

[श्री: भीष्म नारायण सिंह]

है। जब सब का सहयोग है, तो हम रामनवमी के दिन न बैठने की बात पर कैसे एतराज करें ?

सभापति महोदय : क्या मैं मान लू कि सदन का निश्चय है कि रामनवमी को सदन नहीं बैठेगा ? तो यह बात सर्व-सम्मति से तय हुई कि रामनवमी के दिन सदन नहीं बैठेगा।

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Durgapur) : Guillotine is the practice of the 19th century. It should be discontinued in this Parliament.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That you cannot discuss now. You ask your representative to take it up in the Business Advisory Committee. So many 18th century practices we are continuing.

Now, Shri Banatwalla.

17.08 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1982
Contd.

Ministry of External Affairs—*Contd.*

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Pon-nani): Sir, it is commendable that our foreign policy is by and large in the right directions. The policy formulations are based on correct perspectives. This goes to the credit of our hon. Foreign Minister. The entire nation endorses the foreign policy and this particular fact is a great achievement for any Government that is in power. There may be certain areas where we may require that the policy should be followed with greater vigour. There may be certain areas where we may feel that a re-look is necessary, but by and large it must be admitted that the foreign policy of our country is in the right direction.

In the limited time that is available at my disposal, I shall refrain from

making any general observations about our foreign policy and confine myself to only certain areas.

West Asia continues to be a region of acute crisis and dangerous conflicts. The recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people, including the right to form their own State is the core of the Middle-East crisis. Indeed, Israel in its intransigence, gangsterism, international hooliganism and aggression has surpassed all limits. It is most unfortunate that in defiance of world opinion, Israel annexed Jerusalem and Golan Heights. It had the audacity to attack and destroy the Iraqi nuclear installations. It launched a major aerial attack on Southern Lebanon and the attack was on PLO Headquarters. Israel is continuously destroying houses, demolishing villages and forcibly uprooting and deporting the Arab people. It has let loose a rein of terror in occupied Arab territory. There is repression of the Arabs, ruthless suppression is there. It had even the audacity to try to liquidate physically major Palestinian nationalist leaders. No words can suffice to deplore and condemn this particular attitude of Israel. Indeed, our Minister for Foreign Affairs has been alive to this particular problem. There were prompt reactions from our Government on all these occasions. However, I have risen specially to emphasise that there is need now for greater and fuller sanctions against Israel. The non-aligned countries met in New Delhi some time back. They called for severance of all ties with Israel. Then the United Nations General Assembly in its February 1982 Resolution was constrained to remark that Israel is a country which does not love freedom and peace. It called for a total isolation of Israel. I must congratulate our Government that they were one of the co-sponsors of this particular Resolution. But it is painful to find that while we were co-sponsors of the Resolution in the United Nations, calling for total isolation of Israel and severance of ties

whatsnever with Israel, the Israeli Consulate continues to function in Bombay. It is a great anachronism in our policy. I am sure, tomorrow at 4 O'clock when the Minister for Foreign Affairs rises to reply to this particular debate, he will declare that the Government has decided to call upon Israel to close its Consulate in Bombay. The matter brooks no further delay. Then, we issue passports. Our passports bear the endorsement that the passports are not valid for South Africa. In the same way, the passports should be endorsed that they are not valid for travel to Israel.

Israel has been described by the United Nations as the racist entity, like South Africa. Therefore, why should there be a difference in attitude between South Africa and Israel, so far as we are concerned? As I said, this is an anachronism. Some years back, the passports used to be endorsed as "not valid for travel to Israel", if I am not wrong, that was the position. But, then, unfortunately, Shri Vajpayee came as the Minister of External Affairs, which was the greatest misfortune for this country... (*Interruptions*) what with secret paryls with Moshe Dayan and others. I think it was during that particular period that this particular endorsement that the passport will not be valid for Israel, in addition to South Africa, was very quietly withdrawn. I urge upon the Government to move in this matter also.

Indeed, we have no official trade with Israel. But, then, there can be no denying the fact that there is private trade and economic relations. Some time back, when I had an opportunity to speak in this House, I had given figures of imports from, and export to, Israel. They are on the increase. I urge upon the Government to ban all trade relations with Israel and to prohibit all economic relations with Israel.

The Asian Games are approaching. They will be held in Delhi. Still

there is no categorical assurance from be invited to participate in the Asian Games. There is no announcement yet from the Government. It is necessary that the announcement should come without any further delay, specially after the UN General Assembly resolution, to which I have referred.

There are still professional and educational qualifications acquired in Israel, which have been recognised by the Government of India. The recognition of these qualifications should be withdrawn.

Moving on to another point, unfortunately, the war between Iraq and Iran is still on. Indeed, it goes to the credit of our Minister of External Affairs that he has, left no stone unturned, along with other countries, to see that peace is restored and the problem is sorted out by bilateral talks. It is necessary that diplomatic moves should continue with greater vigour. Several moves have been made in the past. We had a very positive response from the Iraqi President, Saddam Hussain. Unfortunately, a positive response is yet to come from Iran. I urge upon the Government to continue the diplomatic moves with greater vigour, in order to bring about a cessation of the unfortunate hostilities between Iraq and Iran.

Unfortunately, Iran has now made one question a matter of prestige. We all know that the Non-Aligned Conference is to be held in September, 1982 in Baghdad. Iran has taken exception to it. Not only that, Iran has unfortunately gone to the extent of threatening that those countries who would participate in the non-aligned meeting, if it is held in Iraq, will face its wrath. This is a very embarrassing position for the non-aligned countries. I hope that our Minister of External Affairs will continue the diplomatic moves in order to prevail upon Iran to see reason, and not to insist on any shift of venue, specially when the venue was decided long ago

[Shri G. M. Banatwalla]

and it would be most embarrassing for the non-aligned countries to agree to shift the venue at this late hour. It would perhaps not be in accordance with the high principles of non-alignment to have any shift of venue.

Mr. Chairman, there is yet another area of conflict that threatens world peace. I refer to the United States having violated the Bay of Sidra in the Mediterranean. The United States and Libyan planes have also been engaged in shooting incidents. To show how grave is the situation, I may quote the words of Col. Gaddafi of Libya. He said:

“If America enters the Bay of Sidra, war in the full sense of the word would begin...war with planes, movies, missiles and everything. The Bay of Sidra is a part of Libya's territory and sovereignty.”

Sir, our Government has rightly given out a statement saying that our support and sympathy is with Libya in this matter and I hope that this particular solidarity with Libya will always be demonstrated in the name of principles and justice.

I may now refer to the problem of Cyprus. The conflict in Cyprus is still far from any solution. On the contrary, some recent developments have created a few complications also. We all know that in order to solve this question of conflict between the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots there are inter-communal talks under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General. But Sir, the entire world was stunned when the Greek Premier made certain observations ignoring the progress of these inter-communal talks. The Greek Premier today talks in terms of a crusade for an International Conference on Cyprus. Sir, too many countries, too many outside powers,

have meddled in Cyprus. The need of the hour is to prevent Cyprus from once again becoming a pawn in great Power politics. There was an unfortunate provocative sentence from the Greek Premier using very provocative language. He has even said that Hellenes have not forgotten Constantinopolis and that they will take part in the crusade which has just started. These are unfortunate provocations on the part of the Greek Premier and I say that they are also contrary to the terms of the Denktash-Kyprianou Summit Agreement that has taken place on May 19, 1979. This Agreement, *inter alia*, said that the parties agreed to abstain from any action which jeopardises the outcome of the talks and that special importance would be given to initiate practical measures by both sides to promote goodwill, mutual confidence and the return to normal conditions. But despite this agreement these unfortunate complications have come up. Now it is here that I submit that the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots have to live peacefully. It is for them to find out or work out a solution without any outside interference. Fortunately, we have the basis for the solution in the Denktash-Makarious Agreement.

Our Government has also to play a role appropriate to the greatness of our country and the high ideals that we have. India has always responded to the needs and aspirations of people liberated from the colonial rule. I must, therefore, urge upon the Government to make effective moves to encourage negotiated settlement of the question between the Greek and the Turkish communities. It is these people who must have the right of self determination and to decide about their own destiny.

In deference to your bell I will not take much time of the House and hurry with a few more points. We have in Delhi the Mission of League of Arab States. This Mission has a full diplomatic status at the United Nations. This mission is granted full diplomatic status in Spain, Kenya and so on. I

urge upon the Government to accord full diplomatic status to the Mission of League of Arab States in Delhi.

Talking about the missions, we have our missions in the foreign countries and specially in the Middle East—these missions are suffering from shortage of staff. The Estimates Committee has pointed that out. But then the Ministry also admits that the staff is not adequate to cope with the work. However, the Ministry has said that there are several procedural difficulties. I must urge upon the Government to somehow or the other find out ways to overcome these difficulties.

Our Estimates Committee has said in their Report—

“The Committee feel concerned at the rigid procedures”.

I hope that the same concern will be shown by the Government. The Indian Missions in the Gulf countries should be adequately staffed and the overseas Indians should not be made to suffer on account of shortage of staff especially at the time of Huj we require good staff in Mission at Jeddah. I hope that this particular point would have the attention of the Government.

We have our immediate neighbours. The need is to see that we have cordial relations with our neighbours. Indeed the Government is doing everything that is in its power. As far as Pakistan is concerned concrete and positive response has been there from our Government for friendly relations. Our Prime Minister herself declared that whether there is pact or no pact, India will not attack Pakistan. This is a positive and concrete step taken. Our Prime Minister offered bilateral or joint Commission to settle bilateral issues. We offered friendship treaty. Unfortunately, some problem came up at the Human Rights Commission. Earlier speakers have gone into it. I will, therefore, not comment upon it. I will only say this much. I was hearing the hon. Member, Shri B. R. Bhagat, when he said that after every-

thing was said and done, fortunately he had prevailed upon the Pakistan side not to insist upon the inclusion of reference to Kashmir in the report and there was a response from there. The Pakistan representative sought instructions from the Pakistan Government. Then, they agreed to the deletion of the reference. At least, that one small response is there. We have stated our position strongly throughout all these years. I may urge upon the Government that in view of the fact that Pakistan agreed to the deletion of any reference to Kashmir in the report of the Human Rights Commission. Diplomatic moves be initiated in order to see how the talks which have been deferred can be resumed.

Our position with respect to Kashmir and other things need not be stated and re-stated. It is there. Kashmir is an integral part of India. It is not negotiable. But let us see that we do not by completely deferring the talks serve the interests of the United States of America. We have to be careful on that particular point also.

With respect to Bangladesh, there is need for greater cultural exchange of delegates and need for more trade, patience and understanding. Similar is the position with respect to all other neighbours.

I would conclude by saying that apart from a few areas here and there, the foreign policy is in correct direction for which the hon. Minister deserves every credit.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Demands relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

At the very outset, I would like to emphasise the fact that the epicentre of world tension has clearly moved from Europe to Asia and this can be illustrated by the concentration of naval establishments, deployment of forces, continuing war between two non-aligned countries and by many other factors. Therefore, as our

[Prof. Narayan Chand Parasher]

Prime Minister has rightly observed, an atmosphere of insecurity, an environment of insecurity, has been created around our country and we have to be alive to the situation.

I find little justification for Mr. Vajpayee's remarks that there is no need for whipping up the fever of war. In this country, nobody is whipping the fever of war. In fact, the very reference to be sensitive to the situation is scoffed at by him. That is rather sad to note.

India has continued to march on the road to peace and all our efforts have been directed in this regard. Let us take the case of our neighbours. The past year has been a year of great understanding. Many important dignitaries from abroad have come. The Foreign Minister of China, Mr. Huang Hua, came here and India tried her best to move towards restoration of normal relations with China. In fact, it was recognised as a result of discussions that the boundary question is a central question of relationship. Similarly, one official delegation visited Beijing and we are expecting some other important developments in this direction.

Then, the King of Bhutan came here recently. Last year, the Foreign Minister of Bhutan was here. Our Foreign Minister visited Bangladesh and the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh came to India. Our President visited Sri Lanka and he visited Nepal also. Our Prime Minister visited Indonesia and so on and so forth. So, all along there has been a stress on not only maintenance but on the improvement of the relations with our neighbours.

With Pakistan too we have been trying our best. Let us see the whole thing in perspective. As early as in December last year, the Pakistan radio started broadcasting commentaries, directing attacks on us and other mass

media was also utilised for propaganda against our country. Let us not forget the fact that our Ambassador, Mr. Natwar Singh, was not allowed to visit North West Frontier Province. So, even in the case of these provocations, when we lodged a strong protest with the Pakistan Government continued to hold the olive branch. India has always held this olive branch even to Pakistan. The whole controversy about the No-War pact can be seen in a larger perspective that whereas India has been step by step trying to restore normal relations, somehow or other the response from the other side has not been so friendly.

As has been observed, the piling up of arms in Pakistan by the USA is not directed against any other country. Those arms cannot be used against Soviet Russia! Those arms cannot be employed against Afghanistan.

And the danger is that ultimately those arms will be employed against India!

Therefore, India has to be sensitive to the danger and all preparations in this direction are very necessary and, therefore, we have to be alive to the situation. We cannot forget this fact.

What is more important and I would like to stress this point that the world of today is not the world of political realities alone. We are fast moving to an era of economic realities and the powers, the great Super Powers, are making moves in accordance with economic compulsions and, therefore, the response from our side has also to be positive.

In this connection, I would like to answer the criticism levelled by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Why is India trying to get out of the South South Conference, the North-South Conference, the small conference and this conference?

This is a very positive subject in which the unity of the Third World, the unity

of the exploited nations, the unity of the developing countries as against those who are already developed, has to be maintained and strengthened further.

I would refer to the fact that an important shift has taken place in the new economic strategy as has been evidenced by President Reagan's address to the IMF in September last year. In that address, President Reagan is reported to have said that he does not like this division between North and South and all that and this has been further taken up by no less a person than Mr. Clausen, the Chairman of the World Bank while addressing a meeting of the Emeurie International Economic Society of OPEC on 13th January. Mr. Clausen made the same remarks and almost said in similar tones that the world is not divided between two folds. Well, Mr. Clausen said it as multi-polar approach.

It is rather very interesting that instead of appreciating the unity between the developing countries of the world, the US President and the Chairman of the World Bank and others are trying to be very much opposed to it and the reason is not beyond understanding.

A number of nations of the world, may be the developing countries, you call them 44 or 47 nations, or whatever may be the number, it does not matter what is the number, in spite of their inherent contradictions, they have a certain unity and that unity is the unity of approach. These nations have all along been the victims of exploitation.

When the European nations can unite under various names, for example, they can form OECD and similar other Associations and Organisations, then, it is strange in what way it can be considered 'harmful for people' of Asia, for the people of Africa, and for the people of Latin America to come together and try to raise their voice against economic exploitation?

In this regard, we welcome this Cancun Conference.

We welcome the South-South dialogue.

The most important event is the holding of the non-aligned Foreign Ministers Conference in India last year in the month of February where 93 nations of the world participated, with 22 nations as guests and with about 15 nations as Observers. This shows the strength that India has in the comity of nations, this shows the response. This is in direct proportion to the interest that India is taking in world affairs. Therefore, what we are expected to do and by which we can gain more is to have a bigger march, take a quicker step, towards regional cooperation in South East Asia. We understand that this is not easy. Because of the colonial past, there are many contradictions; some countries were ruled by France, some others were ruled by Britain and some other powers, and because of these inherent contradictions and different economic systems, different political systems, different groupings and clubbings, there have not been a smooth inflow of technology, goodwill for cooperation and things of that type. But if we have to develop, then we have to arrive at a common strategy for development in South East Asia. The importance of South East Asia can be understood from this that it has suddenly emerged on the world scene. If you go through the pages of Henry Kissinger's famous book, 'The White House', you would not find any reference to Afghanistan in that big and bulky big. Why? Because Afghanistan was not on the world scene then. Now Afghanistan is not only in Mr. Kissinger's mind but it is on Mr. Reagan's head; it is troubling him every day. Why? Because it has become suddenly alive. When Mr. Henry Kissinger was only a Harvard don, when he was an Adviser to President Kennedy, he used to say, 'I will not think of the problem of Baluchistan'. Today Baluchistan is fundamental to the security of Pakistan. What I am trying to say is that South Asia and West Asia have suddenly emerged as important points for world strategy and we have to be alive to the situation. Unless we settle our differences among ourselves through bilateral talks and agree for cooperation in development and

reduce the tensions that are becoming irritants day in and day out, we are not going to have a smooth path for development and we have to spend more on arms than on development. This is also not sufficient. We have to take our steps into every arena that is possible. Here in comes the need for greater cooperation for cultural and economic relations between various countries of the South. We have Plans like the Colombo Plan and we have institutions like the Asian Development Bank, ESCAP, etc. But what is important is this. Instead of looking to the IMF, instead of looking to the World Bank, why not have some sort of an arrangement among ourselves, so that the credit flows from inside and not from outside. We can have some understanding even with the OPEC. We heard their remarks in 1980 in the United Nations when they were having a discussion on a new international economic order; they used to emphasize this fact, "Well, you increase the price of armaments, you increase the cost of aeroplanes, but when we increase the price of oil, everybody is angry with us; everybody starts frowning upon us; after all, it is our basic source of wealth, it is our raw material for prosperity". They put forward a proposal, "If you come forward with a guarantee that we will be given cheaper finished products from outside, then you will have cheaper oil". They would assure cheaper oil provided they would get the costlier inputs at cheaper rates. Therefore, some such arrangements can be worked out. The OPEC countries are not blind to any type of reasoning. What is needed is a shift in approach. Instead of looking westwards, instead of being dependent on the Super Powers, let us take the help of friendly countries in our region, in the east, in the west and in the south, and that will open an era of prosperity. Let us not be blind to the fact that the USA and other Super Powers are initiating certain moves to disrupt the new economic order, their moves are against the South-South dialogue or the North-South dialogue; their strategy is to disrupt the emergence of the new international economic order in which the poorer countries will have a say. What I want to emphasize is that, when the

question was posed by some of us to the members of the American Senate, US Senate have just scuttled the issue. They wanted issues which were political in nature to be discussed by us. We wanted a clear answer from them as to what is their commitment to the development of the world. Today USA and other super powers are more willing to spend on armaments than they are willing to spend on health and education and things like that. It is in this direction that the new world is moving. Let us not forget the fact that the emergence of a new international economic order is the cause for a new age and new era and all the steps should be directed in that direction and any attempt to defeat this would be an attempt to crush the emerging nations of the world.

I would like to refer to the protectionist approaches. You protect your various markets by institutions like the European Economic Community market and things of that type. But when it comes to the Asian countries, there is no protection. Our Prime Minister has been talking against these protectionist measures. So we have to be very careful that the hard-earned wealth of our countries is not spoilt by the political moves of the strategists sitting in the Pentagon or somewhere else. Let it be known to the world that we cannot stand on our own feet. But we cannot stand on our own feet simply by raising political issues. The new focus, the new attempt should be to seize the bull by the horns and think of strengthening those institutions, those arrangements, those facts, those moves which leave us in a better world and which take us to a better economic order. In this case, the formation of the UNIDO which is a specialised agency of the United Nations is a step in the right direction. Similarly, the creation of a World University for Peace in Costa Rica is also very important. Similarly, other steps, all those steps which help to reduce tension, which help to raise the prestige of the non-aligned nations, which help to make the less advanced countries to go

up in the world, are the steps that must get the blessings of India.

I would like to conclude by quoting one of the remarks that Pandit Jawaharlal made when he was speaking in the Constituent Assembly over our foreign policy in those earlier years—what was the vision and what was the hope with which our course was launched. Of course, there were the big people—Tito was there, President Nasser was there and Jawaharlalji was there. They built bridges of understanding and pushed back the waves of distrust and despair that swept the world from time to time. And Jawaharlal Nehru warned, 'Peace has been said to be indivisible; so is freedom, so is prosperity now and so is also disaster in this world which can no longer be split into isolated fragments. Let us have an integrated approach to all the problems of the world. They are not merely political, they are social and they are cultural also and in the totality of approach, in the peace of the world lies the hope of mankind.'

With these words, I commend the hon. Foreign Minister for his right approach to the various issues and also the stand India has been taking at the various international forums.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): I think you will agree with me that in to-day's context the foreign policy of a government can be worked out successfully only on the basis of a global conception as well as enlightened perception of the region to which a particular country belongs. Of course, I am of the opinion that the global perception must prevail over the regional perception so that the right direction can be achieved in the formulation of the foreign policy. But, at the same time, both of them should be supplementary and complementary. It is at this stage necessary for us to really identify the basic ingredients of the global perception as the situation exists to-day.

Sir, I shall be brief. I would only point out that the main ingredient of our global perception is the sharp deterioration of the external security environment,

multiplication of flash-points, escalation of international tensions, burial of the detente spirit, intensification of cold-war—diatribes, on bridled armament drive. These are the basic ingredients; these are the basic elements to arrive at a correct perception of the global situation. To-day, all this generally contribute or, rather, has already added to the aggravation of international situation which is to-day marked by the increased war danger including the danger of nuclear war.

It is, at this stage, necessary for us to understand what has particularly contributed to the emergence of this situation? I would only briefly say that this dangerous situation is the inevitable outcome of the adventurist war-mongering policies of the Reagan Administration. Reagan Administration's declared intentions are clear. Their clear and unequivocal intention, their declared intentions, are:

1. Attainment of strategic superiority.
2. Deterrent armaments.
3. Assertion of the right to defend American vital interests in any part of the globe.

4. Limited and winable nuclear war. Generally speaking, these are the four-fold cornerstones of the American global policy that they are firmly pursuing. I consider it needless to narrate the series of steps which have been taken by the Reagan Administration in the recent past towards the achievement of those objectives. It is not necessary for me to tell that because it is known to you and it is also known to the entire House—it is particularly known to the Government of India.

Sir, in this situation, I think, the entire country would agree that the supreme question which faces the man-kind to-day is the question of war and peace. That is the supreme question before us. Now, Sir, the time has come when we, on behalf of the people of India should say firmly and unequivocally that we are for peace and we are against war. I should also say that it is necessary for us to identify the forces of war and the forces

of peace. Unfortunately, our Government falters when we come to this question of identifying the enemies of peace. Therefore, it is necessary that the House should give greater thought over this particular aspect.

We are also disappointed when we witness the persistent and ill-conceived efforts of the leaders of the Government to explain every event in the unfolding of the international situation, as the outcome of the super-power rivalry.

Sir, allow me to say that this is a deliberate attempt to create confusions. This is also too simplistic. The tension in the world arena to-day is, in fact, the result of the intensive struggles between two principal forces in the world arena,—one which stand for the preservation of peace, for tension-free world, for the banishment of war and the other which persistently prepared for war, contribute for aggravation of tensions, new drives for armament and thermo-nuclear war.

Sir, this is the struggle between the two vital and principal forces and this struggle is inevitable today. We cannot wish away this struggle. My point is that any attempt at equating the two or any attitude of equi-distance from the two or any attitude to equally appreciate and equally deprecate the two is nothing but what strengthens the forces of war and to that extent—you would agree—weakens the forces of peace. As a matter of fact I have got the charge against this Government that they have taken a position of equi-distance, they have taken a position of hesitation and sometimes they take a position of ambivalence on this issue. This position of hesitation, this position of equi-vocation and this position of ambivalence ultimately results in the weakening of the peace forces in the world.

Sir, sloganised formulation is there that we are not pro-USA, we are not pro-USSR and that we are pro-India.

I am second to none when the Government takes a position to be really pro-India. I want that the Government should take a firm pro-India position. (*Interruptions*) To be really pro-India what is needed? It is needed to be truly anti-Imperialist. Unless you become truly anti-Imperialist you cannot become truly pro-India. Unless you become truly anti-colonialism you cannot become truly pro-India. Unless you are truly against anti-colonialism you cannot be truly pro-India. Unless you add power and strength to the camp of peace, to the camp of self-reliance, to the camp of socialism the true pro-India foreign policy cannot be evolved.

Therefore, it is anti-Imperialism, anti-colonialism, anti-neo-colonialism and the policy of peace and self-reliance and the policy of friendship with the socialist community is the real foundation of the policy of peace, non-alignment, self-reliance and development. Sir, if we are to become truly pro-India in our foreign policy we cannot but accept these ingredients as the basic foundation for the formulation of the foreign policy. That is this case we are sorry that there are symptoms of hesitation. (*Interruptions*)

Now I want to come nearer home. There are certain regional problems which we have to take note of. I think the entire House agree—barring a few—that induction of Arms in Pakistan constitutes a grave threat to India's security and sovereignty. It has assumed added dimension in the context of the American global policy to make...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, I would like to take the sense of the House whether we can extend the time for half-an-hour or more.

There are a few more speakers. Shall we extend the time today upto 6.30 P.M.

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We will sit upto 6-30. Time is extended upto 6-30 P.M.

You may continue your speech, Mr. Chitta' Basu.

18.01 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI CHITTA BASU: As I was pointing out, the induction of arms into Pakistan by the United States of America poses a grave threat to the security and sovereignty of our country. The recent No-War Pact proposal from Pakistan is nothing but a propaganda ploy and diversionary tactics. I feel that bilateral discussion with Pakistan should be resumed because we believe in bilateralism. We believe in the policy and the principle of bilateralism, particularly in the relations between India and Pakistan. But, before the resumption of talks, it is necessary to be sure that Pakistan also accepts the basic principle of Bilateralism and rejects outright the principle of third-power intervention in the matter of settlement of bilateral disputes.

PROF N. G. RANGA: That is also the basis of the Simla Agreement.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I wish that Government should make sure about it. Regarding China, we also strongly feel that Government should continue the dialogue with the People's Republic of China and strive to bring about normalisation of relations between the two countries in a manner which would be consistent with the historical friendship between the two countries, the national feelings, commitment of the Government and the people of the country, which can be settled in mutual faith and understanding and on the basis of equality and legitimate honour. It is necessary not only in the mutual interests of India and China. But, it is also necessary in the larger interest of world peace. This is also necessary in the interest of stability in the region.

Therefore, I urge upon the Government to continue this dialogue vigorously to achieve complete normalisation of relations between India and China in the interest of world peace and for the mutual interest of our two countries.

Certain questions were raised today by

members on the political solution in Afghanistan. Now, it is necessary to understand the crux of the problem. We have to understand the fundamental nature of the problem in Afghanistan. Somebody said that the crux of the problem lies in the pull-out of the Soviet Army from Afghanistan. No. It is not so. The crux or the quintessence of the problem in Afghanistan is the halting of, and ultimately eliminating of the intervention from outside, which have been made, which are being made, with the declared objective of denying the fruits of a revolution to the people of Afghanistan, thereby negating the benefits and fruits of the Afghan revolution. So this outside intervention is the crux of the problem. No body can deny that the foreign powers are intervening. Therefore, a political solution has to be arrived at, which will eliminate all outside interference. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, they have already made it clear that whenever the condition is created for the safeguarding of the sovereignty of Afghan people and then non-aligned status, they are agreeable for pull-out from Afghanistan. They should have no hesitation to pull out from Afghanistan. The question is not of pulling out of Afghanistan. The question is elimination of outside intervention from Afghanistan so that the fruits of revolution could be enjoyed by the people of Afghanistan who could decide their destiny according to their own wishes. That is the basic problem.

Sir, so far as Indian Ocean is concerned, the question is not the limitation of existence of military presence, but the basic question is the elimination of foreign base and dismantling of the foreign base. I would urge upon the Government that the question should be viewed from the point of view of elimination, of dismantling of the foreign base in the Indian Ocean and declare the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. In this connection, I may point out that it is the United States of America which is scuttling the Conference on Indian Ocean which was to be held. The Government of India should take initiatives, diplomatic and otherwise, to see to it that the United Nations' decision regarding the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is implemented.

Another point which I want to mention is that there has been a new political change in Bangladesh. Bangladesh being in our neighbourhood, has also got cultural, linguistic and other relations with us for ages together. I think the Government should continue to maintain friendly relations with Bangladesh, despite political changes that have taken place there. And for that matter, it is necessary that there should be greater trade relations, more exchange of cultural delegation so that we can really impress upon the people of Bangladesh that the Government of India and the people of India are firm in their friendship with the people of Bangladesh and the friendship between the people of India and the people of Bangladesh is the only guarantee against any kind of machinations that might be carried out by some interested third party, the outside force. Equally I want that the relations of India with its other neighbouring countries namely Nepal and Sri Lanka have to improve.

Lastly, I hope that the Government of India give up the policy of equivocation, hesitance, ambivalence and firmly and steadfastly join the campaign of peace and defend the policy of non-alignment.

श्री विलीप सिंह भूरिया (झाबुआ)

माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं विदेश मंत्री जी ने जो मांगें प्रस्तुत की हैं उनका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी 35 साल की आजादी के बाद भी हमारी तटस्थता की नीति सफलतापूर्वक चल रही है। हमारे देश के लोगों ने, खास कर हमारे तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के समय में, जब वे विदेश मंत्री थे तो उन्होंने यह पौधा लगाया था और आज कई देश और कई राष्ट्र इस तटस्थता की नीति को मानते हैं।

भारत ही नहीं भारत के साथ छोटे छोटे और भी राष्ट्र हैं जो हमारे साथ जुड़े हुए हैं और वे भी इस नीति पर चल रहे हैं फिर चाहे यह आर्थिक नीति हो या सामाजिक नीति हो या विदेश नीति हो।

माननीय श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जो जनता पार्टी के राज में विदेश मंत्री थे उनके भाषण को मैं सुन रहा था। उन्होंने कुछ तो हमारी विदेश नीति का समर्थन किया और कुछ आलोचना की। ढाई साल तक वह सत्ता में रहे और विदेश मंत्री रहे। इस देश के लोगों और दुनिया के देशों का उनको अनुभव है। लोग भी उनको जानते हैं। उनकी बात को सुन कर मुझे एक बात याद आई गई। श्री कैरोन चीफ मिनिस्टर हुआ करते थे। वह कार से दिल्ली आ रहे थे। रास्ते में उनकी ड्राइवर ने एक गिलहरी को बचाने की कोशिश की लेकिन फिर भी वह नीचे आ कर मर गई। जब उन से पूछा गया कि यह कैसे मरी तो श्री कैरोन ने कहा कि यह निर्णय नहीं कर सकी कि इधर जाए या उधर जाए। इस वास्ते . . . मर गई। यही नीति हमारी जनता पार्टी की रही। न वह पूजीवादियों के साथ दोस्ती कर सकी और न ही साम्यवादियों के साथ। ढाई साल तक आपस में ये लड़ते मरते रहे। आखिर में ये दिखर कर ही रहे। यही हाल इनकी विदेश नीति का रहा। हमारी विदेश नीति स्पष्ट है। दुनिया के लोग आज इसको मान रहे हैं। देश की नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी फ्रांस की यात्रा पर गईं, इंग्लैंड की यात्रा पर गईं, दूसरे देशों की यात्रा पर गईं। उनका वहाँ बड़ा भारी स्वागत हुआ। हमारी डिप्लोमेसी का वहाँ लोगों ने स्वागत किया, उसकी प्रशंसा की। चाहे विदेश व्यापार हो

या आपसी रिश्तों को अग्रे बढ़ाने की बात हो। महात्मा गांधी और जवाहर लाल जी के जमाने से हमारी यही नीति रही है कि शान्ति से जीओ और शान्ति से ही दूसरों को जीने दो। यही हमारी संस्कृति है, यही हमारी कल्चर है। हम किसी से झगड़ा करना नहीं चाहते। किसी को एडवाइज करना नहीं चाहते।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी और विदेश मंत्री द्वारा पिछले दो साल में जो विदेश नीति अपनाई है उसके रिजल्ट निकले हैं। भूटान, बंगला देश, श्रीलंका तमाम देशों की यात्रा करके जो रिजल्ट निकला है वह इसी ओर इंगित करता है। विदेश मंत्री जो जिस तरह से काम कर रहे हैं, उसके लिए वह धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं।

विदेशों में हमारे जो राजनयिक काम कर रहे हैं उनकी कुछ समस्याएँ हैं। हम उन को जो सैलरी देते हैं वह विदेशी मुद्रा में देते हैं। डालर की कीमत दस रुपये के करीब बैठती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन लोगों को जो तनख्वाहें दी जाएँ, वेतन दिए जाएँ वे वहाँ के हिसाब से ही दिए जाने चाहिये, ठीक वेतन उनकी मिलने चाहिये, तभी वे सही तरीके से काम कर सकते हैं।

उनकी सिक्योरिटी का भी ठीक प्रबन्ध होना चाहिये। थोड़े दिन पहले ब्रिटेन में ऐसी ही स्थिति पैदा हो गई थी जबकि उनको खतरा महसूस होने लग गया था। उनको पूरी सुरक्षा का प्रबन्ध भी किया जाना चाहिये। यह ठीक है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रूल कुछ बने हुए हैं। लेकिन आपको यह भी देखना चाहिये कि उनकी सुरक्षा का पूरा प्रबन्ध हो।

हिन्दी हमारी राष्ट्र भाषा है। बहुत से डेलीगेशंस हमारे बाहर जाते हैं,

अक्सर विदेशों में जाते हैं। वे विदेशी भाषा अंग्रेजी में वहाँ बात करते हैं, बोलते हैं, स्पीच देते हैं और इसी भाषा में नोट भी बनाते हैं। लेकिन आप देखें कि फ्रांसीसी, जर्मन, जापानी लोग अंग्रेजी जानते हुए भी अंग्रेजी में नहीं बल्कि अपनी मातृभाषा में बोलते हैं और ट्रांसलैटर साथ रखते हैं। इस में वे गौरव का अनुभव करते हैं। अपनी भाषा से अनुवाद करके वे दूसरों को सुनाते हैं।

तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि विदेशों में जो हमारे डेलीगेशंस जाते हैं वह अपनी राष्ट्रभाषा का उपयोग करें इससे हमारे राष्ट्र का गौरव और शक्ति बढ़ेगी। अभी दिल्ली में जो बहुत बड़ा सम्मेलन हुआ उससे हमें काफी लाभ मिला। विदेशों में जो प्रचार होता है, बहुत सारी हमारी पत्रिकाएँ जाती हैं वह हमारे दूतावासों तक ही सीमित रह जाती हैं। हमारा प्रचार माध्यम प्रभावशाली नहीं है। कुछ दिन पहले मैं यूरोप के देशों में गया था वहाँ मैंने पाया कि लोगों में एक धारणा सी है कि हमारा देश बहुत गरीब है, वहाँ कुछ खाने को नहीं मिलता। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश ने इतने थोड़े समय में जो चहुमुखी प्रगति की है उसका प्रचार अच्छी तरह होना चाहिये जिससे लोगों को गलत धारणा दूर हो। हमारे विकास की पब्लिसिटी विदेशों में होनी चाहिये। संसद कार्य मंत्री यहाँ बैठे हुए हैं मैं उनसे कहूँगा कि एक पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी बनाये जो दूसरे राष्ट्रों में जा कर बताये कि हमने क्या प्रगति की है और अधिक पब्लिसिटी हो।

दुनिया में बेरोजगारी बढ़ रही है। बहुत सारे राष्ट्रों को रोगन प्रशासन हथियार बेच रहा है जिससे खतरनाक

स्थिति पैदा हों गई है मैं विदेश मंत्री को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने छोटे छोटे राष्ट्रों में इसके प्रति विरोध को भावना को जागृत किया है और सारे राष्ट्र हमारी प्रधान मंत्री को एक महान नेता मान रहे हैं, न कि रोगन को ।

पाकिस्तान को जनता कभी भी लड़ाई नहीं करना चाहती मगर वहाँ का तानाशाही प्रशासन लड़ाई करना चाहता है । हमारे यहाँ जो प्रजातंत्र है उसको फूटते फूलते नहीं देखना चाहते । छोटे छोटे देशों में हमको प्रजातंत्र का पैगाम फैलाना चाहिये । आज पाकिस्तान में वहाँ की जनता चाहती है कि चुनाव हो; प्रजातंत्र स्थापित होना चाहिये । मगर तानाशाह ऐसा नहीं चाहते हैं । ऐसे लोगों को भी हमें भर्त्सना करनी चाहिये । आज हमारी विदेश नीति को दुनिया तारीफ कर रही है । प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री जिस प्रकार कार्य कर रहे हैं उसके लिये वह धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं । हमारे साथी इस दात से सहमत होंगे कि आज देश में शांति की आवश्यकता है ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपका आभारी हूँ और इस बजट का समर्थन करता हूँ ।

*SHRI C. CHINNASWAMY (Gobichettipalayam): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on the demands for grants of the Ministry of External Affairs for the year 1982-83, I wish to say a few words on behalf of my party, the All India Anna Dravida Munnefra Kazhagam.

The foreign policy of a nation is not an exclusive problem of any political

party. All the political parties should wholeheartedly support the Government's foreign policy. In this there cannot be any difference of opinion among the political parties. The political predilections should not be introduced in this, as that adversely affect the country's prestige and standing among the galaxy of nations.

I would emphasise the need for improving our relations with the neighbouring countries. In 1964 we had the Sirimavo-Shastri Agreement regarding the stateless people of Indian origin in Sri Lanka. This expired on 31-10-1979. In 1974 in the form of a supplementary agreement this 1964 Agreement was extended for a period of two years. This also came to an end on 31-10-1981. During these 17 years India has scrupulously implemented the provisions of the two agreements. All the commitments enshrined in the agreements have been fulfilled by India. But Sri Lanka has been unable to fulfil the obligations stipulated in the two Agreements. Even today thousands of stateless people of Indian origin with Indian passports in their hands are unable to get repatriated to India. The main reason for this is that the Sri Lankan authorities are unable to disburse the Provident Fund and Gratuity amounts to them. They are there for several years in this helpless condition. Their number is about 60,000.

Last week the Estimates Committee of this House has submitted a Report about this matter. I have gone through this Report. Our Prime Minister's illustrious father, Pandit Nehru was emphatically refusing to accept the principle of repatriation. He argued with his counterpart in Sri Lanka that these people had lived in Sri Lanka for more than hundred years and they had given their sweat and blood for the advancement of Sri Lanka. Hence it was the duty of Sri Lanka to protect them. His daughter, Shrimati Indira

Gandhi should adopt the same policy. It is the responsibility of Sri Lanka to resolve the statelessness of the people of Indian origin. The Government of India should stress this aspect, particularly when there is no agreement in force now. There is no need at all for any fresh agreement in this regard.

It is a matter of pride and historic significance that one who was born Sri Lanka happens to be the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu today. Our Puratchi Thalavar Thiru M. G. Ramachandran knows the problems of the stateless people of Indian origin but also of the plight of Sri Lanka Tamils, who enjoy equal rights like Sri Lankas. Sir Lankan Tamils are the citizens of Sri Lanka. Their rights have been enshrined in the Constitution of Sri Lanka. Some months back my Chief Minister led an all-party delegation to the hon. Prime Minister to apprise her of the atrocities being perpetrated on Sri Lanka Tamils. It might be said that this is an internal problem of Sri Lanka. But Sri Lanka is a signatory to Human Rights Convention like India. The recurring racial riots have ravaged the lives of Sri Lanka Tamils and have ruined their properties. Our Foreign Minister should take it up with the Sri Lanka Government and request him to take drastic steps for ending such wanton racial riots. The Central Government should not show any hesitancy in this matter.

In Malaysia there is a systematic attempt being made to demolish all Hindu temples. Some reactionary elements seem to enjoy the elimination of cultural abodes of Hindus. The Minister of External Affairs should take up with the Government of Malaysia and put an end to the destruction of Hindu temples.

In Singapore, the plight of people of Indian origin is really very bad. Even for shifting the residence from one street to another, the permission of the Government is to be obtained. This matter also should be taken up by our Government with the Government of Singapore.

So far as I know, many of our legations and Embassies are located in rented ac-

commodation. Every year we are expending huge sums of money in foreign exchange on the rents of Embassies and Legations. To give an example, a plot was acquired many years ago for building the High Commission in Colombo. Even today the plot is lying vacant and we are paying fabulous rent for our High Commission. This should be looked into by our Government and the needful must be done.

In the Ministry of External Affairs, we have IFS-A and IFS-B Services. When the IFS-A Officers are abroad, they get more salary than the IFS-B officers here. But when they are posted in New Delhi and when they do similar jobs like the IFS-B officers, why should they be given extra allowances? This discrimination in emoluments must be removed forthwith.

Before I conclude, I would like to demand that the Government of India should put an end to the system of foreign countries appointing Indian nationals as their representatives in our country. With these words, supporting the Demands for grants, I conclude my speech.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Chandrajit Yadav.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not today. Let him speak tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We are adjourning at 6.30. Do not worry.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh): Sir, I think the external Affairs Ministry has got an added importance in today's world situation. The world situation is really very complex and I think it had never been so in history that the international situation was so much and so powerfully influencing the internal situation of any country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Yadav, you can continue tomorrow.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from