

I. Accounts (1984-85) of the Aligarh Muslim University and related papers.

II. Accounts (1984-85) of the University Grants Commission, New Delhi and related papers.

III. Accounts (1983-84) of the North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, and related papers.

IV. Notification of the University of Pondicherry notifying addition and substitution of statute (4) of the Pondicherry University Act, 1985

THE MINISTER OF STATE (EDUCATION AND CULTURE) (SHRIMATI KRISHNA SAHI): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table—

I. A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following papers:—

(i)(a) Annual Accounts of the Aligarh Muslim University Aligarh, for the year 1984-85, and the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (4) of section 35 of the Aligarh Muslim University Act, 1920.

(b) Statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the papers mentioned at (a) above.

[Placed in Library See No. LT—2720/86 for (a) to (b)].

(ii) (a) Annual Accounts of the University Grants Commission, New Delhi, for the year 1984-85 and the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (4) of section 19 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956.

(b) Statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the papers mentioned at (a) above.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT—2721/86 for (a) and (b)].

(iii) (a) Certified Annual Accounts of the North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, for the year 1983-84, and the Audit Report thereon.

(b) Statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the papers mentioned at (a) above.

Placed in Library, See No. LT—2722/86 for (a) and (b)].

II. A copy (in English and Hindi) of the University of Pondicherry Notification No. PCU/A Estt.25/85, dated the 7th February, 1986, notifying additions and substitution to statute (4) of the Pondicherry University, Act, 1985, under sub-section (2) of section 41 of the said Act [Placed in Library. See No. LT—2724/86].

Notification of Ministry of Health and Family Welfare publishing the Prevention of Food Adulteration (First Amendment) Rules, 1986

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI S. KRISHNA KUMAR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table under sub-section (2) of section 23 of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954, a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Department of Health) Notification G.S.R. No. 73(E), dated the 29th January, 1986, publishing the Prevention of Food Adulteration (First Amendment, Rules, 1986. [Placed in Library See No. LT—2725/86]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

SHRI P. BABUL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I beg to present the Seventieth Report (in English and Hindi) of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Ethnic Problem in Sri Lanka

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka and the

outcome of the recent visit of the Indian Delegation to that country.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER):
Mr. Chairman, Sir...

An Indian delegation led by Shri P. Chidambaram, Minister of State for Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions visited Colombo from April 29 to May 4, 1986. The delegation included Shri Romesh Bhandari, Special Representative for Sri Lanka.

The delegation had extensive and detailed discussions with President Jayewardene, the Minister for National Security, Mr. Lalith Athulathmudali and the Minister for Lands and Land Development and Mahaveli Development, Mr. Gamini Dissanayake. The delegation also exchanged views with the Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka Mr. A. C. S. Hameed, the leaders of all political parties including Mrs. Bandaranaike, as well as representatives of ethnic minority groups in Sri Lanka.

As a result of these discussions, the delegation returned with some more detailed formulations on the extent to which the Sri Lanka Government is willing to meet Tamil political aspirations. While there has been some movement on issues like the overall structure for devolution of power and land settlement policy, there are still a number of crucial gaps in the formulations on core issues like law and order and on the nature of the relationship between the present Northern and Eastern provinces which are issues to which Tamils attach great importance.

Government are evaluating the formulations received from the Sri Lanka Government. The Sri Lanka Government has also been requested to communicate their views on certain alternative formulations. In our view what can be put to the Tamil side is only a package of proposals which are evaluated as constituting a fair and reasonable basis for a negotiated settlement. Since the process is continu-

ing, it would be premature to draw any firm conclusions.

It is our clear position that unless the Government of Sri Lanka takes decisive steps to accommodate the Tamil aspirations, the political process which has been re-started after a gap of time may suffer a setback. Government are of the firm view that the process towards a political solution must be carried forward urgently and that there can be no military solution to the ethnic dispute. The basic and urgent objective which India has in mind is to find a peaceful and durable political solution to the long-pending ethnic problem of Sri Lanka. Government are keen to ensure that a solution is arrived at within a compressed timeframe so that the agony and sufferings of the people of Sri Lanka, and particularly of the Tamils in the Northern and Eastern provinces, are brought to a quick end. Government condemn the continuing violence in Sri Lanka which is vitiating the atmosphere for working towards a peaceful solution. The return of normalcy to Sri Lanka is not only essential for the further well being of that country but also for the stability and peace in the region.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the very outset I accuse the Government of India of becoming a pawn in the betrayal game of Sri Lanka. All your attempts, your attitude and approach, your foreign policy on this issue have ended in total fiasco and failure. You have failed to learn a lesson from the long, bitter historical experience of continuous deception and betrayal by successive Sri Lankan Government.

In your statement you have stated that you are trying to arrive at a political solution. But, Sir, I would like to know from the Minister when the Indian delegation recently visited Sri Lanka, on what points the Sri Lankan Government was agreeable to the demands of the Tamils. Sir, the reports say that Sri Lankan Government will not agree to the northern and eastern provinces to be treated as one unit. But may I say, after the recommenda-

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

tions of the Choksi Commission in 1955 when Bandaranaike had an agreement with Selvanayakum in 1957, this is the verbatim text of the Bandaranaike-Selva Pact. According to this Pact, it is clear that there will be Regional Councils in the northern and eastern provinces. There may be more than one Council in the eastern province, but if the Regional Councils so desire, they could amalgamate beyond the provincial limits. This was agreed to in 1957. Of course that Pact was abrogated unilaterally by the Government. After 30 years, after all these sufferings after all this agony and anguish, now the Government is telling that they will not agree to such a demand; only within the framework of Sri Lanka they could accept certain devolution of powers. May I know from the Government whether the Sri Lankan Government will agree on the land question—that the land question should be decided by the Regional Councils? Of course, they do not agree to that.

Sir, during 1984, when Mr. Jayewardene came here and had a discussion with our late Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi, he agreed to let the Tamil leaders, when they went to the all-party conference, put this demand. "I will not object to the demand of treating the northern and eastern provinces as one unit", he said. But what happened when they went there to attend the all-party conference? They were not permitted to put forth this demand. So this is the betrayal, this is the reception every time. What happened to the 1957 agreement? What happened to the 1965 agreement? And what happened to the assurance given by Mr. Jayewardene in 1984? Annexure 'C' which was issued and was to be included in the agenda for the all-party conference was not included. Why does Jayewardene Government now and then come and offer that it is prepared for a solution? Last year the Aid Consortium meeting was fixed on 21st June regarding grant of aid to Sri Lanka. Some

of the human rights organizations in their campaign prevailed upon the AID consortium countries not to give aid to Sri Lanka. On 1st June Mr. Jayawardene came here. He met our honourable Prime Minister. He agreed for a ceasefire. He agreed for the talks at Thimphu just to hoodwink India as well as the world. What happened afterwards? They succeeded in getting 482 million dollars from AID consortium countries, that is, exactly eight million dollars more than the previous year. Immediately he started purchasing arms, gunboats, battle ships and war planes from Great Britain, Pakistan, Israel and also South Africa. Sir, in the middle of June the AID consortium meeting is going to take place. Therefore, Sri Lanka wants an alibi again. Last year they had an alibi and know also they are going to have an alibi.

Sir, every time, under the pretext of negotiations and continuing talks they have succeeded in gaining time, buying time, to strengthen their armed forces, to mobilize their armed forces and to purchase armaments from many countries. When these talks were going on in Sri Lanka, what happened? The statement says that talks were held with the Sri Lankan Minister for National security, Mr. Lalith Athulathmudali. But I would like to ask whether Mr. Lalith Athulathmudali, the hardliner, was present at the final round of talks. No, where had he been? He had been to Israel. It is very clear from press reports that when Mr. Chidambaram and our delegation were staying in Sri Lanka, Mr. Lalith Athulathmudali went to Israel to seek more support for an all-out military offensive against the Tamils. Is it not an insult to India is it not a humiliation to India is it not a slap in your face? But you are capable of stomaching and digesting any amount of humiliations, any amount of insults and any amount of slaps. Sir, Mr. Jayawardene in his recent interview to Jhon Mills of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation on 18th April stated: "Pakistan

is a better friend. India has double standards." So we cannot be friendly with a person with double standards." He also said: "India got annoyed with our reply and asked Bhandari not to go here." "It was fortunate," he says, "not necessary." But you have no shame on your part to go and sit there. Sir, Chamberlain becomes a pigmy before you. How many times have you not been hoodwinked? Now, in his recent interview, Mr. Jayawardane stated: 'Unless these proposals are accepted by the Tamils, I will unleash the troops.' Sir, these proposals do not indicate even the minimum powers. Do we expect the Tamils to live in seritude and slavery? And then, Sir, Sri Lanka is getting arms from Pakistan and sending its soldiers to Pakistan to get training. They are getting arms from U. K. and the British commandos—the SAS—are manning the raids and attacks. It has also been proved that their aeroplanes and helicopters are manned by foreign pilots—Pakistani pilots, Israeli pilots, South African pilots and U.K. pilots. And they have agreed that South African personnel were involved in this. Sir, our hon. Prime Minister on the 5th of March was replying to the President's Address on the floor of this House. During his reply I interrupted and sought a clarification and said, "You have advocated sanctions against South Africa. But Sri Lanka is getting arms and armaments from South Africa. They are having trade relations with South Africa. Is Sri Lanka a member of the Commonwealth or not? Has at any point of time the Government of India taken up this particular issue with the Sri Lankan President?" My question was an embarrassing question because you are beating your drum that you are the only Messiah for the Negroes of South Africa. For that purpose you are also going to fly this evening. My question was irritating and embarrassing. I am sorry to say that our hon. Prime Minister was very much angry with me. He called me ignorant. Yes, I accept, I am an ignorant man. But exactly after six days the same

question was raised by the representative of Bulgaria in the United Nations. What question the Sri Lankan delegate accepted. "Yes, we are having trade relations with South Africa." Now you say who is ignorant. Your veil of hypocrisy was torn by my question.

Sir, today, at the very present moment, aerial bombing is going on on the one side. There is sea-shelling on the other side. There is fire in the land. They cannot go to the fields because their areas have been declared protected zones and surveillance zones. (Time bell rings) Three more minutes, Sir.

They cannot go to their fields, they cannot go for fishing. They are subjected to virtual starvation. More than 10,000 Tamils have been killed so far. More than 200,000 persons have left their homes, 1,50,000 have come to India and another 50,000 have crossed different seas and gone to different lands. Their cultural treasures have been totally destroyed. On 21st April, Selvasmadi, the most venerated Murugan Temple in Tondaimannar in the Jaffna District was attacked by the Srilankan army and was destroyed. Two priests were gunned down or shot down inside the sanctum sanatorium, inside the Karbagraha. The most glorious and historic chariot of the Temple was gutted to ashes. Why are they doing all these things? Not only to annihilate the Tamils but to destroy every vestige of the Tamil culture and civilisation. That is why our sisters and mothers are raped. That is why our cultural treasures are destroyed. That is why our hon. Prime Minister called it genocide on the very floor of this House on the 16th of August, 1983. When it is a case of genocide, is it only an internal matter of Sri Lanka. Sir, To-day they have lost all their hopes. Sir, this is a photograph of the head of a small child spouting in blood because of the aerial bombings.

I will take only one or two minutes, please. I have confined myself because my learned colleagues are there.

Mr. Jayewardene says, "Unless you lay down your arms, I am not prepared even for a dialogue with you. This

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

question is bothering everybody's mind. Sir, for 30 years they have been patiently, through peaceful means, agitating. They never took up arms in 1950s and 1960s, till late 1970s.

The moment they lay down their arms, I warn you, our Tamil population there will be totally liquidated. This time also you have become an alibi to consortium. The consortium is going to give aid. They have already started campaigning to get more arms. I warn you the 1983 July massacre will be repeated this year in July, 1986 also. This is going to happen. Definitely it is going to happen and the July massacre is going to be repeated in all its barbarity and severity. Therefore, is it not the duty and responsibility of this Government to urge upon the Aid Consortium not to give any further aid to Sri Lanka? Is it not the duty of this Government to mobilise public opinion and also the international public opinion and raise this issue that the international forums? Have you ever raised the issue in the United Nations before? Only last year when Argentina raised, we objected to it. Have you ever raised the issue in the Commonwealth?

SHRI R. MOHANARANGAM (Tamil Nadu): Our State hon. Minister, Mr. Ramachandran and Mr. Ramakrishnan, MP, have already raised this issue on the floor of the United Nations.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, the Government has failed in this regard. It is time that it comes within its senses. I would urge upon the Government not to play this role of alibi in the hands of Jayewardene. I would request the Government to give an ultimatum to Sri Lanka unless you stop this genocide, we will break away our diplomatic relations. I would also request the Government to be prepared to undertake every possible means, including the military intervention, to solve this problem. This is an important demand. Yes, when our own fishermen have been killed, 96 of them were assaulted within our territorial water; the other day, Mr. Nara-

yanan said we cannot protect inch by inch our fishermen. I would ask then what for are you keeping your army and navy? Therefore, with pain and agony, I would request the Government to give up this vacillating, incoherent and low-key approach to this problem and take effective steps and restructure your policy to protect the lives of the Tamils there.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): The statement made by the hon. Minister for External Affairs is greatly disappointing. I expected from the new Minister a positive approach to this problem and hoped that there would be some indication as to what policy the Government of India would like to adopt for solving this complex problem, but once again the Statement confirms the vacillating policy of the Government of India in this respect and once again it reiterates the pious hopes that a political solution would be found to the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka. The Minister said that the Government are of the firm view that the process towards a political solution must be carried forward urgently. I do not know what he means by 'urgently', because for the last few years we have been hearing the same cliché and the same wording in every statement made by the Government in this House and the other House. While the Government of India hopes that a political solution would be found to this problem, on the other side we hear Jayawardene speaking and asserting of a military solution to this problem. Yesterday's newspapers carried an interview by Jayewardene to Sunday Times in which he not only accused our country or backing Tamil separatists, but also threatened if his latest proposal for a limited degree of federalism was not accepted, the Government would opt for a military solution and unleash its troops. He said that India and the West must realise that Sri Lanka would be left with no other option, but to seek a military solution. Sir, he says that he would unleash his troops. What else he has been doing all these years since he came to power in 1977. He made it a virtual policy to annihilate

the Tamil race in Sri Lanka. Every measure adopted by him was aimed at removing the traces of this race from Sri Lanka and amounted to virtual genocide. Sir, we all know how the Tamil population in the northern and eastern areas of Sri Lanka is being gradually eroded by bringing in more Sinhalese people into those areas. The Sinhalese who number only 10,000 earlier, today number more than 3 lakhs in the same area. The Tamils in Sri Lanka has been given a secondary status and Sinhalese policy is being adopted right from 1956. There is discrimination in jobs, even in representation in the Parliament. The Tamils are at a disadvantage, because they got only 18 per cent of representation as against their population which accounts for 30 per cent. The Tamils in Sri Lanka are fighting with their backs to the wall and they have been waging a desperate battle to retain their identity and to maintain their cultural heritage. Sir, several riots took place, but since the worst riot took place in 1983, the position of the Tamils has become more vulnerable in this island. Today more than one lakh people are in refugee camps in Sri Lanka itself. In Trincomalee at one place there are 50,000 refugees. Today in India we have more than 1½ lakh refugees from Sri Lanka. About 50,000 people have fled to other countries in Europe like Canada and Australia. This is the position of the Tamils today in Sri Lanka. This is the fate of the race which played such vital role in the development of Sri Lanka for centuries.

Sir, we have all along been asserting that we do not want break up of Sri Lanka. Whatever solution the Tamils majority have been suggesting we have been pleading only a solution within the Constitutional framework of Sri Lanka. But even that is not acceptable to Jayewardene. He wants to completely erase the Tamil race from Sri Lanka. Sir, we are all aware, how many times he has broken his promise to which every time he agreed to something. He broke the promise. He broke the accord. Even at Thimpu talks whatever little was agreed upon, Jayewardene had not stuck to this. He went back on every agreement.

Sir, the Sri Lanka Government is acquiring more and more military hardware. Today a small tiny island and a poor country like Sri Lanka is spending nearly 20 per cent of its revenue on defence, that is, Rs. 600 crores nearly per year. That itself shows the way of thinking of the Sri Lankan Government and how they want to solve this problem also.

Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Gopalsamy has rightly pointed out that they are not only getting arms from Pakistan, South Africa and Israel, but they are also getting their people trained by these people. He mentioned one organisation in Britain which is particularly training these Sri Lankan Armed Forces. A security force from Kinimiri services based in the channel islands of South England coast has said that Sri Lanka Government had hired their men to train Sri Lankan Armed Forces at a cost of R 3,800 per month. He is acquiring more and more arms to strengthen himself. Not only that he is giving bases to western powers also and particularly the Western powers have an eye on the Trincomalee harbour. They want to have a base there so that they can threaten India's security also. And the Government of India appears to be treating this problem purely as an internal problem of Sri Lanka, and that is why there is this vacillation. Several times, it is said, "It is a problem concerning another nation. What can we do?" The Prime Minister in his discussions with us several times mentioned, "It is a problem concerning the other country. We have got our own limitations." But, Sir, can we completely treat it as an internal problem? When so many refugees are coming to this country, when people of Indian origin are suffering, when a virtual genocide is taking place in a neighbouring country, we cannot keep our eyes shut. We have raised such issues in the comity of nations. For example, there is the South African issue; it is a parallel to this. What did we do in Bangladesh when similar things happened earlier? I do not immediately champion military intervention as we did in Bangladesh. At least there should be a threat; there should be an ultimatum to Mr. Jayewardene that unless he solves the problem, India cannot continue to keep

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

quite and keep the people also within control. Therefore, some kind of an ultimatum has to be given to Mr. Jayewardene so that he will come to his senses.

I also feel that we have not exhausted all the international forums. Though the matter was raised in the Human Rights Commission, still in the UNO itself, it should have been raised. This has not been done. Even in the Commonwealth Heads of Government conference this should be raised because it is not a bilateral issue. It is not an issue concerning two countries. It is an issue concerning human rights and the question of genocide in a country. Even in the Non-aligned Conference this subject was not raised. There is no international pressure on Mr. Jayewardene in this respect. That also we will have to do.

The Minister's statement does not indicate as to what is the timeframe we are keeping for this. He only says:

"Government are keen to ensure that a solution is arrived at within a compressed timeframe..."

And what is that "compressed timeframe" that the Minister has in view, I would like to know. What are the specific proposals which President Jayewardene has spent through our delegation which has recently gone there and about which he is threatening, "Unless these proposals are accepted, Sri Lanka would seek a military solution"? I would like to know whether the Tamil organisations in Sri Lanka have been taken into confidence and whether the Government of India through their representatives have discussed these proposals with the Tamil representatives in Sri Lanka. Recently we attended a conference at Madurai on the Sri Lankan issue. As many as eight Tamil organisations in Sri Lanka were represented there, but they did not appear to have known the details of the proposals which the Sri Lankan Government has just now sent. Therefore, I would like the Minister to enlighten this House as to what are those proposals exactly which President Jayewardene has sent and what is our reaction to them.

SHRI S.W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is very unfortunate that our external policy is not yielding any results not only with regard to Sri Lanka but also with regard to other neighbouring countries. Though we claim ourselves to be the leader of the Non-aligned Movement and leader of the Third World, the net result of our policy is that we are not taken seriously. It is a well known fact, admitted by the Government, that Pakistan is training extremists who are playing havoc in Punjab. Similarly with regard to Bangladesh, we have got border problems. Refugees are coming. We could not solve anything worthwhile. The Sri Lankan problem is continuing. Discussions are going on, but we could not solve any problem to meet the aspirations of the Tamil population there, nor could we give any solution which could satisfy both sides. It has been mentioned in the Statement:

The delegation had extensive and detailed discussions with President Jayewardene..."

And on page 2, it is said:

"...Proposals which are evaluated as constituting a fair and reasonable basis for a negotiated settlement."

In an interview to the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, which appeared on the 18th April, 1986, in the *Hindu*, it has been specification stated by President Jayewardene:

"We have come to the last stages of the talks. It is only a question of devolution of authority to the provincial councils."

"India also does not want to go beyond the provincial councils."

So I would like to know from the Minister what the proposal with the Government of India is to satisfy the Tamil population, whether the proposal of the Government of India is that the Tamil population should be satisfied with the provincial councils. World public opinion is being created by Jayewardene either against us or against our proposals. When that is the position, you must make very clear to the people of India what the proposal is. If you do not

do that, only one side of the picture comes out and our name will be tarnished.

Then the second question is very important. It has been stated in paragraph 2 of the interview part of which has been read out by Mr. Gopalsamy. I hope the Government of India will contradict it—

"Has Sri Lanka a better friend in India which is trying to bring about a peaceful settlement or in Pakistan which is supplying military officials?...Pakistan is a better friend...If India does not help us and is helping the terrorists, it is not helping us. They have double standards. So we cannot be friendly with double standards."

So, clearly, whatever Jayawardene and his agents may talk with you, they do not consider you friendly. If they do not consider you friendly and say you have double standards, how do you expect the honourable Minister that he will agree for a negotiated settlement? There is no atmosphere of genuineness in their approach because they do not want any solution to be given by you nor are they interested in having a negotiated settlement. Therefore, the question has been raised here last time and this time also is whatever negotiations you are carrying on are only resulting in delaying a solution while all along the Tamil population is being butchered and killed. They have no safety. Their Government treats the people born in their own country as aliens in that country. This is what they are doing and we have a direct stake in the matter because refugees from there are coming over to India as it happened in Bangladesh time. At that time we did take some firm action. In Sri Lanka the Government wants to completely annihilate the Tamil population. That is what your predecessor also said, that it was a genocide. Therefore, what is the firm proposal with the Government of India? Why not the Government of India think in terms of having economic sanctions against Sri Lanka Government? Neither are you protecting the Tamil population nor are you suggesting any solution which will be useful. Jayawardene has taken a definite stand that he cannot go beyond the provin-

cial councils and he says that you are also saying the same. Therefore, my submission is that the time is ripe when you must take positive steps to bring about a proper solution to the problem.

Lastly, why should the Government of India feel feeble? Are we giving any protection to our fishermen? Thirty, forty fishermen who were Indians were killed and no compensation was paid. People are being killed in their own waters. Do we not have a duty to protect the Indian citizens? If a single citizen is killed anywhere else, there will be a war in that part of the world. Here people are being killed and no compensation is asked for. What steps have you taken? Have you at least asked for compensation to be paid to the dependents of the people killed, of the fishermen killed? Nowhere in the world can it happen that a country's citizens are killed and compensation is not paid by the offender or action is not taken against the offender. Whatever may be the consequences, Indian Government has a duty to protect its own citizens.

It has been stated in the statement that we want to find a peaceful and durable solution to the long outstanding problem of Sri Lanka. These are good words but words alone will not produce any solution unless we have power and strength and determination to have sanctions against Sri Lanka. Sri Lankan Government fears that they will have to face trouble if any solution is agreed to. Unless the policy is radically changed, I don't think the problem in Sri Lanka is going to be solved.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, pardon me if I say that the statement which has been made by the hon. Minister is an exercise in wilful understatement of the gravity of the situation in Sri Lanka now prevailing there. The statement also reveals equivocations, haziness and half-hearted attitude of the Government of India regarding this problem. It has not taken into consideration the recent developments which have taken place within Sri Lanka

[Shri Chitta Basu]

and the attitude of the Sri Lankan President. Sir, it is clear that President Jayewardene in the course of his statement, as has been mentioned by my friend and colleague, Shri Upendra, has been trying and is also trying even today to internationalise the entire question. Sir, for your information, I would like to quote a few sentences from his statement. In his bid to internationalise the situation, President Jayewardene has to say this:

"The outside world must help now, because this is now an international problem."

Mr. Jayewardene said that he had asked for arms, money and moral support from some specified western countries. "I have to have a quick solution to this problem now. I want the English-speaking world, both black and white, to understand that they must help me to suppress the alarm and rebellion here." Therefore, it is quite clear from the statement of president Jayewardene that he wants to have a full-fledged war against India and in that respect he wanted and he has sought the help—moral, arms and everything, from the western part of the world. Now, this is a statement made very recently. But what we have been witnessing for a few years? There is an involvement of foreign powers in Sri Lanka and the Government of India cannot ignore this aspect of the problem.

Sir, I give some instances. There have been reports of British mercenaries being hired to fight Tamils. A security firm, Keeni Meeni Services, based in the Channel Islands off the south England coast, said that it hired men to train the Sri Lankan armed forces—not to fight with them—for about 3800 dollars a month. It is an open statement made by that security services. They have been paid money and they are training the people of Sri Lanka to fight against the Tamils. Sri Lankan National Security Minister left for Israel on a secret mission. This is the report of Hindu only of yesterday.

Now, I come to the involvement of Pakistan. In reply to a question here in this House, the External Affairs Minister has admitted only on the 24th of April, the increasing military relationship between Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The reports say that military arms are being supplied from South Africa, Israel and other countries.

...Two Britons and a South African have been seen manning helicopter gunships which bomb regularly."

This is according to the information given in the Sunday Times of London.

Sir, taken together, all these are very evil portents of dangerous strides and drifts. All these must open our eyes, particularly in view of the aggressive military strategies of the United States in this region. India cannot afford to ignore all this, particularly with reference to the policy of the United States of America to persuade the hostile countries of our neighbourhood to take to the policy of encirclement of India.

Therefore, Sir, my first charge against the Government is that they are underestimating the implications of the situation in Sri Lanka and that is injurious to the interests of our country, let apart the question of Tamilians who have fallen victims to the military activities or aggressiveness in Sri Lanka. But in the national interest, the implications have not been taken into serious consideration. And, therefore, my first charge is this. Sir, what has been the reaction of the Government of India to this developing situation? They have taken an attitude of complacency, if you allow me to say so. I say this, being conscious of the statement being made by Mr. Bhandari, a member of the Chidambaram delegation which visited Sri Lanka recently. Mr. Bhandari is reported to have said yesterday in a statement that there has been "much improvement"—please note "much improvement" in Sri Lankan situation. Does this development conform to this statement that there has been much improvement of the

situation in Sri Lanka? He further goes on to say and he is on record—I quote:

“There has been a significant scaling down of violence”.

I think my friend Gopalsamy made some statement wherein it is clear how the violence is being perpetrated. But one of the member of the Chidambaram delegation says that violence has been scaled down.

Sir, again the attitude of the Sri Lankan President is to be taken note of, and noted very seriously. What he says—I quote:

“The assistance which (Prime Minister) Rajiv Gandhi is giving or which he is allowing to be given is destroying us and quickening the slide towards total separation of our country. He must be told this aid must be stopped.”

This is the kind of irresponsible statement, despite the fact that the Government of India has been saying all along that the Government of India is interested only to have a mediator role and help the Sri Lankan Government and Sri Lanka Tamilians to come to a solution of the problem. He wants to have India take a position, which our Government should take serious note of. The hon. Minister should have mentioned something about this irresponsible statement being made by the Sri Lankan President. But he is silent about these things.

Sir, it is reported, and the statement also mentions, that some formulations have been arrived at. It is stated that some formulations have been prepared and our Government has sought certain amplifications on certain points. What are the formulations? What are the amplifications sought for? The House is entitled to know this new formulation and the amplifications sought for by our Government on those formulations. In this connection, Sir, particularly in the context of the statement being made by the Sri Lankan President, I would like to quote him. He says: “I still have some optimism that the Tamil leaders will accept the proposal

we have offered for a limited degree of federalism.” What is the new formulation? To what extent it reflects the limited autonomy or federalism? To what extent it means autonomy? And what are the clarifications and amplifications you have sought for because, Sir, I feel, at least my Party is of the opinion that there should be a political solution to the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka within the united Sri Lanka with a maximum federal autonomy to the federating units. In this case, the Sri Lankan Government says that there will be limited degree of federalism. To what extent it is limited and whether at all it is federalism? And what does this federalism mean? Have the Government sought amplification on this thing? Have the Government sought amplification on the land settlement problem? Have the Government sought the amplification on the other formulation? The House is very much entitled to know all these details.

Lastly, Sir, as I have described earlier, Mr. Jayewardene is trying to mobilise the international forces to meet the situation and seek for a military solution of the problem. Our Government has taken the stance that there should not be any military solution but a political solution. Now military solution appears to be the only solution for the Sri Lankan President, and for that he is doing all this thing. Now, may I know from the hon. Minister whether diplomatic measures are being taken with these Governments as mentioned above by me so as to persuade them not to supply arms to the Sri Lankan Government because that would constitute an act of hostility towards the Government of India? Have you the courage to take that position even at this stage? And unless we can take these diplomatic measures and diplomatic offences to persuade other Governments in not sending arms and ammunitions, the situation is likely to aggravate further.

Sir, I conclude by saying this: Would the Government kindly inform this House that if they have not taken these diplomatic measures, what other measures the Government proposes to take to meet this

[Shri Chitta Basu]

situation and bring forward a political solution at the earliest possible time? Thank you, Sir.

श्री सत्यप्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मान्यवर, 27 फरवरी 86 को श्री नंका की जातीय समस्या पर इसी सदन में तत्कालीन विदेश मंत्री श्री भगत जी का वक्तव्य हुआ था और उस पर दोनों पक्षों के सदस्यों ने अपने विचार प्रकाट किए थे, लेकिन तब से आज तक हालात और खराब हो गए हैं और आज जो मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य है यह बहुत ही निराशाजनक है। श्री लंका में भारतीय मूल के जो नागरिक हैं उनका तो नरसंहार हो ही रहा है, साथ-साथ, वहां पर जो मंदिर है, मस्जिद है या जो कैथोलिक चर्च है वे बराबर सुनियोजित ढंग से नष्ट किए गए हैं। इस सिलसिले में कामराज कार्पेंस के अध्यक्ष श्री नीडूभारन अक्टूबर में 23 दिन घूमे थे और उनकी रिपोर्ट का उद्धरण मैं अन्त में दूंगा। जयवर्धने साहब भारत के दुश्मन पश्चिमी देशों से मांग कर रहे हैं कि समस्या का समाधान करने के लिए उनको शस्त्र की जरूरत है, उनको धन की जरूरत है और बराबर इस बात को कह रहे हैं कि इस समस्या का कोई राजनीतिक समाधान नहीं है।

बल्कि उनका विचार है कि इस समस्या का समाधान मिलिटरी या सैनिक समाधान ही है। भारत में हम सब लोगों का यह विश्वास है कि इस समस्या का उचित समाधान अन्य कोई नहीं है, केवल राजनैतिक समाधान ही इस समस्या का समाधान है। इसलिए शासन से हमारा यह अनुरोध है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत पर इस समस्या के पक्ष में और इस समस्या का उन्मूलन कैसे हो, इस के लिए भारत सरकार को एक जन समर्थन बनाना चाहिए और अपने देश में और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में भी इसके लिए प्रयास करना चाहिए।

मान्यवर, निर्गुट सम्मेलन भारत में हुआ था। उसमें भाग लेने के लिए श्रीलंका

के विदेश मंत्री श्री हमीद आए थे। समाचार पत्रों के माध्यम से यह जानकारी हुई कि श्री हमीद ने कुछ ठोस सुझाव भारत सरकार को दिये हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं भारत सरकार से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि श्री हमीद ने—जो निर्गुट सम्मेलन हुआ था—उसमें यहां आकर क्या सुझाव दिये थे और उन सुझावों के सिलसिले में भारत सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है? इसके अतिरिक्त पिछले अप्रैल महीने में टर्फ के नेता श्री अमृत-लिंगम के नेतृत्व में एक प्रतिनिधि मंडल भी आया था और वह हमारे परराष्ट्र मंत्रालय के अधिकारियों से मिला था। इसके साथ-साथ प्रधान मंत्री से उनकी मुलाकात हुई थी। प्रधान मंत्री जी से इस प्रतिनिधि मंडल के नेताओं ने कहा था कि श्री नंका में युद्ध की स्थिति है और वहां पर जो सुरक्षा बल है वे भारतीय मूल के नागरिकों का, निर्दोष लोगों का बराबर नरसंहार कर रहे हैं। 27 फरवरी को इस सदन में एक वक्तव्य हुआ था। इसके बाद इस प्रकार की स्थिति हुई है। इसके अतिरिक्त अभी हाल ही में एक प्रतिनिधि-मंडल हमारे मंत्री श्री चिदम्बरम के नेतृत्व में श्रीलंका गया था। इसमें परराष्ट्र मंत्रालय के भूतपूर्व सचिव श्री रमेश भंडारी भी सम्मिलित थे। उन्होंने श्रीलंका में वहां के राष्ट्रपति श्री जयवर्धने से भेंट की और वहां के अधिकारियों से भी भेंट की। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि इस सिलसिले में क्या बातचीत हुई और क्या सुझाव लेकर वे लोग आए हैं? इस सिलसिले में जो वक्तव्य लिया गया है इसमें उसकी कोई चर्चा नहीं है। बिल्कुल थोड़ा सा वर्णन किया गया है। इसके अतिरिक्त 5 मई को डा० करुणानिधि की अध्यक्षता में मदुरई में एक सम्मेलन बुलाया गया था, जिसमें इस समस्या के समाधान के लिए चर्चा की गई थी। इस सम्मेलन में करीब-करीब सभी विपक्षी दलों के लोग शामिल हुए थे। इसमें काश्मीर से लेकर कन्याकुमारी तक के सभी लोगों ने भाग लिया था। उस सम्मेलन में भी कुछ प्रस्ताव पास हुए थे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उस सम्मेलन में जो प्रस्ताव पास किये गये थे उनके संबंध में भारत सरकार की या प्रतिक्रिया है?

मान्यवर, मेरे पास यह 12 पृष्ठों की तमिलनाडु क मराज काग्रस के प्रेजिडेंट श्री नडुमारन की रिपोर्ट है। "A Nation bleeds". 23 दिन तक अक्टूबर, 1985 में श्री नडुमारन श्रीलंका में गये थे। इस रिपोर्ट के अनुसार उन्होंने कवल सड़क मार्ग से करीब दो हजार किलोमीटर की दूरी तय की थी और समुद्र भाग से करीब पांच सौ किलोमीटर की दूरी तय की। इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ने से रोगें खड़े हो जाते हैं। इससे यह पता चलता है कि किस प्रकार से निर्दोष लोगों की वहां पर हत्याएँ की जा रही है और किस प्रकार से वहां पर मानव को नष्ट किया जा रहा है, मानव मूल्यों को नष्ट किया जा रहा है। मैं यहां पर केवल धर्म के संबंध में जो उद्धरण हैं उनको सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और उनकी तरफ सरकार का ध्यान आकषिप्त करना चाहता हूँ। पृष्ठ 9 में यह लिखा है -

"A number of Hindu Temples have been destroyed. These include the Akkarayanagar Vigneswara temple, the Valvetthithurai Lord Shiva's Temple and the Point Pedro Sithi Vinayagar Temple. Priests are unable to conduct regular poojas even in famous Hindu temples like the Thirukeetheswaram and Thirukoneswaram due to action of the armed forces, Hindu temples are often desecrated by the armed forces. I was informed by reliable sources that since 1977 over 150 Hindu temples have been destroyed and after 1983 over 50 Hindu priests have been murdered. A number of pilgrims resthouses have been burnt down."

Then, Sir, it has also been stated there:

"In the Mannar and Jaffna districts. I observed that a number of Catholic Churches too have been damaged. Villagers from the Mannar district told me that Catholic priests have been killed and many other priests have been arrested for no reason by the armed forces."

12 Noon

"I was also told that in December 1984, the armed forces entered the Parapukananthan Christ Church and shot dead 4 persons while they were praying and arrested

8 others whose whereabouts are still not known. Some mosques too had been targets and attacked by armed forces. Even Muslim priests narrated to me instances of Muslims and Muslim priests coming under army attacks. Muslims have been driven out of a number of Muslim villages in the Amarai District and Sinhalese have been settled in these places, I was told."

तो मान्यवर, न केवल मानवता का वहां सत्यानाश किया जा रहा है बल्कि चाहे इस्लाम धर्म हो या हिन्दू धर्म हो या इसाईयों का धर्म हो, उनको भी वहां नष्ट करने की साजिश की जा रही है। इसलिये अंत में मैं इस सिलसिले में तीन सुझाव देना चाहूंगा। एक तो मेरा ऐसा विचार है कि भारत सरकार इस सिलसिले में केवल मुकदर्शक रही है और केवल आश्वासन देने के, वहां पर जो हिंसक घटनाएँ हो रही हैं, वहां पर जो धर्म नष्ट किया जा रहा है, इस सिलसिले में विवाय निन्दा करने के, भारत सरकार और कोई कदम नहीं उठा रही है। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि भारत सरकार को इस सिलसिले में कोई संक्षत कदम उठाना चाहिए और वह क्या कदम हो इन के लिए भारत सरकार को ही तय करना चाहिए।

राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी कहा करते थे कि जो लोग अत्याचार सहते हैं वे कायर होते हैं। इसलिये राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी को भी इस देश के लोगों को और इस सरकार को याद करना चाहिए। इसलिये मान्यवर, मेरा इस सिलसिले में अंत में सुझाव है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी को जितने भी इस देश के मुख्य मंत्री हैं उनका एक सम्मेलन दिल्ली में बुलाना चाहिए और जा राष्ट्रीय नेता हैं विपक्ष के उन को साथ में बैठा कर इस सिलसिले में विचार विमर्श करना चाहिए और इस समस्या को क्या समाधान हो इस को तय करना चाहिए और फिर आवश्यक कदम उठाना चाहिए। मेरा सुझाव है कि जितने भी इस देश के राष्ट्रीय दल हैं उनका एक प्रतिनिधि मंडल अक्विलम्ब श्रीलंका में भेजा जाना चाहिए। मुझे पूरी आशा है कि श्री जयवर्धने साहब जो भारत को बार-बार धमकी दे रहे हैं उस से न केवल भारत की प्रतिष्ठा गिर रही है बल्कि उन तमाम लोगों की प्रतिष्ठा गिर

[श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय]

रही है जो शान्ति में विश्वास करते हैं, जो उपवासिता और हिंसा का विरोध करते हैं और इस लिये इन सारे मसलों पर आज सरकार को अपना स्पष्टीकरण देना चाहिए।

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Already, as many as 5 colleagues of mine have spoken and while speaking they have termed the statement of the hon Minister of External Affairs Mr. Shiv Shanker either as a disappointing one; someone said it as unfortunate while some others stated it as an exercise in futility. I share none of them. It is exactly what is expected of our Government which is unable to deliver the goods and is thereby taking recourse to verbiage. It is mentioned in the statement that our Government is of the view that the ethnic minority problem in Sri Lanka has to be solved politically not militarily. But while our Government is hoping and expecting that the Jayewardene Government is merrily seeking assistance from imperialist countries for more arms to curb and suppress the genuine aspirations of the ethnic minority in Sri Lanka. We know already the USA has got a base at Trincomalee; the MOSSAD, Israeli counter-revolutionary agency is giving training to Sri Lankan army and other armed forces to combat the genuine struggle of Sri Lanka Tamils. British and South African pilots are helping to bomb the Tamil population in Sri Lanka. Sir, we know what is the motive behind it. So far as the imperialists are concerned, they always would like to fish in troubled waters. This is, particularly, quite in tune with their present strategy of exporting war and terrorism, particularly, to those areas where peace is prevailing, for overcoming people from the economic crisis in their own countries. Naturally, they have started creating tension around the borders of our country, to destabilise our country and threaten peace in this zone. The Sri Lankan government has also a motive, motive to bail itself out of the economic crisis which it has enmeshed Sri Lanka into, the Government having failed to deliver the goods there. It is a diversionary move on the part of the Sri Lankan Gov-

ernment to bail itself out of the crisis created by its own economic policies. But Sir, we have a concern. We have a concern for this problem not merely because of the fact that we have age-old ties, ethnic ties, with the people there, we have blood relationship but at the same time because human rights are being trampled upon there, and the presence of imperialist agencies are endangering peace in this zone, we cannot afford to turn a Nelson's eye to this particular problem. Therefore, we must act. But how to act? Certain suggestions have been made by our Government. Mr. Shiv Shanker has preferred not to spell out those alternative formulations which they have put across to the other Government. But here, they have mentioned—I quote:

“Government are evaluating the formulations received from the Sri Lankan Government. The Sri Lankan Government has also been requested to communicate their views on certain alternative formulations. In our view, what can be put to the Tamil side is only a package of our proposals which are evaluated as constituting a fair and reasonable basis for a negotiated settlement.”

What are these alternative formulations. I do not know. May I know from the hon. Minister—since he has indicated that he had talks, our team which had recently visited Sri Lanka had talks with all political parties and groups in Sri Lanka interested in solving this issue—how many political parties and groups in Sri Lanka have approved or at least endorsed our alternative formulations? I would also like to know whether our teams has exchanged their views with them over the alternative formulations and whether they have agreed with our alternative formulations or they have made other suggestions. Secondly, I would like to know whether there is any party in Sri Lanka which has since submitted any positive proposals of made any positive suggestions to overcome this particular problem because we know some of our brother parties are there; They have some positive proposals. Therefore, may I know from the hon. Minister

whether there is any party in Sri Lanka which has made any positive proposal to our team in regard to a peaceful settlement of this problem? Here we want to make it clear that actually the call or demand for a separate Eelam objectively helps Jayewardene to pursue their military offences against the genuine aspirations of the ethnic minority in Sri Lanka. Only the utmost autonomy, the widest possible autonomy within the united framework of Sri Lanka can provide a solution to the problem and also can facilitate the unity of both the ethnic minority, the Tamilians, and the Sinhalese. So, I would expect that the Government of India would take a positive step in bringing about a political solution with the help of the real and genuine forces inside Sri Lanka who are interested to fulfil the genuine aspirations of the ethnic minority, and at the same time to keep Sri Lanka united. Sir, the more there will be delay, the more the handle will be given to the U.S. imperialists to fish into the troubled waters, thereby endangering the peace in this region. So, act now, act quickly.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Chairman, Sir, if you want to understand the problem of Sri Lanka, it is necessary to know briefly the history, the nature and the dimension of the ethnic problem in that country.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

Sir, as back as 1947 when the Ceylon Independence Bill was discussed in the House of Commons, Conservative M.P., Mr. Gammons, expressing his fears for the safety of the Tamil people said as follows, and I quote:

"The danger which Ceylon faces is that Ceylon is not a single unit. There are two faces in Ceylon, in Sinhalese and the Tamils, a total of 6.5 million. They differ from the Sinhalese in face, religion and to a large extent in the background. They are extremely capable and intelligent people. I have had a lot to do with them because they played a very large part in the development of Malaya. It was the Jaffna Tamils who came in large numbers and started the railways and government

services. Where there is a racial minority in the country, the danger is that it may become a Permanent Political Minority, Ceylon's evolution on a democratic basis is bound to fail. This imposes a great responsibility. It imposes on the Sinhalese the responsibility of seeing that they grant fair and if necessary rather more than fair treatment to the minority not only in political power but also in administrative responsibility so that the minority is not inevitably driven to regard itself as a permanent political minority.

By Malaya he meant Ceylon at that time. Sir, Ceylon was granted independence on February 4... based on unitary constitution. The Tamilians protested against this unitary type of constitution. At that time Lord Salisbury, who was one of the authors of this Constitution, said later in 1964: "In the Constitution which I recommended, there seemed to be at that time ample safeguards for minorities. But section 29 has not been as efficacious as I had hoped and I now see that I should have recommended a human rights clause as in the Constitution of India and elsewhere." Within six months of the measure being passed, one million Tamilians in Sri Lanka were dis-enfranchised. There were protests against this. Tamil which was one of the official languages of Sri Lanka was down-graded later and the Sri Lankan Government, made the Sinhala language as the sole official language of Sri Lanka.

There were other developments which militated against the ethnic minorities in Sri Lanka. We have to bear in mind this background, this history, when we talk of a permanent political solution to the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka.

I do not want to go into the recent developments which have been referred to by my colleagues already. I went through the statement of my friend, Shri Shiv Shanker and came across one sentence in the first para which is rather puzzling to me. The Minister has said that the latest delegation included Shri Romesh Bhandari, Special Representative for Sri Lanka. When was he appointed a Special Representative for Sri Lanka, I do

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

not know. After his retirement, Shri Bhandari was made the Chief of the Foreign Affairs Cell in the AICC. I do not know how he can be included in an official delegation. He has become a partyman. I know Shri Bhandari was very much associated with this problem when he was the Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs. I respect him and I value his opinion. But it looks very odd to include him in this official delegation on behalf of Government of India when he has retired and when he is the Chief of a Cell in the AICC.

It is a minor digression, but apart from this I would like my friend to carry these points. Coming to the ethnic question in Sri Lanka, this delegation which had been sent to Ceylon has come back with certain proposals. The Minister has said that these proposals are being evaluated and he has used the words in the statement that the Government of India is amplifying these proposals. I do not know what type of amplification is thinking of. We do not know the proposals. They have not been put before us. But I understand that these proposals do not go far enough to meet the legitimate interests of the ethnic minorities. I am told—subject to correction I say this—that one of the proposals is to delegate law and order powers to the Provincial Councils. The word used is “delegation,” not transfer of law and order to the Provincial Councils. Sir, you and I understand what delegation means. Power which is delegated under law can be withdrawn at any time by the Government; a delegated power does not confer independent authority to the constituents. Delegation can always be taken back by the Central Government. Unless the power is transferred, delegation has no meaning. I would like my friend to tell me whether one of the proposals is to refer this aspect of the matter.

Sir, I am also told there is no improvement at all in respect of land settlement in the proposals. The same old attitude, the same old view of the Government of Sri Lanka is incorporated in this propo-

sal. If the land settlement issue is not resolved to the satisfaction of the Tamilians there, I am afraid these proposals will fall through.

Now, Sir, out of these proposals we came across the statement by President Jayawardene which is astonishing, to say the least. Sir, Jayawardene has said that his patience was running out. May I use the same words and say our patience is also running out or has already run out? Jayawardene has created this problem for the ethnic minorities there. He is the author, he is the father and now he says his patience is running out. I am amazed at this statement. He further says that if countries of the world do not come to his rescue, democracy in Sri Lanka may be destroyed by the Tamilians there. That is the kind of attitude we are now seeing. It is the language of a person who wants a solution, understanding, settlement! He thinks these Tamilians are a threat to democracy there. He further states, very soon, if this situation continues and Tamilians—by implication he says—indulge in such hostile activities, the situation as obtained in Cyprus may be repeated in Sri Lanka. Sir, we can understand the attitude of the mind of this person. He is the head of the Government, he is the Head of the State there, who is indulging in reckless and extravagant language to describe a situation. Is it the attitude of a person who wants settlement?—I want to understand. I would like the Government of India to know the kind of person with whom they are dealing. He is adopting the posture of a hawk; he is using the language of a hawk. But the Government of India is using the language of a parrot, the language of a lame duck. This is not a language. I expect from the Government of India. I understand, Sir, that this language can be used at the beginning of a negotiation. I take it that the negotiations are not going well. I am amended that the Government of India is playing a role of a conciliator, a mediator. The Government of India is talking of the language of a political settlement which I want. But Mr. Jayawardene is talking of a military solution. These two are

worlds apart. He is saying that the Prime Minister is indulging in double-talk, but he himself is indulging in double-talk. He is saying that he wants a political settlement, but at the same time he is saying that there is no alternative but to have a military solution if the situation continues.

Sir, the minority issue, the ethnic issue in Sri Lanka was created by the Sri Lankan Government. The Government of India should tell this to Mr. Jayewardene. I don't think you have told them. You are behaving as an umpire between the two parties, between the Government of Sri Lanka and the Tamilian minority Organisations. You are playing the role of an umpire. You seem to be non-aligned between these two parties. This type of non-alignment cannot take us farther.

I do want a settlement. For our consumption, Sir, I know, Mr. Shiv Shankar used the word 'time-frame'. There should be urgency in settlement, in the time-frame, and all that. It is for our consumption. Has he told Mr. Jayewardene about this time-frame? When his predecessor, Mr. Bali Ram, talked about a time-frame, there was a sharp reaction from the Sri Lankan Government about the time-frame. His Government considered it an ultimatum. Even though it was a very very soft word, mild word, mild term, they cannot countenance even this mild phrase, whereas the President indulges in an extreme language, irresponsible language. He is taking the most objectionable attitude. I don't think his attitude, his behaviour is impartial. I don't think his statements are conducive to a settlement. Then what? What shall we do in this context? If these proposals failed to bring about a settlement, I am afraid, we will have reached a point of no return, the dead end. What shall we do then?

Mr. Jayewardene has appealed to the international world, the Western powers to come to his rescue. He has said that the issue was an international issue, that it was no longer an issue between him,

his Government and the minorities. He is trying to internationalise the issue. Please, let us remember this. The dimension of the problem is being changed. Therefore, I expect my Government to take note of this.

I ask him straightaway: what does he want? For the last many years, since the independence, these ethnic minorities have been suppressed and oppressed in various ways. There is disenfranchisement of 1 million Tamils there. Today there is a continuous exodus of Tamilians to other countries. To my country more than 2 lakh people have come, creating a problem for us. I do not know whether they can go back. I do not know whether the people who have gone to the European countries can go back. I know, Sir, Germany, France, Switzerland have taken steps to see that no Tamilians could go from Ceylon to those countries on the plea of political asylum.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Germany is also going to send them back.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Yes, on the basis of political asylum they are not admitting them. Where will they go? They will come to us. We are our blood brothers. Let us say that they are our blood brothers. We are to solve their problem as our own. My friend, Mr. Gopalsamy was emotional when he said that we are taking so much of keen interest about the Negroes in South Africa, about the people in Namibia, but we are not exhibiting exactly the same type of spirit in respect of our own kith and kin in Sri Lanka. We should talk the language they understand. I want political solution. I belong to a party which believes in political solution, but the language of Sri Lanka and the language of the Government of India seem to be very different and divergent. I, therefore, as my friend, Shri Shiv Shankar, who has taken over this Ministry yesterday, want to bring in a fresh air to negotiations. We want a negotiated settlement, but this to come now before people are killed. Temples are pillaged or plundered, desecrated, children are murdered, women are

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

raped and innocent men are killed. This has got to stop here and now. Can we expect the Government of India to give a definite time frame within which this has got to be settled? We should tell the Government of Ceylon that we will not be responsible for future events, if there is no settlement within this time framework. I want this type of long-wedge. At least there should be militancy in the use of long-wedge, if not the military intervention. This much I expect from the Government of India. I want them to give up this lameduck policy, and posture of helpless and hopeless consiliation, a posture of hesitation vacillation and weakness. We are a power. We want peace and stability in our neighbourhood. We want to respect Ceylon and its sovereignty. Yes, its sovereignty should remain inviolable, but Tamilians should enjoy freedom, human rights and right to live in Sri Lanka.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): I would like to start by welcoming my honourable distinguished friend, Mr. Shiv Shankar in his new incarnation as the Minister for External Affairs. I wish him well.

Knowing as I do, as indeed he does, that his Ministry is casualty-prone and there are frequent changes, but this being his first day in Office...

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): But he is a versatile genius. He can fit in any place.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This being his first day in his new incarnation, I would request him to approach this debate cheerfully. He is sitting very morosely on the benches. Even if he does also as past history demonstrates, becomes victim of casualty-proneness, of this Ministry, there is still a long time to go.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am not bothered about it. I am bothered about the problem, the presentation aspect of it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Indeed, taking up the hon. Minister from his cue that he is bothered about the problem and is trying to understand where to take

it up from, the most distressing aspect is the hon. Minister's statement itself. I would however exonerate him from this responsibility for the statement, because he has just taken over and he has not perhaps had a chance to meaningfully contribute to the drafting of it. A number of previous speakers have commented on it. I cannot without in any fashion labouring over it, I, however, help expressing, Sir, that this particular statement on Sri Lanka as a representative statement of the Government of India, on the present situation in that country, to my mind, is a statement which is really an expression of helplessness. A number of speakers have gone into various aspects; history of the problem, the ethnic problem, etc. So I shall attempt not to be repetitious or reiterate what they have said. I am really involved passionately and very interestedly in two aspects of it. One is the fate of the Tamil minority; and the second is the Government of India's approach to that problem and its attempts to resolve it. I shall take Government of India's approach and put across, through you, Sir, to the hon. Minister, that I find great difficulty with it as an Indian. We have witnessed this strife in Sri Lanka the present strife, for the past four years. The Government of India adopted a mediatory role. This is an objective fact. The consequence of that mediatory role now in the month of May, 1986 are: Firstly, that the Government of India is no longer fully trusted either by the Tamil groups or by the major Sinhalese elements. Secondly, that Indo-Sri Lankan relations despite that somewhat unrestrained and positive assertion by hon. Prime Minister, that Indo-Sri Lankan relations have never been better—on the contrary Indo-Sri Lankan relations have never been worse. Thirdly, Sir, it is a matter of deep concern which few other speakers have referred to earlier, that because of all this India's immediate, medium and long term security interests are vitally affected, and our Southern maritime territories are now the scene of destabilisation. Finally, Sir, I find that in this catalogue of the failures of Indian foreign policy, the Government of India as such now finds itself in a position where we can no longer

meaningfully influence the situation in Sri Lanka—and the Government of India itself is left without any perceptible intelligible diplomatic options to influence the situation in that country. This is a very sad situation for any country to find itself in these all the particularly distressing aspects as I said; about the role of the Government of India; the second is about the situation of as such Tamils in Sri Lanka; and thirdly some vital aspects of this Tamils ethnic strife in Sri Lanka. We have to recognise all of them. What are they. The first is that political instability in a neighbouring country will influence us. The second aspect is social turmoil affecting communities that straddle both Sri Lanka and India and which cannot leave India free from the consequences of that social turmoil. The third aspect is the immediate consequence of influx of refugees which at latest count number nearly 1,40,000. Now, what refugees bring with them is a social turmoil of which they themselves are a consequence. This, in turn, results, therefore, fourthly, in affecting the domestic polity of India. I am mentioning these aspects because these are some of the aspects which were not mentioned by some of the earlier speakers. Finally—yet again repetitiously—there is the international aspect affecting India's security interests. Now these are some of the questions which arise in our minds whenever we discuss Sri Lanka in this House.

My time is limited. I do not want to go elaborately into the history of what is taking place. These are some of the important aspects and it is my hope that the Minister in his reply would throw light on these aspects as to how the Government of India approaches the problem or looks at these particular aspects.

Before I come to specific questions, there is one curious aspect of the Chidambaram mission which I cannot help referring to. The history of Indian mediatory efforts in Sri Lanka is a convoluted history. It was earlier the charge of an eminent Indian who is now the head of the policy planning forum, newly constituted. Then that charge got shifted from

that very eminent Indian to the head of the Foreign Office, to the civil service head of the Foreign Office. And then we entered a phase of high exposure diplomacy, diplomacy under the searchlight, as it were, and this phase of India's conduct of diplomacy under the searchlight of high media exposure did more harm to Indo-Sri Lankan relations and to the situation of Tamils within Sri Lanka than ever earlier. And a curious phenomenon takes place. The elegant head of the Foreign Service overnight changes clothes, as it were. From the well-cut suits to which even the hon. Minister of State while in the External Affairs Ministry was used to, suddenly there is a transformation overnight and we witness his new role as a kurta-pyjama-clad Congress-man—suddenly from the head of the Foreign Office to a kurta-pyjama-clad Congressman. There are very many questions involved the question of propriety, the question of continuity of the conduct of Indian diplomacy, the question of the very conceptualisation of the Indian foreign policy. The present is perhaps not the time to raise all these questions. Nevertheless I cannot help reflecting that now that the gentleman has left the secure, insulated world of Foreign Office and joined the ranks of the noisy, disorderly world of politics, I am free to criticise him. And I do criticise the Government for including a party-man, however high he might be within their party, in the official delegation. To include a party-man in an official delegation, on as a serious matter as the situation of Tamils in Shri Lanka and Indo Sri Lankan relations is really to treat the whole complex question with the kind of casualness which has characterised the approach of the Government of India. And that is why we have arrived where we have arrived today. I will raise my questions as soon as your conference with the hon. Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs is over.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SITARAM KESRI): No, I only wanted to know how many persons were still there to speak.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: He thinks it to be a conference.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Some of the questions, of course, arise from the statement itself, though some earlier speakers have referred to them. Now, this is a question about detailed formulations and I would request the hon. Minister to clarify both the Government of India's thinking and the Government of Sri Lanka's thinking and in that light, explain what several hon. Members have asked. The five essential questions are:

The debate is between devolution and delegation. Where, therefore, does the Government of India stand? Do you stand for devolution or do you stand for delegation? Where does the Government of Sri Lanka stand? Does it stand for devolution or for delegation? And where do the groups of Tamils stand? What are the formulations on this aspect and what clarification have you sought?

The second vexed question is about one unit, about eastern and northern—where does the Government of India stand on that? Where does the Government of Sri Lanka stand on that?

Thirdly, what precisely is the stand of the Government of India on land settlement; of the Tamil groups, and what is the stand of the Government of Sri Lanka?

Fourthly, though there is no reference to it here or indeed by any of the earlier speakers, is the question of language.

Fifth is on law and order.

These are the clarifications needed on Government of India's viewpoints and on Sri Lankan Government's viewpoints.

Thereafter is the question of reconciling the obvious discrepancy between the stated position of the Government of India which is this statement, and the stated position of the Government of Sri Lanka, which is the statement by President Jayewardene. Now, there is a wide discrepancy between the stated positions of the Indian

Government and the Sri Lankan Government. Government of India post Chidambaram Mission is tending to convey an impression that every thing is under control and we are moving towards a solution. But that is not the impression one gathers from Jayawardene's stated position. Would therefore, the honourable Minister reconcile this?

Two more questions and I will conclude. There is a curious though characteristic Foreign office euphemism in the statement: "The Government are keen to ensure that a solution is arrived at within a compressed time-frame." I am charmed by the choice of words. Your predecessor had very gravely, in a similar debate on Sri Lanka here in this House, announced, "I want a solution within weeks", and we got up and asked; "Mr. Minister, if there is n't a solution within weeks, what are you going to do?" I now find an answer. There hasn't been a solution for weeks. It is now months since we last discussed Sri Lanka and the Foreign Office, the Minister of External Affairs, has now come forward with a 'compressed time-frame', an euphemism for a few weeks. Would, therefore, the Government of India elaborate what the time-frame is within which they are working—a few weeks, compressed or a compressed time-frame? What is it that you are referring to? Because, it makes a mockery of the position of the Government of India and these have become empty words; hence the difficulty with the statement.

Finally, and the most important, I am really not grieved about it for it; it does not bother me if a few SAS mercenaries or even a few Mossad or about the casual interest of Pakistan beginning to be felt in Sri Lanka. They are the effect, they are the consequences of a much wider cause, and unless the Government of India approaches the cause, begins to rectify the causes which have led to the presence of SAS or Mossad or whatever or Pakistanis, because, I think India is capable enough of protecting itself against a few hot-headed SAS or Mossad or Pakistanis or anybody, they are only a consequence, the causes are elsewhere, and I do believe that one

of the signal failures of Indian diplomacy, in the context of Indo-Sri Lankan relations, in the context of ethnic strife in Sri Lanka, has been this failure to safeguard India's maritime security interest, as far as our southern maritime boundaries are concerned. And I do charge, with all responsibility and seriousness, that forces inimical to India's security interests are now drawn in into Sri Lanka merely because Government of India's conduct of its diplomacy, in the Sri Lankan context has been faulty for the past four years. What, therefore, is the Government's thinking on that subject? And how are going to move towards rectifying a situation which is deeply disturbing as far as India's security interests are concerned?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman. Sir, today we are once again discussing the very serious problem of Sri Lanka. It arises because several developments have taken place in between. But I will come to these developments a little later. I must first invite the attention of the hon. Minister, and a reference has been made by more than one Member here today about the interview which President Jayewardene gave to *Sunday Times*, in which he has spoken so uncharitably about our Prime Minister. That is the London Dateline of 11th May. Then in the day before yesterday's 'Newsweek' and 'Time' magazines we have reference again to President Jayewardene's appeal to several nations for aid to combat so-called terrorism. Therefore, on the one hand, we are here discussing the very serious thing as to what my good friend Chidambaram leading the delegation has brought back as a package deal in the matter of political settlement of the problem on Tamilians in Sri Lanka, on the other hand you find that President Jayewardene is going full blast against our country. Now, I want the hon. Minister to keep this in mind because this is very relevant for the purpose of determining and ascertaining what are the real intentions of President Jayewardene in the matter of settlement of the Lankan problem.

What is distressing is that this problem has been hanging and continued for a very long length of time at the cost of want has been variously defined as genocide, naked attack on the human rights and other things which really shock the conscience of any rational human being.

Now, I want to place before the hon. Minister this because we are concerned in many ways with this problem, and then I will come to the settlement issue. Firstly, we must realise that 55 millions of our people speak the same language as Tamils in Sri Lanka. So it concerns a very large majority of our population. When you go to Tamil Nadu, you realise the intensity of their feelings. And when I speak here, I cannot but have my intense feelings for the intensity of the feelings of the Tamilians in Tamil Nadu. Secondly, it must be remembered, as has been rightly pointed out by several Members, here that it is an acknowledged and accepted fact that the so called terrorists are really those who save the Tamilians from utter destruction and annihilation by the Sinhalese army. I think no Government can have a claim to be democratic if it chooses to adopt aerial bombing to meet the threat of so called terrorists. Today what we must condemn, when we condemn terrorism, even in greater measure the state terrorism. The theory of proportionality must be applied. Steps must be taken which are commensurate to meet the threat of terrorism. But what has happened is that President Jayewardene has unleashed State terrorism against the Tamilians to an extent which is unprecedented. It is not that I say this because I share the feelings of the Tamilians in Tamil Nadu. But every international organisation which is concerned with the protection of human rights in this world has condemned President Jayewardene and his Government for the violation of basic human rights. Sir, I would request the hon. Minister to go through the report published by the International Commission of Jurists. There is another report which has been published by Amnesty International. All these reports clearly

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

bring out how children, women, innocent old men and innocent civilians have been massacred in the name of fighting terrorism. As has been pointed out, India has a very proud record in the field of protection of human rights and we cannot ignore this aspect when we are dealing with the situation. I am merely enumerating them. Some of them have been enumerated.

The second problem which has been rightly pointed out is the problem of refugees. The figures vary. But the figures which I have got are that at least 1,25,000 refugees have crossed over. I want to impress upon the hon. Minister the principle of non refoulement." We are obliged to return these refugees with a full assurance of protection of their personal safety and also the safety of their property. It becomes our responsibility as it had become our responsibility in Bangladesh when 10 million refugees came and we had to take steps to see that they went back with a full assurance of the safety of their person and their property. So, this is also a very important aspect.

The third aspect, as has been mentioned, is that it does disturb peace in that zone. Now, our policy is well known and particularly so with Sri Lanka. Though it is a tiny country, we have long and ancient cultural connections. This is one country which, along with us, has kept up democracy. Therefore, we have common cultural ties. We have this democratic spirit to share and we always believe that if there is peace with our neighbours, there is peace for us. We have always believed that if our neighbours are strong, we are stronger. Therefore, I do not agree with the extreme suggestions which have been made here about military intervention, this and that. But I think a time has come to assess the situation in all its aspects and not to permit President Jayewardene to carry on with his fooling game. Today, it appears as if it is no problem of Sri Lanka at all and it is

only the problem of the Prime Minister of this country to solve this problem. This is a very serious and dangerous situation. Sri Lanka must realise and President Jayewardene must realise that it is his problem which he has to solve. It is very easy to understand that unity does not necessarily mean unitary Government. There can be unity, as in the case of India, through a federal structure. The U.S.S.R, the U.S.A, Australia, Canada, they are all having unity and they have federal structures. So, I do not see any reason why Sri Lanka should not have such a unity through a federal structure. I am glad that the hon. Minister, Shri Shiv Shanker, is a constitutional expert.

1 P.M.

He can impress upon them that there can be unity through a federal government as well. Then, there is the question which everybody knows. First is about law and order. That is a very serious thing. You will find that it is not expressly mentioned here. Law and order even under our Constitution vests with the States. And, I think, this is on this ground, on this area of law and order, I see no reason why the full power should not devolve on the northern and the eastern provinces because it is for their protection. You cannot have law and order in the hands of the Centre when those people in the provision have substantially lost faith in the protection by the Centre of their interests. Then there is the land settlement question. Then there is the distribution of powers of the provincial executive and the Legislature. And lastly there is the question of adequate representation to the Tamils in the Central Cabinet, administrative service and the armed forces. Now, the point which is important is that the Government find that the proposals which have been made to the Tamil side are only a package of proposals which are evaluated as constituting a fair and reasonable basis for a negotiated settlement. As far as I remember, the TULF had made ten points, and

they were put to Sri Lankan Government when Mr. Hameed, their Foreign Secretary ...

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: (Tamil Nadu): Foreign Minister.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: ...their Foreign Minister came here for the NAM. And he had come with a counter proposal. So, I would like to know as how these ten points which were made by the TULF were met by Mr. Hameed in response to which the Chidambaram Delegation went to Sri Lanka. I want to know as to what has happened thereafter, namely after the Chidambaram Delegation came back from their discussions? What has happened thereafter? and what is the package deal with which they have come? If we have these three stages—namely, the initial TULF proposals, then the response which was brought by Mr. Hameed, and now the package deal which is brought back by Mr. Chidambaram—then we will get a clear picture as to where we stand and whether at all it is possible to settle the problem because this is not something on which we can live on hopes all the time. And what has been rightly said is quite true that it is a relative thing. This time-frame has been said time and again with no respite to the sufferings of the people of Sri Lanka and particularly of the Tamils in the northern and the eastern provinces. And, therefore, to use the words which are really vague is understandable but is not advisable because at least the Government should be clear that it cannot go on extending the miseries and the sufferings and the agonies of the people of Sri Lanka, particularly the Tamils in the northern and the eastern provinces. I do hope that this compressed timeframe which is referred to in this statement really remains compressed and it is over in the hot summer that we are going through and it does not spill into the monsoon and the monsoon does not spill into the autumn and the autumn does not spill into winter resulting in further deprivation of the human rights and further agonies and sufferings to the Tamils of Sri Lanka. Therefore, the

only thing which I would request the hon. Minister, if it is possible for him to take this House into confidence. He must continue his efforts with negotiations, because there is only one solution possible and that is the political solution and you must tell Mr. Jayewardene that the alternative solutions which he is searching behind our back, we are not going to be fooled by them of a military solution and that we will counter if he chooses to go along the same path. I would like the hon. Minister to take this House into confidence and tell us three things, namely, the proposals of the TULF, the proposals which Mr. Hameed brought and lastly, the contents of the package deal, so that this House knows what really is the correct situation so far as the negotiations are concerned. Thank you.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: Sir, he posed both the questions and gave the answers himself.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, with heavy heart, agony and anguish at the very outset, I would like to assertively say and bring to the attention of the hon. Minister for External Affairs that his statement on the Sri Lankan issue, though this is his very first statement after assuming this new charge, is a great disappointment. While we can say that the statement exhibits the hon. Minister's scholastic attitude, it does not show his concern for the Tamil cause. Time and again, it is not only today the Government of India in almost all the statements that have been doled out, they have been sermonising, they have been preaching, that there can be no military solution to the ethnic dispute. In almost all the statements on this ethnic issue this kind of a sermonising, this kind of preaching has been there.

Sir, I would like to say that while Mr. Jayewardene in his recent interview to the 'Sunday Times', repeatedly pointedly made a reference and he is reported to have said, my patience is running out, if my proposal for limited federation, a regulated autonomy, is not accepted by the Tamils, then I will have

[Shri Valampuri John]

no choice but to have recourse to military action. On the part of Mr. Jayewardene, he says that he will resort to military action, while the fact is that he has already embarked upon military action by eliminating segments of Tamil people in a terrible massacre, total conflagration, where a bold community, civilised community of sensible people have been condemning his military action. Now, he says, after three years, after eliminating large segments of people, now I will resort to military action. On the part of the Government of India, the Government of India says, again and again, no, we stand only for political solution, we are not for a military solution. Sir, while we sermonise that there is no need for a military solution, Mr. Jayewardene says, after embarking upon military solution, after massacring civilians, that he will resort to military action as a last resort only and we see that the Tamil people, our brethren, sisters and children in Sri Lanka are uprooted and ours is a cursed generation who are simply put to that fate in dead silence in Sri Lanka.

Sir, I would like to remind, as Mr. Gopalsamy has rightly pointed out here that for Mr. Jayewardene it is an yearly lamentation, an annual ritual when the months of May and June come. If you see the record of the last few years you will see that he says, my country, Sri Lanka, would bleed to death or be divided. Why does he say this in the months of May and June. He repeats it for the simple reason that there is a Conference of aid consortium countries, and only in order to exert influence on them, in order to evoke pity and sympathy in the feeble minds of the donors he says it and then we find that he goes with the same money that he purchases arms and ammunitions to put down the cause of Tamils and the whole race is terminated while we are sitting

here, because this is only a ventilating chamber of our grievances.

Sir, I would like to point out that in his interview to the 'Sunday Times' in London he said, 'My country will bleed to death or it will be divided like Cyprus...unless, and until western powers come with enormous aid military or otherwise. He said that Cyprus had been divided between Turkey and Greece and now Sri Lanka will be divided. Can I take it as a kind of admission on the part of blood-thirsty monster Jayewardene that these things have come to stay in his island and ultimately he has come to the end of the tunnel and now because he is tired of shooting down and killing Tamil people, in a desolate and desperate mood he says 'my country is being divided'? Who will believe him? Who is going to believe him? As Mr. Amirthalingam, one of our great Tamil leaders, who is espousing the cause of Tamils has said on a number of occasions, even if today Geobbbels has to come for his refresher course on the political dynamics, he has to have his refresher course only from Jayewardene. Who will believe Jayewardene?

I ask you a pertinent question. He says that he is going to resort to military action when he has already embarked on military action. Government of India says that we are not for military solution; we are for a political solution. You have to give me a categorical answer. To you it may be a friendly Government; but for a Tamil bleeding nation, it is not a friendly Government; it is an enemy Government because they are killing and liquidating segments of Tamils population. We are not protesting at all. When Mr. Gurupadaswamy said whenever these things happen, whenever this kind of infernal massacre is there, you use the language of a parrot, he is correct. I will show you how. On the day when we came to know that there was a broadcast of Mr. Jayewardene in the Australian Broadcasting Corporation immediately wrote to Mr. Bali Ram Bhagat, I wrote three letters pointing out that this is what

has been said by him and he accuses India of double standards. I am sorry that those three letters have not been acknowledged. It is not to me; it is to a cause that these have not been acknowledged. Again I took another opportunity and utilised another forum by way of an Unstarred Question. Mr. Gurupadaswamy said that you are using again and again the language of a parrot. He is cent per cent right. The question is: will the Minister of external Affairs be pleased to state: (a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a news item which appeared in 'The Hindu' of April 19, 1986 to the effect that Shri Jayewardene, the Sri Lankan President has accused India of playing double standards; (b) whether it is a fact that India does not want to go beyond provincial Councils, as stated by Shri Jayewardene; (c) whether India has registered any protest in this regard; and (d) whether Shri Jayewardene is also reported to have attributed to Shri Arun Nehru's statement regarding military victory in Punjab; if so, whether Government have registered any protest against these irresponsible statements of Shri Jayewardene? And the answer given is:

(a) & (b): Government have seen the report in 'The Hindu' of April 19th about an interview given by President Jayewardene to the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, in which he is reported to have accused India of practising double standards. This accusation is absolutely without any foundation. It is also not correct to say that "India does not want to go beyond provincial Councils." It is a clear case of glossing over; in a tricky fashion your own journey to no end; your own exercise into futility. The answer further says: It is ultimately for the Sri Lankan Government and the Sri Lankan Tamils to agree on an acceptable political solution to the ethnic crisis. India's offer of its good offices is to facilitate a dialogue. The terms of the settlement will have to be agreed directly between the two sides.

(c) No protest has been lodged with the Sri Lankan Government in connection with this interview.

(d) In the interview referred to

above President Jayewardene is reported to have remarked "Mr. Arun Nehru has said they will have a military victory soon". It may be stated that the Minister of Internal Security had not made any such statement. Government have not lodged any formal protest to the Government of Sri Lanka on this point. So, not even formal protests are registered against this kind of intemperate language and distortion of facts by Sri Lanka.

Sir, he says he is going to resort to military solution. What happened in the month of February? In the month of February, there was an independent enquiry by Catholic Church in Sri Lanka and a Papal Seminar in Candy. They have no axe to grind. They have reported—I have received the report—that in the last six months, 23,170 Tamil civilians, innocent and harmless people, unarmed people including children, have been butchered...

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS:
Shame, shame.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN : It has come in all the international press on February 27 that 68 Tamil agricultural labourers have been set ablaze. Thousands of people have come and they have wept their lungs out on witnessing the charred bodies and Father Padiar a Fernandes has reported to International Amnesty that I have not seen such a horrible sight in my life. They say it. Mr. Jayewardene says he is not resorting to a military solution. What is this if it is not a military solution? Already, he is resorting to it. He is embarking upon it. But the Government of India from a very high pedestal is sermonising that he should not resort to a military solution. Are you hoodwink—you believe what Jayewardene says? tell you, we are carrying the wounds with us. What I say may seem emotional, it may appear to you as a mad man's prattle. But I tell you a day will come when this House will be greeting an independent Tamil Eelam because there is no other go for them when they have been sub-

[Shri Valāmpuri John]

jected to this kind of slavery and they will not take things laying low for long. Sir, what has happened? In the month of March, on 25th, in Batticaloa, 160 people have been butchered. They have been charred to death. Now, Mr. Athulathmudali comes out with a statement that hereafter no bombs will be used. Why? Because, if bombs are thrown, they are too inaccurate. He says, instead of bombs, they will use rockets on civilian targets. Is it not a military solution that Jayewardene is embarking upon? I do not appeal to your reason, I appeal to your heart. Please answer me. Is it not a military solution? Then, why do you say, why do you time and again sermonise that he should be resorting to a military solution? Already, segments of people are being massared. Already, they are being eliminated. On 16th January, there was a proclamation issued in Sri Lanka. As per this, they have established military camps. Within one mile radius of military zones, arms and ammunition can be used. Even mortar can be used in this one mile radius. What has happened? In Jaffna town alone, 1,50,000 people are living death-traps. Not only this. Hospitals, churches, temples, even the the general hospital in Jaffna, so many markets, so many residential buildings, have come under this one mile radius. In the mainland, 2,50,000 people are risking their lives because of this new arrangement. Not only this. In this Eastern provinces, 2,60,000 fishermen are not able to go out to the sea to eke out their livelihood because they come under this zone. These military zones are there. The whole civilian population is being liquidated. But time and again, they say they are embarking upon this operation only to fight the terrorists. In this kind of quagmire, the only consolation is that Jayewardene has not succeeded—I do accept—in convincing the Government of India that they are putting down only terrorists. (Time-bell rings) You do not say that Tamil freedom fighters are terrorists. This is the only consoling factor, I do admit. But I would like to ask don't you consider that this is a dastardly act of state terro-

rism, killing of so many innocent people? This is a clear case of State terrorism. Now, from how many lands how many foreign countries, they have derived so much of help? Every month, 1,500 people are being recruited to the police. The strength of the constabulary is on the increase. Why? It is only to put down the Tamil freedom fighters: It is only to put down the Tamil civilian population. They are being massacred. After two or three years, you need not solve the problem. With a heavy heart, I will tell you, there will be no problem. The problem will be there as long as people are there. If there is no Tamil race, if there are no people, where is the question of solving the problem? The whole race is being eliminated. They say, these people are terrorists. I say, they are freedom fighters. They are fighting for a cause. It is not all of a sudden, on a Sunday morning, they decided to take up arms. Sir, the hon. Minister is a scholar. He is a Constitutional expert. He knows for certain, what happened after 1949. What happened in the post-colonial history of Sri Lanka? It is replete with so many examples of discriminatory legislations against Tamils. In 1949, the Tamil plantation labourers were disenfranchised. It was a mortal blow to them. Again, in 1972, in 1978, through Constitutional amendments, Tamils have been brought down from the pedestal, from the kind of place, they have been occupying. Tamil ethos, Tamil culture, was being unceremoniously put down under a beastly feet. Again, by the 'Only Sinhala Act of 1956, a seal was put on the future of Tamils, Sri Lanka has almost become a theocratic State espousing the cause of Buddhism. Tamil has no place. Tamil students have no access to higher education. This kind of discrimination in the post-colonial era of Sri Lanka has resulted in this kind of armed rebellion. It has not come in a day. When these things are happening, you are sermonising that he should not embark upon a military solution. I would like to ask a pertinent question to the hon. Minister. The whole race is being eliminated. Can he not stop this kind of mass killing of civilians? Can he not stop this if he is sincere? I do not want a solution immediately. It may not be possible. But if you are sincere enough,

can you not stop this by one word, by use of powerful language? India is a mighty power. It is a great subcontinent of great people with great history. Can you not stop the mass killings, killings of innocent Tamil civilians? But subject to correction it seems, you go hand in hand with them and this is the net result. What is happening in Sri Lanka today? There is no parallel in the history of genocide anywhere. Even as a race Jews have not been subjected to this kind of a misery. I would like to remind the House and the hon. Minister, Mr. Shiv Shanker, when they say that they are for a limited federation, will the Government agree? Hon. Minister is a constitutional expert. I am asking him this question. They say, have a limited federation, a regulated autonomy or face the bullets. This is the caption. Suppose, we accept the proposals, what is the position? Is there any provision, any single provision under Sri Lankan Constitution today which can concede a limited autonomy or the regulated federation for the Tamils? Sri Lankan's provisions are the carbon copy of the French Constitution. In French Constitution there is no place for federalism, for sharing powers. It is the unitary form of Constitution. Even if there is Constitutional amendment, Jayewardene has to go for referendum to his people. Then there will be the question whether the majority Sinhalese fanned by Buddhist Clergy would accept this kind of federation or this kind of regulated autonomy. Don't you think that this is a kind of cheating of the people, of the gullible masses there, again I would like to plead that until and unless Government of India goes for economic sanctions, you cannot achieve anything. Shed away your role of a mediator. Your role of a mediator even after 100 years, will not bring anything. Instead of being a mediator, identify yourself whole heartedly with the people there, with the Tamil civilians there, who are being butchered. Convince the international community, heads of the Governments, that there is every possibility of a solution other than a political solution in the Island. I will say, for example, agricultural operations have come to an end. The basic postulates of agricultural

economy in Jaffna are chillies and potatoes. It has come to an end, but Government of India even today is exporting to the same island, they are encouraging them. That is why I say that India has not taken the problem seriously. I will show you hundred news papers of Sri Lanka. Out of 100, almost in 70 papers you will find, "Big brother, mind your business", "big brother, do not meddle". Do you know why the great George Orwell, when he wrote the celebrated satire "1984" became great. It is only his words 'big brother' when he wrote he would not have thought of Sri Lankan editors that gained currency. And even today the Ceylonese races would have been unsparingly using this kind of a phrase 'big brother'. We are condemned. We are not taken seriously. We are considered to be only paper tiger. Unless and until you convince the international community for this kind of a solution other than political we cannot find any positive solution, no solution will be in our sight. A day will come when we will be greeting an independent nation, with a soul search because in Sri Lanka there are two races, there are two nations. You go and advise them that they have to live in amity, they have to live in brotherhood, they have to live in peace. This is the diplomatic pep-talk but the reality is totally different. You cannot have two Caesars in a tent, you cannot have two swords in a sheath. This is not possible at all.

Sir, without taking much time on this. I would like to say that when the Tamil blood is seeping through your feet, do not hold an olive branch, this will not bring any permanent solution to this ethnic problem of Tamils in Sri Lanka.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House shall continue to sit without lunch break. Shri Kalyanasundaram.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman. Sir, at the outset I want to seek a clarification regarding the statement made by the Minister in the second paragraph. That our delegation met leaders of all

[Shri M. Kalyanasundaram]

political parties, including Mrs. Bandaranaike. I want to know whether our delegation met the Communist Party of Sri Lanka whose only member in the captive Parliament of Jayewardene is fighting for a political solution and for avoiding a clash with India, protesting against becoming the tool of imperialism and attempts to allow military bases in Trincomalee. I want to know why our delegation avoided meeting such a man and such a party in Sri Lanka. I have definite information that your delegation did not meet him. If they had met him, they would have brought some wisdom.

Now, Sir, we have two statements. One is the statement made by our hon. Minister. I know his capabilities and capacity. I do not want to cast any aspersions on him. I wish him all success. This is a matter in which we should unite. There is nothing to gloat. We can afford to gloat if something goes wrong in any other economic Ministry. But if something goes wrong in the Defence Ministry or External Affairs Ministry, it will affect the entire country. If Mr. Jayewardene or his agents were to watch the proceedings of this House, they will be very happy. We have missed the real enemy; we have missed the real target. We are fighting amongst ourselves. The Opposition is accusing the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister is accusing the Opposition.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, not the Prime Minister. It is only one way traffic.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: The Prime Minister may not have accused, but he is also feeling that it is the DMK which is whipping up Tamil chauvinism. Otherwise it is all right. But that is the impression we are creating. It is not a problem between the DMK and the Congress (I) or the Prime Minister.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I assure you that is not the question at all.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:

That is a different issue. That is what I want to say. Now I have read both the statements. One is the statement of Jayewardene made to India through the 'Sunday Times'. He is making statements to India through London. That statement is before me. And the statement made by our hon. Minister is also before me. So long as the late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was handling it, she was handling it with great courage, shrewdness and cleverness. She refused to be drawn into the trap. She confined herself to saying that the role of India was only to offer good offices to enable both the parties to meet and discuss. "We are not concerned either with the demands or whether you accept the demands or not or how far you accept them. It is not my concern." That is where she played her card well. The advisers she had advised her very cleverly. So India refused to go beyond offering good offices to bring the parties to the dispute to the table for talks. Now you are becoming the representatives for Jayewardene. And you are taking the responsibility for Jayewardene. This is what the statement says: Government are evaluating the formulations received from the Sri Lanka Government. The Sri Lanka Government has also been requested to communicate their views on such alternative formulations. In our view what can be put to the Tamil side is only a package of proposals which are evaluated as constituting a fair, reasonable basis for a negotiated settlement. Is it for the Tamilians to assess and say whether it is reasonable or fair or acceptable. India never assumed the role of being a mediator. This is the trap into which you have been drawn by that wonderful Foreign Secretary. Mr. Romesh Bhandari. Jayewardene laid the trap and through this former Secretary we walked into the trap. We are now having the role of a mediator. This turn came from the Thimphu talks. Now you are caught between the Tamils and Jayewardene. Jayewardene is very happy and he thinks we will do his job and he will be safe. The moment you took over the role of a mediator, Jayewardene thought his hands are strong. It is not Jayewardene with whom we have to deal. We have to deal with the ringmasters behind Jayewardene. It is very clear. An international stage.

managed drama is taking place among American President Reagan, Mrs. Thatcher, Israel, Pakistan and Jayewardene. Even his refusal to negotiate for economic aid from the consortium is a drama. They want to give him aid, but if they give aid India will protest. So, to avoid the protest of India they advised Jayewardene to carry on this exercise of negotiations with India but not to reach a settlement. Jayewardene does not want a political settlement; it is very clear from his statement. You want a political settlement. Repeatedly you are saying it. For tactical reasons at least, can't you keep quiet? Is it diplomatic wisdom to place your cards on the table? Whatever happens, even if all the Tamils are killed, nothing will happen. Then why should you argue for a political settlement? He is using your good offices—now I use the words with the dictionary meaning—or your mediation efforts to gain time to pile up arms, to get his supporters into the island and threaten us. Some people may be happy that he has slapped Rajiv Gandhi or he has cheated Rajiv Gandhi. A slap on Rajiv Gandhi is a slap on 70 crores of Indians.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Nobody could feel happy. If Rajiv Gandhi is slapped it is a slap on India, not on Rajiv Gandhi.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: My dear Mr. Gopalsamy, there is no insinuation against you. Your position is very clear. Your party has been demanding right from the beginning, that the army should be sent. Your position is clear. Even though we will not agree with that, we know where you are. That is a different matter. But there are others who sail with you and those who sail with us. Similarly we know our position.

It is not a defeat for the Rajiv Gandhi Government or a slap in his face. It is a serious matter for the whole of India. They are combining Pakistan, Israel and South Africa there—the ringmaster is Reagan—and they are trying to land in Sri Lanka, using this problem. I ask Mr. Shiv Shanker or Mr. Narayanan to tell me why Jayewardene is so adamant with regard to a link between the eastern and the northern provinces.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: How can they answer that?

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: If they don't answer, then they are unfit to be diplomats. It is because Trincomalee is needed badly by the Americans. They do not have such faith among the Tamils. They feel that the Tamils and closer to India and so Trincomalee must be separate and the harbour of Trincomalee should be directly administered by Colombo. That is their game. Why is a settlement is not possible? If land settlement takes place, if it is negotiated, then, the whole thing, the Tamil majority area can be constituted into one unit.

Even if Mr. Jayewardene, in a week's time, agrees to discuss this problem, his masters will not allow. Don't miss to see the real masters who are twisting Mr. Jayewardene. And Mr. Jayewardene is twisting the Government of India so that you can twist the Tamils and reach a political settlement according to the likes of the Americans. This is what has happened.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I would like to agree to your theory to a certain extent, not in coming to a logical conclusion.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: To that extent my statement is correct. You will take some more months to agree with me. Your predecessors have taken more than a year to agree with me. You kindly study the whole thing in the light of what I say. *(Time bell rings)*.

Why? A few more minutes. I cannot leave. Mr. Jayewardene so lightly. I am not attacking Mr. Jayewardene. Mr. Jayewardene is only a tool in the hands of Mr. Rengan.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please ask clarifications.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: I am only trying to substantiate.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Fourteenth century^{*}

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : This is what he says, "I am losing my patience and I will unleash the troops." Where is the effort on his part to reach a political settlement? Is there any indication? This has happened when our delegation was sitting before him, and he has issued the statement when the delegation was in Colombo.

Similarly, another thing happened at the same time. This is the respect shown to our delegation. This is how lightly they treat our delegation and our Government. On the last day the Security Minister, Mr. Athulathmudali was not able to participate in the talks. Why? He went on a secret mission. Where? To Israel. What for? To get their advice to spell out the terms and conditions of the negotiations or to seek other help, military help. So, the game of Jayewardene Government should be understood properly, and those who twist Jayewardene Government also should be understood. Then only will we be able to reach a proper solution to this problem. Sir, this is what has appeared in a London journal. According to the "SUNDAY TIMES" three pilots—two Britons and one South African, have been seen manning helicopter gunships which regularly bomb the rebel positions in and around Jaffna and Trincomalee. So, already they are operating. When they say South African, they cannot be black South African. They are white South Africans, that is, racist South Africans. And the British are there.

There is another wonder. I think the Government should study this. To escape any responsibility, what the British do is to create some fake private company dealing with army and security. Here is one company called Kintini Mini Services. Are they running

transport service or an air service? They are prepared to lend the services to any mercenary for any purpose, for killing anybody. And Mrs. Thatcher will say tomorrow to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, "What can I do? My country has democracy. So, they have the right to organise a service company like that. They are supplying arms. They are supplying mercenaries. What can we do?" Then, can we repay in the same coin? Suppose, some two lakh Tamils organise themselves and offer themselves to go there, will you allow?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : We should do that.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : This what has happened. That is a different matter—how to do it and what to do it. It is a different matter I am not concerned with it. I am putting that question. Now Government's hands are tight. You have got into the trap as a mediator. As a mediator you are negotiating. Tomorrow you would not ask Amrithalingam, Prabhakaran or Padmanabha or Mr. Uma Maheshwaran. He will ask: Mr. Rajiv Gandhi I have given this proposal through Chidambaram. What has happened to it, you tell me. Why should the Government of India take this unpleasant and impossible task of being a mediator for an unscrupulous man, who has no respect for democracy. Hon. Member Bhandari was comparing him with us. Even when Emergency was there, Indira Gandhi extended the Life of Parliament only by one year and in 1977 she went in for election and she lost. Here is a man who extended the whole life of Parliament by a referendum and got himself elected its President. It is a captive Parliament there. Why do you compare that with our democracy? I do not say that there are no defects in our democracy, but that is a different matter. Of course, our electoral laws require some changes, but that is a different matter. Don't compare with what Jayewardene has been doing even without

^{*}Expunged as ordered by the Chair

emergency. This Parliament was elected some ten years ago and it is being extended without election. Have you ever witnessed a Parliament moving a no confidence motion against a leader of the Opposition. Who was the leader of the Opposition? The leader of the Opposition was the leader of the Tamilians, Mr. Amrithalingam, who won 18 of the 19 seats representing the Tamilians. The motion of no-confidence was against him. And later the Constitution was so amended to remove him from Parliament altogether. Eighteen Members from the Opposition were also removed from Parliament. One Communist MP escaped from this and he is still continuing. That MP also is not to their liking.

Now, I want to know what are the prospects of any political settlement. From what appears in both the statements—the statement sent to us through the 'London Times' by Jayewardene and the Statement made by the Hon. Minister in this House. I have no any political settlement. Political settlement will emerge only with the cooperation of the Sinhalese and the Tamils there. I am not desperate, but a political solution will be there. I am not for any reason demanding that our Indian Army should invade. No, I am not for that. It will create more complications because one crores sinhalese and 27 lakhs of Tamils will become our permanent enemies. That is what Jayewardene wants. That is why he is comparing himself with Cyprus. There are about ten lakhs of Tamils spread all over the country. Other ten lakhs are where the Sinhalese majority is there.

So, if our Army goes whom will they instai? It is not like Bangladesh. There was Mujibur Rahman to be placed on the throne. Can our Army enter and place Mr. Amrithalingam in Colombo or leave Amrithalingam in Jaffna and return? What will happen to poor Amrithalingam, who

is left there in Jaffna by our Indian Army?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Dou you want a debate on this?

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Let us discuss. You also explain. I am only trying to explain if Tamil Eelam was practical and viable and achieveable, I will not hesitate. If by sending Indian Army, the problem can be solved, I will not hesitate to make that demand. That is why my party did not attend the Conference convened in Madurai for which an invitation was sent to us. But unfortunately we are unable to speak in one voice. Members of the Opposition parties sitting here either Mr. Upendra or Mr. Advani, also do not demand that the army should be sent. If they are convinced that the Army should be sent, then they must tell ...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Even in Madurai, it is not there.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: I have seen your resolution. Many of the Tamils support the demand for sending the Army. Even political solution ...

SHRI J. K. JAIN (Madhya Pradesh): Have you supported this resolution?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Do you know what it is?

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: The resolution says that we, therefore, call upon the Government of India to raise the issue that figure in all international forums like U.N., NAM and CHOGM to seek remedial action. This is operative portion of the resolution passed in Madurai. I have no quarrel with that resolution. Having passed such a resolution, what is the stand we should take? I have no objection for criticising Government of India and its failure. I have made my criticism that they

[Shri M. Kalyanasundaram]

walk into the trap laid by Jayewardene. They are very much afraid of him. They don't show the courage and conviction shown by late Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Now he realised the vacillating policy of this Government and he wanted to solve it by force. That is the courage he has got because of our vacillation and after Government started handling of this problem. For that reason I won't attack the foreign policy as a whole. Some hon. Member asked what is happening in Pakistan and Bngiadesh. I won't attack on this account. But I must turn the anger of 70 crore of Indian people against those forces which try to encircle my country. This is my country. I won't leave it to Rajiv Government alone to ruin or save it. We must all rouse the people equally to save this country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Madan Bhatia, do you want to ask any questions?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, ...

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Just one point only. In the Minister's statement there is a sentence, I quote:

"Government condemns the continuing violence in Sri Lanka."

What is continuing is State terrorism. You are saying 'continuing violence'. You are equating both. The Tamil boys who are dying and the Tamils who are being killed: Are you pin-pointing that? Who has blown up that aeroplane in Colombo airport? It is not Tamils. The above sentence gives a confused meaning. It should be corrected. It should not come in this form.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I shall be very brief. I share the feelings of the outrage to which an expression has been given by the hon. Members at the tragic events in Sri Lanka. It is no doubt a

very unprecedented situation where the Government of the day is bombarding its own civilians including innocent men, women and children. The hon. Members have said that the policy of the Government of India is vacillating and incoherent. Sir, I do not subscribe to this proposition. The questions, in fact, which are staring us in the face today over Sri Lanka today are three questions: The first is what is, in fact, India's foreign policy *vis-a-vis* the events in Sri Lanka? The second question is: Whether this foreign policy continues to fit in with the unfolding drama in Sri Lanka? The third question is: Whether if any departure is to be made from the foreign policy as it exists today?

Whether that departure could be justified within the parameters of international law? India has repeatedly declared that the events in Sri Lanka are the internal affair of Sri Lanka. It is within the constraint of this basic postulate that India has been operating to bring about a peaceful solution to the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka. This basic postulate, this constraint of India's foreign policy is in accordance with the traditions of India's foreign policy of good neighbourliness, goodwill, brotherhood and peaceful co-existence with its neighbours. But the question is whether this present policy fits in with the events which are now taking place in Sri Lanka. I respectfully submit that, firstly, Sri Lanka has chosen to externalise its own problem. Sri Lanka has invited foreign, external forces to carry out its own well-calculated policy of annihilation of its own civilians and finding out a military solution to its own problem. Having externalised its own problem, Sri Lanka can, in no justification, claim to assert that what is happening in Sri Lanka is the internal affair of Sri Lanka. Secondly—and this is more important—the mounting intervention of the external forces totally inimical to India is part of a gigantic international conspiracy to bring about a military encirclement of India and ultimately affect India's security and its stability.

If that be so, then my respectful submission is that the present policy of India or the basic postulate of India and the constraints which India has imposed upon itself with regard to its policy *vis-a-vis* Sri Lanka, no longer holds goods—that is, that the events in Sri Lanka are purely an internal affairs of Sri Lanka. A departure is called for in view of these developments which have now taken place.

The third question which I posed to myself in the beginning was whether such a departure could be justified within the parameters of international law. I respectfully submit, Sir, yes, firstly because no nation has got the right to indulge in mass genocide of its own citizens with the help of external military forces. If it does, it can no longer claim that the events taking place within its frontiers are the internal affair of that particular country. Secondly, Sir, under the international law, India has the right of anticipatory self-defence. It was this right which was invoked by the United States of America during the Cuban crisis in the sixties. When the missiles were installed by the Soviet Union in Cuba, the United States relied upon the principle of anticipatory self-defence to call upon Cuba to dismantle all the missiles and to call the Soviet Union to take back those missiles from the soil of Cuba. It is on the basis of this principle that it is possible for us to say that the events within the frontiers of Sri Lanka are no longer the internal affair of Sri Lanka. And India can reply upon this principle of anticipatory self-defence to say that being a serious threat to the stability and security of India, India can no longer remain quiet. Therefore, I will ask one last question at the end. Will the honourable Minister clarify whether, in view of these developments, the Government of India is contemplating to bring about a departure from its declared policy that

the affairs within the frontiers of Sri Lanka are its internal affairs?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the outset, some honourable Members were kind enough to congratulate me on the floor of the House and I deem it my duty to express my very sincere and grateful thanks to them. Coming to the subject on this issue there has been quite a lot of debate. Government of India's standpoint has been explained from time to time. Many an honourable Member has been quite critical of the statement that I have made. Some of them have been pleased to use invectives of disappointment, they have gone to the extent of saying that it is unfortunate, some of them have used the expression that it is an exercise in verbiage, some honourable Members felt that it is a statement of helplessness. I don't think that any of these invectives could be used to the statement. I shall presently make my submissions about the various aspects that have been raised with reference to the statement. But before I go into this question, we must understand certain basis which honourable Members are well aware of. I would like to clear this premise because some Members have gone to the extent of saying that we had assumed the role of a mediator which, in my view, is not a correct reading of the situation. The position is that the issue of Tamil in Sri Lanka is a very delicate issue, very delicate because (a) it concerns a neighbouring country of ours and (b) in the other neighbouring countries which we have, the problem arising there have delicacy because of the fall-out that it could have in that country as well. Here is a case of an ethnic minority which is very closely related to a considerable segment of our society, and naturally there is bound to be an emotional upsurge whenever something happens to our blood relations. As a result of what has been happening in Sri Lanka, as honourable Members have very rightly observed, quite a good number of refugees—their number today

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

is 1,26,000—have come over here to seek shelter. If the Government of Sri Lanka think that they do not have any obligation towards them, it would be a

very unfortunate approach. 2.P.M. They cannot just throw them away. Situations arise in the international relations where some of the solutions as have been suggested by the hon. Members would prove disastrous. The Government of India, on a very careful consideration, thought that this is a problem which requires a political solution. And I would like to make the position absolutely clear that we would strive every nerve to see that we achieve a political solution within the framework and the context of the situation and the atmospheric effect that it will have. I am not prepared to accept that we are undertaking merely remedial role. Why do I say this? It is true that we are using our good offices while we are trying to negotiate with the Sri Lankan Government and the authorities. But I am not unmindful, and the Government of India cannot be unmindful, of the fact that this ethnic minority has a blood relationship with a large segment of our society. We owe certain obligations because of a neighbouring country and also owe obligations because it has an effect over a large segment of our society, and I would not like to look at it from the point merely of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu or anything but the country as a whole. And it is in this background we would like to seek a solution. When we are trying to speak to the Sri Lankan Government, we are also taking into considerations the hopes and aspirations and the emotions of the Tamil minority and we are consciously and unconsciously influenced to a certain extent by what they are thinking when we are trying to negotiate this issue with the Sri Lankan Government.

Sir, in this background I would not like to go into the details because a lot of time would be consumed and it is also not possible for me to answer each and every question that has been raised. I would try to meet all the important questions which have been raised.

Sir, very rightly I could see the justified agitation on the part of the hon. Members in regard to the statement that has been made in 'Sunday Times' by Shri Jayewardene. I can only comment: it does not behave well for a seasoned politician of the stature of Mr. Jayewardene to speak in terms that he has done. To say the least, perhaps the adjectives that have been used by some hon. Members fit into the texture when they have said that the language is intemperate ...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : A seasoned politician like Shiv Shanker and not like Jayewardene ...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER : ...and irresponsible. Sir, while I was trying to read that statement, if that statement is made only to purchase certain arms as it appears to be and trying to say that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is helping, this only shows how much President Jayewardene has lost the confidence of his own people. He attributes that Shri Rajiv Gandhi is trying to help the other side. He goes to the extent of saying—since there is no denial so far, I am going on that basis—that there is no other go except a military solution. This is how he tries to put it. That shows that the man has lost his nerve and that is where—as some hon. Members, perhaps very rightly, have observed and I feel like agreeing with them—it is an intemperate expression and an irresponsible thing to say. It is unfortunate that the accusation has been made against the Prime Minister without any basis whatsoever. If this is merely to get some arms or some

money or whatever it could be, this is far more unfortunate. As Mr. Kal-
yanasundaram has very rightly ob-
served, if the sentiments of this House
are reckoned, I am confident and I
confidently expect a reasonable person
to rethink and review his approach and
to make a sincere effort to find out a
happy solution to this problem.

Sir, essentially this problem requires
a political solution. Ego or vanity in
an individual on a problem like this
obviously creates more problems.
Perhaps in politics, ego or vanity of a
man mars or makes, makes rarely but
mars on most occasions, the career of
the whole nation. I would not like to
go further.

Some of the hon. Members have
asked about various proposals. I would
only make a submission at this stage
that it will not be possible for me and
I would request the hon. Members to
bear with me. As regards the propo-
sals that have been put forth on the
side of the Sri Lankan Government,
there is a gentleman's agreement that
we should not disclose and I would
beseech the hon. Members not to press
this point. I was very careful in ex-
pressing myself and I had gone to the
extent of saying that "while there has
been some movement on issues like
the overall structure for devolution of
power and land settlement policy,
there are still a number of crucial
gaps in the formulations on core issues
like law and order and on the nature
of the relationship between the present
Northern and Eastern provinces which
are issues to which Tamils attach
great importance." We concede that
point. Some of the hon. Members were
trying to ask me whether these things
have been discussed with the Tamil
leaders. I have actually made the posi-
tion clear in the latter paragraph.
"Government are evaluating the for-
mulations received from the Sri Lanka
Government." I would like to explain
one or two sentences which have been
made the butt of the criticism. "The

Sri Lanka Government has also been
requested to communicate their views
on certain alternative formulations."
On this, one of our elderly Members
has gone to comment that we are
assuming the role of a mediator.
I am sorry that it is a misreading of the
sentence. "In our view what can be put
to the Tamil side is..." because as on to-
day, what proposals or formulations have
been received are being evaluated by us.
And as I said, the Sri Lankan Government
has also been requested to comment, to co-
municate their views on some alternative
proposals. So, the matter is still in the
embryonic stage. And then the next sen-
tence that has been said is: "In our view,
what can be put to the Tamil side is only
a package of proposals which are evaluated
as constituting..." I would request the
hon. Members to give a little attention to
this expression-- "constituting a fair and
reasonable basis for a negotiated settlement."
As long as we are not satisfied that these
proposals constitute a fair and reasonable
basis for a negotiated settlement which
could be approved by the Tamil side, till
then we thought that we should not put it
to them. What is the purpose of putting
to the Tamil leaders matters which
have not come to a stage where we are
satisfied that they have become salable to
them.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:
How can you decide on their behalf?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: It should
not be that difficult, Mr. Upendra to come
to some conclusions. After all, we know
their mind. We have been discussing with
them for quite some time. How they are
bending what is their psychology is also
known to us. There, it is here
where I would like to say that
it is not a case of a mediator's
role. But we are becoming subjective
there. We would like to assess ourselves
whether with this can we talk to the Tamil
leaders so that it becomes a saleable issue.
Till then, we would not like to. It is not
just as though a mediator, and alright you
are giving and I am doing the post office
work and I am passing it on to them. That
is why I prefaced by submitting that our

[Shri P. Shiv Shankar]

natural sympathies are also there for whatever reason it may be because this is not as though one could say that I would be totally an umpire. Some hon. Members have said that we are behaving like an umpire. No. It is true that when it comes to the question of the Sri Lankan Government, we are using our good offices. Yes. And we would like to use it till the time when we feel, look, we should not, and it is possible. Therefore, I would like to remove from the mind of the hon. Members a feeling that they have tried to convey that either we are trying to be merely an umpire or we would like to be a mediator without any thrust on our back. One aspect where the hon. Members have been pleased to criticise with reference to the expression of the 'compressed timeframe'. I think that expression cannot be read divorced by the context in which it has been used. And the context is, we have said there that the "Government are keen to ensure ..." We have only expressed our keenness to ensure that a solution is arrived at within a compressed timeframe so that the agony and sufferings of the people of Sri Lanka, and particularly of the Tamils in Northern and Eastern provinces are brought to a quick end. Our keenness is to ensure that this problem is resolved as early as possible so that it does not further perpetuate the trouble of the people. It is in this background that we have said, and I would not like to make too much out of the criticism that has been made.

Sir, some of the hon. Members felt and, perhaps, speaking here I was thinking that there is some basis for the argument that the Sri Lankan Government raised the issue in this form just on the eve of the meet of the Aid Consortium. I would not like to hazard my opinion on it. But we are making our position clear to the various powers, we are trying to explain our stand as well. We are trying to explain the stand of the Tamil leaders also.

Sir, in this context I must also bring to the notice of the House when some of the Members have been pleased to raise the

question about the SAS and so on and so forth.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: What about the aid consortium?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: What was said by the hon. Members was that this type of an approach as to the solution of the problem is projected by the Sri Lankan authorities on the eve of the air consortium meeting only to get more aid . . .

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN. It happened last year.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER . . . and then divert it for the purpose of purchasing arms. I said that I would not like to hazard any opinion on that, but we have approached the different countries. We have been trying to convey to them what we feel about the issue, what the sentiments of the Tamils are and what exactly is happening. It is very difficult for me to go into the details of it. But nonetheless it is not as though on our part we are not carrying on our diplomatic activity in that regard. It is true, it is possible. I do not deny that. It is possible that on some occasions not withstanding this things happened against our wish and will but that is because of the power game that goes on, be it a policy in relation to India which might influence their thinking adversely or otherwise. These are the matters which cannot be gone into in detail in a debate like this. I wanted to say only this much that we are aware of the observation that has been made by the hon. Members. We, on our part, are trying to take all the steps we could take. That is all that I can say at this stage. (Interruptions).

Sir, I must submit that the hon. Member would, at least, agree with me that if I have said something that is not merely as an advocate, but I have said it with all the sincerity at my command, and I assure the hon. Members if there is a flaw I have never hesitated to accept that flaw also. I have only said as on today that we are making our efforts, we have been continuing our efforts. They have not found a

trusion is a different issue altogether and it is not possible in an international diplomacy of the nature that exists, and perhaps very rightly Mr. Kalyanasundaram projected a different approach altogether. These are the various things which have the effect, the cause and effect in an international diplomacy and if we are getting influenced and if these things influence, they have their effect also. And it is precisely this which is happening.

Sir, one of the hon. Members has been pleased to go to the extent of saying that it is a case of total break-down of our diplomatic relations. I do not think that such an uncharitable view could be taken of our diplomatic relations. We are no doubt cautious and as it has been very rightly said the powerful authority and the more powerful has got to be the restraint. One cannot lose temper in matters like this. One has got to be patient enough in trying to seek solutions. And if we lose patience, the utterances are what we have found in 'London Times'. That type of utterances would only mean the breaking down of the diplomatic acumen.

Sir, one of the hon. Members has suggested—though not very clearly—that the statement is a great disappointment and possibly it is because of certain international pressures. I do not concede that any international pressure is falling on us for the purpose of putting out this type of a statement. We will certainly take into consideration what is in the interest of our nation and people. We have certain avowed objectives. We have our clear foreign policy, the foundations of which were laid by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We pursue those policies and in pursuing those policies, we see to it that no country becomes unduly a subject of injustice and we raise our voice and we have done so on all international occasions.

Sir, one of the hon. Members was pleased to ask as to what are our very clear views with reference to different issues which the Tamil minority and their leaders have raised. I have broadly made my state-

ment with reference to our attitude part of it. When it comes to the question of going into the brass cakes and going into the details, our attitude is naturally governed by the attitude which I have submitted in broader terms. But nonetheless, if the Tamil minority would like to accept a position other than the avowed approach that they have taken, well, that is a matter which is left to them and if it pleases them, we will welcome it and we would certainly take it up with the Sri Lanka Government and the authorities for the purpose of seeing whether this is acceptable to them. It is precisely this which we had been trying to do. If it does not please them, if it is not acceptable to them and if it does not become saleable with them, no purpose will be served by taking it up and that is why to say as to what exact views we have with reference to each and every issue, is to expect or to demand too much from the Government of India. Government of India has its views but they could slightly change if the Tamil leaders take a slightly different view because ultimately as one hon. Member has rightly said, while it is an internal affair of Sri Lanka, we are concerned because the fallout is likely to be on us. Therefore, we would like to help out the morass that has come to pass. We would like to see that it is got over and for that what could be done. It is there where we have said that we will certainly use the good offices and this we have done at the instance of Sri Lanka Government because we wanted a proper solution. After all, they are our neighbours. In a pluralistic society, the rulers have got to be very careful. They cannot behave in a manner they would like to which creates problems for the minorities, be it linguistic religious or whatever it is, and this is very well known to us because after all, ours is so much a multiple society and you cannot get an example in any other country of the world. Sir, one of the hon. Members was pleased to raise the issue about the attacks on fishermen. He was pleased to ask whether any compensation has been paid to them. (Interruption) There have been attacks on Indian fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy. But Sri Lanka claims that these attacks have taken place in Sri Lankan waters, when Indian boats crossed over to

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

the Sri Lanka side on the maritime boundary

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that our own Government have admitted that 96 times our fishermen have been assaulted within our own territorial waters. A statement to this effect has been made on the floor of this House.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am trying to meet the point which was raised by Mr. Dhabe. Sir, we have lodged protests with the Sri Lankan Government wherever it was relevant and in some cases, we have demanded compensation. They have, of course, not come out with payments. They have in fact, no accepted the theory that they owe any amount. So far as we are concerned, our coast guards have been trying to intensify patrolling and co-ordinate with the Tamil Nadu Governmental authorities to ensure that no attacks take place in Indian waters. On the question of compensation, I would not like to go into the details. In 1986, there have been no deaths...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Six persons have been killed.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am just giving the details. Five persons were killed in 1985 and one during 1984. In these cases, Government of India have paid compensation to each one of them, to the relatives. Of course, no compensation is sufficient enough to replace the lives lost. But nonetheless, an amount of Rs. 10,000 was paid to the relatives of each of the persons who died. Also, the Tamil Nadu Government has taken care of them. This is a matter where, as I said, on the question of compensation, on the question of the attacks, the Sri Lankan Government is adopting a totally different approach. Sir, an allegation was made about the involvement of British mercenaries, Pakistan and

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: South African involvement.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: That is also there. I would not like to go into this. But these issues are taken up. We have taken it up with the British authorities.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: A specific thing was mentioned. There is an organisation called Kini-Mini or whatever its name, which has supplied arms, which has provided training to the mercenaries to fight the Tamils in Sri Lanka. Do you have any information on this?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: So far as the British authorities are concerned, various issues have been raised with them. But they deny their involvement. In fact, some details have already been furnished. But when it comes to the question of Israel or South Africa, it is not possible for us to directly communicate with them. But we have tried to take up this issue with some countries which have friendly relations with them.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Have you taken up with Sri Lanka about the South African involvement. This was my specific question and on this even Mr. Prime Minister did not agree with me?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: The point is, these issues are put before the High Commissioner who is here and also before the Sri Lankan Government. It is not as though it has not been taken up, but the point is in matters like this the first answer that comes is that all is false. It is a part of international diplomacy, you could call it. The question is, one need be content with that answer or one gives further details where they would again say that the same are all false. That is the thing which has got to be determined. It is not as though we are not taking up these issues.

SHRI S. W. DHABE: Just like election results are changed.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: They have openly admitted in the United Nations that

they have trade relations with South Africa. (*Interruptions*) That is why I have asked the question whether you have taken up the issue with Sri Lanka.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Gopalsamy, this issue has not only been taken up with them but has also been taken up with some other Governments so that if they can exercise a little influence on them they should do so. What result follows is a matter about which, on many an occasion you cannot say with certainty, what will follow because when they also take an approach, many a thing determines their approach. Supposing, they are antagonistic to us they would not only like our lodging the protest, they would cover it up and try to help other side much farther. This is part of international diplomatic logic.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Is it diplomacy?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Whatever you call it, you call it, but this is the reality which one faces. (*Interruptions*). One aspect which I would like to say, which the hon. Members have been pleased to advert to, is with reference to the position of Mr. Romesh Bhandari. Mr. Romesh Bhandari, as a Foreign Secretary, had been handling this issue for quite some time. After his retirement, if he has been included in the delegation, I see no flaw or informity in his being included as one of the persons in the delegation. Merely because he happens to be the chairman of the foreign affairs cell of the party, I do not know how...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: For that* * * * *

It has come in the press.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: That I do not know. I am sorry I would not like to go into those facts, I would like to answer only those questions that have

been raised here. A fact on which I am not sure I would not like to answer nor it is relevant at this stage here.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Why don't you include somebody who is competent from this side?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Whether somebody should be included or not is a matter which you will have to leave it to the realm of the Government. (*Interruptions*). Not you, you will not decide it. (*Interruptions*).

I am only trying to put it that when you are trying to find a fault I say that there is no fault or flaw in it. That is why I said that the man had some experience of handling the issue. He had been discussing this for some time. Therefore, his expertise could be taken advantage of. That was the approach. That was the reason.

Sir, various suggestions, that have been made are the matters on which I would not like to comment at this stage. These are the matters which could be gone into a little further. I would not like go into the various other small matters which have been referred to by the hon. Members, I would like to say one thing. Because it was said whether the delegation met the CPI member of Parliament of Sri Lanka.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is Communist Party of Sri Lanka, not CPI.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am really sorry, I accept the amendment. The delegation met the leader of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka—Peter Keuneman. The M. P. Mr. Sarat was not available. In fact he was invited for a dinner that was hosted by the Indian High Commissioner. He was not available. Possibly if he were to be available, some discussion could have taken place with him.

Sir, I have made my submissions broadly on the various issues. It is possible for hon. Members to come to the conclusion that I have not met each and every point, but it is not possible to meet each and every point, minor or otherwise. But, as I said at the very outset, this is a deli-

***Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

cate issue where I would request that the hon. Members sitting on the other side would lend a hand of support to the Government in seeing through a political solution on this issue. To my mind, we are not that disappointed not to find a solution. As I said, we will strive every nerve to see that some solution is possible. I appreciate the emotions, the sentiments that have been expressed on the other side. I am sure if some of the hon. Members who have spoken with so much emotion were to stand in my place, perhaps they would have been too *sobre* or more *sobre* perhaps than me. I am grateful to the hon. Members for the suggestions that have been made over the time. I would also make all efforts to see how best to sort out the issue. I share the concern. I want to end up by saying, of the hon. Members that they have expressed about the situation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now further consideration of the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund (Repeal) Bill, 1986. Last speaker, Shri S. W. Dhabe, to continue his unfinished speech.

SHRI S. W. DHABE: I hope we will have tea interval today. You have skipped over our lunch.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, we continue.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri R. Ramakrishnan) in the Chair.

—
**THE COAL MINES LABOUR WELFARE FUND (REPEAL) BILL, 1986—
Contd.**

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, I was referring to the question about coal workers' strike on 9th April 1986 for various demands, one of which was ensuring employment to dependents of retiring employees as per the agreement. They have made an agreement between the workers' representatives and the management. It was not proper on the part of the

Government and Coal India to turn about and take a stand that this provision has been found to be unconstitutional and is not being acted upon even in the steel sector. I go further and say that though the agreement was made it has been nullified by a directive of the Bureau of Public Enterprises. It is most surprising for Coal India or any public sector to say that dependents of retired employees will not be given jobs. This is very serious and I think the Government should review the situation and allow the agreement to be implemented. The coal-miners spend their whole lives in the area which is congested, in a bad atmosphere, and lead hazardous lives. One foot always in grave.

There are two other points which I have to make. There are two problems which I find when I go to the collieries and to which not much attention is being paid by the Ministry. One is the problem of pollution. If you go to the collieries, you will find that near the houses of the miners, because of burning of coal there is so much of gas. Details are given that many persons are affected by it. I do not know whether any health survey is made by Coal-India or its subsidiaries about the pollution problem in the collieries because of burning of coal and other pollutants.

Secondly, I find that unlike the Railways, Coal-India does not give much encouragement to sports. Football is very popular and if adequate sports facilities, specially for football, are created, it will go a long way in creating outstanding sportsmen. There should be more of promotion of sports.

Sir, I cannot support the abolition of this Act for two reasons. Firstly, the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act is a statutory legislation and its functions are very important. In the Labour Ministry's annual report for 1985-86, on page 22 it is stated:

'8.2 The funds have been created by levy of cess on production or consumption or export of the minerals and in the case of beedi on the manufactured