

Ministry for implementation. These proposals were adopted by the AC and EC and sent to the UGC in 1983. The UGC passed them on to the Ministry where they have been pending ever since. Almost 500 teachers are not receiving increments for, in some cases, as long as six years.

The January, 1983 agreement had provided for a Rs. 3 crores housing scheme for University employees and Rs. 6 crores housing scheme for the colleges. In 1984, the Ministry had agreed in principle to another Rs. 20 crores scheme. All these proposals are awaiting the Ministry's financial allocation while the overwhelming majority of Delhi University teachers still have no housing facilities.

The professional colleges of the University of Delhi continue to be outside the purview of Ordinance XII. The promotion scheme of January, 1983 agreement was for all teachers of Delhi University. However, the teachers of the professional colleges have been kept out of the ambit of this promotion scheme.

The University authorities have not only failed to implement the Interim Report of the Working Group on Democratisation but have consigned the Working Group itself to cold storage and attacked these limited democratic rights by imposing a restriction of two terms on elected teacher representatives in AC and EC. Attempts by the Delhi University Teachers Association to reason with the authorities through various memoranda, delegations and demonstration have failed to persuade the authorities to implement the 1983 agreement. The Delhi University Teachers Union, therefore, resolved to go on an indefinite strike from today. As a result of the strike forced upon the teachers, studies of 1.5 lakh students will be seriously affected. I request the Government to immediately intervene in the matter and take steps for a just and fair settlement of the dispute. Thank you.

REFERENCE TO DELAY IN REPAIRING RAJASTHAN ATOMIC POWER STATION UNIT

श्री धनेश्वर मीणा (राजस्थान) : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस स्पेशल सेशन के द्वारा आपकी मारफत सरकार का ध्यान राजस्थान एटोमिक पावर स्टेशन यूनिट-I जो कई वर्षों से बन्द पड़ी थी, जिसको फरवरी, 1985 में चालू किया गया उसकी ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। महोदय, इस यूनिट को दो तीन महीने में चालू करके अब फिर टेस्ट किया जा रहा है। श्रीमन्, यह कोई नयी बात नहीं है। एटोमिक पावर स्टेशन बन्द होते हैं चालू किये जाते हैं लेकिन इसका असर किसानों पर पड़ता है, उद्योगों पर पड़ता है। इस चीज को कोई नहीं देखता है। आज इसके कारण बिजली की सप्लाई नहीं हो पाती है और इसलिये कई उद्योग बन्द पड़े रहते हैं। आज विकास के साथ हमने किसानों को पानी दिया है, बिजली दी है लेकिन इस प्रकार के यूनिट जब बन्द हो जाते हैं तो पानी की सप्लाई टाइम पर नहीं होती है। इस समय सिंचाई का समय है। किसानों को पानी की बहुत सख्त जरूरत है। श्रीमन्, आपको तथा हाउस की मालूम है कि राजस्थान में इस साल भीषण भ्रकाल पड़ा हुआ है। यदि पानी की सप्लाई नहीं की जाती है तो किसानों को अब की बार की फसल ठीक से नहीं मिल पायेगी। इसलिये मैं आपकी मारफत सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ, कि इस प्रकार के जो यूनिट्स हैं इनकी व्यवस्था ठीक ढंग से की जाए ताकि आए दिन एटोमिक पावर स्टेशन बन्द न हों और किसानों को समय पर पानी मिल सके, बिजली मिल सके और इस प्रकार की सुविधा बराबर दी जा सके।

MOTION RE. PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I would like to make a short intervention on the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Why now? Why at this stage? The hon. Minister may make a full statement on the total international situation, but why utilise this opportunity to make a small statement on the SAARC conference? He has said what he had to say in the Lok Sabha...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are a very senior Member. The Minister is entitled to make a statement at the beginning and at the end, and in the initial statement, he can touch upon one aspect. Therefore, please sit down. Mr. Bhagat will go on.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, the first summit conference of South Asian countries was held in Dacca on 7th and 8th December, 1985. Prior to the summit a meeting of the Standing Committee comprising the Foreign Secretaries, followed by a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the seven countries were held on 4th and 5th December to prepare for the summit.

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

The Heads of State or Government of South Asian countries adopted a charter and a declaration and issued a joint press statement containing certain important decisions, on the last day of the summit. Copies of the charter and the declaration and the joint press statement are laid on the Table of the House. I am glad to inform the House that our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, was unanimously requested to convene the next summit meeting in India. Our Prime Minister's offer, in response, to host such a conference has been accepted. The Prime Minister's offer for convening a ministerial meeting on the participation of women in activities at regional level within the framework of SAARC has also been accepted. The Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, met all the participating Heads of State and Government. Both bilateral and multilateral issues of mutual interest were discussed. In

the meeting with President Ershad of Bangladesh satisfaction was expressed at the present state of relations. Besides other matters, an understanding has been reached that India and Bangladesh will jointly deal with the Mizo, Chakma and TNVF insurgencies. With the King of Bhutan the two leaders carried forward the discussions held only a few months ago when the Prime Minister visited the Kingdom of Bhutan. The President of Maldives extended an invitation to the Prime Minister to visit Maldives. This has been accepted with pleasure. King Birendra and the Prime Minister reviewed the development of relations since the King's visit to India. It has been agreed that President Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan will come to New Delhi for a day on the 17th December when discussions on bilateral matters will be continued. The Prime Minister exchanged views with President Jayawardene of Sri Lanka on the Sri Lankan ethnic problem. The summit can be rightly described as a historic event. It formally brought into being what the Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, called in his concluding statement the most populous regional group in the world. The decision of the Conference to have more frequent meetings of the Heads of State or Government and of the Foreign Ministers of the member-countries has created a much-needed framework for regional consultations at a very high level. Such consultations are expected to promote goodwill, understanding and friendship among the member-countries of SAARC which will have a positive impact on the bilateral relations between these countries. New areas of cooperation have been identified and instructions given to intensify South Asian Regional Cooperation. The Heads of State and Government have placed considerable emphasis on people-to-people contacts and their involvement in the activities under the aegis of SAARC. From now onwards the activities under SAARC will be vested with the authority of the political will and determination of the member Governments at the highest-

level. Under the leadership of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi India played an important role in the summit conference. That role was well appreciated and widely recognised. While the summit conference has ushered in a new area of cooperation among the South Asian countries, we should not underestimate the difficulties that we are going to encounter in this ambitious venture. We have still to overcome the bitterness of the past and satisfactorily resolve some of the current problems in our relations. There are also, inevitably, differences in our preception of both national interests and global issues. SAARC proposes both a challenge as well as an opportunity to overcome these difficulties.

The question was proposed.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, today when we are entering into a discussion on the international situation the world, in fact, stands on the brink of a nuclear holocaust. It is in such background that we are discussing the international situation. Even after forty years of the Second World War the imperialists have not learnt a lesson as to what a war means. They are again trying to drag the entire world into another war, this time not a conventional war, but a nuclear war which will destroy the entire humanity on the globe. After the Second World War the imperialists lost their colonies; they lost control over the subjugated people. Now, the present crisis has developed out of the imperialists' attempt to regain their control over the areas which they have lost during the forties or the fifties. This attempt of theirs to regain in which the control over these areas is actually giving rise to the present situation imperialists are trying to penetrate into and intervene in all the countries in the world, whether it is Latin America or whether it is in South-East Asia, or Africa or India or anywhere in the world.

Now, Madam, the present situation is such that even in India we find that the imperialist hand is very clear. They are attempting to create another world war. This attempt is threatening the Indian population also. During the Second World War, Madam, India was not so much affected in terms of death and destruction. But, today, if such a thing develops, India will not be out of that destruction which the entire Europe and other countries witnessed. We find that the American intervention in the various countries, particularly in the Latin American countries, in the African countries and the Asian countries has taken the acutest form. Now we find that wherever there is a liberation movement, wherever there is a democratic movement and wherever there is a revolutionary movement, it is the American hand which is trying to thwart the movement. In Nicaragua, you find that the American imperialists are intervening in a shameless way and they have now declared economic sanctions against Nicaragua. They have even mined the Nicaraguan ports so that all trade and other economic activities come to a stop and the Nicaraguan people are started to death and are forced to surrender. We find this sort of a thing in other countries too. In Angola, we have found that they are trying to dislodge the revolutionary Government there and are trying to help the counter revolutionaries. In South Africa, the American Government is shamelessly supporting the apartheid regime. In Israel, the American Government is supporting the Government there, is supporting the Israelis, and are arming them. And, Madam, it is only the American Government which has openly supported the invasion of the Palestinian Liberation Organization's case in Tunisia. So, we find that wherever there is trouble, there is the American hand. The American hand is there everywhere. In Lebanon, they tried to divide that country, but they failed. In the Arab world, they tried to divide the Arabs but they failed. But they have not stopped their activities and

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

they are again trying to divide these nations, to set one against the other, so that they can thereby gain control over them. These are the machinations of the American imperialism everywhere in the world.

Now, Madam, we have seen that Iran is lost to America. Previously, Iran was under the regime of the Shah and then it was the base for the American imperialists and they used to operate in the entire Middle-East from there. Since Iran is now lost to them, the Americans have now found another base in Pakistan and from their base in Pakistan they are trying to destabilize the entire South-East Asia including India. Now we find that the imperialists have assumed in fact, the interventionist from and they are intervening in our internal affairs and are aiding and abetting the secessionists. They are aiding and abetting the secessionists, whether it is the Khalistanists or the other secessionists. Whether it is the Khalistanists or the other secessionists it is only the Americans who have abetted and assisted them, not only within India, but also outside India. Wherever the secessionists and the separatists form themselves into group, whether in Canada or elsewhere, we find that the American hand, the imperialist hand, is behind them. So it is the American imperialism, the head of all the imperialist countries, which is creating trouble everywhere and the entire world is being brought nearer to the brink of a nuclear holocaust.

Now, Madam, we find that after a lot of attempts and under world pressure new developments are also taking place. Big peace movements have started and such peace movements are developing even inside America also.

Europe it is a powerful movement for peace and against war, because the European people who saw what war is, who saw what devastation the war brings—they saw it, they experienced it—the Russians who fought the Nazis know what war is, so in all these countries a very big peace move-

ment is developing for staying the hands of the imperialists who want to bring the world to another nuclear war. Now, there is a peace movement that is developing everywhere, including America, and because of the persistent efforts of the Soviet Government, ultimately, Reagan had to agree talks at Geneva in November last. But even when we see even when we look at the results of the summit talks in Geneva, we will find Reagan's obstinacy in continuing the star war programme. Still obstinacy was there and Reagan did not want to retreat from his position of the so called research work on star war.

Six years back there was a summit talk between the leadership and Soviet Union and American regime. During the last six years there was no talk between them, and the Reagan administration adamantly refused to talk to Soviets. The Reagan administration declared that it is their aim to destroy the entire socialist world, it is their aim to fight Marxism. Even Hitler did not declare that. He tried to fight Communism within Germany. But initially he did not declare war against world Communism and Socialism. But it is Reagan who has declared world-wide war against Socialism, and he openly declared that he will try to destroy the entire socialist countries. And he also made appeal to the so-called nationalists in socialist countries to rise up in counter insurgency. All these happened during the last six years, and they refused to bow down to any pressure and they wanted to continue with their programme of bringing the world into a nuclear holocaust.

Now, Madam, after the peace movement developed throughout the world, particularly in America and several other countries and the persistent efforts of the Soviet Russia, Reagan had to agree to talk with Gorbachev in November last in Geneva. We found a popular movement in favour of peace. Just on the eve of the summit

talk in Geneva, it was broadcast even by the All India Radio, that there was a huge demonstration in Geneva by the people from different countries, asking the two leaders to talk on peace terms, so that the world is relieved of tension and the world is assured of peace. There was a huge demonstration organized in Geneva itself. Now, only three or four days back—it was again broadcast—that in New York there was a huge demonstration of the American people. They were demanding of the American Government, The Reagan Government that the Reagan Government should renounce nuclear tests, they should stop nuclear tests and they should declare a moratorium on nuclear tests on the line that has been adopted by the Soviet Union. Even the American people are now feeling that it is the Soviet Union which is a champion of peace, it is the Soviet Union which wants to bring peace in the world, which wants to relieve the world from this tension, and that is why the American people demanded a moratorium on nuclear tests and reversal of the policy of stockpiling of nuclear armaments. Now, we find that Reagan obstinately refused to hear the popular opinion, public opinion, and it is the Soviet Union alone that is taking a different path. Not only today, when Brezhnev was alive, he declared in the U.N. Assembly that the Soviet Union will never use nuclear arms or a nuclear bomb as the first striker, they will never strike first with nuclear arms. It was declared by the Soviet Union in the United Nations General Assembly session. But the U.S.A. did not respond by making the same declaration that the U.S.A. would not be the first to strike with nuclear weapons. Had there been that response from the U.S.A., the world would have been relieved from this tension to a great extent. But the U.S.A. refused to announce like that. Even China who has acquired nuclear weapons, has declared that it will not be the first to strike with nuclear weapons. This is a very

good declaration. If this declaration had come from other nuclear powers, particularly the U.S. Administration, the world could have been relieved from much of the tension that it is suffering from. But that has not happened. They are not doing it. Madam, the Soviet Union not only declared that they will not be the first to strike with nuclear weapons; they have also declared that from August 6 till the end of this year there will be no nuclear test done by the Soviet Union. Not only that, in October when Gorbachov visited Paris, he declared openly that the Soviet Union was ready to reduce the nuclear arms that had been stockpiled in his country by 50 per cent if others also agreed to do it. The other side did not respond to it. The Soviet Union alone declared that they are ready to reduce the stockpiling of armaments by 50 per cent. There was no response from the other side. Madam, not only that, the Soviet Union was even prepared to eliminate the entire weaponry of nuclear weapons gradually if the other side responded properly. But that response did not come.

If we look at the Geneva talks of November, we find that it is good that ultimately President Reagan had to agree to the talks. It is a victory of the world opinion for peace. It is a victory for the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union for peace. But Reagan, while talking to Gorbachev in Geneva, made it clear that he will not refrain from his programme of research in star war. He says that it is a programme of research. But that is absolutely wrong. Even the American experts say that it is not defensive but rather a programme of aggression. The star war programme gives an advantage to the one who attacks first. While Reagan is saying that the star war programme is defensive, Mr. Robert Brown, President for the Institute of Security Studies, said in Washington, addressing a panel on space weapons in June 1984: "Space weaponry supposedly being

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

developed as a defence against nuclear bombs would have no real effect against anything other than silo-based missiles. The net effect of such systems to both sides gives an enormous advantage to the one who strikes first." It means that it will give advantage to them for striking first. Although the American experts are saying that it is not a defence programme, Reagan wants to mislead the world by saying that it is a defence weapon. I would like to say that in one newspaper even the British experts have written that leading computer scientists were expressing serious doubts about the defensive nature of the star war enterprise. They say that far from preventing war, this programme will increase the chances of accidental nuclear war. After his return to Moscow, Gorbachev addressed the Supreme Soviet and said that after the star war programme being carried out any computer going wrong will engulf the entire world into a nuclear holocaust. After the star war system is on, it will not depend on human mind or the political will. Once the war is started, no ethics or morals will work because it is the computer that will work. If the computer goes wrong a little way, immediately the war will begin with irreversible consequences. There will be nobody left in the world to reverse the consequences. The war will start. And retaliation will go on. In this way, the entire humanity will be destroyed. So, Reagan's plea that star war is a defence system is an absolute lie, an absolutely bogus thing. It is perpetrated to mislead the world. And it is, in fact, designed to destroy the entire humanity. It is designed to gain upper hand in the parity in military weaponry. He wants to gain dominance over the Soviet Union. That is why they are dogmatically proceeding towards the star war programme. Madam, we find that while America is doing in this way, they have got their allies to, the NATO allies. I am ashamed to talk about

Britain. They are ever ready to the line of US imperialism. They have allowed their own soil for deploying Pershing and Cruise Missile. Now, they have agreed to join the star war programme also. And not only that. They are following the American imperialism in all other ways. They are helping them. It has become the number two enemy, supporting the American imperialism in all its nefarious deeds. Now, American imperialism is trying to drag Italy and West Germany also in their so-called research programme of star war because France, under the leadership of Mitterand has refused to the line of American imperialism on the star war programme. That is why they are trying to drag in West Germany and Italy. This is what is happening inside the Europe about the star war programme.

Madam, while the American imperialism is dragging the world on to the road of nuclear holocaust, on the other side it is trying to intervene in all countries which are trying to assert their independence. As I have said, whether it is in Nicaragua or in Angola or in India, everywhere they are trying to intervene. And now we find that they are forming a ring around India. In Pakistan, they are forming a base. In Sri Lanka, they are trying to form a base. Even they are trying to form a base in Bangladesh. They are trying to form a ring around India so that they can intervene in India and try to disrupt the Indian unity and dismember the country. But I am sorry to say, Madam, that although our country, our leadership is saying every time about the unity of the country, they are not pointing out the main danger the American imperialism are trying to penetrate into India. It is high time that we should point out the enemy, we should name the enemy, and we should identify the enemy so that the people become conscious and people can fight it out. Madam, our independence is threatened by American imperialism be-

cause of their interventionist activities whether through inciting the Khalistanis or through other means. Our independence and our sovereignty are in danger. That is why I would urge upon the Government to be more alert and point out and identify the enemy and rouse the people to fight against the imperialist intervention. Madam, our India has a glorious tradition of fight against imperialism. Our people fought against it and laid down their lives. Why not rouse the people to fight against imperialism? Only some talk at the top level is not sufficient at the present moment.

Madam, I am sorry that when all these things are going on, our Government is also talking in wrong terms. First of all, I would like to say that NAM, the Non-aligned Movement has made a great contribution towards maintenance of peace. It is a Movement of peace essentially and we support. From our Party, we have always extended our support to the Non-aligned Movement. India is the Chairperson of the NAM which has played a good role, a significant role in fighting against imperialism and in maintaining world peace. But CHOGM has played a different part. But the difference that we find between the NAM and the CHOGM is that while NAM is fighting against imperialism, at CHOGM we are accommodating all sorts of people and we are compromising there. Regarding South Africa, we have compromised with Mrs. Margaret Thatcher at CHOGM. So, while the NAM is fighting against imperialism, in the CHOGM, there is also the compromise with imperialism and its nefarious activities. So, Madam, I would urge that the activities of the NAM should be more strengthened, and we will have to rethink about our ties with the Commonwealth and whether they are serving any purpose.

Finally, Madam, I come to my last point. Our Government is very much fond of talking about two Super Powers. What is the fact? The fact of life is that while the American Government,

the US imperialism is trying to engulf the entire world into another nuclear holocaust... It is Soviet Union which is trying to save the world from the nuclear holocaust and trying to give peace to the world. But we find that these two powers are put on the same footing and we call both of them super powers. What did Mr. Rajiv Gandhi himself say after his visit to America and the Soviet Union? He is himself on record as having said that Soviet Union is very much friendly to India and Rajiv Gandhi wants closer relations and closer co-operation with the Soviet Union, while in America we found that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi did not get that much of closer co-operation. So, everywhere in the world we find that the Soviet Union is giving a helping hand to non-aligned countries, and is helping the Non-Aligned Movement, and is helping them economically and, if necessary, militarily also, through technological and economic collaboration. On the other hand, the American imperialism is trying to subjugate the earlier colonies. This is the difference between the two super powers. They are actually trying to mislead the people and hiding the main enemy from the eyes of the people. If the enemy is hidden from the eyes of the people, I do not know how the people will be roused to fight the enemy and without fighting the enemy how our Prime Minister and Foreign Minister can save the country from the onslaught of the imperialists. So, I would appeal to the Government that they should stop talking of two super powers. They should distinguish between the role of the two powers. They should tell the people that this is the Soviet Union, the friends of the socialist world, they are the friends of the people, the friends of the oppressed people, and this is the American imperialism who are the enemies of the people, who are the enemies of the entire world. That should be

talked very plainly before the people of our country and the world. (*Time Bell rings*)

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

Now, lastly, our Minister has said something about the SAARC. I welcome the development that has taken place through this meeting and I hope in future the SAARC will be able to play a significant and effective role. I would suggest and I would request the hon. Minister to see whether the SAARC can be extended in terms of participation. There are other neighbours who can be included in the SAARC so that the SAARC becomes effective for maintaining peace and stability in the South Asian region, so that we can extend economic co-operation and trade co-operation among the countries. (Time bell rings).

Another point I will touch and finish. It is in this background that I would like the hon. Minister to think seriously of the China policy. India is being surrounded by a ring where imperialist are dominating. It is in the interests of Indian people. It is in the interests of the Indian nation that we should be more prompt in solving our dispute with China in regard to our borders. It is in the interests of both the countries, China and India, and both the countries should come together and in a spirit of give and take both the countries should settle their disputes so that in the Asian region we can maintain peace and we can save our people from impending danger. So, in the South Asian Region and in the entire Indian Ocean area for maintenance of peace we should have closer co-operation with all South Asian countries, including China. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Shri Shrikant Verma.

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA (Madhya Pradesh):

उपसभापति महोदया, श्री सुकोमल सेन

AN HON. MEMBER: You can come this side.

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA:

उपसभापति महोदया, श्री सुकोमल सेन ने अपने भाषण में एसो कोई बात नहीं कहा (व्यवधान)।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not for you to give him the permission, Mr. Verma. It is the right of the Chair to permit any Member to speak from the front benches. It is not your right. It is my right.

SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): I have not advised.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, sit down. Do not do it again. (Interruptions) Very fine.

SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA: Some other hon. Member advised.

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: I sought the permission from the Chair.

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : उपसभापति महोदया, 40 साल पहले दूसरा महायुद्ध समाप्त हुआ था और दुनिया ने राहत की एक सांस ली थी। लेकिन यह सांस सिर्फ एक सांस होकर रह गई। इन 40 वर्षों में एक भी दिन और एक भी क्षण ऐसा नहीं आया जबकि मनुष्यता के सिर से युद्ध का बोझ उतरा हो। कभी भी लोगों ने आशंका से मुक्त जीवन नहीं जिया। इन चालीस वर्षों में महायुद्ध तो नहीं हुआ लेकिन सौ से अधिक छोटे-छोटे युद्ध हुए। दुनिया के तमाम हिस्सों में हुए और इनमें मरने वालों की और मारे जाने वालों की तादाद दूसरे महायुद्ध में मारे गये लोगों की तादाद से ज्यादा है। उपसभापति महोदया यह दुनिया का दुर्भाग्य है कि दूसरे महायुद्ध की समाप्ति तो हुई लेकिन एक भयानक चेतावनी के साथ हुई और यह चेतावनी थी परमाणु बम। हिरोशिमा और नागासाकी पर परमाणु बम गिराया गया तब कि युद्ध का अंत किया जा सके। युद्ध का अंत तो हुआ लेकिन तीसरे महायुद्ध की भूमिका का सूत्रपात भी हो गया। सिर्फ चार साल के अंदर संसार में एक ऐसा तनाव पैदा हो गया, जिसकी कोई मिसाल

ढाई हजार वर्षों के इतिहास में नहीं है। दो महाशक्तियों के बीच जो तनाव पैदा हुआ, उसके फलस्वरूप एक से एक आयुधों का, हथियारों का, संहारक अस्त्रों की कल्पना की जाने लगी और वे ईजाद हुए। आज संसार में परमाणु बमों की संख्या इतनी अधिक है कि वह प्लेनेट, यह नक्षत्र, एक बार नहीं, दो बार नहीं, दस बार नहीं बल्कि दो सौ बार नष्ट किया जा सकता है। दूसरे शब्दों में अगर इन पृथ्वी जैसे दो सौ नक्षत्र हों, तो वे दो सौ नक्षत्र नष्ट किये जा सकते हैं। ईश्वर का धन्यवाद है कि पृथ्वी जैसे दो सौ नक्षत्र नहीं हैं और अगर हैं तो आस पास नहीं हैं। उपाधाति महीदया, जवाहरलाल नेहरू, नासिर, टीटो, मुक नी, उस जमाने के कुछ बूढ़ लेकिन बुद्धिमान और दूरदर्शी व्यक्तियों की कल्पना और दृष्टि का ही परिणाम था कि उस कहाने, उस धंध से, जिसमें भूराज की एक भांति किरण नहीं दिखाई पड़ती थी, निकलने का कोई रास्ता बूढ़ा गया और वह रास्ता था गुट निरपेक्ष आन्दोलन का। इसके अतिरिक्त छोटे देशों के पास और कोई विकल्प नहीं हो सकता था तो वे बड़े देशों के पिछलग्गू हो जायें और फिर बड़े देशों की इच्छा के मुताबिक काम करें, व्यापार करें, वाणिज्य करें, बौद्धिक गुलामी करें, शिक्षा-दाक्षा उसकी इच्छा के अनुसार करें। दूसरे शब्दों में पूंजीवाद और साम्राज्यवाद के भ्रम और दास हो जाय या फिर अपनी अनादा को दुहराये। जवाहरलाल नेहरू और उनके सहयोगियों ने जिस सिद्धांत को जन्म दिया उस सिद्धांत के वदीलत ही आज दुनिया के सौ से अधिक देश बंके की चोट पर यह कह सकते हैं ... कि न केवल वे स्वतंत्र हैं बल्कि अपनी स्वतन्त्रता का उन्हें अहसास है और उन की स्वतन्त्रता को छेड़ने का अधिकार किसी को नहीं है। इसलिए भारतीय विदेश नीति पर मैं नहीं समझता कि किसी भी तरह से टीका टिप्पणी की कोई गुंजाइश है। फिर भी हर देश में हर क्षेत्र में कुछ लोग होते हैं जो आलोचनाएं सिर्फ इसलिए करते हैं कि आलोचनाएं होनी चाहिए। समाचार पत्र, होते हैं, अगर वे आलोचनाएं न करे तो समाचार पत्र नहीं बिकेंगे। असहमति भी,

डिस्सेंट भी एक पेशा हो गई है, एक व्यवसाय हो गई है एक नया व्यवसाय हो गया है। जहां सहमति की जरूरत है वहां भी असहमति होती है। हमारे युवा प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी ने 1984 के अंतिम दिनों में और 1985 के शुरू के दिनों में प्रधान मंत्री की हैसियत से वागडोर सम्भाली और उन्होंने अपने पहले ही प्रसारण में कहा कि मैं सहयोग की राजनीति चलाना चाहता हूँ। इससे बड़ी बात और क्या हो सकती है। आज दुनिया के सामने सिर्फ दो विकल्प हैं सहयोग या संघर्ष, सहयोग या संहार, सहयोग या सर्वनाश, सहयोग या आत्म हत्या। तीसरा कोई रास्ता नहीं है। जब राजीव गांधी ने सहयोग की बात की तो यह बात सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान की भीतरी समस्याओं और हमारे विपक्षी दलों की दृष्टि में लेकर कर नहीं कही बल्कि उन्होंने कहा कि मैं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में भी सहयोग की राजनीति चलाना चाहता हूँ। अभी एक वर्ष भी पूरा नहीं हुआ हमने देखा कि श्री राजीव गांधी ने न केवल सहयोग की राजनीति को आगे बढ़ाया है बल्कि सहयोग की राजनीति के अब फल भी दिखाई पड़ने लगे हैं इसी वर्ष के शुरू में 6 देशों का एक शिखर सम्मेलन हुआ, जो कि सिक्स नेशन समिटि के नाम से जाना जाता है। इसकी पहल भी भारत ने की थी। उस महिला ने की थी जिसे हम विदेश नीति की किसी भी बहस में न आज भूल सकते हैं न आने वाले किसी भी शताब्दी में भूल सकेंगे। जब भी विदेश नीति पर बहस होगी श्रीमता इंदिरा गांधी का नाम आएगा और मुनहरे अक्षरों में लिखा जाएगा। यह श्रीमति इंदिरा गांधी का ही योगदान है कि आज हम यूरोप और अमरीका की सड़कों पर सिर उठा कर माथा ऊंचा कर चल सकते हैं। उस महिला ने इसकी कल्पना की थी और उस महिला के कारण यह 6 देशों का शिखर सम्मेलन हुआ। दुर्भाग्य यह है कि वे स्वयं इस शिखर सम्मेलन में शामिल न हो सकी। उनकी मृत्यु हुई, काल ने उन्हें हम से छीन लिया। लेकिन इस शिखर सम्मेलन से एक महत्वपूर्ण शुरुआत हुई। वह शुरुआत यह हुई कि संसार में जनमत बनाना पड़ेगा और जनमत से

[श्री श्रीकांत वर्मा]

या दबाव डाल कर बड़े बड़े देशों पर महा-शक्तियों पर यह दबाव डाला जायेगा कि महाआयुद्धों का, अस्त्रों का, हथियारों का उत्पादन बंद हो। संसार से युद्ध का खतरा टलना चाहिये क्योंकि यह युद्ध कोई मामूली युद्ध नहीं होगा। 19 वीं शताब्दी में एक कवि ने लिखा —

"If winter comes, can spring be far behind?" Madam, I can only say that after the nuclear winter, there will be no spring. That will be the final winter.

इस खतरे को समझने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि जनमत को जागृत किया जाए। जिनके पास शक्ति है वे या तो शक्ति की भाषा समझते हैं या फिर जनता की भाषा समझते हैं।

1 P.M.

हमारे पास शक्ति नहीं है और अगर है भी तो हम उस शक्ति का उपयोग और अधिक शक्ति बढ़ाने में और भी अधिक शक्तिशाली अस्त्रों के उत्पादन में, निर्माण में नहीं लगा सकते क्योंकि हम अगर अपने रक्षा बजट पर विचार करें तो देखेंगे कि पिछले 30 वर्षों में दुनिया के सौ से अधिक देशों का रक्षा बजट पहले से 10 गुना बढ़ चुका है। एक करोड़ से अधिक बच्चों को आज भी दूध नहीं मिलता है। 2 करोड़ से अधिक लोग ऐसे हैं जो कि शब्दशः भूखे हैं। नंगे रहते हैं एक जून खाना खाते हैं। यह मैं मुहावरे के बतौर नहीं कह रहा हूँ यह मैं आंकड़े दे रहा हूँ। आंकड़े ज्यादा ही होंगे लेकिन यह तो मेरे पास जो उपलब्ध है वह मैं बता रहा हूँ। यह सारा क्यों है? क्योंकि सारी शक्ति और सारा पैसा खर्च हो रहा है बड़े से बड़े संहारक से संहारक और संघातक से संघातक अस्त्रों के उत्पादन में इन अस्त्रों का उत्पादन रोकना शायद दुनिया की पहली जिम्मेदारी है।

आज से करीब 23-24 साल पहले जेनेवा में एक द्विपक्षीय वार्ता हुई थी, एक महत्वपूर्ण सम्मेलन हुआ था प्रेजीडेंट कॅनेडी और ख्रुश्चेव के बीच में वह सफल नहीं हो सका, लेकिन कोई बात नहीं।

सफल नहीं होने से हम हथियार नहीं डाल सकते हैं, हम चलना नहीं रोक सकते जैसा कि एक उर्दू शेर में कहा गया है: "इसी उम्मीद पर भीलों चले जाते दीवाने वे उठा पर्दा—ए-महफिल से, वे निकला हाथ पर्दे से" हाथ निकले या ना निकले लेकिन चलना बंद नहीं हो सकता। सफर का कहीं अन्त नहीं हो सकेगा। इस साल फिर लगभग 23-24 साल के बाद श्री गांबाचोव और प्रेजिडेंट रीगन के बीच बातचीत हुई। मैं इससे बहुत निराश नहीं हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया के लोग भी निराश नहीं हैं। एक महत्वपूर्ण शुरुआत हुई है। संसार के लोगों को यह लगा कि पिछले 25 वर्षों से जो जनमत बनाया जा रहा था उसका कुछ नतीजा निकला। आखिरकार दो बड़े नेताओं को, दो महान शक्तियों के प्रवक्ताओं को एक जगह मिलना पड़ा और विचार करना पड़ा कि संसार को वर्तमान संहार से कैसे बचाया जाये यह जनमत का चमत्कार है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह पिछले 40 वर्षों में विश्व जनमत की पहली महत्वपूर्ण विजय है। अगर जनमत का दबाव बना रहा तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आगे और भी कामयाबियाँ होंगी क्योंकि यह बातचीत तो एक शुरुआत थी। अगर कुछ कामयाबियाँ मिली हैं तो इसका कुछ श्रेय भारत को भी है। भारत के युवा प्रधान मंत्री को भी है, उन्होंने ही शुरुआत की। इस वर्ष उन्होंने ही सबसे पहले शांति मिशन, शांति अभियान पर यात्राएं की, सोवियत संघ गये, अमेरिका गये, यूरोप के कई देशों में गये, अभी हाल में जापान और वियतनाम की यात्राएं कीं। इन यात्राओं से सबसे बड़ा फायदा तो यह हुआ कि कुछ देशों के मन में अगर यह भ्रम था कि भारत सच्चे अर्थों में गुट निरपेक्ष है तो यह भ्रम टूटा कम से कम पश्चिमी देशों में यह भ्रम था, लेकिन आज वह भ्रम टूट चुका है। पश्चिमी देशों में भी आज लोग यह मानने लगे हैं कि भारत न सिर्फ एक गुट निरपेक्ष देश है बल्कि गुट निरपेक्षता की नीति ही एक ऐसी नीति है जो भारत के लिए बिल्कुल और पूर्णतया अनुकूल हो सकती है। आज हेनरी कीसिजर जैसे लोग भारत की विदेश नीति के समर्थक दिखाई पड़ते हैं। आज

दुनिया की निगाहें भारत पर लगी हुई हैं, भारत फोकस में है। यह हमारी विदेश नीति का चमत्कार है। उपसभापति महोदया, यह तो मैं नहीं कहूंगा कि संसार में अन्याय और अत्याचार कम हो गया है। अगर यह बंद होता और सर्वे सुखनः भवन्तु की स्थिति हुई होती। बात हो क्या है? फिर क्यों इतने हंगामे होते, फिर क्यों इतने आंसू होते फिर क्यों इतने दुख होते फिर क्यों इतने विलप होते। उस रोज हमारे मित्र श्री जसवंत सिंह ने कहा भारत ने वहामा में कुछ नहीं किया। एक गुंगे देश की तरह और एक निरोह देश की तरह देखता रहा। लेकिन यह सरासर गलत है। भारत ने ही इसमें पहला कदमी उठायी भारत ने इस बात का अहमास कराया कि दक्षिण अफ्रीका में जो कुछ हो रहा है, वह गलत है और उसके खिलाफ एक दण्ड विधान आवश्यक है। अब अगर श्रीमती माथेट थैचर पर उस का सीमित असर पड़ा तो हम इस पर बहुत टिप्पणी नहीं कर सकते। हम सिर्फ इतना ही कह सकते हैं, वक्त बदलेगा और जैसा मैंने कहा जनमत के दबाव से जब दो महाशक्तियों के बीच बातचीत हो सकती है तो उन लोगों का भी हृदय परिवर्तन होगा और उनके मन भी बदलेंगे और जो आज दक्षिण में अफ्रीका पर सैनिकशक्त के बारे में खुलकर सामने नहीं आ रहे हैं, वे आएंगे।

अब मैं कुछ पड़ोसी देशों की चर्चा करना चाहता हूं क्योंकि उनकी भी चर्चा हुई है। अभी तीन चार दिन हुए दक्षिण-एशिया के सहयोग से संबंधित सम्मेलन समाप्त हुआ है। दक्षिण एशिया हमारी विदेश नीति का दुखता हुआ घाव रहा है। यह सही है कि हमने यूरोप, अमरीका और अन्य

देशों की चकाचौध में काफ़ी वर्षों तक दक्षिण एशिया को भुला दिया था, यह सही है कि हमारे हाथों उनकी जाने-अनजाने उपेक्षा हुई। यह हमारी गलती थी। वहां रहने वालों में अधिकतर भारतीय वंश के हैं और अगर वंश के न भी हों, तो भी वह हमारे पड़ोसी हैं। और हमारा व्यापार और हमारे राजनयिक संबंध आगे चलकर उनके साथ चलने वाले हैं। देर आयद और दुरुस्त आयद। हमारे युवा प्रधानमंत्री के शासनकाल में ही यह एक महत्वपूर्ण पहल हुई कि दक्षिण एशिया के साथ सहयोग बढ़ाने की प्रक्रिया आरंभ हुई और यह सम्मेलन हुआ। यह एक महत्वपूर्ण सम्मेलन है। सारी दुनिया ने इसका स्वागत किया। सारी दुनिया ने इसे प्रति सहमति व्यक्त की क्योंकि इसी तरह के छोट-छोटे और क्षेत्रीय सम्मेलनों के जरिये ही एक बड़े सम्मेलन, बड़े सहयोग की कल्पना की जा सकती है। चेरिटी बिगिन्स एट होम अर्थात् पहले हम अपने क्षेत्र में शांति कायम करते हैं, उसके बाद हम बाहर जाते हैं। जो अपने घर में ही शांति कायम नहीं कर सकते, वे दूसरों के घर शांति क्या कायम करेंगे। इसलिए हमने अपने आसपास के देश में सहयोग का वातावरण बढ़ाया है और सहयोग का हाथ बढ़ाया है।

श्रीलंका की समस्या पेचीदा है। ठीक, है, मैं यह नहीं कहता कि श्रीलंका में भारतीय वंश के लोगों के साथ जो हो रहा है वह सही है। वह गलत हो रहा है। लेकिन यह एक ऐसी समस्या है, जो बातचीत के जरिए सुलझाई जा सकती है। यह कलह के जरिए या तनाव के जरिए नहीं सुलझाई जा सकती। इसलिए मैं समझता हूं कि श्री राजीव गांधी ने इस संबंध में जो कदम उठाए हैं, वह महत्वपूर्ण हैं। तनाव आज पहले से कम है और कम होता जाएगा और अगर कम नहीं होगा, तो भी हमको प्रयत्न करते रहना होगा। नेपाल और भूटान के साथ भी आज हमारे संबंध पहले से बेहतर हैं। जहां तक बंगला देश का प्रश्न है, उनके साथ हमारे आत्मीय संबंध हैं और जैसा कि एक बहुत बड़े रूसी कवि ब्लादीमीर माइकोतस्की ने लिखा है "Wherever a tear is shed, I feel I am crucified."

[श्री श्रीमान् वरमा] :—

अर्थात् जहाँ जहाँ भी आसू की बून्द गिरती है, मुझे लगता है कि मैं सूली पर चढ़ाया गया हूँ। इसी वर्ष जब बांग्ला देश एक भयानक प्राकृतिक प्रकोप की चपेट में आया तब श्री र.जी.व. गांधी और जयवर्धने बांग्ला देश गये क्यों? क्योंकि कोई भी आसू किसी भी देश में गिरता है तो वह हमारी छाती पर पिघले हुए लोहे की तरह टपकता है। इस यात्रा के एक सीहारे पर सदभावना का वातावरण बना।

अब मैं पाकिस्तान और चीन की चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक पाकिस्तान का प्रश्न है, उपसभापति महोदया, बहुत साल से इस पर बहस हो रही है, लेकिन हम भूल जाते हैं कि पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान से ही पैदा हुआ था, इसका हों एक भूखंड अलग हुआ। और तनाव तो पाकिस्तान के जन्म के साथ ही जुड़ा हुआ है। लेकिन जो तनाव जन्म के साथ जुड़ा हुआ हो जरूरी नहीं कि वह जीवन भर बना रहे। हमारी कोशिश तो यह होनी चाहिए कि पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे संबंध बेहतर हों और तनाव समाप्त हो। यह भी सही है कि पाकिस्तान ने बार-बार यह साबित किया है कि उसकी नीयत साफ नहीं है और यह भी सही है कि पाकिस्तान को जो हथियार मिले उनका इस्तेमाल भारत के विरुद्ध किया गया। जैसा कि वर्षों पहले श्री कृष्ण मेनन ने कहा था, ऐसी कोई तोष अभी नहीं बनी है जिसका मुहं सिर्फ एक ही दिशा में मुड़े। इसलिए अगर पाकिस्तान यह कहता है कि उसे जो हथियार मिले हैं वे अफगानिस्तान के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल के लिए अर्थात् आत्मरक्षा के लिए हैं तो इस पर संदेह के कारण हैं और होने चाहिए क्योंकि, जैसा मैंने कहा जो तोपे अफगानिस्तान के खिलाफ मुड़ सकते हैं, वे भारत के खिलाफ भी मुड़ सकते हैं कोई ऐसा विमान अब तक नहीं बना है जिसकी उड़ान सिर्फ इस्लामाबाद से काबुल तक होती हो जो विमान काबुल तक जा सकता है वह बिल्ली तक भी आ सकता है।

फिर पाकिस्तान के बारे में यह भी खबरें हैं कि वह परमाणु बम बनाने की तैयारी कर रहा है। मैं नहीं जानता कि वह कहाँ तक और किस हद तक इस मामले

में पहुँचा है या कामयाब हुआ है। वर्षों पहले श्री जुल्लिकार अली भुट्टों ने कहा था कि हम घास खाकर परमाणु बम बनाएंगे लेकिन पाकिस्तान के वर्तमान शासकों ने बिना घास खाए परमाणु बम बना दिया। हम भारत के लागू न बम बनाना चाहते हैं न घास खाता चाहते हैं। हम एक समृद्ध और सुखी जीवन व्यतीत करना चाहते हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि जो पैसा बमों के ईजाद में, बमों के निर्माण में खर्च होता है वह हमारी आम जनता के जीवन के सुधार में खर्च हो, इसलिए हम फिलहाल बम बनाने का कोई फैसला न करें। लेकिन यह भी सही है कि हम भावी पीढ़ियों की ओर से कोई कमिटमेंट नहीं कर सकते। भविष्य के हन प्रतिनिधि नहीं हैं, हम सिर्फ वर्तमान के प्रतिनिधि हैं। भावी पीढ़ी, आगे आने वाली पीढ़ी क्या फैसला लेगी इसे उमी पर छोड़ दिया जायें और मैं समझता हूँ कि जब श्री जियाउल-हक हिन्दुस्तान आए तो उनसे स्पष्ट रूप से कह दिया जाये कि जो फैसला है बम बनाने का वह सिर्फ फैसला हमारा है, आगे आने वाली पीढ़ियों का फैसला नहीं हो सकता, क्योंकि वे क्या करेंगी हम नहीं जानते।

अन्त में, मैं आप से सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ उपसभापति महोदया, कि अगर संसार के साथे की शिकने आज कुछ ठीकी हुई है तो इसका कुछ श्रेय भारत वर्ष को है। हमें शमिन्दा होने की, सिर झुकाने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमारा सिद्धांत आज से नहीं, हजारों वर्षों से यह रहा है कि हम लोगों पर हुकूमत नहीं करेंगे दूसरे देशों पर शासन नहीं करेंगे, हम झूठी अगुवाई नहीं करेंगे, हम नेता बनने का प्रयत्न नहीं करेंगे, हम एक समान विरादरी कायम करेंगे। हमारी विदेश नीति के सिद्धांत बरकरार, क्रूरता, हत्या, आतंक पर आधारित नहीं हैं वे कुछ प्राचीन और सनातन मूल्यों पर आधारित हैं हजारों वर्ष पहले सम्राट अशोक ने कहा था देश मत जीतो, दिल जीतो। हमने कोई देश नहीं जीता है, दिल जीता है।

आपका बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Valampuri John.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: One point of clarification.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Valampuri John, just wait. He is on a point of order for clarification or something.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam Deputy Chairman, on two separate occasions, firstly on the occasion of the Prime Minister's visit to Japan and subsequently when we were so enchantingly informed about the well-being of Asha and Daya by the Minister of External Affairs, we have been deprived of the benefit of an intervention by the Prime Minister himself. This matter was raised with the Chair in the Business Advisory Committee and again this morning. Therefore, I would like to know, because Rajya Sabha was deprived of the right to seek clarification from the Prime Minister when the statement was made, whether he is going to intervene in this debate or he is not going to do so.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Foreign Minister, do you have any information whether the Prime Minister is going to intervene?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: So far there is no intention of the Prime Minister to intervene.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): When the Prime Minister made a statement on his visit to Bahamas and also the United Nations, we were deprived of seeking clarifications on the statement that day. Next was his visit to Japan and Vietnam also. That time our hon. Minister, Mr. Bhagat, made the statement. At that time also we demanded that the Prime Minister should have come and made the statement. Now on his recent visit to Dhaka also our Minister, Mr. Bhagat, made a statement. This time also we have been deprived of seeking clarifications from the Prime Minister. So, it is a very bad precedent as far as Rajya Sabha is concerned because this privilege does not exist in the Lok Sabha. This is a prerogative in Rajya Sabha. It is a very bad precedent. We are very

much upset about the attitude of this Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I understand your point. I hope the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will find out from the office of the Prime Minister whether he is free and willing to come.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He is interested in addressing parliaments of foreign countries, not ours.

उपसभापति : केसरी जी पता लगाकर बतायेंगे । संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री स. हराम वेंसरी)

उपसभापति महोदया, आपने ही कहा है कि प्रधानमंत्री चूँकि बहुत व्यस्त है, अवकाश मिलने पर संभवतः वे आयेंगे । मैं आपकी भावनाओं को उन तक पहुँचा दूँगा ।

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairman, Mr. Shrikant Verma,....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One more thing. I do not want to interrupt you. Today we have been allowed six hours by the Business Advisory Committee for this discussion. It is an important discussion. So, I think that we should forgo the lunch hour today.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Agree.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is better so that we can keep it within the stipulated time.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We are always co-operating with the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is for your sake. I do not mind sitting here till any time.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: Mr. Shrikant Verma, in the course of his speech, made a reference to the Prime Minister's initiative in adding a new dimension to our foreign policy, to our attitude and approach towards various problems we face in foreign parlance. As he was making a reference to the new dimension that the Prime Minister had added, he said that because of the initiative of the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, Indians today can walk with their heads aloft in the streets of Washington and in the streets of London. MR. VERMA

[Shri Valampuri John]

I do not dismiss what Mr. Shri Kant Verma has said as pectic exuberance; I do accept what he has said, but with only one qualification with only one reservation. About our approach, our attitude as far as the different communities of the world are concerned, we may agree that the Prime Ministers initiative has been so productive positively productive. But as far as the Srilankan Tamils are concerned, the Tamil Eelam is concerned, I would like to inform the House and I would like to impress upon the Government that we cannot say the same thing. I do not even for a moment say that there has been a change in our attitude. I do not say that there has been a change in our approach. I do not say that there is a shift in our policy.

Since Mrs. Gandhi's time to our Honourable Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi's time I do not say that there is a change.

I would like to draw the attention of the Government to a very tacit fact that earlier there has been a kind of fear in mind of Mr. Jayawardne. The kind of killings were less. But now we can find a strange adroitness on the part of Sri Lankan leaders. Not only strange adroitness but a kind of complacency has also dawned upon Mr. Jayawardne. This has been revealed in most of the statements that have been doled out through their official communique which have reached us. When we talk to our friends of the movement we have more information on the day-to-day happenings in Sri Lanka than some of the officers in the Ministry of External Affairs have who are entrenched in the high pedestal of this Ministry. I should not be mistaken. It is not an outrage of

modesty. There is a fundamental reason for saying so.

Recently there were press statements what we understand is that the Government is entertaining a strange idea. They have been saying it openly also. Even the Honourable Prime Minister is reported to have said that there have been flagrant violations on both sides. I would like to take a very strong objection to this kind of statement. When he says that there have been flagrant violations on both sides, it is very wrong. You cannot equate a calculated machination against the innocent people by Sinhalese army. On the one hand it is a calculated attack on the unarmed people—it is state of terrorism—on the other hand, there might be isolated incidents of violence by unarmed people in self-defence. You cannot equate the state incidents in self-defence. Even animals fight in self-defence. So when nature concedes a kind of prerogative for animals to fight in self-defence you cannot deny the same right of self-defence to our friends, Tamils there. I want to impress upon this Government that they cannot equate both at the same level and say that there have been flagrant violations on both sides.

The cease-fire agreement is very clear. The agreement says that immediately after the promulgation of the cease-fire there should be a cessation of raids as well as searches in Tamil provinces. This has been flagrantly violated. The official communique issued by the Sri Lankan Government may make a claim. After June 13, that is after the promulgation of cease-fire there have been a number of occasions where these raids and searches have taken place. The newspapers which come from Tamil provinces says that the Army goes there and cordons off the entire area in Jafna, Trincomellee, Mattakkallapam. Vavuniya and so many

other places. We have this information from our friends there. They go and search every house there. The first question they pose is: Do you have girls here? The second question they pose is: Do you have jewels? The third question they pose is: Do you have Kancheepuram sarees? The Sinhalese army is posing these questions to our friends there who are innocent and unarmed.

In Trincomelee, Mattakkallappam those three wings of Sri Lankan Armed forces—the army, the navy and the air-force are on a spree of killing Tamils. It is an informal massacre. A total flagrant violation of the cease-fire agreement. Our people in the refugee camps at Trincomellee Mattakkallappam and Vavuniya have fled away. Have you ever heard of refugees fleeing away from the refugee camps in other countries? They go voluntarily to the refugee camps in other countries. This is classic and historical example where people flee away from the refugee camps. These refugee camps are worse than Nazi concentration camps.

On the whole there are 104 camps. We can find 1,23,000 Tamils in concentration camps are there. After the cease-fire agreement we have got reliable information that 80,000 Tamils have fled away from these concentration camps, because they are not refugee camps. For example in Mattakkallappam 400 houses have been destroyed for a military aerodrome. This has been done after the cease-fire. In Vavuniya 18 rice mills, 270 shops and hundreds of Tamils houses have been destroyed and razed to the ground. In Kilinochi a super bazar belonging to Tamils which is worth of crore of rupees has been destroyed. In Paruthihurai Harleys College which is one of the greatest institutions for Tamils; and Methodist Women College have been destroyed. The latter is the in-

stitution of higher learning. All these incidents took place after the cease-fire agreement, that is, June 18.

They have been captured by the unscrupulous military and Tamil students are prevented from pursuing their studies. In Ambarai, Tamil women—forty of them—were stripped off their clothes. They have been paraded. They have been exhibited to the human vultures there. 45 military camps were created after June 18. There is a proposal to have another military establishment after every 10th mile in the Tamil provinces. Not only the Tamil people are being massacred the Sinhalese Government also by a kind of calculated move prevented Tamil people from executing their agricultural operations. Even agricultural ponds are destroyed. So, a kind of economic blockade is being hatched against the Tamil there. This has happened after June 18, after promulgation of the cease-fire. Fishermen are the worst effected. Most of the fishermen villages look deserted because they feel they are more safe in the mid-sea than on the shore in the hands of Sinhalese. Students are not allowed in most of the places in Tamil provinces to pursue their studies. In the Cease-fire Committee, there are three Tamils and one Mr. Sivanathan, finds a place in the Ceasefire Committee because he happens to be the classmate of the Secretary of the Internal Security Department. On this ground, because he has gained the confidence of Sinhalese, he finds a place in the Cease-fire Committee. The other Tamils except Mr. Shivanathan are under surveillance. Their telephones are being tapped. One Mr. Rodrigo—a Sinhalese, who finds a place there in the Ceasefire Committee though he is a Judge, this Justice Rudrige, even in his public utterances he has positively asserted that he has to see one day or the other

[Shri Valampuri John]

that Sri Lanka is free of Tamils. I have got quotations from a number of Ceylonese papers—17 of them in the past ten years, through which I can prove that if you are a Sinhalese, you can find a place in the Committee. If such people find a place in the Cease fire Committee, what kind of justice can be expected by an unarmed, innocent people, from the hands of Sinhalese Government? Another term of cease fire is, the stopping of the infusion of further resources to armed services and police establishments. This has been totally violated. The following news item appeared in the Sri Lanka government-owned newspaper the DAILY NEWS of August 17, 1985, under the headline "Danger signals in economy, says Ronnie":—

"Finance Minister Ronnie de Mel warned of "danger signals" in the economy and said prospects for the second half of the year did not "appear very favourable". The 1985 budget was estimated to be in deficit of over Rs. 5000 million. The Minister said. This is a turnaround of Rs. 6700 million from earlier estimates of the budget which promised a Rs. 1700 million surplus."

"If we are unable to keep defence expenditure down due to increasing tension in the country, our efforts to reduce the budget deficit and enhance capital investment will not be successful", he said."

Mr. de Mel has gone on record saying that the country's defence spending this year exceeds Rs. 2000 million over and above the budgeted Rs. 3800 million. Defence expenditure cost of country Rs. 16 million a day, he had said."

Now, I would like to inform the House that it was June 18, 1985, i.e. promulgation of ceasefire was on June 18, 1985. This particular provision that there will be no more infusion to the military as well as

police establishments has been totally violated as per the above quotation of the Finance Minister Ronnie. I quote what recently the Hon'ble Prime Minister is reported to have made a remark. I have great regards and respect for the Prime Minister but Hon'ble Prime Minister is reported to have said, we cannot prevent the country from arming itself. But I would like to ask through the instrumentality of the External Affairs Minister, from the Prime Minister, when Pakistan gets itself armed, we raise a hue and cry in this country but we are using another yardstick for Sri Lanka because we have inherent fear in ourselves that the Pakistan may attack us. We raise a hue and cry whenever Pakistan is armed but here, Sri Lanka may not be an Indian nation. We may not have suzerainty over their land. We may not have sovereignty over them. But what is the land after all. Land is agglomeration of people; it is people. When the people of Indian origin are adversely affected and against them the Sri Lankan Government has increased the defence budget and it is arming itself, our Prime Minister says, "We cannot condemn them because we cannot prevent a nation from arming itself." I would like to say to this Government: we never say there is a change in your attitude or there is a shift in your attitude. But I would like to say that when the Prime Minister says this is widely reported in the Sri Lankan press, which results in mass killings. Such kind of references immediately embolden Jayewardene and there is mass killing in Sri Lanka again."

I find that there is another reference in the cease-fire agreement that there will be no more colonization. When they say there will be no more colonization, what happens? New settlements are allowed. From the 13th century, a major demographic movement has taken place in Sri Lanka. The Sinhalese shifted

towards southern, western and central regions, and the Tamils to the northern and eastern coastal belts. The situation has been virtually frozen in this fashion for seven hundred years. The Portuguese who ruled most of Sri Lanka since 1606 treated the North and the East as Tamil territory different from the rest of the island. Similarly the Dutch from 1658 to 1796 identified the North and the East as separate Tamil territory. The British too administered from 1796 to 1833 the North and the East separately. These parts have been considered as Tamil provinces."

The earliest available census of 1827 shows that there were only 0.35 per cent of Sinhalese in the North and 0.51 per cent of Sinhalese in the East. Even in 1921 the position had not changed substantially.

The Sri Lankan Government carry out deliberate colonization and then deny the Tamil people their right to own land. In flagrant violation of the terms of the ceasefire agreement, 10,000 new Sinhalese have been settled in Mullaitivu. After the ceasefire agreement, 2,800 people have been murdered. After the ceasefire more than 17,000 people have been arrested. This is not our information. This is not our imagination. This is the claim of the official communiques in Sri Lanka.

Even today, even at this moment, we do not accuse the Government that there is a shift in your policy, that there is a change in your attitude. But I would like to say that a kind of adroitness has come to Sri Lanka and a complacency has come over us. At the height of the Bangladesh war, in a television interview, a British journalist asked Mrs. Indira Gandhi, "Why are you helping the guerillas?" And pat came the reply from Mrs. Indira Gandhi: "How do you say so? Should we not help the guerillas? Who attacked first? Innocent people have been killed. The Pakistani army was

on a killing spree. Then the guerillas came and fought in self-defence. That is why we helped them. We cannot keep silent when such crimes are committed and innocent people are being liquidated." Again on August 27, 1979, Mrs. Gandhi in her letter to Mr. Vaikunthavasan, Convenor, Tamil Coordinating Committee in London says:

"I have just received your letter of 22nd August and am horrified to see the enclosures."

What were the enclosures? They were photographs of the horrors that happened in Sri Lanka and Mrs. Gandhi said she was horrified to see those enclosures.

"The Janata Party Government is going out of its way to be friendly with the present Government of Sri Lanka. I doubt if they will wish to take up the issue, the sufferings of the Tamils in Sri Lanka. At the moment, all attention is on our election but I shall see if it is possible to bring this issue to the notice of the public in some other way."

This is what she has said. Again I say on the floor of Parliament, Mrs. Gandhi on the 16th August, 1983 called this kind of mass killing as genocide. When Mrs. Gandhi has taken this kind of a stand, I do not say there is a change in your attitude or there is a shift in your policy. But I would like to draw attention to the complacency to this kind of courage, to this kind of strange adroitness that has drawn upon Jayewardene because whatever the Prime Minister says today gets the topmost priority in the Sri Lankan press. How does it happen? Why does it happen? All along we have been saying that these people have to live together. But I may tell you—you may dismiss my statement; you may arch your eyebrows—that you can never make the Sinhalese and the Ta-

[Shri Valampuri John]

mils live together because for years for centuries together, they have been two nations. When two nations are at war, you have been sermonising them that they have to live together. Can you make a lamb and a wolf live together in a tent? It is impossible. You are trying for something impossible. Even if this century passes, even if India sees very many Prime Ministers on the pedestal, this cannot happen. We have been telling the whole world that now there is a kind of an international situation, that international ideas are changing. Amnesty International has reported an MPs's team has come from England, another team has visited from Australia. It is time the Government of India sent another MPs' team from India to assess the situation there. There is an economic blockade. For years together the very economy of the Tamils in Sri Lanka was mainly dependent on agricultural products—potatoes, chillies and onions. Agricultural income was the foundation of their economy. But what happened now? The Sri Lankan Government, because it imposes economic blockade on the people, on the Tamils, is not purchasing potatoes, onions and chillies because the people of the Tamil Province live upon these products. Instead of purchasing from them, the Sri Lankan Government is importing everything from India, and India allows it. Now may I ask: Do you have sympathy for Tamil in Sri Lanka- If you have even a streak of sympathy, do you allow this kind of an export from this country? Purposely Jayawardene imports from here potatoes, chillies and onions, only to impose economic blockade on the Tamils. And wittingly or unwittingly you are helping the Sri Lankan Government. You are answerable for this, not only to us, to the whole world. When there is a problem in Namibia you say we are with you. When there is a problem in Africa, you say we are with you. What kind of an approach this is

I do not know. I do not understand why you adopt such a different stance. When there is a problem in a distant place, you support the people there, but when it happens near here, under your very nose, you are not prepared to support the people's cause here. We have to convince the world leaders. It is time we took steps to convince the world leaders that there is justification for a war against Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka may be a very tiny island. But when they are carrying on military operations and police action, unless and until you find, explore, possibilities other than diplomatic, other than peaceful, negotiations, this problem will not end because Jayawardene is succeeding in convincing some of the officers of the External Affairs Ministry that the terrorism that is taking place there is deep rooted, that he is having to deal with the same kind of terrorism that we have witnessed in Punjab. But between the terrorism we have witnessed in Punjab and the terrorism that he has unleashed on the innocent people of Sri Lanka there is a vast difference, there is a world of difference. There is a safeguard for the minorities in our Constitution, in our country. There is no safeguard, there is no safety, whatsoever for the minorities in Sri Lanka. These are two different things. But he tries to equate the two. That is how he is trying to convince our officers. In this situation Rajiv Gandhi is our only hope. Today he is the captain of the ship of our nation. We believe in him. I tell you, it may not be today, it may not be tomorrow, some day or other Tamil Eelam will be the only reality. Today you may laugh at it, but nowhere in the human history have you heard innocent people being butchered again and again for ethnic reasons. But the people have never remained silent and the day has come in the history of the world when people have risen. Even today I find they themselves go for agricultural operations... (*Time bell rings*) And today when under the presidentship

of Jayawardene Sri Lanka is behaving in this fashion, it is time you recognised this kind of a liberation army... (*Time bell rings*) and unless you recognise it the world will look at you with suspicious eyes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I call Shri Madan Bhatia. I request our new Panel Member, Shri M. P. Kaushik, to take the Chair. I hope everyone will cooperate with him as they have been cooperating with others.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri M. P. Kaushik, in the Chair).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are very happy that you are presiding over the proceedings and I am sure that your valuable experience will guide this House. Our cooperation will be there with you.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by my honourable friend.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): On the first day you must give us the maximum time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK). Now, Mr. Madan Bhatia.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the history of mankind in the post-Second World War era has been a history of contradictions. The year 1985, which is coming to a close, has been a remarkable symbol of these contradictions of this history.

Sir, the Second World War brought so much havoc, destruction and death on the world the like of which had never been seen by the humanity before. On the sollering ruins brought about by the Second World War, man aspired to build a new world, a new world free from fear of war and war itself, a world from which fear and hunger would be totally eliminated, a world which will be free from the courage of inequality

and the indignity of racism, a world in which every nation will have the right to stand up to and rise to the full stature of her destiny. But this did not happen. But what actually happened? On the one hand, Sir, the world saw the armaments race and the nuclear race of a dimension the life of which the world had never seen before and, on the other, we saw man clinging to the precipice of peace with the security almost of a razor's edge. On the one hand we saw the emancipation of the whole of Asia and Africa and, on the other, we saw colonialism fighting the last-ditch battles in different parts of the world. On the one hand, we saw the struggle of man to free himself from the shackles of want and hunger and, on the other, we saw the forces of imperialism seeking to prevent the new nations from rising to the full stature of their destiny.

I would respectfully submit, Sir, that on the one hand, we saw the people in different parts of the world seeking to co-operate with each other in order to bring about a new era of peace and prosperity and, on the other, we saw those very regions gripped with tensions and conflicts. May I respectfully submit, Sir, that the year 1985 has symbolised all these contradictions? On the one hand, we have been a witness to the resolve of the United States to carry the nuclear arms race into the outer space and, on the other, we have seen the Geneva summit at which the United States chose to abandon the deadful doctrine which had been enunciated by President Reagan, namely, the winnability of nuclear war and joining hands with Mr. Gorbachov to declare what was contained in the summit declaration which I would like to quote here:

"The two sides, having discussed the key security issues and conscious of the special responsibility of the USSR and the US for maintaining peace, have agreed that a nuclear war cannot be won and they will not seek to achieve military security."

[Shri Madan Bhatia]:

Sir, on the one hand, we have seen the United States and some of its allies continuing to give support to the racist regime in South Africa..... and on the other hand, we have seen the gleam of light in the declaration made at the Commonwealth Conference which said, and I again quote:

"We, therefore, call on the authorities in Pretoria for the following steps to be taken in a genuine manner and as a matter of urgency:

—declare that the system of Apartheid will be dismantled and specific and meaningful action taken in fulfilment of this..."

Sir, on the one hand, 1985 has seen the continued struggle of the people of Namibia against the stranglehold of colonialism by the South African regime, on the other hand, we have also seen the Non-alignment movement led by India making a declaration in concrete terms that we shall come forward with material support to the people of Namibia, fighting for their independence. In 1985 we have also seen the tragedy of the people of Palestine, their struggle to secure for themselves their hearths and homes and their dignity. On the other hand, we have also seen 1985 as a year in which concerted efforts have been made to snuff out the flame of struggle of the people of Palestine. In 1985 we have also seen tensions and conflicts in different parts of the world, and particularly the South Asian region of the world. But it is remarkable that 1985 has also seen the birth of South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation. This is a unique development. I respectfully submit, Sir, that one really wonders how it has taken almost 40 years for this development to come about.

The next question, Sir, is, where does India stand with regard to these developments in 1985? My submission, Sir, is that it is a matter of gratification and pride for India and the Indian people that India was not

only on the side of the positive forces which operated in 1985 but was almost at the centre of these forces. Take, for example, the nuclear armament race. It was India which hosted the six-nation summit at New Delhi in 1985 January, and it is this Summit which had declared "We reiterate our appeal for an all-embracing halt to the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery system." This declaration was followed up by the visits of our hon. Prime Minister to the United States and the USSR. This declaration was further followed up by a powerful call given by the hon. Prime Minister of India at the United Nations, calling upon the super powers to bring about—I just quote a few lines from the speech of the hon. Prime Minister at the United Nations; he declared:

"All of us have a collective interest in the preservation of the planet. Let us cure the world of the insanity of nuclear militarism. Let man's creative genius be utilized on behalf of enrichment, and not destruction."

It is this contribution made by India towards the political climate in the world which brought about certain very positive steps. The first was the unilateral declaration by the USSR of a moratorium on nuclear tests for a period of one year. The second was the proposal, again made by the USSR to the United States, for 50 per cent reduction in the nuclear armaments. It was this political climate created in the world, to which India had contributed, which brought about the Summit at Geneva between the two Heads of States or the USA and the USSR, where the two leaders got together and declared and I again quote: "They agreed to accelerate work with a view to accomplish tasks set down in the joint US—Soviet Agreement of January 1985, viz. to prevent arms race in space." It is true that President Reagan declared to the nation that the United States has no intention of

abandoning this programme of star war. So far as Gorbachev is concerned, he declared to the Supreme Soviet that this may not be treated as the last word, and I respectfully submit, Sir, this may be so because of the declaration which has been made at Geneva. And what was India's contribution towards this vital aspect of the nuclear armament race? This was the declaration made at Delhi in January, 1985. (Time bell rings) Sir. Just one or two more minutes. The declaration said: "Outer space must be used for the benefit of mankind as a whole and not as a battleground, of the future. We, therefore, call for the prohibition on developing, testing, production, deployment and use of all space weapons."

Sir, in 1985, India decided to keep aside the regional tensions and conflicts and differences between herself and Pakistan and play a leading role to bring about this association of the southern region. I respectfully submit that so far as this particular region is concerned, it shares common culture, it shares common history and to a considerable extent it shares common languages. But despite all these factors of commonality, these countries could not come together. But now they have come together. Take, for instance, western Europe. Under the compulsion of economics, under the compulsion of the consequences of Second World War and under the compulsion of the activities of the modern State as a welfare State the western European countries came forward and formed the European Economic Community. Let us hope and pray that this particular association in South Asia will be the equivalent, the beginning of the equivalent of the European Economic Community.

In the end, I want to submit that the famous American philosopher Will Durant once said:

"The story of man is the story of river with banks. In the river the man has been fighting, has been

quarrelling, has been waging wars and battles and has been shedding blood. On the bank the man has built homes, the man has sung songs, the man has loved, the man has talked of peace, the man has helped his fellow human beings." I respectfully submit that India's contribution towards humanity in 1985 has been a symbol of man's story on the banks. And for that contribution which India has made, let us not deny the credit which is due to the hon. Prime Minister. Let us give him a hand and a salute and wish him godspeed in the years to come for the persistent efforts which are being made by the hon. Prime Minister to create a new climate of peace, amity, co-operation and a new world order. Thank you.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I welcome this debate on international situation. But I only hope this will be a regular feature in future also. As you know, Sir, there used to be a debate in every session of Parliament when Nehru was the Prime Minister. It was given up. But I hope and trust, at least, hereafter, this convention is observed, in every session of Parliament the international situation is debated. Sir, this is an important debate where I expect the Prime Minister also to be present because several Members here are praising him and praising his role. I very much wish that he should be present in the House to hear the praises and flatteries and also provide us an opportunity to hear him. I feel that the Prime Minister should come and intervene in the debate.

Sir, this is an important year which marks the 40th Anniversary of the United Nations. This Anniversary has been observed all over the world. India was a founder-member of the United Nations and it has played a limited role in the United Nations as well as in various agencies

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

of the United Nations. India also has been a founder-member of the Non-aligned Movement, a leading member of the Non-aligned Movement. Even there, it has been playing a limited role. And in the Commonwealth too, it has been associating itself with all its activities. My point is that India has been playing a very limited but vacillating role on occasions. It has not been very effective. It has not been very effective because of certain compulsions, or imperatives

2 P.M. in the situation. Sir, we are in a mad, mad, mad world where power counts; values, ideals, objectives, principles play a secondary role. They only buttress the nations which have military and economic power. India is adversely affected in playing its legitimate role equal to its status or commensurate to its size and importance all along. Our role has not been commensurate with our location as a country, its history and background. The credibility of any nation, Sir, is measured in terms of military strength and economic power. On both these counts India cannot equal some of the powerful countries of the world. Take China. It has been playing quite an effective role in the international affairs. Sir, China was trailing behind India in 1949, both economically and politically and militarily too. But over a period of years it has been able to build its might and it is causing an uneasy feeling and a certain amount of consternation even among great powers. Even small nations like Yugoslavia is holding its own against great power, super power, because of its strong leadership, because of its economic strength, and because of its military might. Today we have not been able to play an effective role, very effective role in the United Nations or in the Commonwealth or in the Non-Aligned Meetings because of this fact, this drawback. No nation today, when power and power alone is most important, can play a very effective role and influence the poli-

cies of other countries so long as that country does not have the military strength or the necessary economic might. This has been our handicap. Take the case of Indian Ocean. We have been saying for years that it should be a zone of peace. The Indian Ocean does not wash the shores of great powers and it has nearly thousand million people surrounding it, including India it has nearly 36 states, nations, bordering the Ocean, its shores. So long and so far India has not been able to be effective; it has not been able to check the infiltration of the Indian Ocean by Super Powers. Sir, Indian Ocean is an ocean of the future; it is an ocean of destiny; it is ocean where there is tremendous wealth; it holds the key for world communication. Whichever power controls the Indian Ocean, will have India at its mercy. If we can not match with our own power if we cannot match the powers of other countries in the Indian Ocean, I am afraid there will be a terrible set-back, calamity, tragedy for India itself. We have not been effective to check either the Soviet Union or the United States coming into the Indian Ocean. We have failed there.

We have not been effective in Afghanistan. We have been wavering, vacillating. Our stands have shifted from time to time. Today, Afghanistan's future is shrouded with uncertainty. We do not know what will happen to Afghanistan. During the days of the British, Afghanistan was regarded as buffer State for India. Tibet was regarded as a buffer State for India. We have given up these buffer States. Afghanistan and Tibet are very important for the security of India. We have been wavering and vacillating on Afghanistan. We have accepted power of China over Tibet.

Fortunately we have formed an association, SAARC. I wish this regional association becomes viable.

credible, strong and dynamic in future. But the test of our success in this lies in solving certain basic problems.

Take the case of Tamilians in Sri Lanka today. My friend made a reference... (*Time bell rings*). I have not spoken much. I think.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): I have already given 13 minutes.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: First day you should be liberal.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): I can't help.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I will finish within five minutes.

Sir, I was referring to Sri Lanka. My friend referred to this issue. Please remember, unless we settle this issue amicably, unless the Tamilians are made to feel that they are secure and unless there is administrative and political devolution of power for Tamilians in the northern and eastern provinces, I am afraid this will be a problem for India and for Sri Lanka. In Sri Lanka, as you know, already foreign powers have been intervening. We do not want either Sri Lanka or any country in this regional grouping for that matter to be a hand-maiden of a Super Power. I think, we should settle this issue, the Prime Minister should take more initiative in this regard. He has been rather weak, hesitant, defensive, in the matter of setting the problem of the Tamilians in Sri Lanka.

Sir, Pakistan is another country which is important in this grouping. There are about 21 divisions in Pakistan. Out of these 21 divisions 19 divisions are deployed around our borders. Only one division is deployed against Afghanistan. This is not a happy situation. We have to take up this issue with Pakistan. We should create more confidence in Pakistan. SAARC should not go the way ASEAN has gone. Today

among the ASEAN countries, the spirit, which was there when it was formed, is not prevailing. Why? Because, there is no political will. There is bureaucratic inertia. There is suspicion among these countries. Today, ASEAN, though it is in existence, is not playing its historic role. I would like the SAARC countries, to develop contacts with ASEAN countries on the one side and GCC countries in the Middle-East on the other. They are important. GCC countries are another grouping in the middle east. These groupings have got to combine so that the great powers, the super powers, will not be able to play havoc in this region. Please remember, Sir, almost all the conflicts and wars after the Second World War have been fought in Asia. Nearly sixty wars and conflicts have been fought there. There were no wars in Europe. There were no wars in North America. Almost all the conflicts have been fought in Asia. Therefore, Sir, these groupings are important. SAARC, ASEAN and GCC groupings should combine, evolve a common strategy, which will contain the super power rivalry and confrontation. In this strategy, Indian Ocean becomes important. China is also trying to enter the Indian Ocean. Japan is trying to enter the Indian Ocean. Already, Soviet Union and America are in the Indian Ocean.

Sir, in the end, I would say to the hon. Minister, my friend that regional groupings have got to be viable, credible, strong and all the misunderstandings and suspicions have got to be removed. There has got to be greater consolidation of these groupings so that the Third World, and South Asia in particular, could be free from the super power rivalry, could be free from the gunboat by diplomacy which has been unleashed by the super powers. I do not make any distinction between America and Russia in this. Both are in the same category, at the same level. Both of

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

them want to dominate the world. We do not want to succumb to this domination. China is also emerging as a super power. It considers itself that it is the heart of Asia. Historically, China has been an expansionist power. You should bear this in mind. Therefore, Sir, India is surrounded by all these countries. China, Russia, America and others. These are the challenges which we have got to meet. The only answer is the country has got to be strong militarily and economically. The Prime Minister must evolve a consensus, adopt a consensus strategy to formulate our foreign policy.

Sir, in the end, I will say one thing. The foreign policy of this country is, unfortunately, shaped by individuals, not institutions. Individuals are directing this policy, not the institutions, like in the Western countries. This kind of a thing should stop, Sir. External Affairs Ministry is not taking important decisions, is not shaping foreign policy. It is either the Prime Minister's Secretariat, or the Cabinet Secretariat or the Prime Minister at the personal level taking decisions. This should not be there. The whole thing has to be changed. In the days of Jawaharlal Nehru the foreign policy was formulated by the External Affairs Ministry after arriving at broad consensus. That method has to be adopted now. Individuals may be important, eminent, but they cannot be given the power of formulating or shaping our foreign policy.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA (Delhi): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to hon. Mr. Gurupadaswamy for at least one thing. The key, according to him, in foreign policy is to remove suspicions between nations and peoples. He also referred to SAARC and the recent initiative. We are meeting in a very happy atmosphere of the birth of SAARC, South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation. Now, there are many formations and groupings in the world already either for peace-

ful or military purposes, like ASEAN, EEC, NATO, Warsaw Pact, etc., but I venture to suggest that SAARC is, in many ways, unique and, therefore, the circumstances of its birth are happy and significant one. Sir, SAARC has been derided in some quarters as a grouping of poor nations, but that precisely is a unique and significant quality. Other groupings are of rich nations, trying to enlarge their prosperity, well beyond super abundance, whereas SAARC is of poor nations, but proud and conscious of their development, strategy and their sharing of evolving technological knowhow. Therefore, they can also fruitfully prosper and progress.

Sir, as the Prime Minister put it succinctly, the objectives of the SAARC are towards attaining collective self-reliance, strengthening the forces of multi-lateralism and world-wide cooperation. As the Prime Minister also put it, the South Asian countries had not sought to meet their bilateral relationship into a common regional identity, but rather to fit South Asian cooperation into their respective foreign policy as an additional dimension. Therefore, I am very happy that this SAARC has been born and I think this in itself answers one of the points made by my learned friend that it is an organisation to remove suspicions in this region, to get further cooperation in this region. And I am very happy that we have taken a key initiative in this matter.

Here I would also like to clarify and remove a misconception that India's foreign policy has been radically changed or altered or that a major shift has taken place in its thrust in the past years. If at all there has been any shift it can only be in certain emphasis but its basic principles remain unaltered from the days when Jawaharlal Nehru propounded the lasting philosophy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. My friend has mentioned

that we have failed not only in the Non-Aligned Movement, but also in the Commonwealth, in the United Nations. I would like to know if the chairmanship of the NAM is not itself a proof that we have had a substantial contribution in the Non Aligned Movement.

Sir, my friend referred to China as a big power in this area and playing a very effective role in world affairs. As far as I can see China is playing only a second fiddle to the United States and a second or third fiddle to the U.S.S.R. They are making every effort to try and continue to bridge their gaps though they do not see eye to eye with each other. I do not see how even China can be called to be playing a more effective role than India in world affairs today.

Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Gurupadaswamy, mentioned about the oceanline that we have, which is very large, and he wanted us to prevent by force or otherwise the Super Powers from entering this area. I do not know if the Super Powers have been successful even in keeping each other out from their own shores. I do not know India in the present situation and at the present stage of development can possibly keep the Super Powers, who are rivals to each other, away from this area. I agree with him that the future of India, future of the World perhaps, also lies in this area. It is a very vital area for us and we have left no stone unturned to bring this to the notice of the Super Powers, as well as, I am sure he would have read in the newspapers there has been tremendous support from the Non Aligned Movement for keeping this area as a zone of peace.

He also referred to Afghanistan. I am only taking a few points. Mr. Vice-Chairman, could India have taken any more diplomatic initiative in Afghanistan than has been taken over the last one year? The matter has been discussed by our hon. Prime Minister both with the president of USA and the Party Secretary

of USSR and he has tried to talk to them to find an amicable solution and I think there is some silver lining to the cloud as far as Afghanistan is concerned after the recent visit of our Prime Minister to the USA.

Mr. Gurupadaswamy also referred to Sri Lanka. I think I would agree with him that Sri Lanka's problem and Tamilian problem is very vital for us, but in his whole speech made today he has failed to make even one single specific suggestion as a solution to this problem. This house has debated this problem many a time and there has been no specific solution coming forward from the Opposition, let alone by my hon. friend. I think the initiatives taken by our Government, the Ministry of External Affairs especially our Prime Minister, in having dialogues with the President of Sri Lanka have shown that we have made every earnest effort to solve this problem and that we are aware of the vital need of the Tamilians to have a reasonable solution, an honourable solution to this problem. I would not take more than a few minutes, Sir.

Now, my friend also referred to Pakistan. Again I have to say the same thing. With regard to Pakistan, I think our foreign policy has been very very pragmatic. Their effort in making the atomic bomb has kept us on our toes, we have been very alive to the question. We have been very firm but very clear on what we wish to do. We do not wish to have a nuclear race, an armament race in this region. This point has been made clear to Pakistan at practically all levels but at the same time, Sir efforts have been made to build confidence between the people of Pakistan and the people of India and remove suspicions. One of the reports says that the President of Pakistan himself is coming here on the 17th to have a dialogue and have the matters discussed and sorted out across the table. Now, Sir I think that this initiative and this foresight of our Government, our Ministry and our Prime Minister is ample proof that the

[Shri Vishwa Bandhu Gupta]
entire approach of the Government of India its foreign policy is to remove suspicions—of which Mr. Gurupadaswamy had made reference in the beginning.

I would only like to make one or two points more. The major concern of India has been and will continue to be to see that the world is at peace and wanting to bring about development and prosperity. Disarmament been a very major concern for us, which involves the very survival of the human race. The arms build-up and, particularly, the horrifying space war concept not only imperils the millions of the world but also retards all development. Nations go on wasting money and resources on these very negative fields of operation. This is a matter of major concern to us.

In the light of all this it is obvious that India's foreign policy, as enunciated and practised by the country today, is the best we can have and, therefore, it merits the fullest support of all the people of India. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I cannot help reflecting that whenever I have been a witness to discussions and debates on our foreign policy—and I have had occasion to say this earlier—I am reminded of love-making between elephants; It is always conducted at a very high level it is accompanied by a great deal of noise, and we don't come to know of the results for a least two and a half years. Except that all the previous speakers have spoken about India's foreign policy and had gone back to World War II. I am glad they did not go back to Ramayana and such other mythical days. We are however really speaking of the past one year, of the steering of our foreign policy by the present Government—therefore, we are talking of the past one year—then the peregrinations of the Indian foreign policy and its chief architect in that one year, is really the object of our inquiry, interest of

hilarity, depending on whichever way you approach the matter.

Sir, unfortunately this is a point which has been made by some other speakers as well as the Ministry of External Affairs in India in discussions of foreign policy, is really an irrelevancy. They are not the architects of our policy quite often they are not even the spokesmen of it. Therefore, I find his whole aspects of discussions on our Indian foreign policy being conducted by the hon. Minister as really a kind of shadow play.

I wrote recently, Sir that this last one year of the Indian foreign policy irresistably reminds me of a book which was published in the mid 70 and which was called the Philosophy of Andy Warhol From A to B and Back Again. That is the impression that the Indian foreign policy has conveyed in one year. I do not wish to be epedantic I will, therefore put across to the hon. Minister all the doubts that have arisen in my mind and would except that in the process of clarifications, in his replies he will attempt to clear some of them.

Following upon the get-acquainted visit of high summer of 1985 when the chief architect of our foreign policy took a visit abroad to get acquainted with various people the next significant development in the conduct of our foreign policy was in the autumn of this year when tours were again undertaken and when, leaders from other nations also visited, the Bahamas and the UNO which process for current year is now over. I regret that we were earlier denied of an opportunity to clarify this autumn visit else some of these queries would not arise. The first casualty of these autumn visits was the PLO. It was a very welcome initiative that we had taken, that the Head of the PLO Yassar Arafat, been invited to the 40th anniversary celebrations of the United Nations. And then quite inexplicably and with unbelievable pusillanimity we capitulated under the

bullying of the United States of America and disinvited him. I do not think that the invitation to the UN 40th anniversary celebrations is quite the same thing as an invitation by the Indian Youth Congress. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what precisely happened. We took the initiative to invite Mr. Yasser Arafat. What exactly happened which resulted in our dis-inviting him?

Then the sorry saga of South-African sanctions. On this vexed question, on an earlier occasion when we attempted to ask clarifications from the hon. Prime Minister, the chief architect of India's South African policy we chose to lower the whole debate to the level of a Doon School dormitory, jibe. That is matter for him to decide. It is also a matter of choice. The question, however, still remains, and I would, therefore, ask the Prime Minister today at least to move away from his Doon School dormitory come to the House and explain to us, firstly, how you reconcile comprehensive mandatory sanctions with the limited object, purpose, intent, content of recommending merely recommending not mandatory, but limited economic measures. It was our understanding an assurance had been given in the House that our aim as far as the pretoria regime is concerned, is the removal of apartheid. It is not preservation of the illusion of Commonwealth unanimity. How do you therefore, call a comprehensive mandatory sanctions as the same thing as recommending a course of action?

Just one or two additional brief words about South Africa. Let us experience what are the steps being recommended. This group of elder statesmen, who are more elder than statesmen, after it gets constituted, for the first six months thereafter will observe what South Africa does and does not do. Then it will recommend to all the Commonwealth countries and those which participated in the holiday climate of Bahamas to stop buying Kreggerand. Canada will

be delighted if you stop buying krougerrand, their sales will increase. Who constitutes this group is not entirely besides the question. One is Lord Anthony Barber, a former Chancellor of Exchequer, currently the Chairman of Standard Chartered Bank which has vast commercial interests in South Africa. Julius Nyerere declined to be a member of this group of elder statesmen. Pierre Trudeau also declined. We depute a venerated foreign policy name, Sardar Swaran Singh about whom I would not go further into that matter. The point is that with his kind of instrumentally we are attempting to put across to the country that our policy on South Africa as far as Bahamas meet was a great success. And further that as far as South Africa is concerned it has been a great success. I am not convinced, I would therefore, repeat my question. How do you reconcile the difference between comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions and merely a recommendation of economic measures—those also to be adopted after this group of six amongst whom, I have just taken but one name have studied and come up by June, 1986 with recommendations?

My next point is what happened, during these travels on the occasion of the United Nations 40th anniversary? The U.N. statement on this occasion raises large questions about India and the United Nations. According to me, two issues are invited. I would request the Minister to clarify these points. Firstly, in the U.N. it was our initiative against that we wanted a statement to be accepted on the occasion of 40th anniversary of U.N. The U.N. General Assembly rose without accepting any statement leave alone our initiative—we had given considerable publicity to the fact that we were taking the initiative and yet that statement was not adopted. I would therefore, like to know from the Government—what were the particular references in the draft that we had worked so hard on that met with diffi-

(Shri Jaswant Singh)

culties, if so, why and from whom? What was our response to those difficulties? Yet again like in the case of P.L.O. What that made us give up? Or alternatively, why was this draft not accepted?

Secondly, as far as India and the United Nations were concerned, a very brief news report appeared in the press on November 22, which is a factual report. I would like the Honourable Minister to explain in the wake of this report, whether India was diplomatically isolated by a group of almost impossible to conceive of as allies who aligned against India, the United States, Libya and Iraq (*Time bell rings*) Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, the next speaker has agreed to give five minutes of his time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): Sorry, Sorry. How he can give?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: He has agreed.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I have agreed to give time tomorrow but not today.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): You cannot give time to anybody.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Anyway, the United States, Libya, Iraq and Zambia not only aligned against India but also against non-aligned as well as Commonwealth countries.

On a resolution moved by Pakistan on the question of nuclear arms free zone, the voting pattern was 90:3 which stands with India, Mauritius and Bhutan. Would the Government like to comment, because; it is a reflection of what India's position today is in the United Nations.

On Indo-U.S. relations, I will just raise four specific questions. We were

given to understand that following upon these great visits to the United States a new dawn had broken out in Indo-U.S. relations. A *Staid Journal* like the *Wall Street Journal* comments, say break danced on the streets of New York" and devised pharaseology which suggested. Rajiv and Indian Reagan-Thatcherism, whatever that might mean. My specific questions therefore, are: Would the Government clarify that they have taken up all those matters with the Government of U.S.A.? If you have taken up these matters, what has been the response of that Government? And what is your response to the reaction of the Government of U.S.A.? My first query is upon the termination of the present agreement with the Pakistan in 1986. U.S.A. will not automatically grant the Pak demand....and these figures are not clear. It is rumoured that they could be as much as 6.4 billion dollars. Secondly, in the context of this Arms Agreement, has the Government of India asked the Government of USA to clarify and re-define its obligation to Pakistan under the 1959 Mutual Security Agreement so that US involvement in an Indo-Pak conflict is ruled out. (*Time bell rings*). Sir, you have to give me some more time. I will sum up very quickly. Thirdly, in this context of improved Indo-U.S. relations, has the Government of India asked the Government of USA to clarify that the inclusion of Pakistan as one of the 19 countries covered by the recently established Central Command does not relate to contingencies involving India and Pakistan, and in your reply, include the Indian Ocean also? Fourthly, has the Government of India sought an assurance at any time during this last one year from the USA, that in the new security relationships with Pakistan, it does not involve any intelligence-sharing between them which could be adverse to the Indian security interests?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): Please conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I will conclude in two minutes. So much for that I will now conclude by touching upon some item of crucial importance, national security, the Government's pronouncements on national security and on the nuclear conundrum that it has created. Because my time is limited, I will not say what I have to say on the subject. I will merely ask clarifications. During these recent travels, the Hon'ble Prime Minister made statements, while abroad, while out of the country, of a Chemical Warfare threat from Pakistan, of a chemical warfare angle to Indo-Pak security—which chemical warfare threat, angle, suggestion, question, all seem to have chemically evaporated ever since the Delhi Gas leak. Would, therefore, the Government clarify this as to what the Prime Minister meant? How has that threat suddenly vanished? Secondly, there were reports that following upon the meeting with President Zia in New York an agreement has been reached of Nuclear Scientists to meet together, and that was followed upon by a frenzy of contradiction issuing. What is the correct stand? I believe, Sir, that you will ring the Bell very quickly. Before you do so, I will also quickly conclude by pointing out in two-three sentences, that this whole confusion that has been created on the nuclear question. Having unwillingly been forced into a situation of acquiescence in conventional weapons parity, a situation of nuclear weapons asymmetry will not now be accepted by either of the two countries. The options available, therefore, to India are of either a resolute, purposeful, controlled nuclear weapons programme or an equally purposeful but a joint programme for non-nuclear South Asia. The Government of India does neither. The Prime Minister says one thing, at one place, and quite another thing, at another place. The Hon'ble External Affairs Minister is attempting to cover the track of confusion which is spread on the nuclear question by the Prime Minister, which further confounds

the situation. I would appeal to the Government, in all seriousness, that ambiguity on as important a question as nuclear threats, is not a good policy and whenever the Government chooses to speak on nuclear subjects on nuclear weapons matters and more particularly, when it is the Prime Minister that speaks he must speak seriously and only seriously. That situation wherein you are blowing hot and cold simultaneously on nuclear matters is not a policy, is a non-policy. It spreads alarm at home; it spreads confusion abroad. That really is the account of one year of foreign policy of this Government in action: confusion at home, confusion abroad. I would like to conclude with just one sentence... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAV-RAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): There is more confusion in your mind.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): No interruptions, please. Please conclude.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: They cannot understand. That is why they say like this.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would like to conclude by suggesting . . . (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): Ignore the interruptions altogether. Please conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would conclude by suggesting to the Government, as also to my friends on the Treasury Benches who have honoured me by interrupting me, that I could do no better really than, as I wrote recently, by paraphrasing Oscar Wilde and repeating what Miss Prism Whight have suggested to her bunch of girl students, teaching them elocution, to say: "Go back to elementary education. Practise saying prudence in front of a mirror for half an hour every day." Thank you.

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: I hope you remember what Dorian Gray said before the mirror.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we could not have chosen a more auspicious day for today's debate. Today is the 10th December. And on this day in 1948, the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognising thereunder the basic philosophy that inherent dignity and inalienable rights of all members of the human family are the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world. And I feel myself proud, despite what has come from the hon. Members of the Opposition, that no country in this period has endeavoured in greater measure than India to ensure these basic rights and to usher in an era of freedom, justice and peace in the world. Secondly, there could not have been a more, shall I say, significant change or qualitative change in the circumstances that existed last year when we debated this question and today when we are debating it again. Many things, not only of national importance but of great international consequence, have happened in this year and a half. I think we discussed this subject sometime in May last year. Every year, whenever we discuss the foreign policy, the internal situation casts its shadow on the foreign policy. Last time I found that we were all bugged by the problem of Punjab and the problem of Assam. Luckily both these problems have disappeared and we have emerged much stronger, and a greater nation. Everybody in the world hoped that our democracy would collapse, and this one significant beacon which is shining in this part of the world, this one beacon of democracy which is shining in the world would be shattered when Indiraji was shot—this is what even our well-wishers thought. They have now realised that that beacon is glowing with greater luminosity and shedding greater light to the benefit of the rest of mankind. And it is a matter of eternal gratitude that every drop of Indira's blood has watered the flower of democracy in our country and also elsewhere and that flower—as we see

the chrysanthemums these days—is in full blossom and full of fragrance. It is against these changes that we have to view the current foreign affairs situation. And when people have chosen Prime Minister Gandhi to lead the country, they have also chosen him to lead the world in the same manner as Pandiji led, in the same manner as Indiraji led. I will come to that a little later.

The second significant change which has taken place is that the two super powers have started talking with each other and, may I say, there is some sort of a very welcome shift or, to put it negatively, a drift towards catastrophe has been halted. That is also a very encouraging feature of this year which has gone by. And it is here that India will play a very vital role, because if anybody today is acclaimed as the leader in the world for peace and peaceful development, it is India and India's Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi. I will come to the other parts a little later.

Firs let me deal with what the honourable Mr. Jaswant Singh had to say. I always listen to him with great interest and very often with great amusement. And today I must admit that his reference to the love-making of elephants, the shadow play, the Doon School dormitory, the bunch of girls, has really left me amused. But at the same time I am a little confused and totally unconvinced of what he had said. I wish he gets an opportunity to deal with diplomacy because I think what he does is he conceals what he ought to reveal and he reveals what he ought to conceal. Therefore, to come to my favourite topic, because I started with the declaration of human rights, we have a proud record, we were the first to challenge it, we were the first in the international fora to raise our voice against the apartheid and I always felt if Mahatmaji were not to come to our country, we may not have got independence by now, but certainly there would not have been apartheid in South Africa. That is our proud heritage and, therefore, it

has pained me that in this ignorance—and it is said to be bliss—he has made all those accusations which are totally unfounded. He must remember that CHOGM is not India, it is a combination, it is a family of all Commonwealth countries, and the honourable Member seems to forget that when members of the same family with divergent views—in this case, almost opposing and clashing views—meet together, to say that if a consensus is arrived at and a consensus not to give up what we stand for, but at consensus to see that the opposite view which is the extreme opposite view, makes a shift and comes in our direction, I do not think one can call it really a compromise on principle. Sir, no one is more conscious of this situation of this position, than the Prime Ministers himself because in a statement he made before our House on the 25th November, 1985, he said something about the situation in South Africa and this is what he has said about the situation in South Africa:—

“The situation in South Africa was the focus of our attention at the Commonwealth summit in the Bahamas. Consistent with our position, we called for comprehensive mandatory sanctions. The Commonwealth accord on South Africa was adopted...” the most important words come now—“We would have preferred a stronger statement. But the accord represents a step forward and nobody can take exception to it.”

Anybody who knows the position of USA, the position of Canada, the position of UK in particular will take exception to this. I am mentioning the UK particularly because 60 per cent of the trade of South Africa is with the UK and it would affect the total economy of Great Britain. So, to get a concession from a country which is placed in that position, to say that they will, over a period of time, get over to the sanctions, I think, is a feather in the cap. I think it is a shift, a definite shift, not in our position, but in their posi-

tion, because our position stands as it has been. We are not going to resume trade with South Africa and we are not going to lift the unilateral sanctions which we have imposed. Therefore, the objection to this which has been raised is really without any substance. Even in America you will find that there is a great deal of disenchantment at what is called the Sullivan principles or the doctrine of constructive engagement and you find that the Universities like the Berkeley, which have a multi-million, if not a billion, dollar investment in South Africa are pulling out and are withdrawing their investments and all this has been possible because of the hard stand which India has taken as the spokesman against apartheid and racism in this world. Then, Sir, he mentions some other point and I will leave it to be dealt with by the other speakers because my time is limited.

Then, Sir, I come to my esteemed friend, Shri Gurupadaswamy. I do not know what he meant by saying that Afghanistan and Tibet were buffer States and we have given them away. I do not know what his solution is. Should we have a war with China? Should we take on Pakistan and Afghanistan together to keep Afghanistan? He said that we were wavering or vacillating. Now, in a situation which is never static, in a situation which is ever changing, if the USA and the USSR can come and talk together—they are again talking on the 14th of January, according to what I have read in the newspapers—I do not think one can say that there is any wavering or vacillation on the part of our Government in respect of our foreign policy. Yes, he said that today we are living in a world which is dominated by power. But Sir, I think that to go after that power will be totally suicidal. I say this because, today, between themselves these two powers are spending over five hundred billion dollars every year on armaments and it is almost half of what we will spend for the full Seventh Five-Year

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

Plan of our country. Now, I do not know what is to be done. The only thing which is left to us is to exercise our moral authority and that is why keep on remembering the words of our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, to the United Nations: "We are not going to fight with the nuclear arms." I will come to this a little later. But this is what the honourable Prime Minister said while addressing the United Nations:
3 P.M.

"Let us fight against the shame of starvation in a world of plenty."

And that is why India will continue as a leader of the third world. And when I come to that, kindly see in what manner, if at all, has there been a shift in the negative sense. There has been a more positive shift for peace, more positive shift for co-operation. And I have enumerated certain heads to find out where we have made any shift in our foreign policy, which continues to be our pride and envy of the rest of the world.

The first is Non-alignment. In what way have we deviated from that? We still continue to be leader of the Non-alignment. The second is Peace, peace in the world. I think nobody thinks of anyone else as a champion of peace, except India as the leader to give them the lead. The third is Development. And, SAARC is a point, because, I think, the relevance of SAARC is also a collective self-reliance of poor and developing countries, and some of them are really under-developed, to combat the state of food and agriculture, the woefully low rates of domestic savings, the equally dismal rates of growth in per capita income and dependence on all external forces. Then, we come to the question of Apartheid. We come to the question of racial discrimination. We talk of colonialism. We talk of imperialism. We talk of mutual relations and we talk of mutual trust. We talk of

confidence, mutual confidence and cooperation. On each of these points, if there was a marking system we would get 10 out of 10 marks. And that is the way to evaluate. In a debate like this, take the whole and take the components of that whole and find out where we have gone down and find out where we have gone up and where we have remained stationary. On each of these 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 points; I find that we have gone ahead; and we have not taken a step backward on any of these points. Therefore, the policy remains. Of course, there is a greater thrust, there is a greater realisation. And that realisation is necessary because of the personality of the Prime Minister as was mentioned in the Newsweek dated 3rd June 1985: He is a model of modern India... a man unfettered by bitterness and pain of the colonial days, a man eager to lead his country into a new era. Now, if this new era is change, then we plead guilty to the charge. Yes, we are going into a New Era of faster development, we are going into a New Era of rapid peace and very extensive peace and we are going into an era as SAARC has shown, of greater mutual cooperation in regions, because ultimately India is the only country which has got its borders with all the remaining six members of SAARC. Nobody else has that continuity of the border. And therefore in this context if they say here is a change, I plead guilty to that charge, for there is a change towards a more dynamic, more vibrant and a more pragmatic policy within the framework of the policy which has been enshrined and which has been made by our forefathers. There is no doubt in my mind that the policy will continue to give its benefits. I have only two more points and I have done. I have always had reservations about Sri Lanka. It does not affect only the Tamilians who are Sri Lankans. In this country, we have about 55 million Tamilians. Where is Mr. Gopalsamy. He would correct me if I am wrong.

Now, what is happening in Sri Lanka—I have said it on the floor of this House and I want to repeat it with all the anguish and emphasis at my command—is a negation of basic human rights. Jayawardene is a captive of the Sinhalese Army and he cannot get out at all. He talks one thing and does just the other. He has no sanctity for the basic human rights. We love Sri Lanka because we have many many common cultural ties. It is a tiny country. It is a democratic country and we want it to be strong because if they are strong, if our neighbours are strong, we are stronger. What are the demands of Sri Lankan Tamilians? One is acceptance of Tamilians as a national minority. We accept national minorities in our country. Our Constitution specifically provides for the recognition of national minorities. I do not see any reason why a similar recognition should not be there of Tamilians as a national minority. Then, there are recognition of their homeland right, self-determination, citizenship and the right for Tamilians to live in Sri Lanka, all within the four corners of the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka. (*Time Bell rings*). What have we done in Punjab? We brought about a democratic solution. The Akalis are in power and we never objected to it. There is no reason why they should not, looking at the strong sentiments of Tamilians, come to a solution, a solution which is a political solution, a package deal which must respond to the urges and aspirations of the Sri Lankan Tamilians. As has been rightly pointed out by our friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, it is necessary that there should be a devolution of effective power, administrative, legislative and political power because they are as much a part of Sri Lanka. If they believe in democracy, then there cannot be any objection to the sharing of these powers.

Then I come to Pakistan. My hon. friend Shri Jaswant Singh referred to it. I think here we have to have

a close look. Of course, President Zia says one thing and he does another thing. Sometimes, I have been really pained by his double talk. On the one hand, they talk of friendship with India. On the other hand, they go on arming themselves in this manner. I want to point out one particular aspect of it. (*Time Bell rings*) Their military aid is over 3 billion dollars. But this again is a facade. Every item which is supplied to Pakistan is a subsidised item. If a tank costs one crore of rupees, it will be shown as Rs. 50 lakhs and Rs. 50 lakhs will be a subsidy. So, they get much more. I would like the hon. External Affairs Minister to look into this and ask both the U.S.A. and Pakistan about it. If they claim to be our friends, let them at least be honest with us and tell us frankly what they are giving.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Do you expect that they will tell you?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARJE: At least the U.S.A. should tell us. They said that there are new relations in the offing. They should share this information with us. I am disappointed. (*Time Bell rings*) Two minutes more. I am disappointed that President Zia refused our Prime Minister's invitation to visit Kalpakam on 16th.

Look at the way they behave towards the Canadian Sikhs, look at the way the Pakistan is encouraging the extremists and the terrorists to train them in Pakistan and carry on their activities in India. And, I think, though we are friends—and we should continue to be friends—a time has come for us to tell them what the truth of the matter is. And there is nothing wrong in telling, even if it means sometime's a little harshly and not altogether gently, the Pakistan Government that we do not appreciate all this increase in the border incidents. At this stage, I would like

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

to make a distinction between the Government of Pakistan and the people of Pakistan. I think, the people of Pakistan want to have the most friendly relations with us. And it is only the Government of Pakistan which is standing in the way of these friendly relations. What is necessary today is the restoration of full democratic rights to the people of Pakistan and the restoration of democracy in Pakistan. President Zia has already postponed the elections which he had announced for January. And, I think, unless democracy is restored in Pakistan there is no manner of really being assured, and no use of my friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh, putting all these questions because he knows who is coming in the way of restoration of democracy. That is another super power which is trying to see, well that it remains a power base by not becoming democratic. These are the few views which I want to share with you on this occasion.

All that I will say is that I must congratulate the Government, the External Affairs Minister, and the Prime Minister for continuing on the glorious path laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Indiraji, and particularly the Prime Minister himself for even achieving a greater glory in such a short time.

Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman and Madam Vice-Chairman.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shrimati Kanak Mukherjee) in the Chair]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE): Now, Shri Kalyanasundaram.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Madam Vice-Chairman, we are now discussing the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in regard to that.

At the outset, I want to say that some important event has taken place, that is the Summit between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The fact is that the US President had to meet the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for discussing not merely their bilateral relations but the important question of world peace and disarmament and to secure a world without arms and war. That was the aim of the Soviet Union. And the world knows what the aim of the US imperialism is. When we discuss either the international situation or the situation in our region, we should bear in mind what the US imperialism is trying to do in the world and in our region. So, what is their aim? It is world domination and taking the nuclear arms even to space.

In the Geneva Summit, although it is important, the U.S. President had to sign a statement that a nuclear war is not winnable, it cannot be won, and there should be no nuclear war or conventional war between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union has been campaigning for it in the whole world. The people who fight for peace, world peace, disarmament and the diversion of military expenditure for the development of the backward countries are advancing. Even in America there are scientists and workers and intelligentsia who are fighting against the warmongering policy of President Reagan. We have also joined with the forces which stand for peace. India is not just a regional power. India is one of the great countries in the world, not because of its population and size, but because of our culture, our tradition and the policy of non-alignment and peace which we are pursuing after independence.

Our Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi during this short period of just one year had risen on important issues to the occasion. He is hailed

as following the policy of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Shrimati Indira Gandhi in international affairs. But nevertheless I have certain questions to ask. There were my predecessors who asked those points for different purposes. In the Commonwealth Summit, it is asked why we could not succeed in demanding a total ban on economic sanctions against South Africa. Then, how to trust those who are responsible for it, namely, Canada and Mrs. Thatcher? I am only surprised that the Congress (I) Member, Shri Bhandare should go to the extent of defending Mrs. Thatcher. There are others in this country to defend Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Reagan. Why should the Congress (I) people go to the extent of defending Mrs. Thatcher? It may be that the Prime Minister for tactical reasons might have signed that Accord but is it not the duty of the Congressmen here to see that it is wrong and that we were compelled to do it and should we not demarcate it? Then where is the strength for this foreign policy? Whatever our leader says, we say, yes. I do not say that you should quarrel or rebel. But the Congressmen should reflect the mood of the people of the country. The Prime Minister for reasons of international compulsion might have signed that Accord. But I do not think that his conscience will allow him to justify it.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Mr. Bhandare did not say that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: My friend, please do not interrupt. you will be diverting me. I can meet that point.

Is the trade with South Africa more important than killing of black people there? How can you justify it? But he justified it on the ground that it will affect the foreign trade and so, how can the economic sanctions be imposed. That is what Reagan also is saying. That is a lame excuse. There are so many other countries which will suffer and they

are prepared to purchase things at higher prices from other countries. If that is the argument, then talk of economic sanctions against Pretoria Government is senseless. That is a different matter. That is why I am asking the Prime Minister to tell the world. If the Commonwealth behaves like this, how can we advance our progressive foreign policy by being a member of such Commonwealth? At least this House should protest. That is my point. My Congress friends must understand this. The foreign policy cannot rely on one single individual. It should be taken to the people of our country. They must be roused as we were roused during the days of freedom struggle. Our foreign policy was evolved not after independence; it had its germs in the freedom struggle. Who built the African National Congress? Where did Mahatma Gandhi get his training? Where did he experiment his philosophy of non-violence and truth? It was on that soil. So we must be proud that we have always been with the people in South Africa right from the beginning. Some of those who are in the African National Congress are Indians, people of Indian origin. Even those who had worked closely with Gandhiji are still alive.

Another important question is about the conference on Indian Ocean. Indian Ocean is the outcome of history which has conferred the name of Indian Ocean on this piece of water. It is not we Indians who call it Indian Ocean. From times immemorial, it has been of clear and vital interest for India and other littoral countries. There are people in this party, in this House, in this country who equate the two Super Powers. Either they should be ignorant or they should be mischievous or they would like to shield America. What is the Soviet Union doing in Indian Ocean although it has commercial agreements with '36 littoral countries whose shores are being washed with Indian Ocean. They have even security pact, like India and Vietnam. What

(Shri M. Kalyanasundaram)

is the interest that America should have in the Indian Ocean—six thousand miles away? Is their interest more sacred and valid than India's interest? The population of these littoral countries is more than one-third of the world population and out of this, India accounts for more than 50 per cent. The U.N. resolution was passed in 1971 that a conference should be held in Colombo for declaring Indian Ocean as the zone of peace. Of course, India is everytime in the forefront to demand that a conference should be held. Even this year that ritual was done very effectively in the forum of U.N. Assembly that the conference should be held. But who is sabotaging it?

Is it not the policy of the Janata Party? What does the Janata Party want the Congress (I) to do? They are still pleading for the policy of equi-distance between the two super powers and genuine non-alignment. It means, surrender to imperialist manouvres and intrigues. This is what my friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, is trying to advance. No Indian can agree to such a proposition, whatever may be our grievances against the Congress (I) and the Government. We may blame them. We have a right to fight against their wrong policies. But in fighting against the Congress (I) and its policies, we should not give alibi to the imperialists who are furious against India because of its foreign policy. Imperialism will throw a stone on the Indian Government and the stooges will also throw another stone from inside. This should not be the attitude to take. Madam, Soviet Union has offered bilateral discussions with the U.S.A. on the Indian Ocean. They have been repeatedly telling that no country other than the littoral countries should hold naval exercises in the Indian Ocean, should have bases in the Indian Ocean. This is the policy of the Soviet Union. And you equate them with the U.S.A. which has got 36 bases in the Indian Ocean,

most powerful bases. The U.S.A. has three spheres of vital interest; first, Western Europe; second, Far-East and, third, Indian Ocean.

(Time bell rings)

Please allow me a few more minutes. Anybody who forgets this cannot serve the cause of Indian security and Indian independence. We have vital interests in the Indian Ocean and in keeping it as a zone of peace. The Sri Lankan tension should be viewed in this background. No doubt, Sri Lanka is a small country with a population of just the size of Kerala. But we should remember that Sri Lanka, geographically, is located inside our coastal route. Even the Indian naval vessels from the Western ports, either from Bombay or from Cochin, have to go south of Sri Lanka to reach Madras, Visakhapatnam and Calcutta. The Palk Straits which separates Sri Lanka from India is just about 20 miles. It is very shallow. No vessels can go. Our naval vessels and military vessels have to circuit around Sri Lanka. Inside that coastal route, the Jayewardene Government allows hostile forces. Just two weeks ago, one American naval vessel, called Kitty Hawk, with 87 aircraft, some of them even carrying nuclear weapons, was anchored for more than two weeks in Colombo. What does Jayewardene say? He says, they came, we did not invite. Can any country, conscious of its security, do such a thing? If it has come uninvited, should he not protest? Madam, the Voice of America has the strongest base there, in Sri Lanka. My friend from the All India Anna DMK was giving the details. I do not want to repeat them. The U.S.A. is vitally interested in a base in Trincomalee, not satisfied with Diego Garcia. The story is, whoever gets Trincomalee and Singapore will dominate the Indian Ocean and even advance towards Pacific. Jayewardene is playing the game of imperialism in his country. Even the Sinhalese people

are opposed to Jayewardene's pro-imperialist policy in his country. It is what our friends must realise. If the Sinhalese democratic forces and the Tamils who are fighting for their survival combine, there will be no Jayewardene or killing of Tamils. The Sinhalese democratic people and the Tamil people should unite and resist. That is the way to save the Tamils and save Sri Lanka.

Regarding the help that we should give, it is an important matter. I have to say plainly to the Prime Minister that he is unwittingly playing into the hands of Jayewardene by equating killings and the violation of the truce, agreement. During the past six months more killings have taken place compared to the last three years. That is how Jayewardene has utilised the truce or observed the truce. So, I want to know what Government of India proposes to do to protect the Tamils, to prevent influx of refugees from Sri Lanka into India and to stop the killings. Unless the killing is stopped, any talk of peaceful solution is meaningless, it will not yield results. Jayewardene should be asked to seek a political solution, not a solution through this military terrorism. Until a peaceful solution is reached, it should be the responsibility of the Government of India to give protection to the Tamils in our soil. If they come, we should help them. In what form they should fight, what should be their demand, how they arrive at a settlement, should all be left to the Tamils. They should decide themselves. Our role should be one of guarding their interests and giving them help. This is what was happening during the days of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. She understood the danger to our country through the Jayewardene Government. Now that understanding is weakening, the help to the Tamils is weakening, both politically and materially. So, I want the Government to be vigilant of the danger and this will have its adverse repercussions in India too. It is a threat

to India's security. What Jayewardene is doing is a threat to India's security. Well it is not a problem of Sinhalese or Tamils alone. It is an imperialistic game which Jayewardene is playing.

In this background, one more remark about SAARC. It is also a recent political event. (Time bell rings). I welcome the declaration and the Charter of SAARC, but I must warn about the dangers. It is on his way to Dhaka that President Ziaul Haq talked of Kashmir and it is on its way to Dhaka that President Jayewardene allowed the American vessel to visit Colombo. So, these participants, these seven countries which constitute the SAARC, have divergent approach to international problems. It is not only on local issues we differ. What is the quarrel between us and Pakistan if it is not through America? If you see Pakistan without America, we will be committing a serious mistake. There are no reasons for us to quarrel amongst ourselves. We were under bondage from the common British imperialism. We fought them—those of us who constitute India today were in the forefront in those days of freedom struggle, but those who constitute West Pakistan and Sri Lanka got freedom, because of our struggle.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Frontier Gandhi was very active.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI KANAK MUKHERJEE): Please don't disturb. Let him conclude. Mr. Reddy, you will have your chance. Please conclude now.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Yes, yes, he will be coming here. He is well known as Frontier Gandhi. Excepting that I said there were other provinces which were not so active. Don't go by one or two instances.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Let us not ignore him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI KANAK MUKHERJEE): Mr. Reddy, you will have your own chance.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: I am concluding, Madam. Now on present issues we have divergent views. We should be vigilant and it will not be very easy to observe the Declaration and the Charter. But people in this region have to be roused. It is for that reason that I am saying that we should take the people into confidence. That is, in this region we must help support this Charter and Declaration but SAARC should not become a fetter in our help to the democratic movements in the neighbouring countries. While it could be used for building good neighbourly relations among our countries, tomorrow just because Jayawardene is a member of the SAARC, we should not stop giving help to our Tamil brethren. Similarly because Zia-ul-Haq will be visiting us and meeting and having tea and nice conversation, we should not be less vigilant about the intrusion of terrorists from Punjab or about the border clashes in Kashmir. That is what I say that there should be vigilance and greater vigilance, while SAARC could be tried and experiment could be made because the imperialists are trying to divide us, let us try to unite. The economic reasons are there which will make us unite because they are also suffering from debt burden, they are also suffering from uneven economic relations with the advanced countries. Like the Latin American countries, there is economic basis for mutual cooperation and collective self-reliance. They should accept the struggle for new international economic order. The struggle for removal of poverty and unemployment in these countries is linked closely with the struggle against colonialism and for new international economic order. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to rouse the political will of the people of our country, to see that peace is

maintained in this region and a conference is held about the Indian Ocean as early as possible. If the imperialists sabotage that, I will request the Prime Minister to convene a conference of the governments of littoral countries and independently discuss and bring pressure and build world opinion against the imperialists who are sabotaging this conference on the Indian Ocean and from the Indian Ocean they want to conduct experiments for their Star Wars programme. This is very vital for our security and for strengthening the cause of our development.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI KANAK MUKHERJEE): I would request the hon. Members to cooperate with the Chair, otherwise we will not be able to complete the discussion today at all. Shri Satya Pal Malik.

श्री सत्यपाल मलिक (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय मुझे बताया गया था कि मेरा नम्बर देर से पड़ेगा लेकिन कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता है मैं अपना काम शुरू करता हूँ..

(व्यवधान) मैं बोल देता हूँ आखिर मैं शुरू हो चुका हूँ ।

उपसभाध्यक्षा (श्रीमती कनक मुखर्जी) : ठीक है बोलिये, आपका नाम लिखा है।

श्री सत्यपाल मलिक : बहुत बारीक और तकनीकी बातें बहुत से साथियों ने कहीं हैं मैं साधारण तरीके से जो विश्व की स्थिति है उसमें हमारी सरकार ने जो किया है उस सिलसिले में कुछ चीजें कहना चाहता हूँ ।

विदेश नीति एक ऐसा मामला है कि राजनीतिक आदमी कितनी ही होशियारी की बात कहें लेकिन साउथ ब्लाक में जो विशेषज्ञ बैठे हुए हैं उनके लिये ये बातें बेवकूफी की हो सकती हैं होती रही हैं । लेकिन वक्त ने यह साबित किया है कि संसद ने जो बातें कहीं हैं अगर उनका नोट साउथ ब्लाक नहीं लेता है तो नतीजा अल्टी-मेटली खराब होता है । ऐसा पहले देख

चुके हैं। साल भर में हमारी सरकार ने विदेश नीति के बारे में जो कुछ किया है उससे न सिर्फ मैं संतुष्ट हूँ लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि मौजूदा स्थिति में सामान्य कल्पना से बाहर हमारी सरकार ने कामयाबी के साथ अपनी विदेश नीति को चलाया है। जब हम इस बात पर विचार करेंगे तो हमको देखना चाहिये तथा खास करके विपक्ष के साथियों को भी कि आखिर किन स्थितियों में हिन्दुस्तान को अपनी विदेश नीति को चलाना पड़ रहा है। दुनियाँ के हालात क्या हैं, दुनियाँ किस तरफ जा रही है, दुनियाँ के बड़े देशों के, ताकतवर मुल्कों के रुझानात क्या हैं और हमारी स्थिति क्या है, सारी चीज को समझकर चलेगे तो फिर आपको हमसे डिफर करने की या मतभेद करने की गुंजाइश नहीं रहेगी। आपका कर्तव्य है मतभेद रखने का लेकिन वह बाकी चीजों में रखिये। विदेश नीति के बारे में भारत के विपक्ष की यह परम्परा रही है कि वह कभी मूल से हटा नहीं है और मूल प्रश्नों में सदैव संसद और संसद सदस्यों का मतक्य इस मामले में रहा है।

स्थिति क्या है। जो मौजूदा सरकार है, प्रधान मंत्री राजीव गांधी की सरकार, आज से 3 साल पहले इसकी कल्पना नहीं की जा सकती थी। इस सरकार का जन्म ही हुआ है हिन्दुस्तान की दुश्मनी से। दुनियाँ में एक बड़ी ताकत ऐसी है जिसका सारा वक्त जाता है हिन्दुस्तान को डीडिस्टे-ब्लाइज करने के लिये, तोड़ने के लिये, वह ताकत 7 हजार या 8 हजार की फिलिस्तीनी फौज को बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकती है। दस हजार फिलिस्तीनियों को मारने के लिये तमाम दुनियाँ के इंतजाम करती है और 60-70 करोड़ का हिन्दुस्तान जिसके अनाज के भंडार खुद के किसान भरते हैं जिसकी आर्डिनैस फैक्टरियाँ सारे हथियार खुद बनाती हैं, जो सेटेलाइट भेजने में सक्षम है, जिसके पास दुनियाँ में दूसरे तीसरे नम्बर की फौज है, जिसके पास दुनियाँ में सबसे बड़ी तादाद में टेक्नीशियन्स, वैज्ञानिक, इंजीनियर, डाक्टर मौजूद हैं, उस हिन्दुस्तान को वह ताकत बर्दाश्त करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है और उसका सारा वक्त इसी में लगता है कि आर्थिक तौर पर, राजनीतिक तौर पर, कूटनीतिक तौर पर, सामरिक

तौर पर हिन्दुस्तान को कमजोर करें। उसी साजिश के चलते हमने अपने नेता को खोया और एक नयी सरकार बनी। नयी सरकार को आकर जिस स्थिति में काम करना पड़ा, वह साजिश वहीं मौजूद है, वह बड़ी ताकत वहीं मौजूद है, उसका सारा प्रयास वहीं मौजूद है। देश के स्तर पर हम सारे मसले हल कर लें लेकिन उस ताकत की बराबर कौशिश है कि हिन्दुस्तान को किस तरह से कमजोर किया जाय। दुनियाँ की पंचायत में हिन्दुस्तान की जो इज्जत है, हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई से लेकर आज तक कांग्रेस जिन-जिन दुनियाँ के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों पर अच्छी-अच्छी बातें कहती रही है या भारत जिन बातों के लिये जाना जाता है और उन पर हिन्दुस्तान जो बोलता है तो इन तमाम चीजों को वह बड़ी ताकत नहीं चाहती थी और खास करके एक बड़ी ताकत कि हिन्दुस्तान इन बातों को बोले। लेकिन इस सरकार के पास मॅन्डेट है, 402 आदमी चुनकर भेजे थे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों ने, केरल और काश्मीर के गरीब आदमी के बीच में संवाद का कोई साधन नहीं है, वह अखबार पढ़ता है, अन्य चीजें जानता है लेकिन वोट करने के लिये जब गया तो एक ही मिजाज के साथ गया और सबका मॅन्डेट था कि हमको एक मजबूत लीडरशिप और मजबूत हिन्दुस्तान चाहिये।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जो पिछले साल भर में दुनियाँ के जिस मुल्क में गये, बड़े से बड़े और ताकतवर से ताकतवर मुल्क में खड़े होकर, वहाँ की जमीन पर खड़े होकर, जिन चीजों के लिये हिन्दुस्तान खड़ा हुआ है उन्हीं चीजों को कहा उनकी आंख में उंगली देकर बताया कि हम फलां-फलां चीजों के खिलाफ हैं। तो भारत की विदेश नीति, खास तौर से हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भारत की विदेश नीति का जो स्वरूप साल भर में दुनियाँ के सामने पेश किया है वह स्वरूप एक निडर, एक बहादुर, एक स्वतंत्र और कमजोर मुल्कों के बेहतर रहनुमा का स्वरूप है और हमको इस बात के लिय फख है और उसमें आप चाहे जितनी पक्षपातपूर्ण दृष्टि से देखें, अमेरिका के लोग, रूस के लोग, फ्रांस के लोग, ब्रिटन के लोग — मैं उन विदेश मंत्रालय के अफसरों की बात नहीं करता

[श्री सत्य पाल मलिक]

हूँ और वहाँ के अखबारों ने और दुनियां ने स्वीकार किया है कि हाँ हिन्दुस्तान का प्रधान मंत्री वहादुरी के साथ, ईमानदारी के साथ, कन्विकशन के साथ वाकई दुनियां के सामने वह चीज कह रहा है जिस के लिये हिन्दुस्तान खड़ा हुआ है। अब यह दोनों जो मैंने बताया जहाँ-जहाँ जाता हूँ सब जगह जो अप्रिय बात भी थी वह भी उस जमीन पर की है। उसमें हमें कामयाबी मिली। कॉमनवैलथ का जो सम्मेलन हो गया तो उसमें दक्षिण अफ्रीका के मामले में जब यहाँ से गये थे प्रधान मंत्री जी तभी से यह बात साफ हो गयी थी कि वहाँ जाकर स्टेप लेंगे और हिन्दुस्तान के लिये यह कोई नया बात नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी का लड़ाई का यह हिस्सा है गाँधी जा के उमाने से उस चक्र के लिये हम लड़ते रहे हैं अगर इसको छोटा मानने का कोशिश करेंगे तो गलती करेंगे। मिरेज थैंचर ने अपने मुल्क में क्या कहा है इससे हमें कोई मतलब नहीं है, थैंचर को कोई पचास मजबूत हों लेकिन मिरेज थैंचर ने अपने मुल्क में कुछ भी कहा हो, कॉमनवैलथ का उससे कोई महत्व कम नहीं कर सकता है। कॉमनवैलथ का हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में बहुत महत्वपूर्ण कदम है और उसके बारे में जैसा कि उस दिन प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बताया कि चर्चाएँ सारी दुनियां में इसकी हो रही हैं, उसे किसी भी तरीके से कम नहीं कहा जा सकता है। हिन्दुस्तान का उसमें विशेष रोल रहा है और मुल्क के लोगों ने इसको फायदे के साथ महसूस किया है कि एक ऐसे मानवीय मुद्दे पर हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बेहतर रहनुमाई की और कॉमनवैलथ में इंग्लैंड की जो भी हैसियत थी, वह एक बड़े जमींदार या सामंत की होती है, जो रियाया के साथ बैठता है, वह हैसियत एक दिन बाकी नहीं रह गयी हिन्दुस्तान की मौजूदगी में। हिन्दुस्तान ने वहाँ कामयाबी के साथ अपनी बातों को मनवाया है और इसका देश में बहुत अच्छा असर पड़ा है।

अब हमारे जो पड़ोस के साथी मुल्क हैं आसपास के, उनके साथ हमारे

जो रिश्ते हैं, उनमें साल भर में क्या-क्या कामयाबियाँ हुई, उसे मैं नहीं कहता, वह हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी बताएँगे। लेकिन आज जनता महसूस करती है, लोग महसूस करते हैं कि हमारी विदेश नीति कितनी आगे बढ़ी है, यह नये सिरे से दिखाई दी, इंदिरा जी की जो विदेश-नीति थी, उसी को चलाते हुए उसी को मजबूत करते हुए, इंदिरा जी की क्या, यह तो इस सरकार की विदेश-नीति, कांग्रेस की आजादी के जमाने से ही जो नीति जवाहर लाल जी वगैरह ने तैयार की थी, उसी पर हम चल रहे हैं, उसी नीति को एक नए महत्व के साथ, एक नयी खुशबू के साथ पेश किया है। पड़ोसियों के सम्बन्ध के संदर्भ में यानी सैद्धांतिक मजबूती और व्यवहार में विनम्रता। वह दो बातें प्रधानमंत्री जी ने साल भर में दिखाई। अपनी बात को मजबूती से कहना, लेकिन दोस्ती का कोई तकल्लुफ नहीं, बहुत बढ़िया तरीके से मिलना-जुलना और यह सारा काम करना। लेकिन मैं इस सब का पीछे इस बात को भूलने के लिये बिल्कुल तैयार नहीं और संसद् या सरकार गलती करेगी अगर हम यह भूलने की कोशिश करेंगे कि पाकिस्तान के इरादे क्या हैं? पाकिस्तान और चीन को जो आणविक सहयोग हो रहा है, उसके नतीजे हमारे लिये क्या हैं?

महोदया, सड़क पर खड़ा हुआ चार साल का बच्चा भी इस बात पर एतबार नहीं करेगा कि अमरीका से जो पाकिस्तान को हथियार मिल रहे हैं, वह रूस या अफगानिस्तान के लिये मिल रहे हैं। रूस की फौज के लिये तो पाकिस्तान दो दिन का सामान नहीं। पाकिस्तान में अमरीकी सैनिक सामग्री रूस के लिये नहीं, सिर्फ और सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान की काटेस्ट में दी जा रही है और पाकिस्तान ने खुद भी माना है कि उसकी दो-तिहाई से अधिक फौज हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं पर लगी हुई है। हमको इससे कोई शिकायत नहीं है, हम उससे निपट सकते हैं, लेकिन सवाल यह है, जैसा हमारे माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी कहते रहे हैं हमें गरीब आदमी को पावरटी-लाइन

से ऊपर नहीं ले जाना है, हमको गांव का विकास नहीं करना और एक बड़े सेठ का, जिसका काम आणविक हथियार पैदा करना और दुनियां को बर्बादी की तरफ ले जाना काम है, उसके जखीरे से जो हमारे पड़ोस में अस्थिरता पैदा की जा रही है, इसको हमें दूर करना है। पाकिस्तान के इरादों के बारे में हमको कभी गलतफहमी नहीं रही। हमारी सरकार की बहुत व्यवहारिक तरीके से बातचीत, बहुत बढ़िया होती रही। लेकिन उसके बाद पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति जो बात एक तरफ करते हैं, तो काम दूसरी तरह वा करते हैं, चाहे आणविक हथियार बनाने का मामला हो, या अमरीका से हथियार लेने का मामला हो, वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ छेड़छाड़ के इरादे को कभी नहीं बदलेंगे। हम सक्षम हैं सैनिक तौर पर, हम सक्षम हैं आर्थिक तौर पर, हम सारी चीजें अपने यहां बनाते हैं, हमको कोई दिक्कत नहीं है, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ाई नहीं चाहता। अब सारे काम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में नेकनीयती से नहीं चलते। लिहाजा हमको देखना पड़ रहा है कि पाकिस्तान में किस तरह से हथियार इकट्ठे किए जा रहे हैं, कितने आर्दानियों की नेवी बनायी गयी है, किस तरह सऊदी-अरब में कोशिश में है, जो सऊदी-अरब को सहायता अमरीका से मिलती है, उसमें से कुछ हासिल करे, तमाम दुनियां के लोगों की मदद लेकर जहां-जहां से मदद मिल सकती है, जहां तक कि चोरी करके आणविक हथियार बनाने में भी लगा है...

इन सारी वास्तविकताओं के मामले में हमारी सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री ने कभी गफलत नहीं दिखाई। यह अलग बात है कि हम जिया-उल-हक को आम-खाने की भी दावत देंगे और कलफ़ाम भी जाने की दावत देंगे। यह खूबसूरती प्रधान मंत्री के शिष्टाचार की है। महोदया, शिष्टाचार से, जैसा कि आपका लहजा है, वह चूकते नहीं, लेकिन वास्तविकता के घरातल से हटते नहीं। यह पड़ोस के मुल्कों के साथ हमारा व्यवहार रहा।

मैं अगर चीन का जिक्र नहीं करूंगा तो गलती करूंगा। भारत सरकार ने चीन के साथ जो अफसरों के स्तर पर बातचीत चलाई है वह ठीक किया है। अफसरों के स्तर पर ही बातचीत चलाई जाना चाहिए था। माननीय जसवन्त सिंह जी बड़े विशेषज्ञ आदमी हैं, बड़ी अच्छी अंग्रेजी बोलते हैं, कई दफा समझ में नहीं आता। उनका यह कहना था कि प्रधान मंत्री का मौजूदगी में चीन के साथ जो भी बातचीत की जाय उसके दौरान भारतीय संसद का संकल्प याद रखना चाहिए। भारत य संसद का संकल्प राजीव गांधी तो याद रखें लेकिन वाजपेयी जी याद न रखें। मैं जानना चाहूंगा जसवन्त सिंह जी से कि वाजपेयी जी ने चीन यात्रा के दौरान भारतीय संसद के संकल्प को दोहराया था या नहीं। अगर दोहराते तो उनका निकाल दिया जाता, वापस भेज दिया जाता। जाने के पहले दोहराते तो चीन इनवाटशन न देता। मैं हवा में यह बात नहीं कर रहा हूं। माननीय मधु लिमये जी ने लिखा है कि—वे जनता पार्टी के बहुत महत्वपूर्ण आदमी थे—उन्होंने मोरारजी से कहा कि चीन जाने के पहले अफसरों के स्तर पर बातचीत होनी चाहिए। मोरारजी भाई ने कहा कि मैं समझा रहा हूं, पर वे मान नहीं रहे हैं। बड़ा उत्साह था वाजपेयी जी में। मधु जी ने कहा कि जाने के पहले हेंग सेमेरिन को सरकार को ही कम्पूचिया में मान्यता दे दो या जाने से पहले घोषणा कर दें कि हमारी यह-यह राय है। कुछ नहीं किया। सारो दुनियां देख रही थी। चीन बराबर रेडियो से कह रहा था कि जो 1962 में हमने हिन्दुस्तान की गत की वही वियतनाम की करेगा। वाजपेयी जी को रात को ही बोरिया बिस्तर समेट कर लौटना पड़ा वियतनाम पर हमले के बाद। पिछले दस साल में हिन्दुस्तान की इतनी बेइज्जती कभी नहीं हुई जितनी केसंदर्भ में वाजपेयी जी ने कराई थी।

[श्री सत्य पाल मलिक]

आज आप कहते हैं कि संसद का संकल्प दोहराइये। संसद का प्रस्ताव हमारी सरकार ने कभी भूला नहीं, न भूलेगा। चीन के साथ हमारी सरकार ने जो बातचीत चलाई है उसका न केवल मैं समर्थक हूँ बल्कि मैं मधु लिमये, जो विपक्ष के सबसे होशियार लोगों में हैं विदेश नीति के मामले में, समझते हैं कि यही एक रास्ता था चीन के साथ सम्बन्ध सुधारने का। सही बात यह है कि मैं इस बात को ज्यादा बढ़ाना नहीं चाहता था, लेकिन मैंने बताया कि हिन्दुस्तान में कमन्वेल्थ विपक्ष का एटीट्यूड यह अच्छा रहा है जो हमारी विदेश नीति की बुनियादी चीज है, जो दोस्त और दुश्मन की पहचान है उसके सम्बन्ध में ज्यादातर पार्टियों की दृष्टि यही है। लेकिन कुछ पार्टियाँ ऐसी जरूर हैं जिनकी दृष्टि अमरीका को देखकर बदल जाया करती है और हिन्दुस्तान के हित उनके सामने नहीं रहते। मैं उन भाइयों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले एक साल दुनियाँ की जो स्थिति है उसमें भारत की सरकार ने बहुत बढ़िया तरीके से काम किया। उसी के चलते पहली बार सम्भव हुआ कि विदेश नीति में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने, जिनका साल भर पहले राजनीति में आने का इरादा भी नहीं था और जिनके बारे में राजनीतिक पंडित सोचते थे कि चीजों को किस तरह से चलाएंगे, विदेश नीति के मामले में कुछ ऐसी घटनाएँ कीं जिनके व्यापक नतीजे हुए हैं। मैंने एम० जे० अकबर का इन्टरव्यू पढ़ा। उन्होंने बांग्ला देश के राष्ट्रपति से पूछा कि जिस समय दैवी विपत्ति आपके देश पर आई उस समय भारत के प्रधान मंत्री आए, उनके आने का क्या असर हुआ। उन्होंने कहा कि उसका बहुत जबरदस्त असर हमारे देश के लोगों पर हुआ। विदेश नीति में इस तरह की घटनाएँ जो राजीव गांधी ने की हैं उनका बहुत अच्छा असर हुआ है। अभी थोड़ी दिन पहले दुनियाँ के दो बड़े आदमी मिले थे, जिसको सारी दुनियाँ देख रही थी। कोलम्बिया में एक रात में 20 हजार आदमी मर जाते हैं।

इतनी जबरदस्त घटना होती है मानवीय इतिहास की। रीगन साहब के लिए 30 मिनट से ज्यादा का समय नहीं लगता जाने में, लेकिन नहीं जाते। हमें फक्र है कि हमारा प्रधान मंत्री अकेला ही नहीं बल्कि पड़ोस के एक और राष्ट्रपति को बांग्ला देश के तूफान में ले जाकर खड़ा हो जाता है और कहता है कि हम जिस मदद के लायक हैं करने को तैयार हैं। यह विदेश नीति का बहुमत पक्ष है। इसके लिए मैं भारत सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ।

अभी सार्क की मीटिंग हुई। उसके बारे में सारे लोग बोले हैं। मुझे इस बात को देख कर खुशी हुई कि पहली बार—और हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ यह आरोप होता था—हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने ऐसा कहीं दिखाया नहीं कि मैं ताकतवर हूँ या बड़ा हूँ।

[उपसभापति महोदय पंठासांन हुई।]

वह जिस भाईचारे के साथ, जिस नम्रता के साथ जिस खुले दिल के साथ यहां गए और उसमें शिरकत की, उससे जो नतीजे निकाले हैं, उससे मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूँ कि पड़ोस का वातावरण आने वाले दिनों में बेहतर होगा और हमारी जो विदेश नीति है, वह बेहतर तरीके से आगे बढ़ेगी।

इसी तरह से श्री लंका के मामले में कुल मिला कर प्रगति हुई है। मैं इस पर ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लूंगा, कांग्रेस पार्टी के तमाम लोगों को इस पर बोलना है, लेकिन मैं निश्चित रूप से यह कह सकता हूँ कि नई सरकार ने दुनियाँ की मौजूदा स्थिति में सुधार लाने का प्रयास किया है। हिन्दुस्तान ने गरीब लोगों, तीसरी दुनियाँ के लोगों, पिछड़े हुए मुल्कों के लिये उनके बेहतरीन कामरेड, बेहतरीन साथी के तौर पर बहादुरी के साथ अपनी आवाज बड़े से बड़े ताकतवर मुल्कों की जमीन पर, उनके बड़े से बड़े प्लेटफॉर्म पर खड़े होकर उठाई है और वह अपने

पड़ोसियों के साथ बड़ा अच्छा व्यवहार करता रहा है।

महोदया, मैं पढ़ रहा था कि, महा-भारत में एक छोटा सा दृष्टांत है, जब भीष्म पितामह स-शय्या पर लेटे हुए हैं तथा कौरवों और पांडवों को नीति संबंधी उपदेश दे रहे हैं। पांडव पूछते हैं कि परिवारजनों और संबंधियों के साथ किस तरह का आचरण करना चाहिए, यह पड़ोसी के संदर्भ में भी सही है, तो भीष्म पितामह कहते हैं कि उनके साथ आचरण मित्र जैसा करना चाहिए और उनसे सावधान दुश्मन की तरह से रहना चाहिए। इसी सूक्ति के चलते हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने बेहतरीन तरीके का आचरण किया है व्यवहार में और सावधानी बरती है तैयारी में और उसके लिये प्रतिज्ञा दोहराई है।

मैं इन शब्दों के साथ नई सरकार की सक्षम और कुशल विदेश नीति का समर्थन करता हूँ। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Madam, Deputy Chairman, I expected that the practice followed hitherto in this debate regarding time would also be available in my case.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, seven minutes would be allowed to you.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: No, people have been speaking for more than fifteen minutes and even twenty minutes. Well, I will not pray for that but at least, the ringing of the bell will take its due course after sometime.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You would be allowed ten minutes.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: Thank you Madam.

Madam we are discussing today our relations with foreign countries and the success of our foreign policy during the last one year or so and I must say that whereas there is not much difference in the broad outlines of the foreign policy which this Government is pursuing but regarding its implemen-

tation, its pursuit, its execution, I have all my doubts in my mind, which, I would be trying to translate into words. Madam, our country has basic problems all around, and we have been running to far off countries, enjoying their hospitality, enjoying their press Conferences, staying in good places and having a good holiday. But as far as our own achievements are concerned, I do not think they are of any great magnitude. For instance, so far as our relations with America are concerned, let me say one thing. We went there, we enjoyed their hospitality, we were broadcast on the television forum, photographed and all that, but in fact, what did we get out of that? We know, for a fact that if Pakistan is being armed today by America, it is an eyesore for us. It is America who is not asserting its moral authority to dissuade Pakistan from going nuclear in spite of the protests. It is 4 P.M. America which has stationed itself militarily and heavily in the Indian Ocean and is not listening to our protests regarding their stay in the Indian Ocean. We also know that if in Sri Lanka, there is the Tamil problem, at the back of it there is some American influence or American support to it. If the apartheid is being continued in South Africa, there is moral support for it from the United States of America. If there is any problem for us from other sources, behind all these problems we find the hand of the United States of America. And yet, we have not had the courage to openly say that the United States of America, the American Government is not being fair with us, is not having a friendly approach towards our problems and towards us; rather it is creating problems and difficulties for us. We find that the people of Bangladesh have come into India, into Assam and West Bengal in large numbers. We have not been able to stop it. We have not been able to establish a dialogue with Bangladesh so as to make them take their people back. We also find that a number of Tamilians, probably over 50,000 or 70,000, have come into India and

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta]

they are now staying in India. We have not been able to persuade the Sri Lankan Government to take their people back, saying that it was a type of indirect aggression against India. We have also found that Pakistan is training and sending terrorists from across the border into India and a problem is being created in India. But we have neither been able to dissuade Pakistan from it nor influence or make the United States of America recognise this fact that it must withdraw its support, military support to Pakistan. I am asking you does the United States of America know or not that the arms that it is giving to Pakistan are mainly directed towards India? And if so, is it a friendly act on behalf of the United States of America towards us? If not, why don't we have the guts and the courage to say it plainly and openly?

On the other hand, I must say that our relations with the Russian block have been very good. They have helped us. They have been sincere with us. At all difficult times, they have been helping us. But when we compare the relationships of the two super power blocks, we try to equate them and put them on the same platform and thereby we are trying to befool ourselves and we are trying to befool the whole people of this country. Therefore, I am saying that in foreign relations, our achievements with respect to the Western bloc have been more or less negligible. We have not been able to get the economic aid that we wanted, the technical know-how that was needed by this country, the moral support needed by us for dealing with the gigantic problems of development in this country. Yet, at the same time, we say that our visit to these countries has been very successful and has brought us great gains and great laurels. I doubt it.

Another aspect is that we in this country have been suffering for quite

some time now because of lack of development on the industrial side. When we ask for help in terms of technology, we do not get the required help. Rather we get outdated, outmoded help and that also is not sufficient to make the common man of this country come up to the level of self-employment, to be self-employed and to make himself sustain in these difficult times. Therefore, I am saying that our foreign policy has been given tilt in the wrong direction. If we could only realise that our foreign policy must be so directed as to be realistic.... and to be in the best interests of this country so that we can call a spade a spade and value our friendship with those countries which are sincerely and genuinely helping is and be on guard against those countries which are directly or indirectly trying to thwart our progress, we will have achieved a lot. We must be on guard against this. And our foreign jaunts must be restricted. After all, if the Prime Minister of this country goes to any foreign country, he is bound to get a good reception because this country is a great country and when its Prime Minister goes to a foreign country, he will be given a good reception. There is no doubt. But that by itself is not sufficient. For instance, he went to Japan and we got a loan of probably Rs. 160 crores. Considering the wealth of Japan, the Budget of Japan, I say the loan we got is a meagre type of loan which could have been obtained by anyone at the ambassadorial level in Japan and it was not necessary for the Prime Minister to go there for this kind of a loan. Now we are the head of the third world countries. Yet it is surprising that during this period of nearly a year or so he has not visited many third world countries. How many third world countries have you visited? You have visited the sophisticated, developed, Western countries. If you have not visited those third world countries, is it not our failing in this respect that we are trying to ignore those countries which are with us, which have the same problems as

we have, which are thinking in line with us, but are visiting those countries which are adopting a definitely hostile attitude to us? I, therefore, request the honourable Minister to clarify this point, whether or not at this point the United States of America is decidedly acting against our interests, whether the Government is aware of it and what safeguards they intend taking in this regard.

SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA: (Himachal Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairperson I rise to speak on the international situation and to support the foreign policy which we have pursued for the last so many years. It is a chain of continuity kept up. I congratulate the Government that under the stewardship of Shri Rajiv Gandhi it has achieved a tremendous success. Only recently we have learnt about SAARC being launched and India had a significant role in the evolution of SAARC. Before dealing with the other points in the debate I would like to say something on what our honourable colleague across the floor, Shri Gurupadaswamy, said, that there has been no effectiveness in what we have pursued and in the same breath he said we were the founder-members of the UNO, we were the founner-members of NAM...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: There is no contradiction.

SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA: Now he himself says there is no effectiveness. When NAM started, there were just a handful of countries in it. Today we have the support of one-fifth of the world's population with 101 countries supporting NAM. I am surprised and shocked if he still thinks his way. So far as the United Nations is concerned, has not India been spearheading so many resolutions in favour of Namibia, in favour of PLO? Has it not been able to demarcate a place for them? Has not PLO got the status of an Observer from the point when it was referred to as a refugee problem? Has Namibia not found a place in the mention it has had in the successive summits

of NAM throughout? And today if the whole thing culminates into the resolution against Apartheid at CHOGM, is it not something that we have achieved under the dynamic leadership of our leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi? I would say that you have to take into account these successes and you must learn to take these successes in your stride even if they belong to the opposite party. Shri Jaswant Singh pointed out one thing and asked why we should refer to the past. Now, you cannot just formulate your foreign policy overnight any say that here is an instant success of it. It is deeply rooted in the Independence struggle that we had and what was formulated at that time by the party leaders of yester years and, today, we have to refer to that. I do not expect you to know about my party's history. But I would certainly expect you to know about the country's stand, a consistent one and a continuous one, its stand to adhere to the the principles of non-alignment. And you know what it is: non-interference, peaceful co-existence and all that. What is bad in that? It is because of the success of this policy that you have not had war in this region although we were attacked. I would say a word more. India was never blamed at any time for having attacked any country. Today, he even went to the extent of saying that India, because of its great size, should have done that. I am surprised at this. How would the size of a country determine its foreign policy? It is the position, the geo-political position, of a country or a nation which determines its foreign policy. Now there is a propaganda being made around the world that India because of her size might attack or dominate, that it has not done any thing of this kind so far. You are trying to feed some such ideas into the minds of others which is not correct. The effectiveness, I would say, has been proved not once, but so many times, by India and more so now when we have entered a new era in which the success of NAM and SAARC is before us and the

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta]

world to be seen. It is built on the general consensus of the public opinion within the country and without. No policy can be successful till you carry the people with you, and the very fact that India has been supported at the NAM by so many countries, by almost one-fifth of the world's population, shows that the ideas of the people of India in the form of their foreign policy, are being reciprocated the world over. This is what we have achieved. We have tried to win the hearts of the people. My hon. colleagues asked why we have entered the CHOGM and why we should not leave it. I am surprised at this. Is it not worthwhile staying in an institution or an organisation and working for certain goals rather than coming out of it and isolating your self? I see no point in that we have a tremendous amount of support, let me say emphatically, at the CHOGM, and our leader has added another feather in his cap, and you must learn to take it in the proper spirit.

Now, in pursuance of this policy of adhering to the principles of non-alignment, the greatest peace movement of our times, we have played a very great role in the establishment of SAARC. When Bangladesh was facing the fury of the floods—I am reminded of it now—it was our hon. Prime Minister who, along with the Sri Lanka President, Shri Jayewardene, went across to assist them in the relief plans. This is what we have been working for, that is, for good neighbourly relations and, as a family, we would like to move as one among equals. At no point of time has India tried to steal a place for itself as a leader because it believes in collective participation, collective co-operation, I would say, which would solve the problems of this region.

And in pursuance of this policy, SAARC, along with Bangladesh and other six countries, including India, has emerged as the peoples and the countries which want to rise above what-

soever pressures are on them, like the collapse of certain global financial institutions, the weakening of these institutions. We have to be self-reliant and we have to see that we carry one and a quarter billion people who are facing starvation and death. India is coming forward to extend a helping hand of friendship, not as a leader but as one amongst equals, let me emphasize this. India has consistently adopted a positive attitude towards SAARC, and the launching of SAARC demonstrates our determination to cooperate regionally, to work together towards finding a solution for our common problems in a spirit of friendship, trust and understanding. This alone can lead to an atmosphere of understanding where all the seven nations can put their resources, both human and natural, in ameliorating the lot of the people of this region.

The south Asian Association of Regional Cooperation ushers in a new era of cooperation, amity and friendship amongst these countries. The Summit is the grand culmination of the process initiated by Bangladesh. Yes, the credit goes to Bangladesh, because it initiated it under its previous leader and India was there to cooperate instantly with it. SAARC brings a new hope into this region. (*Time-Bell rings*) At this point I would like to congratulate our Government for having a vision and foresight in working out certain areas which it has identified with the object of co-operation. I would say that we would transcend those narrow barriers and extend them to the outer world for global, collective cooperation. We look forward to it. SAARC has got the heads of the States together so that the hearts could meet and here we see what India has achieved. The adoption of the Charter was unanimously accepted at the SAARC summit.

One of the important Resolutions which came up focussed the attention of the world on the deteriorating international political situation and the unprecedented escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear weapons.

That called upon the nuclear weapons States to urgently negotiate a comprehensive test ban treaty leading to complete stoppage of testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons. A new era of understanding and India's relations with its neighbours and big powers has come about; whether you admit it or not, it is quite evident. Shri Rajiv Gandhi took over after a grim tragedy struck India in particular and the world in general in the assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. She crusaded, lived and died as a martyr for the high ideals of unity, peace and understanding. That was terrorism that struck the citadel of peace she became a target, India condemns terrorism and calls upon the international community to crush it. State and individual terrorism has no place in today's world. It is a grave threat to all of us. Do we not remember what happened to President Kennedy? What happened to Lord Mountbatten? Have we forgotten? What happened to the Olympic stars at Munich in 1972. Was an attempt not made at Margaret Thatcher's life! Was an attempt not made on Poppe's life? this time, I would appeal to the international community, through our External Affairs Minister, to see and to bring about an International code of conduct whereby this grave threat is eliminated. (*Time bell rings*).

The time-tested policy of India, the Non-Aligned Movement which it is heading at the moment, is the only hope that would lead us out of a World which faces a collapse. I would say it is criss-crossed with such tensions. It is resting on the brink of a precipice and perilous perch. We have to bring about an end to this conflict and, therefore, in our policy we have to stand by what we said earlier. We want disarmament, nuclear and general. We are against all sorts of violence. We are for world peace and we are for peaceful co-existence. When the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. met in Geneva, we thought that we would see a new chapter being turned over

and it was so. We hope that with a further dialogue there will be a solution to the grave dangers that face this world. India, as a Member of CHOGM and as a member of the United Nations crusades for world peace and it is known. Our credibility has been built up and there is no denying from it. We recall the outstanding contribution made by Shrimati Indira Gandhi. She visualised clearly the dangers of the arm race. She carried the simple message, the powerful message, to other continents. She said: "Either we cooperate to live together on this lovely planet of ours or we are condemned to die together without human dignity. Her message, in fact, was an immortal message of India through the ages. Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and other leaders of our freedom struggle always emphasised that Independent India would be a bulwark of world peace and the harbinger of the liberation of subjugated peoples all the world over. We have always adhered to these principles of non-intervention, non-interference, peaceful co-existence and of sorting out problems through negotiations.

Peace is a prerequisite for development anywhere and it is very true for us. All of us are working towards that end. This policy is based on sovereign equality, mutual understanding and respect for each other. Mutual trust is the bedrock of peace in the region and the world (*Time bell rings*). Just two minutes more, Madam. Our Prime Minister's tireless efforts and endeavours to build bridges of understanding have borne fruit. There is no denying it. The world knows that India has forged ahead with these efforts and endeavours. We have not deviated from our path of peace, world peace, which we seek to achieve. India watchers must have noted his pragmatism and his determination to solve problems through discussions. He has visited U.S.S.R. to strengthen the ties of friendship and of cooperation which existed between the two States. These ties are

(Shrimati Usha Malhotra)

traditional and have been built up over the centuries. The moratorium placed by U.S.S.R. on nuclear tests is a positive step which should be responded to by the other side also India's approach to the Sino-Indian relations has always been to normalise relations. With the boundary problems being a central issue.

And it is also to see that the friendship which existed in the 50s is restored, I hope that China will not lag behind and work hand in hand to see that that climate is built up.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, we are concerned over the fact that it is being supplied with sophisticated arms, nuclear and general, which are a source of great concern to us. We were attacked twice and there are apprehensions that these arms may be used against India once again. And as such we would appeal to the United States of America to desist from doing so because this creates an imbalance within the region. So far as India's nuclear policy is concerned, we have no plans, but at the same time it is being reiterated that if the security of the country at any time is in danger, the option is open as no country would have it that way and be passive against aggression by the people who attack us and it would try to build up safety devices. And India's position in that we are not going in for it but if the security is in danger, the option is open and the challenge is to be met.

We are aware of the fact that the international order shows wide cracks. Our hon. Prime Minister has appealed to the UN General Assembly to launch a crusade for peace, freedom and equality. International order and nuclear weapons cannot co-exist; freedom and racism cannot co-exist; science and poverty cannot co-exist. Madam, quite a lot has been achieved after the World War II as was mentioned by my hon. colleague, Mr. Bhatia. And we have to refer to it because whatever institutions were built up, everything seemed to have

just turned to cinders after the world War II.

Our Party has worked with conviction for the Non-aligned Movement. And from where it started, it also took up the cause of the Namibian people fighting for their rights. Whereas it did not even find a mention in the 1st summit, in the 7th summit, it was brought about that the Pretoria regime has to dismantle apartheid and has to handover Namibia to the Namibian people. The Prime Minister has accorded full diplomatic recognition to SWAPO. India as the Chairman of the NAM recognised SWAPO as the sole and exclusive representative of the Namibian people. Till Namibia achieves freedom, there may not be peace and stability in the region. NAM summits have helped Namibia's cause throughout, and I would say that at the 7th summit, a serious violation by the Pretoria Regime was noted in the Charter, and the political independence of Namibia was stressed upon. (*Time bell rings*) There is one more point, that is the Prime Minister's visit to Bahamas for CHOGM. I cannot leave that out because that is the most important point. The Prime Minister made it clear that South Africa compounds the guilt of apartheid by the crime of aggression against her neighbours and by the illegal occupation of Namibia. The situation in South Africa was focused upon at the summit at the Bahamas. Consistent with our position comprehensive and mandatory sanctions were suggested. And there has been no compromise on this. The wording might be different but we are closer to the goal which we had set forth for ourselves during the NAM summits and over the years during which our foreign policy was formulated.

With these words, I thank you very much, and I support the motion moved by the hon. Minister.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman, so far as our foreign policy is concerned, it has been evolved during our freedom

struggle and even the policy of non-alignment was evolved in order to save the world from wars and for peace. But we have observed and seen that there is a shift in our foreign policy and also erosion. It is less dynamic and less fruitful and less tangible so far as results are concerned. Let us look at it so far as recent Commonwealth Conference held at Nassau (The Bahamas) is concerned. The Commonwealth Conference was expected to do something for the long battle that the people of South Africa are fighting against the white regime, the racist regime, the white rule in South Africa. The whole world, the mankind, who are for peace and freedom and for the liberty of the human beings, and their rights were expecting that something good will come out of this Commonwealth Conference. We have even the Resolution that has been adopted at the Conference was very mild and the words that have been persistently used by all the countries that we must take economic sanctions against South African regime, nowhere we find those words, in the final Resolution "the economic sanctions." Instead of that we find that the words used are "economic measures." We do not understand what they mean. As a matter of fact, in spite of the will of the majority of the members, nearly 40 nations have expressed the view that they were in favour of taking economic sanctions against the racist regime of South Africa. Mrs. Thatcher, the British Prime Minister was able to pressurise the Members, and even our Prime Minister agreed to her point of view and the result was that in the Resolution the words used are 'economic measures' and not 'economic sanctions'. I would like to quote the words of our own Prime Minister when he said during his speech "Let not the Commonwealth be charged with cowardice in action and bravery in words". I would like to say that keeping in view the words used in the Resolution, it is both cowardice in action and cowardice in words. This is the result or outcome of the Com-

monwealth Conference. So, we could not impress upon the British Prime Minister the need of strong action that be taken against the South African racist regime.

So far as the Geneva Summit is concerned, we expected, the whole humanity expected, that something good will come out of it. The meeting that took place between the President of the United States of America, Mr. Reagan, and the Soviet Leader, Mr. Gorbachov, we expected, the whole humanity expected, that some concrete decisions will be taken for world peace for the destruction of nuclear weapons, complete disarmament and the ban on nuclear weapons. But because of the unhelpful attitude of the American President no decisions worth the name could be taken and we are sorry for that. But, at least, they could come together for a dialogue, for a discussion, and we hope that in future, at least immediately, they will respect the wishes of the mankind and they will take concrete decisions for the complete disarmament, for the ban of nuclear weapons and for destruction of nuclear weapons. So far as our relations with these two countries are concerned, America and the Soviet Union, we have friendly relation. But there is no point in equating these two countries. The Soviet Union has always stood by India. The Soviet Union has always stood for the liberty and freedom of the people all over the world, wherever there was freedom struggle, wherever there was injustice against the humanity. They have always taken side with the people's struggle. We have seen in our own region, our relations with Pakistan have been strained and in the Security Council America has always sided with Pakistan but the Soviet Union has come to our help. In other matters also, both in the Security Council and in the United Nations and out of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has helped us and stood throughout with us as a friend. But America wants us to concede on

[Shri B. Sahyananayan Reddy]

something. We want to have friendly relations with America but American want that we should concede something which cannot be done. So far as the visit of our Prime Minister to United States is concerned, we had expected some tangible results would come out of this visit. We welcome this visit but our expectations out of this visit have been belied. American President could not change his views on the supply sophisticated weapons to Pakistan and these weapons have been continued to be supplied to Pakistan. There is no change in the policy of U.S. so far as Pakistan is concerned. As a matter of fact, Pakistan is being encouraged by America in certain matters. We say that we equally want to have friendship with America as we have good friendly relations with the Soviet Union. But it all depends on America how it acts in relation to supply of arms to Pakistan. That is a very important aspect and until and unless that policy changes, I don't think our real friendship with America could develop.

So far as our relations with our neighbouring countries are concerned, I would say that our foreign policy, or the success of our foreign policy will depend on our relations with our neighbours. So far as our relations with Pakistan are concerned, there are two or three things that come in the way of real friendship between India and Pakistan. The most important one is Kashmir. A part of Kashmir is still in illegal possession of Pakistan and I don't understand how the Government of India is silent over it! It has not explained to the country and to the House what its real stand is, whether we are going to give up our claim over that part or try to take it back and if we are going to get it back, by what means and how. Of course, Simla Agreement is there that we shall have bilateral negotiations for a solution of our problems. But everytime Pakistan is insisting that

Kashmir is a part of it and that it belongs to them and that India has no right over it. Whereas we say that Kashmir is a part of it and that it is in illegal occupation of Pakistan. I don't understand as to what our concrete policy is on this issue. Of course, in words, we say that whole of Jammu and Kashmir including that part which is in illegal possession of Pakistan, belongs to us. But that is not sufficient. We want to know how we are going to solve this problem.

Another important point is manufacture of nuclear weapons by Pakistan and its acquisition of sophisticated weapons from America. Recently, there was a meeting of SAARC. That is good. But what about these issues Pakistan is a member of the non-aligned movement. Why I say that there is a slight shift or erosion in this movement, because certain countries which do not believe in the policy of non-alignment, have become members of this movement and there the shift or erosion of policy arises. We meet in different conferences with other countries and we discuss these aspects but at the same time there is no sign of any change in the policy of Pakistan so far as acquiring of weapons and manufacture of the atomic weapons is concerned and Kashmir issue is concerned.

I would now like to deal with our relations with China. China is of course a great country, our great neighbour. We want to have friendly relations with China as we want to have friendly relations with our neighbours. I have been to China. Chinese people have great respect for the people of India. We have also great respect and regard, affinity and love, towards the people of China. In this connection, I would like to point out to the hon. Minister and the Government that we adopted a Resolution in Parliament that even an inch of Indian territory which is in illegal possession of either China or Pakistan should not be bargained for anything. We have to settle this issue honourably

without the loss of any territory of India to any other country.

Then, Madam, a word about...

उपसमाप्ति : बस, आप ५ पा करके बंद करिये ।

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY:
One minute more. You have given so much time to others. Let me take one minute more.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have given many minutes to you.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY:
As far as the Sri Lankan problem is concerned, there was some hope when the talks between the two, between the Sri Lankan Government and the Tamil leaders, began in Thimpu. But no tangible results have come out of this. In this connection, I would like to point out that some proposals have come from Mr. Thondaman. To break the deadlock, it will be desirable to take up, as a starting point for the discussion, the proposals submitted by the Ceylon Workers' Congress, popularly known as Thondaman proposals. I think, the Government should be in possession of the details of these proposals. The Government should look into it, and try to influence and persuade the Tamil leaders as well as the Sri Lankan Government, try to see if Jayewardene can agree to these proposals so that we can try to find a solution to this problem. (*Time bell rings*) If you give the bell, Madam,

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have got to. You do not know. There are 26 speakers. You should also give chance to other Members to speak.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY:
As far as the visit of our Prime Minister to other countries is concerned, I have said earlier also. We are not against his visits abroad. We welcome such visits, if it brings some tangible results. Some of our friends were saying that the success of our foreign policy is evidenced by the fact that our Prime Minister is the head of the non-aligned movement. This is not a significant thing. Next year, somebody

else will become the head of the non-aligned movement. This is not a thing by which we can judge the success of our foreign policy. The success of our foreign policy will depend upon the fact whether we have been able to achieve what we wanted to Achieve, whether any tangible results have been produced, whether we have succeeded. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, let this country know, let this House know, whether we have succeeded. Of course, we might have said brave words. We might have made efforts. But what has been the result, the concrete result? This is very important. Thank you.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU
(Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman, we are discussing the foreign policy of our country in the context of the international situation today at a time when the world is full of horrors. The world is threatened with a nuclear holocaust and the danger of star wars is looming large over the world today. Mankind is faced with a terrible disaster. Whatever my friends from the other side may say about the credibility of our foreign policy I would like to point out that a great beginning has been made when the leaders of the two super powers met in Geneva. It has been widely acclaimed in the foreign Press that India has played a leading role in bringing the two leaders to the conference table for discussions. We expect that in future also, India will continue to play this role in the interest of world peace so that mankind is saved from the brink of nuclear disaster. This is the measure of success of India's foreign policy.

Now, Madam, criticisms have been made in this House and apprehensions have been voiced, about the Sri Lankan problem; China, Pakistan and various other countries have been brought in. But I would say

[Shri Santosh Kumar Sahu]

that foreign policy of a country cannot be tested by questions. Some times there are historical compulsion and sometimes there are geographical compulsions. But whatever might the compulsions whether you like them or not, the question is that in any civilised society in any international diplomacy there must be negotiations we should try to sit round the table to sort out all the problems. There ought to be dialogue and understanding for the peace and progress of mankind.

Madam, I would like to say that this policy of non-alignment, which has really been so, has a historical background. It has come up successfully. It has seen bad weathers and still it has proved to be a very strong and sound policy. If we look to the current history we see how the non-aligned countries have gathered strength how they are relying upon the leadership of India. In the past Madam Gandhi was elected as the chairman of the NAM. Not only that she was the hope and aspiration for the developing countries of the world. After that, Shri Rajiv Gandhi was elected as the President. It is not only the nomenclature of Presidentship but it is the real hope of the developing countries the depressed people, the people who have freed themselves from colonialism. They have relied the greatest hope upon the leadership of India.

Recently I visited Zambia with a Parliamentary delegation. I know how much respect was given to our delegation. Shri Agarwal, the Secretary-General who was in the delegation is here. He knows how Mr. Kaunda, the President of that country had cancelled his appointment when he heard that the Indian delegation was coming. The respect that

he gave to our leader was a question of prestige for us. African people had the greatest feeling for whole of our nation because this is a continuous process. India has stood like a rock for anti-colonialism, anti-racism and economic emancipation of the poorest people of the whole world. That is why we cannot forget the words of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who when he was the Vice-President of the interim Government in 1946, even before independence, talked about non-alignment. We cannot forget Jawaharlal Nehru as and when we discuss the foreign policy of our country. This is what he said and I quote:

"We propose as far as possible to keep away from the power politics of groups aligned against one another which have led in the past to world war and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interested in emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races"

So this is the fundamental guideline. Nobody can prove it to be wrong. You know it, Vietnam is a small plateau a small empire where every inch was bombarded by Americans but this could not defeat the people because the people there had the will and the national spirit. So in any country if we have to solve any political problems we have to bring those countries round the table we have to discuss, negotiate and earn the goodwill of the people.

I would now like to come to other points one by one. In the Northern region there is China. The 1962 Chinese aggression gave the greatest shock to our policy of co-existence. But it is necessary for the two neighbours we are the two most populous countries in the world to co-exist to have sweeter relations. In the recent meeting between the Prime Minister of India and China at New York expectations were roused that we will come to better understanding about our border. Discussion have continued, yet no result has been achieved. The existing status-quo cannot be agreed to for ever.

Let us hope this be the beginning to have more economic and political relationship between the two countries which will create a new era of friendship and understanding between the two countries of Asia and in the whole world.

Coming to the other countries we have seen how Indian Ocean has become a very vulnerable point. The old imperialism and old colonialism are gone. Neo-colonialism and new super power domination have come. Diego Garcea is a naval base. It is a nuclear warheads base, where, as the Indian delegation at the UN said, they are planning to have space war from that centre. As such it is a potential danger to India. About 140 crore people live in the littoral State. Their wishes have been vitiated. They have not been consulted. It is a shame on the part of human civilization that such barbaric acts are being done. We are being exposed to nuclear holocaust in future. We have that apprehension. So I would like to ask the Foreign Minister that as Madam Indira Gandhi had asked the UN to convene a conference of the littoral States, that should be convened to see that Indian Ocean

becomes a nuclear-free zone. Efforts should be made continuously to pursue the Super Power bloc especially the Western bloc, that they should desist from such plans for future nuclear war from the Indian Ocean where the most under-developed people, the poverty-stricken people of the whole world live. This is one of the most important things that I would like to emphasise which the foreign policy of India should more try to achieve.

The other most important question is about the non-nuclear pact in the South Asian countries. Of course, many Members have rightly pointed out how Pakistan is going the nuclear way. They have the reactors and they are being assisted by big Western powers. They have tried to build up nuclear devices so that they can have a nuclear bomb and other things. Of course our Prime Minister has rightly said that we are not planning for one. We are going on experimenting with different reactors and other things. We had in the past exploded one, but after that Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister, had told and now Shri Rajiv Gandhi has clearly told that we have no intention of creating war weapons, that we are going in for peaceful uses. So it is high time that this understanding must come to the people. So SAARC is the proper beginning. I am very happy that at least a step which was not taken in the past even when the Opposition Government was there—which was more for ASEAN than for South Asian agreement—has now been taken. Now we have this Dhaka Declaration of this Summit Conference in which they have said at least one thing: that the mistrust and conflict in this region should be tried to be removed by negotiations. A Secretariat has been drawn up. This is the beginning as the Prime Minister has rightly

[Shri Santosh Kumar Sahu]

said, this is the dawn. He quoted the great Poet Qazi Nazrul Islam, that man lives in hope; he cannot live in mistrust. In the encircling, darkening clouds, there is a ray of hope. The people of the country must understand this, as has rightly been pointed out by my friend, Mr. Malik. In the darkest time of Bangladesh when there was cyclone, the Prime Minister of India went there to meet the affected people and the President of Bangladesh said that he had endeared himself to the people of Bangladesh. This understanding between the peoples of the two countries will force the Government to create better understanding between the two countries. This is one of the fundamental things that we must emphasise in our foreign policy. We have been doing it and it is a good beginning. It may take some time. But it is more important to have better understanding because the Western countries are trying to magnify the differences between the South Asian countries for their ulterior motives. They have created those places of conflict. They want some problems to persist between Pakistan and India, between Bangladesh and India and Sri Lanka and India, because they see India emerging as the most powerful nation in the Non-Aligned countries to take leadership of the under-developed and suffering millions of the whole world. So, I would submit that this is the real beginning. We must have friendship with our neighbours. We have to do it even at some cost.

Then, about non-alignment, we have seen it in the past. There are certain historical compulsions, I would say, about it. Non-alignment is also dynamic and flexible. It is not that we are standing rigidly somewhere. Some people might criticise us that we are doing a balancing act, tilting towards right or towards left. Madam, it is absolutely a figment of their imagination. We know the history of non-alignment

since the beginning of 1947 when the Kashmir issue came up—what the western powers did and how the Soviet people tried to help up and did help us from the beginning. So, this part of history cannot be erased from the Indian history of today.

Now, for technical and other things, it is good that the Prime Minister wants to prepare India for the 21st century so that the technological and other benefits could be enjoyed by India. He has gone to Japan to try and open a new vista for technical cooperation. It might be that we have not achieved many things today, but if real friendship prevails they can be attained. Nobody can deny that Japan is a very advanced country in the whole world today. People in the western countries, even the Super Powers, are afraid of competing with Japanese manufacturers in the markets because the Japanese have developed such a high technology. So it is high time that India must have good relations with this country so that we can also develop technologically because we must ultimately deliver the goods for the benefit of our people.

Then, coming to the working of this particular Ministry, I would like to tell one thing. A Committee has been set up to give a report about the working of our Missions abroad. The Pillai Committee gave a report 17 years before and, consequently, the Policy Making Committee was created in the MEA. Now the Estimates Committee Report has very clearly stated how a foreign diplomat has given evidence that these policy making institutions in the Ministry of External Affairs are taken as a thick wheel in the course of the chariot and are not accepted. It is high time it is developed. It has done something. But if you want to make a headway in the international relations and policies, this Policy Making Committee in the Ministry of External Affairs must be institutionalized and it must have a dynamic role.

Now a new dimension has come in foreign affairs which has got to be looked into. The terrorism which is created in our country is sometimes bred in foreign lands. Not only that. Even our diplomats are exposed to violence and murder. Mr. Mhatre had been murdered. So, the Ministry of External Affairs must guarantee a certain protection and security. At the same time, it must also fit in with the modern espionage activity that is going on. Now India has also been exposed of espionage activity and it has been proved by the different cases which have appeared in the newspapers. So, we must have the modern techniques and the External Affairs Ministry must so organize itself that in the international field we can keep ourselves on par with the rest of the countries.

I hope the External Affairs Minister will be able to tell us what concrete steps he is taking in the case of Sri Lanka since we are witnessing the racial carnage that is going on against the Tamils in Sri Lanka. We want to know actually what steps he is proposing to take, how he wants to solve the problem. He must enlighten this House on this. This is a very important thing, and everyday we are seeing in the newspapers that the ethnic problem is erupting and the Tamils are being killed.

Now India is emerging as the leader of the non-aligned countries. So, we hope that our foreign policy, under the dynamic leadership of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, has progressed—viewing the way he has proved in the different meetings with the different power blocs and tried to bring peace in the world by bringing the two Super Powers to understand each other. He is forging India ahead to good neighbourly relations and better understanding with neighbouring countries, thus ushering in a new era of peace and prosperity.

Thank you, Madam.

5 P.M.

SHRI SANKAR PRASAD MITRA (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, in this long debate on external affairs, almost all important issues have already been raised, and it is difficult for anyone speaking at this stage to avoid repetitions altogether. I would, however, confine myself only to certain problems which are threatening our day-to-day existence in relation to our neighbours.

I am glad that the hon. Minister, in his introductory remarks, started with the latest event of international significance, which has attracted the attention of everyone of us, and that event is that the Heads of States and Governments of seven South-Asian States formally adopted on the 8th of December, 1985 the charter of the South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation. The Association, we are glad to know, would seek to promote collective self-reliance and to contribute to mutual trust, understanding and appreciation of one another's problems. It was but natural that these States should have come together at some point of time or other on grounds of the geographical contiguity, ethencity, historic cultural affinity and a common level of interactions arising out of juxtaposition.

The Association has, no doubt, brought these seven countries closer to one another than in the past, and it is legitimately hoped by many in this country that, if not directly, it would indirectly help the solution of some of the major problems we are faced with.

For instance, so far as Bangladesh is concerned—I come from one of the north-eastern States—apart from disputes on Farakka water, there is the serious problem of continuous influx of large populations into north-east India, creating serious economic burden on, and political problems in, these States. We were told about the barbed-wire fencing. How far that has progressed is not clearly

[Shri Sankar Prasad Mitra]

known. Moreover, the barbed-wire fencing would not permanently solve this problem. India and Bangladesh have to evolve a method on the basis of mutual understanding to enable us to know how many persons are crossing this long border every day, for how long they are staying in India and whether they are returning to their ordinary places of residence. Perhaps, visas or permits granted on the border itself would provide a solution to some extent. But it would require appreciation and understanding on the part of Bangladesh of our problems in this regard.

Secondly, how far is this Association likely to restore mutual trust between India and Pakistan either on the question of the nuclear bomb or on that of the terrorist menace?

Thirdly, would this Association help in promoting mutual confidence between the Tamils and the Sinhalese in Sri Lanka and eventually lead to a settlement of a grave and dangerous situation in an area constantly subjected to international pressures owing to the interests of big powers in the Indian Ocean?

Fourthly, would any attempts be now jointly made to seek a programme of permanent political settlement in Afghanistan like Vietnam's commitment to withdraw from Kampuchea in 1990?

Fifthly, would this Association help in promoting Nepalese desire to be declared as a zone of peace?

These are matters in which persons who look upon the formation of this Association as a dawn of hope would like to be concerned with. It is my fervent appeal to the Honourable Minister that in his reply—if he is in a position—he would kindly indicate the reactions of the Government of India on these issues. Thank you.

SHRI THANGABAALU (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you for giving me

this opportunity to participate in the discussion on the international situation and foreign policy of the Government of India.

Madam, at the very outset, I would like to congratulate our Hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi for successfully implementing the tenets of foreign policy which was enunciated by the great leader of this nation, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and our beloved Shrimati Indira Gandhi. In 1947, speaking at the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru stated that there will be no peace until Asia played her role very effectively.

In the Congress centenary year, a beginning has been made in the declaration of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation which says that the Heads of States and Governments of South-Asian nations present at the summit expressed their concern over the escalation of arms race and particularly the nuclear weapons. The Dacca summit is a significant step in diffusing tensions for peace and development in this region. For this purpose, a permanent Secretariat is being set up for pursuing the objectives of the Heads of Governments of the States who had met in Dacca on the 7th and 8th of this month. I hope that the international institutions will not make simple things difficult and difficult things impossible. This institutional framework will help in the execution of our political will accepted by the Heads of Governments of all States who attended this Dacca summit. Madam, I am sure, that this summit will augur well for translating its objectives into action.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to point out a very important point. Pakistan's President, Gen. Zia is a signatory to this SAARC declaration. Yet he says in his statement that India's big brother attitude and approach stands in the way of regional cooperation. He also says that India has problems with all its neighbour.

ing countries. Similarly, Mr. Jayawardene had issued a statement just four days back saying that if India invades Sri Lanka and calls him for a discussion in order to arrest him—in such a case no Tamil race will be in Sri Lanka. That means he is cautioning us that the entire Tamil race in Sri Lanka will be wiped out. At the same time, the some leaders, both Mr. Jayawardene and Mr. Zia have stated in the Dacca summit that India is a great country and we respect the leadership of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. These are the two faces of their speeches, rather contradictory speeches. Madam, India must also understand the logic behind these statements. Another very important thing has happened in that particular meeting which was very effectively tackled by our great leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, i.e. the maps of the seven Member Countries on the formal launching of the South Asia Association of Regional Cooperation were depicted on a special stamp, brought out to mark the occasion. In that Madam, Pakistan had shown Jammu and Kashmir as an independent nation and completely omitted the State of Sikkim in the Indian Map. Luckily, our Prime Minister's intervened and he took up the matter with the Chairman of the SAARC Mr. Irshad. Then those special stamps were withdrawn. Madam, the SAARC summit represents 20 per cent of the human race. The few measures other than measures against terrorism and drug peddling ought to be identified to make it effective for closer involvement of all the Members of SAARC. If the agony and the teething troubles are to be minimised, the member nations should subject themselves to self-imposed moratorium on the recent bilateral issues involving SAARC Members. Madam, our Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi's initiative brought about a cease fire between Sri Lankan Authorities and the agitating Sri Lanka Tamils but the Sri Lankan Authorities are committing the violation of the cease fire day in and day out. Madam, you must be knowing

and everyone of us know about the acts of atrocities organised in Sri Lanka against Tamils. The State terrorism against the Tamils in Sri Lanka is not an ordinary thing. Everyday, thousands of innocent people are being tortured and butchered and I can say, innocent Tamil ladies are being raped. The Government of India is taking very effective steps to stop these atrocities. On the other hand, one of my hon'ble friend said in the morning that the Government of India is changing its attitude towards the Tamils but I apprehend that Sri Lankan Authorities, particularly Mr. Jayawardene is taking undue advantage of our friendliness and day by day, they are increasing their atrocities on Tamils in Sri Lanka. Madam, this is a sensitive issue as far as we are concerned. The Tamil brothers in Sri Lanka are part and parcel of the Indian community, as our beloved leader, Shrimati Indira Gandhi stated when she was alive. She said she could not tolerate any more incidents, any more killings and each and every action in Sri Lanka would affect the Indian community. In the same spirit, our beloved leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has taken it and he is trying hard to see that a political settlement is achieved. But Madam, according to our information, as Mr. Kalyanasundaram just now mentioned there is an American vessel, fully armed, staying there for more than a week. And they are saying that there is no intention of keeping the vessel on their own. But why are they keeping it? The American vessel is there to protect and to help of Sri Lanka in case of a war at their doorsteps. The Government of India and our Prime Minister have been saying that there will be a political solution. We have been telling this for quite a long time. From 1948 onwards, the discussions are going on, and continuously the Government of India is trying to help the Tamils. But there is no result so far. We are hoping to get a solution whereby the Tamils will have a peaceful coexistence in that

land. Madam, I would like to state here one thing. The Tamils and the Sinhalese cannot go together hereafter. The saturation point has come. The Tamil race and the Sinhalese can never go together because the atmosphere over there is not such. We are trying for a political settlement. What kind of settlement are we going to give the Tamils there for a respectable living? More than 2-1/2 lakhs of Tamil people are in Tamil Nadu and in the neighbouring States and day and night we can see thousands of people fleeing from Sri Lanka where they cannot tolerate the atrocities of State terrorism.

Another factor, Madam, is that the Indian Government has been advocating for peace and development all over the world. Our policy of non-alignment has been a great success to this sub-continent and all over the world, India's leadership is acclaimed and accepted. Our great leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has contributed to the success of accelerating peace all over the world and he is doing his level best to stop killings and massacres in other parts of the world also. But even he has stated in his speech on the 15th August that the pending problem before us is the Sri Lankan Tamil problem. I do agree, Madam, that there is a fear among the Tamils, particularly in this land. More than ten crores of people all over the world of the Tamil community are expecting that the Prime Minister of this country, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi will come forward with an amicable solution to the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka. But the hopes have gone. I can tell you, there is no hope for the Tamil people in Sri Lanka because the attitude of the Sri Lankan Government is not in accordance with the cease-fire agreement. They have violated the cease-fire agreement, not once but every day, every minute. They are violating it with the help of the Sri Lankan President, Mr. Jayawardene. Those reports must have come to this Government. What action has it taken?

You have been saying that we are taking action, we are taking action. But you are taking action to kill the Tamils continuously. This is what I can say. And the expected political solution is not going to bring about any reality in the Sri Lankan land because before you come to a solution there will be no Tamil race, the people who are to accept your solution will not be there. I urge upon the Government, particularly our honourable Prime Minister—the negotiations and further negotiations by the Sri Lankan authorities and the Tamil militants in the presence of the Government are not going to produce any results in the near future and the methodology which is being adopted is not going to be helpful—that certain new measures, certain new directions, have to be formulated and applied. Then only the Sri Lankan Government will understand the realities. That is the only way for India to see that the people of Sri Lanka, the people of Tamil Nadu, the people of India as a whole, are convinced. This is a challenge and a commitment to the Indian diplomacy. If we fail in this, I do not know where we can stand, how far our credibility can be accepted. I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister that a solution to the Tamil problem has to be found without any loss of time. Then only we will be doing justice to our brothers and sisters in Sri Lanka so that the commitment of our great leader, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and our great leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, will be fulfilled.

While on this subject, I would wish to say something about the functioning of our Indian embassies abroad. Except one or two embassies, the others are not functioning very effectively, they are not up to the expectations of our leaders, and of the people of this country. There must be certain norms of conduct given to them for implementing the aspirations of the people of this country by bringing about people-to-people contacts. In this respect—I have visited fifteen

to sixteen countries—only in one country our Ambassador was able to give me a correct picture of the situation. None of the others could tell me anything about the country. This was the experience. So I request the honourable Minister to strengthen our embassies abroad to make them understand the challenges before us, and to tell the world community that India stands for the effectiveness of peace movements and other important issues. (*Time bell rings*) I would make a suggestion in this connection. Our bureaucrats who are appointed as our Ambassadors, are not doing justice to our country. I suggest, therefore, that the services of very important political leaders who have contributed to the development of the nation can also be drawn upon, such senior people from public life should be accommodated in these areas, so that they will be able to do better than the people whom you have there.

Lastly, Madam, I would like to emphasise one more point and it is this that our Prime Minister has been trying to see that India's flag flies high in the comity of nations. But our friends on the opposite side have said that the Prime Minister is just rousing the world like a tourist. I am sorry to hear this. He is not touring as a tourist or trying to see the countries abroad. But he is doing his level best for the cause for which India stood in the past and will stand in the future. Madam, he is the symbol of not only the Indian community, but he is also the symbol of hope of the whole humanity and almost all the countries of the world are appreciating the initiatives taken by him. We are proud to have such a leader like Shri Rajiv Gandhi in this country as our Prime Minister and his contributions, his excellence, his leadership, and his dynamism will have to be strengthened, and I would like to say that his contribution to the whole peace movement will go a long way in bringing about peace in the world. For this our co-operation is required and the policies of the Government will have to be

supported with the mass contact programmes, etc.

With these words Madam, I support the foreign policy of our Government and the leadership of our beloved Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, and his efforts to see peace in the world today. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now Shri V. Gopalsamy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, I would like straightway to confine myself to the tragedy of the Tamils in Sri Lanka because this is the only occasion on which I can express my sentiments, this is the only occasion on which I can express my agony and anguish, pain and pathos and this is the only occasion on which I can express my views. I say this because we Tamils have become unfortunate creatures to such an extent that even a debate on Sri Lanka could not be permitted in this House or in the other House.

Madam, my learned colleagues have congratulated our Prime Minister and have applauded the role of our Prime Minister. And they have also presented many bouquets to him and they have called him as the champion of human rights, as the custodian of human rights. They have also said that he raises his voice when he goes to Bahamas, when he goes to the United Nations, when he goes to Dhaka, as a champion of human rights. We have now launched a crusade to demolish the abominable structure of apartheid in South Africa. Of course, I welcome it and I appreciate it. But, Madam, they say that when the human rights are violated, when the human dignity is destroyed we will raise our voice, whether it is in Namibia or whether it is in Zambia or whether it is in

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

Pretoria or whether it is in Morocco. But, Madam, I am very much pained to point out that whenever human rights are grossly violated in the tiny is and of Sri Lanka, I do not understand the rationale behind the attitude of the Government in not raising the issue in the various forums.

Have you raised the issue at Bahamas? Have you raised the issue at the United Nations? Have you raised the issue at Dhaka? Are they not human beings? That is my question. If you say that wherever human rights are violated who will raise our voice, then I will put a simple question: whether the Tamils in Sri Lanka are human beings or not.

Madam, is it not a crime of genocide that places of worship of Tamils are continuously attacked and destroyed? Is it not a crime of genocide that temples, Hindu temples, are being destroyed? Is it not a crime of genocide that churches are destroyed? Is it not a crime of genocide that mosques are burnt? Is it not a crime of genocide that the great Jaffna library was burnt? Ninety-six thousand books were burnt. Was it an arsenal of arms? It was a treasure house of our ancient literature. Is it not a crime of genocide that our womenfolk are paraded naked in the streets of Jaffna and raped? Is it not a crime of genocide that our women are raped, butchered and killed? Is it not a crime of genocide that our kids, our children, are killed, riddled with bullets? Is it not a crime of genocide? Why are our churches, temples and mosques attacked? Why was the Jaffna library burnt? Why are our women raped? Because they cherish their chastity as dearer than their life? Even then you have not raised the issue at Bahamas.

Madam, from the dawn of history the Tamils have been the inhabitants

of Sri Lanka. They have had their own kingdom. As far as the role of India is concerned, right from the days of great Jawaharlal Nehru, for whom I have got the greatest respect, we have betrayed the interests of the Tamils, because when the most obnoxious legislation was passed in 1948 disenfranchising one million Tamils, we never raised our voice. When our relationship with China, when our relationship with Pakistan deteriorated under these circumstances just to befriend Srimavo, a pact, the Shastri-Srimavo Pact, was signed, betraying the Tamils in 1964. So right from 1948 our people are harassed; right from 1958 they are killed. Right from 1961, 1971, 1974 1977 and right from 1981 they have been continuously killed and betrayal of India has been going on. Then we are very much shocked, Madam because I find a very clear shift in our attitude, a great change in our attitude. The other day when our hon. Prime Minister made a statement that the ball is now in Tamils' court that was welcomed widely in Sri Lanka. The Press coverage was such that there was so much jubilation. The Sri Lanka Government were so much jubilant about the statement of our hon. Prime Minister that Jayawardene in an interview in the 'India Today' quotes his. Madam, there is again a statement of our Prime Minister at a Press Conference in Madras, about the arms build-up by the Jayawardene regime in Sri Lanka he says: Any Government could build up security forces; it cannot stop a Government from doing it.

[The Vice-Chairman, (Shri Santosh Kumar Sahu) in the Chair.]

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you advocate sanctions against South Africa for the simple reason that a crude form of Apartheid is being practical

there in South Africa. You are advocating that no countries should have any truck, political—cultural, economic or commercial truck—with South Africa. But at the same time Sir, this racist regime of Jayawardene is getting arms from South Africa. When you are advocating that no country should have any truck with South Africa, what stopped you at Bahamas to raise the issue with Jayawardene that they should not have any commercial links with South Africa? That is my question.

The Minister must reply to my question. You are advocating that no country should have any truck with South Africa. Sri Lanka is getting arms from South Africa. What made you not to take up the issue with Jayawardene? Our hon. Prime Minister said the other day that Sri Lankan side has given proposals, but not the Tamilians. Sir, what are the proposals? Does the Prime Minister realise or not that the very same proposals were given during the days of the British in 1928 in the name of Provincial Councils. The very same proposals were given again when there was a pact between Bandaranaike and Chelvanayagam in 1957. There was proposal of Regional Councils. What happened to the proposals? The proposals were unilaterally abrogated by Sri Lanka Government. The very same proposals were again mooted out. Then there was another pact with Dudley Senanayake in the year 1955. What happened to those proposals? Those proposals were also shelved. The very same proposals which were thrashed out threadbare many times were placed again. At the same time, after the ceasefire agreement, thousands of Tamils have been killed. Even today, the bombardment is going on from helicopters. Are we shutting our eyes? Have we become blind? The bombardment of civilian areas from helicopters is going on even this day, this minute. You are shutting your eyes. You have become blind. Your ears have become deaf. Sir, even then you are saying

that the proposals have been given by the Sri Lankan side. We are telling these things not for political ends. The hopes of our people have been totally shattered. Jayawardene compares Madam Gandhi with our present Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi. I quote India Today of December 16, 1985. The question posed to him is: "Do you find any difference of approach between Rajiv Gandhi and Mrs. Gandhi to this problem." Jayawardene says: "The difference was due to the elections in India. Mrs. Gandhi was due to face the elections in India and Tamil Nadu. So, she kept her political interest in mind. But Rajiv Gandhi need not do so because the elections are over now." Again he says: "I am determined to finish these militants." After signing the ceasefire agreement, he says that he is determined to finish the militants. After signing the ceasefire agreement, he goes to London and makes a statement there that he will wipe out the militants. Having signed the ceasefire agreement, he goes to London and he says: "I believe only in military." The question is: "Should you not desire a political solution?" You are speaking about political solutions. Many of my friends including yourself have talked about political solutions. He says: "The Tamil problem is more a military problem. Any military problem has to be tackled militarily." He also says: "We were not ready earlier. Now we are acquiring arms and getting our soldiers trained. We are getting ready for a decisive military action. We are getting our own cadres trained in Israel. Israelis are our friends. I have my independent views on international politics. Israelis are helping my soldiers." So, they are getting aid from Israel. They are getting it from South Africa. They are getting aid and assistance from Pakistan. He is sending his soldiers to Pakistan. He is sending his soldiers to Israel. You know how much is this years'. Defence budget of Sri Lanka—budget 600 billion dollars. It is more than 70 per cent more than the last year's budget. He is getting arms from all over the world to wipe out our people. You say that this is not the concern of only Tamil Nadu but this is the concern of the whole countries. If so show your action and reaction.

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

What action? When the genocide is being continuously perpetrated on our people, you should come and say in the Parliament that you condemn genocide. As the condemnation was made by Madam Gandhi on the 16th August, 1983 will you come to the Parliament and say that you condemn the genocide? Then, Sir, after all these things...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): Please try to conclude.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I will only take two minutes. Throughout the session we have been trying to have a discussion on the subject. This is the only forum, Sir, through which we can express our views, Sir, I want to know from the hon. Minister as to what the credibility is of the proposals of Mr. Jayawardene. What is the credibility? Has he ever honoured the assurances given by him? Never. Our Prime Minister has shaken hands with Mr. Jayawardene at Dhaka, whose hands are stained with the blood of our Tamils. Sir, this is the 'Hindu' of today. Here, I am shocked about the statement of our Prime Minister. I quote: "Asked whether he discussed the Tamil United Liberation Front's proposals to end the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka with President Jayawardene, the Prime Minister said that he had not seen the proposals." He says that he had not seen the TULF proposals. They have got the proposals. The TULF has given the proposals. He says publicly that he has not seen the proposals. So, you are betraying our interests, you are selling our interests just to keep up the diplomatic niceties with a racist regime, with a blood-thirsty regime, with a monster. You are selling our interests. You are betraying our interests, Sir, here again, I am very much pained to hear when some of my friends say that there is a vast difference between the problem of Bangladesh and the problem of Sri Lanka. Then the humanitarian flag fluttered high. Why is it half mast now? When the genocide is continuously going on, you are not going to condemn it. When Benjamine Molire, the great Negro poet was publicly hanged, we all shed tears, including myself. When the Negro

poet was killed, we have expressed our condolences here. But, Sir, history is going to judge us. When hundreds of Tamils were killed in the Velikade prison, when the blood was flowing like river in the prison, when the detenus were killed, I would like to ask whether the then Prime Minister or this Prime Minister or the Government has made any condemnation and whether any condolences were uttered on the floor of this or the other House. This is your attitude.

Sir, you say that we cannot have a truck with the terrorists. Are they terrorists? They are not terrorists. They have to live in dignity and honour. They do not want to live as slaves. That is why they have taken up the arms. If you call them terrorists, then Bhagat Singh is a terrorist. If you call them terrorists, then Chandrasekhar Azad is a terrorist.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): Please conclude now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Therefore, Sir, I would like to ask one thing from our hon. External Affairs Minister. Sir, in reply to my question on the 21st November, 1985 as to how many assaults have taken place against the Indian fishermen, against the citizens of India on the high-seas by the Navy of Sri Lanka, he says, "According to the information available with us, the number of assaults from January 1, 1985 to date is 58, that 96 assaults have been reported since July, 1983; 6 deaths resulted and many wounded." So, our Indian fishermen have been assaulted 96 times. What for are you keeping your Armed Forces? You are spending Rs. 8,000 crores. I am also a taxpayer. I have got every right to ask. If our kith and kin are attacked and killed by the foreign navy 96 times, what for are you keeping your Navy?

Rs. 10,000 crores you are spending for defence (*Time bell rings*). I would like to ask the External Affairs Minister are you going to condemn the crime of genocide or not? Are you going to give an ultimatum that genocide should stop or else we will sever the diplomatic relations? Are you going to help the Sri Lankan racist regime or protect, the rights of the Tamils there? (*Time bell rings*).

Sir, only one word more before I conclude. Our homes will become a shelter for those Tamils. I want this Government to help the liberation group publicly. I say when you are recognising the PLO, when you are recognising the shirue democratic republic, you recognise the Eelam revolutionary groups, you recognise the Eelam. You may not agree with me. But a day will come when you will have to agree. In the words of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, they are boys. But those boys are determined. They will either perish or they will succeed. One day the Embassy of Eelam will be opened here in Connaught Place we will join liberation movement. We will join it. (*Time Bell rings*). I warn you, unless you change your attitude, our people will never forgive the callous attitude, the discriminatory attitude of this Government headed by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi.

SHRI P.N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are considering the international situation with a view to having an appraisal...

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, my name was there first.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): Yes, we will see that.

SHRI P.N. SUKUL: Sir, we are considering this international situation only for having an appraisal of our foreign policy, for having an evaluation of our foreign policy. Sir, as regards our foreign policy, it has remained practically the same, during the last about four decades. It has remained the same. Our foreign policy is a policy of peace and friendship of anticolonialism, of disarmament and of peaceful co-existence. This is our policy. This was our policy in 1947 also.

Sir, the success of our foreign policy lies in the fact that today we are not tied up with the apron strings of any power, any country, even a super power. We are free to decide about our destiny. We are free to decide about our course of action. We are not tied up with anyone. And, Sir, if you will remember, almost all other countries which became free with us or after us do not today have

this freedom. The success of our foreign policy also lies in the fact that by pursuing this policy our leaders like Pandit Nehru and Smt. Indira Gandhi, have been able to bring about a sort of qualitative change in world politics, and they have helped the emergence of a new third force in the world, a strong force, and that is why it is rightly said that today the world is not only bi-polar but a third force of non-aligned countries has already come. The success of our foreign policy also lies in the fact that today more than 100 countries of the world have accepted India as their leader and they look up to us for guidance. And the success of our foreign policy lies in the fact that we have lived and worked for certain principles, not just for a handful of silver or a little money, as many other countries have been doing and that is how the Philippines or Pakistan or so many countries are taking loans and grants from America and they have now become puppets in the hands of America. We could also have done that but our leaders had taught us to live by certain principles, to work for certain principles and there lies the ultimate success of our foreign policy.

The success of our foreign policy also lies in the fact that today with most of our neighbours we are living in peace and friendship and we are trying to promote friendship amongst them. Even with China we are having a dialogue, which was said to be our worst enemy; but now the tension is lessening. We have been having dialogue and a time will come when our relationship will normalise. And this is the burning testimony of our foreign policy that even leaders of the CPI (M) like Mr. Namboodiripad or Mr. Rajeshwara Rao, leader of CPI have all been supporting our foreign policy.

It is true that today we are living under the shadow of a nuclear holocaust. If we are not discreet and careful, if we do not have a sense of responsibility and if even by mistake someone presses a button somewhere, the entire humanity may be wiped off this globe. That is why Pandit Nehru and Mrs. Gandhi and now Shri Rajiv Gandhi had worked and have been working incessantly for peace and

[P. N. Sukul]

friendship, for disarmament and for peaceful coexistence with the neighbouring countries and other countries.

As I was saying, our foreign policy is a policy of non-alignment. Now, some of our critics try to make a controversy as to what non-alignment is. In this connection, I would like to quote from a speech of Pandit Nehru delivered in Hyderabad on 27 July 1963. "Take our foreign policy. What do we stand for? Well, broadly we stand for peace and friendship among nations. We stand for the end of colonialism and for non-alignment. That means, we do not attach ourselves to any power bloc. By attaching ourselves to a military bloc, we may gain some advantages but we also acquire many disadvantages and our capacity to work for peace will become tremendously affected thereby." In this connection, I would like to give a very small quotation from the speech of Pandit Nehru when on 3 September 1963, replying to a similar debate on international situation in this very House. Pandit Nehru tried to explain non-alignment. He said: "Non-alignment means that we do not join military blocs which have created lot of trouble and tension. We did not join any of those blocs. Non-alignment gives us freedom of action, freedom to function as we think best, which is a part of our independence. Whether we use our independence wrongly or rightly is a separate matter and this we can discuss but this has nothing to do with non-alignment."

As regards our approach to the Super Power blocs, as I have said, we are nonalign but we want friendship with both. Our friendship with the Soviet Union does not mean that we are enemies of all others or we cannot have friendly relations with others. That is why Mrs. Gandhi went to America. That is why Mr. Rajiv Gandhi went to America, just to explain to them our stand and I think as a result of the visit of our Prime Minister to United States, there is now a better understanding, a better appreciation of each other's points of view and also there has been an agreement about a joint research programme. The

trouble with U.S. is that it has invested a colossal amount of money and material in Pakistan.

That material, that money, which it has already invested, it does not want to write off. It wants to have certain benefits. It is having certain benefits. It is, in fact, the U.S.A. which is behind the strained relations, to whatever extent it may be, between India and Pakistan. The U.S.A. has armed Pakistan with F-16 aircraft. It has provided her with Harpoon missiles. It has provided her with new and powerful tanks, modern communication and radar systems and what not. Therefore, with all these American resources, Pakistan is now a puppet in the hands of America. It is behaving exactly the way America wants it to behave. Pakistan is not free like us to decide about its destiny, to decide about its course of action. It is a facet that both the U.S.A. and Pakistan want to destabilise and disintegrate this country. (*Time-bell rings*) Pakistan, in fact, is wanting to avenge its defeat which it had to face in 1971. I believe—this is my personal belief—Pakistan may try to wage a war against India with all its material and arms, which have been piled up there. Although Pakistan may be wiped off. Pakistan will, no doubt, try. Today, ten divisions of the Pakistan army are deployed along the Jammu and Kashmir border. At so many points, there are skirmishes every day, firing. Their war planes are crossing our boundary line, the Indian border. (*Time-bell rings*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): Please try to conclude. The time is very short.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Then, Pakistan has the Islamic bomb or it is going to have one, as our Prime Minister has repeatedly said. Jack Anderson, the American journalist, has also said that Pakistan tested a bomb two years back on the soil of China. They have tested it and that is why, perhaps, the Prime Minister also said that Pakistan has acquired the bomb. In this connection, I would like to suggest to my Government, because our Prime Minister has already said that we keep our options open; it depends upon Pakistan what we should do; we keep our

options upon. But I suggest that India must make the bomb. Keeping the options open alone will not suffice. Suppose they have the atom bomb and they attack you. What will you do? You will not have the time to make the bomb. Therefore, I would say, discretion is the better part of valour. It is better to have the atom bomb for self-defence purposes, only for self-defence. Even Mahatma Gandhi, the exponent of non-violence never said that you should not be able to defend yourself. India must be in a position to defend itself, its people, its boundaries. I, therefore, humbly request our Prime Minister, our External Affairs Minister and the Government, that we should try to have the atom bomb as early as possible so that no country, no nuclear power, can threaten us with atom bomb. (*Time bell rings*). Since the time is up, with these words, I fully endorse and support the foreign policy of India and once again repeat my request that we should make the bomb as early as possible.

DR. SHYAM SUNDAR MOHAPATRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhagat, has added many feathers to his cap. One feather he added in London, another in Bahamas, the third in Washington, the fourth in Oman, the fifth in Tokyo and then, of course, the last but not the least, credit goes to him for the India-China official level talks.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: He is a Hanuman.

DR. SHYAM SUNDAR MOHAPATRA: Sir, the foreign policy of a country is dependent upon the policy at a time, as Mr. Castelveigh once Foreign Secretary of Great Britain has said. Let me take up the issue of India-China talks. There was a time when India used to participate in the anti-imperialist struggle in China.

I remember Madam Sun Yat-Sen and Jawaharlal Nehru speaking 6 P.M. in Brussels in 1937 and after which the Indian National Congress had volunteered to send corps and we sent the medical men to China, Dr. Kotnis, Dr. Basu and others. That was the policy of the Indian National Congress that was

followed till today by the Government of India under the Congress. The question is, the talk was on the border issue. Madam Gandhi always used to think of the friendship movement. I am quoting Mrs. Gandhi when she was talking to Mr. Chutunon? who came here: "It is like putting one brick on the other to build a friendship house." In fact, she thought that the boundary issue can be kept away for the present and we can have collaboration in industry, in science, in technology, in education and culture and all that. Well, Mr. Venkateswaran is a very seasoned diplomat who led the delegation of India, but what is the net result of this talk? The Government of India has, of course said, "Achieved a clear understanding of each other's position." Good. Again, they said: Useful and conducive for a better understanding between the two countries. Very good. And third time, the spokesman said: Talks were held in a friendly and cordial atmosphere. The result should have been something very concrete. Mr. Deng Xiaoping's package deal probably means that they think that all the 14000 sq. miles in the Chinese occupation will be given to them. They want to take Sikkim, they want to take Arunachal, they want to have their sphere in other places, but we cannot forget that we have passed a Resolution in this Indian Parliament that we should try to bring back every inch that we have lost. Mr. Minister, things are changing very rapidly. We have to make a compromise. We have to see the reality and come to a position so that we can solve this vexed problem. Well, the new Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, spoke in Lok Sabha that the most important thing is the boundary issue. Now the most paramount point that I want to impress on you is this that if we go logically, then it should be on "as is and where is" basis in regard to the area of actual control. If they say that the Government of India has tacitly agreed to a position of actual control in Kashmir, why not here? But much can be done across the table, much can be done behind the scene. If our Foreign Minister talks to their Foreign Minister and Mr. Gandhi talks to Mr. Deng Xiaoping, behind the screen, much can be done. I will request the hon. Foreign Minister to make a visit

[Dr. Shyam Sunder Mohapatra]

to China because their Foreign Minister has already visited India and their Prime Minister has invited our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, for a visit there. Unfortunately, again some other spokesman said: Adequate steps to find a solution to all our outstanding problems between the two countries must precede such a journey. It is a queer logic, as has been told in an editorial of the Indian Express. Mr. Minister, we have to visualise the reality. Unless both these leaders sit across the table, unless Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Deng Xiaoping talk behind the screen about this question of 14000 square miles, this vexed problem will never be solved.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Do you think this question will ever be solved?

DR. SHYAM SUNDAR MOHAPATRA: Well, something can be achieved. Otherwise, we cannot continue with this vexed problem for an unlimited time. *(Interruptions).* I think you have already met with some success in Japan. I must say a few good words about the Prime Minister's visit to Japan. When I was there in 1982 I was probably the first among six or seven important people who had visited Japan in those days. They remember Rabindra nath Tagore, Rash Behari Bose, they remember Subhas Chandra Bose, they remember so many people. But after all, who went from India? Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. Mrs. Indira Gandhi. There have not been many visits of important people to Japan. And Japan remembers Radha Binod Pal's verdict on the Tokyo crimes trial. Let me quote a few lines from it: I would hold that each and every of the accused must be found not guilty of each and every one of the charges and should be acquitted of all charges. This is one of the statements of Dr. Radha Binod Pal which the Japanese people remember till today. They do remember the elephants, which you mentioned. You have given four. Two elephants they do remember. But they remember the galaxy of leaders who have bound India and Japan in cordial bonds. Your visit to Japan and that of Prime Minister will certainly be a milestone in the progress of Indo-Japan friendship.

We have to have economic and technological collaboration with them. You know, Japan is bound to USA by a treaty which forms part of the constitution something unprecedented and unheard of in any constitution of the world. But yet

I must admit that Japan has never supported the United States in their gunboat diplomacy anywhere—not in the Middle East, far less in Latin America or Central America, not even in Africa. I must say they have maintained a seat of isolation and that is where they and we stand. Today we find that it is not only the Maruti Suzuki that you have but you have Suzuki, Yamaha, Honda, Mazda and so many factories that are having collaboration. It is an automobile revolution and if you want high technology, don't go to the West. USA has already transferred 56 technologies to you, but Japan can give you about 100 technologies. Our Prime Minister is called a Hi-tech Prime Minister and a Computer Prime Minister. But I can tell you that the age is for high technology and you must depend on Japan, far less depending on the United States, France, United Kingdom or Germany. That will be the starting point of our relations with Japan.

Today the whole world is divided between collective security and collective self-defence. So far as collective security is concerned, you have the NATO powers and you have, on the other side, the socialist powers led by USSR Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and all the East European countries—and the Warsaw Pact. Then you have the ASEAN where you have countries aligned to the United States of America. Now you have GOC—which is called the Gulf Cooperation Council. Then you have the States under the US influence in Latin America and Central America. You have the OAP, Organisation of African Unity. Well the whole world is covered with blocs. And now you have NAM also. The question is that the whole power remains with the stronger element. Either you must go to the Soviet bloc or you must go to the US bloc. There is no halfway house. And if there is a half-way house—the NAM—you have all the failures that you have.

In the case of Iran-Iraq war, for the last five years it has been raging. In a recent interview the Prime Minister has told some journalists that he is withdrawing from the peace move. That means you have failed. How can you do it in Iran which has a fundamentalist government? You cannot equate Iraq and Iran. Our Congress Party has relations with the Arab Baath Socialist Party of Iraq lasting 40 years. Mahatma Gandhi in 1938 wrote in the *Harijan* that the Arab Baath Socialist Party was much nearer to the Indian National Congress. In this background you are supporting the fundamentalist government which has killed nothing less than 50,000 people in the last 4 years and put all their leaders in jail. Women are being killed because they want to come out in the streets. I was there in Iran when the Shah was there. I had an interview with His Majesty. I do not like imperialism, and far less appreciate monarchy. But at that time the women were free. They were in hospitals, they were in colleges, in universities, they were in the buses, in the cars. You could find an egalitarian society, a modern society emerging in Iran. And yet Khomeini has taken the country 50 years back. And you want to equate Iran and Iraq; Because India wants friendship with both. And the NAM has failed and the Prime Minister feels frustrated because he is not able to do anything.

About Nicaragua and Latin America I want to pose a few questions because I may be the last but one speaker. We have been linked to Latin America for the last 30 years. During the Bnadung Conference, there was pressure on Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru to invite a few leaders from Latin and Central Americas but because the Nazi leaders were trying somewhere to remain in the Military Council in Argentina, Bolivia, Guatemala and the Honduras, they were not called, because they were protecting the Nazis. Again I can tell you that when I visited Argentina after the Falklands War, invited by the President of Argentina, I found again that Rabindranath Tagore was as nearer to the Argentinians as he is to us. One person, Rabindranath Tagore, from Japan and China through United Kingdom, to USA to far away Argentina at the end of the globe, had popularised Indian

culture. And, Sir, let me tell you, your NAM could not support the Argentinians when they stood up against the might of Margaret Thatcher. For the stay of hardly 2,000 people in the Falkland Islands, the British Government wanted to use nuclear arms against the Argentinians. When Jack Anderson threatened to publish everything in the *Washington Post*, the world became aware of the danger the Argentinians were facing, and Mr. Galteiri had to go down in history as a reckless person. But Galteiri was told by Alexander Haig at that time that America would come to support the Argentinians. That was the mistake Galteiri made. Mr. Alfonzin is the new President of Argentina. He came here and invited our President to Argentina; he had gone there. What I say is, try to befriend the Latin American and Central American people.

Nicaragua today is in danger of liquidation. Nicaragua today is facing the might of American force. Everybody from aeroplanes they are bombarding people, from helicopters they are bombarding hospitals and they are not leaving even the civilian population free. So, at this moment, what is the Non-Aligned Movement going to do? Mr. D'Escoto, their Foreign Minister, was here a few days back. I had been to Nicaragua again in 1984, and I was the second person of India to have visited that country after Mr. Narasimha Rao. What I found there is that the entire population consists of people who are in the age group of 15 to 35. The older people have been killed. All went to dictator Somoza outside of Nicaragua. The new President, Daniel Ortega, is hardly 39 years old. These young people are trying to save the honour, security and sovereignty of Nicaragua. Our Minister of State was our Ambassador in the United States a very competent Ambassador and I had been to the United States in 1984. It is unfortunate that the Senate and the publicmen in the USA today are supporting the Reagan Government, and the Reagan Government is today empowered with billions of dollars to support the Centres group, which is a mercenary group trying to liquidate the sovereignty of Nicaragua. This is the situation.

[Dr. Shyam Sunder Mohapatra]

I appreciate the Cuban people who, under Fidel Castro, had sent forces —volunteers—to fight in other lands. You are telling about the Tamils being crucified in Sri Lanka. Why not you send volunteers, if the Government can't to die on the soil of Sri Lanka?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We are going to.

DR. SHYAM SUNDAR MOHAPATRA: Sir, the question is, what is good today may be bad tomorrow, and what is bad today may be good tomorrow. The world changes. When Russia intervened in Afghanistan, it was good because socialism was to be protected. They were mighty people; they did it. And when Iraq, under Saddam Hussain, tried to crush the fundamentalist Khomeini regime, he was right. And for 2,000 people only, Margaret Thatcher wanted to conquer Argentina.

What I intend to say is, we are at the crossroads. While complimenting the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, I say, they have hard tasks before them, mighty tasks, insurmountable tasks. They should not stand on prestige. They should not think that non-alignment means timidity, that non-alignment means cowardice. India will be proud if they can show their might in cases where the liberty and independence of people is threatened. Thank you.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, after listening to the inspiring speech made by Mr. Mohapatra who has recently gone to several countries he has covered so many points; actually he was to initiate this debate from this side; he is expert on foreign affairs I would like to fully support and welcome the Motion on the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto moved by our honourable Foreign Minister.

Really, when we think of the international situation, several questions come to our mind. The international situation is quite tense. We are living under the shad-

ow of a nuclear holocaust. There is a nuclear weapons race in the world. America and other advanced countries are developing theories of star wars. There are chemical weapons, biological weapons, and the Super Powers have got the power to destroy the world more than three hundred times. It is a mad, mad race of the arms. Sir, in this situation, I am proud to say that India has given the message of peace centuries ago through Mahatma Buddha and later on Mahatma Gandhi who started the freedom movement. Its fundamental principle was non-alignment.

Sir, at the time of the Non-aligned Movement Conference, our beloved leader Smt. Indira Gandhi, defined non-alignment. Non-alignment is the movement for independence; non-alignment is the movement of peace; and non-alignment is the movement of human existence and co-existence. Madam Gandhi stated this in the Non-aligned Movement Conference. Madam Gandhi was such a towering personality in this world that 102 countries came under her leadership. She has contributed a lot. She has sacrificed her whole life. And at the end every drop of blood of her body went for the cause of suffering human race from this mad, mad arms race of this world.

Sir, there are two big democratic countries in the world. One is the United States of America, and the other is India. Sir, there is a lot of difference, fundamental difference, between these two democracies because India always believed in co-existence, India always believed in the non-alignment policy, and America, though it claims that it has got democracy for more than a hundred years, could not make its own country democratic. For that I will read out what their President said. Very recently there was a summit in Geneva. What they could bring out is:

"A nuclear war cannot between and must not be fought."

It was the agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. It said:

"...and pledged not to seek military superiority and showed earnestness to reduce nuclear arsenal."

The day following as my friend, Dr. Mohapatra, said, following the conclusions of the summit, the U. S. Senate authorised the delivery of aircraft, trucks etc. to Nicaragua rebels. Two days earlier they voted to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua. President Reagan, they said, would personally resume the direct military aid to Nicaragua rebels early next year. It was the resolution by the American Senate.

Almost simultaneously, the U. S. President endorsed covert aid to Savimbi, an instrument of the South Africa's racist regime to overthrow the Government of Angola. The President also called for Congressional support for his plans for a military build-up. "Without this", he said, "The world would become more dangerous again. Unless they have a military build-up, the world would be more dangerous, he said. This is the belief of the American President.

Sir, this is the follow-up action. The U. S. President, a couple of days earlier, has challengingly asked the Soviet Secretary-General:

"Will he join together to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflicts in Asia, Africa and Central America?" It was the talk between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. The days later, he made this statement in America, Sir, both the U.S.A. and the USSR must be aware that it is impossible to wage a nuclear war against any nation, without waging it against the entire human race including one's own. Sir, nuclear war can never be won. To borrow Norman Cousins's expressions,

"The winds are the conveyor belt of mass death. The nuclear gun contains three barrels, one is pointed against enemy, a second is pointed against people who are not enemies and third bends completely and pointed squarely at the holder."

These are the consequences of nuclear weapons.

Sir, Theodore Roosevelt, who was one of the most progressive Presidents of the United States, has written in his biography and has admitted that there has been a

riot of individuals materialism in the U.S. system under which complete freedom for the individual turns out in practice to mean perfect freedom for the strong to wrong the weak. President Woodrow Wilson in his book "The New Freedom" says that the freedom of the individuals was meant domination of the economy by big business and special interests that were ruthless in their exploitation of the human and the natural resources of the nations and that it was the tyranny that deprived the people of their natural rights and opportunities.

Sir, these are the statements by their own Presidents. They have written in their autobiographies.

As I said earlier, Mahatma Gandhi was a great hero and champion who has given the principles of the non-aligned movement to the entire world.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wrote about Mahatma Gandhi's autobiography that Mahatma Gandhi had instilled courage and manhood in his people and discipline and endurance and the power of joyful sacrifice for a cause and with all his humility, pride.

What is the actual policy of non-alignment that we are having? Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has said that by aligning ourselves with any one power, you surrender your opinion, give up the policy you would normally pursue, because somebody else wants you to pursue another policy. I do not think that it would be a right policy for us to adopt. If we did align ourselves, we would only fall between two stools. He has said this in Parliament in 1951.

Sir, now coming to the international situation, our young Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has visited the Soviet Union, the USA, the United Kingdom, France, Oman, Vietnam, Japan and Bangladesh. Recently there was a SAARC conference at Dacca also. We know that some of our neighbouring countries like Pakistan are under the influence of the United States. The whole trouble has been created by this imperialistic big power country setting up its bases in Diego Garcia. They have brought their nuclear submarines and other sophisticated weapons into the Indian Ocean. (Time bell). I would

[Shri Vitthalrao Madhanrao Jadhav]

just take only two minutes and then conclude. But our young Prime Minister is a very outstanding leader of this world. He is pursuing constantly to build up our friendly relations with all countries.

India is one of the biggest and powerful countries in the field of science and technology. We are having the knowhow to manufacture nuclear weapons. We have got that capability, but we do not want to manufacture it.

We believe in the policy of non-alignment. (*Time bell rings*) Sir, with one quotation of Madam Indira Gandhi, I will conclude my speech. Madam Gandhi said:

"The struggle for freedom began when the first man was enslaved and it will continue until the last man is freed not merely of visible bondage but of the concepts of inferiority due to race, colour, caste or sex." So that was the belief of Madam Gandhi.

Lastly, the entire third world countries are fighting against colonialism. Madam Gandhi said about colonialism and I quote:

"Colonialism is dying but its ghost will haunt the world until political independence is matched with economic viability. Non-aligned nations have a positive and a creative role in promoting economic development and social change and in protecting developing nations from external pressures."

Sir, this is the policy of our Government.

Sir, some Members from that side always align with the capitalistic countries and they blow up whatever has appeared in the press from New York and other places. These Members want that our Government must run after those news reports. If we run like that what self-respect we will have? We have won our freedom after a great struggle. We are following the path of non-alignment and we are also fighting for the third-world countries. We know that about 90 per cent of the democratic countries are under the

pressure of this group or that group. The entire human race is under this pressure or that pressure. So our Prime Minister is trying very hard to ease the tensions in the world. I wish him all success in his efforts and lend my full support to him.

With these few words, I endorse the statement made by the Honourable Minister.

Thank you.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the success of our foreign policy has been manifested in the last meeting of the SAARC. Sir, one must have friendly relations with his neighbours. The latest achievement of our Government of this SAARC is the biggest achievement that we have achieved during the last one year because the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation is to promote collective self-reliance and to contribute to mutual trust, understanding and appreciation of one another's problems. This is very important to promote intra regional collaboration and mutual assistance in the economic, social, cultural technical and scientific fields. The Charter also provides scope for cooperation among themselves in international fora, on matters of common interests and to cooperate with international and regional organisations with similar aims and purposes. I must say, Mr. Foreign Minister, this is our greatest achievement during the last one year and I attach great importance to this. Sir, I have to state one important thing. I had been to China in June last for two weeks. Right from the North to the South, when we visited China, I had an exchange of views with diplomats and other dignitaries of that country. I did not say with any fear of contradiction that the Chinese people, at the present moment want peace with India. They want solution of the border problem. But in this context. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was disappointed with the speech made by the Hon'ble Foreign Minister, the other day. Now, with regard to the border issue, we have had official level talks and he stated in this House

that these official talks will continue. Then the question of Foreign Ministers level will come and then the Summit will come. I am afraid, this is not the correct approach. Mine may be alone voice in this House but certainly after my visit to China, I have realised that this is the most opportune time for settling our border dispute with China. We must authorise our Prime Minister to sit across with the Chinese Prime Minister and the Chinese President and settle this issue. It is a fact that when such issues are resolved, give and take is always there. We must not bind the hands of our Prime Minister that we do not want this thing to happen or we do not want that thing to happen. This attitude is wrong. Then, no settlement will come. The second submission that I have to make in this connection is that the impression that I have got from China is that right now, we are fortunate in having the strongest Government in India and the strongest Government in China. This is the most opportune time in which we can solve this problem. If we do not solve this problem now, we will not be able to solve this problem later on. Sir, our relations with U.S.S.R. are very cordial. They have stood in good stead in times of need. There is no doubt about it but our policy of non-alignment is there which we have been following right from the time of Jawaharlal Nehru. We should not, therefore, emphasise and over-emphasise our relations with a particular power, at a particular point of time because when we over-emphasise the relations with a particular power, the other powers feel that we are getting away from them. Our policy should be gone the non-aligned. That is possible only when we do not over-emphasise our relations with a particular power. No doubt, there may be certain areas in which we are having closer relations with any other country but that should not be over-emphasised in the interest of non-alignment policy. Sir, I must congratulate the Government because the whole Arab world is with us. Our policy towards the Arab world has stood us in good stead, has given us the greatest number of friends. The Palestine policy is one which has brought laurels to our foreign policy. We must, therefore, see to it that our

policy towards the Arab countries, particularly the Palestine problem, continues.

The last point that I want to make, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is that we should not over-emphasise certain things. For instance Pakistan is making a nuclear bomb and we know it. As our Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister have stated, we have got circumstantial evidence to prove that they have got nuclear programmes. Now what does one do about it? Our Prime Minister talks to General Zia and our Foreign Minister talks to their Foreign Minister. They deny it. They have denied it. We are not convinced. That is all right. It is for us to keep ourselves ready. But we should not over-emphasise that we do not believe them because the other party will say that they have denied it and they are not having such programmes. But we must not yield to any sort of pressure.

The last point is with regard to Kashmir. As Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy has stated, in the negotiations that we are going to have with Pakistan, we must definitely take up the issue because we have committed ourselves under the Simla Agreement that we shall have a peaceful settlement of all our outstanding issues. So according to that, we must talk to them about the area that is under their illegal occupation. There should be some way found for a peaceful negotiated settlement so that the territory which is under the illegal occupation of Pakistan is also restored to India. But that, I emphasise, must be done in a friendly atmosphere.

Lastly, I want to talk about the Sri Lankan issue which is agitating the minds of the whole people of this country. Our Government should also make it known to the Sri Lankan authorities that enough is enough and that we shall not be able to take much more of it. Some sort of a mild warning to Sri Lanka is indicated and needed at the present moment because of the genocide that is taking place there. And daily we are hearing that 30 or 40 people have been killed. So this aspect must be brought to their notice and they must be told that we are not going to tolerate it any more. Thank you.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. House has debated the international situation for now, I think, nearly seven hours and half hours, and if you include my speech, it will be more than seven hours. I am happy that as many as 22 Members participated in this debate and made very valuable contribution on all aspects of the foreign policy and the situation in the world today. Sir, many Members from this side and many Members from that side generally supported, some in full measure and some in very large measure, the conduct of the foreign policy in face of the challenges made by the international situations and particularly the captaincy and conduct of the foreign policy by the Prime Minister. They have been very well appreciated. I am grateful to the hon. Members. Some hon. Members have expressed some doubts. The first is about the necessity or the essentialness of the Prime Minister's visit in the last few months to a number of countries. Some Members have said that it is not the Foreign Office or the Ministry of External Affairs that is conducting the Foreign Policy, it is the Prime Minister's office that is conducting the Foreign Policy. I would like to clear the mist, if any. There is no mist about these matters. Before I proceed to the other subjects, so far as PM's visit is concerned, one of the points raised was that PM has not visited the third world countries, as if he has visited only the more industrialised countries. Purely on facts, this is not true. The Prime Minister's visits included as many as seven countries, developing countries or non-aligned countries or third world countries, as you may like to describe, countries like Egypt, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cuba, Oman, Vietnam. Then the other countries he visited were the USSR—the Soviet Union -- which stands in a special category, then France, the USA, the UK, Holland and Japan. Apart from that, there were very important multilateral visits, the visit to CHOGM meeting, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, in Bahamas, where 46 or 47 Heads of Government of the Commonwealth attended. It was an important meeting and the Prime Minister's visit was a necessity, a matter of duty and responsibility: similarly, his

visit New York in connection with the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations, in which, apart from all the member-countries participating, as many as sixty Heads of Government participated. If you analyse this you will find that there was not a single visit of the Prime Minister which you can say was not necessary. And every one of his visits projected the correct image of the country which was very necessary; it has also served the national interest. You are aware that India is the chairman of the non-aligned movement and our Prime Minister is the chairman of the non-aligned movement. There are certain special responsibilities cast on him in this matter. As you know, the non-aligned movement under India's leadership has assumed a dynamic role. I could not see even a single Member who has questioned the role, the efficacy or the dynamics, of the non-aligned movement under Indian leadership, first under the chairpersonship of our late Prime Minister, Shrimati Gandhi, and presently under the chairmanship of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. And there is a special responsibility cast on the Prime Minister in this role. The non-alignment movement grapples with some of the most urgent issues that the world faces today. And I am happy some honourable Members—although we do not take special credit for it—were good enough from the other side to point out one good thing. And, Sir, it is this that there is a silver lining under the dark clouds which are threatening the world with a nuclear holocaust, and the silver lining was the summit meeting in Geneva between President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachov. The Non-Aligned Movement, since 1983, from the Delhi Declaration, was trying to do its best and it identified two main issues in the world. One was the question of nuclear disarmament and peace and the second was the question connected with the new international economic order in which both the developing and the developed countries are able to maintain a momentum of development on an equal basis. The present international organisations, particularly, the monetary, trade and financial and other arrange-

ments, created just after the Second World War, do not serve the interest particularly of the developing countries where the very process of growth is threatened, is under a serious jeopardy, and also, Sir, the developed countries are none too better. They are facing a serious economic crisis in the form of unemployment, inflation, popularly known as stagnation and unutilised capacities and, therefore, both the developed countries and the developing countries in the world as a whole are facing a serious economic crisis and the international organisations and arrangements like protectionism, GATT, multilateralism, free trade, etc., these international economic systems and arrangements, are failing. It was in the Delhi summit that the NAM pinpointed these two issues and then came the declaration. The declaration was that the two powers or the big powers or supers, call them by whatever name you like, those powers who mainly own the nuclear arsenals of the world, must meet and must decide about the disaster that the world was facing which might end the life on this planet itself many times over. Some Members rightly described the situation and said that life on this earth, on this planet, would be destroyed several times over if there is a nuclear holocaust and it was this declaration in 1983 which said that these powers must meet. Then, you know, the initiative was taken by the late Prime Minister and then came the initiative in 1984 when it was suggested that the two super powers must talk. There was no dialogue. The whole world was going towards disaster and complete end and nobody was talking. Therefore, you know, this call came and the lead was taken by the then Chairperson of the NAM and then it was followed by the six-nation appeal in which they asked for a moratorium and in which it was said that there should be a complete test ban, a ban on testing, on production and on deployment of nuclear weapons. The six nation appeal came and asked for a moratorium on this and it said that they must meet. As a result of this pressure, particularly the initiative taken by the Non-Aligned Movement with India as its Chairman, we must be happy that the Geneva summit took place

which has been welcomed by all sides of the House. We knew that unless they met, it would not produce the results. But the very fact that the two leaders have agreed to continue the dialogue is itself a matter of importance, and they will continue the dialogue. The proposal for a reduction by fifty per cent of the nuclear arsenal, as suggested by Mr. Gorbachov, the fact that they will consider the other aspects like non-use of force, the declaration that they will not be the first to strike, etc. are all important. The question is that with the advance that has taken place, the first and second strikes do not have any meaning because the difference between the first and the second strikes is a matter only of a few minutes, less than ten minute and, in some cases, it is even less than that. So the first stage is that they are going to talk on this. This is one dynamic aspect, and that is why we talk of peace. 'NAM' has been described by Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our late Prime Minister, as the biggest peace movement in history. And I am very happy that India is associated and is in the captaincy of this movement which is playing a role which can make all the difference between life and death on this planet. This is the No. 1 issue.

Similarly, the issue of development is connected with all the economic issues that compounds the picture of gloom and doom in the world today. Again, the initiative has turned to the North-South dialogue. There is no progress in the North-South dialogue between developed and developing countries. But let there be progress on the South—South dialogue. Let the developing countries build up what is called the concept of collective self-reliance. This, again, came from the Delhi Declaration, and we are working towards it. Some people may not be satisfied with the progress. But the fact is that we are in the right direction. We are progressing. And you have welcomed the SAARC, South Asian Association of Regional Co-operation, the Charter of which was signed only the day before yesterday. It has been described by the Prime Minister as the biggest, most populous regional organisation in the world today. One billion people are involved. I am happy that to give it strength there is the

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

support of this august House. There have been some warnings, too. But we are aware of these pitfalls, the difficulties. There is the collective wisdom among the leaders, the seven leaders of this region, and there is the political will that they have launched this organisation, a regional organisation. They want to make a success of it. They have identified the first group of subjects, and then they will go to another group of subjects, and then ultimately they will make it a viable, dynamic and lively organisation, because we need it in the chain, whether we need security in one or peace in one region or any larger region or in the Indian Ocean as it has been discussed. It is necessary that whatever opportunities or institutional framework that are created, if they are worked properly and in the right spirit and constructive cooperation is created, then, I think, it is a fact of peace and stability.

Some Members suggested that the SAARC must be strengthened. Somebody compared it with EEC. The conditions are different in different regions. But the fact is the necessity, the desire, strong desire, for cooperation so that it helps development of each country of the region, a number of States and of the region as a whole. On the basis of this, if they are able to work, I think the SAARC is going to be a success. The optimism and good wishes expressed and the support given by the Members will further strengthen the leadership in the region for making it a real success.

Sir, the other question that was raised—all Members here are such experienced people with a vision, and statesmen, many of them—was who conducts the foreign policy: is it the Prime Minister's office or is it the External Affairs Ministry? I think this is relevant. Under both the systems, under the Presidential system, the Cabinet is appointed by the President.

In Westminster, the system that we are practising, all appointments are made on the advice of the Prime Minister. The foreign policy is laid down by the Prime Minister in all systems. Who lays down the policy in the Soviet Union? It is the party in the Soviet Union. Who lays

down the policy in the American system? It is the President who lays down the policy. In our system, the foreign policy is the sole prerogative of the Prime Minister of the country. The External Affairs Minister or the Ministry of External Affairs implement that policy. I think this arrangement is the only arrangement which has been evolved through historical experience, through long tradition and it is everywhere. Therefore, it is only the ignorant people who ask this. I don't think this ignorance can be there in this august House. All the hon. Members are very distinguished people. It is a non issue. I won't say more on this. I am running against time. I have to deal with many more questions.

Then I come to ideological questions about foreign policy. Mr. Sukomal Sen and some other Members on the other side said that we are compromising with imperialism. He said that we are compromising with this country or that country. We are compromising with none. We pursue our policies. What is India's foreign policy? India's foreign policy is one which has been born out of the Indian freedom struggle. India's foreign policy was fashioned by our first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, taking the ethos of the Indian struggle for freedom. This is the hundredth year of the Indian National Congress. No other organisation emerged in history which is for anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and which is for the liberation of the people of the world. The policy formed by the Indian National Congress cannot compromise with any such form, whether it is imperialism or colonialism or neo-colonialism or hegemonism or of any other kind. It is basically and essentially against any such oppressive domination of the weak by the strong. This has been our record. Nobody can cast any doubt on this bright record of the Indian National Congress and India's foreign policy. NAM Movement has emerged out of that. As has been described, it is the biggest peace movement. It is for the national independence of all the developing countries which emerged and became independent after the Second World War as a result of India's struggle against colonialism in the world. Together they have

formed the organisation to maintain national independence, independent development, to build up their national self-reliance and economic self-reliance. There are platforms in the U.N. There are platforms in the NAM. It is a progressive platform. They have friendship with the socialist world. They have friendship with all the progressive movements where they are peace movements, where they are movements for a just and equal society, not only within the country but in the international framework. This is the ethos and this is the main bulwark of India's foreign policy. There can be no compromise on any of the basic things, on the oppressive trends and negative trends. Whatever remains in South Africa or in the P.L.O. or in any other place, whether it is apartheid or racism or oppression based on colour economic domination of any kind, we will continue to struggle till the last remnants of colonialism or oppression or subjugation are wiped out.

And that last phase has begun. And our vision is clear when we decided in CHOGM in Nassau. We have given a chance. We have given the last chance to these forces who are subjugating the people in that area whether you want the process of dialogue, whether you want to end it by a process of dialogue. That is the essence of the Declaration. I do not know how people, out of some misconception, can express that it has not been progressive. I think there is no compromise on the decision in the CHOGM in Nassau. The decision is that apartheid has to be dismantled. The final phase of the struggle has emerged. A group of prominent persons has been created to continue the process of dialogue between the black majority, the coloured majority and the Pretoria regime if they want to have a dialogue and settle this matter peacefully. If they do not, then the mandatory sanctions and other measures and the struggle will be continued. And we will provide all help. We have provided all help. We are committed to provide all help. So, there is no compromise on any of these basic issues. And let there be complete clarity about that.

Sir, there have been so many points raised by the hon. Members. They have touched almost all the aspects and all the events and it is very difficult to deal with all of them. But I can assure the hon. Members that those who have given their constructive support, we are grateful to them. And those who have offered their suggestions we will certainly examine their suggestions even if we are not able to deal with them here. That leaves the last group, those who have raised some issues and wanted some clarification on some of the issues. I would like to deal with them now. Well, hon. Member, Mr. Gurupadaswamy is there and I have always great respect for his views because on almost all points we are on a very common wave length unless he is sometimes, maybe, influenced by some subjective considerations. And it is one of those things when he described our role in the 40th Anniversary of the UNO as very limited and that it was a very vacillatory role we have played. Then he said and he almost expressed a truism that our limited role is because we have not that military and economic power which is understood and recognised in the present day reality of the world. I do not know what he means that we have not that military and economic power. I think, he tried to compare it with China. Maybe China's own perceptions of their role is different from ours. But our perception is very clear. We do not seek any domination. Others may say so. And they may work towards that. But it is a fact now that as far India's credibility on this matter is concerned, it is absolutely accepted universally that India does not seek any dominating role in the world. And, therefore, whatever military muscle that we have or military strength we have it is entirely defensive and for peaceful purposes. So, there is a difference in this. And we do not want to use military power for pursuit of our international relationships. That precisely what we do not want because one of the axioms of India's foreign policy is that we do not seek military solutions to any problems.

What we seek is peaceful co-existence and political negotiations in the settling of

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

all disputes, i.e., through negotiation. And in that respect, you know, the concept of military power that you think that a nation must have to play an effective role is very different from what we think of India's projection, as we think India to be a modern military machine. Every State must have that. And our military strength is commensurate with our national security and the perceptions that we have of our own national security and of the defence of our country. Similarly, in economic power, India is emerging as an economic power in the sense that we are a self-reliant economy. I will give you two examples. One example is very well known. We are now the tenth country in the industrialised countries of the world. We have the infrastructure. The sinews of economic strength is the science and technology and its application and modernisation and already India has achieved in science and technology the third biggest structure only after the United States and the Soviet Union. In agriculture we are not only self-sufficient but we are surplus in certain cereals and others. And, in the potentialities if we are able to use our all water resources, in another 15 or 20 years, India will emerge as a big grain exporting country after meeting the needs of the people. First we have to provide them with higher standards of nutrients to our people, caloric requirements by raising them. Well, India has emerged as one of the large agricultural commodities exporting countries. That is the potential and we will do it and we are determined to do it and we have planned for that. But the most important thing is that if you see our economic management, financial management, the whole world is under the grip of economic crisis, debt trap. What are our own resources? One example I am giving of our national self-reliance and that gives you the self-confidence to play that role. That is in the Seventh Plan all the resources that we need will be ours, domestic resources, only 6 per cent will be external resources. We have the least external debt in the world today and that is why we say that if our defence requirement is under control we can divert the funds to economic

development. If we seek friendship in our region, that is the main thrust of the Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi's policy, actually we are seeking friendship in all our neighbourhood, not only in the Indian Ocean area but even beyond that, there need not be any diversion of resources from agriculture and economic development to defence, which is hurting us. At the same time, we have to provide for defence because there can be no compromise on the basic security of the country or the defence of the country. At the same time the country also needs for economic development, to maintain a rate of growth, commensurate with India's requirement, the requirements of 750 million people, to fight for anti-poverty measures India's example is quoted in many quarters. Well, I did not tell you. You ask any organisation. Well, the World Bank is not a very popular thing with our friends of the Left. But they have been our supporters. They have been critical. But from the U.N. or any other organisation you can hear that India's example is the best example of development on the basis of self-reliance and building up of India's self-confidence and economic power as you call it. India's economic power is the best example and the way India's policy has been pursued they have been able to harness their resources, which is the best way in full freedom. There is no other example in the world of this size and dimension. So, therefore, I am surprised at this remark that our role was limited, vacillatory, when he said so about the 40th Anniversary. I think he has this in mind, a remark made by some other Member. I think he did not spell it.

I think our friend Mr. Jaswant Singh said that it characterises failure of India, that India failed in the 40th anniversary to bring about declaration on this historic event from the U.N. as there was no declaration, there was no statement and he says that it is our failure. Probably my friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy may be having in mind that—our role was very limited because we followed a vacillatory role, because we neither have the military muscle nor the economic power. Let me clarify that situation, as to what happened there and the correct assessment

about it. A preparatory committee had been established by the 30th U.N. General Assembly to consider substantive issues involved in the preparation of the commemoration of the 40th anniversary and an informal drafting group was entrusted with the task of elaborating on the text of declaration to be adopted by the commemoration session. Regrettably, owing to the inflexible position taken by certain States, no consensus could be reached. Negotiations on the draft declaration broke down mainly on the question of Palestine although there were some other relatively less contentious points of disagreement. Syria and some other Arab countries were intent upon a reference to the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people. The U.S. delegation refused to accept such a reference and insisted on formal reference to Security Council Resolutions No. 244 and 388. This was unacceptable to the Arab countries and ultimately the exercise was abandoned. When it became clear that a consensus would not be possible. In the U.N. General Assembly, if you do not reach a consensus, you do not adopt a resolution or any such thing. In the General Assembly it is not done. But this is not our failure. Jaswant Singhji has openly said that it is our failure that the U.N. General Assembly could not adopt resolution or declaration on this important occasion.

Similarly another point made was about Stars War. Well, you know our position on the Stars War and SDI. U.K. has sided with the USA and therefore this is supposed to be, by inference, our failure that we could not persuade U.K. not to sign the Stars War agreement with USA. The fact is that U.K. and the USA have signed what they call Memorandum of Understanding on U.K.'s participation in the SDI research programme. This is entirely upto U.K. and USA to reach an agreement as sovereign countries, or arrive at an understanding which they deem appropriate. It would not be proper for us to say anything about this understanding. However, on the general question of the new outer space weapons system, our Prime Minister in the U.S.A. in the major press club, the National Press Club of Washington, came

out openly against the SDI or the Stars War programme of the U.S.A. and therefore we hope that this problem will be solved because we firmly believe that outer space should be for peaceful purposes and it should be inherited by the entire mankind and it is not be used as a platform for future wars, nuclear wars or the laser beam wars, or other wars of micro computer technology and all these kinds of things that are being done at the moment.

In the same connection, another point was made about the U.S.-U.S.S.R. summit at Geneva, in regard to the non-use of nuclear weapons. Members wanted to know the latest position on this. We do not know what happened in the discussions. We do not know whether the discussions came down to every detail. But I can inform the House that so far the Soviet Union is concerned, their position is that 'no first use of nuclear weapons'. They want to retain the option to use the nuclear weapons for retaliation. The U. S. and their allies do not accept the non-use proposal. This is on the ground—this is what they say—that the Soviet Union is far superior in conventional weapons. Therefore, the U. S. and their allies, particularly, in the European context, cannot prevent an U.S.S.R. invasion; they feel that they can deal with the superior conventional weapons of the U.S.S.R. only by using nuclear weapons. This is the latest position as far as these two countries are concerned. So far as we are concerned, our position is quite clear, that all nuclear weapons are an evil. There should be no use at all of these weapons under any circumstances. This stand is based on the principle that nuclear weapons are an evil thing and they should not be used at all. Secondly, after the first attack, as I said earlier, nothing will remain. Therefore, where is the question of using nuclear weapons in retaliation? We have submitted a draft convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons and every year in the U.N. General Assembly and in the conference on disarmament, we press for negotiations on this draft.

Now, Sir, I would like to take up one or two important aspects. Members have spoken on Sri Lanka. The question of India-China relations has also been mentioned, particularly, the border talks. I

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

would not like to go into the details of other aspects. But there are one or two things which our hon. friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh, has raised.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: There are only three Members in the Opposition.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: But I would like to deal with two important aspects, Sri Lanka and India-China relations.

Hon. Member, Mr. Johan, referred to the developments in Sri Lanka. This was followed by a number of other Members, Mr. Gopalsamy and other Members on this side also. He was good enough to concede that there has been no change in our policy, in our active interest in seeking a fair and effective solution to the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka. Our friend, Mr. Gopalsamy, made a very impassioned speech....

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Mr. Gopalsamy is on this side.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: He made a reference to genocide, and violation of human rights in Sri Lanka. May I assure the hon. Member that the Government is not insensitive to the human sufferings in Sri Lanka or anywhere else? We are very deeply concerned over these sufferings and I would also like to reiterate that this concern is felt all over the country, not only in Tamil Nadu or in certain sections. Reference was also made that the cease-fire violations were more justified on one side than the other. Violations by any side cannot be justified. All must respect the cease fire. The main victim of these violations are the civilian population and what is a matter of deep anxiety for all of us....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The main victims are Tamilians.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am coming to that. Please hear me. What is a matter of deep anxiety for all of us is that such population is mostly of Tamilians.

We have tried hard for the observance of the cease-fire. The setting-up of the cease-fire Monitoring Committee was an effort in that direction. We have been stressing on the Sri Lanka authorities the need to made the Monitoring Committee

more effective and the importance of controlling the security forces. It is Sri Lanka's responsibility to prevent violence against civilians. They must protect their own citizens.

The dangers of an escalating cycle of violence are obvious. We believe that there is no alternative to a negotiated political solution acceptable to all concerned. We have stressed to the Sri Lankan authorities the futility, and the enormous cost in terms of human lives and sufferings, of seeking a military solution. We are aware of the genuine grievances and demands of the Tamils. These will obviously have to be addressed if we hope to achieve a lasting solution to the ethnic problem. We continue to be in touch with both sides and we hope that all concerned will continue to work towards a peaceful political settlement and will eschew violence.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Minister would you kindly bear with me? I want to ask a specific question. (*Interruptions*). At that time he was not there and I do not know whether the information has been passed on to him or not. That is why I am asking this specific question.

I want to know whether our hon. Prime Minister has taken up the issue with Mr. Jayewardene not to have any commercial truck with South Africa because we are advocating economic measures against Africa. Whereas Sri Lanka is getting arms from South Africa. So, has the Government taken up the issue with Jayewardene?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We have taken up all relevant issues. (*Interruptions*). We are in close touch with the President of Sri Lanka. (*Interruptions*)

Now, finally, Sir, on the India-China border talks and the relations, the relations are more relaxed and there are exchanges at all levels. As you know, there has been meeting at the level of the Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and the Prime Minister Zhao Zhiyang and I had met the Foreign Minister. They had the sixth round of talks. There are legations coming. We had the trade delegation also coming here. Our position is that the settlement of the border question is the central question and at the instance of the Chinese side we have agreed to pursue relationship

in other areas also. There are cultural delegations, cultural contacts and also some trade is flowing. All this is going on but the point is, and we have made it very clear to our Chinese friends that unless this question is solved, there will not be a full normal relations between our two countries. At the moment, the relations are good, friendly. However, at the sixth round of official level talks they have reciprocated the sentiments but I want to say that at the sixth round of the final level talks which took place in Delhi a little while ago, the Chinese side has shown no flexibility at all on the boundary question. Any settlement on the boundary must necessarily take into full account of the just and the legitimate position of India on the Sino-Indian border which is based on historical evidence, treaties, traditions, customs and usage and had not been disputed by the Peoples Republic of China up to the late 50s. Hon. Members have referred to and we are aware of the resolution of the Parliament on this question and the pledge and we said so. On this question, the legitimate national interests will be kept in mind in settling this matter. We shall continue our efforts in this direction to find a peaceful solution through negotiations.

Sir, with these words, I again express my deep thanks to the hon. Members for their participation in this discussion.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): Now the discussion is concluded. Now Secretary-General.

The Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Bill, 1985

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha I am directed to enclose the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Bill, 1985, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 9th December, 1985.

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): The House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-one minutes past seven of the clock, till eleven of the clock, on Wednesday, the 11th December, 1985.