

12.39 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL), 1983-84—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We now go to the next item—Further discussion and Voting on the Demand for Grant under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Hon. Members, 8 hours are allotted for this and 5 hours and 47 minutes have been exhausted. Two hours and thirteen minutes are left from now. I think from the Opposition side some hon. Members have got to speak and the Minister will be replying at 2 O'Clock.

Now, Shri B. D. Singh may speak.

श्री बी० डी० सिंह (फूलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सर्वप्रथम इस बात के लिए सतोष व्यक्त करना चाहूंगा कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी बड़ी ही कुशलता से अपने दायित्व का निर्वाह कर रहे हैं वह बात और है कि सरकार की विदेशों के सम्बन्ध में क्या नीति है और किस प्रकार उनके नेतृत्व के द्वारा नीतियां तय की जाती हैं। उनसे हमारे मतभेद भी हैं। सभवतः विदेश मंत्री जी इस बात से सहमत होंगे कि दिन प्रति दिन किसी भी देश के विदेश मंत्री का दायित्व तेजी से बढ़ता जा रहा है, क्योंकि ज्यों ज्यों विज्ञान के चरण आगे बढ़ रहे हैं विश्व के विभिन्न देश एक दूसरे नजदीक चले आ रहे हैं त्यों त्यों हमारा उनसे कैसा व्यवहार हो या विभिन्न प्रकार की समस्याएँ उत्पन्न होती हैं तो इस सम्बन्ध में विदेश मंत्री का दायित्व बढ़ता चला जाता है। इसमें दो राये नहीं हैं, जैसा हमारे विदेश मन्त्रालय की रपट में भी है, सब लोगों को चिन्ता है और विदेश मंत्री ने भी चिन्ता व्यक्त की है कि आज जिस विज्ञान की प्रगति से मानव कल्याण की बात होनी चाहिये थी उससे वह न हो कर के

विज्ञान के द्वारा ऐसे विध्वंसात्मक हथियार महाशक्तियों द्वारा निर्मित किये जा रहे हैं जिस से कि आज समस्त मानव जाति के लिये एक भयंकर खतरा उत्पन्न हो गया है। और इन परिस्थितियों में जब हम देखते हैं तो यह बड़ी कठिन समस्या हो जाती है कि महाशक्तियां विभिन्न देशों के प्रति किस तरह का व्यवहार करती हैं और वह किस प्रकार से अपने प्रभाव में लाने के लिये प्रयास करती रहती हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक तो स्थिति होती है युद्ध की, और दूसरी शांति की स्थिति होती है। और इन दोनों के बीच में एक और विकट समस्या शीत युद्ध की हो गई है। और ऐसी स्थिति में हर गरीब और छोटे मुल्क को बारबर आशंका बनी रहती है, भय का वातावरण रहता है और वह स्वच्छन्द रूप से या स्वतंत्र रूप से अपने विकास कार्यों को सुचारु रूप से नहीं चला पाते हैं। उनको बराबर इस बात की आशंका बनी रहती है कि दुनिया का वातावरण, क्या होगा? युद्ध कहां पर भड़क सकता है और हमें उसके लिये किस प्रकार की तैयारी करनी चाहिये? उससे नतीजा यह होता है कि जो थोड़े बहुत साधन इन डैवलपिंग कन्ट्रीज, विकासशील देशों के पास हैं उनके सामने विकट समस्या बन जाती है कि उन सीमित साधनों का कहां पर उपयोग करें। उन्हें अपने देश की सुरक्षा की चिन्ता होने लगती है जिसके कारण वह लोगों के रहन-सहन को ऊंचा करने और आर्थिक विकास के कार्यों को नहीं कर पाते। ऐसी स्थिति में विदेश मंत्री की विशेष भूमिका हो जाती है।

[श्री वी० डी० सिंह]

12.48 hrs.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW *in the chair*)

विदेश नीति में कूटनीति का भी महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है। 18 अप्रैल, 1981 को हमारे मरहम दादा आचार्य कृपालानी ने चौधरी चरण सिंह जी की पुस्तक का विमोचन करते समय एक बात कही थी। विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने बताया कि जब वह कांग्रेस में महासिचिव थे तो पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू अध्यक्ष थे। उस समय भी विदेश नीति की बातें चला करती थीं और हम लोग तटस्थ नीति रखने की बात करते थे। अन्त-रोगत्वा यह नीति तय हुई कि टस्थता की नति नहीं होनी चाहिये, हमें स्वतंत्र रूप से किसी बात पर निर्णय लेना चाहिये और निगुट रहने की बात को हमारे विदेश नीति का अंग माना गया। मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ कि यह किसी एक व्यक्ति की देन नहीं है। शुरु से यह हमारी परम्परा रही है, आजादी की लड़ाई में भी महात्मा गांधी के नेतृत्व में यह चला। उसके बाद भी हमारी यही नीति रही है। कभी भी इन बातों को लेकर किसी व्यक्ति विशेष या व्यक्तिवाद की बात को उभारने की बात होने लगती है। अक्सर पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू की बात आती है। और इधर श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की बात हो रही है। यह जो साइकोफेंसी देश में चल जाती है, तो इन बातों से लोगों को तकलीफ होती है। हमारे देश की विदेश नीति के जो आदर्श सिद्धान्त रहे हैं, उनको चलाने के लिये नेहरू जी की कूटनीति कहां तक सफल रही है, यह सारा देश देख रहा है। आज देश के सामने इतनी विकट समस्याएं उत्पन्न हो गई हैं और जो बाहर से खतरा पैदा हो गया है, वह कहां से हो गया है ?

आज हमारा एक बहुत बड़ा इलाका चीन के अधिकार में है। मैं इसमें नहीं जाना चाहता कि वह चीन के पास कैसे गया या तिब्बत पर चीन का आधिपत्य कैसे माना गया ? मुझे अभी कुछ दिन पहले एक पुस्तक पढ़ने का अवसर मिला था। इस पुस्तक में एक लम्बा पत्र जो पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू को सरदार पटेल ने लिखा था छपा है। मरने से कुछ समय पहले 1950 में यह पत्र उन्होंने लिखा था। 1960 या उसके पश्चात् चीन के सम्बन्ध में जो घटनाएं घटीं, उनसे ऐसा लगा कि सरदार पटेल की किननी बड़ी दूर-दृष्टि थी। उन्होंने 1950 में, चीन के सम्बन्ध में क्या-क्या हो सकता है इन सारी बातों से नेहरू जी को अवगत किया था कि आपको क्या करना चाहिये। किस तरह से इन से हमारे देश को खतरा हो सकता है। सारी बातें ब्यौरेवार उस लम्बे पत्र में लिखीं, लेकिन उन बातों पर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। वह सारी बातें बाद में एक-एक कर के घटीं, हमारे समक्ष आईं और तिब्बत पर भी हमने उनका अधिकार मान लिया।

मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में चीन से वार्ता की क्या प्रगति है ? आप उसके आटोनामस स्टेट मानते हैं, उसके अन्तर्गत क्या यह नहीं हो सकता था कि तिब्बत के लिये जो लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं, उसके लिबरे-शन के लिये इस निगुट सम्मेलन में श्रीबजबैर के तरीके पर उनको बुलाया जाता ?

चीन के सम्बन्ध में जो हमारे मतभेद चल रहे हैं, उसमें बात होनी चाहिये और उसका जल्द से जल्द कोई न कोई समाधान निकाला जाना चाहिये। उधर रूस और चीन की बात हो रही है, यह और भी अच्छा हो कि पड़ोसी देश आपस में बातचीत करें और मित्रता से रहें क्योंकि किसी भी स्थिति में कोई भी सुख की नींद तभी सो सकता है जब पड़ोसी से उसके सम्बन्ध अच्छे हों। मैं ऐसा अनुभव करता हूँ कि हमारी कूटनीति की जो भी स्थिति रही हो, चाहे तिब्बत और चीन की बात हो या काश्मीर और पाकिस्तान की बात हो, असफल रही है। यह चर्चा का विषय बन जाता है कि काश्मीर की क्या स्थिति है और उस पर हमारा स्टैंड क्या है? क्योंकि विश्व के विभिन्न संगठनों में आए दिन पाकिस्तान काश्मीर का मामला उठाता रहता है। हमने बहुत प्रयास किया कि पाकिस्तान निर्गुट सम्मेलन में इस बात को न उठाए लेकिन फिर भी यह प्रश्न उठाया गया। जब यह प्रश्न उठता है तो हम अपना जवाब देते हैं लेकिन इस चीज को कभी हम बताने का प्रयास नहीं करते कि काश्मीर के मामले में हमारी क्या स्थिति है। जो शिमला समझौता हुआ है उसमें काश्मीर के बारे में यह बात नहीं आई है, इसके बारे में दोनों देशों का जो स्टैंड बना हुआ था, उसको अच्छता छोड़ा गया है। काश्मीर का मामला एक ऐसा मामला है जिसको लेकर दोनों पड़ोसी देशों के बीच विवाद बना हुआ है और हमेशा इसको लेकर तनाव पैदा होता है। अतः इस मामले को भी हल किया जाना चाहिये। मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध कुछ बिगड़ते से नजर आ रहे हैं। चाहे सीलोन की बात हो, पाकिस्तान की बात हो या चीन की बात हो, उनके साथ जिस तरह के हमारे सम्बन्ध होने चाहिए,

वह नहीं हैं। श्रीलंका में अमरीका के सैनिकों को रेक्रिएशन के नाम पर कुछ संरक्षण देने की बात हमने अखबारों में पढ़ी है। इस तरह की बातें चल रही हैं। कूटनीति के आधार पर या बात-चीत के तौर पर इन लोगों को कैसे हम अपने प्रभाव में ला सकें। यह हम नहीं कर पा रहे हैं।

जहां तक निर्गुट सम्मेलन की बात है, कोई दो राय नहीं हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को गर्व है कि बड़े अच्छे तरीके से वह हुआ लेकिन जब किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को उठाने की बात की जाती है तो वह अनुचित होता है। चाहे एथिआई खेल हों या कुछ और, यदि उसका हम विरोध करते हैं तो उसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि उसका कोई महत्व नहीं है बल्कि वरीयता के आधार पर हम देखना चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश की जो समस्याएँ हैं उसमें किस चीज को पहले वरीयता देनी चाहिए।

चूँकि हम विदेश मंत्रालय के अनुदान की मांगों पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं इसलिए हम यह भी जानना चाहेंगे कि जो निर्गुट सम्मेलन किया गया उस पर कुल कितना पैसा व्यय किया गया। कहीं-कहीं तो हमने पढ़ा है कि उस पर 50 करोड़ खर्चा हो गया है। इसलिए हमें मालूम होना चाहिए कि निर्गुट सम्मेलन से सम्बन्धित विभिन्न मदों पर कुल कितना खर्चा किया गया है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि अभी एक हफ्ता पहले "हिन्दू" में, जोकि मद्रास से निकलता है, एक आर्टिकल छपा था, जिसमें नेपाल के राजा के सम्बन्ध में कहा गया कि पता नहीं क्या बात डेवलप हुई जिससे निर्गुट सम्मेलन के समय वे असंतुष्ट रहे, भोजन पर भी कई बार

[श्री बी० डी० सिंह]

उपस्थित नहीं हुए और विदाई के समय भी जो औपचारिकतायें होती हैं वह पूरी नहीं हुई। ऐसी बातें क्यों पैदा हो रही हैं? नेपाल के साथ हमारे अच्छे सम्बन्ध हैं। उनके साथ हमारे मधुर सम्बन्ध उत्तरोत्तर बढ़ते रहने चाहिए।

तीसरी बात यह है कि जो निर्गुट सम्मेलन हुआ उसमें जिस बात की सबसे ज्यादा आवश्यकता थी, वह था आर्थिक प्रस्ताव। लेकिन उसमें कुछ नार्थ-साउथ की बातें कही गई हैं, नार्थ को ज्यादा कडेम करने का प्रयास किया गया है।

मैं देखता हूँ कि साउथ-कोरिया और जापान आदि देशों ने श्रम शक्ति का बहुत अच्छा उपयोग किया है। अधिक उपयोग किया है, इसलिये वे देश तरक्की करते चले गए। लेकिन जिन्होंने अपनी श्रम शक्ति का सही उपयोग नहीं किया, वे तरक्की नहीं कर रहे हैं। जो डवेल-पिंग देश हैं, जहाँ श्रम शक्ति ज्यादा है, पूंजी कम है, उनमें उत्पादन की ऐसी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए जिसमें श्रम शक्ति अधिक लगे और पूंजी कम लगे। हमारे देश में पूंजी कम है। इस बात पर आप ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। अगर हम अपने देश की आर्थिक नीति को सुचारू रूप से नहीं चलायेंगे, तो दूसरे मुल्कों की तरह से हमारे देश की व्यवस्था ठीक नहीं हो सकती है। यह बात भी बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है, क्योंकि विश्व के छोटे-छोटे देश नजदीक आते जा रहे हैं। इससे एक दूसरे पर डिपेंडेंस ज्यादा होने की संभावना बढ़ती जाती है। इंटरनेशनल एग्रीकल्चरल डवेलपमेंट फण्ड में ज्यादातर आयल-एक्सपोर्टिंग कन्ट्रिज हैं। वे ही इसको फाइनेंस करती हैं। इसका व्यवहार भी बिल्ड बक जैसा ही है। इसकी भी नीतियां व बैंक से मिलती जुलती हैं, जबकि

यह दक्षिणी देशों के नियंत्रण में है। साउथ दी फण्ड फार डवेलपमेंट की भी नीतियां करीब-करीब उसी प्रकार से हैं। पिछले दिनों हमने पढ़ा था कि कुछ हाइड्रल प्रोजेक्ट्स के लिए हमने इनसे फण्ड के लिए एप्लाई किया है। इन्होंने जर्मन के एक्सपर्ट्स से कहा है कि वे जाकर देखें और अपनी रिपोर्ट दें इसकी भी नीति उसी प्रकार की है। इस पर हमें ध्यान देना चाहिए।

यह कोई महत्वपूर्ण बात नहीं है कि हमने दिल्ली में गुट निरपेक्ष सम्मेलन आयोजित कर लिया है। असल बात यह है कि जो हमारे ऊपर दायित्व सौंपा गया है, उसको आगे आने वाले समय में हम निभा पायेंगे। इसको निभाने का हमें समर्पित प्रयास करना होगा।

अफगानिस्तान का मामला है, इसमें ऐसा लगता है कि तटस्थता की नीति अख्तियार हो रही है। इसमें दो रायें नहीं हैं कि अफगानिस्तान में रूस की फौजें हैं, लेकिन इस बात को हम साफ-साफ नहीं कहना चाहते हैं। इसकी तीसरी वर्ष गांठ बनाई जा चुकी है। कम्पूचिया में भी विदेशी फौजें हैं। मेरा यह सुझाव है कि हमें इस बात का प्रयास करना चाहिए कि अभी जो निर्गुट देश हैं, उनकी अलग से एक फोर्स बनाई जाए, उनको वहां पर डिप्लाय करके वहां चुनाव कराए जायें। अफगानिस्तान में एशिया की फोर्स को हटाया जाए और यही बात कम्पूचिया के बारे में हैं। दोनों देशों में निर्गुट फोर्स भेज कर विदेशी फौजें हटाई जायें। हमारे जो कार्यक्रम हैं, वे कार्यक्रम सही दिशा में चल रहे हैं, रुके तो नहीं हैं— इनको देखने के लिए वाच-डॉग कमेटी बनानी चाहिए। यह एडहॉक कमेटी होनी चाहिए, जो समय समय पर इस की समीक्षा करें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

13 hrs.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North East): Mr. Chairman, Sir, originally I did not want to speak on this, but my colleague is not well and so, I have to speak on it.

This Government takes a great pride in their foreign policy successes, but I am very surprised to see that not even one Cabinet Minister is present in the House at this time, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is also not present and there are more Members outside than here. So, it is very difficult for me to speak on such an important subject..

भाचार्य भगवान देव : (अजमेर) :

आप के तो लीडर भी यहाँ नहीं हैं।

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I am the Deputy Leader and I am functioning for him.

Therefore, it is impossible for me to speak without there first being a quorum in the House. Sir, please call for quorum in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The bell is being rung... Now there is quorum in the House. Your wish is fulfilled, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. You can now continue.

~~DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:~~
The formulation of foreign policy which should be the subject of discussion in the debate on these Demands for Grants has to be an integrated formulation. I am sorry that the two other vital elements of foreign policy-making, namely the defence angle and the economic angle, are rarely taken into account in formulating the foreign policy. I would think that it would be far better in this Parliament to have a discussion on national secu-

rity in which the economic, defence and foreign policy angles are all taken together and considered together. But we have to consider here, in a way, the foreign policy in isolation. Therefore, I will have to do what is required under the circumstances.

I look at the foreign policy not in the way at the foreign policy not in terms of Conference and *sammelans* and so on. If you ask, them as to what are their successes, they say, 'We held the Non-Aligned Conference'. What is the outcome? Well, that outcome, of course, is something which they cannot concretise. In the same way, if you ask them 'What is ahead?', they will say, 'The meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government is coming'. It appears to be more a foreign policy around Conferences rather than in terms of concrete achievements.

I see the foreign policy priorities for this country in concentric circles. I would think that the most important thing to be considered first and foremost is our foreign policy initiatives in South Asia region—this is our region. Then I would go to the Asian context and finally I would consider the super power equations. It is in this system of priorities that I would like to evaluate the performance of this Government in the area of foreign policy.

Where have we progressed in the last three years in the South Asia scene? During the Janata rule we had the best of relations with our neighbours. In fact, you do not have to hear this from me. If you go outside this country, you hear this. As you know, I travel quite a lot; I had been to Bangladesh, I had been to Pakistan, I had been to Nepal, I had been to China, I had been to a number of countries and there is uniform praise for the Janata Government in its relationship with our neighbours.

(Dr. Subramaniam Swamy)

7 Pakistan considers Janata period as the golden period which I am sure, they would not like to hear this.—the golden period of relations between the two countries. During the Janata rule there was never an occasion for the USA to supply arms to Pakistan because we knew what diplomacy means, whereas...

AN HON. MEMBER: Why were you then thrown out?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: That is not because of our foreign policy.

Therefore, the South Asian relations were at a peak. Sir, I am not here preaching something which we do not practise. What do we find now? We find that in the last three years the South Asian environment has become worse. The Bangladesh President, the late Zia-ur-Rahman proposed a South Asian summit. The Government of India was not ready for it. They said, 'All right, let us first try from the bottom.' So Foreign Ministers level meetings took place. Three meetings have taken place. But we have not gone further. So this Government should have taken the initiative. That initiative which the Bangladesh President, took, this Government should have taken and they should have taken care to see that the six or seven countries in this area—the Seven Sisters you may call them, that is, India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Maldives, Sri Lanka and Pakistan, all work together. There should have been a meeting at the Foreign Ministers' level. There should have been a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of all the South Asian countries, but that has not taken place. So, I am sorry to see that here in the South Asian angle where India could have made great strides, where we could have evolved a clearcut approach and worked together in the United Nations and in the non-aligned countries and other

blocs, we have found ourselves increasingly isolated from our neighbours.

What is our relationship with Pakistan today? Bad. Who can say that it is good? What is our relation with Nepal—a small country? Nepal is unhappy because we are not treating them in the way we should be treating them. What about the relations with Bhutan? The Bhutan Foreign Minister has gone on record to say, 'We have fundamental differences with the Government of India.' What about our relations with Bangladesh? They are extremely unhappy that we have not been able to work out an agreement on the sharing of waters whereas during the Janata rule we had such an agreement. So you find all around, in our neighbourhood the South Asian concept is losing ground and instead of gaining ground, the initiative started during the Janata rule, I am sorry to say, has been dissipated. And why has it been dissipated—this is something they should give an answer to. And I think this is one of their major failures—that this Government which inherited a peaceful environment in South Asia, has used the last three years to convert this into an area of tension in which foreign arms have been inducted. This is a failure of their policy for which they are answerable.

12 We talk much about our relations with Pakistan. Now, I would like to know what happened to the so-called No-war Pact. There was so much publicity for it. The Government of India offered another pact—what is called Friendship Pact and after that we did not hear much about it. What has gone wrong? Where is the intervention? Some people say that because of our Indo-Soviet treaty of which says that India and the Soviet Union have to collaborate or at least come into mutual consultations whenever there is a threat to either country, this clause prohibits India from entering into a No-war Pact with Pakistan because Pakistan

could be perceived by the Soviet Union as a threat at some stage and therefore, there would be a conflict. I do not know; That is the speculation. This Government has been evasive on most answers. We saw to-day during the Question Hour the Minister chose to deftly dodge our sharp questions and leave the House as unwise as it was before the question was asked. So, here is a question I have asked specifically as to what happened to this proposal. This is something which the whole country wants. Nobody wants war with Pakistan. The people of Pakistan have relatives in this country and people of this country have relatives in Pakistan. There is a bond there plus I think if India and Pakistan were able to work out the relationship, it would be, in my opinion, a great contribution to stability in this area. So, Sir, along with the fact that we have failed to evolve a South-Asia concept in order to keep the super-powers out which would have definitely contributed to keeping the super-powers out. We have, in fact, dissipated the legacy that the Janata Government left behind and made this a tension area and we have once again embarked on a path of confrontation with Pakistan which is in fact helping the super-powers to play a role in this region.

Another point I would like to say is that if you go outside the South-Asian region you find again the same situation. What about our relations with China? Where are they progressing. I find we are running out of steam in our talks with China. There was great hope at one stage that we will be able to settle. Nobody is saying that you should concede whatever they want. You negotiate with them and, in fact, you have to negotiate hard with them. But what is our policy. I am not able to clearly understand. Are you able to effectively follow that policy? Are you effectively able to make that policy understood to the Members of this House? I was happy last year and the previous year we made great

progress. Huan-Hua came here. There were very friendly talks. After that a gesture was made. Kailash-Mansarovar route was opened. Our trade increased. Now, I think, it is 200 million dollars. Lot of delegations were exchanged. Our Foreign Minister had a meeting with his counter-part and even later on the Prime Minister had an occasion to meet the Prime Minister of China at Cancun. So, it looked very good. But suddenly we find certain snags seem to appear in our relations. This is how I see it. I would like to know why is it so? Is the Government confused? Now I will give you one example. I have come to learn from the newspaper accounts that 70 Members of the Ruling Party have written to the Prime Minister asking her to intervene to ensure an independent observer status for the country called Tibet in the non-aligned conference. My colleague here also referred to it while speaking. Do you regard Tibet as part of China or not and if you do how is it that Ruling Party members are signing memorandum and raising questions about that issue? This issue of the sovereignty of China over Tibet was settled by Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru. When the Janata Government came to power we reiterated it and we said "yes, it is part of China" and now we find that Ruling Party Members are signing memorandum asking for a review of that question. Therefore, this is inducing tension. When China objected to the Arunachal Pradesh dance being shown in Asiad the Government took a stand which I supported. Many people were surprised that I supported it but I did support. I thought it was a right thing for us to have done under those circumstances. The Government said that the Government of China has no business to tell us whether we have Arunachal Pradesh/dance or not and we cancelled an official delegation from going and participating in a cultural event there. This is how sensitively we reacted. Now, in a bilateral framework you have to consider the other person's feelings also. If you feel that Tibet is not part of China why don't

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

you come out clearly and say we have changed our stand? Jawahar Lal Nehru's decision is no longer binding. Janata Government decision is no more binding. Now, we are going to take a new approach or if you believe that this is, in fact, so and that this is the fundamental faith of ours then at least ensure ~~our~~ that Ruling Party members do not go about signing such memorandum. When last year this question was being debated, there was hope that our relations with China were developing fast but, Sir, as an observer of the China scene I will say that I do get a feeling—I do not know how to concretise it—that a certain amount of casualness has come into our relations with China and I believe—as rest of the world believe—a normal healthy relationship between India and China would be conducive to Asian/peace, would be conducive to keep the super-powers out from Asia. If they believe in that then, in fact they should implement their policy.

Sir, then we come to the relations with super-powers. Here you find again that a certain amount of confusion has come into the picture/ I am really unable to understand by cause when I meet the Minister personally I find him very clear, very intelligible but when he comes to formulating Government policy there seems to be all kinds of confusions that comes into the picture. How is it so? Why is it so? Is it because your decision making techniques are ad-hoc and you are unable to analyse what you want?

Sir, when the Prime Minister went to the United States there was a feeling, well, not at least our relations will become normal and, of course, this normality led to some people thinking that our relations will become equi-distant. The word 'equi-distant' is anathema to friends sitting here. Equi distant does not mean neutrality at all but that the basic functioning super power is similar. Who can that? Can anybody deny that function-

ing of the Soviet Union is not the same as the functioning of the United States? In world forums take the nuclear question. Is not the Soviet Union part of the London club? Does not the Soviet Union demand the same conditions on heavy water which the United States demand of India? When we took heavy water from Soviet Union they said, you sign the new amended International Atomic Energy Act of 1976 which the United States was demanding. Where is the fundamental difference? Where the fundamental interests are involved where is the difference between the super-powers? When the Janata party says 'equi-distant' we do not talk of neutrality. We never supported the United States in Vietnam but we will not support the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. There is no difference in our approach. There is no question of neutrality. It is a question of taking a principle stand. But here we find the Government was bubbling when it came to question of Soviet Union. When it comes to United States well justify—I do not oppose it—United States is doing wrong things in Latin America. We know about that. They are doing all kind of wrong things in lots of places but there they are clear. The condemnation is absolute but, when it comes to Soviet Union then other forces, political solutions and all these things come into play. Why is this nervousness in dealing with one super-power? Why don't you deal with them equally? It is here we have to do it. United States does an action which we do not consider right and it is clear condemnation. Soviet Union does it there no condemnation.

Sir, I give you an illustration. Just before the non-aligned conference a newspaper called 'Patriot' by the improbable name Patriot—published a so-called plan of the United States to balkanise India—Jean Kirkpatrick Plan. I went to United States while the non-aligned conference was going on here. I was in the United States when this 'mela' was going on here.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Was it a 'mela'?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: When people come together it is a 'mela'. It is not a disparaging term. I did not say "jhamela". So I inquired about it. I was surprised to learn that this alleged speech of Jean Kirkpatrick was never delivered. She was supposed to have delivered it on such and such date at such and such place but it was not delivered. Secondly, the person who delivered the speech on that day was the President of United States, Mr. Reagan. Thirdly, this group never discusses foreign policy. It only discusses how to finance Republican candidates for various elections... (Interruptions) It is called Conservative Political Action Committee and its primary purpose is to get businessmen and politicians together to work out financing of elections of candidates and help Conservatives. Of course, they want to back certain kind of candidates. Then none of us has seen the document. It is only some photostat print and the spelling there is English spelling and not American spelling. Sir, you know there is difference between American spelling and English spelling. Americans spell the word colour as 'color' whereas Englishmen put the alphabet 'u' (Interruptions)

There are so many other differences. It is a clear forgery. It is a clear dis-information technique. It is not only published here, but simultaneously in about 8 or 9 other countries. And this Government is paralysed, is not able to do it. If the United States had put such document it is also condemnable. But this Government would not have hesitated one minute. We have been there shouting and screaming about it. We don't have this even balance. I am not talking about equi-distance and sense of neutrality. I am talking about balanced approach, independent approach, ever handed approach. Because our interests are our interests. Regarding Soviet Union and United

States, have they shown in fundamental areas any differences—I would like to know. In Lebanon have they shown any concern? United States had taken a lukewarm attitude in Afghanistan. You may say, they are giving arms here and there. Well, that is nothing. It is nothing compared with the tanks, with the helicopters, the nepalm bombs and so on. And the United States took a lukewarm attitude in Afghanistan; likewise the Soviet Union took a lukewarm attitude in Lebanon. What were Soviet Union doing when the Israelis were going on bombing left and right and knocked off the entire missile battery and the T72 tanks of Syria and they walked straight into Lebanon and knocked off the PLO? PLO had a huge amount of arms in Soviet Union but Soviet Union just stood by because there was super-powers collusion. This you have to accept; They had some basic interests; on that they are not going to change, and therefore we must have equi-distance.

And therefore, Sir, winding up, I would say, if this Government took a stand which is similar to the stand on Afghanistan and Kampuchea, similar stand which they take towards the United States, similar action, then I would have some respect for this Government. This Government has been greatly pressurised by the Soviet Union to do a number of things which we did not do. They kept on telling us—don't make up with China. Every time there was talk of normalisation of relation with China they intervened. Kosygin came. He spent 9 hours in separate meeting with Morarji Desai. No aides. He hinted at all kinds of things, including a suggestion that if we recognise the Heng Samrin Government in Kampuchea he would do the following. He told the whole world. Morarji Desai told it at a public meeting. He told the public meeting that Kosygin gave a gentle suggestion: Pakistan is troubling you; they are troubling us in Afghanistan. 'Why don't you teach them a lesson; and we are with you.

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

'Morarji said it at a public meeting. But the fact of the matter is, Kosygin spent 9 hours. Morarji said, no. He did not yield to the pressure. Then Kosygin asked for time on television. He tried to go straight to the people. He said, "I know that the people of India are against China. So I want to speak to the people." He spoke to the people on China. But why cannot they come out openly and say that Afghanistan is in our region; foreign troops, whether American or Russian should get out? Russians are in occupation. You cannot equate the Russian army with our Mujahideen freedom fighter's or whatever they are called, fighting with whatever weapons they got from Sadat or United States. You come out and say that thing; I will have respect for you. (Interruptions) A confirmed Marxist is one who has head where the brain is taken out and concrete is put in! He is a confirmed Marxist.

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): Confirmed reactionaries are going on without any brain at all!

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I had all along told you of what the Americans did in Vietnam, Latin America and all that. What about Soviet Union? Super powers are super powers; they are colluding. We want an independent foreign policy, genuine nonaligned foreign policy. This Government is not pursuing the foreign policy pursued by the Janata Government. Its policy is tilted towards one super power, namely, the Soviet Union. By this the prestige of India has come down. We have weakened ourselves in South Asia, We have harmed the geo-political situation in this area.

Therefore, I strongly oppose the Demands for Grants that the Minister has brought forward.

13.25 hrs.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpapee to lay a Note.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (New Delhi): Sir, my notice of Question of Privilege is not against the Chief Election Commissioner, as was indicated by the Speaker in the House this morning. The privilege motion was against the Ministers of Home Affairs and Law, Justice and Company Affairs. I did not give any Privilege Motion against the Chief Election Commissioner. Sir, while giving his ruling today on my notice of Question of Privilege against the Ministers of Home Affairs and Law, Justice and Company Affairs, the Speaker had allowed me to lay on the Table the Note sent by the Election Commission to the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs.

I am accordingly laying on the Table a copy of the said Note duly authenticated by me. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—6184/83.]

13.26 hrs.

DEMAND FOR GRANTS (GENERAL),
1983-84—Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd.

आचार्य भगवान देव (अजमेर) : सभापति महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करने के लिये मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं अपने माननीय मंत्री जी को इस बात के लिये बधाई देता हूँ कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थितियों को देखते हुए जो साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियाँ आगे कदम बढ़ाना चाहती हैं, उसमें बड़ी सृजक से, बैलेन्स रखते हुए, भारत की गरिमा का ध्यान रखते हुए उन्होंने जो कुछ भी कदम उठाये हैं, उनके लिये मैं उन्हें बधाई देता हूँ।

अभी जनता पार्टी के लीडर श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी ने विदेश मंत्रालय की नीति की आलोचना की और पड़ोसी देशों के सम्बन्ध बिगड़े हैं, ऐसा आक्षेप किया। परन्तु हकीकत यह है कि जनता पार्टी के शासन में जो स्थिति बिगड़ी हुई थी, उससे कहीं अधिक बेहतर आज बनी है।

निर्गुट सम्मेलन के समय भी हिन्द और पाक के आयोग सम्बन्धी जो बातें हुई, माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी द्वारा पाकिस्तान के सैनिक शासक के साथ जो बातचीत हुई, उसमें उन्होंने बड़े मार्कों की बात कही है कि लाहौर और अमृतसर सिर्फ 50 मील की दूरी पर हैं और हमारा आदान-प्रदान 35 माइल है। रेल, डाक-तार और संचार का भी आदान-प्रदान होना चाहिये। इससे स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि भारत-सरकार क्या सोचती है, प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री क्या सोचते और चाहते हैं। यह नीति स्पष्ट हो जाती है कि हम पड़ोसी देशों से अच्छे सम्बन्ध रखना चाहते हैं, जिनको बिगाड़ने का प्रयास यह विरोधी पार्टी के लोग हमेशा करते रहे हैं। ये एक तरफ लोकशाही की बात करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ तानाशाहों के साथ मिलते भी हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष श्री राम जेटमलानी ने भी कहा कि निर्गुट सम्मेलन में 101 प्रतिनिधि आये। उसमें दो राष्ट्र ऐसे थे जहां लोकशाही है और 99 ऐसे हैं जहां डिक्टेटर राज्य काम करते हैं। परन्तु वह इस बात को भूल गये कि जो भी यहां आये थे, राष्ट्रों के राष्ट्राध्यक्ष या उनके प्रतिनिधि, चाहे वह लोकशाही को मानते हों या न मानते हो, उन्होंने यहां

सर्व-सम्मति से वोट देकर हमारी परम आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को उस सम्मेलन का अध्यक्ष चुना।

एक माननीय सदस्य : : उसमें चुनाव नहीं हुआ।

आचार्य भगवान देव : यह एक हकीकत है कि जो चुनाव को नहीं मानते थे, वह भी सहमत थे, उन्होंने चुनाव में भाग लिया, किसी ने विरोध नहीं किया। उन्होंने सब ने गौरव का अनुभव किया श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को अध्यक्ष बनाने में। यह भी लोकशाही की परम्पर है। जो राष्ट्राध्यक्ष लोकशाही को नहीं मानते, जो चुनाव को नहीं मानते, उन्होंने भी सर्व-सम्मति से उन्हें चुना। इसमें 101 राष्ट्रों की सहमति थी, उनको बनाया। अगर उन्होंने मत नहीं दिया तो विरोध भी नहीं किया। आज जो इस तरह से लोकशाही को नहीं मानते, उन्होंने भी उन्हें चुनकर अध्यक्ष बनाया। दूसरी तरफ इन लोगों की चाल देखिये कि पाकिस्तान के साथ दुहाई देते हैं और यहां अटक करते हैं।

अभी बोलकर गये हैं जनता पार्टी के लीडर श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी। क्या हमें यह पता नहीं है कि यह जनता पार्टी के लीडर श्री स्वामी उस सैनिक तानाशाह से मिलने के लिये पाकिस्तान गये और उनसे बातचीत कर के आये, रोटी खाकर आये। दूसरी पार्टी भारतीय जनता पार्टी है, उसके उपाध्यक्ष श्री राम जेटमलानी, वे पाकिस्तान गए वहां उस सैनिक तानाशाह** बात-चीत करके आए। लोकदल के जार्ज फर्नांडिस भी उस सैनिक तानाशाह के यहां गए उनसे बातचीत करके आए। ये विरोधी दल

[**आचार्य भगवान देव**]

के लोग अमरीका के इशारे पर इस देश में क्या क्या अराजकता फैलाकर आसाम और पंजाब यहां दिल्ली में लाना चाहते हैं उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं ज्यादा गहराई में नहीं जाना चाहता क्योंकि समय का अभाव है। ये विरोधी पार्टी के लोग हमेशा दुरंगी चाल चलते हैं। वे सदन में कुछ कहते हैं बाहर कुछ कहते हैं और विदेश में कुछ और कहते हैं। इनकी कलाई यहां भी खुल चुकी है और पूरे संसार में भी खुल चुकी है। मैंने एक बार कहा भी था कि दुरंगी छोड़कर एक रंग हो जा या संघ हो या या सारा होम होजा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: About the words रॉटियां खाएँ आएँ। I will go through the records and see if they are unparliamentary.

आचार्य भगवान देव : यह असंसदीय शब्द नहीं है। आप भले ही देख लीजिए मैंने उस उद्देश्य से नहीं कहा है। परन्तु हकीकत यह है कि विरोधी पार्टियों के लोग तानाशाहों से मिलते हैं। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कुटनीतिज्ञ ए० के० ब्रोही को दिल्ली की रामलीला ग्राउण्ड की आम सभाओं में बुलाकर भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोए स्वागत करते हैं। इससे बढ़कर और क्या प्रमाण होगा कि ये कितने देशभक्त हैं? इन्होंने इस तरह की स्थिति पैदा करने का प्रयास किया है जिससे पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध बिगड़ें। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी और विदेश मंत्री ने पूरा प्रयास किया है कि न केवल पड़ोसी बल्कि सारी दुनिया के साथ हमारी मैत्री हो, जियो और जीने दो की नीति को अपनाकर चले और हर क्षेत्र में लोकशाही के आधार पर स्वतन्त्र होकर विचारों का अदान-प्रदान कर सकेंगे तथा मुक्त वातावरण में रह सकें। निगुंट सम्मेलन जिस

सफलता के साथ सम्पन्न हुआ उसके लिए मैं परम आदरणीया प्रधान मंत्री तथा विदेश मंत्री को बधाई देता हूँ।

मैं विदेश मंत्री का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहूंगा कि जितने भी हमारे दूतावास हैं उनकी स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है। आज जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय तनाव है और जो परिस्थितियां हैं उनको देखते हुए हमारा बजट बहुत कम है। विदेश मंत्रालय का बजट बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए। संसदीय राजभाषा समिति के दौरे के सिलसिले में कई देशों में मैं गया था। वहां के दूतावासों की जो स्थिति मैंने देखी उसका विस्तृत विवरण मैं नहीं देना चाहता सामान्य रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहां पर अनेक प्रकार की कमियां हैं। वहां पर आर्थिक स्थिति अच्छी न होने के कारण कई प्रकार की कमियां हैं जिनको दूर किया जाना चाहिए। इसके अलावा दूतावासों में जो अधिकारी व कर्मचारी हैं उनका वहां के प्रवासी भारतीयों के साथ सम्पर्क भी बढ़ना चाहिए। प्रवासी भारतीयों के साथ उनके सम्बन्ध बहुत कम हैं। राजभाषा हिन्दी का प्रयोग करने के सम्बन्ध में टाइपिस्ट एवं अधिकारियों की भी कमी थी जिसकी पूर्ति होनी चाहिए। इसके सम्बन्ध में आज तक आपने कितनी पूर्ति की है और कितनी बाकी है इसका विवरण देने की कृपा करें।

इसके अतिरिक्त अभी लन्दन में कुछ घटनायें घटी हैं, एक ही दिन में तीन भारतीय प्रवासियों की हत्या कर दी गई। आए दिन हम अखबारों में पढ़ते हैं कि लन्दन में भारतीय लोगों के ऊपर सरकार के इशारे पर कुछ स्थानीय गुण्डों के द्वारा जुल्म डाये जाते हैं और उनको डराया-धमकाया जाता है। अभी तीन व्यक्तियों की जो मृत्यु हुई है, उसके

सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार ने क्या कदम उठाया है और आगे क्या भारतीय प्रवासियों की सुरक्षा के लिए क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ? क्या इस सम्बन्ध में ब्रिटिश सरकार को कोई विरोध-पत्र दिया गया है और क्या उनकी ओर से कोई जवाब आया है—इसके बारे में भी विदेश मंत्री में सूचना दें ।

मैं एक बात डिएगोगाशिया के संबंध में भी कहना चाहता हूं। इसकी चर्चा अभी निर्गुट सम्मेलन में भी हुई है लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ मैं विदेश मंत्री का ध्यान सेलसियस की तरफ भी दिलाना चाहता हूं। बीच में वहां पर कुछ बगावत हुई थी वहां के प्रशासन के खिलाफ। जहां तक मुझे पता है मैं एक बार वहां पर गया भी था अन्तरराष्ट्रीय अड्डा बनता जा रहा है। विदेशी ताकतों की नजर वहां पर गिट्ट की तरह से लगी हुई है। उस टापू के संबंध में भी भारत सरकार को बड़ा सावधानी से ध्यान रखना होगा। सिर्फ डिएगोगाशिया का ही मामला नहीं है सेलसियस भी उनमें से एक है। इस संबंध में भारत सरकार क्या कर रही है मैं जानना चाहूंगा ?

जहां तक मोरिशियस का सवाल है मोरिशियस में भी उथल-पुथल हो रही है। जहां तक मुझे पता है विदेशी ताकतें वहां भी अपनी नजरजमाने की कोशिश कर ही है। वहां आर्य-समाज का संगठन मजबूत है। मैं वहां एक-दो बार गया हूं। 1973 में हरिमहासम्मेलन रखा था। उस समय प्रतिकूल अन्तर-राष्ट्रीय परिस्थितियां थी। उसमें हमने ढंग से कार्यवाही की जिससे भारतीयों में फूट न पड़े। मोरिशियस का प्रेम भारत के साथ बना रहे ऐसी बात वहां के लोगों को समझाने की कोशिश करें। वहां दूता-वास और कर्मचारी भी बड़े सूझ-बूझ के होने चाहिए जिससे भारतीयों के साथ संबंध अच्छे रहें। इन की तरफ भी भारत सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिए।

पाकिस्तान बहुत छोटा देश होते हुए भी, उसने भारत के बजट से सुरक्षा का अपना बजट दुगुना बनाया है। इस के संबंध में भी भारत सरकार को सोचना होगा और कदम उठाना होगा तथा विदेश मंत्रालय को इसकी तरफ भी ध्यान देना होगा।

स्वामी जी आ गए हैं। मैं उनके संबंध में भी एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं। इन्होंने अफगानिस्तान की बात कही और भारतीय जनता पार्टी वालों ने भी अफगानिस्तान की बात कही, परन्तु ये पाकिस्तान की बात नहीं करते हैं। पाकिस्तान ने अमरीका के इशारे पर मदद ली, चाहे वह वास्द की हो या कोई और साधन हो—इस संबंध में वे सदन में खड़े होकर टीका नहीं करते हैं। आज अफगानिस्तान में रशिया है तो अफगानिस्तान के कहने से है। उनकी स्वीकृति से है। भारत किसी भी राष्ट्र के अन्दर हस्तक्षेप नहीं कर सकता है, क्योंकि उसने अपनी नीति ऐसी बना रखी है। इस बात पर जोर क्यों दिया जाता है कि रशिया से कह दो कि वह अफगानिस्तान से हट जाए। अफगानिस्तान में रशिया है तो अफगानिस्तान की सरकार ने उनको निमंत्रण दिया है। जब तक वे चाहेंगे उनको रखेंगे और जब नहीं चाहेंगे, तब हटा देंगे।

डा० सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी : दोबारा कहिए।

आचार्य भगवान देव : कह दिया। मैं आपको सुनाना चाहता हूं। स्वामी जी अफगानिस्तान की बात करते हैं, लेकिन पाकिस्तान की बात नहीं करते हैं, जो अमरीका से हथियार मंगा रहा है। आपमें हिम्मत है तो आप सदन में खड़े होकर कहें कि अमरीका का पाकिस्तान में जमाव और उनको दी जाने वाली

[आचार्य भगवान देव]

मदद का मैं विरोध करता हूँ। यह आप क्यों नहीं कहते हैं....

डा० सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी : मैं विरोध करता हूँ।

आचार्य भगवान देव : यह बात खुल कर आई।

डा० सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी : आप उस की बात कहिए।

आचार्य भगवान देव : मैं तो कह रहा हूँ। रशिया आफगानिस्तान में है तो आफगानिस्तान की सरकार की सहमति से है।

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Mr. Minister, do you subscribe to this view?

आचार्य भगवान देव : आपने उनसे क्या कह रहे हैं। वे पहले ही अपना जवाब दे चुके हैं। आप उस वक्त सोए हुए थे, समाधि लग गई थी। (व्यवधान)... विदेश मंत्री ने पहले ही कह दिया है।

विदेश मंत्री (श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव) : मैंने जो कहा है, वही कह रहे हैं।

आचार्य भगवान देव : विदेश मंत्री पहले ही कह चुके हैं कि आफगानिस्तान की स्वीकृति से रशिया वहां पर है। (व्यवधान)... स्वामी जी खुल कर बात नहीं करते हैं। आए दिन अमरीका विश्वविद्यालय के निमंत्रण पर वहां पहुंच जाते हैं। वहां पर ये क्या-क्या करते हैं, यह उनका व्यक्तिगत मामला हो सकता है, लेकिन हमें उनकी गतिविधियों से सावधान रहना पड़ेगा।

डा० सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी : आप मंत्री जी से पूछिए।

आचार्य भगवान देव : सारी जानकारी है।

डा० सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी : रखो न सभा पटल पर।

आचार्य भगवान देव : जहां तक ईराक और ईरान की बात है, पड़ोसी देश और दुश्मनावट, उनका भी साथ-साथ हाउस में बैठना कोई कम सफलता की बात नहीं है। झगड़े तो भाई-भाई, बाप-बेटे, मियां-बीबी, में भी होते हैं लेकिन समझदारी यह है कि उन को इकट्ठा कर के उन के अन्दर मिलाप कराया जाय, विनाश की तरफ बढ़ते हुए कदमों को रोकते हुए इन्सानियत का पैगाम दिया जाए और इस तरह का पैगाम माननीया प्रधान मंत्री जी और विदेश मंत्री जी बखूबी अच्छी तरह से भारत के प्राचीन गौरव "मनुर्भव" के संदेश के रूप में दे रहे हैं। यह वेदों की धरती है.....

मित्रस्य चक्षुसा समीक्षा महे।

ऐ संसार के लोगों, अगर मित्र हो कर चले तो कभी दुश्मनी आ नहीं सकती। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने हमेशा बड़े-बड़े सम्मेलनों में कहा है—

समानी आकृति समानी हृदयानि वः।

लोक दल के श्री वी० डी० सिंह ने हिन्दी की बात कही। क्या उन को पता नहीं है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने वेद की सूक्ति को कह कर अपने भाषण का प्रारम्भ किया था—

सर्वे भवन्तु सुखः न भारत हमेशा सर्वे भवन्तु सुखिनः की नीति पर चला है—सारे संसार की मानव जाति सुखपूर्वक रहे, अच्छी तरह से रहे,

मित्रता से रहे, तनाव न हो। वारुद के ढेर पर दुनिया बैठी है उस से हट कर सुख-शान्ति से रह सके। इस तरह का प्रयास भारत सरकार का रहा है। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी और विदेश मंत्री जी दोनों बघाई के पात्र हैं जो संसार में मानव जाति को मानव बनाने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं।

एक बात मैं पुनः कहना चाहता हूँ—हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय बहुत विशाल है। सारे संसार से इस का सम्बन्ध है लेकिन इस का बजट बहुत कम है, इस को बढ़ाना चाहिये। विदेशों में हमारे दूतावासों में जो हमारे अधिकारी रहते हैं, वे स्थानीय भारत-प्रवासियों के साथ सम्पर्क बढ़ायें, जिस से भारत के प्रति उनका प्रेम, मेल-मिलाप दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ता रहे।

~~SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN~~
(Badagara): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I welcome this opportunity to discuss the dimensions of our foreign policy and conduct of diplomacy, although we had an opportunity only a couple of days ago to discuss a major important international event which took place in India, the Non-Aligned Summit. The Non-Aligned Summit was a major event which had been separately discussed. But I want to clarify one thing. My esteemed friend, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy a little while ago said that we are allergic to the concept of equi-distance, some of us. We are not allergic to anything. Those people who believe in non-alignment are not allergic to anybody. But to say that non-alignment ought to mean equi-distance—if I may say so; if he will forgive me—is a little bit of nonsense; it has not been conceived as equi-distance. There were in this country people like late Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and others who talked of equi-distance because of equi-irrelevance. He used to say that capitalism

and communism as two distinct ideologies are equally relevant to the future of India, Asia and the developing countries and the world. From that standpoint, rather philosophical standpoint, having wanted to question the credentials of Jawaharlal Nehru's approach to non-alignment talked of equi-distance. What exactly does equi-distance of foreign policy mean? You see the conduct of our foreign policy and our acceptance of non-alignment.

It means, as I always say, an assertion of our independence and sovereignty and also an independent approach to the crucial contemporary questions of peace and war and various other questions, because we have certain basic international perceptions which obviously are influenced by our own consideration of our national interest, security, consideration of our economic ties. We look at it basically according to our interests. We look at it from the point of view of our interests. If some of our perceptions coincide with those of 'A' power or 'B' power, then you cannot say that we are trailing behind that power. That is the point that my friends like Dr. Swamy want to make out. He would agree—everybody agrees—that when there were crucial questions of the day, when it was about Goa or Kashmir which is an integral part of this country, or when there was aggression on our frontiers, or when the people of Bangladesh fought for their freedom, on all those questions of consequence and importance to our future and our natural interests, the Soviet Union stood by us. So, there is an identity of approach and interest and that does not mean that we follow the Soviet Union and on all these questions, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy will agree with me—the United States did not support us; but opposed us. That is why there is no question of our following or trailing behind any power. So, there is no question of equi-distance or equi-irrelevance; this concept of equality does not fall into the parameters of our perception of Non-Alignment.

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

Sir, the House is fully aware and I do not want to go into the details that he has mentioned. I want to clarify one point. I want to say that on issues of great consequence to the humanity as a whole, particularly disarmament—somebody pointed out the other day how more than six hundred billion dollars are going down the drain in the amendment race—we ought to reinvigorate the initiatives which we used to take earlier in the United Nations and elsewhere. We have to regain our initiatives on these questions, like disarmament. Because, this is very important from our moral stand point, that we cannot allow cynicism and certain amount of despair to grow in the minds of men wherever they may be, because that will drain the last hope of humanity, the hope of fulfilment, the hope of peace.

I do not want to go into the details on this issue, about our relationships with—or bilateral relations—powers like the United States and the Soviet Union at length. Dr. Swamy talked about certain normalcy—hope for normalcy—in our relations with the United States after the visit of the Prime Minister. I should have expected him to spell out “normalcy”. When we have, as I said, different perceptions to events, to our own national interests and when they collide, what exactly is normalcy? On events like—or—let us say—what is going on in Central America and South America, the champions of human rights had nothing to say, about El Salvador and Nicaragua.

~~DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:~~
I did say.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: Did you? I am sorry. Probably you did it in a low profile.

They have nothing to say, the champions of human rights about them. I

want to say that this country stand by the people who are standing for national liberation, whether it be Nicaragua or El Salvador or anywhere else for that matter. So, my friend Dr. Swamy is trying to spread confusion by confusing our basic approach.

Now, I want to talk about something, where I am sure I have some newly found identity of views with my friend Dr. Swamy. I have consistently held the view, in this House as well as outside, that we should not unnecessarily get into the kind of a situation where our national interests would suffer, as far as our relations with China are concerned.

But I must say nothing in the world is static. There are very hopeful signs of China changing; at least some of their global perceptions with which we have been used to over the years are undergoing some kind of change; if not transformation. China is not a country that can be wished away in interational affairs and more so for us with our geographical proximity. I am not trying to go back into the area of romanticism in our relationship with China where probably we committed a mistake. But of course, the shadow of events of 1959 to 1962 remains, and our border claim, not claim but right and China's attempt at subversion and aggressive support to our neighbours and various other problems remain. But I think it is time that we take an adult and mature view in relation to this question. I do not want to spell out in detail, but this is a time of crucial significance for us to take decision it may be that it is our last chance to do so; it has a vital consequence for this country now at this point of time, more so when you have got a pivotal position of the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Community. We have to take a very objective view of this relationship between India and China and the dialogue Mr. Morarji Desai and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee started not only the dialogue should continue

but it must continue with a clear sense of purpose of settling the outstanding issues left over by history. Why I am trying to emphasise on this is not because I feel that China's attitudes are changing, not only the dialogue with the Soviet Union and China has entered a very/significant phase but also possibly because there is possibility of China-Vietnam dialogue on the question of the consequence of South East Asia entering into an equally significant phase and this is the time for us for a break-through.

You know I have my great difference with the Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi. With all that, I have equal respect for her for many things. When she is Prime Minister not because she can appropriate for us, as some of them would want, kudos for it as they sought to do in a very cheap way on the question of Non-Aligned Summit, but I feel this may be the Summit, but I feel this may be the Prime Minister to make a decisive break-through in the relations between India and China. This chance may never come again because the pattern of events, domestic events is forcing certain compulsions on this country. You have to take a long-term point of view. We may never again be able to settle these questions. But for that, I would request the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs to evolve a national consensus on China and to call without any reservation the leaders of opposition, because these questions of our frontiers are sensitive questions. It is not the time to debate it in the Parliament. For this, we have enough of approach; whether it was in relation to Tibet; whether it was in relation to the question of Dalai Lama or China; we have enough of this sentimental romantic involvement. It is time to end this. And, if we want to do it, the initiative should come from the Prime Minister, the Ruling Party and the Minister of External Affairs for a serious dialogue on these question and once for all settle this issue. These questions are of great importance for our future. As the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement we had an

opportunity, great opportunity to lead and implement the Economic declaration of the New Delhi Meet. I want to pay tribute to the draftsmen of his Declaration. It is not merely an outstanding contribution, but a lot of skill has gone into it. Now, we have to implement it. There is no point in saying that we have the wonderful Resolution or Declaration. This restructuring of the Brettonwoods institutions is going to be of great consequence. About the question of aid, our Foreign Minister some time ago has said that he has his great frustration in the failure of North South dialogue, because the interests are 'colliding', contradictions are there. You cannot resolve it. But again, there is the question of race against time in this. This gives an opportunity to involve ourselves in a big way and use all our diplomatic resources that we have in our Foreign Service, which is second to none. So, it is very important that this South South dialogue as well as this Declaration be given effect to by taking initiatives in this matter, in the United Nations and various other international forums. It is equally important that in conferences or dialogues over the question of Indian ocean—again an area of great importance from our security angle—we should involve ourselves.

Yesterday, my friend, Mr. Chandrajit Yadav, regretted the absence of some other senior officials when this debate was going on. This casualness in relation to Parliament is inherent in the situation. When the Leader of the House herself does not attend important debates that go on in this House, other Ministers pay scant attention to what goes on in this House and Members themselves keep away, why blame only the top officials? This is an overall question of casualness of approach that we have developed in relation to Parliament; Parliament being taken for granted.

But I want to say one thing. The Service that he has in terms of human material—Indian Administrative Service, Police Service or any other

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

Service, may be as good or as bad—they are some of the finest minds in this country. But I do not think, they are being looked after properly. However much the Minister may want, the Finance Ministry's and the C&AG's view, which is totally irrelevant to the conduct of our diplomacy and indirectly to our national interest, prevails and the leadership is unable to say that they must be looked after. It is not only the question of, as somebody said it yesterday, people wanting to go to better postings—London, Washington, New York and so on. That is also inherent in our social milieu. For all of us whatever is foreign in this country has a magic. That means best. So, why blame them? But as long as they go there as the representatives of this country, they must have tolerable levels of living. They must be able to survive in a diplomatic community. And unless we pay them more, to put it very bluntly, they cannot do so. Also our Missions start from vital fronts in many vital areas. This is a question of utmost importance. More so since we are involved as Chairman of the non-aligned community, we will have to involve our diplomatic service in many questions. And they cannot do so without substantial support.

14 hrs.

About the Counsellor sections, there are a large number of people, many of them belonging to my State, in the West Asian countries. If you go and visit some of the Missions, you will find how under-staffed they are in the Counsellor Departments, where the people have to wait for days to get clearance. After all, you know they do all kinds of work to earn a living and send the money home. The entire national economy and the nation ought to be grateful to them. In China, when the overseas Chinese, those who send dollars to China arrive, they are welcome with bouquets and here in this country, in our consular sections of our embassies, passport

offices, customs in the airports, Indian Airlines, what is the treatment that we give them? We harass them, make it impossible for them to spend more time with their families. This is the attitude. That is why I have been repeatedly saying that this 1923 Act should be amended and they have been saying that this Emigration Act which is meant to deal with indentured labour, should be thrown out of the Statute Book. But, now we have started another thing—ceiling, immigration required, not required and people are made to run again from pillar to post. These are little areas which encourage and breed corruption. It is time that we ended anarchy. I want a kind of assurance, a statement of policy from the Foreign Minister on what he proposes to do with the 1923 Act. Ultimately, foreign policy is not a matter of a populist strategy nor an exercise in image building. As I said earlier, it is primarily concerned with our national interest and there is a broad area of consensus, near unanimous consensus, on questions of foreign policy in this country. I have no doubt, as before, we will continue to support the directions in foreign policy which the Ministry actively pursues. Thank you.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: So, we should welcome Mr. Unnikrishnan's views on China.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA (Amritsar): Mr. Chairman, Mr. Swamy has been referring about the isolation of India. The very fact that the summit which was to be held in Iraq was held in India—it was a consensus of all the non-aligned countries that we may have a conference in India—it bears testimony as to how much confidence the non-aligned people have in us. He also referred about China. He says that during Janata rule, Janata's policies were very good and Janata tried to befriend all the countries around this country. I take only China which he was referring to for quite some time. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the

then Foreign Minister of Janata Government, went there and China, without caring for his presence, attacked and wanted to punish Vietnam. This is the kind of courtesy they offer to you and this is the kind of policy. If you want to jump at conclusions and say that friendship is something which is just one-way traffic and you will go there and develop friendship, it is not like that. You have to see so many things—basic policies, basic issues—and if they also agree, it is only then that friendship comes. He was speaking in the Parliament as if these are the perceptions of some foreigner and not the perceptions of an Indian. He was talking that he went to see Mr. Zia, he went to see Dean Kirkpatrick, the United States Ambassador in U.N. and all that. What transpired between the two people, we are not concerned. What we are concerned with is the policies of these Governments and we definitely see that those policies are such that they have created problems for the whole world. Whether it is Europe, whether it is Asia, whether it is Latin America it is the U.S. Government and their policies which are creating problems for the whole world.

14.40 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

First of all, I must congratulate our Foreign Minister for convening the Seventh Non-aligned Conference, which was a big success. I also want to congratulate our officers, who worked very hard before the Conference, did their home task well, so that the Conference could be a grand success. I also congratulate our Prime Minister for the decisions came out after deliberations which were held under her leadership. Otherwise, it would not have been possible to collect 101 countries with diverse views and ideologies and make them agree on a consensus. It was a very big achievement. Therefore, I congratulate our External Affairs Minister as well as the officers.

A very serious situation has developed in the Indian Ocean. When

Diego Garcia was taken over by America, it was stated that a kind of assurance was given to the world that it was only for reconnaissance purposes. But, later on, they started building up military bases and now they have made it the most formidable nuclear base in the Indian Ocean. Mauritius is demanding it back but there is no response from the United States. Diego Garcia is posing a very big danger to us and also to the other littoral countries. Many a time, the littoral countries have raised their voice in many conferences, including the Non-alignment Conference, pointing out the dangers involved, but no heed was paid to this. Now the United States have got a Command there and thus they are further endangering the security of the nations in this area. I would like to know how long he will wait for the initiative to be taken by the United Nations or other countries. Now what happens in the United Nations is that every year it is postponed to the next and no decision is being taken, while the United States is strengthening its bases more and more. So, I would request the External Affairs Minister to come out clearly with our policy on the Indian Ocean. The position is becoming more serious because USA have brought the nuclear warships there. In 1971 the Seventh Fleet came to the Bay of Bengal. Since Pakistan is a part of their global policy, they are arming Pakistan also and they are having joint naval exercises in the Indian Ocean. Since all these dangers are there, we must have a positive attitude towards Indian Ocean, especially Diego Garcia. I am sure in the Seventh Summit you must have had an opportunity of meeting the Foreign Ministers of the littoral countries and discussing this problem with them. What is the attitude of India to this big problem, which is posing a great danger to India, and what is the reaction of other countries... (Interruptions)

I must congratulate our External Affairs Minister for taking a correct line and attitude in Kampuchea.

[Shri R. L. Bhatia]

When we recognised China first, everybody said that India is wrong and then the whole world has recognised China. And now when we have recognised, 24 countries have recognised Kampuchea and 54 countries took part in U.N. in the discussion on Kampuchea, and opposed tooth and nail the Government of Heng Samrin and supported Prince Sihanouk. In Delhi summit only 31 countries opposed it. The rest were silent and it shows that every day the situation with regard to Kampuchea is improving. I must say that I was there only last month in Kampuchea and the things were absolutely normal there. There is a normal life and Heng Samrin's Government is almost in complete control of the area. There is no fighting and whatever is coming up in papers, the armies of Pol Pot are in other countries, not on Thailand borders, not in Thailand jungles, not in Kampuchea. I met various people over there, the man in the street, I met individuals and others and everybody said that this Government is a very popular Government and Heng Samrin is also liked by the local people and, therefore, there is no question of changing our policies towards Kampuchea. So, your line of thinking about Kampuchea and your helping Kampuchea is a correct line and I would also mention that India sent Mr. Rao there to go there and find out the condition and how India can help them. The report has already come and I would request the External Affairs Minister to look into it and finalise it as any little help by India will go a long way in strengthening that Government.

I must say that the reality of Kampuchea is now being understood by many other countries. But some people ask why China is opposing Kampuchea? The reason is that even China does not want a solution in Kampuchea because this has given them a hand, this has given them an

opportunity to have better relations with the ASEAN. So, they will like this Kampuchea question to be alive and similarly Singapore has 80 per cent population of Chinese and they have tremendous business opportunities in China. So, therefore, these are some people making a hue and cry, but otherwise, by and large, the people of the world have understood the situation in Kampuchea and now things are improving.

Lastly, I would like to say that various Missions we have seen abroad, I join with Mr. Unnikrishnan and other friends who have said that the amount must be larger at the disposal of our Missions because other countries are throwing so many parties and getting together, with each other explaining their point of view. That is the basis of the diplomacy which is played outside the country. But the funds are so less with our officers that they are not in a position to do all that and play an important role there. I joint with my other friends and say that the demand should be increased and the officers who are working abroad for this nation should be helped.

श्री ए० नील लोहियादसन नाडार
(त्रिवेन्द्रम) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश नीति के मामलों पर जो यहां पर विचार प्रकट किए गए हैं, उनके बारे में कुछ कहने से पहले मैं अपने राज्य केरल से सम्बन्धित दो मांगों की ओर माननीया विदेश मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ। केरल में कई लोग पासपोर्ट लेकर बाहर जाते हैं। वहां पासपोर्ट लेने के लिये बहुत ही भीड़ रहती है। लेकिन दुःख की बात है कि अभी तक वहां केरल की राजधानी त्रिवेन्द्रम में कोई पासपोर्ट कार्यालय नहीं है। इसलिए मैं उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आपके जरिए मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि केरल की राजधानी त्रिवेन्द्रम में एक

क्षेत्रीय पासपोर्ट कार्यालय खोलने की व्यवस्था करें।

दूसरी बात आबूघाबी में कुछ मलयाली लोग हैं। उनको वापिस लाने की बात है। ऐसी भी रिपोर्ट है कि उनके लिए 'लांच' का इन्तजाम है। सन् 1973 में कुछ लोगों को लांच में भेजा गया। ऐसी भी बात है कि लांच डूब गई है। भारत सरकार को, विदेश मंत्रालय को इस बात पर ध्यान देना चाहिए। कि उन लोगों को हवाई जहाज के द्वारा या जलयान के द्वारा वापिस करना चाहिए इस के बारे में सरकार ने क्या कदम उठाया है, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश नीति के बारे में यहां पर काफी चर्चा हुई है। मैं आपका ध्यान 1980 के चुनाव के पहले जो स्थिति थी, उसकी ओर ले जाना चाहता हूँ। उस समय हम लोग सी०एफ० डी० में थे। हमारा एक राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन हुआ था। उस सम्मेलन में 31 सूत्री कार्यक्रम की घोषणा की थी। इसमें कम्पूचिया की सरकार को मान्यता देने की बात थी। हमारे और कांग्रेस (ई) के बीच में उस समय जो चर्चा हुई थी, उस में हमने 31 सूत्री कार्यक्रम को आधार बनाया था। 31 सूत्री कार्यक्रम होने के कारण ही कांग्रेस-आई के चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में कम्पूचिया को मान्यता देने की बात आ गई हमें खुशी है कि सरकार ने कम्पूचिया की सरकार को, हैंगसैमरिन की सरकार को मान्यता दी। दूसरी तरफ हमें दुख होता है कि अभी जो यहां दिल्ली में तटस्थ राष्ट्रों का सम्मेलन हुआ था, उस सम्मेलन में उस सरकार के प्रतिनिधि को हम नहीं बैठा सके। ऐसी परस्थिति में हम कैसे कह सकते हैं कि वह सम्मेलन सफल हुआ है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम अपने देश की विदेश नीति की नींव स्वराज्य की लड़ाई में देख सकते हैं। हमारी विदेश नीति का आधार तो आत्मनिर्भरता थी। गांधी ने स्पष्ट कर दिया था कि यह आत्मनिर्भर भारत ही है जो दूसरे राष्ट्रों की मदद कर सकता है। एक आत्मनिर्भर भारत ही दूसरे राष्ट्रों को सच्चा रास्ता बता सकता है। लेकिन आज गांधी जी का भारत कहां गया है? गांधी जी ने स्वराज्य की लड़ाई के समय में विदेशी वस्त्रों और वस्तुओं का बहिष्कार और स्वदेश का प्रचार करने का आह्वान दिया था। उसी भारत में आज 36 वर्षों की आजादी के बाद न केवल हम विदेशी वस्त्रों का आयात करते हैं बल्कि विदेश से सांकेतिक-विद्या और विदेशी पूजा का भी आयात करते हैं। इस तरह से हम आत्मनिर्भरता के रास्ते पर कैसे पहुंच सकते हैं। इस समय देश में विदेशी पूजा का बोलबाला है। बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियों, पूजापति हमारी नीति का निर्णय करते हैं—यह बहुत शोचनीय स्थिति है। ऐसी स्थिति में हम कैसे स्वतन्त्र विदेश नीति को अपना सकते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, द्वितीय विश्व महायुद्ध के बाद जो अन्तराष्ट्रीय परिस्थितियां पैदा हुई, जो अन्तराष्ट्रीय मामले हुए, उन सब का सूक्ष्मण करें तो हम देख सकते हैं कि चाहे किसी राष्ट्र का बाहरी सम्बन्ध, आपस का सम्बन्ध.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have got to complete now. Your party has been allotted eight minutes. You have exhausted eight minutes.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: Have you stuck on to that?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Don't question me. I say, you have got to complete now. Complete it. You cannot put that question to me. I tell you that time is over. Then you may continue for some time and finish your speech.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: Did you tell yesterday and did you tell upto this time to anybody?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have been telling everybody.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: No, no.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please listen, nobody has been allowed time more than allotted here. We are following it. We are conducting deliberations. You have got to complete it.

श्री ए० नील लोहिया दासन नाडार :

विश्व महायुद्ध के बाद का जो मामला है उस में हम देख सकते हैं—राष्ट्रों का आपस का सम्बन्ध दो बातों पर आधारित है—एक तो सांकेतिक विज्ञान की सहायता की मात्रा पर और दूसरा आर्थिक सहायता की मात्रा पर। इन दो आधारों पर ही हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों पर अपना योगदान कर सकते हैं। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि हमारे यहां सांकेतिक विद्या का आयात हम करते हैं, आर्थिक बातों पर हम आई० एम० एफ०, विश्व बैंक, बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियों तथा अन्य अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय आर्थिक संस्थानों के सामने भीख मांगन जाते हैं। ऐसी परिस्थिति में हम कैसे विदेशी मामलों पर अपना योगदान महत्वपूर्ण तरीके से अदा कर सकते हैं।

हम देखते हैं—भाषण होते हैं, प्रस्ताव पास होते हैं। दिल्ली में सम्मेलन हुआ, लेकिन भाषणों से, प्रस्ताव पास करने से कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। यदि कुछ होने वाला होता तो हमारा भारत तो सदियों से, शताब्दियों से,

शान्ति का पाठ करता आ रहा है। यदि कुछ हो सकता है तो उस के आधार हैं, दो पहलू हैं—एक तो वह जो हम अपने लिए कर सकते हैं और दूसरा वह जो हम दूसरों के लिए कुछ कर सकते हैं। यहां दिल्ली में हुए सम्मेलन में भारतीय समुद्री क्षेत्र के बारे में भाषण तो हो रहा था, लेकिन उस समय श्री अमेरिका दियागो गाशिया में अपने सैनिक हवाई अड्डों के विकास में लगा हुआ था। उसके विरोध में हम कुछ नहीं कह सके। हम इस के बारे में अमेरिका का नाम ले कर के एक प्रस्ताव तक पास नहीं कर सके। ऐसी परिस्थिति में हम कैसे कह सकते हैं कि जो तटस्थ सम्मेलन यहां हुआ वह वास्तव में सफल हुआ। क्या हम दियागो गाशिया के मामले में यह कह सकते हैं कि जब तक अमेरिका दियागो गाशिया में अपने सैनिक अड्डे समाप्त नहीं करता है तब तक अमेरिका के साथ हमारे आर्थिक और व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध नहीं होंगे। क्या हम अमेरिका के बारे में यह कह सकते हैं कि जब तक अमेरिका दियागो गाशिया में अपने सैनिक अड्डे समाप्त नहीं करता तब तक हम तटस्थ राष्ट्र अमेरिका को अपना कच्चा माल नहीं देंगे? क्या हम अपने अरब दोस्तों से यह कह सकते हैं कि जब तक अमेरिका दियागो गाशिया से नहीं हटता तब तक अरब राष्ट्र अमेरिका को तेल नहीं देंगे? क्या हम ऐसा कर सकते हैं। अगर यह ऐसा नहीं कर सकते हैं तो घोषणाओं और प्रस्तावों से क्या फायदा है।

आण्विक अस्त्रों और निरस्त्रीकरण के बारे में बहुत कुछ बातें कहीं गयीं। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो राष्ट्र आण्विक अस्त्रों का निर्माण करते हैं या प्रयोग करते हैं, उन राष्ट्रों को क्या वे राष्ट्र जो कि तटस्थ राष्ट्र हैं, यह

कह सकते हैं कि हम उन राष्ट्रों को कच्चा माल नहीं देंगे ? क्या ऐसा निर्णय तटस्थ राष्ट्र कर सकते हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think now you are not getting angry when I ring the bell. Therefore, you can conclude.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: (Patna); He is speaking in Hindi.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am following. What is there? I know Hindi better. He is from South, he is speaking in Hindi. Can I not follow?

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I am praising him.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: He will also speak in Tamil.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I will try to learn.

श्री ए० नीलालोहियावसन नाडार : हम तो कहते हैं कि अमेरिका और सारे योरोपियन राष्ट्रों का बैंकिंग पेट्रोल डालर्स पर आधारित करता है। क्या हम अपने अरब दोस्तों से यह कह सकते हैं पेट्रोल डालर्स जो अमेरिका और दूसरे राष्ट्रों की बैंकिंग व्यवस्था का आधार है, उसको वे खतम कर दें। हम यह नहीं कह सकते हैं।

क्या हम अरब राष्ट्रों को पानी के पाइप लाइन दे सकते हैं और अरब राष्ट्रों से वापसी में हम तेल ले सकते हैं। अगर तटस्थ राष्ट्र वास्तव में तटस्थ राष्ट्र हैं तो क्या अपने आप में कच्चे माल का वितरण करके क्या वे एक नई आर्थिक व्यवस्था की स्थापना करने में कुछ कर सकते हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Would it not be a negative policy?

श्री ए० नीलालोहियावसन नाडार : हमारी प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया शासक दल के और विपक्ष के कुछ लोगों ने भी कहा। मैं उन बातों से सहमत नहीं क्योंकि पिछले तीन वर्षों से मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारी प्रधान मंत्री की नीति में कोई कमिटमेंट नहीं है। जब वे संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका जाती हैं तब तो वे अपना झुकाव उनकी ओर प्रकट करती हैं। जब वे रूस जाती हैं तो अपना झुकाव उनके प्रति प्रकट करती हैं। इससे प्रधान मंत्री की ढलमुल नीति साफ दिखाई देती है। यह नीति उचित नहीं है। अपने पड़ोसी देशों भूटान, नेपाल, बर्मा और श्रीलंका के साथ अपने संबंधों को सुधारने के लिए पिछले तीन वर्षों में प्रधान मंत्री ने क्या किया इस के लिये उनके पास समय नहीं है। वे सिर्फ 'लॉनिंग टावर आफ पीस' और 'ट्यूनिंग फोर्क' का आचरण करती हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Ram Jethmalani.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Bombay North West): How much time are you giving, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your time is 14 minutes.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jaipur): According to the extended time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No time has been extended.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Without wasting time on unessentials, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, let me say something which may bring some peace of mind to my friends the Members of the various kinds of Communist Parties that exist in this country.

(Shri Ran Jethmalani)

Our friendship with the Soviet Union which has been a corner-stone of our foreign policy is a welcome step. We are not ungrateful and we cannot be ungrateful for the political and economic support which we have received from the Soviet Union and from our Socialist friends time and again. At the same time, I am not unmindful of the errors of world democracies, their occasional lapses from the path of international law, morality and rectitude which have soured our relations and which have kept our relations in the kind of frozen coldness in which they exist today. But, Sir, I will say this and I wish to emphatically reiterate my convictions even at the cost of my Foreign Minister getting up and characterising it as the voice of Israel. If that is the level to which the debate descends, I could well retaliate that all those who speak from those Benches are the voice of some vested interests. But I have no desire to imitate them and to reduce this Parliamentary debates to a farce. The other day when I spoke, Comrade Indrajit Gupta has said that Mr. Jethmalani ran amuck. I can only forgive the comrade because this must be the result of his deficiency of either education or good manners. 'A person runs amuck—'amuck' is a maligned word which comes from the maligned mind. "Amuck" means when a person has taken lot of hashish and gets into the mood of murderous frenzy. If any of my friends here think ever I get into the mood of murderous frenzy, the word "amuck" may be appropriate. But to my mind, the Comrade was only reflecting the murderous frenzy of those interests whom he represents in this House.

Sir, we cannot forget our abiding interest in the survival of the free world. However detestable it may be to those who do not like the free way which we have chosen, however irri-

tating it may be to the agents who would want to destroy our free way of life, our abiding interest in the survival of the free way of life cannot possibly be overlooked.

Not one Soviet Union, not ten Soviet Unions and not any consideration of gratitude or otherwise shall make us abandon this abiding interest, this primary interest, that India will continue to preserve her free way of life.

Sir, I, again, do not wish to imitate the idiom or the language of Mr. Indrajit Gupta. But he did say, when I was talking of the non-aligned movement, that the non-aligned movement in the form in which he wants it and in the form in which he likes it will continue. And he said, "The caravan of non-alignment will go on; the dogs will continue to bark."

**(Interruptions)*

what he said that day. You should preach to him.....*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will go through the records.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: I thought this gentleman was better educated.... *(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER: Whether he is running amuck or not?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): I would request him to withdraw that. We have political differences. But we should not actually trade in such words.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: He used that word. I got up and protested. You did not protest at that time.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: It is not a question of not protesting. It is a phrase, "The dogs may bark." He may have a good

command over English. I know that he has a good command over English. He should understand it.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: ***

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will go through the proceedings. If I find anything unparliamentary, if he has called any member like that, I will definitely expunge it. I expected that he would withdraw it. But if he does not withdraw it. I will expunge it.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: On that day, you forgot the dignity of the House. When it comes to protecting me, you will not protect me.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: He is capable of using such strong language. We are also capable of using such words. But we will not do it.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: On that day, I did not get protection either from the Chair or from my comrades and friends.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The protection of the Chair is always available to any member of the House.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: On that day, why did not you protect me? You were in the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nobody got up and protested. When he used that phrase, nobody got up, including yourself, to ask for the protection of the Chair or ask him to withdraw that phrase.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: If you look into the records, you will find that I protested. I said, "Please mind your language." His reply was, "I speak better English than you do."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You did not want any direction from the Chair. You only protested. Now, they are saying that the words used by you

are not correct. Therefore, I said, "I will go through the records." If you are saying this to any member of the House, I would expect you to withdraw it. I know, you are a powerful advocate.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I want that this phraseology should not be used in the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I know, you do not want to offend anybody. Therefore, I expected that you would kindly withdraw it. I will go through the records.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: You go.... (Interruptions) through the records.

AN HON. MEMBER: If he goes out, the House will come to a stop.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Because you have requested me to go, I will remain in the Chair.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: He is protesting against the phrase "going amuck". But he is doing the same thing.

**(Interruptions)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: That also goes off the record.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This will not go on record.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Was I wrong in saying that you had people like that in this House?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That does not go on record.

The speech was made by Shri Indrajit Gupta about two days back, I think and how he has been maintaining for 48 hours, I do not know. He is still angry. That is; why the name is given very late. I was also thinking whether to admit

***Expunged as ordered by the

**Not recorded .

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Mr. Jethmalani's who has come just now to speak. But anyhow, it is all right.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: How sweet and reasonable he is. Very good.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Only when you hit the Marxist to behave.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: With all our gratitude to our friends the Soviet Union and the Soviet Bloc, we cannot at the same time behave like ungrateful people and take no notice or not give enough consideration to the fact that even from the West we have received economic assistance which far exceeds in its proportions, in its magnitude, the assistance which we have received from the Soviet bloc and only very ungrateful people will forget the political assistance which this country received in 1962. It is for the Foreign Minister to ponder over and for all Members of this House to take note of.

It is true that I speak a much different language and express views which are widely different from some of my friends. But that is an inevitable consequence of the fact that some of those from whom I differ have heroes whom I do not consider heroes and I have heroes whom they do not consider heroes. My hero in the post-independence struggle has been Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and not Mohd. Ali Jinnah. My hero has been Mahatma Gandhi. My heroes have not been international murderers and gangsters and hijackers. My good friend from the Muslim League who spoke the other day said that Arafat is a hero. I had no quarrel with anybody adopting anybody as a hero. This is a democracy. This is a free country. Anybody can adopt any body as a hero. But equally my friend from the Muslim League will concede to me the liberty of not acknowledging his hero as a hero. I am in the exercise of my right of freedom and free speech and particularly my right to form intellectual and moral opinions of my own. I may be one in the world but it is my

opinion that I will not recognise some persons as heroes. My heroes are those who believe in non-violence, who believe in the doctrine of love, and who believe in the doctrine of friendship. Those who believe in war, those who talk of war, those who practise war as an instrument of policy, are not my heroes. And this applies to wherever people of that kind exist. I am a refugee from Pakistan. I have been the victim of *Jehad* and, therefore, today that word *Jehad* sounds very irritating to me when I hear that word whether it comes from Islamabad or West Asia or any single quarter of the world. But again for the benefit of my friends in the Muslim League, I want to say this, that living in a refugee camp as a refugee, I have developed one conviction in my life and that conviction is that his country will prosper and thrive only when there is love, more love and still more love, between all the communities and between all those who practise any kind of religion. That does not mean that I will accept some of the heroes only to please them and since we have different heroes, no wonder the Foreign Minister characterises my speech as the voice of Israel. Since it came from such an important person in our political life, I think a word of defence is perfectly in order. We pride ourselves over being a democracy. We pride ourselves on being a secular country, on being a socialist country. In that whole region of west Asia, will my Foreign Minister point out to me what one country practises all these three qualities. To say this is not to approve every single act or every policy of any country. But so far as the basic requirements of democracy are concerned, which means freedom of internal debate and protest, commitment to the rule of law and the supremacy of the judiciary, a vigorous kind of socialism, it exists only in that desert, in one small oasis called Israel. And if for raising the voice of democracy, socialism and secularism, I happened to be characterised by the Foreign Minister as the voice of Israel, I am not ashamed of it, I am quite proud of it. I would rather be the voice of Israel than be the voice of forces which are feudal, which are ata-

vistic, which are the kind of forces which believe in religious hatred, religious violence, which believe in eliminating a small little country just because it happens to be inhabited by people who do not share their religious faith.

Now, may I say one word about each of the topics which I have in mind. Non-alignment was discussed. My speech is being misrepresented. The Bharatiya Janata Party which I represent and to which I have the honour to belong accepts non-alignment as a basic cornerstone of our foreign policy. But all that I have said before—and I wish to repeat—is, to my mind, somewhere along the growth, along the process of evolution of non-alignment movement, the non-alignment movement has come to be dominated by my Soviet friends. The Soviet and their supporters and admirers have overtaken this movement, and the movement is today very dear to them because it happens to further the purposes which they have dearest to their mind, to their heart. If this very movement tomorrow puts a spoke in the Russian wheel, they will be the very first ones to get up and protest that they do not like this non-aligned movement. They like it because at the moment it furthers their purposes and it is dominated by them.

I do not approve of the non-aligned movement because, over and above these forces, it has also been dominated and overtaken by the forces of religious fanaticism by whatever name they are called. I do not wish to point my finger at them. The Foreign Minister is too intelligent and too wise not to spot them, and I have no objection to India too in some sense making use of this non-aligned movement if it furthers our purposes. But basically my criticism remains that we are in a very bad company; we are in the company of people who do not share the internal values of our domestic politics and, therefore, we must be in that company knowing the dangers of it and knowing how, like a lotus, to keep ourselves aloft even when our roots are—you know where the roots of the lotus are.

Sir, I do not quite approve of our foreign

policy which is based upon bogus patriotism, and I want to give you an illustration of that bogus patriotism. Our territory, the Indian territory, the territory of *Bharat Mata*, is in occupation of at least two powers—China and Pakistan. But nobody in this House has ever got up and said this. Some years ago, all Members of this august House marched in assembly and passed a Resolution saying that we shall not rest in peace until the last inch of our soil is recaptured. Our territory, we forget. With China we have diplomatic relations. It is good that we have diplomatic relations. We should have diplomatic relations even with our enemies as far as we can afford it. I am one with Dr. Subramaniam Swamy that our relations with China must improve; our relations with Pakistan must improve. With Pakistan we have full relations today. But my patriot friends here who beat their breasts about patriotism are worried that some portion of Arab territory has been taken over by Israel and, therefore, they say, we should have no relations with Israel. To these great patriots I say only one thing—to them Indian territory is not important but the Arab territory in West Asia is much more important. Therefore, I am also intelligent enough to see through this joke and I see through this joke that somewhere for reasons of domestic politics, vote banks and sometimes for the attraction of petro-dollars and sometimes for the purpose of earning foreign exchange by my friends from Kerala going there and others from elsewhere also going there, we go on talking about these things but at least in the heart of our hearts we know where the truth lies and where the things go bad actually.

In Kampuchea, I want to ask my Foreign Minister—please tell us what is your policy. Are you in favour of the policy that the troops of North Vietnam must get out of that country or are you not? Sir, I am not a supporter of that murderer Lon Nol...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Pol Pot.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: ...or whatever name it is...Sir their names are onomatopoeic.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have given some other name.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I do not know what their names are. He also committed genocide. He was no better. It is only a difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. We do not hold any brief for any kind of a regime there. So long as the regime is a murderous regime, so long as it betrays and destroys human rights of the citizen, it will never have my approval. But we are least committed to the freedom of the countries in that region and the commitment to the freedom of the countries requires that we must use our moral influence and force for the purpose of getting foreign troops out of that country and my Foreign Minister will perhaps enlighten me as to what exactly he is trying to do.

One word about West Asia again. I want to ask a few questions because of your confusion. I wish to say in all seriousness that the resolutions and the policies which we have adopted in West Asia have committed that unfortunate region to a perpetual war. A thousand year war will rage in that territory if this is the solution which you have found for that particular problem. You are literally accelerating the biblical prophecy of an Armageddon. Only that will rescue West Asia in the condition in which you have put it today by the solution you are having. The rights of the Palestinians are very important. They are, I assure you, as dear to me as they are to you and as dear to every Indian. But it is my firm conviction that neither the methods of the PLO nor the methods of the surrounding Arab countries nor the methods of the Government of India will ever secure the recognition and enforcement of the rights of the unfortunate Palestinians. Once again—if the Palestinians have to make a success of their rights in that area, we will have to talk to them in the language of love, the language of affection, the language of Gandhiji which somehow we are ashamed of speaking. That problem will only be solved by the language of love. Unless the Arab countries and Israel build bridges of love, affection and trust, that is not possible. I want to ask the Foreign Minister. We have recognised Israel *de jure* and *de facto*. Does he ever advise our Arab

friends, 'You do likewise.' After all what Nehru found good for India must also be good for other Arab countries. Have you ever advised on that? Are you encouraging the Jeneva Accords? Are you applauding, appreciating and augmenting the work of one of the greatest men of history? According to me, one of the greatest men of history is President Sadat of Egypt. Are you trying to lend any assurance of strength to the work which he has initiated and which still lies incomplete?

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

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Two minutes more...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have got your own watch—I think...

AN HON. MEMBER: He is entirely different.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In the watch also there is some difference.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: If you, as Deputy Speaker, insist that I must stop, I will stop because I have too much respect for your office.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: But after two minutes.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, when all is said and done... I will wind up in half a minute. Sir, when all is said and done, let us recall what Pandit Nehru said...

SHRI R. L. BHATIA: That is your latest acquisition perhaps.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I knew. I read him and knew him very well even though I was not born here... Kya Baat Kar Rahe Ho?...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Even a single interruption sitting he cannot avoid.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: One clarification, Sir. Considering his age, even if it is true that he knew him even before he was born, here then, Sir, in which world was he then?

SHRI RAM JETHALMANI: One last sentence; and that is uttered by way of a question, rather than a statement from me.

Nehru told us that the keynote of India's foreign policy is going to be that we are going to advance the area of freedom. Tell me, how have you advanced the area of freedom during your limited tenure of office and let us understand how the area of freedom has increased after the great Pandit—Jawaharlal Nehru died. To my mind, we must remain anti-colonial to the hilt. We must not forget that our foreign policy was born out of a repulsion to colonialism. Yet, we will be acting foolishly if we do not take into account those new and subtle forms which neo-colonialism has taken in this world. Those forms are again forms which I do not wish either to recapitulate or to specify because it will irritate lot of friends. But those will be more dangerous than the colonialists because the colonialists have now withdrawn into their den — Britain, France, Holland, Germany, America. They have no intention now of conquering territories but they can only preserve the free way of life without subjugation, but my other friends continue to practice subjugation of territories. Poland and its workers are the latest example.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): May I suggest one thing? The whole speech may kindly be expunged from the record.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Shri G. M. Banatwalla. He will be the last speaker. He will please take 5 minutes.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I support the Demands for Grants brought up by the Ministry of External Affairs.

The policy formulation and the conduct of foreign policy is, by an large, in the right direction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it must be admitted that there are notable achievements in the area of our foreign policy.

The consensus in favour of selecting India as the site for the nonaligned summit under extraordinary circumstances is itself ample evidence of international confidence in India. I must say that our foreign policy truly reflects the aspirations and opinions of our people. When the Prime Minister and the Minister for External Affairs rose in this august House condemning the genocide of the Palestinians and the Lebanese perpetrated by Israel through inhuman and forbidden weapons, they were really voicing the deep grief, agony and the indignation of the people of India.

Anybody in a deranged condition of mind may try to equate Israel and China. But the United Nations in its wisdom and all the nations of the world have describe Israel as a racist entity like South Africa. That is a point that must be remembered.

The independence of Lebanon has to be maintained. There are various problems that engage our attention like the safeguarding and the security of the Palestinians living in Lebanon and security their rights to residence, freedom of movement and political and social activities.

15 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is a need to bring about an end to mass and individual arrests which are carried out on a political basis and to work for the release of the Palestinian prisoners detained in the Lebanese authorities prisons. The first and foremost point today is to secure an unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces in Lebanon. Of course, here are Syrian forces there, but, then, Sir, I must point out that very recently the Syrian Information Minister, Mr. Ahmed Iskander said in an interview in these words:—

“Syria is prepared to do anything which helps the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon.”

He further goes on to say —

“We have no objections to a simultaneous withdrawal if that would ach-

[Shri G. M. Banatwalla]

ieve Lebanon's legal sovereignty over all Lebanese soil."

This is the present situation in Lebanon.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there are various important points that must be remembered. Even the United Nations General Assembly had called for a total isolation of Israel. I must once again repeat and urge upon our Government for a closure of Israeli Consulate in Bombay. There is a limit to the patience of the people. I am afraid that if the Government does not act in this direction, perhaps the people would now act and rise to put a lock on the Israeli Consulate in Bombay. Further, though we may not have official trade with Israel, yet there is unofficial trade with Israel. The result is that there is black-listing of various Indian firms by the Arab countries. Sir, this is a point that must be taken into consideration and a proper ban on all trade should be imposed.

Sir, the Non-aligned Conference which met here recently in Delhi, had decided to request the International Community to set up a War Crime Tribunal in order to try Israel under the International Law for the crimes committed against the Palestinian people in all the territories which it has occupied since 1948. Every effort should be made to secure the setting up of this War Crime Tribunal. The Non-aligned Summit which met in New Delhi decided to press these various matters in the 38th Session of the United Nations General Assembly. I hope and I am sure that India will play an important part in this 38th Session of the United Nations in all these respects. It must be said that the boldness of Israelis because of the support of America to Israel. The United States of America and Israel are even threatening to attack the courageous Syria. I must say that in its support for Israel, the United States has stooped so low as to indulge into international gangsterism. We have the evidence of military manoeuvres by the United States in Libyan waters. There

has been also shooting down of Libyan planes inside Libyan airspace over the Gulf of Sirte, about 24 miles from the mainland.

The Summit of the Non-aligned which recently met in Delhi has also set up a Committee under the Chairmanship of India for the rights of the Arab Palestinian people led by P.L.O. We wish the Committee success.

Sir, I must also express my pain and agony at the repeated attacks on the holy Al Aqsa Mosque. Very recently on March 11, 1983, a number of armed Zionists tried to take over Al Aqsa. Diggings are being carried out at the foundations of Al Aqsa Mosque by Israel. Therefore, every step should be taken for the safety of the Mosque.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Kindly conclude.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: Sir, I must also refer in brief to various problems being faced by the world. Unfortunate war between Iran and Iraq continues. Every effort should be made to bring a cessation of hostilities there.

The situation in Cyprus also demands our attention. Sir, I may clarify that the Cyprus situation has resulted out of the efforts of the Greeks and the Greek Cypriots for the unification of Cyprus with Greece which is called ENOSIS and the consequent Turkish Cypriot determination to resist such a colonisation. Sir, in order to obtain this union with Greece, which is called ENOSIS, the attempts thereof also assumed a militant nature. An underground organisation named EOKA was established. It killed a large number of those opposing ENOSIS. Six thousand Turkish Cypriots were forced to abandon 33 villages as a result of the terrorism conducted by EOKA. Later there was the notorious AKRITAS Plan. Turkish Cypriot houses and properties in 103 villages were destroyed. Nearly 30,000 Turkish Cypriots became refugees. There was the massacre of November 1967. Then, Sir, the coup of 1974 for the take over of the Island by Greece and destruction of independence of Cyprus also was there. Sir, between 1963

and 1974 Turkish Cypriots were the target of attacks. Therefore, Turkey had to move in under the Treaty of Guarantee, thus safeguarding not only the independence of the Republic of Cyprus, but also saving the Turkish Cypriots from annihilation. Sir, I may say that the future of Cyprus is linked with the question of an independent, bi-communal Federal Republic. Let the inter-communal talks proceed on the basis of Makarios-Denktaş guidelines of 12th February, 1977 and the United Nations Resolution relevant to the Cyprus issue.

Sir, India now chairs the Non-Aligned Movement. Therefore, great are her responsibilities and I am sure that meaningful and effective steps will be taken in order to see that we succeed in various directions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir I will like to draw the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the League of Arab States Mission in New Delhi. It must be given a full diplomatic status. Sir, various countries like Austria, Argentina, Spain, Senegal and others have given such full diplomatic status to this Mission. I am sure the Government will come out and do the needful in the matter.

Sir, there are reports that a number of Indians today are languishing in jails in Pakistan for various reasons. I have written to the Hon. Minister of State for External Affairs in the matter. I was assured that the matter was being taken up with the Government of Pakistan and that an effort will be made to get them released and brought to our country.

Sir, before I conclude, I must once again support the demands for grants. I must reiterate that by and large the policy formulation and the conduct of foreign policy is in the right direction. However, the need is for a more vigorous thrust. This is especially because we now chair the non-aligned movement, and great are our responsibilities. We wish success in the discharge of all these responsibilities.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Sir, I have a point of order. On the floor of Parliament, a very distinguished Member of Parliament, Shri Banatwalla said that either we should close down the Consulate of Israel at Bombay; or, he would go there and lock it up. I hope he meant it only as a joke. Otherwise, the Bombay Police will have to be informed so that every body is safe (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. The Minister will now reply.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir As many as 25 hon. Members have participated in this debate, and I am grateful to them for their valuable contribution.

The day before yesterday, we had a 5-hour-long discussion in this House on the Non-Aligned Summit held in Delhi recently. It was natural that the same topic should have figured in this debate also to some extent; and, therefore, I would start my reply by informing the House about the follow-up that is being proposed after the Summit.

I would not repeat what I said about the content of the discussions in the Summit, because that would be repetitive. I would not like to do that. But the follow-up is something which I think hon. Members are entitled to know; and I am placing the details, whatever details I can place at the moment, before the House.

Evidently, we have adopted a document which has evoked a good deal of response from all over the world. So, it would be our first duty, to see that this document, the New Delhi Message, as well as the full document is transmitted to all the heads of State and heads of Government in the non-aligned movement, and this is being disseminated at the U.N. in New York, and also separately to the heads of the non-aligned movement. They have been here. It was they who adopted it, but as the host-country and as the Chairman of the movement, it is our

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

duty to transmit to them the Declaration and all the documents that went with it. Outside the movement, there are many important countries whose heads should know that these 101 non-aligned countries meeting here have brought out certain very important documents containing their views on global matters, and therefore, the Summit documents are being brought officially to the attention of the nuclear-weapon States, industrialized countries, and others outside the non-aligned movement, in order to obtain the support and cooperation of these States on specific suggestions contained in them.

Then, Sir, the Ministry, both at the headquarters as well as our Permanent Mission in New York, is being suitably strengthened by posting hand-picked extra staff, so as to cope with the work of our Chairmanship of the non-aligned movement. It is clear that this work is going to increase. We are almost completing those arrangements and that is another necessary step that is being taken.

As Chairman of the Movement, India will have to respond to requests of Member States on issues affecting them. For instance, for convening of meetings of the Coordinating Bureau in New York and the participation on behalf of the non-aligned movement in the meetings of the Security Council, this falls to the lot of the country which happens to be the Chairman of the Movement and, therefore, these are also being looked into and arrangements are being made. These actions are taken after consultation with other non-aligned countries in New York.

On the economic side, follow-up of decisions will be taken up at various international meetings on economic issues including the forthcoming G-77 meetings in Buenos Aires beginning next week, the UNCTA VI in June 1983, etc. Normally, the G-77 meetings are attended by our Minister of

Commerce, but since this meeting is taking place immediately after the Summit and since the Summit has come out with certain very important ideas and views in regard to the economic aspects of the movement and of the developing countries in general, it has been decided that in addition to the Minister of Commerce, India will also be represented by me and that I should go and explain the decisions, explain the views of the Non-Aligned Summit to the G-77.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: We welcome that.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: We welcome that.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We are also initiating consultations on the suggestions that the Members States of the United Nations should attend the 38th United Nations General Assembly Session at the level of the Heads of State or Government. You may recall that this call was given by the Prime Minister and this had been hailed all round and we shall take steps to see that this attendance of all the Heads of State and Government, as far as possible, becomes a reality because it will be a great occasion when they will be able to meet and exchange views on momentous issues of the world.

Suitable action will be taken at the appropriate time in respect of the undertaking given by the Chairperson on the Iran-Iraq conflict. Members would recall that the question of the Eighth Summit presented some difficulties during the Conference as also this substantive aspect of the Iran-Iraq conflict. Our Prime Minister, as Chairperson made a statement which actually brought the discussion, brought the dispute there to an end and in her capacity as Chairperson she had undertaken to do certain things to take certain steps in order to find a solution or in the direction of finding a solution to the Iran-Iraq conflict. Now, we have been considering how these steps have to be properly

ordered or timed. I would like to say that at the appropriate time, she will have to step in. We will have to find the appropriate time, but meanwhile, we are in constant touch through diplomatic channels both with Iran and Iraq; and at the appropriate time steps will have to be taken. I am stressing this because there is a tendency to ask me every week or every fortnight what we have been doing or what we propose to do. Now, if we are not doing anything for the next one month, please don't think that we are not doing anything because we have not thought about it. The truth of the matter is we have considered it in all its aspects and we find that for the next few weeks we should hold consultations through diplomatic channels rather than the Chair-person taking any overt step.

So, this is a decision, a well-considered decision and we are actually addressing ourselves to this question, from the day next to the Summit. We have not let any time be lost.

A Political Committee at Heads of State level has been set up under India's Chairmanship to work with the seven-member Arab Group for a just, durable and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. Steps are being taken for initiating consultations, for achieving the objectives of this machinery. Hon. Members are aware that the Arab Group has just made some visits and perhaps we would have to understand from them what the results of these visits have been and compare notes with them, how we could coordinate, how we could harmonise our steps, our efforts, with their efforts in order to find a comprehensive solution to the Middle East question.

The Asian Regional Meeting, preparatory to the international Conference on Palestine will take place in Malaysia in May. We shall take part in this meeting at Ministerial level. Similarly, we shall attend, at the appropriate level, the Conference on Namibia, at the end of April in Paris. Preparations for our participation in all these events are al-

ready in hand. A great deal of contact work and other activity lies ahead of us between now and September, 1983 to prepare opinions in support of the new programme of immediate measures, especially the Conference on Money and Finance for Development and the proposal that all Heads State should meet at the U. N. General Assembly session. On both these counts we will have to do a lot of preparatory work and that is being taken up.

These are some of the important points on which decisions have been taken for initiating action and therefore the decisions of the Summit are being followed up in the right manner and with all possible expedition.

Sir, I shall now take up certain specific points raised during the course of the debate and I would like to place before the House certain factual information in regard to these points.

Some Members raised the question of India's relations with certain important areas of the world, Latin America for instance. I would like to assure the Members that we are very conscious of the need to improve, deepen, widen our relations with the countries of Latin America both in the economic field and in the cultural field.

15.23 hrs

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

You will be happy to know, that during the last three years this process has been considerably increased, considerably widened, and we have several cultural delegations being exchanged between India and the countries of Latin America, business delegations have been exchanged, and we have taken all steps to see that our relations with those countries are stepped up.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: What about Parliamentary delegations

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Oh! Yes!

MR. SPEAKER: We sit here and you still ignore us?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I shall transmit that request right here, on the floor of the House, to you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: All right.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: About the Middle-East I do not have to say in any great detail as to how close our relations with the countries of the Middle East are and what we have been doing to give them all political support, not just today, not when petro-dollars have become visible, but since a very long time. As I said the other day, we have centuries old relations with those countries, and to say that we have suddenly woken up to this friendship when we saw petro-dollars coming or the prospect of petro-dollars coming, is, to say the least, unfair.

About Israel, I am glad that Mr. Jethmalani finally has expressed his happiness at being called what I called him. So, there is no quarrel between us. I called him just what he is proud to be called. There the matter ends and I do not have to make any further comments.

MR. SPEAKER: That is how intelligent people fight.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: A point was raised about the Commonwealth. The question was asked: what is India's role in the Commonwealth; how does India fit into the Commonwealth at all? Now, I would like to say that the decision to remain in the Commonwealth was taken after due consideration. It is true that the Commonwealth again is a heterogeneous body. There are no unified opinions in the Commonwealth. In fact, about three-fourths of the Commonwealth countries are in the Non-Aligned Movement. So, you will see that certain harmonisation of positions that takes place in the Commonwealth is to some advantage to us, because it will be possible for us to some extent, to influence the opinions,

the views, of those who do not agree with us, with whom we have very clear differences of perception. That is how the forum of the Commonwealth is generally used. But apart from this, we have certain programmes of economic assistance and cooperation within the Commonwealth. They are progressing rather well. I do not think that we should fritter away those advantages just because we do not happen to agree with certain other countries of the Commonwealth on political issues. It is well known that we do not agree with them. Some of them have been colonial powers; some of them have been powers under whom we have been the colonies. Therefore, on political questions, it is not to be expected that we agree with them. We cannot. But we can take certain positions which to some extent, alter their own positions and, to that extent, there is an advantage.

About the Indian Ocean, again, I do not want to repeat all the arguments which were advanced on both sides the other day. The only point which I would like to make is that, as I have stated earlier, may be last year, may be year before last, this understanding of what is termed as equating one super power with another, is really not adequate. There is no question of equating one with the other, because there are a host of issues on which one side agrees with us. There are certain issues on which the other side agrees with us. So, there is no question of equating. If agreement comes from one side, we welcome that agreement. If the agreement comes from the other side on certain other issues, we welcome that too. But this does not mean that we are equating. Do we say, because some power agrees with us, we should reject that agreement? We just cannot. Therefore, I neither call this equi-distance nor equation. I call this the situation as it exists today. We are non-aligned, therefore, we do not believe in alliances. We are against alliances and have us allies as such; but we are all for agreements on individual issues on merit. Therefore, if on merit

they agree with us, there is no question of our equating one with the other and that kind of projection of our policy, I may submit, is not correct.

Then, Sir, the question of neighbours. Questions have been asked about our relations with Pakistan. I would like to submit to the House that the friendship treaty which we have proposed and the no-war pact which they have proposed are both under consideration.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:
For how long?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: As long as they are not sorted out. The Joint Commission has been agreed to and in spite of the fact that all the Heads including our Prime Minister were breathlessly busy during the Summit. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: You would not mind that he is impetuous because he is still young.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I do not mind.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: What was the reaction of Pakistan to our suggestion that Pakistan should not offer any of its occupied territory for military use by any foreign power? What was the reaction of Pakistan?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:
Under negotiations?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would like to inform Prof. Chakraborty that when we have given them a draft for a friendship treaty, naturally that would contain elements which he is referring to and when I say that it is still on the table under discussion.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:
Under negotiations.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Therefore it is still under discussion. If we had not had these differences in per-

ception, there would not have been any need to continue the discussion still. It so happens that both, in their no-war pact and in our friendship treaty, there are certain common elements but there are certain elements on which agreement could not be arrived at so far. Therefore, they are under discussion. The Joint Commission has been established. We are going to have the first meeting of the Joint Commission by mutual convenience at the earliest possible time.

Then, a question was raised about cultural and trade relations. I would like to inform the hon. Member who raised this question that we on our part are prepared for an enlargement of trade relations, are prepared for an enlargement of cultural relations but it so happens that from the Pakistan side there has been reluctance for what they may consider good reasons. We will not go into that since they are a sovereign country. But they have so far not shown the readiness to expand trade relations except on a government-to-government basis. Recently they have exempted a few items but even on those items no trade has really been expanded or enlarged. So, that seems to be the position but I hope that with the Joint Commission having taken off it should be possible, it would be possible, to go afresh into these questions. Wherever there is a hitch, we could look into that and see what can be done. The idea of having a Joint Commission was that wherever progress is not up to the mark, not satisfactory, we should at once pay some special attention to those areas and see that relations between the two countries are developed as both the countries went to develop them. Of course, the question of induction of arms is there. That is coming in the way of rapid normalisation, improvement of relations; that creates tension, that creates suspicion. A mini-arms race has started in the sub-continent. All these fall-outs are there. We cannot wish them away. We take note of them. We tell them again and again and yet again that

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

this is unnecessary, they need not embark on this, but they seem to have other ideas evidently and, therefore, we will have to live with this dialogue with them and we also have to take into account that in our neighbourhood all this escalation of tension as a result of sophisticated arms is taking place and we have to ask ourselves as to what we should do to meet the situation. This position will continue.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:

Much more reasonable this time.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:

About Bangladesh, a question was raised in regard to Tin Bigha. I would like to inform the Hon. Member that we are fully aware of the position in regard to Tin Bigha, and particularly the possibilities or the danger that has been mentioned, about one of our areas becoming cut off from the rest of the country. This has been taken care of. While the terms of the lease deed are being worked out, we have taken care to see that this does not happen. We are in touch with the Government of West Bengal. I would like to assure the hon. Members that nothing will be done to isolate any part of the country from the rest of the country.

About Sri Lanka and the stateless persons, the present position is hopeful the Minister concerned, Shri Tondaman himself, the President of the Ceylon Workers' Congress and now the Minister of Rural Industries Development, has said that sensible basis for the solution of the problem of statelessness would be for Sri Lanka to accept all those who wish to become Sri Lankan citizens. Since we have no agreement subsisting at the moment, we will have to find a way of solving this problem, and this is the direction in which presumably the Government of Sri Lanka are considering the problem. We agree that this is a very satisfactory way of solving it, and we would also pursue action in that direction.

About Nepal, as hon. Members know, our relations are good and whatever, agreements, and other cooperation schemes were being considered between the two governments, we have been able to make some headway. But we would like to make more progress in these things, and I think on both sides there is a desire to make greater progress, for which we are proceeding on the right lines. There was some newspaper report to the effect that there was some displeasure on the part of the Nepalese delegation, which attended the Non-aligned Summit. I would like to state categorically that there is no truth, no basis, for thinking on these lines; there was no question of causing any displeasure to them, as there was no question of causing displeasure to anyone, on any score whatsoever.

Coming to China and Tibet, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy particularly raised this point. I would like to reiterate the Government's position that Tibet is an integral part of the People's Republic of China and the the Government of India have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of any other country. That is our position and that continues to be our position. In fact, when Mr. Huang Hua came here, during our discussions I had brought to his notice that, while we are readily co-operating with them on all matters on which they feel sensitive, the same is not being done by them; this I pointed out to him. So, there is no question of any departure from our policy in regard to Tibet. If any members have said any thing which goes counter to the policy, I have not come across any such statements. But I would like to say that this is the policy, and this has to be accepted by the members of my party. There is no question of their not accepting it.

Sir, there was this question no about our relations with the United States, particularly in the light of the visa granted to Mr. Jagjit Singh Chauhan. I would like to inform the House that this matter has been taken up with them quite forcefully. Some time back the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Shultz, had written to me to say that we need not agree on all questions and still we could improve our relations. In general that is true, we do not

have to agree with all countries on all questions in order to improve relations bilaterally. But then, this particular question happens to be one on which relations cannot but be affected. You cannot treat them as one of those differences which do not affect our friendship, need not affect our relations. The reason, is simple, that this is a matter which concerns the integrity of the country and when it concerns the integrity of one of the countries, it has a different discussion. I would certainly say that if we had done a similar thing in a matter which concerned the integrity of the United States, they would have had the same right to tell me that our difference in this goes to the root of the matter. It is not one of those differences in perception in regard to matters in which we are not vitally interested. Therefore, this stands on a different footing. This has been conveyed.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: What is the reason? What is the explanation given to this? You have withdrawn the Passport of Chauhan. Even then they had given a Visa. What is the answer given to this?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I need not point out to Mr. Yadav that we do not really get instant answers to everything that we say.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: You did not get the answer. Then it is all right. This is what I wanted to know.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Or a different answer.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Sir, may I make an interruption? I had seen a press speculation that the Indian Government is also encouraging Rican secessionists to visit India. I saw this in the newspaper. I would like to know whether you have come across this kind of a reaction.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Never heard of it.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Have you heard of Puerto Rico?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes. What have you said about that?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, SPORTS AND WORKS AND HOUSING: (SHRI BUTA SINGH): Do not believe in speculations.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Have you seen Puerto Rico?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Yes. I have visited it. Do not believe in speculations.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I asked him the question to get clarification.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He does not believe in them. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you think he has been keeping company with Satyasadhanji?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Sir, in that case he is a bull.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: One point raised by Prof. Chakraborty related to the IMF etc., and he seemed to have some objection to our policy of taking loan from the IMF and also seeking to restructure it. He seems to find some contradiction in this. I would like to point out to him that there is no contradiction. We go on taking loans from the World Bank and IMF on terms which are acceptable to us and at the same time, agitating for a restructuring of these institutions. There is no difficulty, there is no contradiction between the two and if we cannot take a loan from them until they are restructured, we will never be able to get any loan from them. *(Interruptions)*. Therefore, the contradiction which he saw is no contradiction in the real sense.

About the working of our missions Shri Chandrajit Yadav directly and some other Members also not so directly raised some very important points. He was pleased to say and I am grateful to him for the compliments which he has paid to our missions, to some of our official and so on. But he was pleased to say that when Members of Parliament go to other countries, our missions and Ambassadors only treat them to a good dinner. I do not know if that is held against the ambassadors. I

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

am not sure. But he says that they have no arranged meetings with important persons of those countries. I would like to point out. I made some enquiries on this. It so happens if M.Ps. find time, if M.Ps and others go from here and if they have time to spare and if they notify our missions in advance, it will be possible to arrange meetings. But if they are rushing in transit, they are in that capital for three hours and if they wish to see the President of that country within those three hours, I am afraid, this is not going to be possible. Sometimes it may be possible. It is quite possible that he may be having free time, and you may go and have a chat with him. But that is different. But it is not generally arranged that way. It should not be expected to be arranged that way. Therefore, I would certainly be happy if more and more Members of Parliament are able to talk to Members of Parliament in other countries or V.I.Ps or Heads of Government or Foreign Ministers or any responsible persons in those countries. But these meetings have to be arranged properly. Take our own example. When a Foreign Minister wants to come here, the dates are notified two or three months in advance. We cannot accept certain dates. Other dates they cannot accept. Therefore finally we have to come to certain agreed dates, and agreed times and so on. Therefore, it is a logistic problem. It is not a problem of our ambassadors not being able to do that. I would like to inform the House that as far as I have seen and I have seen quite a few countries and the way our missions have been functioning there, in the matter of having access to the Government of that country, in the matter of being able to arrange meeting with dignitaries of that country, Head of Government and so on, our ambassadors are in no way less effective than any other ambassador. In fact they are much more effective than many others. Therefore, there is no question of their not being able to arrange meetings. It is only a problem of logistics and that can be taken care of if sufficient time and information is given to them.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: Our own ambassadors do not have the time even to meet the visiting Members of Parliament. This is the situation. Therefore, my request is that what you have said just now should be conveyed to them.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: There may be dishonourable exceptions everywhere. But I am talking of the rule. As a rule they receive them. They get them received. Someone goes from the mission and they are given all courtesies.

Shri Chandrajit Yadav also raised the question of some prestigious missions and needy missions. There was a kind of contrast between the two. I would like to inform him and the House, that as I had promised in 1980, 1981, 1982 this elaborate exercise of axing some of the so-called prestigious missions. I do not call them prestigious but they are big missions. For historical reasons they have come to be big missions. It means, the personnel there are more than other missions and they have been there for a long time—Whenever we have found that there is need and there is possibility of reducing the staff from those missions and utilising that staff and other missions, we have done that. Particularly, in the WANA Division where the number of Indians has grown, and, therefore, the consular and other duties of the Missions have also increased enormously, this has been done. This is what I would like to inform the House. In the case of London, the total number of posts was reduced from 382 in 1979 to 260, that is, in one Mission, there was a reduction of more than 100 posts. The same was done—not to that extent but to the extent possible—in Washington, Katmandu, and all these personnel released from these Missions have been deployed in the WANA region, that is, West Asia and North Africa. In this region alone, we have given them 50 additional posts to cope with the increased work. We are again looking into the matter. A committee headed by one of our veteran diplomats, Shri Samar Sen has been appointed recently. That committee has been charged with the duty of going into all those details and coming up with

further recommendations and that committee has started its work and we will look into the recommendations of the Committee.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Will they be allowed to travel abroad for on-site inspection ?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : That decision has not yet been taken. But I presume that if there is any need, there is nothing wrong in it. Generally all the material that is needed for their consideration is available at headquarters. Therefore, unless at the last moment it is found that a visit or two are necessary, they would remain here, and examine the matter.

Finally, Sir, about the 1923 Emigration Act, a point was just raised. I would like to inform the House that the matter of emigration, you know is now being dealt with by the Ministry of Labour. We are in touch with them. The Bill is ready. I am not sure when they are going to introduce it. The Labour Minister will be able to tell the House. I know this as a fact that the Bill is ready in all respects because we have all worked on it and it will be introduced at the earliest.

Finally, I would like to thank all hon. Members for their very valuable contribution. As I said, the points in regard to the Non-Aligned Movement etc., need not be reiterated. All opinions that have come in favour of the Movement throw light on different aspects of the Movement. So, they are all correct in their own way but they are not the whole truth. The stress that has been laid on different aspects of non-alignment and the Non-Aligned Movement are all true. I would like to assure the House that India as chairman of the Movement will do all that is in its power to see that the Movement is strengthened. And not only that, the Non-Aligned Movement today is just pitching its base camp as the Prime Minister put it at the Summit it is not really a movement that has reached the summit. It is only a base camp

and, therefore, the climb is going to be hard and we are going to need full support both at home and in other countries. And I am sure, this august House will give us support.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA (Bombay South) : Sir, before he concludes, I would like to elicit one information from the hon. Minister. The United Nations Human Rights Commission has passed strictures regarding the persecution of the people in Iran by the Khomani regime. We do not interfere in the internal affairs of anybody. But what is the stand of our Government as far as the trampling under foot of the human rights concerned ? Have we declared ourselves in favour of safeguarding human rights in Iran ?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am not concentrating on one country and I do not think it is fair.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Take a stand.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The Human Rights Commission is deliberating on several issues, on several countries and on several areas; and, of course it has got its own aberrations. We send our representative Mr. Bhagat had been there and we have done our duty by taking a right stand in the Human Rights Commission.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : No, Mr. Rajda, Not allowed.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV : Sir, I want to know just one small thing. I want to know whether the Foreign Minister has deliberately not replied.

AN HON. MEMBER : Kampuchea.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV : Not Kampuchea. It should not be all the time on your mind. You just have a little patience and you will know.

[Shri Chandrajit Yadav]

I had said that certain forces are indulging in destabilising activities in our country. Certain reports have appeared in newspapers in the country and abroad. The Foreign Minister had assured us in the Consultative Committee that he will give information about that. I wanted to know whether he does not want to say anything or he has got some information. I am asking this because we are very much concerned about what those forces are doing here.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
What about the balkanisation plan ?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have not deliberately replied to that.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV : This is what I wanted to know, I hope, you are taking full care of that.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now put all the cut motions together to vote unless any member desires that any of his cut motions may be put separately. I put

all the cut motions together to the vote of the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the Demand for Grant relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

The question is :

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1984 in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 32 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

Demand for Grant 1983-84 in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs voted by Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 18th March, 1983		Amount of Demand for Grant voted by the House	
		Revenue	Capital	Revenue	Capital
1	2	3	4	5	6
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Ministry of External Affairs	31,13,88,000	6,33,83,000	155,69,41,000	31,69,17,000
------------------------------	--------------	-------------	---------------	--------------