that those countries which do not have democracy based on adult franchise, are not likely to be stable and the transfer of power there takes place through violence as has been happening in Pakistan.

So, you have the USSR with 110 thousand troops occupying Afghanistan with Khyber Pass in their control and next to it is Pakistan, which is unstable. Therefore, the security implications for this country are quite clear.

Therefore, now the question arises what is the Government of India's

(Dr. Subramaniam Swamy)

policy in defusing the situation? They say we have close relations with the Soviet Union. I have never been an advocate of having enmity with the Soviet Union. We have all been in Janata Party opposed to a policy of tilt towards the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union needs India very badly. There are very few friends to the Soviet Union. Take for example Asia. From Israel down to Japan, I think except India or Vietnam or may be South Yamen, the Soviet Union does not have any friends. So, we are very important for the Soviet Union and they would like to be friends with us and may be willing to pay a price.

And the proof of it is that Mr. Desai when he was Prime Minister, took very tough stance and the Soviet Union was quite friendly with him and the biggest arms deal ever signed by the Government of India was signed when Mr. Desai was the Prime Minister.

So, the Soviet Union needs us and you say, you have good relations with them.

PROF. N.G. RANGA : We also need her.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : It is OK. I am saying that if you have such a good friendship, why is it that you have not been able to persuade the Soviet Union to get out of Afghanistan? It is of great vital significance to us. This shows that you are impotent and ineffective.

So, here is one world hot spot where the policy is of utter failure. I am quite confident that if the Janata Government had been in power in Delhi, the Soviet Union would not have dared to go into Afghanistan. It is because of the fact that you were there in power, they felt encouraged to go into Afghanistan.

Sir, in this Parliament it is only the Janata Party which can given an

alternative point of view along with the Lok Dal. All these people are with you and they are all side kicks as far as the international policy is concerned. I will not be surprised if they do not accept, but I am posing this question to you and I say that again if the Janata Party comes to power, the Soviet Union will walk out of Afghanistan once again.

The second hot spot is Kampuchea and here, the Foreign Minister's own statement in Parliament—I recall for you—was that the Government of India under the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi recognised the Government of Hang Samrin as the Government of Kampuchea. Of course, during the Janata rule we refused to do and the Soviet Union had tried enormous amount of persuasion to make us recognise that Government. In fact, Mr. Kosigin came here in March of 1979, he spent a good deal of time trying to persuade Mr. Desai to accept the fact that the Hang Samrin's Government should be recognised by the Government of India. This we refused to do because 30,000 Vietnamese troops were proping up that Government and he said, 'As long as Vietnamese troops are there in Kampuchea, we cannot recognise this Government.' Then in July 1980, Mr. Narasimha Rao came to this House and he announced that 'we recognise it.' And I asked him : 'How many countries have recognised Hang Samrin's Government so far?' He said in reply that 11 countries have recognised—the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Cuba, Afghanistan and countries like that. So, I said, 'You are in that category of Cuba, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Afghanistan, and you are now the 12th country to recognise.' He said, because we are a non-aligned country, if we recognise Hang Samrin's Government, then it might lead to normalisation; other countries would follow suit. Today is 9th May, 1984 and, Sir, still not one country has followed suit after you. You are still the 12th country and the last country. After the Government

recognised the Hang Samrin's Government, four years have almost elapsed, not one country has followed India's example and recognised the Hang Samrin's Government. This is another example of failure.

(Interruptions)

Similarly, the third hot spot is the Middle East. In the Non-Aligned Conference a Special Committee was set up consisting of 7 people with the Prime Minister as Chairman. When CHOGM Conference was going on Mr, Narasimha Rao was packed up to Beirut, to go and try to settle. He was also given the responsibility to find a solution to the Iran-Iraq war. This is the third world hot spot today. What is the relevance of India in the Middle East today or in West Asia? Is there any country which is today prepared to say that India can solve the problems? India is partisan in the West Asia situation, India will take sides. On the Palestine question, certainly I would say that Palestinians have a right to their homeland and India should fight for that.

PROF. N.G. RANGA : Thank you.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Well, I have always held that opinion. It is not that I am saying it now, I had said it in Israel also. I am not like you saying one thing here and another thing at another place.

So the Palestinians should have a home land and you must fight for it. But with whom will you fight? You have no voice in the West Asian situation. You are playing double policy with the Arabs. You have recognised Israel. You have a Consulate in Bombay. You have trade with that country of Rs. 100 crores. Students go to that country. Your business men go to that country. South African diamonds go to Israel and then come to Surat, get cut and then are sold in Brussels. You are not prepared to talk to Israel and say why do you

not clear out of the occupied Arab land and make way for Palestinean homeland? It is because you are afraid that Arabs might mis-understand you. But the Arabs know you very well.

Saudi Arabia black listed 67 Indian companies for trading with Israel. Which is the other country which has more number of companies black listed than India? It is only one and that is the United States. This is the reality. The whole Arab world knows about the sincerity on that cause. No matter how much you may say that you are successful on this, Arabs really do not believe you. It will be more honest on your part to say that we will be mediator in the West Asian situation. We have already recognised on the 17th September, 1950 the State of Israel and we will continue to fight for Palestinean right. We will talk to both the sides for it. But Shri Narasimha Rao went to Iraq-Iran, came back. It was too hot for him to handle. Left it. He went to Beirut. Produced nothing because he was on one side. The Israel press, the American press on the other side made a fun of Shri Rao's visit because he was there as a spokesman for one side. For a big country like India to become irrelevant in Afganistan, Kampuchea, West Asia, I think, it is for you to consider, what a major failure has been there in the foreign policy?

The other aspect of foreign policy in relation to current international situation is in three parts—those friendships which you should consolidate by your foreign policy, where you win new friends, and finally those adverseries—you try to soften them by your foreign policy. This should be a three pronged attack as a component of your foreign policy. What do we find? In these 4½ years in Congress (I) rule all the existing friendships are weakening. I remember Shrimati Indira Gandhi remarked against the Janata Government—Janata Government has become

(Dr. Subramaniam Swamy)

so weak that even a small country-
she told in Hindi :

“छोटा देश भूटान ने भी भारत को
घाँस दिखाया”

In other words that Bhutten dare to stare into the eyes of India—a big country. But to-day Bhutan is not only starting you in the eyes but it is actually cooking a snook at you to use slang. They have gone to China say they will negotiate with the Chinese. They go to South East Asia and say that your policies are all wrong—Something, which Bhutan has never done. You sent.

Mr. Rasgotea. He rushed to the capital of Bhutan. But they were not prepared to listen you. Why did it happen? It is because Bhutan feels that this country is not taking the attitude. They, therefore, want to go independent. Bangla Desh—this is a country to which we contributed in its liberation. To-day what news do we read? They are firing at you. I am not going into the question of fencing. But the fact to the matter is that your diplomacy has been mishandled. Otherwise, this situation would not have arisen. You say that in 1975 Bangla Desh agreed to this. Why cannot you persuade them. The President of Bangla Desh says this is without consultation that they have done this. Why did not consult them? We have an agreement on the Frakka. You are unable to agree on the river waters. This is an outstanding failure. The country to which you contributed for its liberation, which is next to you, you are unable to reach an agreement! The Janata Government in November, 1977 reached an Agreement. You did not like it. But what is your agreement? After 4½ years there is no agreement for the division of the Ganga water. I think this is an outstanding failure which Minister must tell us now.

Sri Lanka also is a country on which I have made my own personal views

which I am not going to express in this debate.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MADHUSUDAN VAIRALE
(Akola): You express your party view.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Yes, I will express my Party view.

MR. SPEAKER : Party view is here. Personal view is outside.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
If I am not speaking on Party time, I will say my personal view. I am a Swamy. I can certainly do that.

Sir, again the Sri Lankan situation is mishandled. We really do not know that what is happening in Sri Lanka. The Minister is not telling us the whole story. I also know many Sri Lankans, some of them happen to be Ministers. I happened to be studying with them when I studied in America. They were students there. The fact of the matter is that the Government of India does not inspire any confidence in Sri Lanka today either in Tamils or Sinhalese. The Government of India gave some proposals to Mr. Jeyawardene which is called Annexure-C and you may not agree. Mr. G. Parthasarathy went there. After all, why did you send a bureaucrat like Mr. G. Parthasarathy there. In fact, you should not have sent him. People like you should go there. You should send some politicians there. But bureaucrats are sent because you want to approach in a bureaucratic way. You have proposed a set of proposals and gave it to Mr. Jeyawardene. Mr. Jeyawardene called a meeting and there a friend of Congress-I, Mrs. Bandaranaike was also there. She has been long associated

with Congress-I. She has herself gone on record. When she was thrown out of power, Mrs. Gandhi was also voted out of power in India. Mrs. Gandhi said, in sympathy, that the foreign powers are responsible for unseating of Mrs. Bandranaike. This led to great protest from Sri Lanka. And this very Bandaranaike, in fact, said, whose proposals are these? Are these Indian proposals?

Mr. Jeyawardene said, "Yes, they are Indian proposals". And then, after that no further meeting could take place. I am told the meeting is to take place today. I do not know whether it has taken place or whether it has led to anything. But all that happened with Government of India is that Sri Lanka is buying time and is not solving the problems of Tamils. And the Government of India also seems to be buying time, till the Lok Sabha elections are over. Some-how they are buying time and the people of Tamil Nadu should be warned in advance not to be fooled with the volley of Mr. Narasimha Rao and equally the volley of Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

Here are examples of existing friendships weakening. Then, in this entire period, you have not won a single friend. The Janata Government created new friendships with Pakistan and China.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU (Chaugal-pattu) : You created enemies.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : With Pakistan, the Janata Government did not create enemy. You can go to Pakistan and find out the fact. Today anybody will tell you that Janata Period is the golden period in the Indo-Pakistan relations.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU : You are aligning with enemies.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Are you sure who is enemy and who is friend in the international policy? In 1962, the Soviet Union said that China...

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, SPORTS AND WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI BUTA SINGH) : You were just going in the American lines. Therefore, you could not afford.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Mr. Sardarjee, I will explain everything to you.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You see him in his chamber.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Sir, this is a fact that with Pakistan, the Janata Government had established great friendship and this friendship bore result Salal Dam. 15 years you kept it pending. The Janata Government solved it within 20 minutes. The Foreign Minister came here and we were able to solve it. On those very points which you were insisting. It is because you did not know how to deal with Pakistan. You did not know how to do diplomacy. You wanted to talk down to them. You did not know what is the meaning of diplomacy. That is why, Pakistan was refusing. But during the Janata rule, it a fact that the issue of Salal Dam was settled. On those very points you were insisting and your earlier Government was insisting, on those very points, we solved it. But today what we find. The General Secretary of the Ruling Party—the Congress-I—Mr. Rejiv Gandhi says that by December, there will be war. In Pakistan, everybody is convinced that there is going to be war. In India also, slowly the opinion is growing there is going to be war.

(Dr. Subramaniam Swamy)

So it is a was by mis-calculation because each side thinks that the other side is going to declare a war. This situation is going to escalate. Have you got any idea of defusing it? In October last year, I went to Pakistan and I may sny I countri-buted to a little bit of the defusion, But today I wonder whether it can be defused. I am not saying Pakistan will never attack us. I am not one of those who say that Pakistan will never attack us, I cannot even say that China will not attack us: I cannot say that America will not attack us or that Russia will not attack us. I cannot say that Bangladesh will not attack us.

But question is whether our pre-paration is sufficient to meet an attack from any of these countries. This is not may statement. I am a Mem-ber of the Defence Consulative Committee. But in the meeting of the Consultative Committee, the general opinion is that if Pakistan over make the mistake of attacking us, then Pakistan will suffer. Some military men told me that in 1965 we gave Pakistan a thrashing. In 1971, we divided Pakistan into two. And if there is another war, there would not be another Pakistan left. That is quite clear. That is the strength we have and the strength should in-spire self-confidence.

17.50 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER
in the Chair]

Everyday we hear that Pakistan is doing this and that. Now why is it like this.

It is your diplomacy which has failed. You should go on preparing as we did during Janata rule. We went on pre-paring and acquiring arms. We did not stop acquisition. But, at the same time, we did not worry about Pakistan's threat, because we said, when the attack materi-

alises, we can reply to it and that generated certain confidence.

Today the atmesphere of suspicion is so strong that, in fact Mr. Rajiv Gandhi may turn out to be the astrolo-gical accurate forecaster by his fulfilling prophesy. By saying it, an atmosphere has been created. A suspicion has been crated, No every Pakistani is convinced that we would attack them. We are convinced that they are preparing. And ultimately that will happen in such a situation? War will take place by mis-calculation. If you read the history of wars, you will find that at least half of them have been by miscalculation. And that will be a very unfortunate situation.

I do not know what one means by destabilisation. We keep talking of destabilisation. This is a Communist term, So, I do not understand it. But there is plenty of dis-information. It is true that Pakistan has refused to give you an undertaking that they do not give bases to the United States. It is a fact. They told me that also. That is why I think that it is not possible for you to go through not a war pact. I know you what that understanding.

The question is that the Pakistanis have refused to do that.

But the amount of dis-information that takes place in our country, that the bases have already been given, that the nuclear materials have already been supplied by China and that near Karachi the Americans have already got a base.

These are all coming from the Soviet Union, through Tass and through New Times. It is quoted here. There are all propaganda machines. They want India and Pakistan to fight and they are creating this. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is unable to counter-act this dis-information.

Finally, though these adversaries are there we hardened them.

Mrs. Gandhi made a trip to the United States. Why? If we do not want friendship with the United States, why did she make the trip? She made the trip. She made it in July, 1982 and today in May, 1984 the United States Senate Foreign Relations says that all our visits have gone waste. Nothing tangible has come out.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA (Amritsar) :
Why Mr. Bush is coming here?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Well, Mr. Rao has to answer this question, I cannot answer, no matter how much I know more than him. But the fact of the matter is that the United States is an important country for us from commercial angle. There are 500,000 Indians living there. We are in close race with the Soviet Union which is the leading partner. For some years, we are ahead with the Soviet Union.

In some areas we are ahead of the Soviet Union. Leave aside the Soviet Union. In terms of technology, India benefits a lot by the technology we purchase from the United States. Many U.S. companies have been invited by the new liberal policy of the Government and so, there is a certain strong economy link. But the policy towards the United States seems to be such that all the time we get into difficulties. We are not able to understand them. I do not understand why the Government is unable to understand. The United States have a global policy. You are not a part of it. Pakistan is a part of it. We can never play second fiddle to the United States; that is quite clear, and, therefore, we can never be close friends like Pakistan to the United States. Pakistan is ready to play a second fiddle to the United State and therefore, they are going to have close friendship with them. We can not have that. We are a big country. But at the same time, we can have far more civil relations than what we are having today. Day in and day out there are abuses on the United States.....

AN HON. MEMBER : Who does it.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
In Parliament. You come to the Zero Hour. Prof. Tewary is not here. On every little thing, the United States is brought in, the opposition is being encouraged by the United States; all that goes on. I may tell you, if the history is written about your collaboration with the United States in the intelligence field, it will be a big shocker. The first U-2 flight into China was flown out of Orissa by Jawaharlal Nehru Government. They took photographs of the nuclear installations of China and those photographs were later taken by a member of the Congress Party who later became a member of the Janta Government to the Soviet Union to tell them what the Chinese were doing. The collaboration with the American Central Intelligence in Nanda Devi is documented. Therefore I do not want to go into all that, I do not want to rake up all that. But this must stop—saying daily that the CIA is there in Punjab, the CIA is there in Assam, the CIA is there in Sri Lanka, the CIA is there everywhere. In tomorrow the Janata Party wins the election, it would be said that the CIA got them win the election. This kind of irresponsible talk must stop. If you want to have civil relations with the United States, you must recognise that not only the CIA is active but the KGP is also active. You have to take a balanced relationship. That is why I talk about 'equidistant'. I am not saying, 'Support the United States on Diego Garcia'. On Diego Garcia, if you want to condemn them, condemn them. On Grenada, if you want to condemn them. I will join with you. But at the same time, by the same measuring rod, you also judge the Soviet Union.

In conclusion.....

AN HON. MEMBER : What about Sri Lanka ?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
About Sri Lanka, I have said whatever I have to say.

Wish all the international carnivals they have held here, the Government of India's prestige in the international area is only going down. Recently they had Mr. T. N. Kaul go to Paris to contest the election for the UNESCO Executive Board Directorship. It was Ghana which defeated India. Mr. T.N. Kaul had to come back humiliated. There is no international body on which they can win an election today. They are losing the election one after another. I do not want to document all the other elections they have lost. What is it so?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Sitamarhi) :
What other elections?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
You lost the UNESCO election just a month and a half ago.....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
They have filed an election petition.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Where is the respect for India that they talk about? In these four and a half years, actually the respect for India has gone down. Why? Why is it so? Why is it that India goes to contest an election in a place like the UNESCO and loses? We have won in the past. Dr. Radhakrishnan was the first who was elected.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Apart from UNESCO, can you cite any other election?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Yes, plenty, but I am running short of time. If you want more, I will give you more.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has already taken 30 minutes. The other speakers will not get an opportunity. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy, please conclude.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
You tell me what you have won in your time.

In the same way, when the Non-Aligned Conference took place, the Resolution which was passed on Afghanistan, was it the Indian Resolution? In fact, it was the Pakistani draft which was passed. Their draft was not rejected. It is a fact. In other Conferences of the world also, they are in a minority, they lose elections.

18.00 hrs.

Why is it that they lose elections? Why is it that their resolution is not accepted?

In conclusion, the impression in the whole world to-day is that when the chips are down, this country is with the Soviet Union. It is not an independent country in international matters. They may assume some posturing here and there, but when the chips are down, this country is with Soviet Union. There is a tilt towards Soviet Union. That is why I have brought my substitute motion. I am saying: get yourself more flexibility. If you have friendship with your neighbours, you will get more flexibility. If you fight with Pakistan, United States will take advantage of it. No doubt about it. If you fight with China, then China and Pakistan will get together and then you will have a very big defence problem. Individually you can take care of China and you can take care of Pakistan. But if the two join together, bad for you. Your friendship with the neighbours is of a great importance. That will give you the capacity to defend your other interests as well.

Secondly, I am saying this international impression is harming the reputation of the country anywhere and everywhere and in every forum that you are tilting towards Soviet Union. Correct this tilt and maintain equidistance. That is the text of my

substitute motion, I think the Foreign Minister will be convinced and he will support my substitute motion.

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE (Bombay North Central) : What happened to the Bill, Sir? I was told and I was shown also that it will be circulated at 5.30 p.m. It is now 6 O'clock...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He is still on the job. Whatever assurance has been given to you and the House will be implemented. He has said that he will introduce the Bill.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He has gone for cyclostyling,

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE : Since 11 O'clock in the morning it is being cyclostyled?...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : All of them are one on this—whether this side or that side...I am one with you. It is coming up.

AN HON. MEMBER : How can you be one with them?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : They are my sisters.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA : Just now Dr Swamy was trying to justify that whatever he was saying was not his views but that was his Party's views. Either he does not have confidence in himself when he says so or his Party does not have confidence in him. Otherwise, what was the need of his justification here?...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Because your Party raised it and I was replying to it.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA : When he was speaking about Afghanistan, he gave us a new logic that the Afghan refugees are there in large numbers and Pakistan is not a stable Government. Therefore, it is a security risk for us and, therefore, we should ask the Russians to get away from Afghanistan. Can we say to any government to get away from any other country? Can we say that America should withdraw from South Korea?...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Yes, say that.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA : Every country has its own policy. There is no question of whose policy and whose interests. We should only watch our own interests and what are our national interests and what is the national assertion of this country over Afghanistan? It is a fact that a socialist and secular Afghanistan is a friend of India and a reactionary force in Afghanistan supported by Pakistan and America is not a friend of India. Therefore, it is in our national interest that we should support a secular and socialist Afghanistan...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : What about non-aligned Afghanistan?

SHRI R. L. BHATIA : He referred to our recognition of Kampuchea. I was there 2 years back and I think this is the wisest policy India has adopted and it rather delayed their action in recognising a fact because all the time they have been ascertaining who is in control of Kampuchea. Since the new government of Heng Samrin is in complete control of Kampuchea and the people are happy, therefore, we recognised that.

Does he mean to say that we should recognise Pol Pot Government who killed three million people? This is his line of action. If this is his line of action, then, I must say that it is not India's line of action; It is

(Shri R. L. Bhatia)

America's line of action ; it is China's line of a action. Whom is he supporting here in this country ?

(Interruptions)

Sir, he also objected to our policy in the Middle-East. P.I.O. is the sole representative of Palestenians and they have the right to have a home and we recognise their right. Because India has a principled policy whether it is in the Middle-East or Israel or anywhere else, our policy is a principled policy and we go by principle. Since the P.L.O. are the sole representative of Palestenians, they have a right to have their own home. Therefore, we supported it.

Coming to Bangladesh, he said that India did not consult the President of Bangladesh. If we want to do anything in our country, should we ask others? This is his line of action. This is a loose talk that many people have been doing. We begin to think whether Dr. Swamy is an Indian or he is an agent of some foreign country? He is always speaking about Pakistan.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : I object to that. He must name the people. Who say like this? So that I can take care of them.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Dr. Swamy is a world citizen.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : He says that some people say that I am an agent of a foreign country. Let him name them. Let him not be coward Mr. Vajpayee had to withdraw that once. You also have to withdraw it.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA : I change the word. He spoke about their policy. You should support India's policy ; India's national interests. What is the national assertion? What other people want us to do we will not agree to it. He also said that Pakistan is part of the global policy of U. S. A. and India is not. What should we worry about it?

This is a very simple question. Even an ordinary man, a rickshaw man will tell him. By making Pakistan as part and parcel of the global strategy of U.S.A. who will be harmed? Does he think that Afghanistan will be harmed or Russia will be harmed? Is Pakistan in a position to fight back the Russians? Sir, three-fourth of the Pakistan Army is in the Indian border and the past experience shows that all the material supplies, weapons etc, by the U. S. A. had been used to fight against us. Still he is trying to say why should India be afraid of the global policy of America? Because it directly hurts us, therefore, we object to that.

Sir, the international situation has deteriorated quite a bit. Now the situation is that we are close to a world war, nuclear, missile war. Who is doing it? Who is accelerating the arms race? It is only one Super Power. Wherever you see who is deploying the missiles in Europe? who is deploying the Task Force in the Middle East? Who has created Diego Garcia? The U. S. A. has bases in all the countries. I think there are more than thirty countries where they have the military bases. Why don't you object them? Why should we shut all our eyes to this fact? There is only one country which is creating all this problem for the world.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Name them.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA : It is U. S. A., your friend. I am not dwelling on the various regions, since the time allotted is very short. I shall confine myself to the region, especially, to Pakistan.

A serious situation has developed in Indo-Pakistan relations. Since this Government came into power again in 1980, we have made best efforts to cooperate with Pakistan and to develop friendly relations. We have done our best. But, unfortunately, the response to Pakistan is not there. We sent

Mr. Sathe, our General Secretary and later Sardar Swaran Singh went there as a personalemissary to our Prime Minister. And then our External Affairs Minister went by himself to explore the possibility of friendship between the two countries and later Prime Minister at Salisbury met Gen. Zia and had a talk with him and thereafter also she wrote a communication to Gen. Zia let us have friendly relations, let us cooperate with each other and let us leave the path of confrontation. But, unfortunately, there was no response. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy has been there and he is very keen that we should develop relations with Pakistan. We should develop relations with whom. We have done our best to cooperate with our neighbour. We want to have relationship with them. We want a strong Pakistan because a strong Pakistan is in the interest of India. We want that country to flourish, to be independent and sovereign but when we find that a country becomes a client State of America, a front line to represent them and to watch the interests of America rather than their own country naturally we feel it and object to it.

Sir, in my view there are four factors which stand in our way for the development of relations between India and Pakistan. The first is the feeling of insecurity of Gen. Zia from India. Geographically India is a big country. India has a great manpower. India has great technology and great industrial base. These are the things which deter him. So, Gen. Zia is feeling very much insecure. He has developed this kind of complex although we want to be friendly with him, cooperate with him and have any kind of understanding with him. But it is not forthcoming because it has a fear complex which we cannot help.

The second point is the security relationship which Pakistan has developed with other countries. In order to get over this complex they have entered into security arrangements with foreign countries like USA, China and some other Middle East countries. Right

from the beginning they have been in the plagdad pact and so on and so forth because they want to have other friends who could supply them arms and material so that they may feel secure. In this connection I would like to say that when we said that we are prepared to have a no-war pact it was not replied to and implemented and in various other meetings we have shown that we can be friendly and talk many things which can be common but they are not coming forward. Instead of that they are getting military aid from America much beyond their needs. They are getting nuclear know-how from China and they are having divisions in the various Middle East countries in order to get lot of money so that they may raise more Divisions. They are also having a bomb which they have told to other countries is going to be Islamic. So, these security arrangement are also responsible which stand in the way of our friendship.

The third point is that there is no popular government in Pakistan. The law of inheritance in Pakistan is usually there. One General kills the other and takes position. It happened when Ayub came or when yahya was there. Zia is another usurper who has usurped the power without the consent of the people. They usurped power and took charge of the government. There was only one period during Mr. Bhutto when there was a popular government. At that time there were friendliest relations between the two countries. We had Simla agreement and Delhi agreement because a popular government has to listen to the people and had to take care of the national views of the people and look to the interests of the nation. A military General has only to take interest of his own. So, a General will choose his own priority.

Whether to look into the interest of his nation or to his own interest. Since one man has to decide in Pakistan about foreign policy therefore, it is not a people's Government, nor people's

policy, it is only the policy of those who are ruling in Pakistan, that is, the army.

The fourth problem which stands in our friendship is this. It is USA's global policy. USA has vital interests all over the world, whether it is Latin America, Middle-east, Indian Ocean, Pacific or South East Asia. Everywhere they have interests. They have no colonies but yet they want to have a position of strength all over the world. If they want to have a policy of containment against Russia we have nothing to do, But in that process various countries are threatened. They have a Diago Garcia in the Indian Ocean. They started with it as an observation post but now it is a fullfledged nuclear base threatening the independence of the littoral countries around Indian Ocean. Mr. Swamy says that Pakistan is part of global policy of America and India is not. When Diago Garcia is like a sword turned to us, the sovereignty of any country is threatened. They are sitting in Diago Garcia which is so near to our country ; We are bound to oppose it, we feel insecure and we are found to make arrangements so that we are not insecure and we have our sovereignty.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Troops in Afghanistan are not security threat to you-that is very far away ?

SHRI R. L. BHATIA : I, have told you that our policy in Afghanistan is very clear. We support the secular and socialist Government of Afghanistan.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
And Soviet troops are for peace there.

SHRI R. L. Bhatia : So, this global policy of America is also responsible because they are equipping Pakistan with arms much beyond their need. Pakistan-as Mr. Swamy says-is a weak Government, unstable Government. America has taken advantage of that. Today you cannot say that Zia is ruling that country. You can't say that Pakistani people are ruling that country. Today Pakistan is governed by America.

So long as Pakistan is governed by America, as part of the global policy, as a front line State of their policy and acting according to the wish of USA we are bound to oppose the global policy of USA. That is why this policy of USA is also responsible for Pakistan not coming nearer to us. You remember, Sir, sometime back we had negotiations. We thought we will be able to forge cooperation with Pakistan and both countries will have agreements and all that. Immediately F 16 was supplied to them without any reason. F 16 is not normally made available to another country. There was a declaration of supplying them, in large numbers. What was the idea ? The idea was to wreck the talks which were going on. Therefore, so long as this American global policy is there, and Pakistan continues to be a client State of America, there is not going to be any friendship at all. I would like to ask the Foreign Minister, after all the efforts have been made by us with Pakistan for friendship and cooperation, we had bilateral agreements which they have refuted now-what is to be done ? We must have a permanent Pakistan policy. We should evolve a new policy which is beneficial to us which is in our own national interest. How long will you go on running after Pakistan for friendship while they are getting away from us because a third party is there which will not let you to have friendship ? So my emphasis would be that we must have a positive permanent policy about Pakistan. We must evolve that policy so that the people of India feel that we have a permanent positive policy against Pakistan.

With these words I support the Motion moved by our Foreign Minister.

श्री सुरज भान (अम्बाला) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज टेक्नोलॉजी के एडवॉन्समेंट के कारण दुनिया के मुल्कों का एक-दूसरे से फासला बहुत कम हो गया है। हम अलग-अलग होकर न रह सकते हैं, न

सोच सकते हैं। इसलिए आज इंटरनेशनल सिचुएशन पर हर डिस्कशन कर रहे हैं।

अक्सार्ड-चिन में चीन, अफगानिस्तान में रूस और डिएगोगशिया में अमेरिका, इस त्रिकोण से भारत घिरा हुआ है। केवल यह त्रिकोण ही नहीं, हमारे पड़ोसी देश, चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो, श्रीलंका हो, बंगला देश हो, और आज मुझे यहां तक भी कहना पड़ रहा है कि नेपाल के साथ भी हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे नहीं हैं।

यहां से कुछ प्रसिद्ध पत्रकार नेपाल गये थे। उन्होंने बताया है कि वहां पर लोगों में भारत-विरोधी भावना बढ़ती जा रही है।

मैं बंगलादेश से शुरू करना चाहता हूं। 1980 में जब सदन में इस इश्यु पर डीबेट हुई, तो फरक्का बांध के बारे में श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी की बात का जबाब देते हुए श्री नरसिंह राव ने कहा था:—

“.....जब पड़ोसियों की बात उन्होंने उठाई, तो उन्होंने मुझे एक ऐसे धर्म संकट में डाल दिया है कि मैं कुछ कह भी नहीं सकता। इतना जरूर कहूंगा कि उन्होंने जो कुछ किया है, उसका नतीजा यह है कि आज हम खून के घूंट पीकर चुप हैं।”

मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि 1975 में श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी और शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान में जो समझौता हुआ था, उसके आधार पर 11,000 से लेकर 16,000 क्यूसेक पानी हमको मिलना था, लेकिन जनत रंजीम में फरक्का बांध का जो एग्जी-

मेंट हुआ, उसके हिसाब से 20,500 क्यूसेक पानी हमको मिलना था। तो फिर मंत्री महोदय को खून के घूंट पीने की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी? अब तो वह समझौता भी खत्म हो गया है। अब तो वह कम से कम पानी के घूंट पिला दें। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अब वह क्या समझौता करने जा रहे हैं। और उसमें क्या व्यवस्था करने जा रहे हैं।

जहां तक सीमा पर बाड़ लगाने का ताल्लुक है, घुसपैठिये आसाम, बंगाल, बिहार और बम्बई में आ रहे थे-और रिपार्ट यह है कि हमारे कैपिटल, दिल्ली, में ढाई लाख लोग बंठे हैं-, उनको रोकने के लिए बाड़ लगाने की जरूरत पड़ी। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बंगलादेश के साथ लेटेस्ट क्या बातचीत हुई है। क्या सरकार ने बाड़ लगाने के काम को रोक दिया है? उसमें कहां प्रोग्रेस हुई है? बंगलादेश एक छोटा मुल्क है। उसके साथ ताल्लुकात सुधारने चाहिए।

आज के अखबारों में छपा है कि पाकिस्तान की बहुत बड़ी फौज हमारे बार्डर पर जमा हो गई है। यह भी एक कटु सत्य है कि अमरीकन आर्म्ज पाकिस्तान के पास हैं। वे मोस्ट माडर्न आर्म्ज हैं और वे हमारे खिलाफ इस्तेमाल होने हैं। पाकिस्तान के लोग यह भी कह रहे हैं कि हम एटामिक हथियार बनाने वाले हैं। उनका मुकाबला करने के लिए सरकार क्या करने जा रही है?

कांग्रेस पार्टी के महामंत्री, श्री राजीव गांधी, ने कहा है कि एक साल के अन्दर पाकिस्तान हमला करने वाला है। अगर यह फैक्ट नहीं है, तो मन्त्री महोदय हाउस को बताएं कि किस आधार पर वह यह बात कह रहे हैं। अगर यह बात कहकर

(श्री सूरजभान सिंह)

महज मुल्क में यूनिटी, इतिफाक, लाने की बात सोच रहे हैं, तो यह प्रॉसेस बहुत डेंजरस और गलत है। अगर वह लड़ाई का होवा खड़ा करके देश के लोगों को इक्ठठा करना चाहते हैं, तो यह बड़ी गलत बात है। मंत्री महोदय एक मुल्क को कान्फिडेंस में लें कि इस बात में कहा तक असलियत है। अगर लड़ाई होने वाली है, तो सरकार उसके लिए क्या तैयारी कर रही है? हम लोग इस बात में यकीन करते हैं कि एटॉमिक पावर को पीसफुल परपज के लिए इस्तेमाल करना चाहिए। लेकिन अगर पाकिस्तान के पास एटॉमिक वैपन्ज होते हैं, तो सरकार क्या करेगी? मंत्री महोदय पार्लियामेंट के जरिये मुल्क को कान्फिडेंस में ले।

जहां तक अफगानिस्तान के ताल्लुक हैं, रूस हमारा मित्र है, जो आड़े वकल में हमारे काम आया है। आर्थिक स्थिति की बात हो या मुल्क की रक्षा का मामला हो, जब कभी और कोई मुसिबत आई है, सभी मरहलों पर अपने रूस को एक दोस्त के नाते अपने पास खड़ा पाया है। मगर अफगानिस्तान के मामले में भी उसकी पालिसी को मैं पसन्द नहीं करता, वहां पर जो उसकी फोजे आई हैं उसको बिल्कुल पसन्द नहीं करता। लेकिन रूस की जो तीखी नुक्ताचीनी करते हैं उनसे मैं एक बात कहना चाहूंगा और वह भी उर्दू के शेर में। इसलिए कि जब कभी देश पर हमला हुआ तो अमरीका ने मदद नहीं की, चीन ने हमला किया तो रूस ने हमारी मदद की है। तो उन तीखे नुक्ता चानों से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कहीं कल पछता कर उन्हें यह ना कहना पड़े :--

कभी जिसको ठोकर लगाई थी मैंने
सिर उस आस्ता पर भुकाने चला हूँ।

इसका सीधा सा मतलब यह है कि कहीं ऐसा मौका न आ जाए, कोई जरूरत पड़े तो आड़े में उन्हीं के दहलीज पर सिर भुकाना पड़े। कहीं पछतावा न करना पड़े लेकिन एक बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि अफगानिस्तान में जो कुछ हो रहा है, जैसे बिल्ली के नरम नाजुक पंजे में कुछ तीखे और तेज नाखून भी होते हैं, बिल्कुल वही मामला है अफगानिस्तान हैं। अफगानिस्तान की आग की चिनगारी हिन्दुस्तान के दामन में भी कभी आ सकती है। इसलिए इतनी हिम्मत तो आपमें होनी चाहिए आपकी दोस्ती कच्चे धागे की तरह इतनी कमजोर न हो कि कभी भी टूट जाए और आप अपने दोस्त को अस्लिमत भी न बता सकें, सच्चा दोस्त तो बही होता है जो दोस्त तो वही होता है जो दोस्त के मुंह पर बता सके कि सच्चाई क्या है। आप इतना तो कहते हैं कि फौरन ट्रप्स किसी मुल्क में नहीं रहने चाहिए लेकिन आप इतना तो कहने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं कि अफगानिस्तान में रूस के ट्रप्स है वह वापिस जायें।

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त : यह तो कई दफा बोले हैं।

विदेश मंत्री (श्री पी. वी. नरसिंह राव) : आपसे कहा जैसे उनसे कहा, और क्या करें ?

श्री सूरज भान : ठीक है, अच्छी बात है।

आप अपने ही भगड़ों में उलभे हुए हैं। भारत गुट निरपेक्ष आन्दोलन का

चेंगरमैन है, चाहिए तो यह था कि एशिया में, अफ्रीका में जहां कहीं भुखमरी है उसको दूर करने में आप मदद करते, कम्पूचिया, लेबनान या इराक-ईरान की लड़ाई की जो समस्याए हैं उनको हल करने में मदद कहते लेकिन बदकिस्मती यह है कि आप खुद ही पजाब के मामले में उलभे हुए है, लका के मामले में उलभे हुए है। आपको अपने घर से ही फुर्सत नहीं है और पड़ोसियों से ही सम्बन्ध अच्छे नहीं हैं तो विदेशों में आप क्या साख बिठा पायेंगे ?

आखिर में एक बात कहना चाहता हूं। हिन्दुस्तान तो सुपर पावर्स की प्राक्सी वार का मैदान नहीं बनने दिया जाना चाहिए कि वे यहाँ अपने हथियारों का टेस्ट कर सकें। इस बात को बिल्कुल नहीं होने देना चाहिए। अभी पिछले महीने भारतीय जनता पार्टी की आल इण्डिया वकिंग कमेटी की बैठक हुई थी जिसमें एक रेजोल्यूशन पास हुआ था, वह बहुत लम्बा है, उसके कुछ सेन्टेन्स ही पढ़कर मैं खतम करना चाहूंगा :—

“For that purpose, we would urge the convening of a South Asian Regional Summit, which amongst other things would work for :

- (a) Joint regional approach to a lasting solution for Afghanistan, which would ensure its independent, non-aligned status without any outside intervention or interference;
- (b) A regional call for the super powers to withdraw from the Indian Ocean and a dismantling of all naval bases like Diego Garce;
- (c) An early end to the Iraq-Iran War and an end to all super power involent in the Gulf.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU (Chengalpattu) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is right and proper that we should end our marathon budget session by having discussion about the international situation. Our internal stability is dependent upon external conditions. As our hon. Prime Minister has stated in Bombay the other day, our developmental efforts are at stake if the external situation compels us to take adequate steps for protecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country.

I would like to confine myself only to the international situation as well as the external situations around our borders namely the adjacent countries.

Unfortunately, on the other day in our Lok Sabha we heard the voice of General Zia through some of our hon. members here. Sir, at the outset I deplore such anti-national utterances on the floor of the House. Our Hon. members and Janata Party colleagues Shri Patnaik and Shri George Fernandes have now become votaries of the military dictatorship of Pakistan. It is indeed paradoxical that they call our democratically elected Prime Minister, a dictator, whereas they call Zia their friend. The hon. members are praising the peace move by President Zia who is committing ceaseless intrusions, on our skies and on our territories. He is amassing troops in the borders of Ladakh and his military colleagues are making insidious attempts for supplying arms, ammunition and trained subversive experts to extremists in Punjab. Mr. Subramaniam Swamy is also a staunch supporters of America and China. When he himself is titled towards America, there is no fun in his preaching our country to change our policy to stay equi-distance between Russia and America.

Mr. Swamy knows that America is arming China and Pakistan to the teeth with sophisticated nuclear weapons. But still it is unfortunate that he has become a votary and supporter of

(Shri Era Anbarasu)

American policy, and the policies pursued by Pakistan. I understand that the hon. member, Shri George Fernandes is going to lead a batch of internationally reputed members to Sri Lanka. I do not know what he is going to do in Sri Lanka, when he never supported the stand taken by our Government. I know that the ethnic violence in Sri Lanka was stopped only because of the strenuous and right steps taken by Government of India. I do not know how Mr. George Fernandes and our hon. member Shri Subramaniam Swamy are going to change the development that is taking place in Sri Lanka.

President Jayawardane agreed last time that the army went out of his control when there was violence in Sri Lanka. We Indians believed up his version, But later it is really painful to hear what he said. He said that even 100 Indians cannot shake Sri Lanka. He might have said to meet the burning internal problems or to show his military strength. But Sir, we are second to none in this world. We are not for waging war against any country. We have no intentions to annex even an inch of land from any other country. But at the same time we are not inferior to any country. In fact I would like to say that Ceylon is like**.

But that is not our intention at all. We were brought up by the ideology of Mahatma Gandhi.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : You should not say that.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU : We leave got our able Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi.

We have no intention like that.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South) : You should not say that.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU : When another Minister in the Sri Lanka Cabinet says that the Indian Ocean will be the burial ground for Tamilians am I not provoked to say this ? Don't you think that my blood also boils ? I have my own relations, kith and kin in Sri Lanka. Therefore, I feel I have the right to reply to such provocative remarks by responsible persons in Sri Lanka.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Anbarasu, you mentioned that Sri Lanka was something and all that ; that India can do this and that—this does not reflect the foreign policy of the Government of India. So, I will have to go through the record.

When we speak about another country, we should not call it as this and that.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU : It is my remark as an individual. I have also got the liberty to say so.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : It is all right, but you should not mention it. It would not serve any purpose.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU : When they say so much about India ..

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We must have respect for other countries in the world, though we may differ from them.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU : What I want to impress here is that as it is, we should not believe totally the President of Sri Lanka when he says that he will definitely solve the problem of Tamils in Sri Lanka or that he will find a proper and amicable political Solution to the problem of Sri Lankan Tamils.

And again I would like to point out that Shri Lanka's economy is in a shambles. Therefore, he is more

** Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

dependent on USA's help. It is an evident fact that there is the leaning out of Trincomolee which is known as the Eye of Indian Ocean to a consortium comprising and a Singapore-based U.S. company. It is an evident fact that to save the condition of his country's economy, he is leaning towards, and taking all possible help from America. He is also shortly visiting USA. The Voice of America has made the Sri Lanka Radio a powerful radio in this part of the world. Sri Lanka is being made a second Diego Garcia to supervene the movement of Russian fleet in the Indian Ocean. After losing its foothold in Vietnam, Sri Lanka has become the springboard for the US.

Here again, I would like to refer to the recent speech of our hon. friend Mr. George Fernandes wherein he made a remark that America is so genuine. Even the attempt of Zia is so reasonable, for amity and friendship with India. I only suspect** these three persons, viz. Mr Patnaik, Dr Subramaniam Swamy and Mr. George Fernandes. It only reflects the America-China-Pakistan axis. That only I can say.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: You may have different views. But you should not suspect the hon. Members. This is not fair. You can enter into a debate.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE: You cannot suspect his *bona fides* **It is definitely in bad taste. It is only for the sake of protecting our country that we feel that we must have friendship with our neighbours. Why should you doubt.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU: Undoubtedly, even Mr. Chakraborty was telling...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Anbarasu, you should not doubt their patriotism.

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE: I object to this. He should not say this. He should withdraw this.

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT: (Ahmedabad): The other gentleman has referred to him as an agent of a foreign country...

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE: Please ask him to withdraw. It is unfair.

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT: It is unparliamentary.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU: Mr. Chakraborty was very reasonable when he said that we could not hold the country together. What is the reason for this? Even assuming that the comment he made is true, the reason is we have such leaders in the country.

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE: Sir, you have not asked him to withdraw. If we had said something, you would not have allowed us. You must ask him to withdraw.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All right; you leave it to me. You have mentioned it.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU: When you support, when you say...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Anbarasu, that is not correct.

** Expunged as ordered by the Chair,

When you mention about any hon. member you should not say that it is wrong. You should not mention it.

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT There is no reason why somebody's bonafide should be doubted.

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDA-VATE That should be expunged.

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT : We strongly protest against it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has withdrawn it.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU 11 right. I don't want to injure the feelings of our hon. members. I will withdraw my words. We do not want anything more on this.

SHRI MADHUSUDAN VAIRALE (AKOLA): You can doubt their wisdom**

(Interruptions)

SHRI ERA ANBARASU I was really surprised to read the comments of a Minister of Sri Lanka that Indian Ocean will become a burial ground for Sri Lanka Tamils. When they say so, you want me to keep quiet, no to reply to their points. That is why they are meant for somehow wiping out the entire Tamil people in Sri Lanka. Therefore, India should take more initiative to bring out a lasting permanent political solution.

Once ayewardene was commenting that Buddhist Monks were so powerful in influencing them not to implement the formal understanding arrived at between Parthasarthy and Jayewardene. Why can't we convene a buddhist Organisation in India to invite those Monks to India and teach them what Buddha wanted and what Buddha stood for. Therefore, I request you to organise a high level Buddhist Conference here for finding out a lasting political solution.

** Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

I was told that due to the navel blockage there—in fact, they called it as a naval blockage for surveillance—actually, they have trespassed into our territorial waters and our coast guard people are in danger. It appears that our fishermen could not fish in our own territorial waters. Therefore, I request the hon. members to supply them arms and ammunitions to safeguard their interest from the enemy. After all, we have got our own interest not to invade, not to fight against them and to safeguard our coast guard people and fishermen. Further, we should not hesitate to raise our voice in the U.N. Human Rights Commission regarding the blatant violation of Human Rights Convention of Sri Lanka. I think you will be surprised to know that in the IPU Conference held in Seoul, South Korea some time in September or October, 1983, the representatives of Sri Lanka raised the issue about the separatist Tamil forces and their activities in Sri Lanka. Our M.P. Delegates were directed not to talk about Sri Lankan atrocities on the minority Tamil Race in that country. It is really surprising why we would not raise such issues in all international forums to find out a lasting solution. Why should we feel shy to face reality in Sri Lanka? I am unable to comprehend the efforts of our country in the process of finding a political solution in Sri Lanka.

There is a limit for the endurance of the people of Tamil Nadu whose kith and kin are being massacred and butchered. Before Tamil Nadu erupts into an enragee volcano, the Centre should take some pre-emptive steps. After all, irrespective of the political hangover of this issue, the fact that the people of Tamil Nadu have their own blood relations in Sri Lanka cannot be denied.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please conclude now.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What is there ? This is the last day. Let us go on.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No. All of you have to speak also.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU : The continued atrocities of Sri Lankan Army should be vehemently protested against by India. The continued atrocities on Tamils should be very vehemently with some strong words, be condemned by us.

We need not pin all our hopes on the all-party conference being convened in Colombo. While we wish it all success, because failure at this juncture will lead to anarchism in Sri Lanka, all the same, we should not be reluctant to protect the rights of our people there.

Our hon. Prime Minister has stated that India cannot keep itself aloof when life and property of Indians there are threatened. Here, I would like to point out that during the Bangladesh liberation war, the Sri Lankan Government had permitted Pakistani Air Force planes to get refuelled at the Colombo Airport. This may be right of an independent and sovereign nation, but it shows the anti-Indian stance of Sri Lanka. It has appeared in the newspapers that British and Chinese boats have reached the Sri Lankan northern Coast to help the naval blockade of Jaffna. Therefore, they have sided with China and Pakistan and we should not neglect all these facts. At this juncture, when there is a war hysteria on the northern borders with Pakistan and when there is shoot-out from Bangladesh on our unarmed staff engaged in fencing on our soil, we should take note of Sri Lanka's threatening posture on the southern side.

I want the hon. Minister for External Affairs to give a reply to the

issues that I have raised in my speech and further, before concluding I have collected some photographs and also some video tapes recording the atrocities committed on Tamils—I would like to leave them here or place them on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You may give them to the Hon. Speaker in his Chamber. The rules do not permit it to be given here.

SHRI ERA ANBARASU : I have given notice to the Hon. Speaker in the morning. I would like to give them to the Hon. Speaker if he wants to see how the Tamils were set fire to in the open streets and how Tamils were butchered there openly. And, therefore, it will really serve some purpose ; it will give some useful information in providing some interest, and to evolve a political solution to the problem of Sri Lankan Tamils.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Shri Dhandapani.

You can give them to the Hon. Speaker. Do not give them to anybody. Yes ; Mr. Dhandapani now.

SHRI C.T. DHANDAPANI (Pollachi) : Very recently, we discussed the Sri Lanka issue in this very House. The hon. Minister was kind enough to give us the information which he had received from the Sri Lanka Government. After that discussion, the Minister Incharge of National Security in Sri Lanka, Mr. Athulathmudali, had visited India immediately after the Prime Minister wrote a letter to the Sri Lanka Government. I do not know the contents of the letter. But it was reported in the newspapers that the Prime Minister had written a very strong letter to the Sri Lanka Government. On the eve of Mr. Lalith Athulathmudali's departure to Delhi, questions were put to him by the press-men, All this

had appeared in *The Patriot* of 14th April, 1984, which I would like to quote here :

Q : It is said that you are going to Delhi because of the strong letter written to the President by Mrs. Gandhi ?

A : If I am going to Delhi because Mrs. Gandhi has written a strong letter to the President, then this country has lost its sovereignty. If it is a strong letter, we will give a strong reply. I am going to discuss things of mutual interests.

Q : What mutual things ?

A : I will tell them. That is sort of thing which is reported. In July they said the violence was stopped because of India .”

This shows, what is said here is completed by contradicted in his reply. This shows how they are interested in solving the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka. This also shows their attitude and their audacity to tell all those things in public. India is one of the countries which always stand for human rights and self-determination. Our country, on many occasions, had voiced its concern in support of self-determination and opposed the countries which violated the human rights.

18.52 hrs.

[SHRI CHINTAMANI PANI-
GRAHI *in the Chair*]

I have seen many instances. I appreciate the stand taken by our Government. In 1960 in Langa township some freedom fighters went in a procession. They were killed by the whites. The then Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, moved a Resolution in this very House on

28th March, 1960 which I would like to quote :

“I beg to move :-

“That this House deplores and records its deep sorrow at the tragic incidents which occurred, at Sharpeville and in Langa township near Capetown in South Africa on March 21, 1961, resulting in the death of a large number of Africans from police firing. It sends its deep sympathy to the Africans who have suffered from this firing and from the policy of racial discrimination and the suppression of the African people in their own homeland.”

This was the resolution moved by him. Then the Prime Minister found out the way as to how this kind of discrimination and killings could be taken to an international forum namely the UNO. He said :

“Something terrible has happened there. Something terrible not only on that particular occasion but in the context of the modern world; and it is not surprising that there has been this great reaction all over the world, and I believe the matter is going to be brought before the United Nations.

Now the United Nations Organisation also, normally, does not interfere in the internal affairs of another country although there have been cases when it has interfered and rightly interfered in giving consideration to those matters. It may be said that this is not a matter for the United Nations a matter that is likely to lead to violation of international peace and security, that is, the charter of the United Nations. Well, in that sense, in the strict sense of the word, perhaps it is not. But in any reasonable sense of that word, of that phrase, it is very much a matter in which

the United Nations, as representing the international community, should consider this, because it involves something of the most intimate concern to humanity itself."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru stated this when the African Negross were killed in Langa town, not in Sri Lanka but in Langa town in South Africa. The same way the Present Prime Minister, when she was the Prime Minister during the Bangladesh issue, also moved a Resolution in the very same House. It said :

"This House expresses its deep anguish and grave concern at the recent developments in East Bengal. A massive attack by armed forces, despatched from West Pakistan has been unleashed against the entire people of East Bengal with a view to suppressing their urges and aspirations."

Not only that, the Congress Working Committee also expressed its anguish over that incident. They passed a Resolution saying :

"The Working Committee expresses its solidarity with the people of East Bengal and solemnly pledges itself to do whatever lies within its power to mitigate their suffering. The Working Committee appeals to the international community to raise its voice against this crime of genocide."

So, what I am saying is that the Indian Government has always been supporting the people who are fighting for self-determination. The same way, recently our Government has said on 25.8.1983 :

"The Government has been watching with uneasiness and distress the recent happenings

in Pakistan and the sufferings of the people who have been demanding restoration of democracy in that country. As a nation we are committed to democracy."

We are committed to democracy, that is why we have issued this statement. Despite that, all this is happening.

Another important matter I would like to say is about the P.L.O. We have recognised the P.L.O. It is reported in the Hindu dated 16th April 1984, and it was brought to the notice of the Minister also. It says :

"India close to recognising Saharawi Arab Republic.

The Foreign Affairs Department of the All-India Congress Committee (I) has expressed its support to the 'long struggle waged by the Saharawi people for independence and for a sovereign homeland!—a step widely interpreted here as a move towards official recognition of the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic."

It further says :

"The AICC (I) statement also reiterated its support for the U.N. General Assembly resolution, calling for the recognition of the right to self-determination of the people of Western Sahara and the 19th DAU summit resolution, calling for a ceasefire and direct negotiations between the parties in the conflict. According to a spokesman of the Polisario Front, Morocco which is 'illegally occupying' Western Sahara, has so far refused to honour either resolution."

There is a similarity in Moroccan affair as well as in Sri Lankan issue,

(Shri C.T. Dhandapani)

I had been to Morocco in 1981, I met many people there, I had an opportunity to discuss with them also. That country was divided both by Spanish and the French. Then it was occupied by the Moroccans. Now they want liberation. The Polisario Front is trying to have their own nation. They are fighting against the present Moroccan Government. Now we are going to support their movement according to the Press report.

19:00 hrs.

So these are the incidents which I quote showing that really the government is very much interested in protecting the minority community. But the question is why has the Government failed in protecting the Tamils in Sri Lanka? Tamils are being continuously harassed and killed since 1956. 1958, 1961, 1972, 1977, 1979, 1982 and 1983, in all these years they have been harassed. Of course. Sri Lanka is a neighbouring country and we have large links with them, but the question is did you continue to receive information about these happenings there? And if so, what action have you taken so far? Whether you have made any protest to the Sri Lanka Government all these years?

Some people said that my Party, the DMK, wants to have political advantage of this and that we wanted to start this agitation and raise this issue in Parliament and also make it an election propaganda. As soon as this carnage took place we all represented to the Prime Minister and requested her to look into it and take necessary diplomatic and other steps to stop this persecution and cultural genocide. We never said anything against the Government. But what happened is that the Indian Government itself wanted to make it politics. Instead of taking further steps they invited Amrithlingam. They wanted a statement from him. We know that they

wanted a statement from him saying that all the actions taken by the Indian Government were correct; we support the initiatives and measures of the Indian Government. Second motive was to make an appeal to the leaders in Tamil Nadu to keep quiet and that they should not interfere in this matter. Thirdly the Elam demand should be given up. These are the three matters which were contained in the letter, but the Indian Government did not try to get that letter. After that the Indian Government succeeded in getting the very same statement from Mr. Tondaman, the Minister from Sri Lanka.

But the Congress Party and the Indian Government thought it in a different way. They thought they will put this issue before the people for election purposes. Now the elections are taking place for four Assembly constituencies. We declare openly that as far as these bye-elections are concerned, we will never raise this issue. We will never tell the people that the Prime Minister was against all this.

Sir, late Anna's speech in Rajya Sabha in 1964 December dealt on the question of Sri Lanka people and the Stateless people. He spoke when we did not expect that we will come into power. What I submit is that we are not here to make any political advantage of any particular issue. We want the issue to be settled only through the Indian Government. DMK party or Tamil people are not powerful enough to face the Sri Lanka Government, because we are the ordinary citizens.

The only thing is that the Indian Government has got some moral obligations. It is their bounden duty. The people of Indian origin are there. It is their duty to protect them even by way of rescue operations. You can send some rescue missions also so that the Sinhalese people may stop the killings of our Tamil people.

By saying this, I once again request the hon. Minister to see that the dialogue which is taking place now is not going to be a fruitless one.

Finally, before I conclude, I would like to draw your attention to a news item under the heading 'Jayewardene proposes plan for regional devolution'. President Jayewardene told :

The Times, London, to whom he gave an interview, and I quote : "If the TULF does not agree, they can stay out", the President said, adding, "We do not need an agreement with them to go ahead with our proposals".

This is the position. In that case I would ask the Minister, what is going to be the future course of action. Mr. Jayewardene has taken a very strong line in this matter. He takes an upper hand. This is what I personally feel. So, I leave it to the Minister, and I hope he will deal with it in a proper way.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, Mr. B.R. Bhagat may speak. Unless the Members cooperate, I cannot accommodate all the Members.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT (Sitamarhi) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, It has been the tradition in this House that on foreign policy matters we always evolve a consensus.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : No, no.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : You are a new Member or you are taking a departure, but this is the tradition ; I am telling you the fact because basically international relations are determined by the national interest of the country and I think, to whatever party we belong there is a common ground on what is the national interest of a country, and that is the reason why on this issue at least there has been a

consensus in this House and where there are only two crystalised parties, it is known as bypartisan approach on international affairs, whether it is the United States or England or any other. So far as the question of this country is concerned, we must approach the international situation or any discussion from this point of view. The international situation today is very grave. So far as our country is concerned, we are facing many dangers and therefore, on this matter at least the House must give a correct lead and some people have talked about the unity of this House on this issue. The unity is needed and unity of approach is needed. The two basic factors are threat to peace and the threat to development. It is these two issues which are crystalised that call for the worsening of the international situation today. The fact is that in the second cold war situation that the whole world is facing, it has become more dangerous than the first one simply because the nuclear arsenal,—the nuclear armaments, thereby posing a threat of nuclear holocaust to the world—is there by which mankind faces extinction. And there is an agreement, I think, in the whole world whether it is North or South or whether it is East or West, and therefore, we must have at least an agreement or consensus on this that if there is an outbreak of nuclear war, we face a total extinction. Similarly, this situation is compounded by the worsening world economic crisis.

I need not go into the details of it. The non-aligned Conference held here very precisely concretised these two aspects. The economic crisis is leading to creation of situation which becomes threat to world peace. Therefore, we have to approach to this problem.

Dr. Subramaniam Swamy talks of equi-distance. It is not a question of equi-distance. If you have an agreement, you cannot be equi-distant with friend and the enemy.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Who is a friend and who is an enemy ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Equi-distan-
ce to what ?

You have talked of Afganistan ?
Our policy is very clear on Afganistan.
We are opposed to any presence of fore-
ign troops in any country.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Have you said so ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Afganistan
problem has to be settled politically.
We see war preparations and piling up
of arms, etc. The United States of
America used this Afganistan position
in postponing the Conference which was
agreed on the Indian ocean as a zone
of peace. Is it not a fact ? Do you
want that we should be equi-distant to
that ? It is a matter of vital interest.
Everybody is worried. The Indian
Ocean is full of navy sub marines, nucl-
ear sub marines, nuclear base missiles
in Diego Garcia. Because this meeting
was to be held in 1980, the United
States of America says-because Soviet
troops are in Afganistan we will not
discuss it. Meanwhile they are putting
all arms every where in the Persian Gulf
in Pakistan. Do you want us to be
equi-distant in this matter ?

We are non-aligned. Non-aligned
means freedom of action. It means we
pursue all issues on independent basis
and you have seen the expression of over
100 country in the Non-aligned Confe-
rence.

(Interruptions)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
The Resolution is different from this.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : This is the
time-when the the country faces
danger, there are armaments all around.
There is de-stabilisation going on. Neo-

imperialism is in action. Neo-colonia-
lism is in action. They are trying to
de-stabilise and weaken our economy,
cut our aid. In global economic, mone-
tary issues we are drawing blank.
There is collapse of talks on disarm-
ment. Mean while the arms race is
going on. There is rapid deployment
of forces. There cannot be greater
critical and dangerous situation in the
world, in our country, than what we are
facing to-day. Have we not a consen-
sus on this ?

You say we must be friendly with
our neighbours. That is our policy.
We are not hostile to any one.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
They are hostile to you !

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : My point
is that except with Pakistan, our rela-
tions with all our neighbours are
homely. With Pakistan also, the dialo-
gue is going on. No war pact or a
treaty of friendship and cooperation,
and in various other ways we are trying.
But you know the situation there !
Our main approach to our region, in our
neighbourhood, is that we must agree to
basic principles. We must solve our
problems through bilateral talk. This
was the essence of the simla Agreement
There is no way out.

Secondly, there should not be an
involvement of outside or extra regional
power. This is the policy agreed every-
where—whether you talk of Monroe
doctrine or talk of any other place or
any other region. Outside forces or
super power should have no involve-
ment. Can you say that in Pakistan this
power is not there ? The supply of
sophisticated arms is there. Therefore,
don't say one is hostile with the other.
We know the situation. We have to be
prepared for the worst. And we are
preparing. And at the same time, we
are persuading Pakistan. We want to
have a friendly relation with pakistan.
We want to have a friendly neighbour.
Even with China, we want to have

friendly relation because in the neighbourhood, we must have this. Therefore, the pursuit of national interest demands that we must have national unity and consensus on basic foreign policy and the policy which we are pursuing is the correct policy. That is the policy of evolving good and neighbourly relations, friendly relations with others. In this situation, let the House be one so that we will be able to face this danger that the world and India are facing today, unitedly and with confidence.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :

Sir, Rao Birendra Singh met President Zia-ul-Haq very recently. He should make a statement on this.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (RAO BIRENDRA SINGH) :
It is too late now a statement.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA

(Barasat) : Mr. Chairman, I think, on the occasion of this debate, it is my solemn duty also to remind the House that today, the 9th of May, happens to be the anniversary of the day which is observed as the day of victory over fascism. 9th of May 39 years ago was the day of the victory over fascism. It was the day when the world War II was finished by the complete defeat of Hitler's forces. The day is being observed in many countries which were victims of fascism. It may not be so observed or even remembered by us. Hitler was the symbol of a force which set out to dominate the entire world by force of arms and we know what price the world had to pay for that.

Sir, today the mantle of Hitler, in this sense, has fallen on Reagan, on Reaganism. Reaganism stands for the same policy. It is an attempt to dominate and subjugate the world and intimidate the world by force of arms. But this time, this is threat of nuclear war ; we all know what it is. Let us at least remember all those millions who perished in World War II and let us at least see

that whatever efforts our country can make should be made in the direction of averting the threat of another World War which would this time, as other speakers have said, mean perhaps the complete extinction of humanity.

Sir, I find not much reference is being made to a very important event which has taken place recently and I would like to know what is the Government of India's assessment. More or less, Members in this House, with the unfortunate exception of Dr. Swamy, are of the opinion that the main danger to peace, main threat of war is coming from the Reagan Administration...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Alone.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Yes, alone, but I do not blame the American people for it. I blame the Reagan Administration, the Pentagon, the industrial military complex in the U.S.A. And knowing that and then everybody admitting that, we should have some assessment of how we look at the recent visit of President Reagan to Beijing. Nobody has said anything about that. I do not know what the Government is thinking. Because, here we all understand that in November, the Presidential elections are coming in the U. S. A. And Mr. Reagan is obviously trying to use this visit as an election gimmick. He is the man who has once declared publicly that he would never set foot on the soil of a communist country, particularly of China.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : Did he say that ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Yes, he said.

Today he has gone there with certain obvious purposes.

I am very glad that as far as I have understood from the reports that

(Shri Indrajit Gupta)

are available, the Chinese authorities have not obliged him by agreeing to any anti-Soviet world front or a sort of global consensus or strategic consensus, as the Americans are fond of elaborating. It appears that Chinese have not agreed to that. In fact, they have reportedly advised him that he should try to make up with the Soviets.

But that is one side of the question and the welcome side of it.

On the other hand, we do see that there is some difference in the stand of both sides. There is the question of Taiwan. I cannot go into details now. But there is a change. Mr. Deug Tsias Peng has agreed over the re-unification of Taiwan with the mainland to be carried out peacefully, not by force of arms and, they have even agreed that after re-unification, the social, political and economic structure of Taiwan will remain undisturbed. They are prepared to guarantee this. That is a new development. The Americans have agreed to supply them nuclear equipment, nuclear reactors, spares and ancillaries. Apparently, no restrictions have been placed on Chinese acquisition of uranium or even on the reprocessing of spent fuel. We do not know the details of it. But Government should be better informed and should be able to tell us.

It is a big contrast, anyway, with the relations we had on the question of Tarapur. There is much contrast in the attitude of Mr. Reagan towards the Chinese demand for nuclear facilities and towards our demand over Tarapur. Even the commitment of Tarapur has not been honoured by them in the end.

The positions of the United States and China seem to be more or less identical as far as Vietnam and Kampuchea are concerned. They broadly share the same view as Dr. Subramaniam Swamy as far as Vietnam and Kampuchea are concerned.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
We should join Communists then,

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I would like to know the assessment of the Government of India regarding this as far as it affects India. Do they consider it to be a welcome and good thing? Or has it got any ominous or sinister implications?

In this context, I am asking "Why is Mr. Bush coming?" Somebody asked a little while ago here, I think Shri R. L. Bhatia. Why is Mr. Bush coming now to India? Has he been invited? if so, for what purpose? We should like to know. Mr. Bush is after all, the representative of President Reagan. Everybody here has talked of global US strategy. I would like to know what exactly is going on in the context of this new development.

Secondly, we have had the visit from the Japanese Prime Minister Mr. Nakasone. It is in keeping with the Indian traditions that we always show utmost courtesy to foreign guests who come here. I do not want that there should be any departure from that. But even going by those standards, I think we went rather out of the usual way in giving him red carpet welcome. I can understand it because, for economic reasons we are very anxious to develop new relations and contacts with Japan. I do not know what the result of it has been. I do not suppose it will come up in the Minister's reply to this debate.

But, as has been mentioned here, we can not forget that the present Japanese Government is very much part of the United States global strategy in so far as it affect the Far East. In fact, a sort of axis of the United States, Japan and South Korea is very much active at the moment trying to see that the presence of US troops in South Korea is maintained, that Japan is re-militarised and takes over from the United States the task of policing the pacific so that

the Seventh fleet is released for the Indian ocean and, in view of that, Mr. Nakasone's visit, of course, may have a political side and an economic side. We are never informed or taken into confidence as to what has been discussed or what is going to happen as a result of this. We should know.

About Afghanistan, some people here wanted to provoke the Minister to repeat again, I think, what has been said many times that nobody is happy at the presence of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan and they went there, as we know, at the request of the Afghan Government...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Which Government ?

SHRI INDRAJEET GUPTA : I am afraid that this is, soon, going to become a dead letter for the very simple reason that we had stood always for a political negotiated settlement which would include the withdrawal of Soviet troops, which would also include guarantees that there would be no other external intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. The United Nations people were brought into this process at a certain stage, but it did not work out because Zia-ul-Haq at that time refused to talk to the Babrak Karmal Government. I think some change is now coming about. I am emphasizing this because, I think, it is time for India once again to take some initiative in this matter, because reports show that the Panjshir Valley which was the main stronghold of the so-called Mujahideen, so-called insurgent forces led by Ahmed Shah Masood—this was their stronghold, Panjshir, that—backbone of these counter-revolutionary forces has been destroyed only recently, and destroyed not by the Soviet forces, I may say. The Panjshir Valley was a show-piece always of the western media the BBC and the American media, everybody was always playing up Panjshir Valley because it is inside Afghanistan. It was there that foreign visitors were

always taken, the latest being Mrs. Margaret Thatcher who went there and is reported to have told the Mujahids—I do not know if they have understood what she was talking—“What does it matter if President Sadaq is no longer there? I am there to help you”. That Panjshir Valley, that stronghold, has been liquidated. And many voices in Pakistan, inside Pakistan,—you will find in the press and elsewhere—are again advising President Zia to open talks with the Government in Kabul for a negotiated political settlement of this issue; otherwise, it will do limitless harm to Pakistan itself ultimately. This is the time, I feel, when India has the Chair-Person of the Non-Aligned Movement should think of taking new initiatives so that this matter can be again brought to the negotiating table and it can be settled in a way which will satisfy everybody. The trouble is this: somebody asked, ‘Can you persuade Zia-ul-Haq because he is not a representative of democratic government, he seized power by force and all that? It is true. But it is also true that he is not a free agent by any means. It is also true that today there are two Pakistans. One is the Pakistan represented by Zia-ul-Haq, and the other Pakistan is the one represented by those forces who are fighting for the restoration of democracy in Pakistan, who are being suppressed by the present military regime, who are with great courage and heroism fighting and suffering being repressed, put into prison and so on. They do not represent the same outlook which President Zia-ul-Haq represents. They stand for friendship with India, genuine friendship with India, they stand for peace and good neighbourly relations. So, when we talk about Pakistan, we do not mean only the military ruler. There is another Pakistan and they are our friends, our real friends, and we should take initiative in such a way that these forces are strengthened and the forces which are really hostile to India are isolated.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
He should specify what he means by that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please try to conclude.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Since you are ringing the bell, I would like to say, finally, finally, a few words about the question which has been raised about our relations with our neighbours. There is no doubt that the situation as it has developed today is certainly one which is very disturbing. Whether we are to blame for it or not, that is a different matter. But the fact remains that Pakistan, Sri Lank, Bangladesh, all our immediate neighbours, and ourselves have got relations which are certainly very strained, to say the least. One thing I should say here. Mr. Subramaniam Swamy was trying to take credit for the Janata Government because it had managed to enter into an agreement with Bangladesh Government on the Farakka waters. He said, 'We did it and you cannot do anything,' I would just like to remind him that so far as we, people are concerned, at least in West Bengal and Calcutta who are much more concerned with the Farakka waters to keep the navigation open and to keep the port of Calcutta alive, the biggest blow that was struck to us by the Janata Government was that agreement they signed without consulting the West Bengal government even at that time. That agreement deprived us of the water which was our legitimate due.....

AN HON. MEMBER : Policy of appeasement.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Now I can only say this much that I am glad that the present Government has at least done, if nothing else, they have managed to get out of that agreement. They have got of that agreement. They have not been able to negotiate a new agreement. That is true. But they have got out of that agreement and Bangladesh was demanding that there should be a further five year extension of the same agreement which the Government

of India has refused to enter into. Now there will be some ad hoc year to year agreement perhaps. But at least it is better than what we were trapped in—that five year agreement which the Janata Government has signed.....

DR SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : We know which side you are.

AN HON MEMBER : It is not a question of side.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : As far as these countries are concerned with whom our relations are deteriorating... I would be much obliged if your running commentary is not kept up... ..

(Interruptions)

I do not want to spend my time crossing swords with him.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : I will not confuse him.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : ...to take up the same old—his friend, Mr. Vajpayee who was the then Foreign Minister and of whom Mr. Swamy is a great admirer—the same old theory about equi-distance from the super powers, genuine non-alignment, that we should not tilt this way or that way. That is all old mutton that is being dug up again after all these years. But anyway I feel that is not a coincidence entirely that with all these three neighbours our relations are far from happy. And I think there are two sides to the question. One is that each, one of them has got certain internal compulsions. To get out of it this may be some, partly at least, a diversionary tactic. Gen. Ershad is facing serious troubles at home, as everybody knows. This fencing business has come a convenient excuse. I think, to stir up trouble. It is very easy to stir up trouble on this issue also unless the Indian Government makes it perfectly clear that they

are not in any way violating the 1975 agreement.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, the internal compulsions are quite clear. As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, the internal compulsions are very clear—what is going on there. This is one side of the question. I said the internal compulsions are a very important factor in the sudden sort of, apparently sudden deterioration in the relations with India. The other side of the cause is the external compulsion. There we must remember this. About Pakistan I need not say anything more. Everybody here has spoken on that. As far as Bangladesh is concerned, we must remember that in addition to other things, there are the moves that are going on in St. Martin's island. They are trying to get bases in St. Martin's island and also in the Chittagong harbour. We cannot divorce this aspect from these external forces which are trying to spread their network of bases around India. That is a fact. In Sri Lanka it is not only a question of this barbarous repression against the Tamils. It is also the question of Trincomalee harbour. It is also a question of this new oil base which they have offered to the consortium, the new big oil depots which are based there and which tomorrow the Americans can claim as part of their vital national interests or something. So all forces are at work. There is an external compulsion on those countries, on the governments of those countries, I should say and there are also very powerful internal compulsion unfortunately at the moment which also they want to get out of by creating some diversion.

This does not mean that our Government has nothing to do in the matter which is of vital interest to us. That is the friendliest, possibly, normal relations with these neighbours of ours which are, after all, much smaller than India, must be restored and we must spare no effort to see patiently, firmly but without panick and without getting

excited and soberly we must try to see that relations with these countries are restored as far as possible.

With Pakistan, we must pursue our attempts for some sort of an agreement whether it is called no war pact or treaty of friendship or whatever it is—a very difficult job no doubt because there are restraining hands which are keeping them back. Nevertheless, we must try.

With Sri Lanka, I really do not know what to suggest. After all, we cannot go to war with Sri Lanka in order to save the Tamils, our brethren. We cannot go to war with Sri Lanka. That is my view. If you want to go to war, you better announce it here. Short of that, whatever else we can do, we have been trying to do. May be it is not succeeding now. For a while, it looked as if it might succeed. Now it seems again to have taken a turn for the worse. But, we should find some way out through friendly persuasion and advice. That is all we can do. We should try to see that the interests of Tamil people are protected to the utmost possible.

19-36 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER—
in the Chair]

Regarding Bangladesh also, many thousands of our jawans had shed their blood for their liberation. We have come to such a pass and it seems that the popular movement in Bangladesh has acquired a great deal of strength over the last few months and that movement is probably in a position to compel the Government of General Ershad to go in for some type of election in the not distant future. We should take some initiative. Well this fencing business has come in the way. The causes of that should be removed by a patient exposition, by explaining to them, that it is not meant to be in

(Shri Indrajit Gupta)

any way hostile against the interests of Bangladesh and that we really want to help them in every possible way to prosper. So, I would not say that it is a failure of diplomacy and all that. But I think that more energetic and diplomatic initiative is required than we are showing at the moment.

Sir, finally, all these issues, after all, pale into insignificance in front of the grim facts that 50,000 nuclear war heads are in existence now. These stocks have got the destructive forces which are 5,000 times more than all the explosives that were used in World War II. We must never forget this fact that Pershing II and cruise missiles to-day are in Western Europe. There is no reason why tomorrow these will not be put somewhere else in some other part of the globe. In the last forty years, 50 million people had been killed in what is described as minor wars, small wars, which were fought on the soil of the developing countries. If this catastrophe which is looming over the world cannot be stopped, then, all these other quarrels and disputes we are talking about will have no relevance at all. They pale into insignificance before the horror of impending threat of the total and absolute destruction of the humanity. Therefore, I hope the Government and the whole House will pursue relentlessly, in every possible way, the policy of India which, I do not consider to be a policy of any particular Government but it is the policy which this country has evolved over many years. In that sense, it is a consensus that we stand for these basic issues of peace non-alignment and anti-colonialism and anti-Imperialism and we must defend this to the last because these are the only values which can save us from World War.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Hon. Members, I think the External Affairs Minister will have to reply at least at 7-45 PM because the time allotted, namely, five hours, is already over.

There are now only two speakers. Since the ruling party Members names have been withdrawn by the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, there are two more members from the Opposition. I do not want to stop them. They will each take five minutes. First will be Mr. Ashfaq Husain and then Mr. Barot.

Shri Ashfaq Husain.

श्री अशफाक हुसैन : (महाराजगंज) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, समय सीमा को देखते हुए मैं उन बातों को नहीं दोहराऊंगा जो यहां पर कहीं जा चुकी हैं। उन भावनाओं से मैं सहमत हूं लेकिन कुछ बातें ऐसी हैं जो अब तक नहीं कही गई हैं, उनके बारे में मैं कुछ चर्चा करूंगा।

एक बात पड़ोसियों से रिश्ते के बारे में है। जब पड़ोसी देशों से दोस्ती की बात आती है तो हमारे सबसे करीबी पड़ोसी देश नेपाल की चर्चा से मैं शुरू करूंगा। नेपाल जो मजहबी तौर से हमारे करीब है, नेपाल जो कल्चरली हमारे करीब है, नेपाल जो भौगोलिक दृष्टि से हमारे बहुत करीब है लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि नेपाल से हमारे रिश्ते वे नहीं हैं जो होने चाहिए। मुझे बड़ी खुशी की कि एक सवाल के जवाब में इसी सदन में हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब ने मुझ को जवाब दिया था नेपाल के संबंध में श्रीर खुशी इस बात की है कि उन्होंने इस बात की परवाह की कि उस जवाब में जो बातें रह गई थीं, वे मेरे पास खत लिखकर बताई हैं। तो मैं जो नेपाल के बारे में कह रहा हूँ वह इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि नेपाल से जो खबरें आ रही हैं उससे नेपाल हिन्दुस्तान की दोस्ती को ठस ला रही है और वह इसलिए लग रही है कि

नेपाल को एक तरफ तो चीन से मदद मिल रही है, दूसरी तरफ अमरीका से मदद मिल रही है और रूस से मदद मिल रही है। हमने भी उसकी मदद की है लेकिन जो नेचुरल रास्ते हैं, जिनसे हम फायदा उठा सकते हैं वे फायदे हम नहीं उठा पा रहे हैं। एक तो नेपाल से जो सड़क का रास्ता है, उस सड़क के रास्ते पर हम कतई ध्यान नहीं दे रहे हैं। भैरवा, पोखरा जो सेंटर बन गया है, जिससे भारत का सीधा ताल्लुक हो गया है, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि मेरे बार-बार इस सदन में सवाल उठाने के बाद भी अब तक गोरखपुर से सिनौली का जो रास्ता है, उसको राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग तक घोषित नहीं किया गया है। उसमें धन की आवश्यकता को सामने लाया गया है जो हमारे राष्ट्रीय महत्व के लिए, सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से महत्व रखता है। लेकिन इस ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। इसी तरह से रेल के रास्ते के बारे में मंत्री जी ने कहा था और बाद में पत्र लिखकर बताया कि नेपाल गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से ऐसी कोई चर्चा नहीं है। लेकिन मैं उनको बताना चाहूंगा कि नेपाल गवर्नमेंट के अधिकारी एन ई रेलवे के जनरल मैनेजर से मिल चुके हैं और उनसे इस बात की मांग की थी कि इस लाइन को बड़ी लाइन में तब्दील कर दिया जाए ताकि हम अपना ट्रेफिक इधर डायवर्ट कर सकें और एन ई रेलवे ने रेलवे बोर्ड को यह प्रस्ताव भेजा था कि इस बजट में इसको रखा जाए, लेकिन रेल बजट में यह प्रस्ताव नहीं रखा गया। इसी तरह से करनाली, पंचेश्वर, भालुबांध और इसी तरह की बिजली बनाने की योजनाएं, जलाशय बनाने की योजनाएं, नदियों को कंट्रोल करने की योजनाएं, जिन पर प्रगति नहीं हो सकी और इसके कारण यह हो

रहा है कि नेपाल के अन्दर अलग से चीन की मदद से, अमरीका की मदद से जलाशय बनाने की योजनाएं चल रही हैं ताकि वे पानी का इस्तेमाल कर सकें, बजाय इस बात की परवाह की कि उस पानी से हमको क्या नुकसान हो रहा है। इस पानी से पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में हर साल बाढ़ से अरबों रुपये का नुकसान होता है। जिसके कारण हम सफर करते हैं, नुकसान उठाते हैं। हमारी सरकार को उस तरफ जो तवज्जह देनी चाहिए थी उसने नहीं दी। चूंकि मेरे पास वक्त कम है, इसलिए मैं थोड़े में बंगला देश की चर्चा करना चाहता हूं।

अभी हमारे इसी तरफ के एक साथी ने कहा और अखबारों में भी उसका जिक्र आया कि लगभग ढाई लाख बंगला देश के लोग दिल्ली में हैं, लगभग 10 लाख बिहार में हैं और कुछ बम्बई में भी हैं। बंगाल की मेरे पास जानकारी नहीं, वहां भी जरूर होंगे। लेकिन मैं जो कुछ अखबारों में आया उसके बारे में बताना चाहता हूं। हमारे यहां बंगला देश के लोगों का सवाल उस समय उठता है जब कहीं से यह खबर लग जाती है कि ये माइनोरिटी के लोग हैं और किसी तरह दिल्ली में, बिहार के पूर्णिया जिले में या बम्बई में आकर बस गए हैं। लेकिन यह माइनोरिटी का सवाल नहीं है और न इसको आप बंगला देश से मांग कर आये लोगों का सवाल समझिए। जिस तरह से आप दूसरों के भड़कावे में आकर, दूसरों के कहने में आकर, बंगला देश की सीमाओं पर फैसिंग करवा रहे हैं, उस पोलिसी के नतीजे आगे चलकर बहुत खतरनाक हो सकते हैं। उसका कारण यह है कि जैसा आप जानते हैं आप सीमा पर

(श्री अशफाक हुसैन)

जीरो लाइन के बाद फंसिग कर रहे हैं और अपनी टैरिटरी में कर रहे हैं लेकिन ऐसी भी खबरें हैं कि बंगला देश के लोग जीरो लाइन के बगल से खाइयां खोद रहे हैं। जब बारिश होगी तो आपकी तारें गिर जाएंगी और तनाजा अपनी जगह पर रहेगी। बंगला देश के साथ पहले तो हमारे सम्बन्ध ही अच्छे नहीं हैं, जो सम्बन्ध मुजीबुर्रहमान के समय थे, वे अब नहीं हैं। लेकिन हम उन सम्बन्धों में क्यों और बिगाड़ लाना चाहते हैं? बंगला देश के साथ सीमाओं पर फंसिग पर हम 500 करोड़ रुपया खर्च करेंगे, सिर्फ इसके नाम पर कि वहां से स्मगलर्स आते हैं, वहां से इन्फ्लेट्रेंट्स आते हैं, माइनोरिटी के लोग आते हैं। लेकिन जब मैजोरिटी के लोग आते हैं तो वे रिफ्यूजी हो जाते हैं और उन रिफ्यूजीज को आप लोग बसाते भी हैं, परन्तु जब माइनोरिटी के लोग आते हैं तो उनको पुश बैक करके वापस भेज देते हैं। उनके लिए आप सीमाओं पर तार भी लगाना चाहते हैं। तार लगाकर कई-तरफा पौलिसी आमत अपनाइये।

इसी तरह से दो शब्द सीलोन के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। श्रीलंका के साथ हमें बहुत घीरज के साथ पौलिसी अपनाने की जरूरत है। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जो वर्ल्ड इम्पीरियलिस्ट ट्रैप बनाया जा रहा है, उसमें आप फंस कर रह जाएं। उस ट्रैप का मतलब यह है कि हमारी हमदर्दी तमिल लोगों के साथ जरूर है, पूरी हमदर्दी है कि उनको पूरी मदद मिलनी चाहिए, लेकिन वहां जो राइट्स हुए हैं उनके मामले को इन्टरनेशनल फोरम के जरिए बाकायदा सही ढंग और जान्ते से उठाना चाहिए।

मैं यह बात जोर देकर इसलिए कह रहा हूं क्योंकि यह तमिल लोगों का मसला है, यदि आप एलम में फसते हैं तो आपको खालिस्तान में भी फंसना पड़ेगा। खालिस्तान दूसरा ईशू आपके सामने है, लेकिन उसका भी सवाल उठ सकता है।

अन्त में मैं स्वामी जी को उनकी बात का जवाब देना चाहता हूं। वैसे वे हमारे बहुत अच्छे दोस्त हैं, लेकिन हमारी दोस्ती सिर्फ कुछ बातों पर आधारित है। मैं पाकिस्तान और पाकिस्तान के लोगों का भी दोस्त हूँ और मैं साफ तरीके से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा यहां पर चर्चा की गई, पाकिस्तान में मिलिटरी शासन है, बंगला देश में मिलिटरी शासन है, श्रीलंका में दूमरी तरह का शासन है, आखिर हम शासन के चक्कर में क्यों पड़ना चाहते हैं, क्या दोस्ती शासन से होती है। हमारी दोस्ती शासन से न होकर मुल्क से होती है। पाकिस्तान में चाहे मिलिटरी शासन हो अथवा कांमी राज, किसी मुल्क में कैसा भी राज्य क्यों न हो, या जैसे आप कह रहे हैं अफगानिस्तान में क्या है, अफगानिस्तान में उस हुकूमत ने फौज बुलाई थी जिसको हमारी जनता पार्टी ने रिकग्नाइज किया था। क्योंकि आपने यहां यह सवाल उठाया था कि अफगानिस्तान में जिसने फौज बुलाई

Dr. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
We recognise the Tarakha Government.
That Government where Mr. Bahuguna
was Minister, recognised the Hafizillah
Government.

श्री अशफाक हुसैन : मैं उसको अलग नहीं समझता। इसलिए आपको दोस्ती का हाथ पाकिस्तान से भी बढ़ाना चाहिए,

पाकिस्तान में कोई भी हकूमत हो, आपको दोस्ती का हाथ बंगला देश की ओर भी बढ़ाना चाहिए। पूरी कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि हमारे सम्बन्ध उनके साथ अच्छे बनें। जब पाकिस्तान से दोस्ती का सवाल आता है तो यह बड़ा अच्छा मौका हमारे सामने है। कुछ समय पहले कुछ लोगों ने यह सवाल उठाया था कि पाकिस्तान की तरफ से हमला होने वाला है। शायद कांग्रेस आई के जनरल सैक्रेटरी का बयान आया था। मैं समझता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट में हमें उसको स्पष्ट करना चाहिए इस समय कांग्रेस आई के जनरल सैक्रेटरी श्री राजीव गांधी भी सदन में मौजूद हैं, जो इस सदन के मंत्री भी हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे अपने बयान की सफाई दें कि उनका ऐसा मकसद नहीं था। मैं उनको कन्डैम नहीं करता। यदि वे कह दें कि उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं कहा तो बड़ी अच्छी बात होगी। अगर वे अपनी बात पर स्थिर रहते हैं तो मैं जरूर कहूँगा

(व्यवधान)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : He says that you have said some time back that war with Pakistan at the end of this year.....

(Interruptions)

श्री अशफाक हुसैन : जो चर्चा आपने इस बारे में उठाई, मैं उस पर ही कह रहा हूँ। यहां पर तीन-चार सदस्यों की ओर से कहा गया कि श्री राजीव गांधी ने ऐसा बयान जारी किया है कि दिसम्बर में पाकिस्तान से लड़ाई होगी। वे लड़ाई का स्पष्ट भी बता देंगे कि किस स्पष्ट पर लड़ाई होगी।

इसलिये उस चर्चा का कंट्रोवर्शियल अगर उनकी तरफ से आता है तो ठीक है।

और अगर नहीं आता तो यह जो होगा मिनिस्टर और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर की बात है, चाहे वह आर्गनाइजेशन के महा सचिवों का यह नहीं कहना चाहिए। ...

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI (Amethi) : Can I clarify the point? Firstly, I am not exactly aware of what he has said before this because he has not been very clear. But a lot has been stated in the newspapers and misquoted and I am not answerable for everything that is appearing in the newspapers. I have made my position very clear that I had said that our neighbours are arming themselves at a very speedy rate with very sophisticated equipments. On previous occasions, we have found that these equipments were invariably used against our country. Today, they are saying that it is for use against Afghanistan and other areas. But the type of equipment that they are getting is not the type of equipment which could be used in the mountainous areas of Afghanistan. This has been basically all that I had said.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about war with Pakistan ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I did say that the rate at which they are arming is highly dangerous for us and I had not specified any date or deadline on which they were to do anything.

(Interruptions)*

On every previous occasion, when they had armed themselves in this manner these weapons have been used against only one country and that is India

श्री अशफाक हुसैन : मैं वही कह रहा हूँ, स्वामी जी सेटिस्फाइड है कि नहीं वह जानें। लेकिन अगर बात यहीं तक है तो मुझे नहीं कहना है।

उर्जा मंत्री (श्री बी. पी. शिव शंकर) : अब सुबहा किस बात का है ?

श्री अशफाक हुसैन : इसी बात के साथ मैं अपनी बात खत्म करता हूँ।

شری اشفاق حسین (بہاراج گنج):

آپادھیکش بہودے، سے سیماکو دیکھتے ہوتے

میں ان باتوں کو نہیں دہراؤں گا۔ جو یہاں پر کہی جا چکی ہیں، ان کھباؤناؤں سے میں سمہت ہوں۔ لیکن کچھ باتیں ایسی ہیں ان کے بارے میں میں کچھ چرچا کروں گا ایک بات پڑوسیوں سے رشتے کے بارے میں ہے

جب پڑوسی دیشوں سنے بارے میں دوستی کی بات آتی ہے تو ہمارے سب سے قریبی دیش نیپال کی چرچا سے میں شروع کروں گا۔ نیپال جو مذہبی طور سے ہمارے قریب ہے نیپال جو کلچرلی ہمارے قریب ہے، نیپال جو کہ کھوگوگنگ درستی سے ہمارے بہت قریب ہے لیکن دُربھاگتہ کی بات ہے کہ نیپال سے ہمارے رشتے وہ

نہیں ہیں جو ہونے چاہئیں، مجھے بڑی خوشی ہے

کہ ایک سوال کے جواب میں اسی سدن میں ہائے

نارین منٹر صاحب نے مجھ کو جواب دیا تھا۔ نیپال کے

سمندھ میں اور خوشی اس بات کی ہے کہ انھوں نے

اس بات کی پرواہ کی کہ اس جواب میں جو باتیں رہ گئی

تھیں وہ میرے پاس خط لکھ کر بتائیں ہیں، تو میں

نیپال کے بارے میں کہہ رہا ہوں وہ اس لئے کہہ رہا ہوں

کہ نیپال سے جو خبریں آ رہی ہیں اس سے نیپال ہندوؤں

کی دوستی کو ٹھیس لگ رہی ہے اور وہ اس لئے لگ

رہی ہے کہ نیپال کو ایک طرف تو چین سے مدد مل رہی

ہے، دوسری طرف امریکہ سے مدد مل رہی ہے اور

روس سے مدد مل رہی ہے ہم نے بھی اس کی مدد کی

ہے لیکن جو نیچورل راستے ہیں چین سے ہم فائدہ اٹھا

سکتے ہیں وہ فائدے ہم نہیں اٹھا پارہے جنہاں تک

تو نیپال سے جو سڑک کا راستہ ہے اس سڑک کے رستے

پر ہم قطعی دھیان نہیں دے رہے ہیں، بھیروا، پلوکھراجو

سینڈون گیا ہے جس سے عبارت کا سیدہ حلقہ ہو

گیا ہے لیکن دُربھاگتہ کی بات ہے کہ میرے بار بار اس

سدن میں سوال اٹھانے کے باوجود بھی اب تک گورکھپور

سے سنولی کا جو راستہ ہے اس کو راشٹریہ راج مارگ

گھوشت نہیں کیا گیا ہے، اس سے دھن کی آراہیتا

کو سامنے لایا گیا ہے، جو ہمارے راشٹریہ مہتو کے لئے

سورکٹ کی درستی سے مہتو رکھتا ہے۔ لیکن اس اور

دھیان نہیں دیا گیا، اس طرح سے ریل کے راتے کے

بارے میں منٹری جی نے کہا تھا اور پٹر لکھ کر بتا یا

کہ نیپال گورنمنٹ کی طرف سے ایسی کوئی حیر چاہئیں

ہے، لیکن میں ان کو بتانا چاہوں گا کہ نیپال گورنمنٹ

میں ادھیکاری این۔ ائی۔ ایلوے کے جنرل مینجر سے مل چکے

ہیں اور ان سے اس بات کی مانگ کی تھی کہ اس لائن

کو بڑی لائن میں تبدیل کر دیا جائے تاکہ ہم اپنے ٹریفک

ادھر ڈائریٹ کر سکیں اور این۔ ائی۔ ایلوے نے ریلوے

یورڈ کو یہ پرستاد بھیجا تھا کہ اس بجٹ میں اس کو رکھا

جائے لیکن ریل بجٹ میں یہ پرستاد نہیں رکھا گیا۔

اس طرح سے کرنالی۔ پنچیشور، بھالو بانڈ اور اس طرح

کی بچھی بنانے کی یوجنائیں، جلاشے بنانے کی یوجنائیں،

ندیوں کو کنٹرول کرنے کی یوجنائیں جن پر پگتہ نہیں ہو سکی

اور اس کا کارن یہ ہو رہا ہے کہ نیپال کے اندر الگ سے

چین کی مدد سے، امریکہ کی مدد سے جلاشے بنانے کی

یوجنائیں چل رہی ہیں تاکہ وہ پانی کا استعمال کر سکیں۔

بجائے اس بات کی پرواہ کے کہ اس پانی سے ہم کو کیا نقصان

ہو رہا ہے، اس پانی سے پوروی اتر پردیش اور بہار پر

سال باڑھ سے اربوں روپے کا نقصان ہوتا ہے۔ جن کے

کارن ہم سفر کرتے ہیں نقصان اٹھاتے ہیں، بہاری سرکار

کو اس طرف جو توجہ دینی چاہیے تھی، اس نے نہیں دی۔

چوں کہ میرے پاس وقت کم ہے اس لئے میں تھوڑے

سے میں جنگل دیش کی چرچا کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔

ابھی ہمارے اس طرف کے ایک ساتھی نے کہا اور

اخباروں میں بھی اس کا ذکر آیا کہ لگ بھگ ڈھائی لاکھ

جنگل دیش کے لوگ دلی میں ہیں، لگ بھگ دس لاکھ بہار

میں ہیں۔ اور کچھ بمبئی میں بھی ہیں، بنگال کی ہوائے پاس

جانکاری نہیں وہاں بھی ضرور ہوں گے۔ لیکن میں جو کچھ

اخباروں میں آیا ہے اس کے بارے میں بتانا چاہتا ہوں

ہلکے یہاں جنگل دیش کے لوگوں کا سوال اس سے اٹھتا

ہے، جب کہیں سے یہ خبر لگ جاتی ہے کہ یہ مینارٹی کے

لوگ ہیں اور کسی طرف دلی میں بہار کے پورنیا ضلع میں
یا ممبئی میں آکر آباد ہو گئے ہیں لیکن یہ مانٹارٹی کا سوال
نہیں ہے اور نہ اس کو آپ بنگلہ دیش سے جھاگ کر
آئے لوگوں کا سوال سمجھئے جس طرح سے آپ دوسروں
کے بھروسے میں آکر دوسروں کے کہنے میں آکر بنگلہ دیش
کی سیمادوں پر فینٹنگ کروا رہے ہیں، اس پالیسی کے
نتیجے آگے چل کر بہت خطرناک ہو سکتے ہیں، اس کا کارن
یہ ہے کہ جیسے آپ جانتے ہیں آپ ممبھا پر زیرو لائن
کے بعد فینٹنگ کر رہے ہیں اور اپنے ٹیری ٹری مین
کر رہے ہیں۔ لیکن ایسی کبھی خبریں ہیں کہ بنگلہ دیش کے
لوگ زیرو لائن کے بغیر میں کھائیاں کھود رہے ہیں۔
جب بارش ہوگی تو آپ کی تاریں گر جائیں گی اور تنازع
اپنی جگہ پر رہے گا۔ بنگلہ دیش کے ساتھ پہلے تو ہمارے
سمبندھ ہی اچھے نہیں ہیں، جو سمبندھ جیب الرمن کے
سکے تھے وہ اب نہیں ہیں، لیکن ہم ان سمبندھوں میں
کیوں اور لگاؤ لانا چاہتے ہیں، بنگلہ دیش کے ساتھ
سیمادوں پر فینٹنگ پر ہم ۵۰۰ کروڑ روپیہ خرچ کریں
گے صرف اس کے نام پر کہ وہاں سے اسمگلرس آتے ہیں۔
وہاں سے انفلٹریٹرس آتے ہیں، مانٹارٹی کے لوگ آتے
ہیں۔ لیکن جب میجارتی کے لوگ آتے ہیں تو وہ ریپبلو جی
ہو جاتے ہیں اور ان ریپبلو جی کو آپ لوگ سب سے بگڑتے
جب مانٹارٹی کے لوگ آتے ہیں تو ان کو پیش بیک کر کے
واپس بھیج دیتے ہیں، ان کے لینے آپ سیمادوں پر تار
بھی لگانا چاہتے ہیں۔ تار لگا کر کئی طرح پالیسی آپ
مت بنائیے۔

اس طرح سے دو شدید سیلون کے بارے میں کہنا
چاہتا ہوں، نٹری لنکا کے ساتھ بہت دھیرج کے ساتھ
پالیسی اپنانے کی ضرورت ہے۔ کہیں ایسا نہ ہو کہ جو ورلڈ
امپیریلٹ ٹرپ بنایا جا رہا ہے اس میں آپ بھینس کر رہ
جائیں، اس ٹریپ کا مطلب یہ ہے کہ ہماری ہمدردی
تمہارے لوگوں کے ساتھ ضرور ہے پوری ہمدردی ہے کہ ان کو
پوری مدد ملنی چاہیے لیکن وہاں جو رائٹس ہوئے ہیں ان
کے سینے کو اسٹریٹس نارم کے ذریعے باقاعدہ

سکھ ڈھنگ سے اور ضابطے سے اٹھانا چاہیے۔ میں یہ
بات زور دے کر اس لئے کہہ رہا ہوں کیوں کہ یہ تمہارے لوگوں
کا مسئلہ ہے یہی آپ ایل میں پھنتے ہیں تو آپ کو خالصتان
میں بھی پھینٹ پڑے گا۔ خالصتان دوسرا ایٹو آپ کے
سامنے ہے۔ لیکن اس کا سوال بھی اٹھ سکتا ہے۔
انت میں میں سوامی جی کو ان کی بات کا جواب
دینا چاہتا ہوں، ویسے وہ ہمارے بہت اچھے دوست
ہیں۔ لیکن ہماری دوستی صرف کچھ باتوں پر ادھارت
ہے، میں پاکستان اور پاکستان کے لوگوں کا بھی دوست
ہوں اور میں صاف طریقے سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جیسا
یہاں پر چرچا کی گئی پاکستان میں ملٹری شانس ہے
بنگلہ دیش میں ملٹری شانس ہے، سری لنکا میں دوسری
طرح کا شانس ہے آخر اس شانس کے چکر میں کیوں پڑنا
چاہتے ہیں، کیا دوستی شانس سے ہوتی ہے، ہماری
دوستی شانس سے نہ ہو کہ ملک سے ہوتی ہے، پاکستان
میں ملٹری شانس ہوا تھا تو می راج کسی ملک میں کیا
بھی راج کیوں نہ ہو یا جیسے آپ کہہ رہے ہیں افغانستان
میں کیا ہے افغانستان میں اس حکومت نے فوج بلائی تھی
جس کو ہماری جنتا پارٹی نے ریلگنا کر لیا تھا۔ کہوں کہ
آپ نے یہاں یہ سوال اٹھایا تھا کہ افغانستان
میں کس نے فوج بلائی؟ ...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
We recognise the Tarakha Govetnment.
That Government where Mr. Bahuguna
was Minister, recognised the Hafizullah
Government.

شری اشفاق حسین: میں اس کو الگ نہیں سمجھتا۔ اس لئے آپ کو دوستی کا ہاتھ پاکستان سے بھی بڑھانا چاہیے۔ پاکستان میں کوئی بھی حکومت ہو۔ آپ کو دوستی کا ہاتھ بنگلہ دیش کی اور بھی بڑھانا چاہیے۔ پوری کوشش کرنی چاہیے کہ ہمارے سمند وہ ان کے ساتھ بچھے بنیں۔ جب پاکستان سے دوستی کا سوال آتا ہے تو یہ بڑا اچھا موقع ہے ہمارے سامنے کچھ سے پہلے کچھ لوگوں نے یہ سوال اٹھایا تھا کہ پاکستان کی طرف سے حملہ ہونے والا ہے۔ شاید کانگریس رائی، کے جنرل سیکریٹری کا بیان آیا تھا۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ پارلیمینٹ میں ہمیں اس کو اسبشٹ کرنا چاہیے

اس کے کانگریس رائی کے جنرل سیکریٹری شری راج گاندھی بھی سدن میں موجود ہیں جو اس سدن کے ممبر بھی ہیں۔ میں جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ اپنے بیان کی صفائی دیں کہ ان کا ایسا قصہ نہیں تھا۔ میں ان کو کونٹرم نہیں کرتا۔ یہ س وہ کہہ دیں کہ انہوں نے ایسا نہیں کہا تو بری بھی بات ہوگی۔ اگر وہ اپنی بات پر اصرار رکھتے ہیں تو میں ضرور کہوں گا ... (انٹروپشنز)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :

He says that you have said sometime back that war with Pakistan at the end of this year.....

(Interruptions)

شری اشفاق حسین: جو چرچا آپ نے اس بارے میں اٹھایا ہے۔ میں اس پر ہی کہہ رہا ہوں، یہاں پر تین چار سہ سیوں کی اور سے کہا گیا کہ: شری راج گاندھی نے یہ بیان جاری کیلئے کہ دسمبر میں پاکستان سے لڑائی ہوگی۔ وہ لڑائی کا سپاٹ بھی بتادیں گے کہ کس اسپاٹ پر لڑائی ہوگی۔

اس لئے اس چرچا کا کانٹراڈکشن اگر ان کی طرف سے آتا ہے تو ٹیک ہے۔ اور اگر نہیں آتا تو یہ جو مونسٹر اور ڈیفینس منسٹر کی بات ہے چاہے وہ آرگنائزیشن کے بہا منسٹر ہی ہوں ان کو یہ نہیں کہنا چاہیے۔ ...

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI (Amethi) :

Can I clarify the Point? Firstly, I am not exactly aware of what he has said before this because he has not been very clear. But a lot has been stated in the newspapers and misquoted and I am not answerable for everything that is appearing in the newspapers. I have made my position very clear that I had said that our neighbours are arming themselves at a very speedy rate with very sophisticated equipments. On previous occasions, we have found that those equipments were invariably used against our country. Today, they are saying that it is for use against Afghanistan and other areas. But the type of equipment that they are getting is not the type of equipment which could be used in the mountainous areas of Afghanistan. This has been basically all that I had said.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about war with Pakistan ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I did say that the rate at which they are arming is highly dangerous for us and I had not specified any date or deadline on which they were to do anything.

(Interruptions)

On every previous occasion, when they had armed themselves in this manner, these weapons had been used against only one country and that is India.

شری اشفاق حسین : میں وہی کہہ رہا ہوں۔
سوامی جی سیسفاٹڈ ہیں کہ ہمیں وہ جانیں۔ لیکن اگر بات
ہیں تک ہے تو مجھے کچھ نہیں کہنا ہے۔

ارجا منتری (شری بی۔ شیو شنکر) : اب
شہ: کس بات کا ہے۔

شری اشفاق حسین : اور اسی بات کے ساتھ
میں اپنی بات ختم کرتا ہوں۔

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT (Ahmebabad) : Mr. Deputy Speuty, Sir., after the hon. Member, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, having clarified the position raised by the hon. Member on this side—Shri Rajiv Gandhi is a responsible Member of the ruling Party—I was in fact going to refer to only two or three points. Whereas I entirely agree with what Shri Bhagat has said that this House has tradition of consensus so far as foreign policy is concerned and therefore we ultimately agree and support the Government for what it does. I think it is our obligation, our right and our duty to discuss it frankly and freely and raise certain questions when such a debate take place and in that context I am only raising two or three points for consideration of the Hon' ble External Affairs Minister.

First, it is a matter of pride for all of us that as Chair person of the NAM, we are being invited by the UNO along with the two super power leaders to help in reducing the tension of the armed race.

We wish all the best to our leader, our Prime Minister and we wish that she succeeds in persuading the two Super Powers, but the question is, charity bebeg at home. Therefore, we will have

to note what our relations with our immediate neighbours are. Only the other day when discussions on the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of Defence were going on, the entire House agreed with the hon. Defence Minister in granting whatever amounts he asked for the army. In matters of national security no patriot will look behind, and we all agreed with the Government. But the question is, in our relations with Pakistan, in our relations with Bangladesh, can we say that it is only their internal compulsions, or the external compulsions, and, therefore, they are acting and we are just honest people doing nothing and we are not at fault. I think, that complacency is not warranted. Every country has some internal compulsions and external computisions too, and therefore, its action is bound to be guided by some such thing, but the wisdom of a greater country like India requires that if a war comes, well, it has to be faced, but it has to see that it does not come, but should we say always that it is only Pakistan which wants war?

In view of the clarification given, we are happy that it is not so, but for months together, an impression goes round throughout the country that a responsible office bearer of the ruling party has said with a precise dated that the war is to come fram Pakistan in December. What impresion does it give? Is this a healthy approach? Till, today it had not been controverted. But today it has been done; better late than never.

However, an impression has gone round the country that all these talks are taking place in the year of election. It appears that Pakistan has probably some understanding about our problems that whenever this country is to go for elections, particularly the general elections of the Lok Sabha, it prepares for a war. Why is it so? And if it is so, and if a highly placed and responsible person says that Pakistan is going to have a war with us, and he also has the precise information that it is to take

(Shri Maganbhai Barot)

place in the month of December, how far is it wise to publicly say so, so that Pakistan can change the dates. Or is it that these are the dates decided by someone here? I would respectfully make one submission to the hon. Minister for External Affairs and would also avail of the opportunity of the presence of the hon. Defence Minister too,

Nobody is prepared to believe at its face value that Pakistan is preparing for a war with India because of its size and many other reasons. No doubt in the past, they have done this foolish experiment. But if everybody starts talking of danger from Pakistan, particularly in an election year, we somewhere start feeling that is to create an atmosphere of fear so that everybody looks only to the Government, the leaders at the helm of affairs, and say, that as the war is going to come, let us elect only the party in power, so that we can be saved.

Now, in our capacity as the Chairman of NAM, as the world leaders, and in order to prove our claim to the leadership of the world, let us defuse this tension.

Similarly, about Bangladesh. It is being said that fencing has come as an excuse to General Ershed. It is bound to come... (*Interruptions*). How is it that we are so fast losing the goodwill of country whom we helped to liberate? Our goodwill has been systematically and gradually reducing.

20.00 hrs.

My friend Mr. Bhatia says, are we going to take the permission of General Ershed to solve the problems in our country well it is not like asking permission to solve the problem of

Punjab with the permission of General Ershed ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Even with our permission, you are not able to solve the Punjab problem.

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT : The whole nation has given the permission. Yet they are not able to solve it.

The question of border is certainly a question where we will be within our rights absolutely justified in our approach. However it is a matter of relationship with the neighbours. Therefore, even though we are just in our cause, just in our action, we cannot act in a manner that may generate more ill will rather than goodwill. I submit that three problems are awaiting us and the whole world looks up to India, how it solves its problems with Sri Lanka, how it solves its problems with Bangla Desh and how it solves its problems with Pakistan.

I would only say this. We in this part of the world are poor people. Poverty is our greatest common enemy and perhaps the solution lies in making the best use of our natural resources such as river waters with Nepal and Bangla Desh. India can solve it to the best advantage of all the three countries, and I think India can take initiative in such matters, even at the cost of losing something technically, for the benefit of its neighbours. For diffusing tension, India requires to take such initiative on economic basis, rather than on a military basis.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, the Minister will reply.

(*applause*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Delayed applause.