

[श्री सत्यनारायण जटिया]

इन सबके बावजूद आज भी कपड़ा उद्योग में मुनाफ़ा नहीं है और न ही उसमें काम करने वाले मजदूरों की हालत अच्छी है। एक्सपोर्ट के आंकड़े देखने से पता लगता है कि टेक्स्टाइल उद्योग द्वारा अर्जित विदेशी मुद्रा में भी काफी गिरावट आई है।

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हम टेक्स्टाइल उद्योग पर अलग से विचार न करें। उद्योग पूंजी और पसीने का मिला-जुला उपक्रम है। अगर हम सोच लें कि पूंजी लगा कर हमारा काम बन जाएगा, तो यह नहीं हो सकता। हमारी नीयत यह होनी चाहिए कि किसी भी उद्योग में पूंजी और पसीने को बराबर का हक और हिस्सा होना चाहिये।

14.00 hrs.

किन्तु होता यह है कि पूंजी का तो आप सम्मान करते हैं क्योंकि पूंजी के बिना तो कोई काम चलता नहीं, परन्तु जो पसीना बहाते हैं, जो मजदूरी करते हैं, जो श्रम के आधार पर उत्पादन करते हैं उनकी सतत उपेक्षा होती है। यह बात हमेशा के लिए चलने वाली नहीं है। हम चाहते हैं कि राष्ट्र का उद्योगीकरण हो, उसके अन्दर ऐसे उद्योग लगाए जाने चाहिए जिससे उद्योगों का श्रमिकीकरण हो। अधिक से अधिक श्रमिकों को उसमें काम मिले।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Are you going to conclude ?

SHRI SATYANARAYAN JATTIYA : I want to continue.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : All right. You continue next time.

14.01 hrs

DISCUSSION ON PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN RELATION THERETO.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now we take up the international situation.

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. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Motion moved :

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

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : 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, recommends in the national interest that the Government change the present policy of confrontation with the neighbours to that of promoting amity, and also maintain equidistance from the big powers USA and USSR”

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Motion moved :

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

This House, having considered the present international situa-

tion and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto recommends in the national interest that the Government change the present policy of confrontation with the neighbours to that of promoting amity and also maintain equidistance from the big powers U.S.A. and U.S.S.R."

Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty will initiate the discussion.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South) : It would have been better if we could have discussed this international situation before the commencement to the CHOGM. But unfortunately the Government was not ready to come before the Members of Parliament to get our opinion and, most probably, they were afraid of us because in CHOGM, unlike the non-aligned summit, the NATO powers were there and they knew that they would have to compromise with some of the principles enunciated in the non-aligned summit.

There is a substitute motion by Dr. Subramaniam Swamy which asks the Government to maintain equidistance. Now the Government actually does follow a policy where they say that the two super-powers are involved and it is because of their power struggle, all these dangerous situations arise.

Even in the Commonwealth Conference, they say that the two powers, the US and the Soviet Union, should go to Geneva talks again. I would like to ask our Minister for External Affairs, do you consider this stand taken by the Soviet Union in Geneva talks reasonable or not.

In its latest proposal, the Soviet Union was even ready to reduce its number of SS 20 missiles to 120.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
 How do you know ?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Yes. That is the proposal on record.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
 A public proposal.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : While allowing Britain and France to retain 160 missiles, the US could have given up its plan to deploy 572 new missiles in Western Europe but the United States was determined not to have any agreement with the Soviet Union because it decided earlier to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles and thereby have military superiority over Soviet Union.

You know that there is a rough parity that exists between the NATO powers and the WARSAW powers in Europe. The United States of America was to have military superiority and also to have the first-rate advantage and that is the reason precisely why they torpedoed the Geneva talks and I am really astonished to find that our Foreign Minister even his statement, without mentioning about the reasonable Soviet stand, without mentioning about the intransigence of the United States of America, which is out to create an imbalance in military parity and bring the world to a nuclear holocaust. i.e. equating both the Powers as if they are equally responsible. In this respect I would like to quote from our Indian newspapers, what our newspapers feel about it. *The Hindu* observed on Monday, November 28 :

"It is the militaristic and swaggering policies of the Reagan Administration—in particular, its insistence deploying a total of 572 Pershing II and Cruise missiles in five European countries staring with Britain and West Germany, in defiance of mass democratic European sentiment—that have situation to a dangerous point where all reasonable prospects of arriving at a negotiated arms limitation compromise based on a rough balance of intermediate nuclear forces in Europe have disappeared."

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

The Hindustan Times observed on November 26 :

"From the start the Reagan Administration has pursued a policy of bellicosity and adventurism not only unbecoming but dangerous for a Super Power."

This is what the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* has to say :

"As Moscow was making substantial concessions in the course of the two year long negotiations—the first being freezing unilaterally of the existing strength of SS-20 missiles and nuclear warheads in Eastern Europe—it was expected that Washington would hasten slowly."

Further it has said :

"It cannot be contended that the Soviet Union did not agree to meet the American demand at least half way. It offered to reduce the strength of SS-20 missiles to 120 (half the existing strength), the number of which is less than that of the combined British and French missiles directed at the Soviet Union. If in addition to this the USA's submarine-based missiles are taken into account, the Russian proposal would appear quite reasonable."

14.06 hrs.

[SHRI F.H. MOHSIN in the Chair]

In the face of these facts, how is it that our Government is trying to equate both the Powers? While the Soviet Union is sincerely trying to almost de-nuclearise the European arena, the Americans who are out to have military superiority have deployed medium range missiles in Europe. And our Government says that both the Powers are responsible. It does not even name the United States of America as the aggressor anywhere. It is an insult to the millions of Indians who participated in the freedom struggle to go through the CHOGM

declarations and papers. Yesterday our Foreign Minister referred to these papers. It is a shame on our part that we could produce such papers where we have compromised our position. This House applauded the Government of India, and particularly the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi—and I took part in it—because of some NAM decisions, particularly the new economic order, the North-South dialogue for restructuring the financial institutions and naming seven times the United States of America—the NAM document mentions that the Americans have created dangerous situations in Central America and in the Caribbeans. But unfortunately in the CHOGM document, the U.S.A. is not mentioned. Even in Grenada where open, naked aggression has taken place, where the U.S.A. has resorted to gun-boat diplomacy, we have failed to mention the name of the aggressor. Not only that, it is a Commonwealth country and when a Commonwealth country is attacked, the CHOGM, the Heads of States, do not utter anything against the aggressor; there is only an innocuous Resolution that we hope that normal order will be restored. May I ask on what plea the United States of America attacked Grenada? 1500 helicopter-borne Marines landed and captured the airport and Reagan says, 'We have taken this decisive decision for three reasons: (1) for the protection of the lives of the one thousand American marines and No. 2—we did it to restore law and order.' Strange! Then he says, the lives of the Americans were threatened. Nobody threatened their lives, and is it the responsibility, of the USA to restore law and order in a different country? Is it not the internal affair of that particular country? Some other stooges—I must say—say, 'You go and invade' Is it permitted by the international law? Certain things are happening in Pakistan. Can India say that I want to put things in order in Pakistan and that is why I invade. Or can Pakistan say the same thing about India? Is it justified by international law or by international morality? Even intervention by invitation—that is also by international law, conditional. But, here is a naked aggression by the United

States of America. But our Government has failed to condemn this naked aggression and we talk of anti-colonialism. We talk of decolonisation. We talk of a new international order. We talk of fighting against all these forces. All talks. But, here, when that iron lady-I do not know-the papers were saying two iron ladies—whether Mrs Gandhi appreciated it—She is a partner of NATO and she is dittoeing the American policies and while she was talking about peace and all the good things here, sermonising, her country was the first to have the Euro missiles from the USA. This is hypocrisy that has been perpetrated by Mrs. Margaret Thatcher here... (*Interruptions*). Yes, it is hypocrisy, she did it—a reactionary regime, a Tory regime under Mrs. Margaret Thatcher and what was your stand regarding Falkland?

That Falkland belongs to Argentina. That was the decision of the NAM and the UN, but she openly violated it. And with that lady you sat together, all the Heads of Governments sat together and they retreated to Goa. All the papers carried headlines and they had something in common. It was a huge Rs. 20 crores *tamasha* that you staged in Delhi and every patriotic Indian is ashamed of this grand farce that was done here. The papers were full of whatdishes were served and all that. Nobody took you seriously.

By holding NAM you could enhance your image, By holding CHOGM you have gone down. People are looking at you as an opportunist. What you say, you do not do.

What about West Asia? You have said something about the Palestinians. May I ask you what the Americans are trying to do there? Well, Sir, it is a fact that all the communities of Lebanon have agreed on one thing at the Geneva meeting that Israel should pull out. The Americans did not accept it. The Israelis are there. There is a peace-keeping force. Who brought them there? It was the Americans who decided that they would send their Army and, well, with others.

And no non-aligned army was permitted and no United Nations Army. The American army who are instigating the Israelis is there. The Israelis are nothing but the stooges of the American imperialists. The Syrian forces are there because of the Arabs' agreement and it is their land. The land belongs to the Arabs and because of the agreement the Syrian troops are there and Syrian position are there, But what the Americans are doing? In West Asia what have they done? The USA has deployed in the past few weeks an Armada of 3 warships including the warship, New Jersey and 3 Aircraft Carriers with 300 fighter bombers—all these for a new military operation in West Asia.

Now, they have started bombing the Syrian position. What they say is that, we have a right to reconnaissance. Who has given you this right? Is it your land? From hundreds of miles away you send your army, you create conditions. What is the aim in West Asia? First of all it is to make Israel an unchallenging power in West Asia so that the Americans can have hegemony there. They are trying to use Lebanese as a spring board to control the forces of the Gulf countries. There is nothing in the CHOGM document about this American policy and there is nothing about that. What is the business of the American peacekeeping force there? It is a shame, I must tell you; it goes against our basic foreign policy. I want to ask you, Mr. Rao, since you have said that you have something in Commonwealth. Can you tell me except the English language which all of you speak as to what have you in common? It was Ivor Jennings, Mr. Minister, the British Constitutional pundit in his book on Commonwealth who said that 'since all the Commonwealth countries speak English, we should use this language for our cultural invasion.' We should not be proud of it that we all speak English. Apart from this, tell me frankly what have you in common? With the NATO countries you say that we are against Imperialism. Did they say that they are against non colonialism? They did not. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher is

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

a votary, a staunch believer. Western economic supremacy over the Third-world countries and there is no difference between the Reagan Administration and Thatcher Administration. Then, you say 'we have in common.' I would ask a question and you answer: what have you in common? You will say 'we want peace.' Well, everybody will want peace. It is easy to love humanity but it is very difficult to love your own neighbour. Now, everybody is speaking about peace. Are they preserving peace? Whenever they talk about peace in a country did they preserve peace? Mr. Rao, what have you in common. Take racialism—apartheid—I would like to know what are the Governments which are supporting the South African apartheid system? Britain is one of them and, I am sure, you will agree. Here, in New Delhi, Mrs Margaret Thatcher says 'she is against this racial discrimination but in her own country, she is the champion of the discriminatory policy not only against the Blacks but also against the Asians. Have you anything in common? You are asking for a new international economic order. Did she agree to it? You demanded one percent of the G.N.P. of the developed countries, but they conceded 0.7% have you been able to impress on her that they will do it? She has denied it. She won't do it. Then what did you achieve from this Commonwealth Conference—the so-called CHOGM? In your statement also, you have loudly said that you should develop this Commonwealth. It was the Imperialist Commonwealth as it used to be. It was during Pandit Nehru's time that the name was changed to Commonwealth. You accepted the British Queen as the head of the Commonwealth. May I ask you—why did you not suggest that there should be no permanent head? Have you got the guts to say that your Prime Minister will be the head at the next Commonwealth Conference? You cannot. You want to be in that and under this hegemony of the British Queen. It is a strange thing that has happened. Sir, we demand that India should come out of the Commonwealth;

we have nothing to do with it; I remember, as a young boy, I participated in the Anti-police movement in 1942 who fought against the Britishers. We wanted to make our country free—not only we wanted political freedom but also economic freedom. I am ashamed to find that our leaders are now saying so many good things about the British Queen. To Mrs Margaret Thatcher you did not have the courage to say in her face that you are following a new-colonialist policy; you are following militarisation and you are following a policy of bringing down the world to the verge of nuclear holocaust. You don't have the courage to say. Instead you say as Mr. Subramaniam Swamy is glad equi-distance from two super-powers.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
I am not glad enough.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Now, you want equi-distance because there is a verse in Sanskrit :

सर्वनाशे समुत्पन्ने

अद्वैतः त्यजति पण्डितः

You know the Americans are the aggressors. So, now you want equi-distance from right and equi-distance from wrong.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
Are you saying Soviet Union is alright?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Of course. I would like to ask in the talks what have you achieved? Your statement is only loud sounding. It is full of sound and signifies nothing.

Mr. Chairman, the image of India has gone down in the eyes of the third world countries. Because of your honeymoon with the NATO powers in the third world countries your image has gone down. Because of your refusal to call a spade you have lost your image as Chairperson of NAM. You should remember that.

I want to know what is happening with our neighbours. What did you discuss with Jayawardene and other Commonwealth leaders? Is he going to give up his policy of attacking the Tamilians? I would also like to know, did they say anything about militarisation of Pakistan? What was the opinion of the NATO powers about it? Did they agree with you that it creates a danger for Indian sub-continent? Did you ask the Bangladesh President that if you want to push back the people who came after 1977 are they going to accept them? Did you discuss all these issues with these governments?

I would like to know from the Government whether the Government is going to adhere to the declarations of NAM? Whether you are going to adhere to what you have said about New Brittonwoods. I would like to say to the Government that they should give up their economic dependence. It is because of the economic dependence on the Imperialist power that you compromise. My party supports wherever the government takes a correct stand but I must oppose this Government where it takes the wrong stand particularly concerning the basic principles of anti-imperialism, new economic order, fighting neocolonialism and fighting this war danger created by the United States of America.

Sir, I think because of the weak economic position the Government of India is shifting from its foreign policy and is trying to have a compromise even with the Imperialist powers and thereby its image is going down among not only the people of India but also the people of the third world countries. I want a categorical answer from the Government whether it stands by the NAM principles or whether it is ready to reject the so-called achievement of CHOGM.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Sitamarhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, whenever the House discusses the international situation there is only one dominant feature of the international scene. That

is the continuous current trend in international situation giving rise to grave and graver concerns. This has been unfortunately the fate of the present generation. What are the elements of this worsening international crisis? The collapse of *detante* and the emergence of the second cold war leading to the great power confrontation. There is a total breakdown of the armament negotiations. The recent refusal of Soviet Union to participate in any kind of negotiations at Geneva has thrown not only shock waves to Reagan—President Reagan expressed his shock—but really it has thrown very serious concern to the entire mankind as a whole and during this period the piling up of nuclear weapons continues. They are adding up new weapons, qualitatively more dangerous kinds of nuclear weapons. It seems now that collapse of *detante* has led to the emergence of a generation of armament culture and that culture is that of nuclear armaments. What is worrying us is the nuclear manifestation of this culture.

There is the doctrine of 'Strategic Balance.' It was called at the end of the first cold war not 'Strategic Balance' but 'Balance of Terror' and this has become more dangerous now with the piling up of nuclear deterrent or a concept of a limited nuclear war. It is now recognised by all concerned, the super powers, the Soviet Union and America have said that any outbreak of nuclear war will lead to the total annihilation of mankind. This is admitted by leaders of these two countries. Still the whole world and the whole mankind is going towards this precipice of a total annihilation which has led to a new feature which is contributing to a worsening of the international situation leading to international economic crisis. And the reason for this international economic crisis is the very astronomical cost of nuclear armaments. 3/4 of the nuclear armament expenditure today is incurred by the big powers, major industrialised countries. The cost to the world is not only financial or monetary. But the cost is very colossal in terms of human, material and technological—all the three combined. And what it has led to? It has led to consumption of last amount of re-

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

sources which would have otherwise gone to the development even in the industrialised countries of the world. And then what has it led to? It has led to a dwindling of expenditure for their own developmental needs. It has resulted in acceleration of inflation. Almost all countries engaged in heavy armament expenditure are consuming hundreds of billions of dollars every year on this account. This figure is given in the Economic Crisis Report of the Willy Brandt Commission, that is, over 800 billion dollars of expenditure on armaments by industrialised countries. This has resulted in inflation and the dwindling or the rate of economic growth in these countries. Recession and the worst of it is because they are not able to meet their own inflationary trends, they are not able to meet their own inflationary trends, they are not able to meet their own crisis that is enveloping the industrialised countries which are engaged in armament race, nuclear armament race. They have their own policy of protectionism over them. It has developed the protectionism and they are prevented from having exports, leading to the export trade with the world outside, that is, the developing world. The countries like the U.S.A. depend on their export to these developing countries. A sizeable part of its exports goes to the developing countries, something like 38% to 40% of export of America goes to the developing countries and 28% to 30% of imports into America is from these developing countries and when you throw protectionism these highly developed industrialised countries are trying to restrict trade because they want to reduce their balance of payment or they want to fight their inflation. The result is that it has thrown the bankruptcy, economic paralysis all over the world and particularly in the under developing countries and their crisis largely originate from the armament race, nuclear armament race in the industrialised countries leading to the economic crisis which is being exported to the developing countries as a whole. Now, what is the situation in

the developing countries? They are now on a very marginal basis. They are extremely vulnerable to the economy and the result is that they are not able to make both ends meet. They are not able to export more and they are not able to meet the demands of their people. All their resources have been used for economic development and the result is that many of them are in what is described as in a process of debt trap. They are not able to pay their debts. Their service debts are mounting and therefore this is the situation which is now leading to further aggravation of the international tensions. The crisis is not only between East and West. There is not only East—West crisis. Even the crisis is North—South also and there is a total crisis, economic crisis compounding the political crisis and the whole mankind is hurtling towards a nuclear holocaust from which the survival of the mankind is at stake. The present scenario, the present international situation is at stake. The survival of the mankind on this planet, on our beautiful planet is in threat.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :

Whose threat ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I am talking of the threat, not whose threat but it is total. Threat to mankind is there, wherever it comes from. That is not the purpose at the moment. Therefore, nuclear disarmament is not moral issue or an ethical issue. It is an issue of the survival of the mankind as a whole. Therefore, the declaration in the General Assembly of the United Nations is not only a pious declaration but a practical declaration. The General Assembly declaration on the principles of disarmament is valid and accepted by everyone. But when it comes to actual negotiation, as I said, the negotiations have broken down totally. The United States, as has been pointed out by our friend who spoke before me, is insisting on deployment of Pershing missiles in Europe. I have seen the peoples' reaction. Millions and millions of people have protested against this. It was

an election issue in Germany, France or all over the Europe.

Now, there is a threat of deployment of missiles; there is a declaration by Soviet Union that in the interest of security, as they say it, they are going to deploy missiles close to all the missiles, not only here but all over the world, wherever the American missiles are there either on sea or below the sea. SIM or various other missiles the Soviet Union is going to deploy. This leads to a situation where at any time there can be an outbreak of conflict. But in this situation, there is only one relief; we still have the hope that we are not foolish or mad enough to destroy ourselves. And it is refreshing that in this capital in March this year, and again in November now we heard the voice of sanity. Prof. Satyasadhan Chakraborty may say that CHOGM is a little backward, reactionary than the NAM declaration, but if you see the declaration, we have named some one at some place, while at another place, we have not named. But let us not go into these trivialities. The NAM is a movement of over hundred countries, and it is the quality of leadership of the chairperson, our Prime Minister that she was able to bring about a consensus on these major issues. A great lead! And so much was President Reagan annoyed on that that when there was a meeting in New York, President Reagan described it as pro-Soviet and anti-American. And you know, how Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the chairperson of NAM replied whether in person or at the United Nations; she said that NAM movement is not pro-anyone or against anybody; it is pro-mankind. It takes independent decisions; and the basis is the consensus. And when they reach consensus on that, it is a great document; it is a document of hope and survival of mankind and deals with the basic problems; it reasserts that there is no other way except settlement of all the disputes that mankind faces through peaceful negotiations, peaceful coexistence and cooperations among all nations and democratization of the decisions of the entire body.

In the present world, it is not a few big countries, who can take decisions; or should take decisions, it is a number of countries, big and small, irrespective of their social system, political and economic system, or their size, or their geographical location. They have to decide collectively, whether the forum is the United Nations, or NAM or even for that matter, we support the CHOGM, the Commonwealth. You are still speaking the cliché of the 50s when you are dealing with the problems of the 80s. Today, the Commonwealth is not the British Commonwealth. If you have a look at the present Commonwealth, except only four white people, all are coloured, the black and the brown.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Shakespeare said—what is there in the name.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: Yes, a rose is a rose. The character of commonwealth has changed now.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Is the Queen not permanent head of the Commonwealth?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: Let us not go into that. These things have been settled in the 50s. You see the basic thing there and what we try to achieve. The process in the last Commonwealth meeting, as you have seen it for yourself, is the same process, and the objective is the same, that in this confrontation, particularly the confrontation between the two great powers, leading to the threat of nuclear holocaust. The Commonwealth is trying to play the same role which the NAM has played.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): They are both the same.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: One is a little more forward, but we accept there is a principle of consensus in both. Therefore, I say if you take the burning question of Grenada, a place in the Central America, the same principle has been applied. The point is that they have emphasised the same thing in both the

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

documents. In the NAM Declaration the words may be different or in the CHOGM the words may not be the same, but they have emphasised the same principles. In regard to the Contegora group of countries—Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and others, they have said that all the disputes or problems of the Central American countries and others should be settled through negotiations peacefully. And this is what has been accepted. We have re-asserted that policy. In the CHOGM Declaration we are opposed to any military intervention in any country. We have expressed very serious concern not only about the Grenada situation but also in regard to the Cyprus situation. We have said there should not be any intervention by outside powers into the affairs of the small States or any support to the secessionist movement or unilateral declaration of Independence as in the case of the northern part of Cyprus. Not only has the grave concern been expressed, but a strong and practical action has also been suggested. So, this is in essence what has been done in both the Conference Declarations. There is not much difference. I will tell you the reason for that. The reason is that the leadership happens to be that of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, who is not only the Chairperson of the NAM, but also the Chairperson of the CHOGM in New Delhi. Therefore, you have this assertion in the Documents coming from the Commonwealth Heads of Governments and also in the NAM. It is a voice of sanity in the present-day mad world which is heading towards disaster. Therefore, I say let us use this occasion to assert the very basic principles on which the world relations can be re-structured and fashioned. It can only be done on the basis of negotiations, peaceful settlement, peaceful co-existence despite the different systems. And also calling in appeal to the two super powers basically to come together, to come to negotiations and settle these basic questions of disarmament.

Similarly, on the grave international economic issues, I think the CHOGM

Declaration calls for three basic papers. one paper is against protectionism and more liberal flow of trade. The second is on the new Bretton Woods and the third is the Conference on the International Monetary and Finance. These are the three basic papers. So, on economic issues they have determined the priorities, in which more practical action seems to be feasible. In that respect it is a reinforcement of the decisions taken at the NAM Conference in the economic field.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Have you read Mr. Narasimha Rao's statement of yesterday about the economic part? What he has said and what you are saying are something different. Please read it.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I am making a point of view. If I am wrong, you can say this. I am saying about these three aspects.

After the general, overall situation, let me deal with some of the red flash points. I have already spoken about Greece, Grenada and Lebanon.

Unfortunately, everybody seems to have gone to Lebanon—somebody with the concurrence of the Government—and sitting over it. And the situation has been compounded by the very unfortunate conflict in the PLO itself.

I congratulate the Foreign Minister who led a group of four non-aligned Foreign Ministers as directed by the Chairperson of the movement, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. He was able to bring about a cease-fire among the quarrelling groups in PLO. It again shows the lead coming from Shrimati Indira Gandhi and our Foreign Minister trying to persuade people. Although this cease-fire is fragile, I hope it will not further be allowed to be broken.

There are basically four elements in the Middle East situation. The first is that Israel must withdraw its forces from

the territories occupied after the 1967 war. The second is the settlement of Palestinian question. Palestinians must have a homeland, the right of self-determination being given to them. The third is that all States in the region—Israel and others—must have a secure and settled boundary. The fourth and very important element is that PLO is the only, i.e. sole representative of the Palestinians. This is what was threatened in the northern Lebanon conflict, and in the strife. I am happy that our Foreign Minister led a team and settled this. Unless this is recognized, there cannot be any peace. This is one of the biggest threats to peace. And therefore, this has to be recognized.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Secure boundaries for Israel? This is what Israel also wants.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Since you have rung the bell. Sir, I would lastly like to secure your indulgence to speak for a few minutes on our neighbours, because in India's foreign policy, good relations with neighbours is most important. Since I do not have time, and I cannot deal with all the neighbours, I would like to deal with our relations with Pakistan.

It was a happy augury that we entered into very fruitful negotiations for building up relations with Pakistan. Apart from setting up of Joint Commissions and committees of Foreign Ministers, we identified some of the areas of cooperation, including trade and economic matters. Somewhere we have succeeded, and in others we have not. Still the process is on.

Now about the Delhi Declaration or the South Asia Regional Cooperation, for which all the seven Foreign Ministers of the region came and gave a call for the setting up of a Regional Conference. It was an act of good neighbourliness and cooperative relations. But we cannot say that this process has gone further recently. Rather, there has been a setback in this happy situation; and curiously, the setback has taken place

from misconception. When there are some internal affairs in Pakistan, i.e. agitation for the restoration of democracy—or struggle for the restoration of democracy in Sind, particularly and it may spread to other parts—President Zia, other leaders of Pakistan and the Foreign Minister are openly accusing India of interference. This has been totally denied, because, as you know, an expression of concern for democracy is one thing; there is a struggle going on in a country and helping, assisting and abetting is another; and they have not been able to prove whatsoever that India has tried to interfere. But the fact is that they have objected to our expressing sympathy for the welfare of that great leader for whom we owe our independence also—Badshah Khan, the Frontier Gandhi. Now, certain developments are taking place there. There was a dinner of Ambassadors. Forty five Ambassadors were invited to Gilgit. Now, there is a statement of President Zia that Gilgit, Huzra and Skirdu are not parts of the State of Jammu & Kashmir, they are parts of Pakistan, which has been even opposed by the four parties' opposition leaders in Pakistan itself; they have said that this is a fallacious statement; they have said that the statement of Pakistan President that Gilgit, Huzra and Skirdu are not parts of the State of Jammu & Kashmir; is a fallacious statement. So, all this is trying to put the cart backward—militarization, acquiring of arms, new weaponry and all this.

There is afresh lease of propaganda in the Pakistan Press in which India has been decried as a monster; it is always a threat which has not been accepted in Pakistan. Their previous Foreign Minister wrote that India is an expansionist. I say these are very unfortunate things.

I conclude by saying that India and Pakistan are neighbours. We share our common history and culture. We want not only to wish-well ourselves but also Pakistan and the people and the Government of Pakistan. We are not interested in what sort of government is there; it is for the people of Pakistan to decide.

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

Similarly, in Bangladesh or in other places, what is our record? In Sri Lanka, we have said the same thing that we are committed to the total integrity and unity of Sri Lanka; and within that, it is for the Government and the people of Sri Lanka to settle whatever system they want to have there. Our approach to our neighbours is the same. Therefore, any misconception, may be due to some thing, maybe due to domestic compulsion, maybe that Pakistan is facing some trouble and they want to divert the attention of the people towards India, whatever maybe the reason, let it be known that India wishes well of Pakistan. We want stable and strong Pakistan; we are not interfering in the affairs of Pakistan. We are for fruitful and cooperative development of our relations with all the countries as is mentioned in the Declaration of the South Asia Regional Cooperation.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh.

आपकी पार्टी के 15 मिनट हैं। आप 15 मिनट में खत्म कीजिए।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : What time has been fixed?

MR. CHAIRMAN : It has to be concluded today.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I requested you to see that the time is distributed equitably.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is what we are doing.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : In the beginning, you will give a lot of time; and in the end, you say that everybody will speak within five minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Usually the first speaker is given more time. The subsequent speakers take less time.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : If it is to be completed today, by what time do you like to sit—10 p.m., 11 p.m.?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) : The Hon. Speaker yesterday said that this debate must end by 7 P.M. because the Indo-Soviet Joint Commission is in session and we have a dinner in honour of MR. Arkhipov. So, I requested the Hon. Speaker and he very kindly agreed that he would see to it that this debate would be over by 7 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN : At what time would you like to be called?

Shri P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : At about 6-15 or 6-20 P.M.¹

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : My suggestion is that since there is a statement by the Minister and he will also be speaking, there is no need for the Members from the Treasury Benches to speak. You let the Opposition Members speak.

(Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Please fix a time-limit for the speeches right from now.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All right. The time allotted is 15 minutes per member.

Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh.

श्री राजेश कुमार सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) : सभापति महोदय, अभी हाल ही में राष्ट्रमंडल

के शासनाध्यक्षों का सम्मेलन हुआ था। विदेश मंत्री जी ने विश्व के समुदाय के बारे में अपने वक्तव्य बहुत सी चर्चाओं की हैं। इन चर्चाओं में जाने से पहले मैं यह देखना चाह रहा हूँ जो कि साफ नहीं हो रहा है कि अभी थोड़े दिन पहले गुटनिरपेक्ष सम्मेलन हुआ, उसके तुरन्त बाद चोगम बुला ली गई और उसके पहले एशियाड खेल सम्पन्न हुए, लेकिन इससे देश को फायदा क्या हो रहा है? निर्धन देश का 40 करोड़ रुपया चोगम पर खर्च हुआ, तो उसकी उल्लिखियां क्या हैं—इन दोनों बातों पर विचार करना पड़ेगा। आपने 1600 करोड़ रुपया एशियाड पर खर्च किए, दो हजार करोड़ रुपये गुटनिरपेक्ष शिखर सम्मेलन पर खर्च कर डाले और अब 40 करोड़ रुपया आपने अब चोगम पर खर्च कर दिया—लेकिन इन सबका क्या हुआ ?

माननीय मंत्री जी बता रहे थे कि प्रधान-मंत्री के नेतृत्व में भी विश्व शान्ति की ओर अग्रसर हो रहा है। मैं इसी संदर्भ में चर्चा करना चाहूंगा। मैं राष्ट्राध्यक्ष सम्मेलन के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ कि बढ़िया-बढ़िया फोटो छपे और देहात में रहने वाले लोगों ने महारानी जी का फोटो देख लिया और बहुत खुश हुए। लेकिन हकीकत यह है कि गुट-निरपेक्ष शिखर सम्मेलन में जो रिजोल्यूशन पाए हुए हैं और चोगम में जो रिजोल्यूशन पास हुए हैं—इन दोनों में कितना अंतर है, इसकी सफाई होनी चाहिए। पता नहीं लगता है, बातों में बातें उलझ कर रह गई हैं चाहे वे आर्थिक हों या राजनीतिक हों, दोनों के फर्क को देखना पड़ेगा। आपने अपने वक्तव्य में यह भी कहा है कि यहां के तौर-तरीके कुछ और हैं और गुट निरपेक्ष सम्मेलन के तरीके कुछ और हैं, इस प्रकार भ्रांति पैदा कर दी गई है। प्रश्न यह है कि शान्ति का पैगाम

देने वाले राष्ट्रमंडल के शासनाध्यक्षों ने सम्मेलन में गिनेडा के बारे में प्रस्ताव पारित किया लेकिन अमरीका के बारे में चुप्पी साथ ली। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा क्यों? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि साइप्रस तथाकथित एसेम्बली को कौन समाप्त करेगा, इस बारे में कहीं सफाई नहीं दी गई। नामीबिया के बारे में बहुत-सी बातें उठीं, लेकिन एक प्रश्न सीधे-सीधे उठता है कि नामीबिया के ऊपर दक्षिण अफ्रीका का आधिपत्य बनाने वाला कौन है और सम्मेलन में उसकी क्या भूमिका है—इसके सम्बन्ध में कोई संकेत नहीं दिया गया है। मैं प्रो० चक्रवर्ती साहब की बहुत-सी बातों का समर्थन करता हूँ। यह कॉमनवैलथ ब्रिटिश हुकूमत की पुरानी यादगार है, जो आज भी आर्थिक और राजनीतिक ग्रेट ब्रिटेन की उप-लब्धियों को कायम करने का उसका यह तरीका है। इससे अधिक और कोई कारण मुझे दिखाई नहीं दे रहा है। आप देखेंगे कि ग्रेट ब्रिटेन इंग्लैंड रंगभेद नीति के प्रस्ताव पर 23 बार गैर हाजिर रहा या रंगभेद नीति का समर्थन किया। आप कॉमनवैलथ के मँबर बनें या न बनें, लेकिन कुछ बुनियादी प्रश्न उठते हैं, हमने फॉरन पालिसी के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कमियां पैदा की हैं। आप कहते हैं कि विश्व शांति की हमें चिन्ता है। विश्व के अन्दर न्यूकलियर मीसाइल लगाए जा रहे हैं। एक तरफ अमरीका अपने कदम बढ़ा रहा है और दूसरी तरफ सोवियन यूनियन भी पीछे न रहने की बात करता है।

15.00 hrs.

वह भी कहीं न कहीं समुद्र में मिसाइल लगाने की बात सोच रहा है। सारे विश्व में तनाव की स्थिति है, वेस्ट-एशिया की स्थिति भी बहुत असंतोषजनक है। पी० एल० ओ० की

[श्री राजेश कुमार सिंह]
आप चर्चा कर रहे थे—जो डिवीजन हो गया है, उस सारे मूवमेंट में भारत की भूमिका क्या रही? इस सवाल पर भी आप के स्टेटमेंट से कुछ साफ नहीं हुआ है।

हमारी फॉरन पालिसी पर निगाह डालिए—वह कितनी असफल रही है इस पर भी थोड़ी सी चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ। एक सदस्य कह रहे थे कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के नेतृत्व में नान-एलाइण्ड कान्फरेंस हुई, वे उस की चेअर-पर्सन हैं और अब कामनवेलथ की कान्सरेंस हुई है। मैं उसी संदर्भ में एक जरा-सी जानकारी चाहता हूँ—कहा गया है—

Indian invitations to Heads of the States and Governments were submitted during the Thirty-eighth session of the U.N. General Assembly in New York.

वह जैनरल असेम्बली में गई थीं, वहां उन्होंने नान-एलाइण्ड मूवमेंट के चेअर-पर्सन की हैसियत से हैड-आफ-दि-स्टेट्स को इन्वाइट किया, लेकिन आपको मालूम होना चाहिए—वहां उपस्थिति कितनी थी—100 राष्ट्रों में से कुल 10 या 12 राष्ट्र वहां उपस्थित थे। यह लीडरशिप का हाल है जो कहीं-कहीं पर चुभता है...

श्री रामप्यारे पनिका (रावर्टसगंज): 10 नहीं 12 थे।

श्री राजेश कुमार सिंह: 12 लीजिए। लेकिन इसके पीछे कारण क्या है? विश्व के उन राष्ट्रों ने बैठक में भाग क्यों नहीं लिया? यह कितने शर्म की बात है—भारत गुटनिर्पेक्ष आन्दोलन का चेअरमैन है लेकिन 10-12 राष्ट्र उपस्थित हुए, यह ऐसी बात है जिस पर विचार करने की जरूरत है।

हम जब ग्रैनेडा की बात करते हैं तो हमें एक और महत्वपूर्ण बात पर भी विचार करना

चाहिए। इस तरह की चर्चा में हमें अपने पड़ोसी मुल्कों के बारे में भी विचार करना चाहिए। ग्रैनेडा के बारे में तो हम सोचते हैं, लेकिन अफगानिस्तान के बारे में हम चुप रह जाते हैं—हमें अफगानिस्तान के बारे में भी सोचना चाहिए, डीगोशाशिया के बारे में भी सोचना चाहिए। इण्डियन ओशन में आज जो डवेलपमेंट हो रहा है वह यूरोप के न्यूक्लियर मिसाइल से भी ज्यादा भयानक होती जा रही है। इसको निमन्त्रण देने वाला कौन है? इस मामले में भी आपकी विदेश नीति असफल रूप में साफ जाहिर हो रही है। आप एक बार कहते हैं कि हम गुट-निर्पेक्ष आन्दोलन के अगुआ हैं, तो अफगानिस्तान तो शुरू से ही आपके आन्दोलन का सदस्य है। 4 वर्ष बीत चुके हैं, 27 दिसम्बर, 1979 को वहां वह स्थिति पैदा हुई...

डा० सुब्रह्मण्य स्वामी: आक्रमण हुआ।

श्री राजेश कुमार सिंह: आक्रमण हुआ या आक्रमण किया—कोई शब्द कह लीजिए, लेकिन मेरे कहने का मतलब सिर्फ यह है कि आपने उसके सन्दर्भ में कोई स्पष्ट नीति नहीं अपनाई। जब आप उसके प्रश्न पर खामोश रहे तो आज ग्रैनेडा के प्रश्न पर भी आपको कम्प्रोमाइज करने की जरूरत पड़ गई। कम्पुचिया के सम्बन्ध में भी आपकी नीति असफल रही। हमें तो ऐसा लगने लगा है कि आज जो हम थ्योरी आफ इक्विडिस्टेंस की बात करते हैं, वह गलत है, हम भी एक बड़ी पावर के प्रवर्तक बन गये हैं, चाहे अमरीका हो या एशिया दुनिया में कोई हमारा दोस्त नहीं है। वे ही हमारे दोस्त हैं जो हमारे दोस्त हैं लेकिन परमानेंट दोस्त दुनिया में नहीं है। दोस्ती होती है लेकिन बिगड़ती रहती है, इस लिए आपको अपनी नीतियों के चलाने के लिए एक तरीका बनाना चाहिए, किसी के पीछे

चलकर हम अपनी नीतियों में सफल नहीं हो सकते ।

मैं इस समय नेपाल का भी उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ—यू०एस०ए० ने उसके सम्बन्ध में कहा है—

“U.S. to declare Nepal zone of peace” उसको जोन-आफ-पीस डिक्लेअर कर दिया है । किंग आफ नेपाल वहां गये थे । वह कह रहे हैं कि हम डिसाइड कर रहे हैं और शायद उन्होंने डिसाइड भी कर दिया है ।

एक लम्बे अर्से से यह प्रश्न चला आ रहा है और हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी के दिमाग में भी होगा । मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इस बारे में आपकी प्रतिक्रिया क्या है और क्या इसके विषय में कोई बातचीत चल रही है और जो इण्डियन इन्स्ट्रुट है, उसको किस तरह से सुरक्षित रखा जाए, इसके बारे में आपने सोचा है । यदि अभी तक ऐसा नहीं किया है तो अब आप क्या कदम उठा रहे हैं, यह एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है ।

इसके अलावा मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि इण्डियन औसन को पीस जोन रख जाए, यह छपता रहता है । यदि नेपाल को अमेरिका पीस जोन डेक्लेयर करता है, तो उसके सामने एक प्रश्न यह भी आएगा कि इण्डियन ओशन को भी पीस जोन रखा जाए या नहीं । ऐसी कुछ बात बन सकती है और अगर यह नहीं होता है, तो यह बात अधूरी रह जाएगी ।

अब थोड़ी-सी बात मैं पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में भी कहना चाहूंगा । पाकिस्तान को एक मौका मिल रहा है और हमारी नीति असफल हो रही है । क्या बजह है कि अमेरिका पाकिस्तान को हारपून सप्लाई कर रहा है । डिफेन्स की दृष्टि से यह हमारे लिए बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है लेकिन हम यह भी देखें कि

ऐसा क्यों हुआ है । हमारी विदेश नीति कितनी सफल रही है इस मामले में, यह माननीय मंत्री जी बताएँ और वे इस चीज पर भी प्रकाश डालें कि आर्माइंट रेस को रोकने में वह कितनी सफल रही है । पाकिस्तान जहां से चाहता है, आर्म्स ले लेता है । इसमें डिफेंस की बात तो है ही लेकिन थोड़ी बात विदेश नीति की भी आ जाती है । हमारी विदेश नीति में कहां-कहां त्रुटियां हैं, इस सन्दर्भ में यह सोचने की बात है और हमारे रिलेशनस क्यों अच्छे नहीं बने, यह भी सोचने की बात है । हमने कह दिया कि पाकिस्तान में जन-आन्दोलन हो गया है । पालीटीकल तरीके से इसके बारे में कहा जाए, तो ठीक है लेकिन सरकार का कोई बड़ा आदमी यह कहे कि जन आन्दोलन को हमारा समर्थन है, यह कहां तक सही होगा और फिर आप कहते हैं कि हम किसी के घरेलू मामलों में दखलन्दाजी नहीं करते हैं, यह बड़ी दिक्कत की बात है । इस तरह की डबल स्टैण्डर्ड की बात क्यों की जाती है । जो बात हो, साफ करो । एक तरफ तो आप कहते हैं कि हम इसमें विश्वास नहीं करते हैं कि किसी के आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप किया जाए और दूसरी तरफ इस तरह की बात कही जाती है । मेरी पार्टी और मेरी राय कुछ हो सकती है लेकिन सरकार की राय तो साफ होनी चाहिए ।

श्रीलंका के बारे में भी थोड़ी चर्चा करना चाहूंगा । जिस वक्त श्रीलंका में निर्दोष लोगों को मारा जा रहा था, उस वक्त हमारी सरकार ने बहुत बड़ी धमकी दे दी कि हम चुप नहीं रहेंगे, मूक-दर्शक नहीं रह सकते । अब मूक-दर्शक रहे या नहीं रहे, यह तो सरकार को अच्छी तरह से मालूम है । वहां पर बहुत से निर्दोष लोगों की हत्याएँ हुईं लेकिन अब श्री पार्थसारथी साहब के जाने के बाद जो डेप्लपमेंट हुआ है, उसको हम एप्रिशियेट

[श्री राजेश कुमार सिंह]
करते हैं और श्री जयवर्धने का जो बयान अभी अखबारों में हमें देखने को मिला है, उसको भी एप्रिसियेट करते हैं। उन्होंने टी०यू०एल० एफ० को भी बातचीत के लिए आमंत्रित किया है। विरोधी पक्ष से जो वार्ता हो रही है, उसमें उनको भी आमंत्रित किया है और यह एक अच्छी शुरुआत है। भारत सरकार को भी अपनी पहल श्रीलंका के बारे में करनी चाहिए और यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि एक धमकी की बात कह दी और मोटी सुर्खियों में वह अखबारों में आ गई कि कुछ विदेशी एण्ड इवन बिग पावर्स इसमें इंट्रस्टेड हैं। दूसरी तरफ आप देखें कि इण्डियन ओशन की हालत किस तरह से बिगड़ती जा रही है। योरुप में न्यूक्लियर मिसाइल के डेपलपमेंट की बात हम करते हैं लेकिन यहां क्या हो रहा है। हम दो बिग पावर्स के बीच खड़े हैं, एक तरफ रूस है और दूसरी तरफ अमेरिका है और यदि हम इनसे सावधान नहीं रहे, तो इसके नतीजे अच्छे नहीं होंगे। ये दोनों पावर्स हमारे दरवाजे पर आ खड़ी हो गई हैं। आप नेम के नाम पर इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में विश्व में शान्ति स्थापित हो जाएगी। वेलब्रेड में जाकर कहते हैं कि दोनों देशों में दोनों बड़ी पावर्स में शान्ति होनी चाहिए, डिसआममिंट होना चाहिए। जब 4 जून को पिछली बार गई थीं, तो वहां मेरे ब्याल से कुछ किया नहीं और कभी भी कहते रहें कि हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधानमंत्री श्रीमती जो विदेशों के दौरे पर जाती हैं, तो वहां पर क्या क्या होता है, यह थोड़ी-सी चीज मुझे देखने को मिली है। विदेशों में जाकर डेनमार्क की राजधानी कोपनहेगन में भारत की प्लानिंग की चर्चा की। यह आपकी विदेश नीति है और प्रधानमंत्री खुद इसके बारे में कहती हैं। नावें में गईं, तो पहाड़ों और भीलों का अवलोकन करने के अलावा और कोई कार्यक्रम नहीं था। बायेना में तो उनका सब प्रोग्राम ही गड़बड़ हो

गया। अब अगर यही हालत रहती है और विदेशों में जाकर अगर भारत की प्लानिंग की चर्चा करती हैं, तो आपकी प्लानिंग क्या है, यह देश अच्छी तरह जानता है।

विदेश के लोगों को बताने से कोई इसकी उपलब्धि नहीं है। यदि आपको कोई उपलब्धि करनी है तो आपको आमूलचूल परिवर्तन करना होगा अपनी विदेश नीति में। नहीं तो आपकी विदेश नीति खोखली ही सिद्ध होगी। इसीलिए विश्व में आप अपने को प्रोजेक्ट नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। भले ही आपके अधिकारी यह कह देते हों कि बहुत कुछ हो रहा है और हमने बहुत कुछ कर दिया है। आप टेलीविजन पर भी दिखाते हैं कि हमारा प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बहुत उपलब्धियां हासिल की हैं।

मेरे कहने का मतलब यही है कि आपको एक व्यावहारिक नीति अपनानी पड़ेगी। हमें दुनिया को यह भी नहीं दिखाना है कि नान-एलाइंड मूवमेंट के नेता होने के नाते हम किसी बिग पावर के मोहरे बनते जा रहे हैं। हमें किसी का मोहरा नहीं बनना है। हमें अपने को साफ रखना है और साफ रखने के लिए साहस की जरूरत होती है। हम कहीं अधूरी बात कहते हैं लेकिन अधूरी बात कहने से कंप्यूजन क्रियेट होता है। इसलिए विदेश नीति हमारी साफ होनी चाहिए।

हम आज तक बंगलादेश से कोई मसला हल नहीं कर पाये हैं। गंगा और ब्रह्मपुत्र के पानी का सवाल हल नहीं हुआ है। नेपाल के साथ पानी का मसला बना हुआ है। अगर पड़ोसी मुल्कों के साथ हमारा तनाव बना रहेगा तो विश्व में हम कितने ही बड़े बनने की कोशिश करें, लोग हमारा विश्वास नहीं करेंगे।

अभी जब प्रधान मंत्री यू०एन०ओ० गई थीं तो उन्होंने बहुत से राष्ट्रों को दावत में

बुलाया था लेकिन उसमें 15 राष्ट्र ही उपस्थित हुए थे। ऐसी परिस्थिति क्यों उत्पन्न हुई ? इसके लिए हमें गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिए कि हमारी विदेश नीति दोषपूर्ण है और इससे स्थिति भयानक होती जा रही है। तनावपूर्ण विश्व में हमें एक समर्थ और साफ नीति अपनानी होगी जिसमें देश का हित सर्वोपरि रखना होगा।

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA
 (Bombay South): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are debating and discussing the international situation at a time when the global strategic environment has deteriorated considerably. Sir, the situation in the world is very tense. Instead of cooperation, conflict, confrontation and conflagration is visible in various theatres of the world. We have tried our level best and at the very outset I would say that when the credit is due, it should be given unreservedly for all the attempts that India has made in the Non-Aligned Conference and in the recently Commonwealth Heads of States Meeting. All the attempts made by us to bring about or to strengthen the forces of world peace, security and development are commendable and due credit should be given to our Prime Minister and to our Foreign Minister. (Interruptions)

Sir, first of all, we may take the question of world peace. The United Nations has been passing Resolutions on peace, security and development year after year. These have been debated continuously at various international forums—it may be the United Nations Security Council, Non-Aligned Conference, Commonwealth Heads of States Meeting and everywhere. The question of maintenance of world peace and security and development has already been there. We have passed several resolutions. But the question is, paradoxically enough nations are talking of peace and preparing for war. This international hypocrisy is the main stumbling block which prevents the

entire world from bringing about the environment for peace and security in this world.

Sir, though the voice of sanity has been raised by the non-aligned nations and by the Commonwealth countries on the super-power bloc rivalry, we have not been able to check all these forces, and the greatest tragedy, according to me, if it is at all, is that some of the powers and some of the people which are part and parcel of the non-aligned movement or are part and parcel of our Commonwealth heads of States are themselves flouting the resolutions. Not only these super-powers are flouting U.N. Resolutions but other powers also who are with us and who are talking of world peace, security and development. When it touches their feet are also flouting the resolutions of the United Nations. Shall we be the silent spectator to this aspect ? That is the main problem to which we should address ourselves today.

I had an occasion to attend under the leadership of our Hon. Speaker the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference which was held at Nairobi recently. There we raised certain questions and it was my privilege to speak on International peace and security with special reference to South Africa and Namibia. South Africa has been flouting the world opinion. South Africa is not only oppressing the people in South Africa but it has extended its pernicious policy to Namibia. Namibia is completely under the feet of South Africa because of its racial policy and apartheid and all these things. In spite of the UN resolutions, South Africa stands defiantly against the world opinion and we are silent spectators today. Why. I say that we are silent spectators today is that though it is to the credit of India that we have incessantly and continuously in all the international forums waged a war, a relentless war against this apartheid policy and pernicious policy of South Africa, but at the same time when we met in the Commonwealth Heads of States meet....Great

[Shri Ratan Sing Rajda]

Britain itself—the United Kingdom—supporting the pernicious policy of South Africa is tolerated. When these things are standing as a stumbling block, contradictions are created between practice and preaching. Here, when we pass the resolution, either they abstain or they do not support it or they say, "We will not vote for it." And then, we say that consensus has been obtained having obtained that consensus, some of the Western powers have themselves flouted all the resolutions of the United Nations pertaining to South Africa. In Namibia, the situation is very terrible. The patriots are fighting for their own fundamental rights for the emancipation of the country. That freedom struggle goes on. But some of the Western powers are supporting South Africa. This is the contradiction in our international situation. I think, it is high-time, we shall have to think what can be done, so that the resolutions of the United Nations are not flouted. We shall have to think about it since it is high-time and things are dangerously drifting.

Apart from oppressing Namibia, South Africa is trying to create trouble in all front-line States of Africa like Lesotho and Zimbabwe. In many of the front-line States, South Africa successfully created trouble. When such a situation is created, we cannot be a silent spectator. It is to our credit that we raised voice. But I would request our Government that apart from raising our voice and fighting in the comity of nations and various international forums we must give our solid support to Namibia in man and material. We must give very concrete and wholehearted support to the freedom fighters of Namibia—men and material, and we must do it openly. We must tell the people of the world that during our freedom struggle, when we were fighting for freedom, Mahatma Gandhi taught us that we were not fighting for only our own freedom but every Indian will fight till the last vestiges of colonialism, are pulled down in all parts of the world, and then and then alone we shall consider that our freedom is complete.

From that view-point, I think, the Government should extend all possible help, men and material, to the people of Namibia who are bravely fighting for their freedom.

Having said this, I would now like to state about the resolutions on disarmament which we have passed. Our Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister have put certain concrete proposals for bringing about disarmament. We have stated that whatever nuclear armament is there, all the stockpiling that is there, it must be agreed that it would not be utilised. Non-use of the existing stockpiled nuclear arsenals is the first thing that we have suggested.

The second thing is the freezing of the present nuclear armament.

The third thing that we have suggested is GCS that there must be a treaty; General and complete disarmament Treaty, which would take into all the consideration not only nuclear armaments but also all the conventional weapons.

We must see that these things are implemented. These are very pious resolutions that the United Nations and its Security Council have adopted. We have been repeating them. But in spite of that, much headway has not been made because of the obstinacy of both the Super Powers. They are not considering the world opinion; they are not respecting the world opinion. Because they are not respecting the world opinion, we are facing brinkmanship and the world is on the verge of nuclear war. Any time nuclear war may develop. That is what the situation is today.

We have to see what should be done when the United Nations resolutions are flouted.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : What is to be done ?

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA :
 We can do many other things. Instead of merely passing resolutions, some concrete steps should be taken. I may give an example. Resolution 435 was passed by the United Nations with regard to Namibia. There were certain mandatory sanctions agreed to be taken against South Africa. We must see that these mandatory sanctions are implemented. We must bring about boycotting of South Africa and see that all the Commonwealth countries cooperate in that. We have not been able to do that. Resolution 435 of the United Nations remains only on paper. It has got to be implemented. On behalf of India, our representatives, our Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister, have been voicing this. But we have failed to see that those mandatory sanctions against South Africa are implemented. That has not been done. We have failed to see that they are implemented immediately.

There are certain visionaries in this world. Wenden talked about One World. There are many others who talk about One World, Oneness of Mankind, etc. If nuclear holocaust takes place, we shall be destroyed; the whole world shall be destroyed several times over. What should be done under the Circumstances? There are certain movements going on in the world to which our Government can extend full cooperation and strengthen their forces. Recently, I had been to New York to attend a conference on : Global Militarisation Versus Economic Development organised by Parliaments for World Order, an organisation under the aegis of the United Nations which has been trying to beseech both the Super Powers and they have approached our Prime Minister requesting her to take a lead in bringing both the Super Powers to negotiation table and to make them agree on certain disarmament proposals. I am very happy that our Prime Minister has stated that India is very much committed to disarmament and that we shall take the lead and whatever we can do, we shall be positively doing. That is a good thing a Constructive Step in right direction. Whenever some such move-

ment takes place, it is good thing, a good augury for all the elected legislators and parliamentarians of the world have now girded up their loins and have come forward to see that forces of world peace are strengthened.

Apart from that, there is one organisation, which, like to the World Constitution and Parliament Association. The representative of that Organisation, Mr. Philip met our Foreign Minister the other day. This Organisation is going very far. They say that merely preaching world peace would not suffice. We shall have to organise rallies. We shall have to organise the people, build up public and, when UN resolutions are flouted, and mere speeches do not suffice, we should teach a lesson to these people to show them that the people of the world are united and they would not tolerate often this war is being fought by proxy in various Asian and African countries. At that time, when the World Constitution and Parliament Association and such other organisations approach us, supported by some concrete proposals, it is the duty of Government to see that they are supported vehemently. Now they have got a proposal and placed before us a Constitution for the Federation of Earth. Such proposals also should be given due consideration and we must think very seriously and dispassionately on this problem. The die is cast. It is now or never.

If nuclear war takes place, the world would be destroyed several times over.

From that view point, let us decide and declare that all such forces fighting for world peace will be strengthened by our Government, and the entire country.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT (Bharatpur) : Sir, when this resolution was moved, I had a feeling that this will be the one resolution which would be supported wholeheartedly by all Members in the House.

[Shri Rajesh Pilot]

It is because this is the one aspect in our Government on which very solid and constructive progress has been made and which has been appreciated all over the world.

Anyway, I rise to support the resolution moved by the Hon. Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Narasimha Rao.

I was also listening to the speech given by Prof. Satyasadhan Chakraborty. He started criticising the Government and others from the very beginning of his speech. I would like to tell you the general attitude of people to similar situations in the past.

When Asian games were held, there was great criticism by lot of people. But immediately after the games were over, they started appreciating it as a great event in the world of sports.

Then NAM was held. It was criticised. It was the people who criticised it. It was again appreciated. It is appreciated today by the Hon. Member himself.

Now CHOGM has been held. It has been criticised. After three months, you will find good remark by the people that it is good Conference.

I also remind you that emergency was totally criticised and now some of them say that during emergency things improved.

This feeling of criticism has developed into our character.

I am not advocating or going for it but I am telling what is happening in this country and of the opinions the people are having. We criticise for the sake of criticism.

As far as the non-Alignment policy is concerned, I have heard them and my Hon. friend from our side Mr. H.K.L. Bhagat has very clearly outlined the whole thing in detail. He left hardly anything for anyone to go in detail.

I ask you two questions. Has not India stood the test of time during the crisis of Syria, Grenada and Afghanistan? We stood the test of time. We did not change our policy either towards disarmament or towards nuclear weapons.

We did not change our line of thinking when President Reagan spoke something in the United Nations.

Our Hon. Prime Minister put forth in the United Nations the clear-cut thinking and policy of our Government. Our attitude towards the changing international events is one of stability.

In contrast to this, look at the fickle-minded approach of some people who sometimes praise and sometimes criticise the Government policies. You can find these articles published in our newspapers. It is bootlace diplomacy of the time. We have brought up the prestige of the country from the boot-lace diplomacy to the table of discussion. And even this is criticised!

I will speak only on two points. The responsibility of the country is great; especially after we have been chosen as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, it has increased. And this has to be seen in what conditions, under what circumstances? What is the atmosphere prevailing all over the world. One of the Super Powers says in the morning that they believe in democracy but in the afternoon they support the dictatorship in one particular country. And still they say that they are democrats. Under such circumstances, we can only project our policy, we can only fight for our principles. Our policies have stood the test of time.

Without going further in detail, I can only tell this House that by reading the newspapers, by collecting public opinion, as a public representative, I only feel that the population in the country, is behind this non-aligned policy and we are proud of it. I am not saying that the whole country has to be proud at one time, that the whole House should be proud at one time. But we are proud

of it that it has enhanced the prestige of the country in the international scene. I had been myself abroad and I have talked to the people outside. If you go abroad and talk to the people, you will find that even the people who are against our policies also praise India's efforts and India's role as a non-aligned country. They all say that India is the only hope; even people belonging to the Super Powers say that India is the only hope for the world to bring peace back to the world; they all praise India...

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jai-pur) : You take me also along with you.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT : Allright, but you will come back to the House and say something else; I cannot control that. This has become the trend in the political character.

I personally feel that I have nothing much to say. I cannot pick up anything where we can say that Government has failed or has not put in the efforts. I find our Hon. Minister going abroad nine months in a year, making all efforts; if there is a problem, he rushes and tries to find solution. This is all we can do as a non-aligned country, to project our policy to the world.

I fully support Government's policy. It is right. I congratulate the Government on this. As a Member of Parliament I say that we are proud of this policy and we must maintain it in order to sustain peace in the world.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : Sir, I do not agree with the view that everything that has happened in the CHOGM is to be painted as black, nor do I agree with the view that everything that has happened there is to be painted as white...

SHRI C.M. STEPHEN (Gulbarga) : Then what is the colour ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : The non-aligned colour, like yours—black and white.

I would say that the compulsions of the world events and the compulsions of the crisis which is palpable before the eyes of the people of the world, which is bringing closer and closer a terrible threat, have compelled in this particular

Conference, CHOGM, 'silence' on those people, those members of the Commonwealth who are themselves accomplices in precipitating this crisis and bringing this war-danger nearer. They did not have the courage here to speak up as to what actually is their conviction. Public postures have been struck here which will be repudiated in private. I know that. It is a fantastic thing; Mrs. Thatcher is herself a partner of the United States and NATO in allowing the missiles to be put on her soil; we do not expect her here in this particular company to speak up in defence of that; she could not have spoken up in defence of that, because the whole world opinion is going against this, certainly in India. But we cannot forget that she represents a Government which is carrying out this very dangerous job on behalf of the Americans.

A Government which, as my friend here has said, is hand in glove with the racist regime of South Africa—could she have said it here in Delhi, in India with our long record of fighting for the rights of the South-African Blacks against this horrible racist regime and Apartheid? She could not open her mouth here. Does it mean that she has changed by coming to Delhi or by relaxing by the side of the blue waters of the beaches of Goa and now she will go back and take up a different policy? We should not hoodwink ourselves. This is the composition of the Commonwealth. The only thing I like about the Commonwealth is that it is a forum where many people play cricket. I like that, because I like that game. I do not know yet why we should continue all these years and why should we continue to accept that the Queen is the head of the Commonwealth. I do not understand.

Can this Commonwealth last without India? I ask you. If India ever decides to get out of the Commonwealth what will be left of the Commonwealth? Obviously nothing will be left. The old white former Dominions of the British Empire will be left. And all the other countries which were former colonies are here only because of this huge country of India. Otherwise, there will be nothing left.

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

What I wish to say is that if the Government of India is conscious of the strategic place that we occupy in this Commonwealth—the indispensability for the existence of the Commonwealth is the membership of India—I would like them to come out. But if they want to continue, they should at least utilise their strength and their power inside the Commonwealth to insist on certain things and not take shelter always behind this hypocrisy called consensus... (interruptions). This is escapism. We have spoken out, our country, our government, our Prime Minister have all spoken out against the invasion of Grenada. Grenada is a commonwealth country. It is not any country, it is a part of the Commonwealth family, a little country with 1-1/2 lakhs of people. The Grenada was occupied and invaded by an American military force, and this Commonwealth Conference does not have a word to say about the American action. Mr Narasimha Rao said and he has been quoted in big headlines in the Press that the decisions and resolutions of the CHOGM reflect the viewpoint of India. Do they ? ...

SHRI RAJESH PILOT : Consensus.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : How do they reflect the viewpoint of India ?

High tributes were paid to the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr Trudeau who is referred to as a venerable statesman. But Mr Trudeau is a confirmed votary of the non-proliferation treaty to which we do not subscribe and he has offered the American facilities in Canada for testing of their missiles because Canada has a lot of open space. How do you expect such people to speak up here on these points ? But we ought to have spoken out and we will continue to speak. Our Government has spoken on this and taken a firm stand and should we not say that...if they are not able to reach agreement on such important issues on which the future of humanity depends, then let at least India's position be recorded that India has a different standpoint ? Why cannot this be done ? What is so sacred about this Commonwealth that always takes shelter behind consensus ?

If we record our viewpoint, will the whole Commonwealth fall to pieces or what ?

Just now I find that the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr Hawke, on returning to his own country made a statement in the Australian Parliament saying, why should the Israeli forces get out of Lebanon until the Syrian forces also get out ? 'They should both get out.' He is equating the two. He is equating the Syrian Arab Army which is there in some strength in Lebanon with the Israelis who committed the unforgettable repression last year in Lebanon and committed all sorts of atrocities on the people there including killing of thousands of people in the refugee camps. Mr Hawke was here in the Conference. I was in Australia less than two months ago and I found that Mr. Hawke as Prime Minister, had been going back on the decision of his party—the Labour Party—in Australia which, when it was in the Opposition, had adopted a policy decision that they would not allow the mining of uranium ore in Australia which is being mined and exported and obviously, it was going to be used for some nuclear purpose. That was the policy decision of the Labour Party. When they won in the elections and when M. Hawke became the Prime Minister; he had gone back on that and is leading to a very serious repercussion inside the Labour Party itself. He says that our uranium ore can be mined and taken out of the country. So, what I am saying is this. About the economic part of the New Delhi meeting, I do not want to say much because, in the statement made by the Foreign Minister, he has himself admitted that there is some disappointment with that part as if the rest of everything is all right. Only that part is not upto to our expectation. I do not know what was the expectation when many of these people were participants of the Williamburg Conference. Did they not take a certain stand at the UNCTAD VI Conference regarding this problem of what we call 'the struggle for a new international econo-

mic order' ? It is a question of an International Conference that NAM had called for to reform the whole economic, financial and global structure. Have they supported it ? They were dead opponents of all these things. I am only worried that our Government, in the name of consensus, is going along all kinds of wishy-washy, hotchpotch documents which have been produced ; the sharpness of our stand for which we are respected and admired in the World, particularly, by the countries of the non-aligned world, gets blunted ; the clarity gets obscured or blurred. I do not like this. I do not say they have surrendered or anything like that. These are harsh words to use. Why should I say that ? Did they think of some means ? Now in Cyprus they have taken a good stand. I do not know what would have been done if President Kypriou had not been able to come to Delhi. He was able to give a good Resolution which was adopted on Cyprus. Now I would like to ask about the Islamic Conference which is going on in Dacca. Now what will happen if the Government of Bangladesh which is playing host to the Islamic Conference, and the Government of Malaysia or Government of Maldives which have agreed to something here, when they go there to Dacca for this Islamic Conference and if the general tenor of that Conference is to support the Turkish regime for setting up an Independent State there in a part of Cyprus which they have illegally occupied ; will not that position be ludicrous as far as CHOGM is concerned ? I just want to say one thing and I will finish in five minutes. A lot of hallaballoo has been made over the fact that the countries of the Caribbean—small countries—had asked the United States to take military action against Grenada. They supported the U.S. This was what was said by that lady, particularly, who is the Prime Minister of Dominica. I have no time to quote but, I am sure, our External Affairs Minister might have seen it. There is a speech and I could quote it. I won't. It has been made by the Chairman of the CARICOM—Caribbean

countries—an organisation called 'CARICOM'. Mr. George Chambers, Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago—perhaps, he came here also—in a speech made before the Parliament of Trinidad and Tobago on the 26th of October, just a day or two after the attack on Grenada that took place, he categorically said this. I may quote one paragraph only.

"I would like to state that the first official notification, I, as Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago and current Chairman of the CARRICON, received of the landing of forces in Grenada, came from the United States Embassy in Port of Spain through the Minister of External Affairs several hours after the actual landing. I wish to state further that upto date I have received no notification from any CARRICON member country of any intention to request assistance from the Government of the United States to intervene militarily in Grenada ; nor have I been informed by any CARRICON member country that such a request had in fact been made."

This is what he says. All these things have been cooked up later on by some people under American pressure to say "no, no, we asked you to go there. We supported your action". This calls for stronger condemnation here. If they did not agree—the other people—we should have made our position clear. Why not ? What will happen ?

As far as the new international economic order is concerned there is no demand even made for it in this economic document of New Delhi. It can't be with these people around. Please compare the Delhi statement on economic action with what I suppose is a moderate kind of utterance made by the Secretary General ; Shri Ramphal and I quote :

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

"A particularly distressing feature of the last two years has been the tendency of the U.S., the world's richest nation, to distance itself increasingly from the generosity and enlightenment which marked the high point of its internationalism. It has cut back on aid for even the poorest nations. It has hindered efforts to improve world liquidity. It has pursued domestic policies without much concern for their effects on world economic recovery and it has led the resistance to a coordinated approach to global recovery."

Even Mr. Ramphal has said it.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO :
Who is he ? What is he to the commonwealth ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What he has said in his report is not reflected in your New Delhi economic declaration at all.

Sir, one thing more I would say finally on this Commonwealth business. We have a long connection. Isn't it ? It is supposed to be a Commonwealth connection with the old days and with the old regime. I think that we are still suffering from some kind of a complex—excuse my saying so—vis-a-vis the British and it comes out in little things. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that for the last two years our Government has been trying to make the U.K. government and U.K. High Commission here accept that the British Council which is their so-called cultural department here must not be allowed to function as a separate independent organisation but should become a part and parcel of the High Commission itself. This became necessary because those British citizens who work in the British Council the question of their paying taxes—double taxation in England and India—arose and our Government told them if you want to avoid double tax-

ation then you must become part of the diplomatic staff of the U.K. High Commission. In that case the British Council cannot function as a separate thing. It must become part of the High Commission. I want to know have they accepted it upto today ? They have not. I have a proof here. In the newspapers so many advertisements are being published in the name of the British Council—commercial advertisements—selling tickets for various kind of shows : A charity premiere of Heat and Dust. It is a film. The Taj Group of Hotels and British Council present on Friday the 14th October at Chanakya theatre. That means they are functioning independently. Who allowed them ? Look at the films which are being shown. One is called Helen. Queen of the Nauch girls. Then there is another one called Autobiography of a princess. I do not know whether all these films were shown here. They are importing films duty free.

Here is another advertisement : Siri Fort auditorium, Asian Games village, October 8. The British Council presents 'Yettis'. Tickets for Rs. 50, Rs. 25 and Rs. 15. And this is done in colloberation with the soft drink called Thrill. These people are doing anything they like. They are not prepared to accept your pre-conditions and conditions.

Did you raise this with Mrs. Thatcher ? Or, because of the fear of offending the great; white queen, we kept quiet ? He must tell us.

Finally, Sir, I will say this.

I am sure the Minister also shares the great concern which everybody is feeling at the escalating situation. In the Middle-east the drums of war seem to be beating again now and Mr. Hawke might like to equate the Syrian forces with the Israeli forces but nobody in his commonsense will do that. I do not know what is going to happen. The attack has begun. And it is said that the Syrians have no right to fire on United States' reconnaissance planes fly-

ing over the Syrian air space I don't know what is the international law. Suppose every day reconnaissance planes fly over Indian air space,—Pakistani planes or any other planes—are we not entitled to fire at them? And because of that, they want to retaliate by attacking the Syrian positions on the ground for which they have paid the price of having two or three of their planes shot down also. But this is a very serious state of affairs and we would like them to tell the House something by which we would like them to tell the House something by which we will know that our Government along with other Governments have been making strenuous efforts in that region to bring about some kind of disengagement and peace. And also there is the question of the PLO. It is unfortunately a tragic that the PLO has suffered some sort of an internal split. And I know he went there with some attempt to bring about some reconciliation and all that. Perhaps it is this split in the PLO ranks which is further encouraging Mr. Regan to strike at this very moment. He is taking a calculated risk. It is a risk which may escalated into something beyond anybody's control. It does not follow that war will break out only where the missiles are being kept. War can start from any other place and therefore it is a very serious situation. We would like him to tell us frankly what they think of this deployment of missiles. Do they go on talking like others that it is very unfortunate that the Soviet Union walked out of the Geneva talks? It is very unfortunate; but it is even more unfortunate that while the talks are going on, what was the great hurry for the U.S. to go and put their missiles in West Germany and Britain? Could not they have waited till the talks concluded? So, this is a situation of reckless adventurism and the Indian Government must make its position clear and call a spade and we know who is responsible today for creating this war crisis which threatens the world with destruction, Thank you.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur): Sir,

I agree with my respected friend Mr. Indrajit Gupta that the world situation today is very sombre, very serious, very dangerous and very alarming. His solution is that we should walk out from these international organisations including the Commonwealth, calling a spade or going ahead with the banner on our heads. Would it help? Would a serious student of international affairs like Mr. Indrajit Gupta recommend it? Would he really think that it would help? My friend from there Mr. Satyasadhan Chakraborty—my fellow Professor—said that there should be no compromise at all with anybody; he said, nobody should have any truck with any kind of inconsistency. Sir, when I was a young student somewhere else in the west, I also stood for a similar attitude, when Soviet Russia refused to have anything to do with the League of Nations. But did not Soviet Russia find it necessary to come again to the League of Nations and now to the United Nations?

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: You said that you were also thinking on those lines when you were young. So, fault is not of the professor but it is of the age.

PROF. N.G. RANGA: Both of us are cold enough to have sensible view of things. I fear my Hon. friend continues to be in that state of thinking. (*Interruptions*). Now, the USSR walked out of the United Nations during the early part of Korean crisis. Did she not find it necessary to come back again? Did she not find it necessary a result of her absence, her own position in regard to Korea got worsened and her opponent, America, got advantage from it? So, these things do not work out in this manner. Why do you want to have all these conferences? Then what is the need of continuing in the United Nations when it is not able to implement any of your resolutions? There was no sense at all behind that attitude. All this time, we have been working for the removal of the veto

[Prof. N.G. Ranga]

power. The delegation from the USSR did agree with us. We wanted the strength of the Security Council to be raised. Did they not unite with each other, the USA and the USSR, in opposing our resolution in the United Nations, not once but several times? How does it work out? The only silver lining in the whole of the present situation is the line being followed by our Prime Minister, by our Foreign Minister, by our Government, that is, laying stress on negotiations, persuading the people to sit round the table, agree to discuss with each other and even if they are not able to agree with each other, at least to force such of them—as has happened in the CHOGM as some of them were not able to agree with us but at the same time not able to say 'No' and therefore, force them—into silence.

My Hon. friend, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, was finding fault with even that. I consider that to be a great achievement. The Prime Minister of England held very strong views. Indeed she agreed more with America than with anybody else with regard to Grenada and here she had to keep mum. She agreed in regard to North-South dialogue regarding New Economic Order, not with us, but with those who would not have anything to do with that and yet, all that she could do was to prevent us from having a clear declaration in regard to that. She could not very well take us in her wing. There are definite gains. One of them is to silence such friends. My Hon. friend from the Janata Party was advising our Government to give every possible support to a member of these non-official world level organisations working for peace, working, for strengthening the United Nations. I am all in favour of those who have been trying to strengthen them. But then, would it be possible for them to have a constitution by themselves for the world order, for the world organisation like the United Nations? Though we could

not succeed with the existing United Nations that we have had till now yet they are necessary. This kind of world public opinion has got to be created and that is what our Prime Minister has been trying to do and our Foreign Minister also and in that direction I am satisfied. Anyhow, our Government has made the maximum possible contributions during the last three years in softening the world tensions in cooling down the tempers of many of these Knight templars.

16.00 hrs.

Who are these great Knight Templars? Is America alone guilty? Is USSR alone guilty? Is it not a fact that each one of them has put its foot in mud and mire of neo-colonialism, neo-imperialism, and exploiting these middling countries, developing countries, some trying to be weaned away towards America, some trying to be enticed away to USSR. They have been at it. All the Non-Aligned are not free. Even in the NAM our friends were quite clear about it, and they began to deplore it also. Quite a number of NAM countries are under the influence of USSR, some countries possibly are under the influence of U.S.A. and at the same time, they are willing to go together. They are anxious to go together, and they are glad that, as luck would have it, no less a person, than the Prime Minister of India happens to be the Chairman of the non-aligned group. Why? They would like to get economic assistance from Russia, they would also like to get similar assistance or more assistance by way of armament and so on from the United States. Nevertheless, they do not want to go under the complete control of either United States of America or USSR. They would like to have some kind of mid-way stand, Platform where they, without trying to offend either of their influential friends, powerful friends, even dangerous friends, would be able to talk to them in an independent

manner without being threatened with aggression.

Is aggression all out of consideration? What happened in Afghanistan? What happened in Grenada and Folkland?

Shri Indrajit Gupta was talking about the hypocritical and silly manner in which America has behaved in regard to Grenada. Similar things had happened in regard to Korea also; there happened in Afghanistan also. Some dictator was there in Afghanistan; he is supposed to have sent an SOS to USSR, therefore, USSR came in. American papers were full of all sorts of inconsistency with regard to that. Anyhow, USSR wanted to go into Afghanistan, had to go into Afghanistan because of the compulsion of world situation, as she had seen it. So is the position with America also. All these things are happening.

While these things are happening without almost any notice at all, would it not be better that there should be a platform like the NAM, another platform like the CHOGM, and Commonwealth Conferences. As we know, a number of us have been members of these parliamentary groups, and international parliamentary Union. Are all the members really having democratic constitutions? Then, Commonwealth Parliamentary Conferences; we are all going there. Talking shop it may be, yet talking shop is the most important thing. People are ready to fight with each other, and at the same time there must be some people who could force them to calm down, sit round the table and begin to talk. And that is exactly what our Prime Minister, our country and our foreign policy experts have been doing, and I would like to pay my tribute to them. Of course, I praise my Prime Minister. I am proud of the role that she has been playing and I have been saying so to her, as well as to the House. I am also proud of the

Foreign Minister, but I would also like to pay my tribute to our experts in the External Affairs. I have been seeing them for the last 3-4 years at close quarters.

I am full of praise for them. They are competent people. They are patriotic people. They are good experts and they have been helping our Prime Minister as well as the Foreign Minister in a capable manner. They have not let us down.

My Hon. friend, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, was wondering whether some where or other there must be some kind of a weakness towards the British people because this Queen was visiting the country during that period. If there had been any kind of a weakness at all, the Queen would have been a special guest at that conference. We did not invite her as a special guest. She came and she went round the country like any distinguished representative of any of our friendly countries. But she was not invited into the Conference.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Is she not the head of the Conference?

PROF. N.G. RANGA : Yes, of course, Symbol is hers. My Hon. friends also have symbols. There are several symbols. I need not go into all that. It pleases specially some people. Therefore, since we want to be friends with them, we make a compromise and say all right, let there be a symbol. I was one of those people who were opposed to it, when Pandit Nehru came over here on the advice of our good friend, who has passed away and who became their special friend later on for years and years in our country, Mr. Krishna Menon. On his advice he came and advised us in the Congress Working Committee. I was one of the few people who opposed rather sharply. But nevertheless I have accepted it. I have no objection. I am not afraid of that kind of a thing. There is no sense of infe-

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

reiority towards the British, I can assure my friends.

It pleased me very much the other day to see the British Prime Minister sitting along with other delegates while my Prime Minister was there in the front table inaugurating the Conference. If there is a kind of symbol at all which can be recognised and which is being respected as the head of this Group of Nations, it is my Prime Minister. Therefore, I am not bothered about it also because I do not hang by symbols. It does not give me much strength or credit, but nevertheless it is a symbol of our rising stature in international affairs. It was very much more symbolic at the NAM Conference.

Having said that, let us see if we have achieved anything at all. True detente is gone. USSR and USA are ranged against each other. Any moment anything might happen. After all they are human beings. The other day one gentleman had suffered a heart attack. Another day another man also may suffer. We don't know. Instead of suffering heart attack they may suffer from fear complex. Therefore, they may lose their nerve and then they may put their finger on the Nuclear Bombs. Then what happens? To prevent that it is the sacred duty to day of every human being in the world who wants peace, who wants progress, who wants people to live as human beings to present it, is the mission that our Prime Minister has taken upon herself and she is fulfilling that mission. I can tell you that she has done that successfully so far, but I cannot say it would be successful completely. How could it be and how could we be sure unless the USSR gives up her fear of the United States of America and unless the USA also give up her fear of the USSR? They want world domination. What for? For their own protection. I don't blame them They are entitled to look after themselves. But that does not

mean that they should endanger the life and culture of the peoples all over the world. That is exactly what they are doing. That is why we regret Soviet Russia's refusal to continue to be at the disarmament Conference table. My hon, friend Indrajit Gupta, I am sure in his private counsels with himself, would not find it difficult to agree with me.

We regret that she has committed another, as grievous a mistake as she had committed when she walked out of the Security Council during the first phase of the Korean War. She should not have done it. In a huff, she has done it. That is the real trouble. Today, Indira Ji wants to insure this world against that kind of a temperamental huff, either from this side, or that.

We know Mr Reagan a little better than we know Mr Andropov. This gentleman is a highly temperamental person. Can we trust the whole world to this gentleman, and his so-called statesmanship—especially when he has to go to the polls? There are people in that country who allow themselves to get excited much more easily than people in so many other countries, especially when they hold such a highly responsible position in the world. That is why I am glad that my hon. friend, our Foreign Minister had the courage to express his regret that Soviet Russia has walked out.

Americans are very funny. They say to Indians: "You say that you are holding the scales even between us. Yet, you have voted so many more times by the side of Soviet Russia, and so much less with us" etc. That it not the way. We certainly hold the scales even as between these two people, not because we hold both to be equally guilty. Someone may be more guilty at a particular time. But both of them have got. This terrible nuclear power. They have got capacity to destroy the world. America has enhanced this risk of destruction by her latest moves in

Europe. That is why we are so unhappy that America is going the wrong way.

MR CHAIRMAN : We are hard-passed for time. Please be brief.

PROF N. G. RANGA : That is why I say that to-day the role being played by India is worthy of emulation by all peace-loving peoples all over the world. I am glad all those African, Asian and Pacific nations within the Commonwealth had come over here the other day and demonstrated their affection and also their faith in our Prime Minister.

I am also glad that in spite of all these risks; all these dangers and all these clouds of destruction that are hovering over us, this ray of hope for peace is growing wider and strong in enlightening the peoples and rousing the peace-loving peoples all over the world through their wise use of this instrument of consensus. That is where I cannot agree with my hon. friend who has no use at all for consensus. Consensus is the discovery achievement and development in these postwar of the U.N. There is no other development at all. This is the development which has come as a political weapon through the United Nation. I am glad our Prime Minister has used it in the interests of world peace.

MR CHAIRMAN : Mr Chandrajit Yadav has made a special request, saying that he has got some work to attend to. So, I call him to speak. I would request him to be as brief as possible, and not take more than ten minutes.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh) : I think Prof. Ranga, in his own way, made a very interesting and important speech. I also respect his views. But I think he has not fully represented even the government's stand. In his own way, he has put forward certain very important things.

I think, the international situation

had been never so bad and so dangerous as it is today and, therefore, the concern of the people for their own survival is very natural, which is being expressed all over the world. The situation has been highly aggravated because of the recent decision of the United States of America for deployment of missiles and Pershing 2 to some of the western countries.

Now the question is why did the Soviet Union withdraw from the negotiations? I think it will be very unfair to blame the Soviet Union for this action because now the Pershing 2 has been brought to a point from where any target in the Soviet Union within 4-6 minutes can be hit. Now, when the negotiation was going on, then during the negotiation to take this kind of a major step to bring the missile to a point from where in the Soviet Union any target can be hit within 4-5 minutes, is it not unjustified on the part of the United States of America who is responsible for this nuclear confrontation? I am sorry to say that I have not seen any statement of the Government of India at least condemning the act of the United States of America at a time when negotiations were going on, important negotiations, at Geneva. They should not have taken this kind of a stand. (2) when that target, that missile comes so close to the Soviet union, the Soviet Union only said, let the people of America understand that it is not that the war is going to be only in Europe, the confrontation is only in Europe, but if you are coming very close to us, then for our own security, for our own safety, we will also come closer to your border so that you may realise the danger of nuclear confrontation. Is it not a fact, during the last Special General Assembly Session on Disarmament where our Foreign Minister, I think, very ably represented our desire for peace and with very concrete proposals, on that occasion and earlier also to that, President Brezhnev made a clear-cut proposal on the Floor of the United Nations Organisation, General Assembly, that the Soviet Union will

[Shri Charanjit Yadav]

not be the first to use nuclear weapons and the Soviet Union will take the initiative to destroy all chemical stock-piles and will go all out for nuclear disarmament, if the same kind of a guarantee is given by the United States of America? But America ridiculed the proposal: America did not agree to that. Therefore, to equate these two powers on the question of peace will be a major mistake and this is where I will request even Congress Members to be careful because they go a few steps further without understanding their own government's policy. I think our government does commit mistakes at certain times equating both. The government's stand seems to be very clear. They stand for peace: they stand for disarmament. They are against the nuclear confrontation on these issues. Government's stand is clear. Today, what is the situation? Today, the situation is that the world accounts for 50,000 nuclear weapons which have destructive power equivalent to a million Hiroshima Bombs. Now, let us imagine one million Hiroshima bombs. Destructive nuclear power equal to that has been created in the world. And today the explosive power is about three tonnes of TNT for every human being. This is where the world has reached, the most perilous situation. If world peace had been ever in danger and the entire survival of human being has been ever in danger it is only today. And therefore our concern for peace is natural, Mr. Ranga, I agree with you that today the people all over the world, have taken the initiative; they have come out. But their voices are not being heard. In West Germany where millions of people came on the road and a human wall of 132 km. was created, including mothers with children in their laps. Did the West German Government listen to the voice of those people? Have they not passed a resolution in their Parliament about the deployment of Crude missiles in their country?

Madam Thatcher made a statement that those who would demonstrate

about the bases will be dealt with properly and that her Government would not hesitate to resort to killing the agitators, that is to resorting to violence. Because she said that she would not tolerate this kind of demonstration about the bases, where the missiles are going to be deployed.

Therefore, I am saying, today I think the Government of India and the people of India give great moral support to that cause. If the voice of India is being heard all over the world it is because the people of India, very often I would say, on such questions, mostly I will say, the Government of India represented really speaking the feelings of the people for peace, for harmony, for unanimity for their survival now and therefore if India is respected by Viet Nam, if India is respected in the Middle-East countries, if India is respected in South Africa, the black people of South Africa; if India is respected for its certain moral values it is only because India has a very great and rich tradition from Mahatma Gandhi onwards and even our old civilisation, our culture and our stand for peace.

Therefore, I say today this is the most important human duty. I will make one or two observations very briefly; then I will finish.

If you look around the world, what is happening in Central America, where small island countries are there? Grenada was a island country with a population of 150,000 only. My criticism is that had there been Jawaharlal Nehru, he would not have bothered for consensus and said, "No, India will record its voice. India will never tolerate that a small country like Grenada will be attacked by American aggressors." We did not even insist for the withdrawal of the forces. We did not insist on withdrawal of forces from Grenada, leave alone, the condemnation, we have not even insisted on the withdrawal. I think this was a compromise

of the Indian stand in Indian policy because of Commonwealth. India's prestige got a setback, its prestige was higher. It was raised high among the non-aligned countries where the Prime Minister was able to provide the leadership, in a difficult situation. But here the same Prime Minister compromised in this foreign policy and India's stand only for the name of success. This is my charge. This is what I say our prestige has come down.

I will say that India's stand on the Indian Ocean will be clear if I read what they have said about the Indian Ocean :

"The Heads of Government again voiced their disappointment that despite the views expressed by the littoral hinterland States and the adoption of the 1971 U.N. Declaration on Indian Ocean as a zone of peace there had been a further increase in military presence and rivalry of outside powers of the Indian Ocean with adverse consequences for the peace and security of in that area.

They called upon all the governments concerned to each agreement for convening of the proposed U.N. Conference on the Indian Ocean in 1984 or early 1985 the latest."

What is this? Who is preventing Indian Ocean Conference? Does the Foreign Minister not know it? It is only the United States of America? The Resolution was passed in 1971. Soviet Union never said that they will not come and attend the conference. They have said: Yes, Indian Ocean should be the zone of peace. They are prepared to attend the conference. It is only the United States of America which is saying they will not attend this conference and now they have found an excuse that

if you want to have this conference, include Afghanistan also Afghanistan came three years before but this decision was taken ten years before. Therefore, who has established Diego Garcia in Indian Ocean? Has Soviet Union established a military base? On such issues when you equate these powers then I am sorry to say that you compromise even with your national interests. This time you must know who is your enemy, who is surrounding you, who is trying to surround and help your enemies around your country. Don't try to equate at least a country which has been your friend in the most difficult period. It does not mean that we agree with everything what Soviet Union does, but Soviet Union has been our most reliable, dependable friend in all our national crisis.

If you equate it, a friend's feeling is hurt and it also hurts our own national interests. Therefore, I think that the time has come that India must take a stand. India must take an initiative for a world conference for peace where not only the governments and the heads of the governments are invited but let even those organisations which are working for peace, those personalities who can contribute for peace, also be invited and let there be a proper initiatives and let those forces be isolated who are today bent upon creating a difficult situation. Mr. Reagan may see his own election prospects but Mr. Reagan has no right to destroy the entire humanity, Mr. Reagan has no right to get away with all kinds of things which he wants to do. Sometimes a time comes when *Akela Chalo*. Rabintra Nath Tagore said: Time comes when you will have to be alone. Then be alone but do not give up your principles, do not give up your ideals when the question of survival of human beings is concerned. I am not demanding here the withdrawal of India from Commonwealth though I agree with Ranga Ji that perhaps the world situation is such that these forums, in spite of having lost their importance, at least provide a platform where you can meet

[Shri Charajit Yadav]

across the table, you can talk from that point. I am saying, this is not the time to withdraw and walk out from the Commonwealth Conference but the time is that you must speak the truth, the time is that you must act as a leader and I will again hope that the Prime Minister who has been given a very major responsibility of leading the Non-Aligned Movement at a very crucial time, will not compromise its positions in future. I request the Foreign Minister to take the initiative. I know him personally and I sometimes pity that since he has taken over this Ministry, has been working day and night. His concern I can see and on major issues he has been working and I feel that this is the time when they should take initiative and they should really speak for the 90 per cent people of the world. Three-fourth people are on the other side only one-fourth people, with their imperialistic approach, with their resources, with their exploitative policies want to create a situation where world will be again confronted with the most dangerous war humankind has seen.

SHRI R.S. SPARROW (Jullundur) :

Mr. Chairman, the subject for today is indeed of red hot nature and that is the subject of the international situation and the global scene. If one seems it from atop as to how the situation obtains, one should feel astounded and one may even feel that civilisation has possibly gone berserk. It is quite evident it appears very clear to any eye, or to the imagination of today's man, with all the knowledge behind him, whichever way you look, things are in red hot fashion. Most of the progressive, advanced nations seems to be quite helpless in their particular power confrontation. From whichever part you start, it may be Chile, Argentina, Bolivia, Grenada, Honduras or Guatemala, the situation is the same. Then if you come down to another area, starting from Lebanon, it is not a question of

what is happening around Lebanon, Even within Lebanon the Druz are fighting among themselves and the PLO is disintegrating, each confronting the other. Go anywhere you wish to, it may be towards Syria, Israel, Iran, Iraq or Afganistan, one finds everything in and the waves are expanding, enveloping and everybody in its fold. If you go to Africa, starting from that small little Chad, if you move on to Congo, Katanga, Biafra, Uganda, Ethiopia or Somalia, you will see nothing else is happening except a hot war. Then if you come to Far East, in North Korea, South Korea, Viet Nam, Viet Congo, the situation is no different.

The important point to note for this august House and the sharpest brain the world over, which is the Indian brain is that it is the super-powers, who hold tremendous power, who have the habit of having surrogates, satellites, want other powers to be subservient to them. That is how the whole thing is working under the gun shade, under the power element, under their own umbrella of superiority. Things are happening that way, civilisation is tottering under all types of oppression.

In such a situation, it is for us in India to understand where we stand and what the role of India is. This is a problem not only for us but for all who life at the moment on the surface of the globe, the total human race and even for posterity to come.

When we are considering such an issue, I am not going to drag you on to the dangerous type of weaponry that is being amassed; of course, I can quote chapter and verse; I can tell you all about bacteriological and other types of germ warfare and the different types of weapons that are coming into play, in the global scene, the push button type, all keyed up; I am not going into that. I have not got the time, nor the Chair-

man gives it because of the constraint of time. Therefore, within the time limit, I will talk about India, in the context of the type of scenario I have narrated, of being the torch-bearers of hope for the future.

And the credit goes to the Government, to the Prime Minister of India, to the Foreign Minister of India, the Ministry of External Affairs, and the Government as a whole in whichever way you look at it. I will explain this. Lately, incidentally, I had the opportunity of being amongst about 70 nations of the world in Baghdad only a few weeks ago, and I am going to tell you what I sensed there. The cordial manner in which the Indian Government and the present Treasury Benches in power are using their cards was being sensed and felt by everybody around the globe and there I found from those different delegates of 70 nations, from their talking, their understanding, their behaviour their having to work with you and so on, they hold India in a very high esteem today for the manner in which you are handling the foreign affairs under the aegis of the Prime Minister for the good of the world at large. That is something which one has to understand. There is no reason why there cannot be criticism, I accept that. There is no reason why there cannot be any room for improvement, I accept that. But the nodal fact in that bigger scenario of the world at large is, India is working as an oasis amongst something that is really sithering and burning around. I have given you that idea a minute ago. Here you see certain proof of it. In the Non-Aligned Conference everybody woos you, everybody praises you, 104 nations getting together, it is a very big chunk of the total number of nations in the world. It is not an easy thing to be Chair person and to adroitly and diplomatically, in a friendly tone, work out and move all around them. People come to you. In any forum and top rank forum, it may be UNO, it may be a Non-Aligned Conference, it may be CHOGM, it may be bilateral give-and-take meetings, it may be any kind

of forum, you would have noticed that India's name is sky-high and I admire the manner in which this particular Department under the overall supervision of our honourable Prime Minister is giving us this big name. But we have to move forward, there is no question about it. India is not going to be aligned with anybody for power tactics. No. We are not doing that. It has been made abundantly clear. Here is somebody who was saying that we did not condemn Grenada. Time and again any invasion, any foreign troops that may have landed in other people's country has been condemned every time. We have made no exception whatsoever. Our Prime Minister and our Minister of External Affairs have been clearly indicating every time, it may be Afghanistan, it may be Grenada, it may be any other country where foreign troops have come and we have condemned that in unequivocal terms. And these things we have to watch. It is a pity that even around India things have gone very hot. You know that is happening within our next-door neighbouring country itself. It is a turmoil of a type. We know what is happening there. We also know geo-strategically how the super powers are bringing their jaws about with a view to militarily and otherwise own the world from one side or the other. My proposal has to be put before the House and to my Government also. You have given us a very fine direction. India has to be self-reliant and I would recommend self reliance along with other friends around us, for which so much of work has been done by our External Affairs Ministry and in that you have to form one super bloc also. And I can assure you that geo-strategically South Asia should take the lead.

My friends around this county—may be Pakistan, may be Bangladesh, may be Afghanistan, may be Sri Lanka, may be Burma or may be some other country—for God's sake, forget about having to be subservient to others. Why? South Asia and some other

[Shri R. S. Sparrow]

nations will join and as a bloc, they will say, we are a super-power bloc. "It is not a question of challenge but it is question of creating a proper balance of power and in that you will be able to work as a big deterrent on the super-powers which are grasping powers and powers. This is the idea with which you should think on those terms.

I once again have to mention that our Prime Minister and the Ministry of External Affairs have been very successful (internationally) in making for the direction and giving the direction at all times. With these words, I thank you very much for giving me the time.

SHRI C.T. DHANDAPANI (Pollachi) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to associate myself with some of my friends who have expressed anxiety over the deployment of missiles and other weapons in many parts of the world. Particularly the imperialistic society from Western countries is trying to destroy the entire socialistic society. As far as peace is concerned, I may say here that peace and socialist society go together and they are inseparable. So, socialist countries alone can provide peace because they have commitments to the commonmen whereas the Western powers and the imperialistic society do not care about the commitments which have been made to the people. So, the socialist countries alone can bring peace.

In this context, I only appeal to the Government to take a firm decision as to which side the Government of India should tilt. Therefore, it is high-time for the Government of India to think about this issue.

As far as other issues are concerned and with regard to their decision take in

CHOGM conference, many have expected very wonderful things and that the outcome would be very useful to the world. But many people are very much disappointed. It is nothing but an affair like an annual temple festival. So, people returned up, enjoyed something and dispersed without any tangible result. That is what you have seen here.

I would like to mention here that many issues have been raised and according to the statement of the Hon. Minister the problem of West Asia, Namibian people's struggle for independence and also the American action in various parts of the world, particularly Lebanon and Grenada have been discussed. Ultimately, it has been said about the Cyprus and the Unilateral Declaration of Independence. But I am very sorry to say that the Government of India being the host country has not made any reference about the integrity of an individual. It has been said about the sovereignty of a state but the Government of India has failed to talk about the sovereignty and integrity of an individual, particularly to what happened in Sri Lanka. It has not been stated. We the Members of Parliament belonging to DMK Party circulated pamphlets to all heads of nations to raise this issue so that it can be discussed. I do not want to say that even though I am willing to say. The Government has not come forward to condemn the action of the genocide there. There are two parts in it. One is the role of the Sri Lankan Government and the other is the genocide perpetrated by the thugs.

I thought that the Government of India would take an initiative to condemn the genocide, leave alone to condemn the Government of Sri Lanka. They have failed in that also.

We think much about the resolutions normally passed by the United Nations,

On many occasions, the Government have taken part in the United Nations deliberation to voice the human rights of the people. For example, with regard to Cyprus, the Government of India, along with other countries, in 1974, in the United Nations Security Council said that peace should be established in Cyprus. India also supported that issue there. Secondly, our then Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon, himself moved a motion on 16th December, 1966, in the General Assembly stating that under the Human Rights Charter the people have the right of self-determination on the basis of cultural similarity. But it is only for other nations. As far as the genocide of Tamils is concerned, I do not know why the Government are shutting their eyes and they are not at all taking any interest regarding that issue in the international arena.

My hon. friend, Mr. Stephen, General Secretary of the Congress-I Party, visited Tamil Nadu. Wherever he goes, he utters something which always will not be relevant. He said, "D.M.K. should shut up. It should not open its mouth." That is what he said. I sincerely ask them to touch their heart and tell me, had the D.M.K. kept quiet, would this issue have been discussed in the House and would the Government of India have taken up the matter with the Sri Lanka Government? No. I do not have anything personal against the Minister of External Affairs. I know him; I know his initiative and know his anxiety.

But as the Government, as the Congress-I Party, what do they think? They think that genocide of Tamil in Sri Lanka is a political issue in Tamil Nadu. They think that the D.M.K. Party gets some political advantage of that in Tamil Nadu. That is wrong. We do not get any political advantage. We were able to bring the entire population of Tamil Nadu, belonging to different religions, belonging to different languages, to one front and we were able to

move them together. Now, the Government thinks that it is going to benefit the D.M.K. Party. That is wrong.

Our Foreign Minister also visited Sri Lanka. He took much interest about the talks between Mr. Jayewardene and Mr. Parthasarthy. Mr. Jayewardene accepted our emissary. At one time, he went back on that. He said, "I have no time to discuss." There was a pause for one or two months. We have been telling in this very House that Mr. Jayewardene is trying to bide time and that he will not implement the pacts or the agreements which are going to be arrived at. But still it is going on. We wanted the Government to intervene immediately. But the Government did not act in time. Had they acted immediately on the request of the people of Tamil Nadu, the lives of more than 2000 people would have been saved.

How our Government has miserably failed. For example, our team was sent to UNO. Our Prime Minister was also there. The Prime Minister did not say anything. But on her way to United Nations, she said in Bombay that it is an internal issue, the killings and rapings. Again, Sinhalese started disturbing the Tamil community. This is the position.

Mr. Hamid, the Minister of External Affairs of Sri Lanka, was speaking in UN General Assembly that because 13 soliders were killed by the Tamil youths, this violence erupted. Nobody was there to counter his argument. The Government of India too very cleverly has chosen a Minister from AIADMK Ministry to represent in this team. This is the first time they have chosen an Opposition member in the team. We also expected that he will give a reply. It happened that six young girls were abducted from the college hostels. They were raped. Two girls died on the spot. Two girls committed suicide. One girl was missing. The sixth girl gave

[Shri C. T. Dandpani]

the information. That was the reason they have done it. This is the position. Nobody was there to counter it. But the position is different. But our Government have failed in this matter, I would say.

However, Mr. Jayewardene was given a red carpet welcome here. But as in the case of England when Mr. Jayewardene was to visit England, 80 Members of Parliament objected to his visit. Then the Prime Minister of England said to Mr. Jayewardene "We cannot give you protection" and he cancelled his visit to England. We, the DMK Members of Parliament staged black flag demonstration against Mr. Jayewardene. We were arrested. Even the news was not read in English on radio, TV and other media. That way, he was given a very comfortable stay here. However, it is a question of two provinces. Now, Mr. Jayewardene says that Tamils will be given two provinces, one from East and the other from North. It is not like that. Why I am saying this is I would tell the Minister that this is not a new proposal of Mr. Jayewardene. On August, 10th itself Mr. Jayewardene has started—that appeared in the newspaper—that the predominant Tamil district of Jaffna in Sri Lanka is to be split into two. That is the old theme he is going to impose on Indian Government, Sri Amrithalingam and others.

As regards the setting up of police force, they say you can have only home guards. What can they do with home guards? They can be utilised for only controlling and regulating the traffic! They cannot face army personnel. This is the position. Therefore, this talk which is going to take place and this agreement also, should be in a rational way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude. You have taken 15 minutes.

SHRI C.T. DHANDAPANI: I will finish in two minutes. I would say that to the Sirimavo Bandaranaike Sastri Pact, our Government was a party. But Mr. Jayewardene and the government of Sri Lanka have not implemented that in spirit. Still there are State-less people numbering more than five lakhs. What has the Government done in this case? The same thing is going to happen in future also. There is no other option except giving a separate Eelam; there is no other go.

They have mentioned Cyprus. What happened in Cyprus? There is communal violence took place in 1963, in 1967 and also in 1974. Because the Turkish Cypriots have some links, bondage and affinity with the Turks, they got the help of Turkey. That is how it was raised in the U.N.O. Because the Tamils have no representative in the U.N.O., the issue is being completely sealed off; nobody is taking any interest. The Govt. of India condemning the unilateral declaration of Independence by Turkish Cypriots. What they say is, an Agreement was arrived at in 1959, the Zurich-London Pact of 19th February, 1959. What the Turkish Cypriots say is that they were struggling against the Greek Cypriots to get some rights, some benefits, out of the Pact and they are still fighting. That is one of the reasons why they have declared independence unilaterally. It can happen anywhere in the world; if a particular community is suppressed in the name of religion or in the name of culture or even in the name of ethnic minority that will be the result.

I only request the Hon. Minister to tell us as to what are the views that have been exchanged between Mr. Jayewardene and the Indian Government and what are the proposals given by the Indian Government and what is the reaction of the Tamil leaders who have come from Sri Lanka, and if Mr. Jayewardene does not concede to your proposal, what is going to be the future

course of action of the Indian Government.

I do not approve of the statement made by our Hon. Minister of External Affairs because it contains nothing about the problem of Tamils in Shri Lanka.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR (Trivandrum) : Sir, just after the Non-Aligned Summit, a discussion of this type had taken place in this House, and I had said that our Prime Minister rose to speak, while in the U.S.A., in their language to please them and while in the Soviet Union she used to speak in their language to please them. Now I have heard from our most learned Member, Prof. Ranga, both these languages at the same time in this House itself. This is the position where the foreign policy of the Government stands now. There is no definite commitment or conviction.

The motion moved by the Hon. Minister reads :

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

No doubt, the international situation today is a matter of serious concern.

16.59 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Who has contributed to the seriousness of the situation? That is the main question. No doubt, the capitalist forces of the world, the neo-colonialists and the imperialist powers have aggravated the situation to such an extent. If you want to make the situation conducive for peace and progress, we have to fight imperialism. We have to fight capitalism. We have to fight neo-colonialism. Somebody on the other side was telling that we have to keep the balance between the big powers. For what purpose? I am asking you. If we want to keep the mankind in peace and if you want to create a situation so that the mankind can march towards progress, then the powers which are to be destroyed should be destroyed and the powers which are to be maintained should be maintained.

17.00 hrs.

No doubt, during the Non-aligned Summit you have spoken about a new economic world order. To-day also while participating in the discussions, some friends have spelt it out. How can a new world economic order be created? What is the order? It should be a socialist order—no doubt. If you want to create a new socialist economic order, it should be based on the socialist countries. It should be based on the socialist forces in the capitalist countries. With the support of the Socialist forces in capitalist countries only we can create a new world economic order.

Situation and the Policy of the Government of India in Relation thereto

[Shri A. Neelalohithadasan Nadar]

In the statement the Minister presented before the House, he has claimed that with the recent CHOGM conference, we have hosted three important world events. Mr. Rajesh Pilot was telling that when the Asian Games took place, the Opposition parties criticised it and that now they are supporting it. When the Non-aligned Summit took place they also criticised it but they now support it. 'So in regard to CHOGM also they will criticise now but later they will support' it.' That was his argument. I am asking: what is the purpose of the Asian Games? What have we gained out of it? When the whole country was facing a drought and other problems and even when the villages of this country were facing problems of drinking water and we are not able to provide them drinking water, you have wasted so much money.

After the NAM I have stated clearly in this House that the pronouncements and declarations are good but they will be only on paper and that nothing is going to be implemented. This government cannot do anything to implement it....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Nadar, all resolutions have to be in paper only.

SHRI NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR : There are so many declarations. They are dependent on world economic powers, the capitalist power and the imperialist nations and unless we become self-reliant and unless we attain a self-reliant economy, as Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation said, we will not be able to play a key role in the international affairs.

Regarding the Indian Ocean and Diego Garcia this Government has not been able to do anything even after the lapse of all these years.

Regarding Grenada, I think, Prof. Ranga was in a way trying to defend the

Americans through his utterances and he was trying to equate the Afghanistan with the Grenada issue. How can it be equated? We have made it clear that for Afghanistan, a political solution should be found. As regards to Grenada, it is a naked aggression by the Americans. You have failed to make the Conference to come to a conclusion like this.

Our Prime Minister herself has made it clear that we have tried our best; we have tried to convince them but we were not able to give a declaration of this type. That shows the failure of our foreign policy in its implementation. It is only on paper. After the non-alignment summit, one important event took place. That was an infighting between the P.L.Os. Were we able to make peace between them? Somebody was telling that our Foreign Minister led a Delegation. I did not know what he had done there and whether he was able to do anything substantial there to the withdrawal of the foreign troops from there. This is the situation. If we analyse foreign policy of the Government in the last four years and the performance, we can say that they are unable to do anything substantial in this field. We will not be able to do anything substantially unless we concentrate our attention on economic self-reliance. Our internal policies and performances are also important because foreign policy is the extension of our domestic policy. With these few words, I conclude.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Brajamohan Mohanty. I would request all the Hon. Members to be as brief as possible because our Foreign Minister will have to reply at 6-15 P.M.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : Am I to conclude that I have been lengthy in my speech?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am making a request to all the Hon. Members to be as brief as possible because everybody must get the opportunity.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY : Sir, I am surprised to observe that some of the Members of the Opposition—the stalwarts—have perhaps reconciled to this situation. But, some of them have not. What is the problem? The problem is consideration of new ideology including nationalism and self-interest, peace and disarmament. Certainly peace and disarmament are a must. The efforts of the Hon. Prime Minister—I should say that efforts of India—are laudable. One may accept this or may not accept this.

Posterity will accept this and history will congratulate the statesmanship of the Prime Minister of India in her contribution to the cause for peace and disarmament. Sir, when this debate was going on, I come across yesterday a newspaper report about the U.S.A's naval build-up in the Indian Ocean. The Navy is being equipped with nuclear weapons including the atom bombs. Also further it is seen that the patrol aircraft of the Diego Garcia is also equipped with the nuclear weapons. So, my submission would be this. What is the reaction of the Government of India?

I hope the Hon. Foreign Minister will enlighten us on this. Another matter which I will place before this House is that so far as non-alignment movement is concerned about nuclear disarmament they have devised a new strategy. The strategy is to declare phase-wise different areas of the world as nuclear free zone. My submission would be whether any progress has been made in this regard because it is a question of existence and non-existence. I would quote here the words of our Prime Minister which she spoke in Europe: Whether war is obsolete or mankind is obsolete. So, the problem before us is to make war impossible for all time to come and establish peace to save mankind.

Sir, today a new type of bomb, namely, neutron bomb has been devised where the life will be extinguished but all the cities, houses, etc. will remain

intact. That indicates how today we have degenerated ourselves and how we have sacrificed all the human values.

Sir, it has been commented that so far as Commonwealth is concerned why the Queen is there? The Queen is not there on our account. The crown and the United Kingdom are inter-linked and, as such, on account of the people of U.K. the Queen is there. So, it is not that Queen is there on our account or that we are adoring the Queen in India but as she happens to be the symbol of the people of United Kingdom that is why the Queen is adored.

Another point has been made why not free discussion in Commonwealth meeting and particularly the rescue operation of the USA in Grenada has been pointed out. My submission would be that if the Hon. Members look into the newspapers they will find it has been categorically stated that in spite of India's opposition to the rescue operation it could not be put in the resolution because of the opposition of the Caribbean nations. So, we have to accept the realities of the situation and if the basic purpose of our foreign policy and our international relations is to bring peace then we have to cultivate friendship and eliminate all constraints or anything that will widen the conflicts and differences. Differences have been very ably projected by the Government of India—our Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister—but it could not be projected in the Press because that will widen the conflict. Sir, as a matter of fact some of the nations attending the Commonwealth conference are involved in military politics. Some are in NATO and even in non-aligned conference. Some of the nations are almost aligned but they are there. So, this is the reality and we have to accept the reality.

Sir, our broader aim is to establish peace, free existence of nations and the prosperity of different nations. My submission would be if we compare the outcome in the background then it would be a fair assessment that the non-

Situation and the Policy of the Government of India in Relation thereto

[Shri Brajamohan Mohanty]

aligned conference and Commonwealth conference have contributed a lot and strengthened the forces of peace, strengthened the forces who stand for disarmament and the forces who are working against imperialism, colonialism and economic domination.

So far as our economic perception at NAM is concerned, no doubt we could not carry the Commonwealth to that point. But the broader objective has been widened to that direction and in that direction. That is the positive achievement which should not be minimised. There is one thing more I wish to say. I said how we see today that even in our neighbourhood the nuclear armaments are entering into the Indian Ocean. Sir, you hear everyday the news that Islamic Bomb is being manufactured here in Pakistan. and you have seen various irritants around our own neighbouring countries. But in spite of everything we are pursuing a policy of peace, a policy of friendship and a policy of cordiality. Sir, in spite of the fact that China does not accept our position in Sikkim, China claims Arunachal, but still; would we advise the Government of India to open the question of Tibet? No. It will not be possible because we want peace and friendship with our neighbour. Similar is the case with Pakistan. Yesterday I had put a question in Parliament and I have got the reply. I asked how is it that some of the extremists are being trained in Pakistan and training is being given by Niazi. About that the Government of India says that they have protested; but Pakistan does not accept it and they say, 'we are not giving any assistance.' So, in spite of that, we are pursuing our effort to have lasting peace with Pakistan. Despite all these irritants, in spite of the provocation, in spite of the fact that there is concentration of all the sophisticated weapons by USA in Pakistan—apparently it is aimed at us—still we want peace and lasting friendship.

Lastly, I congratulate the Foreign Minister. I congratulate the Prime Minister for the bold step that they have

taken to create an atmosphere of peace, to sponsor the culture of peace and the culture of disarmament in the world.

With these words I conclude.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat):

Sir, I think the House will agree with me when I say that the present epoch of human history is confronted with the biggest of the questions, the question of war and peace. I am convinced that this question of peace and war constitute the only touch-stone to adjudge the correctness or otherwise of the policy stances of any nation.

Having that premise, I now proceed to say that this very premise, this very concept, enjoins on us in this Parliament to identify the forces of war and the forces of the peace today.

It is to be admitted by all today that war danger has increased manifold. The continuing acceleration of the nuclear arms race, the breakdown of the Geneva talks no Euromissiles and development of Pershing and Cruise Missiles in Britain and West Germany have contributed towards a further worsening of the International situation. In all these have led to the threshold of nuclear confrontation which means the total destruction of life and human civilisation.

Sir, these flash points of nuclear confrontation is not an event of recent origin. It is rather a continuation of a process which had arisen out of the global strategy of the United States' imperialism and this strategy—to be very brief is the United States' design to perpetuate its domination both economic and political over other parts of the world. And, in order to achieve this aim, in order to achieve this strategy, they want to achieve this by following a policy of aggrandisement by a policy of aggressiveness, by a policy of interference, by a policy of intervention and by a bolstering up of certain reactionary designs in different parts of the world. Examples are numerous. If you go to

to the recent development in Asian countries, Latin American countries, Central American countries, it is not necessary for me to give the example of that kind of attitude of strategy now being adapted and practised by the United States of America. One thing is to be taken note of. This nuclear confrontation has become imminent because of the persistent moves of the USA to scuttle all the reasonable proposals even for limited disarmament. This is the strategy of the USA to sabotage the SALT-II Treaty and even the Geneva Talks for limiting the use of missiles. They have not even responded to the latest Soviet offer to freeze the bulk up development and even destroying of all nuclear weapons. On the contrary, they are still continuing to adhere to the theory of the limited nuclear war. As a matter of fact, there cannot be anything which can be called a limited nuclear war. Therefore, the danger has increased manifold, as I mentioned earlier. The danger today is not far off. It has come closer to our doors also. This danger to our country's security is a reality and not a gimmick. As somebody has described, this danger to our country's security has increased because of the massive arming of Pakistan by the United States of America including supply of F-16 and Harpoons and all other kinds of sophisticated weapons. This danger has increased because of the USA's policy of encircling India by way of setting up newer and newer bases in Pakistan, and it is a very sordid fact that the Government of Sri Lanka is reported to have agreed to allow the USA to use Trincomalee as their Naval base, by the reported move of the Government of Bangladesh to allow the USA to use Chittagong for their Naval base. Naturally; when mentioning all these facts, this poses a grave danger to India's security. This is the aim of the USA for encircling our country. Now, the outcome of the Commonwealth Meet-I am afraid—cannot be properly judged unless you taken merely as an isolated event of so-called great international importance. Therefore, I would urge

upon the House to see that while they express their views on the outcome of the Commonwealth Meet, the entire totality of the world situation has to be taken into account. The outcome of the Commonwealth Meet is the emergence of three documents. To that, I will come later on. But now I want to make it clear that the Commonwealth is nothing but a ** relic of the former British Imperialism. If you allow me to say so, an insult to the anti-imperialist ethos and anti-imperialist traditions of our great people. Therefore, I do not find any reason even after listening to Professor Ranga, as to whether there is any justifiable reason for continuing our association with the Commonwealth. It is high time that we take a decision...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would only suggest that in place of that word, you may use a better word.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : **
 But if you want, I am prepared to accept an amendment, and 'not desirable'.....

(Interruptions)

You should also take note of the composition of the Commonwealth of nations. It is under the domination of the imperialist Britain and their cohorts—Australia, New Zealand and Canada, who are all active partners and abettors of the aggressive NATO, military bloc headed by the United States of America. Therefore, what kind of decisions, or what kind of opinions, you can expect from a body which is constituted or which comprises of this kind of abettors and perpetrators of aggression, who distort and subvert the peace of the world.

Briefly speaking, the three documents of which a mention has been made in the statement of the Hon.

** Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Shri Chitta Basu]

Minister for Foreign Affairs are, one, the Goa Declaration on International Security, two, New Delhi Statement on Economic Action and three, Final Communiqué. If you just spend a few minutes to analyse them, you will find that these documents reflect patently stances which fall far short of the positions India took on many earlier occasions. These documents made a casualty of many strongly held and publicly articulated positions of India on many issues earlier. Further, if you permit me to say, these documents expose India to the charges of surrendering the basic principles held dear by her and some other NAM countries.

Lastly, there has been a studied silence over the developments in Grenada. You have not got the courage to condemn the invasion by USA on Grenada, but you have maintained a studied silence. I do not agree with Prof. Satyasadhan Chakraborty when he says that the documents are full of sound and fury. As a matter of fact, it is a document of dead silence which has got onimous repercussions.

The document also addresses an appeal for a genuine dialogue between the two Super Powers. As a matter of fact, I do not agree with the concept of Super Powers. One power represents the forces of aggression and another represents the forces of peace. Therefore, there cannot be any question of equation. As a matter of fact, that has been the principle of policy stand of the Government of India since long. And unless this policy approach is changed, I think, this kind of ambivalence and hesitation would continue to grip our foreign policy stand,

The New Delhi Statement on Economic Action dealing with the restructuring of the international financial institutions falls far short of the principles as enunciated in the NAM document.

The NAM document wanted to underscore the immediate and urgent

need of an international conference, a universal participation on money and finance. Here what has been mentioned is that there may be a preparatory consultation for exchange of views or something like that. Concretely speaking NAM reflected the finality of a process and this Commonwealth document indicates the initiation of a process. Therefore, Sir, I conclude by saying that the claim that the Government has made that there has been no shift of the policy, that there has been no surrendering of the basic policy, that the Commonwealth Conference has yielded certain outcome, is a tall claim, which cannot be justified. And therefore, I feel the Government should think about it and restructure and re-shape their policy stance so that India can maintain its prestige as a truly anti-imperialist nation which fights for real peace and fights against wars.

श्री जैनुल बशर (गाजीपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, चोगम की सफलता पर प्रधानमंत्री जी और विदेश मंत्री जी को मैं बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। क्या यह चोगम की सबसे बड़ी सफलता नहीं है कि विभिन्न विचारधाराओं के राष्ट्र एक स्थान पर बैठकर शान्ति की बात कर सकें। शान्ति की बात अलगाव में रहकर नहीं हो सकती है, बल्कि उसके लिए किसी फोरम पर एक साथ बैठकर उस बात को किया जा सकता है। निर्गुट देशों की सफलता-पूर्व कान्फ्रेंस के बाद चोगम की कान्फ्रेंस से विश्व के देशों में भारत की और उसके नेतृत्व की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ी है।

दुनिया जिस खतरे से गुजर रही है, उसके बारे में यहां पर बहुत चिन्ता व्यक्त की गई है। मैं भी उससे बहुत चिन्तित हूँ, लेकिन मेरी अधिक चिन्ता इस बात पर है कि हमारे पड़ोसी देशों में क्या हो रहा है। हमारे पड़ोसी देशों में आज जिस तरह से मानव अधिकारों का हनन हो रहा है, जिस तरह से खूमन-राइट्स का बायोलेसन हो रहा है,

उससे हम सभी भारत के लोग, जो मानव अधिकारों में विश्वास करते हैं, जनतान्त्रिक परंपराओं में विश्वास करते हैं, बहुत चिन्तित हैं। इन पड़ोसी देशों से, जहां मानव अधिकारों का हनन हो रहा है, हमारे ऐतिहासिक, सांस्कृतिक गठबन्धन हैं, हम उनसे बहुत नजदीक हैं। उनसे सिवाय राजनीति के और हर तरह से जुड़े हुए हैं।

श्रीलंका की बात इस सदन में कई बार उठी, हमने उस पर बहस भी की और श्रीलंका में तमिल भाषी लोगों के साथ जो अत्याचार हो रहा है, उसकी हम सभी ने मिलकर निन्दा की, न केवल इस सदन में बल्कि पूरे देश में उसकी निन्दा हुई। आज हम इस बात पर संतोष व्यक्त करना चाहते हैं कि जिस प्रकार से हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने और भारत सरकार ने इस मसले को हल करने की कोशिश की है और कर रही है, उससे हमें आशा है कि अच्छे नतीजे बरामद होंगे। हमारे दूत वहां के राष्ट्रपति जी से बात कर रहे हैं और वहां के जो तमिल नेता हैं, उनसे बात कर रहे हैं। और हमें इस बात की आशा रखनी चाहिये कि सरकार के प्रयत्नों से कोई मुस्तकिल हल श्रीलंका के बारे में निकाला जा सकेगा जिससे वहां के तमिल-भाषी लोगों को भी संतोष हो सके और उनको सुरक्षा मिल सके।

इसी प्रकार से आज हमारे पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान में मानव-अधिकारों का हनन किया जा रहा है। पाकिस्तान की जनता अपने जनतान्त्रिक अधिकारों के लिये, अपने जनतान्त्रिक मूल्यों के लिये जो संघर्ष कर रही है, पाकिस्तान के फौजी शासक उनका उत्पीड़न कर रहे हैं, उनका दमन कर रहे हैं और वहां जो प्राकृतिक (नैचुरल) राइट्स

लोगों के होते हैं उनका भी इस्तेमाल करने नहीं दे रहे हैं। वहां पर एजीटेटर्स को जेलों में बन्द किया जा रहा है, उनको यातनायें दी जा रही हैं, उनको टार्चर किया जा रहा है और तरह-तरह की तकलीफें दी जा रही हैं। यहां तक कि हमारे स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम के एक बहुत बड़े नेता, जिनका हम सब बहुत ज्यादा सम्मान करते हैं, सीमांत गांधी खान अब्दुल-गफ्फार खां को, जिनकी आयु 90 वर्ष से अधिक हो चुकी है, उनको भी जेल में रख कर यातनायें दी जा रही हैं। जो वहां पर पहले प्रधान मंत्री थे—श्री भुट्टो साहब—उनकी लड़की और पत्नी को भी इसी प्रकार से जेलों में रख कर यातनायें दी जा रही हैं। हम भारत के लोग इससे बहुत चिन्तित हैं। हम भारत के लोग चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के लोग हमारे भाई हैं, उनसे हमारा ऐतिहासिक खून का रिश्ता है, वे भी हमारी तरह फल्ले-फूलें और अपने प्रजातान्त्रिक अधिकारों का प्रयोग करें।

इसी तरह की घटनायें आज बंगला देश में भी हो रही हैं। हम लोग यह सोचने पर मजबूर हैं कि पाकिस्तान के फौजी शासकों से जिस बंगला देश को मुक्ति दिलाने में हमने सहायता की थी आज वही बंगला देश फिर दूसरे फौजी शासन के अन्दर कराह रहा है। वहां भी जनतन्त्र के लिये वहां के लोग संघर्ष कर रहे हैं और उन संघर्ष करने वालों के खिलाफ उसी प्रकार के उत्पीड़न की कार्यवाही हो रही है जिस प्रकार की कार्यवाही पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ वहां की फौजी हुकूमत कर रही है। बंगला देश के लोग भी हमारे भाई हैं, उनसे भी हमारे उसी प्रकार के ताल्लुकात हैं जिस प्रकार के पाकिस्तान के लोगों से या तमिल भाषी लोगों से हैं।

[श्री जैनुल बशर]

मैं आज माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ—जब वह श्रीलंका के तामिलियन्ज के उत्पीड़न के बारे में कदम उठा सकते हैं तो पाकिस्तान और बंगला देश के लोगों के उत्पीड़न के बारे में कोई कदम क्यों नहीं उठा सकते? आज इस पूरी संसद और पूरे देश के लोगों की भावना बंगला देश के लोगों के साथ, पाकिस्तान के लोगों के साथ और श्रीलंका के तमिल भाषी लोगों के साथ जुड़ी हुई है, इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार को भी उन आन्दोलनों के लिये अपना नैतिक समर्थन देना चाहिये। मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अभी कुछ दिन पहले इसी प्रकार की बात कही थी कि कोई भी जनतान्त्रिक आदमी इसको रोक नहीं सकता। भारत की आजादी के समय इस देश ने कुछ मूल्य स्थापित किये हैं और यह देश हमेशा उन मूल्यों के लिये संघर्ष करता रहा है। आजादी के बाद जितने भी गुलाम देश थे उन्होंने आजादी का अपना संघर्ष जारी रखा तो पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू के नेतृत्व में इस देश ने उनका समर्थन किया। इस देश ने उन देशों को आजादी दिलाने में मदद की। इसी तरह एक नैतिक मूल्य यह भी है कि जनतान्त्रिक देश होने के नाते हमारी नैतिकता का यह तकाजा है कि जहाँ भी लोग जनतन्त्र के लिये कोशिश कर रहे हैं, जहाँ भी लोग सेल्फ-रूल के लिए कोशिश कर रहे हैं, जहाँ भी लोग इन मूल्यों के लिये संघर्ष कर रहे हैं हम उनको उसी प्रकार से समर्थन दें जिस प्रकार से आजादी की लड़ाई के लिये समर्थन दिया था।

दूसरे देश के गुलाम रहने और अपने ही देश के डिक्टेटर के गुलाम रहने में कोई बहुत बड़ा अन्तर नहीं है। दूसरे देश की गुलामी

भी उतनी ही बुरी है जितनी बुरी अपने देश में एक डिक्टेटर फौज के बल पर, हथियारों के बल पर शासन करता है या दूसरों को दबाता है।

हमें बंगलादेश और पाकिस्तान के फ़ौजी शासक और श्रीलंका में जो डिक्टेटर श्री जयवर्धने हैं, इन सबकी जबदस्त निन्दा करनी चाहिए और भारत सरकार को इन संघर्षों के लिए कम से कम अपना नैतिक समर्थन अवश्य देना चाहिए।

इन सब बातों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि सरकार इस पर विचार करेगी और विदेश मंत्री जी जब अपना जवाब देंगे, तो इन मामलों पर भी कुछ कहने का कष्ट करेंगे।

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we discuss the international relations, we find a distressing situation. The situation in the middle East is steadily deteriorating. We have a war-like situation in Lebanon. The threat is not merely to Lebanon or Syria. The fact is that the threat is to Syria and the entire region. I go a step further and say that the situation is so grave that it can escalate into a larger international armed conflict. The entire world peace is at stake. There can be no denying the fact that the United States of America has indulged into direct military aggression against Syria from the Lebanon base. The America war-planes have attacked Syria and leftist position.

The USA has the audacity to say that this action was in reality a retaliatory action and it has tried to avenge itself. I must emphasise here that this act of the United States of America and Israeli strategy in Lebanon is the strategy under the pretext of reconnaissance mission. Under this protest the USA wants to acquire an open general

licence to indulge into any kind of a military activity and, if challenged, to attack in retaliation and so-called defensive measure. I must say that when the United States of America has made it very clear that its attacks were in retaliation, then one point must be taken into consideration. The USA says that it wanted to avenge itself. I must emphasise the fact that a country that tries to take all sorts of objectionable liberties and is motivated by the feeling of revenge and wants to avenge itself, that country has no place whatsoever in peace mission; it must go from the peace force; and the entire civilized world must be unanimous in this particular demand.

It is abundantly clear that the USA-Israeli scheme is to control Lebanon and to convert Lebanon into a base for launching aggression against Syria, in particular and the Arab in general. The brave Syrians under the leadership of President Hafez Assad are fighting against imperialist and Zionist planes. It is these heroic Syrians who had destroyed the myth of Israel's superiority over the Arabs during the Golan Heights and Mount Hermon battles.

The Syrian Foreign Minister Mr. Abdul Halim Khadam has written to the United Nations appealing to the Security Council to prevent USA from repeating its aggressive acts. Now, our Foreign Minister is the Chairman of the Non-aligned Bureau. Therefore, the Syrian Foreign Minister has also addressed a Communication to our Foreign Minister Mr. Narasimha Rao. This is the time to act. As I said, our Foreign Minister is the Chairman of Non-aligned Bureau. This is the time to act, this is the time to condemn the aggressive acts and to express our solidarity with the Syrians.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, indeed it is most unfortunate and distressing that while the call of the time is unity we find that there are internal conflicts

among the PLO. This is a matter of great anxiety. One need hardly stress upon the need for unity among the PLO and also the entire Arab world. But it is commendable that our Government took prompt steps to initiate a process of reconciliation in the PLO. The efforts of the non-aligned panel, inclusive of India, to bridge the gulf between the various factions of the PLO are also laudable. Then, we must also welcome the efforts by Saudi Arabia and Syria for cease-fire agreement among the warring factions of PLO. This agreement needs to be honoured, this agreement needs to be implemented, for otherwise the gains will be of the racist state that goes by the name of Israel.

The United states of American threatens not only the Syrians but also another champion of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians, namely, Libya. We have the situation in Chad, that by all sorts of propaganda there is large scale American interference in Chad. The fact is that the U.S.A. wishes to use Chad as its base for intimidation and subversion of Libya. But congratulations to Libya. Under the leadership of Col. Gadaffi Libya rejects surrender and compromise and is waging a noble struggle with full faith that imperialist and Zionist forces can be defeated, if Arab resources are also united.

Here, I must also refer to the emerging concept of unity and self-reliance in defence which is projected by the Gulf Cooperation Council of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, UAE and Oman. The basic idea here is that the security of the region is the responsibility of its own sons and thus rejects all kinds of foreign interference. We wish the GCC well and every success.

It is agonising and very distressing to find that despite all efforts the Iran-Iraq continues war. Efforts have been made by the United Nations, NAM and the Islamic Conference, I hope efforts will continue to be made and better counsels will prevail.

[Shri G.M. Banatwalla]

The need of the hour today is immediate cessation of all hostilities between Iraq and Iran.

Before I conclude, I would like to say a few words about the situation in Cyprus. The declaration of independence by the Turkish Cypriots must be understood in its right perspective. I must emphasise that this declaration of independence by the Turkish Cypriots is a logical culmination of a developing situation and we find this developing situation reflected in flagrant violation of Cyprus constitution and Turkish Cypriots being deprived of their legitimate share in administration. The Turkish Cypriots were pushed in a corner and the declaration of independence, in fact, is a sign of their frustration with this position. There was an invasion of island by Greece, persecution of Turkish Cypriots, there was the persistent desire to annex this island to the mainland Greece and to treat it as a colony of Greece, and then it was this type of resistance by the Turkish Cypriots who want the sovereignty and the independence of Cyprus to continue. But then economic embargo and several other disabilities were imposed on them. Finding that there was no positive response from the civilised world and in view of the fact that they cannot be a party to this continued unjust position, they were left with no other way but to make a declaration of independence. But here, President Denktash has made it clear, while making this declaration of independence, that doors have not been shut on inter-communal talks under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary General. He has made it clear that still there is possibility of genuine federation and he has also made it clear that the new State will be non-aligned. There is need to work on Denktash proposal rather than to have a negative, unjust attitude of merely deploring the declaration. Let us work for political settlement and I, therefore, impress upon the Government of India the need for the revision and the correction of its stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now you conclude.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Just a few sentences about neighbourly relations. We are committed to improvement of relations between India and Pakistan. Unfortunately, several irritants are coming up. We must strive to see that all these irritants do not come in the way of improvement of relations. There is also the question of this Jinnah House in Bombay. I must say that there was a commitment to lease this Jinnah House. I myself had raised the question some time in 1978 and I was told that after the lease given to the Deputy High Commissioner for Britain ended, the Jinnah House will be given to Pakistan for the residence of their Consul-General but now the Government wants to go back on its word. I hope that these irritants will not come in the way and every effort will be made in order to see that we have cordial and friendly neighbourly relations with all our neighbours.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, while I congratulate our Prime Minister for the successful completion of the NAM and the Commonwealth Conference, as a citizen of this country living in the north-eastern State, I would like to draw the pointed attention of the Hon. Foreign Minister, on behalf of the people living in that area, bordering Bangladesh, China and Burma. The whole of Assam is in turmoil, because of the agitation on the foreigners' issue. In the recent Commonwealth Conference, where one of the representatives tried to equate American invasion of Grenada with India's army action in Bangladesh, our neighbourly friend, Bangladesh, instead of coming out with a protest in that meeting, kept mum. That itself proves how sweet is the relationship between India and Bangladesh.

I would like to say that the foreigners' issue will be settled in Assam by the fixing of tribunals. There is a provision in the tribunals that those who are undeniably foreigners will be pushed back through the borders to Bangladesh. I come from a district where there is no TV of India. But the Bangladesh TV is shown there everyday and there we

see Gen. Ershad and other Ministers are repeatedly saying that they will not take back a single so-called foreigner. But there is no denying the fact that there are some foreigners, not only in Assam but also in certain other northern States, including West Bengal and Bihar.

In that context, I would like to know from the Hon. Foreign Minister whether during the recent discussion that Gen. Ershad had with our Prime Minister, and decision has been arrived at regarding deportation. I would not like to delve into a sensitive subject, but it is a sensitive subject for us also, not only from the point of view of deportation but also from the point of view of elections, because during that recent discussion of the political parties with the Election Commissioner, it was made very clear that no election could be held in Assam unless the foreigners' issue is settled. It has come out in the papers.

So, I would like to say that the foreigners who are in Assam must be identified, detected and deported. If it is not settled very soon, a large number of people in Assam will be deprived of their precious franchise rights for a reason for which they are not at fault because it is the people coming from a neighbouring country that is creating that situation. Therefore, I would like to know from the Hon. Foreign Minister when the deportation would start. If there is a situation in the border area, it will definitely affect the situation in Assam, which is now peaceful.

Now I come to another point. Now 1971 has been declared as the cut-off point. There was a treaty with Nepal in 1976. Now they are asking what happens to those Nepalese who came to Assam before 1976 but after 1971 and what will be their position. We should remember that there are many Indians who have settled in Nepal.

Since this is a discussion on the international situation, I thought I will

draw the pointed attention of the Hon. Minister to these two aspects. I do not know whether he will be able to reply to them but I thought I should take this opportunity to draw his attention to the situation there. I have full confidence in the Minister that he will deal with the situation when the occasion arises. I am drawing his attention to these problems so that he can give due consideration to these problems of the north eastern region.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI
(Bombay North West) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I will come straight to the point.

You don't judge the success of a foreign policy by the hosting of international conferences in the capital of India, nor do you judge it by the number of trips and jaunts by our diplomats abroad for the purpose of solving the problems of others when there the burning problems at home, nor do you judge the success of a foreign policy by the glamour and glitter which you project on the television, the radio and other news media. It is true that with all these glittering conferences and more glittering Heads of States—there, are still more glittering spouses—the Capital was in a state of illumination, and perhaps even euphoria, maybe that you have also created an image, particularly an image of the Prime Minister, but is well to recall that the image is not reality, and ultimately the perceptive and discerning people have standards of judgment which are entirely different from those of the illiterate simpletons whom you try to impress.

Sir one of the criteria by which I judge the success of a foreign policy is how much love, affection and influence you have succeeded in creating amongst those in the midst of whom you operate. Sir, I want to give an illustration which says that by this criterion our foreign policy has miserably failed and all this tall talk that India has achieved a certain stature and so has its leader, is nothing but non-sense and moonshine.

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

Sir, only the other day we have suffered a humiliating defeat. It is a defeat because we contested the seat of the Chairman of the UNESCO's Executive Board. We put up a candidate, Mr. T.N. Kaul, a very hot favourite with those that matter in this country. Against our representative and candidate, Mr. T.N. Kaul, was a gentleman from Ghana. And we lobbied for him, we worked for him, and the Prime Minister and the Government of India used all the influence they could muster. But, Sir, we lost by 14 votes to 34. And most of the African, Arab, Asian and Western nations voted against our candidate, and principally we were let down by the Non-Aligned Bloc, whose leader Mrs. Gandhi claims to be.

Sir, this is one way of judging the success of foreign policy and the truth of the propaganda which has been unleashed on a mass scale in this country. There is a still more substantial criterion of judgment and that is: To what extent have you been able, by clever diplomacy and all the strength of your moral voice or by your reasoning, to influence the course of world events? I shall deal with only specific problems with which we are primarily concerned, and I think again by this criterion we have been a miserable failure and our foreign policy continues to display that abysmal degree of muddle-headedness and lack of foreign value which has characterised it for the last 20 or 30 years. First of all, let us talk of the important problem of disarmament. At the Non-Aligned Meet in the declaration which we issued, we devoted pages and pages to disarmament.

At this Commonwealth Meet, we again discussed disarmament. What have we been able to achieve? What we have been able to achieve is that our friends Russians walked out of the Geneva Conference and do not know when the talks are going to be resumed again.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :
What are the Americans doing?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : But, sir, my friend here technically a member of the Opposition but substantially belonging to that side is asking a question whispering in my ears, "What were the Americans doing"? Sir, America is their *betenoir* and America is their bugbear and the whole of the speeches of my friend on this side are only a denunciation of the Americans and a thoughtless and irrational support to the Soviet policy and world politics. That is part of your philosophy. They are true to their philosophy.

Let us say this about disarmament. I want to ask the Foreign Minister that when you go about and talk about disarmament, what exactly do you tell them on behalf of the Government of India? Today the major problem in disarmament and the major hurdle in the way of any disarmament talk succeeding is that on the other side of the iron curtain, the Soviet's have amassed more conventional forces than existed in the armies of the rival forces when the landing took place in Normandy on D-Day in France. By all standards and by all computations, the Soviet's conventional might on that side of the iron curtain is such that Western Europe and free democracy cannot possible defend themselves. Then, Sir, more than, this must be acknowledged. (*Interruptions*) I know that you are one on so many things. Listen to the fact. Sir, facing Western Europe, the Soviets have the impressive array of missiles—SS-5s and now the SS-20s. There are about 350 of the last variety constituting a sort of threat to the security of Western Europe. There are no such comparable missiles in any of the NATO countries so far excepting those that are now being brought in.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : What about Sea power?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : Western Europe, therefore, depends for its security against nuclear aggression on U. S. will and interest to use their long-range weapons and missiles.

Sir, nobody can blame the NATO powers therefore of wanting inter-mediate range missiles to be located on their own territories to be able to face the SS-20s which the Soviets have amassed across the border.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : He is substantially in the United States of America and not in India.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : But you are not substantially, but you are really there.

Today, the offer which has been made on behalf of U. S. A.— which people in this country must know and which my comrades must be knowing it but they are not willing that others should know it—is the offer of Zero option. The Zero option is that the Soviets must remove and eliminate SS-20s which they have amassed across the boarder and not a single missile will be introduced on the soil of Europe by the Americans—neither Persian missiles nor any other implements of any kind. This is the Zero option. But the propaganda goes on and I hate to say the things against the Soviet Union because ultimately, Soviet Union is our friend. But I find this is a kind of incessant attack all the time that everything which the Soviets do is good and everything the other side do is bad. It is inconsistent with honesty and inconsistent with the concept of genuine Non-alignment to which India should be committed, though it is not. I say this that today if the Government of India is serious that disarmament must come about in the world, a time has come when we must use our influence with our Soviet friends and tell them that “Please remove all these missiles which you have amassed on the continent of Europe, remove them, eliminate them, destroy them, and there will not be a single missile introduced by the democracies.”

(Interruption.) I am entitled to my own facts. I do not take my facts from communists. If you are better informed

you are entitled to better information. My information is my information. I do not trust you with better information; I do not trust you with true information.

My respectful submission is that our policy will never succeed in producing disarmament so long as we do not understand the realities of Soviet power...

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : As a parliamentarian, you must reveal the source of question. You must reveal what you are quoting from.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : I am not quoting anything. This is my speech, these are my own notes.

SHRI B. R. BAAGAT : You are reading from something.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : I am reading from my own notes:

AN. HON. MEMBER : Supplied by America. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : It is a printed note. Is it not a printed note ?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : To satisfy their curiosity, because they do not do home work, you look at it. These are my own notes.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : They are printed. You print your own notes.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : Yes, I do.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : But you will not reveal.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : It is not printing; it is some kind of typing. When all this talk goes on about Ame-

Situation and the Policy of the Government of India in Relation thereto

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

rican imperialism, U. S. imperialism and Western Democracies' imperialism—I have heard all this kind of talk for the last many-many years. I must get attuned to this talk. But since I am provoked, the other side must be represented. So far as the other side is to be represented, let me say in my own words which I have written down that the Soviet Communists have neither abandoned the active goal of turning the whole world communist, nor have they abandoned the use of violence as an instrument of their global ambitions. Detente to them is not a goal but a tactic. It is a period between two hot wars when communism can be spread by methods other than war. Their regularly mounted and well-publicised peace offensives must be seen in the light of Afghanistan and Kampuchea, Angola, Ethiopia and Yemen. They go on talking incessantly about Granada, a country of 110,000 people; the capital of that country has 8000 people. They concentrate on this.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :

Therefore, it should be invaded ?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI :

Afghanistan is swallowed; Angola is swallowed; other countries are swallowed and the rest of the countries are in the process of being swallowed. Unless we understand the reality of this neo-imperialism, we are not going to solve any other problem. India is opposed to imperialism. But you must understand the modern imperialist power. The modern imperialism is that of those who have swallowed Afghanistan and who are in the process of swallowing every other free country of the world. This is about disarmament.

I must now talk about my friend, distinguished representative of the Indian Union Muslim League. While we in this country are agonised by the lack of unity which prevails between Hindus and Sikhs of Punjab, while we are agonised about what is happening to our kith and kin Tamil Nadu, about what

is happening to them in Sri Lanka, while we are deeply concerned about what is happening in Assam, I do not blame the Indian Union Muslim League to be deeply agonised by what is happening in Lebanon and what is happening in Iran-Iraq war. But I was amazed to see one thing. Today, Mr. Banatwalla told us that we must now express our solidarity with the Sayrian Government. Only a few days ago, he was saying that we must express our solidarity with Uncle Arafat. The Prime Minister of the country is the mother of the whole nation. Her brother must be the nation's Uncle. The Mama Arafat was the kingpin in the Muslim League's pronouncement, a few days ago and suddenly they want us now to shift our ground and express solidarity with the Syrian Government. Why? Because now the Syrian Government is trying to kill Mana Arafat. With whose arms? Where do the Syrians get the arms? Syrians do not manufacture arms. The Syrians have nothing in their own arsenal, with which they can fight. But they have the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union supplies arms to the Syrians and the Syrians, acting as the proxies of Soviet power, are trying to exterminate Mama Arafat.

I want this country to continue to show some loyalty to our Mama. He is a very dearest friend. Since he became the leader of the PLO in 1967, he has not succeeded in regaining one square inch of Palastinian territory. In 1970, he was thrown out from Jordan. In 1976 he was humiliated by the Syrians. In 1982, he is thrown out from Lebanon by Israelis and now the poor fellow is fighting for survival in Tripoli. Who are his defenders? Today, if he is able to survive, it is because of the USA forces, the Italian forces and the French forces. But the Russians, through their agents, are trying to destroy him.

I hope our Foreign Minister, when he went there to solve that problem, should have invited Arafat come here. We have so much confusion in this country. If Arafat comes and lives here,

I do not think we will add to confusion. You bring him here. Show him hospitality. But loyalty to that uncle must be preserved.

The Iran-Iraq war about which Mr. Banatwalla is very much exercised, who has asked them to fight? Both sides have no arms of their own. Iran is getting arms from the Syrians. The Syrians are getting them from Russians. Iran is taking arms from Soviets. Now I am told that they are beginning to get some from the French but basically it is Soviet arms.

I want to ask "Why did you go there? If people do not listen from here, why did you go there and teach them? If they cannot understand the ways of peace because they will not understand, they do not know how to co-exist with anybody and, therefore, they will not co-exist with one another. If these are the kind of people you are dealing with, it is better in the context of the talks here of Islamic bombs being made and things like that, let them be weakened, think of your national interest and do not think of any extractions and do not think of any moral building up of image and winning the nobel prize in the future. That is not required, and what is required to be done.

Lastly, the problem of Grenada. I am told it was discussed at great length in the Commonwealth Meet and these great representatives of the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth spreading over a great part of the world's surface, was discussing the tiny Grenada. Let us have some facts about Grenada. It is a Member of the United Nations. It is an independent country. It belongs to the British Commonwealth. The Governor-General is appointed by the Queen of England, on the advice of the Prime Minister. Up to 1972, they were having elections. They had a decent chap called Mr. Garry. Such is power, that once you get into power by the electoral process, you climb to the terrace of power, then kick the stair

case from the terrace so that nobody would be able to climb it. He was trying to destroy the electoral process in Grenada. Then come the Bishop. The Bishop, Pro-Cuban, supported by our brother, Fidel Castro, ultimately by a coup captured power. But having captured power by a coup, the man has some decency left in him, because he promised the people of Grenada that "I am going to hold elections and return to democracy. But my friends, the Communists, do not like it." The Cubans do not like it. He brought his country into the Organisation of East Caribbean States and there are treaties in existence between Grenada and these Caribbean States. Under Article 8 of the Treaty, the Caribbean States have the power and the duty to remove and to fight against any threat in that region.

Has the Foreign Minister or any Commonwealth Head, during these confabulations on Grenada, ever asked one question, what do the poor people of Grenada want? Everybody is worried about his political ideologies, about the camp in which he is and about his own or her own image, but nobody asked about this 1,10,000 people of Grenada.

Has anybody ascertained their wishes? If there is no mechanism for ascertainment of the wishes, if the people of Grenada are not participating in the governmental process, human rights of the Grenadians have been denied and a war to restore the human rights is a justified war. (Interruptions) They do not know the international law...

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHARKA-BORTY : Should we go to Bangladesh because human rights in Bangladesh are being trampled upon? Should the Indian Government send their army to Bangladesh or...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : Professor, we went there.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRA-BORTY : ...or to Pakistan or to Ceylon? What are you talking?

Situation and the Policy of the Government of India in Relation thereto

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : My friend Mr. Chakraborty cannot learn sense because sense assumes capacity to learn sense.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : I have that capacity.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : You are bound down to the Soviet doctrines ; you are hand and foot slave to the Soviet doctrines because you have mortgaged your soul...

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : The Soviet doctrines are better than the American doctrines.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : You are entitled to them,

I want to ask our Foreign Minister because he is Foreign Minister of a democratic government. I want to ask him this question : did you through your confabulations discover or at least argue that we might find some mechanism for the discovery of the real will and wishes of the people of Grenada ? The people of Grenada can only express themselves if they get freedom from the military junta which had come to occupy and the military junta was the junta of the Cubans, (Interruptions) the Cubans who pretended to be construction workers, but whose implements of construction were really arms. Some day they come out in their true colours ; these construction workers become the armed force, My friend is laughing. This is the usual tactic, the usual strategy, which is adopted.

So long as this Government does not realise that there is a neo imperialism which is nibbling at the free world, we shall solve no problem.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad) : Sir, I request you to expunge his whole speech, from 'A' to 'Z'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Under what rule ?

Mr. Unnikrishnan.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN (Badagara) : Sir, we have just listened to an extraordinary performance from a very able criminal lawyer. My dear friend—he is a very dear friend of mine—I must say, has been practising in criminal courts, in High Courts and in Supreme Court defending many a people who have escaped the clutches of the law and he has helped them with his voice, with his knowledge of law, with his eloquence, and so on. Similarly we had a performance from him today. But I would like to say that it was the voice of shamefaced defence, Mr. Jethmalani, of U.S. imperialism and Zionism that I ever heard...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : Abuse is no argument.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN : I do not know whether the party or the Alliance that he represents...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : I would say that there is a shamefaced sale of national interests to the Soviet Union.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN : Please do not get excited. I do not know whether the party or the Alliance that he represents in this House would own up all the statements he has just made in this House. I do not think so ; I do not think Mr. Vajpayee would contribute to what he had said. I shall come to some of those statements, remarkable statements, a little later. Anyhow, he does not represent the consensus around the foreign policy that we have in this country or in this House. His voice does not represent the voice of the people or the political movements or the media or anybody in this House. You should treat it as a kind of aberration. I am sure nobody would take it very seriously

except in the quarters where they are meant to be taken seriously. I do not want to talk more about my dear friend.

I was rather disappointed, I must say, with the statement given by the Minister for External Affairs yesterday. He tried to build up a kind of reverential aura around what is called 'Commonwealth links'. It was worthy of Mr. Ramphal but not quite worthy of the Foreign Minister of Independent India who claims that they are the Chairperson and the dynamic force behind the Non-Aligned Movement.

Now I do not want to go at this time through what all he has said. But I will not agree with some of the friends who have said—what is this link about? May be useful instrument. I am not prepared to quarrel. But it is a link to be under-played. But the non-aligned forum was very different. We belong to—whatever may be Mr. Jethmalani's figures about the voting, whether it might have happened in the non-aligned meet and their support or otherwise, we have a certain mutuality of interests with the non-aligned. Whether they have voted for us—that is not the criteria. I do not know whether the facts are correct. But, whatever it may be, even granting that it is correct, CHOGM is not a substitute forum for the NAM. But, in our craze to help every conceivable international gathering here so that we can have more debates in this House and outside the House and for the Government-owned and controlled mass media to talk continuously about the great leader and her dedication in the cause of peace and development, so on and so on, worthy for a future Nobel prize, we have to... (Interruptions) Yes, our diplomatic channels are even used to promote the cause of an individual for a Nobel prize. Are you surprised? Prof. Ranga, we will discuss it outside.

Now, Sir, our firm policy has been anti-imperialist, anti-racist and it is also the policy of the non-aligned nations and we are for peace in the world. It is an exercise of our own sovereignty and the

sovereignty of the people who were struggling to be liberated or those people who are already liberated. To project the CHOGM in the manner and the way it has been done is not a very welcome development.

Mr. Ram Jethmalani forgot about the existence probably of a man called Reagan, President Reagan...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : How can he forget?

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : I thought, and I do not know. This Reagan and reaganomania is the greatest danger to the world today, to the aspirations of the people all over the world, to the peace-loving citizens all over the world and more so to the non-aligned community and those who seek peace. He is the real cowboy.

(Interruptions) We saw a very small, a mini edition of it here in this House. I do not know. You know.

They say he is very tough. That is why Mr. Ram Jethmalani admires him. You know the Korean jetline episode.

I am surprised that the lawyer in him did not provoke himself to talk about that incident in detail. He should have About Grenada, Is it his contention or anybody's contention that a people, a sovereign nation, though it is a population of 5000 only, have no right to live and anybody can go and commit an aggression on it? A powerful country can go and occupy? Similarly, I do not know. What has happened in Nicaragua and El Salvador? What are his views, reactions and attitude to global issues and also concerning our own development? He talked about the Russians walking out of Geneva or some other place. What is the record of the United States? Who has undermined *detente* which was seriously built up? People everywhere of good intentions prayed that it may promote peace,

[Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan]

that the United States and Soviet Union may get together. What is his attitude to SALT II ?

He is not only a national criminal lawyer but he is also an international lawyer. He takes part in various forums—international forums—where he talks about banning of nuclear weapons and on limiting military activities. But, the Indian Ocean area is the deep concern to us, to our security, to our security environment. He also gave some figures—he can correct me—of post 1947-48 period. Whose defence budget was galloping at the rate of 12 to 15% ? It is that of the U.S.A. In 1982 it was 211 billion dollars. I am told this year it will be 240 billion dollars and, by 1985 it will be 323 billion dollars. This is the level in which the U.S. is spending on defence. This has been proved in the case of Grenada that this is used for the aggressive purposes. This is going on—this building up of nuclear arsenal weapons or the use of Pershing missiles whether it be in Europe or anywhere else. What we are concerned with is peace. Peace is essential for this country. It cannot develop without peace. Without anti-Imperialism, this country cannot survive. Occasionally, I feel—the Foreign Minister can correct me if I am wrong—that there is involvement of the Chair person in the non-aligned conference or in playing host in various other conferences. Is it not really hampering our style of functioning or bringing in a certain amount of obstruction in saying or doing things which we would otherwise have not done which, I am sure, he would not have also done ? Several hours after Grenada was invaded, the Chair person of our non-aligned movement came out with a statement. I can understand that we have to exercise a certain restraint and, more so, for a statesman like her. I can understand her difficult position. Even here when it is a clear cut case, was there a communication or was it a deliberate act, that you refused to act on the small country, about which when Mr. Jethma-

lani could ridicule, but you could not when that country was subjected to the naked aggression ? We have never seen this anywhere. Sir, in the communique also, everywhere, it is trying to be under played and they say, the spokesmen say, that nothing has been given up excepting diluting the quality of deliberate aggression.

Sir, I agree with Mr. Banatwalla when he spoke very feelingly. We must also remember the tragic fratricide which is going on. This does not do any credit to us at the cost of Arab nationalism whether it be in Lebanon or Syria. This has to be remembered. We do not condone any aggression whether it be against Syria or Lebanon. Our views, unlike the views of Mr. Jethmalani, are clear. His views are known on this. (Interruptions) But, I am sorry the other gentleman is not here today—Dr. Swamy. His is an amazing performance. I do not know whose view it is. I do not know whether it represents the view of his own or his party's view. He has turned out to be an apologist for General Zia. I am sorry to say that in this House anybody should become an apologist when there is a massive movement—democratic movement in our own sub-continent, in our neighbouring country when you could turn round and defend the naked military dictatorship.

Sir, as far as the democratic segments of opinion in this country are concerned we stand four square by all those people who are fighting for liberty and democratic rights whether be in Pakistan or anywhere else and our concern is more with the veteran captain of our freedom struggle, Frontier Gandhi, who in his old age has been interned by this brutal dictatorship. All the same I must say that we should not give up that aspect of our foreign policy which tried to develop our relationship with our neighbours. I notice that our relationship with Nepal is steadily deteriorating. I would like the Hon. Minister to assure us that the same will be improved.

Sir, yesterday he said something about the commonality of outlook. I do

not know whether he discussed with Jaywardene about the future of Tamils in Sri Lanka. Maybe he had to discuss other things but I would like to know whether they did inquire about the visit of Wenberger about which there have been controversial reports that he just dropped in there. What is this visit about and what was the commonality of outlook? Has it changed the attitude to Indian ocean? I would like the Foreign Minister to elaborate on these issues. What are the concrete results of the dialogue which has been going on the question of Tamils. It has not been elaborated. It is time somebody talk. I do not want to go into the various aspects of the economic declaration. I would like to end by saying that there has been a broad consensus around our foreign policy. By and large you can call it not merely bi-partisan but a built-in consensus. But all these foreign policy's gains are not to be made use of as though the achievements of an individual or a party and made use of for partisan purposes and also to carry on the work for a party or an individual. I am sorry to say that I have heard the reports. I would like you to deny if I am wrong—that instructions have gone from Prime Minister's Secretariat to carry on a campaign against Dr. Farooq Abdullah, Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir. I know it could be wrong. I am asking him and the way some leading figures in Congress I are making use of the subtle things. We have a Chief Minister in my State, Mr. Karunakaran. He called the bishops of Kerala and told them that pope is about to visit Kerala. If the Government falls you will be responsible. It has been published. There is no question of any visit of Pope. You are fooling around even the heads of State. What is all this? He says that he has contacted the External Affairs Ministry. Which External Affairs Ministry?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : This may be the brain-wave of Shri Stephen.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN : I am concluding. Therefore, we have a consensus. We have to strengthen this consensus and we need not drag any controversies into these things so that the voices of people like Jethmalani are drowned.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, 18 Members have participated in this Debate and I am grateful to all of them for the keen interest which they have evinced in India's foreign policy and their comment on several aspects of it.

I would have to admit—which I thought I would not have had to—that the Commonwealth has now to be seen as a little more important than otherwise because it has attracted attention—starting from Satyasadhan Chakraborty and ending with Indrajit Gupta. They spoke of nothing but the Commonwealth. So, in that view, it has attracted attention. I did not want to praise it to the skies. I am here to explain the documents, not to raise the Commonwealth. In my statement yesterday I did precisely that. I did say what I must say in regard to the deficiencies in the ideas adumbrated in the Commonwealth Documents wherever those deficiencies occurred.

Sir, there is no justification in trying either to compare the Non-aligned Movement with the Commonwealth or to judge them by the same standards. They are entirely two different bodies. They are incomparables.

The Non-aligned Movements happens to be a movement of essentially like-minded nations. There may be variations here and there. But they come together, they reiterate their common position on all these matters.

The Commonwealth, on the other hand, is not like the Non-aligned, which I explained yesterday. And the consensus which is arrived at in the Commonwealth necessarily has to be

Situation and the Policy of the Government of India in Relation thereto

different from what we arrive at in a non-aligned gathering. Now, each has its own position. We don't have to say, one is superior or the other is inferior.

18.42 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Naturally, we belong to the Non-aligned; therefore stick to the Non-aligned.

After the Commonwealth Summit was over, a Press Conference was addressed by the Prime Minister. She made no bones about it that her position, India's position, is the Non-aligned position. In response to every question that was put (just on the lines on which points were raised in this Debate) she made it absolutely clear that India's position is the Non-aligned position. At one point she said, I would have liked if the phraseology had been this instead of that.

Therefore there is no question of the Government of India having diluted its position or having given up its view as a non-aligned nation; particularly; as Chairman of the Non-aligned Movement, in which capacity we are shouldering certain responsibility. Yes. Sometimes our style may be cramped, but responsibility always cramps style. That is why we don't just for that reason run away from responsibility. We have to shoulder it. And in what circumstance it came to us is well-known. I don't have to go into that history.

Sir, so much was said about the economic aspect of the Communique.

I have myself said that it is on the whole good but it is not as good as we would liked it to be. But please look at this difference. We are talking about the North-South dialogue. We are talking about the discussions in the G-77. Would anyone say that the discussions in the G-77 would be the same as in the North-South dialogue, suppose it is held

tomorrow? There is a complaint that it is not being held; many are coming in the way; we know that. We have been trying to leave the dialogue. G. 77 wants the North-South dialogue tomorrow, if possible. When we came to the Non-Aligned Meet, we knew that the dialogue was not coming tomorrow. Therefore, we said "a few steps have to be taken in that direction and step by step approach" and we called for a Conference on Money and Finance with universal participation. It is not the North-South dialogue itself, but it is substantially in that direction. Then came the Commonwealth. Here we could not get even that. But would I be very wrong in saying that when we discussed this matter in the Commonwealth, we were having a mini-North-South Dialogue because the Commonwealth is a North-South Forum? And would Hon. Members not attach any significance to the fact that the spearheading on behalf of the developing countries was done by a developed country, namely, New Zealand. Has this no significance? This is what I would like the Hon. Members to appreciate. If the Commonwealth, if this mini-North-South forum agrees to certain things to which a country of the North left to itself would never have agreed, is it not a forward movement? Have Hon. Members, I am sure those who have read these statements, not found the seed of the North-South dialogue or the seed of possible success in the North-South dialogue in this mini-dialogue? The Commonwealth says in so many words that the Non-Aligned Summit has proposed an International Conference on Money and Finance for development with universal participation and the Williamsburg Summit has invited Finance Ministers to define the conditions for improving international Monetary system and to consider the part which might in due course be played in this process by a high level International Monetary Conference. Again we believe that the situation calls for a comprehensive review of the International Monetary Financial and relevant issues and immediate process of preparatory consultation is needed to identify areas of agreement, potential agreement and areas requiring

further consideration. If there is a North-South dialogue, would anyone do anything more than this? Would anyone jump to the final conclusions all at once? What were we talking in the North-South dialogue when the matter came up? We talked about the agenda, we talked about time-frame, we talked about participation, we talked about many things which are covered in these lines of the Commonwealth document. It also says that all the countries affected must be directly involved in the discussions and decision-making. Is it not just the same as universal participation which we said in the NAM? Thus it goes on to say, "There is a widespread belief among us that it will be necessary to discuss these issues at an International Conference with universal participation. Again, the preparatory process could result in a consensus at convening such a conference."

Now, Sir, how is this against the Non-Aligned Resolution? How does it go against the purport of the Non-Aligned Declaration? I would like to know? I have not seen anything like that and if it had gone against NAM, I would like to assure this House that the Government would certainly have done what has been referred to as '*Ekla Chalo*'.

Yes, we are prepared to do that if it becomes necessary, but *ekela chalo* does not mean *ekela raho*. Ploughing a lonely furrow so long as you are ploughing it and going forward is one thing; being bogged down and getting isolated everywhere is a different thing. These are two different concepts altogether. Therefore, we have not found anything which bogs us down in this document, although I have made no secret of the fact that the non-aligned position to which we subscribe has not been fully reflected in this. That is because of the composition of the Commonwealth itself.

On Namibia, for instance, is it not a significant fact that the Commonwealth has said everything that the non-aligned have said including the linkage, including

the security council Resolution 435, including what have you, on Namibia? Was this stated before? Is it not a forward movement? And if two of the contact group countries are in this Commonwealth and if those two have subscribed to these views, the views of the non-aligned movement, if you wish to know, is it not a forward movement? Is it not a gain? Does it not augur well for the Namibian peoples' independence? I would like Hon. Members to look at these aspects.

Then on Grenada. Yes, on Grenada, I am sorry, if Shri Jethmalani thinks that the peoples' wishes in a country are to be ascertained and, therefore, another country has the right to send their troops to ascertain the wishes of the people there, or to start a process by which peoples wishes are to be ascertained, no one can agree with him; at least, this Parliament will not agree; the people of India will not agree.

The Commonwealth Heads of Government themselves have drawn attention to small states, to the freedom of small States, the preservation of the freedom of small States. All these principles have been laid down in this document. The only thing they did not summon courage to say is 'so and so' has done it. This is nothing new. We have not said, so-and-so has done it in many other cases. Therefore, either say that that was wrong and also this is wrong, but here is a case where we have said two things. We want a Grenada free from foreign intervention and the presence of foreign troops. This is one sentence. Take another sentence, for instance—we want foreign troops from Grenada to go out of Grenada. What is the great difference between these two sentences? We know that foreign troops are there. What we are wanting is a country free from the presence of foreign troops. This could only mean that the foreign troops should leave that country. The difference is mainly a drafting trick, if you ask me. I do not see any substantive difference between the two. But I agree that left to ourselves, if our

draft, India's draft, had been accepted, we would have said the same thing in a different way. So, there is a difference in the draft, difference in the phraseology, difference in the image of the draft. When we read, it, you think that it is mild. If you look at it carefully, you find that you have all the ingredients which are wanted. There is not much of harshness in its phraseology and I think, this is the price we have to pay for getting so many things accepted by persons and countries which would never have accepted them otherwise.

Take Cyprus. It is not just the presence of President Kyprianou ; no. Of course, his presence did make difference. But the point is that everyone agreed. If it is suggested that he alone was able to veto everything else and get the Communiqué drafted on the lines it was drafted, then I would not agree there. We have great respect for him and his presence has made a difference. But it was a consensus and it was a fact that every one of these Heads of State, Heads of Government thought that this unilateral declaration of independence cannot be tolerated, cannot be countenanced and it should be depreciated and deplored in whatever phraseology that is possible.

So, on these matters I would like to submit that the Commonwealth Document as it is with all its deficiencies, does not go counter to India's policy or the policy of the Non-Aligned Movement. That is why when you are in a company, you agree with something, but you do not agree with anything which is proposed which goes against your basic policies, if that is the situation naturally India would think about that its role is going to be in the Commonwealth. I am quite sure about that I have absolutely no doubt. But such a situation did not arise. And the Prime Minister has made very clear statements in this regard in the Press Conference. Come to the Middle East for instance. There was difference of opinion on the question of foreign troops in Lebanon. It is reflected in the phraseology of the

Document itself, where it says that many of the Heads of State felt this way. What does that mean? By necessary implication it means that others did not feel that way. Therefore, there is a difference of opinion. And the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Hawke, goes back and says something in his own Parliament. In reply to that we have come out with this: "We have seen Mr. Hawke's statement in the Australian Parliament on December 1. We do not wish to enter into any controversy, particularly since the proceedings were regarded as confidential. Mrs. Gandhi was trying to put across the point of view shared by many others that the illegal presence of the Israeli troops, who are in Lebanon as a result of the aggression, cannot be put on par with the presence of the Syrian troops who had originally gone there at the Lebanese Government request. India is for the withdrawal of all foreign forces, but the Israeli troops have to withdraw first unconditionally, since they are the forces of aggression. This basic distinction was blurred in the amendment put forward by Mr. Hawke." But this was not blurred at the Conference. It was made. And the Prime Minister also made it at the Press Conference. So, we are not concealing anything. All the cards are on the table. It is for anyone to judge, whether by the standards, by which the Commonwealth has to be judged, it has or has not served its purpose.

Sir, the Commonwealth seems to have really got the lion's share of all the time and attention in this Debate, but one or two other matters were touched upon and I consider it my duty to take the House into confidence on those matters.

Now, about Sri Lanka. I have already made a statement when the Prime Minister's envoy went there on his first visit. Later on, he went on his second visit and I don't remember to have made any statement because Parliament was not in session at that time. I would like to touch upon it very briefly without going into details.

it is best to avoid details at a very delicate stage such as this. During the second visit of the special envoy, all the discussions were held mainly with President Jayawardhane. The papers prepared during the first visit were further considered.

Now, someone referred to India's proposal. I would like to state categorically that India did not take any proposals. India did not offer any proposals. India has only tried to ascertain the views of both sides, conveyed them from one side to the other. And in this discussion, certain ideas, were up, certain ideas emerged; and on the basis of those ideas, certain proposals also were formulated.

A set of proposals was formulated on the basis of talks with president Jayawardhane reflecting the Sri Lanka Government's views. These included several suggestions made in the earlier paper, and also some new approaches. It should be pointed out that both the papers mentioned above were working papers for consideration by the two sides with a view to narrowing down differences. These were discussed with the TULF leaders on the Special Envoy's return to Delhi, and their response was communicated to President Jayewardane, who visited Delhi to attend the CHOGM summit. The President had two meetings with the Prime Minister at which the Tamil question was discussed; he also had talks with the Special Envoy. We separately had talks with TULF leaders.

So, it was a kind of talking all round; and the occasion of the President's visit for the Commonwealth Summit was utilized for this purpose.

Hon. Members will have seen the statements issued by President Jayewardane and Mr. Amirthalingam consequent upon their discussions in Delhi. These statements speak for themselves, but for the benefit of Members, I would just briefly summarize the present position.

Initially, the Sri Lankan Government was prepared to make improvements in the District Development Council Scheme. The Tamils on their part made it clear that this would not be adequate for meeting their aspirations. As a result of discussions that have been held, the Sri Lankan Government has agreed that larger units may be formed. The proposals provide for the establishment of Regional Councils through the amalgamation of District Councils within each province. There would be an effective devolution of legislative, executive and financial powers to these Councils, including powers of taxation and responsibility for law and order. All subjects not specifically assigned to the Councils would continue to be the responsibility of the resident and the Parliament who would also have overall responsibility for the unity, integrity, security and economic development of the country as a whole. A Central Port Authority is proposed to be set up for administering the Trincomalee Port.

There is going to be an All-Party Conference and it is expected that the TULF will be invited to participate in the conference. President Jayawardane has informed us that he intends to place these proposals before the All-Party Conference. So, this, in short is the position.

About the Stateless persons, Mr. Dhandapani raised a question. The position remains what it was, viz., that the President has given a commitment that all the Stateless persons will given Sri Lankan citizenship. He said, it is his problem. Therefore, he is going to solve it.

It is encouraging that progress has been made in the discussions during the last three months—progress which I have just delineated.

We hope that the remaining differences will be resolved, and a settlement acceptable to both sides will be reached within the framework of Sri Lanka's

unity. Our good offices will continue to be available towards this end.

This is the position in short.

About the Middle East question. I have nothing much to say, except to submit that the mission which was sent by the Prime Minister to some Arab capitals, amongst which we covered Kuwait and Damascus, was for a specific purpose.

Members will appreciate that the Palestinian problem is at the root of the Middle East question and the differences in the PLO therefore are the most important and most difficult aspect of the problem and they had assumed certain proportion which would have caused incalculable harm to the Palestinian which would have caused incalculable harm to the Palestinian cause itself. So, when Chairman Arafat wrote to Prime Minister and even otherwise Prime Minister thought that the time had come when as Non-Aligned Chairman she had to summon the meeting of the Committee of Eight on Palestine appointed by the Non-Aligned Summit. The Committee was called at Foreign Ministers' level. Earlier there was an official committee meeting also. At the meeting of the Foreign Ministers Committee, it was decided or it was recommended by that Committee to the Prime Minister that a mission should go. So, she selected this mission, members of this mission and asked us to go. I am glad to say that the specific problem to which we wanted to address ourselves and we did address ourselves to, was sorted out at the time of our visit; and we got certain commitments from those who did not agree with Chairman Arafat. They have reassured their obligation to unilaterally protect and safeguard the ceasefire without any time limit. In the beginning, we were afraid that we would not get a respite even for a few days, but after talking to them and after taking the message of the Chair-person of the Non-Aligned

Movement, they came round and said that they were going to protect and safeguard the ceasefire without any time limit provided of course the other side does so. The opposing side also has assured the Non-Aligned Ministerial Group that they were fully committed and will defend the unity of the PLO as a whole and as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people they will take all necessary steps within the Palestinian framework to solve by peaceful means all their internal differences.

Now, these were the two points on which we got a categorical assurance. I have been reading the newspaper ever since; except for one stray report, I have not come across anything which suggests that the ceasefire has been breached or taken, the cease-fire seems to be still holding, but that is only part of the story. The Palestinian liberation Organisation has to be restored to its united position and whatever differences there are in the Aligned group need to be resolved. I don't have the latest information on the subject but we hope that that process also would be activated. Meanwhile, of course, the Lebanon aspect has suddenly erupted. We are aware that the Palestinian question in the last one year has been more or less subordinated deliberately with deliberate intent to the question of Lebanon; and that is why we wanted the question to come back to its prominence so that the solution of that problem would solve automatically many other problems including the internal situation in Lebanon to a very large extent. So, we have now tried to bring it back into focus. I cannot quite say that we have succeeded for all time.

I am not able to say what is going to happen to the local situation, the local situation in Tripoli because it is not just two factions fighting. There are many.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : What are they fighting for ? Would you like to tell us ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : We had no occasion to talk to those who were fighting. We talked only to one set of persons. We had met them earlier, along with Chairman Arafat. Each one of them I had met earlier along with Chairman Arafat. This time they were ranged against him. They have given their own version why they are against him and so on. But finally they said, they are not going to break the PLO or the Al Fatah. Whatever their differences, they will compose their differences, according to the institutional framework that they already have. So, to that extent or mission succeeded. We have a long way to go and we will have to see further developments, watch them carefully. This is the position.

I think I have covered all the points.

Again, I thank the Members for their contribution.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, before you leave, Guptaji, I have a substitute motion. But I find that the Hon. Member who moved the Substitute Motion, is no longer interested. He is absent now. Mr. Swamy has gone.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : He himself has moved out of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER : After moving the motion he moved himself.

MR. SPEAKER : Good idea. Anyhow we have to dispose of it. I shall now put the Substitute Motion to the vote of the House.

The question is—

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, recommends in the national interest that the Government change the present policy of Confrontation with the neighbours to that of promoting amity, and also maintain equidistance from the big powers USA and USSR.”

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

19.12 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, December 7, 1983|Agrahayana 16, 1905 (Saka)