

roft affair so far as rural and backward areas are concerned. And one of the main thrusts in our Seventh Plan is to take these communication facilities and postal facilities to the rural areas by the most modern means available. A lot of other individual things have been mentioned by the Members. I have taken note of them. And I assure them that they will be attended to with seriousness, and they will be informed about the results. Once again I thank you and all the Members who participated in the debate and gave us the benefit of their advice.

श्री खरद प्रकाश मालवीय: लखनऊ
उत्तर प्रदेश की राजधानी है। दिल्ली से
लखनऊ के लिए डायरेक्ट कनेक्शन जल्दी
राइये (व्यवधान)

Discussion on the Working of the
Ministry of External Affairs

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): We
now take up the discussion on
working of the Ministry of Exter-
Affairs. I have to inform the
Members that the Business Advisory
Committee has allotted one day for
discussion on the working of this
Ministry, i.e., today. The reply to the
question will be tomorrow. So, we
will complete the discussion to-

HON. MEMBER: There is no
conditioning, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI
SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): With regard
to air-conditioning, there is a defect.

SRI S. W. DHABE (Maharash-: Mr.
Vice-Chairman, Sir, I want to raise a point
of procedure. This is an important Ministry
and we are in the discussion after half
the time is over. If it was one day, we could
have started the discussion after the Question
Hour and

then he could have had the discussion for the
whole day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU): Yes, Shri
Mohan. . . .

SHRI K. MOHANAN (Kerala): Mr. Vice-
Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you and to the
House for giving me a chance to initiate the
discussion on the working of the Ministry of
External Affairs, which is one of the
important Ministries under the Government,
especially in the background of the existing
serious international situation. Sir,
formulation and implementation of a correct
foreign policy, taking into consideration of
the national interest, is the main job of this
Ministry. So, for formulating a correct foreign
policy, we may be allowed to take note of the
existing international situation with a clear
and correct perspective.

Sir, on the international scene, the existing
reality is that the entire world is facing a
nuclear war threat. Mankind throughout the
world is facing the prospect of total
extinction. We are sitting on a volcano.
Nobody can say what will happen tomorrow.
Such a situation the entire mankind is now
facing. In that background the functioning of
this Ministry, we are discussing and the
developments taking place throughout the
globe.

Sir, when we are discussing the interna-
tional situation with particular reference to
the nuclear arms race, we will have to see who is
responsible for this unending tension, cold
war and nuclear arms threat hanging over the
heads of the entire mankind. There is a
deliberate attempt in our country and outside
to put the blame for the nuclear arms race on
the USA as well as the USSR, in the same
way. It is a fact that these two countries are
equally strong in military power but that does
not mean that the USSR and the USA are
equally responsible for nuclear arms race. The
very intention of the American imperialism is
to expand their military might all over the
world. By acquiring more and more
sophisticated types of nuclear weapons, they
want to expand their military might all over
the world. But at the same time, what is the
attitude of the

[Shri K. Mohanan]

Socialist bloc, especially the USSR? Here, I would like to say that the equation of these two countries, or these two Super Powers, is irrelevant because it was very clear, very unequivocal and it was a unilateral declaration of Moscow, in the case of using nuclear arms that the Soviet Union will not be the first user of nuclear arms against any other country in the world. What is the attitude towards it of the American Administration and how did they respond or whether there is any positive response from the American Administration? No. That is the difference.

Another example which I would like to point out is the recent declaration of the newly-elected leader of the USSR, Mr. Gorbachev regarding the limitation of medium range missiles in Europe. He declared that the Soviet Union is prepared to stop deployment of nuclear medium range missiles in Eastern Europe and other counter measures taken by the Soviet Union in response to the deployment of US Pershing Cruise Missiles till November 1985, if the American Administration is prepared to stop further deployment of Pershing Cruise Missiles in Europe. But it is unfortunate that the U.S. Administration has not only summarily rejected this proposal or this gesture or the initiative and refused to stop deployment of Pershing Cruise Missiles in Europe, but Washington is speeding up its Star War programme which constitutes the gravest peril to humanity. Soviet Union has expressed its disagreement to change the outer space into nuclear arsenal.

It is clear from all these facts as to who is responsible for this arms race and who is mounting tension on the international scene and creating a threat of the nuclear war.

It is quite unfortunate and unfair on our part to equate them and blame both the big powers with the same weight for the nuclear arms race. That is my point.

[The Vice-Chairman (Dr. (Shrimati) Sarojini Maheshwari) in the Chair]

In this context, I would like to welcome the Delhi Declaration of the Six-Nation

Summit regarding ban on nuclear arms. I would also like to congratulate the Government for the initiative taken in this regard and I would like to congratulate the Soviet Union also for their ready positive response in this regard. But here also, what was the approach of Reagan Administration and whether there was any response from their side to the Delhi Declaration? But our Government failed to condemn the attitude taken by the Reagan Administration to the Delhi Declaration. We have to welcome the recent declaration of Mr. Gorbachev, and we have also failed to condemn, in this regard, this issue.

Madam, in this context, I would like to say that non-alignment does not mean impotence. 'We cannot shut our eyes to the facts and the realities. We will have to call a spade a spade. In this context, in the name of non-alignment, — I am not using the word 'opportunism,' — a kind of opportunism you are playing. This is my criticism. It is true. We are doing our best through diplomatic channels and mutual negotiations, for the establishment of peace in the world. We are also campaigning for a ban on nuclear arms using the forums of the United Nations, or non-aligned movement and such other forums. But my point is, my criticism is, the Government and the ruling party, have failed to mobilise the people of this country, in a big way, under the banner of world peace and against nuclear arms race. You are doing so many things through diplomatic channel, or using the international forums. The Indian people are traditionally anti-imperialistic. The Government and the ruling party have failed to mobilise and to strengthen the feeling of anti-imperialism of the Indian people by mobilising them in a big way. This is one of my criticisms. But in this context, I would like to congratulate the left and democratic forces of this country: they have done this job in a big way throughout the country by mobilising people in a big way, for world peace and against nuclear arms. It is imperialism, for a quite long time, his brother, Irving to destabilise the political system of this sub-continent. Everybody knows about it. Not only that. I would like to point out, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to a

new development in Asia. This is, after the Second World War, after the treaty, there was a ban on the supply of arms to Germany and Japan. But the U.S. imperialists have violated this ban. They are now supplying even nuclear arms to West Germany. In the same way, now, the U.S. imperialists are trying to enter into a military treaty with Japan and North Korea. This is also a new phenomenon which is in the offing. This will be another threat to the entire continent of Asia. This is what I would like to point out *in this* context.

Madam, I am going to certain developments inside our country, which have in direct connections with the international situation. I would like to mention Assam and Punjab in this context. It is an open secret that the U.S. and the British imperialist forces are abetting the secessionist and the divisive forces in this country. The Assam incident was part of 'Operation Brahmputra', a project of the CIA to dismember the whole of the North-East..... (*Time bell rings*)

Madam, this is a very important discussion. I would request through you. The Leader of the House is not here. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is also not here. Kindly give me some more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR.
(SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]:
Please try to conclude.

SHRI K. MOHANAN : I have no hesitation in concluding at this point itself but it will not be fair on my part. When we are discussing such an important Ministry, it will not be fair on the part of the Chair or the House itself to curtail my speech abruptly. Anyway, I will try to be brief.

Regarding good relations with neighbours, there also the main impediment in the way of our efforts is the imperialist machination in continuing to supply highly

sophisticated weapons to Pakistan and encouraging and supporting Sri Lanka* to create more and more problems in the Indian Ocean. This is the strategic point, very important point, where the U.S. imperialists are trying to establish their bases. In view of this, how can we achieve good relations with the neighbouring countries? Our neighbours are very good people. I am not blaming the people of Bangladesh or Pakistan or Sri Lanka, but their existing-administrative system in collusion with imperial forces is doing all this mischief so that they do not have good relations with India. So, the atmosphere is full of animosity, discontent and feud. Who is responsible for this? I am not elaborating Sri Lanka issues, but I am sorry to note that our Government is a little on *tot* defensive in this matter, I think so. The Sri Lanka Government is campaigning in a big way. The question that they are posing is, what is happening in Punjab, are you supporting terrorism in Punjab and so on. That is the question they are posing. Before this question is answered, I think the Government of India is a little on the defensive. Nobody can equate terrorism in Punjab and the things that are happening in Sri Lanka. The Sri Lanka ethnic minority are forced to take arms into their hands because of the engineered terrorism in their own country. That is the difference between the terrorist activity in Punjab and what is going on in Sri Lanka. Anyhow, even though it is a small country, the Sri Lanka Embassy is doing well for their propaganda. They are doing well, that is my impression, I am getting so much material every day. They are condemning the Indian Government and charging the Government of India for encouraging terrorist activities in Sri Lanka, but what are you doing through your Embassies? Are you raising your voice against the killing of innocent people in that country? You have failed to do so. This is my criticism on that point. I am not going into the details of the Sri Lanka issue. Even now in demand is for a separate and full-fledged discussion on Sri Lanka in this session itself. Madam, why I am explaining all these things is that when we formulate our foreign policy and diplomatic relations with other countries, we will have to take all these aspects into consideration.

[Shri K. Mohanan] Imperialism is not a relative expression. It has its own relation to other walks of life, especially on the economic front. It is all embracing one. We know, through the International Monetary Fund and other financial institutions what role they are playing. We have the experience about Chile. How Allende was dastardly killed and his Government smashed and destroyed. It was not through direct military intervention of US administration, but the whole plot was planned and engineered through the International Telephone Industries, one of the biggest multi-national companies in the world. In this context, I would like to warn the Government of India that through their new budget, through their new import policy, they have already opened the floodgates to the multinationals to increase the chances for their investment in this country. This will be a dangerous thing. Imperialism is not only operating through the administrative services or intelligence agencies, but it is also using these multi-nationals because the system of imperialism is itself the creation of these multi-nationals. We will have to take this point very seriously and Government will have to do a rethinking on their policy regarding concessions extended to these multi-nationals.

As far as Gulf war is concerned...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. ^SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: May I request the hon. Member to conclude now?

SHRI K. MOHANAN: I will finish in two or three minutes. So I am it going into details. I am really sorry.

As far as Gulf war is concerned, I welcome the steps taken by the Government of India and our Prime Minister to end this war. I am not saying anything more at this juncture because it will not be useful to say anything in this regard at this stage. So we extend our support to the Government in their efforts to end this war as early as possible and also to the NAM Executive Committee's Resolution on Namibia. But I have a strong criticism against the working of our embassies. One I have just pointed out. I am saying so especially for the embassies

working in the Gulf countries. For the time being, my impression is that one embassy and one ambassador is necessary for the whole area of these Gulf countries. But I do not know why you have opened separate embassies in all the Gulf countries. The main intention behind that was, if I am correct, to safeguard the interests of Indians working in these Gulf countries, the Indian labourers working in Gulf countries. A majority of them are from the South Indian States, and majority among them is of Malayans. But how these embassy people are treating them? They are treating them simply as coolies. Nobody is there to look after their problems. They are sitting there 'as Maharajas; they are colluding with those employees who are working for Britain or America. They have thoroughly failed to safeguard interests of the Indian people working in the Gulf countries.

So, Madam, I request the Minister for External Affairs to look into the matter very seriously and rectify the functioning of our embassies throughout the world to gear them up to work for the benefit of the nation and to safeguard the interests of the nation and the people.

I am sorry. I have no time. So, I am concluding. As I have mentioned in the beginning of my speech, I request the Government that when we are formulating our foreign policy, simply making passing references like big power, super powers etc. will not be fair. We will have to take the realities into consideration. Who is the culprit? We will have to expose them to the people and organise the people against this criminal—the international policeman. America imperialism is at the same time the international criminal and the international policeman. We will have to expose this fraud to the Indian people and to the world and mobilize people in a big way and when we are formulating our foreign policy we will have to take those elements into serious consideration.

With these words, Madam. I thank you.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Vice-Chairman. I am also very thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this important subject.

which embraces the foreign policy of India. Madam, as regards the functioning of the External Affairs Ministry, broadly speaking, it may be divided into two parts:

- (1) Maintenance of our Missions abroad and supervision of their functioning; and
- (2) to help in the evolution and successful implementation of our foreign policy. As regards the first part pertaining to missions abroad, it is an administrative matter and almost a routine matter. So, nothing needs to be said about that except making a few suggestions which I will make later on.

As regards the foreign policy of India, I must congratulate our Government that within a short span of 37 years, because, they pursued the right type of policy, India has today become a very important factor in international politics and the impact of our foreign policy has been felt and is being felt throughout the world by almost all the countries.

Madam, the foundations of our foreign policy were laid by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and he repeatedly made it clear in the very beginning that the fundamentals of our foreign policy are anti-racialism, anti-colonialism and non-participation in power blocs. From the very beginning we have been against racial discrimination, imperialist expansion and exploitation of man by man in any form. That is why, Madam, as early as in 1946 when Nehru was heading the Interim Government, he declared that India would keep itself away from power politics, and that was the beginning, in fact, of the theory of non-alignment which, today, has gathered such a momentum that it is very hard to ignore the importance of this movement. In the mid-50's India did its utmost to fight colonialism as well as racialism and to unite the people fighting against colonialism. That is why, Madam, whether it was the Korean war or Vietnam or the joint attack by British, French and Israel troops on Egypt or the question of liberation of African countries or that of the Palestinians, Pandit Nehru always, stood for freedom, equality, justice and peace in the world. Owing to the positive role played by India against colonialism and for having peace in the world-our policy of non-participation in blocs

gradually changed into that of dynamic neutrality or, positive neutrality, as some people call it.

As regards the USA, which is still rather inimical to us and to all those who do not subscribe to its views, it was from the very beginning interested in providing us with aid with certain strings, with certain politico-military obligations, and Nehru could never agree to these strings. I am glad that neither Mrs. Gandhi nor Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri agreed to have aid with strings. Our present Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, has this very morning made it clear that he is not going to have any aid with strings. The USA wanted that Kashmir be handed over to it so that the Americans could have a military base there against the Soviet Union, and Nehru flatly refused this offer, and he could never put up with that. And that is why on his very first visit to the United States in October, 1949, while addressing a joint meeting of both the Chambers of the US Congress, Nehru said, and I quote:

"Where freedom is menaced or justice threatened or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral. What we plead for and endeavour to practise in our own imperfect way in a binding faith in peace and an unfailing endeavour of thought and action to ensure it. . . .Friendship and co-operation between our two countries are, therefore, natural. I stand here to offer both in the pursuit of justice, liberty and peace."

Madam, no doubt, our non-alignment or our policy of non-alignment has been a debatable point, and debatable more at home than abroad. During the life-time of Nehru, leaders of the Jana Sangh like Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherji, Dr. Raghu-vira, Socialist leaders like Ashok Mehta, Acharya Kripalani, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and even the Swatantra leaders like Prof. N. G. Ranga who is now with us but at that time was in the Swatantra Party and Minoo Masani have always criticised this policy of neutrality or non-alignment, and even Congressmen like Mr. Morarji Desai and a few others did not very much approve of our policy of non-alignment.

[Shri P. N. Sukul]

But, after all, what is non-alignment? Nehru has tried to explain it a number of times. On the 27th July, 1963, while speaking to the Andhra Pradesh Legislators in Hyderabad, Nehru said, and I quote:

"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 block. By attaching ourselves to a military block, we may gain some advantages, but we also acquire many disadvantages, and our capacity to work for peace will become tremendously affected thereby."

And Madam, the same year, replying to the debate on the international situation in this very House on the 3rd of September, Pt. Nehru said, and I again quote :

"Non-alignment means that we do not join military blocks which have created a lot of trouble and tension. We did not join any of these blocks. 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."

And Madam, as I said earlier, Mrs. Gandhi also pursued the same policy of non-alignment in the international affairs, and she eventually became the Chairperson of the Non-alignment Movement. India, even today, is the Chairperson of the Non-alignment Movement, and our Prime Minister is the Chairperson. And I must say that Nehru as well as Mrs. Gandhi wanted to pursue this policy of non-alignment not only to preserve peace in the world but also to ensure accelerated economic growth of various nations and growth with honour and dignity.

In this connection I would like to quote from Mrs. Gandhi's keynote address at the inaugural session of the Seventh Conference of the Heads of State and Govern-

ment of Non-Aligned Countries held in New Delhi on the 7th of March, 1983. I quote:

"Non-alignment is national independence and freedom. It stands for peace and avoidance of confrontation. It aims at keeping away from military alliances. It means equality among nations and the democratisation of international relations, economic and political. It wants global cooperation for development on the basis of mutual benefit. It is a strategy for the recognition and preservation of the world's diversity."

In the same speech she further said and I quote:

"The NAM has stood firmly for a thoroughgoing restructuring of international economic relations, we are against exploitation. We are for each nation's right to its resources and policies. We want an equal voice in the operation of international institutions. We reiterate our commitment to the establishment of a New International Economic Order based on justice and equality."

As I said, Madam, it is a matter of great satisfaction that our present Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi is also sharing the same ideas and is pursuing the same policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. He is very eager to preserve peace in the world and also to have rapid economic growth in the underdeveloped and developing countries.

While replying to the debate on the President's Address in Lok Sabha on the 22nd January, 1985, our Prime Minister said in the context of India's foreign policy and I quote:

"India has been a strong supporter of the non-aligned movement. We are founder-member and our policy towards the movement have not changed. We shall, in fact, be taking more interest, developing more contacts, and trying to improve South-South relations. South-South exchanges and see that the Third World can help itself. We have seen that there has not been enough imagina-

tion; we have succumbed to foreign i thought, it has ended in a disaster; U has not ended in development. We shall in a similar way, look towards the Souih Asian region for better cooperation within the sub-continent."

Madam, in May, 1984 six nation summit that was held in Delhi had appealed to the nuclear super-powers to stop the arms race and to implement a programme for complete ban on testing, production, deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery system. This call was supported by several countries and national groups and one nuc ear power also responded favourably towards it.

The summit held in January, 1985 has also reiterated the same appeal and called upon the powerful nuclear nations to prevent the arms race in outer space and to have a comprehensive treaty to ban the testing of all nuclear weapons. Madam, banning the testing is more important. Because testing means, evolution of more Lethal weapons. As regards the weapons a'ready produced you could not have a treaty. You can ban them also. But you cannot be sure whether the ban is being implemented or not, unless there is some international agency to check them. Those arms and ammunition that are produced you cannot ensure their banning. At least testing can be banned. So, it is a good thing, that this summit has tried to call upon the nuclear powers to ban the future testing.

It is unfortunate that though we have stood for friendship and cooperation amongst nations specially with our neighbours, they are not responding favourably. In spits of our best efforts, some of our neighbours are still not friedly with us. We know that Pakistan is not friendly towards us because of its policies. We know that Pakistan is providing training to extremists in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir. They are providing arms and funds to these extremist elements. Then, how can we be friendly with that country which is trying to destroy us and is trying to destabilise our country. The same is the case with Sri Lanka today. One lakh Tamilians have come over to India. So many are being massacred there every day. So many have been massacred....

^ilAIRMAN (DR. SHRI-MALI) SAROJINI MAHISHI): I rer quest the Member to conclude.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Madam, as you did in the case of the other Member, kindly allow me some more time. I am out-ting it short. I have now come to the present stats of affairs.

Very recently the Sri Lankan President went to Pakistan and had a five-day stay What for? These two countries ioday are under the total influence of America. At least to Sri Lanka, Israel is providing arms and military aid, but to Pakistan, Am rica is providing aid, as it is providing arms and ammunition to so y other NATO countries. All these arms and ammunition, Madam, are going to be used agai;it India alone. And what is reaty alarming is that Pakistan is supposed to have evolved an atom bomb or is trying to evolve an atom bomb or a nuclear bomb. Now if Pakistan is able to have a nuclear bomb of its own, what will be the fate of India? It is not going to use it against the Soviet Union. Pakistan knows very well that if at all it uses one bomb against the Soviet Union, it will be decima'ed within an hour and finished, finally liquidated. But it knows that India has no nuclear bomb and that is why it is trying to develop a nuclear bomb. In this connection, Madam, very humbly I would suggest to my Government that we must reconsider and revise our stand on only peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We must be strong. Only then we c>on defend ourselves against such an enemy. We must try to develop a nuclear bomb of our own. I know that if we try to develop such a bomb, tons of money will have to be diverted from our other schemes, developmental schemes, towards that. But so what? In the larger interests of this country, in the best interests of the citizens of this country, we must try to develop the nuclear bomb. That is my very firm opinion.

THE VTCE-CHAIRMAN [TJR. (SHRI-MATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: Please conclude.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Two minutes more. As regards our immediate neigh-

[Shri P. N. Sukul] hours, I have mentioned about two countries. We are very friendly, quite friendly with Burma, Bhutan and Nepal. We are quite friendly with Afghanistan also, although we want a peaceful settlement of the situation there. Bangladesh is one about which I am not very sure myself. Although we have had exchanges of visits and other things, still with Bangladesh we are having certain problems, and the problems pertain to the increase of Ganga water at Farakka, large scale infiltration of migrants, their strong reaction to our decision to erect barbed-wire fencing along our borders, settlement of the claims of Indian nationals, the lease of the Tin Bigha corridor to Bangladesh and, as it has appeared in today's newspapers, their decision to construct a dam on the Muhuri river, which will result in great loss of crops and suffering to many people of our country. I personally feel that Bangladesh is also trying to go under the American umbrella. Sooner or later, it is going to fall in the lap of America. And if that happens—and that is bound to happen because it is interested in American aid because its economy is badly shattered—like Sri Lanka and Pakistan, it may allow America to have its base in Bangladesh necessary and in that eventuality, we will be facing a very bad situation. It is a matter of satisfaction that our relations with China are improving day by day and China sent a delegation to attend the funeral of our late Prime Minister. We have also had some trade agreements with China. However, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries remain our best friends. Our mutual trade and cooperation has been steadily growing. Our bilateral trade with the USSR is supposed to grow by 20 per cent in the current year.

Now, as regards our immediate problems, as I said, we have still failed to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, have been trying to do it. But America is turning a deaf ear to all our requests and instead of making it a zone of peace, it is trying to instigate and try to help forces like Pakistan or Sri Lanka or others against us. The acquisition of sophisticated arms by Pakistan goes unabated. It is also causing alarm

in our country and we must also try to find out some solution to these problems; otherwise, we have to prepare ourselves militarily to face the challenge squarely. Barbed wire fence has to be erected along the Indo-Bangladesh border, whether Bangladesh likes it or not.

Now, about our missions abroad I have a word to say. Some of our missions are not working properly, especially those in the Middle-East are not working at all in the desired way. Two of our friends here, Shri Allahabadi, who is not here, and another honourable friend, had been to these countries recently and they told me personally. They went to Iraq and Iran. The people there do not know what is happening in India, what India stands for; they are not aware of our achievements, our policies, our programmes. So, all these missions have to be energised so that they are able to project our image well in those countries and create a better awareness in those countries about ourselves. (*Time bell rings*). All right. Madam, with these words I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Madam Vice-Chairman, I rise to say a few words on the Ministry of External Affairs. The foreign policy of our Government is welcomed by all with some exceptions. Our objectives like international peace, disarmament and non-alignment and the approach for the same have elevated our nation so as to lead the developing countries and the underdeveloped countries and have equated India with the Super Powers. Since India is the birth place of the Buddha, Gandhiji and Dr. Anna, it is quite natural that the spirit of peace and non-violence emerged from this sacred soil abundantly.

The objectives of our foreign policy in the initial stages were duly proclaimed and propounded by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. His initiatives regarding non-alignment and panch sheel are considered to be the milestones in our post-independent period. I need not say much about the greatest service rendered by our late Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi, towards the po-

licy formulated by her beloved father, Pandit Nehru. Now, our young and dynamic Prime Minister, Thiru Rajiv Gandhi, with all his vigour and vigilance, adheres to the policy of his mother and his grandfather. His utterances and advice, deeds and demeanour, his decision and determination are like scientific signals to guide and aid our country towards peace and tranquility. At the behest of our Prime Minister, Mr. Romesh Bhandari, our Foreign Secretary, visited Pakistan, Afghanistan, N^opal and Bangladesh to improve the relations and mutual understanding, draft of the friendship treaty proposed by India and the no-war pact proposed by Pakistan remain petrified, the efforts made by our Government to improve our relations are in the right direction. Our role as the chairperson of non-aligned countries is much warranted to promote peace, mutual understanding and cooperation. The Delhi declaration of the six-nation summit on 28 January 1985 under the chairmanship of our Prime Minister to control the arms race in the outer space and to halt the production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their distribution has received extensive and substantial international response and enhanced the prestige of our nation.

To end the war between Iran and Iraq and to liberate Palestine from the occupation of Israel and to establish peace in West Asia, the steps pursued by our Prime Minister are welcomed by all. Our diplomatic policy towards South Africa against its apartheid is the traditional way of registering our protest against colonialism and imperialism. The extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-aligned Countries on Namibia in Delhi and its call to all the members of the NAM, no doubt, have enhanced our image. When our Prime Minister announced the decision of recognition of the SWAPO under the presidentship of Mr. Sam Nujoma, it was received with a thunderous applause and cheers, not only in the hall where the meeting was going on, but also in the entire nation. We are proud to say that India is the first country which recognised the SWAPO which is fighting for the freedom of Namibia, against the domination of Pretoria. When the

President of the SWAPO, Mr Sam Nujoma, met our Prime Minister to thank him, our Prime Minister assured further that many other things would follow. The non-aligned countries have favoured the severance of diplomatic relations with South Africa and the intensification of arms assistance to the SWAPO and, because of our efforts, the non-aligned countries have favoured the launching of a massive diplomatic offensive to isolate South Africa in the comity of nations. Madam, on behalf of the All-India Anna DMK, I welcome all these measures which are quite essential to free the underdeveloped countries from the domination of the superpowers. While I welcome most of the programmes of the External Affairs Ministry, I am here to record that the anxiety that you have shown towards the problem of the PLO, Namibia, and Bangladesh and also the earnest steps you have taken for the same are totally absent when you are dealing with the problem of Sri Lankan Tamils.

The problem in Sri Lanka is flaming and is explosive since July 1983. Killing, massacre, shooting, torture, and rape are going on every day. No day is left without tears and blood and no day passes without the roaring noise of the guns. No dawn sets in with light and no dusk sets in with peace. Everyday they are in the throes of torture and death. While forty lakhs of Tamil people there are crying with their blood and tears, we five crores of Tamils, just at a distance of about twenty miles, stand with folded hands like slaves and cowards. Madam, our leader, Dr. Anna, to explain the sorrowful position of the Tamils abroad, once described it wisely and asked why the sea water is salty. He said it is salty because our Tamil people abroad had wept and shed their tears which flowed into and merged with the waters of the sea and that was why the sea water is salty? Had he been alive today, he would have asked why the sea water is blue to look at. And, Madam, he would have said that since the spoiled blood looks blue and since the Tamils abroad have shed their blood their spoiled blood has gone into the waters of the sea and that is why the sea water looks blue? The history of our freedom movement is full of service and

[Shri P. N. Sukul]

Sacrifice and there is no difference of opinion on that. But, if you compare the loss of life and property here with that in the Sri Lankan movement, you will see that the Tamils in Sri Lanka have sacrificed much more and that is something unprecedented. We have faced only one Jallianwalabagh here. But our people in Sri Lanka are facing Jallianwalabagh every week. Nearly seven thousand people have been killed so far and two lakhs of families have been uprooted and they have been stripped of their livelihood from all sources. Properties worth about ten thousand crores of rupees or so have been destroyed and devastated by the Sri Lankan army. Nearly ninety thousand people have come to our State as refugees. Now, Madam, the question is what we have done to these people and whether we have taken adequate measures. No doubt, our Government has taken certain measures. It has made some budgetary provisions to redress the grievances of the Sri Lanka Tamils. It has ordered coastal patrolling and impounding of Sri Lanka boats and it has also refused to have a joint patrolling in the sea there. It has also appointed a Committee consisting of six members to deal with the Sri Lankan problem. Our hon. Chief Minister, Dr. MGR, thanked our Prime Minister and his Government for these measures. But the pertinent question is whether the measures taken so far are adequate to prevent the atrocities of the Sri Lankan army or at least these were helpful to reduce the atrocities of the Sri Lanka army, whether we have risen to the occasion promptly. Sir, the answer to this question is always 'no-no', because we have not taken adequate steps, we have not risen to the occasion. We have not yet touched the fringe of the problem. We are just witnessing as a third person to the occurrence. Your sympathy for the Tamils is not doubted but Tamils is no doubted but your sincerely is still under the fire of scrutiny.

You have already recognized PLO and Yussaf Arafat is received in India with due respect. But the same Arafat has not been allowed in some of the Middle East countries. You know well that when he began to speak in the meeting of non-

aligned countries, some of the representatives of the Middle East walked out of the summit. You are aware of the news. So this is the position that in spite of this weak position we are extending our support to Arafat.

Similarly, Sir, now we have recognised SWAPO under the Presidentship of Sam Nujoma. We are not against it. But do you know that the declared policy of SWAPO is not only to protect the rights of their people but also to wipe out the white race from their soil. They are against the formation of racial society. What is the alarming news, which has been published in the Statesman, is that Namibia is the only country in the world which is celebrating the birth and death anniversaries of Hitler. We have recognised SWAPO and we have given a status to its leader, but at the same time we hesitate, we are reluctant, we are indifferent to pass a Resolution in this House condemning the atrocities of the Sri Lanka army. (*Tim* bell rings*). We are taking some measures like giving food, cloth and shelter to the affected people who have come to our country. But, Sir, at the same time the Sri Lanka Government is taking steps to improve its military. You know very well that apart from increased budget allocation and military assistance from Mossad, now they are making other arrangements. They have active support from Jordan. They have requested the Prime Minister of Britain, Mrs. Thatcher, to give aid to their country. When she visited that country, Jayawardane in his augural address requested Mrs. Thatcher to give military aid. Sir, Jayawardane said: "You have sent troops to such and such countries to protect democracy. Now in our country too democracy is being destroyed. You say that in future too you will meet your responsibility in the defence of democracy." These are the words of Jayawardane. So he has indirectly asked Britain for military help. At the same time he has reminded of the defence agreement of November 11, 1947. These are the steps taken by Sri Lanka Government against our Tamil people. Further, even though the British Government has not given any military assistance, it is a fact that some of the British commandos are giving train-

ing to the army of Sri Lanka. The House is aware of that. Sir, to put an end to the atrocities of Sri Lanka army and to stop the exodus of refugees from Sri Lanka to India and to protect the interests of the Tamil people, their only method is to send the army. Military intervention is

quite essential. Any method other than military interven-

tion will be futile and will in no way be helpful. In fact, it will only pave the way for prolonging the miseries of the Tamil people. Sri Lanka Army is increasing its military measures, ignoring our dissent and displeasure expressed on various occasions only because they have a strong confidence in their mind that whatever may happen to the Tamil people, the Government of India will not use force against Sri Lanka. That is their confidence. That is why they are increasing their military preparedness. One historian from Sri Lanka remarked on one occasion that whenever there is a fight between the Tamil people and Sri Lanka, South India always supports the Tamil people and the North India does not. Kindly disprove this belief at least on this occasion in this historic moment and show that history does not repeat itself. With these words, I conclude.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, Vice-Chairman, the year 1985 has a special significance so far as our foreign policy is concerned. It is the 40th anniversary of the United Nations which has served humanity and which is still serving humanity. Some powers have challenged not only the tenets and the philosophy, but the very existence and the credibility of the United Nations. India, as the Chairperson of NAM is seeing to it that this anniversary is celebrated in a manner which it rightly deserves and the preparations are already afoot.

Madam, 1985 also stands out as the year of centenary celebrations of our Indian National Congress. The policy pursued by the Congress Government, the policy pursued in our foreign relations, is more or less an extension of the peaceful tenets laid down during our freedom struggles which were enshrined in Panchsheel, which Gandhiji had always propagated, which Jawaharlal Nehru had initiated and

which Indiraji, through her martyrdom and through her blood and through her sacrifice, left to history and which is continued today by a young and dynamic Prime Minister.

Madam, this is the policy of non-alignment, of peace not passive peace but peace which is fortified with self-preparedness; peace which does not bow to anything, but peace which stands for certain principles and objectives. The objective is very clear and categorical here and it is a better future and a better tomorrow for us now and for our children tomorrow. Is it possible to have that peace now with the pendulum of a nuclear war hanging over us? Is it the question: Who will be the victor and who will be the vanquished? Will there not be total annihilation when the war rages around us and when the people realise the devastation it is bound to create? There will be no spectators to watch and still this war enlarges its sphere, its range and its ferocity.

It is now proposed to convert it into a star war. India, throughout its history since Independence, has been pursuing a policy of peace. We find that our Prime Minister in his very initial speech had said that we have to have peace inside the country, peace around the area, peace in the world and also peace in the outer space which is not free from war danger. An attempt has been made recently in this direction of creating better relations with the neighbouring countries. I am glad that our Foreign Minister is present here. Immediately he rushed to remove the tension between Iraq and Iran. These are not easily soluble matters. They take time. They take persistence. Above all, they need a sense of purpose. India has not been lacking either in its resolution or the will or the desire or the determination to go ahead with this effort for peace. We find that our attempt has been to create a deeper understanding, a closer understanding, an understanding which penetrates sometimes deeper than the Government treaties and pacts. We find that our country is encircled from all sides. As many hon. Members have spoken before, Pakistan gets funds. It gets arms and ammunition. It sets military intelligence. It is offering military bases. It is even

[Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi]

making the atom bomb. And above all, it is getting the carriers which will carry these nuclear weapons. So, it is getting armaments more than it has ever acquired in the name of helping the Afghan people. But it goes through Pakistan. How much is sent there? How much is kept there. And history has shown to us that all this is used against us on every occasion. America is aware of it. And still it persists and ignores our plea, and ignores the people's opinion here. On the other side we find that Trincomalee probably has been taken over or has been handed over as a base to America for the Voice of America. We also share reports that in Bangladesh, Chittagong has also been taken or is being offered as a military base to the US. And what is happening about Diego Garcia? In spite of all our endeavours and the endeavours of the other countries, we find that the Indian ocean is not being allowed to be kept as a zone of peace. In fact, Diego Garcia is being used for taking up the militarisation programmes of America for the outer space. I think, all these things are inimical signs. And that is why the Government of India's first step was to send our people, our Foreign Secretary and our Foreign Minister with direct instructions and a letter of our Prime Minister to create more cordial relations with all these neighbouring countries. And the initial reaction was good. But these have to be pursued. And our Prime Minister "has already had an occasion of meeting President Zia twice, both in Moscow and here in Delhi.

My memory goes back to 22nd May, 1984 when a Joint appeal was issued by Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Heads of five other nations for peace, for disarmament and to see that the United Nations was strengthened and a substantial sum out of the money spent on the arms race was diverted and transferred for a better living, for a better development and for better living conditions. Whether it is the banning of testing or production and deployment of arms, we find that all these things were there.

The first step that we found here as a follow-up action was a Six-nation Summit

at New Delhi over which our Prime Minister presided. And they not only reiterated the Joint Appeal but they went two steps further, and these are outstanding in nature. After reiterating this they said that there should be a complete ban on expansion of these nuclear arms to outer space and at the same time the testing of these nuclear arms should also be stopped. This is a very historic step, trying to halt the testing of nuclear arms. The stand that checks should be kept on the expansion of these weapons into the outer space was very widely acclaimed. But at the same time there were some other powers which naturally had their reservations. In spite of all these efforts, Madam, we find that the war goes on, the stock-piling and production and deployment of arms goes on, the tension goes on. And it is our earnest endeavour that this tension must be reduced. It is only by reducing the tension, it is only by reiterating our stand on every occasion that we can strengthen the hands of valiant fighters because our policy has been to strengthen the hands of peace and to strengthen the hands of those who are Prhrting for their freedom, and those people in Namibia, as we saw in the meeting last time, and those people who are fighting there for their homeland. These are very clear-cut policies and these policies have been clearly demarcated. And I share the anguish of the previous speaker who was speaking about Sri Lanka. Our hearts are with them. And we find that the Government has taken whatever steps that have been possible and it continues to take those steps. We cannot neglect any; we cannot ignore any, especially those who are our neighbours, and those who belong to our own country. Our sympathies are with them. But at the same time a very sane and a very reasonable attitude has to be taken by us.

Without taking much time of the House, I would like to say that at a time when there is not much of a concessional finance coming to us, at a time when the economic order is not of the type that it should be, at a time we find that we cannot expect much of foreign aid—India has even more to be more or less stand on its own feet. The country and **the**

people, the farmers and workers of the country, have already proved their achievement to the world. Today we have been in a position to rush one lakh tonnes of wheat—though it is not very much—to our friends in Africa. Could this be possible some 20 years earlier? It has only been due to the continuity of our policy. This has been due to the developmental and progress of our policies and due to the hard work of the farmers and others.

But, Madam, my mind naturally goes back to some incidents. Are these more coincidences that the studies were carried out by Prof. Harvard of Texas along with Mr. Griffia, who was declared a *persona non-grata* in India? Is it only a coincidence that this meeting of 25 MPs took place in London initiated by Sultan Mohammad a person who has been supported by General Zia of Pakistan, who has been given full assistance by the Pakistan Embassy there? Is it only a mere coincidence that the Russian diplomat met with his death here and a person defected from here? Are all these only coincidences? If all these are added up, a total picture emerges clearly that there are powers not only around us but more so inside our country who are determined to see that we are destabilised. They made the most dastardly attack on us by eliminating the Lady who commanded affection, dignity and honour of our country, who fought valiantly for peace and for the good cause of the people all around the world. But the people of India, the character of India have shown that it has the strength, that it has the resilience that while the hearts of the people of India were bleeding in sorrow, they showed that they can control themselves when the occasion come, (*time bell rings*).

With these words, Madam, I would say that the Foreign policy, the External Affairs policy, which has been in continuity for the last so many decades, has earned the reputation of great credit and credibility not only in the country itself, but in the entire world. This is like a beacon which shines throughout the world and which will give succour to those who need it, and wisdom and conscience to those who still believe in peace and to

those who are striving for peace and have faith that there will be a better tomorrow.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Madam Vice-Chairman, as we are aware, a country's foreign policy is not created in a vacuum and is not created at a single point of time. It is evolved as the country is evolved and a country's foreign policy broadly reflects the history, the tradition, the culture, the outlook, the urges, the aspirations, the compulsions and, more than all, the geopolitical situation of that country. The history's contribution so far as we are concerned is that it has created two most populous countries in the world and placed them almost in the neighbourhood; China on the one side, and India on the other. This is the geopolitical situation. India is only second to China so far as population is concerned. For the last many centuries, there was not even a single conflict between China and anybody till 1962. China was looking after its own affairs, tackled its own problems internal and external; India also had its own problems. There was no conflict or war between China and India for centuries but it happened in 1962.

The most important economic and political centres in India are located in the north. I am talking of geo-physical situation. Whereas in the case of China, the political centre of gravity and the economic centre of gravity lies to the East near the Pacific sea-bed. In other words, it means India is far more vulnerable than China if there is mutual hostility between China and India. This factor has got to be taken into consideration.

If you look at our foreign policy in retrospect briefly, we committed two blunders in the past: one, in recognizing Tibet as part of China, and second, in accepting the subordination of Afghanistan to the domination of a Super Power. During the heydays of British imperialism both these areas were advisedly kept by the British as buffer zones. They were the thresholds which would protect the vital interests of India. So, we made two blunders while signing a treaty with China in 1954 when India did not demand the demarcation of the boundary between

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy] China and India; and on the other hand it conceded totally that Tibet is the legitimate part of China which was not so, historically. China had only nominal suzerainty, according to historical records. Any country in the world can have nominal control; on that account its overlordship or supremacy cannot be justified. Tibet was, for all practical purposes, independent. So it became a part of China. We conceded it. And then recently, Afghanistan became a part of Sovietisation. When these two bulwarks have been removed, I think, Indian sub-continent, that is South Asia has been exposed. We never took into consideration our vital interests; we never pondered over our security problems; we never considered the implications of Chinese domination over Tibet and Russian domination over Afghanistan.

For the last 37 years—I am not going into other details which is a past history—Indian foreign policy has been described more or less in negative terms. We defined that policy anti-this and anti-that. It is non-alignment, it is anti-imperialist; it is anti-colonial, anti-racialist; it emphasises non-use of force in other countries, nonintervention etc. people may say there are certain positive characteristics in this negative description. I may concede; but we cannot overlook the fact that for the last 37 years we have been describing the policy more in negative terms and we have been doing it not foolishly; we have been doing it indeed deliberately; and perhaps we have been forced to do it. Why? A foreign policy to be strident, to have a thrust, to be effective, it should have some content. Mere oral exhortations, oral pronouncements, and passing of resolutions do not make foreign policy. Foreign policy, to be effective, has got to be backed by internal strength. It should have economic content. It should have technological content. Foreign policy has to be backed by domestic policy, and domestic development. Defence and development together will give the necessary thrust, necessary orientation, to our foreign policy. Therefore, these things were absent for the last 37 years. The question now is, whether we should continue with this kind of thing even in the future. We

glorify ourselves that we are the founders of non-alignment. We undoubtedly subscribe to non-alignment. There is no difference in this House on this matter. But have we made non-alignment effective, uniformly effective, applicable to all situations? No. the two-thirds of the member countries in the U.N. constitute the non-aligned group. The family of non-aligned powers has increased tremendously. But I am afraid, in spite of this tremendous development in non-alignment, our voice in the United Nations, in the international agencies and in the international institutions, is not commensurate with the membership. (Time-bell rings) Madam, I have just commenced. You have to bear with me for some time.

Madam, India has the third largest army in the world today, standing army. It has got the 5th largest airforce and the 7th largest navy in the world. In spite of this, we are weak. We have not been able to consolidate our position all these years.

Take our own sub-continent, South Asia. I will deal with a few things. I do not want to take many other things because of lack of time. Take South Asia itself. If you want to have cordial relationship, with the seven countries, of South Asia, the most important thing is, there should be mutual trust and understanding. There should be goodwill. We have not been able to achieve this. We have problems with Pakistan. Pakistan has completely aligned itself with the U.S.A. Further, to add to our difficulties, sophisticated weapons are being imported into Pakistan, from the U.S.A. There is a danger of nuclearisation of South Asia. I think, we should be careful to avoid this nuclearisation of our sub-continent as far as possible, as long as possible. We have to settle our problem; with Pakistan. We have to settle our problems with Bangladesh. We have to settle our problems with Sri Lanka. These are the three areas, where we are having differences.

In the case of Sri Lanka, much has been said. I do not subscribe to the theory that there should be military intervention in Sri Lanka. I hope, my friends will appreciate it. But I am not satisfied also with the stand taken by the Government of India. We have been trying our best

to impress upon the Government there to treat Tamilians as the equal citizens of Sri Lanka. On the contrary, Tamilians have been pushed to the sea, they are being treated as second class citizens. The genocide is going on there on a large scale, but we have not effectively raised the issue of Sri Lanka at regional and international forums. Recently, we had a summit here in Delhi. We discussed Namibia. Rightly so. We are happy about it. But why did they not discuss the problem of Tamilians in Sri Lanka? Why? Why not? It is equally a burning problem. It could have been taken up at regional levels. International institutions have not been approached in this matter either.

I think we should create an international public opinion against the Government of Sri Lanka for what it is doing against Tamilians there. So far we have failed to do this. I again say that the Government of India should adopt more positive approach to the solution of the problems of Tamilians in Sri Lanka. Otherwise, I am afraid there may be other pressures. There have been suggestions made in some quarters that there has got to be humanitarian intervention in Sri Lanka, meaning thereby that we should mobilise forces all over, militarily, or if it is not possible we should apply sanctions. We may apply diplomatic sanctions, withdraw our High Commissioner or there may be other methods also. I do not even subscribe to that theory. What I want is a strong projection of our approach and Sri Lanka should be told that this cannot go on. We should make their position impossible in the Councils of the world. International public opinion has got to be mobilised. Steps have got to be taken in the same manner as you have done in the case of Namibia.

Now, take the case of Indian Ocean. Super power rivalry has been at its height. Both powers have developed their forces in Indian Ocean and the littoral nations have been divided, they are not united to face this problem. And no attempt has been made to take up the issues once again in the United Nations. We have been saying, and repeating it has got to be declared as a zone of peace. When Pakistan brought cleverly a resolution in the United Nations

recently that South Asia should be declared as a zone of peace, we voted against it. Why? I cannot understand it. It was of course a clever move on the part of Pakistan, but we voted against the resolution. Only Bhutan supported us. No other government representative supported our stand. We were isolated. We call ourselves to be the vanguard of non-aligned movement and no non-aligned power stood by us. You could have accepted the Pakistan's clever move, strategic move, and said, yes, we are prepared to accept your move. I do not know why you have failed to do this. We say that we should bridge, our understanding with our neighbours. I would like to say one thing. Our foreign Policy has got to bring into focus . . . Madam, please don't ring the bell for a while.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu);
The Minister, it seems, is pressurising ...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
(SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN); No, no.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : So far as South is concerned, the foreign policy lacks perception. It has got to bring into focus Asia and Asian consciousness. In this, I say there has got to be extended regional cooperation—I mean Asian, South-East Asian countries on one side and on the other, Gulf countries—the Gulf countries Council and SEARC. AH these organisations have got to get together on a common platform. India has got to play a role of a philosopher and guide of all these powers—SEARC, ASEAN and Gulf countries. It would not be difficult to do that. India has not done this so far. Unless we bring into focus, again I say, Asia and Asian consciousness, I am afraid we will be isolated. Asia will become the theatre of the conflict. Middle-East has already become a dumping ground of arms from super powers, super power rivalry may come more and more to our doors.

May I therefore appeal to my friend the Minister to enlarge our perception so that we can have an extended regional cooperation including all these powers?

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy] Lastly, I would say that we should reorganise our External Affairs Ministry completely. It is ineffective. I fail to understand why there should be a Policy Advisory Committee at all. It is a fifth wheel in the coach. There is the Prime Minister, there is the Minister, there are Secretaries. Why should there be a separate body—an Advisory Committee—over which some person presides and he is equated with the Minister of the Cabinet? I think this complicates the matter. This should be done away with.

Secondly, I say there should be a full-fledged Foreign Minister. I do not want my country to be represented in the Soviet Union or anywhere by the Home Minister. The Home Minister went to Russia to preside over the joint Commission between India and Russia. The Foreign Minister did not go there; the Home Minister goes there. Why is this being done? It is not the responsibility or work of the Home Minister.

Therefore, Madam, I say—because of lack of time and bowing to your pleasure—that the Minister should take immediate steps to reorganise his set up in the External Affairs Ministry.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): May I inform you that we are just coming out of the Business Advisory Committee meeting? It has been decided to extend the time for the discussion on the External Affairs Ministry, seeing how such an important debate is lapsing because of shortage of time allowed to the participants, to tomorrow. It will continue tomorrow and the reply will come tomorrow in the evening.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: But why did you not come to my rescue when I was speaking?

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: So that it may not be misinterpreted.

SHRI BIJOY KRISHNA HANDIQUE (Assam): Madam Vice-Chairman ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: I request the Member to take only ten minutes.

SHRI BIJOY KRISHNA HANDIQUE : Madam, you did not ration the time in the beginning. You do it now. Anyway I shall try.

Our late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi declared before the Second Summit of the Commonwealth countries of Asia and the Pacific that the '80s have begun ominously with the collision of interests between powerful nations, imperilling the stability and peaceful development of the countries in India's vicinity. Madam, these ominous beginnings have manifested themselves not only nearer home—i.e. in immediate neighbourhood—but in the world at large. Never in history since the second World War has the world been gripped by so much of uncertainty, defiance of international ethics and rivalry and hostility exploding into open war. As an answer to this situation, let us recall that in the political declaration the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries re-emphasized the struggle for peace and development. Our present Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, immediately on assuming office, called for "repedication to the twin causes of peace and development." If you look back, this is reaffirmation or extension of the basic tenets of Nehru's foreign policy which consist of non-alignment, positive action for peace and building bridges of cooperation specially among the Asian nations. This is more relevant for India today. For in the rapidly changing world scene it is necessary to give it an added assertion or a new dimension which should cover such aspects as enhanced emphasis on development of science and technology in third world countries and patiently persuading the developed nations to desist from practising technological imperialism and help actively in reducing the commercial and economic gap between the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the one hand and the developed countries on the other. Thus, Madam, it is evident that from the very outset India's foreign policy is in the right direction. However, apart from the policy, we have to see whether there are lacunae or weak points, or, to use a better expression, whether there is more room for improvement while implementing our foreign policy, particularly, since the discussion is

on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs and not a general discussion on the Indian foreign policy. I want to refer to certain points which I personally feel have room for improvement.

The first point I want to refer to is external publicity. I have gone through Chapter XI of the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs under the heading "External Publicity." Referring to the Punjab situation, the report says:—

"Events in Punjab posed a particular challenge for our External Publicity effort, particularly in countries with large ethnic population originating from the State."

It also outlines the step the Ministry has taken to disseminate the correct facts to the media and the Indian community by way of daily transmission to Missions abroad, video and audio tapes made available to Indian associations, ethnic radio and TV stations and screening in the embassy premises and distribution of printed materials. So far so good. But the question arises, "Is that all?" Is it not a fact that in spite of all this publicity, the impact is not up to the mark and misconceptions persist not only among the nationals of the foreign countries but among the Indian nationals too? So, what I want to point out is that it is just a conventional, stereotyped publicity done in a perfunctory way and that is why it has failed to produce the desired effect. In such a situation, the only effective measure is to involve the people. Meaningful and purposeful publicity is not just a media advertisement, however, cleverly or imaginatively designed it may be, or screening of films, however, largely attended they may be. For involvement, Madam, people to people diplomacy is the only answer. In this connection I want to mention interesting, nay, amusing episodes which have already engaged the attention of Parliament and there was a debate in the other House and there was the Minister's statement there too. One is the formation of the panel of some British MPs, highlighting the so-called Kashmir issue internationally. It appears that they had involved the local people hailing not only from Pakistan but from the occupied Kashmir, and even the President of the

Azad Kashmir Muslim Conference specially travelled all the way from occupied Kashmir to London to attend the launching ceremony.

Thus involvement of the people concerned helped the organisers to highlight the issue in a bid to unsettle a settled issue in an effective manner. I do agree that the Indian High Commission had tried to bring home to the British MPs the facts on the Kashmir issue, that the State had legally acceded to India in 1947 and that it had elected successive Governments in the State freely by democratic elections, whereas in the Pakistan occupied Kashmir the people have been deprived of their freedom. What I mean to say is that it would have been more effective had the Indian High Commission seen to it that the people, British as well as Indian who are in the U.K. were involved in the exposure or clarification. The British people also realise, Madam, at least those MPs realise, the implications of the adage, "those who live in glass house must not throw stones at other." What about the Irish issue? I need to elaborate. The other episode is, the American Senators holding brief on the Punjab situation, raising the question of human rights, while their own society is marked by the racial segregation which makes a mockery of their democratic traditions and values. Therefore, I feel, Madam, there is much room for increasing the range and functional efficiency of the External Publicity Division. Our diplomats too must adapt themselves to the present day conditions. They can no longer behave like touch-me-not ladies. They must recognise and utilise the rising political consciousness of our people who are at the centre of things. This is a new concept of diplomacy which is required at the present juncture.

Madam, next, ... (*Time bell rings*)
Have ten minutes been completed?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SAROINI MAHISHI]: You have taken ten minutes.

SHRI BUOY KRISHNA HANDIQUÉ :
May I take some more?

Next to people-to-people diplomacy, I refer to cultural aspects of modern Indian

[Shri Bijoy Krishna Handique] diplomacy. Here too the objective is to foster people-to-people contact and nongovernmental interaction between societies of ours as well as the foreign countries. As a matter of fact, Madam, cultural exchange programmes cover a wide range of artistic, academic, scientific and technological activities in foreign countries. The main purpose of all these arrangements is to reach out to the maximum number of people in any society, especially amongst the decision-making elite to influence them in favour of the country engaged in cultural diplomacy.

Madam, considered from this point of view, the record of the Indian Council of Cultural Relations, as recorded in the Annual Report, is quite impressive even though the total resources allocated by India for these external cultural activities is meagre, I don't think it will exceed Rs. 4 crores. In order to improve the efficacy of India's foreign cultural policy, it needs the creation of trained manpower, allocation of increased resources and equipment and a more precise framework of programming of selectively worked out priorities.

And finally, Madam, a basic point has to be considered, namely, the fundamental institutional arrangement to be made for conducting India's external cultural relations.

Madam, in 1964, the Bhave Committee recommended that the Ministry of External Affairs should have a Cultural Cell or a Cultural Division to oversee the conduct of India's external cultural relations.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SAROINI MAHISHI]: Will you please conclude?

SHRI BUOY KRISHNA HANDIQUE: Iust in a few minutes I will finish. Pillai Committee Report in 1966 endorsed that recommendation.

Again in 1977 the recommendations of the Asoka Mehta Committee ran along these lines. I request the hon. Minister that he should reconsider the recommendations so that these may be implemented.

The next point that I want to reter is that the Government must go all out for a *detente*. Since peace and development are the main thrusts of our foreign policy, *de'tente* is the only course to approach the belligerents or those locked in conflicts, ideological or political. Not that our Government has not projected *de'tente* as the only way to find a settlement.

Particularly as the Chairman of the NAM our Prime Minister had sent ernis-saries to Iran and Iraq to end that unfortunate war. And our Honourable Minister of State for External Affairs was an emissary. It is not, however, important whether or not we have succeeded in our mission, but our faith in the *de'tente* has the most intrinsic values and tremendous moral force and great meanings for the mankind. What I mean is that the remaining years of the decade which the late Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi called ominous, be marked by a vigorous pursuing of a meaningful *de'tente* to restore the voices of reason and sanity. (*Time bell rings*) I will conclude, Madam, in a few minutes. While pursuing *de'tente* India must take the initiative, and not just participate in the conferences, to demilitarise the Indian Ocean.

The Indian Ocean which has been referred to by a number of spakers already, has increasingly become an area of super power rivalry and a combative assertive-ness. No nuclear power can today have its first and second strike capabilities both located on its own soil. Since long range missiles placed in hot Silos are more vulnerable than those installed in the nuclear * submarines prowling under the sea, the nuclear deterranls are increasingly being shifted from land to sea. It would, therefore, be difficult to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Indian ocean unless the countries of Asia are able to establish an identity of interests, concert their action and evolve a common approach towards the political and economic problems.

It is of paramount importance for India to take the leadership and as a first step to organise and call a conference of the littoral States to build a massive opinion against the militarisation of the Indian Ocean and

for full exploitation of the sea bed resources.

Before, I conclude, I congratulate the Government, particularly, our Prime Minister for the decision to accord diplomatic status to the SWAPO (South West African Peoples' Organisation). This is not only an indication of the great importance India attaches to relations with the African countries but in consonance with our tradition and heritage of fighting colonialism, imperialism and apartheid. With these words, I conclude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHffIU-MATT) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Madam, Vice-Chairman, I would start by voicing a primary difficulty about debating the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs. Constitutionally the Parliament has only limited powers, as far as the discussion on foreign policy, is concerned. We are not empowered to ratify treaties or even to appoint Ambassadors. And whatever limited functions that we perform are being used or misused during question hour of an occasion like this. Whereas I am constrained with that difficulty. I am also simultaneously aware of the importance of such debates as and when they arise. This is not a criticism of the present Government. This is a difficulty which goes well beyond the present Government—indeed it dates back to the first Government of independent India and the initial years of our independence. That really set the tone on how the Parliament was insulated from influence in foreign policy.

I would like, therefore, to make my first submission that the growth of an independent and articulate public opinion on foreign policy and the resultant rationality in the making of it cannot be expected in our country. More particularly because in pre-independence India there was not a tradition of it. So long as the Government is unduly restrictive, almost authoritarian, if you permit me to say so, in its approach to the wide and fundamental question of the right to information we will not have meaningful debates. We approach these

debates, Madam, not knowing what has happened, how the Government is conducting its policy and we have to base our comments either on the Ministry's Report or on our own endeavours and efforts. When I examine my personal differences, and the differences of the political party that I have the privilege to represent, on the conduct, on the content and on the tone of India's foreign policy, indeed the differences between us and the ruling party, I come to the conclusion that they are essentially not one of interpretation of phenomena, whose reality perhaps we are all in agreement about, but rather over the very nature and significance of the observable phenomenon itself. In other words, it is not a question of my differing with the Government on what we see as issues in foreign policy, but rather, and more fundamentally, it is about what they actually see, in the first place. Why is this so, Madam? It is because, firstly, the ruling party is as ignorant as we are: it is as ill-informed about the substance as we are; it comes to these debates with as little equipment as we do because all the equipment is with the Government. And yet the ruling party finds no other way to approach those debates but to applaud everything that they see and support everything that they are asked to. They do not have any additional equipment with them. They do not have any additional information with them. I can elaborate this point a bit further, but time constrains me. I talked about this fundamental difference of what they actually see and what we actually see because the ruling party Members, as I have observed earlier, in all their participations, in all the interventions that have been made by them, not in this particular year's debate, but even in earlier years also, tend to reduce the whole assessment of India's "success" or lack of success in foreign policy not against the objective criteria of fulfilment of national interests but against the somewhat amorphous but perhaps more identifiable quantity of individuals. It was Panditji's policy; therefore, it was so good. It was late Mrs. Gandhi's policy; therefore, it is so good. And, of course, now the same eulogies are sickeningly transferred to the new Prime Minister. Because he is following the same policies, therefore, the policies are good. As far as assessment of national policies is concerned, one should

[Shri Jaswant Singh] see whether they fulfil the function of national interests. And that is the second difficulty that arises. India's foreign policy gets identified as an individual's success or failure.

Madam, a brief word about non-alignment and only because the leading interventionist from *the* Treasury Benches spoke about that. I would not have otherwise spoken about it, but because he chose to almost metaphysically go into the question of non-alignment, I was persuaded to then reflect and now repeat that quite often non-alignment is put across to us didactically from the Treasury Benches as if it were an imperative, as a value in itself and that it ought not to be judged against the rather mundane criteria of success or failure. I might even go along with that to an extent. Indeed after 1962 non-alignment ought not perhaps to be judged against the criteria of success as such. Here the first difficulty that arises is again about what they are actually seeing and what we are seeing. It is not as if in Indian democratic polity, foreign policy is being formulated by a process of pluralistic bargaining and interest reconciliation. It is ridiculous, therefore, of the Government as it has done in this report—I do not have time to go into all these aspects of the report—or of the Treasury Benches to define non-alignment as a value and yet go on in terms of individual subscription to it, (*Time-hell rings*) To dispose it of very quickly, the question of pragmatism—because that is what we will come to—when too much emphasis is placed by rendering a value aspect to non-alignment, then the word pragmatic is brought to us and it is said, no, it is a pragmatic policy. May I remind both the Government and the Treasury Benches that pragmatism in its generally accepted form would be more concerned with method and somewhat less with judgment. It would seek to reduce judgment to methodology and values somewhat to mere knowledge. When it does so, then pragmatism would have a tendency to become ad hoc and when it becomes ad hoc, we would again get trapped into the pitfall of individual policies. What are we actually looking for? When I chose to intervene in this debate and discuss the

report of the Ministry of External Affairs, what criteria did I apply? I don't say they are all the criteria. There could be more. You could lessen them. To my mind there would be four criteria that one would apply. Firstly rationality. In our country's foreign policy are we being rational, in the face of unrealistic expectations of the international system and as to our position in that system, more particularly because of our somewhat exaggerated notions of where we stand and where non-alignment makes us stand in the comity of nations, how do we contend with that, how do we overcome that and how do we impart rationality into the conduct, into the content and into the tone of our foreign policy? Secondly, focus. Have we chosen efficient means to define our national goals and have our realisable national interests been attained? Thirdly, institutionalisation. Because of the inherent weakness in personal or individual dominance, have we created institutions and processes for organised, systematic, policy making and implementation. And finally, evolution of consensus. Has there been a debate and a discussion on the fundamentals of a policy and is there a creative societal consensus on national interests? Let me talk about consensus a bit more. Why do I think consensus on foreign policy so important? For two reasons: Firstly, because unlike some other countries the Indian nation the Indian state, does not represent social cohesion. Our image and our reality is different. We do put across both internally and externally an image of discord and dissatisfaction. Secondly, this Government is a government on probation. It is being watched internally by my countrymen and it is being watched externally, not just through the embassies and the legations and the high commissions here, but it is being watched in its performance and how it tackles the internal conveys a message of its credibility as far as the external is concerned....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: May I request the honourable Member to conclude now?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am deeply appreciative of the constraints under which you are working. I want you only to be

marginally appreciative of the constraints under which I am working...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I understand the Business Advisory Committee has decided to extend the time of the discussion till after the Question Hour tomorrow morning...

THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: Even then the number of speakers is large.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, as a matter of fact, some of us have to attend Consultative Committee meeting now...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI] : The House will rise at 6 o'clock.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam Vice-Chairman, I was talking of consensus and let me apply these criteria which, I repeat again, are not exhaustive; you could expand them, you could reduce them. The

5 P.M. primary thing is the national security environment and my very first difficulty arises there. I not only went through the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs, but I also went through the Report of the Ministry of Defence to reap some benefit out of this debate. I went through what the Report of the Ministry of Defence to learn about what is happening around us. The Ministry of Defence Report opens with the security environment assessment as it necessarily ought to. It not only opens with the security environment assessment but it also. I am given to understand, in fact, highlights the threat that we face on account of Pakistan's nuclearisation and it highlights it as the primary security problem that we are facing. But the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs is totally silent on nuclearisation or the potential of nuclearisation of Pakistan. Now, you can interpret this in various ways. But I interpret it this way—because my thinking is perhaps limited and my understanding is not as deep as perhaps the Government's is—that there is disorder and there is absence of harmony between the defence policy and the foreign policy of our country. Defence and diplomacy are, after all, parts of the **same** coin. If the Defence Ministry

highlights Pakistan's nuclear threat And the External Affairs Ministry is totally silent about it, I cannot take that lightly. This shows a huge rift, not just a schism. It shows a fracture in the co-ordination of the integral arms of the very same Government.

Then I come to the second aspect. When you study these Reports, both these Reports, jointly and the' various and the varying emphasis on the question of Afghanistan, you will find that the Ministry of External Affairs is almost totally silent on Afghanistan as if Afghanistan as a problem on this subcontinent has ceased to be five years after it came to be, while the Ministry of Defence Report refers to it somewhat differently, and I find that the nuclear question and the problem of Afghanistan as having an impact on India's security environment are the most unsatisfactory aspects of this year's Report of the Ministry of External Affairs. We have, Madam, briefly to consider Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. We have, in the BJP, indeed, at the cost of earning the ire of some of our senior leaders, been advocating that the only sensible policy that India can adopt in the context of the millions in the South-Asian subcontinent is a policy which works purposefully towards reconciliation of the peoples of these lands. When we talked about it a few years ago, when Pakistan came up with a 'No war' pact, we talked of advocating and supporting the movement towards that 'No war' pact and the Government thought it fit to criticise us. But now the Government itself is taking or has taken the initiative and wants to move towards a purposeful coming together of the nations of South Asia. We welcome it. But we would like to caution it. We welcome it because we have been consistently advocating this policy as the only same thing that we can have in this subcontinent. But we would like to caution it. The Government has gone about suggesting, merely because their emissaries are travelling — against these emissaries and their personalities I have nothing to say because they are highly intelligent, highly motivated, extremely intelligent and at least some of these officials are such that any foreign office in any country in the **world can be**

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

proud to have — merely because these officials travel to Sri Lanka, suddenly an attempt is being made to show, that this is the new initiative of the new Prime Minister and a magic will descend on this land overnight. Some emissaries are sent to Rangledash and some emissaries are sent to Pakistan and we are informed that because of this initiative of the new Governmental. Suddenly the whole climate in the subcontinent is going to be transformed overnight. I would like to caution you about such exaggerated hopes. Diplomacy does not work on this kind of exaggerated hopes. I say this because even after you raise these exaggerated hopes, Tamils still continue to be killed in Sri Lanka and they are being killed despite all these exaggerated hopes. Now, is it a criterion of success or failure? (*Time bell rings*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: Kindly finish. I know you are capable of speaking for hours together.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I cannot possibly go against your dictates.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: I would request you to conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would like to caution the Government against such simplicism. If the content of diplomacy is questionable, do not make the conduct of Indian diplomacy exaggeratedly public. Do not raise expectations about it because, as I said, your Government is on probation. You may like my saving this or you may not like my saying this — it is a matter of profound indifference to me — your Government is on probation. If you conduct foreign policy in the manner in which you are doing it now, you will be putting one other minus mark against that probationary report.

I would like to conclude with just one small quotation, and it is something which would perhaps make a greater sense if I had had a chance to say all the things that I wanted to say. But perhaps

we never have in Parliament a chance to say all that we want to say. There is a great need, Madam, in this country— because this Government is on probation— for me to tell them that because you are conducting yourself in the manner in whicij you are, in the context of how you are conducting India's diplomacy, the message which is coming across to some of us, who watch you closely, not with any great friendliness. I accept, but to those who all the time watch you closely, the message that comes across is that your Government lacks *gravitas*. It lacks substance. To put it inelegantly, it lacks bottom.

I would, therefore, now conclude by just reading three or four lines. I would like, through you, to inform the Government, that those in high places are more than the administrators of Government bureaus. They are the custodians of nation's ideals, of the values it cherishes, of the faith which makes a nation out of a mere aggregation of individuals.

Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: Mr. Bir Bhadra Pratap Singh... Not there. Mr. Anand Sharma... Not there. Shri Thanga-baalu... Not there. Shri Bhuvnesh Cha-turvedi... Not there. (*Interruptions*) Shri Shyam Sundar Mohapatra.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDAR MOHAPATRA (Orissa): I am very grateful to you, Madam. Madam...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, what has happened to my name? My name was there. (*Interruptions*) I have no objection; I am very much interested to hear Mr. Mohapatra. But why should we give notice to the Table Office? It is taking chance. When there is an order list of speakers... (*Interruptions*) It happens very often. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHYAM SUNDAR MOHAPATRA: Madam, Vice-Chairman, I must confess that brother Khurshid Alam Khan has a feather oh his cap after this

conference on Namibia. Namibia is as dear to us as any other country where the people are fighting against imperialism and aggrandizement. But my point, Madam is, is this going to succeed. When the Government of India has a media in the USA which has South Africa connection, when you have a media in the USA to project your policy — I raised it in the last Consultative Committee and Mr. Nara-simha Rao said that they were going to enquire into it—what has happened to it—because we have already lost face in the United States, because the various newspapers have come out with these disclosures?. Peace moves have never succeeded during the last 200 years, It is a pious thinking, wishing thinking. But humanity has to proceed with the urge of the people. Right from the 1815 Congress of Vienna, with all the pious wishes of Mettrlinck, Italy, Hero, Gavour, Nepoleon the III, Woodrow Wilson, Gribaldi, the French Revolutionary Maribeau, Bismarck and Tillovyskov, the only Chairman of the League of Nations who tried for world peace, all have failed. The League of Nations failed because of Japanese Invasion »f Manchuria. It could not do anything against the fascist invasion of Abyssinia. Mr. Minister, you are indeed the Chamberlain who goes to Yugoslavia and returns back with "peace with honour". Your attempt in the NAM Conference is laudable. No doubt, it will be frustrated as Chamberlain's attempt was frustrated. Hitler raped Czekoslovakia and annexed it and be annexed 13 countries one after another. Madam, Vice-Chairman, our Indian stars are going to South Africa and you cannot put an embargo on them. Our players are going to South Africa and you cannot put an embargo on them. Your artists are going to South Africa and you cannot put an embargo on them. You speak in the NAM Conference that you are for Namibia. You see that apartheid is there. Tell me where there is no apartheid. Apartheid is there in East European countries. Apartheid is there even in Ceylon where the Tamilians who are there for the last 1000 years are going to be ejected out. I definitely appreciate the Government's policy. Today they are going to help the Tamils. Indians were thrown out of Burma. Indians were

thrown out of South East Asia. Indians Were thrown out of many countries and not a drop of tear was shed for them. Bandaranaike-shastri Agreement, this agreement or that agreement could never help the overseas Indians. Today, for the first time, I must appreciate that the South Indian people are solidly behind the Tamilians' fight for liberation in Ceylon. You could not take up that issue in the NAM Conference.

Madam, we are talking about Namibia's freedom. But we are in Commonwealth conference and the Britishers are helping South Africa. There is already an agreement about nuclear energy. The Foreign Minister of Federal Republic of Germany said only last month in a speech that they are going to build up colleges. They are going to build up marine Colleges. They are going to help them in agriculture. They are going to help them in nuclear physics. And we have a partnership with the Federal Republic of Germany in many spheres of activities. The American Gunboat diplomacy is already in South Africa helping them. Our Prime Minister is going to the United Sta' Why does he not talk to Mr. Reagan that the entire NAM and the whole world is for Namibia's independence? You have to do this or you don't have to do this. Otherwise take a bold stand. Kasselri in his book "World Foreign policy" has said: Foreign Policy abroad reflects the foreign policy at home. If you are not progressive at home, you cannot be progressive abroad. And the confusion through which you are passing, Mr. Minister, will not take you to the proper direction.

Sir, it is all right to fight for Namibia. But we know what is happening to the Indians in African countries. What is happening in Kenya? What is happening in Zambia? What is happening in Nigeria. What is happening in Ethopia. There is a tendency in all these African countries to drive out the Indians from African countries because we are considered the wrong people. I remember that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had sent Dewan Chaman Lai to fight the case of Jomo Kenyatta. Kenyatta was roped, he was chained, he was beaten on the streets of Kenya and Dewan Chaman Lai went from

[Shri Shyam Sundar Mohapatra] India taking the goodwill and good wishes for the African people. That is fast dwindling. You have to do something. In all these African countries, there must be goodwill for India. There are one million Indian people in South Africa. They are very prosperous and very good. They want to have partnership with the black people. A misunderstanding is created by the imperialist powers. Madam, during the Conference we did not discuss about Poli-serio. It is another African country. You try to have good relations with Morocco. You try to have good relations with the Sahara Arab Republic. It is unfortunate. You cannot have relationship with the imperialist power and at the same time you cannot have relationship with the people fighting against that particular imperialist power. You are waiting for the decision of the OAU. But that decision will never come. And a person who has taken all the contracts in Morocco has assured the Moroccan Govt, that Indian Govt will never accept the Polisario Front. It is a shame because I was the person who sent a delegation to the Sahara Arab Republic when I was the General Secretary of the AICC. Thanks to the Prime Minister, he had invited also a group from the Polisario Front to India on behalf of the Indian National Congress. But the policy you are adopting is absolutely dual. It is a dichotomy in your diplomatic policy. You have got to assure the Sahara Arab Republic that you are standing by their side and you support their movement and not support the Monarch of Morocco.

Madam Vice-Chairman, we are in the Non-aligned Movement. And Fidel Castro is also in the Non-aligned Movement. How many thousands of soldiers did Fidel Castro send to different African countries, to the Central American countries and Latin American countries to fight with the people against the usurpers? Why don't you follow that policy? If you want to fight the imperialists, you cannot just fight them by passing resolutions in the NAM Conference. You have got to fight with the people who are fighting. Jawaharlal Nehru sent a Brigade to work with the persons in the Spanish War of Liberation. He sent a medical delegation to China

with Dr. Kotnis and Cholkar and others. Why don't you send a delegation to Namibia? Let it be a medical corps; let it be anything. And that will be in keeping with the foreign policy of the Indian National Congress which was laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. And it is your centenary year. Why don't you send a delegation to Managua? Today, Nicaragua is passing through the greatest hazard of its history. And President Reagan has already got the power to sanction billions of dollars to send arms and ammunition to support the Contra group against the President of Nicaragua. Madam Vice-Chairman, it is an irony of history that we speak something and we do not do the same. When the Falklands war was there, a small country like Argentina was fighting against the might of the British power and Margaret Thatcher was going to use nuclear arsenal against the Argentine people because Jack Anderson had disclosed it (already in the Washington Post. There was no statement by the Indian Prime Minister or the Government that they condemn the British because we are in the Commonwealth. It was we the Members of Parliament here who said that Malvinas is a part of Argentina, the sovereignty lies with the people. Thanks to Mr. Narasimha Rao, I think, in reply to a question in the Lok Sabha, he said it. But we should have been forthright to support the Argentine people's struggle against the USA, against the UK. Here, your policy is faulty. You must be very clear, very precise and very forthright that we are with the people. Madam, there is nothing wrong for Nicaragua or any other country's fighting people to join either the Russian group or any other group. During the last 40 years, after the Second World War, we have what is called the collective defence. There is NATO, there is CEATO. There is Warsaw Pact, there was Comintern, Cominform, there is the ASEAN block and so many other blocks. It is only for self-preservation, blocks. It is only for self-preservation, for collective security. If the Nicaragua Government has joined the USSR or is friendly with Cuba, President Reagan has nothing to do. The whole trouble today, Madam, is that from the helicopters bullets are fired on people on the Red

Cross, on the hospitals, on civilian houses killing thousands of people. And the NAM Conference or the NAM has not been able to achieve anything to stop it. If we cannot stop it, then let us struggle forward. That also we cannot do. It has gone down to the position of passing pious resolutions only. Madam, what is happening in the war between Iran and Iraq? There is senseless bloodshed. The hon. Minister has done everything. He had run to both the countries with his Foreign Secretary, Mr. Romesh Bhandari who is a very knowledgeable person. I appreciate his stand. The United Nations passed a resolution that they should not bombard the civilian houses, the civilian sites, and the civilian installations. But Iranians did it. The Iranians bombarded no less than 13 cities and in retaliation Iraq also did it. The Indian National Congress has got a good tradition of having good relations with the Arab Baath Socialist Party of Iraq. We have signed a Protocol with them. It is a revolutionary Government. On the other hand, the Ko-umeinis are fundamentalists. We cannot support them ideologically but because of the petro-dollar interests we are not able to speak out the truth. And when the hon. Minister went, the Prime Minister of Iraq asked him, first point out the aggressor. It is difficult to point out the aggressor and the aggression. The war should stop. They should go back to the international border. There should be cease-fire. But both the parties are not willing to accede to the request of India, which is the President of the NAM, Then, where is your success? We have failed even with two friends, Iran and Iraq. The war is not stopped.

Now, we are talking about the nuclear war. Today the United States has installations to carry out the nuclear warfare in almost 700 places in Europe. In Britain— it is a shame that the British people have agreed—there are more than 75 U.S. bases and installations in Great Britain. In Germany, it is worse, it has 750 installations. In Belgium there are 35 and in Netherlands more than 50. The whole of Europe has passed into the Pentagon apparatus and that is why the USSR is concerned about it. (*Time bell rings*). So, what can the NAM do? We are a very small power. We have no strength. The

best policy to establish peace is to get stronger. That is what Bismark said, if you are not strong, no body is going to obey you. Even Ceylon, whose military capacity is less than the police capacity of Tamil Nadu, will use its thumb. I have said in the Consultative Committee there is nothing wrong to have an aggressive posture, for the sake of saving humanity. Mrs. Gandhi was the person who stood against the entire might of U.S. and Pakistan in the Bangladesh war, at the time of the Bangladesh crisis in 1971. She emerged a hero, a second personality in global politics. It requires Mr. Rajiv Gandhi to take a stern posture, an aggressive posture, a creative posture to save Tamilians in Ceylon. Ceylon does not belong only to Sinhalese. It also belongs to Tamilians who are there for more than a thousand years. They have become a part of that culture, identified themselves with that culture. We have to take the stand. (*Time bell rings*).

Madam, I want to ask one last question and complete in one minute. Our foreign policy is such as it suits our convenience. Our embassies abroad lack in foreign publicity. Whatever you are doing or you are speaking, the great jobs done by the Government of India, is completely misinterpreted. Pakistan publicity is much more vigorous, much more positive. That has been my experience during the last 15 years. I have visited 82 countries. I have visited most of the countries except Australia and Netherlands and my experience is that our Foreign Office does not have either competent personnel to project our policy abroad or they are only busy in cocktails and dinners and get-togethers here and there. You are opening a Consulate in Milan. First time this has come out. This is in violation of the ban on the creation of new posts within India or abroad. The Government has cleared the proposal to open a Consulate in Milan (Italy) to be headed by an officer of the rank of Joint Secretary. You know, Mr Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, that there is already a slant which is projected in Wall papers, the slant towards West. But our positive friend is USSR by geo-physical compulsion. Let not this slant take us to another side which endangers the safety, security

[Shri Shyam Sunder Mohapatra]
and dignity of this country. Thank you, very much.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Madam Vice-Chairman, we as Indians are proud of many things. Above all, we are proud of our rich cultural and ancient heritage. To talk of modern times, we are proud of being the largest democracy, the most effective democracy which has survived the worst of the traumas in our history and we are equally proud of the foreign policy of our Government. It is some measure of satisfaction that the Government of our young and dynamic Prime Minister has kept the head of our country high in international comity and that is comparatively an easy task for the reason that we are following the great and noble policy of non-alignment which had been laid down firstly by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and thereafter by the late revered leader Indiraji. That is undoubtedly a correct path because it has given us a leadership which is unique and it has given us not any other power, the power to which my friend Mr. Mohapatra referred and to which I will refer a little later while dealing with that question, undoubtedly, it has given us a position of moral authority in the whole world. To quote only recent example, the initiatives taken by our Prime Minister in the Iraq-Iran war, received universal approbation and everybody knew that if one country could bring some sanity to this insensible war sometimes it is comical; sometimes it is farcical but at all times it remains horrendous it is India. Everybody realised that such moral authority rests with India.

To come to some of the basic features and what needs to be done, everybody has said about our relations with our neighbours. I have said it on more than one occasions that there is nothing like having neighbourly neighbours. If we have friendly neighbours, if our neighbours have peace in their land, we have also peace in our land. I have also gone to the extent of

saying that if our neighbours are strong, we may also tend to be stronger and what has been referred to by the hon. Minister of State as offensive of peace and of friendly relations with neighbouring coun-

tries, must be welcomed. And I must not fail in my duty to pay compliments to the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs as also Mr. Romesh Bhandari, the Secretary, whom even the BBC praised while referring to his indefatigable energy in his assignments which have been entrusted to him. . . . (Interruptions) No, he is no relation of mine; we are only related by name, excepting that my name ends with the letter 'e' and he ends with 'i'. But I must say that these are welcome steps. You try to bring about a change. But Mr. Minister, you must not forget the realities. I am glad because I have been saying many things on Sri Lanka from time to time. Last time when I spoke here, I could see a little annoyance when I said that you just change the order of the two phrases. I said, you first put the withdrawal of security forces and then put the violence. You were a little annoyed; I could see that. But time has shown the correct perspective. After a little while, only 2 days ago you made very much the same statement which I made 10 days earlier, that is because we must realise..

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: We learn from wiser men.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I know your compulsions; I know the compulsions of Mr. Bhandari also. When he goes with his brief, he cannot go outside his brief. You are doing a wonderful job. I am not saying that you are not doing that. But you should realise the compulsions and the realities of the situation. We have president Zia. When he meets our revered Prime Minister in Moscow, he is very friendly, over-friendly. It appears as if, we could not have a better friend. But the moment he returns, he does something else. He starts talking of taking over Kashmir. He rakes up the whole issue. As I said, while trying to be friendly, you should, at the same time, realise the compulsions and the realities of the situation. The same thing is with Bangladesh. Therefore, I would like the Government to be more realistic, so far our policy with our neighbours is concerned, particularly with Sri Lanka and Pakistan.

We are placed in an awful situation. The way Pakistan is getting arms. It has at-

ready acquired nuclear weapons. It has also acquired planes to carry these nuclear weapons. If we are going to remain totally blind to all these realities and try to develop merely friendly relations, I think you are absolutely on a wrong path.

Madam, today's world is very very queer world. There is peace everywhere. But the peace is the result of the fear of war. Both the (J. S. S. R. and the U. S. A. are advocating peace because, they really fear war. What is the result? If there was real love for peace, if there was real concern for peace, you should find that the first step would be disarmament, but here, it is a race for armaments. It is something amazing that even a poor country like us, comparatively has to spend Rs. 8,000 crores on our defence budget. And to talk of the billion dollars which Pakistan has invested, is really unimaginable. Therefore, I do not think, we have any other choice, but to think of revising our nuclear policy for peace. We should be in readiness to meet the challenges across our northern frontiers, our northern borders, and be ready to meet the nuclear challenge which, I am afraid, may be there in not a very distant future.

Then, I come to Sri Lanka. There again, the problems have been there since 1976. They are getting aggravated. There is no solution, whatever you may try to do with President Jayewardene. Here, I re-what I had said earlier. Just as the Vnals had lost all control over the situa-

on and have become captives and prisoners of the extremists, which is borne out by the news which appeared in today's newspapers that Bhindranwale's father is

in the head the Akali Dal, I also feel that President Jayewardene is a prisoner of his army. The worst possible atrocities which an army can perpetrate on citizens in any country, are to be found in Sri Lanka. I am not going to suggest that you interfere with their Independence. But you also owe an obligation duty, to almost over a lakh of refugees, who have come and who are now living in India. It is our duty to send them back with honour, safety, security, dignity and protection of their property. I do not know how you

are going to create conditions for this. Of course, I am not in favour of war. It would be a wrong step. But you must have a more aggressive policy. Here, I must really compliment the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs, for his statement in the Lok Sabha the other day. (*Time bell rings*).

One thing should be remembered here. Pakistan is a dictatorial regime. It is serving as a very useful tool in the hands of a super power. Therefore, it is not merely bilateral relations in the case of a power like Pakistan, but several other complicated and extraneous factors, which govern peace in the world, that come into play. The same thing in regard to Bangladesh. All liberties of the people are suppressed there.

Now we are the only largest democracy to have survived. We have a far greater stake to survive than any one of these undemocratic and dictatorial regimes. Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister to have a second look to the policy of appeasement. Let it be only a policy of friendship but not a policy of appeasement either towards Sri Lanka or Pakistan or even Bangladesh for that matter. I would request the Government to put an early end to the various disputes which have been existing between us and Bangladesh, like the sharing of the Ganga water, barbed wire fencing which is coming up again and again, settlement of claims maritime boundary, controversy over the Moore Island and other things. I am glad that we have taken a positive lead in West Asia. Efforts may not bear fruit, but I do not agree with the Hon'ble Member Mr. Mohapatra when he says that if you are more friendly towards Iraq, certainly the war will end, I think this is a very queer logic. It is difficult to understand because there are many aspects of the case. As I said, firstly, it is an insensible war. Secondly, they are attacking the civilian installations. They are indulging in chemical warfare. Many of these things can be removed before a total peace can be ushered in there, but that can be done only if we keep ourselves equidistant from the two warring nations.

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare] Now, I welcome the NAM meet on Namibia. That has been a welcome thing because despite the United Nations declaration on 24th October we are going to celebrate 40 years of the existence of the United Nations—despite the fact that the South African regime were only trustees for Namibia, there has not been greater breach of trust than in the case of Namibia, and therefore, I welcome this. I welcome and reiterate on the floor of the House the support coming from all sections of this House to SWAPO and particularly its President Sam Nujoma, for their valiant battle and war for independence.

There is one thing with which I share my views with Hon'ble Member Shri Mohapatra and it is this and I have done. Our foreign embassies, our foreign missions have a poor performance so far as the publicity of our country is concerned. You have had a festival of India in Great Britain. You will have a great festival of India in France. You will have a festival in the USA, but after that is over, people will forget as to what is happening in India. I will give one small instance and I would like the Hon'ble Minister to answer it in his reply to this debate. Last lune I was in London immediately after the Blue Star operation and the Sikhs there had taken an offensive. They were coming out in large processions. They had burnt the effigies of our late revsred leader Indiraji and what the Indian High Commission did is appalling. There was not even a protest. There was nothing in the newspapers worth noting. There was no publication taken out. I was so shocked. The only thing which I could read in our favour in 20 days was one of the letters which I wrote to the London Times explaining the position. Some shots of late Indiraji were shown, but they were also shown in such an ineffective manner that instead of helping the situation they only showed as if we have no case to project. I would like you to tell me Mr. Minister, what is the literature you have distributed on Punjab in the U.K. or the USA or Canada? The Congressional Committee in U.S.A. is going into the human rights problem and we are

not doing anything about it to meet that challenge. I think time has come for us to strengthen the propaganda machinery of these missions and I am quite sure that the Government will look into it.

All in all, I must end my speech with complete satisfaction over a policy which is a vigorous foreign policy, a policy of non-alignment, a policy of anti-colonialism, a policy of anti-imperialism, a policy of peace, a policy of self-reliance, a policy of just economic and social order among all the nations of the world. Thank you.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM (Kerala): Madam, Vice-Chairman, I would like to join this debate to raise one or two points which I think are more important during a discussion on foreign affairs.

Of course, it is obvious that the main aim of the foreign affairs department is to evolve a policy which will help the country. According to my understanding, the present policy pursued by the Government of India is not detrimental to the interests of our own country. It is a progressive foreign policy. I do not agree with the argument that this policy has already hampered the interests of our country. When we look at the neighbouring countries, we can see the difference between India and the surrounding countries. That is why I said that the foreign policy pursued by the Government is not detrimental to the interests of our country. For instance, recently the Coordinating Bureau of NAM. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: The hon. Member is not audible. Let him come before the mike.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: The Conference of Coordinating Bureau of NAM, held recently in New Delhi, was very successful. I would request the Minister here to implement the decisions taken at that Conference. One of the chief decisions of that Conference is to give all material aid to the liberation movement in South Africa. We all know that Namibia has been struggling for the last four decades for liberation. And now South Africa wants to foist upon them a stooge government. To foil that attempt, NAM

has taken a very good decision of supporting the liberation movement. I do not think, it is a wrong step or it is detrimental to the interests of our country. That is genuine international policy which we wanted to follow. The decision taken by the NAM Conference to give them material aid is a very important decision. I think we should follow it up. That will give a very good impetus to the liberation movements—especially SWAPO—for the future.

Secondly, with regard to the question of peace and the question of war and peace, the foreign policy is very categorical. India is definitely against Government of India is very much worried about the recent developments that are taking place on the international plain. I can very well understand, as some of my friends have already pointed out, that a nuclear war is hanging on our heads at this juncture. The initiative taken by the Prime Minister and the Government of India, along with other five nations, demanding stoppage of activities to create a State of War, is a very important decision that has got a worldwide impact and I think all peace-loving people in the world will support that decision. I am not detailing the foreign policy pursued by the Government. On all these questions, the foreign policy, I think, is not detrimental to the interests of our country. But when I am saying this, I don't mean that there are no defects on the part of the External Affairs Ministry. I can cite a number of examples. This morning, during the question hour, when one or two questions were shortly posed to the Minister, his answers were not categorical—according to me. For instance, on the question of anti-India briefing that has taken place in America, everybody knows who is behind that and now it is very clear that it was sponsored by the American Government itself. But when the question was repeatedly put to the Minister, I found an element of hesitation on his part to say categorically no or yes to that question. I do not know why he is fighting shy on this point. It is very clear now as to who has sponsored this anti-India briefing. On another question relating to the request made by the President of Sri Lanka for getting some military aid from Mrs.

Thatcher, the answer given by the Minister was, "These are the facts and the Member can infer whatever he wants." I want to know what is the real situation, from the Government itself. What is the idea of the Minister on that point? What does he think about it? I think some negotiations are still going on. It is not high time. Some negotiations are still going on the part of the Sri Lanka Government to get military aid to suppress the movement there. That is why I am saying that there is an element of hesitation on the part of the Government of India,

I can give one more example. Recently the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Romesh Bhandari, had toured the neighbouring countries. He had visited Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. I am not against such visits of Foreign Secretaries or Foreign Ministers to neighbouring countries. If possible, we should try to have good relations with them. It is quite good; I am not against such visits. But my point is not that. After that visit, he had issued some statements in the press which, according to me, is very embarrassing. He said that there is definite improvement in the relations between our country and these countries. This is the statement. I ask the honourable Minister: Is it a fact that our relations have improved? I will be very glad if it is a fact. Is it a fact that our relations with Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh have improved? I think it is a very rosy picture, a very unrealistic statement, because this sort of euphoria of immediate improvement of our relations with these countries that can so easily be made is understandable to me. And it is also not true, according to me, because when he makes such statements he doesn't understand the forces that are working behind these countries to destabilize our country. So, what I am saying is, there again I do not know what is in the mind of this Government.

I have read the Report of the External Affairs Ministry and I have also read some of the speeches made by the Prime Minister as reported in the press. There I have found a new phrase coined by the External Affairs Ministry. I do not understand the meaning of that phrase. The phrase is, "Adverse security environment".

I do not know whether the Members understand this phrase. What is this adverse security environment? This is only a semantic exercise to hide the real fact, I want to tell the Minister. I would not have raised this point, unless this point was raised by the Prime Minister. In one of his speeches the Prime Minister himself had used this phrase once. Adverse security environment, what does it mean? When the question of anti-India briefing comes, we are not so sure, Sir, who did this. We know that Pakistan is getting sophisticated arms from America. It is very clear. The American Government itself has been saying that they are supplying the most sophisticated arms to Pakistan. It is a fact, and everybody knows it. And the Sri Lanka's position, everybody knows what it was. Now our Foreign Affairs Department and the Foreign Minister are speaking as a sort of dubious language which nobody can understand, that adverse security environment is there.

Sir, I am coming from Kerala. All of you may be knowing that. This is the first time that I am speaking in the House. It is my maiden speech.

In Kerala, suppose you ask a Namboodri lady, I mean a Brahmin lady, what her husband's name is. She will never say that. She is prohibited from saying that—She will only reply. "The name of my husband is my son's father." She will never say his name. Suppose, she is asked to recite the *numinmi of Narayanaya Namaha* and suppose her husband's name is Narayana, she will never say "Naraya-na". She will say "My son's father Namaha." The Foreign Minister is like that Brahmin lady in Kerala. He does not want to say where the danger is coming from. I do not understand this sort of thing.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: If that lady has no son, how will she address?

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I do not know that. Ask the Minister. He will give you the proper answer.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: He has learnt it from Kerala.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: Then you forget it. We have all forgotten it. (Interruptions) No, no. I am not advising. I am giving only comments, I am not a person to advise you.

What I am saying: Unless you tell the people, unless you take the entire nation into confidence, how are you going to fight this so-called adverse security environment? You cannot fight it out without the co-operation of the people.

I have been listening to the speeches made here. Somebody was saying that our foreign policy is based on phenomenological concept. Somebody was saying that the foreign policy was based on pragmatic considerations. I do not agree with all these metaphysical excerpts. If you are persuaded by these theories of phenomenological explanation, the result will be that you are deviating from correct policy you are pursuing. That will ruin our country. It should be stopped. Why should they hide the fact? You should tell the truth, that is my complaint against the Foreign Affairs Ministry.

Now, Sir, with regard to the question of the Ceylon problem, I want to say a few words: I do not want to take much of the time. Sir, the ethnic problem in Ceylon is not a small problem. It is not a problem which is the concern of only the south Indian people. Somebody was referring to that. I am sorry to say that. That problem, according to me, is a national problem, the number one national problem now. I think the Government must have understood it by now. A number of refugees are coming to India. In addition to that, for the traditional fishermen who are fishing in our own waters — there is an agreement which the Minister knows very well, that we can fish in that water, the Palk Straits, where we can fish—it is impossible to go there. Do you mean that this is only a Tamilian question? Somebody was speaking like that. Some idea was there. It is number one national problem now.

I want to tell the Minister that there is a feeling now that you cannot help it, that the Government of India is quite indifferent to this problem. You have to remove that feeling that the Government of India is not sufficiently pressurising to solve the problem. I am not advocating the theory of sending the army or attacking that country: I am not of that opinion at all. They should put more diplomatic pressure. They should mobilise entire International community to solve this problem. Otherwise, we are going to face another national problem' in the immediate future. This is what I am saying. This is a very serious thing. These are serious defects that I found out in the functioning of the foreign Ministry. I think the Ministry will take into consideration all my suggestions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: Mr. Madan Bhatra

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Madam, Vice-Chairman, the foreign policy of a country is a three-dimensional activity: (1) formulation of policy by its political leadership; (2) its execution by the diplomats and the bureaucrats, and (3) the articulation of its various concepts through public perception and public opinion.

The hon. Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh, on this side, stated in his speech that this policy was for the first time formulated by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru with no background of any historical stand on which this foreign policy could be framed. I respectfully submit that this was not so. What was the foreign policy of Mr. Nehru? He stood up for peace. He stood up for national liberation movements in the world. He stood up for nuclear dis-

armament. He stood up against racialism and against imperialism. He stood up for fight against colonialism.

All these aspects of his policy had their roots in India's ancient history, in India's culture, in India's own fight for her independence. The policy which was framed by Mr. Nehru could not be otherwise than what he actually stood for. It was an articulation of the whole ethos of the Indian nation, the struggle through which the Indian nation had passed. That policy was not merely based on philosophical or moral considerations. That policy was equally consistent with the national imperatives of India. It was India's own security—it was India's own imperative of economic development and self-reliance and it was India's own national imperative to prevent the come-back of imperialistic forces which have the habit of coming back and staging a come back through the back doors and side doors that this policy had to be framed and was consistent with the national imperatives of India...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [UK. (SHRI-MATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: Would you like to continue tomorrow.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I would like to continue tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: I have an announcement to make.

**ANNOUNCEMENT RE. GOVERNMENT
BUSINESS FOR THE WEEK COMMEN-
CING 6TH MAY, 1985**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-MATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the 2nd May, 1985, allotted time **for**